Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana July 25,2006

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Jeffery A. Hogan at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 25, 2006, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Jackson.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Carmody.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan and Jackson. 5. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lester is ill today, and Mr. Green is out of the City.

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Jackson</u> to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, July 10, 2006 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, July 11, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

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

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Mayor, do you have any communications or distinguished guests today?

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I do just have one distinguished guest, and they're going to take my time up. I've got Lindy Broderick and Dick Bremer with the Chamber of Commerce along with the new Chairman for the year, John Dean. So they've got a short presentation.

Councilman Hogan: Alright, we'll hear your presentation now Mr. Bremer.

Mr. Richard Bremer: (400 Edwards Street) We'd like to take a few minutes and update you on some activities involving our community. Some things we're very proud of and first of all, I wanted to share some comments about our Champions for Business II Program. And that's a program that we started in 2004 and we raised the necessary funds in the business community to deploy those funds to see where we could create additional jobs, help companies that are already here attract additional companies. And when we did that we set specific goals. And I noticed the Convention Center in the paper had some goals that they are exceeding, and I'm proud to say that the goals that we have set for this economic development campaign, we are also exceeding. But just to share some quick statistics with you, in 2004, we set as a goal to create 3,000 jobs during the period 2004, 5, and 6. And as of the end of June of this year, we have actually created 3,400 jobs. We set a goal for ourselves for additional investment in our community of about \$200,000,000, and then as of

the end of last month that investment has exceeded \$560,000,000. And all of the goals that we have set for this most recent economic development campaign are going to be exceeded. We're quite proud of that, and I'd hasten to add that when we're working the various projects and so forth, we always, we always work with other partners. The City is a very valuable partner of ours. We work with the Mayor, we work with his key people on various projects. We work with the Port, Bio-Med. We work with Desoto Parish, Webster Parish, so I never want you to take the - - - get the impression that we're doing this ourselves, we're valuable partner working with other economic partners in Northwest Louisiana for the benefit of our community. I think most importantly though, what we're seeing right now is we have what we like to refer to as our 'Economic Development Pipeline.' And it's a software package where we keep track of all of the projects that we are working on, either it's companies that's already here, that we're trying to assist in the expansion program, or it's brand new companies taking a look at our community. We have more projects in that pipeline now than ever before. There are 45 active projects in that pipeline. We're looking at an investment anywhere from \$1.2 (billion) to \$3 (billion). We're looking at the potential of 10,000 jobs. The economic activity, the companies that are looking at Northwest Louisiana is at the highest point ever. And we're very proud of that, and again, we look forward to working with our economic development partners to see if we can't do a good job and effectively help those 45 companies, either expand or put new facilities here. I want to share one quick comment. One compliment that we received reflects positively on our entire community. Dealing with the steel company, there is a small dinner, Brenda Levinson from the Port, myself had dinner with the company official and two consultants. And during the course of that dinner, the company official mentioned first, he said, 'you know we looked at a lot of communities when we were looking to locate a new facility. Your community does the best job of providing the information that we need in order to make a decision.' And when he refers to the community, it's not just the Chamber providing data, which we do, the city provides data, the utility companies provide data, in this case the Port was very, very helpful. But I wanted to share that with you because the consultants immediately chimed in and said that's exactly right. Fancy dinners and so forth are all well and good, but what we need is data on which to make a decision. So, we continue to work with that company, but that's about as good a compliment as you can get. And we look forward to continue to work with our economic development partners for the benefit of our area. As the Mayor mentioned, John Dean is the Chairman this year of the Greater Shreveport Chamber, and I'd like to call on him to share a brief comment with you about a recent economic development effort, because we're in the fund raising mode, and we want to take advantage of these 45 projects, and he'll share some comments with you about that program.

Mr. John Dean: (333 Texas) I want to reiterate what Dick said about just the general business environment in our area right now. I think it's extremely strong. In my real job as a CPA with Heard, McElroy and Vestal, we have the pleasure of serving about 4 or 5,000 clients across North Louisiana, and our impression is that all of them are doing extremely well right now. And I think that (inaudible) well for the future. A lot of people would ask well, if we're doing so well, why do you need to continue spending large sums of money on economic development, and our response to that is there is never a better time. Because you'll never get a better return on your investment than when things are good, the pot is hot, and you can just fry some more fish, and that's what we're going to try to do. We're undertaking a five year economic development campaign, trying to raise approximately \$3.2

(million) from area business. That will supplement the monies that we receive from other places like the City. And the riverboat funds that we have all will be dedicated to economic development. We're going to try to do a lot of the same things, we've been doing, but have generated a lot of success as Dick explained. We've also got a couple of issues that are on the horizon that we're going to try to address during the next five years. One of those is a more intense effort in workforce development. We're lucky enough with all of this growth to have manufacturers, and construction trades that are saying that they need additional people, and we've got a tremendous asset here, and some people are under employed, and some people that we can accelerate and elevate through proper training to better positions, I think that would be a challenge that we're going to face with a little more intensity than we have in the past. The other issue that we have that we hear over and over again, relates to sometimes it's just not getting off the blocks with respect to our State image. And we've got some surveys and polls that have come out with respect to quality of life that we think are very undeserving, and we're going to work to address those. Because we've got some data to provide to prospects when they come relative to the true quality of life in our area. I appreciate the time. I would mention that Lindy Broderick has brought some materials that we'll hand out to the Council at this time for your review. They contain some results of our efforts in the legislature in the State this past session. Also, some specific information relative to capital outlays for this area, and then a brochure on our Northwest Louisiana Government Procurement Center, which most of you I'm sure are familiar with, which has been extremely successful, in making sure that the businesses in our area get their share of the government procurement in Northwest Louisiana. Thank you.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Dean. Ms. Broderick, are you going to come speak today?

Ms. Broderick: No.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you. I'd just like to say that I appreciate the job that the Chamber has done in the past and is doing right now. That's exciting news and as the Council had requested a few months ago, that semi-annually that you give us this report and it's very enlightening, and I do appreciate y'all coming today.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you. My compliments to the Chamber and all the hard work that y'all have done. It certainly is refreshing to hear the same things that I hear about y'all from everybody that I deal with and try to solicit the market, and have people that are not familiar with our area of the state, to take a look at it. We do have some hurdles to overcome, but when I think we put our best foot forward, and basically put a smile on our face and show people that what they've heard is many times is just unfounded, that we find that we make new friends, and that they are interested in taking a look at the market. Mr. Dean you had mentioned something I think that is going to be particularly important in job creation and job development. Specifically in light of what occurred along the coast as a result of the hurricane damage, that many of those - - - I would just say craftsman, for lack of a better term, have sought the opportunities that have been afforded out of the tragedy that occurred which means that there are a lot of people here that would certainly like the opportunity to have a good solid job, that don't have the skills, and I applaud the effort to do that, because I believe that our economic engine works best when we have homegrown jobs. Because those are the people that know the community, and love the community, and want to stay here. So, again, my hats off to you, keep up the good work.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Councilman Carmody. Are there any other comments from Council Members? If not, does any Council Member have any special guests or distinguished guests today? I do, I have one that I would like to introduce, my oldest daughter Hannah is here with me today on the front row, stand up Hannah. Hannah is helping out this afternoon, helping Ms. Sharon today, and she's a student at Calvary Baptist Academy and will be starting 5th Grade this fall. Thank you for coming today Hannah.

Reports:

<u>Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel</u> (To include detailed personnel report from SMG)

Mr. Antee: We presented that yesterday, we would announce that on Thursday morning at 9:00 we'll have a topping off ceremony, and afterwards, we'll take the media and whoever wants to, to go view the model rooms which are a replica that will be in the rooms that will be in the hotel, that are currently in the Convention Center. With that we'll answer any questions. We do have - - - we were requested yesterday to have somebody from Walton so, Tommy Clark from Walton is here for any questions as well.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Antee, this morning, I read the front page with great interest, and was excited to read that we're actually, the facility, the Convention Center is out performing, I guess our expectations. And it brought me back to the request that I had made two weeks ago, and was nice enough that Mr. Carrier provided us with a contract for SMG, and I was noting that basically what was reported this morning, certainly provides the information on what we're grossing. What I would like to request is more of something for us to evaluate as far as like a P & L Statement (profit and loss). Could you provide the Council with the breakdown of the expenses to operate the facility including the utilities, any consulting fees, the name of the consultant, so that we can evaluate what we're bringing in versus what the operational costs are for that venue? And if we could do that year to date, so that we could compare it to at least what we've got up to this point, I think that would be helpful.

Mr. Antee: Yeah, that would not be a problem.

Councilman Jackson: First, to Mr. Carrier while we're on the subject, I wanted to find out if maybe you could get together with the Administration and perhaps it may be the CAO or Ms. Stone with SPAR who may be able to help with this. Because I thin all success is relative. What I'd like to see is the 2004 numbers from lets say the Expo Hall, what we did during that period of time, juxtaposed to what we have right now. For example, in the same period of time, six months if you will, first of the year, and those kinds of things. Because this morning when someone called me and asked me if I'd seen the newspaper, (and I still haven't seen the newspaper), but they'd asked me what was that in comparison to what we have done before, and were we simply moving the events from Expo Hall, which currently we don't have over there now, and is there anything, obviously everybody would like to say, 'oh no, we would never have it, if we didn't have the Convention Center.' So, if there is some way to substantiate that, so that I can say back to them, in fact if we didn't have this Convention Center, then you know whoever did come, would not have come, and here's what we think we've done. Because I think one of the numbers that you can just kind of I guess recognize it as there, though it is not expressly written, is that whenever there are conventions in town, that also impacts our hotel stays, it impacts our sales tax dollars and all

those things. And I don't know that we can quantify any of that at this point, but certainly I think that's something that we have to talk about. What the multiplier effect has been with regards to being able to have a real economic - - - I guess for lack of a better term, what the economic benefits have been from that specifically. So my question again, if we look at the same period of time from a prior year, are we exponentially higher than what we would have been given our former set of municipal assets as compared to this newest municipal asset, Vis-à-vis the Convention Center, if we could. If we could. I guess you all could work together, and get that information.

Mr. Antee: Okay, so what I'm hearing, what you want, we'll get you what was done in Expo in '04 and '05, and then we'll show you which events have been in the Convention Centers year to date, that have been previously in Expo, and then be able to show you the ones that were new that hadn't - - -, we can get that to ya.

Councilman Jackson: Alright. My next question has to deal with as we talked about on yesterday with the hotel project, and I'd asked if we could have someone who is representing Walton to come today, and I guess I can pose - - - Mr. Clark is here, I can pose a question to him?

Mr. Antee: For the Council's benefit, Mr. Clark has taken the responsibilities, I don't know if it's the same title or what, but the same responsibilities, that Mr. McCrocklin previously had.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clark, I'm going to assume that you've spoken with someone from the Administration and happen to know the area in which my concerns lie? *Mr. Tommy Clark:* (6425 Youree Drive) Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: So, I won't go through a lot of the history of that, but my major concern is that when we got started, you came I guess late to the ball game, for lack of a better term, because of Mr. McCrocklin being the person who represented the company, and who represented to this Council that we in fact would have a percentage of minority businesses who would be involved in this process, so on and so forth. In that process to even decide if we were even going to have a hotel, my sole reason for supporting the hotel at all had partially to do with the fact that we had made a commitment, and that it may be a good mix, that it was a good fit if we were going to go with the Convention Center. But I think one of the other parts is that all of it represented economic development. Very often we talk about the subject of economic development, the issue becomes what is the job of economic development? The Chamber has talked, and it's just my personally philosophy that the job of the economic development department is to raise the tide. And that economic development if you will, will raise the tide. And all folks who have boats out there, their boats notwithstanding their size, or whatever their make up may be, will rise with the tide, if you will. And so I said to them, my interest is making sure that minority businesses have the opportunity, and the same opportunity that everybody has, that we have got a Fair Share Program, and we've got programs, and we've just got generally have a philosophy that I believe that we ought to be inclusive. In this process, Mr. McCrocklin and the Walton Company said to us, well we're trying. We've got some folks we don't really know. And I said to them, what I hate to see continue to happen is that we go out and we find a company that is a shell company of sorts, or someone whose worked with you before, and they get credit for being somewhere and doing something, but when you really look at that capacity, they don't really have the capacity. I said, why don't you, and my question was, model it after Walton. Walton Construction is a company from Kansas City, MO., am I correct?

Mr. Dean: You're correct.

Councilman Jackson: From Kansas City, MO., who followed a business model that came to Shreveport, say there was some opportunity in Louisiana, let me say, had some opportunity, took roots in Louisiana and grew to be probably the largest, if not one of the largest general contractors in the State of Louisiana. I think it's a good business model, it makes sense, it was the right time in the market, so on and so forth. I said to this Administration as well as to Mr. McCrocklin, I think that's a great model for all businesses, and I said that I think that if we can attract African-American businesses who can do the same thing, we entail begin to grow all of our businesses the same way. The construction industry, and at the time, Mr. (what's Mike's last name?) Mike - - - Councilman Gibson was here, and at the time, (wrong Mike), Councilman Gibson was here at the time, and I said to him, we talked about how Walton impacted the industry if you will, of General Contractors, and I said I think we can use the same kind of scenario, if we find competent and capable African-American businesses who can come in and make the same level of commitment Walton did. Mr. McCrocklin sat down with him, and after they sat down, he said to me, Councilman Jackson, we looked at a lot of companies, there are several companies, and he asked me did I know of anybody, I think I gave him four names, people from Dallas, Tennessee, Atlanta, different places. I said, I don't know of any of the work they do, but I do know they have capacity. Sat down, with him, he came back to me, he said, 'Councilman Jackson, I'm just shocked. They're as big as we are.' And I said, well I think it would be a good model, it'd be a good way - - - they would take every minority business that's there. If you want to subcontractor, if you need bonded capacity, they're willing to do all those things. I said, my interest is making sure that beyond the hotel, that we have an industry in this area that will continue to grow, and everybody can grow. He said to me, Yes, I think it's a great idea.' From that the project went on, they were fortunate enough to get the bid, and in that process, he began to write these contracts for companies to do it. He contacting one of these companies, and contracted with them about - - - I think they did - - - they had the largest piece of the whole little minority slice, if you will. And on June $20^{\text{th}}\,$ or somewhere thereabout, I got a call from this company saying well, we got a letter from Walton Construction saying they cancelled our contract. Well, my first concern was, first of all we never even, we hadn't even met the agreed upon amount in the contract, and so, we were at 19% forever. And then I said to Mr. Antee, and others that we are not at 19, so Greg nobody had ever come back, but they came back with another sheet. And we went from 19 to like 21 with some asterisks, because the asterisks said, we're not even sure these are minorities, but it does get us to the 21% number, we think they might be. And so that's how we get to the 21% number. Well, this contractor called and said, "FYI, got this contract cancelled," and sent me a copy of this letter that you sent to him. And it said that, "Due to logistical circumstances made necessary by the ongoing conditions of work in progress on the project, it has become necessary to reassign the scope of work contained in your subcontract to one or more local, similarly situated subcontractors." I told him, of course I'm not a lawyer, I don't know what all that means, I think that means they've taken you out of the project and replaced you with somebody else, is what it sounds like. Well, (inaudible) I was serious about it and said I wanted to find out what was going on. I called the Mayor and much to my shock, and to some degree, chagrin, he didn't have any idea what was going on, because he didn't know that it had happened. That's what he said. He hadn't spoken to anybody, nobody knew anything. He called me back, we talked a few days later and he said he had

talked to somebody, and sure enough what I suspected is what happened, that's what he said, what I suspected is what happened, is just kinda how he explained it to the guy. And I say well, did you know anything about it? And clearly, I guess the Administration was not aware of what was going on, because he suggested to me that he didn't know. So, I asked them to ask you to come today so that No. 1, you could perhaps define what the logistical circumstances in this scenario was.

