

Unedited Captioning Transcript of Metro Council Meeting – November 10, 2022

>>> the regular metro council meeting of NOVEMBER 10th 2022 is now in order to understand for the flag we are honored to have central high school color guard, through the instruction of senior chief phillips in recognition of veterans day. @#

>> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the united states of america, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible @#, with liberty and justice for all.

>> thank you.

I just want to introduce the color guard to you.

We have ashton, @# dorian, arianna, and elias.

We want to thank them for coming here today to present colors, as we recognize, and MR. Orlando phillips, I @# want to thank you, also.

We would like to have the opportunity for councilmembers to take a photograph of the color guard, please. @#

>> please be seated.

Thank you, senior chief.

This meeting is being held --

>> MR. PRESIDENT, taking a quick point of personal privilege?

I would like to, in addition -- wish a very happy @#247 birthday to all the marines out there who have served in my beloved core, and on behalf of tomorrow, veterans day, to thank everybody who served, including PRESIDENT James and -- other branches, such as th united states army.

We thank @#you all.

>> thank you, counsel for
castleman winkler?

Back I would also like to
exercise personal privilege.
in addition to what COUNCILMAN
Padgett -- I would like to
recommend COUNCILMAN Piagentini
on his -- and also happy
birthday, @#PRESIDENT James.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN
Feller, thank you, COUNCILMAN
Winkler.

MADAME Clerk?

Could you @#please call the roll,
and please note that COUNCILMAN
Dorsey has requested an excused
absence, please?

>> council member bowen?

Back here.

>> council member shanklin?

>> present point about is a
member dorsey?

Matt scott member arthur?

PRESIDENT James?@#

council member Mccranie?

Council member armstrong?

Does member hollander?

Councilmember mulvihill?

Member kramer?

Councilmember blackwell?

Councilmember fox?

Castle number four?

Councilmember triplatt?@#

councilmember winkler?

Councilmember parker?

Councilmember piagentini?

Councilmember vincent?

Councilmember george?

Council member angle?

Councilmember payton?

Councilmember flood? @#

does member stewart?

Councilmember ackerson?

We have 25 and a quorum.

>> thank you.

Just for the record, you do
have a brother from another
mother, his name is
councilmember scott reed, his
earth day is also NOVEMBER 22nd. @#
happy birthday, councilmember
reed.

>> what he is older.

>> all right.

colleagues, we are still in the
green zone as relates to covid-
19.

This is great news.

But we need to stay vigilant as
we head into the hold holidays,
to @#protect our most vulnerable
to.

Please get your vaccinations
and boosters.

This community lost nine people
this wee, confirmed cases have
increased by 936 since last
week.

Please keep the families who
have been touched by covid in
your thoughts and prayers.

Also, colleagues, @# -- fisher's
father, george, passed away
tuesday, at the age of 90.

George was an air force veteran,
entrepreneur, philanthropist,
and he left this world a better
place, a much better place than
he found it.

He is survived by his wife, his
children, his grandchildren,
and his great-grandchildren.

We also lost @#a local icon,
former U.S. Representative ron
rizzoli passed away NOVEMBER 1st
, one day shy of his 90th
birthday.

Ron represented the third
congressional district for 12
terms.

He chartered his own course,

made decisions based on his own
compass rather @#than party
lines.

He is survived by his children,
michael and andrea and four
grandchildren.

I would like to take this moment
for our thoughts and prayers
with a moment of silence,
please.

Thank you.@#

MADAME Clerk, are there any
addresses to the council?

>> there are.

>> let me remind those that
address the council to refrain
from using profanity or making
derogatory statements to
councilmembers.

MADAME Clerk, please bring them
forward.

>> reverend cindi @#weber.

>> I am cindi weber, pastor of
-- baptist community and
liberty, on east liberty
street.

He received my email a few
weeks ago about my homeless
friend who asked me to restore
the feather crown @#he got from
his grandmother's pillow when
she died, so it could be kept
safe.

I wrote that to remind you of
the tenderness and humanity
that so many people
experiencing homelessness
express and show, and of their
need to be treated with
compassion instead of with
punitive measures.

Our church has worked with
persons@# who have experienced
homelessness over the last 40
years, and unfortunately, we
have seen a huge growth in

those numbers, as have each of you.

Over the last three years, there was a 41% increase, more than 10,000 persons, in our city @#experiencing homelessness.

And you are the ones who have the ability, as our metro councilmembers, to change their lives, to find multiple ways to house them, to fund services that will allow them to find jobs that will provide them with the healthcare they need.

You are the ones who @#have the ability to decrease the numbers of those in our city who experience homelessness.

I am here to ask you to focus on that, to support measures that make a difference for them.

No punitive measures, please, but housing, services, investing in human beings.

For that is @#what is going to solve our city homelessness.

I know that it is sometimes hard to see difficult things and not feel punitive or judgmental.

They should not do this or they should not do that.

All of us, sometimes say.

Yet, so many of them, so many of them are doing the absolute best they can, given how very little they have.@#

when I first started working with homeless people back in my 20s at my church, one of the things I began to think about early on is, what if this man was my brother?

Or what if this woman was my grandmother?

Or what if this child was my

niece or my nephew?

And it totally @#changed the way I began to think of them, to care for them, to relate to them.

I am telling you that because I want to invite you, I want to beg you to deal with issues that involve homelessness.

So, imagine how you, how each of you would help them, how you would care for them, if they were @#one of your family members, your sibling, your child, your parent, your grandparent, your uncle, you're on, because they are.

They are family members to you.

Because all of us are connected as family in some way.

So, please, metro councilmembers, please see our homeless friends as people that matter @#to you. Find ways to address their needs, to treat them with compassion, to create safe, affordable, permanent housing for those who are experiencing homelessness, and for those who are so very close to experiencing homelessness, for they are, they are our sisters. @#

and our brothers.

Thank you.

>> natalie harris.

>> hello, my name is natalie harris.

I am executive director of the coalition for the homeless.

I am here to speak about the @# camping ordinance.

The first thing I want to say is that this proposed ordinance comes with very legitimate concerns, both from local

citizens and from metro councilmembers.

We are seeing more people sleeping out on our city streets . We have data to show these increases as well as the increased cost in housing. Even @#people who have been allocated a section 8 voucher are having trouble finding housing.

These same concerns lead us to create the 2022 plan to address unsheltered homelessness that we released earlier this year.

We have been using every funding source that we can to target reaching @#those goals.

Our rept shows that while -- housing crisis and homelessness crisis is not as large as other cities with higher housing costs, it is still big.

It was created by a lack of affordable housing, inadequate shelter facilities for all people @#in need, a backlog of sites that need to be cleared, and the fact that no one has been willing or able to clear sites that had already been cleared in the past.

I want to make metro council for taking steps toward addressing these needs by allocating money from the american rescue fund dollars.

But the problem was not created @# overnight, and it will take us more time and dedication to solve it.

I also want to thank COUNCILWOMAN George and the other sponsors of the -- ordinance for working to make changes to existing policies.

At the coalition for the homeless, we understand that people cannot take over public or private property of others.

We simply ask that they be removed in a manner that protects their safety and belongings by giving notice to move and to save their items.

We also ask that they're not the insult added to injury through fines that build up and follow people when they are finally ready to get back into housing and employment.

Unfortunately, the proposed changes do not address all the issues we have raised or even that metro council has raised in their committee meeting.

Therefore, my belief is that we must work together with the incoming administration to figure out how to change policies that will improve lives not only for homeless people, but for those affected by where they have to live outdoors.

I hope you will join me in asking the new mayor to create a task force that can create clear implementation to address all your concerns as well as hours, so that we can move forward to not only address these housing issues, but also to figure out where people can be safe and warm.

And also to make sure that people are not just moving from one side of the street to another.

Thank you.

>> bruce hardy?

bruce?

Mandy simpson?

>>@# thank you PRESIDENT James and councilmembers.

I am mandy simpson, chief quality officer with metro united way, and a representative of the ready for k alliance.

We fight for all children to have strong, healthy starts to their lives and learning journeys.

We thank you for your consideration of legislation to prevent what is an incurable but preventable condition harming thousands of our children and families, @#that is lead poisoning.

We know lead exposure is linked to dramatic, lifelong impact on well-being.

You will hear more about that momentarily.

We also know that long present dangers -- themselves in our communities and@# lives in ways that are difficult to uproot, but no less imperative to eradicate.

More than six months ago, we joined a group of stakeholders convened by COUNCILWOMAN Armstrong who agreed on those two things.

Addressing lead hazard in our community is complex and it is critical.

We came to the table with perspectives from public health, property rental, real estate, business, education, local government, and more.

And candidly,@# offered what were initially a lot of concerns and critiques, but ultimately, improvements to make sure the

lead housing ordinance before you today is efficient and effective policy.

Specifically, you will find a lead safe ordinance that is the narrowest of its kind in the nation.

Requirements apply only to rental housing units with the highest risk of lead based hazards based on their construction date.

Renovation history and current maintenance protocol.

The ordinance exemptions are sensibly broad and informed by landlord representation.

They ensure resources are used efficiently, landlord responsibility is reasonable, and safe housing stock is unaffected.

action will happen only when and where it is necessary to prevent active harm to children and families.

For the tightly targeted properties that are not exempt from lead safe protocols, landlords retain the right to choose how they remain in compliance and MAY use a range of measures from lead remediation to full abatement.

They will also have access to significant local resources available to cover all those costs from initial evaluation to addressing lead hazard with metro united way and be ready for k alliance stand alongside the ohio county teacher association site, coalition for the homeless, housing coalition, kentucky advocates, and many others endorsing

the ordinance before you today.
The coalition rejoined has spent months developing compromises to move as close as possible to full consensus without removing every single proactive measure to prevent our children from facing an incurable condition. @# we have worked comprehensively through the complexities of this challenge and its solutions.

That means the choice before us now is clear.

We can accept reasonable responsibility for a limited scope of landlords, or we will continue to use our children as test instruments for finding lead hazards and accept the lifelong impact on their futures.

We walked a long road, but before you @#is good policy and we hope you support it.

Thank you.

Back thank you.

Amir bryant?

>> hi, councilmembers.

My name is @#amira bryant. I have joined the coalition for the homeless because one year ago, I began working with through the community organization called the delegates. As we conducted focus groups to learn of their experiences as a homeless community member in the city of louisville.

before that, as we occupied@# -- I connected with many homeless members as we created a community in that space that aided them in most of their

needs, food, water, for the moment, a safe space to set up housing/their tents, transportation, clothing and shoes, therapy services, checkups with @#nurses, and lastly, communion.

This is a world that can be created by government forces through support of entities such as the hope village, or creation of more affordable houses.

Joining the conversation last week, I learned of the ordinance and how it is@# going to appear to make things harder for people already down in this community.

I thank you for making a few more changes to the ordinance for the better.

I hope these are steps in the right direction to what we truly need to assist our homeless community.

Just last year, the city had over 10,000 community members experiencing homelessness, along with 4000@# jcps units.

The average rate per month -- the average rental rate per month in louisville is \$1125, and an average family of four, at 30% ami, are making \$24,000 annually.

I appreciate you taking the time to listen to us today@# and making the adjustment to th proposed camping ordinance.

The bigger conversation is the need for help.

To accommodate families today, we need 31,000 units of affordable rental for the 20 percent of louisville residents

who earn under \$25,000 per year.
We all want a vibrant
louisville.

To reach this vision, we need
to shift from luxury condos to
more affordable housing.

When we speak of the needs of
the community, we need to be
speaking for the needs of the
entire community, not just the
citizens gainfully employed or
owning property.

We also know building
affordable homes is possible,
as we see Impd's budget rising
every year, now to \$175
million.

This is unfortunate.

While resources -- city, but
actually address root causes
and make a difference in our
living capacity and living
health -- rarely receive a
raise.

Please continue to invest in
louisville's future by
prioritizing housing.

Thank you.

>> thank you.

Brian gwen?

>> hello, my name is brian
gwen, and I am here today --
ordinance.

I am a lifelong louisville he
and, registered nurse --
epidemiology -- researcher at
university of louisville.

.1, we should support this let
ordinance because the release
of lead during the 21st century
is one of the greatest
environmental disasters in
recorded history.

Lead is a known environmental
neurotoxin, and it negatively
impacts nearly every aspect of

human health.

This is especially true of children during their first five years of life. Lead

does not serve a single biological function in the human body.

Yet since the beginning of 2006, we know of at least 200 children with lead poisoning right here, in our community.

These elevated lead levels are consistent with permanent disabilities like hearing loss, speech problems, slow growth, learning and behavioral problems, reduced IQ, ADHD, renal insufficiency, renal failure, hypertension, heart disease, and even reduced developed brain size, especially of the prefrontal cortex, which gives rise to executive functioning.

I could go on.

Even a cursory review of the record has literally thousands of journal articles that detail the hazardous and harmful nature of environmental lead.

That, this might surprise my colleagues, but I have a fiscal conservative values.

I was initially concerned about the effectiveness and cost of this ordinance.

However, you should note I reviewed every case study I could find in the literature around similar ordinances in around the net estate.

I have concluded first, local lead abatement works, because primary prevention works.

Remove the lead hazard, children cannot be poisoned.

The rate of lead poisoning comes down.

The second thing I learned was that the local laws do not appear to harm the housing market.

I literally did not find evidence that homeowners or renters were negatively impacted by local lead laws.

The last one I want to make is about values, what we value.

I think we can all agree that we value the health and wellness of babies and young children.

We value their safety more than we value the cost of importing latex paint. You have the opportunity to be a public health hero and -- epidemic of lead poisoning in our community while children are born -- perfectly innocent, they need safety and security.

They need a lead safe environment before early lead exposure permanently ruins their health and future.

Therefore, I humbly ask that you vote yes for this ordinance.

Not because it is the politically expedient thing to do, but because it is the right thing to do.

10,000 children, that is a shame.

10,000 more children, that would be a sin.

Thank you.

>> elisa owens?

>> GOD evening to you all.

I appreciate being able to speak to you briefly this evening.

I happen to be related to @#one councilperson who used to work with you guys, and one who is shortly coming to be with you all in JANUARY.

I know it is a tough thing to spend your thursday nights every othr week doing the city's business, and I appreciate it.

I am with you @#this evening because I am the executive director of kentucky interface power and light, and kentucky interface power and light exists for one reason and one reason alone.

That reason is because global warming is @#the opposite of a hoax.

It is caused by humans.

There is no doubt about it.

If you ask directions of 100 people in a city and 99 of those people told you to go one way and one person told you to go another, @# which group would you follow?

We have got 99% of our scientists telling us that we have got a problem, and the problem is bad.

The reason I am here is to remind you that we have @# still got time to fix it.

That is the good news.

A little bit of time.

But we hae got time.

So, I would like to ask you this evening to vote in support of the resolution on louisville's @#climate goals that I believe will come up this evening, if not this eveing, it will come up in short order. I have got two children, one is

a 13-year-old and one is a 10-year-old, both girls.

I want a future for them@#, just like I want a future for your kids and your grandkids.

And I think that although the metro council has dealt with this resolution in the past, I think it would be really wonderful for the council to be able to give a signal to the new administration that you are behind them @#as they work to mitigate Louisville's climate

-

footprint.

That would leave me, on behalf of myself, on behalf of my children, and on behalf of yours.

Please vote in support @#of the resolution this evening.

Thank you for your time.

>> thank you.

Cesar Calhoun?

I'm sorry, what did you say?

You said your civil rights are @# being violated?

>> okay, anyway, my civil rights, all talking about home -- I already work for my life.

I lost my home due to somebody here.

But what I am @#trying to tell you all is, my civil rights have been violated. I don't have an apartment.

My civil rights have been violated -- the people.

And also, if they let other people talk for me -- I will say this really quick.

This@# -- filed in court is a bogus paper.

Here are the titles, and the sheriff messed with the numbers

, I can prove it.
About it.
That is a felony.
At the end of the day, y'all
threw me out @#of home. Y'all
don't deal with me.
And my civil rights just -- be
able to work like y'all work it.
Forced into housing, and all
y'all -- I am just crazy -- @#the
police running around here,
targeting me with -- no, y'all
talking about killing -- people
not going sit around here,
debate y'all or work.
What I am telling I just@# told
it to you.
Here is the paper, right here.
This is a paper that says
august 23rd, kicked out.
One thing in SEPTEMBER,
SEPTEMBER -- not true.
I went on the seventh month.
This paper is all messed up.@#
you call the democrats up there
in franklin heard you?
All I am telling you, I have
rights -- not be a fruitcake.
I never put my hands on nobody. @#
y'all talk to my family
members, you taught to
everybody around me but me.
Y'all want tell I am crazy, say
I am crazy but I appreciate --
presentation -- could have
asked me a question -- on
computer.
I was in jail 30 years
something I did not do.
That paper @#should not even got
there.
I was in jail in taylor county
30 years, was not even me.
, overwork, lose my house, my
dignity, and my mind?
All I am telling y'all, police

around here, playing with my
medical @#records -- out of here
-- section 8.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, that
concludes the addresses to the
council.

