

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION OF THE
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION
HELD ON THE 19th DAY OF APRIL, 2021

The Caddo Parish Commission met in a Work Session, on the above date, at 3:30 p.m., in the Government Chambers, with Mr. Johnson, presiding, and the following members in attendance constituting a quorum: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (11). ABSENT: Commissioner Epperson (1).

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

AGENDA ADDITIONS

- It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to expand the agenda and addition Special Resolution of Recognition for Antioch Baptist Church under New Business.*

At this time, Mr. Atkins opened the floor for anyone to speak in favor or opposition to the agenda addition. There being no one to speak in favor or against the agenda addition, Mr. Atkins closed the public hearing.

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

VISITORS

- Capital Area Finance Authority
Kristin Delahoussaye

Ms. Delahoussaye said that the Commission approved their Down Payment Assistance Program in 2019. She said that they work with the lenders who work with homebuyers who are struggling with down payments or closing costs. Since CAFA was able to come into Caddo Parish and offer this service, they share their fees. A total of 212 homebuyers have been able to buy a home utilizing CAFA grants since 2019 with a total of \$50,000 in fees.

Ms. Delahoussaye said that other parishes use the money coming back as beautification projects.

Mr. Young wanted to know what type of homes are eligible for these grants. Ms. Delahoussaye said that the homes can be new construction or older homes, but they cannot be mobile or manufactured homes. She also pointed out that you do not have to be a first time homebuyer.

Mr. Taliaferro wanted to know if they have joined the Northwest Louisiana Association of Realtors. Ms. Delahoussaye said that they have.

Mr. Atkins wanted to know the relationship between CAFA and the Caddo Parish Commission. Ms. Delahoussaye said that since they are a local housing finance authority working in Baton Rouge in a nine-parish region, they had to get permission from the local government to operate in their parish.

Mr. Burrell wanted to know how this program worked. Ms. Delahoussaye explained that some of them are grants and are a spread on the rate. Some of the loans are forgivable, but there are terms. You can choose to stay in the house for 7 or 10 years. She also said that there is no loan level pricing.

Mrs. Gage-Watts thanked Ms. Delahoussaye for coming to the Commission and giving an update on this program. She is grateful for the partnership between the Caddo Parish Commission and CAFA.

A citizen can apply by going through one of their approved lenders. There is a debt to income ration and income base limit.

Mr. Jackson also thanked CAFA for coming today. He said that affordable housing is often overlooked. He wanted to know if there was anything beyond lending that CAFA does. Ms. Delahoussaye said that she will have to look into it, but she believes that the other housing projects that they do would have to be in the nine parish region.

- Master Plan Update
Alan Clark

Mr. Clark said that there is a Master Plan Advisory Committee that consists of members from the City of Shreveport, Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the Caddo Parish Commission. There has not been a meeting this year. He asked that the Commission appoint members from the Caddo Parish Commission to complete the appointees of the board.

He also said that they have been involved in neighborhood engagement and has consisted in applicants coming to the City of Shreveport. He said that these meetings have been successful and affords an opportunity for developers to explain what's being proposed in their area. Residents and developers can discuss issues and concerns of developments that is being proposed.

Mr. Clark also mentioned that one of the biggest complaints they received a few years ago, was that the process was taking far too long. In an effort to change that, the MPC came up with a faster process to keep the progress moving. That has been successful.

Another important item that the MPC is dealing with is affordable housing. It has been approved through the City through the MPC board and will come before the Commission soon. Years ago, manufactured housing was allowed in residential districts; and in recent years, that was removed from residential districts, with the exception of Residential-Agriculture, Residential Mobile Home Parks, and Residential Mobile Home Subdivisions. In order to have a manufactured home in a residential area, a special exception use permit must be issued by going through the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Another issue the MPC is working on is short term rentals. They have received complaints regarding the negative impacts of short-term rentals. Currently there are not regulations to deal with short term rentals, so they are going through the process of developing an ordinance to address these concerns.

Mr. Jackson commended Mr. Clark and his staff for their hard work in getting residents and developers to communicate regarding the development in his district. Mr. Jackson suggested that the MPC utilize a public notification system to alert the citizens and media regarding their neighborhood meetings. Mr. Chavez also thanked Mr. Clark for these neighborhood meetings to allow the citizens to communicate and discuss their concerns to the developers.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know the progress on the MPC online application process. Mr. Clark said that there is a proposed soft showing in June, 2021 with a live date in July, 2021.

Mr. Chavez also asked about the progress regarding 18 wheeler parking lots. Mr. Clark said that there are some alternative surfaces that applicants are referring to the MPC. They are working with the Public Works Department to determine if it is really a hard surface and sustainable.

Mr. Burrell wanted to know if the project or development is approved through the Master Plan, how does this approval affect the final outcome of the project as it moves to the final process and making it shovel-ready. Mr. Clark explained that the purpose of the Master Plan was to determine where certain developments would develop. It determines the land use map, i.e. where residential property is, where commercial property is, where industrial property is, etc. For example, when an applicant wants to develop a property as industrial, the Master Plan determines whether or not that property is deemed appropriate for industrial development.

ADMINISTRATOR REPORT

- Confederate Monument Update

Dr. Wilson said that several contractors looked at the project, but only one bid which came in at four times what is budgeted for the project. They will resume the process and continue to look for a service provider that will relocate the monument within budget.

- Disparity Study Update

Administration has received the proposals from the disparity study and are reviewing them now.

- I-49 Welcome Sign Update

LADOTD approved the original design and are now in the finalizing process for that.

- U.S. Treasury Emergency Rental Assistance Program

2,900 applications have been submitted, and the first check will be issued April 30 to the recipients of the first round.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know how many applicants were chosen to receive funding. Mrs.

Bryant said that 300 applicants were chosen last week, and more will be chosen this week and the following weeks. Mr. Jackson suggested that they review the process to determine another system aside from the currently used lottery system. Mrs. Bryant explained that part of this system is not overwhelm the people who are doing the work, as well as obtaining various documents.

Mr. Jackson also said that there might be an opportunity to repurpose left over dollars for other housing needs in the community.

- E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund RFP

The RFP is scheduled to be advertised Thursday, April 22 with a return date of June 30.

Mr. Jackson also said that he has a list of organizations that would share the RFP for the E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund on their website.

- Public Works Department Update
Tim Weaver, Director

The Public Works Department has 110 employees with an approximate \$20M annual budget.

The Adjudicated Property division of the Public Works Department started in 2001. Even through the pandemic, the Adjudicated Property division was able to put approximately 80 properties back on the rolls. Civic Source also offers title insurance.

