

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
OCTOBER 14, 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, October 14, 2003, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Jackson led the Invocation.

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

Councilman Walford: At this time I would ask that if you have cell phones or pagers to please turn them off or put them on silent so they won't disturb the meeting. And before we move on, there may be some confusion. If there are any of you here involving the case of Randy's Travel Town, that case is not to be heard today. I understand that there were a few people that were here for that. Please understand, that is not on the agenda for today.

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of September 22, 2003 and the Council Meeting Minutes of September 23, 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

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

Mayor Hightower: We've got some visitors with us today from the Russian Health Care Program and they are being hosted by the Shreveport Rotary Club. Larry Howard and Ala Bedfa are here with them today and would ask them to come forward for just a minute. (The participants in the program where recognized and identified and the Mayor made a presentation to each one of them.)

Convention Center Report and Property Standards Program Report.

Councilman Walford: Yesterday, we received the Property Standards Report. Mr. Dark I am assume you are no more--? Mr. Dark: The only Convention Center Report we have, Mr. Chairman, is that this is the week in which bids will be received on Thursday.

Councilman Gibson: Mayor, I've tried to get a hold of the design professional. We are receiving several issues regarding a request, and this came out of the pre-bid conference, the mandatory pre-bid of which we had seven national firms that are bidding on the project turning their bids in Thursday.

One of the items that several of those firms have requested and have called on me to ask you for is some assistance with Slack Alost & McSwaine is there has been a commitment by the design professional at the mandatory pre-bid for a Geotechnical Report that was done on this site, and several requests have been made of the design professional and that information has not been provided. Could I ask for the Administration to make some inquiries of why that geotechnical information has not been provided because it is going to reflect on the competitiveness of these general contractors on the Convention Center Project bids on Thursday?

Mayor Hightower: We will do that.

Councilman Lester: I would just like to publicly announce that the Property Standards Committee is changing its meeting from the 22nd to the 29th. The time will be the same. I've spoken with Mr. Thompson, we are going to get the official notice to everyone but I just want to let staff know that we are making that change.

Public Hearing: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments:

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green for confirmation to the Property Standards Board: Tristan Larson, L Keith Mason, Jr., Brian Joffrion, Louis Wells, Sr., James Moore, Jose Harris, Mattie Wilson, Cleveland White, Lola May, Francis Colicchio

Councilman Jackson: I guess to the Mayor, I asked a question about particularly, I think it was Ms. Lola May who was on the School Board about our, I guess the historical precedence of that and what

was the Administration's disposition—obviously with the name still be up there, I'm assuming that something happened?

Mayor Hightower: Actually, I have to apologize to you, nothing happened. I didn't do anything after we had talked about that at the last meeting.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I would have liked to offer, what I guess would be an amended motion, to minus that name, to confirm the others.

Mayor Hightower: That's fine.

Councilman Jackson: I need a second.

Mayor Hightower: I would give it to you, if I could.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to eliminate Lola Mays' name.

Councilman Lester: I guess my question would be to the Administration, is there a set number of people that are on this Board? I mean, could we expand as opposed to contracting on the Property Standards Board. I am not aware of, statutorily, does the statute say that we have to 10 people and we can't do 12 or something of that nature?

Mayor Hightower: I don't know if it does or if it doesn't, but I know we can certainly operate with the absence of one member, so we'll look into that before we make a replacement for Ms. May.

Councilman Lester: Well my question was going to, do we have to, I understand what Councilman Jackson was saying, but I don't think that we are crossing any particular threshold by adding someone that just so happens to be an elected official given the fact that she has done a lot for the Queensborough neighborhood and is the Executive Director of the QNA. I was just thinking in that capacity, I don't think that she would overshadow her service on the School Board with the something that would prevent her from serving on this board especially given the fact that I don't think that they are going to be making any (inaudible) policy other than following the recommendations from the Council.

Councilman Jackson: My concern was, that it was appointment and certainly don't want to not have representation from Queensborough. in general. But I mean, I would even solicit the Vice President or some other officer to be involved. I just didn't know and without having an answer to that question from the last time if we are going to move forward and proceed with it, I would like to have that question answered.

I think logically what you said is probably true and I thought it the first time. I just don't know as a matter of fact, and so as not to hold up the rest of it, I was just suggesting that maybe you substitute someone else, and if it was okay then that was another thing, but not having had the answer to that, I was moving to confirm contingent on her name not being on the group but certainly not excluding Queensborough representation and I would hope maybe at the next meeting we could confirm another person either to take that spot or her at that particular time.

Councilman Lester: Could I ask that maybe procedurally that we just postpone action on the whole scenario until that question is answered especially since that board hasn't been operating at this particular time. I would hate to single somebody out at this particular.

Mayor Hightower: I'm pretty certain that it is okay as far as the statue is concerned for an elected official to serve on there, but Councilman Jackson had some concerns about that before but there are other boards we have elected officials on: the Sports Authority, Carl Pierson who is with the Caddo Parish Commissioners Office and so forth. I know we can do it, but I don't object if there is an objection or if there is someone better suited to serve in that spot, I am certainly fine with that maybe Councilman Jackson will be willing to ride with his motion, if that is what the Council wants to do.

Councilman Walford: To give a perfect analogy to that one, Mr. Alvin Mims is an elected member of the Caddo Parish School Board and serves on the Zoning Board of Appeals. I can call Mr. Kirkland up if necessary, but I know that has been thoroughly researched and there was no legal problem. So with that in mind, I would offer a substitute motion to go back and include all the names.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester to include all of the names.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Mayor, I don't want to sound like a broken record, but what I mentioned yesterday, have those records been checked?

Mayor Hightower: I don't know the answer to that, but we will be sure those are done.

Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Hogan and Jackson. 2.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda. Motion by Councilman Lester to add the following to the agenda (no second). Councilman Walford: Hold that.

Councilman Green: Can we add them one by one or should we just add them all together?

Mr. Thompson: If there is a reason, if you would like to, take them one at a time. We can.

Councilman Green: I would just like for each one of them to stand on their own merits.

1. Resolution No. 173 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the employment of Special Legal Counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Councilman Gibson: Point of Order. I think, if I am not mistaken, I would like to get a ruling from the Chair, we had a motion on the floor to begin the process to accept these additions in their totality by Councilman Lester.

Councilman Walford: But there was no 'second' for that.

Councilman Gibson: I understand that, but we hadn't gotten to that point, yet. You cut him off before a 'second' was (inaudible).

Councilman Walford: I did and asked that we finish discussion. If Councilman Lester wants to go ahead with his motion and there is a 'second' it is certainly in order. It had died for lack of a 'second', that is correct.

Councilman Gibson: But you cut me off before I had a chance to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: Okay.

Councilman Lester: My question was, are we at the point that we can add the legislation at this particular time?

Councilman Walford: We are indeed. If there are any other additions, we may take them up now, per a motion with a second, take them up individually.

Councilman Green moved that they be taken individually, seconded by Councilman Hogan. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Jackson. 1.

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

2. Ordinance No. 175 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the Northwest corner of Greenwood Road and Bert Kouns Industrial Loop, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-3, Commercial Business District, to I-1, Light Industrial District, and I-1 (SPI-2), Light Industrial (Industrial Park Overlay) District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford to add the ordinance to the agenda for Introduction. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester,

Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

3. Confirmation of Appointment: Danny W. Malone, Downtown Development Authority.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson to add the confirmation to the agenda.

Councilman Hogan: I am going to ask again if Mr. Malone's record has been checked?

Mayor Hightower: I don't know that either. I feel confident that he is in good shape, but we'll do that.

But on your prior question, on the Property Standards Board, I was just told that they were all checked and all checked out fine.

Councilman Hogan: If you could, if we'll go ahead and vote, I'm in favor of it. You can get that information to me later, that will be fine.

Mayor Hightower: We'll do that.

Councilman Walford: Councilman Hogan we are only voting for introduction not for confirmation.

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

Public Comments.

Wilbert A. Williams (2755 Circle Drive): I would like to thank you for being here. I am the President of North Shreveport Development Corporation, which presents the MLK Area, Cherokee Park, Lakeview, Agurs Business District, and North Highlands. I am here today in opposition for the zoning change, Item No. 144.

Several months I was here before this same body representing the housing in the Phase IV that they were building. So, I am not here against building houses. I am here against the zoning change. The reason for this, I have right at 400 signatures here, you should have them in your package that I have passed out to each one of the Council members that we think that this is a bad precedent to set because in North Shreveport we are trying to develop businesses. We can build all the houses we want to, but if we don't have businesses and jobs, there is no rent that is going to be paid or no mortgage. Some of the business that is in this area already, I've talked to some of the managers and CEOs of it, they are in the future plan of expanding.

I don't want to lose another business to Bossier City. You know, if we get these houses built here, I know of one particular that is going to move out and expand in Bossier City so this is revenue that the City is losing. And, I'm quite sure it is a time of doing all of the budget crunch, this is money that we don't need to lose in Shreveport.

Two weeks ago the City of Shreveport sent me a letter to come and talk to the Community Development Board, to partnership with them to try to get more business on North Market. You know it is sort of hard for me to go before a business and explain, to come to Shreveport to establish a business in an industrial zone or a commercial zone and four or five years later or ten years later we change it to residential. It is a bad precedence. You know, you have got several members that is going to speak on it. It is a safety factor. You know, we can do all the pros and con about it.

I was a diesel mechanic for 30 years. You can't stop an 18-wheeler on a dime. There is no brake system in the world going to do it. I am a certified brake and electrical, AFC and not

only is it a safety factor but we just don't need to lose another business to Bossier.

Gene Land (1809 Corporate Drive): I own Nation Chemical. I was hoping I might speak a little later after some of the other things had come up, but I'll go ahead and tell my little story.

Basically, of course the history being that the zoning for the case 144, of course has gone through the professional body of the MPC which is looked at the ideas as far as the pros and cons of this, the members of the MPC board have looked at it, and they have voted 7 to nothing that it was not necessarily a good business decision. When we have a body like that, of course, I don't think it is very often that ya'll change what they might say, you do have that option of course by the form of government.

But in looking at this application of course this is one step into an application to build a housing development which as other people will probably mention, I am not against housing. I am against the housing in industrial area. And this is an application step in a federal funded project and so in doing so we want to be sure that we bring all of the truths and the things out that are facts and they are not any type of rumor or things of that nature so in that consideration, I would ask ya'll to look at it under that realm.

Also, I'd like to reiterate what Mr. Williams says that the future of Shreveport is based on decisions that you might make on this. Because it is not easy to get businesses to come to any community. It is very competitive just as in my business, it is competitive particularly with the economic situation, as it is. So, if we go or you go as a body and make a decision saying hey, we are going to change this zoning in this I-2 area, then it is very difficult for, say for the Chamber of Commerce or the North Shreveport Development group to go out and tell a business 'hey, come here. It is a good place. We want you here. We want your jobs, and we want the income for our community and then we are going to turn around, three years from now, we are going to change the zoning next to you.' It is very difficult for those people to make that type of decision and if we do, then the word get out. Yeah, Shreveport may not be the best place to go and so I would like for ya'll to entertain these ideas in making your decision and I appreciate your time.

Hugo Holland (501 Texas Street, 5 Floor): I am going to be very brief. I have a PowerPoint presentation prepared if the Council needs to see it. I don't plan on taking my full three minutes unless there a question from the Council.

I am standing up here representing as an Attorney not only National Chemical Company, but Frankies' One-Stop which is a business in the area affected, Frack Lights and Equipment, Corporate Roofing, Inc. and Signal Equipment Company.

I have a five page letter prepared I sent to Mr. Lester, that I requested be sent to all the Council. I need to know if ya'll have that. I have copies just in case you don't. Everything I need to say is in this letter and I am going to ask that a copy be made a part of the record.

Let me just say this very briefly. In the letter you will find very important information about the unfortunate but undeniable increase in crime that comes with changing zoning from an Industrial to an R-3. But more importantly, what you are going to find, at least with the businesses I represent which represent 44 employees and \$9.4 million dollars in gross sales in this City every year, they are unauthorable opposed to this rezoning.

What you will also find in that five page letter, which by the way, Ms. Clerk was provided last week for distribution, you will find that even though the national concerns that are located in this industrial park, such as the Pepsi Distributorship and Frito Lay can not take an official position. Between the two of them, they represent over \$30 million dollars of gross annual sales in the City of Shreveport and over 100 employees and they are opposed to this rezoning change as well.

The reasons for the opposition for rezoning which you will find in my letter are very brief.

1. There is industrial traffic in this area 24-hour a day, 7-days a week. And I am not talking about industrial traffic, 4-wheel vehicles. I am talking 18-wheelers. And at least in the case of National Chemical Company, they are transporting hazardous and corrosive materials. National Chemical Company which is located in this industrial drive, actually has to comply with certain state and federal regulations, which could compromise homeland security. The bottom line is none of these businesses moved to this industrial zone, so they would have to deal with residential traffic.

2. There are no sidewalks on any of these streets. The street lights are not designed for residences and simply speaking, one of the reasons they are there is because the traffic just won't—safety would be compromised if we have residences in the area.

And again, in addition to what is in the letter, let me say this. There are other sites that are better suited for this housing project. None of these businesses are against housing project. We are just against it in this industrial park. There are already three housing projects in the area, but they all face North Hearne so that none of the residential traffic has to come through the industrial area.

I think that Cambridge Court, the limited liability corporation or the partnership or whatever it is, that made application for this re-zoning, took a gamble. When they purchased this property, they gambled that the businesses in the area were not going to oppose a change from I-2 to R-3 and they lost the gamble. Now, it would be good for them business-wise I suppose if the businesses didn't oppose it because they already have some projects in the area and the same managers that run the projects, can also manage these additional projects but the fact is, the projects that exist simply don't impinge on the businesses in the area, other than the increased crime rate whereas changing the I-2 zoning to R-3, which is what Cambridge Court is asking this Council to do even though the MPC voted unanimously not to do it, would impinge on every single business in the area.

Again, I'll be happy to answer any questions if there are any but again Mr. Clerk, I'd ask that a copy of that letter be made a part of the record.

Travis A. Miller (6745 North Club Circle): What we've heard is mostly BS. The truth is, did we purchase this property, true, to build express purpose of building residential housing. There are five (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) projects in this area that are multi-family. One going back 20-years ago, which is the Barton Street Housing belongs to the Housing Authority which abuts Hunter Park. We have the Villa Norte Apartments which has been there about 15 or 18 years which abuts Hunter Park. We've built four and building another one on North Hearne that abuts Hunter Business Park. So we are not doing anything that, you know, we are not breaking new ground out here.

This location, Cambridge Court on Nelson Street, at the end of Nelson Street is not part of Hunter Business Park. It is outside of the Park, it is across the street. This property has been for sale for 30-years and no takers. It is classified as a difficult development zone, in an enterprise zone simply for the reason there has been no development or development has been declining in this area for many, many years.

This belonged to the Hanes Estates. I think our opponents tendered that maybe there was a buyer maybe for this property or somewhere out there. There is no buyer for this property. We bought it in 2002 and they hadn't had a call on it in 20 years, according to the owner.

The number one concern they had was crime. The truth is since 1999 when we built the

first ones on North Hearne, crime has been reduced. There is good reason for that. We've got a lot of eyes and ears watching what is going on out there. We got citizens who are watching for themselves for safety as well as those businesses on Barton Drive, so crime has been diminished.

We have security. Another reason that the crime is down, we have security every night on the apartments that we have now. They have a golf cart. They ride through at night. They have cell phones where they can contact if there is any suspicious activities, they contact the Shreveport Police Department. They also keep an eye out for these businesses. We have been actually helping them at no cost to them.

We have what we call a 'cop shop' at Devourshire Apartments where the Shreveport Police has a key to our office. They can come in and drink coffee, they can make their telephone calls. We have computer hook-up if they want to do that and Cambridge, we are going to have a little separate office. We are going to call it our cop shop. This is being done in a lot of other cities around the nation and it works very well. The police are there. They are constantly coming in on a 24-hours a day, they can use that office. We are going to furnish that.

They talked about on the Planning Commission, about noise. I don't know what noise they are talking about. Their noise don't bother us—any jack hammers or drilling rigs over there. Maybe they are talking about our noise. Maybe they don't want to hear the children laugh and play, that is the only noise we make but we did agree to plant trees along Nelson Street as a buffer. We agree to screen the area, put a gated community there so that we will have better control of that so they don't have to look at those kids over there playing, I guess that bothers them.

Traffic. Nelson Street is a dead-end. Every car that comes by there, has to almost come to a stop to make a left turn on Corporate Boulevard. Either turn left or they are coming out Corporate so we will have a natural safety zone there that the average feet according to my wife, who did the survey out there, was 12 to 15 miles an hour. She also counted the cars. There is 1500 cars a day. Three 18-wheelers. On Hearne Avenue there is probably 40,000 cars and a thousand 18-wheelers, not has been a problem. So traffic is not a problem. With the natural speed zone that we have, and our kids they don't play in the street. It says, well they play inside, behind the fence in a gated community with playgrounds and a lot of sitting area out there.

Chemical Spill. I don't know anything about, you know, what this chemical company has. If it is that kind of dangerous maybe they ought to move somewhere else. Hell, I don't know, maybe it is a whole danger to North Shreveport. Or maybe we ought to put up a fence around it or something, but we do have a plan, an evacuation plan as we always have in all of our units. In case of emergency, here is your evacuation plan. It is posted at the office and every tenant is aware of it.

Business Support. We have a lot of business support on North Market, the retail people are happy to have us. I think you have something in your file attesting to that. There business is going to increase and they are happy to have us there. The site is a great site. If it was, it would have been a slam dunk in my mind, this site because it was ideal for what we wanted. It is isolated. There is nobody around. The street separates it from anything else. It is in walking distance of shopping and grocery stores, and all of that. Tenants love the area where it will be built, the ones that are waiting for it (some have been waiting for many years.)

So that listing been available for 20 something years. We now turn it into tax, \$2.8 million dollars, and if it is true, there is \$5 dollars spent for every dollar that you put into development, then we are going to do a lot for the North of town, and we are happy about that.

We just want to supply decent, safe, sanitary and affordable housing for the people in that

area who deserve it, who waited a long time and who want it for (inaudible).

So if it is not about traffic. It is not about chemicals. It is not about noise. It is not about safety. If it is not about the crime. What's it about? We all know the answer to that I think without me having to say it so, I urge you to reverse the decision of the MPC and allow R-3 zoning.

Clint Simon (308 Decatur Court): I am actually here to speak on Item 148, the zoning appeal of the Harders property. I am here to speak in favor of it. I have not seen or am not aware of the persons who appealed it having appeared today. I am here to answer any questions or to rebut any of the opposition to the decision of the MPC in granting the zoning change. Other than that, I really don't have much to add. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer those or I would like to be afforded the opportunity to rebut any opposition that may arise later in the session.

Bill Good (404 Atkins Avenue): It is temporary housing and I'm an applicant to live in the Cambridge Apartments that are being proposed.

I suffer from severe panic attacks and as a former pastor who has fallen on hard times, I'm part of the homeless masses that need a helping hand and a hand up and I want to live in a place that is safe, affordable, and that would motivate upward mobility.