>> thank you, MADAM Clerk.
Next, we have approval of
council minutes for the
recorded meeting OCTOBER 27th,
2022.

Any@# amendment or deletion?
Moved to approve.

>> second.

>> minutes have been properly
moved and seconded.

All votes in favor, please say
I?

>> ollie pope?

-- have it, approved as
written.

Next, we have approving
committee minutes, regular
committee -- @# OCTOBER 27 20 22.

Parks and sustainability
OCTOBER 21st, 2022.

Planning and zoning committee,
NOVEMBER 1st, 2022.

Labor and economic development
committee, NOVEMBER 1st, 2022.

Regular public works committee @#
NOVEMBER 1st 2022.

Regular government oversight
and audit committee NOVEMBER
the 2022, regular community
affairs, housing, health, and
education committee, NOVEMBER
2nd 2022.

Regular public safety
committee, NOVEMBER 2nd, 2022,
regular appropriations
committee, NOVEMBER second
2022, regular parks and his
inability to meet@# committee,
NOVEMBER 3rd, 2022, regular
committee on it the inclusion

NOVEMBER 3rd, 22, regular
budget committee, NOVEMBER 3rd,
20.2 point any deletions?

>> motion.

>> second.

>> minutes are properly moved
and seconded.

All in favor, please --

>>

>> aye..

>> ollie pope? @#

aye's habit.

Man up for, and it medications
from the mayor?

Please read them into the
record.

Back here PRESIDENT James, in
accordance with commission on
persons with disability

ordinance, I am reporting the
following -- , term expires

DECEMBER 12, 2023 @# -- much
appreciated, sincerely --

fisher mayor -- port ordinance

I am reappointing the following:

michael the cut, reappointment

expires -- 2035 -- sincerely --

mayor -- PRESIDENT James --

human relations advocacy board @#

reappointing the following --

reimport expires 2025.

DR. Karen shah, reappointment

term expires SEPTEMBER 30th,

2020 -- most appreciated

sincerely -- mayor. @#

their present, in accordance

with the landmark and

preservation district

commission ordinance, I am

appointing and reappointing the

following: -- 2025, NOVEMBER

30th 2025 -- reappointment term @#

expires and never 30th 2025,

ashley ackerman, term --

reappointment term expires

NOVEMBER 30th 2025, david --

term expires and never 30th
2025, and morgan ward,
reappointment term expires
NOVEMBER 30th 2025 for your
prompt action on the
reappointment @#is most
appreciated, sincerely, greg
fisher, mayor.

>>, those appointments meeting
council approval -- government
oversight and audit committee.
Next of business is consent
calendar.

Consent calendar comprises
items number 19 to 33.

Are there any deletions or
additions?@#

MADAM Clerk, a second reading
of these items, please.

>> following what is important
from a perfusion study, item
19, ordinance amending
ordinance 084 series 2022 and
or DECEMBER 83 syrah 22,
relating to fiscal years 22-23
respectively by transferring
\$3710.80 from the district six
neighborhood development fund -- @#
item 20 and ordinance 084 series
rates for fiscal year 2022 --
metro government by lapsing
completed capital projects [
Indiscernible] Funding to the
unallocated @#bipartisan
infrastructure law bill.
Grant projects to address
future bill grant
opportunities.

Item 21 is a resolution to
request the release of federal
interest in the revolving loan
fund operated by the
metropolitan business
development corporation.

Item 22 @#is a resolution
acknowledging the satisfaction

of conditions precedent on the appropriation authorizing premium pay for suburban fire and ems employees.

The following legislation was forwarded from community affairs health and education committee, honoring the honorable reginald meeks by dedicating the corner of virginia avenue and 28 street as reginald meeks way.

Item 24 is evolution honoring mary collier woolridge by dedicating winfield lane and the intrsecting corners of each street, south 23r street, and dixie highway as mary collier woolridge lane in her honor.

Item 25 is a resolution to address theadverse effect of decades of redlining. The following legislative order from the government oversight and audit committee, item 26, the apartment of tyler blackwell to the commission on public art board term expires OCTOBER 24th, 2026.

Following legislative forwarded by labor and economic development committee, 27, a resolution determining certain property at 3025 west madison street, 3033 vermont avenue, 3048 west mohammed ali boulevard and west muhammad ali boulevard parcel I.D.

Number 007601050000 as surplus and not needed for governmental purpose and authorizing its transfer.

The following legislation was forwarded from parks and his inability committee, item 28, a

resolution approving the naming of a new park as windsor park. Item 29, a resolution recognizing the legacy of alberto jones, a black american attorney and civil rights icon, and approving the naming of a new park on maple street between DR. Wj hodge and 25th street in her honor.

The following legislation forwarded from planning and zoning committee, item 30 is an ordinance relating to an amendment to the planned development district for an adjustment to the boundary lines on the southern area map and being in louisville metro case I.D.

Dp 0021 item 31 and accordance leading to the closure of a portion of old taylorville road between us outside of taylorville road and east bank of lloyd's for containing approximately 1.26 acres and being in louisville metro. item 232, an ordinance relating to the closure of a portion of enterprise drive adjacent to csx railroad containing approximately 2.034 acres and being in louisville metro, case number three closure 0051.

The following modulation forwarded from public safety committee, item 33, a resolution authorizing the mayor to make application for and upon approval to enter into an agreement with the kentucky office of homeland security to execute any documents which are deemed necessary to facilitate and administer the project and

to act as the authorized correspondent for this project in the amount of \$1,072,341 for the purchase of ballistic rifle plates to be administered by the louisville metro police department.

>> motions move.

>> motion by COUNCILMAN Triplett, seconded by COUNCILMAN Piagentini@#, MADAME Court, will you please open the role for voting?

MADAME Court, would you please call the role for those not present in chambers?

>> councilmember @#

>> present?

>> cousin amber dorsey, customer purpose?

>> yes.

>> councilmember mulvihill?

Councilmember flood?

>> yes.

>> @# MR. PRESIDENT, you have 23 yes votes.

>> thank you.

The consent calendar passes.

Next item of business is old business but medical, read item number 34, please.

>> an ordinance creating chapter 149 and repealing and replacing@# sections of chapter 156 of the louisville metro code of orders relating to owners of property on which reoccurring crime is negatively impacting sliding neighborhoods as amended.

>> motion, winkler.

>> seconded, councilmember piagentini.

any discussion? COUNCILMAN Fox?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This is your ordinance --

COUNCILWOMAN George at@#
councilmember -- work on it as
well.

Great civil events to be [
Indiscernible] By the code
enforcement board for the
problem properties that are
detected in a neighborhood. I
will defer to COUNCILWOMAN
George or to COUNCILWOMAN Purvis@#
to discuss this further.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN George?

>> thank you, PRESIDENT.

And to chair fox's point, what
we are looking to do is better
identify definitions around@#
persistent illegal activity on
a property, looking to better
identify a process around that.
That is what you will see
reflected in the ordinance.

-

everything from how a property
gets notified to also be steps
that are taken, particularly
around treatments that then can
be made -- in the event that
there is disagreement @#between
the property owner, the tenant,
and those stakeholders who are
advancing safety and health of
the community.

I see robbie is here, robbie --
this work, I do not know if he
wants to speak to the changes
made.

I know we have several
amendments tonight that also
could get @#us to a better
product, and are more inclusive
of the overall community in
trying to achieve our goals.

>> robbie -- assistant county
attorney's office -- you have
described the main aspect of

the change we want to make to this ordinance -- dealing with the problem of properties that have continuous criminal elements going on, there.

The ordinance changes we have before you today streamlines the system about how that gets addressed.

It gives property owners greater ability to work with the city to address those problems, and really just eliminates some procedural problems -- this ordinance [Indiscernible].

>> all right, thank you.

Did you have anything further, COUNCILWOMAN?

>> know.

I would either turn this over to council member purvis, if she has anything to add, because she also worked on it, or we [Indiscernible]

>> iq.

council member purvis, would you like to discuss it?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

And thank you to my colleagues, COUNCILWOMAN George as well as COUNCILWOMAN Fox.

This is something we felt was necessary to enhance this ordinance, a few of my constituents in certain areas have been affected by the behavior and lack of oversight, with some businesses that either ignore criminal activity or actually encourage it.

so, I hope my colleagues will support this ordinance. That is all I have to say.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

There is an amendment, substitution in the system, for this document it really @#comes about from the discussion we had at the committee, and then at the caucus last week, particularly regarding notification to tenants.

One of the improvements, I think, in this ordinance from what we currently have on the books is that there is an earlier process where this notification of @#potential violation -- the ordinance really talked about notice only to the property owner, it would be a posting, but no direct notice to the property owner.

So, and multiple locations, we have added language that tenants would also be notified, so @#they could also take some action to remedy whatever situation exists that could potentially be declared a criminal activity.

That is really the only change, adding the language intense.

There is also @#one section, making it clear that if a tenant fails to meet with appropriate city officials -- that is on page 70 -- again, actions MAY be taken to remedy the ongoing criminal nuisance.

So, I move that as an amendment.

>> motion from COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> second. @#

>> seconded by COUNCILMAN Fox.

Any discussion?

COUNCILMAN George?

>> this is not on the amendment, but on the overall. Are you ready?

Excellent.

What I failed to mention was just really, a lot of appreciation for both presenting -- being able to elevate some of the challenges of your team and @#our community with problem properties, where there is ongoing in person crime, and particularly violent crime on site.

So -- reflect that.

In addition, I want to mention a lot of the challenges we hear in the community around how we respond@# to these properties, one of the pieces that should be elevated is the fact that code enforcement does tremendous work, and has strong leadership on public nuisance.

What we see, though, is that there really would be a benefit to having dedicated expertise in the way of a specific @#unit that is responsible, and where there is a clear bridge with Impd, whether that is a liaison or someone that can work typically with [Indiscernible], and then, when you have that level of focus, but will, is a level of consistency that then develops trust in the community.

I think that is a really important piece that, while @#we cannot legislate it, should be elevated for making improvements.

Thank you.

Thank you, councilmember.

Any further discussion?

Hearing on, all in favor, say
aye.

All opposed?

The aye's have it, amendment@#

-- any further discussion?

Hearing on, MADAME Clerk,
please open the role for voting.

MADAME Clerk, would you please
call the role for those not
present in the chambers?

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

>> councilmember purvis?

>> yes.

>> councilmember mulvihill?

>> yes.

>> @# councilmember flood?

>> yes.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, you hav 25
yes votes.

>> thank you, ordinance passes.

MADAME Clerk, please read item
number 35.

>> an ordinance@# amending
sections 21.02, 21.05, 21.06,
and 21.99 of the louisville
metro court ordinances and
creating new sections of
chapter 21 relating to the
lobbying of metro officers,
amendment by substitution as
amended.

Back motion,

>> thank you, motion by
COUNCILMAN Winkler.

Second by@# COUNCILMAN
Piagentini.

Ordinance is before us.

Is there any discussion?

COUNCILMAN Ackerson?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This is an ordinance that has
been a long time coming, an old
hollander ordinance.

It is the psa resistance at the
end.

Very @#important --
>> thank you, counsel.
COUNCILMAN Hollander?
>> not sure if that is meant to
defeat it or support it.
I thought it was the tree
ordinance that had my name,
that is what councilmember
peden always said.
I think it is important, @#it has
been a long time -- remember
last year, we had to re-file --
we are unusual as a community,
certainly as a community that is
[Indiscernible] We don't have
any registration, any
regulation, any recording on
the activity [Indiscernible].
If @#you look around the country
[Indiscernible] The cities
close to us, but if you look at
really, most cities that are
our size, they do have a
lobbyist registration [
Indiscernible] Rec relation
indianapolis, cincinnati,
nashville, those are not
exceptions, they are the rule.
Even contract lobbyists have
told me@# [Indiscernible] How
unusual it is to lobby [
Indiscernible] With no
registration and no regulation.
So, I think we should fi this
[Indiscernible] Trying to do.
We made a proposal in
NOVEMBER.
We heard a lot of comments,
including from lobbyists, and
from many members.
We have made many @#changes to
the ordinance [Indiscernible]
Accommodate those changes, and
now, I think we are at a point
where we should pass it. [
Indiscernible] Otherwise

doing this [Indiscernible]

Let me talk about what we are doing, in terms of the details . What this does is require the registration of lobbyists. Lobbying is defined as direct communication with a metro officer or staff for the purpose of influencing an official decision or official actions.

It does not include, and this is very important, any communications by a person who is not getting paid.

It does not include ordinary and routine permitting.

It does not include ordinary and routine comments or request about operational issues.

It does not include any comments in any public meeting.

It does not include solicited comments, where a member of metro council MAY call somebody who works for an organization to say, what do you think about this?

The exceptions are broad, and they got broader as we went along.

I think it was an improvement in most respects.

It also requires disclosure of expenditures.

It requires registration, and the registration provision, however, is delayed for six months after the effect.

We did that intentionally, so that the ethics commission would have an opportunity to inform the public, hopefully present a handbook, tell everybody what to do.

So, the registration

requirements do not take @#effect tomorrow -- today.

They don't take effect when the mayor signed it, they take effect in six months.

The registration is, and most of the cities I have looked at, a two page form.

It says I am a joe, I work for @# this organization, and I am lobbying on this subject.

It requires -- the ordinance requires registration every two years.

It requires updated lobbying statements every two years.

There is no charge to register.

It also prohibits some financial transactions between lobbyists and metro @#officers.

It prohibits elected metro officers from becoming a lobbyist within one year after leaving office.

That was also changed from two years in the original proposal.

It is not just elected, and some other metro offices.

Two and, frankly, the revolving @# door we have sometimes seen.

Though, that provision, and the prohibition on financial transactions, would take effect at the end of the year.

I know there will be some amendments tonight.

I have worked with councilmember -- , we have made some@# amendments that council member george suggested.

We will talk about them.

I think we should be very careful in not trying to address every potential issue and creating loopholes in the ordinance that really will

weaken it in serious ways.

I will be happy to address the amendments as they come up.

I want to @#thank everybody for participating in this process.

I have got a lot of comments from members, and made a lot of changes in response to those comments.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN Hollander.

COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I want to thank COUNCILMAN Hollander for [Indiscernible] @# this.

I have regularly covenanted COUNCILMAN Hollander [Indiscernible] I thought the way he went about amending this, being open to suggestions.

I met with him, we addressed a while back [Indiscernible]

We went through it, compromise @# to address just about every scenario we talked about.

So, first of all, I want to thank you for all the hard work.

i support [Indiscernible]

After tonight.

I want [Indiscernible] COUNCILMAN Hollander said toward the end.

That is, I tend to lean hard @# for transparency, okay?

I think it is quite overdue that we have something like this [Indiscernible]. With

that said, I have also [Indiscernible] Bureaucracy. [Indiscernible] Creating new groups of people lobbying this, that, the other thing.

Really, all of this @# just requires transparency related

to what is going on, currently.
It does not create some army of
people that are monitoring all
this, but the transparency
allows the public to [
Indiscernible] Which is first
and foremost on my mind.
I think the amendments that
have been made are very good,
and I agree that I would be [
Indiscernible] To go much
further than we have run
without implementing this.
Like I said, [Indiscernible]
I have no doubt that once we [
Indiscernible] This, once this
goes into effect in six months,
and once we get six months to
one year under our belt, some

-
situation is going to [
Indiscernible] That we will
probably need to clarify, but I
would rather do that after
this has been in place, and we
have an actual case of
unintended consequence, rather
than a lot of hypotheticals.
I think -- this enough to
balance overbearing reporting
structure with transparency, so
I am just saying, I am going to
be somewhat hesitant to go
further in further tailoring it
until we try this level of
transparency, and see where we
can make small adjustments that
makes sense, given the
experience.

That is what I am going to ask
you for, and hopefully, get a
great experience with this --
would also be open -- anybody
else has, but I wanted to thank
COUNCILMAN Hollander for
working -- this, all the others

that have put in @#feed back.

I think we have a very good start at increasing transparency.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILMAN George?

>> thank you, PRESIDENT.

I also want to thank COUNCILMAN

Hollander for all the work that has gone into thi important ordinance.

I am certain that will be echoed tonight.

I want to @#start by saying that we want to strike a balance between ensuring transparency on issues -- public interest, while also putting a premium on community voice.

Particularly from those who represent ou most vulnerable, and have -- often. @#

since we heard there are other ways to do this, I would like to propose four opportunities to strengthen wha came out of committee, so we have amendments loaded in the system.

I appreciate everyone keeping an open mind, @# COUNCILMAN Piagentini's reference.

You will hear the term "hypothetical" a lot tonight.

I want to say, on the front and, if you hear a scenario raised, it is not hypothetical, it is because it came about in a real-life scenario.

I wish I were smart enough to think and hypotheticals.

So, to start, I want to offer an amendment.