Mr. Clark: I'll be glad to address that Councilman Jackson.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jackson, if I may prior to him getting started, we were aware. I was aware.

Councilman Jackson: Oh, the Mayor said he wasn't aware, and I told him that I was shocked, that he would know because one of the things that was contractual about this process is that we were going to be sure that we held up, because I think the Mayor knows that the only way we even got to this process where we would have a hotel is because those of us that were in favor of it, the majority of us who were in favor of it said this is a sticking point to us. So, if there was a principle or a material change or whatever the change was, that we would at least know something about it, because we don't want to micro manage the contractor, it's not our job. But to have some knowledge of what's going on so that we can respond to those, and so I was shocked that the Mayor didn't know anything about it. And he said that the did not, and then in our second conversation when I was out of town last Council Meeting, the Mayor said well, maybe he told me, I just didn't remember. And I said my only concern was, was there a reason and what was the reason? The Mayor said to me that he thought that and maybe Mr. Clark will address this in his logistical circumstance's definition, the Mayor said because they were local and that they were cheaper. And so that was the crux of what the decision was. But I'm sure that was his interpretation. But I just wanted to see if Mr. Clark had the same - - -

Mr. Antee: But so there's no negative implication on Walton prior to taking that action, Walton did contact us. The Mayor was aware - - - he wasn't aware of the details, but basically we were aware that they were looking to replace the Tennessee minority with a Shreveport minority, and wanted to make sure that we were okay with that prior to taking that action, and I assured them that - - -

Councilman Jackson: So, the Administration had signed off on it before they had made their action?

Mr. Antee: Yes, as long as we were using a local - - -

Councilman Jackson: Well, that answers some of my questions, but not all of them.

Mr. Antee: A local and a minority, and the reason I wanted to clear that up is that I didn't want the negative implication to be on Walton that they did it without us knowing when in fact we did.

Councilman Jackson: Well, that was the communication. And Mr. Mayor, if I'm wrong, you could tell me if I'm wrong, we're trying to be open.

Mayor Hightower: No, you're correct.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, now let me ask you this, since Mr. Antee said this, I will change my line of questioning just a little bit. Was in fact the crux of the definition of the logistical circumstances lower cost and geography?

Mr. Clark: Not completely. Let me explain.

Councilman Jackson: Go ahead.

Mr. Clark: And for the benefit of the Council, Walton Construction Company is headquartered in Kansas City, MO with six divisional offices around the country, one of them being Shreveport, Dallas, New Orleans, Springfield, St. Louis, and Kansas City. This year, they're projected to be about a \$720,000,000 a year company, so they're substantially large company. Within that company, the founder Greg Walton who founded it 20 years ago has successfully grown that company by using a very successful diversity program. And in that diversity program, and I've got a copy of that, I'll be glad to give that to you- - -

Councilman Jackson: We never saw it, so maybe we don't really need it after the fact

. _ -

Mr. Clark: But what I wanted to share with you that in this program, there are certain, in the body of the program about community outreach, how we're obligated to run our business, divisions, and when I took over the interim role of this thing about 90 days ago when Mr. McCrocklin resigned, and just yesterday, for your information, Ken, I don't know if I told you this, Mayor, that title "Interim" was taken off so, I got that permanent now. But my obligation was to look internally and to see where are we not providing the diversity that we need to be providing as a corporate citizen and as a community partner. Now one of the things in this - - - in our diversity program that as a company, that we try to do is improve our long term businesses by affecting individual business growth and within our surrounding community to establish new relationships and bring that perspective into our business leader. Basically, we try to provide and grow the local minority businesses to create that capacity in order to keep up with our growth. And to that end, we looked at our contractors within the Convention Center Hotel, and we discovered that we had one in Atlanta that was part of the MBE Fair Share addition that we turned in. We had the same capacity of a local minority Fair Share Certified, and we said, why are we shipping this out of the market? We should be bringing that money, keeping that money local - - -

Councilman Jackson: Did you say you had the same capacity?

Mr. Clark: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: So, the company that you hired, if we were to do an analysis, you are suggesting it's the exact same size and capacity as the company that you replaced, or did you replace them with a smaller business, or do you even know?

Mr. Clark: No, let me clarify that. The capacity may be - - -

Councilman Jackson: You mean the scope of work could be done by another company as well? Not capacity. You use the term capacity, and I wanted to be sure we're talking about the same thing.

Mr. Clark: I think your definition of capacity, correct me if I'm wrong, is the size of the company?

Councilman Jackson: And the ability of work that that company can do. Capacity.

Mr. Clark: Okay.

Councilman Jackson: Now, I think you're talking specifically about scope of work in a particular project. Is that correct?

Mr. Clark: Yes sir, I'm talking about building the capacity in the local market.

Councilman Jackson: No, no not the building capacity, because if you talk about building capacity in the local market, we're on a whole nuther subject. Because that would suggest that somehow or another, you all possessed an ability to build the capacity, and you're exercising that ability by using a smaller company which is going to take longer to build a capacity in the market. When you start talking about building capacity of the market,

if you ever matched large with large, you automatically have exponentially larger capacity. But when you start talking about whether or not we're going to take a small company and grown them to the level of an existing company, you know that that takes time, that takes effort, and that in fact is a process that happens over time. And so when you talk about building capacity in the lower market, I'm assuming you mean building capacity in smaller businesses so that they can become larger businesses and not just increasing the capacity in the market.

Mr. Clark: No, the latter part is what our diversity program is all about. Is to take that small business, grow it into a larger business and grow it into a larger business so that it can handle additional capacity in the market. And that's what we found with the local contractor that we have here that we substituted with the out of market contractor. We worked with this other contractor more.

Councilman Jackson: So, you cancelled it - - - I'm trying to get to the bottom line, which is (inaudible) you cancelled the contract because this was an out of market contract, yes or no?

Mr. Clark: The geography was logistically out of the market.

Councilman Jackson: Out of the market, that was a driving factor, yes or no?

Mr. Clark: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee, do we have a program in our Fair Share where we ask people as they register for Fair Share if they are out of town, and then inform them that if they are out of town, they may be because of our geographical preference program that obviously you all created since the last Council Meeting, that because of our geographical preferences program, that's probably now I guess a part of our Fair Share that they may in fact, not be treated the same because they are not in town? Or can they apply for Fair Share, and they are never told that you may be pre-empted because of a local business?

Mr. Antee: There is nothing that has a geographical preference or (inaudible) we can use local people, we'd much rather use local people, than out of town people to help grow the local market. Although there's nothing written.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask, is that why - - -

Mr. Antee: The Fair Share Program is open to anybody.

Councilman Jackson: But is that why when we look at our Convention Center, the largest thing we've ever built in our city municipal assets, we use Yates from Jackson, Mississippi, when we built this convention center hotel, we used Walton from Kansas City? I think we look - - - typically I was thinking we would look for what's the best deal for No. 1, the City; but also not to discriminate against people based on their geography.

Mr. Antee: No, on those two projects, we're required by law to go with the low bidder that complies with the public bid law, and that's what we did on both of those. And on both of those projects, with Yates, there were six bidders, none were local. And on the hotel, there were two bidders, Yates being one, and Walton being the other. But by law, we had to go with the low bidder.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask you Mr. Clark. So, the City was informed. Is there a precedent in this particular project of what happened in this scenario? In other words, you looked throughout your philosophy and your policy after the project is started. It said there is something in our philosophy and project that doesn't fit. And we've cancelled another business. Is there any other business that you can point to that you've cancelled during this process for convenience?

Mr. Clark: I'm sure there is, but I can't name one of them off the top of my head.

Councilman Jackson: Can you find one and bring it to the next meeting?

Mr. Clark: I'll try to discover that.

Councilman Jackson: But you can't think of one off the top of your head?

Mr. Clark: I think the spirit of the whole thing Councilman Jackson was No. 1, the spirit of Fair Share participation. If what the Fair Share spirit is all about is promote local businesses and help them grow. Also it was the spirit of our diversity program in a community outreach effort to help grow those local businesses as our partners.

Councilman Jackson: So, if that's the case, then take Mr. - - - there was a gentleman who is from New Orleans, who had a business in New Orleans, who is one of the major contractors too, did you see that in that project?

Mr. Clark: I'm not sure if I follow you.

Councilman Jackson: It's (inaudible) reinforcement who is a minority business.

Mr. Clark: Larry McCorkel? Councilman Jackson: Uh hmm.

Mr. Clark: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: And is he in fact from his business from New Orleans?

Mr. Clark: I think that's where his base was and he got diverted up here after the hurricane?

Councilman Jackson: Right, but this project in fact happened before he moved here from the hurricane. He'd done business - - - in other words Mr. McCorkel suggested that you all had done business with this guy before and he had a reputation of doing good work, and so you have done business with him before, and he's from New Orleans. He specifically said to me that he's not from here, but he does good work. Is that correct?

Mr. Clark: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: I guess my other concern is, is it a practice, a standard practice to have a contract in place, working on a project, and still looking to see, cause the Mayor told me that it was because they were local, and because this group was less - - - the cost - - to save money. And I'm assuming the logistical circumstances would also inure to the benefit of Walton Construction, thus saving some money at the bottom line. But whenever they submitted to us, they submitted the exact same numbers of the project from March, April, May, June, and it wasn't until July 18th that the name was replaced on our sheets that we receive from the Fair Share office, and they tell us every Council Meeting, what has already been spent and if I'm not mistaken, if you look at your total budget, 45.6% of your money has already been spent. But when it comes to the Fair Share portion which nobody really knows what the percentage is, we hear a whole lot of different stories, but nobody really knows. You look at what the line share of the minority business contracting dollars have not been expended probably 65-70% of that hasn't been expended, and on that sheet, every month they say this was the company's name, they're going to spend this much, they're going to do carpentry. So at this meeting, they give us the sheet that replaces this company's name with the exact same dollar amount and say they're going to do rough carpentry. So, it wasn't the less money, it was the local. Because the Mayor said to me, it was less money and local. And I was concerned because here's what I'm having to suggest, because maybe Mr. Clark you can explain this to me, because I may be as wrong as two left shoes. But I'm thinking that if I had \$50,000,000, and I go out and say Mr. Clark I want you to build something for me for \$50,000,000. You go out and bid it and you contract with

people to do it, that whenever you sign contracts with folks to do it, that you have language in the contracts to say that if you don't perform, I guess we can cancel for whatever, even for convenience. But we've got all of these contractors lined up to do work. I would like to believe that if I'm one of those contractors, that you're not still looking for a lower price than what I've already given you. And that you're not still looking for other people to replace me while I am preparing to do the work, even if I have mobilized, or if I'm preparing to do the work. I'd like to have confidence that I'm doing business with somebody, that when they sign this contract with me, that they're not looking for anybody local, they're not looking for anybody less, because I gave them - - - I went out and did the work, I gave them the best bid I could possibly give them. They looked me in the eye and said this is a good deal, we should cancel, we thought we had a deal. But In the process we change horses in the middle of the stream or whatever the correct analogy may be, we make a U turn. My question is, is that your practice of doing business? Because if we're doing business at the city, then maybe Mr. Antee or the Mayor could speak to it. I would think that if we have something on the books, and we say we're going to do business, whether or not whoever the company may be, that those folks don't have to go to bed at night worrying whether or not the city is looking for a lower price and whether or not the city is looking for somebody who lives closer to downtown. And who is going to get the deal. I would think that if we have a deal, we've got a deal. Is that a common practice?

Mr. Clark: No sir. 99.9% of the time, those contracts are just what they are. Councilman Jackson: 99.9% of the time. So, we're dealing with the .1%? Mr. Clark: In this particular case, it was purely convenience, it was purely logistical -

Councilman Jackson: But this would be the .1%?

Mr. Clark: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: That probably gets me closer to my answer because that would put it outside of the norm and it would take something very extreme and extraordinary to trigger that and to make that happen. But that's getting closer to where I want to be. So, you weren't shopping with an active contract in place?

Mr. Clark: No sir.

Councilman Jackson: How did you know that the other business could do it for the same amount of money? Was that a bid that they had already turned in and you went back and looked at the bids from subcontractors and say they gave us the same amount, lets go with them? Or how would you know that they in fact could give you the same work for the same money?

Mr. Clark: Well, I wasn't involved in the negotiation part of that, but most of this with the one that we'd substituted, we'd worked with him before, we know his quality of work and he pretty much said he could assume the scope of work.

Councilman Jackson: And he said 'I can come in under budget.' So, you told him what the budget was?

Mr. Clark: He already knew what the contract was. He basically assumed the contract.

Councilman Jackson: So, he knew what the contract already was, the cost of the contract, and the scope of work, and somebody called him in? I'm assuming he wasn't continuing to call your office because I assume that if he had a contract, he'd think I

- -

wouldn't have to call because I've got some work. Should he as a Fair Share client right now feel confident that in August, we won't have another person to replace him?

Mr. Clark: Right.

Councilman Jackson: And would you ever do the same kind of scenario with a majority/minority business, for example. If you had a local business who was out of town and you had a minority business that was in town, have you ever had a circumstance or a precedence where you replaced a majority with a minority? Lets just say in this project.

