

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA  
OCTOBER 28, 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 28, 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.

**Approve Minutes.** Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of October 13, 2003 and the Council Meeting Minutes of October 14, 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.**

Mr. Antee: We have the representatives from United Healthcare as well as Kent, Kent and Tingle to answer any questions if there are any. I know one of 'em's gotta catch a plane and needs to leave shortly; so, if we could take that first.

Councilman Walford: That'd be fine.

Mr. Antee: And if nobody has any questions, I'm sure they won't mind.

Councilman Walford: Gentlemen, basically we had the presentation yesterday, does anyone have any questions at this time.

Councilman Hogan: Fred, how are the meetings going so far?

Mr. Kent: The actual meeting today was much better. Well attended. We had an average of - - - well at the 10:00 meeting, we had over 75 people. And yesterday, we had like ten people at the different meetings and there's five meetings per day, Tracy is actually over there right now having a meeting. I think once the employee comes to the meeting, they feel a lot more comfortable with the plan. A lot of that was misinformation that was out there or whenever there's change, people are questioning that change and so after the meetings, 95% of the people feel very good about the plan; that's my feedback. They feel more comfortable with the base plan, that they know that it has a doctor co-pay with it and just the overall feel of it, once- - -if we can get the employees at the meetings, we can have the right communication. So, I think the meetings are one percent better.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you. Probably the number one complaint that I'm getting is people do understand that changes are coming because of the overall healthcare industry. The increases that we're facing but probably the number one thing that I'm hearing is that people want the City to pay 60% of the new plan.

Mr. Kent: Well, when you look at the funding arrangement, Harriet, if I could ask you to come up here, (unclear) was the actuarial projections.

Mr. Antee: I think if I may Councilman, the real answer to that is not with our insurance people, that was a policy decision made by Healthcare Trust Fund Board.

Councilman Hogan: I understand. I wasn't asking for an explanation on that Fred, I was just making a comment.

Mr. Kent: The actual budget of course is how much can you afford as a city and every year, we can't just continue to go up 18-20% and so at some level, you have to look at the benefit design and structure the benefit to manage the claims better. With that, the

Health Board Trust is the one that determines how much they can spend.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, we had talked a little bit and one of the, I guess one of the calls that I received today from an employee I believe at the Police Department was, if I'm not mistaken, obviously their concerns were basically echoing the sentiment that I expressed on yesterday. And I had gone to talk to the Mayor as well, but didn't get a chance to speak with him and maybe Mr. Antee, you could help. But I wanted to know what situation we would be in as a city, if you will, if in fact, I think the only action this Council, one of the two options this Council could take would be to go back to the Health Care Trust Board and ask if in fact, there was some other alternatives besides those which they've already presented.

I assume based on the letter I received that this in fact was their plan that they were submitting as their plan to consider maybe you all could tell me if there would be any significant resolution or anything that could possibly come out of any further meetings of the Healthcare Board, whatever the right term is that, that particular Healthcare Trust Board or do we think we've reached what is the optimal choice for this particular body?

Mr. Antee: There were about seven or eight different choices that ranged anywhere from keeping the plan, the benefits exactly the way they were and going up 25-30% on everybody's premium. And going up on 25-30% on what the City had to match to a plan that would actually reduce the premium for everyone but it reduced the benefits even way down.

Mr. Kent: It took away the co-pay.

Mr. Antee: It eliminated the co-pay. It had a higher deductible. I mean - - putting together a benefit plan, you can go from one extreme to another and one of the things the Healthcare Trust Fund Board did was make sure that we kept the co-pay in place, even though it costs us a little more money, because that's a benefits the employees we felt like really wanted to hold onto. And tried to come up with something that the City could afford, that the employees could afford and gave them the option that if they wanted to keep, yesterday they referred to it as a Cadillac Plan, I refer to it more as Ferrari Plan, and we've got a Cadillac Plan with our base plan now, and give them the option. So, the ones that want to keep it, they can pay more and that's their option. I mean the City could pay 100% or 0%. It's totally up to the employer as to what's gonna be provided and we do think and I do think one of the questions that was asked at the Healthcare Trust Fund Board Meeting, was how does this plan and how do these benefits compare to what somebody would get at another municipality or in the private sector for some major companies and its up there in the upper echelon of what any other benefit plans are out there. Is it less in terms of benefits than what it was before? Depending on the usage, yes. But in some cases, it would be better. But those are far and few between. But overall, the benefits had to be adjusted or else, the price had to be adjusted.

Mr. Kent: We actually wrestled with this for five months and started this process. We uncovered every stone. We looked at every single alternative and by far, this is the best alternative. It was a unanimous decision in the Health Board vote and it was one after excruciating pain of checking every available option but I recommend that plan proudly.

Mr. Antee: And as an employee on the plan, which I am, I'd love for the City to pay 100% but the reality of it is, that's just not reality. So, I'm sure you're gonna get calls.

If anybody has to pay anything, somebody's gonna call and say, you know you should pay all of my insurance. But what we had to do is strike a plan, so that the 2,700

employees and retirees on it weren't paying much higher premium for the 4 or 5% who really drive the cost up.

Councilman Lester: I had to run to the side here to use some technology. I got an email Mr. Kent and Mr. Tingle from a City Employee that asked a question that I wanted to pose to you. The question was, I guess in two parts. The first question as I appreciate it, they, the employee says that at one point in time, we had a - - - I think Councilman John David Steward passed some legislation that allowed a more expensive option that allowed a 52% match instead of the 60-40 normal. The employees concerns were in their opinion that the two option plans that we are presented with, the city is presenting to the employees now represent , as sharing of the 14.09% increase across the board, in their mind, they believe that, that's a 37.4% increase to the employees.

Mr. Kent: That's correct. That's a choice plan.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Mr. Kent: What happens is, with the City funding, the base plan is 60% for the employee or the family rate. When you stop funding at that base level, that employee has to pick up the difference between the base and the choice plan, which is roughly 16.5% total but with the employee paying all of it, it turns out to be 37.4%; that is a correct e-mail.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Second question, they did a question about math and they said that the cost of the employee with the choice plan at \$84.35 bi-monthly amounts to \$2,024.48 annually and they indicated that the base plan that is being proposed is \$1,473 and some change, but it includes a \$500 deductible and \$100 deductible for prescription for a base of \$2,073.36, and this is before and I guess in this particular instance, the City is going to pay 80% which equates to a 40.7% increase for using the base plan.

Mr. Kent: Well, I do know this. The City of Shreveport pays over \$5,700 to every employee through their employee benefits if they have family coverage. So right now, every employee has \$5,700 of benefits going towards their health insurance. At some level, we have to say we can't afford anymore and that's what's the base plan does. We're capping it at the \$5,700.

Mr. Antee: But Councilman Lester, for those 40 or 50 or 60% who only have the health insurance to cover major illness and things that don't use the deductible, then its gonna be less and if we stayed with the same plan and they paid higher premiums for those who do use it. What we tried to balance was, if you use your pay, we're still having some stock loses there. And this plan we think provides the best so that everybody is not paying 14, 15, 20% higher in premium for those 5, or 10% that use it the most.

Mr. Kent: We tried to design the plans that accommodates the large majority. The 90% of the employees and with that it gives them both the co-pay, the prescription drugs and then in case you do have the major illness, the cancer or the heart attack, you're still capped at that \$2,500 and so, it provides protection at all three areas. So, it is a wonderful plan. I will match that plan against private employers. It will beat 90% of the employers plans out there and especially because the City is paying 60% of the family rate. You don't see that nowadays. They pay the employee rate only and not for the family. And so with this, it has to be redesigned. I will be coming back in future years, because this is not the end all. We're going to be looking at capping the most that the plan could pay. Right now one employee, as I said last week, had a \$670,000 dollar medical bill for a dependent child. That takes a lot of premiums to match that \$670,000 dollar. And so when

you have 2,800 people on the plan, just a few people can make the whole plan turn upside down. It's a quality plan, it's been for five months, we've gone through this plan, checked every other option, the employees are seeing some change. I think they are worried about that change. But, it's a quality as I seen out there, Councilman.

Councilman Lester: Thank you and I appreciate you answering those questions as you Mr. Antee. Thank you.

**Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project.**

Mr. Antee: Last week as everybody is well aware, we did receive the bids from the re-bid of the Convention Center. The net cost of \$65,384,000. If we accepted all three of the Alternates which with the mechanical, interior finish and exterior finish, that results in about \$6,000,000 dollars less than the original Whitaker contract which was \$71,300,000. In addition to that, we received a \$4.5 million from SAFECO in a cash settlement. We received that money about three weeks ago. So as a result of the two years of delays, that was necessitated by Whitaker's failure, the taxpayers have benefited to the tune of about \$10,000,000 dollars.

We are in the process of finalizing the contract and its to the point where we're ready to sign the contract with Yates accepting all three Alternates. And we have with us today Mr. Bill Yates whose Chairman of the Board and Micky Rosenblum who will be our direct contact person and I'd like for them to come up and tell us where we are with the project, and where we are with our Fair Share/Minority Participation as well as tentative schedule.

Mr. Carmody: Is this report in writing? I've looked for it here today.

Mr. Antee: No, I'll get it to you in writing, I've been busy on other things today.

Mr. Rosenblum: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Micky Rosenblum, I'm the Vice President of W. G. Yates of the Jackson, Mississippi office. We have been working steadily since we submitted the low bid. Our current percentages that Mr. Antee speaks of looks today like our Minority/Fair Share percentage is a little over 24%. Our Louisiana percentage, of this subcontracted amount of the job which will be 67% with Louisiana contractors and approximately 40% will be Shreveport contractors. All of those numbers we think will be going up as we work through the job. We are committed to making those numbers go up. We've been here all day today, have spent today with Fair Share Contractors working through with them and we are confident that all of those numbers will improve.

We are prepared to mobilize to the site within ten days to two weeks. So the contract being signed, we expect tomorrow maybe and we expect in a couple of weeks to be on site working.

Councilman Green: When you talk about the Fair Share, you said 24%?

Mr. Rosenblum: Our overall minority, MBE Fair Share percentage right now, looks to be about 24%.

Councilman Green: Is it any way possible you can break that down as to, how many when you talk about the minority, how many women, how many others, how many Black folk, just can you break it out versus just saying 'minorities'. Because when we talk about minority, since we started that at one time, it was just basically Black folk, if the truth is told. But then now, we've customized it and now, its everybody who is not basically a Caucasian male. So, is there a way possible that we could break it out that we could see the true colors of it?

Mr. Antee: Councilman Green, we're in the process.

Councilman Green: Excuse me.

Mr. Antee: I just thought you wanted an answer.

Councilman Green: Oh, I'm sorry, if he had--I didn't know if you had the answer or if he got it. If you got the answer, then I'll take the answer from whoever has the answer.

Mr. Antee: Well, basically the process is working right now, they submitted their list of who their Minority/Fair Share/WBE contractors are. Karen and Sam in the Fair Share Office are now in the process of going through and categorizing. We've got a list, they're already in our Fair Share Certified, so there's one category. And then going through their list, the ones that we don't have that they brought to the table that aren't certified with us now, going through the verification of making sure that which category they fit in and doing that, that's gonna be a two, three, four week process to really get those numbers. But what we will have is, we'll have the numbers of the ones that are already Fair Share certified within our system. Minority, WBE as well as local. And then we'll see which ones fit in those three categories that aren't Fair Share certified in our system now and that qualify and go through the process of getting them qualified as well but that will take place over two, three week process.

Councilman Green: Okay, and here again, my basic concern is when we break it down, I want to actually be able to see how many Black folk got jobs. How many women got jobs and then others and whatever, that's what I actually want to see. Because basically, as I said before when minority started out, it was just basically Black, but now its anybody other than a White Caucasian. So, what I want to see is the true color of the actual Fair Share to see if its really fair share.

Mr. Antee: And that's what Sam and Karen are doing now, based upon the list that's provided by them as their suppliers. And then they'll go through- - - some of 'em may not qualify that they've presented, some of 'em may be replaced with others that do. But we'll try to get you that information in the exact form that you ask.

Councilman Green: Okay, and my other question is as to being the low bidder, with your company, is there a, do you have a motto at your company as to the service you provide and how you will go about to basically make sure that whatever is in the contract comes to fruition as to the basics? For instance, the Fair Share agreement, how does your company feel about the Fair Share?

Mr. Kent: We support it. We have committed to Sam that we're going to do it better than he's ever seen it done before. And if I could answer your question, we do have a motto. And its more than a motto for us, it's a way of life for us: *Its on time and in budget to the owner satisfaction*

Councilman Green: Okay.

Mr. Kent: We make that commitment to you.

Councilman Green: I really appreciate it and here again, I'm concerned about the entire City but, all of the rigmarole as to how Fair Share came about had nothing to do with 'others', it had something to do with folk of my color. So I would just ask that if in fact you could do your best to have as many folks in your company working on this particular project making some (as my granddaddy would say) some 'nice' money to reflect the population of our City.

Councilman Lester: I have a few questions if I might and I guess these questions would be toward the Administration just to get me to where we are.

My first question is on this project, did we require the bidders, the general contractors, to submit their Fair Share vendors and the percentages that they were doing and the people

that they were going to subcontract with, at the time that we opened the bid?

Mr. Antee: No. Because of the way the Fair Share Ordinance is written, once the bid is received in accordance with Louisiana Public Bid Law, then they have three days to provide the Fair Share information and that's only from the low bidder, at that point.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Because, the reason I ask that question is because previously, when we went through this exercise, the people that were bidding actually gave their number as well as saying these are my Fair Share vendors and this is the percentage. And it seemed like there was a change and I was wondering what was the reason for the change?

Mr. Antee: No, there wasn't a change as you recall, the first time it was bid in accordance with the public bid law in the same way, and we had 45 different packages that were bid. Once those low bidders, those 45 low bidders were determined, then they had three days to submit the information that you're talking about.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it, the bidders came to the table when the bids were opened, and they had their Fair Share numbers. I don't want to get into a quibble as far as what was done, because what has been done has been done, but I just wanted to make sure-, I guess in my mind what was the reason for us doing it differently because it was done differently.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Lester, could I borrow one minute of your time on that issue?

Councilman Lester: Yeah, I defer.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Councilman Lester. I think what I hear Mr. Antee is the first go around of bids versus this time around, was the bid form had on it, and the 45 bidders, a requirement to read aloud their minority participation on the front end. In this current set of bid openings, the bid form did not have that as a requirement. There was the difference between the two. Because each bid form when opened actually, Tom Mattox, the Director of Procurement, read aloud the minority participation for each of the bidders not the low bidders, each of the bidders. And then once the lowest responsible bidder was determined, then you went through the process. But I think what Councilman Lester was looking for, an explanation is, the first set of bids two months ago on the bid form, did require minority participation and this requirement, the bid form did not require that to be read aloud.

Mr. Antee: I wasn't aware of that. And I guess the only reason why there would have been a difference, was that Barton Marlow prepared most of the front end documents and they had that probably for their informational purposes in the 45 different bid packages.

When we did it this time in a lump sum bid, we bid it in complete compliance with the Louisiana Public Law, and the way we bid all of our projects which does not have that information. So, I wasn't aware that it was in the original one, but it would have only been for informational purposes at that time.

Councilman Lester: Okay. The reason, I asked that question is quite obviously, this Administration has been very committed to the Fair Share Program and I applaud what we've been doing. And I think we need to continue. And I'm glad to hear Mr. Rosenblum indicate that they will not only adhere to the program, but their goal is to exceed that and I think that's important.

But the question that I had I guess was, if previously we asked the bidders to give their Fair

Share numbers and we determined who the lowest bidder was, my question would be could you be the lowest responsive bidder if in fact you did not meet the Fair Share?

