

ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL  
REMOTE BROADCAST CAPTIONING  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2020

Services provided by:  
QuickCaption, Inc.  
4927 Arlington Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92504  
Telephone - 951-779-0787  
Fax Number - 951-779-0980  
[quickcaption@gmail.com](mailto:quickcaption@gmail.com)  
[www.quickcaption.com](http://www.quickcaption.com)

\* \* \* \* \*

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.  
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in  
order to facilitate communication accessibility and **may not be  
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.**

\* \* \* \* \*

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THE REGULAR LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL MEETING WILL BEGIN COME TO ORDER. I'M METRO COUNCIL PRESIDENT JAMES. PLEASE RISE FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE. [PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COLLEAGUES, WE HAVE SEEN AN INCREASE IN COVID-19 CASES IN LOUISVILLE AND ACROSS OUR STATE. AS OF THIS MORNING, WE HAVE 301 LOUISVILLIANS WHO HAVE DIED DUE TO COVID-19. WE MUST NEVER FORGET THESE ARE NOT JUST NUMBERS. THESE ARE PEOPLE WHOSE LOSS IS BEING MOURNED. WE MUST NOT BECOME COMPLACENT. WE MUST FACE THE CRISIS AS A COMMUNITY AND EVERY PERSON LOST DIMINISHES OUR COMMUNITY. THE COUNCIL FAMILY EXPERIENCES A LOSS. COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL'S MOTHER MARY DIED AFTER A LONG BATTLE WITH CANCER. SHE WAS AN ALDERWOMAN DURING THE HARVEY SLOANE ADMINISTRATION. SHE SERVED ON THE TARC BOARD OF DIRECTORS. AND IN BETWEEN, DEDICATED HERSELF TO BEING OF SERVICE TO THE PRESENTATION ACADEMY. ON THE GROUNDS OF THE CATHEDRAL OF THE ASSUMPTION, SHE HAD THE BRONZE STATUE OF MOTHER CATHERINE SPALDING INSTALLED, THE FIRST STATUTE OF A WOMAN PUBLICLY DISPLAYED IN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE. VOLUNTEERING AT ST. JOHN'S CENTER FOR MEN ARE INCLUDED HER WORK. AND SHE'LL BE MISSED. COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL ASKED WE REMEMBER, HE PASSED WAY LATE TUESDAY, MR. HOWIC WAS 100-YEAR-OLD, THE OPERATOR OF THE CANDY MART IN THE GERMAN TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD. HE LIVED IN ST. JOSEPH HOME FOR THE ELDERLY FOR THE LOUISVILLE SISTERS OF THE

POOR. COLLEAGUES, PLEASE JOIN ME IN A MOMENT OF SILENCE. [MOMENT OF SILENCE OBSERVED]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. THIS REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL IS BEING CONDUCTED BY VIDEO TELECONFERENCE KRS61.826. AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH SENATE BILL 150. SOME MEMBERS ARE PRESENT IN THE CHAMBERS. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI, WINKLER AND COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE AND COUNCILMAN SCOTT REED. IF WE EXPERIENCE A DISRUPTION FOR ANY ATTENDEES, THE MEETING WILL BE SUSPENDED FOR FIVE MINUTES WHILE WE MAKE A REASONABLE ATTEMPT TO FIX THE ISSUE. WHILE THE MEETING IS SUSPENDED ALL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS WILL CEASE AND NO ACTION TAKEN. IF AFTER FIVE MINUTES, THE ISSUE WITH THE MEMBER'S FEED WE'LL RESUME THE MEETING AND THE MEETING WILL CONTINUE AS LONG AS WE HAVE A QUORUM OF MEMBERS. IF WE EXPERIENCE ANY TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES THAT AFFECT THE PUBLIC'S ABILITY TO SEE THE MEETING AS A WHOLE WE'LL SUSPEND THE MEETING WHILE ATTEMPTING TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE AND ALL PUBLIC BUSINESS WILL CEASE AND NO ACTION TAKEN. AFTER 20 MINUTES, THE ISSUE CANNOT BE RESOLVED, THE MEETING WILL STAND ADJOURNED. ANY UNFINISHED OR PENDING BUSINESS WILL BE ADDRESSED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF COUNCIL. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GREEN.

>> HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN

>> PRESENT.

>> MADAM CLERK:

>> PRESENT. COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN

>> PRESENT. SEXTON SMITH.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN HERE. PURVIS FOSTER.

>> MADAM CLERK: PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN COAN.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> HOLLANDER HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MULVIHILL. COUNCILMAN KRAMER.

COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.

>> HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN REED.

>> HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN WINKLER.

>> HERE.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PARKER.

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI .

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BENSON .

>> PRESENT .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE .

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN ENGEL . COUNCILMAN PEDEN .

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD .

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN YATES . COUNCILMAN ACKERSON .

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCIL MEMBER COAN . COUNCIL MEMBER  
MULVIHILL . COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER .

>> HERE .

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCIL MEMBER ENGEL . COUNCIL MEMBER YATES .  
MR. PRESIDENT YOU HAVE 21 MEMBERS PRESENT .

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, MADAM CLERK, LET THE RECORD  
REFLECT, COUNCIL MEMBER A MCCRANEY HAS AN EXCUSED ABSENCE FOR  
THIS EVENING. MADAM CLERK, ARE THERE ANY ADDRESSES TO COUNCIL?

>> MADAM CLERK: YES, SIR, THERE ARE .

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: LET ME REMIND THOSE ADDRESSING COUNCIL TO REFRAIN FROM USING ANY PROFANITY OR MAKING DEROGATORY STATEMENTS TO COUNCILMEMBERS. BRING THEM FORWARD.

>> MADAM CLERK: PAXTON TATE.

>> CAN YOU HEAR ME?

>> MADAM CLERK: YES, SIR.

>> HELLO?

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES, SIR, WE CAN HEAR YOU. MY NAME IS PAXTON. A MEMBER OF THE YOUTH ACTION BOARD. A GROUP OF [INDISCERNIBLE] I RESIDE IN DISTRICT 6. JUNE 6, 2019, I TURNED 24 YEARS OLD. ON THE DAY THAT SHOULD REPRESENT THE [INDISCERNIBLE] IN PROGRESS. I WAS OVERCOME WITH ABANDONMENT AND FEAR, I WAS HOMELESS. STRUGGLING TO FIND GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT AND [INDISCERNIBLE] HOMELESS, ODD JOBS AND WORKING ON GETTING MY GED, AND STRUGGLING TO FIND PURPOSE AND BATTLING MENTAL HEALTH. I CLUNG TO THE HOPE OF INDEPENDENCE AND GETTING THE BASIC NECESSITIES THAT MANY TAKE FOR GRANTED. I WAS ADDRESSED UNTIL I HAVE AN INTERNSHIP PROGRAM THROUGH THE KENTUCKY YOUTH CAREER CENTER. WORKING WITH HER MADE ME FEEL REDEEMED. IT WAS EMPOWERING TO GO FROM THE DARK PLACES AND WAKE UP TO A NEW WORLD OF OPPORTUNITY. I PERMITTED MYSELF TO TAKE CHANCES OF POSSIBILITIES WERE ENDLESS. FOR THE FIRST TIME I FELT FROM FROM MAKING NO PROGRESS. I WAS POWERFUL. I AM HERE TODAY BECAUSE OF THE NETWORK OF ORGANIZATIONS INVESTED IN MY FUTURE. I AM LUCKY