I am looking at alice, the county attorney's office,

because I want @#to make sure I do this properly.

But I would like to offer each amendment individually, there are four amendments to be made. I am doing that because I think each deserves a little bit of discussion.

I want to make sure -- given space for that.

The first amendment I would propose is @#to the definition of employer, on page two.

The proposed amendment would be to include that an employer shall not include a sitting member of the metro council.

The reason for this is that councilmembers seek influence by our definition of service.

It is not a secret.

Many communities do not have the @#capacity or the runway to implement community identified initiatives like neighborhood plans or four door studies.

Many council officers -- some council offices spend dollars, which, of course, is public knowledge, to be able to advance those goals.@# this, in the ordinance itself, lobbying does not include an elected official.

So, for that reason, I proposed specifying that elected cannot be an employer.

>> thank you.

We have a motion for an amendment.

Do we have a second? @# we have a second by COUNCILWOMAN Fowler.

Any discussion?

COUNCILMAN [Indiscernible]

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I would like to say that I think the whole concept of council members paying people to lobby is foreign to me. @# I do not think -- I have talked to COUNCILWOMAN George about some of the things her office is paying people to do. I do not think they are lobbying under the definition we currently have. She has mentioned, for example, organizing a meeting. That is not direct contact with a mentor office advocating for something. I do not think that @# is lobbying. I also think we should be extremely careful and very reluctant to say that other people who are employers of lobbyists need to register, but metro councilmembers do not. I am extremely nervous @# about doing that, not only nervous, I think it is wrong. I do not want to exclude us from what we think other employers should do. So I will vote no on this amendment.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT. Nobody think this is @# twilight zone night, that COUNCILMAN Hollander and I agree on so much, but I agree. First of all, I am generally opposed to making exceptions for elected officials exceptions should be used sparingly, related to -- can do in closed session, related to [Indiscernible] @# privacy concerns [Indiscernible]

Issues, but [Indiscernible]
Extremely narrowly tailored
idea of where we [
Indiscernible] Exceptions.
That is number one.
Number two, frankly, even -- @#
why wouldn't the public want to
know this?
Let's assume for a second --
because I agree with COUNCILMAN
Hollander, I think some of
those areas [Indiscernible],
but said he would, or whatever
scenario [Indiscernible]
Metro councilmembers, eight
sitting member of metro council
is an employer, as defined here
[Indiscernible] Contact, and
that group of @#people are
coming back, fitting the
definition of lobbyists.
I absolutely think the public
should know about that.
It makes no sense to me why you
would hide that, what is the
difference?
The point is the transparency.
We should be just as
transparent, arguably even more
transparent, @# when public
dollars are used in the context
of doing footwork [
Indiscernible] People with
private dollars.
I agree with this one. Thank
you, MR. PRESIDENT.
>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN Kramer?
>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.
I think my confusion centers
around the language. @#
as I understand it, I have the
ability to employ someone to
work in my office, it is late
of assistant, if I were to hire
a secretary, something like

that, that would be an employee of mine.

I do not get the sense that is what we are talking about. @#

-- understanding having our legislative assistant or somebody who works in our office, go out and lobby.

There are a host of reasons that would be a problem.

If that is not what we are talking about, as I understand the way it works, as a councilperson, @#we cannot contract with someone.

I cannot hire an outside contractor using my office account.

I cannot hire an outside contractor using my neighborhood

-- funded there is not a way to employ anyone except in my office. @#

so, unless -- and again, I am seeking clarification, I suppose, unless what we are suggesting is, as a sitting council member, using my own personal resources from some other source of income, to hire a lobbyist to go out and lobby.

If that is what we are talking about, then I agree with COUNCILMAN's hollander and piagentini, @# that certainly, if we have got a councilperson who has an external source of income, hiring lobbyists, I don't know why that city elected official would warrant anymore exemption or preference over -- @# I mean, private money, they can do what they want, but I should think it would be held to the same standards as anybody else.

I do not know if that is confusion on my part, but I do not know how, other than outside money, I don't know how a councilmember would hire

-

somebody or contract with them anyway.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN George?

>> thank you.

First of all, yes, @#we wan to hold everybody to the same standards.

This is not about hiding anything, it is about administrative burden.

And to answer your question, we all get the same amount of money.

And with that, we have the ability to contract out professional services.

As part of that, what comes with that is the scope of work.

As part of that scope @#of work, a counsel office would not specify lobbying activities, I will give a real-life scenario.

What happens is that your contracting professional services to advance a corridor study, for instance.

Anyone connected with @# -- highway is currently benefiting from the contract with streets for people.

It seeks to advance that immunity-driven corridor study. Not the court aside from anyone counsel office, the community driven study.

It is a mirror to what happens with friends of -- road, which we should all be so fortunate to have @#that level of capacity,

to drive forward the changes that were identified as community needs, and in alignment with metro goals.

So, as part of that, what happens is that, while none of the scope of work specifies lobbying, to advance those initiatives, the contractor, by necessity, could be involved in lobbying.

a very good example would be around -- identified in the preston highway plan, we have six major intersections -- dangerous as part of that.

We know that many community members are going to want to advocate for funding, and having streets for people being able to advocate for highway safety improvement program dollars is going to be very important.

So, as lobbying is defined in this ordinance, there is a concern that, by extension, a counsel office could employ a lobbyist.

That is not the intention.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

>> thanks for the specific scenario, COUNCILMAN George.

I would say this is precisely the scenario -- disclose.

I am not disputing we have the ability to do that, we do.

I don't have any special groups in disrict 19, like friends of brownstone road or -- that pay for things like that.

That got paid for a neighborhood plan in an area that was redistrict it out of my district.

In the context of that, is that group that we have contracted with, then comes back and does anything within the definition of -- does anything within the @# definition of lobbying, they are going to write the report, they are going to educate about it, something like that, but I can tell you, the contractor doing [Indiscernible] Is not going to do anything that would constitute lobbying.

But if they did, I would want it disclosed.

so, I appreciate@# the situation you are in.

I think the majority of districts do not have groups that help for some of these things.

I have used my own -- money to pay for neighborhood plan -- COUNCILMAN Benson has [Indiscernible] Other things.

We @#have these contractors that do work for us.

But if they were then taking the next step, and coming back to convince people that this

-

should be passed or certain actions should be taken, I am precisely voting against it, because I do think that should be disclosed. @#

thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN Pete in?

>> sorry, I thought jecorey was before me.

I want to use the example that COUNCILMAN George just used, the -- corridor.

I checked in, @#COUNCILMAN Phlogiston, COUNCILMAN Fox MAY

have chipped in.

I guess, is the implication,
then, it would all be listed as
funding a lobbyist?

Because number one, like
piagentini, okay.

You want to add my name, we all
take credit for that stuff
anyway, so I do not necessarily
have a problem with that.

But @#my question is, is that
what your fear is?

>> COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> it is not a fear.

And to be clear, for
councilmembers who recently
contributed to the press --
that is a really good question,
obviously, that group will be @#
doing some advocacy, in the way
of improvements to the cora
door and opportunities.

I am referencing [
Indiscernible] Dollars that
were spent across [
Indiscernible], a similar
responsibility component of
improvements to preston.

It is not a fear, what I would
say is @#it is now another
administered a task on
something that I would see as
duplicative, because wha we do
is already transparent.

We spend our counsel office
dollars as it should be,
already available to the
public.

There is no secret that we are
relying on [Indiscernible]
Alliance to do some of the work
in terms of advancing the plan, @#
same with crawford, preston --
all that can being said, my
position is that councilmembers
should not be employers.

I understand if folks are not going to allow it.

Thank you.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I guess my question is for the counsel attorney's office.

I was not aware that we could use our office cost center accounts with no oversight from the counsel, to pay an outside source.

You know, ndf has come back to us, and ndf would obviously be approved by the council, then a nonprofit organization or public works, or some other entity would enter the contract.

Councilmembers, typically, would not.

I have to tell you, I have been on the counsel as long as anybody.

this is the first time I have ever heard of a councilperson using an office account to pay

-

a contractor, and as a matter of fact, not only is it the first time I have heard of it -- I wish I could -- I was not planning -- I did not realize it was even happening.

I cannot even point to something I got as a rule or law, I can tell you, we have been told expressly in the past, that as councilmembers, we cannot enter into contracts.

There is not a way to do that.

I know that was in a conversation, I feel now, in this conversation, it was probably in a conversation about neighborhood development funds.

I do not know if I just thought that applied to office accounts, too. It seems to me @# it would apply more to office accounts than nef accounts. Office accounts have no oversight, each of us gets \$30,000, we can move nef funds over there, that is over \$100,000 in an office account with no counsel oversight at all.

If you@# cannot write a contract using ndf's, how could you use your office account to enter a contract agreement?

Could somebody in the county attorney's office respond to that for me?

I am really struck that this is part of the conversation.

Thank you.

>> MS. Lyons, are you there?@#

>> I am here, and I can say my colleague, catherine -- is on the call.

Catherine has more experience in appropriation funding than I do.

I drafted the ordinance, but I cannot answer councilmember kramer.

So, I will turn it over to catherine --

>> hi, @#this is catherine from the county attorney's office.

To answer your question [Indiscernible] Are not able to unilaterally enter a contract, but you can purchase services through the cost center.

You will not be entering into that contract [Indiscernible] Process, @#so there is a process you would go through with your

metro council business, but you are not unilaterally entering a contract, that is correct.

Does that answer your question?@#

>> I am not an attorney, so I am not sure if it does.

I am struggling to understand --

I have a printer in my office that is a service, I suppose.

Many of us pay for printed newsletters that we @#put out.

I do not guess -- I would not consider that a contract.

But if somebody is performing work for me, it would seem to me like that is a contract.

And I would think we would be expressly prohibited from those.@#

a contract in my office is one thing, to pay for my printer or to publish a newsletter.

Those are office expenses you would normally expect.

You might purchase furniture or something.

But paying someone to do work separate from your office, that seems like a contract to me.

I would think, again, that kind @# of arrangement would make more sense through an nef, where it requires more transparency than this ordinance requires.

At the very minimum, I am in agreement that we should vote against this amendment, at the very least.

Having done @#that, I would encourage that we go back and take a good, hard look at the rules that are in place around our office accounts.

Because if this is somehow an appropriate use of office accounts -- I question that.

I think anytime you enter a

contract, the council should @# know that.

More than just a declaration on a form somewhere.

And I understand, all the time with our nef accounts, we support nonprofit organizations that do all kinds of work.

I don't challenge or question that, but it comes before the counsel, get a robust discussion, or at least it should.

It @#gets a declaration to the county attorney's office, as the public purpose.

That seems like a more appropriate way to enter contracts to me, then through an office account.

I am taken aback by this.

I will vote no, and I hope the rest of my @#colleagues will as well.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN Peyton?

>> a couple questions have arisen.

Maybe I am thinking like an old guy, like kramer, since we have been around forever.

As soon as we start talking about contracts, I brought up grass cutter.

I cannot just go out and tired higher a grass cutter because a @# parkway needs to be cut.

COUNCILMAN Winkler was like yeah, you can.

How long have we been able to do that?

Because we tried -- going back 20 years ago, we were told it wesley, finally, MR. Blackwell to the right, over there, he has been around as long.

We were told, straight up, you could not do that.

When @#did we start being able to just hire people to do stuff?

I mean, I am asking when the line changed?

Because anybody who has been here since the beginning, if we wanted to get a project like that done, you had to move money to a @#sponsoring agency, a nonprofit, an h away in the area, some business association.

Then, they would go get the grass trimmed, or the tree cut down or whatever.

Please, somebody tell me -- I want to be re-elected again, how do I go back on -- I want to know, when did that change?

Seriously, look at the confusion on the old people around here. @#

tell me when we started being able to hire public service people?

>> COUNCILMAN George?

>> thank you, PRESIDENT.

I do not know when that changed.

But I want to be clear to say, these are nominal amounts of money. @#

so, while, maybe it does not matter, I think it is important to know that they are nominal amounts of money.

We are talking about use of cost center dollars for professional consultancy work, professional services consultancy work, things like organizing meetings, engaging the community, providing expertise on ways to engage --

>> no, I@# get your ordinance, I

know what your amendment is about, I know what hollander's ordinance is about.

I have a question that I will go back to in a minute.

Right now, I want to know when did I start being able to hire people to do stuff that needs to be done? @#

that MAY be a question for the county attorney.

Because when we started -- and again, COUNCILMAN Blackwell, help me out.

You are not in your head, but I need somebody else to tell me that was absolutely not a thing we were allowed to do.

>> COUNCILMAN Peden, did you have a question for somebody?

>> that is my question, when did it change?

Who are you asking?

>> the county attorney, I guess. @#
-- it was very clear you cannot do that.

Spent thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> MS. Lyons?

>> council member peden, as you know, I have only been with the county attorney's office for a couple years.

I certainly do not know when the switch happened, but I will do the research with my colleagues @#and get an answer for you.

If there was a switch.

I cannot even answer that much right now, but I will find out.

>> again, COUNCILWOMAN Flood is up from the original crew, MR.

Mulvihill has been around a very long time.

Can any of @#them?

I mean, seriously -- there was

stuff we all needed to get done,
each one of us would have loved
to hire a cleanup crew to go to
that abandoned house.

We would have loved --
COUNCILWOMAN Purvis could be
hiring people -- 175 abandoned
yards.

When were retold we could do
that?

I @#want to know, and I will be
out the door before the answer.
Now, I want to go to COUNCILMAN
Hollander and his ordinance,
and COUNCILWOMAN Jordan she's
amendment.

I go back to my example of the
preston highway business
alliance. That is, again, me,
flood, fox, george, a few
others, @#gave funds to support
their activities, including a
single individual, whose job is
to go around and find other
members to join, coordinate
businesses in the area, et
cetera.

And beyond me putting my name@#
on that nef, I am a sponsor in
there, now officially tied to
that, COUNCILWOMAN George is
saying, because of that nef, I
would have to register as a
lobbyist.

You are shaking your head no,
but she is saying differently.
Maybe that is the question for
the county attorney.

>> I am happy to answer that.@#

>> and I'm going to agree with
council member piagentini --
make this a habit.

I do not think -- and I think
it is quite clear in the
ordinance, that the preston
business association, funding,

going around finding the @# members, having meetings, whatever the business association does, is lobbying. Now, if, at some point that paid person -- again, if they are not paid, they are not a lobbyist, ever -- has direct communication with a metro officer about a regulation, a policy, or whatever, that @# is lobbying.

And at that point, they should disclose it.

And if the metro council has paid for that person to lobby, then, that should be disclosed, too.

You would fill out a form, a two page form that says you employed this person to go lobby.

-

that is it.

There is no prohibition @# on it.

I am not sure it is the best policy, but that is not my call.

But what you are describing, what the preston business association is doing, is not lobbying.

>> but, let's say that that employed person does exactly what you said, comes in, meet with nicole, @# comes in and meets with whatever councilmember is representing that area, saying we need help with this, we need supplemental, blah, blah, blah. Think how many times we give an ndf that are just 500 here, 500 there.

Does each of them now had to fill out that two page declaration? @#

>> no, because you are not paying them to lobby, you are paying their operational expenses.

You are not paying them to lobby.

>> they had to fill out the form?

>> yes.

>> okay.

>> does that answer you, councilmember peden?

>> yes.

Back all right, thank you.

COUNCILMAN Winkler?@#

>> I think we have moved back to the lobbying ordinance, which is what I actually wanted to ask about.

The county attorney cannot answer the question about the contract thing.

I think there are a number of contract -- direct example I can think of is, when we have a recycling event, we pay -- truck.

I do not know the mechanics of how that works, but I know my office gets an invoice from @#the shredding truck.

I think that is a contract between my office and whatever company does the shredding.

I do not think that is somehow nefarious or inappropriate, or any other thing.

I hope we can put a pin in that, let the county attorney do some research, and -- the committee@#, something like that.

That is my only request, that we focus on the ordinances before us.

>> thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN Parker?

>> yes.

It has been my experience that anything that has gone through our cost center always has to be through an approved vendor. @# that is what I learned, that is the way I always operated. And I mean, even if it is for shredding, that shredding company has to be an approved vendor.

I wanted to put in some speed lights, and I was directed, the city of linden did them so much better, they @#were half the cost , and I could not use those, because they were not an approved vendor.

So, we had to pay double for a lower quality product.

But my point being, I always thought that everything that went through the cost center had to be @#through an approved vendor.

So, I do not see where ndf meets that criteria.

I have a gulping problem with this.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN. COUNCILWOMAN George?

No?

All right.

COUNCILWOMAN Arthur?@#

>> thank you.

I am confused.

I am just curious if the sponsor, councilmember hollander, could you tell us if you think the example that COUNCILWOMAN Nicole george just shared, would make -- she said, according to your definition -- have to fill @#out whatever registration?

Okay.

And then, MAY I ask
COUNCILWOMAN George a question?

>> yes, sir.