Mr. Clark: I can't answer that question, because I don't know. I've only been on - - - Councilman Jackson: What confidence can the Fair Share client have right now? Because that's the person whose interest I'm concerned about right now.

Mr. Clark: If he's a Fair Share client and like I said, and our whole goal is to create that community outreach locally in the spirit of Fair Share, they're in it for the remainder of the project.

Councilman Jackson: So, do you recognize then why a minority business should have some concern based on the "M. O." of Walton Construction Company in this process right now, that I'm lifting up? If they came to talk to me, they would think that - - -

Mr. Clark: I would have to debate that because all the things that we're doing in this market to create the outreach, we created a construction basis class for minority contractors and small businesses. And had it set up with the Chamber of Commerce. It's never been done before. Tremendous participation, tremendous response, and because of our creating the program, the Chamber has adopted it as an ongoing program. So, we feel that we're providing value to the community in promoting our diversity, and our commitment to the minority Fair Share Program.

Councilman Jackson: Well, you know like I do that value doesn't always mean money. And I guess my question is you said to me that in your order of doing business, and the way you do business, that you in fact do not shop for contracts when you've got an active contract in place, 99.9% of the time, but .1% of the time, you did?

Mr. Clark: In this particular case, where it was the Fair Share spirit to comply with the spirit of Fair Share, we did, yes.

Councilman Jackson: And so you felt like you were outside of the spirit of Fair Share when you had the minority business was utilized in the beginning?

Mr. Clark: When we had a Fair Share certified potential here locally to fulfill, yes we did.

Councilman Jackson: And you just discovered after the contract was in place, or did you know that whenever the contract was negotiated in the beginning? Or this was you commenting, this is your initiative since you came on board to replace contractors who were there with other contractors?

Mr. Clark: I was trying to comply with our diversity program. Trying to reach out into the community and do our Fair Share commitment to our local community.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee, do you know if our Fair Share language that's on our website and everything else says that we are looking to promote local minority businesses or does it talk to minority businesses in general?

Mr. Antee: I think it talks in general, but there's definitely in the spirit of Fair Share where we want to look local first and foremost.

Councilman Jackson: do we do business with minority business out of town where there are currently businesses that exist in the city?

Mr. Antee: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: So we do. So we're not - - - in other words, it would not have been unprecedented in this contracted to do what Mr. Clark said he undid?

Mr. Antee: No, it would not be unprecedented.

Councilman Jackson: So, there are cases that happens in the city?

Mr. Antee: I'm sorry, I was speaking with - - -

Councilman Jackson: So there are cases in the city?

Mr. Antee: Cases of what?

Councilman Jackson: Where there are minorities who live outside of the boundaries of the City of Shreveport, who do business in the City of Shreveport, where there are businesses within the boundaries of Shreveport, who could do that business?

Mr. Antee: Yes, there are those cases. But that's up to the contractor once the contract's let, our requirement to them is to maintain the Fair Share Ordinance. Who they pick within their subcontractors is up to the General Contractor. We don't get into that, as long as they're meeting the Fair Share Ordinance.

Councilman Jackson: Gotcha.

Mr. Antee: And in this case, they replaced a minority with a minority, so we allowed it.

Councilman Jackson: (inaudible) suspect that they would do that, because that's the little game part. But that's neither here nor there. What I'd like to know is do you all, can you all submit to this Council a copy of all your subcontracts? And I'd like to know the contract that the subcontractors have with other people as well. In other words, if a subcontractor has subcontracts, if he or she could supply those contracts to us as well?

Mr. Clark: On minority participation?

Councilman Jackson: On all of them, but particularly minorities, but I'd like to see all of them. Could you do that?

Mr. Clark: I'll see what we can compile. You may have to haul it in here with a truck.

Councilman Jackson: Well, go to the back door, that'll be fine. And what I'd like to do is see those particular - - - I tell you what you could do Mr. Clark, if you could concentrate on the Fair Share folks or the minority business or whatever flavor of the month or whatever the name is, if you could concentrate on this group first, that phantom 21%. That group.

Mr. Clark: I think you have that already. There's the list already.

Councilman Jackson: Who the subcontractors are doing business with?

Mr. Clark: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: I haven't seen it, so if we do have it, I haven't seen it. So, I've got a list of - - - let me tell you what I do have since we're pointing this out. I've got a list right here of all the money we spend with Walton Construction. The AI8 document G702, and then behind that, there's a G703, and on that list – on this G703s, they've got all of the work that's being done, but it doesn't say who it's being done with. All the money that's going to be spent, all the material that is being purchased and what it's going to be used for. It doesn't say who the businesses are. Okay? So, if you look at any particular sheet, you may see a VE item, you may see MECHANICAL, you may see GENERAL REQUIREMENTS, SITE WORK, CONCRETE, and it spells out all those particular areas, but it never says whose doing what per se. Because one of the things that I'm concerned

about is so often we like to say we're doing business with certain subcontractors who turn around and do business with majority companies because they can't do the work, but we get the credit, and so it's like a rooster taking credit for the sun coming up in the morning. And just because they happen to be there. And so what I'm trying to suggest is that if it's going to be real, then what I'd like to do is see those subcontracts, and try to see if we can through those subcontracts make some sense of what's really going on in this picture. Can you take care of that for us?

Mr. Clark: I will. I'd like to point out to you that what our current status is today of the current moment. We've got per cent participation projected is at 20.36% which is probably a conservative number, and to date is 8% participation. And let me explain that 8%. It's because we've gone 12 floors vertically up in the air with specialized concrete, and that 8% of that participation was involved in that. So the remainder of the building is a lot of finish out work, where the remainder of the participation will be involved in.

Councilman Jackson: Small dollar items?

Mr. Clark: Mechanical, electrical, drywall, painting, there's a significant amount of work.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah to be done, but not by these companies who happen to be minorities. Said masonry and stone, you got some people. You got some electrical equipment, not electrical work. You got soil treatment, fire protection, toilet accessories, concrete reinforcement which is already being done. Concrete finishing which has to be done, you've got carpentry, and you've got cleanup and a sign rental. And so, all of those things you named about none of those things are listed.

Mr. Clark: (Inaudible) the 8% to date and the 20 ½ % where we projected is what's left to do.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, so the 13% is finishing the whole project. But you've got 45.6% of the money spent. So, certainly if you do the math, and you look at the numbers, the other 54.4% of that money could not be captured in 13% of a minority contracts. That's only 21.9% of the entire contract. So, to some degree it's (inaudible) to say that was left is all there. Because if you look at what's spent which is 45.6%, minus that retainage that we have which is a small percentage, then that 54.4% does not. That's a \$34,000,000 project. So that's over \$17,000,000, the minority piece of this whole project is if I do my math right, that's just under \$7,000,000. So of that over \$17,000,000 that's left, it's disingenuous to suggest that somehow or another that \$7,000,000 is going to be the balance of this project, when there is still another if my math is right \$18 or 19,000,000 out there yet to be spent. Am I way off on that?

Mr. Clark: Well, we've spent \$2.6 (million) already, and the total is \$6.8 (million) so that remainder is - - -

Councilman Jackson: \$4,000,000. Mr. Clark: The other percentage.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, but not the remainder of the project. Not the remainder of the money you're going to spend on the project. Specifically it's going to be for the most part soil treatment, fire protection, toilet accessories, concrete finishing, the carpentry, and the final cleaning for the most part. Would you say that's correct?

Mr. Clark: And that brings us to roughly 20 ½ % Fair Share participation.

Councilman Jackson: 20 1/2?

Mr. Clark: 20 1/2.

Councilman Jackson: And you suspect that'll be your final number?

Mr. Clark: No, I think that's low.

Councilman Jackson: Well that's low compared to the contract number, I know it's low.

Mr. Clark: 21% is just ½ % off of what the contract is.

Councilman Jackson: Right, and so, we're pretty sure that we're going to get there, and certainly I hate to say by hook or crook, but based on what's here to date, you're suggesting that you're going to get there?

Mr. Clark: We're doing everything we can Councilman.

Councilman Jackson: Are you aware that in your 21.2% that the Administration has listed that some of it is asterisks, somewhere over I'd say around nearly \$700,000 of that percentage, which would be 10% of that 21%, that there is an asterisk by that \$700,000 that suggest to me according to what they're saying, and maybe Mr. Antee or his office can tell you, but it seems to me that the asterisks say Tru Bond is Fair Share Certified, but is not a Minority Business Enterprise. That's \$650,000. And then the other group that they've got \$30,000 for say we have no verification or clarification. They're on this list but we have no idea who they are.

Mr. Clark: We provided that to Mr. Gilliam. We'll have to clear that up with him.

Mr. Antee: I can explain that Councilman Jackson. Tru Bond is Fair Share certified, which is the Fair Share program, and the \$29,800 on Sterling Janitorial, it's my understanding that they're still in the process of verifying what the exact certification is. And once we have that verification from Karen in that office, then that amount will - - - it just hadn't been verified.

Councilman Jackson: Well, that'll help, then so be it. It's just so confusing to me, and I guess it's oxymoronic that the Chamber came first, and then the Convention Center came first, the Convention Center gave us these new brochures, and somebody I guess in the Administration's idea, I looked at billboards on I-20 say all of us, the Convention Center is open now, call folks and get 'em to come to Shreveport. Call people and tell them to come to Shreveport. Be recruiters. I guess that means that they're not trying to make money. It only means that they're trying to spend money. But it would seem to me that we can't have it both ways. That to me it seems to be a bad business practice that 99.9% of the time you do not do, but at the .1% of the time, which happens also to be the largest minority participant in this project. And a company with capacity which I certainly had hopes would be able to do what you did or what your company did. To come to Shreveport and make a difference to be able to grow and be a larger size. Not a company that was from Shreveport that grew to this large size which is a great story in and of itself. To hire people from Shreveport and make sure you're a person whose from Shreveport that your company has come in and (inaudible), and the whole idea is to be able to do the same kind of scenario. We can go inch by inch and it'll take us 40 years to get to where we are, or we could do other things that are more innovative than that, that can give a shot to economic development in our community, but it takes courage and the truth of the matter is, it's my - - - I'm of the opinion that it's no accident that this happened. And that this happened by design and not by convenience. And - - - but you know that's neither here nor there. The idea though is what message does this send? I'm not sure anybody even cares what message it sends, because it may send a greater message, but the message that it sends to the greater community is that in this project, there is no precedence for this happening with any other company. We take this minority business

who is in this project and we juggle them around because obviously they're certainly expendable. So we find somebody else, and we do this. We play this game with these companies. I really think that's a poor sign of the practice of doing business in the City of Shreveport, whether it's Walton Construction, the Administration whoever is involved in the process. The Administration was aware of what was going on, didn't see that it was necessary to tell the Councilmen what was going on. I had to find out from the company to send me some information. The same Administration that when we needed the hotel, to be passed made sure we were in on every detail, because we've got to get this thing done. And as a person who is a part of trying to make sure we can get this thing done, this same Administration who knows everything that's going on all of a sudden didn't know anything. Today I find out they knew everything from the beginning. So, I'm not - - - it has nothing to do with Walton Construction Company. Mr. Clark, thank you for coming, and you can have a seat. I appreciate you being here. But my comment is that this sets a sad precedence for us in doing business in our city that we began to say to people that - - - because if we were serious about local folks, they should have been in there in the beginning. The same people didn't just move to Shreveport. These local businesses have been here. I think if we're going to help local businesses, that we're going to get them involved, we have to do this. And I just believe that this Administration, this Council ought to have a problem when this kind of thing happens. If it had been somebody else, if I had come today and said to this Administration and to this Council, well we've got contracts out there, lets just switch them around. Lets do some things, and we can kinda change because this would be better for the citizens and others, then if it were the wrong contracts, people would have a problem with that. And I just think that we as a Council and as an Administration set a bad reputation for the City. Sometime we don't even care what happens outside of our circle, we just care about what we think in our own little circle. And maybe that's the way we'll be. But I just hope that this doesn't set a precedent for how e do down the road, and how people lie and don't keep their word and do different things, and bait and switch in this whole process. I think it's negative. I'm probably sure this won't be the last time it happens. I hope it would be, but maybe it won't be the last time it happens and it doesn't matter if it's a minority business or a majority business. This isn't even about what color the business is. This is about a standard of practice of doing business that's wrong, it stinks, and everything about it stinks. And I want you to know that I hope that this does not become a precedent that we've set that we follow beyond this point. If we learn from this mistake, I hope that's great, but I really am disappointed that we would play this game in this fashion. But things happen and I realize that. Thank you Mr. Clark for representing Walton Construction, and answering my question and thank you to my colleagues and Mr. Chairman for indulging me in this conversation.

Property Standards Report

Councilman Hogan: I have one new thing Mr. Bowie if you don't mind. If you can get our pin ready, I had a report about some high grass that needs to be cut in the front and the rear of 90422 Kingston Road in my district if in the next few days you could take care of that, I would appreciate it.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Bowie, yesterday we talked at length about a situation that I was hoping that you could provide me with an update on kinda of where we are and hopefully having citing that property and generated a notice to the property owner?

Mr. Bowie: Yes sir, we did. An inspector went out and cited the property owner for the violation and put it in the system.

Councilman Carmody: It was a nuisance and was in violation?

Mr. Bowie: Yes.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and just for those neighbors who had contacted me about it, once the property owner is served with a notice, then he has to bring the property into compliance, he's given how long a time frame to do that?

Mr. Bowie: The whole process takes between 30 and 45 days.

Councilman Carmody: Okay and since yesterday we talked about the fact that this same property owner basically has total disregard for maintaining the property, and has a number of outstanding tax liens. Excuse me, not tax liens, but code enforcement liens I guess against the - - - how then do we pursue recouping that money? Have we turned it over to the City Attorney's office and ask them to try to start legal process to seek that money or it's just a lien that's placed against the property?

Mr. Bowie: This lien is placed against the property and I guess you would have to ask Finance and Ms. Washington how they seek the retribution. Because that's who we turn it over to for collection.

Councilman Carmody: Oh, you do? Okay it goes to Finance. Okay, just wanted to make sure that at least the public understands that when a property owner does not mind his business and the citizens of the City of Shreveport taxpayers have to mind it for them, that they don't get off Scott free?

Mr. Bowie: No.

Councilman Carmody: And that indeed they are subject not only to the cost for us to go out there, and have the property cleaned up, but also new hire administrative cost, correct?

