

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION OF THE
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION
HELD ON THE 5th DAY OF DECEMBER, 2022

The Caddo Parish Commission met in a Work Session, on the above date, at 3:35 p.m., in the Government Chambers, with Mr. Atkins, presiding, and the following members in attendance, constituting a quorum: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Epperson Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (10). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, and Jones (2).

The invocation was given by Mr. Chavez, and Mr. Taliaferro led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

VISITORS

- Redistricting Update by Cedric Floyd, President, Data Center LLC,

Mr. Cedric Floyd, President of Data Center LLC, provided an analysis of the Caddo Parish Commission's Alternate Plan. Mr. Floyd explained that Data Center LLC was requested to provide an analysis of the 2022 Caddo Parish Commission Alternate Plan created by Gary Joiner for Commissioner Atkins and other commissioners. First, the Alternate Plan had a deviation of 9.28%, which complies with the Ten Percent (10%) Deviation Rule. Next, the Alternate Plan was reviewed for compliance with the Voting Rights Act and the U.S. Department of Justice Guidelines for Retrogression and Vote Dilution. Mr. Floyd explained that retrogression under Section Five of the Voting Rights Act. Mr. Floyd read an excerpt of the Federal Register notice from the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division under Section 5 "Benchmark",

"As noted, under Section 5, a jurisdiction's proposed redistricting plan is compared to the "benchmark" plan to determine whether the use of the new plan would result in a retrogressive effect. The "benchmark" against which a new plan is compared is the last legally enforceable redistricting plan in force or effect".

Mr. Floyd read an excerpt of Section 5 *Retrogressive Effect*.

"An analysis of whether the jurisdiction has met its burden of establishing that the proposed plan would not result in a discriminatory or "retrogressive" effect starts with a basic comparison of the benchmark and proposed plans at issue, using updated census data in each".

Mr. Floyd said he presented the benchmark plan, which showed a deviation of 42%, to the Commission in January. He also said that a proposed plan must use the 2020 Census. Mr. Floyd continued to read an excerpt from Section 5 *Retrogressive Effect*,

"A proposed plan is retrogressive under Section 5 if its net effect would be to reduce minority voters' "effective exercise of the electoral franchise" when compared to the benchmark plan."

Mr. Floyd read an excerpt of the U.S. Department of Justice Section 2 Analysis: Discriminatory Result,

"Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act prohibits, among other things, any electoral practice or procedure that minimizes or cancels out the voting strength of members of racial or language minority groups in the voting population. This phenomenon is known as vote dilution."

Mr. Floyd said that Blacks are a protected class in Louisiana. Mr. Floyd pointed out that in order to follow the 10% Rule, District 10 in the Alternate Plan had to remove 1,081 people. Mr. Floyd explained that the 2020 population of District 10 was 21,893 and that the Acceptable District Range over 5% of the district's population is 20,812. He said that the difference between the two population totals is 1,081. Mr. Floyd pointed out that the Alternate Plan Changes show that the total number of people from Precincts Removed is 4,117 people, which consisted of 902 Whites and 3,000 Blacks. He also pointed out that the number of people from Precincts Added is 1,960, which consisted of 1,579 Whites and 164 Blacks. The Net Changes was an increase of 677 Whites and a decrease of 2,836 Blacks in District 10.

Mr. Floyd said that the Alternate Plan removed Precincts 62 and 65 from District 10. He explained that Precinct 62 contained 2,458 people, which consisted of 15.13% White and 80.63% Black; and that Precinct 65 contained 1,659 people, which consisted of 31.95% White and 61.36% Black. Mr. Floyd said that the two Precincts did not need to be removed. Mr. Floyd said that Precincts 75 and 112 were added to District 10 in the Alternate Plan. He explained that Precinct 75 had a population of 1,957 with 80.58% White and 8.33% Black. Mr. Floyd said that three people from Precinct 112 were added to District 10 in the Alternate Plan, two White and one Black, without any justification. Mr. Floyd gave an example of his work for the DeSoto Parish Police Jury while Mr. Gary Joiner worked for the DeSoto Parish School Board. Mr. Floyd explained that for the 11-member Police Jury, he created five majority Black districts, while Mr. Joiner did not for the DeSoto Parish School Board. Mr. Floyd explained that the alternate plan he created did not retrogress, however the U.S. Department of Justice rejected the DeSoto School