BECAUSE I GOT PLUGGED IN WITH THE RIGHT ORGANIZATIONS THAT BELIEVED IN ME. 17,000 YOUNG ADULTS IN LOUISVILLE ARE OUT OF SCHOOL AND WORK. I WAS ONE OF ALMOST 10,000, 18 TO 24 YEARS OLD IN LOUISVILLE WITHOUT A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA. LOUISVILLE HAS THE WORST RACIAL DISPARITY AMONG OPPORTUNITY YOUTH AND THE COUNTRY. THE PANDEMIC HAS ONLY COMPLICATED THE ISSUE. THE NUMBER OF YOUNG PEOPLE DISCONNECTED HAS DOUBLED SINCE FEBRUARY. TONIGHT, I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR DEDICATING NEW MONEY IN LAST YEAR BUDGET TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS FOR OPPORTUNITY YOUTH. WE NEED YOUR CONTINUED SUPPORT AND ATTENTION TO THE ISSUE THAT YOUNG PEOPLE ARE FACING. I URGE YOU TO ASK MCCONNELL TO SUPPORT THE HOUSING CREDIT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT TO ALLOW FOR PROGRAMS TO BETTER SERVE THE HOMELESS YOUTH. I AM HOPEFUL. I SEE THE COMMUNITY INVESTING IN LOUISVILLE YOUTH. I BELIEVE THE COMMUNITY SHOULD CENTER EXPERIENCES OF OPPORTUNITY YOUTH WHEN EVALUATING AND DEVELOPING PROGRAMS TO ENSURE THAT WE'RE GETTING THE BEST OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS. OUR MEASURE OF SUCCESS SHOULD BE THE FUTURE AS WE'RE HELPING YOUNG PEOPLE CREATE FOR THEMSELVES. I ASK FOR THE METRO COUNCIL TO LOOK AT THIS ISSUE AND THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO SPEAK TONIGHT.

>> MADAM CLERK: THANK YOU. FRANK SIMON.

>> YES. MY NAME IS FRANK SIMON. I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR LETTING ME SPEAK TONIGHT. AS WE LOOK AT OUR BEAUTIFUL CITY TODAY WE SEE IT'S ALL BOARDED UP. AND WE ASK OURSELVES, WHAT CAUSED

THIS? WHY ARE THERE NO PEOPLE ATTENDING THE DERBY THIS YEAR? THE CITY HAS BEEN TRASHED BY RIOTERS WHO ARE PAID TO COME TO LOUISVILLE TO BREAK OUT OUR WINDOWS IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA. THE POLICE HAVE SAID THAT MAYOR FISCHER TOLD THEM TO STAND DOWN, AND THUS HE ALLOWED THE RIOTERS TO TRASH OUR CITY. HOWEVER, WHEN THEY CAME TO HIS HOUSE HE EXPECTED THE TAXPAYERS TO PAY FOR HIS POLICE PROTECTION. HE BETRAYED US BUT HE WANTS US TO PROTECT HIM. IS THAT RIGHT? HE HAS TWO SETS OF RULES. FIRST, HE TURNS HIS BACK ON BUSINESS AND CITIZENS OF LOUISVILLE AND TELLS THE POLICE TO LET THE RIOTERS DESTROY OUR CITY. BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, HE EXPECTS THE TAXPAYERS TO PAY THE POLICE TO GUARD HIS HOUSE. TO TOP EVERYTHING OFF, HE TOLD THE POLICE TO NOT WEAR THEIR HELMETS WHEN CONFRONTING THE BRICK-THROWING MOBS. AFTER THE MAYOR LET THE RIOTERS TRASH OUR CITY, THEY NATURALLY TURNED TO THE SUBURBS AND BEGAN CARJACKING. THE RATE IN LOUISVILLE IS UP 400% BECAUSE OF MAYOR FISCHER'S RECKLESS POLICY, THE RIOTERS STARTED SHOOTING AT US FROM THE OVERPASSES, OVER THE EXPRESSWAY. BUT WHAT ABOUT ALL THE MURDERS THAT WE'RE HAVING IN LOUISVILLE. WHY IS THAT? OBVIOUSLY, IT'S BECAUSE THE MAYOR REFUSES TO DO HIS DUTY TO MAINTAIN LAW AND ORDER. AND NOW THE WHOLE CITY HAS BEEN TAKEN OVER BY LEFT-WING CRIMINAL ELEMENT. THE NATIONAL GUARD AND FEDERAL AGENTS STAND READY TO DEFEND US BUT MAYOR FISCHER WILL NOT LET THEM DO IT. HERE'S HAD BOTTOM LINE. HOW LONG WILL WE STAND IDLY BY WHY THE MAYOR'S WICKED POLICY PUT ALL OF US AND