In other words, let's say you're not a company like Yates. Let's say you're a company that has - - -not a good intention in terms of dealing with the Fair Share. You could have bid, let's say, lower than theirs, but instead of saying I have 24.8% or I have 23% Fair Share, your Fair Share number could have been 10 or 12. And the reason I ask that question is, I know the Mayor indicated it and pounded his fist on the table and I agree that when we re-bid this process, we said that we know that from the first time that we were able to get somewhere in the neighborhood of 18%. So, if someone came back with a number less than 18, then we knew that, that was not good faith in terms of the Fair Share.

So, my question was how were we able to determine who the lowest responsive bidder was if in fact, that was not part parcel of it. But if what you're telling me is originally when it was bid and those Fair Share numbers were bid for informational purposes only, then that answers my questions, it was not part of it and we could not have determined who the responsive bidder was in terms of Fair Share.

Mr. Antee: The way that the Fair Share Ordinance is written so that it would comply with State and Federal Law, you can not use that as a determining factor in whether or not somebody is a low bidder or not. What you can do is determine whether or not they made a good faith effort. And if they didn't make a good faith effort, then you could reject their bid on the basis of it being non-responsive.

So, if somebody came in and had 24% and they were listed at 24% and then somebody else came in and had 17%, you couldn't go with the 17% that was a higher bid unless it was not a good faith effort. And then you'd have to get into the process of what did they do to get to the percentage that they have. Is the 24% real or not real, is the 17% real or not real. Did you just send out a bunch of letters to people that had disconnected or make phone calls to disconnected phones. All of those things is what the Fair Share Office would come in and determine.

We've had cases where we've had 18-19% and say that's not good faith, because other people had 25-30% and go in and say this isn't good faith you have got to do better, and Sam and Karen have worked with 'em to get those numbers up.

We've had cases where its been 3% and went in and evaluated and they did everything they could possibly do to get the number and it was only 3% and it was still deemed in good faith.

So, you gotta look at each case, you gotta look at what they did to go out and try and get Fair Share participation, you gotta look at the response between the other people that are the Fair Share certified companies to see if they did in fact respond, if they did get the letter, if the address is correct to determine whether or not its good faith.

Councilman Lester: My next question and I appreciate that answer. Is Mr. Gilliam in the room?

Mr. Antee: I think he's upstairs working on this specific project, but we can get him down.

Councilman Lester: Well yeah, if we could get him down, I wanted to ask him a couple of questions if I could. I guess I'll defer the last of my questions to Mr. Gilliam. I'll give it back to you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson, did you have more questions?

Councilman Gibson: 1. I wanted to commend W. G. Yates for a real competitive bid.

Both you and Hunt Construction out of Dallas were extremely competitive, in fact, for those in the audience only \$226.00 separated a \$63,000,00 dollar base bid. . . .on top of that. That is extraordinary. And again, hats off to your company and obviously to Hunt Construction for those competitive bids.

My question Mr. Chair, is really not geared to Mr. Yates, but it's geared toward Mayor Hightower. In going back to what one of my colleagues just commented on. Mayor, I was not aware that the Fair Share Program was geared specifically to the African-Americans, can you address that particular issue? I thought it was inclusive for everybody, we've got a cross section of people that live in the City, can you address that?

Mayor Hightower: That's correct. The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise is the correct term and that which encompasses like Councilman Green indicated, everything from women to African-Americans to Asians to, you name it, as long as you're not a White male and your income, even a White male could actually qualify if they fall below the income level, so it is a broad spectrum of small businesses essentially that the program is designed to help.

Obviously, in this community, we have half of our community happens to be African-American and obviously some of our focus is there and I think our record stands for itself. We've done a lot to be sure that African-American companies are included in every project that we do as maybe more of a focal point than the entire DBE spectrum, but Councilman Gibson, you're correct, the Fair Share Program so that we avoid a run in, in the judicial system with the Federal Government and the State Government as far as that is concerned. Fair Share is set up for DBEs.

Councilman Gibson: Well, I just wanted clarification on that because I know that there's been major effort by this City and obviously, the statistics bare out that this Administration has been 110% committed to the inclusive efforts for procurement processes for the City of Shreveport which is spilled over in the private sector which has been a major accomplishment which I again applaud you for their efforts.

But when I look at inclusiveness and look up in Webster's dictionary of what inclusive is, its to encompass everybody and its kind of the way I kinda look at it, its like being a little bit pregnant. Either you're going to be inclusive or you're not going to be inclusive. You can't be selectively inclusive, just like you can't be a little bit pregnant. So, again, I just wanted clarification. I appreciate the continued efforts of this Administration. And based on some of the preliminary information for W. G. Yates Management, I do appreciate the efforts to meet the inclusive procurement processes that the City of Shreveport is committed to for a number of years.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I just want to go on the record following that commentary with saying that you know, I think at some point, we get down to the brass tacks and when we do that, you know I understand what the Mayor is saying, we use this term 'Disadvantaged Business' because we want to make sure legally we say the right thing. But I hope that Fair Share is not in place and I think I'm correct If I'm interpreting what I see as the Mayor's spirit of doing this. That in fact, its not about feeling good, its about making a significant difference particularly where there was a disparity and there's been historically disparity. That historical disparity, fortunately for some, unfortunately for others has not spanned the diaspora of all of the different ethnicities and minorities that are in this community. I think when we speak to the spirit of what we are trying to do, we need to speak specifically about 53% of this particular community happen to be African-American

and I just believe that whether we say it nice or not, that when it gets down to the brass tacks, that we have to be sure that we made sure that in that minority population, the predominance of that population happens to be African-American and I think that's what I heard you say---that we've put emphasis in that. We ought not apologize for it nor have to talk in any particular way that cuts across saying it like it is. And I believe that's how it is and I certainly will hope that this Administration continues to hold fast to that and Mr. Rosenblum, that you 'll understand that, that's the spirit that emanates, I can't speak for this entire Council, but certainly from this one Councilman, that's the spirit I want us to continue to embrace.

Councilman Green: Sir, you can have a seat, this is not geared toward you. I just wanted to go on record as to the comment Councilman Gibson made about asking the Mayor a question.

Mr. Mayor, let me ask you a question. Since this whole process has been going on about this building, how many Asians have been knocking on your door about some work?

Mayor Hightower: I can probably count them on one hand.

Mr. Antee: We're trying to get 'em in China Town out there Councilman.

Councilman Green: Oh, okay. And here again, my exact point is when you get down to the bottom as to who has been fighting for rights, everybody in America knows that Black folk always gotta fight for everything they get. I mean everything. I don 't care how nice we put it, we already understand that the Caucasian male is in the position to get whatever he wants and everybody else got to come second. We already know that, that's why all this came about. So, therefore when you talk about Fair Share and minority and whatever, its only giving everybody the opportunity to have a piece of the pie and that's what its all about. America is the home of the free and all of that kind of stuff and it sounds good and its wonderful, but when it comes down to the money, then we want to go north or south or wherever with it and I think that's very unfair.

And so, my point again is when we were out there marching and fighting about rights and going in hotels and whatever, then we was fighting and Martin Luther King was here and all of that kind of stuff. We'd sing about *Free at Last*, and all of that kind of stuff, to be free and broke is bad. And I just think that if in fact a big project like this is going on, I already know that everybody else is gonna get their money. But I want to know how many actual Black folk will have a nice piece of money after this whole deal is over and that's what its all about. Who gets what, when, where and how; so, that's basically what we need.

And, Mr. Gibson, the question that you referred to the Mayor, should have been referred to me. Its just like for an instance, you are the Executive Director of one of the largest contractors' organization in this town. And you're going to make sure that you fight for everything that you feel they ought to have. True or False? True.

So, therefore me as an African-American, I want everybody to be happy. I want everybody to have some money. But when we come to the table, I just want to make sure that (the guy back there with the Afro. What's his name? Larry Wimberly. I want to make sure that) Larry gets his fair share of whatever is coming and that's what this is all about. So, therefore, when it comes down to the bottom line, we gotta just put everything on the table to make sure that everybody is happy when it comes to the money.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Gilliam, could you come forward please.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Green, do I have an Afro too, I'm a little bit less on top too.

Councilman Green: Yours kinda of free fro. Mike, I'll tell you what happen on that last night I told them, if you can't grow it you can sew it and if you can't achieve it, you can weave it, and when you can go to the store and buy it, it's yours.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Gilliam, I appreciate, I want to say before I ask any questions, I really appreciate, I can't say how much I appreciate the hard and diligent work that you and staff have been doing in terms of trying to make sure and I like your terminology, 'your clients' get some access and not just access. We are talking about real participation in this project.

What I wanted to ask you was, as I appreciate it this morning you had contractors, business people, vendors, of that sort here in the Council Chambers that had an opportunity to have a presentation from the Y. G. Yates and took the additional steps to actually have allow them to have some interplay and dialogue with representatives from Y. G. Yates. Could you tell the Council how the process has gone as you appreciate it.

Mr. Gilliam: Well, going back to last Thursday I believe when we had our first contract with Mr. Yates and I present to you that we take on surface as being a very honorable young man, indicated that he would be offer and be open to send representatives. So, Karen and myself we have been up since 2 a.m. this morning preparing. We've engaged in intense negotiations with representatives of this company since 7:30 this morning. We actually brought our clientele in here I think around 9:30 and we offered each one of them a setae with the representatives thereafter.

We are trying to get to the point because the original numbers that were submitted to us, Mr. Lester and the rest of the Council here, were not quite as we would have wanted to have been and we thought that indeed that we needed to take every step possible to enhance and increase opportunities for inclusion and participation in this, the largest and possible longest capital project the city of Shreveport has every been involved in.

We had about, I am going to guess about 30 individuals, 30 companies here today and we sat along with the representatives from Yates to try and explore opportunities. We tried to focus and identify certain scopes, Mr. Lester that would lend themselves uniquely to participation by Fair Share clientele. Because Fair share clientele can not render all the goods and services of every aspect of this project, one I being I think, structural steel. We just don't have a Fair Share clientele who does that.

We have that same challenge with some of the departments within the City. Fire Department. We don't have any Fair Share clientele who offer fire trucks but we try to make up as much mileage as we can and provide as much opportunity for our clientele as we can, where we can.

So, we've engaged in negotiations even since that setae after lunch, we broke for a short lunch and we came back with a representative and around 2 o'clock, Mr. Yates himself was privileged to come over and join us.

Here's the point we are right now. We are at the point now of trying to see where there are possibility for inclusions of Fairshare clientele and minorities within the community. And we stress very pointedly, that indeed this is a local economic development issue. We try to involve people in this process and we hope that we've internalized the best we could to the representative of Yates this reality.

We are trying to include people that have previously been disenfranchised, marginalized in this process and we are trying to bring them as much as possible within the economic stream of this community and we think that we are moving making process in that direction.

And I'll close this out by saying that the point, where we are right now, we are saying to them, they've said to us, look we give you the commitment that we will involve Fairshare and the (inaudible). We are saying that commitment is good. But, we are not at the point where we are saying quantify that commitment for us in terms of where, what scope of this project that you project you will be able to utilize it, quantify it in terms of how much money and percentage will probably and possible go to our clientele; that is where we are now and haven't fully gotten pass that hurdle.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Gilliam. I want to tell you that you are in a very unique position. You have as per, and I am not telling you anything that you don't know already, but you have the power and the authority and I would dare say the responsibility under the Fair Share program to not sign off on this Convention Center deal if in fact in your mind this company does not met the Fair Share goal.

And what I am asking you to do and I am asking and imploring you to hold the line. It is very important that you make sure that this 25% or however much that percentage is going to be is a real and not a pretend number. It does you, the City or anybody any good for us to create any shell companies that are just going to be used to schiphon resources and flow them back into majority companies because as you said, this is the largest capital project that has been done in this City's history.

And we missed this convention center for four or five years and I don't think we will miss it another month or so unless and until this done properly. So, I am just going to ask you to hold the line and implore you to continue do what you have been doing to search tirelessly to make sure that, and I will harp on something that Councilman Green said, that we want to be inclusive, but we also want to make sure at the end of the day, African-Americans business owners, men and women, are included in this process in a significant fashion and not a token fashion. Because you and I and everyone know that the whole impetus for the Fair Share Program was to address past discriminatory practices and past disenfranchised.

So, I just want to make sure that you continue to know that you have our support, from the Council standpoint and to stay in there as long as you need to stay in there and to fight as long and hard as you need to fight because it is absolutely critical that when we do this process we do this in a proper fashion; so, I just want to thank you for that.

Mr. Gilliam: You have our commitment to that end and I should say too, the Administration has also exhibited strong support by (inaudible) in that regard. You have our commitment.

Councilman Lester: If I could speak to Mr. Rosenblum. First, I want to say congratulations to you and your company for getting this work. I am interested that you said your motto was do it better, on time, and on budget. I think that is. . . .

Mr. Rosenblum: On time and budget.

Councilman Lester; Well let me clue in on something that I am sure that you are intelligent enough that you already picked up, Fair share is very important to us. It is very important to this Administration and it is critically important to this City.

And what I just want to communicate to you with no fear or equivocation is we want to make sure that the African-American community and the minority community in the City of Shreveport participates in this project in a substantive way. Too many people have sacrificed a lot for us to be in a position for us not to stand and to fight for what will be the

largest, obviously it is the largest capital project in this City's history, but it is probably going to go down as the most important economic development project in the generation.

When you look at cities like Atlanta, when you look at other cities, they use large scale capital projects, city projects to not only transform their business community, but in transforming their business community they were able to transform their cities. This is very important to us and with as very important to my predecessor, the late Hilry Huckaby.

So, I am just asking you and your company to maintain what you have been doing and we just ask that and implore you to work with our Fair Share Department because we expect that we want, just expect that we won't be satisfied if the Fair Share not met. And I take you at your word, but we just want to trust but we will verify that that process is done in an above board manner and I thank you for working so far with the Administration and Mr. Gillam office on that effort.

Councilman Gibson: You rarely have this happen with a multi-million dollar company but I'd like to bring forward if you would, Mr. Bill Yates who is the Chairman of the Board for Yates Company. Normally we don't have Chairman of the Board of construction firms come to town, but I think he has expressed his dedication and commitment to this project from top to bottom as I understand it and I'd be remiss unless if I didn't at least recognize him, whether he wanted to say anything is a different story, but Bill Yates has come to town with his management team and I do appreciate from an industry standpoint that commitment to a project that is important to all citizens of Shreveport.

Mr. Yates: I believe it has all been said and I would be delighted to come speak and I appreciate being recognized. It is good to be in your fair city, twice here in less than a week; thank you for that.

Mickey said it when he said it was a way of life, that it is on time and that it is in the budget, and it is to your satisfaction. And I think we've heard what your concerns are and I assure you that from the very top down we are going to be trying to meet those concerns and make you feel good about seeing us come here and build this convention center. This is a major project for Yates. We are really excited about it. As I said last week, Yates, we work a lot of places and we have projects I never see, we have owners I never meet. We are here and I am here to make sure that this is a successful project across the board. Not only building it on time, and building a great project, but helping do the things that you been talking about.

Councilman Green: From hearing you say that Mr. Yates, I would just like to commend you for that and certainly we will be looking forward to working with you and may God bless you and your company.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Yates, I would just say and obviously I didn't know that you were here, and I would just in true lawyer fashion, adopt all of the arguments I said before and direct towards you because obviously you are were the buck stops. So, we appreciate your coming down but again, I guess stress the importance of adherence to not only the spirit of the Fair Share but the letter of the Fair Share. And, we trust that that will be done and we will be closely watching to make sure that, that is adhered to.