Mr. Burrell wanted to know if there was a roster of adjudicated properties with the Parish. Mr. Weaver said that they get this information from the Tax Assessor's Office. He said there are about 9,000 properties, but that number changes every day.

Mr. Burrell wanted to know if the Parish includes all the adjudicated properties, including the ones in the City of Shreveport. Mr. Weaver explained that the properties fall into three categories: city only, city and parish, and parish only. The Parish has an agreement with the City to handle those that are city and parish and parish only.

After Hurricane Katrina, the State of Louisiana required everything to be permitted. Public Works partnered with the City of Shreveport, and through a CEA, they were able to do 590 commercial building permits last year.

Last year, the Weights & Standards Division was able to do over 2,600 permits. Currently, there is only one officer who is commissioned by the Sheriff's Office. Last year, only twenty citations were issued. Since its inception in 2010, this division has generated over \$4M.

The Property Standards Division has worked to clean up abandoned properties.

Public Works took over the Fleet Services Department in 2010. The Parish has about 345 vehicles and equipment valued at about \$6M. Over 1,500 work orders were completed last year. The Sign Shop has completed 1,540 permits in the Sign Shop. They also make sandbags for the citizens. The team has also helped with the COVID testing and the water giveaways.

The Road & Bridge Division is the "bread and butter" of the Public Works Department. Currently the Parish owns 166 bridges, but there were more prior to the federal government changing the definition of a bridge. The Parish also has over 800 miles of road and is the biggest asset in the Parish valued at about \$90M. When Mr. Weaver first came to the Parish, there was over 100 miles of gravel and dirt roads, now, there is about 4 miles of gravel and dirt roads. The Off-System Bridge Program just awarded the Public Works Department \$1.86M.

There are two camps, North Camp and South Camp, who do maintenance on the roads. They've completed 1,200 work orders which consisted mainly of trees, ditches, and patching of roads.

Mr. Johnson wanted to know the status of widening Roy Road. Mr. Weaver said that the Public Works Department is doing Phase 2 on the Road Treatment Project, and Roy Road is in that phase. He also said that this year, they will be doing over 40 miles of roads throughout the Parish.

Mr. Johnson also asked that Public Works look at the 5900 block of North Lakeshore Drive.

The Solid Waste Division has over 18 compactor sites throughout the Parish with recycling. They currently accept metal and paper products. Last year, over \$80,000 was made in metals that the citizens recycled. Because of COVID, the trash pickup on the roads have slowed down, but they are looking at alternate ways to clean up the litter.

Mr. Chavez wanted to know more information regarding the recycling. Mr. Weaver said that he will provide the Commissioners with a listing of all the recyclables that they've collected. He also mentioned that the Parish was collecting plastics, but since the City stopped, there hasn't been a market for it. He also said that they do not collect glass either.

Mr. Chavez also wanted to know if businesses could recycle. Mr. Weaver said that they're only accepting from citizens. Mr. Weaver said that it takes education to the citizens to get them on board with recycling.

Mr. Hopkins asked that the Public Works Department evaluate the compactor sites and times they're open. He also said that there is a State program that picks up trash as they are going to different spots.

Mr. Taliaferro wanted to talk about recycling plastics in the Parish. Mr. Weaver said that last year, the Parish only had 200 tons of plastic for the whole year. Mr. Taliaferro agreed that education to the citizens to recycle plastic and glass would be helpful.

Some of the goals for 2021 are to create online platforms for easier access to the citizens.

Mr. Weaver also talked about I-69. He said that there is a project in the works right now from I-49 at Stonewall and Frierson Road to the Port on Hwy 1. The feds, Desoto Parish, and Caddo Parish are all putting up money so this project is feasible.

Mr. Atkins wanted to know if the I-69 service road will be along an existing road or if it will be a new right-of-way. Mr. Weaver explained that it will be both. It starts in Desoto Parish down Stonewall-Frierson Road, then end up in Caddo Parish on a new section that will tie into Robson Road.

Mr. Johnson wanted to know if the snow and ice blades have been purchased yet. Dr. Wilson said that they will be a part of the 2022 Budget. Mr. Jackson suggested to look into purchasing that type of equipment during the off-season.

Dr. Wilson also mentioned that the Public Works Department handles the oil and gas leases. This week, the Parish received a lease payment of \$233,000 for the General Motors property and another lease payment of \$23,000.

- March 2021 Financial Report

Dr. Wilson said that the March 2021 Financial Reports were attached to the agenda and a copy was placed at each Commissioner's station.

- Requests from Commissioners

Mr. Johnson asked that Administration provide the following updates: Facilities & Maintenance—May, Juvenile Services—June, Parks & Recreation—July, Finance—August, and Human Resources—September.

Mr. Jackson asked that Administration provide an update on the earthquakes in Blanchard. Dr. Wilson said that he will reach out with the LA Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Jackson also said that he has a list of organizations that would share the RFP for the E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund on their website.

COMMISSION REMARKS

- Mr. Chavez said that there was situation over the weekend regarding a dog being hit by car and badly injured. He wanted to know if there was a way that the Commission could set up a fund for a situation in which a citizen would have to take a dog such as that to the vet without paying out of pocket. Mr. Samuels said that each case is situational. If the dog came to the shelter, it would be stressed out, and the shelter can only provide palliative care. In this particular case, a local rescue group stepped up and helped with the dog. Dr. Wilson also mentioned that the dog is still alive and at the vet receiving care.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Johnson thanked everyone for the Port City Fest Weekend. He said that the crowds were moving around town and spending money. He said that the fans had a good time at the Bayou Classic.

Mr. Johnson also said that he received a complaint on the 6000 block of Yukon Drive. Mr. Clark said that an inspector has already been out.

NEW BUSINESS

It was **moved by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Atkins, *that Ordinance No. 6051 of 2021, in regards to Zoning Case 21-5-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 N. Market Street, approximately two hundred and sixty feet east of Roy Road Extension, Caddo Parish, LA, from C-1, Neighborhood Commercial District to C-3, General Commercial District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto* be postponed to the next Work Session.

The Clerk of the Commission advised the Commissioners that there was a typo in the title, so it would need to be re-advertised.

At this time, Mr. Johnson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (11). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioner Epperson (1). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Hopkins, *that Ordinance No. 6052 of 2021, in regards to Zoning Case 21-6-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 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, approximately two hundred and fifteen feet east of RC Thompson Road, Caddo Parish, LA, from R-1-5, Single Family Residential District to R-A, Rural Agriculture District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto* be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction. Motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Gage-Watts, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (11). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioner Epperson (1). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Burrell, *that Ordinance No. 6053 of 2021, an ordinance to establish the American Plan Special Revenue Fund, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto* be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Jackson: I think this is consistent with everything else we've done.