Board's redistricting plan. Mr. Floyd read an excerpt from the facsimile from the U.S. Department of Justice to the DeSoto Parish School Board Superintendent and the DeSoto Parish Police Jury President,

"This retrogression was avoidable. Our analysis of the information submitted indicates that the reduction of the Black population percentage in District 9 was not required to comply with the redistricting criteria used by the school district...A proposed change has a discriminatory effect when it will "lead to a retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercises of the electoral franchise...Here the retrogressive effect, as noted above, was easily avoidable. The school board was not compelled to redraw the district, and even if it wished to do so, it was presented with an alternative that met all of its legitimate criteria while maintaining the minority community's electoral ability in District 9, an alternative that the board rejected. Most revealing is the fact that the board has indicated that it sought to devise a redistricting plan resulting in four districts where Black persons were a majority of the population, similar to the benchmark plan implemented in 1994. However, your plan does not take into account the current population of the district according to the 2000 Census as required by the Guidance Concerning Redistricting and Retrogression under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act."

Mr. Floyd said that Commissioner Atkins proposed an alternate plan based on Caddo Parish demographics from 2010 instead of 2020. He said that the alternate plan does not factor in the benchmark of District 10 with the 2020 Census. Mr. Floyd said that he had completed sub-district plans for the Second Circuit Judicial System and the First Judicial District Court. Mr. Floyd concluded that the 2022 Caddo Parish Commission Alternate Plan minimizes the voting strength of Blacks in District 10 based on the 2020 Caddo Parish Commission Current Benchmark Plan and it was avoidable.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know about the protected class in the State of Louisiana and the stipulation was for that. He also wanted to know why that mattered. Mr. Chavez explained that he does not see his self, the Hispanic population, Asians, or Indians in Mr. Floyd's plan. Mr. Floyd responded that Black is a protected class as of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and that the racial polarized voting has been Black and White. Mr. Floyd explained that other races are calculated by subtracting the total White population and the total Black population. Mr. Floyd stated that Hispanic is not a race, because a person could Black Hispanic or White Hispanic. Mr. Jackson commented that the Voting Rights Act was to protect African American votes and expressed that Latinos have not been discriminated against. Mr. Jackson said that recently a specific law was put in place for Asian discrimination. Mr. Jackson also said that there is a constant attempt to diminish the Voting Rights Act policy to resolve historic and institutional discrimination and disenfranchisement. Mr. Jackson asked for clarity on the number of Blacks were moved out of and in to District 10. Mr. Floyd clarified that there were 3,000 Blacks removed from District 10 in the Alternate Plan. Mr. Floyd said that in the last ten years 3,432 Blacks moved in to District 10, 3,826 Whites moved out of District 10 and about four to five Others moved in to the district. Mr. Floyd explained that the alternate plan shows District 10 had moved toward the east of the map. Mr. Jackson predicted that there was an intentional attempt to make District 10 wider. Mr. Floyd agreed with Mr. Jackson. Mr. Floyd explained that the district population needed to be under the +5% Ideal District Size, 1,801, but two Black majority precincts in District 10 were removed and Whites were added purposely. Mr. Johnson requested that Mr. Floyd explain retrogression to the public. Mr. Floyd explained that according to the Section Two of the Voting Rights Act and the U.S. Department of Justice's Section Five analysis, a plan is measured on a baseline, or benchmark, which applies the new census to the current plan; and a plan is retrogressive when a plan falls below the demographics of the baseline, or benchmark. Mr. Floyd further explained that dilution has no baseline and is not retrogression. Mr. Johnson commented that District 10 tried dilution and pointed out that historically Commission Districts were gerrymandered by packing certain people of color into certain districts. Mr. Johnson commented that people move for better conditions, better quality of life based on the assumption that somewhere else is better for them to live. Mrs. Gage-Watts wanted Mr. Floyd to define terms for public knowledge such as gerrymandering, crack and stack, and breaking. Mrs. Gage-Watts said that is important for the Commission to review the numbers, trust what is before them and make the best decisions for the citizens of Caddo Parish. Mr. Chavez commented that his question to Mr. Floyd was to clarify a protected class and that Mr. Jackson was out of line for calling him out.

