

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA

July 13, 2004

(As amended and approved on July 27, 2004)

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of The City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Councilman Jackson at 3:06 p.m., Tuesday, July 13, 2004, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Green.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7.

Approve Minutes: Motion by Councilman Green seconded by Councilman Carmody to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of June 21, 2004 and the Council Meeting Meetings of June 22, 2004. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays. None.

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, and Communications of the Mayor which are required by law.

Councilman Jackson: We want to at this time, excuse me just a second. Mr. Clerk, we have a request for suspension of the rules. Is that something that will have to be done (unclear) that's what I thought.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that we suspend the rules to give one of my constituents an opportunity. They are wheelchair bound.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to suspend the rules to allow public comment. Motion approved by the following votes. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson: 7. Nays: None.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, if I may while Mr. And Ms. Gibbs are making their way up to the microphone, we're in the middle of a jury trial that involves the City and we're at a crucial point right now, they're in cross examination of the plaintiff. So, I anticipate that would take about an hour to an hour and a half. So, if the business of the Convention Center Report and the study and water could come, if you could suspend the rules to move that towards the end, I should be back and if it comes quicker, if you'll call me, I'll be able to leave and get back over here in about five minutes.

Councilman Jackson: Appropriately, I believe we'll have to wait until we finish this and then we can take that action up after we've gone back into - - -.

Mr. Antee: That's fine, I was just going to state why I wasn't here.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, thank you Mrs. Gibbs. If you would, state your name and address for the record and please if you will limit your comments to three minutes.

Ms. Gibbs: First, I want to thank you people for letting me come down and I've got several problems with my house. I've had health during the year- - -

Councilman Gibson: Ms. Gibbs, I need you to state your name and address for the record please. Where you reside at.

Ms. Gibbs: I have, I want to thank you people for having us down today and

we've had quite a few problems.

Councilman Gibson: Ms. Gibbs. First of all, say who you are and where do you live. What is your address?

Ms. Gibbs: We live here in town at 353 W. 78th Street.

Councilman Gibson: And your husband's name?

Ms. Gibbs: My name is Pauline Gibbs and this is my son Albert Gibbs.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you.

Ms. Gibbs: And we have problems with the house of different kinds and I think I've talked to almost all of you at different times this year, trying to explain it, but I have problems with they put tile on my floor and didn't fix it where it would drain correctly. So the water went - - -

Mr. Gibbs: That's in the bathroom.

Ms. Gibbs: In the bathroom, when they changed the bathtub to a shower, after I had a stroke, they didn't fix the drainage good, and the water went between two floors instead of where it should have gone, so it's rotting things out in there now and we've got quite a problem. And other little things have happened that weren't fixed just correctly.

Councilman Gibson: Ms. Gibbs, for the record, did the City of Shreveport provided a grant to pay for some of that work?

Ms. Gibbs: Some of it, yes sir.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, and this work, you felt like had not been completed?

Ms. Gibbs: Would you speak a little bit louder?

Councilman Gibson: I said, you felt like this work hadn't been completed, is that correct?

Ms. Gibbs: It wasn't done. I don't think it was done.

Mr. Gibbs: It was not done according to code.

Ms. Gibbs: It wasn't done correctly.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask, if you will, Mr. Bowie, is Ms. Moore over there? Would you come forward please Mr. Bowie? Mr. Bowie, what I'd like for you to do since Ms. Gibbs, are you finished speaking Ms. Gibbs?

Ms. Gibbs: I can't understand you.

Councilman Jackson: Are you finished speaking now?

Mr. Gibbs: Are you through speaking?

Ms. Gibbs: No. Maybe not. I have - - - we were talking about things that weren't done just right. But when they put some lights up on the side of the house, they didn't put that little receptacle there, to put it in, they just stuck it in a hole in the wall. Well, it come a loose, and now the water is coming in between the siding and the house. And just little things like that.

Councilman Jackson: Let me tell you what and you can help me relate this. Tell you what we'll do. I've asked Mr. Bowie to come who is with the Department of Community Development and he'll get the appropriate staff in Community Development to figure out what was done in the beginning, to go and look at it now and find out what the problems are and where we have a liability from the City's perspective and get back with us and then we can make some decisions on that at that time. Is that okay with you?

Ms. Gibbs: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Alright thank you.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to suspend the rules for our CAO to address the group. Is that appropriate?

Mr. Dark: Well actually, I think Mr. Gibson, he went ahead and wanted to let you know why he wouldn't be here for a while, and the only thing he's really asking you to do is, if you could defer the Convention Center Report until he returns and perhaps the vote on the water until he returns, although I don't know if we'll be there by the time he get's back anyway.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Thompson, is there a requirement that we actually make a motion and second it in order to reallocate the agenda, so that we can receive this information again?

Mr. Thompson: No, I don't believe- - - you mean from the CAO?

Councilman Carmody: Correct, or can we just return to it when he comes back?

Mr. Thompson: We can just return to it when he comes back.

Councilman Carmody: Very good. Thank you sir. Thank you sir.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, there has been some question as to whether the Mayor is out of the State. And I noticed that you voted in the last motion. And you might inquire from the Administration as to whether or not he is out of the State and if so, under the Charter, you are the Mayor Pro Tem and therefore you cannot vote on any of the items that come up during the meeting.

Mr. Dark: It is our understanding he is out of the State by now.

Councilman Jackson: Alright, so we'll move forward. Item 5 on the agenda, Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests and Communications of the Mayor which are required by law, we have a couple of communications. Some distinguished guests who are here today to appear and to speak. Let me- - - I've got two that I know at least, whose names I have. I see that the Juvenile Court Administrator, Mr. Ted Cox is here and I have the names of Judge David Matlock and Paul Young. Are they are here? Judge Matlock is here and Mr. Cox. If you all will, you can come now.

Judge Matlock: I had to step out of the room for a moment, because I had an emergency order to take a child into safe custody. I live by this cell phone and I apologize for having to step out at that moment. But there is an end game, and a brick wall, and a place where the final phone calls have to come and so, I wear my cell phone in Church and to funerals, and I very much apologize for that. I don't know what if any statements were made when I begun, but I had a couple of purposes and assume I'm limited to three minutes or thereabouts. I want to thank the City of Shreveport, the City Council and the Administration for the support that you have provided, in particular, y'all have helped us solve a shelter or at least partially solve a shelter problem by contributing some resources to allow increased shelter beds at Johnny Gray Jones regional facility. Your Police Department and your Police patrol officers will tell you that, that is still a great need and that there are sever problems related to shelter beds in Caddo Parish and we are mindful of that and would like to continue to work with y'all and the Police Department and the community to try to address those problems. Also wanted to tell y'all that there is a tax proposal on this weekend and one of the plans of the Court with respect to that money is to increase the number of beds in detention. That's not the shelter, but the secured detention facility by 24 beds with part of that money. We have the money and actually architectural plans drawn up and prepared

and the money to do the construction to add the 24 beds. This proposed tax increase would afford the ability to operate that increase and again your Police Department would be tremendously impacted as well as the community by that proposal. The Juvenile Court is operated primarily from a tax that had been passed in 1957 and as you know, that was a one judge and an 18 bed facility at that time. And we are now three judges, we have over 1,000 children on probation at this time. We've gone in the last 10 years from handling zero truancy cases to handling at the present time 1200 truancy cases per year. We run a drug court, we run a teen court or are involved with a teen court operation. We have a truancy court operation. We run Star Boot Camp at the Oak Terrace for middle school. Those middle schoolers report to that site at 5:30 in the morning. For the last two years, the eight graders participating that Star Boot Camp Program during the time of the LEAP Test is administered, have had a 100% pass rate. And I think if you compare and you understand that a middle schooler who gets sent to a boot camp or living on boot camp, that starts at 5:30 in the morning, you're talking about generally a very behaviorally challenged child, and certainly academically challenged, and not necessarily a cross section of what you would see across our schools. And yet, we've had a 100% pass rate with that on the LEAP Test with respect to those children. The Court has been very active. We have over the last ten years developed programs to try to keep our community safe and to try to rehabilitate the lives of our children. What we try to avoid is sending a child off to a long term secure placement. You and I think about as LTI, and you send a child there for three or four years to be raised with or arguably by the 500 or 600 worst behaved children in the State of Louisiana, you can imagine what comes back in three or four years. And that's what we try to avoid. It's necessary, it's essential in some cases, because our prime directive is public safety and to protect the community. But we also have a very important mission to rehabilitate children's lives and if you don't get to a person who may be headed down that road early, it becomes hard and some might say impossible as they go further in life and our Drug Court program is a very comprehensive large scale program to address needs or related substance abuse for children. Those needs were not there in 1957. It's a different world today than it was then and largely due to family structure and other pressures that are put on the School System understands and sees and has to deal with many of those pressures, but we do as well and I just - - - wanted to come before you. And I thank you for the opportunity to speak. I wanted to be able to answer any questions that y'all might have, because many of the things related to this tax proposal will impact your departments, your City particularly with respect to law enforcement, but also to extent of fire and other public safety and even other areas as well and certainly your constituents. And if there are any questions, I'm here. Col. Cox, our Judicial Administrator is somewhere - - -right here if y'all have any questions for us.

Councilman Carmody: Your honor, welcome.

Judge Matlock: Thank you.

Councilman Carmody: I did have a question and you started off your statement regarding the bids at that Johnny Gray Jones Shelter.

Judge Matlock: Yes.

Councilman Carmody: And maybe Mr. Dark can help me with this, but I do know that in the past, there has been some discussion about the funding for the shelter. And

I guess from the City of Shreveport, regarding the revenues that we received from the River Boats. Has that issue ever been clarified?

Judge Matlock: I believe so, the City is contributing I think \$12,500 per year. The Parish is also contributing \$12,500 per year for a total of \$25,000 that we pay to Johnny Gray Jones. They also get - - obviously that's not very much money when it comes to housing children. But it made a big difference. I don't know and y'all would be familiar with this. When you have a certain level of services and a level of funding, sometimes, just a little bit more money makes a tremendous difference in the programming and in the overall effectiveness of the program, and the truth is, that \$25,000 made a big difference and made a change in the whole lay of the land with respect to your Police Department, your Police Officers' ability to place children there. There is still much more great need there and we recognize that. And we want to address it. And truthfully, that need is probably at least as pressing as the need for this 24 additional beds in detention. Councilman Lester is very familiar with every aspect of what we do and we use jargon and sometimes, we get sort of off in our own world and we talk about shelter beds versus detention beds versus long secure placement and I recognize those are not terms that the public necessarily banter about, but they make a big difference to certainly law enforcement and to certainly to us as well.

Councilman Carmody: And Judge, I guess the input that I've received from a lot of people is based upon the editorial that was in the paper regarding the fact that request for approval for increase in the mileage was denied by the voters and the appearance was that the Parish Commission, I guess allocated more funds to - - -

Judge Matlock: From General fund and River Boat money to support us.

Councilman Carmody: Correct: Can I ask you to at least touch on that from the standpoint - - it's hard to refute anyone that is talking about children and trying to help children, especially those that are in crisis or creating a problem or nuisance to society, but philosophically, I know that there are persons that feel like that if the public is asked to support an increase on them to fund an operation and they actually vote it down, that it is in very poor management style for them, a governmental entity to increase the budget for that same thing that was just denied in order to operate that function. And I know that I'm not here to ask you to debate or refute Mr. Jones' comments, but I do know that, that is the sense of what I had received from the public that's called me about this particular issue.

Judge Matlock: There are several aspects to that. And that's a great question and an important question and an important question and I'm glad to respond to it. Ten years ago, or thereabouts, there was a public outcry, because frankly, children shootings, gang activity, violent juvenile crime, the wave of crack cocaine was at epidemic levels. And there was a response to local governments, (y'all felt it), to do something about that. The part of the local government body's response to that included drug program, Start Boot Camp Program, truancy program, because what we frankly found with truancy was we could identify children in middle school, elementary school that if somebody didn't step in and do something, they would be involved in those serious crimes later on. So, we find that we spend less money and get more benefit from the public by having these proactive programs. The Parish Commission chose to fund a lot of what we do out of their General Funds and their River Boat money. We also have been extremely active in getting State grants, Federal grants to

run these programs and we are guilty of acting vigorously to protect the community. We are guilty of trying to do something about juvenile crime and to do something about rehabilitating children. I'm holding in my hands a statement from someone else complaining that we are now asking for dedicated funds and saying we ought to use General Funds and River Boat money to continue doing it. It's the flip side of that argument. I think these arguments illustrate the fact that we do need a dedicated juvenile funding source that the public, the court, this body, police, law enforcement, District Attorney and everyone who has a stake in this can help plan a comprehensive program of juvenile justice. But we are providing services and it's a rubber band and it's stretched and the rubber band is about to break in terms of funding for these. We need more jail space. If you accept the argument recently presented in the paper, then we should be operating an 18 bed facility and have none of these programs.

Councilman Carmody: How many beds do you presently operate?

Judge Matlock: 52.

Councilman Carmody: And you're about to add, if the mileage passes, another 24?

Judge Matlock: Correct. Yes another short term, 24 more beds and they would be a different type. And then probably primarily misdemeanor impact incarceration type programs that you'd keep maybe a more serious offender separate from the lesser offenders. But when we order people into community service or when we have them on electronic ankle bracelets which are - - - or have any of the other programs that we have and somebody violates that, there has to be a consequence, otherwise, everyone of those programs loses their significance, and you can't enforce anything. So, it does have to be an end game. And hopefully, you don't have to use it very much. And it's a little bit like the more you try to fill up a jail, the emptier it gets. And I know that sounds like reverse logic, but children understand. They're going to test the limits and they want to know what the rules are and it's up to us to try to provide that for them. Much of the need relates to the fact that we're not running an 18 bed facility, we're running a 52 bed facility and that's where much of this need- - -we're sharing a fund with the Sheriff on that and the Sheriff's drawing on that has increased dramatically over the years as well. But, the Parish Commission, I think wisely has chosen to the extent that we've asked them to, to help fund these programs out of their General Fund. But now is the time to come back in and provide a more stable dedicated funding regime to this. And it is to be honest a modest request. I looked at, I think, and I hadn't followed it exactly the increase that y'all are seeking for water. I think that we're talking about roughly the same amount of money per year, and yet water is important. We're not going to live without it. And we recognize that. But we're not going to live in a safe and healthy community without this as well and so, I appreciate your questions, we're doing the best that we can and honestly, we're working very hard in trying to have programs that work for children, for families, and frankly, for the safety of the community and we don't know what else to do, to be honest with you. But I can tell ya, we're not going to sit back and do nothing. It's just not our style of leadership and community involvement.

Councilman Carmody: And I don't think that those persons who asked to be placed in the position of responsibility went into it with the idea that they were not wholeheartedly committed.

Judge Matlock: You're looking at some judges that were elected on platforms to

do what we're doing and if we didn't honor those commitments, then that would be a problem as well. And I honestly, I would rather be criticized for doing something than doing nothing. And some folks have said or it's been suggested that this was a scare tactic. I'd rather be honest than be accused of being engaged in a scare tactic, than waiting six months and folks saying "why didn't you tell us how significant this was", and "how great the need was?" Because if we don't get this, we are going to be, like I said, the rubber band is breaking. And we're going to be releasing- -we're already releasing children that shouldn't be released. And it's fixin to get worst. And if we have to cut back in terms of supervision, these things just have an impact on the community. And so, I would rather be honest and be criticized, than simply not come forward and let you know, because me, we trust the Public. The public is going to make this decision. But our duty is to inform the Public and then live with what they say. And I recognize that aspect of that. But the Public also approved those General Funds. The Public directly or indirectly approves those River Boat revenues, and vested the Parish with the authority to spend those monies in order to protect the community, promote public safety and help children, and they've honored that authority, and their obligation to fund the operations with the Court as well, so frankly, I applaud them for doing that.

Councilman Carmody: Judge Matlock, thank you sir. I appreciate you.

Judge Matlock: Thank you all. And again, y'all have worked with us. Your administration and y'all have worked with us over the years and it's made a tremendous difference. So, thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Just before you go, I've got Councilman Green, Councilman Hogan, Councilman Gibson, and then Councilman Lester.

Councilman Green: Mr. Mayor Pro Tem. Certainly, Judge and to Col Cox, you don't have to sell me, because I'm connected with children in the schools and over at the detention center and I don't know how you all have made it up to this point and I think what we should do as the general public, is go there and see what you do, and see how you are making it on the little that you have and you've stretched it. So, you don't have to sell it to me. Our children need some help. We want everybody saved, but we want somebody else to do it. And I just think that you all have done your part. I will be out beating the bushes or whatever to help get it passed and I just believe in my heart, that it's going to get passed and I know that you all will continue to do a great job. It's like Colonel Cox. He could be anywhere he wants to, but he has the love of those children in his heart and a safe community. Keep up the good work. You could be doing whatever you wanted to. But because of the love of the children, so you don't have to sell me, I don't have any questions because I've been there and I know what it's like and I do whatever I can to help over at the detention center and the school. So, our children need some help. And sometimes you got a couple of types of folks, some folk watch things happen, and some folks make things happen. On Saturday, I'll be pressing the (unclear) to make things happen to help you all out. So, just keep up the good work. You're going to have some folks with thumbs up and some with thumbs down. But I just think that because of the love for children and the love of Jesus Christ in your hearts, we're going to help you all out. And my vote, I wish I could vote about 100 times, but I can't. But, I'm going to make sure that my vote counts, so just keep up the good work.

Judge Matlock: I want to mention one small thing in response to that. Judge

Young and I share a secretary. We're probably the only District level judges in the State of Louisiana that do that. And I tell you that not to be any big deal cause we've never said anything about it, but Judge Young doesn't have a court reporter. When we get a little money, we're going to put it as close to the child and the mother and the family as we can in terms of services. Because that's what our orientation is.

Councilman Hogan: I appreciate you coming today Judge and Col. Cox. And I think you've done an excellent job over the years in managing the resources that you have. Very limited resources. I have a comment. First of all and then a question- - - or rather, I'll ask you the question first. Do you have any estimates on how long it might last? Assuming that the funding is approved Saturday, could you explain, about how long this would take you into the future?

Judge Matlock: The tax in 1957, somebody told me, was supposed to last ten years and it lasted 47 years. So, with that caveat and obviously, we're going to continue to be as tight fisted. One estimated is around 14 years. That's considered to be the minimum. My expectation- - -, I don't want to do this again to be real honest with you. And I plan on being there about 20 more years, unless the public wants to pull me away which they can do. But I want it to last out my term. And there's some ways that we can do that. For example, this includes the operation for those additional 24 beds. Well, it's probably going to be at least 18 months before that operational expense, so you get some little benefits out of this. And we factored in some inflation factors, but they're relatively conservatively calculated and so, that will probably buy us two or three or four more years. So, my personal hope is that we'll be able to stretch this and I feel confident, certainly in the lower end of that and then probably in the higher end as well.

Councilman Hogan: That's great. I'd also like to comment on most people do not understand that you have a rehabilitation camp. The boot camp that you referred to connected to your program. And I'd like to congratulate you on achieving 100% success rate which is remarkable in my opinion. And I'd like to congratulate you and all your staff members on that. And I'd also like to encourage the public to go and vote Saturday in favor of passing the tax.