I went out to the present facility out at Yorkshire and there I found the wide streets, neat lawns, wonderful people. I had the opportunity to meet with three of them, one who has lived in the area for 4 months, another one who lived for 18-months, and another for 4 years. And each one of the units were well kept, well maintained, and they had rules and regulations and each one of the residents that I talked to spoke so highly of the management and highly of the security. The fact that there were no drugs. The fact that there was a coalition of young people and old people living together in harmony. I find out today that there are 76 young people at the Berkshire Apartments under the age of 12 and they are planning a Halloween party for these kids. They provide a library for them, playgrounds for them, and the streets are wide, the lawns are well-maintained and the people are generous to one another and kind and I want to call that place, home. And I know that there are many out there, just like me, who would love to call a place like that home and in that way they can become more vital members of the community, more responsible members of the community, and they'll feel safe and that is what I want to feel, is safe and I look forward to this being approved so that others like me can have a place to live and call home.

Excuse me, there are two others to follow me. Do I announce them or...?

Councilman Walford: No, we will take care of it, Sir.

The Chairman acknowledged the request to speak of Chasty Moore who had left Chamber.

Vanessa Casey (2120 North Hearne, Apartment 204, that's the Berkshire Court Apartment): I just wanted to say that I've been living there since June. At that time, I'm a Vet and I've been living in Shreveport since 1980. I worked 17 years at Libby Glass and because of the work, it tore my body down. I've got some physical things going on with me. So, I was scheduled for a knee replacement surgery and the place that I was living in, I had to be out by the first of June and if these apartments were not available, I would have been homeless plus facing this major surgery.

The management there, they are great. They will work with you. It has been a Godsend. I live in one of those three apartments that you are talking about where there is so much traffic and everything, if there was more apartments like that there.

Going to Kroger's, if you live in those three apartments, we do take the back way to Kroger's. There is a Frito Lay Company there, there is a Pepsi Company there, but there is not that much traffic. Like the gentleman before me said, there are 76 kids in our apartment complex and I've lived there since June, and I did not realize it was that many kids there, it is that peaceful. There is a place for the kids to play and they play there.

I don't understand everything about the zoning, I really don't, but I live there, and I see that it is a positive place for the community, that it will help the community to have another apartment complex there. Where this one is proposed, you don't have to go through that business area at all to get to the businesses that are on North Market.

I had considered moving there, but it is going to be two-story and with my knees, I can't climb stairs. Also, those that are with me that are not opposed to this, would you guys stand. There are a lot of people that have friends and neighbors that would really benefit from this (20 people stood).

And like I said, I'm a Vet and I've worked all my life, but we all sometimes fall on hard times and this is a place, this is a help for the neighborhood.

Rick Berry (315 Clyde Fant): I am representing Harrah's Casino this afternoon on your repetitive driving ordinance, that is coming up.

Our support for the passage of this repetitive driving is in the last five weeks, the last night repetitive or the circling of downtown especially on the weekends, has hurt our business tremendously. We've had to hire 10 deputy sheriffs to come work the intersections. We've had to turn off the traffic lights to keep the traffic moving in a continuous circle. You see the same cars pass by over and over, especially the ones that stand out in your eye that are really, I mean they are nice automobiles that people fixed up, so they stand out as we see them come by.

And what it has done is that the people from Texas that is using I-20 to get off on Spring Street, the traffic is stacked up all the way up Spring Street, they can't get off and what do they do, they go to Bossier City. And Saturday nights, the weekends, Friday night, Saturday night and Sunday, those are our big (inaudible) in the casino business. This has really put a damper on us.

Councilman Gibson: I am going to comment at another time, but kind of give me, I'm looking at this similar to Las Vegas. Las Vegas has a Strip and there are cars bumper to bumper up and down that Strip. And I've been on that Strip many times to attend Conventions out there and you go from casino to casino seeing the sights and things of that nature, and I'm not aware in talking with the City of Las Vegas officials out there, that they have any similar ordinance to try to put in play to try to legislate this thing into play. And, I guess I would like to hear your comments of what makes us so much different from Las Vegas which has a lot more volume of traffic than here in Shreveport?

Mr. Berry: Yes, sir, I'll attempt to do that. 1. We are a drive-in market, basically. Las Vegas is not. Most people fly in or they drive in and they stay. They take cabs they have transit there. They have the mono-rails from casino to casino. We don't have that. Getting down there is the issue. I would say probably 95% of our customers are all driving in trying to get into the parking garage. The parking garages are filled. Everything we have and they can't park. They can't get in there. The customers have told us that it has taken sometimes from 45 minutes to 50 minutes to get from Spring when they got off down to even try to get into our parking lot.

Councilman Gibson: Well let me ask you this. I'm hearing that is a parking problem not a cars up and down the street. Maybe the casinos need to build 2 to 3 more additional stories to their parking garage.

But again, I'll take exception with you in the fact that in Las Vegas most of the

conventioners, and I will tell you I've got a lot of experience out there from the number of conventions I've attended out there, it is almost impossible sometimes to get rent cars out there. Most people do not use cabs, they use rent cars.

And, again I am trying to in my mind, determine what the difference between Las Vegas and (inaudible) a multi-mile Strip out there with a ton of cars and the Shreveport Riverfront? And all I hear is a parking issue and to me, lets focus on parking and lets not focus on the street?

Mr. Berry: I think it is a combination of both, Mr. Gibson. I think it is a combination of the lack of parking, absolutely. There is a definite shortage of parking. We've done a parking survey and it is in the works now of coming out but there is only so much parking in that area. But a lot of it too is, the circling and cruising of people wanting to show off the cars and driving around through the district and out.

Councilman Gibson: And again, I am still trying to differentiate the fact that in my experience out in Las Vegas when I've gone up and down the Strip, I like to go and see all the sights and lights and things of that nature, and spend a lot of time moving up and down and going to conventions on that Strip, but I don't see their remedy of passing some kind of cruising ordinance or the have the Las Vegas Police Department covered up with trying to maintain that.

My concern is, we are going to tie up a lot of resources with the Shreveport Police Department in trying to adhere to a piece of legislation to regulate something that seems to be more of parking issue than it does a traffic issue?

Mr. Berry: And of course we can look at these generally. I look at it another way, I spent a lot of time in Las Vegas too of going out there and I think a most of the people use a lot of mass transit or cabs. They don't get in a car and they drive down the Strip and then turn and come back around and drive down the Strip again.

But, this is not a sole fix for down there, absolutely not. I'd be telling you a story if I said that was going to fix it but I think it is a tool that the Police Department can use to help regulate it when they deem necessary. On Thursday night, naturally you wouldn't need it but on a Saturday or Sunday, they are or Friday or Saturday night late, they may want to use it. We are in support of this to have it in case they needed it, they can use it.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Berry, if I may. You and I have been down there the wee hours of the morning, correct?

Mr. Berry: Absolutely.

Councilman Walford: I believe we stood for a long time at Caddo and Parkway. If your parking garage would have been 10 stories higher, would it have made any difference? No.

Mr. Berry: No.

Councilman Walford: They weren't trying to go in your garage, were they?

Mr. Berry: Right.

Councilman Walford: They just wanted to go—they weren't trying to go in Hollywood's garage, as I recall.

Mr. Berry: And what we are getting, the police officers that we have working these intersections, it is the same folks you know, going back and forth.

I did bring a, I just picked up one on my way out. It is October 20th tape. If you would like it, I can leave it with you. You are more than welcome to look at the traffic and how it is, and you can see the—if you haven't been down there and really experienced it, it is hard for some, if you would like that.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Berry, it appears to me that you have created, I guess, what we would call in my business an 'attractive nuisance'.

Mr. Berry: I wouldn't refer to it as that, but you can.

Councilman Lester: Well, let me explain myself. You've spent millions of dollars on lights, landscaping. At one time they even used high powered search beams to get people to come and visit what, about a block square area, when we are talking about the Riverfront in terms of the two casino properties.

Mr. Berry: Yes, sir.

Councilman Lester: We've even gone as far as to develop the space under the bridge and one of the casino properties, the lower level of their parking garage to bring more people in.

It seems to me that we are in a scenario where we have created an open invitation for people to come and I think the problem is, that people are coming, we have a crowd (and I could be dead wrong on this, but I don't think I am) that we have a crowd, we just don't have the crowd that we want.

And second of all, the crowd that is there may not be frequently the business that created the crowd. So what we have is a scenario where, I think the real issue is, from your perspective, how do I separate the crowd that is there from the crowd that I want to drive in and come to my establishment. Would that be a fair statement in terms of where you are?

Mr. Berry: Myself or Harrah's and Hollywood, yes we are there to attract gamers and that is what we spent the millions of dollars on, yes. When we have the other folks coming down there that aren't interested in any of that or interested in the Red River District or interested in the eateries that circling, that hurts everybody.

Councilman Lester: Right. So we spent a lot of money to bring people to this area. I guess my thing is, the question that I have and you might not be the party to answer this is, what are we going to do, what opportunities are we going to give for people that want to congregate, if you understand, what I'm saying? I mean. . . .

Mr. Berry: I understand what you are saying.

Councilman Lester: And the other question that I have or the other concern that I have is, how are we going to enforce the cruising statute? Is it going to be something that is going to be selectively enforced? Is it going to be enforced against one group versus another? This type of car versus the other? The first time I see you, the second time I see you, the third time I see you?

I mean, I would think that what we should do and I think you hit the nail on the head earlier, we have a problem. Because quite obviously, if people aren't coming to your establishment then, you aren't making any money. If you are not making any money, the thousands of people that are employed that are citizens of our City don't have job security and quite obviously, we don't have revenues flowing into our tax coffers. And, I think I heard you say earlier that if this was the panacea then that would be one thing, but this is not and we need to dress a holistic approach.

I guess my comment and my concern would be before we go out and try out this statute in terms of anti-cruising, then maybe we should look at what is causing a group of people that don't want to frequent your business and the other businesses in that area, what can we do to give them an opportunity to drive around and do whatever? Because, there has got to be something that they want to do and I think if we maybe we come up with some alternatives, I think we can solve that problem. But I agree with you there is a problem but I don't think that this is going to be the answer to it. In fact, I think this could cause more problems than we actually solve.

Mr. Berry: Mr. Lester, I don't think this is the silver bullet that is going to fix it, absolutely not. But I think it is just a resource that the police could use if they need to and that is

what we are in support of.

Councilman Lester: Well let me ask this, has there been any group discussion or any group task force put together relative to finding alternatives places for people to go? And, as I appreciate it, you have a strong contingent of young people that are down in that area as well as people that are basically, cruising around. Have we sat down and kind of assessed whose actually down there and where we could provide opportunities for those people or people that don't want to game to go?

Mr. Berry: Personally, I haven't. No, sir.

Councilman Lester: Okay, okay. Thank you.

Councilman Green: I don't have just a basic question for you, but I would like to say, basically in America it makes me free to do whatever I please as to, in the bounds of the law.

How many times I can drive down the street is not basically, freedom. Sometimes I go down I-20 ten times a day and would feel bad if they said, well you can only go down there five.

I like looking at all the lights at the boats, but for the fear some of my Deacons would catch me on that street, I don't to much go down there. But if there was a case or a scenario whereas I was with Pastor Jackson and we were waiting for the crowd to get light and one of us was going in, we would have to keep going down the street and we get stopped then we would be in bad shape.

But I just think, I would like to help you, but I don't think this is, as you said, the silver bullet to do it. I think possible we would have to do a possible study as to another better way because then who pays for the police and how many policeman will we have out there to watch whose going up and down the street, I just think that it could be done a better way.

And, that is just basically what I have just—because as I too am in America, there are a lot of other folk who want there freedom to go wherever they please. If they can get the gas, as high as gas is, if you get that much gas to go up and down the street, I just think that there should be a better way and that is just my comment.

Councilman Hogan: I would like to recommend that we discontinue further debate until we reach this item on the agenda.

Councilman Walford: We are not debating the item. These are questions for Mr. Berry, and I admit that several people are beginning to turn it into debate but if there are other questions for Mr. Berry, if not we will call the next speaker.

Councilman Jackson: Will he be around when we get to it on the agenda?

Councilman Walford: I am sure if the Council desires to call Mr. Berry up, he'll wait. Am I speaking for you there, Mr. Berry?

Mr. Berry: You are fine. I will wait around if you would like.

Marque Washington with Hollywood Casino (451 Clyde Fant Parkway): And I too stand here in favor in support of Ordinance No. 143 and I do understand where your concerns are regarding this ordinance and I do understand that there may need to be conditional parameters placed in here.

However, when we have worked over the last nine Saturdays nights from 11:30 to 4 o'clock there are two very serious issues that come up.

First of all, it is a life safety issue for because those hours of 11:30 and 4 a.m. in the morning then you have gridlock traffic down in the downtown, what is defined as, the downtown riverfront area then there is a serious problem for emergency vehicles to get equipment and get those vehicles into the downtown area. That is certainly a serious concern for us because of the

large number of people that frequent our establishment.

The one is, it does affect our ability to do business and it is not just parking. We do recognize that and we do realize that it is not just parking however, parking is a part of it. And, in the essence of time, I am not going to repeat all of the things that Mr. Berry said, because we echo a lot of the same comments but I would be happy to answer any questions that you have, but we do stand in support of this ordinance as well.

Councilman Green: I just thought that I would say this to my member, that I am going to be doing some serious praying, but the time we get to this item.

Ms. Washington: Yes, sir.

Councilman Green: But just in case I vote the wrong way, don't cut back on my Love offering.

Ms. Washington: Yes sir, duly noted.

Councilman Gibson: This is kind of along the lines of good corporate citizenship in which all of this comes in the full circle. I guess the question I have for the company that you work for, we have some businesses down in the entertainment district that made some statements here three or four weeks ago, that said that ya'll have a policy whether written or unwritten within your casino whether your employees can patronize those businesses down in the entertainment district. Is that an accurate statement?

Ms. Washington: I do exactly recall what was said, and no that is very inaccurate. Our employees can go where and whenever the pleased to go.

What we ask them to do is to please not wear their uniforms anywhere. We don't specify whether it is Red River District establishments, but we ask them if they are costume to please change clothes before they leave the casino. But, a number of employees frequent those establishments. You go into some of the nightclubs after our grave shift gets off, you will see a number of our employees in costumes still.

Councilman Gibson: Well I just want to clarify that because again, this all comes down to teamwork. And, again I hadn't had a chance to visit with you, but seeing that you had a chance to come up here and talk on an issue that involves good corporate citizenship, I want to clarify for the record because there were some statements here three or four weeks ago that raised some flags with me because that didn't sound like the corporation that had committed to this community.

Ms. Washington: That is exactly right and thank you for bringing that up. And I would just like to say, that we certainly have a very special interest in making that this district is very successful. It helps our business, it helps the community, and it helps them.

Councilman Walford: Ms. Washington, before you sit down. You and I also took a walk around I believe the entire district very early morning. And would you explain to the Council members the impact that the gridlock has on your customers coming into either the garage or the valet parking and the problem you have with the valet parking, getting out and to the customer. What, basically what ya'll showed me.

Ms. Washington: The problem comes in very similar to what Mr. Berry has stated. When a guest gets off of I-20 onto Spring and they try to get to the garage, we have limited access to the garage in by way you can get in. We don't allow left-hand turns on Clyde Fant, so we are asking all of our customers to go down to the Fannin Street exit and then turn and come back up so they can make a right-hand into the garage.

Fortunately, they have difficulty they have difficulty just getting to Fannin Street when

there is cruising going on. It puts so much pressure on the garage. Not only can they not get into the garage, but if Traffic Street is not cut-off, they can't even get out of the garage from our back entrance. And for those, and it is not just our customers that are in our garage, lets just be frank about this, depending on what time it is, anybody down there that is in the garage is going to have difficulty getting out whether it be employees and we encourage employees not to park in the garage on Saturday night specifically but it puts pressure on us trying to get people in and out of that garage efficiently and effectively.

And I think because of the traffic plan that we have in place, that we placed in the downtown area, that we've worked with the Chief of Police, with our Councilman, and other law enforcement agencies, we've got a very efficient plan in place right now. It is costing everyone a lot of money to do that and it is just a temporary fix.

I do agree that we do need to come together, all come together and try to figure out something that is long-term. We still think that this is a step in the right direction because it is in done in other areas around the country, no it isn't done in Las Vegas, but it is done in other areas around the country where there is entertainment district and there is no cruising allowed.

Councilman Gibson: Could you cite specifically other parts of the country?

Ms. Washington: I can't speak to that right now, I don't have that information, but I could get it from Mr. Chairman to share that information with us.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you.

Pastor Michael Brown (6906 Henderson Avenue): I've just heard the good people at Hollywood and Harrah's talk about this new cruising law and I've heard so many endless hours that Mr. Walford you have spent down at the district, all night long.

When LSU and Miami played, you couldn't get down in that area. Nobody wanted to institute a law then. Gambling game in to play. Southern game in to play. Everyone goes down toward the district because they got the daiquiri place down there, everybody hangs under the bridge now. It is strange and nobody else would say it, and I want to say that this City is so sweet and kind, it is the All-American City and you can't tell me, I want to know whose is cruising?

Because I see this as targeting one group of people that are cruising. Now, the boat won't say that. As long as you go in, they want you to gamble. I am saying to you that at the cost of having this boat these boats here, I don't want them to rule how we drive up and down the City.

I think this is going to target towards African-Americans. I think that it is going to target to a certain group of people. How you going to enforce the law if I drive one, are you going to be saying that is your third time. Oh, that is your second time and then you going to give me a ticket.

It is hard to find parking down in that place so am I going to be penalized because I can't find a parking place? I think it is a parking issue. If the boats wants to solve the problem, build some more parking spaces, I can care less whether you do but to say that you are just so concerned about bumper—don't we want traffic? Don't we want things and if you said you said, you sit down there and I am one of part into a business down there and we been in that business, I been there a lot longer than you been sitting there for those few major events.

Like I say and I'm going to say it again: When Miami and LSU packed that place down there and they were bumper to bumper, I don't think you were down there Mr. Walford when you couldn't get in and there was nobody want to run and pass a law.

It bothers me that when we have problems with certain group of people coming down in an area, we have a problem. I've said to a lot of African-American people---don't go down

there. They don't want you down there, it is a problem. And let me tell you it is the same way under that bridge, it is a problem. You built the dang-gone bridge. You got money, you fixed the place up. You start charging \$5 dollars. You don't know what you want to do.

A part of tourism is crowds. You want crowds in tourists. You got to Disney World, guess what, you got to stand in a line, it is crowded, it is bumper to bumper. I mean, is it a certain persons that you don't want down there or what?

I have a problem with this cruising deal and it is going to target African-Americans who are driving in this area where you don't want them at in the first place. Nobody has said, I'll be the bad guy.

Let me tell you something, when Grambling and Southern come in, I told them they need to re-schedule events other places, don't go down that way because you are going to be targeted and Shreveport Police is not ready to handle a lot of things and especially crowds. And, I am just looking at the fact that if handle crowds, if they do get any problems, I pray that—as a matter I don't even want them down there because, they mis-handle it.

Now, you know on the end of—(Councilman Walford: Can you wrap it up or do we need to give you some more time?) I am going to wrap it up.

Listen, It is a stupid law. We got other things, we need a convention center. We need some jobs. I think a hundred things you could be working on than try to put a law in when you are going to watch somebody drive up and down the street. Thank you very much. It is a crazy law, don't do it.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Brown, I just had a comment for you. The main difference you are talking about in the people with the football games and Disney World, is those people spend money. These people up here riding up and down the road, they are not spending money.

Pastor Brown: But you don't know that, they are spending money. They buying daiquiris, that is spending money. They are doing something. They are buying gas to drive up and down the street; so, they spending money.