Mr. Epperson mentioned that in the '50s, Caddo Parish's highway construction and major infrastructure brought many Mexicans and migrant workers. Mr. Epperson explained that the Parish has always been receptive to the people who went to Black segregated schools and lived in Black neighborhoods, invited Mexicans to Black communities for recreation. Mr. Epperson mentioned that when he entered the military in the late '60s, there were issues between the Mexicans and Native Americans, but African Americans always embraced them. Mr. Epperson said that he would want the heart, the will and respect that constituents have for him irrespective to their racial makeup. He expressed embarrassment for where the Parish Commission is today. Mr. Young wanted to know if interracial people were accounted in Mr. Floyd's breakdown and whether the interracial population could be calculated from the difference between the White and Black population. Mr. Floyd said that Mr. Young was correct and explained that he used the category Black for interracial people, and that he did not use the White category. Mr. Jackson commented that the Voting Rights Act speaks to one race and that the Commission is trying break down the context of the Voting Rights Act into different minorities. Mr. Jackson recalled a lawsuit that changed the Parish of Caddo from an at large police jury to an individual commission district, because African Americans in Caddo Parish and the City of Shreveport could not elect representation of their own. Mr. Johnson said that other races fall under minorities or minority race and that mixed race is in everybody.

Mr. Hopkins commented that it is important for the Commission to look at an alternate plan, because there are many feathers that go into one-person-one-vote and the attempt to keep local areas, like Cedar Grove, together. Mr. Hopkins said it is okay to disagree and that the Commission can vote to turn down or approve the plans, or figure something out. Mr. Young commented that he agreed with Mr. Johnson to have competitive districts because it would result in more moderate candidates that way. Mr. Young wanted to know if a compromise is possible between the districts. Mr. Floyd responded that the Caddo Parish School Board Plan in the primary election was competitive and that the Republican proposal is competitive. Mr. Floyd said he was willing to look at the possibility of a plan that is between the goalposts.

Mr. Jackson commented that the last Long-Range Planning Committee received dozens of citizens comments about how the City Council plan moved citizens around with out their knowledge and that the citizens did not have much public comment. Mr. Jackson cautioned the Commission to not follow that same lead. Mr. Floyd said that he received the alternate plan map around November 16th and the alternate plan map is not on the website. Mr. Floyd pointed out that there was a lawsuit in 1986 where Jefferson Parish paid plaintiffs about \$455,000 due to a Section Two voting rights dilution case. Mr. Floyd said that the alternate plan had exposed the Commission to a Section Two voting rights. Mr. Floyd informed the Commission that several parishes had not submitted redistricting plans to the Secretary of State. Mr. Floyd said that the Parish of Caddo's Charter states the deadline to complete redistricting is December 31st. Mr. Chavez agreed with Mr. Young to have a plan that might fit every Commissioner. Mr. Floyd pointed out that the proposed A-1 Plan resembles District 10 in the current map. Mr. Floyd said that he does not create plans that are retrogressive or diluted. He explained that he is open to reviewing District 10, but expressed uncertainty because his time is limited to review everything up to December 8th.

Attorney Frazier explained that the July 11th date with the Secretary of State may refer to the State's deadline to qualify Parish Commission candidates for the Fall Election and that it does not refer to the Caddo Parish Charter's deadline of December 31st. Mr. Floyd said that redistricting plans are submitted four weeks before qualifying.