FAMILIES IN DANGER. BECAUSE OF THE MAYOR'S CARELESS POLICIES,  
NONE OF US ARE SAFE. IT IS NOW TIME TO STANDUP FOR WHAT RIGHT.  
WE HAVE HERE THE NAMES OF OVER 1,002 CITIZENS OF LOUISVILLE AND  
SURROUNDING AREAS, WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE MAYOR FISCHER REMOVED.  
WE URGE LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL TO DO THEIR DILIGENT DO YOU  
TELL AND REMOVE MAYOR FISCHER FROM OFFICE FOR WILLFULLY  
NEGLECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTY, OF HIS OFFICE TO PROTECT  
THE CITY. FOR YEARS, MAYOR FISCHER HAS UNDERFUNDED OUR POLICE.  
THEY HAVE NOT HAD A CONTRACT FOR TWO YEARS. PLEASE REMOVE MAYOR  
FISCHER FROM OFFICE. THANK YOU.

>> MADAM CLERK: RUTH ANN SHUMATE.

>> CAN YOU HEAR ME OKAY? RUTH ANN SHUMATE. AND I'M A LIFE  
LONG RESIDENT OF LOUISVILLE. GRADUATED FROM SPALDING UNIVERSITY  
IN 1989 WITH A BACHELORS SOCIAL WORK. MY HUSBAND AND I WERE BORN  
AND RAISED IN LOUISVILLE. BUT NOT THE [INDISCERNIBLE] PART OF  
THE OF LOUISVILLE. A DIVERSITY NEIGHBORHOOD. WE LOOK OUT FOR OUR  
NEIGHBORS AND THEY LOOK OUT FOR US. WE'RE PART OF A NEIGHBORHOOD  
WATCH IN THE 4THDIVISION OF LMPD. I HAVE BEEN A MEMBER  
4THDIVISION ADVISORY BOARD WHEN STEVE GREEN WAS THE MAYOR. STEVE  
GREEN WAS AN OUTSTANDING MAJOR. I TELL YOU THIS BECAUSE MY  
[INDISCERNIBLE], SEE THE DAMAGE INFLICTED ON THE CITY DUE TO  
FAILED LEADERSHIP. MAYOR GREG FISCHER HAS FAILED THIS CITY.  
LOUISVILLE, AS OF SEPTEMBER 2ND, 2020, HAS HAD 108 HOMICIDES.  
AND WE HAVE NEARLY 4 MONTHS REMAINING THIS YEAR. 414% INCREASE

IN VIOLATE CARJACKINGS HERE. ONCE AGAIN, ON MAYOR GREG FISCHER'S WASH. MAYOR FISCHER HAS ALLOWED OUR DOWN TO BE TAKEN OVER BY ANARCHISTS, NOT PEACEFUL PROTESTERS. THE BLACK LIVES MATTER ORGANIZATION WHICH SHOULD NOT HAVE IMPROVEMENT OF BLACK LIVES IN OUR COMMUNITY, BUT RATHER, THE DESTRUCTION OF I'M QUOTE WITHING FROM THE WEBSITE, THE DISCONSTRUCTION OF THE WESTERN PRESCRIBED NUCLEAR FAMILY. THIS IS A SELF-PROCLAIMED MARXISTS ORGANIZATION. THIS GROUP IS NOT ABOUT RACIAL JUSTICE. MAYOR FISCHER HAS ALLOWED OUR CITY TO DISINTEGRATE BEFORE OUR EYES. TAKE A LOOK AT WHAT WAS ONCE OUR BEAUTIFUL DOWNTOWN. THE KING LOUIS THE 16THSTATUE WAS VANDALIZED. A REMINDER TO THE CITIZENS OF LOUISVILLE WHAT A CITY LOOKS LIKE WHEN A CRIME IS ALLOWED TO GO UNPUNISHED. LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS ARE FEARFUL TO COME DOWNTOWN BECAUSE OF THE BOARDED UP BUILDINGS AND SO-CALLED PEACEFUL PROTESTERS AND KNOWING FROM LMPD, THE DELAYED RESPONSE WHEN THEY ARE CALLED. I'M IN NO WAY FAULTING THE POLICE. I PUT TOTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE EPIC FAILURE ON MAYOR FISCHER. YOU THE MEMBERS OF METRO COUNCIL. IF YOU DO NOT VOTE TO REMOVE MAYOR FISCHER FROM OFFICE. PLEASE UNDERSTAND, THE TAX BASE IN LOUISVILLE WILL DWINDLE. TAXPAYERS WILL NOT REMAIN IN THE CITY WITH THIS CHAOS, BELIEVE ME. JEFFERSONVILLE, INDIANA LOOKS BETTER EVERY DAY THIS CONTINUES. [BEEPING]