Janie Landry representing the Downtown Development Authority, 401 Edwards, Suite 205, Shreveport: I am here representing the Downtown Development Authority in support of the cruising ordinance that is presently under discussion and I would like to read into the record, the resolution that was passed by the Downtown Development Authority:

Downtown Development Authority Resolution No. 10 of 2003: A Resolution Endorsing and Supporting the Proposed Amendment to the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances Relative to Repetitive Driving

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Riverfront area is located in the Downtown Development District; and

WHEREAS, the Downtown Development Authority and other downtown stakeholders have memorialized the importance of maintaining a safe and clean downtown and enhancing the pedestrian environment in the Downtown Development District through the adopted 2010 Redevelopment Strategy; and

WHEREAS, the traffic congestion caused by repetitive driving in the Riverfront area obstructs emergency vehicles and other traffic, endangers the safety of pedestrians, and encumbers the continued success of the Riverfront area and the entire Downtown Development District;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED in regular session that the Board of Directors of the Downtown Development Authority voted unanimously to endorse and support the proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to

repetitive driving.

THUS DONE AND PASSED this 30th day of September 2003. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY/ By: John Hubbard, Chairman

Councilman Lester: What plans does DDA have to address parking and/or the crowd situation downtown? Have you developed a strategy to maybe give people that are riding around there an alternative place or something of that nature?

Ms. Landry: As alluded earlier, there is a parking study that has been completed. We should have that very soon and that will have a site specific recommendation for our parking garage.

One thing that I think is important to point out and the comments made and I would just like to add a little bit to the cruising idea. The Downtown Development Authority is not against cruising if you are cruising on foot in that area. It does create a problem. There is a national tendency, Councilman Gibson asked about that, has a similar problem in its downtown, cruising and, it really doesn't matter to the Downtown Development Authority and other property owners and businesses in the area, who is driving the vehicle.

The continuous driving around and around. There is parking in the core of downtown if they want to park their vehicles, get out and walk on foot, the businesses in the riverfront district might be appreciative of that and it certainly wouldn't create a traffic problem with the way the existing problem we have now with the driving.

Councilman Lester: But other than the parking garage that you have spoken about, is there any plan in effect to deal with the cruising?

Ms. Landry: Well, we thought this was important enough and when Councilman Walford came to our meeting, we agreed. We would be more than happy to facilitate at meetings to try to come up with solutions that would work.

I can tell you in the Red River Entertainment District, we have had on-going problems. Our Streetscape workers that clean the streets have found items (knives and things like that) buried in the planters underneath the bridge so it is an ongoing problem and in order, downtown, in order to be successful has to, two things that have to be, clean and safe.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Ms. Landry: And so we would be happy to try to facilitate a meeting with the appropriate people to come up with some solutions for this, but the DDA did feel that this was one tool that could be used to try to cut down on the problems that exist in the district now.

Councilman Lester: So, other than supporting in this statute and the parking garage, you haven't developed any plans or any other programs to deal with the cruising issue?

Ms. Landry: We have not because we have not been included in the meetings that there have been any relative to this but I'm offering here and now that it is an important issue and we would be very happy to try and facilitate a solution.

Greg Barrett (1501 Corporate Drive), I work for Pepsi Cola: I am here to speak opposition to the zoning of the appeal of [Ordinance] 144 and I've sent letters to each and every one of you and so I'll just restate that real quick then, won't bore you with the details.

But, the reason for my opposition is that all existing businesses and that is a re-zoning issue from industrial to multi-family residential on Nelson Drive, all existing businesses currently fit the industrial zoning identity. We see an increase in crime in the last two years of our facility. We've had four break-ins over the last 24-months compared to the prior 13 years when we had two.

We currently operate 18 tractor-trailer units, 26 (inaudible) duty trucks and numerous outside delivery vehicles coming over from our facility every day—UPS, Fed Ex, et cetera and freight trucks on a daily basis on a 2 lane streets that enter and leave that facility.

The industrial park has no sidewalks for future tenants to walk on creating a huge safety and liability issue for our vehicles and our employees. And, the entrance of a residential housing in this area, would impede any future industrial development of new businesses. We have expanded our current facilities twice since 1988 and are currently exploring additional options due to the growth of our business.

But if the current zoning changed to residential, we would surely be open to re-location from that location .We currently employ 61 people and have an annual growth sales of approximately \$24 million dollars but we would like to remain in our current location which we chose because it was an industrial site with no residential. And, also I would like to ask the people that are here in opposition to that ordinance, please stand (about 10 people stood).

Barbara Liddenhemer (739 Millicent Way): I am the landowner of which Pepsi Cola rent and we built that building for.

Pepsi Cola was started by my grandparents in this City and we were forced to move it when I-49 came through. They took the land and they asked us to move. We sold the Pepsi Cola Bottling Company, my uncle and my mother did to national of which Greg represents and when they did that, we went looking to be their landowner to build them a building and we went searching for the perfect place where they would stay in an industrial area.

Southern Avenue was not a real great place with the trucks coming and going. We did our homework, talked to the Commission and found them the perfect location. They have expanded, twice. They are wonderful tenants and if we lose them and that is changed to residential, I can't imagine another business coming in and trusting.

It is changing the rules in the middle of the game. It is telling us it would be for industry and because someone thinks there isn't enough industry, there are 16 businesses out there and they run heavy duty trucks in and out. The traffic is there and I don't want to lose the tenant that has been good and has grown and will move out of this City and go somewhere else. Tell me, who else is going to take it when the residents are bill payer and no other industry will move in?

So, I am completely opposed to putting housing in an industrial area. Lets keep our industry where it is and our homes where they are.

Shandra Gant (2020 North Hearne): I am addressing the zoning issue. The problem is that Shreveport population is growing. And not only that, there are no jobs. There is not a lot of places that is offering very many jobs. I am a student. I am 22-years old. I am a computer science major at LSU-S and I am a music major at Centenary College.

I had a hard time finding a place to live. A safe place to live. Not only not safe, it is so many problems I can't even explain what I went through to get a nice place to live and my rent is \$27 and it is a nice place to live for \$27.

I just want to stay there just to get on my feet and move to a nicer place or until I can afford to stay where I want to stay. But for now, that place is a nice place to live. I have a 2-year old daughter. I'm telling you, we need those apartments, we really do and there are in need, desperately. There are 600 people on the Housing Authority list.

In reference to the businesses leaving. Don't you all need residents to come to ya'll businesses? I mean, don't you need people to buy from you all's business. (Audience member: No, these aren't retail). I mean it don't matter. I mean, ya'll still need people here in

Shreveport. People are trying to move from Shreveport to go to Bossier because not only for the jobs, but they need places to stay. I need a place to stay, I am finna go to Bossier.

Addressing the cruising issue (two issues). There is really no place for young people to really go. There is a problem with that too.

I mean, I understand what casinos and the other places down in Clyde Fant, but the problem is that there is not very many places to go. Want us to hang out and enjoy ourselves. There is just the movies and I'm not finna go to those clubs, I am sorry. They are too dangerous (inaudible) for no children between 18 and 22 or young adults between those ages, so that is what the issue is.

So, instead of lets make a cruising law, why don't we find a place or some other places for us to go besides trying to control the traffic to and fro. Because you are going to have traffic regardless because we have the Revel, we had the—there is a lot of things going on downtown that is going to cause traffic. So how you going to say, no cruising law. You don't know. Those people are using money just as well as everybody else. They many not be using any in your industry, but they be using the money so they have to right to go up and down the street, long as they are not harming anybody, they are not harming you all and that is all I have to say.

John Salvucci (1401 Oden Street, Unit No. 32): I am President of the Parkway Commons Homeowners Association. We been over this since May and then in July. I would just like to recap where we are.

Mr. Carroll is in violation of the covenants and by-laws of Parkway Commons Townhomes which state no lot shall be used for residential purposes. These by-laws have been in effect since the inception of Parkway Commons and the owners have expressed concern about it violating the by-laws. Some feel that it could lead to other business uses in the area and it infringes on their rights to the use of their property.

Mr. Carroll has been operating his business at this location without approval of the MPC or the homeowners association and has been having his business address advertised in the yellow pages and that has been done for a number of years.

Mr. Carroll requested the secretary be allowed to work from 9 to 3, in his original request, however she stated before the MPC and Mr. Carroll states before the Homeowners Association that she works until 4 and on occasion until 5. I know there are occasions there have been vehicles in the drive way that is making ingress and egress difficult.

Recently Mr. Carroll has been using the carport at Unit #5 to park his vehicles there. The owner of this unit, #5 has been in a serious accident and does not drive any longer. He has informed me that you will, due to the accident and inability to navigate the steers have to be moving. In all probability to her parents and she'll be selling her home. This leaves the question, what will the new owner do? Where then will Mr. Carroll park these vehicles?

It was our belief that, if Mr. Carroll decided to change the sales of his unit, he'd need to bring it before the Homeowners Association and as Mr. Scott stated at your July 8th meeting, I called for a Homeowners Association meeting. Mr. Carroll also visited many of the town home owners during that period of time. The date was set for the 26th of September and letters were sent out to all homeowners and to Mr. Carroll's attorney explaining the situation and asking them to attend the homeowner's association meeting where there would be a discussion. Also, if they were unable to attend the meeting that they submit a proxy of how they wish to vote on the amendment to change the by-laws. These letters were sent out to all homeowners in July and again in August. Mr. Carroll's attorney asked if he could attend the Homeowners Association meeting and I told him yes. However, he did not show up at the meeting.

At the 26 September homeowner's meeting, there was a discussion about the changes in the by-laws and then there was a vote. With those voting by proxy and those present at that time, there seven (7) in favor of making a change in the by-laws and ten (10) were opposed to making changes in the by-laws. With this Mr. Carroll's request for a change in the by-laws was defeated.

We have also on record that those living within the required distance, thirty (33) are opposed to Mr. Carroll's request and of those thirty (33), twenty-nine (29) are occupants of the Townhomes. If anyone has any questions, I'll take them at this time.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Salvucci, if you don't mind, because of course, we're going to revisit this for consideration later today, could you re-state those numbers for me one more time as far as the vote from the Homeowners Association?

Mr. Salvucci: Okay, the vote of Homeowners Association meeting was ten (10) in favor of changing the by-laws and ten (10) against changing. Seven (7) For and ten (10) Against.

Councilman Carmody: Seven (7) for and ten (10) against.

Mr. Salvucci: Seven (7) for change and ten (10) against changing.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody for Introduction of Ordinance No. 150 of 2003 to lay over until the October 28, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Hogan. 1.

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 150 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning the west 529 feet beginning at Lot 9 and Lot 34 of the 15 foot wide alleyway running between Pierre Avenue and Bosseau in Block "H" of the Ingersoll Heights Subdivision, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS:

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Jackson for Adoption of Resolution No. 167 and Ordinance Nos. 140, 141, and 142 of 2003. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Hogan. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 167 of 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CHARLES J. PAINE & KATHLEEN PHILLIPS PAINE, LOCATED AT 1325 FOREST CREEK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF

THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT
THERETO.

WHEREAS, Charles J. Paine & Kathleen Phillips Paine 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 Charles J. Paine & Kathleen Phillips Paine, be authorized to connect the building located at 1325 Forest Creek Dr., 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:

ORDINANCE NO. 140 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A STOP INTERSECTION AT THE INTERSECTION OF KENSINGTON DRIVE AND NEWPORT STREET 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 the intersection of Kensington Drive and Newport Street is hereby created and established a stop intersection, Newport Street shall stop for Kensington Drive.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 141 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A YIELD INTERSECTION AT THE INTERSECTION OF KENSINGTON DRIVE AND SALEM DRIVE 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 the intersection of Kensington Drive and Salem Drive is hereby created and established a yield intersection, Kensington Drive shall yield to Salem Drive.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 142 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A YIELD INTERSECTION AT THE INTERSECTION OF REILY LANE AND SWEETBRIAR STREET 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 the intersection of Reily Lane and Sweetbriar Street is hereby created and established a yield intersection, Sweetbriar Street shall yield to Reily Lane.

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

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

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 160 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign an agreement between the City of Shreveport and Allen, Green And Williamson, LLP for an external audit of the City of Shreveport for fiscal year January 1, 2003, through December 31, 2003, and otherwise providing with respect thereto..

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green for passage. The Council considered the following amendment(s):

Amendment No. 1 by Councilman Lester:

Amend the resolution as follows:

Substitute the attached resolution as Resolution No. 160 of 2003.

Explanation of amendment:

This amendment selects KPMG, LLP to perform the external audit services for the City of Shreveport, with Johnson Accounting Services LLC receiving 12.5 % of the 25% Fair Share Award, and authorizes the Mayor to execute a one year contract with the KPMG.

If this amendment is adopted, the resolution as amended cannot be adopted before the next regular meeting of the Council.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption of Amendment No. 1.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to - - I have not seen Amendment 1 nor Amendment 2. but with all due respect to my colleagues on the Council, I think, I guess

Councilman Lester authored the first and I think maybe Councilman Carmody offered the second.

With all due respect, the Committee which is the Audit and Finance Committee met. I'm sure that you all have minutes. No one attended those meetings other than the members of the Committee and we saw two presentations. There is a vote that we took in the Committee meeting and scored - - subjectively scored those results and I just would ask the Council to be considerate of the resolution as offered by that Committee. It's just in deference to the work of the Committee because the Committee could not have met if in fact our recommendation was going to be amended by Councilmen, particular who didn't attend the meeting.

And so, I just wanted to state that as the Chairman of the Audit and Finance Committee, neither of these two amendments ever came before our Committee, nor did we have any discussion with reference to any of these amendments and just wanted to be on record as saying that we've never had any discussion about these amendments and I certainly stand in objection to both of the amendments and would ask that this Council would respect the work of this Committee and vote it down if in fact the Councilmen have their pleasure. But I just think that it in fact does not show deference to the work of the Committee and we alter it, particularly, those who have not been a part of that Committee meeting, though they have a right to do so. Not about whether or not we have a right to do it, I just said in deference to the Committee and would certainly like to ask at least your consideration with that regard.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, excuse me for being out, but I have a couple of comments to make on this. A few months ago, Councilman Lester had approached me about this and had asked me, told me the situation over Mr. Johnson. And I told him at that time, that I would be in favor of it, that I would support it. And since those few months have passed, I've come to understand that I said that in ignorance. That I inquired with our City Internal Auditor and she said she did not think it was a good idea. She didn't say that it couldn't be done. I talked to our City Attorney. He agreed with that opinion. He said that it could be done, he didn't think it was a good idea. And I just want to know for - -let it be on the record, that I'm not really in favor of this. I wished I hadn't said that. But because I did say it, I'm going to follow through with my word and I'm going to vote on this and that's all I needed to say. Thank you.

Amendment No. 1 denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Green and Jackson.
4. Ayes: Lester, Gibson and Hogan. 3.

Amendment No. 2 by Councilman Carmody:

Amend the resolution as follows:

Substitute the attached resolution as Resolution No. 160 of 2003.

Explanation of amendment:

This amendment selects KPMG, LLP to perform the external audit services for the City of Shreveport, and authorizes the Mayor to execute a one year contract with the KPMG.

If this amendment is adopted, the resolution as amended cannot be adopted before the next regular meeting of the Council.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption of Amendment No. 2.

Councilman Carmody: As a member of the Audit and Finance Committee, I appreciate our Chairman's comments to the Council. I actually was the descending vote on the Committee. Again, I felt as if there is a - - both are very qualified, but my leaning was more toward trying to make sure that we supported the local business here and that is why I've offered this amendment to the resolution today to try to ask the Council's support to continue in support of a local business in KPMG Peat, Marwick.

Councilman Jackson: We talked about it in our Committee meeting and several things came up and we had a lot of questions asked and answered in our Committee meeting and for the information of the Councilmen who are here, one of the things that we talked about was local and both of the companies who submitted RFPs also allowed us to understand and made us understand that both have offices in Shreveport.

KPMG has done the audit and has for several years as I appreciate it and our recommendation to go with someone else had nothing to do with whether or not they were qualified. I think all of us agree that both of the firms were qualified.

We started talking about who was local and who was not. And, we also started talking about impact. We looked at a situation that this Committee recommended that had about 42% minority participation. 42% of the Fair Share which is 25%. We had here a situation where it was 42% over and above 25%. KPMG has 25% and it's the same scenario that they've had over the course of the last ever how many years its been, the same kind of arrangement and there was some questions with regard to the impact.

And I guess my concern was for what we could do to impact, not only, what we were doing to impact our external audit, but our Fair Share numbers as well and even over and above that just the opportunity, certainly KPMG Peat Marwick is not going out business without the City of Shreveport's business if so, then that's another scenario. But we talked about who is in town, who was out of town. Obviously, they're an international firm and have offices everywhere. And so Shreveport is not necessarily "home of KPMG."

But I did research to find out, in fact this Council and we as a City, do a lot of purchasing and do a lot of business with folks who are from out of town. We do about 35% of the business in this city with people who live in this city. We do 32% of what people who are not even in the State of Louisiana. We only do 26% with people who are in Louisiana, but outside of this city and then I thought that even as we move forward, if in fact, that's the spirit of this Council's decision, that we need to continue to put our money where our mouth is and continue to stay committed to that same kind of principle. But I just think that after having in the room with us both companies and having in the room with us our Finance Director, our (I guess), the Assistant Director of Finance, our City Internal Auditor. We're asked a plethora of questions to each of them. All of who satisfied, I think, our queries with positive answers which led us to voting and then led us to this decision and so I wanted the record to reflect that we in fact have had two qualified companies and the Committee's recommendation was in fact what is the original resolution today. And so, I just urge this Council to vote, not in support of this amendment, but in support of the original recommendation from this Committee.

Councilman Gibson: Since this Council was sworn in, in November, we've been faced with a lot of situations of trust by the public, by a variety of things that the City is doing. Its been a big concern for quite some time. That trust is invaluable in terms of what we do as a city. External audit is critical. It's the last barrier, the last integrity that we have in terms of making sure that we have an unbiased, untarnished quality company that is not going to breach any ethics or any trust amongst these City Councilmen, the Administration and the public as a whole.

It disturbs me with the information that came forward here this week, that one of the principles of the company that we're considering that we're considering that came out of the Committee has given campaign money to one of the members on this Audit and Finance Committee. First of all, I don't blame the politician, I blame the principle of the company who is the company offering their service to this City. I think it sets a dangerous tone that compromises the integrity of what we look for in an external auditor. The damage has already been done. The choices were made. Up until that point, I was very objective in terms of my thoughts on whether it be KPMG or the other firm. But obviously KPMG has been very clear in what they've done for this City and my vote will reflect that in this vote forthcoming.

Councilman Lester: I would just offer that, we do business with who we desire to do business with. For whatever reason we choose to. Sometime there is rhyme, sometimes there is reason and we make choices; that's what we're elected to do.

I understand where Councilman Jackson is in terms of in deference to the Committee and I would think that we would all have and I don't think anyone offering an amendment is any disrespect to or exercising a lack of deference to the Committee. I think the seven of us are each individuals and we make our own choices. Sometimes, we choose to do things to support things, sometimes we choose things not to support things. I think that we have that ability and I think we should exercise it accordingly. In terms of being ignorant to certain facts, well, I'm not going to address that Mr. Chairman, I will simply say that, I call for the question (seconded by Councilman Jackson. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Carmody, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Walford and Hogan. 2.)

Amendment No. 2 passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: Councilman Jackson. 1.

Chairman Walford: Mr. Thompson, before we go on, could I ask you to explain that this was not the selection at this time, that it can't be voted on for two weeks?