Mr. Johnson commented that the Parish hired a demographer that knows nothing about Caddo Parish politics or lines. Mr. Johnson recalled during last redistricting there were almost 16 plans because the Commission could not get it right. He explained that Cedar Grove was initially split. Mr. Epperson thanked Mr. Floyd and suggested to let him go and move on. Mr. Jackson reiterated that the alternate plan intentionally moved 3,000 Blacks out of a majority Black district to a district that would make them a minority is racist.

Mr. Floyd concluded the proposed Plan A-1 is in the middle of the road and considered moving either an all-white precinct, all-black precinct or a precinct of equal parts out of District 10. He said that the proposed A-1 Plan meets the middle.

- Master Plan Update

Mr. Clark, MPC Director, explained that the MPC initiated the process with the Long-Range Planning Committee that addresses the fairness and equity of the Master Plan for the unincorporated areas of Caddo Parish. Mr. Clark will provide progress updates in the Long-Range Planning Committee.

ADMINISTRATION REPORT

- National Development Council

Dr. Wilson invited Mr. Sheldon Bartel, from the National Development Council to provide the Commission an update and overview on the status of the Housing Trust Fund and how the Parish of Caddo used ARPA Funds. Mr. Sheldon Bartel introduced his colleague Mrs. Patricia Santa-Cruz and their Leader Raquel Favela, who were also in attendance. Mr. Bartel explained that the NDC was contracted with the Parish of Caddo to complete an affordable housing plan for the Housing Trust Fund which included a market study, locate the need, a plan to address needs and see how the Housing Trust Fund resources could be directed to the priority housing and affordable housing needs across the parish. Mr. Bartel said that there were compliance issues and the NDC had to complete a needs assessment. Mr. Bartel explained that there were previously awarded projects using ARPA dollars which Administration, which the NDC had return to the drawing board and develop a request for proposal (RFP) process to be compliance with real guidelines. The NDC will meet with Parish staff on December 15th to review the received proposals for the distribution of \$2 million and how the funds will be allocated. Mr. Bartel explained that the Louisiana Housing Corporation considered a sub-recipient agreement with Caddo Parish to transfer HOME funds to Caddo Parish which could be invested in a project at 114 Texas Street. The NDC identified that the process was not straightforward and recommended that the Louisiana Housing Corporation adjust their Ordinances or Board decisions and memorandums so that the Parish of Caddo could be an eligible recipient. Mr. Bartel said that the developer of 114 Texas Street responded to the RFP for funding to redevelop the property at 114 Texas Street. Mr. Bartel said that after the awards have been made, the NDC will work with Parish staff to complete the needs assessment parish wide to address affordable housing needs, policies and

procedures for staff to identify federal or state money to meet those needs, and to address policies and procedures to ensure funds are used correctly.

Mr. Jackson harshly objected to Mr. Bartel's statement about the process with the Housing Corporation not being straightforward. Mr. Jackson said that it was determined, based on what was required, that the Parish of Caddo was not sufficiently set up to accept those funds. Mr. Jackson explained that the Louisiana Housing Corporation wants to be partners with the Parish of Caddo on that deal and there was a staffing, capacity and knowledge issue. Mr. Jackson said that the State receives the HOME funds for the Parish of Caddo and that the Parish could receive the HOME funds if the Parish wants to do it.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know what the NDC has to do with the 114 Texas Street property. Mr. Bartel responded that the HOME funds through the Louisiana Housing Corporation were going to be sent to the Parish of Caddo for use on redevelopment of 114 Texas Street, but during the review of the property and ownership it burned down. Mr. Chavez also wanted to know if the Parish will identify another downtown building that could get affordable housing. Mr. Bartel responded that the NDC and Parish staff are working on RFPs for funds to be used to develop affordable housing and that the RFP is still running.

- Juvenile Detention

There are twenty-three juveniles in the Detention Center; four of which are in OJJ. Ten children are 17-year olds There are also eight juveniles in CCC.

- Covid-19 Update

There were two COVID infections in the last few weeks. As of today, there are zero, but one reported COVID infection situation from one of the Parish's agencies.

- November, 2022 Financial Reports

Dr. Wilson provided the Commissioners with a copy of the November 2022 Financial reports.