Chavez: I'm confused. Is this the same thing that we did last session?

Dr. Wilson: Before we attempt to answer that, let me just state that most organizations are fortunate to have one CPA on staff. We are blessed to have four. I'm not going to pretend to be a CPA, so I'm going to have one answer that question for you.

Bryant: You did receive an ordinance that was introduced at your last meeting that should be voted on Thursday, which adopts the revenue budget for the American Rescue Plan, and in effect also creates the fund. This ordinance is also creating the fund. So, I mean it seems duplicative but it's your all's prerogative.

Chavez: Is it going to create an accounting issue, having two funds named the same thing or will these get absorbed into one account?

Bryant: Well, you will be voting on something on Thursday, and this item will come before you May 3. So, if the item passes on Thursday we will proceed with accounting for The American Rescue Fund and the establishment of the fund.

Chavez: I'm sorry. I'm still confused. Are we voting—

Jackson: I'd like to offer some clarification. This ordinance doesn't create a separate fund for what is the ordinance that is on the agenda on Thursday. I'll read it directly to you. The ordinance on the agenda for Thursday says, 'an ordinance adopting the Budget of Estimated Revenue'. So you have not created any fund yet. No fund has been created. I think you just alluded to me to create a fund for some other stuff. No fund has been created. And the notion that just simply adopting a budget creates the fund. I think it's not true, and is not consistent with what our role is as a body. We have to have enabling legislation to adopt these funds to set up these funds. I've never said that anybody did anything wrong in the past. I just think that it may have been overlooked. Some of these things that are on our agenda for introduction today did not get on the agenda until I took the initiative to call down and reach out to the Louisiana Legislative Auditors. what has not been told to this body is that they said I was correct in that the budgets have to be adopted. What they advised me to do was, what they said specifically was the Louisiana Local Government Budget does not speak specifically to enabling legislation. And what they advised me to do was to reach out to the Attorney General's office because they believe that the attorney general's office had an opinion and I agree. I'm sure legal will say, it's just an opinion, but it also states statute, and it's also going to cite case law in which the Attorney General has used before. Because there is a role and responsibility

that we have as supervisors of this government body to set up. Right now, we don't know what the purposes of the American Rescue Fund for the budget of Estimated Revenues that have been proposed to be adopted. We don't know what the purpose is for. We don't know what the use is for. We don't know how many votes, it takes to pass anything. Does the Commission body even have to adopt anything? I mean, we didn't even know we don't know. And so, all this does is set forth a framework—it does not duplicate or take away from what's on our agenda to be voted on Thursday. I believe, some people will say that it's more of a formality. I'm all for formality. On our agenda, we're limiting how much time a Commissioner has to vote simply because we said it wasn't etched in stone. So why wouldn't we be in favor of having enabling legislation that sets out the parameters that etches in stone what the fund is for, how its supposed to be used, and what the votes are supposed to be to expend any money. Should it be a majority of the body present? That stuff is what we need to know. As individuals of good government, we need to do. To simply say what we have not done it that way before. Some of us on this body got elected because there were some things that were done consistently—I'm not saying anybody did anything wrong. For some things that were done for a long period of time, and all you did was showed up, and was put into it.

Johnson: that's not germane to your clarification. He asked for clarification on the American Rescue Plan.

Jackson: My point is because the germaneness of this is there's a notion that we've never had to do, enabling legislation. And I think legally, that is wrong. I had on the agenda today to ask for an AG opinion. I'm prepared to remove that from the agenda because I've already got the Ag working on that. Had I not asked for the Legislative Auditors Opinion about adopting these budgets, some of these things wouldn't be on there today.

Dr. Wilson: **There's a reason. I mean we can** add one word create and adopt on Ordinance No. 6050 and do the same thing. What we recently were trying to do was create a fund to receive the money when we receive it because we know what's coming in. It's due I think May 11th. The Treasury had not given us their way with all the guidelines on how to implement the program. So we were trying to do a clean way of putting it into this fund so it wouldn't get comingled with any other fund and kept separate. That's what we're trying to do. The Administration never said you can't create enabling legislation because you did it three times. You did it when you created the E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund. You did it back in 2008 when you created the Oil & Gas Fund. You also did it when you created the Reserve Trust Fund back in 1999, 22 years ago. Enabling legislation does does have its place but you don't need it in every case, because you don't have enabled legislation for Public Works; you don't have it for Facilities & Maintenance; you don't have it for Juvenile Justice. What you do have is the citizens vote on it at the ballot box saying we want to use it this particular way. That's what gives us the authority to act. There are 36 funds, and we have 15 funds specifically that we use all the time. And I have an email here from the Legislative Auditor that says his opinion. I can read it to you. we're not saying Commissioner Jackson was wrong, but in this letter that says that creating funds is budgetary. This is to Ms. Barnett, to special revenue funds must be adopted under the LGBA, and we are not aware of any exceptions to this requirement, we don't dispute that. The LGBA does not specifically address the establishment of the special revenue fund, which is often an accounting function. This is an accounting function that's why we went how we were using it. We have several special revenue funds, but at the end of the year, those funds are rolled up and to the General Fund.

Bryant: We have a fund that does that. If it does not clearly meet the guidelines of GASB as a special revenue fund, then we have to do that for the audit purposes.

Dr. Wilson: So we just have a difference of opinion from that of Commissioner Jackson, and the reason why you see the legislation are here today. We did talk to the Legislative Auditors because they called us too. We have a note in our budget book, and then also in the annual report as to the specifics of Section 8 and Head Start, which was start back 60 years ago. we made reference to that, but to lessen the confusion and take the step to clear it up and leave a note out in the future. That's why we put it on the agenda to clear up any confusion so we can move forward.

Jackson: I had a clarification. One, I never said that Administration did anything wrong. I want to be clear that the legislative auditor's office contacted y'all because I contacted them.

Dr. Wilson: We contacted them first because y'all asked us to. And that's why you get the letter from me.

Jackson: we never asked you to—we never approved anything.

Dr. Wilson: Well when that first came up, there was a question arose right we contacted the Legislative Auditor, for clarification.

Jackson: And this on the agenda because the Legislative Auditor's Office said that it needs to be placed on the agenda. when my time comes up, I'll read my letter.

Atkins: I think Commissioner Jackson makes some very good points, but 'm sure there's an alternative view, and you've expressed some that alternative view here, Dr. Wilson. I'm just trying to get some clarification on—the same issue affects Ordinance No. 6053 that we're discussing currently, as well as, 6057, 6058, 6059, and 6060, 6061, and 6062, right? So, I want a clear response from your legal team what the proper legal interpretation is on this issue. I respect Mr. Jackson. I think he makes some very good points, but, you know, it's pretty gray out here for us right now, and we're about to be asked to vote on a pretty gray area on seven items.