Mr. Thompson: By adopting this amendment, you changed the title. And we'll have to re-advertise the title, so it will not be ripe for a vote until the next Council Meeting. I guess you need to postpone the ordinance.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 161 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO APPROVE THE SALE OF EIGHT(8) SURPLUS MASS TRANSIT BUSES TO EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, CAPITAL TRANSIT CORPORATION, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport owns twelve 1989 orion mass transit buses that have been declared surplus by Spor Tran; and

WHEREAS, as a result of an email solicitation to other mass transit properties to purchase the used buses by SporTran, Capital Transit Corporation, the mass transit provider of East Baton Rouge Parish has made an offer of \$24,000.00 for eight of the twelve buses; and

WHEREAS, there have been no other expressions of interest by other transit properties; and

WHEREAS, the price offered does not exceed the per-unit sale price cap of \$5,000.00 placed

by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on sale of surplus equipment in which it has an interest as a result of FTA's 80% match funding in the original purchase of the buses, under a capital grant contract with the City of Shreveport. (FTA Circular 50101c provides that FTA must be reimbursed on a pro rata basis for all equipment sold with a fair market value of over \$5,000. For equipment sold under that threshold, FTA relinquishes its interest in the equipment to the grantee.); and

WHEREAS, CTC has agreed to accept all responsibilities, financial obligation and liability associated with the acceptance of the purchase of the surplus mass transit buses; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that all twelve 1989 Orion mass transit it buses particularly described above are declared surplus property of the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with CTC substantially in accordance with the agreement attached herewith and the remaining buses shall be sold at public auction.

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

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

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

Councilman Lester: Mr. Eddy, quick question. In moving forward on this sale of the surplus transit busses, is this going to affect the idea that I had, that I approached you with relative to the casino shuttle workers bus?

Mr. Eddy: My understanding is that the way the contract that you're going to pass on the set up, that we can sell up to any number up to the amount that we asked for. I'm not an attorney. I do know (unclear) as many of the buses that we would give them.

I think we need to meet to determine what if any changes we might want to make to this arrangement based on things that we may like to do or not do in your proposal.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Mr. Eddy: My understanding of this is if you pass it, we still have the option to give them a lesser number.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Mr. Eddy: That's my understanding.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Eddy, while you're up here very quickly and not about this. But, when you come to speak to us for Sportran's budget, could I ask that you please bring with you the most current information for the hybrid bus system that we discussed in our last budget session.

Mr. Eddy: I would be glad to.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 168 OF 2003

Offered by Councilman Green and seconded by Councilman Gibson:

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ADVERTISING FOR SEALED BIDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THIRTY-SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS (\$37,000,000) OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES 2003, OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

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

SECTION 1. The Clerk of Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "Issuer") be and he is hereby empowered, authorized and directed to advertise in accordance with the provisions of law for sealed bids for the purchase of Thirty-Seven Million Dollars (\$37,000,000) of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2003 (the "Bonds") of the Issuer, said Bonds being authorized at a special election held in the City on Saturday, July 21, 2001, for the purpose of constructing, acquiring, and improving works of neighborhood public improvement for 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. The Bonds will be in fully registered form, will be dated as of November 1, 2003, will be in the denomination of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) each, or any integral multiple thereof within a single maturity, will be payable from unlimited ad valorem taxation and will bear interest from date thereof, or the most recent interest payment date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, at a rate or rates not exceeding seven per centum (7%) per annum on any Bond in any interest payment period, said interest to be payable on May 1, 2004, and semiannually thereafter on May 1 and November 1 of each year. The Bonds will be numbered from R-1 upwards and will mature serially on November of each year as follows, to-wit:

<u>Year</u> <u>(November 1)</u>	<u>Principal</u> <u>Maturing</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u> <u>Per Annum</u>	<u>Year</u> <u>(November 1)</u>	<u>Principal</u> <u>Maturing</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u> <u>Per Annum</u>
2004			2014		
2005			2015		
2006			2016		
2007			2017		
2008			2018		
2008			2019		
2010			2020		
2011			2021		
2012			2022		
2013			2023		

SECTION 2. Those Bonds maturing November 1, 2013, and thereafter, will be callable for redemption by the Issuer in full at any time on or after November 1, 2012, or in part, in the inverse order of their maturities, and if less than a full maturity, then by lot within such maturity, on any interest payment date

on or after November 1, 2012, at the principal amount thereof and accrued interest to the date fixed for redemption. In the event a Bond is of a denomination larger than \$5,000, a portion of such Bond (\$5,000 or any multiple thereof) may be redeemed. Official notice of such call of any of the Bonds for redemption will be given by first class mail, postage prepaid, by notice deposited in the United States mails not less than thirty (30) days prior to the redemption date addressed to the registered owner of each bond to be redeemed at his address as shown on the registration books of the Paying Agent.

SECTION 3. The Bonds shall be sold in the manner required by law, and in accordance with the terms of this resolution, the official Notice of Bond Sale herein set forth, and the Official Statement referred to in Section 6 hereof. In advertising the Bonds for sale, the City Council shall reserve the right to reject any and all bids received.

SECTION 4. The Clerk of Council be and he is hereby further empowered, authorized and directed to issue a Notice of Bond Sale and cause the same to be published as required by law, which Notice of Bond Sale shall be in substantially the following form:

OFFICIAL
NOTICE OF BOND SALE
\$37,000,000 OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES 2003
OF THE
CITY OF SHREVEPORT, STATE OF LOUISIANA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "Governing Authority"), acting as the governing authority of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City" or the "Issuer"), will receive sealed bids for the purchase of -Thirty-Seven Million Dollars (\$37,000,000) of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2003 (the "Bonds") of the Issuer, at the City Hall, 505 Travis, Suite 200, Shreveport, Louisiana, until Seven (3:00) o'clock p.m., Louisiana Time, prevailing Central Time, on October 28, 2003.

The Bonds are being issued for the purpose of constructing, acquiring and improving works of neighborhood public improvements of the City including roads, streets, drainage, parks and recreation facilities including facilities for the police department and fire department, and other public purposes, and acquiring the necessary land, equipment and furnishings therefore, and were authorized at a special election held in the Issuer on July 21, 2001.

The Bonds will be issued as fully registered bonds in "book-entry only" form and registered in the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of The Depository Trust Company, New York, New York ("DTC"). DTC will act as securities depository for the Bonds, and purchasers of the Bonds will not receive certificates representing their interest in the Bonds purchased.

The Bonds will be dated November 1, 2003, and will be in the denomination of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) each, or any integral multiple thereof within a single maturity. The Bonds will be payable from unlimited ad valorem taxes and will bear interest from date thereof or the most recent interest payment date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, at a rate or rates not exceeding seven per centum (7%) per annum on any Bond in any interest payment period, said interest to be payable on May 1, 2004, and semiannually thereafter on November 1 and May 1 of each year. The Bonds will be numbered from R-1 upward and will mature serially on November 1 of each year as follows, to-wit:

Year	Principal Amount	Year	Principal Amount
2004		2014	
2005		2015	
2006		2016	
2007		2017	
2008		2018	
2009		2019	
2010		2020	
2011		2021	
2012		2022	
2013		2023	

Those Bonds maturing November 1, 2013, and thereafter, will be callable for redemption by the Issuer in full at any time on or after November 1, 2012, or in part, in the inverse order of their maturities, and if less than a full maturity, then by lot within such maturity, on any interest payment date on or after November 1, 2012, at the principal amount thereof and accrued interest to the date fixed for redemption. In the event a Bond is of a denomination larger than \$5,000, a portion of such Bond (\$5,000 or any multiple thereof) may be redeemed. Official notice of such call of any of the Bonds for redemption will be given by first class mail, postage prepaid, by notice deposited in the United States mails not less than thirty (30) days prior to the redemption date addressed to the registered owner of each bond to be redeemed at his address as shown on the registration books of the Paying Agent.

The principal of the Bonds, upon maturity or redemption, will be payable at the principal corporate trust office of the Paying Agent upon presentation and surrender thereof, and interest on the Bonds will be payable by the Paying Agent by check mailed by the Paying Agent to the registered owner (determined as of the 15th calendar day of the month next preceding said interest payment date) at the address as shown on the books of said Paying Agent. _____, in the City of _____, Louisiana, has been designated as Paying Agent.

Except as provided under DTC's book-entry only system, the Bonds may be transferred, registered and assigned only on the registration books of the Paying Agent, 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 Bonds 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 registered 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 must be in the denomination of \$5,000 for any one maturity or any integral multiple thereof. Neither the Issuer nor the Paying Agent shall be required to issue, register, transfer or exchange (i) any Bond during a period beginning at the opening of business on the 15th day of the month next preceding an interest payment date and ending at the close of business on the interest payment date, or (ii) any Bond called for redemption prior to maturity during a period beginning 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.

Each bid submitted must be for the entire issue of Bonds, must be on the bid form furnished by the Governing Authority without alteration or qualification, and must be accompanied by a Good Faith Deposit ("Deposit") in the form of a certified or cashier's check or a Financial Surety Bond in the amount of \$370,000, payable to the order of the Issuer, is required for each bid to be considered. If a check is used, it must accompany each bid. If a Financial Surety Bond is used, it must be from an insurance company licensed to issue such a bond in the State of Louisiana, and such bond must be submitted to the Issuer or its Financial Advisor prior to the opening of the bids. The Financial Surety Bond must identify each bidder whose Deposit is guaranteed by such Financial Surety Bond. If the Bonds are awarded to a bidder utilizing a Financial Surety Bond, then that purchaser ("Purchaser") is required to submit its Deposit to the Issuer or its Financial Advisor in the form of a cashier's check (or wire transfer such amount as instructed by the Issuer or its Financial Advisor) not later than 3:30 PM (Issuer's local time) on the next business day following the award. If such Deposit is not received by that time, the Financial Surety Bond may be drawn by the Issuer to satisfy the Deposit requirement. No interest on the Deposit will accrue to the Purchaser. The Deposit will be applied to the purchase price of the Bonds. In the event the purchaser fails to honor its accepted bid, the Deposit will be retained by the Issuer.

Bidders shall name the rate or rates of interest the Bonds shall bear, not exceeding seven per centum (7%) per annum on any Bond in any interest payment period, to be expressed in a multiple of 1/20th or 1/8th of 1% per annum. Bids must stipulate a purchase price for the Bonds of the par value thereof and accrued interest from the date of the Bonds to the date of delivery of the Bonds. No bid which specifies cancellation of the Bonds will be considered. No bids providing for additional or supplemental interest will be considered.

The Governing Authority will meet at the place and time hereinabove set forth for the receipt of bids. The Bonds will be awarded to the bidder whose bid offers the lowest **"true interest cost"** to the Issuer for the full authorized amount of the Bonds, to be determined by doubling the semiannual interest rate (compounded semiannually) necessary to discount the debt service payments on the Bonds from the payment dates to November 1, 2003, such that the sum of such present values is equal to the price bid, including any premium bid but not including interest accrued to the date of delivery (the preceding calculation is sometimes referred to as the "Canadian Interest Cost Method" or "Present Value Method"). In the case of a tie bid, the winning bid will be awarded by lot. If any bid for the Bonds shall be acceptable, a prompt award of the bonds will be made. The right is expressly reserved to waive any irregularity in any bid or to reject any and all bids received.

It shall be the obligation of the successful bidder to furnish in writing to the Issuer's Co-Bond Counsel, referenced below, the reoffering yields within Seven (3) business days after the date of the sale and the initial public offering prices of the Bonds not less than ten (10) business days prior to delivery of the Bonds.

The Bonds will be delivered as soon as practicable on or about November __, 2003, in the form of one initial bond for each annual maturity of the Bonds registered with the name of Cede & Co., as nominee of DTC. The successful bidder or bidders shall pay in Federal Funds on the date of delivery the balance of the purchase price of the Bonds plus accrued interest. The Bonds will be delivered at the offices of DTC in New York, New York, against payment therefor.

The Official Statement containing pertinent information relative to the authorization, sale and security of the Bonds is being prepared and may be obtained upon its completion from the Issuer's Co-Bond Counsel or Financial Advisor.

The approving legal opinion of Co-Bond Counsel, who have supervised the proceedings, the printed Bonds and the transcript of record as passed upon will be furnished to the successful bidder without cost to him. Said transcript will contain the usual closing proofs, including a certificate that up to the time of delivery no litigation has been filed questioning the validity of the Bonds or the taxes necessary to pay the same.

In order to assist bidders in complying with S.E.C. Rule 15c2-12(b)(5), the Governing Authority will undertake, pursuant to the resolution providing for the issuance of the Bonds and a Continuing Disclosure Certificate, to provide annual reports and notices of certain events. A description of this undertaking is set forth in the Preliminary Official Statement and will also be set forth in the Final Official Statement.

For information relative to the Issuer and not contained in the Notice of Bond Sale and Official Statement, address Ms. Elizabeth B. Washington, Director of Finance, City of Shreveport, 505 Travis Street, Suite 670 Shreveport, Louisiana 71101. For information relative to the Bonds being offered for sale, please address Co-Bond Counsel or Financial Advisor .

THUS DONE AND SIGNED at Shreveport, Louisiana, on this, the 14th day of October, 2003.

Monty Walford

Chairman

Attest:

/s/ Arthur G. Thompson

Clerk of Council

SECTION 5. This Governing Authority will meet in open and public session at the time and place set out in the Notice of Bond Sale incorporated herein, for the purpose of receiving bids for the Bonds, considering and taking action upon the bids, and taking any other action required by this resolution, or necessary to effectuate the issuance, sale and delivery of the Bonds. If any award of the Bonds shall be made, such award shall be made for not less than par and accrued interest to the highest bidder therefor, such award and highest bidder to be determined in accordance with the aforesaid Notice of Bond Sale.

SECTION 6. There shall be prepared an Official Bid Form for the submission of bids and an Official Statement which shall contain complete bidding details, security features and other pertinent information relative to the sale and issuance of the Bonds as may be deemed necessary, advisable or desirable, which Official Bid Form and Official Statement shall be distributed to all prospective bidders and other interested parties.

SECTION 7. Prior to the delivery of the Bonds, the Issuer anticipates that it may pay a portion of the costs of the project from other available funds. The project includes constructing, acquiring, and improving works of neighborhood public improvement for 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. This Section is intended to be a declaration of official intent within the meaning of Reg. 1.150-2.

SECTION 8. In order to assist bidders in complying with S.E.C. Rule 15c2-12(b)(5), the Governing Authority will undertake, pursuant to the resolution providing for the issuance of the Bonds and a Continuing Disclosure Certificate, to provide annual reports and notices of certain events. A description of this undertaking is set forth in the Preliminary Official Statement and will also be set forth in the Final Official Statement.

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

Councilman Carmody: I just wanted to ask the Administration, is this the last Bond Sale that we will have until another bond election?

Mayor Hightower: That's correct.

Councilman Gibson: Could I ask the Administration upon selling these \$37million, could you provide Council members with a list of the projects that this money is going to pay for just to refresh our memory. Because several, I guess everybody has projects in their particular districts, so we can go back and revisit with our constituents what money this is going to pay for?

Mayor Hightower: We'll be glad to do that.

Councilman Lester: To the Administration, are we going to have any minority counsel working on this bond issue sale?

Mayor Hightower: Yes.

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

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution No. 169 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 170 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 171 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Resolution No. 172 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to request approval from the State Bond Commission to incur debt relative to the purchase of a Performance Based Energy Management System from Johnson Controls, Inc.; authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with Johnson Controls, Inc., relative to the purchase, installation and maintenance of same; authorizing the Mayor to enter into financing agreement(s) with financial institutions or other lenders for the purchase of same; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Resolution No. 173 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal

counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, And otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Ms. Lee: The resolution that we added for the legal counsel and I need to point out that on No. 172, there was a substitute provided today for it.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson for Introduction of the Resolutions to lay over until the October 28, 2003 meeting.

Councilman Gibson: Where is the substitution?

Councilman Jackson: Right there on the table, you didn't read it.

Chairman Walford: It was passed out to you, it was on your. . . .

Councilman Gibson: Okay, I will find it in the mass of paper.

Chairman Walford: If you need a clarification, we can call on Mr. Dark for it.

Councilman Gibson: No. I'll find it and look at it.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, might I ask that - - I'm voting for this, but I'd like some additional information on the Johnson Controls, Item No. 172. If we could get that to me, before the next meeting, I'd appreciate it.

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

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 151 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances relative to traffic and vehicles and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 152 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 26 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by adding Article VIII., Division 1 and Division 2 relative to disposal of public property and disposal of adjudicated property and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 153 of 2003: A ordinance authorizing the incurring of debt and issuance of Thirty-Seven Million Dollars (\$37,000,000) of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2003A, 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.
4. Ordinance No. 154 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 155 of 2003 by Councilman Jackson: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Retrained Risk Internal Service Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

6. Ordinance No. 156 of 2003 by Councilman Jackson: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
7. Ordinance No. 157 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 Downtown Development District Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
8. Ordinance No. 175 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the Northwest corner of Greenwood Road and Bert Kouns Industrial Loop, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-3, Commercial Business District, to I-1, Light Industrial District, and I-1 (SPI-2), Light Industrial (Industrial Park Overlay) District, 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 Ordinances to lay over until the October 28, 2003 meeting.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, can I just go ahead and formally ask that we have Chief Campbell at the October 28th meeting to apprise us of the Police Department's plan to implement if passed Ordinance 151 regarding the repetitive driving?

Chairman Walford: No, if I may, 151 is merely a clarification- -

Councilman Carmody: Oh, I'm sorry sir. You are correct. My pardon, I misread that.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, but he does have a point. I would like to get some information about item 151 relative to what I perceive to be some judicial discretion that's going to be used and the qualifications of the individual making those value determinations on item 151.

Councilman Carmody: I stand corrected. 143 will actually be on consideration for today.

Chairman Walford: And we have Chief Campbell here ready to discuss it.

Councilman Carmody: Excellent, thank you sir.

Chairman Walford: Other questions before voting.

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

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the last item that you added was C-49-03, I believe it was the Randy Travel Town zoning matter. There were two issues that will be coming before the Council. One is a ZBA matter and the other is a Zoning matter.

The MPC or the Zoning matter can be adopted at the next meeting of the Council, but the ZBA matter probably cannot be considered by you until the first meeting in November because the time to appeal has not yet run.

You may want to consider postponing the MPC or the C-49-03 until the November

11th so both of those items will come up until at the same time and we can send out a letter to everybody so that everybody will know precisely when they are going to be decided or can be decided by the Council.

Councilman Walford: I would certainly welcome a motion.

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

Councilman Walford: And Mr. Walker, I see you back there, you could help with that too if you would please. He doesn't nod or anything, he just stands there.

9. Ordinance No. 158 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 General Fund Budget, appropriating the funds authorizing therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
10. Ordinance No. 159 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
11. Ordinance No. 160 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
12. Ordinance No. 161 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 Airports Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
13. Ordinance No. 162 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
14. Ordinance No. 163 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Golf Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
15. Ordinance No. 164 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Metropolitan Planning Commission's Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
16. Ordinance No. 165 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget funding contractual services provided to SporTran by Metro Management Associates, Inc., and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
17. Ordinance No. 166 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 Debt Service Fund budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

18. Ordinance No. 167 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
19. Ordinance No. 168 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Riverfront Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect.
20. Ordinance No. 169 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
21. Ordinance No. 170 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
22. Ordinance No. 171 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Shreveport Redevelopment Agency Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
23. Ordinance No. 172 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Downtown Parking Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
24. Ordinance No. 173 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
25. Ordinance No. 174 of 2003: An ordinance adopting the 2004 budget for the Downtown Entertainment Economic Development Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester for Introduction of the ordinances for to be passed by December 15, 2003. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Mr. Thompson: If the Council would like to, you could also table those so that we won't have to bring them up.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green to table the budget Ordinances until December. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. Ordinance No. 139 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the lease of certain city-owned property to BellSouth Mobility LLC., d/b/a Cingular Wireless and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 9, 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 Lester for passage. The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment:

Amend the original Rooftop Option and Ground Lease Agreement as follows:

Delete the original Option and Ground Lease Agreement and substitute with the attached Option and Ground Lease Agreement.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Hogan for adoption for the amendment.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I think we have some folks here with us to discuss this. My question would be on the difference between - - the differences in what we were originally given and what we were given today, since we just got this today. My good friend Mr. Jones is here.