Mr. Bowie: Correct.

Councilman Carmody: So, it might be in their best interest to mind their business to keep us from having to mind it for them?

Mr. Bowie: That's exactly right.

Councilwoman Robertson: I just was wondering if you were able to get the glitch for the - - -did you talk to anybody about my addresses?

Mr. Bowie: No, I haven't.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Bowie, those ones on Prospect that I had put in on the 12th, did you find anything on those?

Mr. Bowie: Yes sir, I have a list for you. I'll give it to you after the meeting.

Public Hearing: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments, Adding Legislation to the Agenda, and Public Comments.

Confirmations and/or Appointments: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda

1. **Resolution No. 123 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to accept the donation of a 16' Aluminum Boat and 40 HP Outboard Motor, listed in Appendix

"A" from Reeves Marine Center in Bossier Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

2. <u>Ordinance No. 108 of 2006</u>: An Ordinance authorizing the lease of city-owned property to the Salvation Army and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to add Resolution No. 123 of 2006, and Ordinance No. 108 of 2006 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

Public Comments (Agenda Items to be Adopted)

Mr. Tom Arceneaux: (828 E. Kings Hwy) I sent each of you a letter requesting that you postpone Ordinance No. 69 which is a Zoning Appeal, Case C-16-06. I understand that because of Mr. Lester's illness today, that all the matters in his district are to be continued until the 8th of August. We have requested the 22nd, but out of respect for Councilman Lester, we certainly agree for the postponement for just two weeks. We'll come back and ask for the further postponement for the reasons explained in my letter. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them, but thank you very much.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, a public apology to you Mr. Arceneaux. In the busy and hectic life that we sometimes all lead, I think that I might have given you the wrong impression as to my attendance to today's meeting.

Mr. Arceneaux: I'm certainly glad to see you Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: And I'm glad to be here Mr. Arceneaux. Thank you.

Mr. J. Whitney Pesnell: (400 Travis Street) Perhaps I filed my slip in error. I just wanted to be able to speak when the Council was going to address the postponement of the matters for Mr. Lester's district. So, if I have created a glitch or a problem, I apologize for that.

Councilman Hogan: No sir. I think everything's fine. I understand it'll be postponed today.

Mr. Pesnell: Yes sir, we had a matter from Mr. Lester's district, that was scheduled for hearing today. And that was the only purpose of my dropping a slip. So, if I've raised this at the wrong point of the agenda, I'm sorry.

Councilman Hogan: No, you're fine.

Mr. John Petty: 162 Tharpe Lane, Sibley, LA) And I'm just here representing ADT Security, and I would just like to ask for a postponement on the amendment vote, so that maybe both sides of the party could maybe get together and work out some issues, and - - -

Councilman Hogan: Excuse me, you said for the amendment vote? Did you mean for the Alarm Ordinance?

Mr. Petty: Yes sir. And that's all I have to say.

Councilwoman Robertson: If I could Mr. Petty, what is your reasoning for wanting it to be postponed? Because they haven't had any quarterly meetings is my understanding with the Police Department and with the Alarm Companies that are on it.

Mr. Petty: I think there's one the 31st of July. And we would just kinda like to hear both sides together on that, and maybe work out some issues on it.

Councilwoman Robertson: What issues specifically are you trying to - - -

Mr. Petty: Well, what's being imposed is as far as like the \$100 fine, and we really, the alarm industry, the alarm companies here in Shreveport, have had not input on it. It was from what I understand, it was just put into place without our say so, or our input on it. And I think we would just like to maybe put our two cents in, and come up with an agreement.

Councilwoman Robertson: And you do realize that the ordinance has been in affect for a while, this is just amending some changes after the six month period that it's already been in affect?

Mr. Petty: Yes ma'am.

Councilman Walford: I guess that maybe I didn't hear the answer that I think Ms. Robertson was asking for. What specific objections do you have?

Mr. Petty: I think as far as having the citizens respond within a 50 miles radius cause I do live outside the city, but I am the first responder, say for our office. So, I feel like - - - say our alarm goes off at our ADT office. I'm the first responder which I live 50 miles outside the city, so I'm trying to hustle to my - - - to the business to get there within my 50 minute time frame. So we don't get penalized the \$100 fine and I feel that I'm just - - - it's kinda - - - I'm putting myself - - - I would be putting myself in danger just trying to get there within that timeframe.

Councilman Walford: Okay, well let me ask you this then. Are you suggesting that Chief Campbell should make sure that he has the manpower available to put a policeman there and take him off the streets protecting other citizens while he sits and waits for you?

Mr. Petty: Well, I question that too because I'm wondering if that police officer is going to wait 50 minutes to get to that location. Is somebody going to wait there to see if I get there within that 50 minutes before I get fined \$100 or not, or are they - - - I don't really understand how it's going to work. Cause I'm coming all the way from Minden trying to get to South Shreveport in time so I don't get a fine, or my company does not get a fine. And I'm just - - - I mean - - -.

Councilman Walford: So who should be - - -? I guess I'm not getting where we're going? Who should be responsible, you or the police? How long should a policeman have to wait for you. Now remember he's being taken off the street, away from other calls. How long do you consider it reasonable - - -

Mr. Petty: Is he going to sit there 50 minutes?

Councilman Walford: I'm not going to address how the police are going to handle that part. I'm addressing what the ordinance says. Are you suggesting that - - -give me a time. How long should a policeman sit there?

Mr. Petty: I'm not suggesting anything. I just think maybe both sides should talk and have input from both sides, because I mean I don't know the answer. But I think maybe a lot of the citizens of the town are maybe going to be put in jeopardy by trying to get a certain place by a certain timeframe, because they can't afford the \$100 fine. Now I'm going to agree with the maybe the false alarm fine, that they may get if it is a false alarm. But to penalize them because they can't get to a certain place within a certain timeframe, I just don't agree with.

Councilman Walford: Alright, let me ask you this. Have you been at the quarterly meetings?

Mr. Petty: No sir, I haven't

Councilman Walford: Wait a minute. So, you don't think this is fair to do it now, but you haven't been there representing your company to have any input. Does your company have someone there?

Mr. Petty: Yes, they have. My supervisor has been there. He couldn't make it today, so I felt like I needed to step up and - - -

Councilman Walford: So, did they have input?

Mr. Petty: Yeah, I'm sure he did. I mean I can't answer that if I wasn't there.

Mr. Don Simmons: (2002 Line Ave) I'm here today to request a postponement on the vote for the amendment to the ordinance, till we can have our next quarterly meeting. We've had one meeting and this was not discussed in any detail. It wasn't an eminent thing until after the meeting, and the Police Department has scheduled the next quarterly meeting which is after this on the 31st of July. So we would like to have some input to them before y'all make your decision. There was a serious incident that happened this month in this town regarding a response to an alarm system by the individual business owner who opted not to have the police respond due to the false alarm fine. And it ended up in the person being murdered.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, lets clarify that. I've questioned whether there was a murder in that case.

Mr. Simmons: Well, the guy is dead. I'll rephrase that, the guy is dead.

Councilman Walford: That's much more accurate. But let me ask you while you're here. How do the amendments that we have here, how would they impact that?

Mr. Simmons: The key holder response is my biggest concern. Putting the citizen in danger of having to respond to alarm, when I feel it should be the Police Department.

Councilman Walford: Okay, well let me ask you this. The police department responds and there's a problem, you don't think the key holder should have to go. The police should stay there. Is that what I'm understanding?

Mr. Simmons: No, that's not what you're understanding.

Councilman Walford: Well, tell me again then.

Mr. Simmons: Well, what I understand by reading this thing and what will happen is the key holder or the owner can respond and be there before the police.

Councilman Walford: But that's not what - - -

Mr. Simmons: If there is an alarm, what's going to happen, if there is an actual occurrence?

Councilman Walford: Well, either the owner should respond or they shouldn't respond. They've got 50 minutes after the officer arrives at the scene.

Mr. Simmons: How are they going to know when the officer arrives? When does the 50 minutes start?

Councilman Walford: Well, I would hope that your company would let them know.

Mr. Simmons: We don't know, and if we call to find out, we get fined \$100 for making the phone call.

Councilman Walford: I don't know where that is in the ordinance or where you're getting that.

Mr. Simmons: The Police Department sent me a memo stating that email. Stating that if I called to ask for a disposition on an alarm, I get fined \$100. I don't feel that's right, do you?

Councilman Walford: I'm not going there. So - - -

Mr. Simmons: Why not?

Councilman Walford: I'm still confused - - -

Mr. Simmons: Why not? Why not?

Councilman Walford: Because I'd want to read the ordinance and see what you're talking about. But lets go back to the unfortunate incident earlier this month. The individual opted not to have the police respond, so how is what we've got here is going to - - - what is the relationship between the two?

Mr. Simmons: The fine schedule might have caused him - - - kept him from opting to send the police?

Councilman Walford: Might have, but you don't know that. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Sam McGowan: (3929 St Vincent) I'm not a Mister, I'm a Miss.

Councilman Hogan: Excuse me, I've never met a lady named Sam until today. Thank you.

Ms. McGowan: That's okay. Thank you. First I'd like to state for me to respond to an alarm puts me in what I believe is a dangerous situation. There could be a person that has broken into my house. My home has been robbed once already. Last night on the news, a police officer confirmed how dangerous it is for me to respond to my alarm by telling me to park down the block and wait for the officers to respond. In my neighborhood, shots are heard all the time, and in fact, my neighbor's house last week was shot. I believe the amount of gangs and drugs, drug dealers and sex offenders in my neighborhood, that parking down the block and waiting for the police to show up or guess if they have already been to my home is not, is more dangerous than going to my home during an alarm. Also, I am disabled and on a fixed income. To have to pay \$100 fine for not making it to my home in 50 minutes would be devastating to my budget. I have many doctors appointments, but I have set up six weeks or more in advance. If I have to leave the doctors office for an alarm, I have to wait six more weeks to see them. With my medical problems that would be unacceptable. I'm asking the City Council to think about how dangerous this really is, and to vote no to these changes, and also remove me from having to go to my house on alarms and to remove the fines that I would face, if I failed to go. The \$100, the police would receive is not worth placing us in danger. I thank you for your consideration of this issue and for your time.

Councilman Carmody: Ms. McGowan, I appreciate your thoughts. I go back to this, because this is really the only experience I've had with it, and in the past in another career, as a manager of a business, we contracted to have our security system monitored. But whenever the alarm would go off, and it would normally be in the wee hours of the morning, and it was not in the most desirable area of Shreveport, they had contracted with the security provider with a private security company that would be the first responder and therefore, there would be a layer between myself as a manager. Again, I don't want to show up at the business I'm working for, and get killed trying to find out whether or not somebody's armed inside that business. But that's security company would show up and determine whether or not the police needed to be dispatched. Somewhere along the way it appears that the security company has gotten away from doing that, and allowed the Shreveport Police Department to respond to every alarm. What the consultant had come back to the City and the City leaders to say was that an inordinate amount of time was being taken away from the Shreveport Police Department's manpower by responding to false alarms. Where in the past, those private security companies would show up and they'd determine that either that something had set off a motion detector or that the weather had caused a power surge, and that it was

basically a false alarm, but it was not a need to dispatch the police and call them to the location. I don't know at what point we got away from doing that, but I appreciate what you're saying. I don't think that if I've got a notification that there was an alarm at my house, that I would want to proceed there first without having a police officer being there. But if there were a private security system that my security company were providing that would go there first, I would feel a lot more comfortable about approaching my residence, once they'd determined, no it doesn't appear that you've got anybody or that it does appear that there is a forced entry into this house, we've already contacted the police, just stay back. That's my observation. I know - - - I'm not asking you for a response, but I'm not sure at what point we got away from doing that. But it did appear that at that point, we eliminated the private security companies and the Shreveport Police Department then picked up the immediate response to any alarm. The consultant having reviewed the amount of time that the department was spending and responding to false alarm, had asked the Council to consider doing something, and that's what we're talking about doing today here is again amending this ordinance to make sure that persons have their security systems in proper working order so that we don't have police officers being called off to go to a situation where there is a false alarm. Granted, you don't know if it's a false alarm. I mean and you take a risk, I guess, if you say 'look, I'm having problems with my security system, don't dispatch the police, I'm going out there myself,' and then either in the rush to get to your home or your business, you're involved in an accident, God forbid, that's a tragedy. Or you show up at your home or business, and there's a perpetrator in there that's armed and uses lethal force against you, that's another tragedy. But I think what we're talking about up here and what this Council's tried to work for is to make sure that our police officer's time on their shift are maximized and tried to protect the citizens of the City of Shreveport and not waiting at a location and responding to basically a false alarm then being pulled away from their duties.

Ms. McGowan: I understand that. But my concern as a citizen, I have an alarm system in my home. My alarm system is in good working order. My home has been broken into once before. Okay? The thing about is what really concerns me, if somebody has broken into my home again, and I'm unable to get there, how am I going to know the police have been there? Are they going to wait for me? Or, leave me a note? I don't think so. I do understand that the police officers have their own duties to take care of and to be pulled off for a false alarm. The majority of the alarm companies in Shreveport don't have security guards to go to those homes and/or businesses.

Councilman Carmody: That's my understanding as well.

Ms. McGowan: It is, and - - -

Councilman Carmody: That was my point. I didn't know when they got away from doing that service. I don't know that, and again, I'm not familiar with whether the rates dropped and they eliminated that overhead, but again, that's part of their business, not mine.

Ms. McGowan: Unless you hire a private security firm to come in and do that.

Councilman Carmody: I don't even know if that's still an option.

Ms. McGowan: For the companies that services my alarm, no it's not.

Councilman Carmody: Or for the independent subscriber. Yeah if you would have the ability to contact them again, I think Vincent Security provides some services for the City of Shreveport, so I'm assuming that they're still in business, and I would think that they were actually the ones that I'd seen in the past and years ago. So, And maybe that is something

that the security companies do offer, is that if you don't feel comfortable doing it, you can actually hire additional private security to do your response for you, I don't know.