Attorney
Bernstein:

Commissioner, what the Local Government Budget Act speaks to is that you are required to adopt a budget, the Chief Executive Officer/Administrator is required to prepare and submit that budget to you annually. Our office has looked at the local government budget act as well as the one hundred twenty-three attorney general opinions that cite it. we don't find any mention of a requirement that funds that there is a state wide requirement that special revenue funds be established by legislative act. I would note that part of the problem with that is that the—when such a fund is required as a matter of auditing and accounting. It's the General Government Accounting Standards Board or GASB is referred to and also the Government Finance Officers Association have standards with regard to when those special revenue funds have to be established, or not established, and to come to you with legislation about establishing and that presupposes that you have the ability to refuse to establish, and that would be, in our view, contrary to the intent, because if the government accounting standards require the establishment of the fund, yet the Commission refuses to do that, what position does that put the parish in. And as the Legislative Auditor referenced, establishing those funds is usually a matter of accounting. Now that's not to say that a commissioner could not as a matter of legislation establish a fund, which is what Commissioner Jackson did with the Housing Trust Fund several years ago. But it's not a requirement as we see it, that every special revenue fund in the parish be enacted and established by legislation that's a matter of accounting and auditing done administratively by the executive branch.

Burrell: I think at the last meeting when this controversy came up, I specifically asked the Administration to work with Commissioner Jackson, to get this matter cleared up for this time. Now, the letter that you are reading over there, Administrator, in your opinion, does that clear that problem?

Dr. Wilson: I think from my perspective, it may have. Perhaps, Commissioner Jackson may still have a difference of opinion on this because the letter that I made reference to, I sent on April 8. That outlines the entire process of what we use, how we go about establishing a fund and so on so forth, historically and presently. And I did make reference in this letter that the commission wants to establish the legislation, they can because he did it three times in the last 22 years so you can.

Burrell: So there's more than one way to skin a cat? We will not be prevented from doing what we need to do. Maybe I can put it in those plain terms, right. It doesn't conflict with anything.

Dr. Wilson: In the past, when Commissioners wanted to do certain things, you had the right to set up enabling legislation that says how you want the program ran. The Administration does not need to do that but we could create the budget because we had to present the budget.

Burrell: Ok, so as far as you're concerned, from your perspective, you've done what you need to do to clear this up. That's what I'm asking you, sir. That's what I requested.

Dr. Wilson: Yes, that's what you got in writing.

Cawthorne: It is my understanding that if a couple of words was changed in President Johnson's ordinance, that would afford us the opportunity for these dollars to have a landing space on our balance sheet. meaning that we couldn't expend any money until we do Commissioner Jackson is suggesting. We got a two prong approach. We got a mechanism by which was setting up a scenario to receive the dollars. We cannot do anything with them until we do what Commissioner Jackson suggested. The resolution to Mr. Jackson's problem would be to change the work in Commissioner Johnson's ordinance, so the federal government can send us the money and we can put it on our balance sheet. Before we can expend any money, we can adopt what he's doing to move on down the road, or those that are oversimplification of my understanding of this?

Dr. Wilson: If you recall, when we first start talking about this a few weeks ago, you and Commissioner John Atkins and Commissioner Johnson when we were moving the CARES money into the E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund. You asked the Director of Finance, what would have been her preference. And she stated that she would like to keep it separately in a separate account. We weren't pushing back on Commissioner Jackson's legislation to put it in there to begin with. We had to track it and it created another step for us, but preferably, we would like to keep it separate because of the complexities and the guidelines that you get from the federal government happen to be pretty strict. So Commissioner Johnson called me and said, 'Doc, this money is coming in, what are you gonna do with the money for the American rescue plan?' I walked down the hallway and talked to miss Haley. And I said, Haley, what do you suggest. well I suggest we create a separate fund to keep it separate. so when she said in this meeting what she preferred. We don't push back on Commissioners when they want to add their names to legislation around here. As long as we get the legislation done, that's the objective.

Cawthorne: So the resolution to this could be allowing the money to come and not expending it in any shape, form, or fashion, and adopting what Commissioner Jackson is proposing today. A two-prong approach.

Dr. Wilson: We can add one word and have the same language, right?

Cawthorne: Let's fix it.

Bryant: you all have an item before you on Thursday. Should it pass on Thursday, we will be creating the American Rescue Plan, and having the fund available to accept those dollars. This particular resolution, if you pass it on to the next meeting, it just would enhance what we've already would have done. Yes, on Thursday, you can add language to say create and adopt, and that would essentially create the fund and adopt the revenues. That is an option. But if you leave it at adopt, we're going to create the fund, because once we receive the money, we have to deposit those monies somewhere. If we choose, as Administration, to create the fund, we do have—there's nothing that prevents us from doing that but what we are prevented from doing is spending those funds without coming to the Commission, and then asking you all how you want us to spend those dollars. But revenue is at some point, when it comes through the door goes into a fund, whether it is a new fund, or an established fund, but it has to go into a fund, and it can be a fund that we create through Administration. What's happening on Thursday is the revenue side, for you all to go ahead and adopt. Should that pass, we're going to create it—let's say you don't create the fund, the monies come through on May 11, we will have to establish a fund to put those in. we can establish that fund, but what we cannot do is spend those monies. They will sit there with no budget, no anything. Sit there until you all pass a budget.

Jackson: it looks like we can merge these two ordinances and be done. I'd like to do that.

Johnson: so its my understanding, if we amend one word, it will basically be the same as this. There's no need for us to pass this. if we vote no on both of these, Administration has the right to still create a fund to put the money into. We would then have to come back and say how that money will be expended. You can't expand it until you find out what the guidelines are. The guidelines have not come out yet. They're supposed to come out around May 6. Allow the one that has already progressed to keep on progressing; make the amendment, if that makes Mr. Jackson happy, changing the word, then you got it coming in, and you got a process of holding it. as it stands now, whether we pass or fail on either one. They can still set up a fund to put the money into. So, the last one we had basically was talking about setting up a fund and naming it. And then the money will come into that and it wouldn't go into general fund, like it did with the Emergency Rental Grant. That money went into general fund first, they had to be switched out into the E. Edward Jones with that ordinance. What I was basically proposing, along with finance, was to create a fund before the money comes to put it into that. So it never has to go into general fund. Now, once the guidelines come, because this is federal money, we can set up how we will expand it. So we already got a process rolling to handle this.