>> when you say duplicative, I
assume you mean because we
already have a process where
people can figure out where we
are spending money, so why
would we then also have to fill
this out?

But you are saying we @#would not
have to fill it out at all,
right?

>> yes, that is what I am
saying.

I do not think it is lobbying,
therefore this ordinance would
not affect it.

>> thank you.

>> did you also have a question
for COUNCILWOMAN George?

Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN Flood?@#

>> I went through, I am sorry.

>> thank you.

So, we have an amendment before
us.

We have had discussion.

Any other discussion on this
amendment?

Hearing none, all in favor, say
aye. @#

>> aye.

>> all opposed?

>> no.

>> the no habit.

COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> let's hope this one is not
as much fun.

Amendment number two proposed@#

-- is under what lobbying does
not include, under paragraph 12
, it currently states

communications about community
issues which might require

appropriations of \$25,000 or less, if the potential appropriation benefits two or more persons or entities, examples such as appropriations include, without limitations, speed humps and streetlights. So, the goal of this is really to talk about, again, what lobbying does not include. What I have proposed in the way of an amendment is to strike the language around \$25,000, and instead replace that with communications about community issues involving public infrastructure or management of the right-of-way. Again, it is the potential appropriations benefit -- city, the purpose behind that and the reason is that, quite frankly, it is very impractical for anyone, whether a business or a nonprofit, to really understand or have knowledge of the cost. So, very quickly, something can go from trying to address an issue with parking, advocating for payment of a right-of-way, and -- unaware of the cost, now we go from 25,000 to 30,000. It is just impractical. I think the other piece to consider is that costs constantly change, and what we write in today is not going to mean the same thing tomorrow. Then, the other piece, quite rightly, some communities need more investment than others. So, being able to really stick to what is the public interest is, again, keeping the flow of communication open around public infrastructure and the

management of right-of-way.
With that, I present a motion.
>> thank you, we have a motion
on COUNCILWOMAN George, @#second
from COUNCILMAN Winkler.
Any discussion?
COUNCILMAN Hollander?
>> -- actually in the cuba from
its back sorry, husband
piagentini?
>> thank you.
COUNCILWOMAN George, clarify
something for me.
This is related to number 12,
on page @#[Indiscernible]. So,
you are striking -- I am
looking at [Indiscernible]
Which we might require 25,000
or less [Indiscernible]
Involving public infrastructure
[Indiscernible] Right-of-way,
correct?
>> yes.
>> then, let me just say,
COUNCILWOMAN George, @# correct me
if you think I am
misinterpreting this, but
again, I think, council member
hollander [Indiscernible]
Figure out a number, not sure
if 25,000 is magic, but with
that said, we had the same
discussion@# around things of
value, should it be 50, 100?
What about a spouse?
We had all these discussions
with real scenarios.
A problem with taking the
dollar amount, essentially, as
I read this, the way you worded
it, @# then somebody from a major
traffic organization could talk
to me about a massive
infrastructure project well in
excess of 25 -- I have projects
in my district, mainly state

projects -- influence over that I @#talked to my state legislators and discussed, but these projects are very high dollar. To be very transparent, louisville paving is a company in my district, contributed to my first campaign, the ceo of whom @#contributes to my campaign as a matter of record.

So, you know, theoretically, he could now talk to me about a huge infrastructure project, and not have it disclosed, because of the way this is written, if it involves public infrastructure management [Indiscernible @#] Right-of-way benefiting two or more persons [Indiscernible] Dollar amount restriction -- am I misreading this, or is there some way, COUNCILWOMAN George, that you can assure me [Indiscernible] Does in fact [Indiscernible]?

>> COUNCILWOMAN George?@#

>> I think it is important to note that what we want to do, above anything else, is protect a certain amount of outreach from those who represent the most vulnerable.

So, in this scenario, it is not a hypothetical, but real life, involving rutherford elementary and the concerns on@# [Indiscernible] Boulevard, which everyone has heard the mention for the last year. When the family resource coordinator reaches out, she is a paid employee of [Indiscernible], when she reaches out on something that, to be clear, is not as I

understand it ordinary and routine operations -- @# at the end of the day, what she want is going to require a new capital project.

It is not additional paving it is bollards, striping, replacement of ory movement of existing parking.

So, when she reaches out for that and continues to ask, because of the ongoing impact@# to the school, as I understand it, that is lobbying.

And what this attempts to do is to try and put some level of allowance for, again, things that involve public infrastructure or management of right-of-way.

And there is no limitation, but again, @#I appreciate your trying to identify some parameters all that to say, it is unrealistic [Indiscernible] The family resource coordinator would even understand that what she asks for it would cost \$25,000 [Indiscernible] Had to come back and revisit this, that would be for @#our colleagues, but all that to say that is quickly good growing less relevant by the day.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.
COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

>> thank you for the acclamation.

I would argue we still need to put some sort of limitation, first of all [Indiscernible]

Question whether the scenario you described @#is lobbying.

[Indiscernible] Current definition, engaged to conduct

lobbying [Indiscernible]
Employer individuals [Indiscernible] Individual time influencing [Indiscernible] I am not sure [Indiscernible] This is where we can tweak stuff.

That person was ignorant of the cost, @# and had no ability to estimate a bill of 25,000, they were just making an ask, I think there is provision for first outreach, that sort of thing.

I appreciate what you are saying , @#I am skeptical of the of limitation, because again, infrastructure is a huge issue in my district, and there are many [Indiscernible] This would leave me and others very [Indiscernible] Suburban areas that have [Indiscernible] Project that would give [Indiscernible] Implementation on it.

I @#am not saying all your wording is wrong but [Indiscernible] Somehow restore [Indiscernible]. That is just my thoughts.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN Piagentini.

councilman hollander?

>> let me say, COUNCILMAN Piagentini is right again.

Exception three@# to who is a lobbyist includes an employee of a federal, state, or local government agency.

So, theresource officer who called and wants something for the school is not a lobbyist.

We already have an exemption for that situation.

Here -- and I totally agree,

how we got into \$25,000 -- I made it up.

I think that is an operational issue.

I do not think that is lobbying to start with, but the question came up in committee, well, what if I would have to pay for it?

And the speed hump or the streetlight would have to come out of cif funds, that is a budgetary item, therefore it is lobbying.

So, we wrote to try to accommodate that, a new exemption, and put in the \$25,000.

Here is where the language that has been proposed, I think, creates a big loophole.

I have talked to COUNCILMAN Triplett about this.

A few years ago, we were asked to close a street -- the public right-of-way.

If we adopt this language, churchill downs could have come and lobbied everyone of us.

They could have hired their contract lobbying firm and lobbied everyone of us.

They could lobby the administration, and none of that would need to be reported.

The public would not know anything about that, because we are dealing with the public right-of-way on [Indiscernible] Street.

I think that would be a mistake.

So I hope you reject this amendment.

Thank you.

>> thank you, counsel for

COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> @#thank you, PRESIDENT.

I want to say, -- addressed this multiple times, specifically around communications around ordinary and routine operations.

It is not clear to me that what I am referring to on [Indiscernible] Boulevard is not an ordinary and routine operation but rather a new capital project, since@# I would venture to say, it is not going to be clear to anyone else in the community, just the average person, trying to figure out this problem.

I can appreciate that maybe the school reference is a bad example, but we would agree that if we are talking about americana community center, they are not -- that would involve [Indiscernible] They would not @#have an exception. So, I think, fundamentally, what we see is the challenges that we are treating everyone the same.

We are treating the community center director who is calling to figure out parking, trying to find an answer, essentially, a \$30,000 infusion @#of capital for a new project.

And I can appreciate, understand that everyone has one time to reach out as part of an initial communication, but as we can all appreciate, if you are director of a community center, you will continue reaching out until the problem @#is resolved, and to have to stop and advise them

that sorry, you will have to register as a lobbyist now, I think, has a practical concern, and again, I would want to err on the side of ensuring the community voice, particularly those communities that serve [Indiscernible]. Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Any further discussion?@#
all right.

Hearing none, all those in favor of the amendment, the second amendment offered by COUNCILWOMAN George, please aye.

>> all opposed?

>> no.

>> @# MADAM Clerk, would you please open the role, so we can be clear?

>> councilmember shanklin?

Councilmember purvis?@#

councilmember mulvihill?

>> no.

>> councilmember flood?

>> yes.

>> councilmember ackerson?

Okay.

So, four yes votes and 19 @#no votes, sir.

>> thank you.

Proposed amendment fails.

COUNCILMAN George?

>> thank you.

Amendment number three.

I promise my goal is not to be everyone down to the point of confusion.

Amendment number three is, again, on page six, and it involves the definition of lobbying.

What I have @#proposed is to add two words so it would read any person engaged to conduct

lobbying for an employer,
including individuals employed
or engaged by an association,
coalition, or public entity --
significant -- significant
portion of that individual's
time directly@# -- also new --
influencing decisions of metro
officers.

The goal of this is it attempts
to, again, tease out
professional contract lobbyist
versus someone who is going to
contract our office once or
twice, trying to solve a problem
that they did not even know
when they @#called what the
solution was, how much it would
cost, and the fact that is
theoretically lobbying.

Again, one of the early
challenges I have seen with
this is treating everyone the

-

same, whether it is churchill
downs or the director of a
community center.

So, we see that -- we mentioned
-- we heard COUNCILMAN@#
hollander sa other cities have
more restrictive language
around the definition.

It is not quite so broad.

With that, I would appreciate
your consideration and support.

>> thank you.

Can you repeat that one more
time, the proposal?

>> sure.

So, a lobbyist would be any @#
person engaged in lobbying for
an employer, including
individuals employed or engaged
by association, coalition, or
public interest entities to
spend a significant portion of

that individual's time directly influencing the decisions of metro officers.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Do we have a second?

Second by@# COUNCILMAN Fox.

COUNCILMAN Kramer?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I get that we want people who are actually lobbying. The problem is, when you say "significant portion of that individual's time directly influencing decisions of metro officers"@# I remember when we deliberated a smoking ban some years ago, the american heart and lung association was all over council offices, those of us who were here, I am sure, remember sitting down with them for periods of time, and listening to all of their references to the harms created a secondhand smoke,@# and having the opportunity to ask some really good questions.

But I have to say, I knew one of the lobbyists from my outside life.

And she did not spend a significant portion of her time directly influencing the decisions of metro officers.@# she spent a good bit of her time lobbying.

She lobbied us, she lobbied the state, she lobbied in washington, D.C. She was constantly reaching out to businesses.

She did a lot of lobbying for the american heart and lung association,@# but she did not spend a significant portion of her time directly influencing

the decisions of metro officers, even though it felt like it to me, because she spent a good chunk of time in my office, trying to convince me I was wrong.

If you look at her work week, the amount of time she spent with me versus the amount of time she spent lobbying in places that were not metro, it was not a significant amount of @# her time.

So I am not sure I have a way to offer to capture what it is COUNCILWOMAN George wants to capture.

But this language, I do not think, captures what she hopes for.

It basically says the only lobbyists we have to worry about are the ones who lobby us exclusively and do that@# a whole bunch.

That has not been my experience with most lobbyists that reach out to us.

So, again, I will vote no, and request councilmember to do the same.

Thank you, councilmember kramer.@# COUNCILMAN Ackerson?

>> thank you.

I am going to take [Indiscernible] I have been listening tonight, to people complaining about vagueness, and lack of understanding.

When I hear the word used "significant" and "directly" those do not @#mean anything.

If you use definitive numbers, if a person makes over \$1000 per year, that is defined.

A person who spends more than

five hours per week, that is definable.

But significant and directly are so vague, the lawyer in me says@# that is a surefire way to win, because you cannot measure those.

Because of the lack of measurement -- setting parameters, this ordinance is about setting clear parameters. the adoption of this amendment@# destroys that.

I will join COUNCILMAN Kramer in voting no on this amendment.

Thank you.

>> you.

COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> I agree with councilmember ackerson.

I believe, unintentionally, this is a giant loophole.

I do not know how the commission could define significant. @#

I also think, even someone who spends a very small amount of their time, but lobbied us on an issue that is very significant should be registered.

I will go back to my example of churchill downs [Indiscernible] Street.

If @#I was to hear from the ceo of churchill downs and he never called any metro officer before, but he called me about that, I think that should be disclosed to the public.

I will vote against the amendment.

Thank you.

>> councilmember piagentini?

>> withdraw.

>> @#COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> one thing we see in other cities is guidance [Indiscernible] What we were talking about in the way of definitions.

For instance, in Cincinnati, one of the pieces of guidance they have is, in general, how they define a portion of time that is spent that constitutes significant is with three contacts to an office.

Now, folks MAY believe that just one contact is enough, but it gets to the spirit of trying to tease out what we really see as public interest.

That is, again, professionalize lobbying versus a person who is going to contact your office one time about a speed camera or an Impd real-time camera.

I want to say that if we do not take the time to somehow pin this down, the consequence of stifling community voice out of what will be created, which is fear and or confusion, has the potential to have negative consequence.

That really deserves thought.

It is not the intention of this ordinance, in fact, the exact opposite, the intent is to enhance democracy and faith in the system, but if we do not slow down to really think about how to keep these pieces out, the potential negative impact to democracy [Indiscernible]

Outreach, we have just that little bit of fear or not being quite so clear will inhibit outreach and [Indiscernible]

The community.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Clerk, let@# [Indiscernible]

The chair, and counsel men
hollander?

>> I think the example of that
ceo who called you one time is
important.

I think there is significant
community interest in having
transparency about that.

I also want to keep talking
about that constituent who
called you one time.@#
we need to keep repeating, and
I hope everybody remembers,
unless that person is paid,
they could call you every day
and never need to register,
never be regulated.

thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I want to address this concept
of stifling speech because of
fear@# of noncompliance with this
new law.

A couple things.

First of all, there is not a
series of penalties here, where
you are going to go to prison
or something if you make a
mistake, particularly one made
in good faith.

If anything like that was @#
discovered, it would probably [
Indiscernible] Some
notification from the ethics
commission or something like
that.

There is nothing in here that
has any type of penalty that
somebody should be particularly
fearful of.

Second, I would argue that if
you are fearful in any way of

disclosing -- @# if you think --
let's be clear about this,
coming from [Indiscernible]
You must be paid, and it is
part of your job to influence
legislation.
So, that takes out all our
constituents who bother us
every day, coming to meetings,
all @#types of stuff.
It comes down to those who are
compensated to influence us.
If there is any fear they have,
that is precisely, I would
argue, why we are disclosing. I
would not be @#fearful of someone
disclosed every single
conversation I have it I think
transparency is important.
[Indiscernible] To make sure
I do not strawman COUNCILWOMAN
George's argument [
Indiscernible] Understand
that it is somebody fear of
having a small infraction, a
small organization without the
resources of churchill downs@# [
Indiscernible] Violate some
letter of [Indiscernible]
Somehow they might be [
Indiscernible]. I see no risk
of that, here.
[Indiscernible] Refer to the
ethics commission, they would
have the ability to make a
judgment on that, and @#in many
cases, I would argue the vast
majority [Indiscernible]
Circumstances if not all would
end up being education,
notification, saying okay, we
understood [Indiscernible],
please disclose, because [
Indiscernible] Trying to find
a disclosure, that would [
Indiscernible]. So, I want to

relay this concept of fear,
because I think the enforcement @#
of this is done in a way, done
by a group of people who are
not looking to harm anybody who
is making a good faith
infraction.

Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> I do not want to incite fea.

Trust me, I know the ethics
commission is not out @#to
demonize anyone, they are not
looking to fight anyone.

I would just say, never
underestimate the fact that
perception and a little bit of
friction can cause inaction.

We see this all the time in
human behavior.

It is a real variable @#in how
community members interact with
government. What we should want
to do is inspire that
interaction, and not cause
confusion or fear, which says,
if I reach out, I MAY have to
register, which then creates
additional @#obstruction.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

COUNCILMAN Arthur?

>> I understand the concern.

I do not share the concern, but
I understand it.

I think that is one reason we
have delayed registration for
six months, and we have asked
the ethics commission to put
out @#guidelines as to what is
lobbying and what is not.

If something is not clear,
here, they can make of that.

If there is fear in the
community, they can alleviate

that.

I think the six month delay is important, that is exactly why we rode into the lot.

Thank you.

Spec thank you, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN Winkler?

I want to point out that counsel @#men hollander did agree with COUNCILMAN Piagentini again.

Just for the record.

>> thank you for the record note.

Any further discussion?

Okay.

There has been a lot of conversation.

COUNCILWOMAN George, could you repeat one more time, so everybody knows what they are voting on?

>> yes. @#

so, the proposed amendment is a lobbyist is any person engaged to conduct lobbying for an employer, including individuals employed by associations, coalitions, public interest entities, who dedicate a significant portion of the individual's time directly influencing the decisions of @# metro counsel.

>> thank you.

Those in favor, please aye.

>> aye.

All those opposed, please say no.

>> no.

>>.

The no habit.

Amendment fails.

COUNCILMAN George?

>> thank you.