Ms. McGowan: I can understand that, but there are small businesses that come out before to have those other security companies available to go out to individual homes, and/or businesses. And that is a problem, and continues to be a problem. And my concern is for people like myself who cannot afford that \$100 fine, or the other false alarm fines. That puts us in a very uncomfortable position. And as a citizen, I want to know that if something does happen, if someone does break into my home, that I don't lose my life or I have to kill someone because a police officer hasn't shown up at my home or he's doing something else across town, and he can't get there, well then I will have committed a murder or somebody be shot or myself be shot, or injured, that is a large concern for me. And with these fines, the ordinance, you know - - - I've read the ordinance. I'm very familiar with it, that's why I'm here. I also know too, that the majority of the alarm companies are against the ordinance because the changes are not being there and/or will not be made because the police department is not willing to comply or work with - - - just like last night, watching the news, a police officer was stating the fact that we're supposed to park down the street. In my neighborhood, you can't do that.

Councilman Carmody: I did not see the broadcast that you had seen, but - - - Ms. McGowan: It was on Channel 3 News last evening.

Councilman Carmody: But I'm assuming that what you're saying is that the officer was counseling anybody that had become aware that there was an alarm at their residence or business, that they should not respond and drive directly to that property but they should wait down the street until a police officer approaches so that they can verify that there is not somebody there. I want to make sure that I clarify that, that's my understanding of what you're relating.

Ms. McGowan: I understand that. But in my neighborhood, you cannot do that. You can't just park down the block and wait for the police to get there, because you don't know how long that police officer is going to have before you respond to your place of business and your home because of other incidents he's taking care of across town or couple of blocks away or a fire or something other than that.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. What I was going to do is, I think you brought up a number of interesting questions, I think that we'll ask the Police Department to address when you get to that point of the agenda.

Councilman Walford: Yes Ma'am. Can I ask you the same question? Who should respond if you shouldn't ever have to come take the risk, do we just leave a policeman there indefinitely? That's the question I can't seem to get anybody to address with me.

Ms. McGowan: Well, there has to be a shared responsibility between the public and the police officers. It should be a shared responsibility, not left to the business owner and/or the citizen, but for the police officers to work hand in had with us. And not be one sided to where the police officers are having to stay there and take care of the situation, when they have another call which could be more life threatening to another citizen or business owner. They're not going to stop and leave a note and say, 'well I was here.'

Councilman Walford: Okay, if you read the proposed amendment, the only thing it changes is saying from a reasonable time to 50 minutes after the officer arrives.

Ms. McGowan: What would you consider to be a reasonable amount of time?

Councilman Walford: I think 50 minutes is more than and adequate time to make it from any place in the Shreveport-Bossier Metropolitan area to anyplace else.

Ms. McGowan: Not if you've got an accident. Not if you have - - -

Councilman Walford: I'm not going to argue, but that's the only change.

Ms. McGowan: Well, I honestly think that the Shreveport Police Department needs to work with the public as well and (inaudible) private citizens and their business, and I honestly don't feel like that's happening.

Mr. Mark Serbanic: (845 Natchez) I own Brown Security Systems, and I serve on the Board of Directors of Louisiana Life Safety and Security Association. I came here to ask the Council to postpone this amendment till we have time to visit with the Police Department at their next scheduled quarterly meeting. I've attended all the meetings, they've only had one quarterly meeting since we put this together. Of course I've been at several of the Council Meetings here before, and we went through some of these amendments to 116, since we already had an ordinance on the books which seem to be ineffective at the time. I have visited with you Councilman Walford, and I have invited Shreveport Police Department to Lafayette to look at some of our model ordinances that we have throughout the state. But this most recent change, and I think I shared with you Councilman Carmody, is that we felt like because the way the ordinance was set up, that there probably would be some changes. Of course, now we're facing some of these changes now, and we feel like there may be some other changes in there. We haven't had an opportunity to really go in detail on some of the other issues that we feel like are there with this ordinance. But at this time, we feel like the response issue for the citizens really needs to be looked at a little closer. I think you make comments about there used to be security companies. My family owned Southern Research years ago, of course, we did have patrol response. Bayou Security was another one, Vincent. All of these have gone to the past. They don't exist anymore, and I think if you did any research right now, you would find it very difficult to find any type of private response that would perhaps buffer Shreveport Police. My personal feelings are, is that Shreveport Police should be first response as they do now. Of course, they do have other priorities and delays at times. But we feel like putting any type of time limit on response from a private citizen could put them in jeopardy, just getting to the scene, once they get to the scene, there's a police officer there, or not there. There seems to be an issue of communication where the central stations cannot talk directly with Shreveport Dispatch. I don't think that's a good thing, since we used to give them these type dispositions in conveying it to our customers. I think the time limit may be appropriate if there is an unsecured business or residence and that person is needed there. That perhaps a time limit to get them there would be appropriate only at that moment. But I kinda like the ordinance originally. It was kinda open ended that they would respond, but with no time restraints on it. There's a \$100 penalty. I think if we'd done our research, I think that the City of Shreveport has the most exorbitant fining system in the state, and we've got examples of that. But that's other issues that we'd like to - - - we'd like to postpone this, have our quarterly meeting with the Police Department, maybe re-visit some of these issues, and perhaps, I'd have time to talk to some of you Councilmen on a oneto-one basis on some of the concerns we do have, so.

Councilwoman Robertson: My first question is where - - - you mentioned about there is no first response between the alarm companies and the police dispatch. Where are you getting that information?

Mr. Serbanic: I work very closely with Jeanne Adams, Cpl Adams and I. She's like a liaison and works with, is the Administrator of this ordinance. My company in fact, we contract our monitoring services out of U of L Central Station in Lafayette, Acadian on Watch, and a very reputable firm there. We were reprimanded that our dispatchers that we contract down there had tried to get a disposition. Of course, Shreveport is the only ordinance in the whole state that does that, so we're in the learning curve trying to get these people used to doing it the Shreveport way. But we were reprimanded that we could be fined \$100 for even trying to get t disposition on a residence or a business that their alarm has bone off. Disposition meaning is it secure? Has the police been there? You know, the general information that we're accustomed to giving in most locations. So, that's where I got that.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Serbanic, mine is not a question for you, but it is actually for the Police Department, and it's not that they need to come answer it now, but in the case where a citizen calls in a request for an officer to respond to, and again not an alarm, but to a situation, does the police department require that somebody be there to meet that police officer? So when we get to the point to discuss it, cause I would think that if you saw something across the street from your house, they you God forbid, wouldn't want to step out there to meet a police officer, if you thought something might be going on. But that you have the right to call for an officer to come out and investigate what appears to be a suspicious incident. So, that was my question. Thank you Madam Chair.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Serbanic, I have here a copy of an advertisement that was placed in the Shreveport Times yesterday.

Mr. Serbanic: I barely got my hands on that myself. Councilman Walford: So are you familiar with it?

Mr. Serbanic: I am now.

Councilman Walford: Do you know who wrote it?

Mr. Serbanic: All I know is the Board of Directors with the Louisiana Life Safety Association approved that advertisement to be put in the paper. So, I think there were some corrections to be added to that.

Councilman Walford: Really? Mr. Serbanic: Yeah, uh ha.

Councilman Walford: That certainly doesn't come as a surprise. So, you're asking us to postpone and to then deal with you in good faith after something like this was put in the newspaper? This is the most misleading piece of advertising I've seen in a long, long time. And I would ask you if your association has a Code of Ethics?

Mr. Serbanic: Code of Ethics?

Councilman Walford: Yes, do you have ethical standards?

Mr. Serbanic: We do, but - - -

Councilman Walford: How do you justify what you did here, if you have ethics?

Mr. Serbanic: Councilman Walford, we have tried to work with Council. I was here when I think one of my constituents was asked to leave the Council. It was very embarrassing to me that day. Also we were committed to have a committee formed on this which was never done. We haven't had an ear. We go to these meetings. We've had one with the Police Department, and they tell us how the cow eats the cabbage. Now I've been in business almost 30 years representing Shreveport. I was involved in writing the first Shreveport Alarm Ordinance. I've got a little history here, and we've got a lot of experience throughout the state and nation.

Councilman Walford: But you're avoiding my - - - you're changing the subject on me. Tell me about the 74 year old man that was shot and killed by the 19 year old intruder this month.

Mr. Serbanic: Mr. Walford, I've read that advertisement just like you did and - - - Councilman Walford: Well, who wrote it?

Mr. Serbanic: It was approved by the Council. If you'd like to discuss it one on one, I'd be glad to come by and talk to you.

Councilman Walford: I think we ought to put it on the record because the public has now seen it, and it's certainly misleading the public about our proposed amendment.

Mr. Serbanic: As far as I know, that was to be corrected by the Shreveport Times. As I was notified about it, that it did not follow what was sent to the Shreveport Times at all, and they should have recounted that. But if it was just the reverse, I think the 74 year old man did shoot a 19 year old in his business. I've talked to them about it.

Councilman Walford: Well I know that, but that's not what this ad says. And it appears to be it was intended to inflamed the public.

Mr. Serbanic: Well, I don't think it's an ethics issue (inaudible).

Councilman Walford: Where in our amendment does it lead to identity theft?

Mr. Serbanic: I'm not sure it does.

Councilman Walford: But this says that it does. It says it right here. Identity theft.

Mr. Serbanic: Would you read it, I hadn't looked - - -

Councilman Walford: Well, it just says that upcoming - - - it refers to identity theft is one of the fastest growing crimes today. Alarm companies maintain confidential information on their customers, social security numbers, drivers license numbers, and credit card numbers. An upcoming amendment will allow police department representatives to remove copies of paperwork from alarm companies. Please help protect your identity by asking your Councilman to vote no to this amendment. Do you know what the actual amendment refers to? A copy of the license of the business, not anything to do with customer credit card numbers or anything else. Again, I think this was really disgusting by a supposedly reputable organization. But it's not the first thing that's happened. There has been some letter go out with some very erroneous information by someone who represents himself to be on your board.

Mr. Serbainc: Well, I'm not aware of that.

Councilman Walford: Well, we are, because we've had - - -

Councilwoman Robertson: The calls.

Councilman Walford: The calls based on your erroneous information.

Mr. Serbanic: Erroneous? Okay.

Councilman Walford: Absolutely erroneous and false information. Yes. Misleading just like this was. But you can't tell me who wrote this? The board approved it, but it didn't

Mr .Serbanic: I'll find out.

Councilman Walford: It didn't just jump up and I can't criticize the local newspaper, because they don't compose ads, the ads are given to them to be run. But I noticed there's no correction in today's newspaper to show what - - -

Mr. Serbanic: There should have been a good one in the paper today as I was told.

Councilman Walford: I went through the newspaper very carefully, and there was no correction. So, I hope everyone that's watching those, that most of what's in this ad is very misleading. So, I'm very disappointed in what I saw. I can't believe the tactics that your

organization who is supposedly is out for the safety and security of the state would stoop to this. I mean it's pretty low. And you can sit there and smile, but I don't find anything humorous about it. But you're asking us to work in good faith with you when you all do this?

Mr. Serbanic: Councilman Walford, I would ask that you postpone this until we can visit with the Police Department at the next meeting.

Councilman Walford: And this was introduced more than two weeks ago, and my phone is answered 24 hours, and you haven't called me to discuss it at any way. And I was the author (inaudible)

Mr. Serbanic: (Inaudible) and I've never gotten a reply. I'm sorry I should have called (inaudible) most of my experiences have not been very good. So, I chose not to call.

Councilman Walford: Well, I was the author of that, the amendment, I introduced it, and I'd be glad to talk to you.

Mr. Serbanic: But this is one that we feel like needs to be looked at strongly.

Councilman Walford: But the elements of this are so minor. In other words, we should not go with an amendment that says that we will take a copy, the police will take a copy of your license and not an original. That's all one of the amendments is. The other merely changes reasonable time to 50 minutes. It doesn't set any more fines, or anything else. I don't understand what the big issue is.

Mr. Serbanic: We felt like that the public should not respond. We fell like that needs to be re-done.

Councilman Walford: And so I ask the question again, who - - -

Mr. Serbanic: The Shreveport Police Department should respond to alarms, that's my opinion.

Councilman Walford: Okay, they respond on Friday night at 11:00. Should the business owner wait until Monday morning at 8:00 and Chief Campbell keep an officer there all that time? What is a reasonable time? Why is 50 minutes after the officer arrives - - -?

Mr. Serbanic: Well, this is something we've never set down and been able to discuss with anyone. I'm not sure what a reasonable time is. I'd like the open ended method. If the customer is not needed there, why should they respond? If he's needed there and requested by a police officer, then give them a time limit to get there. If there's extenuating circumstances, let them notify us and say there'll be an ETA change and it's going to exceed one hour.

Councilman Walford: Is there a point - - -?

Mr. Serbanic: Where did they come up with 50 minutes? (Inaudible), you know? Councilman Walford: Because that will - - -

Mr. Serbanic: That's what I'm saying. This discussion needs to be held in some form of committee that's two sided at least. But I mean we were invited to this meeting, and a lot of the companies there, I was there, I make it a purpose of being there. This is my livelihood. This is what I do. I was there. But it felt like that because we're in the Police Chambers, it was a one-sided meeting. There was no comments from the industry. Of course as I go out and talk to my constituents in the industry, they seem to have a lot of problems with this ordinance. And the exorbitant fines system is one of them. It's the highest in the whole state. It's outrageous. And we feel like there's some impact. We feel like - - - and in working with Jeanne, and Cpl Adams is a wonderful person, we work very closely together, candidly with each other, you know? I think that's the appropriate way to

work with the Police Department. But we feel like looking at the statistics you gave me a copy today that just came out. Yes, there is some progress being made, but we don't know if people are just not calling the police anymore. You know, don't call the police, I don't want to get a fine. Well, that's not the way to do it. People need their alarm system, they need the police to respond to them. And we need to reduce false alarms. It's a problem. And we've shown example after example. We don't need exorbitant fines to do that. We invited the police when they came to Lafayette and went to our symposium, along with a lot of other police departments throughout the state, and we spent a whole day showing them. We brought people from out of state that had been working all over the country doing these types of programs.

Councilman Walford: One last comment, and it's more of a comment, but you may pass it to your association that while you may not want to talk to me, I am very please with all but one of the local companies. There is only one who has done everything but cooperate. The others, I commend Interface, I commend Guardian, and the others, they have been great to deal with. We've had good communications. I am just really pleased to see how they have worked to follow the ordinance and helped to reduce the false alarms. There's one that I won't name, but perhaps by exclusion, folks will figure out who it is. It's not yours - - -.

Mr. Serbanic: Well, I hope that we can get along.