>> THE LACK OF LEADERSHIP, YOU CAN CHOOSE NOT TO REMOVE THIS MAYOR, WILL BE THE DEMISE OF THE CITY AND YOUR POSITION ON THE METRO COUNCIL. THANK YOU.

>> MADAM CLERK: SHANNON MUSSELMAN.

>> CAN EVERYONE HEAR ME? MY NAME IS SHANNON MUSSELMAN REPRESENTING THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION. I WANT TO BE SURE TO STATE WE APPRECIATE THE GREAT LENGTHS LOUISVILLE FORWARD AND METRO PLANNING HAVE GONE TO IN MAKING FOR A FAIR AND OPEN PROCESS FOR THIS RECENTLY RELEASED SOLICITATION OF INTEREST FOR THE URBAN GOVERNMENT CENTER CAMPUS. WE NEED THE BEST OUTCOME FOR THIS 10-ACRE CAMPUS THAT INCLUDES THE OWES BAPTIST HOSPITAL AND KENTUCKY SCHOOL OF NURSING TO ENSURE IT MEETS THE WISHES OF PARISTOWN POINTE AND THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS. IT'S ALSO SUFFERED FOUR YEARS OF WAITING AND DISAPPOINTMENT REGARDING THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THIS BLIGHTED BLOCK. AND NOW, THE 11THHOUR, WE'RE DISCOVERING A LANDMARK STATUS APPLICATION WAS FILED WITH SEVERAL FORGED SIGNATURES. WE APPRECIATE THE CHANGE TO INCOMPLETE STATUS WE'RE CONCERNED A THIRD ATTEMPT WILL BE MADE ACCORDING TO YESTERDAY'S BUSINESS FIRST ARTICLE. BOTH DEVELOPERS SUBMITTED PROPOSALS WITH NO LANDMARK STATUS INCLUDED IN THE SOLICITATION OF INTEREST. UNDERHILL AND ASSOCIATED CLEARLY BENEFITS FROM THE LAST-MINUTE MOVE TO SEEK LANDMARK STATUS FOR THE BUILDINGS. WE'RE LEFT WITH GREAT QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS REGARDING THE LENGTH THE APPLICANT

WENT THROUGH TO UNDERMINED THE INTEGRITY OF THE PROCESS AND THE WILL OF THE NEIGHBORS. IN REHABILITATING THE BAPTIST HOSPITAL BUILDING AND 2017 COST JUST SHY OF 34 MILLION AND THE COSH -- COST INCREASED AFTER THREE YEARS OF ADDITIONAL ROOF LEAKS, A LANDMARK STATUS PETITION SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO BE USED AS A TOOL TO SEEK ADDITIONAL FUNDING. THE LANDMARK STATUS PROCESS FEELS BROKEN. AND THIS EXAMPLE SHOULD BE A CALL TO ACTION. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

>> MADAM CLERK: DAN DELANEY.