Mr. Dark: Mr. Lester, while he's coming to the podium, you might want to look at the first page of that substitute has a four or five item change which may be what he's gonna be talking about while you're there.

Councilman Lester: Thank you. Reading is fundamental.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Lester, and Mr. Chairman and Council. The changes that were made were: the original lease that introduced was basically the Cingular Wireless form lease. At that point and time, the City Attorney's office took that lease and incorporated the provisions that they felt were important to protect the City. The negotiations that have taken place since that time and the lease now before you has incorporated the modifications requested by the City Attorney's office and now brings the lease into final agreement between parties.

Councilman Lester: So, as I appreciate it, this will not, we're not entering into an exclusive agreement with Cingular Wireless in terms of Independence Stadium.

Mr. Jones: That is correct.

Councilman Lester: So, we would not be forestalled from seeking other business.

Mr. Jones: That's correct.

Councilman Walford: For the benefit of the Council and Mr. Kirkland might have to come up here and help me with this. But I believe there is an effort being made on the City's part to encourage co-location on cellular towers throughout the City and I see Charles nodding back there to let us know that.

Councilman Carmody: We couldn't do another flagpole?

Councilman Walford: Just keep adding to it? Other questions?

Councilman Green: Yes, Mr. Jones, have your clients to know that my back yard is available.

Mr. Jones: We'll make note of that, Reverend Green.

Councilman Hogan: Aren't you still planting butterbeans in your back yard?

Councilman Walford: Councilman Green, I was under the impression you were going to park the Packer Truck that your were gonna buy back there.

Councilman Green: At \$40 grand a year, I'll pass on the packer.

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

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption of the ordinance as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

2. Ordinance No. 143 of 2003 by Councilman Walford: An ordinance amending Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by adding provisions relative to repetitive driving and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Hogan for passage.

Councilman Walford: Since the Chair was the maker of the motion and has first debate, I'm gonna ask Chief Campbell to come on up because I know that most of us are going to want to hear from him. Mike if you would, I welcome you and you probably have heard some of the concern that's already been voiced on this. I would ask you if you would to talk to us from a Police perspective and set their mind at ease on the ordinance.

Chief Campbell: I think first, the first thing we need to do is talk about the issues down there in general. Basically, what we've seen over the past two years is a seasonal issue or seasonal problem down in the Entertainment District and what I hope to prevent down the road is a similar problem next year because of the cost that the Police Department absorbs in regards to the personnel that we have to put down there to address the problems.

And let me clarify that there is a myriad of issues down there. I think the basic problem is the geographic make up of the District down there and it makes it very difficult wherein sometimes you can't handle the traffic, because there really is no outlet. There is one way in and one way out even though it may be several streets that you can use. There is not a pass through there, there is not an east exit to the Red River District per se; so, it causes some very unique problems to that area. We've got a lot of people going down there to enjoy the various venues and its not conducive to handling that amount of traffic.

And so, hopefully, what we're going to do this year, this is my first year to deal with it. I'm a little bit aware of what happened there last year. We're almost, and I do say its

seasonal, because basically, what it's done the last two years is run from about the first week in August up until probably close to Thanksgiving. And then the problem kinda takes care of itself due to the weather or whatever reason. So, there are several issues there and this by no means is a panacea and an answer to every issue down there because there are varied problems.

For example, your traffic light cycles coming west bound out of the district are very short cycled. We've looked at that. It's a possible solution. The problem that we had there is that those signal lights are in excess of 50 years of age and we can't put 'em on a manual control type of system which that would help alleviate the problems some.

And this is just another tool. It's an option if you choose to pass it. And, basically what it is, it deals with repetitive driving and I can answer specific questions you may have. Nashville, Tennessee uses it. Franklin, Wisconsin, Eugene City, Oregon, El Paso, Texas, the State of Colorado has one. Olympia Wash., Joplin, Missouri, Searcy, Arkansas and then Fresno, California has a nationally recognized project they've handled a little bit differently, the same general concept

The agencies I've talked to, most said that the ordinance in itself, was a deterrent and that very few actual violations were written, just based on the fact that the ordinance was passed.

Councilman Walford: Mike, I really appreciate your or Chief excuse me, your folks. For the benefit of the Council, I had 15 different ordinances, I think ya'll got me 12 of 'em from some of the cities you mentioned. Also Virginia Beach, Virginia.

I was in Myrtle Beach, SC and saw the signs for theirs and talked to some of their officers and I really appreciate the help that your department gave me. I agree with what you're saying, that it's not the answer to everything, but it's a tool that can help and for the benefit of those who haven't read the ordinance, its not a 24 hour a day thing, its from 10:30 p.m. to 4:30 a.m.

And I think your officers, from what they tell me, feel like they can enforce it when they set up a traffic control point and I'm comfortable with that and I hope that the rest of the Council will be. At this time, I'll open for questions from others.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman and maybe you can help us with this Mr. Chairman. Did you just say 10 at night till 4 in the morning?

Councilman Walford: 10:30p.m. to 4:30a.m.

Councilman Jackson: So, it would be okay for them to cruise from 6-9?

Councilman Walford: I would have to answer that by saying it has not been a problem at those hours. The problem tends to begin to occur (and Chief help me out, because I haven't been there as much as you have) but around 11:00 - -

Chief Campbell: It starts picking up around 10 generally speaking and just the number of patrons utilizing the area there.

I can tell you from personal experience, on one occasion, I was at and it was about, right at 10 o'clock, I was at Spring Street and Milam and it took me 25 minutes to get from that location down in front of the Expo Hall which is a distance of about 2 ½ blocks, about 25 minutes to go about 2½ blocks. And there is a myriad of issues. Parking, the way the traffic signals are working on it. We're still working on that hoping that next year we can

change or during the time that we have before we have this problem again next year, is that we can work those cycles and have them changed. We have to, since it is a state highway, Highway 1, there is some regulations that we have to go through and some procedures that we have to go through to get that changed. That would probably help if the lights were newer and we could put a manual operated system on there, that would help. There are a lot of different things that could help address the issue.

And that's where we want to be next year, so this is not a problem. So that we don't have to put the additional resources, police resources, the additional resources that the businesses down there are putting into it.

Councilman Jackson: So, there is in fact additional resources being spent, because of what's happening but the ordinance doesn't necessarily guarantee that any of this changes significantly. Because I guess one of the issues is enforcement. Do you have a plan or model for who's going to stand there and count if this red car has been there three times or this black car has been there three times, or if two of the same kind of Expeditions, and one that has been there, someone is going to take a picture of the driver and then check it each time they come by (I'm being facetious) but it just seems like enforcement of this. I mean it's cute, because it sounds like it could help the problem but when it comes down to the nitty-gritty when it comes down to enforcing what we put on the books. Its one thing to put something on the book that sounds good and say we're really working to make this better, but in fact the enforceability of it is either not necessarily impossible, but certainly difficult to do then I don't know that it makes much sense practically to try to craft legislation or law around something that's difficult to in fact enforce. You're familiar with Greenwood Road and Jewella?

Chief Campbell: Yes sir, I am.

Councilman Jackson: We never passed an ordinance to clear that problem up but we've done at least a decent job with clearing that problem of. Is that correct?

Chief Campbell: That is correct. Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: As a matter of fact, its night and day from what it was when, when I know I came on this Council to this point. And it came because the Police and others worked together and there were businesses down there. MacDonald's, retail businesses, Rite-Aid, Super One. And you know, we didn't craft an ordinance to try to rescue those businesses and save them, but we did go to work to try to find some solutions other than crafting laws particularly that would only apply to Jewella, three times a week or twice a week and it was on the book as something that we can do.

I think in this scenario, we've done the same thing. We're looking to craft laws that actually don't just affect the two days a week, but also only affects only the two days a week for six hours. And I think to craft legislation that deals with two days a week, six hours and it's impossible almost to enforce without some degree or some margin of error, let me say, perhaps. That and it just to me, whatever we applied and whatever we did at Greenwood Road and Jewella to relieve those businesses of the kind of tension and the kind of scenario that they had there, because as you've said, driving from Spring and Milam to get two blocks, you know what amount of time it used to take to get from Dilg League over to I-20 on a Sunday evening or a Saturday evening. I mean 45 minutes would have been a blessing

for a whole lot of people, but we're talking about hours and hours.

I commend the Department because we've done along with the people in the community. We've had meetings with the people in the community, with business owners in the community and I think we made it work. I don't know why an ordinance is the only way that will suffice for this group downtown. I think the same kind of application can be utilized in this area if we just try to work it out without having to craft this legislation and I think you all can do it. You've done it before obviously with much more traffic than what they deal with downtown, in my opinion or at least comparable traffic for what they deal with downtown. I just think we need to try to apply the same rule as it relates to downtown.

Councilman Gibson: Chief, I commend the Department just as my colleague, Councilman Jackson for working with the Councilman in this district to come up with a preliminary plan.

My concern is just like some other things we've looked at is and you and I have talked about this. We're short Police Officers right now to the tune of maybe 35-40 police officers and if we get a call up at the end of the year, overseas, it's gonna put you in another bind and then we're looking at retirement in the not too distant future of several police officers.

I'm looking forward to seeing those Police Academies kick in and I appreciate what Mayor Hightower is proposing for us to look at later this month in terms of two police academies in 2004 vs 1 to help expedite getting more police officers for you.

But my concern is, we're going to legislate something and it always seems that the neighborhoods end up being the sacrificial lamb, so to speak, in the fact because you are short in terms of patrol. And we pass this legislation and then we find ourselves having to add additional staff down in the Riverfront District which then, the only place you can find it is taking away from the neighborhoods.

I guess from our colleague's standpoint, I don't know, from a legal standpoint, everything is trial and error. It just seems to me like I would be amenable to looking at, and I heard, I kinda clued in when you said August to Thanksgiving or something of that nature. Why couldn't we do a pilot program that puts this piece of legislation where it sunsets at the end of the year and then come back and evaluate its effectiveness. And if it's effective, then we come back and pass a piece of legislation that will be permanently in place versus putting something on the books that may or may not work and then we have to deal with another piece of legislation that has to be enforced by your department and to take additional resources.

I guess that's the dilemma I'm dealing with right now and knowing that my district is short police officers, according the perception of District D residents. I'm not, that's not a shot at you Chief, by any means, that's perception and you know and I have talked about perception and reality in that district. But I do believe that if we can craft something that, again would sunset at the end of the year and then have the Police Department, the DDA and whatever agencies out there that could evaluate the effectiveness of such a plan of action. Because right now, it just doesn't seem to me, there has been enough looking. I know its worked in other communities and I appreciate bringing the information to the table in terms of what's going on, but to pass a piece of legislation that's gonna legislate traffic control, I

think is going to put a big burden on you and at the same time.

I'm still in the back of my mind asking where the heck are the casinos in this process? I know they've paid for some of the burden that this Police Department has had to put on, but I'm not convinced that they've paid enough to help in solving this problem. And the only way in my mind I would be able to find that out is to look at a pilot program with this and then come back and evaluate it.

Councilman Lester: Chief, one of the concerns that I have is the enforcement of this ordinance. And please excuse me, I was outside, how are we going to deal with first of all, the perception that - - -well, first of all, how do we get to the point of making the judgement call of who gets the citation and who doesn't? Who gets arrested and who doesn't?

Chief Campbell: There are several different techniques that have been used. Some departments do a manual deal where the officer actually sits there. Which there is some room for error when you do that.

There is also a pre-designed program where the officer just sits there basically with a laptop computer and enters the license plates as they drive by, the computer tallies the information, tracks the information, when he enters that thing, for however times it is for that particular ordinance. It flags it and points that vehicle out as violating whatever the - - whether its two times, three times, or whatever the various ordinance states.

And that's probably the most effective way, but it's a software program where you'd have to purchase if you were going to do it that way. Other agencies use video tape. That's how they determine the probable cause for the repetitive driving.

Councilman Lester: And the other question, I'm looking at the statute and the other question I have, is you know this person is guilty if they pass a traffic control point more than three times in any 3-hour period, what was the rationale? And maybe if someone from Legal could tell us, what was the rationale between the three times within the three-hour time frame?

Chief Campbell: I'm not sure what the rationale is from viewing the other ordinances, that seemed to be the standard.

Councilman Lester: The reason, I asked that question is because, I mean, I came over here to the Council Building, we had a meeting. First I came from Court to my office, downtown; came to City Hall, did some business; came back to my office downtown and came back. And routinely, someone can come backwards and forwards more than three times in three hours.

I just, I guess my question to you, it just seems like this is one of those scenarios that they tell us in law school where bad facts will make for bad law. And this is a scenario where you have a bad fact pattern, i.e., a number of people cruising down a highway in a congested area, causing congestion. Obviously, you have two entities that have a significant financial interest in having free access to their property and you have a scenario of how do you determine who is cruising, who is not, who's going to spend money, who is joyriding, who is causing harm, the whole nine yards.

And personally, I just think we to me, I think what we need is just an overall game plan before we introduce this particular ordinance and go after this. Because I just see this as going after a holistic problem with a piece meal approach.

And I've asked people with the casinos and I've asked people with the DDA and no one has said this is a portion of the game plan, and part B to the game plan is we're going to meet to do this. Or we have met and we believe that Step 1 is this, Step 2 is this, Step 3 is this, Step 4 is that. But the one thing that everyone has gotten in front of that microphone and said is, this is not the answer in and of itself.

So, if this is not the answer in and of itself, and this is piece meal and we have not taken the time to address the holistic problem, then I think what we're setting ourselves up for is a scenario where you could possibly have selective enforcement which, and I certainly don't want to use the term, *visit the sins of the father on the son*, but there is a perception problem as it relates to who was going to be the target and the people that are going to be targets of this particular ordinance.

The fact of the matter is a lot of the people that are cruising downtown do so because they have no other place to hang out, congregate, assemble. For years, you had a certain segment of this population that has had a particular static area, i.e. along Clyde Fant Parkway and the Parkway around Stoner Avenue and that is a static place for a certain segment of this population's demographic age and race to congregate and we deal with that.

My other question and my other concern is, if in fact we move forward with this particular ordinance and we again say, okay, we're going to enforce this rule, we're gonna issue citations and disburse the crowd, where is the crowd gonna go to? Are we going to disburse the crowd from one part of the town to another part of the town that historically has been a problem? I mean who is to say that the crowd that's coming downtown is not going to wind up back on the corner of Greenwood and Jewella? And we have this whole repetitive cycle again.

And then we say, okay, well we're going to put the cruising statute there and then we're going to move it to another place. It just seems to me Chief and obviously, you have one part to play. You have a component to play and we have a component to play as well.

I think before we move forward on this ordinance, we need to sit down as a Council with the people involved and come up with a holistic game plan to find a place for the people that are congregating in this area a place to go. Because if we don't, all we're going to be doing is writing a lot of citations. Now, to some people, writing a lot of citations and getting money is gonna be a good thing but, all you're going to do as I appreciate it, is going to be disbursing the problem.

I mean, I guess my next question is what is the exigency? What is the need for us to this right now as opposed to postponing and coming up with a holistic game plan?

Chief Campbell: That would be the decision of the Council. Basically what this is, this is a tool. A tool, that if you pass the ordinance today and give it to us, it's a tool that we will use, but it's a tool that's probably gonna have very little effect this year because we're already seeing the crowds die down.

I think and I think you're right. I think there needs to be a holistic approach, this is part of that approach, I think. I think its something that could be used in that form but the key thing is as far as I'm concerned as the Administrator of the Police Department is that, next year in August, we don't want to be where we are today. Because it does, it does impact my budget and the amount of extra officers that we have to hire down there. We do

some re-directing of our resources and the important thing is if we don't deal with it today, as long as we deal with it before it becomes a problem again and I think that's the key thing.

Because I agree, there is a better way and there are many, many issues that affect this. Again, one of the biggest and I keep going back to this, one of the biggest problems we have is its basically a dead end, one way in and one way out which causes numerous problems in and of itself. There's also traffic cycle problems that we can address, there's lots of things that we can do to relieve this and this would be a part or possibly a part of doing that. But how we proceed is ya'll's decision.

Councilman Carmody: Chief, you know, I like everybody else up here on this dais wants to be supportive of the Police Department and wants to make sure that the access to the Riverfront is available to anybody that wants to use it.

I'm familiar and have seen the problems that we've got and again, it does look very similar to other areas in town where we've seen people congregate just to be seen and to see. They're not there to actually patronize any business. They're not there to even step down out of the car. I mean, if nothing else, you know, if they could park it and just kinda see their friends and be seen, it seems like that's what they want to do.

And my hesitancy and then why I asked that you kinda come up here and give us an idea about how to do this, is because I too am concerned about putting a law on the books that's very well could require additional manpower for the Department. Granted, ya'll have to follow the crowd. Its just a reality that in order to provide security and make sure that people are behaving, the Police Department has to go where the crowds congregate.

And what I've seen as the situation with the development of our Riverfront is, is that we have kinda built and built and built and not provided anywhere for people to actually park.

And as opposed to supporting a law that in essence is kinda like telling people no, you can't do this, no, you know. And then next year, if you try to do it again, we'll come down there and we'll actually show you that no means. no.

I'd almost rather us take the time between this down time for whatever reason the population seems to go back away from this area and to look and I know ya'll are, along with Traffic Engineering, if it is kind of a one way in and a one way out, that we reevaluate the possibility of re-directing traffic maybe at certain times where we limit the direction that traffic can flow through that area and that it is more or less non-stop. Work with the traffic signals, make it so that the traffic does have to flow. Now granted, some people would say "well, wait a minute, now you're gonna tell us you can't tell us we can't go south on Clyde Fant Parkway out of downtown on the Clyde Fant Parkway?" Well no, not so much that, but it could be very well be that in order to make that block, that you have to come back into the downtown area and get back on Market Street and work your way over to Lake to go south.

But I understand the problem, but I'm not very comfortable having re-read the proposed ordinance as to how to implement this. And with having an officer there with even a portable computer to just put down the numbers, granted, I know if you put up a big sign that says: *This is a traffic control point* and everybody goes down there the first weekend and says, there's an officer that's taking down numbers, we don't want to go by here three

times. I mean, I go back to a prior career and will tell you that more than likely, the number is three because you go to where you're going and you come back to where you came from, normally, the same way that you went. So, to get to where you're going, you go there, and then you follow the same route back (that's twice that you've traveled.) But if you go another time, all of a sudden, you're repetitive driving?

I'm just - - I want to be supportive of the Department, but I want us to put the laws on the books that really are legitimate tools for the Department to use. And I'm not saying that this is not legitimate, but I think that we are entering into a window of opportunity here where we can kind of look at what we might be able to do to improve the situation down there and I'd be more comfortable in taking that window now as opposed to passing this law today.

Mayor Hightower: You know I think everything that's been said certainly has merit and I don't think that the proposal that's before you today is perfect by any means. But as the Chief has said, it's a tool, just another arrow in the quiver to be able to use when necessary. If you hadn't seen the tapes or you hadn't been down there, you don't know. If you have, you do know what's going on and as the Chief said, we can't let another weekend roll by and not do something to address this. We've address it with manpower both from the casinos standpoint, from the Red River Entertainment District standpoint, from the police force standpoint to the point to where its costing everybody a ton of money and they need a deterrent.