Councilwoman Robertson: I have a question. You mentioned when you were talking that y'all would like to have the opportunities as well as the companies to get for this quarterly meeting and it was also stated just how this came out of a meeting, and then trying to tweak if you will, the ordinance we already have. If we were to pass this today, there's nothing to object y'all going to this meeting on the 31st and maybe coming up with some other ideas or some other things that may need to be done with it and with that being also making a change to the ordinance, do you see a problem with that?

Mr. Serbanic: Well, it's an ongoing process, and we were hoping the originally to be able to take care of a lot of these issues with some of our ordinances that we have. Of course, the Police Department did adopt some of the issues and provisions in these ordinances like two-call verification. We still have a problem in dispatch with two-call verification. If you don't know what two-call verification is, is that the central station makes two calls now to key holder in the event they can't reach someone on the first call before they call the Police Department. Sometimes that clears up a false dispatch before it ever was in the making. Second thing, great revelation was that when we started with the Police Department, we didn't have a committee, but we were talking to CPT Floyd, and over at uniform division, you know that Shreveport Police had a no cancellation alarm response for years. Boy that ran the numbers up, that meant we couldn't even call in and cancel the dispatch before the police got there because we're going because we got the first call, and we're not canceling. We don't know how that affected the numbers as far as running up the false alarm numbers. So, I mean, there's a lot of issues like that, that come to light in these conversations, if we can have candid discussions, and find out how the police is working, find out how we can help them, and introduce some of these issues. But to keep coming back to the Council - - - they want to change this, they don't get our inputs, you know we are getting kinda frustrated like that.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Serbanic, I thought I heard you say a few minutes ago, that you were acknowledging some of the information in this article that came out of the paper was incorrect?

Mr. Serbanic: Yes.

Councilman Hogan: Well, I have a suggestion. Would you accept responsibility for that and make sure that a correction gets made? If so, I would be willing to make a motion for a postponement. I cannot guarantee you, that I'll have a second, or that I can get it passed.

Mr. Serbanic: Yes sir, we will take that responsibility, and we do want the Shreveport Times to recount and correct any errors that are in that (inaudible). And Councilman Walford, I'll contact you and lets go over that in detail. I was as shocked as you were.

Councilman Hogan: Well, when it comes time, when we come down on the agenda for that time, I'll make the motion for the postponement, in order for you to have the meeting on Monday. And I have to agree with you that I've not heard an explanation yet for the 50 minutes. I would like to hear that as well myself. This might be the perfect time, but I wonder if they took it from another city's maybe Lafayette ordinance, or from where? I've not heard that. I had a conversation with Cpl Adams about that.

Mr. Serbanic: And she's very open, she and I get along. In fact we're sitting together.

Councilman Hogan: Right, and she's done a fine job.

Mr. Serbanic: She's done a very good job.

Councilman Hogan: She's been very open and willing. I've been to only one of the meetings myself, I wasn't able to make the other meeting. But I'm willing to do that for you to try to reach a solution when the time comes on the agenda.

Mr. Serbanic: And honestly, we feel remiss, if we see issues come up in this ordinance, of course it affects us directly as an industry that we don't bring these to the Council's attention. If we have a problem with them, if we can't get an ear with the Police Department, since we don't have a committee that kinda brings everything together. This is what we did back in the '80s when we did our first ordinance, we had a committee and I was hoping the Councilmen were going to do this. In fact, I think we were promised that this would be done, and it just didn't happen for whatever reason. So, we're here where we are now. But the Committee was a cross section of the community, the police department, because it takes everybody involved to get a working ordinance, because our association is very much in favor of anything that will incentivize the responsible use of alarm systems. Because we all know as business owners, homeowners in this day and age, if you've got anything of significant value, you need an alarm system to survive in this day. I hate to say it. But we are opposed to anything that would disincentivize the use of alarm systems. And we feel like these exorbitant fines are doing that. We just can't get our hands on the data to do that. Of course Jeanne and I have been looking at some different things that will kinda reveal this to us. But if this ordinance is in any disincentivizes people using their alarm system, I'll certainly be back to the Council to address you about that.

Councilman Carmody: One last suggestion Mr. Serbanic, you might want to do with your colleagues in your industry to see if y'all have documentation as to what your subscriber numbers have been since the implementation of the ordinance and provide that during this next meeting for the Police Department to take a look at.

Mr. Serbanic: Those are very difficult wandering numbers for us to get because you have competitors and out-of-staters and all that to get accurate data. Of course in some of our model ordinances, we want it registrations or permitting systems for the city. I

recommended that back in the '80s. We have no idea how many alarm systems are in use. And part of this thing is in this amendment to this ordinance right now is to clarify who is responsible for that alarm system. Permit and registration does that. It also provides you with statistical data. Now that was in some of our model ordinances was not even considered here in the City of Shreveport. That is being done in a lot of metropolitan areas very successfully. It gathers the information that you need. It clearly earmarks who the responsible parties are who are being fined. It also, if you charge a fee for permits creates a revenue stream to support the alarm administration at the Police Department. It creates a lot of different things. Softwares have already been developed and have been presented to the Police Department to use in these ordinances. So there's a lot of things that we can offer, and help the Police Department with if you just had an ear.

Councilman Carmody: I would also - - - make an observation that at one time, and again, I go back to my comment to this young lady. There used to be a lot of ambulance companies in Shreveport. There are very few now. And the City of Shreveport and it's Fire and Police Department have taken over the EMS. Okay? And so when you say, now maybe the Police Department should set up monitoring the calls on the - - - be careful where you go. Because the next thing you know is that the City says 'well, I mean if we're doing all this leg work and we're monitoring the systems, we should be doing it directly.' And then next thing you know all of us have our water bill - - - our alarm fee is included on it.

Mr. Serbanic: That has been attempted in some areas.

Councilman Carmody: I know, and I just warn you. Government has a tendency to creep in my observation, so thank you.

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 ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE OR WHICH REQUIRE ONLY ONE READING

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the first one is No. 100, and I believe Councilman Lester has requested that we postpone.

1. **Resolution No. 100 of 2006**: Authorizing the release of mortgages and cancellation of promissory notes executed by Shreveport Publishing Corporation (now Snap Property, LLC) in favor of the City of Shreveport in connection with the neighborhood improvement leveraging project and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*Postpone-July 11, 2006*)

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Jackson</u> to postpone until August 8, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford,

Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 109 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT A DONATION INTER VIVOS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO BY: Councilman Robertson

WHEREAS, the University Terrace Neighborhood Association, desires to give, grant, convey, donate, assign, set over and deliver unto the City of Shreveport \$3,500 for purposes of sidewalk replacement within the limits of the University Terrace Neighborhood Association, said limits being Youree Drive on the east, Sand Beach Bayou on the west, 70th Street on the north and Bert Kouns Industrial Loop on the south; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to accept this donation inter vivos.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, be and is hereby authorized to accept the donation inter vivos from the University Terrace Neighborhood Association.

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, be and is hereby authorized and empowered to execute a Donation Inter Vivos, substantially in accordance with the document filed along with the original copy of this resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council on June 19, 2006, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

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 <u>Robertson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 115 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR BERKELEY DRIVE IN CANNON SUBDIVISION UNIT 4, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the dedication for Berkeley Drive in Section 23, (T17N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown on the plats attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and the same is hereby accepted as dedicated to the public for public use in the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the original plat reflecting the dedication for Berkeley Drive be recorded in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana. 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 ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 116 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE USE OF PIPE AND DRAPE PARTITIONS BY THE 13TH DISTRICT MISSIONARY BAPTIST ASSOCIATION FOR THE LOUISIANA BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN JACKSON

WHEREAS, the 13th District Missionary Baptist Association (the "Association") will host the Louisiana Baptist State Convention in Shreveport at Summer Grove Baptist Church, July 16-21, 2006; and

WHEREAS, the estimated attendance of delegates and visitors to the convention is in excess of 1,500 people; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport ("City") will derive a significant economic benefit from the convention; and

WHEREAS, a number of the events during the convention are open to the general public and the convention and its related activities provide a benefit to the public; and

WHEREAS, the Association has requested use of pipe and drape partitions during the convention and City desires to provide use of the partitions for the event for a public purpose. NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that the use of pipe and drape partitions by the 13th District Missionary Baptist Association for the Louisiana Baptist State Convention is hereby ratified.

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, 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 <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Robertson</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

RESOLUTION 118 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE CHANGE ORDER NO. 3 TO THE CONTRACT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONVENTION CENTER HOTEL AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO BY:

WHEREAS, Section 3 of Ordinance No. 166 of 2005, the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget, states that the Mayor is not authorized to execute contracts or other legal instruments to expend the funds appropriated for the Convention Center Hotel project without first obtaining the City Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor desires to have the authority to execute Change Order Number Three to the contract with Walton Construction Company for the construction of the Convention Center Hotel.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in legal session convened, that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to execute said Change Order Number Three on behalf of the City.

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 to be 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 <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt.

Councilman Carmody: I appreciate the inclusion of the summary on today's agenda so that we could take a look at this information. Again, I think we have it in a hard copy from yesterday, but it certainly helps to see exactly what we're doing. And what I'm going to ask at this point, is there was a list of the information that I had requested from SMG, and Mr. Carrier provided it to us regarding some outstanding issues. Will that be coming in another change order shortly? He had asked about the installation about a second drive-in ramp, loading dock, build out an office space adjacent to hotel entrance. Build out of the employee locker room support area. Additional security fencing in various areas. Electrical areas in the garage, etc. Additions to the electrical system distribution, adaptation of space for storage uses, miscellaneous small items.

Mr. Antee: Those are convention center items.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and will they be coming in the form of a change order on the convention center?

Mr. Antee: No.

Councilman Carmody: They will not.

Mr. Antee: No. Those are items that during the construction process, you know we either requested pricing from Yates, and the pricing was so out of line that we opted to wait until Yates was completed, and gone and done, and we'd go and do them as separate items, or we knew going in that Yates was going to give us a price that would be so out of line, that

we just held it, and so we used that, or we called those, you know afterward things. We had a running list and - - -

Councilman Carmody: Okay, I don't want to get my convention center and hotel mixed up. But I'm assuming that we will be addressing some of these needs that SMG's asked for at the convention center, in the near future, before we leave office?

Mr. Antee: Through Council action? No sir.

Councilman Carmody: That will not occur? Could I ask then as we do address these, that these be indicated and verified to the Council in our meetings?

Mr. Antee: Sure.

Councilman Carmody: What's being done? Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilwoman Robertson: Yesterday in our Work Session, Councilman Jackson had asked for Change Orders 1 and 2. Were we able to get those for today?

Mr. Antee: I'm sorry, we did not. We'll get those. That's our fault.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 119 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE BIDS RECEIVED FOR IFB 06-060, SOUTHERN LOOP WETLAND MITIGATION-SOUTHERN HILLS OXIDATION POND # 1 AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO By:

WHEREAS, Four bids were received as a result of solicitations on IFB 06-060 Southern Loop Wetland Mitigation- Southern Hills Oxidation Pond # 1; and

WHEREAS, the City has rejected the bids because the were all over budget; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the bids received on IFB 06-060 be rejected;

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>Robertson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 120 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR FERN LOOP AND FERN CIRCLE IN BROOKMEADE COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal,

and regular session convened, that the dedication for Fern Loop and Fern Circle in Section 19, (T17N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown on the plats attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and the same is hereby accepted as dedicated to the public for public use in the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the original plat reflecting the dedication for Fern Loop and Fern Circle be recorded in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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 ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 121 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR NATALIE STREET IN THE CADDO HEIGHTS UNIT NO. 5 AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the dedication for Natalie Street in Section 13, (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown on the plats attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and the same is hereby accepted as dedicated to the public for public use in the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the original plat reflecting the dedication for Natalie Street be recorded in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana. 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 ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

9. **Resolution No. 122 of 2006**: A resolution declaring the city's interest to certain adjudicated properties as surplus and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone until August 8, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS (Not to be adopted prior to Aug 8, 2006): None.

1. **Resolution No. 123 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to accept the donation of a 16' Aluminum Boat and 40 HP Outboard Motor, listed in Appendix "A" from Reeves Marine Center in Bossier Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>Robertson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to introduce Resolution No. 123 2006 to lay over until August 8, 2006 meeting, 2006 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES (Not to be adopted prior to Aug 8, 2006)

- 1. **Resolution No. 101 of 2006:** An ordinance closing and abandoning a portion of the dedicated drainage easement located in the Montessori School, Subdivision, of Sections 5 and 8 (T17N-R13W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford)
- 2. Ordinance No. 102 of 2006: ZONING C-35-06: An ordinance amending Section 47 (C) of Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
- 3. Ordinance No. 103 of 2006: ZONING C-51-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north side of Greenwood Road, 116 feet west of Hutchinson, Shreveport, Caddo Parish Louisiana, from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-3 Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)
- 4. Ordinance No. 104 of 2006: ZONING C-54-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north side of Albert Avenue, 475 feet west of Youree Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, to SPI-3-e (B-1) Commercial Corridor overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, limited to "Pet Grooming and light Retail," only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)
- 5. Ordinance No. 105 of 2006: ZONING C-56-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Stratford Avenue & Youree Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District limited to a Print Shop and Cellular

- Phone and Sales to SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business District, <u>limited to "Medical Equipment Sales and Service, and Frame Shop only,"</u> and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)
- 6. Ordinance No. 106 of 2006: ZONING C-60-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the east side of Linwood, 221 feet north of West 63rd Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from I-2, Heavy Industrial District, to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green)
- 7. Ordinance No. 107 of 2006: ZONING C-58-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north side of Bert Kouns Industrial Loop, 720 feet west of Mansfield Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-3, Community Business District to B-3-E, Community Business District/Extended Use District limited to "Retail, Office, Warehouse, and Manufacturing" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Hogan)
- 8. **Ordinance No. 108 of 2006**: An Ordinance authorizing the lease of city-owned property to the Salvation Army and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Jackson</u> to introduce Ordinance No(s). 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, and 108 of 2006 to lay over until August 8, 2006 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE (Numbers are assigned Ordinance Numbers)

1. Ordinance No. 79 of 2006: An ordinance amending and re-enacting Chapter 58 of the Code of Ordinances relative to nuisances by adding Section 58-2 relative to offensive odors and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*Postponed – July 11*, 2006)

Having passed first reading on <u>June 27, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to postpone until August 8, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

2. <u>Ordinance No. 82 of 2006</u>: An ordinance authorizing the purchasing agent to dispose of surplus real property and other wise providing with respect thereto. (*Postponed – July 11, 2006*)

Having passed first reading on <u>June 27, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the

following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

3. Ordinance No. 94 of 2006: An ordinance amending and reenacting sections of Chapter 6 of the Code of Ordinances relative to burglary alarms and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> 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.