Judge Matlock: Every one of these programs and many people come, and Caddo is regarded as a model program. A model Court for folks to come look at and they'll come up here to look at our truancy program, truancy court program and they'll say, you've got a drug court? And we do, we've got the first juvenile drug court in the State of Louisiana. May well be the single most important thing we do, and when you're sitting there, a mother and child have been in that program for five months and at the beginning of that process, they were sitting six feet from each other and wouldn't speak to each other, and by the end of that process, they're sitting side by side and mother is crying saying thank you for giving me my child back, if that happened once, I wouldn't be telling you about it. Watched it over and over again. It is - - - those children see the judge- - -, you understand probation, they may see a probation officer once a month. And I'm not talking about us, I'm talking about in general. Those children in our drug court program see their judge once a week. They see their probation officer multiple times. They see counselors and they're drug tested several times a week, random drug test. If they mess up, they go to jail for a few days. And we bring em back and we say 'lets try this again. And so, children, they pick up on it and they understand love and they understand discipline and so every one of these, I hate even singling out a single

program, because our teen court program, a very cost effective, peer core community service oriented program. Many, many other things that individual programs that we do, that work, so. And the community, honestly, if you sense, if you go back and pick up a paper from 1994 or '93 from that summer, those summers, and look at the headlines. Teen Shooting, Drugs, Drive By, and you look now, and we all, every time I look and I say 'Oh, whew! That's Mansfield', and I hate to say that, or Coushatta or Minden or something. Caddo Parish and Shreveport is safer from these serious crimes. Now, yes we're very active about school fights and about shoplifting and about possession of marijuana, and other things, gateway crimes. But it makes some sense to try to act aggressively when two days in jail is a big deal instead of waiting when two years or four years might be a big deal, so.

Councilman Lester: Judge it's good to see you again. Usually, you're sitting up higher and I'm- - .

Judge Matlock: No, I'm down here now.

Councilman Lester: It's kind of unusual, but no, I just wanted to take and opportunity to say thank you for the thing that you do and Judge Claville and Judge Young does. A lot of times, people don't understand and I think Councilman Green hit the nail right on the head. The judges, the staff, the probation officers, the bailiffs, just about everyone at Juvenile Court really has a love for kids in our City and our Parish. And some of the cases that come before them are cases that are just literally heart wrenching and it tugs at you so emotionally. I've been fortunate enough when I started practicing, I did about two years as a Public Defender over at the Juvenile Court, so I know very well first hand some of the issues that you deal with particularly as it relates to our children and Johnny Gray Jones and I'm very excited about the partnership that our City has with the Juvenile Court, because it's absolutely imperative that those kids that need that additional help and those parents that need additional help, we have a resource for them rather than going the (unclear) of incarceration and if we can continue to do the things that the Juvenile Court has done through the boot camp and the Johnny Gray Jones and interventions and things of that nature with the probation officers, from Mr. Edwin Scott and Ms. Morgan and the whole staff over there, I think we can turn around what has been a decline, or actually what's been an increase in Juvenile Crime and it can continue to go down and I think that's at the end of the day what we're all concerned about and I think it says a lot. You tell a lot about a society by the way they treat their young, their in firmid and their elderly. And I think the issue that's coming up on Saturday is, are we going to put our children as a priority. And if our children are a priority, particularly those children that need an additional help, then if that's what we're all about, then it should be an easy vote. I mean, no one likes to do sales taxes. I believe sales taxes philosophically are aggressive and they hurt poorer people more because they have to deal with sales tax as a greater portion of their income. But at the same time, I trust the Caddo Parish Commission and they said that this is something that we need to do and first hand, I know that it is something that we need to do. So, I'm certainly in support of what you and everybody in Juvenile Court does. And I just wanted to say thank you from the citizens of my district and we will definitely be trying to support you in anyway that we can.

Judge Matlock: If I stay up here much longer, I'm going to lose all these votes up here, so if y'all do have any other questions- - .

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Judge. Any other questions from the Council?

Judge Matlock: Thank y'all. Appreciate it.

Councilman Gibson: Any other Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests?

Mr. Dark: Yes sir. We have several. On behalf of the Mayor's office, we have some heros we'd like to recognize today. Three of them are in the audience, I'm gonna start though with the one who isn't. But who's been in Council Meetings probably more than even y'all have or so it seems. The Mayor has asked me to do a proclamation and read it in honor of a rather distinguished citizen of this community, whose name is Ann Wilder Stratton and I'm going to read it.

WHEREAS, Ann Wilder Stratton is a much-beloved citizen of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, having lived here for many years; and

WHEREAS, Ann was a champion for and a voice of the people, for years a member of the audience at City Council and other public meetings wearing her trademark hat; and

WHEREAS, Ann believed loudly and strongly in government OF the people and BY the people, and was especially interested in housing, land use, water issues, and good and accountable government; and

WHEREAS, Ann tried to speak for those who could not or would not speak, those who felt disenfranchised , left out and ignored; and

WHEREAS, though her strong social conscience ruled the day, it was balanced by her sense of humor and her love of the arts and literature, and she made many close and strong friends who love her for her wit, spirit, fairness and who know that her light will continue to shine.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, KEITH HIGHTOWER, Mayor of the City of Shreveport, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, July 13, 2003, as: "ANN WILDER STRATTON DAY" in the City of Shreveport, and urge all citizens to recognize Ann for her concern for the citizens of the City of Shreveport.

Mr. Dark: Most of you all are about a half a generation politically away from having had Ms. Stratton in your meetings over and over. Some of you are not. As a recipient of many of her lectures, I want to look her in the eye, because they say she may be watching this afternoon, and thank her. Because she was almost always right and when she wasn't, she told me that she was, so. We very much miss her presence at these council meetings and want her to know that, that was very much appreciated. I would ask Mr. Kirkland to come up and get this proclamation and take it to Ms. Stratton as she is unable to come to Council Meetings any more. But for those of you who've never met her, you missed a real treasure, and missed someone who contributed a great deal to Council Meetings over the years. Charles, thank you.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, I know that Councilman Green and myself certainly remember Ms. Stratton and I think that my first actual speaking with her was after the first budget hearing that I went through. And I recall Ann coming up to me and saying I've seen you before, you've seen me, I want to introduce myself and let you know that y'all have a problem. And I said, Ms. Stratton, what problem is that? And she said, your water and sewer department. And that would have been in the fall of 1998 and I take it from your tenure with the City, that Ann Stratton had been attending meetings probably before you got here.

Mr. Dark: Pretty much sir.

Councilman Carmody: And so, the wisdom that comes with watching the way things

work, again comes back around and I do certainly miss Ms. Stratton's input. I certainly wish her well and wish more citizens were as involved in the issues that concern this City as Ann Stratton was and is, this community would be a lot better off.

Mr. Dark: But you'd need to build a bigger chamber.

Councilman Walford: I know Ms. Stratton is probably watching and I go back to - - - Mr. Kirkland, help me. About 1995, I think, cause Ms. Stratton attended all of our ZBA meetings and is a great proponent of planning, so Ms. Stratton, I know you're watching. I always appreciated your input, and still would.

Councilman Green: Certainly, I'm sure she's watching, and during my tenure before on the Council, as Councilman Carmody has said, she came to every budget meeting, I mean, not just one, but every one. And I'd just like to ask if she's still wearing those little hats that she used to wear? But keep up the good work and certainly we miss you. God bless you.

Mr. Dark: Okay, just a couple other things, one we'd like to recognize a number of participants the Greater Shreveport Leadership Program have come in. They're being punished by making them come to Council today apparently. But looks like there is about 10 or 15 of 'em here and we welcome them. Glad that they're here.

Councilman Walford: Could we ask them to stand and be recognized please?

Councilman Jackson: Let me say to them not only, I guess congratulations, but also whatever you do to continue on your path, I was in the class 12 years ago, I guess and if you're lucky, you won't end up, up here. But so many of the people who were in my class moved away to other cities and are exercising their leadership skills I'm sure in other cities and I guess the biggest regret to my leadership - I guess it was Leadership Shreveport/Bossier at the time, group was that so many left the City and so much talent was in my opinion, exported from the City. So, I certainly hope that you would not only associate yourself with this program, but as soon as you are done, that you will assimilate yourself in leadership outside those leadership roles that you currently serve in and that you'll continue to work to make this City a better place. This is a great first step, and for many of you, it doesn't represent the first step. But for those of you for whom it does, I think 23 or so, when I was there, I was the youngest one in the class and one of my friends who is not here, she was the oldest in the class and we all had a good time and I just hope that you all would continue to stay involved in leadership in this City and we recognize that all leadership is not elected leadership, but we need the low profile achievers who are out there doing things that really constitute leadership as well. So, thank you for your participation. And I know it's not free. So, thank you for your contribution and your participation. Thank you Mr. Dark.

Mr. Dark: Mr. Chairman, we also want to clarify a little bit. Mr. Jackson's not been elected to office this afternoon, but the City Charter requires that when the Mayor is out of State, the Chairman of the Council is Mayor Pro Tem. So, if they tease him by calling him Mr. Mayor this afternoon, you didn't miss an election.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Dark, I want to remind you that I've already appointed our Clerk, Mr. Thompson as my new CAO.

Mr. Dark: Mr. Thompson and I have worked together a long time, so. I'd like to call Chief Campbell up to the microphone if I could, we have some more real live heroes we'd like to recognize and bring before you.

Chief Campbell: Good Afternoon, If I could ask Ms. Beverly Hays and Ms. Arlene

Farley to step forward please? We'd just like to recognize these two fine citizens, Ms. Beverly Hays and Ms. Arlene Farley for their assistance in a homicide case at the Seal Craft Manufacturing Plant that occurred on June 17th in the 1200 block of Airport Drive. The suspect Meeker Fuller was arrested for 2nd degree murder after he entered the plant and fatally shot his girlfriend, Tamika Summage. Mrs. Hays' role was that she witnessed immediately following the shooting and provided information that was extremely helpful to the officers. Mrs. Hays was working at a nearby business on Freestate when she noticed a man walking down the street and acting strangely. She continued watching him and noticed that he removed his shirt and placed it in a dumpster. She also noticed his direction of travel and was able to tell officers where he went as well as give a good physical description of him. Meanwhile, Mrs. Farley located the murder weapon that had been dumped on the side of the road. After seeing the officers searching the area, she wondered what they were looking for and began searching the area as well. At that time, she located a pistol and flagged down the officers to show them where it was. Because of her, a crucial piece of evidence was recovered, that otherwise could have disappeared forever. These two ladies went above and beyond their civic duty to assist officers in this tragic incident. And we sincerely thank and applaud them for their efforts. And as such we're presenting each with a Chief's Letter of Appreciation.

Mr. Dark: Thank you and we have one more hero to recognize, so we ask that Chief Cochran come to the podium.

Chief Cochran: Members of the Council, good afternoon. It's exciting to see citizens stepping up to the plate and aiding in the bystanders role in assisting public safety in Shreveport to reach another level of quality for our community. On the recommendation of Fire Captain J. D. Warren, who is assigned to Engine 14, that serves the Mooretown community, we want to recognize the heroic actions of Mr. David Green. On June 23rd, his next door, Ms. Shauna Thames, her home was on fire. Now, he was alerted by a passerby that the home was on fire and was asked if someone was possibly on the inside. A quick assessment of the time of day, he pretty much drew the conclusion that she had to be inside. So, the passerby went to the rear, he gained entry. It was very, very smoky, dark and very, very hot. Without the aid of water and bunker gear as our firefighters use for their safety, he risked his own personal safety, discovered Ms. Thames and as you can see, even being physically challenged himself, he mustered up enough courage and strength to remove her from the house. Had it not been for his actions, it is without question, that she would not be alive today. So, on behalf of Mayor Hightower, Mr. Green and the City Council of the City of Shreveport, and on behalf of the brave and heroic men and women of the Shreveport Fire Department and Cpt Warren's crew, we want to issue you the Shreveport Fire Department's Civilian Commendation Award and Commemorative Coin for your heroic actions on that day. Often as heros do, he did everything he could to avoid coming down here, he did not want this kind of attention. But it's certainly worthy of honor and thank all of you for allowing us the time to do this.

Councilman Green: Thank you Chief. Mr. Green, you did say Green right?

Mr. Green: Yes.

Councilman Green: God bless you, keep up the good work

Councilman Jackson: And we certainly want to again, congratulate all of those heros.

Public Hearing: None

Confirmation and/or Appointments. None

Adding Legislation to the Agenda.

1. A resolution accepting the bid of *The Times* and selecting *The Times*, the official journal for the City of Shreveport for the period commencing July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to add one item to the agenda.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Thompson, could you just tell me the process of this. I'm not understanding. Did we get bids or did we go out for bids on this?

Mr. Thompson: We advertised for bids. We only received one bid and that was from *The Times*.

Councilman Hogan: So, only one bid was received. Okay, that's all I needed to know. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green. 6. Nays: None.

Public Comments

Councilman Jackson: I want to ask that as we move into this public comment section, I would ask that those citizens who would speak if you will, to be governed and govern yourselves according to the rules of the Council which ask that every person would limit themselves to three minutes and I'd like to ask this Council to be cognizant of that as well. And at the three minute point if the person is not finished, rather than voting additional time, if it pleases the Council, like to give them an opportunity to take 30 seconds to wrap up so that we can facilitate this in a timely fashion.

Mr. Roe (*5705 Camelot Drive*): I'm a business owner in North Shreveport at Hunter Industrial Park and I want to thank you for the opportunity to come and speak to you today. As in the past, I spoke with MPC on two different occasions regarding a zoning change that has been requested in Hunter Industrial Park, to change from an industrial zoning to a residential zoning. My primary concerns are that they didn't pass the concerns of safety for additional residents and children in an industrial park setting where we have heavy trucks and equipment in and out 24 hours per day. A concern also that I'd voiced to the MPC, that I felt an incompatibility issue as far as the future development of the Hunter Industrial Park for future business and adding jobs to the North Shreveport area. I feel like, we built there in 1984 with the intentions of hoping to see that North Shreveport fill up with businesses and we still like that's a very viable possibility with the extension of I-49 right there west of North Market, an interchange where its proposed. But I would like to ask the Council to oppose the change of the zoning of from industrial to keep the future growth and development in our area in North Shreveport utmost and encourage businesses to come in there and to try to keep the compatibility of businesses and residents the way we feel like is healthy for the people and the safety of the people. But thank you so much for allowing me to speak.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Roe, I just wanted to clarify that I've asked this Council and the citizens to be cognizant of the time limits because we have just about 20 people who have requested to speak and I wanted to make sure that everybody has a chance to get their three minutes.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just for those people that are here,

there are two items that I'm pretty sure that we're going to have a lot of comment on, one is Case C-31A-04, which is the North Shreveport development, the other is S-49-04. I'm going to be moving to postpone both of those measures. If the public is here and they want to make their comments, they are perfectly willing and we are perfectly able to sit and listen to their comments, but please know that we are not going to be voting on either one of those issues today. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Mr. Kennedy: *(2408 Lakecrest Drive)* I was one of the founding members of the Agurs Business Association and the issue that we are addressing here today, goes to really the heart and soul of why we were formed. One was to fight crime and the other was to promote business development in the Agurs area. Now, the issue you're going to address whenever you get around to it, (unclear) vote on it today, because its been on this Council before. MPC rejected it and you rejected it. So, with a slight change, they came back again in a slightly differently form. And I would simply ask that you do again, what you did the first time. But please understand that some businesses are already established in this area, particularly the National Chemical and the Pepsi Cola people are right in that area. Trucks running back and forth across and in the street, and creating a very dangerous situation. If we're going to have a successful business park, we're going to have to restrict and prohibit this type of construction. So, if I've earned any points at all in my endeavors over the years with the Agurs Business Association, if I have any chips out there, I'd like to call them in ask you to reject this application. It's skirting around the situation by now, I think they want to call it industrial development by putting a warehouse in front of the lower (unclear) housing project. So, if you have any respect for the business community in the Agurs area, you will reject this application. Thank you.

Mr. Land: *(1809 Corporate Dr)* I own National Chemical in the development of Hunter Business Park. As we've discussed. We've been before y'all before to discuss this matter. I'll try not to repeat anything that's been spoken so far. There's two points, I want to make. One, last week you probably were all aware of a chemical incident at (unclear) Chemical which is also in the Agurs. It was handled very properly as far as what I've read about the incident, by the employees, and by our Fire Department as far as response. We are in that same business, not to the point that we do have chlorine, but we do have those trucks delivering to us. If the development was built probably within 400 yards of my business, it would be very difficult if it became necessary for those people to be evacuated. So, it's something that Councilman Lester had said earlier that I think brings this point forward. It's how we treat the young, the old, and the in firmid as to how you judge society and it would not be a good decision on your part that you place these people in an area where they're having to contend with an industrial area.

Mr. Barrett: *(1501 Corporate Dr)* Can I ask a question before I go any further?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Mr. Barrett: I noticed Mr. Lester made a motion, but I didn't hear a second or any voting on that motion to postpone.

Councilman Jackson: No, he just announced his intention to postpone it at the correct time in the agenda when it comes up. That would be the appropriate time for him to make a motion on it and then for it to be voted on at that time.

Mr. Barrett: To be voted on whether to postpone?

Councilman Jackson: To postpone or not.

Mr. Barrett: Alright. Obviously, I'm here in opposition to the zoning appeal on Case

31A-04 and I will just try to make it brief and try not to cover some of the things that the people have been up here already, cause the fact of the matter is we operate quite a few heavy pieces of equipment coming in and out of that park on a 24 hour basis. We have loads come in from our production facility in Reserve, Louisiana all day long and night long. We have 18 tractor trailer units that come out of there every day. 26 medium duty trucks and a lot amount of freight shipped in and out, whether it be from UPS, FedEx, Common Carrier in and out of that facility. And it's a very dangerous two lane street if any of you and I know, most of you have been up there and toured the area. There are no sidewalks for pedestrian traffic which one of these developments will obviously create that isn't there now, and create a huge safety issue both for those residents and for our employees and our vehicles that we operate each and every day in that industrial park. And there's only two access points in and out of the park at the current time. One being on Nelson Drive, one of the main access points, the other one on Forum. And this would block, we're block already from one side with residential that faces out on the Hearn Ave and now, this will block our other access point, which is at best minimal access for the number of vehicles that operate in and out of there between the prison and the other industrial units that are up there currently. Obviously, it would impede any more residential development and then in an industrial park would impede any future and probably threaten any current businesses that are there. Just because of what it will do to the property value of that park and the industrial development and we also have, we've been there since 1988 in the park and we're about three or four years from the end of our current lease with plans for expansion. But if this residential zoning goes into place up there, and we see that, it will probably allow us or probably create a situation where we'll begin to look for another location to do business out of because we don't own that facility, we only lease it. And we're not tied to that location. But that's not our desire by any means. That's why I'm here today, to hopefully be able to curtail that opportunity. Now, we currently employ, we have six people (unclear) gross sales about \$24million a year and would like to remain there and be a tenant in the Hunter industrial park. Obviously the I-49 development through that area is going to make that much more valuable industrial property than it has been in the past, because it does have key access points from 220, I-20 and I-49. And obviously, once before this body and twice in front of the MPC, the MPC turned it down unanimously two times already. There are a couple of other groups that I know you guys have received letters from all of us, but the Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce issued a resolution opposing this type of rezoning of an industrial area, signed by Dick Bremer and Lenzy Broderick and also the North Highlands Neighborhood Association unanimously opposed this type of development. (Unclear) with the listing agent for Walker, Alley and Associates who has all that land listed for sale is in opposition to this type of development. So, with that, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to thank you for your time and your consideration in protecting the current and future development in Shreveport. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Give us your name and address and try to limit your comments to three minutes.