Mr. Yates: I think we all have a lot to gain by being successfully doing this. Not only you, not only the people who are the most important, but also the Yates organization. Every reason in the world for us to really want to make this successful and I really believe it will be. I think you are going to be pleasantly surprised. We are that committed.

**Convention Center Report and Property Standards Program Report.**

Mr. Antee: We did have one thing further on the hotel since we didn't go into that. We had that, we are going to add to the agenda today a resolution that deals with guaranteeing the franchise agreement with Hilton. It is only for introduction. But, we are to the process now to where they will begin the hard design. We hope to have that done within a 10-month process to where we take it, put it out to bid and then take that to the bond market. But, we will need before Hilton will sign a franchise agreement, we do need the City's guarantee and will be available to answer any questions about between now and the next Council meeting which is when it can come up for a vote.

Councilman Jackson: I wanted to ask the representatives from the Foundation for Arts, Music, and Entertainment of Shreveport and Bossier City Incorporated, which is a non profit corporation. I know there are some representatives who are here, the Chair and the President, Maggie Warwick is here, if you will come. Also, I saw Mrs. Underwood was here, Mrs. Mariah Underwood was here and Ken Mitchell and other representatives as well. All would come if you would.

I wanted just as a matter of, I think appreciation, recognize the Foundation for Arts, Music, and Entertainment, better known as FAME obviously in Shreveport for the work that they have been doing and they have dedicated the plan that they have put together and this plan was Shreveport's historic music village plan. They've dedicated this plan to the memory of the late Claude Underwood who was a founding FAME Board Member and a renowned cultural historian as well as many of know Mr. Underwood and know that he grew up in the area of Texas Avenue and that particular part of the City that has become the area where FAME is developing. And it was his dream to restore the valuable historic area of our City and so wanted to recognize them not only for the work that they've done, but they've also been recognized across the span of this state because the Louisiana Chapter of American Planning Association unanimously selected Shreveport's historic music Village Plan as the 2003 Plan of the Year.

And it is, this plan is a regional economic development initiative plan that combines, music, entertainment and digital media, business along with cultural, tourism an new housing options and what we know as been a blighted inner city neighborhood area that is adjacent to our center business district. And so, I wanted to ask them to come today so that we could recognize the work that they've done.

I think it was earlier this month that they were in New Orleans and they were recognized by former Mayor Moon Landrieu, former Mayor of New Orleans as the keynote speaker and he congratulated them. I thought it would go a lot further if the people at home would congratulate them as well. They have been recognized by Don Hutchinson, Secretary of the Department of Economic Development in the State of Louisiana and they've been recognized by many people. So I wanted to just recognize them and as not only them, but Mrs. Underwood is here as well, Mrs. Mariah Underwood who again, is the widow of Mr. Claude Underwood who not only served in this community in a distinguished fashion, but he also served on this City Council. And so, we would certainly be remiss if we did not recognize an honor both his memory and as well as the work and the legitimate work put into this plan.

We have a copy of the plan that we've received and I just want to give commendations from this Council to you all and from the citizens of the City of Shreveport for the work that you've done in a neighborhood sometimes people have sometimes given up on. So, we thank you for what you are doing, but we also believe Mr. Mitchell that the

best is still yet to come and so we want to thank you for all your work and wanted to recognize you. I'd like to ask this Council if they would join me in a round of applause, as a symbol of our appreciation for your work.

Ms. Warwick: Councilman Jackson thank you for inviting us to come today, Mr. Chairman and entire City Council members, Mr. Mayor.

We are indeed honored to be here today and thank you for recognizing this award. It is a great result of a lot of work that many people have put into the plan and we are so grateful to Claude Underwood and all of his dreams and visions for this geographical area. When we came up with the idea to do the country museum restoration which you all know is around the Municipal Auditorium, it blended right in with his dreams to restore the great African-American cultural that happened up Texas Avenue. So, his dreams are part of the FAME Plan and we are indeed so grateful to him for all the years that he worked with us helping us to come to this position.

Ms. Underwood is here today. She just returned from Washington D. C. in fact, meeting up there and we are so delighted that she could come because she is a member of a group of ladies who, the goal is to restore historic buildings with African-American significance. And as you know there are a great number of those historical buildings within this development plan, including the Lithuania Temple and I'd like for her to come and say a word, Ms. Mariah Underwood and introduce all of the guests, if you would.

Ms. Underwood: To our Mayor and to our illustrious Council members, it is indeed a pleasure for us to come before you all today and I appreciate the authority that you have given to us, Councilman Jackson and my husband, I talk about this Colossian Temple and he worked hard on it all down the line and I would like to continue to it. I am working with a group of out Washington D. C. as known as the National association of Women Clubs and that is what they are doing. They have restored like the Frederick Douglas House that Foundation. They have taken the old Embassy in Washington D. C. They have turned it into, they have turned it into a magnificent place that it is awesome, you would like to see it. They are at the fifth floor and if you are ever in Washington D. C. please stop by and see what these women are doing.

In just two years how far they have gone. And they say in two more years, they will complete it and they are willing to work with us along with our foundation to help in any way that they can to help us restore this building that were started by one of our members back in even 1923, that is when they started here, that Colossian Temple which as been very outgoing at the historical mark that we have here that has come up and we appreciate whatever help you will give us.

We are working on some other projects here also in the arts and I thank the Council for that, that we have to come to our (inaudible). In fact on last week, the 24<sup>th</sup> that received a small grant to help and we appreciate that. It is big to us that our district and we will let you all know how much we appreciate that also.

We are going to continue to work, continue to put our muscle work into it and put ourselves into it. Whatever help we will appreciate it very much to make this be a successful and accomplishing job.

Ms. Warwick: We have also with us today, Peggy Miles and Earnestine Coleman and of course Kim Mitchell, the lead architect and Urban Planner on the design of the plan and we look forward to going forward with all of you and Mayor Hightower in putting forth the implementation of this plan.

We have support by the entire northwest Louisiana Legislators up here from the State government and we have support from federal government. . . . Shreveport and Bossier. And so we have a lot of support and this is a very valuable project for Shreveport, an economic development project that does involve building and construction and development of a major entertainment and cultural tourism venue, so thank you all so very much. Again, thank you, Councilman Jackson for inviting us here today and wishing all of you the very best.

Councilman Green: Pastor Eddie Giles was supposed to be a Special Guest, and maybe he got his dates mixed up but he just finished a CD. He is the proud pastor of the Salem Baptist Church and certainly, he is a legend in his own day and possible he will be here at the next Council meeting.

**Public Hearing: None.** Councilman Walford noted that the 2004 Budget Appropriation public hearing is scheduled for the November 11, 2003 meeting.

**Confirmations and/or Appointments:** Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester for confirmation to the Downtown Development Authority: Dannye Malone, Downtown Development Authority Parking Hearing Officer: Thomas Durham and Mechanical Board: Glenn Miller and Stith Bynum and Dr. Ron Marrus.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Hogan to separate the confirmations. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 4. Nays: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson for confirmation to the Downtown Development Authority: Dannye Malone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Carmody and Hogan. 2.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson for confirmation as the Downtown Development Authority Parking Hearing Officer: Thomas Durham. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Mr. Thompson: On the Mechanical Board, the Mayor appointed but we neglected to put on your agenda Dr. Ron Marrus and you may want to add him. The information we sent to you, had his name on it. Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to add Dr. Ron Marrus to the Mechanical Board. Motion approved 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 to confirm to the Mechanical Board: Glenn Miller, Stith Bynum and Dr. Ron Marrus. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Green: I have three pieces of Legislation in my hand and I am under the impression that it is to be added: 1) *Ordinance No. 184 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson, Lester and Walford: An ordinance amended the 2003 budget for the General Fund Budget and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.* Is that to be added to the agenda.

Ms. Lee: Yes, sir.

Councilman Green: And then we got two amendments, right?

Ms. Lee: Not to that budget, no. The amendments are to a different ordinance.

Councilman Green: Before we move to that, I talked to Councilman Gibson today at

Pete Harris about the Pirates money and I said to him that, if he would give me an opportunity to think about it because he just told me this morning, that I would be willing to work with him on it. And, then today I get this ordinance to do what he told me that he was thinking about doing. I would just ask that if possible that we could wait before we do this.

1) During this whole process of when the Pirates—see, I was on the Council and I fought hard about not giving the money.

Councilman Walford: Councilman Green if I could, lets wait and lets debate them as we go to add them. At the moment they haven't been proposed for addition. I know they are going to be and we'll debate them as they come up.

Councilman Green: I got just one more comment.

Councilman Walford: Go ahead, Sir.

Councilman Green: I would just like and I guess what my point is, it bothers me when folks got to make all of my decisions because I have some ideas as to some things I want done in my district and all the time it is not about streets. Streets sound fine. Streets give contractors a chance to make some money and all of that is good and fine, but there are more to the district that I serve in, the more needs, than just overlay and streets and whatever so I just wanted to preface that with whatever we are getting ready to do; so, that is my comment.

#### **Adding Legislation to the Agenda.**

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody to add the ordinance to the agenda for Introduction.

Ordinance No. 185 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 106-1123, of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances, the Zoning Ordinance, relative to on-premises advertising signs, and by otherwise providing with respect thereto.

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

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to add Resolution No. 177 of 2003 and Ordinance No. 184 of 2003 to the agenda for Introduction.

Resolution No. 177 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a guarantee of payment of certain reimbursement obligations of Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority that may be owned in connection with a termination of the Hilton Hotel Franchise Agreement; authorizing the Mayor to request approval from the Louisiana State Bond Commission relative to same; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Ordinance No. 184 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson, Lester and Walford: An ordinance amended the 2003 budget for the General Fund Budget and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Walford: Could you clarify for me, is this a motion on all?

Councilman Gibson: No. The only one that we are adding as I understood it is

the one that has to stay over for 2-weeks, if I am not mistaken Mr. Thompson, that is \$250,000 for the General Fund for Police Budget for sensitivity training and interpersonal training and then \$70,000 to be allocated for educational assistance program for city employees and then \$100,000 to go to the Neighborhood Investment Program—that would have to lay over for 2-weeks, is that correct?

Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

Councilman Gibson: So in responding, just to. . . .

Councilman Walford: Back to my question: She read the Hilton Guarantee as well. I just need a clarification on your motion.

Councilman Gibson: My motion is just on this particular, the one I just discussed amending the General Fund Budget.

*Motion by Councilman Jackson to amend the motion to add to the agenda the Resolution with regard to the Hilton Guarantee as the single item to be added to the agenda, seconded by Councilman Green.*

Councilman Walford: I have a substitute motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green.

Councilman Lester: If we support Councilman Jackson's amendment does that mean that we can not add anything else or could we not just take them one-by-one?

Councilman Jackson: That was my desire, but the way the motion is, the only way you could do it, is to actually do it one-by-one by amending the motion.

Councilman Lester: I just wanted to make sure that is what we were doing.

Mr. Thompson: My understanding is the motion that Mr. Gibson made was to approve only one addition and that was the ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the General Fund; so, you would only be voting on one if you would vote for or against Mr. Gibson's motion.

Councilman Walford: But that wouldn't preclude Councilman Jackson's subsequent motion, after the vote to add the other resolution, is that correct?

Mr. Thompson: No, you can add the rest of them. You could vote for or against this motion and then come back and made another motion and vote for or against it.

Councilman Jackson: I'll rescind my motion and the motion on the floor, if you can restate it was about adding this other, this ordinance amending the General Fund (motion and second withdrawn).

Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson, help us out. You are not attempting to preclude, you are not attempting to preclude adding additional legislation. You are making a motion to add your legislation to the agenda?

Councilman Gibson: What has been presented to us, I'd like to see them all of them added at one time, lets vote them all up at one time.

Councilman Walford: Would you like to amend your motion?

Councilman Gibson: Yes, so move (Councilman Carmody: I will second his motion.)

*Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to add all the legislation to the agenda.*

Councilman Jackson: My question is, there was something else that we had that could be added as well. I think we have a nomination from the Mayor's Office. I would like to ask if, that is a part of your motion?

Councilman Gibson: That's fine, lets add it. Let get it up, get it on the agenda and move

on.

Mr. Thompson: This is a different motion to which I gave an explanation earlier. Based on the motion that we now have, then it probably would be necessary for Mr. Jackson to make a substitute motion to try to do what he wants to do.

*Motion by Councilman Jackson to amend the motion to take each one separately. (Mr. Thompson: He is calling for a Division of the Question.) seconded by Councilman Green. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Gibson and Carmody. 2.*

1. Motion by Councilman Jackson to add Resolution No. 177 of 2003 to the agenda, seconded by Councilman Green. Resolution No. 177 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a guarantee of payment of certain reimbursement obligations of Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority that may be owned in connection with a termination of the Hilton Hotel Franchise Agreement; authorizing the Mayor to request approval from the Louisiana State Bond Commission relative to same; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Motion by Councilman Gibson to add Ordinance No. 184 of 2003 to the agenda, seconded by Councilman Lester. Ordinance No. 184 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson, Lester and Walford: An ordinance amended the 2003 budget for the General Fund Budget and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Green: Mr. Thompson, to add these to the agenda, how many votes is needed?

Mr. Thompson: Five (5).

Councilman Green: And I'd like to also say that I am not against this, but I would just like to have the opportunity to sit down with my fellow Councilmen and talk about it and discuss some of the needs that I feel as well as what they feel.

Councilman Gibson: Lets be clear that, by passing this or not passing it we still have 2-weeks before we vote on so there is plenty of time for discussion before, during and after.

Councilman Walford: That is correct and this is merely for addition. It can be amended.

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

Motion by Councilman Lester to add the confirmation of the appointment of Shondra Stone to the DDA, seconded by Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Hogan: In going over the agenda, I might have missed this, I am

kind of at a loss right now if you could help me. I've not heard anything about this until now.

Mr. Thompson: This is to add it to the agenda, it does not necessarily have to be vote on today.

Councilman Walford: It is just to add the confirmation to the agenda today. Again, we are strictly adding this to the agenda to be voted on in two weeks.

Councilman Hogan: I had not received this information that Councilman Jackson gave me.

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

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to add the ordinance to the agenda for Introduction. Ordinance No. 185 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 106-1123, of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances, the Zoning Ordinance, relative to on-premises advertising signs, and by otherwise providing with respect thereto.

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

#### **Public Comments.**

*Lee J. Hall* (3017 Louise Street, Councilman Green is my Councilman). First of all I want to thank Councilman Green, Lester and Jackson for their support in our movement to become recognized as PACE International Union to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with the City of Shreveport and hope we will have their support in the future as we continue our movement toward our goal to be unionized.

My main reason for being here today is the concern we have at the way the health insurance is being negotiated at this time. In the last three years, insurance has gone up incredible with no cost-of-living raises to counteract the insurance.

Since Mayor Hightower has been in charge of this city, city employees have been overworked and underpaid. We have seen our insurance rise each year that he has been in office. We have not received but one 2% percent increase since he has been in office, that I can think of at this time. But insurance rise 15% to offset that 2% increase which means we receive nothing.

Now, this year, no increases in wages, but insurance rises 19%, that was the first of January. Now, from what I heard we are suppose to get a 2% increase in January 2004 but insurance is going up 30%. At the first of the year, 2004 how can we as city employees live with this. We can't and that's the bottom line.

Also, last year, 2002 Mayor Hightower could not find enough money in the budget to give a substantial raise to the city employees, but found money in the budget to give him and his staff a 24% increase. How is this possible?