Substitute Motion by Councilman Hogan to postpone.

Councilman Walford: I'd like my discussion on my motion first.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. Yes, Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: I don't think there's any reason to postpone. These are relatively minor changes that the Police Department feels are necessary. I think that clearly we need to have a time limit set for individuals to respond so that we don't leave our Police Officers off the street. That what we've heard today from the discussion is relative to the fines and other things, and they have nothing to do with this. This clears up removing a copy of the license, and nothing more, it merely says that the Police Department will remove, can remove a copy of the State License, and not an original, and sets the 50 minute time limit instead of a reasonable time, and I don't think that we gain anything by postponing, and frankly, I would be concerned about postponing after the tactic that was used. So, I would urge the Council to enact these minor amendments, and certainly at the quarterly meetings, I'm more than willing to be there and meet with the alarm company.

Councilwoman Robertson: If I could, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Jeanne Adams to come up. Cpl Adams.

Cpl Adams: Good afternoon.

Councilwoman Robertson: I've got a question because it came up a couple of times with different people discussing it, and that they were going to get a \$100 fine if they called and asked about the disposition of the dispatch? Could you maybe give us some information about that.

Cpl Adams: The first thing I'd like to say is it has nothing to do with the minor changes today. What you're talking about is a fine to the alarm company. Jeanne Adams headed to her place of business or residence at 2030 Hollywood can call the police and get whatever information she needs if she headed there. Are the police there? Have they left? And dispatch will tell me as the 'user,' not the alarm company. There's two reason for this. The first reason is the user just like Code Enforcement has their property owner problems with responsible owners, we have the same thing. You know the business is over there, they're laying on the couch, the alarm company calls gets all that information for 'em. We need those property owners to get involved. This way, they can get the information, but the alarm can't.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, so for instance if I - - - the alarm company calls me, gets in touch with me, tells me that they're dispatching out to my home because I've got an alarm. I get stuck in traffic, I can call the Police Department and say I'm trying to

respond. There's a tractor trailer that's V'd in front of me. It's going to take me 10 more minutes. I can give you that information?

Cpl Adams: Yes Ma'am. This is a far better system if you - - - you have to realize most of these monitoring companies are out of state anyway. So, what you're doing is you're relaying from an out of state person, it's better to talk to the user anyway. If you're headed over there, you call the police dispatch, and they'll tell you. And the second reason to that is if that alarm went off, there was a reason for it. So, it was either a criminal act that occurred, which makes it not a false alarm, or an equipment issue. Which if it is an equipment issue, you guys realize, this ordinance states that you fix that equipment. Key pads go bad, sensors go bad, they don't get charged. It's not your fault that the equipment is bad. And the other one which is the main issue, is user error. You know, you didn't give Aunt Grace the new code when you changed it. So, there is a reason why the key holder needs to get involved.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, and something else that came up. If I'm in my home and someone is trying to break into my home, and I have the panic code on my thing, and I hit it. I'm going to be at my residence when the police come. Hopefully, I've gone in a closet or something or whatever, but I don't need to call and let them know that I'm there because the alarm companies got my panic code. So they should have told whoever is dispatching that I'm still in the residence.

Cpl Adams: And the codes for the calls are, it will come out as a panic alarm as opposed to a structure alarm. So the officer will know you hit your panic button.

Councilman Jackson: I think my question was answered. My question dealt with why the key holder involvement? And that kind of situation But I think she's addressed why. Because I didn't see a real significant issue if my alarm company was going to call versus me calling. But I understand where you're coming from with regards to the fact that I think my alarm company is out of town, but the monitoring place may be out of town as well. So, I understand better. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: My first comment is one that I would take from personal experience, and that would be that if I had a panic button that I'd hit, I think that I would actually contact the Police Department, if I were able to do so because even police officers entering a premises after other officers are in identify themselves as police officers entering the premises, so that they do not get mistaken for an intruder. So, when you say that you're in the closet hopefully hiding, I would take your cell phone in there with you and let the police department know where you are inside that structure. Cpl, the other question though that was asked, and I wanted a clarification on this was there was a statement as to an inability for dispatch to talk to who? The gentleman made the statement and I saw your reaction, I didn't know - - - could you elaborate on what he was talking about and clarify that?

Cpl Adams: Are you talking about the alarm company to call in for - - -?

Councilman Carmody: Is that what he was saying, because again, I wanted to make sure that I understood what his point was. That he was saying that their company or whoever was monitoring it could not call dispatch and get the information without having to pay some sort of a fee?

Cpl Adams: Well he was talking about being fined. He's talking about being fined. If the alarm companies violate the ordinance, and that wasn't in the old ordinance, then they could also be fined. They have certain responsibilities, the police department has certain responsibilities and the user has certain responsibilities. And what he's talking about is if the

alarm company calls in to get a disposition on what happened with that alarm, as opposed to the user, the user has no problem. I own the place, I'm headed over there, or calling in to find out what's going on. But the alarm company cannot do that, and that's what he's talking about.

Councilman Carmody: Secondly, when an officer arrives on the scene and responds to a request for service, he acknowledges that back to dispatch that he has arrived. That is timed in so that we know when he has arrived?

Cpl Adams: Yes sir.

Councilman Carmody: Alright, and the example that I used earlier, where it's a non monitored request for service from the Police Department, a neighbor sees the front door of their neighbor's house open. They know that they are not in town, they call the police. The police arrive, the officer says I'm at this address, and I'm looking at the situation, and I'll let you know what's happening. He's not going to wait around until those people return back from their vacation. Tell me what occurs in that scenario. Because I think that's kinda of what we were talking about here is that the amendment is asking for the key holder to respond within a reasonable time. That being defined as 50 minutes in the City of Shreveport. I will tell you that I'm hard pressed not to be able to get where I need to go in the City of Shreveport in 30 minutes at the worst possible times. Now, maybe that's because I've traveled the routes that allow me to get from point A to point B and I'm not speeding where I'm going, I'm just saying that I know that the easiest routes to get there drives my wife crazy. Why are you turning this direction? Well, because I'm going to get us there on time. Okay? But that's one of those questions that I really wanted to ask, was what occurs in that instance where it's a non monitored call, request for service, the officer shows up, does find the structure appears to have been broken into. Tell me what his training or her training is.

Cpl Adams: First of all when you say that, it may not be an alarm issue. We may have a house with an open door, that has no alarm. So the same thing will happen in any circumstance like that, and that is the officer - - - and that's why 50 minutes was chosen. The officers by the time they get on scene, get their back up there, call for a canine, and write a report, it's been at least 50 minutes. Most officers will be there longer than that. The issue that you're talking about, if we cannot - - - we have your water billing information, the City has a lot of access, so dispatch will attempt to locate an owner for that address. And there's a lot of ways to do that. The police computer has a whole lot of information in it. All the reports ever written, if you've called in and made a report about a theft, if you called in and made a report about anything, all that information is logged in. So - - -

Councilman Carmody: So, you exhaust your resources to try to contact the owner of record, but y'all don't find anybody, you can't seem to locate a soul.

Cpl Adams: Then we ask your neighbor for some rope, and we try to tie your door close. We do the best that we can do.

Councilman Carmody: Okay. I just was curious as to how that played out. Thank you Ma'am.

Councilman Walford: I'd like to ask Chief Campbell to give us his opinion on these amendments.

Chief Campbell: Absolutely Councilman Walford. I think that they are basically minor changes just to clarify the ordinance, and these basically came out as I understand the last quarterly meeting that we had. There are several things that I heard here today, that I'm

very concerned about. And one is that there is no 'ear.' I think that in the Council's wisdom, they provided that ear, we had a meeting, these issues were discussed, and these were the results of that. I think that there will be probably be more changes down the road possibly. Because I'm not really against permitting, okay? I'm against the Police Department doing permitting, - - - to create another bureaucracy to track information for who? If all I need is statistics, then I can put that in the ordinance and have them provide that to me. Okay? Or do we create a whole new entity a whole new bureaucracy to monitor this alarm program. The one thing that concerns me that I have heard, and I think we've been very open in sharing information, and I want it to continue to be that way, and to continue team work, because I think it is a problem. We will never address the false alarm issue without the assistance of the alarm owners, and informing the public who uses those alarms in the proper maintenance and use of the same. So, I think we're all in the same ball park. But what I continue to hear, over, and over again, is not much give basically that you should adopt our model alarm ordinance. Well, I have some issues with that, because that's the industry's alarm ordinance. That's what they put together. What we should be interested in is what is best for everybody involved. The alarm industry, the citizens we serve, and the Police Department. You want to just basically talk about the four minor changes that are in there.

Councilman Walford: Do you think that 50 minutes is a reasonable time for anybody to respond after the officer is on the scene? Which means we're taking almost an hour of an officer's time off the street.

Chief Campbell: Yes sir, I do. And if there's a case where something comes up, again, we have an appeal process to deal with that. If there was extenuating circumstances, there is something in the ordinance to deal with that. As a matter of fact, and I think to show our open mindedness, I have a meeting with the President of their organization Monday, after the alarm ordinance. They have some issues with the alarm ordinances, of course again, they want us to adopt their alarm ordinance, and - - -

Councilman Walford: And I've got 35 minutes of that today on the phone, so.

Chief Campbell: And I'm not so sure that somewhere down the road, that we may actually take some of those in, but I think we have a very good alarm ordinance. I think the Council did their due diligence in reviewing that, and passing that. I think as we get into this thing, maybe a year, we have some data that we can build on. Is there room for improvement? Yes, and this is a living document. Perhaps, we don't want to come back every six months and do it, perhaps you might want to collect that for a year and then come back and fix it. I'm not opposed again to the permitting idea. I'm not opposed to actually having a member of the board or the association on the Appeals Board. I mean there's a lot of things I think can be addressed down the road. These are minor changes, these are things that came up. I keep hearing that there is no communication and I just disagree with that. There has been a lot of communication. Now there is a certain portion that's dug in the sand and not going to give, and I don't know if we'll ever please that particular portion. But the feedback I've gotten is people willing to work through this ordinance until we get something that actually, hopefully can be mirrored across the country as an equitable to everyone involved. To include the alarm businesses, to include the citizens of the city, and to include the police departments that are (inaudible) to those (inaudible).

Cpl Adams: And let me tell you guys that when this came into effect in the last six months, at the end of June, we had fined the alarm businesses 25 times. And I will tell you

that the first of those fines were - - - now the industry has known about this problem for more than a decade. The first four fines where they went to somebody's house, tested the alarm, and still dispatched us over there. So, am I going to tell you that the alarm companies are great? Yes, most of them are working with us. We're trying to get everything going. But you know you guys know better than I do. You just can't please everybody. And there's a few of them that if you ask 'em what on these changes they disagree with, they really can't tell you because these are so minor. And inspecting the documents was just to change wording from 'city representatives' so that it couldn't be a member of the water department, the police department representatives. The other one, the '50 minutes,' there was not time. So, I could fine 'em in 10 minutes. But you know we've never had to fine them. Fortunately all of the property owners have done what they were supposed to do. We had never fined anybody for that. But the police just don't want to have to leave a building unsecure, and we haven't had to do that. And that 50 minutes was really to put a constraint on us. The other two changes, one of 'em is the mail out, and that actually gives the alarm company an opportunity to mail it out in seven days, and if they have another avenue, if they can contact them by phone prior to that seven days, they don't have to do the mail out. It was jut to give them some latitude in case they wanted to fax 'em, email 'em, telephone 'em and get a confirmation from them, so they didn't have to mail anything out. So all of these changes are just for clarity. That's all they are. The only other one, the very first one you'll notice on there was to change the verbiage so that like the cable company, so we would hold responsible for overdue fines the person with the contract. The person with the contract with the alarm company. Just like if you owned a house and I rented it from you, the cable company won't come after you, then the city goes after who held the contract. And that's all they are, just minor clarifications.

Councilman Walford: And Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Council to pass these changes for the police department.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Councilman Walford. Cpl Adams or Chief Campbell, do you see a problem with having a postponement until we get to the meeting, and my reason for that still, I believe it would make sense, because there could be obviously some people have shown some interest today, and perhaps there could be other amendments that need to come forward, or there could be changes to some of these amendments. But would there be any problems with having a postponement for two weeks?

Chief Campbell: First off, I would reiterate what Cpl Adams said. This is basically clarification. It's nothing more than that. Some of the other issues that they have, and I think that it was very clear, there wasn't a lot of challenge to what we're offering here today as far as what their concerns were. Their concerns are about the model ordinance and the fines, and permitting, and the appeals process. And all of those things are going to be more of a long term deal. They may not get hammered out. We're certainly open to listening to some of those things. But I'm not so sure that delaying this two weeks would allow for us to come to an agreement on the other issues that are hand. I think these are relatively minor. My recommendation would be to move forward. I think it's been clearly explained by Cpl Adams, and I think it's been clearly defined that it is minor changes, and not really affecting the issues that they want to address, which we're open to. But there has to be some balance on give and take on both sides.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you for your comments. From what I told Mr. Serbanic a few minutes ago, I'm going to offer a substitute motion to postpone, because I said I would.

So there may not be a second, and that's fine. And I'm not going to make a big deal over it. That is my motion. A substitute motion to postpone for two weeks.

Substitute Motion by Councilman <u>Hogan</u> to postpone Ordinance No. 94 of 2006 until August 8, 2006. Motion fails for lack of a second.

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 94 of 2006 approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

4. Ordinance No. 95 of 2006: An ordinance amending the 2006 Budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Robertson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

5. Ordinance No. 96 of 2006: An ordinance authorizing and providing for an encroachment on a portion of the Linwood Avenue right-of-way, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford)

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

6. Ordinance No. 97 of 2006: An ordinance authorizing and providing for an encroachment on a portion of the Jewella Avenue right-of-way, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Hogan)

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Hogan</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

7. Ordinance No. 98 of 2006: An ordinance amending the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Green</u>. The Clerk read the following:

Amendment # 1 to Ordinance No. 98 of 2006

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Change the name of project 05-H001 to Rehab Runway 5/23 and Airfield Guidance Signs Lighting and increase its appropriation by \$513,800. Funding sources are FAA \$465,000, State Grant \$24,400 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$24,400.

Increase the appropriation for Rehabilitate Taxiway B and C at Regional Airport (06H002) by \$1,006,200. Funding sources are FAA \$910,400, State Grant \$47,900 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$47,900.