Amendment four.

Then we will be over. @#
amendment four is, again, on
page -- oh, goodness.

One second.

Page 11, under section d. This
states for those lobbyists who
are not employees reporting to
employees, the compensation
earned by @#each lobbyist is
prorated to reflect the time
the lobbyist was engaged in
lobbying during the period
covered by [Indiscernible].

If such compensation exceeds
\$5000 for that period [Indiscernible]
The new piece
is his "if conversation
exceeds \$5000".

The goal is to tease out your @#
smaller entities versus those
more professionalized contract
lobbyists that fall under the
umbrella of something over
\$5000.

Again, the goal of this is to
minimize administrative burden,
tracking those, really in the
spirit of what is the optimal
public interest @# as relates to
professional lobbying.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN
George.

COUNCILMAN Hollander?

Sorry, I need a second from
councilman george's motion.

>> second.

>> COUNCILMAN Arthur.

Now, COUNCILMAN Hollander. @#

>> we actually have already
amended this section once.

That is the language for those
lobbyists who are not employees
[Indiscernible] Employer.

So, the example we have been
hearing about, the small

business person calls their employee, they are the manager, they own it, and they are calling -- they need to register, but they do not need to report the dollar amount they are spending.

So, we have excluded that completely.

That came about during the discussion we had, COUNCILMAN George was in that meeting, COUNCILMAN @peden was in that meeting is open this would go much further than, say, anybody lobbying on -- \$5000, we don't need to hear about it.

I have a variety of concerns about that.

One, I think, on many of our issues, somebody spending \$4500 for a paid lobbyist, the public should know that.

Transparency is important. @# the other issue is, if you hire 10 lobbyists, and they all make \$4900, you have spent a lot of money to influence the public position, but you would be excluded from what I think, again, is an unintended -- it is not meant to be a loophole, but I think it is a real risk. @#

>> thank you, concilman hollander.

COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

>> thank you, to keep the bipartisan nature of the comments on this, I will say, as somebody who has been a registered lobbyist in other states, it is not uncommon whatsoever to pay multiple lobbyists to get around requirements @#like this.

They are not supposed to, but I

am telling you, organizations do it.

The minute you put a threshold in there, they are going to engage three different people, pay them one dollar short of the minimum, and they will not disclose.

Not to mention, I would argue, \$5000 @#over a period is a lot of lobbying for one issue.

There was -- it was rare, I was a fairly high compensation individual, you could argue [Indiscernible] Issue, I was spending more than 5000 [Indiscernible] Particular issue.

So, I am also going to @#be -- again, I want to say, not to be dismissive of COUNCILWOMAN George's argument, I get what you're getting at, I appreciate your intent, but again, I think we need to air on the side of more transparency now, and @# then, if we have concrete evidence of unintended consequences, I will be more than open to address them in the future.

But this is a pretty high threshold, and I have seen -- in jurisdictions that have this type of threshold, to avoid disclosure.

So I will be against this.

Thank you. @#

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILWOMAN Flood?

Back thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

Can I ask a question of COUNCILMAN Hollander, please?

>> yes, ma'am.

The mac as it applies to this, COUNCILMAN Hollander, in our

previous discussions, you said that, even though entities that lobby us during the budget time@# for external agency money, no matter how big or how small that money would be, those agencies would then have to register as lobbyists?

>> if they are paid, yes.

But again, people who are not paid, all the people who support a particular organization, or on the board of a @#nonprofit organization, none of those people have to register.

If they are paid, yes, they would need to register.

However, and this is language we have added, for those lobbyists who are not employed -- we do not need to know the dollar amount, the value of what they are lobbying.

-

all we need is a@ two page statement saying, I am the executive director of [Indiscernible], and I am lobbying for metro funds in this budget.

>> and somebody will let them know ahead of time?

>>@# -- will have six months to publish, hopefully, a guidebook on this.

This is what we have asked them to do.

And yes.

I think it would be a good idea.

We actually prohibit lobbying prior to the budget being fied for people who apply@#, and I think it would be a good idea if somebody reported to those

agencies that there is a new lobbying ordinance.

Again, that is one of the reasons why we have a six month delay in the registration in the requirements, here.

>> thank yo, COUNCILMAN. @# COUNCILWOMAN Flood, did that answer your question?

>> sort of, yes.

I still do not know who we will make tell these entities they need to register.

Some of these are very small groups.

>> thank you.

Is there any further discussion on the proposal by @#COUNCILWOMAN George?

Hearing on, all those in favor of the amendment, please a aye.

>> aye.

>> all opposed?

>> no.

>> the amendment fails.

Thank you, COUNCILWOMAN George.

Did you have anything further?

>> no.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN @#winkler?

>> thank you.

To try to sort of square -- I think COUNCILWOMAN George brought up a lot of reasonable concerns.

So, I want to just take one crack at trying to square the divide, pressure test, see if it works, throughout an amendment for @#quick discussion.

Basically, on the definition of lobbyist, what I would propose doing is -- everything stays the same until you get to after the second, in the second sentence.

This includes @#page six.
So, at the top of page six, you have lobbyist, any person engaged to conduct lobbying for an employer, this includes individuals employed or engaged by associations, collisions, or public interest agencies, to spend -- "a portion" would be struck, and it would @#be replaced with "to spend more than 5% of the individuals compensated time" more than 5% of the individuals compensation of the incident in place -- influencing metro officers.

I would propose that amendment specifically to address the concerns about really small entities, individuals.

So, you@# really -- a low threshold, measurable, and it is really intended to find someone who is really doing this professionally, versus these very small nonprofits. I just want to throw that out for discussion.

I do not know that I feel passionately about it, but just an attempt to bridge the discussion @#tonight.

>> we have a second by COUNCILWOMAN Fowler.

Discussion, COUNCILWOMAN Kramer?

>> MR. PRESIDENT, I had clicked in to speak, I thought amendment were finished.

I do have a comment on this one.

In fairness to my colleagues, my name in there now is @#from before.

I am happy to speak now, if that is okay.

>> I will hold you, I want to

try to address this particular amendment.

Wreck I have a comment on this, too.

>> go ahead.

>> I would make the same argument as before, about [Indiscernible] Association.

If you said 5%, I can assure you the amount of time that @#MR.

Sanders spent sitting in my office was less than 5% of her compensated time.

That is not a small organization we are worried will not get voice, this was the American Heart Association, a very large organization. 5% of her @#compensated time would require a lot more time than she spent in my office.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN Winkler?

>> I would like to reply, just for clarity, this is not 5% of her time on this one issue talking to you this one time, but 5% of her total time spent on advocacy swaying metro officers. @#

I do want to clarify that, the intent was not to say 5% of my time spent on this issue, but that my job is to advocate, more than 5% of my total time.

>> okay, but is it advocate -- @# it says to advocate influencing decisions of metro council.

Is not 5% of my total time on lobbying, it is 5% of my time spent influencing decisions of metro officers.

I am telling you, the heart and lung association -- it was a pretty big deal @#, and they did spend a chunk of time talking

about it, if you counted all of the councilmembers she spoke to, you might approach 5% of her total time.

But if it was not something as big as a smoking ban, you would still have very large organization that would not even come @#close to that reporting requirement.

What you do, then, if you make it were the very people COUNCILMAN Hollander is trying to make sure is transparent around are the same people who would not have to report.

COUNCILMAN Hollander, do not disagree with as often as with huntsman piagentini [Indiscernible] But I definitely @#agree with this one as well.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN Kramer and COUNCILMAN Piagentini.

>> 5% of a person's compensated time, particularly, even worse to exclude their paid time off and other things [Indiscernible] That is a lot of time@# spent influencing legislation.

So, basically, you would spend one day less, or one hour less than 2 1/2 weeks per year, just influencing metro council.

There are so few people that spend that much time influencing metro council -- I do not think -- what I would consider a @#lot of time, spend that much time, just sitting and lobbying us.

So, that would restrict it to an extremely small amount of people, and keep in mind, that

is related to residential lobbying, so [Indiscernible] @# back to \$5000.

You break it up amongst a team of four people, and now you have got 10 weeks of lobbying with four people, none of them reported because they are all under 5%.

Yeah, I think putting limits on it, I understand the intention, but I think COUNCILWOMAN George said this could be a @# philosophical disagreement between COUNCILWOMAN George and I. She talked about treating everybody equally as if that was a bad thing.

I think that is precisely what we are attempting to do here, is treat everybody equally.

And I get that there have been arguments made here about other issues related @#to equity, and sometimes that has been used in a context of this group of people is disadvantaged compared to another group of people, therefore we should consider that in public policy.

I think in this particular case, that is not applicable.

We need to treat everybody the same, otherwise we are @# literally starting -- away, giving preference, giving others the ability [

Indiscernible] So, I truly think we need to be equal in this at all times, consider lobbying if they are [Indiscernible] Meet the definition.

Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you. @#

COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

As you can tell, I opposed the other amendments. This one, I think, is just a gigantic loophole.

I will just name some people. Bob@# babbage is one of the biggest lobbyists in the state. He would clearly be excused. He does not spend 5% of his compensated time lobbying metro officers.

What we are saying is, he could do anything he wanted.

Most of the lobbyists are the McCarthy firm, they do not spend 2 1/2 weeks lobbying metro officers. @#

are we really trying to exclude all them?

It is just madness.

this is a design to get to the smaller people, and I am not saying this is your intention, but this would create an enormous loophole for nearly every lobbyist@#, nearly every paid contract lobbyist in the state.

Surely, we do not want to do that.

I hope we will defeat this.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN Kramer?

>> I am finished with the amendment.

>> @#COUNCILMAN [Indiscernible]'s.

The

>> thank you, sir but I asked this before, but I'm not sure I got the answer that gave me comfort.

Who is going to inform, say, the ministries, that they are now required to abide by this?@#

>> is that a question to someone specific?

>> to whoever wants to answer it.

>> COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> I have already talked to some ministers and tol them what the law would be, which is that anyone who it@# who is an unpaid supporter of the ministry can call me every day, but if they have paid employees lobbying, they would be required to register.

[Indiscernible] More people, I think the way [Indiscernible] A new ordinance, but [Indiscernible]] Actually delayed for six months, and asked the ethics commission to present, effectively, a @#manual that would say [Indiscernible], and then, I think people should distribute that the people who regularly contact us. That is the best answer I have. And again, I think the entire point of the six months is to give people time to understand this new law.

>> thank you for that.@# not everybody is sitting at home, hanging on our every word, here.

It is just not the way it is.

Okay, thanks.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN Fowler.

Is there any further discussion?

All right.

All in favor of@# COUNCILMAN Winkler's amendment, please say aye.

>> aye.

>> all opposed?

>> no.

>> councilmember winkler's amendment fails.

We are back to the original ordinance, and COUNCILMAN Kramer?

>> I am on page 14@#. Number two.

For events to which all metro members are invited, then it changes the amount from 52 it looks like 300, or it looks like it is 300 per individual officer.

I have not @#participated in the national [Indiscernible] For a number of years now, but I was a very active participant in an organization.

I was invited often, as a member of the board of that organization, which, by the way, was a lobbying organization [Indiscernible] Local governments.

It was not unusual for the fir to take us out @#to dinner.

I tried to watch, make sure I was not in excess of -- I am wondering, would this apply to those kinds of activities?

>> COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> let me think about this.

What you are talking about is, this is a lobbyist employer@# who is taking you out to dinner, and the cost of that dinner would be more thn \$50?

And not all councilmembers were invited, because they were not there

>> but evry member of the board of the national league of cities was invited.

They were not inviting me exclusively, they were not trying to influence me!

Me @#to do something.

They are a lobbying organization who was, in some instances, partnered with us to lobby the federal government, S.E.C.

Regulations, for example.

They invite us to dinner --

>> I think my answer would be no, because that is not somebody lobbying metro council [Indiscernible] Or the metro office.@#

if they are lobbying the federal government -- this only applies to someone who is lobbying metro officers, in direct contact with metro officers about changes in metro ordinances.

>> then it would not @#apply.

Thank you, I appreciate the clarification.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN Piagentini?

Is there any further discussion?

>> I have a question, I am sorry.

>> COUNCILWOMAN Fowler?

>> you are on page 14.

I am sorry -- @# we increase that to 300, right?

>> on page 14?

>> didn't we increase that?

>> there are two dollar amounts.

The first is where someone is entertaining an individual member but they have not invited everybody.

We talked about this in @# committee.

The reason we put the \$50 limit there is we talked about some problems, where you MAY be invited to speak at an event, and there is a buffet line

there, but you cannot go through the buffet line because there are some lobbyists, that is a \$50 @#dinner -- individual.

Then change it to if all meto officers are invited [Indiscernible]

>> thank you for that information.

>> thank you.

Is there any further discussion?

All right.

Hearing on, this is an ordinance that requires a roll call vote.

MADAME Clerk, would you please open the @#roll for voting?

MADAME Clerk, would you please call the roll for those who are not present in chambers?

>> council number shanklin?

>> yes.

>> councilmember purvis?

>> yes.

>> councilmember mulvihill?

>> yes.

>> councilmember flood?

>> yes @#

>> MR. PRESIDENT, you have 25 yes votes.

>> thank you.

The ordinance passes.

MADAME Clerk, you're reading a item number 36?

>> an ordinance creating chapter 167 of the@# louisville metro county ordinances requiring abatement of all rental housing units in louisville metro.

>> motion by COUNCILMAN Winkler, second by COUNCILMAN Piagentini.

Any discussion? @#

COUNCILMAN Shanklin?

>> I will -- MR. PRESIDENT -- I

am sorry, councilmember kathy
armstrong?

Back council member chambers-
armstrong?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

What I would like to do today @#
is talk a little about this
ordinance, how we got here,
what it does, and open the
conversation a little bit about
some of the things I have heard
about this ordinance [
Indiscernible] Provide some
information.

I expect there is a motion to
table coming, and if that
motion to table comes, I
recognize @#there is [
Indiscernible] We might have
further conversations.

But this ordinance is a result
of the fact we currently have
thousands of children in the
city of louisville who are lead
poisoned every single year.

The rates of lead poisoning in
our community are going up.

So, @#if you look in south
louisville, you look in west
louisville, we are seeing [
Indiscernible] Problem that
is getting worse, not better
over time.

All of you have a picture on
your desk of a brain.

This brain shows what happens
when children are exposed to
lead.

When you look at it, you can
see that one lead enters the
body, it literally destroys the
pieces of @#a child's brain that
are tied to iq, tied to
executive functioning, tied to
control.

So, it is no surprise that,

when a child is exposed to lead, even in a very small amount, the amount of lead in [Indiscernible] Packet speckled over a football field is twice the amount of let it takes to begin @#to do this to a child brain.

Once that lead has answered and literally exploded their brain cells, one, you cannot cure it, and two, there are lifelong consequences that result from it.

Those consequences include -- we have heard DR. Brian wynne, a leading @#researcher -- we know a lot about what led exposure does.

That includes impact on educational attainment, standardized test scores are correlated with lead exposure. It is tied to renal disease, to kidney failure, to an increased likelihood of becoming involved in the criminal justice system, and to lifelong [Indiscernible]. @# this is a problem, we know it is a problem with louisville, and we know it is costing taxpayers money to the tune of \$50,000 per lead exposed child.

Cumulatively, that means the money we are spending and tax dollars per lead exposed children [Indiscernible] @# over \$500 million each year, which is a shocking amount of money we are losing because these children are facing these [Indiscernible] I hope everyone in this room agrees this is a problem. it is a big problem and an

urgent problem [Indiscernible @#]
] Futures are literally being
stolen away by hidden hazards
in their environment.

We also know what to do about
it.

A lot of cities -- we're not
the only city facing this
challenge.

Many cities have enacted
proactive lead inspections [Indiscernible] I have talked
about what these ordinances
look like [Indiscernible] So
what it looks like @#if someone
pays a couple hundred dollars
to have certified lead
inspectors, and look, to
determine whether or not there
is lead in the rental property,
and if there is, [Indiscernible] Before you
continue to read it and put
families at risk.

What we know, because we have a
lot of data [Indiscernible]

We know that when @#ever [Indiscernible] Ordinances, we
don't see housing prices go up.
There is very little impact on
the housing market.

We do not see units being taken
off-line.

We do not see rents going up.
And most importantly, we know
they work.

We see the rates of lead
exposed children, without any
disaster [Indiscernible @#] For
the housing industry.

We start with an ordinance like
we had in other cities [Indiscernible] Capacities
around the country.