Carl Pierson (*2106 Wyoming Circle*) Thank you, Mr. Mayor Pro Tem. I will try to be as fast as I possibly can, and perhaps reserve some of the comments that I had planned to make, hopefully, not but maybe for another time. I am hoping that this Council, uphold MPC again. I think the Industrial Park ought to remain an Industrial Park. I think that, not to be redundant about anything that just been said, I think that if we court enough

businesses, and the kind of businesses that Industrial Park can support, then we can provide some jobs and the jobs that are provided, people can buy homes and individually live wherever they want to live, that is just one point. Next point real quick, I just have a problem with putting low income housing in a compound, we know about who is going to be living in those facilities, and it is just a compound to me. And I think that we can be better served, especially if we are going to build a community, if there is enough (unclear) property. There's enough adjudicated property if you will, there's enough homes that's been abandoned all across our neighborhoods to perhaps take those over and build, maybe modular homes in there for those moderate income families, so that we can teach them how to maintain a home, and perhaps help their credit issues, so that they can build their own home. But, I'd just like to urge you to continue to support the MPC in this issue. Thank you, so much.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Jeff Ravey, if you will, you'll be next. Mr. Goode, if you will for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes.

Bill Goode (*2140 N. Hearne Ave #603*) I live in one of the compounds that we are talking about, and I am speaking here in support of the Cambridge Apartment Complexes. What we need, and it is evident by the petition that I am holding, which you are more than welcome to take a look at. I am representing 100s of people on waiting list, who are waiting to get on affordable housing, that would be serving their needs and the needs of their families. When we talked about how a society treats the infirmed, how we treat we our children, the housing and the services that we provide it is imperative and important to the process. At the start of the year I was on this waiting list, and I had the privilege of being able to move into one of the (unclear) managed apartments. (Unclear) managed Properties played by the rules, deliver on their promises and the residents like living there, I am one of those residents. We've become, over the time that I have lived there, at the beginning of the year, not only friends but neighbors, actually more than neighbors, they have become sentinels. We watch out for each other, and we watch out for the businesses that are down the road and around the block. They have rules that they follow, and they play by those rules, and people are proud to live there, I know I am. As far as for compounds, the properties are so well maintained, that after five years I dare you to find anything that would be amiss or awry, in any one of the compounds. Mr. Travis Miller who is the representative head of the apartment complexes, does a fantastic job of doing right by his people and right by the community. I personally suffer from panic attacks, very severe panic attacks, and before I went to live there I was afraid of what I would be enduring, and what I found is a haven. I've also found out that the property under discussion, is not in Hunter Park, but adjacent to it, and I have surveyed the businesses myself over there, and they're very well in favor of influx of potential clients, and businesses, and people like that. I write a column for the Bossier Press Tribune, called Good Neighbors, and I am also starting a non-profit organization, called Good Neighbor Outreach. And the purpose of that, is to help people get into affordable housing that they can be proud of and to grow from, and this supplies that. It is a well maintained, well disciplined place, I have never heard a stereo too loud, a car backfiring, an abandon vehicle being worked on, I am proud to bring the people that I know there to visit with me, to be there with me. And I am proud to give out my address and let them know that I love that. I would like to tell you that there is a great need, for this and the best way to do that is, I

would like to ask the people who are here who are on those waiting list, to stand up and confirm by they're standing if they are in favor of this motion. Thank you, very much. I really appreciate this time (unclear).

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Goode. I'm sorry, I was just saying, thank you. Next, Jeff Raley.

Councilman Jackson: I want to ask that Ms. Divita Sidney, be prepared to come next. Mr. Raley.

Jeff Raley (*2285 Benton Rd*): Representing Smith & Raley Incorporated, on behalf of the owners of Rosenwald subdivision unit three and four, we have a plat under that, I think it is case S-49-04. I think we have drawn the plat up to be units three and four in the existing subdivision units one and two, and it will have all city utilities, everything infrastructure, all built to city standards and I will be glad to answer any questions that you might have, in regards to that case.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Raley. Ms. Divita Sidney. Mr. Travis Miller, will be next. Ms. Sidney, if you will for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes.

Divita Sidney (*2400 Deloach St*): I am here to talk about, (unclear) subdivision, in Monroe, Louisiana, my company that I work for Student Enterprises, they would like to build a subdivision similar to it, down here in Shreveport. I first wanted to state it that our subdivision is located in area that has two permanent subdivisions already, that have been functioning with high standards, for over 30 years. Every tenant that is there, has went through a very, very, tough process, we do not accept felonies, we do not accept misdemeanors – within five years, or misdemeanors over five years must have a district manager's approval. We do not accept tenants that have a negative rental history, or have been evicted. We check their credit, their criminal history to include their sex offender database, as well as, terrorists. We check the income status, and if you do not have any income coming in, you can not live there. We go through a lot of practices and it is too many of them to list, because of the time limit today, but I just wanted to tell you about a couple of the residents that we have there. One of them is a mother of five, she is a single mother, and she was so happy when she got into one of those brick homes, because a lot of people had always told her, because she had children young that she could never have anything, and she would not amount to anything, she couldn't have anything for her children. She's happy, she works hard and they work hard, they plant flowers in their yard, they take care of their home and she is happy. We have retired persons there, we have retired school teachers there, that has just become a widow, she was paying \$800 in rent and because of this she is now paying \$675. She wanted the home but she did not want to have the up keep of regular maintenance, that our subdivision takes care of that. We also have another mother, she is a mother of six. She has four children, well she is a mother six, she has three children in college, one of them to very soon be going to college. Out of those four children going to college, one of them was accepted at Spellman, two of them to Moorehouse, the other one decided to go to school here in the State of Louisiana. I am saying all of this to say, that my tenants have worked very hard to establish a resident's association, decline watch prevention, they take pride in their community, and they do not want anybody to come in there and take away from their community. They work with the neighboring subdivision, that have been there over 30 years with their neighborhood association, and they work together, and they continue to working together

we would have a great community. I am not really sure of all the particulars here, but I just wanted to give you an idea of the same program that they want to come here in Shreveport, what's going on in Monroe, Louisiana. Thank, you for your time.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Ms. Sidney. Any questions? Mr. Travis Miller.

Mr. Miller: Thank you, for your time, my name is Travis Miller.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Miller, if you will for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes. Mr. Deloris Bedford, you will be next. Mr. Miller.

Travis Miller (6745 N. Club Circle): I am here on behalf of in support of Cambridge Court Apartments, I am the land owner of this property, which is over behind the old TG&Y.

First statement I would like to make is, we are not part of the Hunter's Business Park across the street. This piece of property has been there and been for sale for 35 years, it was there when the old TG&Y shopping center was built, this piece of land was left over, there are not restriction, there were no restriction then and no restriction now on that piece of land, we are across the street from the Hunter's Business Park. We have to meet with our neighbors, two or three occasions trying to compromise and have something where everybody could be happy with our development, and we made a lot of compromises. The first one being, if we decided if we would leave the front part zoned commercial, and I would build the warehouse and offices there. The next thing we were able to do because we have low density, is move the development back toward the back to allow for this, the biggest problem we had from the opponents or at least what they were complaining about, was the crime, and it's mentioned today. Just yesterday, the officer for that area Agurs Business Association said, crime in that area was down considerably, way down in that area, which we knew that. We don't bring criminals in there, we do extensive background checks, and housing and crime has nothing to do with each other, we have crime everywhere. But we agreed that we would put up a security fence, a steel fence eight foot high, I was suppose to have some drawings, but I did not know that we coming on this early, but most of y'all have seen them. Eight foot security fence all the way around the property, this is going to be a gated community, with a closed circuit tv monitors at the gate.

We have security officers, it faces the Hunter Business Park, it's on our property it faces, so we can monitor what's going on there 24 hours a day, and we do have a courtesy officer at night, that stay there every night to monitor what's going on our property as well as seeing what's going on in Hunter's Business Park, we don't want any crime anywhere. So were actually sentry is for them, we are going to help with any problem that they may have.

And next, was traffic, we designed our front to where there is a turn around at the front of our property, where the school bus would come in and turn around pick up the kids from underneath the porch of the security office, and loop back out to North Market. There is no reason why anybody would want to drive through the Hunter Business Park, when the red light is only a half a block away and the four lane highway, and that's where all the businesses are, so there is no reason for anybody to ever want to drive through the Hunter Business Park. We also said that we would build a sidewalk from our development to Eckerd's Drug, for handicapped and for patrons, for anyone was in a wheelchair, and we do have eight handicapped units, that they would be able to go down the sidewalk without getting out onto the street.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Miller, pardon me for interrupting, but I would like if you would at this time to began wrapping up so we can continue to go on, if you will.

Mr. Miller: We have addressed all the issues that we believe, and we are apart of the redevelopment in that area, as Councilman Lester knows we have gotten a lot of new businesses going in. We think we are the main reason for that, we have 300 hundred families there now, and we are happy to be apart of that growth, and hope to continue to be apart of that growth. And I have to turn in, I am going to turn them into letters of support from the businesses on North Market that includes; Eckerd's, Walgreens, the store manager from three or four different stores, I am trying to see the name of them on here, Northside View on Eckerd Drug, U S Pawn Shop, (unclear) Plus, (unclear) Company, Kroger's, and Brookshire's. I would like to turn those letters of support, and the last thing that I have if you will give me 30 seconds longer, I have a letter of support from the Shreveport Housing Authority, and I will only read you the first sentence. Let me applaud your efforts in enjoying the housing authority City of Shreveport in endeavor to provide sorely needed housing for our low income families, do we turn that in now along with the petition. We need this development, we need housing, we think this is least controversial site that we could find, its available and all of north of Shreveport, and we ask for your approval. Thank you, very much.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Ms. Deloris Bedford. Mr. Wilbert Williams, will be next. Ms. Bedford, if you will for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes. Thank you.

Deloris Bedford (*2421 Kemp Lane*): I am here for concerns for unfinished business, number 10 under number three, zoning appeal S-49-04, Rosenwald Partnership, and before I forget it, I am asking you to please uphold the decision that's been made by the MPC. I live in the Martin Luther King Drive neighborhood, I live in one of three subdivision in that area, University Park, just to get you an idea of where we are. This project is planned for an area that comes into our subdivision, or very closely adjacent to it, so we are asking you to please uphold what MPC has already studied and made a decision on. Units three and four, before you right now, but one and two has already been signed by Mr. Kirkland, my first question is, why is that one and two did not come before three and four, before it was signed? And this I have already told Mr. Kirkland, I can ensure you, that for one and two the MPC members, were not too aware of it, because if they were, they would not have probably voted against three and four. I can almost assure you that they did not visit the area so they could see, just if this project was fitting in well with what had been there over 30 years, if they had been I am sure they would have voted for three and four. I have told Mr. Kirkland and I will repeat it, when things like this comes up things like this come up and Highland, in Southern Hills, in Broadmoor, and a lot of other neighborhoods, rather they have the zoning or not, these neighborhood association and the people that live very close to this, are called in so that the contractor and the neighborhood can get together and come to an happy medium. This was not done for us, and we are asking for it, we would like to meet with Mr. Turrentine, Mr. Lester, and come together and plan for – you don't have people coming in from out of town and God knows wherever else, making decisions for people who already there. We get together – we are not against growth, okay, we are not against renters I can tell you that right now, I was a renter in Allendale for 20 plus years, I stated in a three room house, tin roof, the streets where our playground. I made no complaints and no excuses, we are now homeowners and I make no apologies for that. If Rosenwald is allowed to do what it is getting ready to do now in University Park, you are now setting precedent, and if they can do it, if Rosenwald can do it, in MLK they can do

it anywhere else in this city that they want to do, and they will. Here's what we like to do as a community, we would like to get with – and get a federal program and I am sure that there are those who will help young people low income and medium income to help them buy a house. Like the low income and medium income have already done, and to let's get in and we would also like to get with them and find out what properties are on sale or available in MLK, whereas least to rent properties.

Councilman Jackson: Ms. Bedford, if you are absolutely not done then, I have a motion by Councilman Gibson, to give you an additional three minutes.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, second by Councilman Carmody. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green. 6. Nays: None.

Ms. Bedford: Thank you, we would like to get with Mr. Lester, and any other contractor and help them find properties that are available in Martin Luther King Drive area, and place a lease, to rent, 15 year properties and we got it, we have it, we have a lot of vacant properties. And I would ask that you would uphold the MPC decision. Oh by the way, I must remind you again, that I was a MPC member, for I don't know how long, I know what goes on in MPC. They work very hard, we worked very hard too we worked hard for twelve years for eleven years, we worked very hard on MPC, I also gave up money, that's alright that's besides the point. I do want to be in the planning for my neighborhood. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Ms. Bedford. Mr. Williams. If you will, Mr. Williams, for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Ms. Shirley Culbert, will be next.

Wilbert Williams (*2755 Circle Dr.*): At one point of time, I have some pictures I need to put over the overhead projection, if it is possible that I'd like to show. Councilman, last month we went before the MPC, on this same project, MPC voted this issue down seven to zero, I don't want to be repetitive for what the ones that have come before have said. Residents are complaining about the increase of traffic congestion and crime, and it has been noted that people tend to misuse, and abuse rental property, versus taking care of property their own. It's just a proven fact, if I am renting something I am not going to take care of something as I go out and buy and purchase.

Councilman Jackson: Bea, if you would, would you stop the timer. Robert I don't know if you can hear us, we are having some technical –

Mr. Williams: While she is getting the projector going, I can go on and some (unclear). January of 2003, this same type of project was brought before this very same Councilman. The project was King Garden Apartments, that was going to be put behind University Villages. This same Councilman voted this project down, I don't want to go through all of your minutes, but from the City Council website, I have statements from each one of the Councilman, and some of the statements including my City Councilman, Councilman Lester, said that they wouldn't impede on the existing neighborhood integrity. For 30 years, blood sweat and tears that we have put in our neighborhood, Councilman Gibson, Councilman Green, Councilman Jackson, you also stated in your 2002 -2003 minutes, that you would not go against an existing neighborhood, but yet and still today we coming before you to try to get this stopped a Rosenwald subdivision, it's the same project 15 years, lease to own purchase. It's the same project that Representative Glover came and stood here before you that you turned down, because of the neighborhood. Now we don't have the neighborhood support from University Village, I don't understand why, we

supported them, but one reason probably why maybe because they are on a CDC, that was developed in the MLK area, many officers on the Board of Directors in the CDC, I don't know the reason. This first picture that you are looking at now, to our Councilman, I wish our Mayor was here, you know there is a liability that's going to come up, it might be 15 years from now. This pile of tree limbs and tree stumps, that dozes in a hole over 20 feet deep, you put all this trash in a hole, 15 years or 20 years from now, we all know what wood do, it either rot or decay. That's going to leave a hole, someone is going to have to be responsible for the accident of these houses building, the City going to sign off on this, we got the fire (unclear) from burning, they suppose to be hauling the trash off, but yet and still they are still burying it. There's a group of us that walk up to the David Raines track every morning, this same project is coming up, they are running sewerage lines I guess on phase one and phase two. It took me three City Council, and whole lot of begging and pleading to get out track fixed, that dozer tearing up the track. This is part of SPAR, SPAR don't have the money to come in a replace this, who is going to replace this track, they are digging this whole here, this is a part of the track that they cut out, this is a safe hazard. We got kids that play in this park, that yellow rope is not going to stop these kids from falling off in this hole. Every morning we have at least ten to twenty people that are walking, we have to get a new route because our track is tore up, because of this project that they are doing, this a safety issue that's going to come up before the City Council, it might be ten years from now, but the pictures and the disk we default to DEQ, someone will know that there is a record that they are burying this stuff, instead of hauling it off like they suppose to. The dozer, as it going from Phase I to Phase II, they got to go up Round Grove Lane, and David Raines, this is city street, who going to repair the street? Mr. Williams: Three minutes will be enough, Mr. Turrentine, is not going repair Shreveport City streets that have dozes tearing up.

Mr. Williams: This is coming on up Round Grove, this is coming from phase one to phase two. Pictures don't lie fellows, the streets are being tore up because there are dozers up there. This picture here of the housing the homes that they are putting in, these are the future housing that they are building. Well I have been leaving up here for over 33 years and I know that you must some stable – I am not a expert on soil stabilization, but I know that if you build a house on unsound sunken sand you have this badge here, this is nothing but garden mass that they are putting under these slabs. They got two for the dirt on there that is massed that is not going to stop that from shifting, if every resident from University Park come up here, they can almost tell you that our house done shifted at one time or another. One thing that we do have is bad soil, you know I was born and raised in the bottom area, now it is called Ledbetter Heights, so it is not very impressing if you stay in a house for 24 hours and say I live like you live. I lived in my house for 22 years, until I was a sophomore at Southern University, when you take your family and you live in a poverty area for a year then you can come back and tell me that I walked in your shoes, I done what you said, and with that I will wrap it up. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Ms. Culbert, if you will for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Mr. Michael Williams, will be next.

Shirley Culbert (2811 East West Ave): Mr. Mayor pro-temp, Jackson, and other councilman. I am here in opposition to item 10.3 on the agenda, and it's letters S-49-04. This afternoon, I come before you to help set the record straight, it has been said that the

residence of University Park are against low income housing, that is the furthest thing from the truth. For we recommend fair and just housing for all citizens, and fair and just treatment for all people. I do not deem it fair to stack people on top of each other in such a small partial of land. I also deem it an injustice to have rent pay for people, and I repeat` have rent paid for the people by the government, in order for someone else to get richer for 15

years before the renter can even apply to buy that house that they been renting for 15 years, I repeat renting for 15 years before they can even apply to buy the house. It was unfair for the development of phases one and two of the Rosenwald subdivision to be approved without proper notification to the people of that community, even through public hearing notification, mailbox slot, doors, whatever. Then to find out that phases three and four, was about ready to be broken, the ground was about ready to be broken that just floored me. I have lived in University Park for almost 36 years, now I am not bragging, but we could have been ones to move from the Cooper Road to the Pines Road, when they start moving the Pines Road west, and we could have moved from the Pines Road onto the Ellebre Road, but that's not us, my husband and I we choose to stay there. My parents raised me under the theme and the theory, make a place better than you find it, that's what we decided to do in the MLK area. We choose to remodel and up grade, and then to retire, we wanted to retire in peace in and comfort. My husband – Earl and I, in the past we have received notices, calls, information, letters, and some of everything from; street repairs, utility work, we've even received notices in our mailbox or on our doors to say, that we need to shut the electricity off for a few minutes tomorrow, whatever. Mosquitos spraying, we have received it form everything, even to renaming Cooper Road to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, to renaming Juvenile Road to David Raines, and most recently, renaming Blanchard Road to Hilry Huckaby Road, but not one word did we receive from our City Councilmen, concerning the increase of about 1000 people right there in a two lane one block area, and the building of 108 rent homes in such a small area. Between the subdivision and the main streets which is leading out, which is David Raines, then to find out later that no development in the area should have been started before the approvement of the master plan that the city council itself set out. Well after we were able to detain phase three and four, guess what we had, three weeks ago, we had that meeting to start planning with the architect for the master plan. The very first thing architect hired by the City, and Mr. Macaroy said was, you must involve the people in order for any kind of development to work. Please listen to the people, uphold the decision of the MPC, and I urge you to just put a stop the increase of the Rosenwald development, at it's present sight. And I volunteer my services to serve on sight committee to help find additional sights, MLK is rich in land, and the land is there additional housing is there. Thank you so very much for this opportunity gentleman.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Ms. Culbert. Ms. Culbert, you referred to a fellow named Earl a couple times, did he write that speech.