>> THANK YOU. I THINK WE HAVE REASON TO BE DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED LAST TUESDAY, ABOUT THE SPREAD OF DISINFORMATION AND RUMORS AND HOW POORLY DEALT WITH. MOST OF THE RUMORS WERE ABOUT A BLACK MILITIA COMING TO SHUT DOWN THE CITY. OTHERS WERE DEEPLY DISTURBING. THEY INTEND TO TARGET WOMEN SHOPPING. LOOK OUT SINGLE WOMEN, YOU ARE A TARGET. A BLACK MILITIA OUT TO GET AS MANY WHITE WOMEN AS THEY CAN. WE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORDS. THE MYTH OF THE DIABOLICAL BLACK MEN, A SCALE OF FEAR CLOSE TO THE TOP. EXTREME FEAR DROVE OTHERWISE DECENT PEOPLE TO HANG BLACK MEN FROM TREES. WE DON'T KNOW HOW MANY WERE PUSHED TO THIS LEVEL BUT SOME WERE AND MANY ARE BEING PUSHED TO IT. UNFORTUNATELY, LAST WEEKEND THE POLICE HELPED SPREAD THE FEAR ACROSS THE CITY BY POSTING TO SOCIAL MEDIA AND EMINENT DANGER. AT THE END OF THE DAY, CHIEF SCHRODER IN A PROTEST UPDATE ON A PEACEFUL PROTEST AVOIDING THE

FACT NONE OF THE RUMORS CAME TRUE. I UNDERSTAND SOMEWHAT EMBARRASSING LMPD WOULDN'T WANT TO MENTION IT. EVERYONE NEEDS TO GRASP THE EVENTS OF THAT DAY. WHAT ABOUT AUGUST 25 WAS THE EQUIVALENT OF A SCHOOL BOMB THREAT ON THE ENTIRE CITY AND REACTION WAS JUST AS SEVERE. IT SHOULD BE A SERIOUS CRIME BUT NO ONE IS INCLINED TO TREAT IT AS SUCH. THE PROTESTERS DID NOT CAUSE THE DISRUPTION OR DESTRUCTION TO THE CITY. THE RUMORS WERE THE CAUSE OF THE DISRUPTION. DISINFORMATION BOMB EXPLODED LAST TUESDAY, NOT THE SUDDEN RAPID SPREAD OF CONTENT. THE EXPLOSION WAS THE REACTION TO THE RUMORS. THE LMPD REACTED AS INTENDED. MOBILIZED AGAINST THE PHANTOM OF THEIR OWN MAKING PARTIALLY. WHAT ABOUT NEXT TIME WHEN THIS INFORMATION LEADS TO A PANIC? NOT A QUESTION OF IF BUT WHEN. WHETHER HERE IN LOUISVILLE OR ANOTHER CITY. AFTER THREE OR FOUR TIMES OF MOBILIZING THE FORCES BASED ON FALSE THREATS, HOW MANY MORE TIMES WILL IT TAKE FOR THE PEOPLE TO STOP TAKING THEM SERIOUSLY. HOW LONG BEFORE LAW ENFORCEMENT FALLS INTO THE BOY WHO CRIED WOLF. THE FUTURE ITERATIONS WILL BE LARGER AND MORE DANGEROUS. I ASK THE LMPD TO PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO FULLY ANALYSIS THE WAY THEY DEALT WITH LAST WEEK'S DISINFORMATION BOMB AND TRY TO FIND A BETTER WAY TO DEAL WITH IT IN THE FUTURE. [BEEPING]

>> MUCH MORE DETAILED LETTER WAS SENT ABOUT THIS. I ASK YOU TO PLEASE READ IT. THANK YOU.

>> MADAM CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THAT CONCLUDES THE ADDRESSES TO COUNCIL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, MADAM CLERK. LET THE RECORD REFLECT COUNCIL MEMBER YATES AND ENGEL, AND MULVIHILL AND COAN ARE PRESENT.