Through a six-month process
that you all heard Mandy Simpson

described earlier, @#we had many stakeholders come together to create the most tailored ordinance in the [Indiscernible] Around proactive lead reduction. So, we have three different exemptions we have [Indiscernible] This ordinance to let people choose @#an offramp , either if the property [Indiscernible] Significantly renovated [Indiscernible] Construction done to t, suggesting [Indiscernible] A lot of lead present [Indiscernible] If they have a lead-trained maintenance person on staff, or the new language floated @#[Indiscernible] Is a floor amendment to allow folks if they have anyone who has led expertise in a maintenance plan to seek an exemption from that as well. So, of all the ordinances that exist in the country, this is the most industry friendly. It is the most targeted. I think we have done a lot of really good work@# [Indiscernible] Save thousands of kids in our community [Indiscernible] Thousands of kids in our community. We know black children are nine times more likely in louisville, that is not a national statistic, that is [Indiscernible] To be lead poisoned than our other children in the community [Indiscernible] Racial equity goal. I @#am proud of the process [Indiscernible] To this point.

This ordinance has more exceptions than I would like. I would like to help more children, but I believe we will be able to with the ordinance as it stands [Indiscernible] Very broad exemptions, but I am really proud of creating something @#that I believe will begin the process of helping louisville children.

So, with that, I would entertain any questions, comments, or motions you might have.

Thank you, COUNCILWOMAN. COUNCILMAN Fox?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT I would like to make a moment to invoke [Indiscernible] The debate.

Thank you.

A motion.

Do we have @#a second?

We have a second by COUNCILWOMAN McCrane.

Those in favor of limiting debate, please say hi.

>> aye.

Back all opposed?

Aye's have it.

Any further discussion? Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN Feller? @#

thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

So, I was a sponsor early on of

[Indiscernible] And [

Indiscernible] Where [

Indiscernible] Agree and vote

[Indiscernible] On this. @#

but I feel like there is some more conversation that needs to be had. I would like to propose to table this until two weeks, I guess.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN

Feller began a motion to table
by COUNCILWOMAN Feller been
seconded by councilmember
piagentini.

All in favor of tabling, please
say aye.

>> aye.

>> @#all opposed?

The aye's have it, ordinance is
tabled.

MADAM Clerk, a reading of item
number 37?

>> an ordinance amending
chapter 39 of the louisville
metro court of ordinances@#
require metro government
departments and agencies
receiving funding from metro
council for specific projects
to pay any overages from the
estimated amount submitted in
its proposal, read in full.

>> motion [Indiscernible].

Motion by COUNCILMAN Tribble,
seconded by piagentini, any
discussion?

COUNCILMAN DR. Blackwell?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT it
came out of committee ahead @#of
us, but it was amended in
committee at counselor peden
MAY want to speak to [
Indiscernible]'s back thank
you, kaufman.

COUNCILMAN Peden?

>> thank you.

Again, this is in response to
pretty much every one of us who
had a project that was funded
in one fiscal year.

Might have gotten built@# so,
many agencies did not like it
very much, but with the
amendments crafted [
Indiscernible] Again, like
COUNCILMAN Blackwell said, it

came out of [Indiscernible]

The amendments were @#unanimous
and appreciate your support.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

Any further discussion?

Hearing on, this is an
ordinance requiring roll call
vote benefit, please open the
roll for voting.

MADAM For, please call the roll
for those not present in the
chambers.

>> council member shanklin?

>> yes. @#

>> council member purpose?

>> yes.

>> councilmember mulvihill?

>> yes.

>> councilmember flood?

>> yes.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, you have 24
yes votes.

>> thank you, the ordinance
passes.

Metaphor, a reading of @#item
number 38.

>> a resolution requesting the
planning commission reviewed
the louisville metro land
development code and section
115 of the louisville jefferson
county metro government code of
ordinances relating to short-
term rentals as amended read in
full.

>> motion to approve.

Rackmount motion by COUNCILMAN
Engel.

We have a second. @#

COUNCILMAN Triplett.

>> the resolution is before us.

Any discussion?

Cancel one flood?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This has been in committee, and
we as we amended it at the last

meeting, one of the areas of contention was [Indiscernible] That we had discussion on [Indiscernible @#] Allowing situations where [Indiscernible] Primary structure on a given lot [Indiscernible] Other units including other units in [Indiscernible] MAY be used as a short-term rental [Indiscernible] 600 foot [Indiscernible] A lot of discussion on that 600 rule, and it came out of committee with a negative @#vote 2-3. Two yes what, three no votes, so the resolution failed.

This is COUNCILMAN Winkler's resolution, so, he MAY wish to address that.

Thank you, COUNCILWOMAN. COUNCILMAN Winkler?

>> thank you.

There are three parts to this resolution, two of them revolve around enforcement and actions of the metro government, and @#I think [Indiscernible] Broad support for those.

I want to talk specifically about its number one, and what it seeks to do.

I want what you the history of short-term rentals and the 600 foot rule, thn [Indiscernible] @# what this resolution [Indiscernible] If you recall our discussion around [Indiscernible] Basically a differentiation [Indiscernible] If I live in a unit, I have better oversight of that unit if I am not owner-occupied, that is when the 600 foot rule comes in. @#

purely talking, here, about what is the difference between owner-occupied and not owner-occupied?

Today, the way that [Indiscernible] Is interpreting the law, if I have a room in my house that my kids used to live in that I rent out, clearly, that is owner-occupied. Instead of it being a kids room, if I have a separate my basement and rent out that room, that is also classified as owner-occupied.

If I had a duplex and I live on the left side and I want a short-term rental of the right side, that is owner-occupied.

If I had an apartment above my garage and it is attached to my house, that is owner-occupied.

But suddenly, if my garage is detached from my house by one foot, it is no longer owner-occupied.

I think that is a flaw in the way that the law is interpreted?

Or ask the commission to go back and look at it, my intent, here is if it ends within the four corners of your lot, it is owner-occupied.

That whether that structure is physically connected or not, if it is within the four corners of your lot, it is owner-occupied.

That is the only thing we are looking to change, here.

Still some discussion of removing the [Indiscernible]

Of [Indiscernible] We are only looking to [

[Indiscernible] The owner-occupied portion, clarify the

law that says if it is on the four corners of your property, it is owner-occupied, does not matter if it is the outbuilding, has a two by four connecting it, a pergola connecting it, or has three inches of air between@#. If it is on your property, it is owner-occupied.

All we are doing today, just for further clarification, is asking the planning commission to look at it, and say should we have consistency@# of these rules versus the interpretation?

I am asking for your support, I am happy to answer questions. Smack thank you, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

[Indiscernible] Committee will vote against [Indiscernible] Explain why [Indiscernible] The first portion of this, and that is [Indiscernible] First of all, I think that COUNCILMAN Winkler is wrong [Indiscernible] So, my understanding @#of [Indiscernible] About this. My understanding is [Indiscernible] Have a duplex [Indiscernible] On one side of the duplex, and you [Indiscernible], the other unit [Indiscernible] You cannot make that any short-term rental without [Indiscernible] And this @# would city planning commission ought to [Indiscernible] Like for them to change that and [Indiscernible] 600 foot rule not [Indiscernible] I was

involved in [Indiscernible]
I think we were here [Indiscernible] The morning @#and it is not accurate to say that the only concern was the maintenance of the property [Indiscernible] Would have a better hadle if you live close by.

Some of it is we are very concerned about the deliberation of short-term rentals taking away@# units that otherwise are used by people that [Indiscernible-low volume] 365 days per year, taking housing stock out of the community, and turning it over to tourists.

We have seen that happening. It is a national problem. @# there are articles talking about how one of the reasons rent has increased so much in this country and why we have more of these housing situations is because we have turned more and more of our housing stock over to short-term rentals.

I think we should stop that. [Indiscernible-low volume] Has a situation, and they can waive this @#[Indiscernible-low volume] Spoken to this is one of the reasons we have [Indiscernible-low volume] In place.

So, to say at this point, we think if it is on the four corners of your property, including that duplex@# [Indiscernible-low volume] Should weigh the 600 foot rule, it just means we will lose more housing [Indiscernible-low

volume] Armstrong told me there was a housing study which shows that rent in district eight has increased because of the proliferation of short-term rentals.

Clearly [Indiscernible-low volume] In my district [Indiscernible-low volume] 45 houses that used to be housing stock that are now short-term rentals.

I just fundamentally think we should be very careful about eliminating the 600 foot rule for properties [Indiscernible-low volume] Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN And COUNCILMAN Winkler?

>> I want to make two clarifications.

Number one, no one is suggesting that in that duplex [Indiscernible-low volume] is no longer required.

All this is saying is that the 600 foot rule should not be an automatic denial because it was it within 600 feet.

That is an important part of vacation.

Number two, I would say that COUNCILMAN Hollander hit on the exact issue, which is that sometimes those [Indiscernible-low volume] And sometimes they don't.

That, to me, is the fundamental problem.

You do not have a consistency of definition and consistency of process.

That is what we are asking the planning commission to do, is to say, here is a situation, let's have a definition around

them, so it is not a sometimes we do, sometimes we don't, we don't remember what we usually do -- in the case that brought this to my attention, even the county attorney said that [Indiscernible-low volume] Interpretation has been inconsistent.

I think that is the problem.

I would also add, just for reference, on the 600 foot rule, if the 600 foot rule, I understand some people have opposition to short-term rentals.

We are not debating the value of short-term rentals at all today.

That is not what is before us, okay?

And if somebody wants to revisit whether short-term rentals are a good idea or a bad idea, I think that is a debate worth having, but that is not the question that is before us.

I would point out that the 600 foot rule, again, applies specifically to owner-occupied properties.

We did not put a 600 foot rule that says short-term rentals cannot be within 600 feet of each other.

In fact, on a block, if all the units are owner-occupied, every single one of them can be a short-term rental.

The 600 foot rule was only put in in regards to whether it is owner-occupied or not.

That is why the rule was put in.

Because if we wanted to limit

deliberation, we would have said there is a 600 foot @#rule, and I do not care if you are owner-occupied or not, short-term rentals cannot be within 600 feet of each other.

We did not do that.

We said if it is owner-occupied, you can have 42 on a block.

And again, that is not the issue at hand today.

The only issue is, do we have consistency of process and consistency in the application of the law as it relates@# to [Indiscernible-low volume] 30 foot rule?

>> the queue, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILMAN George?

>> I am certainly a fan of consistency.

I want to underscore some of what I heard COUNCILMAN Hollander say, that is, what I remember from our land development @#reform efforts.

That is that, whether we looked at the [Indiscernible-low volume] Report, whether we look at the equity report, what I remember is that we needed a variety of housing types [Indiscernible-low volume] Affordable housing.

I do think there is a real point two being protective of that 600 foot @#rule.

Particularly for our [Indiscernible-low volume]

That just last year, we debated and [Indiscernible-low volume] Wanted to make sur we were putting measures in place [Indiscernible-low volume] Able to [

Indiscernible-low volume]
The community in a way that
allowed for monitoring [
Indiscernible-low volume] We
did not want to see @#[
Indiscernible-low volume]
Appreciate this bill include [
Indiscernible-low volume]
Process.

Being protective of the 600 foot
rule as relates to short-term
rentals is really important,
and I hope we get to a place
where [Indiscernible-low
volume] For affordable
housing and multigenerational [
Indiscernible-low volume]
>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.@#
COUNCILWOMAN Armstrong?
>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I am on the fence, leaning
toward being a yes vote, but I
want to explain why.

I have all the concerns
everyone has mentioned about
short-term [Indiscernible-
low volume] Taking away from
our housing [Indiscernible-
low @#volume]. I know that an
increased proliferation of
short-term rentals is one of
the reasons district eight rent
is going up, I have data to
show that.

What I am really compiled by in
this [Indiscernible-low
volume] Related to
enforcement.

Because I hear from somebody
every single week asking for
these types of@# increased
enforcement provisions around
bad actors, and specifically
repeat that actors that
continue to make money, that we
have very few tools to deal

with.

so, after struggling with this,
I do not like the idea of
increasing short-term rental
proliferation and @#any capacity,
but very much would like to see
[Indiscernible-low volume]
Implementation around
enforcement.

So, I am thinking in terms of
this is the first step [
Indiscernible-low volume]
Planning commission to look at
and make recommendations to
retain the ultimate ability to
accept or reject those
recommendations@# when they come
before us.

I would say I would be able to
reject any recommendation that
would make it easier for us to
have more short-term rentals in
a way that would deplete our
housing stock.

Let me be very clear about that.
But I am very interested in
increasing enforcement
provisions, so I will [
Indiscernible-low volume @#]
The debate.

Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

COUNCILWOMAN Fowler?

>> thank you.

I just want to say [
Indiscernible-low volume] Of
the planning commission to
review this, and hopefully,
this will put measures in and
that will ensure consistency.
It is crazy that@# one is okay,
one is not.

So, I am in favor, and will be
a yes vote.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Counsel and piagentini?

Thank you.

I will also be a yes vote, in regards to what COUNCILWOMAN Armstrong said.

We have a recommendation come out, we observe @#[Indiscernible -low volume] They go too far [Indiscernible-low volume] I do want to say something [Indiscernible-low volume] Come up now, related to housing.

One of the ways I was first elected four years ago [Indiscernible-low volume] Asked about the affordable housing trust fund. @# you know how you tamp down the cost of housing [Indiscernible -low volume] I will say that area is particularly, for a lot of complex reasons, history, there is also a bunch of provisions for review [@# indiscernible-low volume] Land stock in that area, but there have been -- I cannot think of any significant [Indiscernible-low volume] Councilmember Hollander well knows, but [Indiscernible-low volume] Over the last several years.

So, I am with you.

I understand [Indiscernible-low volume] And I appreciate the council's perspective, [Indiscernible-low volume @#] Reserve that.

I think we need to review [Indiscernible-low volume] Argument, there [Indiscernible -low volume] I will vote yes on it [Indiscernible-low volume] Intent, here [Indiscernible-low volume] To

review or weaken [Indiscernible-low volume] I think [Indiscernible-low volume] To correct what I see@# as a very sort of arbitrary, frankly, decision that it seems the planning commission made while still protecting the 600 foot rule [Indiscernible-low volume] But I do want to say, in your district and others, experiencing significant [Indiscernible-low volume] @# I am concerned that we are seeing [Indiscernible-low volume] A series of legislation, including [Indiscernible-low volume] Harder to build housing in this community. We need to preserve and protect simultaneously.@# I don't think this by itself is going to change what you are experiencing [Indiscernible-low volume] Building for it [Indiscernible-low volume] We all thought [Indiscernible-low volume] Came out, I hope you saw it. Document something I testified a while @#back [Indiscernible-low volume] How much housing has been built [Indiscernible-low volume] Surrounding areas [Indiscernible-low volume] That spread out across the community. So you are seeing increased rents in your area [Indiscernible-low volume] Other areas [Indiscernible-low volume] Frankly around floyd's fork [Indiscernible-low @#volume] The south and has got [Indiscernible-low volume] As well [

Indiscernible-low volume]

Thank you, I will be yes.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN

COUNCILWOMAN flood?

>> if you remember, when we

debated@# -- rules, we were

specifically asked by some of

our colleagues to have

homeowners associations that we

put in part of the amendment

were criteria that all [

Indiscernible-low volume]

Nothing in that @#ordinance would

negate homeowners associations

[Indiscernible-low volume]

Restriction or bylaws.

There are [Indiscernible-

low volume] In our area

unincorporated area that do not

allow this type of housing [

Indiscernible-low volume]

Restrictions or by @#bylaws.

Therefore, it is all

concentrated into one area.

That was on of the provisions.

The other three provisions on

that resolution I agree with.

But when we are taking something

that is not going to be equally@#

enforced over the community, it

is not right.

The last statement I will make

is, every time [Indiscernible

-low volume] Resolution what

comes back is what ever

planning commission decides to

-

do, well, it was a unanimous

vote, so you cannot disagree

with it.

Thank you.

[Captioners transitioning]@#

c1

an owner @#can get a short-term

rental.

Without the 600 foot rule.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> perhaps I misstated it.

What I suggest that is not about the merits of the 600 rule overall.

It's the rental provision.

It specifically relates to if I have a structure on my property that is connected, it is okay.

As soon as there's an inch of daylight, it is not okay.

That to me is just a fundamental flaw in the law. We should clarify it.

I think, consistency in profit.

I would counter that the -- I understand the concerns.

I can make the opposite argument here as well, if there's an incentive to build something, maybe the current owner wants to build a short-term rental, that will not be original in perpetuity.

A person MAY sell the home, and the new owner says, gosh, I don't want to mess with the short-term rental.

I want this to be multi generational.

It is another incentive to build.

And to the COUNCILMAN's point, more building is how you solve the housing problem.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you.

I know that we've again, talked about the 600 foot rule.

It's very specific.

But the fourth one gets to what COUNCILMAN Armstrong.

A very generic, let's look at the total package.

Quite frankly, it's going to look at everything, it's going

to allow all kinds of options coming back.

Whatever the 60 day minimum is, they want to get around with it in 60 days.

You can have hearing of whatever you want after this.

Voting yes for this resolution will allow this group to review everything there is to know about short-term rentals, whatever changes to make it even better or stronger.

And less proliferation.

Use have to craft it that way.

I do have one final question, it MAY be from the original. that would be owner occupied, the definition of.

If it's corporate owned property, and have an employee in one of the two buildings, or a unit that its owner occupied?