Jackson: I want to thank everybody for making my point. this body has the authority to either say they want to establish or not established, because we are duly elected to do so. And to say that the only fix—we just postponed Ordinance 6051. Mr. Clerk, why did we postpone 6051?

Clerk: The language in the title was wrong.

Jackson: Oh, it was something wrong with the title. this ordinance has been advertised as adopting the budget, not creating a budget or creating a fund. So you cannot just come in and just

add the word create to the title, and move on down the road. Because advertising issue at that point, we got a title problem at that point. There's a lot of backstory that's missing because I had threatened to call the legislative auditor's office, and I asked not to do that. They would work with me. There was no need for the Legislative Auditors or an AG Opinion right now. And I said, 'well, don't put it on the agenda'. At the next meeting, here is an ordinance to adopt a budget. Remember, they have said I was originally wrong about adopting the budget altogether. how did we find out about these budgets? When Commissioner Johnson asked about where we should place the Emergency Rental Assistance money. It was then that we found out that we had a Section 8 Fund, that we even had a CCAA Fund. I asked, 'Show them to me.' Well, Commissioner here's the paragraph in the budget. I said, 'no, that doesn't comply with the Local Government Budget Act. This statement does not comply.' And it was not until I reached out to the Legislative Auditors Office, and they may have reached too that it came before this body. So we were expended dollars the whole time without even knowing. Nothing in the ordinance on Thursday says 'create the fund'. I'm not trying to impede on us getting the dollars. I want us to get the dollars and set it up in the right fund. But I think we need to do it decently and in order. I would have love to, Dr. Wilson, have worked with y'all on an ordinance that would have created and adopted. I would have loved it, but nobody reached out to me to do that. What I was told was, that y'all were going to get with the Legislative Auditors Office, find out first, and then y'all were going to get back to me. What ended up happening was this ordinance ended up on the agenda—

Dr. Wilson: because we were talking about two different things at the time.

Jackson: But they all are related to the same. I would have loved to have partnered on this deal. But I'm not here trying to obstruct the fund being set up or the budget being adopted. I'm simply saying, it's got to be done the same way—so are y'all telling me that we can't adopt 6051 today because we've got a title issue? because we could just amend 6051 if we could just amend these other ones down here, if that's what you're telling me. All we go to do is amend the title. Well let's go back to 6051 and make the amendment. You can't do that because now you've got a title issue. And the only thing that has been advertised is adopting the budget. Nothing has been advertised about creating a budget or creating a fund. I am of the position that we have to be consistent with what we do, across the board. Commissioner Taliaferro may want to come and have a Law Officer's Special Revenue Fund. Should he have to come through the body, and get all his votes done? But when Commissioner John Paul wants to create the Community Gardens Fund, he could just go to Administration and say, 'you owe me a favor' or 'I need you to do me a solid and create this fund.' I have a request to the Attorney General's office right now asking can a non-elected—because even the Mayor can't create a Special Revenue Fund without going through the City Council; the Governor can't create a Special Revenue Fund. All of these funds that the State has. All of those are created by acts of the legislature. And there are other statutes that may not be the Local Government Budget Act because I got my email from Eric Sloane, in the Legislative Auditors Office that says, 'an attorney general opinion may help get you where you need to go'. I'm prepared to do that, so I think just as out of a matter of safety, I think we need to create this fund, and I'm fine. I plan to vote for the ordinance on Thursday but I do not believe, you can simply amend the language into because now you've got a title issue.

Hopkins: I think the more we talk, the more confused I get. But let me pull out one thing from being a board member for CAA, working with the Parish, and now as a Commissioner. we have legislation that we do a yearly resolution that all we're doing is passing through money to CCAA. Is that correct?

Dr. Wilson: That's correct.

Hopkins: We don't actually have a fund that we manage.

Bryant: We have a fund on the books that we, at the advice of the auditors, for financial statement purposes. The CCAA draws down the money we write the check. There are no other expenses there. They request the money from HUD, we then write the check to CCAA. That is all that is happening with that particular fund, but it has been recommended as a Special Revenue Fund. Because it is classified as a Special Revenue Fund—when this issue came up, Dr. Wilson sent you all an email stating to you all did he will contact the Legislative Auditors to seek their guidance as to whether or not we should set up a Special Revenue Fund for Section 8 and Head Start. Our practice in the past is because those are grant funds that are handled by outside agencies and the budget is not readily convertible, we were not adopting budgets for those. That is stated in our audit report as well as our budget. Though that was clearly stated, the legislative auditors have reviewed that, the external auditors reviewed that and it was accepted. However, they did state to us that they felt like it was because it is a Special Revenue Fund, that there should be a budget adopted. Once we received that information, Dr. Wilson sent you all a letter stating that that's what they said and therefore, we will be putting an item on the

agenda today to adopt the budget for the Section 8 Fund and the Head Start Fund. Yes, you are correct, the overall administering of those funds are being handled by CCAA through their board. they're also being audited by their auditors, as well as the Feds coming in often to look at the CCAA Fund. You do adopt an annual resolution in relation to that.

Hopkins: And then we do the same thing with our Section 8 Housing. We do it on a five year plan, and then annually. We have a five year plan and then we come back annually and approve it.

Bryant: Correct. Now you will have an actual budget that will be presented to you. And when Dr. Wilson presents his 2022 Budget, that will be there. You will see an additional \$10M - \$11M in expenses, but you will see it in and you will see it out. There is no net effect on the fund balance because it'd be a net effect of zero. What we get in is what we pay out. Same thing for Section 8, what we're seeing in is what we pay out.

Jackson: But it has to be in our comprehensive budget.

Bryant: We will be presenting it in the overall budget.

Hopkins: So that's all we need on those two funds?

Bryant: those funds are established and are still there today. They exist and will continue to be there. Those funds have been established. you're dealing with this one that has that we haven't effectively established yet on the American Rescue Fund; the other two funds exist. This particular fund, in our opinion, will exist if you vote on Thursday. It can exist even if you don't vote on it on Thursday because once we get the money, we have to put it somewhere.

Call for the Question by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne. Motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (10). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion failed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, and Young (5). NAYS: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Johnson, Lazarus, and Taliaferro (5). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Cawthorne**, seconded by Mr. Johnson, *that Ordinance No. 6054 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Riverboat Fund in the amount of \$20,000 to provide an appropriation for Bernstein Development, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto* be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Substitute motion by Mr. Chavez, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, *to englobe and move the following ordinances to Thursday's agenda for introduction:*

- *Ordinance No. 6054 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Riverboat Fund in the amount of \$20,000 to provide an appropriation for Bernstein Development, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- *Ordinance No. 6055 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Riverboat Fund in the amount of \$10,000 to provide an appropriation for Pamoja Art Society and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*

Mr. Cawthorne said that neither of these entities were funded during the pandemic.