Mayor Hightower stated in a newspaper in October 2002, "he can corral the city employees". Well, 'coral' to me means in so many words, Mayor Hightower is insinuating, we're stupid. 'Corral' to me is, herding cattle, mules and as everybody knows, cows and mules are stupid animals. So, I guess why he and his insurance board decided with the United Healthcare when we all know there is a better deal out there.

Our families will have to suffer because I know for sure, we as city employees can not afford this insurance and a majority of us will have to drop the insurance to survive in the City. We do not make six figure salaries like Mayor Hightower and his staff. If we did, insurance would not be a problem as I am sure it will not affect their pockets as it would ours.

I ask you, the Council elected by the people of this City to check into this because there is a serious problem here. We can't afford for our lives to be dictated any longer by the Mayor of this City because he does not care about the city employees nor the people of this great city. Also ask for your continuous support in the matter and in our movement in order to be unionized.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Hall, have you attended one of the insurance meetings?

Mr. Hall: No sir. I understand that we have two city employees on the Board but they don't have no say in it, I understand this, that the, say, comes from other people. I understand that the two city employees involved on the Board don't even have a voting right on there so we haven't heard anything but one thing and that is, insurance is going up. Now, we are trying to figure out why? There is a better deal out there, sir.

Mr. Antee: If I may, so you can understand correctly, there are—Liz, how many are elected by the employees—three. There are three employees elected on the Healthcare Trust Fund Board that has a vote just like I do, just like the Mayor does that is elected by the members and by the employees; so I just want to make sure that that is clear.

Also, there has been at least two meetings that have been publicized that anybody has been invited to attend to go over in addition to the educational meetings so that the general public knows that this is the first time that we've heard any of these concerns.

Councilman Walford: Before we move on, I'd like to welcome State Representative Lydia Jackson. Welcome and thank you for joining us.

Councilman Carmody: I do have a question because I do see so many of our city employees out here. Mr. Strong, you don't need to get up but, are the city employees able to attend these meeting? I mean, are they able to take off work regardless of whether they are in Water and Sewer, Public Works, are they allowed to go ahead and do that? They only thing that I was going to ask is, I see some people shaking their heads, 'no'. If you don't have the ability to attend those meetings that are being held, you need to talk to the representatives and I think he is still here, the gentleman from the insurance. He's already gone. I would ask that y'all attend the meeting. And if, you've got Mr. Strong right here, saying yeah, you are entitled to attend the meeting. If your supervisor says you can't go, tell him to call Mr. Strong, but go to the meeting.

Councilman Gibson: Again, yesterday we discussed health care, about changes and things of that nature and talked about the importance of communication. Mr. Strong, how do we communicate to our Public Works employees that their ability to attend these meetings? Because again, one of the things we suggested yesterday is that maybe using payroll stuffers to make sure that everybody is communicated properly with. But, apparently based on some heads nodding 'no' a lot of our employees may not know that they have the opportunity to attend that meeting. How do we communicate?

Mr. Strong: The information that came out, came out from I believe Mrs.

Washington on setting up the meetings. We had the times and the dates that were sent out. It was sent to all of our supervisors, division heads, to make every employee aware of it. And, I don't know if anything was put in the paychecks, I don't remember that but, that the City would have done but I know that we have notified our different supervisors but I have a staff meeting in the morning and know when all the meetings are and I'll find out what is going on as far as our department is, but I know that is how it is throughout the City.

Councilman Gibson: I realize that Public Works is stretched to the max, obviously we demonstrated both politically and business-wise that we've cut from budgets in the past and you've done an admirable job with the department running at \$8 to \$12 million dollars shortfall on major infrastructure and again that is something for this body to debate in the upcoming budget talks.

But I would encourage you and I'd like to see some response from your supervisory people of how they are taking on the task to communicate with the rank and file because obviously we sat up here for about an hour talking with the Benefits people and everybody agreed that communication is the key in this. If these employees don't understand or don't have the necessary information to make decisions on what's best for themselves and their families, then I think it is our burden as the City to make sure that we do everything possible and I'd appreciate some feedback from what you see out there.

Mr. Strong: And as I said, 8:00 o'clock staff meeting in the morning that I'll be having so I know more by then, but I know the word has been passed along.

Councilman Lester: Just one thing,, U-N-I-O-N. Union. This instance begs for the city workers having a union. At what point are the folks on Operational Services or Solid Waste are going to jump off the trash truck and come to a meeting so that they can all have their grievances heard? It doesn't make sense. They are on, if you know, those guys are on that trash truck from early in the morning until late at night, they don't even have set schedule. If they had a union, then they could elect a representative and have the representative come while work is being done and you don't stop your city services and then at their own time when they have their meetings on Saturday, they can discuss this.

But to the extent that they don't have a union and they don't have anyone to come forward and speak for them unmass, they are left with having to catch as they catch can. As I appreciate it, they are good but no one can be in two places at one time. I mean, when we have a meeting to stop the trash trucks so that they can get out of the trash trucks and come up here, that's one thing, but as I appreciate it, we don't want them to do that. So I think this situation begs for having a union so that when we have these discussions, we don't have to dictate to everyone to put everything in their pay stub. You can contact one person, that union head, that person has authority vested by his fellow city workers to come and speak for them. That person can take off of work, they can have the meeting then the burden will be on that person to go back to the rank and file to disseminate the information. I think what we are dealing right here with is a situation that could have been ameliorated, if we had a city workers' union.

Councilman Jackson: I just wanted to, not necessarily echo what Councilman Lester was saying, but to get some clarity. I think one of the issues that we had is that the city workers are indeed unionized, I believe. Is that correct? And I think that to

function in that regard, to begin functioning in that regard is still going to be healthy at this point for them because I think he is right that this particularly scenario is one that certainly could be handled like that. I think the issue becomes the whole recognition piece, but I would hope that workers and those who are involved in the actual unionization and who are working collaboratively in a union would not wait until certain legislation is passed to operate and to function as a union because these are kinds of opportunities—these are the kind of times I believe that it takes, that we need you to function, like that; so, I think that that is important that you continue to do that.

But I guess my question was and I'd ask Councilman Hogan who sits on that group, on that Healthcare Trust Fund Board as a representative of this Council, whether or not having employees who were elected or who were there on that Healthcare Trust Fund Board, if in fact they may feel intimidated, if in fact they may not be able, somebody I think alleges that they really don't have a voice. I don't know that it is true about them not having a vote. As I appreciate it, they do in fact have a vote on that Board, is that correct?

They do have a vote and I think some of the concern that I'd heard that people are talking about whether or not they feel like they are intimidated. I've never been to one of the meetings so I can't suggest that that is true but obviously that is a concern and I just want the Administration and others who are involved in that to be sure that we do what we can to make sure that all of the voices are heard and that we do it, that it is set up that way so that all voices can be heard. So, I would just like to see the Committee, if you will, the Board function as according to the way that it is suppose to do it.

And I don't know if we can afford to have everybody going into a meeting. We lose productivity I think when we get everybody going to a meeting and in fact, if they could have a representative from their organization there who speaks on their behalf, I think we are going to be better served. I just think that, I want to echo the sentiments of the Councilman who said, communication is obviously important and how we do that is important as well.

Mr. Antee: Councilman Jackson in regards to, yes they do have a vote and they are probably the three most vocal on the Board. And I'd invite you to come to the next Healthcare Board meeting to see that I don't think in any way, shape, form do they feel intimidated. Those three ladies represent the other employees very well and are very vocal with it.

As far as having a representative, we would love for that because what we would like to do is have accurate information get out there, and not rumors. We do lose a little productivity if they go to a meeting, but we think they lose a lot more productivity with the rumor mill that circulates that puts out wrong information. So we'd rather take an hour or so away, get to the meeting, receive this if they didn't get it in the mail and ask any questions that they have and we think they will be much more productive when they are on the job than running around worrying about all the different rumors they hear of things that just aren't factually.

*James Robinson* (131 Mayfair Drive, which is Mr. Lester's Council District): I am also President of PACE Local 4-25 Shreveport City Workers Union. I first want to start by clarifying a couple of things.

I think as we are talking and we are taking of meetings, we are talking about two

different types of meetings. Mr. Antee and some of you are referring to the informational meetings that have been being conducted over the last 3 days by United. I want to bring to your attention that these meetings are after the fact and employees are being allowed to go those meetings, and that is the meetings that Mr. Strong is talking about he is going to see about sending them down tomorrow so that they can justify to us or tell us that United is offering the best deal that is out there.

Now, of course United and the consultants and the City and everybody else will say that because the consultants are benefiting from the deal, United is benefiting from the deal, the City is benefiting from the deal. Nobody is a victim of this deal except the City workers themselves.

The meetings that we are concerned about are the meetings of the insurance committee other committees in this City where we can not attend which is a part of recognition. We can not leave our job to go see about a grievance. We can not leave our job to go sit in and monitor an insurance committee meeting while we are the clock. For me to be here today, just at this Council meeting, I had to take annual leave. I had to use my own time to be here where I could not get fired because we can not take care of union business on city time; that is part of the recognition, the thing that we've come before you and asked for. It enables us to take off time to attend the insurance committee meeting or whatever other meetings that directly impact the city workers.

Now, of course, a Mr. Antee said there are eight members of that insurance committee, but it is a gerrymandered committee and we might have three votes, but it is a gerrymandered committee because you have six positions. You have: the Mayor holding a position, you have a Councilman, Mr. Hogan who is acting a Chairman holding a position, you have Mr. Antee holding a position, you have Mrs. Liz Washington another appointee and Department Head holding a position, you have Mr. Joe Lunt an appointee, head of Personnel Department holding a position, then you have Mr. Mattox who works directly under direct supervision of Mrs. Liz Washington, the appointee, who also hold a position, so what ends up happening you end up with two votes. One female who works for the Police Department and we have a fireman holding the other thing.

What happens is, my appreciation what happens in the Insurance Committee they might be boisterous and they might not feel like intimidated but whatever the six votes want against those two, that is what is going to pass that committee. There is not proper representation and it is overstocked, and for lack of a better word, I call it a gerrymandered, a gerrymandered committee.

But going to that, we are here today really to express our displeasure no so much in the insurance going up, but sort of like Mr. Green said about his district, we've gotten to the point where we are tired of other people making decisions. . . We are not here today to try to stop what is getting ready to go on because as far as we can appreciate it, it is a done deal. The meetings that are occurring at Municipal is just to make us feel good about it.

What the problem that we have, it seems that nobody cares about the city workers and their effect. The same difference, everybody has gotten raises. The City employees, the (inaudible). Why we are saying nobody cares? Sure insurance may go up, we might not be able to find a better policy, we might be able to get there. We came to the table and said at least, give us an opportunity to go out and shop around and see

if in fact United is the best policy for the city workers. Maybe we need to split it up, split the Retirees up and Active Employees up, so that the Active Employees don't have (inaudible) the burden. But we were told that we couldn't shop-out, we couldn't get permission to share the information because in all actually, we don't really exist because we are not recognized. So, any sharing and shopping-out we would be giving it up, going against y'all wishes so we are handicapped there.

But at the same time we say we are, nobody is looking out for our interest and it is like taxation without representation. This matter is really taxing the city employees and bringing us to our limit. If somebody was caring about us in any of these quarters. We have heard no dialogue how to defray the cost on the city employees. Nobody has mentioned the possibility of a coming cost-of-living increase that would sufficient to defray this. Nobody is saying in the committee or anything, well maybe since we are putting all of this burden on the city workers and making them be subservient to what is going on. Nobody has discussed, well maybe we should go up on the percentage that the city contributes to defray what is happening a little (inaudible) and don't say that we can't. You can't when you don't want to. Bossier City does it. They one hundred percent (100%) of the employees insurance then the family and the children, he has to pay for. But at least if they city was considering us, they would do as Bossier City and say, tell you what to defray this, we will pay one hundred percent of the employees and y'all pick up there. But there is no discussion. Why is there no discussion but we are not on the priority top, we are not even a blimp on the radar scope when it comes to concerns. Everyone is being benefited and we have to pay the cost.

We are here to let you know that we are not pleased and somebody has to look out for the city workers and that is what we are going to do. And we are encouraging all of our workers not to re-enroll into the United Plan before November 19 because we are shopping-out. We would hope that we would have numbers and figures by today, but we couldn't get the necessary information to do it but we are compiling it and we have four different brokers and companies looking at it because we think we can beat the deal.

Maybe we can't but at least we want to find out. We want to see it for ourselves. We can't not accept what everybody says at face value anymore when it pertains and affects us directly, our families, our livelihood and our environment. Like I said, it is like taxation without representation. We are paying the price.

Now, taxation without representation y'all know has caused revolutions. I use the word 'revolution', I am not using that word to imply or rebellion or war. I am using that word in the context of change. In our American history, taxation without representation caused a revolution but revolution doesn't always mean a bad thing, that American revolution changed the world and has the world as we know it today. A lot of good come from it.

If you would recognize us, lets us sit and reason together. It may be simply, right now, they say we are locked in. You can't shop-out for three years because we have a three year contract with United. But the insurance companies, back in the day, that might have been a benefit, a long term contract for the insurance because you tried to lock in the rates where they couldn't go up, but the insurance companies have a found a way out of that. They've put a mechanism in there where they can turn around and go up and come back and go up every year so nobody is locked in for those three years

except the city workers because they have a mechanism in place to have advantage over the consumer, the consumer in this instance being, the city worker. Maybe the simplest thing if we were at the table, like he said, we are not stupid, we might be able to give a reasonable idea, maybe we should stop looking at these 3/4 year contracts and go at 1 year at a time since they can change which gives us the option to change also. But nobody is looking out for our interest.

We beg you, we ask you, we are going to try to find something that's livable and workable for the city workers through another policy. Maybe we won't, but maybe we will, put at least we are going to try. But if not, we are asking you to at least consider us and respect us enough and give us enough dignity to recognize us where we can sit with you and reason because together we can build and maintain this community and serve the people, who we as professional public servants took the job to serve and you as elected officials took charge, to give service to. You can't have good service if you don't take care of your service deliverers.

*Terry L. Taylor* (reside in Mansfield, Louisiana.): I am city employee, been a city employee 27+ years. My grievance is that is that I feel that the city is not being, first of all, I would like to give to recognitions to Councilman Lester, Councilman Green, and Councilman Jackson. It is good that we have men these days that will stand up for what they believe in. You know it is not everyday that you find a man, regardless of what the oppositions are, he stand up regardless.

So, our thing is this. Every since I've been with this City, insurance has been going up. I have two jobs with the City. If it goes anymore, I can't afford it. I don't think—and I've talked to a lot of employees that does not have insurance. I think that if we can put multi-million dollars in convention center and not think about what is underneath the ground, I think that is a bad thing. I've always been taught that you have to have a good foundation for anything. Now, it doesn't make sense to have an entertainment center down there when we spent millions of dollars down there and then you are not thinking about the people that are out there everyday that is struggling trying to make a living and I think that is a bad thing. I think our priorities have gotten into the wrong area.

I think that what we should do and we've tried to consider whatever this Council has asked of us, whatever the Mayor asked of us, we've done that. But it is a bad thing when you put the rules back on this system and the system wants to take the ball back because you put that rule back on them and they didn't want to play anymore and that is a bad thing, and I think that it is unfair.

It is either what is it, is it your way? Is what you have, what you have and what we have, is what you have? It can't be a one way thing. You have good employees that work for the City of Shreveport that give their lives, that have families, that have kids going to school and those kids need some sort of health care. And I think it is very bad that the City, as large as this City is, is not taking that into consideration.