Ms. Culbert: No he did not, but he is present.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, I understand. Mr. Michael Williams. If you will Mr. Williams, for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Mr. Mark Turrentine, you will be next. Mr. Williams.

Michael Williams (2101 Carver Pl): Good evening, gentleman, Mr. Chairman, and other fellow Councilmen, to the CAO, I am here on behalf, there are several members of

the Lake Bethlehem Baptist Church asked me to come and speak on a couple of matters here. I believe that the public has been a public outcry for stand with the MPC, we can afford Gerry mandate and put people in commercial and industrial area just for the benefit of just trying to deal with something. That is not good for the community, I think in order for us to have a partnership with the community and with business we have to include the people that is going to be effected by the most. And that is why you have all of this uproar up here in your council chamber, we learn to work together at the grass street level with the people, we wouldn't be having this problem today. We have to work together with choice not by force, I don't think we can force something down the people the throat that don't want it. I feel that we need to work together with the MPC, that's why we appoint MPC members, because they are competent, they are intelligent, they protect the integrity of the community and the proper value of the community and they done that. They done a great job for many years, many years before you and I even served in public office we had an MPC and a ZBA, that was doing their job, and they done an outstanding job. But I feel that it is very imperative that we do not go against the grain of the MPC, who have made a decision, went out and studied, who understand development, I think we need to support them. And then we don't have to rehearse and rehash this particular zoning matter again. Gentlemen, I urge you to support the people, and I believe nobody in Shreveport is against public housing. I believe that some people have been bamboozled by a lot of things that have been going on, it is a hidden agenda, but that is another story. But I believe, even in the Industrial Park area, we don't need to gerrymandate just to put people in with businesses, that's not good, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that, that is common sense. That don't match, it's like apples and oranges, that don't match, so hopefully that you would not postpone this and step up to the plate, and hit a home run, an vote to support the MPC. There's no need to keep going over and over and getting these people from work, they have to work, hard working people, and I believe that Ms. McCulloch did a great job of keeping the people informed on what's going on in their community, I commend her for that. So hopefully, we can work together, cohesiveness, or joint partnership with the people, maybe one day we can find some quality property for people to live and be productive tax paying citizens in our community, contrary what popular belief we have a great community. You guys are doing a great job, but you have to make some tough decisions and anybody can serve in that seat, so I hope that you will consider what's been before you there and what's been said, and honor the wishes of the people, put your self in their shoes, what would you do. Thank you, Councilmen.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr. Mark Turrentine, if you will for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Mr. Walter Beard will be next.

Mark Turrentine (*3104 Breard St*): I am hear to speak to you about Rosenwald Subdivision, and as I sit here, I got to tell you that this sounds a lot like a zoning case, and I want to make sure that you are aware that this is not, and I think that it is incorrectly stated on the agenda, that this is a zoning appeal. This is not a zoning appeal. Rosenwald Subdivision, is properly zoned R1-D, which permits our use. Again, I am here today to appeal a decision made by the MPC, to deny subdivision approval of Rosenwald Subdivision. They denied approval not for reason for within its authority, but for subjective reason outside their legal duty, they denied subdivision approval for reason that are

irrelevant, and immaterial with no bases for law, and no objective or reasonable basis for denial. The MPC staff acknowledges four complaints, with all of the subdivision rules and regulation, I think that it is important that we realize that, that our subdivision, that we have proposed, meets all of the subdivision requirements. We are not asking for zoning change, or anything of that nature, and a lot of things that I hear today, sounds like we are asking for a change of zoning, we are not. A lot of the things that you are hearing are traffic and things of that nature, well all that has already been taking in consideration with you guys, when zoning was laid out here in Shreveport. Again, we are not requesting re-zoning which if we were, could possibly add relevance to the reason that MPC denied the approval. But again, we are not we are talking about land use that is suitable for the zoning, that has been in place there for many years and fits our intended use. The MPC, has a clear legal duty to approve subdivision that meet the zoning requirements, they reacted to many misstatements of fact, and became entangled in dialogue, that had no relevance to approval of the subdivision. In fact, one of the MPC members stated, and I quote you, and I quote, we do not get into who they sell the house to, whether they make them rent, or whether they buy, whether they are rich enough to buy or poor enough to rent, what he was saying, gentleman is discrimination against renters, is not within the authority of the MPC, when considering the subdivision approval. And I am going to give to you the reasons that the MPC stated their denial. One reason was, it could bring crime and lower property value, that was one of the statements. You know this is speculation, its not based on facts or research, or any statical analysis, this speculation was based on the belief that renters or not as good of buyers and that renters should not be allowed in the area. That was one of the reason that MPC denied this, for that very reason that I just stated. According to the 2000 census, the census track that contained Rosenwald subdivision and University Park, consist of 42% renters, 70% of those renters reside in a single family homes. You know this demonstrates a very large ratio of renters – Thank you, with respect to property value, there has been a lot of research lately, and I have discussed this with some of you guys that research done by Harvard University, University of Wisconsin, and other incredible sources. They clearly revealed that this type of housing, does not lower property value, it's a misnomer. In fact, it has been proven statically that it actually increase property values, and I would like to say that I made some of this research available to a lot of y'all. One reason for this could be the creation of the disposable income, you know roof tops in the community, that encourage other types of development, like retail and service businesses, there's also sales tax to consider, from a construction material that's purchased, and also annual real estate taxes. Discrimination against renters, is not within the authority of the MPC when considering subdivision approval, and denial of the subdivision approval, should be overturned clearly. The other reason given, there were three reasons given; one of which I mention, and I can reiterate that, if I can find it, it was bringing crime and lowering value, which is simply not true. Lack of compatibility with the neighborhood. Gentleman, this is a single family home, you see the photographs right here in front of me the fact that it is not compatible is inaccurate and unfounded and in fact, compatibility is re-zoning, we have our zoning. You know this is not the issue here, our subdivision is clearly compatible with the current zoning. Rosenwald Subdivision consist of very nice brick homes, with high pitch roof, antithetical shingles, vaulted ceilings, energy efficient construction, and its clearly compatible, and in most cases superior to other houses in the area. These homes are very comfortable in size, and construction houses are currently being built in University Park,

Phases III and IV are clearly compatible with Phases I and II, already approved, and already under construction. So compatibility, I just don't see the connection of how the MPC can determine that this is not compatible with the houses that are already in the neighborhood.. We chose this location due to it being located in an area chosen by the City of Shreveport, as an area in need of revitalization pursuant to the City Revitalization plan, which designates the MLK neighborhood as an area targeted for affordable housing. According to the plan the MLK neighborhood is one of the lowest income neighborhoods in the city, which this further supports the need for affordable housing there. Although, irrelevant for consideration for subdivision approval Rosenwald Subdivision is clearly compatible with the neighborhood, and now the subdivision approval should clearly be overturned. The last reason given by the MPC for denial subdivision approval was that we ignored the neighborhood, well that is simply not true, the neighborhood was not ignored and should not be a bases for a public body to ignore its clear legal duty. When we started this development, the Councilmen was contacted, he did not offer his support until a neighborhood meeting was held, we attended that meeting, in which the Chairman of the MLK neighborhood association attended, and he spoke today. He was at that first meeting, the people who attended that meeting did not oppose what we had laid out before them, they seemed to be okay with it, and the Councilman gave his support as a result of that. I suppose that one of the reason the Councilman Lester is in support of this development, is due to the numerous phone calls that he receives on a weekly basis, for people that are interested in renting these homes. They are people in there who want this, once we started construction on the first two phases, the MLK neighborhood began complaining and requested a second meeting, we had that meeting, and they complained about the burning, in an effort to satisfy the neighborhood, we stopped the burning. So clearly, we were not ignoring them, public notice were published in the newspaper, I came to the City Council, and obtained a resolution of support for this development. You guys supported this developmental resolution last year, notification excess of what is required for- - - So denial of the subdivision, should be overturned. If I could please, I just got a few more statements that I'd like to make, if objection to this development raised by Commissioner McCulloch, at the MPC hearing, it may be from lack of communication. She stated that her "biggest concern at this point, as a leader in the community, is that people – as a people we were just not informed". She further stated, the only thing that I'm concerned about is the fact that they failed to communicate with me, why I don't know that's their problem. Gentleman, communication failure, between the MPC and the City Council, the Parish Commissioners, should not be grounds for denial subdivision approval . As previously stated, this was not a re-zoning issue, as previously stated, we meet with the Councilman and the neighborhood, a group that he suggest, we published public notices, we sought and we received from this Council, a resolution of support that hopefully today or in two weeks, you will stand behind. I have great respect for Ms. McCulloch, and this City Council, for the job that you do representing your constituents, it is impossible to make everybody happy in the decision that you have to make for the benefit of the community as a whole, is a difficult task at best. However, how is a businessman such as myself suppose to conduct business in this community, if the governing body is arbitrary and (unclear)in the application in its own rules and regulation. I mean gentleman, this is a subdivision approval, we are not talking about re-zoning.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Turretine, that time has expired.

Mr. Turrentine: Okay.

Councilman Jackson: Unless, there is some action by this council, I will ask that you bring your comments to a close at this time.

Mr. Turrentine: Yes sir, thank you. Yes sir, very few people, very good people here today that are opposed to this because they don't understand, I admire their efforts to make a difference, hopefully we can channel that energy to some of the other problems in the area, that need addressing. I intend to assist them in that effort in any way that I can, again we have exceeded the requirements that the City sets forth for seeking subdivision approval, and for those reasons denial of the subdivision approval should be overturned. Thank you, for your time.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. Mr. Walter Beard. Mr. Beard, if you would for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Mr. Bob Pugh, will be next.

Walter Beard (2520 Sadler Dr.): Up in University Park subdivision, and I am against this Rosenwald Partnership, S-49-04. And the reasons that I am against it, is for the same reason that everybody here have been against it, it is lowering my property value, also. But to bring another 1000 low income people, into my area is not going revitalize my area, it tears my area down, it brings it down. Low income people, traditionally produce crime, more crime than we need to bothered with. Low income people, produce the crime that we are all afraid of, the worst, the rapes, the robberies, the home invasion, and drive by shootings and stuff like that. That's what comes and I'm not going to say if I am lying but anyway, but if you think that I am not telling you the truth, check the prison, go out there to CDC, and look around. You will find mostly, low income, and no income people in CDC, not middle and upper income people. I would like for the Council to think about – another thing they are black, they are not low income white people as opposed to, there are more low income black people in prison than there are low income whites. Middle and upper income people do not commit the crime in the neighborhood that's low and no income people commit. Black low and no income are the ones that are committing most of the crime. Another thing, Copper Road is 99.9% black already, and our schools are all black, there are not integrated now. What are we going to do when the federal government comes in and say, hey you got to integrate these schools? First things they gonna want to do is, is bus the black children out of the Copper Road area, to the white schools, like they did last time. White people do not want their children bused down to the Copper Road, and I don't blame them, my children did not go to school on the Cooper Road, we didn't even use those schools. Middle and upper income black people, they can afford it, they did not send their children there, to schools up there. I know middle and upper income white people sure don't want their kids out there, and don't think by moving all these people out of Allendale, and out of wherever you are moving them from, up there into those houses, that you are going to be putting them out of sight and out of mind, that's not going to happen. Low and no income people that produce these crimes, are the ones that closed South Park Mall for you out there, they are mobile. If Dillard's was making a profit and not being shoplifted, and if the rapes hadn't happened out there, and if people could have gone out there to South Park Mall and shopped without the harassment of the low and no income people, South Park Mall would still be open. You need to think about the bases of the City forever, quite running off your middle and upper income blacks and whites, right now two ministers in this town, black ministers, who are negotiating properties in Bossier City. One

is negotiating a \$700,000 piece of property for a home. The other one is \$500,000. One black man that I know of, black business man, has already moved to Bossier, and the reason is crime, and it is not white crime. Its not white people committing the crime, its black people that's committing the crime, and the low and no income that are committing these crimes.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Beard, are you done?

Mr. Beard: Yes sir, I just about said everything that I needed say.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, and perhaps more than you needed to. Let me just say Mr. Beard, before you have a seat, that I've sat in the City Council for two years and if it had been a white man who had stood there and said the exact same things that you just said, then I don't want – I can only speak for myself, I would take as much exception to that as I do to you saying it. I think to generalize into to say all those things as a product of low income, I would suggest that you do yourself a great disservice, and the people that you supposedly speak for, by coming up here and spearing what I think is not only general, but to some degree even ignorant, to some degree. And I would not let a white man stand there and say that without saying the exact same thing to him, and think it would be hypocritical of not only me, but others who may feel the same way, to sit here and have to listen to that, as if the only people that commit crime happen to be low income, and as if the only people that commit crime happen to be African American. I take exception to that, and you don't have to respond to my comment, that's my comment to the comment that you've made. Thank you, so much.

Mr. Beard: Did I lie?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Mr. Beard: No, I didn't lie.

Councilman Jackson: Blatantly, in my opinion.

Mr. Beard: Go out there –

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Green.

Councilman Green: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Beard, you are out of line.

Councilman Green: Excuse me, Mr. Beard, my mom lives on the Cooper Road, and my mom just happens to be low income, but she raised six children, she hustled and she bustled and she did not commit a crime.

Mr. Beard: Most of them do though.

Councilman Green: Sir, I didn't ask you to respond, my mom –

Mr. Beard: Well leave me alone man, I told you what I had to tell you, okay, and I told you the truth.

Councilman Green: Is there an officer in the building? Is there an officer in the building?

Councilman Walford: Yes there is.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Pugh.

Councilman Green: Would you have him escorted out, sir, for disrespect?

Bob Pugh (6706 Gilbert Dr.): I am here today for the purpose of support this project. Now the Woolworth Foundation, owns this property, and we have had it sitting out there for 50 years, without movement. And let me tell you about the Woolworth Foundation, first thing it did was get rid of all the shotgun houses (unclear). The next thing it did was, it was formed for the purpose of all of the income, and that's been about \$25,000,000, goes

to the Retired Methodist Ministries, their wives, widows, and children. That will be the ones who will receive the funds from the sell of this property. Now the Woolworth Foundation, is one the largest tax payers, in the City of Shreveport, and the parish of Bossier. Now recently, when they designed the I-49 change over, we own everything on the east side of I-49, and the City needed to acquire property there, and we gave it to them. Again, these people, I don't represent them, I do represent the Woolworth Foundation, and I am suggesting to you that they wouldn't do anything, that's inappropriate. You know the area out there again, it's holding the world together, but that's about it, and I suggest to you that if these people want to come in, and build brick houses, then all the better thought. And I ask that you reconsider the issue of whether or not you want to actually support the action, what's taken below, cause I think it was a mistake. And I appreciate the opportunity to (unclear), and to meet with you. Thank you, very much. I will be happy to respond to any question that you might have, other than that (unclear) time (unclear. I'll let it go.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Pugh. Mr. John Hamilton.

Mr. Hamilton: My name is John Hamilton.

Councilman Jackson: I'm sorry.

John Hamilton: I'm Hamilton & Pool Real Estate Companies, I am representing Standard Enterprises, for five or six years, looking for revitalization zones withing the City. And I am just here to say, that we had search one end of the City to the next and not been able to find land suitable for the projects that Standard Enterprises does, and that is including Martin Luther King area. This area was – mostly the land up there has been adjudicated, has been lost, and so there is a significant amount of problems with the land up there, so even thou there is a lot of vacant land up there, and it appears to be undeveloped, there is so many implications with taxes, that it would take years for the City to uncover it, reason number one. Reason number two, we choose this particular site here on David Raines, next to the Community Center, because Standard Enterprises builds for superior sites, for low income housing, and anything less than an area like this would've been totally inadequate. So I am just here to say that, they meet all the requirements and I think that because of the reason that I stated before, that y`all needs to support this, and I appreciate your time.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Hamilton. Next we have Mr. Richard Pool.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Pool, would you for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Commissioner Rose McCulloch, will be next.

Richard Pool (401 Market St., #1100): John Hamilton, is my partner, and I saw that Ms. Bedford left, I am sorry that she did, Ms. Culbert, I want to take her up on her offer. This is just a small portion of what I've masked over the last two years, trying to find property to build what is now Rosenwald three and four, as well as, one and two. I spent two years trying to find property in Martin Luther King, where we could build. I found lots of subdivision that have been plated, they were into tax sale 15 years ago, we bought a tax sale, went to tax sale again they were adjudicated city, they were adjudicated parish, we have (unclear) scattered across the world that nobody can find. I have worked with Title Attorneys, I have worked with the City of Shreveport, trying to find a way to get title insurance, for any piece of property out there, as much as five acres, it cannot be done. I have spent hundreds and hundreds of hours trying to find suitable property, to build beautiful new brick homes in Martin Luther King area, and I don't know that there are a lot

of developers busting down your doors wanting to build brick homes out in Martin Luther King. Standard Enterprise does just that, they built a beautiful subdivision, and we have been working very, very hard for a long time to try and find a suitable land. Oh, there's Ms. Bedford, thank you, you missed all that discussion. I went through Political Training Institute with her, about six years ago, and came to love her at that time, I am glad to see that she is still working for her community. And I am trying to work for her community as well, its just that we stand on different sides of this, and I am working for Standard Enterprises, trying to find them suitable land to build beautiful new subdivision out in Martin Luther King. So I would ask you to overturn the MPC ruling, which as Mr. Turrentine pointed out, there is absolutely no bases that they had for voting the way that they did. They totally ignored all there obligations, they did what they wanted to do as opposed to following the law, and I asked that you overturn it. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Pugh. Commissioner – Yes sir, Councilman Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Pool.

Mr. Pool: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: I just had a couple of questions for you.

Mr. Pool: Yes, Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: I recall that you a real estate broker, and you are in brokerage services, you listed (unclear) apartments, and I know that was true a couple of years ago, because you showed me a place here in town.

Mr. Pool: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: But, I am not clear yet on what you are saying. You're the builder?

Mr. Pool: No, no, no I am a real estate broker.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Mr. Pool: We sell primarily apartment complexes, and Mr. Turrentine builds tax accredited apartment complexes, and he also is doing single family homes.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Mr. Pool: He was a client, because she does apartment complexes and that's our primary business.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I miss understood you a moment ago, I thought you said you were going to be involved in the development in building it.