Mr. Hopkins asked for an explanation of the funding for Bernstein Development. Mrs. Barnett explained that they did not receive their funding, but they did have their programs in 2020, so they still have the 2020 expenses.

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

It was **moved by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Hopkins, *that Ordinance No. 6056 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Reserve Trust Fund and the Capital Outlay Fund for the year 2021 to provide an appropriation of \$1,000,000 from the Reserve Trust Fund to rebuild building destroyed by Hurricane Laura and to otherwise provide with*

respect thereto be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Mr. Atkins asked for more clarification on this expense. Dr. Wilson explained that Administration looked at other buildings in the Parish, but did not find one that was compatible with the needs of the building that was damaged. Mrs. Bryant also mentioned that it may be less than the requested amount.

Mr. Hopkins wanted to know if these funds would come out of the Capital Outlay Fund as well. Dr. Wilson said that it would come out of the Reserve Trust Fund.

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

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Young, *that Ordinance No. 6057 of 2021, an ordinance to establish the Head Start Special Revenue Fund, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto* be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Jackson: I think again this is a formality we need to be doing. I think we need to set forth specific enabling legislation so that we have a clear and consistent process that we have and not necessarily doing things on the fly. I ask for favorable consent.

Atkins: I'm trying to determine if 57, 58, and 59 are indeed linked. I see that Commissioner Jackson has proposed 6057, but Administration is also listed for 58 and 59. What's going on here? Are they are these three indeed linked or not?

Bryant: Commissioner, the two from Commissioner Jackson, and he will have to speak for himself, but those two funds exist. They already are being accounted for. They have been in your annual audit. You have not adopted budgets for those two funds, but those funds already exist. I believe because there was not enabling legislation in the past, this essentially will go back and have enabling legislation. It's debate as to whether or not you need it now. what administration is asking to is presenting budgets to you all to actually adopt budgets for those two funds because budgets were not presented to you on 2020, nor 2021, so we need those particular items in order to have a budget for 2020 and 2021, then from that point forward you will be getting these budgets in your budget presentation that is provided by Dr. Wilson.

Burrell: Just as a point of clarification because, you know, we've been bouncing back and forth on this seemed like a procedural matter. I respect Commissioner Jackson, because he's pretty astute at many things but I don't want to confuse anything. What's being done in 6057? It doesn't change anything it just creates.

Bryant: The fund already exists. There is a Head Start Fund right now. There is a Section 8 Fund right now. So, but I believe it's to go back and do something that we did not. There's a opinion that we should have done this before. And since we didn't do it, there's an opinion that we should do it now, but the funds actually exist. The funds are there. they're in your annual audit. They're on your financial statements. the financial statements that you get for the entity each month, they're in there.

Burrell: I recognize that this fund has been set up. 6057 creates what we call enabling legislation, in which I'm very familiar with that in the state standpoint. I guess my concern is, does it change anything?

Dr. Wilson: it's just cleanup.

Burrell: is that important? Is it important for us to clean it up?

Dr. Wilson: Actually, this fund has existed for 68 years. Commissioner Jackson is pointing out that perhaps at the beginning, it should have been enabling legislation, and that's what he's trying to put in place, and the Commission has the prerogative to do that if it chooses too.

Jackson: Yeah, I think that Dr. Wilson, I think you explained it better than I could. Commissioner Burrell, you're right, its cleanup. That's all. we do not have a consistent way of enacting funds, and so all we're doing is—this doesn't stop anything; this doesn't start anything. But if we're going to have special revenue funds, we need to do them consistent with what special revenue funds by legislative authorities set them up. This won't be the last time I imagine we have to deal with a special revenue fund. And so, this is more technical cleanup. I don't understand why the body doesn't want to have enabled legislation or don't want to be on the record as creating enabling legislation but I think we should. And I think we owe it to the people who come behind us, to get it right and get it as close to right as possible. And so that's all I'm saying. I'm not saying that anybody did anything

wrong. They took what was handed to them and is making the best out of it but as you know, in your capacity as a legislator, things come up. you find that things have been sort of overlooked things have just been done that way but to just say this is the way we've done it, I don't think that's right. And you should have the enabling legislation in place. The framework in place to do it because what's going to happen is, somebody else who don't want to do a special revenue fund, and they're gonna have to come to this body, get the votes to get it passed. they won't have the benefit of it, but then somebody else may come, dually elected and say, 'well, I'm just gonna go and see if I can get Administration to propose and create a special revenue fund.' why should we allow somebody to have that political benefit over another member? Everybody, including the Administrator, should be required to come and have enabled legislation for any fund. I've never seen a governmental body that has never required—show me a governmental body they say that the rest of our funds I disagree. When you put it before a vote, that's the enabling legislation. The voters enable you to do it. that was legislation that had to go before the voters did it. You cannot walk over to Capital One tomorrow and open a bank account without producing some type of enabling documents. they want to see articles of incorporation; they want to see your ID. They want to know what is it being used for. You can't just go in and say, 'Here, put this \$10 in my account'. And then you started taking \$10 out. There has to be a process to get to there. And this is that. as much of the minutia, as it may be, its what we should be doing as stewards of the of the public or supervisors for this particular governmental body.

Cawthorne: The Head Start Fund essentially comes into the Parish as a pass through. And then we write a check and send it to them. so, we take it out, send it to our balance sheet, and they write a check and then becomes on that balance sheet. How much enabling legislation we need to do for that?

Jackson: As minute of a process as it is, it still needs to be done. That's not to say that it shouldn't be done. I mean, I got a savings account where I just put money, but the bank still isn't going to let me put the money in there without going through the process of opening an account.

Johnson: So in the Head Start Fund, to Administration, your attempt to cleanup was Ordinance No. 6058 and 6059, and not 6057 because you felt that we didn't have to establish it since it's been around since like 64 years. Okay, so in 64 years, we've probably had 20 CPAs and probably 10 attorneys to look at the same deal. There was no issue. To be good stewards of the people's money, this one is still tracking traceable, whether we do this or not, because you can know where the money comes in, where the money comes out. I think the major confusion is dealing with is when Commissioner Jackson had to set up the E. Edward Jones Fund, he had to go through a lot to enable that fund to exist. That fund took money from existing funds, which had to be brought in, and then had to be set up, because we did not have any type of housing funds. The fund that we talked about earlier, the American Rescue Fund, that's funding is coming from the federal government, which will have guidelines on how you can use that money, which is a big difference. If I wanted to set up a Dog & Cat Rescue Fund, then I would have to see the enabling legislation to say how we can utilize it, where its going to come from, and then how we are going to spend it, and what type of votes is going to take, and all of that. But when you get in federal grant money—basically what you need to do is keep it segregated, and then follow the guidelines of the federal government in order to be able to utilize that money.