>> I don't know.

Honestly, I don't know.

I did not write the original.

>> I'm just saying, owner occupied, being allowed with -- again, as long as there's 42 owners occupied, they can take over one block.

>> I just don't have the language in front of me.

I could be wrong about this.

>> that's fine.

>> how many days it's occupied, similar to this, I don't have that.

>> the reason I'm bringing it up is it something for you to watch for when it comes back, because from the corporate standpoint, and they have a group that occupies a unit going back to COUNCILMAN Winkler's point on, if it's on

a single piece of property,
going back to some of the blocks
, four or five houses in right?@#
they will go have something
redone, and all five will be on
the same piece of property.
Again, something to keep an eye
on.

One of the biggest problems I
have, when we talk about rental
property, it's not -- is not
who own the property, but the @#
fact that it's a real estate
company out of new york that
owned six properties on her
part.

No lives there.

But one person listen
housekeeping eye on the
residence.

It's an issue.

>> thank you.

>> thank you COUNCILMAN @#print

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

Admittedly, I don't have any
short-term rentals in my
district.

I do understand where the
COUNCILMAN Is coming from.

I think what counselor winkler
is asking -- take a very
nuanced look on @#what was his
concern, and come back with
clarification.

I don't see any harm in that.

Is one of the reasons why voted
yes at a committee, to come
back with some clarity, and I
don't think this is any time to
really if that 2:00 A.M.

Debate.

I don't that we should @#do it
now, either.

I would be voting yes.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> at the risk of re-debating that at 2:00 A.M., I recall from the conversation and characterizing that as long as there's an owner operator that lives there, that means @# -- is understood, that is not what the ordinance says.

A person owns a duplex, they are living in the apartment upstairs, and they are renting the downstairs apartment as an airbnb, that's an airbnb.

That's not owner-occupied. @# that owners occupying the apartment upstairs.

The owner can't be an occupant downstairs as well.

Either live upstairs or downstairs.

If they rent out the downstairs, for 365 days a year, as it airbnb, that's one thing.

For example, @#he rented out the downstairs as in airbnb, and that qualifies for the 600 zero. Derby, if they want to rent the upstairs as well, that's owner-occupied.

They can rent the entire house for that period of time.

If you have a building has 42 units, just because you have an employee occupying one @#of those, the rest of those units would have to be considered special separate units for airbnb.

That's not an ordinance.

That's what it did.

I know people who own airbnb's who had to get a conditional use permit, because they owned @# the whole building, there were other people nearby who had

airbnb's they did the same thing.

They lived in one apartment, they were renting another, and they had to get a permit, because they were all already doing this with the ordinance. So they got a permit.

I can see where the zoning comes from, say @#we made an exception here, but not there.

I'm not opposed to sending this ordinance, this resolution. If they do in fact revisit that 600 foot rule, and if they do come back with a different interpretation that@# they argue over until late, early in the morning, I'm more than happy to have a conversation.

I'm surprised that the conversation tonight, it's being thrown out there, like somehow, you can live in one half of the duplexer at the other half.

As I recall @#the discussion, that wasn't the case, and I know for certain that people who own airbnb's, who live in one apartment and read the other one, they have to get conditional use for this.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> I know travis is on.

Correct me if @#I'm wrong.

COUNCILMAN, I think you're not correct with that interpretation.

Yes, you have the conditional use for, but in the case you outlined, it's not applying the 600 foot rule.

In the definition, if it's owner-occupied@#, okay, that's what I'm highlighting.

Travis, correct me if I'm wrong.

Those scenarios qualify as owner occupied.

Is that correct?

>> I think I can clarify.

Part of the issue is -- sorry @# about that.

I will go from the clearest point.

Very obvious, if you have a house, two bedrooms, one bath, you're out one bedroom.

That's owner-occupied.

One house, two bedrooms, one bath, one bedroom is in the basement. @#

it's owner-occupied.

The downstairs has a bathroom and kitchen, but is still occupied that the main house, that's owner-occupied.

Line gets blurry.

Prior to regulation, we had a so-called mother-in-law suite.

Folks effectively make the basement an @#entire other dwelling with independent access, a bathroom, in theory, that's effectively a duplex.

But it's a bit of a gray area.

Those are generally considered owner-occupied, and less it's exclusively a duplex @#in regulation elsewhere.

That's one of the gray areas where I think it's misunderstood.

We moved to very explicit duplex.

Those are regularly required to get conditional release permits.

@#ordinarily, if you live in unit one a of the duplex, and there's one b, you are going to be required to get a permit for

that second unit to be short-term rental.

Consider owner occupied.

With some regularity, I can't give you a percentage, exactly.

Grant those on condition that one of the two units remain the primary residence of the hosts.

As long as they stay in one unit of the duplex, they are also granted the non-occupied short-term rental of another unit.

Moving further on from there to the carriage house situation, that one varies some, because the councils regulations and restrictions on the relations.

There's also unique short-term regulations with zoning districts.

that's where a lot of carriage houses are.

I don't want to get too into the weeds on that one.

I think that covers, more or less, the spectrum.

There are cases where it's not be required, where is being required.

Generally speaking, if it's a true duplex, or carriage house situation, it is being required currently.

But they are somewhat regularly granted.

They have that regulation occupied by the owner.

>> yes, thank you trais.

Clears it up in the sense.

Again, this is not changing the requirement, okay?

I think we belabored it enough.

>> thank you.

Clerk, please let the record reflect they need to ask

questions.

No, you stay there.

>> so noted.

>> I think the real reason is
to chime in @#whatsoever anymore.
COUNCILMAN?

C1

>> do you withdraw for now?

No problem.

COUNCILMAN PRESIDENT U.S. Army
veteran?

>> thank you, @#MR. PRESIDENT.

So when we went to this debate
with a 600 foot rule and short-
term rentals, we were very
clear about the tradition
zoning district. I don't care
if it's owner-occupied, or
anything.

If you're a short-term rental,
you have to get@# that.

With the sponsor of this as an
amendment this is nothing in
this resolution for the
requirement?

Thank you.

I would like to make that is
emotion.

>> sorry.

We have a motion by COUNCILMAN
James.@#

we have a second.

Any discussion on the mimicry.

No discussion on the amendment.

Oh, we have a second.

We need to clarify on the
account of the attorney.

What we @#are replacing?

We did not get that.

>> is subsection 171. The rules
and changing's.

No longer expressly mentions
the requirement, so I'm
thinking it's a new sub five@#
that the planning commission
should not consider the

requirement in the traditional zoning district.

Is authentic?

>> that's right.

>> okay.

>> can we -- you want to use that language?

>> I don't know the that @#was changing.

>> do you want --

>> nothing should make it less restrictive.

>> do want to clarify precisely so we are all 100%?

>> yes.

Let me write it down so I @#don't end up saying a different sentence.

>> will take a moment to.

>> thank you.

C1

>> I'm sorry.

What word did you want to say?

It's as lightning?

>> nothing should make it less restrictive.

>> okay.

The planning solution should not consider the safety requirement in the district less

restrictive than currently @#?

>> that's correct.

>> okay.

That was properly moved and seconded.

To discuss the amendment.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'm a little bit -- the problem is, it's not been consistently applied. @#

travis just told us that, perhaps, of 50% of the time, even if it's a duplex, as long as the owner lives in one of the two, they are allowing -- exemption of the 600 foot rule,

because they consider owner occupied.

In over @#50%.

what about the other percent?

52%, what about the 48%?

If we add this language that the PRESIDENT Is recommending,

I'm not sure what message we are sending. We are telling them that they should @#revisit this, and come up with language that is clearer, and a policy that is clearer.

This set mean that now they can't weaken the ordinance that the duplex is actually two units?

I'm trying to figure out -- I think @#I understand that COUNCILMAN James was to make sure doesn't want to do anything were people still have to get the permit.

I get that.

When you say you can't loosen her liton, you can't reduce, I don't know what that means. @# obviously, I don't think they know what that means, either.

If 52% of the time, they do one thing, and 48% of the time, to do another.

>> to clarify -- in the traditional neighborhood zoning, @# all short-term rentals, regardless if they are owner occupied or not, they require it.

PRESIDENT James amendment is just make sure we don't consider changing that standard.

With the red zoning district.

That's primarily the old city @# downtown.

That's not most of metro.

Currently, there's a standard

for all.

Unless I'm mistaken, I think the addition of the amendment was to clarify that it should not change.

We still look outside at possible changes.

>> that doesn't answer my question.

Within the neighborhood district way you're describing it, you have to get one, one of the reasons that they would reject the conditional use permit would be that they are using a property as short-term rental of 600 feet with another property that is as short-term rental.

The way you define is one unit is a short-term rental.

Whether the owner lives in a different unit on the same property.

I'm trying to get -- what are we asking folks to do?

Whatever it is, plain english?

>> just to keep some order in here, there are people that want to chime in.

Are you asking a direct question to any particular person?

>> I was responded to the county attorney.

I understand -- I think I understand what COUNCILMAN James is trying to compass.

But I don't know that the reason that cups are granted or rejected is based on the 600 feet. if we say that one re-reviews this, we can't lessen the requirements for a cup, in a sense, they are saying that

that specific neighborhood,
it's going to be 600 feet all
the time, nomatter what.

Which is why I thought was the
reason we were having this
discussion, to not be
inconsistent.

>> okay.

You keep finishing what @#I think
is a statement in the form of a
question, I wonder where there
are not your asking a question?

>> I'm waiting for him to
explain to me how saying we
can't make it any less strict,
less stringent, how that allow
for any conversation around the
600 foot rule @#when it comes to
cup?

How will that affect that?

>> I think the proper way to
interpret it, it will not.

Section 1, part one of the
ordinance currently deals with
situations where they @#do not
require or do not trigger the
600 foot rule during the cup
process.

Assuming the planning
commission comes back and says,
you know what?

We think that shold be the
case.

The 600 foot should not apply.

That distinction would still
apply.@# even if the planning
commission recommends changing
it, and not the 600 rule for
the search circumstances -- I
think that was the intent when
read together.

If PRESIDENT James was to
clarify, that's how I
understood the situation.

Two COUNCILMAN Kramer,@# are you
-- 's?

>> I don't think so.

I don't think they are now.

If they are inconsistently applying it, right?

If they are inconsistently applying it, unless they are only inconsistently applying it out some of the stone you are talking about, that's the reason why we're having this conversation.

If there consistently doing it inside that area, and inconsistently doing it everywhere else, then the amendment makes sense.

But I don't know enough about where these airbnbs are, and where -- what the commission is doing in terms of levels of consistency.

Simply saying that we're going to focus on this one area, and you'll have to interpret it, it sounds like he's saying that in fact, yes, what we are saying is, if your airbnb is in this particular part of the community, the 600 foot rule applies every time, and the groups we are saying that to -- they can't change it.

I thought that was the reason we are having this conversation.

Figuring out how to be consistent.

>> okay.

COUNCILMAN Kramer?

>> I still need an answer to that question.

Are we, in fact, going to say that in this specific neighborhood, the 600 foot rule applies every time, but we are going to review outside?

Is that what the amendment would do?

>> okay.

I'm @going to refer the question to the next person in the queue, because he cannot login.

He raised his hand.

I think, to answer this question.

Is that correct, PRESIDENT James?

>> yes.

>> I will refer to@# MR. PRESIDENT.

>> the answer is, they can look over the city and county, but [Indiscernible-low volume]

.

>> okay.

i will continue with the queue, going to PRESIDENT James @# everyone else.

Log back into the queue.

Will appreciate your conversation with.

PRESIDENT James?

PRESIDENT James, did you have additional commentary?

>> yes.

I just wanted make sure that we were quick clear.

We made a lot of effort @#to say -- I don't care if you are owner occupied, 600 full foot rule applies, that should not change.

Unless it offers a waiver.

Consider anything that makes it less restrictive@#, I hope that's clear.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT. COUNCILMAN Winkler?

>> thank you.

Just from a process, I want to clarify.

Was happening, you have an

interpretation, and you have recommendations by the planning commission. The issue is, the application of the recommendations from the planning commissioner, -- we are asking the planning commission to look at the issue, make recommendations, so give clear guidance, who is inconsistently interpreting the law.

For procedural perspective, that's what we are asking today.

To clarify, I think everyone knows this.

The planning commission recommends as we will discuss some point in the future.

We are doing tonight -- we make no changes whatsoever. Okay?

We're simply asking the planning commission to say, can we give consistent rules around this?

Everything else is for future discussion.

>> just to clarify procedurally where we are in this discussion, right now we are debating the amendment that has been proposed by PRESIDENT James.

COUNCILMAN, in the queue?
The amendment?

>> is going to say what COUNCILMAN Winkler said in about six words.

I will skip everything you just said which is, we are just asking them to look at it.

I'm calling the question on the amendment.

>> weber called a question a motion with the second by

COUNCILMAN Winkler.

That is not debatable, correct?

All in favor@#, please say aye.

All opposed to calling the question?

I'm going to say the ayes have it on that one.

We are calling that question now.

To be clear, recalled question on the amendment right now. @#

>> for right now.

You're coming back to me when this goes over.

>> you made the motion.

If get back into it.

>> you just called the vote.

>> okay.

All in favor of PRESIDENT James is amendment, please say aye.

Oppose?

>> no.@#

>> the ayes have it.

And passes.

Before we move on, PRESIDENT James, do you have any more discussion related to this?

madame clerk, but the record reflect that prsidnt james is taking back over this circus.@#

c1

>> COUNCILMAN Pete?

>> I'm calling the question on the whole thing.

>> to have a second on that?

>> second by COUNCILMAN Benson.

>> the question on the whole thing.

On favor, say@# aye.

All oppose?

>> nay.

>> ayes has it.

A resolution before us, this is a resolution that recalls a roll call vote.

All in favor, say aye.

All oppose?

The ayes habit.

All right.

Thank you.

MADAME Clerk?@# a reading.

The resolution passes.

Thank you.

>> the district development
plan and properties located -- @#
[Indiscernible-low volume]

.

>> motion.

>> motion, and seconded.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This property was originally in
2021, a carwash wants to
construct -- three@# continuous
parcels. We actually in
committee changed number 13, so
we could add hours of
operation, which the applicant
agreed to.@#

the operation hours are 7:00

A.M.

To 9:0 P.M.

Number 14 became our standard
language and applies to changes
in binding elements.

He MAY wish to address this.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> this is an example of the
element that@# they mentioned for
change of use.

This was left an empty lot with
the original plan.

It got taken back by the
carwash.

We can com back to that, which
is what we're doing tonight.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

Any further discussion?

Hearing none, this is a roll
call vote.@#

MADAME Roll call, please call
the role.

>> council member?

>> yes.

>> councilmember?

Councilmember?

>> yes.

>> councilmember?

>> yes. @#

>> one moment.

>> standby.

>> councilmember?

MR. PRESIDENT, you have 23 yes votes.

>> thank you.

The ordinance passes.

Item number 40.@#

>> and ordinance relating to the properties -- [Indiscernible-low volume].

>> motion, seconded.@#

the ordinance forces any discussions.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

The original proposal for this piece of property was a change in zoning for seven apartment buildings.

Now, they came back with proposals constructing a 6000 square foot veterinary clinic on @#2.25 acres will be rezoned. 4.6 acres will remain. This is in the COUNCILMAN's district. He MAY wish to address this.

>> thank you.

Two thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This is a good deal.

there's no opposition@#. But yes, thanks.

>> any further discussion?

Bearing them, this is an ordinance requiring a roll call vote.

Please call the vote for those that cannot present in chambers.

>> councilmember?@#

>> yes.

>> councilmember?

>> yes.

>> councilmember?

>> councilmember.

>> thank you.

The ordinance passes.

Read item number 41.

>> resolution in support of
establishing a net zero@# gas
emissions by 2040 in
louisville, jefferson county.

>> thank you.

MAY we have a motion in a
second.

>> motion and second.

Is there any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.@#
this came out of committee with
some negative votes, so that's
why it's on old business.

I support it, and thank you.

We're just trying to@# put out a
target, a goal.

I think it's just -- there's
nothing wrong with that.

>> you.

>> thank you, and sister
PRESIDENT.

Can I ask a question of the
response.

Why is it next year?

>> COUNCILMAN George?

>>@# thank you, PRESIDENT.

I didn't hear the question, but
I went to back up to the frame.
Councilmember fowler did an
excellent job in saying the
purpose.

I want to spend a little bit
highlighting what this does,
and what we hope to achieve, if
possible.

>> yes ma'am.

>>@# okay.

Want to start by saying
sections 1 and two, really,

this resolution does three things.

Section 1 and two establish goals that align with evidence-based recommendations.

That is to say, net zero green gas @#reductions communitywide by 2040, and interim target of 50% reduction. Section 3 holds the administration accountable. Section four coordinates with other agencies to ensure the goal, projects,@# as metro budget allows.

When this is found to not be practical, it requires agencies to explain the opportunities.