Mr. Pool: No, I have spent the last two years trying to find suitable property for Mr. Turrentine, to build this development.

Councilman Hogan: Searching for the property, okay.

Mr. Pool: And, I've worked for two years without getting paid.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Mr. Pool: I take it back, that's not true. On Rosenwald one and two we got paid. I am hoping to get paid on Rosenwald three and four.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I thought that's what you meant, I heard you say in the building, and I wasn't quite clear on that.

Mr. Pool: And I appreciate you clarifying that.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, please.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: I was just given the message by CAO, Tom Dark, that the mayor is actually here in the state, and so at this point, if you would like to participate with us in the votes.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, I was about to make that same announcement. That someone has just got off the phone, and while he hadn't yet been identified in the state, he heard people call me Mayor and got insecure. And so – that's just how it is sometimes, I want to say on my going out speech.

Councilman Green: Yes sir, Mr. Last Time Mayor, you had just really started looking like a Mayor.

Councilman Jackson: Well, thank you. My hair started getting gray. Commissioner McCulloch.

Councilman Jackson: Ms. McCulloch, if you would Commissioner, state your name and address for the record, and please limit your comments to three minutes, and Mr. Kenneth Krefft, will be next.

Commissioner Rose Wilson McCulloch (2509 Kemp Ln.): Representative of District 2 which includes the Martin Luther King area, where this development is being proposed. Also, I am for the record, a resident in this particular subdivision as I have mentioned before. Before I get started, I would like for the people that are here in opposition to stand, because they are starting to leave. So would you allow those people to stand? Those of you that are here in opposition, to this Rosenwald development, please stand? Alright, thank you. Let me share this with you, and I am going to need more than three minutes, I already know that. I have written about three speeches since I left home and maybe two since I have been here, and I have just decided to just – because basically, the people have actually expressed how they feel about this particular project. But I am pretty clear now as to why I wasn't informed, because I live in the subdivision. You know, I love Calvin, as a matter fact my husband told me, I wasn't there during the time the he was on his campaign trail, but he did tell me that Calvin stopped by my house, so I am sure he knows where I live. But I am just a little bit disappointed that I wasn't informed about this development. And to find out that this is something that's been going on for the last two years or so, and so, the residents are just being informed, that are effected by this the most, this past April of 2004. There are some concerns about the resolution, I heard Mr. Mark Turrentine indicate, that you all provide a resolution for one and two, three, and four. Well as far as I can remember, and Mr. Thompson you correct me if I am not correct, when I had them to search for the resolution for Rosenwald phases one and two, there wasn't a resolution in place, unless it just popped up here but, however; they were able to locate a resolution, – we have four commissioners, that's talking while I am talking, I feel bad about that. I am going to wait until y'all finish.

Councilman Carmody: It happens to the best of us, Rose.

Commissioner McCulloch: I beg your pardon.

Councilman Carmody: I said it happens to the best of us.

Commissioner McCulloch: Because I don't know that you are listening, and my husband know that I am pretty good at this, if I feel that he is ignoring me I don't want to talk to him. Cousin James Green, Cousin James Green.

Councilman Green: Yes ma'am.

Commissioner McCulloch: I need your attention.

Councilman Green: I hear you. I mean I can do two things at one time.

Commissioner McCulloch: But I just like for you to –

Councilman Green: And I actually –

Commissioner McCulloch: I love for you too look at me.

Councilman Green: And let me explain this to you. I would not ever come into the chamber, when you are having your meeting and do this. I would listen, and respond.

Commissioner McCulloch: Okay.

Councilman Green: So lets be cousin, and lets be professional.

Commissioner McCulloch: Yeah, I want to see your – I want you to look at me.

Councilman Green: I don't have to do that.

Commissioner McCulloch: Okay, but in reference to the resolution, there's not a resolution in place for phases one and two. There is a resolution in place for this particular phase, that's coming before you today, so I don't understand that, Mr. Thompson left out. But he wasn't able to locate that resolution, so you don't have one in place. I am concerned that since the purchase of the property, the citizens have not been informed, those are the citizens that were effected the most, we are looking at any where from 200 to 250 families that are affected by this particular development, that were not informed, that attended a May 10th meeting, of about maybe a 107 people, it was more than that. But the count that I took it was about 107 people, none of these people had knowledge of this particular development, and they were present at this meeting and this development is right at the entrance of this particular community, concerns about the resolution are not being in place, also, concerns about zoning. Although, Mr. Turrentine says that it was properly zoned, there was some replanting that occurred, and in the replanting, the procedure of replanting, the public was not properly informed, nor was that particular commissioned body properly informed about the replanting of that particular development, so there are some concerns about that.

Councilman Jackson: For three additional minutes, Ms. McCulloch.

Commissioner McCulloch: Based on again, communication, you know I hear you say that there was a meeting held. Again, I am a public official, I was never invited to the meeting, but I understood that this was a CDC that was being set up in another location, that maybe Councilman Lester had knowledge of, but again I was not informed about it. And my concern is that, you know that, although you are saying you had the meeting, and your president was there, your president says that this particular development, was never brought up at that meeting. But you don't just call a meeting and invite only ten people, when you looking at a community with a population over 14,000 people. And you look at the University Park subdivision, that consist of 200 or more families, they were not informed, so there are some concerns about that. I am going ask that – I mean I have been very prayerful about this, and I still have hopes that this is going to turn out to be a very good thing. Why? Because, and I have to say God has allowed six weeks of rain, Mr. Turrentine, has not been able to actually – he says that this project is in place, they have already started the construction, there is no construction. The only thing that they are doing now is landscaping, or whatever, but Calvin, I still have hopes that you are going to work out something on behalf of the people, that's going to be a good thing, other than the financial package that is being presented, the 15 year rent to buy. I strongly oppose predatory lending, which is a form of minority family abuse, you know you tend to want to – even kids get excited over something new, you know you show us something new and you expect for us to get excited, but then you don't tell us all of the details, as far as your

financial plan goes. When we meet with the MPC, you know that it was mention statically, that maybe over a 15 year period, the people would have spent on the average over \$180,000 rental on these houses, maybe leaving a balance of \$25,000. Well will the government help them pay off the balance once they have done the 15 year rental, I have some concerns about that, so I strongly oppose predatory lending. And I ask you Councilman Lester, and I am trusting you as I have in the past, and I have tried to communicate with you on these particular issues, as far as development goes in our particular community, and yet you have failed to contact me. But I am asking you, and I'm telling you that I still have hopes Councilman Lester, that you will communicate with us in the near future on this particular development. And I am going to ask this City Council body to uphold the decision of the MPC, on phases three and four, mainly because when we meet May 10th one of the question that I asked our City Councilman was, if there were going to be other phases to phase one and two. And in the presence of that 107 residents, we were told by our City Councilman, that there would not be any additional phases to this particular project, which consisted of 56 houses in phases one and two. And then a week later, the citizens received a letter, the meeting was May 10th, May 11th, and then they received a letter May 17th, asking them to come in and approve units three and four, which would have been an additional 52 houses I guess, giving us a sum of what 108 houses. And again you are looking at an increase in population of 800 to 1000 people in a set population, and that is so unfair. So I would just like for you to take under consideration the cries of the residents that have been present here today, and just to know that I still have hopes, that I have shared with Mr. Turrentine, that this is going to be a good thing. And I hoping that Calvin, along with Mr. Turrentine, I know that he has gotten his tax credit in line, of course he is pasted due for phases one and two, that should have been completed April of 2004, so I am sure that he has gone through the tax credit office to get an extension on that, because as I said, not a foundation have been laid. And here we are trying to approve, you know units three and four, so I am going to ask Calvin, that you know – that we remain prayerful about this, and as I have shared with you initially, I'm willing to work with you as far as, any thing that is going to benefit the Martin Luther King neighborhood. We have asked, even during my first term, we have had Shreveport Community Development to come out to meet with the association about housing development, and as I have shared, I don't have all of the expertise in ever area, but there are certain ones that I expect, and that I trust. You know if there are some developments coming into the neighborhood, that you would honor and respect the residents enough not to be undermined, in pursuing any future housing developments in the Martin Luther King area. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Commissioner McCulloch. I said again, Krefft, but there is one more person to speak on the same subject. Ms. Janie Samuels, if you would.

Councilman Jackson: Ms. Janie Samuels, if you would state your name and address for the record, and please limit your comments to three minutes. Thank you.

Janie Samuels (2815 East West Avenue): And I am the other person that Councilman Theron was looking for earlier.

Councilman Jackson: What person was that?

Ms. Samuels: The oldest person.

Councilman Jackson: I didn't want to say it.

Ms. Samuels: I am here to speak on behalf of 2815 East West Avenue, and the

Cooper Road area. I heard the developer say that it was 70% rental, and I think from listening to the developer, that he is trying to make it 150% rental. In order for the MLK area to grow, we need home ownership, we can not get businesses in that area with rental income, as the total number of houses that we have. You must have home ownership in that area, so I am asking the Council to uphold the MPC, please. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Ms. Samuels. Mr. Krefft.

Mr. Krefft: Thank you, that was a short term as Mayor. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jackson: But it was a good one.

Kenneth Krefft (157 Archer Avenue): To speak in favor of ordinance 96, and then later resolution #150. First of all, on the ordinance on the Water and sewerage rate increase, I understand that y'all had a fairly good discussion yesterday, and hopefully we will vote on it later today. I think the reason its necessary, for the simple fact that Mr. Dark and others have pointed out, it is an Enterprise Fund, I know I have not personally used my sprinklers since July of 2000, I still have it, I don't need it, it rains a lot. And I just want to read something that'll set the mood, this is a letter from Alexander Hamilton, to the Mayor of Philadelphia, in 1792 about implementing Dr. Franklin's Water and sewerage system. In matters of Industry Human Enterprise, thought that was to be left free in the main not feathered by too much governmental regulation, but practical politician must know that it can be beneficial and stimulative to put forward prudent aids and taxes encouragements on the part of the government. They approved that parts of the system are still in place over 200 years later in Philadelphia. New York at the same time did not approve funding, taxing the citizens for Water and Sewerage system, and it took them about 40 years to catch up. So I really think that's in their serve up, nobody wants to pay it, but I think that y'all are going to do the right thing. Now as far as the resolution #150, I believe that the \$40,000, is an estimated amount for this study, as I appreciate it, is a fairly accurate figure. I just want to point out as much as that is in the absolute its less than tenth of a percent of the supposed \$52,000,000 for the hotel, and I would personally would like to see some type of move to support this, and lets get a truly independent and impartial study, cause I do believe we should as the Mayor stated, in the press be bond by the results of a truly independent study. Whether y'all accept \$20,000 from the hotel group, I don't have a particular strong thought on that one way or the other, but I do think that the study would be beneficial. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Krefft. Next we have requested to speak, from Ms. Mae Evans. Ms. Evans, if you would for the record, state your name and address and please limit your comments to three minutes, thank you.

Mae Evans (441 Columbia St): I moved back to Shreveport its been over 40 years, east coast, west coast. I grew up on the Cooper Road, early 1940's, I moved back four years ago, when I grew up on the Cooper Road years ago there was no plumbing, no running water, no electricity, or anything like that. Outside toilets, I moved back here four years ago, moved in the Highland area, and it smell like I still have outside toilets, the sewerage is so bad, you know. I am just really getting sick and tired of it, I've called, Mike Strong, I've spoken to Lonnie Fonts, and I think I've spoken with Monty Walford, you know regarding a couple of issue. You know I expected for Shreveport to have changed since I have left, not a lot has changed. The problem is the City is growing, the sewer system, its growth has (unclear), nothing has changed. I mean you can't expect to build like you are building here, and you don't upgrade your sewer system, its early in the morning, its late at

night, and it smells awful, it smells like raw sewerage. And I am really sick and tired of it, you know. I lived in New York for 22 years, never smelled it, LA for 20 years, never smelled it, why do I smell it here? I mean there is a lot of money coming into this City, you allow the casinos' to open an operate here, make them pay the piper, somebody needs to pay. You know everybody came up here this evening, is begging for money, beg for some money for a new sewer system. It is unreal, I never smelled anything like it, the only time that I have smelled something like this other than living on the Cooper Road with the outside toilet, is when I walked into LA County Morgue, that's the only time I ever smelled that smell again, okay. Something really needs to be done about it, and I think Shreveport can do better than this, the people that live in Shreveport deserve better than this. And when I hear people spending so much money for the Duck Pond, you know and things like that, you know put some money in a new sewer system, I am not paying taxes anywhere else, I am paying taxes here, and I would like to get my money's worth, okay. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Ms. Evans. Those are all of our public comments that I show at this time. We move to item (unclear). Councilman Green:

Councilman Green: Yes sir, Mr. Chair, I would like to offer a motion to suspend the rules to move some items up, I have a meeting of urgency, that I may have to leave and go to and I just like to move those items.

Councilman Green: I'm going to be in the state. This is my motion.

Councilman Jackson: Is that in a form of a motion?

Councilman Green: Yes sir.

Mr. Thompson: What are the items?

Councilman Green: Items 96, 148, 150. Zoning case C-31A-04, and zoning case # S-49-04. Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry I did not get the resolution and ordinances, which ones?

Councilman Green: Number 96.

Mr. Thompson: Is that a resolution or an ordinances?

Mr. Dark: That would be an ordinance.

Councilman Green: That's an ordinance.

Mr. Thompson: Okay.

Councilman Green: Ordinance 96, resolution 148, and resolution 150.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, Mr. Clerk, do you have it?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Alright.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to suspend the rules to amend the agenda to take up the following matters: Resolutions 148 and 150, and Ordinances 96 and 100 from the Regular Agenda Legislation, and Item No. 2 (S-49) and Item No. 3 (C-31A-04) from Unfinished Business. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Councilman Jackson: Council has voted six for one against to move those items up, Councilman Green I need to if you would I need to get those – a list of those ordinances and resolution, we are going to do that while the rules are suspended, or to change the agenda.

Mr. Thompson: I think the vote was to amend the agenda to take those items up first, and it was adopted and if you are ready we can start with those.

Councilman Jackson: You have them already.

Mr. Thompson: I believe the first is resolution 148, stating the City of Shreveport endorsement of Ivan Smith Furniture to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

RESOLUTION NO. 148 of 2004

RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF IVAN SMITH FURNITURE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

WHEREAS, IVAN SMITH FURNITURE is located in Census Tract 237.00 Block Group 5, which is not a designated Enterprise Zone, and

WHEREAS, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

WHEREAS, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within its jurisdiction
3. To REBATE the 2.75% sales / use taxes imposed by the City of Shreveport on the purchase of eligible construction materials, machinery, and equipment purchased for this project and used by a business **permanently on that site.**

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **IVAN SMITH FURNITURE** and their project **ASSEMBLY & DISTRIBUTION CENTER**, Enterprise Zone Application # **2004-0037**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

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

Councilman Gibson: Just a point of clarification. Mr. Green, is that in your district?

Councilman Green: Yes sir.

Councilman Gibson: Is this a distribution center?

Councilman Green: It's a – I believe it is – yeah it is.

Councilman Gibson: Alright, thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: And I do want to make a point, that if I understood it correctly, Mr. Dark, maybe you can help me if I am wrong. This is actually – I am not sure that it does set a precedence, but there very well might. Isn't the City of Shreveport basically, giving back our portion for taxes?

Mr. Dark: This is one of those where, there is a conscience decision being made to recommend to you that the sales taxes derived from construction only.

Councilman Carmody: From the construction only? Okay.

Mr. Dark: The construction only, it will be rebated back to the Ivan Smith folk.

Councilman Carmody: Maybe we did that with Target, of some of them –

Mr. Dark: We've done a few of those, we don't do many, but this is one were it is recommenced that we do.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, I just wanted to make sure, including the Convention Center, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. Dark: Probably so.

Councilman Carmody: I think so, thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Alright, Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Also, they were in the process of negotiating with going to Bossier.

Councilman Gibson: We don't want that to happen.

Councilman Green: Just throwing that out there.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Green. Mr. Clerk 150.

Mr. Thompson: Authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract between the City and Price Waterhouse, Cooper, Inc., or Hospitality Valuation Services, Inc. There are two amendments.

RESOLUTION NO. 150 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY AND PRICE WATERHOUSE, COOPER, INC., OR HOSPITALITY VALUATION SERVICES, INC., OR ANY OTHER PROFESSIONAL COMPANY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE CITY COUNCIL BY RESOLUTION FOR A INDEPENDENT FEASIBILITY STUDY OF A LAND-BASED HOTEL AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN MIKE GIBSON

WHEREAS, general obligation bonds were approved by the voters to build a new convention center, based on the 1998 City of Shreveport Arena/Convention Center Study, generally referred to as the Ernst Young Study; and

WHEREAS, the Ernst Young Study stated that “The City may wish to foster development of a new land-based hotel connected or attached to the new convention center”, and that a public-private partnership would be needed to build a full-service hotel; and

WHEREAS, because of the 9-11-02 attacks and other factors, there is no private equity partner for the full service hotel, and it now appears that public dollars will be needed to finance or to guarantee all or most of the total construction costs of the hotel; and

WHEREAS, because up to \$52,000,000 in public dollars will be at risk if the hotel is built, and because the convention center market has changed since the 9-11-02 attacks, it is necessary for the City of Shreveport to obtain an objective up-to-date analysis and report to determine if up to \$52,000,000 in public funds should be put at risk to build a convention center hotel.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Mayor is authorized and urged to execute a contract between the City and Price Waterhouse, Cooper, Inc., or Hospitality Valuation Services, Inc., or any other professional company for a independent feasibility study of a new land-based hotel, provided that said contract is approved by the City Council.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption. The Clerk read the following amendments:

Mr. Thompson: Amendment number one, it directs the CAO to negotiate the contract for the independent feasibility study for execution by the Mayor. And two, it uses funds already appropriated in the River Front Development Fund, under contractual services to pay for the feasibility study.

Amendment No. 1.

Amend By: Councilman Gibson

Amend the ordinance as follows:

1. Amend the Now, Therefore Be it Resolved Clause to read as follows:

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Chief Administrative Officer

is authorized and directed to negotiate a contract for an independent feasibility study of a new land-based hotel, for execution by the Mayor, between the City and Price Waterhouse, Cooper, Inc., or Hospitality Valuation Services, Inc., or any other professional company approved by the Council.

2. After the Now Therefore Be it Resolved clause, add the following:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that up to Forty Thousand Dollars in funds appropriated under Contractual Services in the Riverfront Development Fund Budget shall be used to pay for said independent feasibility study of a new land-based hotel.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Amendment No. 1. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Carmody, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Green. 1.

Amendment No. 2

By: Councilman Walford

Amend the ordinance as follows:

1. Amend the Now, Therefore Be it Resolved Clause to read as follows:

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Chief Administrative Officer is authorized and directed to negotiate a contract for an independent feasibility study of a new land-based hotel, for execution by the Mayor, between the City and Price Waterhouse, Cooper, Inc., or Hospitality Valuation Services, Inc., or any other professional company approved by a Convention Center Hotel Feasibility Study Committee, composed of three Council Members appointed by the Chairman of the City Council. The terms and conditions of the contract, to include the parameters of the study, the time to conduct the study, fees and other costs shall be subject to approval by said Committee.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Amendment No. 2.