These people here, don't make a lot of money. Everything that comes out of their checks is: retirement, insurance, long-term disability, by they see it, it is nothing there. I just spent \$400 dollars today, dental. I couldn't afford it but hey, something has to be gotten. Something else, has to be let gone, that is just the way it works with us and these people got to eat instead of worrying about health insurance.

You got people on the back of trucks, people in ditches and stuff like that. It is a

ashamed. It is a shame that I work for this City and this city don't care nothing about us. And it is a shame that if by chance this Council, don't let us shop-out--that is going to be a shame and that is not a threat.

The whole thing is this, I consider you mean being very compassionate men. I am sure that you are family men. You want to provide for the best for your family, so do we.

All we ask is this City needs to be fair with us. We been fair with this City for a lot of years and all that we've gotten on the lower end of it, and I mean the lower end of it because we are the working class people and we get the bits, the crumbs and we are tired of it.

We are tired of accepting what you just said, hey we got to have and that is not right. And I don't think that you, let me ask you this: How many people on that Insurance Board that decided on our fate of our insurance, have that insurance? I mean, you are deciding on something perhaps that you don't even have and how can you do that and that is all I have to say.

Mr. Antee: Sir, do you know how much your premiums are going to go up next year?

Mr. Taylor: It is probably going to go up another \$100 dollars.

Mr. Antee: It is going up, zero.

Mr. Taylor: If I chose that, if I take the same plan that I already have you are saying that my deductible will go and that I would have to pay more.

Mr. Antee: And have you been to one of the meetings or review what the benefits actually are?

Mr. Taylor: No, I haven't had a chance. From my understanding, the way my job is with the City of Shreveport, is that I don't get breaks or anything . . . from where I work down at Customer Service, I'm a Dispatcher down there and if time permits, yes, I will get a chance, if time permits.

Mr. Antee: Well, Ms. Washington is back there and if you'd like as soon as this part is over, at any part, I'm sure that you can take this and she will take it out there and explain it to so that you won't have to leave and go to a meeting, she can answer all of your questions.

Mr. Taylor: I've seen that.

Mr. Antee: But what I am saying is, you said that you can't get to the meeting. She is here and you are here, she will be glad. She knows everything that the insurance people know, and she will be glad to answer yours or anybody else's question while you are here, so you don't have to take off so that you can fully understand what the two plans are and what the benefits are.

Mr. Taylor: Sir, this is basically what we are talking about. Councilman Lester just got through saying up here about the garage men and that, those men are still out there on that truck, working. The same with the guys with the sewer problems and so forth and like that. I don't want-- if you are not going to make special provisions for them, why should you make special provisions for me, and that is not fair; that isn't fair.

Mr. Antee: Well, we are trying to get everybody informed as best we can.

Mr. Taylor: Do you have the insurance?

Mr. Antee: Yes I do. I absolutely do and the Mayor does. And the reason why I do is because it is the best plan that is available that I've been able--Councilman

Walford: Ken, if y'all want to argue that, do it later.

*Ernest Arie* (3101 Boss, Queensborough, Councilman Theron Jackson is my representative): I would like to say good evening to all of you and the Mayor. I have two things that I would like to talk about. I would like to talk about the insurance and then I would also like to talk about the wages that we have been paid.

I have been dealing with this now for quite sometimes, about two years I think you recall Mayor. I come here when you were campaigning you know you was all for giving us recognition in the union and everything. You told us that, if you got elected you would recognize our union.

Again, I am going to bring that to your attention that was your word then and you crawfished on your word then and you are crawfishing on your word now.

I just don't think that the people are being treated fair because we don't have liberties to enjoy those six figure salaries that you all enjoy.

We don't have the liberty to drive Mercedes Benz and stuff that these people, some of these people are able to drive because we can't afford it. We've having got a cost of living raise in three years, insurance has gone up and what raises we get the insurance eat it up.

I mean, Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson they supported us. Councilman Walford, even Councilman Gibson said he would support our cause for recognition and then he crawfished on it. We got a signed letter that he said he would support us in recognition if we supported his campaigned. I mean, to what you guys word, are you going to live up to your word.

We are human beings. I mean, y'all can't enjoy living the way you are living if the City workers are not dedicated. I been employed with the city for 11 years with perfect attendance. What motivates me? Is the fact that I try to set an example for my children, I try to set example or other people to get up and come to work. I don't feel like coming to work everyday. For a—you know I just bought my first brand new car. I mean, I couldn't afford it, but I had to have one, I have got to have reliable transportation. I mean, I've worked with Mr. Strong. He knows that I'm a dedicated employee, I have been involved with all of the employee actions and stuff but we can not afford what y'all are paying us.

If you set aside 4% to the employees, give that 4% to us. Don't let it be decisive on what happens down here in the Red River District. We don't go down there, I am a church-going. You know how many times in been in the Red River District? Once. How many times am I going to go to the Convention Center? You want to build million dollars and Mayor, I 'm sorry I just cant go along with you on that. You want to invest billions of our money in our convention center. How many times will I go, if I live to see the Convention Center. How many times will I go down there? We don't need that.

The employees need you to show us that you care about us, and right now, you are not showing us you care about us. We told you, we will support you. We voted for you to put you in office. You said, if you vote for us, we will support our cause for a union. You didn't do it, Mayor. I mean, I am sorry. And I can't keep coming down here asking Councilman Green, Jackson and Lester to support us when there are other Councilmen on this board that should support us too. We help you enjoy the life that you are living.

What about the services that we provide? Do you think that you could enjoy the

standard of living you enjoy without our services that we provide that we provide to you. We had a fire training academy officer that taught us SCDA classes because we have to have SCDA because we deal with hazardous material, like chlorine. Out of his mouth he said, fifty percent of the fire No. 1 rating is because of the Water Department is because of the City employees. They can't fight fire without water.

This is the next question, I hit him with. Why is it when you went to the Legislature to get raises for the Fire and Police Department, you didn't include the City employees? Oh, well I didn't have nothing to do with that, that was something that somebody. Hey, if all of your services and our services are dependent upon the other man, then why not let us feel that we are included. I mean, Councilman Carmody. I mean you have an expression on your face like this is strange for you to hear. We deal with it everyday, Councilman Carmody. We deal with it everyday. We can not afford the ridiculous rates that the insurance is going up. We can not afford it because our wages are not keeping up with the cost of the insurance and that is as simple as I possible can.

I mean, you know our children have to have insurance. Then they come up and talk about LA Chip. LSU treat you like dogs when you go there. I mean, have you every been to LSU, Mayor? I don't think you want to go there. You don't get you want to go there. You don't get you know—you may get proper there, but you got to sit there all day long. I mean, it is just ridiculous and it is unfair.

And yes, I do have the figure where my insurance is going to go up \$83 dollars a month. How can I afford that. I mean, I worked 5 years with the City without insurance because I could not afford it. I am just now being able to afford it for me and my wife on the insurance. I mean, that is ridiculous that these people, Councilman I am just referring to y'all enjoying luxuries but y'all are enjoying them on the sweat of our backs, but you don't appreciate it because you don't show us that you appreciate us. If you did, you would give us a decent raise, you would help build pride in the employees so that they want to come to work everyday like I do. I don't want to come to work everyday, but I have to and I motivate myself to come to work everyday because I am a dedicated and certified Water Department employee and these are services that we just need.

And Councilmen please don't vote on this insurance with United Healthcare until y'all look into how you help us afford an affordable insurance because United Healthcare is not the only insurance provider in this City and it is not the only insurance provider that can provide the same or comparable care to city employees. Please, don't accept this, don't sign off on this until you look into other avenues because there are other companies out there that can provide just the same amount of quality of service as United Healthcare. You see them guys standing up here in front of you from United Healthcare, they enjoy six figure salaries. How many city employees you know enjoy six figure salaries. It ain't none, it ain't none. Look out here, look at these people. We don't enjoy no six figure salaries. I mean some of us pay Medicare. People that came after a certain date with the City, they don't even pay Medicare. We pay Medicare for other people, not for us to enjoy. Half of us may not even live Look at the guys on the back of that truck. He is subjected to hazardous materials, he is subjected to something that will bust his backbone wide open if he pick it up wrong. These people are not being taken of. And at the sacrifice of maybe myself and these other people that want to get up here and speak for it, Mr. Strong, we need some help. We need some help, we need

the support.

And the Councilmen, if it is in your control to give the city employees a decent raise, a decent insurance company, I deploy you to do that and I deploy you just like you was telling this guy, you are going to be on him making sure that he does that job, you know with that Fair Share Program, you stay on this Board to make sure they provide us with comparable insurance that we can afford.

**CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:**

**TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:**

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green for Introduction of Ordinance No. 176 and 177 of 2003 to lay over until the November 11, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilmen Hogan and Jackson. 2.

**RESOLUTIONS:** None.

**ORDINANCES:**

1. Ordinance No. 176 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning a portion of the 60 foot-wide Southern Loop Roadway located in the SE/4 of Section 23 (T16N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 177 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandonment of the 50 foot-wide La Salle Street in the 500 block of the Duncans Subdivision located in the NW 1/4 of Section 25 (T18N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

**TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:**

**RESOLUTIONS:**

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester for Adoption of Resolution No. 174 and 175 of 2003. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilmen Hogan and Jackson. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 174 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING JACQUELINE DENISE ROBERSON DUPONT, WILLIS E. DUPONT, JR., ALICE G. ROBERSON, ANITA LYNN ROBERSON, AND A. MARION BROWN, LOCATED AT 7564 SHIRLEY FRANCIS RD., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Jacqueline Denise Roberson Dupont, Willis E. Dupont, Jr., Alice G.

Roberson, Anita Lynn Roberson, and A. Marion Brown, 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 Jacqueline Denise Roberson Dupont, Willis E. Dupont, Jr., Alice G. Roberson, Anita Lynn Roberson, and A. Marion Brown, be authorized to connect the building located at 7564 Shirley Francis Rd., to the water system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

#### RESOLUTION NO. 175 OF 2003

#### A RESOLUTION REJECTING BIDS RECEIVED ON IFB #03-069 FOR SOUTHERN OAKS SUBDIVISION FLOOD CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONAL SERVICES / OFFICE OF THE CITY ENGINEER

WHEREAS, three bids were received as a result of solicitations for the Southern Oaks Subdivision Flood Control Improvements, IFB #03-069; and

WHEREAS, the City has rejected the bids due to the lowest bidder being over budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the bids received on IFB #03-069 be rejected.

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

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

#### **ORDINANCES:**

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green for Adoption of Ordinance No. 150 of 2003 . Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilmen Hogan and Jackson. 2.

ORDINANCE 150 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE WEST 529 FEET BEGINNING AT LOT 9 AND 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.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the fifteen foot wide alleyway running between Pierre Avenue and Bosseau in Block "H" of the Ingersoll Heights Subdivision located in the NE/4 of Section 35 (T18N-R14W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned, and be it ordained that the utility and drainage servitudes be retained throughout the closed and abandoned alleyway.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that a certified copy of this ordinance be filed and recorded in the official records of the District Court for 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 resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

/s/Monty Walford, Chairman  
/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

**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. (As amended: KPMB)

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester for adoption of the resolution, as amended. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Jackson. 1. Out of Chamber: Councilman Hogan. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 160 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND KPMG, 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.

WHEREAS, the City is required by City Charter Section 4.28 to cause to have accomplished an annual financial audit of the City; and

WHEREAS, KPMG, LLP agrees to conduct an audit of the City in accordance with the requirements of the City Charter and applicable law; and

WHEREAS, external audit firms are normally selected by the City for four years with one year contracts executed for each of those four years; and

WHEREAS, the engagement of KPMG, LLP best meets the needs of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal, and regular session convened that it hereby selects KPMG, LLP as the City's External Auditor and authorizes the Mayor to execute a contract between the City of Shreveport and KPMG, LLP for the fiscal year January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003, substantially in accordance with KPMG's response, to the City of Shreveport's Request for Proposal, dated June, 25, 2003, and filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of the resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items, or applications and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

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

#### RESOLUTION NO. 169 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Shreveport to retain the services of outside legal counsel to represent the interests of the City of Shreveport relating to employment law matters.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that S. Price Barker, with the law firm, Cook, Yancey, King and Galloway, be retained for the purpose of said representation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with S. Price Barker, with the law firm , Cook, Yancey, King and Galloway, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on October 14, 2003.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this contract shall be paid out of the general government legal expense fund.

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

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

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

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.

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Shreveport to retain the services of outside legal counsel to represent the interests of the City of Shreveport in class action lawsuits.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that Robert E. Piper, Attorney at Law, with the law firm, Piper and Associates, be retained for the purpose of said representation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with Robert E. Piper, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on October 14, 2003.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this contract shall be paid out of the general government legal expense fund.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 171 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF THE 2004-2008 CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND ANNUAL ACTION PLAN TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD) AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, pursuant to regulations of the United States Department of Housing

and Urban Development (HUD) promulgated under 24 CFR Part 91, the City of Shreveport is required to submit a Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Consolidated Plan serves as the consolidation of the planning and application aspects of the Community Planning and Development formula grant programs, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), and Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG); and

WHEREAS, the Annual Action Plan contains the City's one-year plan of action for implementation of the 2004 Consolidated Plan activities; and

WHEREAS, the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan are a collaborative effort where a community establishes a unified vision for community development actions. It integrates housing, economic, physical, environmental, community, and human development in a comprehensive and coordinated fashion so that families and communities can work together and thrive; and

WHEREAS, the City has received input from citizens, neighborhoods, and social service providers in identifying housing and community development needs, priorities, and strategies in formulating the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due regular and legal session convened, that the Mayor is hereby authorized to submit the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan to HUD substantially in accordance with the attached draft which is filed for public inspection with the original of this resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Mayor is hereby authorized to execute and submit any and all documents necessary for the submission of the Consolidated Plan.

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

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

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

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: 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.

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

Lester to postpone the resolution until the November 11, 2003.

Councilman Gibson: I ask for a 2-week delay on this, I mentioned this yesterday. Because of the enormity of the contract and some of the impact, long term, I'd ask that maybe we try to arrange of break-out of City Council, maybe in threes to be able to ask some questions and get more explanation on this because this is a major commitment.

Councilman Walford: If I may clarify a point here, because Councilman Gibson had suggested that, on Tuesday, November 18, 2 p.m. in the Mayor's Conference Room there will be a discussion with the Representatives of Johnson Controls. At this time, if no one objects to it being a bit out of order, I would like to ask Mr. Gibson to chair a committee of the Council to meet with those and I'd like to ask for others who could serve on that committee and attend that 2 p.m. meeting.

Councilman Jackson: I don't know if it is a conflict in scheduling or what the deal may be, but I would like to suggest in lieu of doing that, that any committee discussion that at our next administrative hearing that in fact if that individual can be present, that we can speak to that individual at the administrative rather than having a committee.

Councilman Walford: The problem was, getting them here, as I appreciate it from my discussions with SPAR and they gave me this memorandum just before the meeting started.

Councilman Jackson: And again, if in fact the immensity of the amount of contract is so significant that we are willing to delay, then I would suggest that we delay until such time that we can have them here rather than having a committee meeting, that it can be reported to full Council.

Councilman Walford: Let me suggest then that if the Council agrees, we vote on Councilman Gibson's motion and we will have a Work Session and a Council meeting between now and the potential meeting, we will work with SPAR to see, ask Mr. Thompson if he can coordinate with SPAR and see what we can do.

Mr. Thompson: Would it be ideal to get them here for the next Work Session, is that what we are doing.

Councilman Walford: It would be ideal if we can do it, yes.

Councilman Lester: I think we should direct them and I think they'll come.

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

Councilman Walford: Before we move on, Mr. Thompson, if you could work with SPAR and see if we could have them available for the next work session and if not, perhaps the last November work session so that we could address this issue.