To give a big thank you to our sustainability coordinator, the mayor, in the back.

She did an excellent job presenting and describing what we expect @#to see with greenhouse gas reductions.

That's fewer billion-dollar investors, which transfers to increased health in the community.

We also have a reminder through the presentation about how metro was already engaged in this work.

And how @#it's a formal commitment -- with a formal commitment, we fulfill the commitment we made to cities, how we are able to produce funding opportunities, and how compares @#to other cities like indianapolis.

There's an article in SEPTEMBER, and it alleged that from 2000 to 2022, kentucky has seen more flood related disasters than any other state.

Those floods are related to increases in climate and

greenhouse gas emissions.

As @#evidenced-based.

On a national level, in action means the gdp is expected to shrink 3 to 10%.

Costs will be incurred by the federal government of \$2 trillion by the end of the century.

I went to consider our cost of inaction, and I know my colleagues share the responsibility in planning, and @# willing to make sure that we are not meeting federal money on the table.

Councilmembers also are cosponsors.

If they were to say nothing in the front and, then I'm ready for questions.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN Cuispro @#I'm waiting for the sponsors to say their piece.

>> okay.

You're in the queue.

COUNCILMAN?

>> I will be brief.

I feel the same way as I felt about the resolution we passed years ago.

I think@# in the not too distant future, asked by children and grandchildren, what did you do when you saw this crisis coming?

I don't want to say we didn't do much because we didn't think we could achieve much.@# so just let it happen.

That's why am for this.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILMAN Arthur?

>> thank you, I will be brief.

Unless you have money like jeff

bezos, and can get on a rocket ship and go to space, climate change is going to impact every single person on this earth.

Outside of just what we're dealing with right now, as you just heard, future generations are going to have to deal with this at extreme levels.

If we are not committing to some kind of solution, we are part of the problem.

That's why I support this.

Thank you.

>> the key.

COUNCILMAN?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

Why didn't we set the goal for next year?

>> COUNCILMAN?

>> the question is, why did we set the goal for next year?

As I understand it, we heard testimony given before the committee about how this came about.

These came from recommendations for the intergovernmental panel for climate change.

There already was a goal, well documented in the plan, and available to the public.

Essentially, what this does is take our existing plan, and aligns it with the intergovernmental panel on climate change.

Your recommendation, as I understand, can change new information, additional information, and essentially brought us to these goals around 2040.

>> follow-up question.

Okay.

Our initial resolution says

goals for metro for 100% removal
trainer.

Can anyone give me a specific
status or plan to get us 100%
there? @#

trento.

Anything significant to put any
other sources of energy?

The current status?

>> is that a question to the
sponsors?

>> one of the @#sponsors.

>> would any of the sponsors
want to answer?

>> I look back at he subject
manner experts in the chambers,
immediately is the investments
that we've made for our energy
manager.

I'm speaking in approximate's,
but \$1 million @#over a year.

I would defer to, again,
subject matter expert sitting
in the back.

If you want to entertain or
learn more.

I would say, we know we are
seeing in makng progress
towards our goals.

To clean, renewable energy@# next
to our energy auditor.

>> MR. PRESIDENT?

Trento.

>> I will throw this out as an
option.

If it was the want to hear from
a subject matter expert,
someone could make a motion to
be able to do that.

>> @#not necessary.

Eku, PRESIDENT, for the option.

My point is established.

Right p? I don't dispute.

I fully support the movement?

For example, COUNCILMAN Winkler

-- @#a councilmember, who drives

a tesla, and GOD bless him.
Which doesn't create any
emissions, 70% on call.
Half my friends that drive
tesla's have friends of coal @#
license plates.
I'm not exaggerating.
They are powering most off of
coal energy.
there's nothing sustainable for
impacting climate change.
We haven't made any major
movements towards our original
goals@#. I fully support the
movements we've made. GOD bless
the folks that are making the
impact, saving us money.
In looking to make us more
sustainable.
In real feel, I looked into
what they would charge@# with one
of the solar plants.
The cost is astronomical.
I lose patience wit the solar
movement, and look to convert
my house to solar energy.
The cost was @#astronomical.
Even to break even. I'm not
even sure -- I don't think
there's any proof that if we
went to fully renewable or
alternative energy in this
timeframe that our local
electrical grid even has the
capacity to @#do so.
Or have other capabilities to
do it.
It's not a matter of whether I
think climate change is a real
thing, or saving the
environment.
I myself -- [Indiscernible-
low volume]. I'm not going
to sign off on the resolution @#
that says there zero proof that
it can be pulled off in a way

that is sustainable, cost-effective, or otherwise [Indiscernible-low volume].

Was before, I supported something -- I get what he was saying about triggering the ability to get federal grants. I'm all about getting more federal money.

I'm not about continuing to perpetuate the myth and what we can achieve.

I'm interested in real plans, real ideas.

This, to me is -- you might as well write a resolution.

I want to repeat by 2023.

I will poverty ended, and other things, right?

Which I want, but I know is not going to happen next year.

We do put in place plans for housing.

We put in place plans for jobs. the plans in place for other things.

We can do these things and be realistic about it.

Do not put four things that really -- I don't see the need for it.

Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

In committee, my wife's employment -- I will be abstaining again tonight.

Goals could impact that.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you.

I want to respond to a couple of quick points pertain we've done nothing I think does not reflect reality.

we recognize significant

savings to the energy manager.
We tasked the ordinances to buy
the at&t building.

We put solar facility on top of
that building.

I think we have not only@#
articulated these goals, but I
think we've put our money where
our mouth are, and move
forward.

This resolution calls for that
next layer, next plan.

I think, too, to say this is
not based in reality, I will
call your attention to the
sixth or seventh@# word, which is
a science-based target.

it is a science-based target.

What does the science say?

And create a target around that.

I don't know what more we could
ask for in terms of a realistic
plan.

I will close with commentary
about the energy @#industry in
total.

When we talk about the play off
of solar, I think it's

important to remember that
number one, there has been
significant lobbying activity
done to dis-incentivize
alternatives to the monopolies
that provide power today,@# and
change the regulatory
framework, or how you could
provide solar back to the grid.

You could generate enough energy
, the rates at which I pay that
back to the power grid have
been significantly lobbied
against by the industry so that
they can perpetuate @#the current
status quo.

I would also add, and I think
this is the single most

critical point -- when we consider the cost of carbon, we are not considering the full burden cost.

Right?

The cost of coal, the cost of natural gas, the cost of any other carbon-based fuel is organizing the fully burdened cost.

When you consider the fully burdened cost, the choice becomes quite clear.

I will give you an example of the fully burdened cost.

One need only look at the exponential increase in damage from climate related events.

Not just hurricanes.

Look at droughts, the issues of shipping things down the mississippi river.

Look at forest fires.

Caused by droughts.

Issues with lake mead, on and on and on and on.

These are real costs that are born out of our activity.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

At the risk of sounding cynical, I don't want to sound cynical.

You mentioned science-based target.

Does that include countries that pollute, and really are the ones that lead to climate change that we are seeing now, which would be india, china, russia?

My whole point is that we in the U.S. Seem to take the burden for some of the things that other countries are really

creating.

It's all well and good if we want to be environmentally conscious.

We want to curtail climate change.

But at the same time, it's not going to happen by government regulation.

Is going to happen with free-market makes it affordable for @# individuals.

We've looked at -- we invest in solar farms.

We are as environmentally conscious as we can get.

L.E.D.

Lights, we recycle.

The cost is astronomical.

There's no way @#a small business like that can afford that.

These resolutions, where the public is concerned, it becomes more of regulation.

I'm not willing to stick my neck out, or commit, in my opinion, to something that at this moment is not @#economically feasible, and there's no guarantee in 2040 that it will be economically feasible.

Nor do we know that in 2040 what we are doing here is going to impact climate change because you have countries like russia and india and china that are doig the majority of the @# polluting.

To me, is well-intentioned.

But I will be know.

Thanks.

>> thank you.

She's had trouble getting into the queue.

I will call her next.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

In fact, my name is on there.

The system, but the person did not have a @#problem with getting in the queue.

Just wanted to clarify.

>> I say.

It's not showing up.

>> okay.

It MAY be a moot point, because we now have all of this discussion.

My initial question was, can someone tell me what the objections were for it to be denied at the @#committee level?

Well, I think -- not to call anyone out.

But COUNCILWOMAN Parker had concerns, if you want to fill her in.

Sorry.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN Parker.

@#>> yes.

My concerns were that it is --

I think it's a little bit -- not a little bit, but a lot.

Updates well-intentioned.

But I don't think it's a goal that is realistic @#at all.

i've done research on solar farms.

They actually create a greenhouse effect.

Seller, at this point in time, is very unaffordable.

I guess -- I dislike for people to@# walk the walk, and not just talk the talk.

That is my objection.

Is anybody here writing their bicycle to work.

Nobody turns their lights off, they still watch their tv, they still heat their homes@#. I think for everybody the votes yes on this, I think it's a hypocrite

of boat.

That's awful to me.

I do things in my home to
conserve energy.

But I'm still going to be a no
vote @#on this.

It's like what COUNCILMAN Reed
said.

We are not th big offenders.

We are trying to do some things
about climate change.

The biggest offenders, we can't
do anything about.

I @#think in so doing, anybody
that wants to bring a business

-

here that MAY have to use coal
or energy -- their thinking
down the road, too, I'm going
to be forced to be hit over the
head with a bunch of expenses @#
that I -- if I go to another
city, I won't have to worry
about this.

As far as affordable homes?

For affordable homes, people
can't afford to do this.@#

people who rent homes, they
can't afford to do it.

If they are mandated to, forced
to 20 years down the road, we
took a bunch of homes off the
market for them.

so these were just some of the
issues.

And you can take me out of the
queue, because I said what I
wanted to say. @#

thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Does that answer your question?

Thank you.

COUNCILMAN Hollander?

>> I will be brief.

First of all, I think it's
important in looking at 2040

was picked.

This is a call that has been
agreed to by over 1000 cities
across the globe.

He, many, many corporations in
the United States and
elsewhere.

I will echo what COUNCILMAN
Winkler has said.

To say that we haven't done
anything is incorrect.

I think the fact that we set a
goal with something that I talk
about every time I see Mark
about the AT&T building.

I will be here, but I will be
disappointed and surprised if
there is a plan to put
seller at the top of the
building.

A set big goals, and that's why
I'm voting yes.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

Two things.

As an educator, when I'm
teaching kids about how to set
goals and what goals mean, he
said achievable goals, and then
you establish the steps that
you are going to take to get to
that achievable goal.

Again, you want to be -- you
don't want it to be so easy
that is not a goal.

But you also don't want to set
a goal that is unachievable,
because -- anyway.

I look at this, and I don't
think there's anybody in here
who really does believe that by
2040, or 2050, we will, in
fact, be carbon free.

There's no way.

Unless we think magical
thinking, there's going to be

some new fuel to replace in the next 10 years, 15 years, gps will not be flying planes with no carbon footprint.

They will be able to.

It's not an @#achievable goal.

In my information, it's not a goal.

The first thing.

The second is, as mentioned that we would be signing on with a bunch of other cities, and lots of other people are doing this.

I don't want anybody to think that a vote against this means that to heck with everything, let's destroy the environment.

But if we are going @#to walk into this, we can walk into it with our eyes open.

A couple of years ago, there is a push through waste management . They wanted to do a pilot program to see if we could or should do wet/dry garbage collection.

And they were in a @#very small part of town.

They gave certain businesses a separate cart that they could put all of their organic materials in.

They would go collect these carts, and allow any organic materials to be separated out.

When I asked the question about @# how this is going to result in a residential area, the restaurants were taken the carts and leaving carts.

we took a cart full of material, would empty the car in@# clinic cart, and we come back the next week, and reclean the cart.

When asked about the residential side, that would be cost relative, there were no way the city could come up with that.

And said that the individual homeowner would be responsible for putting the organic waste to put into the cart.

It would fall to the owner@# in the meantime.

I reminded them that in louisville in AUGUST, it gets really warm.

If you were to leave cart anywhere near your home or you would actually take the material outside, if nothing else, the smell would be overwhelming.

That's assuming -- the response @# to me was well, what they are saying done in other cities is, they are freezing the organic waste, and they're putting -- taking the waste out of the freezer the day before it was going to be picked up.

If iphoto yes on this, -- @# and that was a pilot approach we did a few years ago.

If you look at what is before us tonight, that proposal was included in here.

I voted against it then, I spoke out about it then.

There's no way I can@# vote for a resolution that tells a 78-year-old person in the community that they should freeze the organic waste so that in AUGUST when they put it out, it won't smell to high heaven, and was they put it out, the clearer the garbage can.

that's precisely what other

cities are doing. @#
just because other cities are
doing this, -- I'm not going to
say, other cities are doing
this organic waste thing, and
it's working for them.
I'll see how that works.
I won't go to my constituents
and say I voted for resolution
that led to louisville's solid @#
waste management creating the
policy.
They were going to make this a
policy across jefferson county,
and it wasn't just for metro.
It is going to be, everybody
had to do this. @#
they wanted to do it
themselves.
We fought hard to keep it from
happening.
We buried it in here, it opened
up the door for them to create
all kinds of policies.
My colleagues, I will be a no
vote.
Read what they @#are proposing to
make it possible to who us to
get within 20 or 30% of zero
emissions.
It doesn't give us -- it
doesn't get us there.
The proposing is outrageous. @#
I don't know if our
constituents would be satisfied
with that.
Thank you.
>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.
>>.
>> all of this criticism and
cynicism sounds a lot like
people who have their vote
suppressed.
We just had our election on
tuesday, want to encourage as
elected officials, if we believe

boats matter, we should believe our work and commitment to goals that address what I believe is the most unifying political issue, we should believe that this resolution matters.

We heard that we haven't made any progress, we haven't done anything about the previous resolution.

You can see in his resolution it says, since we have made a commitment, the cost savings of over \$1.2 million by increasing efficiency in government operations.

If you don't believe that clause, I would point to my colleagues who are unsure, who haven't kept up with it, to go to 100% move.Com.

Have it pulled up on the screen right now, and it's something like the energy dashboard, they can break down this \$1.2 million. You can clearly see across government buildings and facilities, parks, the zoo, libraries, savings that we have. You can also see a timeline that is very clear in our reduction of natural gases.

Progress is there.

If you haven't kept up with it, that's no one else's job to help you keep up with it. but please don't disparage the progress we have made to do our part to save the planet.

We can have philosophical debates, republican versus democrat, socialism versus capitalism, nothing matters when that tornado hits.

None of that matters when

wildfires hit.

Mother nature doesn't care
about your ideas.

We have to show that our --
that we care about this one
earth we have.

I think that's very important.
that should be enough for you.

Thank you so much.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

So @#about other countries, and
what do they do?

We are one of the most wasteful
countries in this planet.

We can't control what other
countries do.

We just have to do what is
right for the people in the
planet, and contribute to that
end goal.@#

technology is moving forward,
making strides yearly.

By the time 2030 comes around,
things will be cheaper.

There's no reason not to set a
goal.

That's all this is.@#

what did he say?

What are we doing resolutions?

They don't mean nothing.

We are setting a goal, and I
don't know.

I don't know.

COUNCILMAN Kramer, I think it
was you who said that this is
just unattainable.@#

yeah, I just heard five minutes
of I'm not going to vote for
this.

And my constituents wouldn't
like it.

I would give him -- making them
do something they don't want to
do.

It's just a goal.

That's all I can say.
Anyway, @# I called a question.
>> thank you.
We have the question called.
We have a second?
>> second by COUNCILMAN Fox.
All those in favor of calling
the question, please say aye.
>> aye.
>> the ayes has it. @#
resolution is called.
we will need to do this by roll
call vote because of COUNCILMAN
Needing to abstain due to the
wife employment.
Please open the role for voting.
Clerk, please call the role @#for
those who are not present in
chambers.
>> councilmember?
>> yes.
>> councilmember?
>> abstention for the reasons
given earlier.
>> councilmember?
>> yes.
>>@# MR. PRESIDENT, you have 14
yes votes, two notes modes, two
extensions.
>> thank you, the resolution
passes.
Next item of business, it's new
business.
The clerk please read the
assignments to the committee.
>> legislation was assigned@#,
item 42.
Development funds?
[Indiscernible-low volume]
.
C1
>>@# operating budget ordinance.
[Indiscernible-low volume]
. @#
c1
[Indiscernible-low volume]

C1

[Indiscernible-low volume]

C1

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

c1

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

c1

[Indiscernible-low volume]

C1

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

c1

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

c1

[Indiscernible-low volume]

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

[Indiscernible-low volume]

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

[Indiscernible-low volume]

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

[Indiscernible-low volume] @#

[Indiscernible-low volume]

Read in full.

>> thank you.

MADAME Clerk.

X, we have announcements.

70 members wishing to make
announcements?

That @#concludes our meeting.

Our next council meeting is
thursday, DECEMBER 1st, 2022.
I hope everyone has a great