>> MADAM CLERK: THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN, I BELIEVE YOU HAVE A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

>> YES. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT LAST WEEK AFTERMATH, I LOST MY SON, I HAD SUCH A -- I CAN'T EXPRESS MYSELF. THE LOVE COMING FROM THIS COUNCIL. IT MEANT SO MUCH TO ME. I WAS SENT TEXTS, PHONE CALLS, FLOWERS, FOOD, CARDS, SOME SHOWED UP FOR THE MEMORIAL. AND YOU DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH YOU LOVE SOMEONE AND ALL THE COUNCIL CAME TOGETHER AND IT MEANT SO MUCH TO ME. AND I APPRECIATE EVERY ONE OF YOU. AND I JUST HAD TO SAY SOMETHING TO YOU. I DID SEND OUT SOME CARDS. BUT IT MEANS MORE WHEN I TELL YOU MYSELF HOW MUCH IT MEANS TO ME AND THANK YOU EVERY ONE OF YOU AND I MEAN IT FROM MY HEART. THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. AND WE LOVE YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: NEXT, WE HAVE APPROVAL OF THE COUNCIL MINUTES. REGULAR METRO COUNCIL AUGUST THE --

>> MR. PRESIDENT? I BELIEVE COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL SEEMS TO BE CHIMING IN FOR A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: SORRY, I DIDN'T SEE YOU.

>> I APPRECIATE THAT. AND BARBARA COULDN'T BE MORE TRUE. I KNOW DAVID, YOU OFTEN SAY WE'RE ONE BIG FAMILY AND WE REALLY ARE. MANY OF YOU KNOW REACHED OUT AS COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN SAID, MY MOM PASSED AWAY LAST WEEK. IT MEANT SO MUCH TO HEAR FROM EVERYBODY, TO GET CARDS, TO GET THE WIND CHIMES WERE BEAUTIFUL. MY MOM LOVED WIND CHIMES. WHEN I HEAR THOSE IT WILL REMIND ME OF HER AND THE GENEROSITY OF COUNCIL. I CAN'T THANK YOU ENOUGH FOR REACHING OUT TO ME DURING THIS DIFFICULT TIME. AND AGAIN, COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN, SO SORRY FOR YOUR LOSS, AS WELL AS MY OWN. THANK YOU ALL. I APPRECIATE IT. I CAN'T THANK YOU ENOUGH. LOVE YOU GUYS.

>> THANK YOU, PAT, WE LOVE YOU TOO.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: NEXT, WE HAVE APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES. REGULAR METRO COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 20, 2020. ANY CORRECTIONS OR DELETIONS?

>> MOTION TO APPROVE

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: A MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON, SECOND BY COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI. MOTION HAS BEEN IT'S BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED. ALL IN FAVOR, SAY, "AYE." THE MINUTES ARE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. THANK YOU. ALSO FAILED TO MENTION, COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI, HAS A SPECIAL GUEST.

>> YES, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. PRESIDENT. I'M HERE JOINED BY VICTORIA, MY UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE INTERN. VICTORIA, IF YOU WANT TO HIT THE BUTTON AND SAY HELLO AND SAY ANYTHING TO THE METRO COUNCIL I PUBLIC.

>> -- METRO COUNCIL AND PUBLIC.

>> SORRY. HI, VICTORIA. I'M THE JUNIOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE. I AM MAJORING IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND ECONOMICS. AND I'M EXCITED TO BE HERE. AND LEARN MORE ABOUT LOUISVILLE GOVERNMENT. THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: WELCOME. THANK YOU. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ALSO REMIND OUR COUNCILMEMBERS THAT HAVE THEIR CAMERAS TURNED OFF TO TURN THEM BACK ON PLEASE. NEXT, WE HAVE APPROVAL OF THE LOUISVILLE COMMITTEE MINUTES, ALL IN 2020. REGULAR COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, AUGUST 20, 2020. REGULAR COMMITTEE ON EQUITY AND INCLUSION, AUGUST 24, 2020. REGULAR LABOR AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, AUGUST 25 2020. REGULAR PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 25, 2020. REGULAR: COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, HEALTH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE, AUGUST 26, 2020. REGULAR PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 26, 2020. REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 26, 2020. REGULAR PARKS & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 27, 2020. REGULAR BUDGET COMMITTEE, AUGUST 27, 2020. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, SEPTEMBER 1, 2020. ARE THERE ANY CORRECTIONS OR DELETIONS? HEARING NONE, MAY I HAVE A MOTION AND SECOND?