Dr. Wilson announced that Administration would be at the Shreveport Audi dealership doing Toys for Tots and expressed appreciation for the Employee Council. The Toys for Tots event is on Thursday, December 8, 2022 at 8:30 a.m.

Mr. Atkins clarified the number of pods at the CCC. Dr. Wilson responded that there are 24 pods. Mr. Young wanted to know whether OJJ custody has recommenced. Dr. Wilson responded that that it is tough moving kids in the OJJ system because it is overbook everywhere. Mr. Young wanted to know if the OJJ juveniles would leave. Mr. Clay Walker, Director of Juvenile Services, responded that OJJ wrote a letter that said it was at full capacity with 50 children in queue, but OJJ moved a few juveniles. Mr. Walker does not see moving juveniles as completely shut off, although it is still difficult and still backed up. Mr. Young said that the CCC has space for one juvenile to be detained and wanted to know what the judge's actions would be. Mr. Walker responded that there are a few recommendations to release juveniles with increased supervision, such as with an ankle monitor, to get the juveniles out of detainment. Mr. Walker said that the CCC regularly reaches full capacity and staff works over the weekend to get juveniles out. Mr. Young asked Mr. Walker the reasons that juveniles were detained. Mr. Walker responded that children are always detained for any kind of violence such as a school fight or any serious felony violence. Mr. Young wanted to know if released juveniles were likely accused of violence. Mr. Walker responded that the CCC does a risk assessment. He explained that juveniles assessed at low to slightly moderate risk are released, but juveniles assessed at moderate to high risk and any kind of violence are retained. Mr. Young wanted to know what kind of offenses get released. Mr. Walker responded that the burglary cases are the more serious juveniles that get released. Mr. Walker explained there is concern for public safety for those types of cases, so juveniles receive a GPS ankle monitor to determine that the juvenile is at their house and not running the streets. Mr. Walker said that the ankle monitor has been useful in catching juveniles for committing a crime.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Atkins mentioned that the S&P 500 report stated the Parish of Caddo's bond rating status had dropped one level from AAA to AA+. Mr. Atkins explained that the decreased bond rating was largely due to demographics, the declining population and job market of Caddo Parish. Mr. Atkins expressed disappointment in the lower bond rating but was pleased that the bond rating was not a reflection of the Caddo Parish performance. Mr. Atkins requested that the S&P Analysts be advised that the Parish of Caddo is located on the Red River and not the Mississippi River.

Mr. C. Grant Schlueter, Managing Partner of Foley & Judell, L.L.P. and Bond Attorney for the Parish of Caddo, commented that Mr. Atkins was completely correct and he was aware that the analyst was considering a downgrade. Mr. Schlueter said that the Parish of Caddo was stronger than its prior credit report, which affirmed the AAA bond rating. Mr. Schlueter requested that the analyst reflect the

demographics, 10-year trend on population decline in the credit report, and that Foley & Judell also expressed their displeasure to S&P.

NEW BUSINESS

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Hopkins, *that Ordinance No. 6297 of 2022* be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know who administers the housing choice vouchers (formerly known as Section 8). He explained that there is a provision for housing choice vouchers to be used for the homeownership.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Epperson, Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, and Young (9). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, Jones, and Taliaferro (3). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Epperson, *that Ordinance No. 6298 of 2022* be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Mr. Chavez commented that the pay raise would be \$100 for each commissioner, and wanted to know how the pay increase would affect the President. Mr. Johnson responded that the President would receive the \$100 as well. Mr. Hopkins commented that he does not support the increase in compensation. Mr. Johnson commented that the pay increase takes effect next term. He explained that a pay increase would have to be considered in the year before the new term begins. Mr. Johnson thought that the inflation in living costs and gas has increased in the last five years and that the raise would compensate for the inflation. Mr. Atkins commented that he would not support the proposal. Mr. Atkins announced that Mr. Johnson will not be on the Commission next term and the proposal is not for Mr. Johnson's own benefit.