There are a lot of deterrent ordinances on the books now. The curfew is one. We don't write a whole lot of curfew tickets, that's not what the Police Department is out doing at 10:05 on a weeknight and 12:05 on the weekends. But when they do find somebody out that appears to be younger than they should be, at least it's something that they can stop 'em and talk to 'em about, and to get 'em to head on to the house.

The noise ordinance is a great example of - - you talk about an ordinance that's hard to enforce and I agree with some of the sentiment of--we need to give people an alternative and another place to go--but we really don't give them an alternative to where you can go to play loud music, or we don't give speeders an alternative as to where you can go to speed.

So, its not a perfect law and I don't think anybody has said that, but again, I think it's another tool. And part of what the police officers have experienced downtown is symptoms of, you know, I don't know about road rage to a critical level, but when you have that many people in a place at one time that can't get to where they want to go and can't move, the frustration level obviously rises especially, if there has been alcohol involved. Likely, it has been if you're out at 3:00 in the morning on the Riverfront.

So, again all that we're asking for is a tool. I think Councilman Gibson had a good idea. An ordinance with a sunset of one year, I think gives the Police Department enough time to see how effective and how big of a deterrent an anti-cruising ordinance can be and then we can re-visit.

But I think the most important thing is to have something in place quickly so that this coming weekend and the weekend after that and Independence Bowl weekend or whatever weekend that comes about, you know we're not still twiddling our thumbs saying what can we do and where can we send people and how can we enforce and sorry about that shooting.

So, I would ask that, even though it isn't perfect, if you would give the Department some time over the next year to test it for ourselves, I think it would be a benefit to us all. And again, I don't think the Department's M.O. is to go out and to write a whole bunch of cruising tickets. I think its going to be hard to monitor, hard to enforce, but I think it is a tool that the Department can use to walk up to somebody and say look, I've seen you come by here 15 times, either park and come in or go home or move on. So, I would ask that you support the ordinance. I don't think there is a down side to it and hopefully, there is a good bit of deterrent and upside to it and we'll know that at the end of the test period.

Councilman Jackson: I hear the Mayor saying and I think it's been said more than once or twice today, Chief talking about a tool to use. Chief, can you elaborate, I don't know, because it's obvious to me that this doesn't clear up a problem for us city-wide. It only clears up a problem for us in one location, in the Central Business District, particularly Clyde Fant, that one street for the most part.

Maybe you can clarify what tools you use, because this tool was not available to Greenwood Road and Jewella, to the citizens in Queensborough and otherwise this tool was not available but we did use something that was effective. And, we did not have to, we didn't have to enlarge the laws on the books in order to take care of it. Could it happen again? Absolutely. But again, at the same time, this was happening at 6,7,8, 9 on Sundays, before the 10:00 time. We did something before the 10:00 hour which is when you're probably in an area like that, going to have more people not in the Downtown area. I mean, you've got more things for people to come to downtown that you didn't even have to park for, that you'd have to drive to get to then you do on Jewella and Greenwood Road. So that was literally a congregation of people who at many of those times had no options about going into locations. Some businesses closed down because they were out there. So, they were obviously not trying to patronize. You couldn't mistake the people who were cruising there, for people who may be going to shop at Super One. You know that, that wasn't the same group.

In this scenario, I wondered why- -what - -have we tried to apply that tool? I think crafting law and legislation suggest that this is the last result without trying to do everything else we could to mitigate the circumstances on the Parkway. Do we feel as if we've done everything we possibly could do to mitigate the circumstances on the Parkway and thus we arrive at this point now where we must enact this legislation be it perfect or not?

Chief Campbell: No, and I think I made myself real clear, this is just one tool in a bag of many tools. I think if you look at what we've done out there or down there over the past few weeks by increasing enforcement, by increasing the recently passed open container ordinance, that it significantly reduced and we're continuing to do that and we're seeing the results of that, and that's a similar plan that was used on Jewella and Greenwood Roads.

Several of the ordinances that I have reviewed regarding cruising, there's no set place. It's at the discretion of the Chief of Police and the Traffic Engineers. So, that if you do have a problem, your problem's here, and then it's over here. You can move to where the problem is and then it becomes more - - then it just becomes a tool to help you fix that problem.

Another thing I would like to address, and I think the issue is, this is not something that's new. They did it when I was growing up at Kokomo, round and around and around. But I think it's something that when it gets to the level that it is down there, I think that it does affect the public safety and the fact of being able to respond either the Fire Department or the Police Department to respond to emergency calls to get through the traffic; so, there's issues there that need to be addressed.

Like I told you, this is not the panacea, it's not the answer to all things. It is simply a tool which can be used and again, that decision rest with the Council.

Councilman Jackson: But my concern was that if this would be an effective tool, it would seem to me that it ought to be utilized in other areas where the problem could exist. This legislation doesn't give us the opportunity to do that.

Chief Campbell: No it does not.

Councilman Jackson: This legislation restricts us to certain portions of the Riverfront area.

Chief Campbell: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: And it speaks specifically to that. And so, it will not serve as a tool usable or accessible to us if in fact the problem at Greenwood Road and Jewella, God forbid would reoccur.

And I understand that it is in fact seasonal. Not only is it seasonal, it is also minutely jurisdictional and I just think that it would have made more sense if you could use your tool any way you need it rather than only being able to apply this tool in one location which is one of the things that hang me up about this ordinance is its specificity with which it describes that particular area on the Riverfront.

Councilman Hogan: Chief, I'd like to tell you that I could go along with this. I'm along with the spirit of this legislation. I do have some concerns as have been voiced by Councilman Lester and some others about the enforceability of it, but I'm going along with the spirit of this and I'm in favor of it.

Councilman Gibson, you made some good points a few minutes ago about setting a time frame on this and I think that's a good idea. Because it's seasonal, maybe we need to consider, I was thinking like you said towards the end of the year, Mayor, you said a one year period. To be safe, we might want to go with a one year period. Do you have any input on that and if we choose to do it that way, what kind of time frame we could put on it?

Chief Campbell: This particular problem that we've had there, there seems to begin about the first week in August, and runs - - last year, it ran up until the Thanksgiving Holidays but it was a little bit unseasonal. And what we will see, as the colder weather comes in, it's not as comfortable to just hang around out in the open and so, that'll pretty much kinda take care of it. So, if it runs, if that's what the Council chooses to do, I would say, run it through Thanksgiving and see if that's the way you choose to pursue it.

Councilman Hogan: So Chief, you're saying roughly a 6-week period, is that all you need?

Chief Campbell: Well, actually we're almost through this year.

Councilman Hogan: Well you said Thanksgiving which is about six weeks?

Chief Campbell: Right well, actually we were talking about a year and maybe I

misunderstood what you were talking about.

Councilman Hogan: You mean run it. Okay, a year starting this Thanksgiving?

Chief Campbell: Yes

Councilman Hogan: Is that what you're saying? Okay, okay. And you've made some comments too about just the fact that we passed the ordinance, that could in itself prove to be a deterrent? An example of that is the ordinance that I passed on signs, you know. Has anybody seen any signs since we passed that ordinance? Not one (just a little bit of humor there.)

Councilman Jackson: Its against the law.

Councilman Hogan: Just a little bit of humor. I waited until Mr. Brown was gone, yeah. No offense Mr. Brown if you're watching.

Councilman Green: He is. He'll be back next meeting.

Councilman Hogan: Anyway, Chairman has anybody approached you about this idea before today? About extending, about putting a time limit - - a sunset on this if you will?

Councilman Walford: No.

Councilman Hogan: Would you be willing to consider that?

Councilman Walford: I'd consider it, certainly.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, could I intervene on this real quick?

Councilman Hogan: Go ahead.

Councilman Gibson: I've asked Council to pass out an amendment that sunsets this as of October 15, 2004. I'd like to make a motion to amend to this particular motion that this particular ordinance be in place for 12 months with the Police Department coming back reporting on its effects. I'm putting that in form of writing under our policies and procedures.

Councilman Walford: But do I understand you are making a motion?

Councilman Gibson: Making a motion for an amendment.

The Council considered the following amendment.

Amendment No.1 by Councilman Gibson:

Amend the ordinance as follows:

Add Section 90-12(f) to read as follows:

(f) The provisions of this section shall be effective until 4:30 a.m. October 15, 2004.
After said date this section shall be considered repealed.

Explanation of amendment:

Provides for the sunset of this provision on October 15, 2004.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Hogan for adoption of Amendment No. 1.

Councilman Lester: I think the thing that is instructive to us is this is the first time, that we as a body that we have set down and discussed this particular issue. And within ten minutes of us discussing this issue, we already have one particular idea amendment wise as to how to deal with this issue. I think what we need to do is postpone this issue for two weeks. Put together a task force, put representatives from this Body, DDA, the casinos, the affected folks that are downtown, representatives from the Entertainment Area and come up with something that is going to deal with this on a holistic approach, come back in two weeks and put that out there. Because again, I understand where Councilman Gibson is going and I think this is better than the original amendment, but it still doesn't cure some of the concerns that I have and I still think that it's a piece meal situation. I think it's a piece meal situation that does not last as long, but think it's still a piece meal situation. And to the extent that this is something serious enough to have representatives from the casino industry sit through one of our meetings to say this is something that serious to us and the fact that we're going through a budgetary time says, they have some concerns and obviously that's going to impact possibly our bottom line, I think we need to give this our best effort and not just try to throw something up against the wall for the sake of time.

So, I would move to postpone this issue, empanel a committee at the Chairman's leadership and call these people together in a room and sit down and come up with something, a holistic approach to deal with the problem of what's going on downtown. And then come back at our next meeting with an approach that requires legislation or bringing legislation. If it requires some other things or other help from other departments, other corporate bodies, bring that so that we can say to the citizens, we've given this our best effort as opposed to, you know, this sounded good at the time and we amended it because we wanted to get home and kiss our kids; that's a motion to postpone Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: I think we already had a motion and a second on the floor to-- oh, yours was strictly for sunset?

Councilman Gibson: Right and I would like to talk on that at the appropriate time.

Councilman Walford: Well, Mr. Lester has made a motion which I didn't hear a second for.

Councilman Green: We already had one, so.

Councilman Walford: He's making a substitute motion but I have no 'second' for that time.

Motion by Councilman Lester to postpone the ordinance for two weeks and put together a task force, seconded by Councilman Green.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lester gets first, since it is his motion he gets first. . . .

Motion by Councilman Lester to move to the question, seconded by Councilman Gibson (to end debate).

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chair, I'm not clear, excuse me just a second.

Councilman Walford: There was a call for the question with a second which ends debate, so we're voting right now on whether we end debate or not on his motion

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I understand but. Mr. Lester, what was it.

Councilman Lester: My motion is to table this discussion and panel a task force with the persons I enumerated earlier. Come back in two weeks with a proposal to deal with the holistic issue of what's going on downtown.

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

Councilman Walford: Debates ended. Now we'll vote on Mr. Lester's motion to postpone for two weeks, appoint a task force and come back with the results.

Motion by Councilman Lester to postpone the ordinance for two weeks and put together a task force, seconded by Councilman Green. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Ayes: Councilman Lester and Green. 2.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Thompson, you're going to have to help me.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Hogan for adoption of Amendment No. 1.

Mr. Thompson: You have Mr. Gibson's amendment.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, I believe I made the motion for the sunset. I do believe that Councilman Lester has some merit, but I do believe that I've also heard a sense of urgency by the Police Department that this would immediately take - - go into affect and be sunset-ed. There is no reason why we couldn't pass this legislation and then concurrently work with the Police Department, the casinos, the DDA and some people on City Council at the pleasure of the Chair to appoint a group, a task force to work on additional remedies to some of the problems that are going on while this piece of legislation is in effect in order to address the immediate needs of the Police Department.

The only other question I have for the Police Chief is specifically, if were to pass this legislation for sunset-ting, would we be able to, because I see in the legislation signage. How quick a turn around, could we have signage out there to be fair and equitable to the citizens and to the visitors of Shreveport to know that we would be able to have some signs out there to give proper notice to people that we wouldn't catch them blind sided because obviously, it's gonna be a shock to the system of the people visiting down there?

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman to answer that question Councilman Gibson, the law, if you pass it today won't become effective until after I sign it or at least ten days after that. So, we'll have the signs up prior to the law actually being into effect. So, this weekend, we will have no ordinance, but hopefully by the next, we'll be ready to roll.

Councilman Gibson: But would we be in a position, you feel confident from an administrative standpoint that we would have enough signage out there to let people know what's going on. Which kinda parallel's Councilman Green's camera out in his district, to be able to give people plenty of notice that they are having some cameras out there, but that was my only concern in terms of that. But I would appreciate the support and we go ahead and put this into effect as a pilot program, sunset-ing on October 15, 2004.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson, if I could, I'd like to answer a question that you're or a comment that you're making and what Mr. Lester had discussed. And Chief, I need you to help me. Over the past few weeks, we have been meeting almost weekly, and you're gonna have to help me with who all has been in the meetings, but its been SPD in force. Its been the casinos, its been the Red River District, its been Traffic Engineering, its been Mr.

Strong and Mr. Holt from DOS. The only one that I don't remember having that was discussed here was DDA?

Councilman Lester: And us.

Chief Campbell: DDA, I do not believe they were there.

Councilman Walford: But during those meetings, we've discussed traffic flow, we've come up with the decision to block various streets, restricting one way traffic on some streets, completely closing others to facilitate the traffic flow and we still had the problem that I think we all believe this ordinance will help.

Chief Campbell: Right, we have worked diligently towards a solution trying to work the traffic out in other fashions and the casinos have gone to the point of hiring officers just work traffic down there, which they pay for. Which supplemented our officers to do the other issues in the District and so, its been kind of a work in progress as we improved.

Councilman Walford: And it quite frankly has changed from week to week and lessons learned and used our stumbling blocks for stepping stones and we still need some help.

Councilman Green: I just wanted to say Mike thank you for bringing up the camera and it is for lease.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I think based on some of the feedback that you've heard from colleagues up here that it would be very beneficial for the Chair to assign a task force to take in account, not replicate what work has already been done up to this point, but I think there's some other issues that seem to have resonated from this discussion that would lend itself to having merit to further that discussion if we're successful in passing this legislation that, that take place. Because I think this is, I've heard from the Chief, I've heard from other people, seems to me like this is going to be a work in progress anyway.

Councilman Walford: Absolutely.

Councilman: That would be my recommendation Mr. Chair.

Councilman Walford: The Chair will certainly appoint that committee and I think Mr. Jackson. . .

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard and I knew you all, I guess, I'd assumed you all had been probably meeting for a long time about it. But I was still in question with it, if this was the best thing after all those meetings that you could come up with in the sense that it still does not speak to the enforceability. I don't know if at the meeting, y'all were talking about the correct strategy for enforceability. If so, maybe this hadn't been a convincing argument or something today, but it sounds like it's a finger crossing piece of legislation. We put it into effect and hopes it works.

But I just think that certainly with all of the meetings, that you all have had, that certainly I'm assuming this came up in the meetings and that somehow or another you all

were at least able to iron it out to such a degree that you all were satisfied that this would be the most palatable piece of legislation that you all could present. I don't know Mr. Chairman, I still don't think a sunset period answers those questions. I think we have those questions for a shorter period of time, but we still have those questions and I think they remain at least to a great degree unresolved.

And maybe we can speak to again and I've asked a little bit about what we did or what we done before. Obviously we've been using some tools and asked the question earlier, have we exhausted everything that we need to add this new tool to the plethora of tools that we've already been using? And somehow or other, this one enhances that or is it in fact, one of these situations where we put it in place and hope that it will stop what's going on. And if it doesn't, then we're left to look at additional tools and other things that may happen.

Because if I'm correct and I think Councilman Hogan alluded to the fact that once the ordinance or signs were in place, nobody else brought signs, that would have put them in violation of the law. And I think that's probably why. But if they cruise from 6-10 or 7-10, that does not put them in violation of the law, but it would seem to put as much headache on the businesses that are around and be as dangerous as doing it from 10-4. The public safety issue is still in my opinion, something that has to be addressed if that were to happen. I don't know that people will wilfully disobey the law un-mass. But in fact, if in fact I'm being just contrary to what's there, you have allowed me the opportunity to cruise from 7-10. And if I'm going to show off the car and do those kinds of things, I'll do that from 7-10 there and then from 10 on, I don't want to break the law, I'll find somewhere else to go and hopefully not Greenwood Road and Jewella.

So, I guess, that's a lingering concern that has not satisfactorily in my opinion, been addressed. And I'm only speaking for myself. Its not being addressed satisfactorily to me, along with a lot of other issues that Councilman Lester raised a few minutes ago that had to do with discretion and those kinds of things. I don't know that sunset period offers an answer to that question.

I mean I think it's easier to get passed. Because I don't think we're going to pass this piece of legislation. Obviously sunset serves as a compromise, but I just don't know if we ought to necessarily (no pun intended) roll the dice on legislation. I think we ought to have something more concrete when move to put things that are laws on the books.

Councilman Lester: I appreciate you, Mr. Chief, I appreciate Chairman, I appreciate the people that I've heard have been working on this. I can't vote for this in good conscious because there are far too many questions that I think as of yet are unresolved.

If what we're obviously dealing with is a problem with cruising and the impact that cruising has on the casinos, I haven't heard anyone tell me how this statute is going to ameliorate that problem. As a matter of fact every person before the that podium has said,

this is not going to solve the problem. Everyone from the Casino, from the Chief himself to the folks at DDA, all of these people that I 've been told that have been meeting, said either we haven't considered it or yes there is some other things that we think that we need to do but we haven't even addressed those issues. We are going to have a law that we are going to enforce that is not going to solve the root problem and I don't think that we should be in the business of passing laws that are not going to solve the root problem unless and until we have sat down and discussed what the root causes of the problem are and deal with it in a holistic approach. I can not in good conscious vote for this. I think we are doing this piecemeal and I think it is not going to solve—in fact I know that it is not going to solve our problems because don't believe me, every one that has been to the microphone. So if the statute that we ware going to pass, that you are asking us to pass is not going to solve the problem, why are we going to pass this law? And if we can't sit down in a room for 2-weeks and include the Council and include the community, aside from the people that have the problem, what the point of us doing this in the first place? I think we are just again, doing something just to be doing something. There is a axiom that I've heard that a lot of people confuse with movement with progress and I don't think that just because we are moving we are progressing. I think we are doing a lot of moving, but I don't think we are doing any progressing.

Councilman Hogan: Chief, how long have you been on the police force?

Chief Campbell: Nearly 30-years.

Councilman Hogan: Almost 30-years. Of the people that spoke so far today and some in the meeting, I don't know of anybody that has 30-years experience on the police force. And I am going to tell you the truth, I think it is a slap in the face to Chief Campbell, if we disregard his opinion. He has chaired this committee apparently and has come up with this ordinance. And is it a perfect ordinance? No. It is not perfect. Do we know if it is going to answer all of our problems? No. Is it going to help address some of our problems? It could and I believe this is a start. It is a step in the right direction. And, I am in favor of it and I am going to ask everybody to support this.

Councilman Gibson: The two representatives from the casino, still in the audience. Could I have them come forward please. I appreciate ya'll staying around.