Change the name of project 06-H009 to Rehabilitate Lighting on Taxiways B, D and E at Regional Airport and increase its appropriation by \$531,900. Funding sources are FAA \$481,300, State Grant \$25,300 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$25,300.

Increase the appropriation for Perimeter Road and Fencing at Regional Airport (06-H010) by \$1,542,800. Funding sources are FAA \$1,395,800, State Grant \$73,500 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$73,500.

In Program I (Fire Improvements):

Decrease the Grand Total - Program I by \$1,400,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

Motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 98 of 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2. *The Clerk read the following:*

Amendment # 2 to Ordinance No. 98 of 2006 AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Downtown Gateways (96C002) by \$1,000,000. Funding source is 1999 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets).

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

Motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt Amendment No. 2 to Ordinance No. 98 of 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

Motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt Ordinance No. 98 of 2006 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

8. Ordinance No. 99 of 2006: An ordinance declaring certain adjudicated properties to be surplus and to authorize the Mayor of the City of Shreveport to sell the City of Shreveport's Tax interest in certain surplus adjudicated properties, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester/D/Robertson/G/Jackson)

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

9. Ordinance No. 100 of 2006: An ordinance amending and reenact Sections of Chapter 50 and Chapter 62 of the Code of Ordinances relative to operation of vehicles on certain property and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on <u>July 11, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Robertson</u> to adopt Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

10. Ordinance No. 69 of 2006: ZONING APPEAL: C-16-06 – An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Hilry Huckaby and Russell Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture District, to R-1H (PUD) Urban, One-Family Residence (planned unit development) District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)(Postponed June 13, 2006 until July 25, 2006)

Having passed first reading on May 23, 2006 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 Robertson to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

11. Ordinance No. 85 of 2006: ZONING APPEAL – C-26-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinances by re-zoning property located on the east side of Russell Road, 1753 feet south of Gain Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture District, R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District, and R-1D Urban, One-Family Residence District to I-2, Heavy Industrial District and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester) (Postponed – July 11, 2006)

Having passed first reading on <u>June 27, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Robertson</u> to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

12. <u>Ordinance No. 90 of 2006</u>: ZONING – C-45-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinances by re-

zoning property located on the west side of Broadway, 100 feet south of Murvon Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, to B-1-E, Buffer/Business Extended Use District, Limited to "A Barber Shop" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green) (Postponed – July 11, 2006)

Having passed first reading on <u>June 27, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Walford</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Robertson</u> to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

13. Ordinance No. 91 of 2006: ZONING – C-46-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinances by rezoning property located on the southeast corner of Jewella and Sumner, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/Jackson) (Postponed – July 11, 2006)

Having passed first reading on <u>June 27, 2006</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilmen Lester, and Green. 2.

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 82 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASING AGENT TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has acquired certain real property; and

WHEREAS, the property listed herein is no longer needed for public purposes and should, therefore, be declared surplus and excess; and,

WHEREAS, Section 26-292 of the Shreveport Code of Ordinances provides that the sale of surplus property shall be by competitive bids after public notice.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the Purchasing Agent be and he is hereby authorized to advertise for bids for the following surplus real property owned by the City of Shreveport:

.387 Acre M/L tract of land, being a portion of lot D, Summer Grove Village, Unit A, Geographical #161404-031-0005-00. City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the City reserves the right to reject any and all bids and waive any informalities.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the above described property is offered on "as is, where is" basis without warranty of title or recourse whatsoever. BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED

that the Mayor is hereby authorized to execute any and all documents necessary to carry out the sale of the above described surplus property.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or 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 application, and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are here by declared severable. BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are herby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 94 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 6 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO BURGLARY ALARMS 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 Sections 6-27 (definition of Alarm User), 6-28(d), 6-29(e), 6-31(a), 6-36(c), of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport are hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows:

Sec. 6-27. Definitions.

* * *

ALARM USER means the person, occupant, firm, partnership, association, corporation, company or organization holding the contract or agreement of any kind with an Alarm Business or being monitored by any entity to dispatch city police to the Alarm Site for alarm activation. Alarm User also means the owner of the real property on which the alarm system is located in the event the alarm system is non-monitored. The term as used in this Article includes both Monitored Alarm Users and Non-Monitored Alarm Users unless otherwise specifically provided.

Sec. 6-28. Licensing required of alarm business.

* * *

(d) Police Department representatives may inspect documentation relating to licensing. However, all information viewed or used shall remain confidential and shall be protected by the department. In accordance with the provisions of state law, including but not limited to, R.S. 44:3A(3), the information is confidential and any other information received by the police department through correspondence or communications with an alarm user or alarm business shall be securely maintained and restricted to inspection only by Police Department representatives. No person shall knowingly or willfully reveal information to any person for any purpose not related to this article or official law enforcement matters. Police Department representatives will not remove any original paperwork, only copies, from the Alarm Businesses, unless the action is being taken under applicable procedures for criminal action.

* * *

Sec. 6-29. Alarm business requirements to alarm user.

* * *

(e) Within seven days after an alarm occurs, the Alarm Business shall mail a written notification to the Alarm User, which shall include the location, date and time of the Alarm, and inform the Alarm User of the fine schedule. This requirement shall not apply if the Alarm Business notified the Alarm User or Keyholder by telephone or other means with confirmation prior to the mail out deadline.

Sec. 6-31. Additional monitored alarm user requirements.

(a) The monitored alarm user shall keep the alarm business informed of current alarm user and keyholder information. The monitored alarm user or a designated keyholder, shall respond to all officer response alarms, as expeditiously as safety permits, but without unnecessary or unreasonable delay. The monitored alarm user shall be subject to the fine provided in Section 6-36(c) if the alarm user or a designated keyholder does not arrive within 50 minutes after police arrive on the scene.

* * *

Sec. 6-36. Fines and penalties.

* * *

(c) Lack of alarm user or keyholder response as required by Section 6-31 (a) is a \$100.00 fine.

* * *

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 affect 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 2006

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006 BUDGET FOR THE POLICE GRANTS SPECIAL REVENUE FUND AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

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

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it desirable to amend the 2006 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, to reflect reduced revenues 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. 175 of 2005, the 2006 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, be amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Fiscal Year 2006 Revenues:

Decrease Cameras against Crime 2006 by \$203,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

From Fiscal Year 2006 Revenues:

In Cameras Against Crime 2006, decrease Improvements and Equipment by \$286,400. Increase Materials and Supplies by \$26,300 and Contractual Services by \$57,100. Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 175 of 2005 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications; and, to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable. BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 96 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND PROVIDING FOR AN ENCROACHMENT ON A PORTION OF THE LINWOOD AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City Engineer's office of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to permit a parking lot to encroach upon the Linwood Avenue right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, this proposed encroachment upon and use of a portion of this right-of-way is not adverse to the public interest of the citizens of the City of Shreveport; and WHEREAS, such disposition by ordinance is authorized by the provisions of Section 2.03 (e) of the Charter of Shreveport, 1978

NOW, THEREFORE, 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 and empowered to grant a certain encroachment with respect to a portion of the Linwood Avenue right-of-way located at the SE corner of Linwood Avenue and Grisby Street intersection as set forth on shown on the plat attached hereto and made a part thereof, unto and in favor of the Fairfield United Methodist Church, and after due notice, publication, and compliance in all respects with the laws applicable thereto, and after the effective date of this ordinance, the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute and deliver, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, an instrument or permit of encroachment, substantially in the form of the document filed along with the original copy of this ordinance in the office of the Clerk of Council of the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Fairfield United Methodist Church file and record a certified copy of the Permit to Encroach 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. 97 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND PROVIDING FOR AN ENCROACHMENT ON A PORTION OF THE JEWELLA AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City Engineer's office of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to permit a parking lot to encroach upon the Jewella Avenue right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, this proposed encroachment upon and use of a portion of this right-of-way is not adverse to the public interest of the citizens of the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, such disposition by ordinance is authorized by the provisions of Section 2.03 (e) of the Charter of Shreveport, 1978

NOW, THEREFORE, 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 and empowered to grant a certain encroachment with respect to a portion of the Jewella Avenue right-of-way located at the NW corner of Jewella Avenue and Standard Oil Road intersection as set forth on shown on the plat attached hereto and made a part thereof, unto and in favor Mr. Harold Sater, and after due notice, publication, and compliance in all respects with the laws applicable thereto, and after the effective date of this ordinance, the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute and deliver, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, an instrument or permit of encroachment, substantially in the form of the document filed along with the original copy of this ordinance in the office of the Clerk of Council of the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Harold Sater file and record a certified copy of the permit to encroach 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. 98 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By:

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget to increase project funding and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 166 of 2005, the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget, be further amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Upgrade ARFF Snozzle (03H004) by \$16,200. Funding sources are Federal Aviation Administration \$11,400, State Grant \$2,400 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$2,400.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 166 of 2005, 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 # 1 to Ordinance No. 98 of 2006,

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Change the name of project 05-H001 to Rehab Runway 5/23 and Airfield Guidance Signs Lighting and increase its appropriation by \$513,800. Funding sources are FAA \$465,000, State Grant \$24,400 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$24,400.

Increase the appropriation for Rehabilitate Taxiway B and C at Regional Airport (06H002) by \$1,006,200. Funding sources are FAA \$910,400, State Grant \$47,900 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$47,900.

Change the name of project 06-H009 to Rehabilitate Lighting on Taxiways B, D and E at Regional Airport and increase its appropriation by \$531,900. Funding sources are FAA \$481,300, State Grant \$25,300 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$25,300.

Increase the appropriation for Perimeter Road and Fencing at Regional Airport (06-H010) by \$1,542,800. Funding sources are FAA \$1,395,800, State Grant \$73,500 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$73,500.

In Program I (Fire Improvements):

Decrease the Grand Total - Program I by \$1,400,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

Amendment # 2 to Ordinance No. 98 of 2006 AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Downtown Gateways (96C002) by \$1,000,000. Funding source is 1999 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets).

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

ORDINANCE NO. 99 OF 2006

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

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has a tax interest in the herein below described properties which have been adjudicated for the non-payment of City property taxes; and WHEREAS, the herein below described properties are not needed for public purposes and should be declared surplus properties; and

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

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

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

<u>Property No. 1</u> Legal Description - 4.046 acres - S. 312.55 Ft. & E. 30 Ft. Of N. 347.13 Ft. Of Lot D, Washington & Mary Solomon Partnership Sec. 18-18-14, less S. 94.31 Ft. Of E

230.94 Ft., less R/W, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 754, Page 342 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#181418-009-0026-00) Municipal Address - 2428 David Raines Rd

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$1,000.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$6,000.00 DISTRICT A

Property No. 2: Legal Description - Lot 20, Block 4, Oakview Subdivision, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 150, Page 279 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#171425-027-0020-00) Municipal Address - 431 E. 78th Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$150.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$600.00 DISTRICT D

Property No. 3: Legal Description - Lot 110, Cooperville Subdivision, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 900, Pages 39-41, of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#181417-052-0110-00) Municipal Address - 1635 Gilliam

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$325.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$2,100.00 DISTRICT A

Property No. 4: Legal Description - Lot 2, Block 8, Magnolia Addition, a subdivision in the City of

Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 50, Page 515, of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#171410-101-0002-00) Municipal Address - 4105 San Jacinto Ave.

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$200.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$600.00 DISTRICT G

<u>Property No. 5:</u> Legal Description - Lot 41, Cooperville Subdivision, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 900, Pages 39-41, of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#181417-052-0041-00) Municipal Address - 2523 Thomas E. Howard Dr.

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$350.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$750.00 DISTRICT A

Property No. 6: Legal Description - 2.11 acres more or less - E. 163.07 Ft. Of W. 489.21 Ft. Of N. 564.3 Ft. Of NE/4 of NW/4, Section 21-17-15 adjacent to Lot 172 of the Greenwood Manor Subdivision, a subdivision, in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 650, Page 489, of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#171521-000-0039-00) Municipal Address - 62185 None

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$1,700.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$1,500.00 DISTRICT G

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

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 100 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 50 AND CHAPTER 62 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN PROPERTY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Carmody

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that:

1. Section 50-2 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby enacted to read as follows:

Sec. 50-2. Operation of Vehicles on Property Adjacent to Red River

- (a) No person shall operate a motorized vehicle or a motorized bicycle on any property adjacent to the Red River except on a paved parking lot or roadway.
- (b) The terms motorized vehicle and motorized bicycle shall have the meanings set forth in Section 90-1.
- (c) This provision shall not apply to the following:
- 1) Law enforcement officers.
- 2) The owner of the property or the officers, agents or employees of the owner.
- 3) To the right of way of Clyde Fant Parkway during the time it is closed to vehicular traffic for any parade or other event.
- 2. Section 62-34 of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended by deleting subsection(k) and the last unnumbered paragraph of that 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 affect 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 2006

BY:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF JEWELLA AND SUMNER, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-2, SUBURBAN, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lots 1, 2, & 28 of the Johnson Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the SE corner of Jewella and Sumner, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be and the same

is hereby changed <u>from, R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District, to B-2,</u> Neighborhood Business District.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any 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.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

- 1. Ordinance No. 93 of 2005: To amend and reenact Section 3.01 of Ordinance No. 96 of 1980 relative to exemptions and exclusions from sales and use taxes and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (Introduced 6/14/05 Tabled on July 12, 2005)
- 2. Ordinance No. 220 of 2005: ZONING APPEAL C-95-05: Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, to rezone property located on the Southwest corner of Cleveland and Jewella Avenues, from R-1D, Urban One-Family Residence District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green) (Introduced –Dec 27, 2005 Tabled January 10, 2006)
- 3. Ordinance No. 70 of 2006: ZONING APPEAL C-18-06 Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the east side of north Hearne, 1540 feet north of Hilry Huckaby Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture District, to R-A-E, Residence-Agriculture/Extended Use District, limited to "a concrete crushing and product storage", only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)(Remanded to MPC June 13, 2006)

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe any of those items will be removed form the table.

Councilman Hogan: I have not heard from anyone. Does any Council Member have anything to be removed?

NEW BUSINESS:

Property Standards Board of Appeals:

Mr. & Mrs. Dana Capers, 4468 Lakeshore Drive, Shreveport, LA: **HBO0600169** (4962 Hollywood Avenue, Shreveport, LA) (Postponed until August 7, 2006)

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:47 p.m.	
//s// Jeffery A. Hogan, Chairman	
//s// Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council	