At this time, Mr. Johnson's motion failed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Epperson, Gage-Watts, Johnson, and Young (4). NAYS: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Hopkins, Lazarus, and Taliaferro (5). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, and Jones (2). ABSTAIN: Commissioner Jackson (1).

It was **moved by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mrs. Gage-Watts, *that Ordinance No. 6298 of 2022* be moved to the first Caddo Parish Commission Regular Session agenda on January 5, 2023 for introduction.

Mr. Atkins requested a clarification on the R-1-43 district/zone. Mr. Johnson explained that the R-1-43 district/zone will be set up like other residential districts that is based on the square footage of a lot. The R-1-43 district/zone is for 43,560 sq. ft. lot and will follow the same precedence as a half-acre or quarter-acre lot, with the restriction that a manufactured home will be by special use only. He said that R-A zoning will still be in effect and R-A has some agriculture components that are cited if it does not.

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mrs. Gage-Watts, *to englobe and advance Resolution No. 52 of 2022 to the first Commission Regular Session on January 5, 2023 and to advance the following items to Thursday's agenda:*

- *Authorize Special Resolution of Recognition for The Theater of The Performing Arts*
- *Authorize Special Resolution of Remembrance for Mr. Carl Staples*
- *Authorize Special Resolution of Recognition for Shreveport Little Theater*
- *Authorize Special Resolution of Recognition for The Krewe Of Sobek's 20th Anniversary*
- *Authorize Special Resolution of Recognition for The Toys for Tots Program*
- *Authorize Special Resolution Recognizing December 10th As Human Rights Day*
- *Authorize Stacy Brown As A Visitor at December 8th Regular Session to Present 2023 Convention and Tourist Bureau Budget*

Mr. Hopkins gave kudos to Mr. Johnson's creativity for "no more trailers".

Mr. Chavez wanted to know if Resolution No. 52 of 2022 was to advance or be remanded to a committee. Mr. Johnson responded that once Resolution No. 52 of 2022 is passed, the resolution would go to the Caddo Parish Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Atkins explained that the resolution would have to be advanced to the January meeting for debate and to vote whether to forward the resolution to the Caddo Parish Planning and Zoning Commission.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Epperson, Gage-Watts, Jackson, Johnson, Taliaferro and Young (7). NAYS: Commissioners Hopkins, Chavez, and Lazarus (3). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, and Jones (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Hopkins**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *that Resolution No. 53 of 2022* be moved to Thursday's agenda.

Mr. Hopkins explained that the resolution is to approve Caddo Fire District No. 1 to sell and deliver revenue refunding certificate. Mr. Atkins wanted to know the difference between a revenue and refinancing certificate. Mr. Hopkins responded that refinancing has lower rates.

Mr. Johnson commented that he would not support the motion because Fire District No. 1 is also in Commission District 2 and he was not informed about the resolution. Mr. Johnson said that it is bad on Fire District No. 1 for talking to one of the two commissioners in Fire District No. 1. Mrs. Gage-Watts wanted to know if Mr. Johnson would move the agenda item until Mr. Johnson has spoken to Fire District No. 1. Mr. Johnson declined. Mr. Jackson said that he will support the Commissioner for the Fire District No. 1 area and hopes that due diligence and courtesy is given to individuals who are duly elected for their areas. Mr. Jackson wanted to know how the increase in interest rates affect the fire district's ability to refinance and whether the Parish is responsible for Fire District No. 1's debt service in the event Fire District No. 1 defaults on payment. Dr. Wilson responded yes. Mr. Atkins asked Mrs. Barnett if anyone from Fire District No. 1 contacted the Parish about the resolution. Mrs. Barnett responded that she received an email to put the item on the agenda, but she did not have a direct conversation with Fire District No. 1.

At this time, Mr. Hopkin's motion failed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Chavez, Hopkins, Lazarus, (3). NAYS: Commissioners Atkins, Epperson, Gage-Watts, Jackson, Johnson, Taliaferro, and Young (7). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, and Jones (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

Mr. Atkins suggested that Fire District No. 1 come before the Commission for a briefing to get the Commission on the same page. The Clerk acknowledged that he will share the original email with the Commission regarding Fire District No. 1's request to add the resolution to the agenda.