[At the end of the meeting Mr. Thompson provided an update.] Mr. Thompson: Under Old Business, I have an e-mail from Shelly Ragle saying that she has contacted Johnson Controls about their attendance at the work session on Monday, November 11<sup>th</sup> and they will be here.

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.

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Shreveport to retain the services of outside legal counsel to represent the interests of the City of Shreveport relating to collection matters.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that Cynthia L. Carroll, Attorney at Law, be retained for the purpose of said representation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with Cynthia L. Carroll, Attorney at Law, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on October 14, 2003.

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

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

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

#### **INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:**

1. Resolution No. 176 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Purchasing Agent to declare surplus and dispose by public seal bid certain equipment and instruments and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 177 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a guarantee of payment of certain reimbursement obligations of Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority that may be owned in connection with a termination of the Hilton Hotel Franchise Agreement; authorizing the Mayor to request approval from the Louisiana State Bond Commission relative to same; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford for Introduction of Resolution 176 and 177 of 2003 to lay over until the November 11, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody,

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

**INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:**

1. Ordinance No. 178 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 50-86 and repeal Section 50-87 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to Miscellaneous Offenses and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 179 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 180 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 181 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by continuing B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District Zoning limited to "Automobile Repair Service" only on property located on the northwest corner of Shreveport-Barksdale Highway & Camilla Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 182 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 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop 700 feet east of Mansfield Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, From R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-1, Buffer Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 185 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 106-1123, of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances, the Zoning Ordinance, relative to on-premises advertising signs, and by otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford for Introduction of Ordinance Nos. 178 through 182 and 185 of 2003 to lay over until the November 11, 2003. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

7. Ordinance No. 183 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Shreveport Airport Authority to sell the improvements only on the lots described herein located on Meriwether Road, as Surplus Property and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford for Introduction of Ordinance No. 183 of 2003 to lay over until the November 21, 2003. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

## **ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:**

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.

Having passed first reading on October 14, 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 Carmody for adoption.

Councilman Lester: My question was just on the idea that the parking hearing officer having discretion to determine whether or not the a waiver is justified and that they have the power to release the vehicle to prior to the hearing on an appearance bond.

I guess my question is, as I appreciate it, the only thing that this hearing officer was going to be deciding is, 1) is it your vehicle, 2) did you owe the money and 3) did we proper boot the vehicle. And that they would not be in the realm of making any type of discretionary decisions whether or not the waiver is justified or you should reduce the charges in terms of the fees that were leveled by the Parking Department and this ordinance gives them that power.

Ms. Glass: I am sorry Mr. Lester, Ms. Scott prepared. From just looking at it briefly, that does look correct but I am not sure what she would say about that.

Councilman Walford: If I may, Mr. Lester as I appreciate it in my discussion and I've been one that has been pushing very hard to get this done and I am going to ask the Administration if they need to please jump in and help me here.

The discretion that we were giving to the parking hearing officer is if you sold a car a year ago and you kept a copy of the bill of sale but someone never went and registered it, they got tickets, you got the notice. That parking hearing officer would have the authority to based on the information you provided, say that you weren't the one was responsible.

Councilman Lester: Right, right, I understand that part. My question is, the hearing officer shall have the power to reduce or waiver the charges even when probably cause is shown when in his or her discretion it determines that such waiver or reduction is justified. So even after they see that there was probably cause shown, if the hearing officer decided that they want to waive or reduce the fees, that hearing officer has the ability to do that and in my mind, that is a judicial function. And we are having a non-lawyer, a non-judicial type making a judicial call which is not what we, in my opinion or my information is what we were going to do. We were going to have someone that was just going to sit there and say: Is this your car? Yes. Did you make these tickets? Yes. Did you pay your fees, yes or no? If you didn't pay your fee, you got a boot. If you paid your fees, the boot comes off.

But in this show me that, that person could decide even if you did in fact get the boot and even if you did not pay the ticket then we could decide that we don't have to give you, we can reduce your fees and just waive the fees in general. And I don't think that is what certainly, the public is expecting is going to

happen and I don't expect that is what is going to be happening.

Now, if we are saying and Ms. Scott is not here or if the Administration tells me if we are saying that, that is something that we need because we need to give this person some discretion then, my next question will go back to something that I talk about before is, I would like the person exercising that discretion to have some familiarity with the legal process, i.e., someone with a JD as opposed to just someone that is exercising discretion without it which is not to say that lay people can do discretion, because hey, discretion is discretion. But the fact is, we are asking someone to perform a judicial function here, that is what it seems like to me, that was my question. [Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Hogan to call for question. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.]

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

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.

Having passed first reading on October 14, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone the ordinance until the November 11, 2003 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

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.

Having passed first reading on October 14, 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 to postpone the ordinance until the November 11, 2003 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

4. Ordinance No. 154 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on October 14, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by

Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody for adoption.

Mr. Dark: We have an amendment of our own that I thought we had given to the Clerk and we need to make sure that it gets voted on, as well with this one. I have copies of it if Council members need it.

Councilman Gibson: I would like to offer in writing y'all have before you an Amendment to Ordinance No. 154 establishing a new project for asphalt overlay at \$770,000 dollars, Funding Source is Miscellaneous Revenue for Retained Risk. The explanation is at the bottom of that

Mr. Thompson: Apparently there are two amendments. I assume that Mr. Dark or the Administration amendment was given to us first and it is listed as Amendment No. 1. Mr. Gibson's amendment is also listed as Amendment No. 1 but it probably would be proper to change it to No. 2 since it was just done today.

Councilman Walford: I am going to have to defer back to Mr. Gibson who made the motion on the ordinance and he probably would want to amend that motion.

Councilman Gibson: I amend it for Amendment No. 2 and again I would defer to Amendment No. 1. If we want to make a motion on what the Administration put on Amendment No. 1.

Councilman Walford: Clarify your motion and then I need a 'second'. Is your motion now to Amendment No. 1?

Councilman Gibson: I will tell you what, I am going to introduce Amendment No. 1 and No. 2 together.

Mr. Dark: Our recommendation would be that they would be separated and hope that one of you would make a motion to that effect.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I think he is out of order, right now.

Councilman Walford: I am waiting on a 'second' to your new motion, which I assume is a substitute motion and I have no 'second' so that is dead.

Mr. Thompson: What I was about to say was, I think that what he meant by his motion was he was moving to adopt Amendment [Ordinance] No. 154 we normally do that and then the Clerk will say, 'there are two amendments' and then the amendments will be vote on.

Councilman Walford: We never got there.

Councilman Jackson: I would like to move to accept, I think it is Ordinance No. 154 with Amendment No. 1, seconded by Councilman Green.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson, help me out here. You are actually making your motion to Amendment No. 1 of that ordinance?

Councilman Jackson: Absolutely.

Councilman Lester: Procedurally, where do we stand on Amendment No. 2? Has that been offered?

Councilman Walford: We didn't have a second to Amendment No. 2 as the substitute.

Councilman Gibson: I had 1 and 2.

Councilman Walford: I waited for a second to 1 and 2, combined.

Councilman Gibson: Well, fine. I'll make a secondary motion to it to make a motion on Amendment No. 2.

Councilman Jackson: If we vote on Amendment No. 1 does that somehow or another preclude us from voting on No. 2?

Councilman Green: Amendment No. 2 is dead.

Councilman Walford: No, it is not dead.

Councilman Jackson: I am saying that, it seems like all of a sudden we have a misunderstanding of parliamentary procedure. No reason that would preclude from voting, it is just a matter if I desire to vote on both of them or one of them and my motion was to vote on No. 1.

Councilman Walford: It was and now Mr. Gibson has given us another motion, a substitute motion for 1 and 2 or 2?

Councilman Gibson: I am going to defer it, but I am going to add No. 2.

Councilman Walford: I understand that. Right now we are on Amendment No. 1

Councilman Lester: Lets make this easy, so move on No. 1.

Councilman Walford: Well, we already got that. All we need now is to vote on it.

The Council considered the following amendments:

Amendment No. 1:

In Program E (Water Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for McNeil Water Line, Booster Station and Pumps Improvements (94-E004) by \$928,500. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements)

Decrease the appropriation for Stoner Lift Station Improvements (01-F004) by \$928,500. Funding Source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption of Amendment No. 1 Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Amendment No. 2 by Councilman Gibson, Councilman Lester, and Councilman Walford:

In Paragraph 2. Appropriations

Under Program C (Street Improvements):

Establish a new project for Asphalt Overlay Program (03C002) at \$770,000. Funding source Miscellaneous Revenue Retained Risk.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

Councilman Gibson: I would like to make a motion that we approve Ordinance No. 154 with Amendment No. 2.

Councilman Carmody: Let me verify this, the correct motion should have been, a motion to adopt Amendment No. 2 and if that is the motion, I am seconding it.

Councilman Gibson: That is the motion.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you, I'll second it.

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

Councilman Gibson: I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues. We have a tremendous opportunity to save money, that years ago and I appreciate one of my colleagues who did cast a vote on a subject matter regarding the Shreveport Pirates in terms of an opportunity to bring a franchise to Shreveport that unfortunately did not succeed. And, fortunately through the due diligence of the Administration, we were to capture money that originally had good intention. But here we have an opportunity to take money and return it back to taxpayers in the form of street overlay which is in desperate need based on information that Public Works has put before us whether it be street overlay, whether it be concrete replacement, whether it be water and sewer. We've got a number of needs out there and obviously \$770,000 dollars is a good start in helping bolster what Public Works is in need of in terms of help.

And to continue to put money in the Retained Risk that has a significant amount of money in it at this point and time, I don't want to get into the dollar amounts, we have that money in terms of budget but knowing that this City continues to spend a significant amount of money on attorney fees which I believe the last number I have is about \$9.6 million dollars over the last four or five years, it is high time that we start looking at where we can help the neighborhood and I believe that this is a great start in terms of taking monies that originally, I think took away from the taxpayers back years ago with the Shreveport Pirates and now we have a chance to return that back in the form of direct moneys into the neighborhoods. And I would appreciate my colleagues support for something that will help all districts based on unfunded needs on the street overlay projects.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson. No, I am sorry, I did tell Councilman Green. I will be to you next, Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Green: But Mr. Chairman, since he running for Senator and he may get elected, I'll defer.

Councilman Walford: No we are on you right now, the ball is in your court. Please go ahead.

Councilman Green: I would just like to say again, today at Pete Harris about 9 o'clock was the first that I heard about this. All of this well and good. Overlay is fine, I need it in my district, everybody need it in their district. I worked hard, I fought—in fact, along with Cuz and myself, we fought not to give this

money away. Now, that we got it back, I think that everybody that is involved up here—the Mayor and the Council, we ought to all be involved in this process as to what to do with this money.

I mean, the idea is wonderful, but I just think that I ought to be given a shot just like everybody else. It is a wonderful idea. If we are really talking about doing something with the money, we just heard the outcry of some city workers. I mean, give them a one time shot, divide \$770,000 dollars up and give it to them if we are really talking about doing something for the citizens. Lets just say, we'll do this for them and maybe that will lift their morale if we are really talking about what we want to do because there is more to life than overlaid streets and concrete.

The just talked about their insurance, they just talked about a raise, they talked about all of this, so if we are really talking about helping and doing and really putting the bang where the buck is then lets do something different. But I think before this is voting upon, I ought to have a shot as talking about where the money go, every Council member up here ought to have a shot. Everything that we have here about the police and the extended classes for everybody, educational classes, all of that is good and all of this stuff makes the paper and it all makes everybody look wonderful, but I think that before we move on this money we all ought to sit down and talk about.

So, I would urge that we vote against this. And here again, I need overlaying my streets, we got some overlay money, but I just think that if we are really serious about helping our City then lets give this money to the employees and I am sure that if we would do that, everybody would be happy.

So, I would just urge my colleagues to not vote for this and lets sit down and talk about it. But my amendment will be, next Council meeting, to split this \$770,000 dollars up for all the city employees, not just for Fire and not just for Police but all of the City employees, and that is going to my amendment for the next meeting.

Councilman Jackson: I have just a couple of questions because I think the basic answers that people will give to many of the questions that Councilman Green have alluded to is that, any Councilman can put together a plan and any Councilman can offer this. My question goes to the specifics of this particular number.

There is a \$770,000 figure that I see. I didn't know if it was relatively arbitrary or there was some specific wisdom behind that number, if so I wanted to yield at this time even before making decisions about it, to hear the explanation of those numbers with respect to Unfunded Needs and those kind of things and I didn't know if there was a correlation between the Unfunded Needs specifically and the \$770,000 or was it seven districts times an arbitrary number like, \$110,000? What was the basis for arriving at the specific number of \$770,000?

I trust the wisdom of Councilman Gibson, Lester, and Walford and I'm assuming that there is a definitive breakout perhaps or at least a delineated explanation of what that number represents.

Councilman Walford: I am going to defer to Councilman Gibson to answer your question, if that is alright.

Councilman Jackson: That's fine.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Jackson, I appreciate that. Based on the enormity of what we are dealing with in terms of City needs there was not a specific formula. I think if all of us were to talk to our constituency, anything that we can put into our neighborhoods would be definitely appreciated. And again with some of the other things that we have upon our docket that this is a great opportunity to take moneys that otherwise are going to go into a fund, which again, we heard last week in a budget meeting that felt that we had significant moneys available to cover some of our potential risk out there.

But to answer your question there wasn't anything specific. It is a good start. I would like to see a million dollars for district if that was all possible within the budget. I think that Mr. Strong has made it clear to us, back in November and December when we first came into office, and we are going to hear from him, what next Monday or Tuesday. Mr. Strong, that right now, we've been running based on 1994 and '95 engineering studies, anywhere from \$300 to \$500 million dollars in needs on water and sewer and anywhere from \$200 to \$250 million dollars in streets and drainage. And I don't know if that money has shifted up or down but I do know the cost of business continue to go up. So, again, I thought this was an opportunity for all of us to benefit to help our Unfunded Needs in our respective districts to help our constituents to get ahead a little closer to some of the problems that we continue to exist in terms of aging infrastructure.

Councilman Jackson: So, was the number arbitrary?

Councilman Gibson: I don't know what you mean by 'arbitrary', but. . .

Councilman Jackson: I mean, it wasn't based on a formula, it wasn't based on—say, we took the Needs and we took a percentage of the Needs and when we equated the percentage, this was the need that would at least take care of 'x' amount of things. Was it you can get 1.4 miles overlaid for \$110,000, I mean, was it based on anything like that?

Councilman Gibson: Again, I think that is going to be up to Public Works. Public Works can use all of the resources we can give them.

Councilman Jackson: No, I understand. What you are saying is that is how they would spend it. They will decide how to spend it and I understand that. But I guess my question is, how do we arrive at the number \$770?

Councilman Gibson: Don't have any answer for you Councilman Jackson, I am sorry.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Strong, without much specificity, could you just kind of talk in approximate numbers about what the unfunded needs would be for overlay, roughly.

Mr. Strong: I think in the books that we gave each of the Councilmen, we had listed the Funded for this year and some on the Unfundeds that would be under the Priority Is and Priorities IIIs. And I believe that if you look at the Unfunded side of it that is in your books, it is probably exceed \$2 million dollars.

Councilman Jackson: Over \$2 million dollars.

Mr. Strong: Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: And that is collectively?

Mr. Strong: Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: Now, let me ask you also. How much could we feasible do in a district because I am assuming that with the arbitrary nature of this number that, it was thought of as splitting into each district, equally. I don't know was it an equal appropriation to each district?