Jackson: Point of Order. Number one, the E. Edward Jones Housing Trust Fund, when we set it up, it didn't take money from anywhere.

Johnson: it did.

Jackson: No, it didn't. We did not appropriate monies until two years after—

Johnson: We still had to transfer \$200,000. Plus there was money that I found for you in order to get to \$1M.

Jackson: But that was two years after. We enabled it. We didn't take any money from anywhere. You're mixing the two. We didn't—

Johnson: We transferred funds from another fund.

Jackson: But that was when we amended the legislation.

Johnson: but that went into the E. Edward Jones Fund.

Jackson: But to set it up, we didn't take any money from anywhere.

Work Session Minutes
April 19, 2021

- Johnson: I didn't say set it up. I said we transferred money into the E. Edward Jones.
- Jackson: You did say set it up because it needed enabling legislation because it took money over a period of time. it did not. When we set it up, it did not.
- Johnson: that's your interpretation. I got mine.
- Jackson: Well that's the truth, it didn't, you can look into the record. When we adopted it, it had no money attached to it at all.
- Johnson: Today it has a million dollar. It came from—what did it come from though?
- Jackson: we had to amend the—
- Johnson: Where did it come from though?
- Jackson: It came from the General Fund, but it had to be amended. It had to be amended into the legislation.
- Johnson: My point exactly. It was still coming from public dollars that already existed from the Parish. That is the point.
- Dr. Wilson: Commissioners, I just want to give you an idea. We deal with the federal government. This is about five pounds of paperwork. This is the Head Start Fund. We have to follow these guidelines. This is what enabled us to do what we do when we give it to the CCAA. We are the grantees. This is the process we had to go through again. But like Erica and Haley were saying we get \$10M one day, and it goes out the next day. We have no expenses. this body can create any legislation it wants to. We don't create funds without source coming in to it and preferably have revenue results to sustain what you create.
- Jackson: thank you. You just made my point.

Call for the Question by Mr. Burrell, seconded by Mr. Jackson. Motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, and Taliaferro (9). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson, Gage-Watts, and Young (3). ABSTAIN: None (0).

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion failed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Burrell, Hopkins, Jackson, and Young (4). NAYS: Commissioners Atkins, Cawthorne, Chavez, Johnson, Lazarus, and Taliaferro (6). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **Mr. Burrell**, seconded by Mr. Atkins, *to englobo and move the following ordinances to Thursday's agenda for introduction*:

- *Ordinance No. 6058 of 2021, an ordinance amending the 2020 Budget to adopt the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Head Start Fund and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- *Ordinance No. 6059 of 2021, an ordinance amending the 2021 Budget to adopt the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Head Start Fund and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*

Substitute motion by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to amend the language to amend and create the budget item*.

- Johnson: We can't do it because it is in the title, remember?
- Jackson: That's what I'm saying is be consistent now. Basically, y'all just said we're gonna do it on Thursday.
- Johnson: Well, I didn't know it was in the title.
- Jackson: I think we just established that we can just add create into the budget. Are we going to ask the Parliamentarian or the Attorney for an opinion? I'm trying to figure out if we are going to do it on Thursday, why not today? I'm just trying to figure out if I'm in the same meeting.
- Burrell: No one has respected the Parliamentarian so far, so I don't think—
- Johnson: Parliamentarian said it is not in order.

Mr. Jackson will be abstaining from this vote due to his substitute motion not being properly recognized. He also does not agree that a budget can be adopted without creating it.

At this time, Mr. Burrell's original motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Hopkins, Johnson, Lazarus, Talaiferro, and Young (8). NAYS: Commissioner Chavez (1). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: Commissioner Jackson (1).

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson** that Ordinance No. 6060 of 2021, an ordinance to establish the Section 8 Special Revenue Fund, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction. Motion failed due to the lack of a second.

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Atkins, that Ordinance No. 6061 of 2021, an ordinance amending the 2020 Budget to adopt the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Section 8 Fund and to otherwise provide with respect thereto be moved Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Substitute motion by Mr. Atkins, seconded by Mr. Hopkins, to englobe and move the following ordinances to Thursday's agenda for introduction:

- Ordinance No. 6061 of 2021, an ordinance amending the 2020 Budget to adopt the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Section 8 Fund and to otherwise provide with respect thereto
- Ordinance No. 6062 of 2021, an ordinance amending the 2021 Budget to adopt the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Section 8 Fund and to otherwise provide with respect thereto

Substitute motion by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Chavez, to amend both ordinances to create and amend the 2020 Budget for 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Johnson informed Mr. Jackson that this is the same issue as before. Mr. Jackson asked to hear from the Parish Attorney. Parliamentarian Burrell stated that the motion is not valid due to publication requirements and amending the title. Attorney Bernstein said that this has been advertised, and as long as the public is on notice as to what the Commission is intending to do, then the title is sufficient. If the title is changed, there is a possibility that someone could challenge it, and it could be in limbo for some time.

At this time, Mr. Chavez withdrew his second. Due to the lack of a second, Mr. Jackson's substitute motion failed.

Mr. Jackson will be abstaining from this vote because he does not agree that a budget can be adopted without creating it.

At this time, Mr. Atkins' substitute motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (9). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: Commissioner Jackson (1).

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, that Ordinance No. 6063 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the General Fund to provide an appropriation for a Safe Summer Work Placement Program, and otherwise providing with respect thereto be moved to Thursday's agenda for introduction.

Mr. Jackson explained that this is to set aside dollars for the Same Summer Work Placement Program. The goal is to put students out into places of employment. He believes that this would be consistent with what can be reimbursed from the American Rescue Program. The dollar amount will put about 45-50 students being employed. They would have to meet the low income threshold. This is an opportunity to put students to work.

Mr. Cawthorne wanted to know what the hourly rate would be. Mr. Jackson said no more than \$10/hour. Mr. Cawthorne then wanted to know the launch time for this program. Mr. Jackson said possibly June through the end of July.

Amendment by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, to advance this ordinance to Thursday's meeting for introduction and remand to Economic Development Committee prior to adoption.

Mr. Burrell asked for a point of clarification. Dr. Wilson said that there is a Parish Summer Work Program for parish agencies, but this ordinance would be external to the organization.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that there are several companies hiring. He does not understand why the Parish would pay students to work at private companies. He said that there is an abundance of

jobs currently in the Parish. Mr. Jackson said that the Parish does not have enough room to place the student workers within the organization. This is an opportunity to give some low-income individuals an opportunity to go to work, Mr. Jackson said. He also pointed out that this is about safety to ensure students have a productive place to go in the summertime.