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mrs. Gage-Watts, *that Resolution No. 53 of 2022* be moved to Thursday's agenda.

Mr. Jackson commented that he does not see the local minority bond counsel present during the conversation of the reflection of the Parish. Mr. Jackson explained that people leave Shreveport-Caddo Parish due to a lack of opportunities and that the Parish should fight to keep professionals, resources and dollars in the local community. He said that the S&P report stated that there is no response for people who want to live and work in Caddo Parish. Mr. Jackson said that Caddo Parish is leading the State in population loss and Caddo Parish must do any and every thing to correct that.

Mr. Atkins requested clarification on the resolution. Mrs. Bryant responded that Resolution No. 53 of 2022 acknowledges the results of the election and that the Commission has to canvass those results. Mrs. Bryant said that a separate resolution would be drafted to issue the bonds. Mr. Atkins pointed out that the language in the resolution mentions the issuance of general obligation bonds. Mr. Schlueter clarified that the resolution does nothing further than canvass and declare the results of the election. Mr. Schlueter explained that the resolution is required under State law for every public body.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Epperson, Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus Taliaferro and Young (10). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, and Jones (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Hopkins**, seconded by Mr. Johnson, *that Authorize Appointment to The Caddo Fire District 1 Board* be moved to Thursday's agenda. Motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Chavez, Epperson, Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus Taliaferro and Young (10). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Burrell, and Jones (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

COMMUNIQUES/COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Mr. Chavez wanted to know how the new operating system, Open Meetings, logs Commission attendance. The Clerk responded that there is an override feature to manually prevent buttons being pushed by someone else and that he monitors the operating system. The Clerk said that the tablets remain in the Chamber and are not for Commissioners or staff to take with them.

CONSENT AGENDA

- *Ordinance No. Ordinance No. 6264 Of 2022, an ordinance amending and re-enacting Ordinance No. 5111 of 2011, reapportioning Caddo Parish into twelve*

Commission Districts, enumerating the constituent precincts respectively comprising the Commission Districts, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

- Confirm End of the Year Appointments*

| <u>Sewerage District No. 7</u> | <u>Expiration Date</u> | |
|--|------------------------|---------------|
| Billy Woods, Jr. | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Kerry Lyles | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 1</u> | | |
| Joseph Distefano | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Lendell Davidson | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 3</u> | | |
| Susan Tuberville | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 4</u> | | |
| Steve Opdroek | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Greg Sims | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Kevin McClure | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 5</u> | | |
| Jake Majors | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Lennis Elston | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| John Lorick | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Stacey Pierce | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 6</u> | | |
| Patrick Miciotto | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Marilyn Smith | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Mike McCullough | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| Don Razinsky | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 7</u> | | |
| David Houston | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| James R. Alexander | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Fire District No. 8</u> | | |
| David Austin, Jr. | 12/4/2022 | Reappointment |
| | | |
| <u>Shreveport-Bossier Tourist Commission</u> | | |
| Casey B. Hartley | 12/31/2022 | Reappointment |

- Ordinance No. 6295 Related To 22-24-P, an ordinance to amend Volume II of the Code of Ordinances of the Parish of Caddo, as amended, the Caddo Parish Unified Development Code, by amending the zoning of property located on the south side of Southern Loop, approximately one thousand and six hundred feet west of Wallace Lake Road, Caddo Parish, LA., from R-A rural agricultural zoning district to C-UV Urban Village Commercial Zoning District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*

- Ordinance No. 6296 Related To 22-25-P, an ordinance to amend Volume II of the Code of Ordinances of the Parish of Caddo, as amended, the Caddo Parish Unified Development Code, by amending the zoning of property located on the NE corner of Linwood Avenue and Buckley Boulevard, Caddo Parish, LA., from C-1(PUD) Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District to C-1(PUD) Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.



 Linda J. Montgomery
 Office Specialist I

 John E. Atkins
 President