Councilman Jackson: Question, Councilman Walford, I think it's your motion.

Councilman Walford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that it's important that we set parameters, I am going to say that we had egg on our face, with the parking study. I think we all know that, we got a very poor product, and that in large part was because the

parameters were not set out, the time line was not set out, and basically we spent \$34,000 and we don't have anything to show for it but a little binder, that is not even reusable. We can't dump the contents and reuse it so, what I am asking is that – First of all let me say that the idea of a feasibility study is excellent, and I think we should do it, but only if we do set the parameters, let the contractor, whoever it is, know what we are looking for and we put a time line on it so that we are not sitting here six months from now, hearing that we are going to get a draft before long, and wondering when it is going to come. I think that we can very easily set a reasonable time line negotiating with whoever the contractor is, but I think that it is important that we do that and set out the parameters that we want studied, the information that we would like to have back, before we put this much money on the table without that. So I would ask my fellow council members to please support this amendment.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Walford. Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Gentlemen, I have always been in support of this building, this convention center hotel. It is critical to the success of the convention center. That is why I would urge you to support this legislation for an independent auditor to provide an unbiased feasibility study on the Shreveport Convention Center hotel project. The reason for this request is due to the past track record of this administration regarding financial performance, including the current numbers for the convention center hotel (129,000 people are projected to come to the convention center in 2006 at an average of 1700 per convention - that is 75 conventions per year and 1.5 per week, this is unrealistic), the entertainment district which the city lost a 5 million dollar investment, the water departments projections which now are running several million in the hole, just to name some high profile projects. I will remind the public that the consultants in 1997-98 told the City that it would be dangerous to begin a convention center without a hotel contract signed prior to the start of the convention center. Despite this, Mayor Hightower chose to begin this convention center knowing he did not have a sign contract or commitment for financing for a hotel. Playing politics at the expense of the taxpayer is a dangerous business. Because the Mayor chose to begin the convention center project, he now is saying that the hotel is a necessity and not a luxury. I will submit to you that it was a necessity not a luxury to have waited to begin the convention center until we knew the status of the hotel funding and avoid placing the City's financial stability in harm's way. Unfortunately because of improper planning by this City's management we find this issue dumped in the City Council's laps. If this hotel project does not have realistic financial projections the city will lose money just like the entertainment district did, but this time, it will not be just \$5 million it will be \$ 52 million. In addition, the city will incur a tremendous public relations and financial disaster just like what the City of Myrtle Beach is facing because of their publicly funded hotel going into default. We are considering an amendment to my legislation because Councilman Walford and Mayor Hightower have indicated that they do not want to see this feasibility drag on. I will submit to you that the Mayor has had 4 plus years to focus on this hotel issue and this Council needs to take a little more time to examine this issue. This time will be a wise investment to assure the citizens that we have protected not only their tax dollars but also protected the success of this hotel project. This feasibility study should be able to provide

this City Council with a best case scenario and a worse case scenario. Because this City does not have the resources to pay back a guarantee \$52 million default without subjecting the taxpayer to severe cuts in city services(streets, water/sewer, drainage, police/fire) - and gentlemen that is what this is about (just look at our water dept. situation). We must take as much time as possible to work with the independent financial group to examine this situation very carefully. The Mayor stated yesterday that he ran for Mayor on a pledge to be aggressive and not study things to death, well I supported him in 1998 but I cannot support aggressive behavior that produces reckless abandoned for being fiducial irresponsible with the taxpayers money. Because at the end of the day reckless abandoned produces results that cost taxpayer's dearly in their financial wallets.

Councilman Green: I'd just like to say that I'm voting on this whole resolution no. Even if we were, if the feasibility study cost \$4, my vote would be no. Even if we get a study from a company, there are no guarantees that even if they say yes we need a hotel, if they say no, there are no guarantees. One is in a few minutes, we will be voting on raising the water bill and I would prefer keeping that money, put that \$40,000.00 in a fund to help some senior citizen pay their water bill vs finding somebody to do a study that once we get it back, all it will be is a stack of papers. That's all. It won't be a guarantee in it, there is no company that we could hire that could say, whether or not it's gonna be great or it's gonna be not great and put a guarantee that if it's not, what we say, we'll refund your \$40,000.00. So, my vote will be no on the whole deal because 1) it's a waste of time; and it's a waste of paper. And in fact, if you want a study, I mean, I can get you one for \$40,000.00 and I can also sell you the Cross Lake Bridge. So, I can do that, if in fact this study will give us a guarantee. But it won't. So, I'm voting on the whole make of the whole resolution because I don't think that we ought to be spending \$40,000.00 and then in a few minutes asking to raise water bills when we are already saying that we can't afford to pay 'em. So, I'm voting no, no, no, and again no. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: I'm voting to support this and I think it's not unreasonable if we're looking toward obligating they type of resources that we are going to obligate in terms of the hotel to have an independent third party look at it. I have no problem with that at all. I do have one concern and I wanted to say this to Mr. Gibson and to those that might be watching. If we are going to have an independent group, I think it needs to be independent. I don't have a problem with Price Waterhouse or whoever or whatever group is chosen. But what I do have a problem with is the Hotel/Motel Association participating in the payment for that. Because that gives the appearance that a group that has publicly gone on record against the hotel for a number of different reasons, and I think their reasons that they expressed are theirs and they are legitimate in their minds. For them to participate in the payment of or payment for the independent study brings a bias that at some point, people on the other side will say, well, this was not completely unbiased, because you have one group that has a financial interest in this, (unclear) participating in this. So, my support is for the concept. I'm for the amendment. I'm for the resolution to spend the money, but what I'm not in favor is anybody whether they be Hotel/Motel or whatever, that has a stake in this participating in the payment. And if Councilman Gibson can tell me that, that's not going to happen, then I have no problem. Otherwise, I think that puts us in a negative

situation because it opens the idea that its not a completely third party. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Lester, first of all, that particular offer by the Hotel/Motel Association was unsolicited by myself. I do appreciate the fact that we do have local businesses, in fact this Administration has prided itself on doing private/public partnerships. I would hope that first of all that offer would be presented to the Mayor, and the Mayor would make that decision, because this is nowhere in the amendment by Councilman Walford, or by the original by myself, will you find anything on that. And if the Mayor so chooses, and again, they deal with a lot of different things, that there is merit from the Administration to come back to this body and ask us to accept that money, then I leave that up to the Administration. But that was not something that I proposed. I do think it is a tremendous offer by a group of people that have expressed some similar concerns in the fact that we do not have an up to date feasibility study. And if we do have some information, it is again, some people are directly benefitting from providing us that information. And I think that from that standpoint, I think they were on record, if I'm not mistaken, just so we clear the air. I believe the Hotel/Motel Association was on record of opposing the TIF, not opposing the hotel. In fact, nowhere, I think you will find in the minutes of their organization or at the Convention/Tourism Bureau, did anybody speak against the hotel. Just like this Administration tried to portray this City Councilman as against the hotel. I've always been in favor. And if anybody is pro construction, I think I can state for the record that I am pro construction with the professional with the career that I have had. But the fact being is I have been opposed to they way that we have gone about providing financing and if I'm gonna be asked to cast a vote for District D, to guarantee a \$52million note that we don't even know that we can pay back, I think that we need to make sure that we're clear on what we're doing and again also the reason why this is brought to table, because two months ago, when that financial group came before us, there were some serious questions asked by almost everybody on this Body. There were still a lot of unanswered questions that we asked to be placed in writing, that we still haven't seen to this day and I didn't see the Administration at that time writing notes down. If they did, they didn't follow up to say 'listen, financial group, come back and provide our Council with those answers'. But I think that will give us, at least from my perspective, the ability to go back and look our constituents in the eye and say 'we did everything we could', and again, you and I and the rest of the Council have had long discussions about that \$5million loss, that could be put into good use right now in inner cities to help revitalize their neighborhood. So, just to be clear, that group has never, ever said they were against the hotel.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me just say and I want us to move. I think I appreciate many sides of this issue as well and I support the idea of in fact having a feasibility study. It represents due diligence. And we certainly don't want to abdicate what is our, at least our fiduciary responsibility to make sure we know what the best information that we can, what to do. But I also agree Councilman Gibson, with Councilman Lester that to invoke the presence or to even receive any kind of contribution from the Hotel/Motel Association and the effort to pay for that study, but at least jaundice the process to some degree and cast it in a light that may seem less than honorable. So, I would certainly hope

that this City, if we're going to be committed to doing a study, lets not go out begging or with our hands out, or lets be prepared to pay for it if we want to have it and if we can't afford it, then we won't get it, but I think if we're going to do it, I want to also urge this Council's support on this Amendment 2 as we bring it to a vote. Amendment 2, I would certainly encourage your support as well, that we might also have oversight responsibility in this process. Gentlemen, I would ask if those in favor, vote yea. All opposed vote no.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chair, are you closing the discussion now?

Councilman Jackson: Yes. No, I'm sorry, I didn't know there were more people wanting to speak, please Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: I have a couple of questions, that I'd like to ask. First of all, I'd like to say, I believe you have good idea. I'm in favor of the feasibility study. But I do have a couple of questions that I'm not clear on. Have you had contact with either of these proposed companies that we're dealing with?

Councilman Gibson: No, I have not.

Councilman Hogan: You haven't? Okay. Was there anyone or where would the local, where would their office be? Whose gonna do- - - if they do the study, where would they come from?

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Hogan, as I understand it, we're the legislative side, that if we approve this, that the Administration would then put an RFB out and then we would review those RFB's to see what comes back in and what are all those dynamics, so to answer those questions, I don't have an answer to that.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, well I guess, I'm not trying to give you a hard time, but where did the \$40,000.00 figure come from?

Councilman Gibson: I talked with a couple of local financial people that said these are ballpark numbers, that depending on, and this goes back to Councilman Walford, depending on what the parameters are and I think also the local Hotel/Motel Association recognizes too, depending on the RFB and how it's written, as to what kind of quote you're going to get. And what we're going to be looking at. Obviously in talking with the Mayor, there's been a lot of financial data already provided, so they're not going to have to re-create some of this stuff which should keep the price at a reasonable rate. But Councilman Hogan, I would suggest to you, looking at that price vs looking at a \$52 million hickey to this City, I think that you can't even compare the two. Because again, we have a track record, and again, there was good faith effort, a lot of effort, and Councilman Carmody, again, I was sitting in the Council Chambers when the presentation was made back in 2002 about how we needed to have an Entertainment District and it was an aggressive move, but that aggressive move didn't pay off. And I would hate to see what would happen if an aggressive move was made without some back up that this Council felt comfortable with, because again, where do we cut? Because again, where do we cut? \$52 million is a lot of money.

Councilman Hogan: Well, that's fine. I just hope that some of these analyst are very proud of their work, and I hope this \$40,000.00 figure doesn't turn into something astronomical, you know. \$240,000.00- - -?

Councilman Gibson: Again, \$52 million is astronomical to me too Councilman

Hogan. And again, if that things defaults, remember this Council received paperwork from the State of Louisiana just about three or four weeks ago, amending the cooperative endeavor saying that they had concerns about this project and now, if we sell- - -

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman. I want to call a point of order please.

Councilman Gibson: I believe (unclear)

Councilman Walford: A point of order, please Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Gibson: I believe that - - - I'm overruling you on that.

Councilman Walford: A point of order Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Gibson: I believe that at the time, that we have a default or to sell the hotel- - - Councilman Walford?

Councilman Jackson: What's the point of order for?

Councilman Walford: I believe Mr. Hogan has the floor and merely asked a question.

Councilman Gibson: And I believe I was answering his question Councilman Walford. Did I answer your question?

Councilman Jackson: Gentlemen. Mr. Hogan, are you satisfied with the answer so far?

Councilman Hogan: Well, I am satisfied so far, I do have one more question, and as far as the feasibility study itself, is it going answer, or is it designed to verify the numbers that are presented to us so far? Or is it supposed to tell us whether Convention Centers need a hotel, or I'm not clear on exactly it is going to do.

Councilman Jackson: Let me, as a point of order, Mr. Hogan, let me say that one of the things that we are voting on at this very moment is to allow the committee to set the parameters. And I think to answer that question would be premature either on our part or Councilman Gibson's part. Because the most he could answer is what he envisioned when he put the ordinance together. But this ordinance has been amended, so I think it would be appropriate for us to take up the amendment, and at that point, then any questions we might have about the scope. But then if this amendment pass, would then be the responsibility of that committee.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you. I'm going to finish my statement, now that I've got the floor.

Councilman Walford: Point of order Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: I've got the floor Mr. Chair.

Councilman Walford: Point of order Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Walford, what are you scared of?

Councilman Walford: Not a thing Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Gentlemen, I'm going to ask that we move to vote.

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

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt the resolution as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Carmody,

Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Green. 1.

1. Ordinance No. 96 of 2004: Amending Chapter 94 of the Code of Ordinances relative to utility rates.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption. The Clerk read the following amendment:

Amendment No. 1.

By: Councilman Lester

Amend the ordinance as follows:

Amend Section 94-169 (a) to read as follows:

Sec. 94-169. Payment Assistance Program

(a) A fund is established to assist needy low income persons who live within the boundaries of the City to pay water and sewerage bills. Said funds is established at \$550,000.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt Amendment No. 1.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk, can you tell me a little bit about the amendment please?

Mr. Thompson: The amendment by Mr. Lester will raise the amount of the Shreveport Water Assistance Program.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, I got you. All in favor vote yea, all opposed vote nay.

Councilman Walford: Give us a moment Mr. Chairman to read the amendment.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I could- - - we're on 96. What gentlemen, if I might, what this amendment does is, it raises the payment that the Department of Operational Services gives to a program called Shreveport Water Assistance Program (SWAP) by the same amount that we're actually raising the utility rates to give the indigent and poor some relief in terms of helping and assisting needy and low income persons who live within the City to pay for those sewerage and water bills.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Lester, did we approve 6 ½ % in this current year? Is that correct?

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it.

Councilman Gibson: And so, we're adding another 10% with a total of 16 ½ %. Is that right?

Councilman Lester: (Inaudible)

Councilman Gibson: If the proposal is for 10% increase, are you asking for 10%?

Councilman Lester: What I'm asking for is the amount budgeted for the program to \$550,000.00 as opposed to \$500,000.00.

Councilman Gibson: So, it's a 10% increase?

Councilman Lester: Something like that. Yes.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, I hate to nit pick this one, but we're doing the increase for five months? August, September, October, November, December. So, it would be more in line to increase it by 5/12s of the total, to prorate it, just as we're doing the other.

Councilman Jackson: I think that - - - does the amendment speak specifically to numbers?

Councilman Lester: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Or does it talk about percentage?

Mr. Thompson: No, it has a specific number.

Councilman Walford: So, we're increasing \$50,000.00 for five months instead of 50 (\$50,000.00) for the year?

Councilman Lester: I mean, we can change that around, but my whole point is, if the funds aren't used in terms of if the necessity is not there and the outcry is not there, then the money will be left over. But I think in talking to people that live in my Council District, that have participated in this program, previously, I know the outcry is going to be there. And I don't think the extra money is too much to ask if we are actually increasing people's rates. Especially given the fact that you have people in my district and yours and in all of our districts that are on fixed income. I don't think the extra \$10,000.00 is going to make an appreciable difference. I think it says on our behalf as a council, we understand our fiduciary duty. We're not very happy about raising the rates, but at the same time, we want to give you some relief, where we can and not bust the system.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, can I go back and forth, finish my question with Mr. Lester please?

Councilman Jackson: Firstly, I would prefer (inaudible), but you are certainly welcomed to do so.

Councilman Walford: Does this come out of our Water and Sewerage?

Councilman Lester: Yes sir.

Councilman Walford: That's where it comes from?

Councilman Lester: Yes.

Councilman Walford: Okay, thank you.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I call for the question.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Jackson to call for the question.

Councilman Hogan: On the amendment, correct?

Councilman Jackson: No, voting to end debate.

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

(The Chairman called for the vote on the amendment)

Councilman Carmody: Mine is not registering?.

Ms. Pierce: No, Councilman Carmody didn't register

Councilman Carmody: Mine should register as a "No" vote

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

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt the ordinance as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Green, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Gibson¹ and Hogan. 2.

Mr. Thompson: I'd like to inquire about the motion, but I believe that part of the motion was the Unfinished Business Zoning C-31A-04, Nelson Street Cambridge Court Limited Partnership. Is that correct?

Councilman Green: You're exactly right.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, that will be decided by Ordinance 100.

Councilman Lester: Right. Well, could I say at this time, I'm going to stick with what I said earlier, I'm going to be moving to postpone that particular item as well as the companion item 100. So at this time, I'd move to postpone both of those.

Mr. Thompson: I'd like to inquire about the motion, but I believe that part of the motion was the Unfinished Business Zoning C-31A-04, Nelson Street Cambridge Court Limited Partnership. Is that correct?

Councilman Green: You're exactly right.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, that will be decided by Ordinance 100.

Councilman Lester: Right. Well, could I say at this time, I'm going to stick with what I said earlier, I'm going to be moving to postpone that particular item as well as the companion item 100. So at this time, I'd move to postpone both of those.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, is the motion to postpone Ordinance 100 plus Subdivision approval S-49-04?

Councilman Lester: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: Those two items. Is that correct

Councilman Lester: That's correct.

2. Ordinance No. 100 of 2004: ZONING: C-31A-04, 1800 Nelson Street, Cambridge Court Limited Partnership, north side of Nelson at its intersection with Corporate Dr, from I-2 to R-2.

¹Clerks Note: Councilman Gibson's vote was changed from yes to no at his request (later in the meeting after the vote was announced), and without objection from the Council.

3. C-31A-04, 1800 Nelson Street, *Cambridge Court Limited Partnership*, north side of Nelson at its intersection with Corporate Dr, from I-2 to R-2.
4. S-49, *Rosenwald Partnership, ALPIC*, et al, Smith & Raley, Inc. Extension of Markham Street south of Round Grove Lane & east of David Rains Road, R-1, One Family Residence District.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone Ordinance 100 of 2004, S-49 and C-31-04 until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilman Gibson: I want to recall my voted in error on the water increase. I voted yes and should have voted no.

Mr. Thompson: I believe the vote was- - - what was it?

Ms. Pierce: 6-1.

Councilman Jackson: So can we Mr. Clerk, can we - - -

Mr. Thompson: If there are no objections from the Council, we will make a note of that.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS:

The Clerk read the resolution by title: **Resolution No. 139 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with W.G. Yates & Sons Construction Company relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.**

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move to postpone Item 139.

Councilman Jackson: Just 139?

Councilman Lester: Just 139.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Hogan to postpone the resolution until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green,

and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Carmody. 1. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Jackson.

The Clerk read the resolution by title: **Resolution No. 140 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with SMG relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties, and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.**

Councilman Lester: Mr. Lester, I'm going to postpone items 140 and 141.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Hogan to postpone the resolution until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Gibson, Hogan, Green, Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilmen Walford and Carmody. 2.

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: **Resolution No. 141 of 2004: A resolution urging and requesting the Convention Center Hotel Authority to execute an agreement with HRI relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties and otherwise providing with respect thereto.**

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Hogan to postpone the resolution until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Gibson, Hogan, and Green, 4. Nays: Councilmen Walford and Carmody. 2. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Jackson.