Councilman Gibson: Again, the spirit of it would be that the department would make that determination. I think that this Council has always tried to be equitable in how monies are spent, I think that you can see it if we look at the budgets.

Councilman Jackson: No, I guess my question is, whenever it was conceived by the three Councilmen, was it conceived to be just basically that with \$770,000 basically each district could expect to \$110, roughly?

Councilman Gibson: Again, that would be the spirit of it.

Councilman Jackson: If that's the case, Mr. Strong, can you tell me from the overlay perspective, how much road or how much overlay can we do with a \$110,000 dollars lets just say, in one particular district?

Mr. Strong: Depends on the actual bids. The situation that we run into with the base work, that goes in. I mean, like this year we are setting in here, we are coming up on the end of the season. We are at the end of the program that we at in 2003 that we are doing here and finishing that up. The cold weather that is going to be coming up and to be able to do the asphalt, you need to have some where in the neighborhood of about 40 degrees, 24-hours on the rise, to be going in here.

So, I am afraid that what the situation is, is even if we get the money we are not going to be able to spend it this year or be in a situation of finishing up our program for that we have that is on-going this year because we got a late start with going over some issues.

Councilman Green: Again, I would urge this Council. We just heard a group of people talking about how they are suffering, what they need. The love that they don't feel that we, as officials or whoever, have towards them. I think we could do ourselves a great favor by 1. taking \$250,000 of this money in the General Fund, Police Budget to educate the force of sensitivity and training and due to the diversity of the City, and take the rest of this money for just one time and say to the city workers---we always take care of Fire and we always take care of Police. And, 1. being a smart politician, because we realize that they have a union and when they have a union, we realize that they can endorse us on election day, and 2. because they deserve it. But I just think that, we ought to have the heart and we ought to have the guts to say to the rest of the City employees, that we have an opportunity to show you that we care and we are going to do it. We are going to step up to the plate.

We are going to neglect whatever, I'll be the first to say, that I got streets. Mr. Strong just got through saying that we can't do it possible this year. Anyway and who knows what will happen next year, the tax base possible will go up. But, I think that we ought to step up to the plate at this time to show the rest of the City employees that we love them and we care because in three years, is not long.

Mayor Hightower: I too have some concerns. I think that we do need street overlay just like Councilman Gibson said, we are way behind on street overlay but we are also way behind on infrastructure from the Water and Sewer Department. We also would like to have more police officers. I think I've heard several of you say, I'd like more police patrol and protection in my community. The Fire Department has needs. I think as you go through the budget sessions, you are going to hear wish lists and wants and needs from every single department. Councilman Green just alluded to the employees that came forward, saying that they want more money. We just heard about insurance rates going up and how we are going to handle those. So, the list of needs goes on and on and on and I do think that we should take a look. We received this piece of legislation at 2:30 today and as Mr. Strong said, the 2003 budget is coming to an end, 2004 we are obviously working on.

But when we receive notice that we were going to get Pirate money, I am not a financial expert by any means as I don't think that any Council member has those credentials either, we went to our financial advisors and asked them what we needed to do with the money. They cited our bond rating needs, which we all talk about parlaying a little bit of money into more money and that is what a good bond rating is all about is being able to assure that we get the best rates possible so that we are able to borrow as much as we can to do as many projects that you are talking about as we can and I think we've done a good job of that over the past five years.

They also take a look at our retained risk. What's likely to happen with possible situations that are out there from police incidents to bus wrecks to deaths in the jail, and we can talk about numerous ones of those. We also all know that we all have the police and fire retirement issue hanging out there. It could be a \$5 million dollars hit to the City at anytime. And what are we going to do when those things happen to us? We just can't, be like a little kid at Easter time, and go find the golden egg and it has \$0.50 cents in it and we run out and spend it all.

I mean, we've got obligations as adults, as stewards of the taxpayers money to look ahead, to forecast somewhat and I am going to let Tom speak a little bit and he is our in-house budget expert, but I can tell you that our financial advisors did not, and I don't think would suggest spending the money until we have resolution to some of these short/long-term possibilities that may be out there.

Again, I want to pave streets as bad as anybody does and obviously if we can find money and move it into Public Works, they'll use it wisely, same thing with the Police Department, same thing with Community Development, same thing with SPAR (I can go on and on) but for us, at a moment's notice, pull that kind of money out of the city budget and out of the reserve and out of the places that the financial advisors say that it ought to be, I don't think is the thing that we ought to rush into. And, I would ask that this Council, stop, stop, take a look at priorities, meet, meet with the financial advisors and be sure that we continue to keep this City on sound financial footing. With that, Tom, did you have a comment?

Mr. Dark: Yes, sir I do. With Council's indulgence. 1. What you are talking about not only in this but in the piece of General Fund legislation that you chose not to put on the agenda, you are talking about 2004 budget issues. You have a number of budget meetings ahead of you and when those are over, what you are going to be doing is deciding which of these and priorities you hadn't even heard yet that you are going to fund for next year.

I would just encourage a great deal of caution. The day after the next Council meeting, we are going to be in Baton Rouge listening to a judge decide whether we are going to end up having to pay almost \$4.5 million dollars, if the number holds right now, in retirement costs. It turns out we have to do that, that is going to be an annual expense. We are going to need every bit of spare cash we can do to fund that without drastically disrupting the other things that we do.

I guess I share the Mayor's concern. I don't want us to look on the Pirates money as the \$20 bill burning a hole in a teenager's pocket, right now. We need to understand that we have some serious needs in lawsuits pending against us, in retirement pending against us. Some of those, will become known at some point and we will be able to decide better which our priorities are, whether they be pay or infrastructure or some combination of any of all those things, but you've got until December 15 to deal with those and because overlay can't be done this year anyway, it gives us the \$770,000. It is going to be next Spring before we do it. Lets not do that, right now. Lets decide on that in the same time frame as all of the other things that you want whether they be pay or infrastructure or computers at rec centers or whatever else it is that comes up between now and then.

Councilman Gibson: Every time we start talking about infrastructure, there is always an excuse. That is what I've heard for 12 months. We don't have a problem taking \$2.5 million dollars out of Riverfront Development and spending and we don't every go back and say, *let's talk to our financial advisors about how we spend that money.*

But at the same time taxpayers pay big bucks time and time again, for streets, water, sewer, drainage, police and fire and garage pick up. Those are main essentials for this City of what they expect. And to say, *that we are not going to spend it this year.* Mr. Strong, if we put it in 2003 Capital Improvements, you can use it 2004, can you not? That is an affirmative back there, right. Okay. So, that excuse—again, every time we get to a situation on infrastructure there is an excuse.

Ladies and gentlemen, the age of our infrastructure is going to be our problem, not the pension plan, not some potential lawsuits in the near future. You are talking hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure needs, right now, not next year, not 10 years from now. It should have happened 10 years ago. We have had people stand up here, Murray Lloyd yesterday, again said, what are we going to do? I have to concur with citizens out there. What are we going to do?

We are already for the last 10 to 12 years, been \$8 to \$10 million dollars short on infrastructure investment, it is documented. There was a story in the *Shreveport Times* 2-months ago on that very story. And again, \$770,000 dollars

yes, it is a lot of money. Yes, we have a huge responsibility, but ladies and gentlemen, too if we don't start somewhere we keep putting it over in Retained Risk, which has by the way, gets to be serious \$6.4 million dollars sitting in that account right now. There are immediate needs with real consequences in our own neighborhoods.

And when, Councilman Green, when you have a catastrophic failure in your district that affect 100 to 200 homes out there, then you are going to be the one down here crying about how your constituents are beating your doors down.

I think it is a priority for you and I think it is a priority for all of us. And, again and we can knock this down one limb at a time to get where we need to be, but again we come up with excuse after excuse after excuse. Those excuses, in my opinion, fall back on the taxpayer and what I'm hearing from my constituents and others around the City, where are we going to finally step up to the bar and put money where they want to see priorities.

Again, I am not the solution to it. I agree with Councilman Jackson. Hey, this is one proposal. I hope that I see many proposals from my colleagues on infrastructure investments because we got an \$8 million dollars shortfall there, \$8 million not \$1 or \$2 million, \$8 million and that's been going on for 10 plus years. We should be spending \$33 to \$35 million dollars, and we been spending \$23 to \$25 million every year.

So yeah, we are talking about serious things and yeah it is a small drop in the bucket, but again \$110,000 dollars goes a long way in my district. If one of my colleagues doesn't want it, I'll take your \$110,000 dollars in a heart beat. But, again it is a first step of which I am passionate about because again, cost of doing business in this City is skyrocketing on streets, water, sewer, drainage, and the cost of doing business of which we just heard from our health benefits program is skyrocketing but we don't seem to be wanting to put the money back, we are saying, lets just wait.

So, again, I appreciate how everybody is going to vote, but I would urge you to support this and support some other efforts of which we have immediate needs and maybe at the end of the day for this budget process we can knock that \$8 million dollar number down to only \$1 or \$2 million. But, if we don't start guess what, Mike Strong is going to tell us in 2005 and 2006 that number is going to get even higher because again, maintenance costs are skyrocketing because of age of streets, drainage, and water and sewer.

Councilman Carmody: I will have to agree that this legislation actually arrived on the dias in front of me as I came into the meeting. And, although I would say that this is not the first time I've had an opportunity to vote on something just having seen it, I feel comfortable that the need is there for the improvements of the community. This again is money that Councilman Green obviously does not agree that we should ever have laid this money out, but through tremendous efforts it has come back into the City.

And I feel like it is the appropriate thing to do is to support putting this money back in. Granted we are at the end of a budget session and we will go into it trying to figure out the numbers for 2004. But like the old adage, I mean, how do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time and I see this as a bite and I'm

voting to take it.

Councilman Hogan: I would like to mention a couple of things. Each of us have unique needs in our own districts. I could take you through my district and there are sidewalks that are tremendous hazards, I believe, that are 4 inches off and someone that was helping me in my campaign, tripped on one of those sidewalks and almost broke their wrist. Probably, the street overlay needs in my district are not as great as in other districts, I can't name which one that might be.

I go along with the spirit of this. I do question the number. It is \$770,000, why not the whole amount? Another question I've thought of now is, could we take if we split it seven ways, could we use half of it for sidewalk repair? Does it have to go to Street Overlay? There is other needs in each of our district. Could we, would we have the option to address other needs? Would it have to go, be designated for overlay? Maybe we can pass that out later, but I do go along and I am in favor of the spirit of the legislation.

One more question to Mr. Dark, as I recall in one of our budget meetings that we've already had recently, you had commented on the Retained Risk Fund and you said that we were in good shape on the Retained Risk Fund, seem like I remembered that.

Mr. Dark: What I said was, we have been able to build the Reserves up to a better amount than they were. Understand that that is still only \$10 million and we have spent as much as \$12 in terms of the last Council, in a single year. It is not uncommon. We expect it may happen again. But understand that part of the reason that we put the money from the Pirates in the Retained Risk Fund to begin with was that we have a number of fairly immediate situations, whether it be the Stadium or the jail or business with retirement. All of those are fairly immediate things that we are concerned about and that we are trying to avoid hitting the General Fund even further when we have to address those, if we do.

So that is our concern with this. I mean, there are plenty of needs here, infrastructure is certainly one of them. I would just ask you to look at the long picture and do this in the context of the '04 budget when you've got everybody's needs in front of you and can decide which of them you want to fund. Right now you have one of them. If you sit here long enough you can come up with plenty more.

Councilman Hogan: Back when this money was taken out for the Pirates, back in 1998 or 1997 or somewhere in there or whatever year it was, were you on board then in your same position and—Mr. Dark: No, Sir I was Director of Public Works at the time.

Councilman Hogan: Can anyone answer for me where the money originally came from?

Mr. Dark: From the Riverfront Fund, sir.

Councilman Hogan: From the Riverfront—that might have already been discussed, I didn't catch it.

Councilman Green: Mr. Gibson, just to talk to you about what you said, *I'm going to be down here crying*. The thing that I am going to cry about is, whenever something come into your crystal ball that before you make it in the form of an ordinance or an amendment, at least just honor my request. Because I'm not

going to pop anything on you, on the day of about \$770,000 dollars.

I would give you the respect. If I'm going to cry about something, I am going to cry about whenever the stuff come in your crystal ball, that you would give the other six of us up here the opportunity to digest it, because you are way ahead of the game. I mean, you are in this business. You already know about infrastructure. I mean, I understand that. I mean, when it comes to the Bible, then I mean you are talking about Pastor Jackson and myself and on down the line, but you are ahead of the game.

So all I ask is that I'm crying now, that when something comes into your crystal ball that before we have it on our desk as to voting on it and then we got to go through a long drawn out deal as to what is right and what is wrong, that we would be given that opportunity. And, then this morning, I asked you, in fact, if I had known that you were going to do it, when I left, I was under the impression you said, *okay we got two weeks to do it.*

I was under the impression that we were going to talk about this for two weeks and then we were going to come up with a suitable idea for the seven of us, that is what I thought. I did not think that today, by the time I got to Council meeting that I would even be up here debating on the \$770,000 dollars.

And everything that sounds good is not sound. So therefore, again, I would like the opportunity to get all seven of us, whether we break up in threes or however, along with the Mayor and the Administration to talk about this.

And here again, I get tired ever since I been in the world, somebody has always making a decision for me. And, I just think that at the age I am, and I don't tell my age until Christmas, that I ought at this point be able to make a decision for myself, for my district— the folk that elected me to come up here. They did not elect me to come up here and to go along with everything that somebody else say. Even if nothing else, I ought to be able to take this back to my meetings or associations to say, look we have this money available. What is it that you the citizens who paid it from your taxes or whatever, what would you all like to do with it? We always talk about, during campaigning that we are for the people and whatever y'all say and you all are my bosses and whatever and then we come up here and we come up with these grand ideas and we don't ever consult them and I think it is bad.

So, therefore, again, I would ask that we would vote against this and if I can't get you vote against it, I would even ask to postpone it and let people make some phone calls, let them call these Council members. And those of you that is listening and watching television now, call your Councilman and tell them what you want. Again, I hear people talking everyday that it is more to life than overlaying streets and concrete.

People want something else. It gives contractors an opportunity to make some money, but then the grassroots folks still need some help. Again those folk up here just cried out about insurance going up no raise, no whatever, and it is easy when you are on the top to say well, you know we need to do this and whatever. But when you hear the cry of the people, I just think that at some point in time you ought to listen to them. I mean, even if you are not going to do anything, even you are going to do whatever you want to do, at least listen to the

folk and at least make them feel better. Again, we have the power and power is something. It all depends on how you handle it once you got it.

So, again I would urge, I am going to vote against it if we vote for it today, but if somebody would offer a motion to postpone it just to give citizens—and we are always talking about *citizens this and citizens that*, we ought to make citizens count. We talk about the citizens and the trust of the citizens. Well, now we have an opportunity to trust the citizens. We are always talking about well, we've lost the trust and we need to get it back. Well, we got \$770,000—and that might be somebody call now to agree with it. If it is, tell, them I'm fighting for you.

But here again, I need you all 1. is and I again, I do commend Councilman Gibson for the idea, but I just ask for respect, that is what I am asking for. I ask for an opportunity to share in the development of cutting up this pie, that is what I ask for. Most of the times, we are in the basement while the decisions are being taken care of upstairs. But, I just think that at some time, point or another, there ought to be more than one or two folk at the meeting when the agenda is being set; somebody else deserve an opportunity.