Mr. Taliaferro is not sure how this program works. Mr. Jackson said that this would be the first time for this program. Mr. Taliaferro said that he has several questions and needs more information on this ordinance.

Mr. Chavez agreed with Mr. Johnson and said that there are several companies with now hiring signs out.

Mr. Jackson said that he would like to give the children an opportunity to get jobs and be productive during the summer months.

Mr. Lazarus pointed out that on the fact sheet, it says, "legal is determining if this program is allowed". Attorney Bernstein said that they are still researching it, and it is their goal to have something by Thursday.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Taliaferro, and Young (9). NAYS: Commissioner Lazarus (1). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Atkins**, seconded by Mr. Johnson, *to englobo and move the following resolutions to Thursday's agenda:*

- *Resolution No. 37 of 2021, a resolution to authorize the Caddo Parish Administrator to request and authorize the Louisiana State Mineral & Energy Board and the Office of Mineral Resources to accept nominations and advertise for oil, gas, and mineral leases, accept bids, and award and execute oil, gas, and mineral leases on certain mineral interests owned by the Parish of Caddo, and otherwise providing with respect thereto*
- *Resolution No. 38 of 2021, a resolution to authorize the Caddo Parish Administrator to request and authorize the Louisiana State Mineral & Energy Board and the Office of Mineral Resources to accept nominations and advertise for oil, gas, and mineral leases, accept bids, and award and execute oil, gas, and mineral leases on certain mineral interests owned by the Parish of Caddo, and otherwise providing with respect thereto*

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

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, *that Resolution No. 39 of 2021, a resolution amending the Rules & By-Laws of the Caddo Parish Commission regarding the creation of Special Revenue Funds initiated by Commissioners, and otherwise providing with respect thereto* be remanded to the Personnel Policies & Procedures before the next Work Session.

Mr. Jackson pointed out that this is not the title he submitted. He said that he will be amending the title.

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

It was **moved by Mr. Chavez**, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, *that Resolution No. 40 of 2021, a resolution to authorize the addition of Hosston River Road Bridge into the Federal Off-System Bridge Rehabilitation & Replacement Program, and otherwise providing with respect thereto* be moved to Thursday's agenda. Motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (10). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Burrell, *that Resolution No. 41 of 2021, a resolution to amend Resolution No. 35 of 2021 regarding establishing an independent third-party review process into deaths at Caddo Parish owned properties or facilities, to add a provision regarding provision of video footage and otherwise providing with respect thereto* be moved to Thursday's agenda.

Mr. Jackson explained that this is to preserve the camera footage that is there, or at least try to capture the camera footage that is there.

Mr. Taliaferro believes that this is already being done. Mr. Johnson said that it works on different servers and it depends on the capacity of those servers. Some servers are set up for 30 days, some are set up for 90 days.

Mr. Taliaferro wanted to know if there would be a storage issue. Mr. Chavez believes that there was an upgrade to a server based cloud.

Mr. Kevin Lawrence, Director of Facilities & Maintenance, said that the storage varies in each location. CCC has over 37 servers, and they are getting ready to do an upgrade, but the contractor has not been able to get all of their equipment in to do it. He also explained that if, for example, a server is set for 30 days of storage, once it reaches 31 days, it writes over the first day. He also said that anytime there is an incident, the individuals who have control of the system, pulls the video and keeps it stored elsewhere.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know if the Parish keeps it. Mr. Lawrence explained that the entity with the operational control of the system does. He also explained that he has a concern with the Parish pulling it because then the Parish would become "the owner of the chain of custody". Mr. Jackson pointed out that the Parish owns the building.

At this time, Mr. Jackson's motion carried, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, Taliaferro, and Young (8). NAYS: Commissioner Lazarus (1). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson, Gage-Watts, and Johnson (3). ABSTAIN: None (0).

It was **moved by Mr. Hopkins**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *that Resolution No. 42 of 2021, a resolution establishing a Citizens Advisory Committee of the Long Range Planning Committee to study planning and zoning in Caddo Parish and otherwise providing with respect thereto be amended to have nine members and move to Thursday's agenda.*

Mr. Hopkins said that this came out of the Long Range Planning Committee, and this allows for an opportunity for the citizens to have input. Mr. Chavez agreed.

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

It was **moved by Mr. Atkins**, seconded by Mr. Young, *to englobe and move the following resolutions to Thursday's agenda:*

- *Special Resolution of Recognition for Youree Drive Middle School's Boys Basketball Program*
- *Special Proclamation recognizing the Foster Grandparents Association*
- *Special Resolution of Recognition for Antioch Baptist Church*

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

It was **moved by Mr. Jackson**, seconded by Mr. Cawthorne, *that action item to authorize and direct the Parish Administrator to request an Attorney General's Opinion regarding protocol to establish Special Revenue Funds be removed from the agenda. Motion carried*, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Atkins, Burrell, Cawthorne, Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Lazarus, Taliaferro, and Young (10). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioners Epperson and Gage-Watts (2). ABSTAIN: None (0).

COMMUNIQUES & COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Mr. Young announced that the Broadmoor Neighborhood Association will host a run-off candidate forum for the BESE Board Election District 4 on Tuesday at 6:30 PM.
- Mr. Cawthorne thanked the City of Shreveport, Parish of Caddo, and citizens for showcasing this community over the past weekend.
- Mr. Burrell also commended everyone involved in making the Port City Fest Weekend a success.

- Mr. Jackson echoed the same sentiments for the successful event of the Bayou Classic.

CONSENT AGENDA

- *Ordinance No. 6047 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Economic Development Fund to provide an appropriation of \$25,000 for the Shreveport Bossier African American Chamber of Commerce and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- *Ordinance No. 6048 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Economic Development Fund and Riverboat Fund to provide an appropriation of \$35,000 for Gameport Exhibition at Sciport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- *Ordinance No. 6049 of 2021, an ordinance amending the Budget of Estimated Revenues & Expenditures for the Oil & Gas Fund to provide an appropriation of \$100,000 for the ESO Fire Reporting System and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- *Ordinance No. 6050 of 2021, an ordinance adopting the Budget of Estimated Revenues for the American Rescue Plan Fund and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- *Resolution No. 26 of 2021, a resolution amending the Rule & By-Laws of the Caddo Parish Commission regarding the time limits of speakers under Communiqués & Committee Reports, and otherwise providing with respect thereto*

At this time, there was no further discussion to come before the Commission, so the Commission adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

/s/Michelle Nations
Assistant Commission Clerk