I have a couple of questions for both of you. In my mind, and this was something that, I guess there is already precedence there. Harrah's had a parking issue for overflow if I am not mistaken. In fact the City worked with you on a parking lot and some work was done and ya'll subsidized or paid for that work on that parking lot. And I'm thinking in terms of the same like a lot of this was driven in my mind and again I am not speaking for colleagues and I am not speaking for the constituents that I represent here, but in my mind, it seems that a lot of this was driven because of a lot of the concerns that your corporate entity has along Clyde Fant.

I guess my question would be, would you be amenable based on the cost for the signs and also the cost of the equipment to look at helping this City pay for some of those expenses during this interim period of time seeing that this is going to benefit probably you more than anybody?

Mr. Berry: We've always been and I can not speak for the General management, but we've always been—we hire police officers to work the street which is quite an expense. We been doing that for the last four months. We are here to help. It is affecting us.

Councilman Gibson: I guess, could I ask ya'll to work with the Administration to see what, I don't know what the cost is going to be for signage. I know if you are looking at some hardware and software, Chief, obviously this is something that is going to be unique and I think some of our colleagues up here have specifically said, it is site specific.

And I would say that your good corporate citizenship in helping defer the cost of this, could help us if in fact we carry a pilot program that is this successful after 12-months that if we have another and I'm describing it as a hotspot but lets say, at Fairfield and 76th Street in Shreveport, that if you help us with some of the tools that we could take some of that equipment and some of these other things and use it in some other areas. So, I would ask you to consider that. So, would ya'll be amenable to working with the Administration on that.

Mr. Berry: Absolutely.

Ms. Washington: We certainly would like to work with the Administration. . . . speak to you what we can and—

Councilman Gibson: I know ya'll can't commitment financial in terms of. . .

Ms. Washington: We are certainly willing to work with the Administration and support (inaudible).

Councilman Green: Councilman Hogan asked a question as to, how long you been on the force and you said 30-years.

Chief Campbell: Nearly 30-years. Yes, sir.

Councilman Green: Out of that 30-years, where have you spent most of your time?

Chief Campbell: I've been pretty much, all over. I've been lets say. . .

Councilman Green: Where was the last place, you were at?

Chief Campbell: At the Police Academy.

Councilman Green: How long have you been there?

Chief Campbell: I have been at the Police Academy approximately a little over 4 years.

Councilman Green: When you look at traffic, since you been the Chief, 1. whose your best traffic cop as to, that basically would specialize in traffic control?

Chief Campbell: Probably Lieutenant Moore.

Councilman Green: Have anybody consulted him on this?

Chief Campbell: No sir, not today.

Councilman Green: I mean, period. Has he been consulted as to what's your idea about the riverfront?

Chief Campbell: Not during this deal. Now, he's had input on events that occur down there.

Councilman Green: Other stuff. But with this that we are about to make a law, the best traffic cop you've got, hasn't been consulted.

2. Whose your best crowd control officer who specialize, gone to workshops or schools or whatever to deal with crowd control?

Chief Campbell: Well, probably the best and works most of the special events is Captain Vanzant and he has been consulted. In fact he has been down there working in that environment.

Councilman Green: And with the schools that he has gone to or the workshops or whatever, is it anything in this particular ordinance that we are about to put in place that he himself said, was a good idea?

Chief Campbell: We've discussed it and he said it is a tool and the same thing that we've said all along, it is a tool. It is not going to be the panacea.

Councilman Green: Listen to what I'm saying, I am not asking if he said it was, a tool. I am asking if he said, it was good or a great idea?

Chief Campbell: He said it would help. He felt that it would help.

Councilman Green: But he didn't say it was a good or a great idea, but it is a tool.

Chief Campbell: Yes, it is a tool.

Councilman Green: So it would seem to me that since, you have a Specialist in traffic that, that Specialist would have some input on this.

Your crowd control officer, if he in fact gone to crowd control school to know about how to, the best way to disperse or handle crowds, that there ought to be something in here that he specialize in, that he would know more than anybody else because basically we can't specialize in everything.

Chief Campbell: That is correct.

Councilman Green: So therefore, if in fact, we got some Specialists on the police force who have gone to the specialized schools to specialize, then I think we ought to let them have some input on specializing the specification.

Chief Campbell: Right. My comment, I don't think we have any Specialists on the Police Department in regards to cruising.

Councilman Green: No, I am not talking about cruising. Notice I said, I didn't say 'cruising', I said 'traffic' as to. For an instance, national football, they will have 73,000 folks. So they got to have some officers on the street to be able to direct 73,000 folk real fast coming in and when the game is over.

We don't have that many cruisers down so my point is there ought to be somebody on the force who specialize in how to keep traffic moving more than giving a citation.

Chief Campbell: That is correct and I think. . .

Councilman Green: There ought to be somebody on the police force who specialize in disbursing crowds without making an ordinance to do it. Would you agree to both of those? That you ought to have somebody on there that can say, if we do a., b., c., d., this will disburse the crowd. This will take care of, I mean we had a game here. We've had a game. The last game we had was Miami and whoever. We didn't have to come here and do an ordinance. What you did was you decided that coming down Jewella, you can't go past, you can't go under the underpass. You got to turn right on Midway and go up and then come another way.

Chief Campbell: That is correct.

Councilman Green: The reason I know that is because I did it. If you come from Hearne, you can't exit off where-where you have got to go all the way around and come. And it worked because somebody went to the drawing board and decided to come up with a procedure and it worked. We didn't have to put nothing on the book. You didn't have to call any of us. You got your folk together and you did it.

Chief Campbell: Yes, sir and I think that is what we have been doing over the last several weeks, meeting. Captain Vanzant who ran many of the football games and things and he has been in traffic, he has been involved in the process and we have been trying things, different things trying to make it work. And, each weekend we learn something else and we keep tinkering with it trying to make it work without ordinance.

Councilman Green: So my point is this Chief, approximately, how many cars would say would possible be on the riverfront that we are trying to deal with?

Chief Campbell: Well at times and I'm not sure about the number of cars, but I can tell you the number of people at times.

Councilman Green: About.

Chief Campbell: You talking about cars or people?

Councilman Green: Both. I mean, cars. We are talking about cars, we are talking about cruising.

Chief Campbell: Cars. I would say probably it could be anywhere from 5- to 10,000.

Councilman Green: Okay, 5- to 10,000 and there were basically, how many people you would say was at the Miami game?

Chief Campbell: I think the attendance was about 40,000 or something like that.

Councilman Green: An you all took care of a crowd of 40,00 like zap and you can't deal with a crowd of 10,000?

Chief Campbell: Well, there is a little difference. They were wanting to come in and see the game and wanting to leave. This crowd is just going around and around.

Councilman Green: Well basically what I am saying is, you developed a strategy.

Chief Campbell: And that is what we are trying to do here.

Councilman Green: I think before we do anything, the officer who specialize in traffic should be given an opportunity to do his job. The person who specialize in crowd disbursement ought to be given the opportunity to do his or her job and I just think that they ought to have some input, they specialize in that. We pay them for that and I just think we ought to let folk do their job that specialize in whatever. Just like for an instance, you are the Chief, I am the preacher. I specialize over at the church, you specialize in the police force. It really wouldn't be right for me to try to specialize in your department because, I can't. I can have some ideas. I can tell you what I think or feel would work, but I don't have any really, evidence. And then when it comes to the church you know about church, you are a Christian, I can tell but it is not specializing. I just think that we ought to give these folks and opportunity to specialize in what they do. And, I think if we do that, then it will make difference. And we wouldn't have to put anything on, in fact it is challenge to the Police Department and we would have to come up with a law to say you can't cruise because then once you do that, then it makes me, not in America. I call for the question.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson on the question (to end debate). Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Walford. 1.

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

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Hogan for adoption of the ordinance as amended.

Councilman Jackson: As we move to vote on this, I guess my concern was as we move through here, a couple of things that bother me. Obviously the relative term in this ordinance is 'financial deterrent' in the sense that the only penalty is a financial penalty. And I guess maybe that could deter some people but in essence it doesn't necessary deter people would could afford to pay the fine, necessarily.

But more importantly, I have question and I don't know and maybe its rhetorical, but since we've been on this Council there has been consistent legislation about this downtown district. I don't know if the last Council and I guess maybe only Carmody is the person who is here who could speak to that, but I don't know which Council planned this downtown this Red River District or voted on the stuff that put it in place, but they obviously did a shabby job because we have to keep coming back and we consistently putting in whether it through appeal of the other open container and this. Is there somebody, maybe the Administration can answer the question, is there somebody who is consistently looking at the Red River District and should be anticipating continual, I guess, little pieces of legislation that will

keep coming once or twice every two months?

Mayor Hightower: Yes and yes.

Councilman Jackson: There is somebody who is doing it and they need---just only as problems arise they come up with. Nobody is thinking globally about it. Obviously nobody is, you don't have to answer that because obviously nobody though universally about it.

But are we repairing it just as we get a leak, we repair it at that particular point or at some point have we gone back and is there some master designing place that after we put it in place, some things we found out are not working. What is it? Because it seems to me and phone calls, I have gotten I bet you 20 to 25 phone calls in the last three days about a cruising ordinance and people are suggesting that it is one thing after the next, after the next, after the next and so on and so forth and I'm not necessarily saying that they are correct, but it would seem at some point we have to take a moment and step back and look at this thing globally and determine if there are other issues that we can look at, all at the same time. Will this affect something else? Are there going to be ancillary effects to each thing we put in place. What are we expecting from the riverfront?

For me, it just seems that while it is not necessarily, arbitrary, it seems that maybe the process was not well thought out in the beginning and we've come back and we just continually repair it. I don't know who can answer that. As I said, it may be rhetorical, but that is just the perception that I think we see when we continue to do it as we been doing it.

Councilman Green: Chief, so that you know. I just basically like to speak on your level. The reason that a lot of folks are reluctant to this in talking about is because they feel that minorities are going to be targeted, and I'm sure that you probably don't know that. But that is one point that, who will be targeted. And that is the question, who will be the target. And answer that comes from the circle that I travel in, will be minorities and I thought that you needed to know that, so that you can understand where we are. Because basically during that time, probably that is who is doing the cruising so therefore that is where the, I guess you would say, bad blood or whatever will come, it will come because of that. So, I am in hopes that that will help you maybe your officers as to how to handle it.

And again, I'm still in hopes that since we have folk who specialize in whatever on our police force that we will let them do their job because on this particular deal there is no evidence, real evidence that we gave them the opportunity to do that.

Motion for adoption of the ordinance as amended denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Carmody, Green and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilman Walford, Hogan and Gibson. 3.

3. Ordinance No. 144 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the North side of Nelson Street at its Intersection with Corporate Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana,

from I-2, Heavy Industrial District, to R-3, Urban, Multiple-family Resident District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Lester: I would move that we, I think, overturn the MPC's decision and allow the re-zoning of that piece of property.

Mr. Thompson: Is this [Ordinance] 144?

Councilman Lester: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: It is normally what the Council does is to move to approve and then you would request that they would reject it, this is an ordinance.

Councilman Lester: So, what is the proper procedure, Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: Move to adopt the ordinance.

Councilman Lester: And then ask everyone to vote against?

Mr. Thompson : Yes, sir.

Mr. Dark: Art, are you sure on this one because the MPC said 'no' correct?

Mr. Thompson: Right.

Mr. Dark: If the ordinance passes, the zoning is approved; that is I think he said he wanted.

Councilman Walford; This is a *zoning appeal*, this is not approving an ordinance that came from the MPC.

Mr. Thompson: It is an ordinance and in order to change the zoning you have to adopt the ordinance. Now, it takes 5 votes overturn to adopt this ordinance because it was denied by the MPC and it takes 5 votes in order to adopt it, rather than 4.

Mr. Dark: Excuse me Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure, the way I understood Mr. Lester's comment, he is for the rezoning.

Councilman Lester: That is correct.

Mr. Dark: If he is for the rezoning, he would urge his colleagues to vote 'yes'.

Mr. Thompson: Oh, I'm sorry. Correct.

Mr. Dark: If the ordinance passes, the rezoning is approved, if it fails the rezoning is not approved.

Mr. Thompson: That is correct but it does take 5 votes in order to adopt this ordinance.

Councilman Lester: So my motion is to grant the zoning overturning the MPC's decision.

Mr. Thompson: Your motion is to adopt the ordinance. The ordinance as it is on the books would approve the zoning.

Councilman Lester: Okay, alright. Well my motion is to support this ordinance.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003, was ordered passed to first reading. Read the

third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson for adoption.

Councilman Gibson: I am going to have to be in opposition to this particular legislation for the main reason of we've got industrial and commercial or industrial and residential mixed just for the same reason I voted two weeks ago against an annexation issue which involved both commercial and residential. It appears to me that, that mixed use is going to create some real issues for this community. I think that in the long run we are going to be looking at some real inherent problems and with that, I will be voting 'no'.

Councilman Carmody: I too will be voting 'no'.

Councilman Lester: I have agonized over this decision for quite some time. Zoning cases are some of the toughest cases that we have to deal with. I am asking my colleagues to vote with me on this issue. As I appreciate it and driving by this area on a very frequent basis, the property that is subject of this particular ordinance is behind a strip center that at one time was filled with businesses, that was filled with T G & Y, that was filled with a number of businesses that cater to people that live in and around the North Market, Cherokee Park corridor. People left and there were no customers and those businesses moved out. So one of the organizations that is going to most directly affected by this, would be those business owners and merchants that have weathered the storm in North Market. You are talking about national chain, you are talking about any number of businesses that are over there.

The second concern that I had was this particular parcel of land is separate and apart from the industrial area. If this was a scenario where you had the business or a piece of property that was right in the middle of an industrial area, I think your arguments would be accurate, but in this particular case you are talking about a tract of land that is behind an Ekerd's, a strip mall, and it borders on a bayou and then there is nothing else around it much like you have apartments behind East Gate, much like you have apartments behind a number of business and residential developments, you have apartments, this would be a similar type scenario.

I've heard what the business owners have said. I think it would be instructive to note that this would not be a scenario that is changing the zoning of the entire area. We are talking about a small parcel of land.

And I would also bring to the Council's attention that, there are other residential developments that are in and around this area and some of the same people that have voiced objections today, did not voice objections at that time and in fact I would dare say that the retail merchants that are in that area are moving toward that area. As a matter of fact earlier this year, we had a McDonald's that is further down North Market that is actually moving to striking distance, literally, from these apartments that are already existing.

So, if my colleagues decide to not support this development, I will respectfully deal with that issue but this is not a scenario where we are impinging upon anyone. This is not a scenario where we are impinging upon a negative situation. We are in a situation where we are going to be able to give people who have a serious need for housing, a serious need for development an opportunity to have good quality affordable housing in an area that is not going to be offense to other residents in other areas.

And, again I would say, while they might be of low to moderate income apartments behind industrial developments and apartments behind strip malls or something that we see in every portion of this City. I would challenge us to look at any significant business development in this City. I would take you to Mall St. Vincent. What's around Mall St. Vincent? Apartments. I would take you to the one of the largest areas that is being built in and around the Youree Drive area. What's around that? Apartments. I would take you to Bert Kouns. You got Super Wal-Mart and all of those things over there. What's around there? Apartments. And I would say that this is a scenario where you have had a piece of property that has remained vacant and undeveloped for two decades, and now you've got someone that is going to bring housing that is going to spend money to develop this area, and bring people that need goods and services in an area where retail merchants are leaving and we are going to, not support that.

Again, I would just ask my colleagues to support this development because I think it is something that is needed. I think the waiting list speaks for itself. I think the people that have come and said that they would like this development, speak for itself and I would ask that this Council would support me and support this development as we have done in other instances.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Lester, and I have said to Mr. Lester without much, even before we had a whole lot of knowledge about who was where in this scenario and since it seems necessary to announce how we are going to vote, I too will not do as, violate what we've suggested in times prior. Obviously the Councilman in that district has the incumbent responsibility to sit down with the people who work in that district or who have businesses in that district and we have in the past on other issues and I'm sure perhaps even today will take up other zoning matters and I continue to, as I thought was the certainly not the rule but the practice of this Council, to defer to the Councilman in that particular district with regards to the specifics of the case and working all those things that were important. And, in keeping with that Mr. Lester, I intend to support the Councilman in whose district this is going to affect directly.

Councilman Hogan: Along with what you said Councilman Lester, I've agonized with this as well. I can sympathize with Mr. Miller in a way because I'm in the rental property business and I understand. I've tried to get property rezoned before and failed.

As you mentioned a moment ago Councilman Jackson that historically it has been the

pattern of this Council to go along with the Councilman from that distinct and their recommendation however, I've heard both sides. There are people for and against and it has been a tough decision.

And I'm not sure if I need to say this, but Councilman Lester, the reason that I am going to vote against it is what we talked about, about an hour ago you and I just behind the door over there. And, so in things that come up in the future that I'm involved in for zoning, I just want you to know that that's the reason why that I've chosen to vote against this.

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

4. Ordinance No. 145 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the South side of Glen Oak Place 228 feet east of Dowdell Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-3, Urban, Multiple-family Residence District to B-1, Buffer Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003, was ordered passed to first reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

5. Ordinance No. 146 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on North side of Ockley Drive, 1000 feet west of Youree Drive, from SPI-3 (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District to SPI-3-E (B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) Extended Use District, "limited to home based beauty salon," only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003, was ordered passed to first reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption.

Councilman Lester: Are we allowing the home based business, the home based beauty salon on this?

Mr. Kirkland: The property is already zoned commercial it is B-1, to have the beauty parlor requires B-2. So, what you've got is actually they are going to keep the residential structure which is a good thing so it is a combination of business and home so we'd recommend your approval. The Planning Commission was unanimous on that and the BNG

(Broadmoor Neighborhood Group), supported it as well.

Councilman Lester: How does this differ from, I think maybe about a month ago we had two home based beauty salons?

Mr. Kirkland: Residential zoning class, not residential zoning class.

Councilman Lester: And are these in residential areas?

Mr. Kirkland: It abuts—it abuts or is adjacent to a residential zoned property due west of this site but this tract is zoned B-1.

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

6. Ordinance No. 147 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located west side of Kingston Road, 300 feet north of Manor, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District to R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003, was ordered passed to first reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption.

Councilman Walford: Is there any discussion, Mr. Hogan?

Councilman Hogan: I've met with the residents in this area and they are all in favor of it, had no opposition.

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

7. Ordinance No. 148 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the South Side of Southern Loop 900 Feet west of Norris Ferry Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1D, (PUD) Urban, One-family Residence (Planned Unit Development) District to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District, 'limited to retail development, grocery, convenience store, and gas station' only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003, was ordered passed to first reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption.

Councilman Walford: Councilman Gibson, any discussion? Are you asking for a 'yes' vote.
Councilman Gibson: That is what the motion is.

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

8. Ordinance No. 149 of 2003: An ordinance declaring certain adjudicated properties to be surplus and to authorize the Mayor of the City of Shreveport to sell the City of Shreveport's tax interest in certain surplus adjudicated properties, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 23, 2003, was ordered passed to first reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

The adopted Ordinances, as amended, follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 139 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE LEASE OF CERTAIN CITY-OWNED PROPERTY TO BELLSOUTH MOBILITY, LLC., D/B/A CINGULAR WIRELESS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, BellSouth Mobility, LLC. d/b/a Cingular Wireless, has requested the lease of the City-owned property at Independence Stadium, described herein in Exhibit "A", for the purpose of installing, maintaining and operating a wireless communication facility (cellular antenna) and uses incidental thereto; and

WHEREAS, the said property is not needed for public purposes; and

WHEREAS, the lease provides for an initial term of five (5) years plus the option, at BellSouth's election, to renew the lease for four (4) consecutive terms of five (5) years each; and

WHEREAS, BellSouth Mobility has agreed to pay the City the sum of \$40,000.00 as up front consideration for the lease plus an additional \$20,000.00 paid in equal monthly installments during the initial five (5) year term. Monthly installment payments will increase by ten percent (10%) for each of the renewal terms; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to enter into this lease with BellSouth Mobility, LLC.;

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

due, legal and regular session convened that the above described property is not needed for a public purpose.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute all documents relative to the lease of the City-owned as shown on Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made a part hereof, to BellSouth Mobility, LLC., substantially in accordance with the draft hereof filed for public inspection with the original of this ordinance in the Office of the Clerk of Council on September 9, 2003.