Councilman Hogan just got through saying well, in his district he don't need overlay. So, if in fact we approve this. (Councilman Hogan: I could use a little bit.) He could use a little bit but he may not need but \$10,000 dollars. Well, he said sidewalks. So, if we approve this whereas that person who broke his wrist, almost, next time that you campaign won't be able to walk with you because they wrist going to be hurt. So, therefore, I just think, just like I fought against the Pirates getting this money, I'm fighting today to sit down and lets reason together and lets talk about it.

Again, Councilman Gibson, I commend you for this but I just want to be in the process. I mean, I just want to take part in the process and in the procedure of whatever is being taken care of and that is what I want to do. So, if we want to postpone it then fine and we vote for it, I mean, if we brig it up for a vote today, I'm voting against it. And again, whose phone was that ringing? Was that a citizen calling?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson, can you top that?

Councilman Jackson: No, sir nor will I attempt to. I just wanted to echo some of what has been said by different Councilmen today.

I asked, very specifically, a few minutes ago and I think received a response that leaves me to believe that the \$770,000 dollar figure was arbitrary. And the only reason I was asking the question was not to be smug in any way and certainly not to be sarcastic, but to find out what in fact was the formula because my concern was if the needs were that great and it was a \$2 million dollar need then with a degree of passion that Councilman Gibson expressed, I would have expected to see \$1.-whatever million dollars going to overlay. I would have been against that, as well because nobody every said to the people in District G, *do you in fact want overlay to be your priority*. That decision was made for me or was attempted to be made for me in the form of this ordinance.

And so it just seems to me that until, and when you start talking about significant dollars, I think Mr. Dark said it earlier, as we go through the

budget process, the budget process is a scenario where everybody can look at the entire spectra of needs and decide how we prioritize. There are some things we have very little discretion over how to prioritize and what the amounts of money will be. This is something that was totally done at the discretion of, well I'll say it, Councilmen, who I suggested had some wisdom in putting this together, but when it was deferred to Councilman Gibson, he said it was relatively arbitrary.

And, so I just think that it doesn't give me an opportunity to decide for my district, what if the \$110,000 dollars that you talk about is better spent in my district on other needs? I would not have had the opportunity to say that, and every ordinance, every resolution, everything that comes before the Council is up for vote and understand that we all have opportunity to vote on all those things.

It just seems to me that without the opportunity to have spoken on it and even when we talked about flexibility and we could do different things with it for different needs, according to this ordinance we could not do different things. This ordinance is very specific. It says \$770,000 dollars in the Capital Improvements Budget to asphalt overlay deteriorated streets throughout the City of Shreveport and to be divided among the Council districts. It doesn't talk about being need-based, does not say that it is going to be district prioritized, it is going to be need prioritized. It was arbitrary in the numerical figure, it is arbitrary in the illogical nature that it is put together, and I would suggest that this particular time that we would either scrap the whole thing or go back and do it better with the inclusion of other people with other Councilmen involved as well. And at least give it time, give us time to have talked about this because we are not talking an impact that is general, we are talking about Council districts specific impact that I think that are some things that we would like to do as well. It certainly does say that we want to use this \$770,000 or a portion of it in District G. We need asphalt overlay but there may be an opportunity to get more than this when we look at our full budget.

And, so I don't want to act arbitrarily nor capriciously in trying to figure out, because nobody could say what the \$770—we are just grasping at straws and we are just pulling figures out of the air because there seems to be this money tree down on the riverfront somewhere and we just keep shaking it and getting dollar bills off of it, then I just believe that we have to be less arbitrary and more conscious and more, I think we have to put more thought into why these numbers.

And, then, at least Councilman Green heard about it this morning. I saw Councilman Gibson this morning, I didn't hear about it but he knew about it. But I do want to commend you Councilman Gibson because this is better than what it has been in the past because generally I would have read about it in Sunday's paper before we came to the Council meeting, but at least, this way we get it today and even thought it is still, in my opinion, premature in its form.

So, I just think that we should, Mr. Chairman, should exercise a great degree of more judgment on how we divide that money up if in fact we are going to divide it up at all, and would like to offer a motion to postpone this ordinance.

Motion by Councilman Jackson to postpone the ordinance, seconded by Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: The Chair would second that motion. And if you would yield to the Chair for discussion, I have a point I would to make.

I was going to make the same motion when you finished. But what I hear is that we want to get together and act like what we should be acting like and that is a Council; so, I am pleased to second your motion.

Councilman Lester: I just wanted to ask Councilman Hogan, if that person that got hurt needed representation?

Councilman Gibson: I think this will probably hit home with the Chairman. I don't believe we had these discussions when we had about \$2 million dollars in concrete overlay and I believe that money came directly out of your district, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I believe it was a 6 to 1---

Councilman Walford: Don't believe it, let me assure you.

Councilman Gibson: I believe that was a 6 to 1 vote to arbitrarily take that money and put it into concrete panel replacement, but lets be clear on that. And also I know we have got another item coming in just a minute, but the fact being is, I agree that any discussion that we can get to continue to further the opportunity to invest in infrastructure.

And again, \$110,000 dollars for overlay is one column. The next time we are getting in discussions, hopefully, it will be sidewalks, hopefully it will be water and sewer, hopefully it will be drainage, and all the other things. But when you add up at the end of the day, we have got a big--as Councilman Carmody said, there is an elephant out there and one bite at the time definitely makes a lot of sense and that was the spirit of this particular ordinance. And to delay this issue and to look at delaying the next piece of legislation, I think makes a lot of sense.

Councilman Green: Cuz, if you are listening, I need your help, part of this resolution.

Mayor Hightower: I know he is listening, Councilman Green. I am sure he is thrilled that you pointed his name out (probably have dinner for free tonight.)

Councilman Green: For three?

Mayor Hightower: For free or three. Free for three. One thing that I would do or at least ask the Council to do today and I think that Councilman Gibson is graciously agreeing to a postponement on the amendment. What I would ask that we consider doing is, if that is what Councilman Gibson wants to propose for the 2003 or the 2004 budget at this point, I guess it is really irrelevant but what we need to do on the 2003 that we have before you, the Capital Improvements Budget is to have that passed because we have two projects pending on that: 1.

Lakeshore Drive Project and the one is 2. McNeill. And we have contracts that are ready to go on that, we just need the money approved to go ahead and do the job. So, if we don't pass that then we are just talking about a couple more weeks of probably good weather that those guys won't be able to get going on. So if we could do then Councilman Gibson can come back at a later meeting and introduce whatever it is that he wants to introduce that certainly would help.

Councilman Gibson: Is there working contractors?

Mr. Dark: About \$4 million dollars.

Councilman Gibson: Just so we are clear.

Mayor Hightower: Lets also be clear about the \$2 million dollars that came out of your district, that was bond money that was appropriated for infrastructure improvements.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Mayor, it didn't make it less painfully.

Mayor Hightower: And I understand that.

Councilman Walford: And I generously divided it seven ways.

Councilman Gibson: And we appreciate that.

Mayor Hightower: But that money did not come out thin air that was allocated somewhere else or in a Reserve to take care of other problems. It was for infrastructure needs and it was moved at the request of the Administration and graciously by the Council, and I think everybody's district has benefit as a result of that. And I know that that is Councilman Gibson's same thought on this process, except the money is coming from a different spot. But again, that can be debated at a later time, but we would like to have the ordinance itself passed so that we can get these jobs underway. Mr. Gibson, I know you can't vote against that.

Councilman Gibson: According to Councilman Green, I can.

Councilman Jackson: I would like to withdraw my motion to postpone I would like to move that we would accept Ordinance 154 as amended, which would be Amendment 1.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption of the ordinance as amended.

Councilman Lester: My question is procedurally, as I appreciate it, we voted earlier to include No. 1 and I believe did we even vote to include Amendment No. 2?

Councilman Jackson: No, that is where we are now.

Councilman Walford: We have not gotten to a vote on that.

Councilman Lester: My next question was, wasn't this on the floor, as I appreciate it, the motion to accept Amendment No. 2?

Councilman Walford: Until it was an amended motion by Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Lester: So, the fact that we moved--there was a motion o the floor and there was a second to adopt No. 2. And so, your motion is a substitute motion to not approve No. 2, but instead approve No. 1?

Councilman Jackson: We've already approved No. 1.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Councilman Jackson: So, my motion would be a substitute motion to approve the ordinance as amended, thus far.

Councilman Lester: Without No. 2?

Councilman Walford: Without No. 2.

Councilman Lester: I just wanted to make sure.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption of the ordinance

as amended (Amendment No. 1). Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Lester. 1.

5. Ordinance No. 155 of 2003 by Councilman Jackson: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on October 14, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the ordinance until the November 11, 2003 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

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.

Having passed first reading on October 14, 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 Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone the ordinance until the November 11, 2003 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Carmody. 1.

The Adopted Ordinances, as amended, follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 151 OF 2003  
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 90-275(a) OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES  
RELATIVE TO TRAFFIC AND VEHICLES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH  
RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED that Section 90-275 (a) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 90-275. Hearings by parking ordinance hearings officer.

(a) Upon receipt of a written request, the parking ordinance hearings officer shall hold hearings relating to removal, impoundment, or detention of motor vehicles pursuant to subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), or (f) of section 90-273 in accordance with the rules of procedure established by the Hearings Officer(s). In hearings pursuant to this subsection, the hearings officer's determination shall be limited to the question of whether the city had probable cause to tow the vehicle, but the hearings officer shall have the power to reduce or waive the charges even when probable cause is shown, when, in his discretion, it determines that such waiver or reduction is justified. The hearings officer shall also have the power to order the release of the vehicle prior to hearing, upon execution of an appearance bond as provided for in section 90-273.

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

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

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

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

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Lakeshore Drive Extension Widening (89-C021) by \$1,983,700. Funding sources are \$800,000 from 1999 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets) and \$1,183,700 from Urban Arterial.

In Program E (Water Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for McNeil Water Line, Booster Station and Pumps Improvements (94-E004) by \$928,500. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements)

Decrease the appropriation for Stoner Lift Station Improvements (01-F004) by \$928,500. Funding Source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

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

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or

applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications; and, to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.

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

*/s/Monty Walford, Chairman*

*/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council*

### **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. 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.
5. 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)
6. 2004 Budget Ordinances (to be adopted by Dec. 15):
  - 157 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Downtown Development District.
  - 158 Adopting the 2004 General Fund budget.
  - 159 Adopting the 2004 Capital Improvements budget.
  - 160 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund.
  - 161 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Airports Enterprise Fund.
  - 162 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund budget.
  - 163 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Golf Enterprise Fund.

- 164 Adopting the 2004 Metropolitan Planning Commission's Special Revenue fund.
- 165 Adopting the 2004 budget funding contractual services provided to SporTran by the Metro Management Associates, Inc.
- 166 Adopting the 2004 Debt Service fund budget.
- 167 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue fund
- 168 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue fund.
- 169 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue fund.
- 170 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service fund.
- 171 Adopting the 2004 budget for S'port Redevelopment Agency Special Revenue Fund.
- 172 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund.
- 173 Adopting the 2004 budget for Downtown Parking Enterprise Fund.
- 174 Adopting the 2004 budget for the Downtown Entertainment Economic Development District Special Revenue Fund.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None.

### **REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES.**

#### **Infrastructure Committee Report:**

Councilman Gibson: As reported yesterday, so that we are on the record, the Infrastructure Committee of which Councilman Jackson and Councilman Carmody and myself are on have scheduled a meeting for November 5, 2003, 5 p.m., site to be determined by Council office to ask Public Works to come in and talk about some of the problems we continue to have on an on-going basis on and off through the last couple three years in terms of the taste and smell of our drinking water.

#### **Metro Law Enforcement Committee Report:**

Councilman Gibson: And also, just to give a brief update, the Metro Law Enforcement Committee met again last week. We asked have both Sheriff Prator and Chief Campbell, from the first meeting, to provide us in writing the like services that both agencies provide to the public and what dollar amounts associated with those like services. And then we also have discussed working some subcommittees specifically on some of the issues dealing with at-will versus civil service and also some of the things centered around some legislative issues regarding elected versus appointed in terms of the leadership of that particular proposed agencies.

But, so far we have made some productive work, but at the same time, I am anxiously as the Chairman looking forward to getting some information and data from both of those agencies on the like items of which was identified in the 1990 study that showed at least 18 to 20 like services that both of these agencies provide and what kind

of dollar amount the taxpayers are funding for those like services.

And, I will also commend based on some of the issues that this committee has done that both Chief Campbell and Sheriff Prator have been working on some issues that like in nature from drug task force to some other areas that they believe can move forward without this committee coming to its conclusion. So I really appreciate both Chief Campbell and Sheriff Prator in their pro-activeness in working to streamline some of the opportunities that they have in terms of like services because obviously at the end of the day, the taxpayer benefits.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson, did you, since the last time we met devise a list of who was on the committee and are you prepared to share that today with, who is in fact, on the committee?

Councilman Gibson: No, sir. Based on the discussions of the Committee there are some key elements that, in order to continue to move forward, we have to have some answers and the Committee felt the original Committee that have meet the first two meetings, felt like we needed some additional data in order to invite the rest of the group to be involved.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I have some issues with that. And I asked at the last Council meeting. (Mr. Clerk-oh, he is not here.) I don't know Mike, if you have the—excuse me, Councilman Gibson, if you have a copy of the legislation that was submitted because on the legislation that was submitted there were a list of people who were named in all of the possibly affected cities who was suppose to serve on the committee. At the last Council meeting, I asked about that, said committee.

I just am concerned about having these discussions without the people who are stakeholders being in that discussion from the beginning. It is going to be hard to build trust and gain buy-in from people who are not included in the discussion from the beginning. The premise of the committee, if I am correct and that is why I've asked, that is why I was asking for either a copy of what was submitted at that time because I am sure that what was submitted at that time was a list of who would all be on the committee. And my question was how was that committee going to be functional because in my estimation, there was going to be 35 or 40 people on the committee. But if that is what it takes in order to make it work, I don't think that we circumvent having those people on there from the very beginning, obviously they have not been on there from the very beginning. And I guess my concern is that this train doesn't go to far out of the station without these stakeholders being involved in the conversation from the ground floor. If they get in at another level, then you are going to have the group dynamic issue of trying to build trust among people who get into a meeting where all of the answers are preconceived and have already been discussed and they were not a part of the original group when the legislation when voted upon said that everybody would be included and it didn't say everybody would be brought along, later. It said that everybody would be included; so, as I appreciate it, we have not yet had a full convening of that particular task force and/or committee.

Councilman Gibson: We have not and we are gathering data from that particular committee in order to maximize the people who need to be involved but that data still has not been gathered from the two agencies that had been asked at the first meeting, to provide that data.

Councilman Jackson: So technically, it is not a committee meeting, is what you

are saying?

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Jackson, I'll have the discussion with you, later to get into an argument whether it was full committee or not.

Councilman Jackson: I don't want to argue with you.

Councilman Gibson: That's all I am going to say.

Councilman Jackson: I just want to answer whether or not it has been a full committee meeting?

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Jackson, I've stated—we went into this two weeks ago.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, is there a way that you can ascertain whether or not these have been full committee meetings as we voted on and as in our records?

Councilman Walford: I'll have to get that information from Mr. Gibson because I have not been party to the committee meetings.

Councilman Jackson: Can you get that to me. How soon can we get that?

Councilman Walford: I will request that information from Mr. Gibson and have it to you as soon as possible, is the best commitment I can make.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you.

Councilman Walford: But I will do that.

*Property Standards Committee Report:*

Councilman Lester: Just to give Public Notice, we've already given it there is a Property Standards meeting tomorrow at 3:00.

**CLERK'S REPORT:** None.

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

**ADJOURNMENT.** There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 6:55 p.m.

*/s/Monty Walford, Chairman*

*/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council*