RESOLUTION NO. 149 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE BOARD OF 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 Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Board of the City of Shreveport in connection with the investigation regarding Marquise Hudspeth.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that Billy R. Casey, 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 Billy R. Casey, 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 June 22, 2004.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 154 of 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CHARLES LABORDE, SR. FAMILY, L.L.C. AND JANA E GALVEZ, LOCATED AT 2671 EAST 70TH ST., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Charles Laborde, Sr. Family, L.L.C. & Janae Galvez have agreed to secure all permits and inspections required by the Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code. Said party having submitted a petition for annexation to the City of Shreveport, and having agreed to fully comply with the regulations of the City of Shreveport in connection with said property, all as set forth in Section 94-1, et. Seq., of the Shreveport City Code. Said request and petition are attached hereto.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Charles Laborde, Sr. Family, L.L.C. & Janae Galvez, be authorized to connect the building located at 2671 East 70th St., 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.

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

The Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 151 of 2004: **A resolution approving a restoration tax abatement application for 411 Ashley Ridge Blvd., (Formerly TicketMaster) Ashley Ridge Partners, Ltd.**

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone the resolution until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Carmody, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify for the public that's watching, this could not be adopted prior to July 27th, so we couldn't act on it today, that's why we postponed it. Thank you sir.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we need a motion for 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, and the resolution accepting the bid of *The Times*.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to Introduce Resolution 155 through 160 to lay over until the July 27, 2004 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

1. Resolution No.155 of 2004: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to accept a donation from U.S. Smokeless Tobacco Company and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No.156 of 2004: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a professional services agreement between Commerce Street Ventures, LLC and the City of Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No.157 of 2004: A Resolution ratifying the waiver of building permit fees and the donation of building materials and supplies to 12 qualified low income homeowners in the City of Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. Resolution No.158 of 2004: A Resolution authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose by public auction of certain supplies, material, equipment, and vehicles and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Resolution No.159 of 2004: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a

cooperative endeavor agreement with the Central Trades and Labor Council of Shreveport and vicinity, AFL-CIO relative to holding the Union Industries, Trades & Service Show in Shreveport, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

6. Resolution No. 160 of 2004: A Resolution accepting the bid of The Times and selecting The Times the official journal for the City of Shreveport for the period commencing July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we need a motion to introduce 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford seconded by Councilman Lester to Introduce Ordinance 101 through 106 to lay over until the July 27, 2004 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

1. Ordinance No. 101 of 2004: An Ordinance amending Chapter 66 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to Personnel and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 102 of 2004: An Ordinance repealing Ordinance No. 28 of 2004 which created a two-way stop at the intersection of Manor Place and Midvale Street and to create and establish the intersection of Manor Place and Midvale Street as a four-way stop intersection and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 103 of 2004: An Ordinance amending the 2004 General Fund Budget.
4. Ordinance No. 104 of 2004: An Ordinance amending Section 62-78 of the Code of ordinances relative to the Department of Public Assembly and Recreation fee schedule and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 105 of 2004: An Ordinance approving the Act 529 relative to the Policemen's pension and relief fund as enumerated in R.S. 11:3724(8) relative to the remarriage of widows of deceased policemen after the age of 55 with no loss in pension benefits and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 106 of 2004: An Ordinance amending the 2004 General Fund Budget.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE

- 1. Ordinance No. 78 of 2004: Amending certain provisions of Article VIII of Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to the Fair Share Program for Equal Business Opportunity.**

Having passed first reading on June 8, 2004 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 Jackson to postpone the ordinance until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 4. Nays: None. Councilmen Walford and Carmody. 2. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

- 2. Ordinance No. 83 of 2004: Closing and abandoning the 60' foot-wide Whittington Drive in the 80 Industrial Park Subdivision located in the SE & SW 1/4 of Sections 18 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Jackson adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

- 3. Ordinance No. 84 of 2004: Amending Certain Sections of Chapter 38 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to housing and property standards and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Walford: Comment Mr. Chairman? This is a step in the right direction.

Councilman Lester: Very much so.

Councilman Carmody: Please explain for the benefit of the public.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lester, you want to do it or you want me to do it?

Councilman Lester: Sure. Thank you Mr. Chairman. As part of the Property Standards group that I'm proud to Chair, Mr. Walford is also a member of that group. We are reducing the time from 30 days to 15 days that people have to cut yards and deal with weeded or abated or blighted properties. So that this is an overall approach that we're

taking to get more aggressive about blight issues in our communities so they don't linger and linger. And I just want to say, I appreciate the Council's support on this. This is another tool in our arsenal to get to 'blight police' or I guess 'blight busters'. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

4. Ordinance No. 85 of 2004: Authorizing a temporary construction servitude and a permanent servitude and encroachment on a portion of Festival Plaza in conjunction with the Regional Visitors Center Project, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Strong, could I ask you to come forward? Seeing that a permanent servitude was rejected in my district not too long ago because of concerns about water pressure and sewer and everything else, how is this going to be affected with a project tying into what's going on down there?

Mr. Strong: I have not seen this ordinance.

Councilman Gibson: I'd ask for a two week delay until we can get an answer on that.

Mr. Antee: Is this item 85?

Councilman Jackson: I think we can answer that. This is the Corps of Engineer s that's building the \$4.5million Visitor Center. As part of doing that, I think there is a right of way or servitude encroachment on part of Festival Plaza, and they need this legislation, so that they can continue. I would hope we would not try and play these petty politics over an issue that's got nothing to do with what took place in District D. And quit messing with the Corps of Engineers who is trying to build a \$4.5million Visitor Center and Facility and Museum for petty politics. It's got absolutely nothing to do with anything. And there is not need in sending the message to Vicksburg where the Corps is or to Washington because one Council Member is mad about a vote that took place two weeks ago. We need to get over this kind of stuff, move the City forward, and let the Corps of engineer build their building without playing games, with all due respect Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, seeing that we got an editorial from our CAO.

Mr. Antee: More to come.

Councilman Gibson: You're the one who brought before this body that we had a problem with water and sewer in terms of pressures and I'm just bringing to point that servitude is an issue because of tapping into water and sewer and I just asked the question. Is it going to be a problem? You're not an engineer, but I asked Mike Strong is it a problem. If its not a problem, then you've answered my question. I'd appreciate your editorial cause you're not an elected official to stay out of this Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: I'm sure you would. I'm sure you would not like the truth to be told, but with all due respect Mr. Chairman, what this does is, this has nothing to do with water. It's a construction servitude so that part of Festival Plaza can be used by the Construction Company within their fenced in area to store their materials.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Gibson: I'm not finished Mr. Chair. So, all I need is a yes or no. Mr. Strong is that going to be a problem? That was the question I asked I believe to my colleagues, I think I asked is there is a problem. If the servitude is granted on water and

sewer in terms of pressures and sewerages.

Mr. Strong: As far as anything to do with water and sewerage in that area, there is water and sewerage sufficient to handle any building (unclear).

Councilman Gibson: You answered my question. Thank you sir.

Councilman Jackson: I heard us talking about a substitute motion that didn't get to the floor.

Councilman Gibson: I will remove my substitute motion based on the answer that I got.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

5. Ordinance No. 86 of 2004: Amending the 2004 Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund Budget.

Mr. Thompson: Ordinance 86, I believe we could have a motion to withdraw. This one that is not needed Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: I withdraw.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 withdraw the ordinance from the agenda. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

6. Ordinance No. 95 of 2004: Amending the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption. The Clerk read the following amendment:

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt Amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 1

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Decrease the appropriation for **Slack Industrial Park Roadway - St. Vincent to Ellerbe Road (89C023)** by \$150,000. Funding source is 1993 B GOB, Prop. 1.

Increase the appropriation for **Jefferson-Paige Bridge Replacement (01C028)** by \$150,000. Funding source is 1993 B GOB, Prop.1.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

In the paragraph changing the funding sources for **Albert Street Sewer Main (02F008)**, change the numbers "\$97,000" to "\$95,000".

In Program L (Transit Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **2004 SporTran Capital Improvements (04L001)** by \$415,000. Funding source is Federal Transit Administration.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Dark, as I look at this, of course, you're trying to bring the City's budget back into (inaudible).

Mr. Dark: Yes sir.

Councilman Carmody: And it appears a cross section of the districts of the City are taking some portion of a hit here. I guess my question is how long do we anticipate a delay in trying to work towards these capital improvements that have been promised to the (unclear)

Mr. Dark: Mr. Carmody, the projects that we've been able to shift funding into by using unappropriated bond funds, you'll see no change. The ones where you simply see a decrease, they're on hold until we find some money.

Councilman Carmody: That's very good. Thank you sir.

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

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

7. Ordinance No. 97 of 2004: Amending the 2004 Budget for the Water and sewerage Enterprise Fund.

Councilman Jackson: So moved.

Councilman Walford: Second.

Mr. Dark: The amendment that you guys adopted a few minutes ago on the Water Assistance Program requires us to amend this one as well. Ms. Pilkinton is typing the amendment as we speak, would it be possible to defer action on this on until she can get back with the typed copy?

Councilman Walford: Could I offer a substitute motion that we postpone action on

this?

Councilman Carmody: Second.

Councilman Jackson: I have a motion by Councilman Walford and a second by Councilman - - -

Mr. Dark: Actually she's walking in.

Councilman Carmody: Right. Here she is.

Councilman Walford: I might withdraw my motion.

Councilman Carmody: And I'll withdraw my second.

Mr. Dark: She's quicker than I thought.

Councilman Lester: We've got great staff.

Councilman Walford: Okay, how about a motion on the amendment that she's passing out?

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption. The Clerk read the following amendment:

Amendment 1

By Councilman Lester

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

In Section 2 (Appropriations)

Decrease Contractual Services by \$50,000

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Amendment No. 1. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Hogan. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt the resolution as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Hogan. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

8. Ordinance No. 98 of 2004: Authorizing the Lease of City-Owned property to North Shreveport Development Corporation, Inc.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester to postpone the ordinance until the next regular council meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford,

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

9. Ordinance No. 87 of 2004: ZONING: C-39-04. Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by amending Section 106-1125 by modifying provisions for single family care homes and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Jackson to adopt.

Councilman Lester: Can we have Mr. Kirkland?

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Kirkland, would you come. You'd probably be able to explain quicker than my colleagues can scroll down.

Councilman Walford: You know that's what we were doing, that's why the delay. I apologize Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: Yeah, cause all I'm going through is strike-outs.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Kirkland, can you explain the gist of this.

Mr. Kirkland: Short and brief Mr. Chairman,

Councilman Jackson: Yes, clip notes.

Mr. Kirkland: This law is no longer needed. The Federal laws are more than adequate to protect these rights, in fact the way the law was written served an excellent purpose in our community for many years, but the bottom line now is that it serves as a limitation in the light of the Federal Fair Housing laws so, we're recommend repealing of it because we have better laws than the Federal law now to assure the rights of these citizens are protected.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Kirkland, you're asking us to repeal it, but we're actually just modifying or amending the chapter?

Mr. Kirkland: Well, by modifying, you're deleting an entire section of (unclear) unless - - - Julie, is there anything?

Councilman Carmody: Is that the appropriate legal way to handle it.

Ms. Glass: I would probably have written it as repealing, but I don't think it's that misleading, because you're modifying and you're deleting the section, you're calling it reserved and there is still law in affect based on the Federal law. So, I don't think it's that misleading.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you for the clarification.

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

10. Ordinance No. 88 of 2004: ZONING: C-40-04. Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by amending sections 106-1122 and 106-1123 by modifying provisions for on-premise signs and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 to adopt.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Kirkland, if I could ask you to please come back up. Again, if you could kind of run through the highlights of this particular legislation?

Mr. Kirkland: You can see the bold sections of the ordinance that are being added. It's simply clarifying so that there is no confusion with an on premise sign and what it can promote and an off premise sign and what it can promote. It's helping to assure that on premise signs are strictly on premise activity or businesses or services and it cannot promote an off premise activity. Conversely the same thing on the off premise.

Councilman Lester: Okay, let me be a lawyer for about five minutes here. And I think I understand the impetus for this. My question is if - - - are we dealing in expos facto, if someone is already in the process of constructing a sign?

Mr. Kirkland: No sir. I can tell you what cause this. There is a sign on Youree Drive and what a merchant wanted to put on what is an off premise sign for whatever reason, the real estate deal was not well put together and they did not get the rights to property to have what would be considered an on premise sign and they wanted it to be what would appear to be an on premise sign, but although legally, it's an off premise. So, that was the genesis of why this ordinance, but then as we worked through it, we found that there were other examples. So, what you're thinking probably has some credibility.

Councilman Lester: Okay, well I was just curious because I didn't want us to get (unclear). If someone is in the process of constructing a sign and then we pass this ordinance that clarifies it, cause I can think of an issue in a B-4 District that - - -

Councilman Carmody: Off premise signs are prohibited in a B-4 district?

Mr. Kirkland: That's exactly correct.

Councilman Lester: That's what I was wondering. Thank you.

Mr. Kirkland: Other than the ones that are there - - -grandfathered.

Councilman Lester: Right, I just wanted to make sure. Thank you Mr. Chairman.
Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

11. Ordinance No. 89 of 2004: ZONING: C-30-04, 7020 Union Avenue, *Rinchuso's Plumbing and Heating, Inc.*, Leon J. Rinchuso Sr. & Rose Borman Rinchuso, west side of Union Avenue, 200'south of West 70th Street from R-1D to B-3.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Carmody to postpone until the next regular meeting.

Councilman Lester: And we're doing that because it's in Councilman Green's district and I think that might have been one of the ones he missed. Thank you Mr. Chair.

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

12. **Ordinance No. 90 of 2004: ZONING: C-32-04, 800 Blk. Travis & 300 & 400 Blks of Douglas & Common, *FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH*, North and south sides of Travis Street, being surrounded by Common, Sprague, Douglas & Fannin Streets, from R-3 to B-4.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

13. **Ordinance No. 91 of 2004: ZONING: C-33-04, 3618 Youree Drive, *SEDONA SPA & SALON*, Joseph C. Lahood & Elizabeth Lahood, west side of Youree Drive, 500' north of Ardmore Ave from SPI-3-E (B-1) to SPI-3-E (B-1).**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

14. **Ordinance No. 92 of 2004: ZONING: C-33A-04, 9250 Ellerbe Road, *Tommy R. Smith Builders*, west side of Ellerbe Road at its intersection with Lake Forbing from I-2 to B-2 & B-3.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

15. **Ordinance No. 93 of 2004: ZONING: C-34-04, 890 Mt. Zion Road, *Randy W. & Leisa K. Nolen*, northeast corner of Mount Zion & Kingston Road from B-2 to B-3.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Lester adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

16. **Ordinance No. 99 of 2004: ZONING: C-35-04, 5600 Buncombe Road, *Vintage Realty Company*, Beaird Properties, L.L. C., west side of Buncombe Road, 1,400 feet from north of West 70th Street from B-3 and I-1 to R-3, Apartment complex or other permitted uses within this zoning classification.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Carmody to postpone until the next regular meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Green. 1.

17. **Ordinance No. 94 of 2004: A Ordinance authorizing the lease of parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot to Overton Brooks VAMC and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.**

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone until the next regular meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

The adopted Ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 83 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE 60' FOOT-WIDE WHITTINGTON DRIVE IN THE 80 INDUSTRIAL PARK SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN THE SE & SW 1/4 OF SECTIONS 18 (T17N-R14W), CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, today the Property Management Section of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to close and abandon the above identified drive; and

WHEREAS, Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to the 60' foot wide right-a-way being closed and abandoned.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the portion of the 60' foot wide right-a-way acquired by the City of Shreveport and recorded in Plat Book 2050, Page 323, dated May 5, 1986 of the Records and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned.

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 of this ordinance or the application thereof is invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 84 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CERTAIN SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 38 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO HOUSING AND PROPERTY STANDARDS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Section 38-111(4)(a)(4) (iv) and Section 38-111(4)(a)(4)(vi) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and reenacted to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-111. Sanitation requirements.

(1) *Care of premises.*

a. *Nuisance on private property.*

4. *Grass and weeds and wild growth.*

- iv The chief administrative officer or his designee shall divide the city into several weed and/or grass cutting areas, the number and limits of which are to be established by the chief administrative officer, and such chief administrative officer, or his designee, shall notify the individual property owners who are not in compliance with the provisions contained in this article, by certified United States mail, return receipt requested, or at the option of the chief administrative officer or his designee, shall place advertisements in the official journal of the city, such advertisements shall appear for two consecutive days in such official journal, advising all property owners within the designated areas that any vacant lots, vacant places or vacant areas, described in subsection (4)a.4.i., within such designated areas having grass or weeds exceeding the heights prescribed in subsection (4)a.4.i., or other obnoxious matters growing thereof, may be cut, destroyed or removed, and the deleterious, unhealthy or obnoxious matter lying or located thereon may be cleaned off or and/or removed by the city within 15 days from the date of receipt of written notice by the owner or the second advertisement mentioned in this section unless sooner cut, cleaned and/or removed by the owner, agent or other person in control of such

vacant places or vacant areas. Such notice to the noncomplying property owners may be effectuated by either method described in this section, or by a combination of both.

- vi. If the owner shall fail or refuse to abate the nuisance within the time required in subsection (4)(a)(1)(vi) above, the city may cause such nuisance to be abated; and when the abatement is done the chief administrative officer shall compile the cost of such work done or improvements made in abating such nuisance. The actual cost to the city, including reasonable administrative charges, of the work of mowing and/or cleaning the premises referred to in this section, whether performed by the city or by private contractor, shall be charged to the person owning the premises, and shall be due and payable on the date of completion of such work. The minimum charge for work accomplished with the personnel and equipment of the city pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be as provided in section 38-87.

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. 85 OF 2004
AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION SERVITUDE AND A PERMANENT SERVITUDE AND ENCROACHMENT ON A PORTION OF FESTIVAL PLAZA IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE REGIONAL VISITORS CENTER PROJECT 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 City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to grant a temporary construction servitude on a portion of the property commonly referred to as “Festival Plaza”, more particularly

described in the attached Exhibit "A" and as shown on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit "C, to the United States of America, through the U. S. Army, Corps of Engineers (the "Corps") , as the acquiring federal agency, for use during construction of a retaining wall and other purposes in conjunction with the Regional Visitors Center project.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the City of Shreveport is authorized to grant a permanent servitude and encroachment to the Corps on that portion of the Festival Plaza property more particularly described in the attached Exhibit "B" and as shown on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit "C, for the purpose of the location, placement, operation and maintenance of a retaining wall in conjunction with the Regional Visitors Center project.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute and deliver, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport all documents relative to the authorization granted herein after review and approval of such document(s) by the Office of the City Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that a certified copy of this ordinance and all documents executed by the Mayor of the City of Shreveport relative to the authorization granted herein shall be filed and recorded in the conveyance records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 95 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2004 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 2004 Capital Improvements Budget to reduce existing appropriations for water and sewer capital projects and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 159 of 2003, the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget, be further amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Program E (Water Improvements):

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

Change the funding sources for **City-Wide Water Improvements (00E002)**. Decrease Water and Sewer Revenues by \$150,000 and increase 2000A URB by \$150,000.