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. 145 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF GLEN OAK PLACE 228 FEET EAST OF DOWDELL STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-3, URBAN, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT, 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 zoning classification of Lots 7, 8, and 9, block L, Sunny Slope Addition, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the south side of Glen Oak Place 228 feet E of Dowdell Street, be and the same is hereby changed from R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District, to B-1, Buffer Business District:

SECTION II: THAT the rezoning of the property described herein is subject to compliance with the following stipulation:

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any changes requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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. 146 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON NORTH SIDE OF OCKLEY DRIVE, 1000 FEET WEST OF YOUREE DRIVE, FROM SPI-3 (B-1) COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT TO SPI-3-E (B-1), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (BUFFER BUSINESS) EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, "LIMITED TO HOME BASED BEAUTY SALON," 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 zoning classification of Lot A, Plot 129, Broadmoor Subdivison, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the north side of Ockley Drive, 1000 feet west of Youree Drive, be the same is hereby changed from SPI-3 (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District to SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) Extended Use District, "limited to home based beauty salon" only.

SECTION II: THAT the rezoning of the property described herein is subject to compliance with the following stipulation:

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the final site plan submitted to Staff with the requirement that any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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. 147 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF KINGSTON ROAD, 300 FEET NORTH OF MANOR, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-1-E, BUFFER BUSINESS/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT TO R-1D, URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, 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 zoning classification of

property located on the west side of Kingston Road, 300 feet north of Manor, legally described below, be and the same is hereby changed from B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District to R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District

Beginning 330 feet N and 40 feet W of the SE corner of Section 3 (16-14) run N89°40'W 175 feet, thence N11°41'W 121.26 feet, thence N0°20'E 360 feet, thence E along the S line of Lot B, Southridge Commercial area 200.00 feet to the W line of Kingston Road, thence S along same 479.48 feet to the beginning, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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. 148 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF SOUTHERN LOOP 900 FEET WEST OF NORRIS FERRY ROAD, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-1D, (PUD) URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE (PLANED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) DISTRICT TO B-2-E, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, 'LIMITED TO RETAIL DEVELOPMENT, GROCERY, CONVENIENCE STORE, AND GAS STATION' 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 zoning classification of property located on the south side of Southern Loop 900 feet west of Norris Ferry Road, legally described below, be and the same is hereby changed from R-1D, (PUD) Urban, One-Family Residence (Planned Unit Development) District, to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District, "limited to retail development, grocery, convenience store, and gas station" only:

From a found cotton spindle marking the SE corner of said Section 20, run thence N88°51'43"W a distance of 766.00 feet to the P-O-B of the tract herein described, from said P-O-B, run thence S01°06'20"W a distance of 279.69 feet, thence run along a curve to the right a distance of 194.03 feet (said curve having a radius of 2244.86 feet and a chord of N84°41'58"W 193.97 feet), thence run N81°25'20"W a distance of 62.76 feet, thence run N79°52'08"W a distance of 8.43 feet, thence

run N01°06'20"E a distance of 36.31 feet, thence run along a curve to the right a distance of 167.90 feet (said curve having a radius of 2208.86 feet and a chord of N78°05'22"W 167.86 feet), thence run N14°05'17"E a distance of 120.00 feet, thence run along a curve to the right a distance of 32.38 feet (said curve having a radius of 2088.86 feet and a chord of N75°28'04"W 32.38 feet), thence run N14°58'35"E a distance of 144.00 feet to the S R-O-W line of Southern Loop, thence run along a curve to the left along said S R-O-W line a distance of 403.48 feet (said curve having a radius of 1944.86 feet and a chord of S80°58'01"E 402.75 feet), thence run S01°06'20"W a distance of 20.47 feet to the P-O-B, said tract containing 2.766 acres, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

SECTION II: THAT the rezoning 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 review by the Planning Director or his designee, which shall require that vertical improvements be in substantial accord with the elevations presented at the public hearing on September 3, 2003. In addition, other requirements regarding the vertical improvements are listed as follows:
 1. Brick/ stucco exterior
 2. Architectural roofing with tile ridge caps
 3. Wood windows and wood doors stained or painted to match housing exteriors
 4. Brick or colonial columns
 5. Signage on ground only
 6. Heavy landscaping
 7. Exterior lighting shall be restricted in height, intensity, and style in order to ensure a residential character.
 8. The developer shall be required to retain a heavily landscaped (foliage/trees) buffer adjacent to residentially zoned property.
2. Extended use designation shall be limited to the following uses only:
 - a. Air conditioning sales and service.
 - b. Ambulance service
 - c. Animal hospital or veterinary clinic provided no outside kennels are maintained on the premises
 - d. Auditorium
 - e. Auto parts and accessories, including installation service and the retail sale of gasoline
 - f. Automobile filling station and/or service and repair, but not including commercial wrecking, dismantling, or auto salvage yard; need not be enclosed

within structure provided the enclosed part shall comply with the requirements for maintenance of off-street parking facilities; pump islands shall be located at least 15 feet from the property line; canopies anchored or supported in pump island may extend to within five feet of the property line, canopies shall have a minimum height of ten feet above driveway.

- g. Automobile laundry, where the primary function is washing automobiles, but not including trucks or trailers, and the retail sale of accessories, tires, and batteries is a secondary function only, and where services are limited to installation of items sold; operations shall be conducted only within a completely enclosed structure, and all wastes shall be discharged directly into the sewer.
- h. Building specialties store.
- i. City Hall, police station, courthouse, federal building.
- j. Diaper service.
- k. Dry cleaning with noninflammable cleaning agents only.
- l. Electric repair shop.
- m. Exterminators.
- n. Fur dyeing, finishing and storage; no tanning.
- o. Glass store.
- p. Laundry, including uniform rental and processing.
- q. Newsstand.
- r. Optical goods.
- s. Package and parcel pickup.
- t. Pet grooming facility; no outside kennels.
- u. Pet store.
- v. Printing, publishing, and allied industries.
- w. Radio and television store and repair shop.
- x. Restaurant, including indoor and outdoor dining areas, drive-thru, pick-up window, delivery service operations or other exterior service facilities.
- y. Rug cleaning.
- z. Security trailer; must be in compliance with guidelines.
- aa. Sporting goods store, retail.
- bb. Tile shop.
- cc. Tire store.
- dd. Tool and equipment rental (inside display only).
- ee. Used furniture, rummage shop.
- ff. Vegetable store.
- gg. Video sales and rentals.
- hh. Wholesale and warehousing, with 15,000 square feet or less of gross floor area.

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. 149 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING CERTAIN ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES TO BE SURPLUS AND TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO SELL THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S TAX INTEREST IN CERTAIN SURPLUS ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has a tax interest in the herein below described properties which have been adjudicated for the non-payment of City property taxes; and

WHEREAS, the herein below described properties are not needed for public purposes and should be declared surplus properties; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has received offers to purchase its tax interest in the herein below described properties as indicated below.

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

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the City Council of the City of Shreveport does hereby authorize the sale of its tax interest in the herein below described properties for an amount not less than the offer as indicated below.

Property No. 1: Legal Description - Lot 5, Waterside Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana as per that plat recorded in Book 50, Page 505 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO# 171307123000500) Municipal Address - 119 E. Dudley Drive

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$380.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$1,00.00 DISTRICT B

Property No. 2: Legal Description - Lot 5, Dorian Terrace, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana as per that plat recorded in Book 1100, Page 135 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO# 181434058000500) Municipal Address - 2703 Dorian Terrace

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$547.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$3,300.00 DISTRICT G

Property No. 3: Legal Description - Lot 16, Block "N" of the Mandel Subdivision a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 150, Page 52 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#1760880016) Municipal Address - 4209 Mandeline Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$75.00. APPRAISED VALUE: \$500.00 DISTRICT E

Property No. 4: Legal Description - Lot 125 of Evangeline Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 250, Page 200 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171417001012500) Municipal Address - 4239 Marston Avenue

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$400.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$600.00 DISTRICT G

Property No. 5: Legal Description - Lot 627, Cedar Grove Addition, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 50, Page 389 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171425067062700) Municipal Address - 136 E. 80th St.

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$2,000.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$7,500.00 DISTRICT D

Property No. 6: Legal Description - Lot 3 & N 10' of Lot 2, Dutch Gardens Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 1799, Page 594 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#181435093000300) Municipal Address - 316 Pierre Avenue

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$225.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$1,000.00 DISTRICT A

Property No. 7: Legal Description - Lot 69, Block 9, Dixie Place Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 100, Page 82 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171413125006900) Municipal Address - 4515 Tulsa Avenue

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$700.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$1,000.00 DISTRICT C

Property No. 8: Legal Description - Lot 634, Cedar Grove Addition, A subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 50, Page 389 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171425065063400) Municipal Address - 142 W. 80th Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$400.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$1,000.00 DISTRICT F

Property No. 9: Legal Description - Lot 496, Cedar Grove Addition, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 50 Page 389 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171425060049600) Municipal Address - 263 W. 80th Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$1,500.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$2,100.00

DISTRICT F

Property No. 10: Legal Description - Lots 65, 66, & 67 and the East 23.2 Feet of Lot 64, Newglass Plant

Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 2683 Page 546 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171416009009400) Municipal Address - 3829 Doris Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$2,200.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$9,000.00 DISTRICT F

Property No. 11: Legal Description - Lot 2, Pernici's Addition, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 450 Page 431 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana

(GEO#171306086000200) Municipal Address - 151 East Merrick Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$2,800.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$14,000.00

DISTRICT B

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport shall be authorized to do any and all things and to sign any and all documents, including Acts of Cash Sale, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney necessary to effectuate the purposes set forth herein.

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 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.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Resolution No. 88 of 2003: Amending Sections 1.8 and 1.11 of the Rules of Procedure of the City Council (Public Comments). (A/Lester) (*Tabled on June 24*)
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) *Tabled *As Amended on July 8 - *Changing the name of the Shreveport Blanchard Road from the Roy Road to North Hearne to Hilry Huckaby III Avenue.*)
3. Ordinance No. 80 of 2003: Amending the 2003 Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund Budget (disparity study). (G/Jackson) (*Tabled on July 8*)
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) (Postponed)

on July 8 until October 14)

Councilman Carmody: I have the pleasure of bringing one of the items off the Unfinished Business into our agenda and I believe that the President of the Common Homeowners Association actually spoke to us during the Public Comment.

I had understood that we had given ample time for the Home Owners Association to meet and my understand is that they again have concurred that they did not want to revise their by- laws to allow for a home based occupational this facility and therefore I am going to asking for, and let me make sure Mr. Thompson that I've got the correct motion, I would think that is a motion to uphold the denial of the Metropolitan Planning Commission for the use of the expanded home occupation.

Councilman Walford: You are almost correct, the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Councilman Carmody: Oh, thank you sir.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to uphold the denial of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

David R. Carroll (5681 South Lakeshore Drive): I'm kind of confused on filling out the form here.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Carroll, I think you were called up to answer questions from Mr. Lester.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Carroll you indicated that at some point, the original complainant wanted to withdraw their complaint and was not allowed to.

Mr. Carroll: Yes.

Councilman Lester; Could you elaborate, please sir.

Mr. Carroll: She told my son, what this all started over was a little discussion between his secretary and the complainant and she called the MPC about it and he had send in a form (inaudible) and things. He had been there probably about 13 or 14 years, I believe with no complaints at all. And he's in the insulation business but he has over, north of town, is where all the insulation is kept. He brings them in with 18-wheelers once every week or so I think and he don't have any transfer of stuff there. The only thing that he has, is a secretary to answer the phone and some typing and things of that nature. And that's the only difference from other people in the apartment complex itself. If you deny this to someone like this then every where in town, you'd have a deficit left here, I think, most people have some kind of office thing in their house.

I just wanted to discuss if I could, a little bit more on the lady that complained and the reason she complained.'

Councilman Gibson: I would like to give 3 minutes of my 10 minutes to Mr. Carroll.

Councilman Walford: At this point, I think it would take a motion to suspend the rules.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to suspend the rules to allow Mr. Carroll to speak. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford,

Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Carmody. 1. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Jackson. 1.

Mr. Carroll: That is the way the whole thing started a little discussion in the parking lot over a parking place at the complex.

She told my son that is here, that she asked them to withdraw her complaint and she said that they wouldn't do. Now, this is hearsay to my son who is here and she could not stop it, in other words and they continued with it and a lot of people don't even know he has any kind of business, if you call a business with a secretary in there. He has been there for that many years and has no complaints except this one and then she tried to withdraw it and couldn't.

And so if you vote against us on it we would like some time because my son does have plans to move out and find a lot and build a building and office, so just give us a little time.

On this listing here, I'm in Mr. Lester's district but it is in Mr. Carmody's district where my son has the business and I would just like consideration on the thing.

If you don't feel like you can vote against the Metropolitan Planning Commission on it, I've heard some reports out of it, if my son had been here at the time it happened, they would not have done me like they did.

He is on the Board of Directors of National Association of Insulators, of course they met in really nice places all over the country and he had a meeting that he felt like he had to go to at that time, so he missed it.

Now, I think, if it is possible to refer it back to the Metropolitan Planning Commission for a re-hearing on the thing, it would give us a chance to talk before them, I don't think they'd have the vote they had before but I am not getting you how to do it.

I was on the Police Jury for 12-years until I tried to step up to District 39 Senator and I lead in the first primary and the second primary, my friend, Don Williamson beat me out for it but I lived in District 39 and I'm proud of it. I live in Mr. Lester's district as City Councilman and I'm proud of it but I appreciate you giving me some consideration, if you could.

In order to change it through the Homeowners Association, you got to get a 2/3rds vote. They have difficulty I understand getting a quorum which is pretty hard to do is you can't qualify for a meeting, lets say, a lot of time it is hard to get 2/3rds. But, I'd just ask for consideration because I've been in the same boat that you are in now on the Police Jury and I know how it is and I don't want to take up any more of your time, it was a long meeting for you. Thank you for your consideration and appreciate you letting me speak before you.

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

Motion to uphold the denial of the Board of Appeals approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 4. Nays: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

Councilman Green: *Mr. Thompson, the rules state that if in fact you are on the prevailing side, that in the same meeting you can bring an item back up for discussion?

Mr. Thompson: A motion to reconsider.

Councilman Green: I would like to make a motion to reconsider Item 144, seconded by Councilman Lester. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 4. Ayes: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. ABO Card Appeal: Joshua Davis (Employer: Blind Tiger - B/Walford - *Deferred on Sept. 22/Dismissed on Oct. 13*)
2. ABO Card Appeal: Brent Durham (*Denied on Oct. 13*).

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES.

Metro Law Enforcement Committee Report:

Councilman Gibson: About a week and a half ago, the Metro Law Enforcement Committee met for about an hour, hour and a half had a very productive meeting. Chief Campbell and Sheriff Prator are charged with gathering some data for the next meeting which is called on October 22 at 3 p.m. That will be a brain storming session to identify the reasons why the Metro Law Enforcement—combing the Sheriff's Department and Police Department will not work and go through an exercise of about an hour and half to two hours, to identify those reason why it won't work.

Infrastructure Committee Report:

Also on October 29, at 4 p.m., the Infrastructure Committee will be meeting. Mr. Strong I would ask that your staff be prepared to come forward to address an on-going issue that has been talked about across the City in terms of some of the problems we are having with the taste and smell of our city water and the Infrastructure Committee would like to address those issues and see what issues are being address by Public Works in terms of trying to remedy that situation.

Councilman Jackson: I serve on the Committee to study the combining the Police and the—the Metro Law Enforcement Committee and I was just wondering to we have minutes from the meeting and or at least a roster of who was in attendance?

Councilman Gibson: There are minutes. I would have to defer to Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Thompson: Minutes have been drafted which include the people who were in attendance. They have been submitted for the Chairman for his review. As soon as he is comfortable with it, then we will send it out.

Councilman Jackson: Do we have an approximate number of people who were present?

Councilman Gibson: I would say we had about a dozen in attendance, including the Sheriff and the Police Chief, and the DA's office.

Councilman Jackson: How many did we mail out? I mean, how many people were suppose to be in attendance?

Councilman Gibson: Well, first of all that meeting was of the initial group that was identified in the legislation that was passed.

Councilman Jackson: Right, that is what I am saying, that should have been more than 12 though?

Councilman Gibson: I think that there was about 18, if I am not mistaken, 18 to 20 that were in it that were invited.

Councilman Jackson: But the legislation spoke to probably about 30, minimally, about 30 people.

Councilman Gibson: Some of them were dealing with a --Senator and a House Rep again, we elections going on and to put them in that kind of position, would not have been prudent at that point in time and there were a couple of others that were out of pocket that could not attend.

Councilman Jackson: But it is true that the committee is probably made up of about 30+ people?

Councilman Gibson: That is your—I'm not familiar with 30 people. I know that there were about 12 agencies, 12 to 14 agencies that were listed there.

Councilman Jackson: I thought we said we were having a representative from each town that will be affected?

Councilman Gibson: No, that is going to be sub-committee.

Councilman Jackson: But that legislation had them included?

Councilman Gibson: Well again, until we can have the main body meet, Councilman Jackson, to arbitrarily pick that, that is something that will come out of some of the discussion.

Councilman Jackson: I guess my question is, was this a committee meeting or a subcommittee meeting? It sounds like it was a subcommittee meeting.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Jackson, I'd be more happy to address it after this meeting, if you want to.

Councilman Jackson: No, I just wanted to know now while we were talking about it.

Councilman Gibson: I'd love to discuss it after the meeting.

Councilman Walford: Gentleman, right now we are on Committee Reports and. . .

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, can he finish answering my question?

Councilman Walford: I think he answered your question that it was a committee meeting. But if y'all would take it up or take it up in Councilman's comments when we get there.

Councilman Jackson: You are not going to let him answer my question.:

Councilman Walford: I am indeed. He said it was committee report.

(Councilman Jackson comments inaudible.)

Councilman Walford: I heard what Mr. Gibson said.

(Councilman Jackson's comments were inaudible.)

Councilman Walford: Does anyone else have a Committee Report? I allowed you to ask a question out of order.

Councilman Jackson: If you are not going to address me, don't talk to me in that fashion.

Councilman Walford; Not a problem. Let me reiterate as Mr. Lester said that the Property Standards Committee was changed to October 29th at 3 o'clock in the afternoon here in the building.

CLERK'S REPORT: Letter of Appeal: ZONING APPEAL: C-49-03, *Sports Mall L. L. C. & Randy's Travel Town, Inc.*, 7288 Greenwood Road, from B-3 to I-1 & I-1 (SPI-2), truck stop. (G/Jackson)

BAC-92-03, *Sports Mall L. L. C. & Randy's Travel Town, Inc.*, 7288 Greenwood Road, truck stop with gaming and on-premise consumption of high alcoholic content beverages, and a restaurant with the on-premises consumption of high alcoholic content beverages, and a convenience with the sale of packaged beer. (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 7:10 p.m.

/s/Monty Walford, Chairman

/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council