Decrease the appropriation for **82nd, 83rd and Ray Street Water Mains (03E001)** by \$288,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenue.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

Change the funding sources for **Wastewater Collection System Rehabilitation (98F013)**. Decrease Water and Sewer Revenues by \$600,000 and increase 2000A URB by \$600,000.

Decrease the appropriation for **Southern Hills Interceptor Improvements (99F005)** by \$122,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenue.

Decrease the appropriation for **Avery/Lawhon Sewer Main (99F011)** by \$150,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenue.

Change the funding sources for **Odor Control for Sewer Collection and Transmission Systems (01F006)**. Decrease Water and Sewer Revenue by \$70,000 and increase 2000A URB by \$70,000.

Change the funding sources for **Albert Street Sewer Main (02F008)**. Decrease Water and Sewer Revenue by \$97,000 and increase 2000A URB by \$97,000.

Decrease the appropriation for **Corbitt Street Water and Sewer Mains (02F009)** by \$225,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Change the funding sources for **900 Erie Street Sewer Main Improvements (03F001)**. Decrease Water and Sewer Revenues by \$125,000 and increase 2000A URB by \$125,000.

Change the funding sources for **North Regional Main and Manhole Rehabilitation (03F002)**. Decrease Water and Sewer Revenues by \$792,000 and increase 2000A URB by \$792,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 159 of 2003, 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.

Amendment No. 1

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Decrease the appropriation for **Slack Industrial Park Roadway - St. Vincent to Ellerbe Road (89C023)** by \$150,000. Funding source is 1993 B GOB, Prop. 1.

Increase the appropriation for **Jefferson-Paige Bridge Replacement (01C028)** by \$150,000. Funding source is 1993 B GOB, Prop.1.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

In the paragraph changing the funding sources for **Albert Street Sewer Main (02F008)**, change the numbers "\$97,000" to "\$95,000".

In Program L (Transit Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **2004 SporTran Capital Improvements (04L001)** by \$415,000. Funding source is Federal Transit Administration.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

ORDINANCE NO. 96 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 94 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO UTILITY RATES AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Shreveport is authorized and empowered to establish rates and charges for the customers of its water and sewerage system; and

WHEREAS, the City Council is required by City Charter to operate the City's water and sewerage systems in a businesslike and self-supporting manner; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to adjust water and sewerage rates, in order to adequately fund the City's water and sewerage systems.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Chapter 94 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended as follows:

Amend Section 94-164 (1) (d) to read as follows:

d. *Effective August 1, 2004:*

--	--	--

Water Meter Size (inches)	Inside City	Outside City
5/8	\$3.48	\$6.96
3/4	\$4.00	\$8.00
1	\$4.51	\$9.02
1 ½	\$7.22	\$14.44
2	\$10.18	\$20.36
3	\$21.60	\$43.20
4	\$37.37	\$74.74
6	\$73.46	\$146.92
8	\$109.74	\$219.48
10	\$148.84	\$297.68

Amend Section 94-164 (2) (d) to read as follows:

d. *Effective August 1, 2004:*

Customer Class	Rate per 1,000 Gallons (Inside City)	Rate per 1,000 Gallons (Outside City)
Residential	\$2.20	\$4.40
Commercial	\$1.94	\$3.88
Industrial	\$1.79	\$3.58

Amend Section 94-165 (1) to read as follows:

(1) *Monthly sewerage charge.* A monthly service charge for all users is established as follows:

Effective Date	Inside City	Outside City
January 1, 1996	\$2.45	\$4.90
July 1, 2003	\$2.70	\$5.40

January 1, 2004	\$2.88	\$5.76
August 1, 2004	\$3.17	\$6.34
January 1, 2006	\$3.27	\$6.54
January 1, 2007	\$3.48	\$6.96

Amend Section 94-165 (2) ©) by deleting the section titled “Effective January 1, 2005” and replacing it with the following:

Effective August 1, 2004:

Inside City	User Charge Portion	Capital Charge Portion	Total
Residential	\$1.95	\$0.97	\$2.92
Commercial/Industrial	\$1.62	\$0.79	\$2.41

Outside City	User Charge Portion	Capital Charge Portion	Total
Residential	\$1.95	\$3.89	\$5.84
Commercial/Industrial	\$1.62	\$3.20	\$4.82

Amend Section 94-165 (6) (b) (2) to read as follows:

- The flat rate charges shall be as follows:

QUANTITY CHARGE
INSIDE CITY

Customer Charge	User Charge	Capital Charge	Total
\$3.17	\$11.68	\$7.73	\$22.58

QUANTITY CHARGE
OUTSIDE CITY

Customer Charge	User Charge	Capital Charge	Total
\$6.34	\$23.36	\$15.46	\$45.16

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

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

Amendment No. 1.

By: Councilman Lester

Amend the ordinance as follows:

Amend Section 94-169 (a) to read as follows:

Sec. 94-169. Payment Assistance Program

(a) A fund is established to assist needy low income persons who live within the boundaries of the City to pay water and sewerage bills. Said funds is established at \$550,000.

ORDINANCE NO. 97 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2004 WATER AND SEWERAGE ENTERPRISE FUND BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2004 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund to reduce appropriations to match current revenue estimates, to reallocate funds among expenditure categories 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. 160 of 2003, the 2004 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Revenues):

Decrease Estimated Available Fund Balance 1/1/2004 by \$3,516,800.

Increase Water Sales by \$475,000.

Increase Sewer Charges by \$419,000.

Decrease Interest Earnings by \$250,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Decrease Personal Services by \$350,000.

Decrease Contractual Services by \$996,300.

Increase Transfer to Capital Projects Fund by \$600,000.

Decrease Operating Reserve by \$2,126,500.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 160 of 2003 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

Amendment 1

By Councilman Lester

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

In Section 2 (Appropriations)

Decrease Contractual Services by \$50,000

ORDINANCE NO. 87 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES AS AMENDED, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY AMENDING SECTION 106-1125 BY MODIFYING PROVISIONS FOR SINGLE FAMILY CARE HOMES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 106-1125 of Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, is hereby repealed and re-enacted to read as follows:

Sec. 106-1125. ~~Single family personal care homes.~~ **Reserved.**

~~_____ (a) — Intent. The City of Shreveport and Caddo Parish recognize that there are~~

individuals in the community who are unable to meet the demands of independent living and need to live together for mutual support in larger numbers than what is currently allowed by this chapter. It is further recognized that through the deinstitutionalization of persons who are mentally handicapped, many persons have been returned to our community unprepared to live alone and without an adequate support system. It is further recognized that through personal interaction and involvement with the community these individuals can reach their fullest potential. Although these individuals may not require daily medical care, they may need guidance with daily living skills. The intent and purpose of the provisions of this section is to provide a safe residence for these persons which:

(1) — Constitutes a single housekeeping unit in which residents share responsibilities, meals, and recreation;

(2) — Is limited as to number of occupants;

(3) — Is maintained in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood.

(b) — *Definitions.*

(1) — *Single family personal care home* is defined as a dwelling that provides personal care services and supervision to six or fewer service dependent persons; such home shall provide trained supervisory personnel in order to function as a single family unit but not to exceed two supervisory live in persons; such home shall insure that admission decisions for mentally handicapped persons are medically appropriate, based on the recommendation and approval of the admission by a state licensed clinical psychologist or psychiatrist; and such home shall be certified, licensed or monitored by the state and shall otherwise insure compliance with written state and federal placement and funding criteria.

Single family personal care homes do not include boarding homes, fraternities, sororities, halfway houses, homeless or transient housing, day cares, nursing homes, hospices or acute medical care facilities.

(2) — *Service dependent person* is defined as any person who has a mental or physical impairment which substantially limits one or more of the following major life activities: (1) self care; (2) receptive or expressive language; (3) learning; (4) mobility; (5) self direction; (6) capacity for independent living; and (7) economic self sufficiency. This definition shall not include persons impaired by reason of drug abuse or alcohol abuse; or shall it apply to persons currently under sentence or on parole from any criminal violation or those who have been found not guilty of a criminal charge by reasons of insanity; or any

person whose past threats or behavior creates a medically significant risk to others or to property; or any person who is currently a danger to themselves.

~~(3) — *Personal care* is defined as protective care of a resident who does not require chronic or convalescent medical or nursing care. Personal care involves responsibility for the safety of the resident. Personal care may include a daily awareness by the management of the resident's functioning, his whereabouts, the making and reminding a resident of appointments, the ability and readiness to intervene if a crisis arises for a resident, supervision in areas of nutrition and medication, and the actual provision of temporary medical care.~~

~~(4) — *Temporary medical care* is defined as the kind of medical care which is normally provided in the home by one family member for another, not skilled nursing convalescent or acute medical care.~~

~~©) — *Criteria.* In order to provide a safe residence and adequate living space for service-dependent persons, and to minimize the impact of single family personal care homes on the single family residential districts, all single family personal care homes shall meet the following criteria:~~

~~(1) — A single family personal care home shall provide the following minimum physical requirements:~~

~~a. — At least 200 square feet of gross floor area per occupant thereof.~~

~~b. — Each room used for sleeping purposes:-~~

~~Eighty square feet per single occupant;-~~

~~One hundred twenty square feet for two occupants;-~~

~~Sixty additional square feet must be provided for each additional occupant in excess of two per room used for sleeping purposes.~~

~~c. — A minimum of 200 square feet of living/recreation space.~~

~~d. — At least 1,000 square feet of outdoor area shall be provided, exclusive of driveways, parking areas, and maneuvering space. All such area shall be appropriately landscaped.~~

~~e. — Two full baths.~~

- ~~(2) — A proposed single family personal care home shall not be located within a radius of 1,000 feet of an existing single family, personal care home. Measurement shall be made from the nearest point of the existing site to the nearest point of the site of the proposed home.~~
- ~~(3) — Professionally trained 24 hour supervision shall be provided at all times.~~
- ~~(4) — Adequate hard surfaced parking shall be provided onsite for clients, staff, and visitors. The required parking shall be determined by the zoning administrator based on (1) the number of live in staff, the number of residents who possess a driver's license, and the number of additional employees regularly visiting the site, and (2) the compatibility of the parking plan with the residential character of the immediate neighborhood. If additional parking is required, it shall be provided behind the required front yard setback.~~
- ~~(5) — No sign advertising the organization or otherwise distinguishing this site from other residential sites shall be permitted.~~
- ~~(6) — Exterior and interior improvements shall only be permitted which maintain the residential character and integrity of the existing dwelling. Exterior appearance, including yard and vertical improvements, shall be maintained in a manner in-keeping with the immediate neighborhood.~~
- ~~(7) — There shall be no office activities conducted from this site. The dwelling shall not be used for nonresident counseling activities.~~
- ~~(8) — Since it is unlikely that occupants of single family personal care homes will have personal transportation, these facilities shall be located within one fourth mile of established public transit routes, or evidence of an alternative transportation plan shall be submitted to and approved by the zoning administrator.~~
- ~~(9) — Single family personal care homes shall comply with all other codes and ordinances of the City of Shreveport and Caddo Parish.~~
- ~~(10) — All single family personal care homes shall comply with Louisiana Life Safety Code (chapter 21) for residential board and care occupancies.~~
- ~~(11) — The sponsoring agency of the single family personal care home shall comply with all state licensing requirements including, but not limited to, personnel, programming, admissions, safety and sanitation for the particular type of residents being cared for.~~

~~(12) — A certificate of occupancy shall be required for all single family personal care homes.~~

~~(d) — Procedure.~~

~~(1) — Application. Application for a single family personal care home shall be made to the zoning administrator. In order to determine whether a particular site meets the criteria of this section, a site plan, a detailed floor plan and a completed technical review form shall be required. The technical review form shall include the name of the sponsoring agency and the licensing agency, a statement of the exact nature of the home planned, the type and number of personnel, and the number of residents. It shall also include specific information regarding the proposed site such as location, size of structure, number of bedrooms, number of parking spaces, size of outdoor and indoor recreation area, etc.~~

~~An inspection of the site shall be undertaken by zoning, building, plumbing, electrical and fire prevention inspectors to determine compliance with this and other applicable ordinances regarding the proposed occupancy. The zoning administrator will make a decision and notify the applicant in writing within seven calendar days of the date a completed application is received. In cases where the zoning administrator considers the application not within the scope of the single family personal care home criteria, the application will be denied.~~

~~(2) — Time limit/renewal. All single family personal care certificates of occupancy shall be valid for a period of two years. Requests for renewals shall be submitted to the zoning administrator in writing prior to expiration of the certificate of occupancy. The zoning administrator may refuse to approve a request for renewal based on one or more violations of the provisions of this section.~~

~~(3) — Appeal to the zoning board of appeals. The decision of the zoning administrator concerning approval or renewal shall be final unless a written appeal is filed with the zoning board of appeals within ten calendar days of the decision. An appeal may only be filed by the applicant.~~

~~(4) — Special exception from criteria. An application requesting special exception from strict application of any of the criteria in subsection (3) of this section may be filed with the zoning board of appeals and may be approved in individual cases if the special exception is in accordance with the intent of this section.~~

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.

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

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective ten (10) days after publication in the official journal.

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

ORDINANCE NO. _88_ OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES AS AMENDED, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY AMENDING SECTIONS 106-1122 AND 106-1123 BY MODIFYING PROVISIONS FOR ON-PREMISE SIGNS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 106-1122 and Section 106-1123 of Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, are hereby amended to read as follows:

1122 (b) (3) *Off-premises outdoor advertising* means any outdoor sign, display, figure, painting, drawing, message, plaque, poster, billboard, flag, or any other thing which is designed, intended or used to advertise or inform, which is not located within the public right-of-way, and part of which advertising or information content is visible from any place on the main travelway of the interstate system or any public street in the city. The term "off-premises outdoor advertising," however, does not include signs with subject matter relating to the premises on which it is located (business signs) **so long as it makes no reference to a completely separate business that is not located on the premises or an activity that is not conducted on the premises**, or signs of a noncommercial nature placed on the premises by the owner or occupant thereof, and such on-premises advertising or identifying structures shall not be considered "outdoor advertising" structures for any purpose of this section.

1123 (e) (1) *On-premises sign*: any sign that advertises goods, products, services, business, persons or activity found on the premises where the sign is located **so long as it makes no reference to a completely separate business not located on the premises or an activity that is not conducted on the premises**.

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

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

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective ten (10) days after publication in the official journal.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 90 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON NORTH AND SOUTH SIDE OF TRAVIS STREET BEING SURROUNDED BY COMMON, SPRAGUE, DOUGLAS & FANNIN STREETS SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-3, URBAN, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO B-4, CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the north and south side of Travis Street being surrounded by Common, Sprague, Douglas and Fannin Streets, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family District, to B-4, Central Business District:**

Block 1, Subdivision of TAL 3, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15. Block 3 Subdivision of TAL 3, rear part of and the SE 150 feet Lot 7, 8 & 23, SW 32 feet of SE 135 feet Lot 9, Lots 10, 11, 12, 13, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

- ii **Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.**

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. 91 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF YOUREE DRIVE, 500 FEET NORTH OF ARDMORE AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM SPI-3-E (B-1) COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (YOUREE DRIVE) <BUFFER BUSINESS> EXTENDED USE DISTRICT LIMITED TO AN” 800 SQUARE FOOT ONE OPERATOR BARER SHOP” ONLY, TO SPI-3-E (B-1) COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT-(YOUREE DRIVE) <BUFFER BUSINESS> EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, FOR A SPA AND SALON LIMITED TO “2 STYLISTS AND 1 MASSAGE THERAPIST”, ONLY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the west side of Youree Drive 500 feet north of Ardmore Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, **be and the same is hereby changed from SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Youree Drive) <Buffer Business> Extended Use District, limited to an “800 square foot one operator barber shop”only, to SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Youree Drive) <Buffer Business> Extended Use District, for a spa and salon limited to” 2 stylists and 1 massage therapist”,only.**

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

- ii **Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.**
- ii **No certificate of occupancy shall be issued without prior approval/verification of a variance of three parking spaces, or a shared parking agreement for three spaces being approved by the Zoning Administrator, and said agreement shall be filed at the Caddo Parish Courthouse.**
- 3. **Approval is limited to 2 stylists & 1 massage therapist only, as applied for.**

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. 92 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF ELLERBE ROAD AT IT'S INTERSECTION WITH LAKE FORBING, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM I-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT TO B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND B-3, COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the west side of Ellerbe Road at it's intersection with Lake Forbing, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from I-2, Heavy Industrial District to B-2, Neighborhood Business District and B-3, Community Business District:**

TRACT 1: I-2 to B-2

The east 228 feet of the S 294.1 feet of the north 1905.4 feet of that part of the NW/4 of Section 6, T16N-R13W, lying between the Kansas City Southern Railroad R-O-W and Ellerbe Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana

TRACT 2: I-2 to B-3

The S 294.1 feet of the north 1905.4 feet of that part of the NW/4 of Section 6, T16N-R13W, lying between the Kansas City Southern Railroad R-O-W and Ellerbe Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, less and except the east 228 feet thereof.

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

- ii **Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director, showing all required landscaping, location of trash/dumpster, with proper screening. Any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.**

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 93 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON NORTHEAST CORNER OF MOUNT ZION AND KINGSTON ROAD, SHREVEPORT, CADDO

PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO B-3, COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the northeast corner of Mount Zion and Kingston Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to B-3, Community Business District:**

From the SW corner of Section 35, T17N-R14W run along the centerline of Mt. Zion Road N89°46'E 50.09 feet, thence run N0°30'E 40 feet to the P-O-B of the tract herein described, run thence N0°30'E 125 feet, thence run N89°46'E 150 feet, thence run S0°30'W 125 feet, thence run S89°46'W 150 feet to the P-O-B, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

10. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan, to be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator, showing alternative landscaping and parking. Any significant changes or additions shall require further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
11. No Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued until all required setbacks have been complied with.

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.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Mr. Thompson: The only one we have remaining cannot be adopted or taken up prior to July 27th, which is S-19-04.

1. ZONING APPEAL - Case No. S-19-04, *Brenda Lilley Kraak Pettit*, Northwest corner of Creswell Avenue & Montrose Drive, R-1D. (postponed until July 27, 2004). (C/Carmody)
2. ZONING: C-31A-04, 1800 Nelson Street, *Cambridge Court Limited Partnership*, north side of Nelson at its intersection with Corporate Dr, from I-2 to R-2. (A/Lester)
3. ZONING APPEAL - S-49-04, *Rosenwald Partnership, ALPIC, et al*, Smith & Raley, Inc.,

Extension of Markham Street south of Round Grove Lane & east of David Rains Road, R-1, One Family Residence District. (A/Lester)

NEW BUSINESS; None

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES. None

CLERK'S REPORT:

Letter of Appeal:

S-52-04: Doug Shurling, Emberwood Homeowners Association, approval of Subdivision Request, dtd - July 7, 2004. (D/Gibson)

To address Communications and Miscellaneous Matters, the Council resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, on a motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester. Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan,, and Jackson: 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Green. 1

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 6:59p.m.

//s// Theron Jackson, Chairman

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