>> MOTION.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI, SECONDED BY COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH. IT'S BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED. ALL IN FAVOR, SAY, "AYE." OPPOSED? THE AYES HAVE IT. THESE MINUTES ARE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. THANK YOU. MADAM CLERK. DO YOU HAVE COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR?

>> MADAM CLERK: YES, SIR.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: PLEASE READ THOSE INTO THE RECORD.

>> MADAM CLERK: PLEASE BEAR WITH ME. DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDINANCE, I AM APPOINTING THE FOLLOWING TO THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT. JAMES TUTT, APPOINTMENT. TERM EXPIRES JANUARY 31, 2023. YOUR PROMPT ACTION ON THIS REAPPOINTMENT IS MOST APPRECIATED. SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR. DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES, I AM REAPPOINTING THE FOLLOWING TO THE URBAN SERVICES DISTRICT BOARD. MR. KARLESKI IS ALSO BEING APPOINTED AS CHAIR OF THIS BOARD. KOLEMAN KARLESKI. MAYOR'S APPOINTMENT. TERM EXPIRES AUGUST 13, 2021. THIS IS TO BE READ INTO THE RECORD ONLY. METRO COUNCIL APPROVAL IS NOT REQUIRED. SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR. DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT 109 BOARD ORDINANCE, I AM APPOINTING THE FOLLOWING. CARL BRAZLEY. TERM EXPIRES JUNE 22, 2023. YOUR PROMPT ACTION ON THIS APPOINTMENT IS MOST APPRECIATED. SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR. DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD ORDINANCE,

I AM REAPPOINTING THE FOLLOWING TO THE BOARD. LISA NICHOLSON, REAPPOINTMENT. TERM EXPIRES AUGUST 15, 2023. YOUR PROMPT ACTION ON THIS APPOINTMENT IS MOST APPRECIATED. SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR. DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICTS ORDINANCE, I AM APPOINTING THE FOLLOWING TO THE TEMPORARY TO THE PLEASURE RIDGE PARK FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BOARD. BETTY JARBOE. PROPERTY OWNER ELECT POSITION, TERM EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2023. METRO COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THESE SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR. JOSEPH. TERM EXPIRES JULY THE FIRST, 2023. TO BE READ INTO THE RECORD ONLY. METRO COUNCIL APPROVAL IS NOT REQUIRED. SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER MAYOR. READ IN FULL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. THESE APPOINTMENTS NEEDING COUNCIL APPROVAL WILL BE FORWARDED TO THE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT AND AUDIT COMMITTEE. OUR NEXT ORDER OF BUSINESS IS THE CONSENT CALENDAR. MADAM CLERK, A SECOND READING OF THESE ITEMS. THE CONSENT CALENDAR COMPRISED 19 THROUGH 26. ARE THERE ANY CORRECTIONS OR DELETIONS? MADAM CLERK, A SECOND READING OF THESE ITEMS.

>> MADAM CLERK: THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS FORWARDED FROM THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$20,000 FROM NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER: \$10,000 EACH FROM DISTRICT 2 AND DISTRICT 5, THROUGH DEVELOP LOUISVILLE, TO METRO HOUSING RESOURCE CENTER FOR TREE

REMOVAL ASSISTANCE TO HOMEOWNERS THAT MEET THE ESTABLISHED INCOME GUIDELINES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: WE LOST COUNCIL MEMBER ENGEL AND ACKERSON. I THINK WE'RE BACK UP NOW. WE'RE STILL WAITING ON COUNCIL MEMBER ENGEL. SORRY. [PLEASE STAND BY]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: WE WERE UNABLE TO REESTABLISH CONTACT WITH COUNCILMAN ENGEL. FIVE MINUTES HAS PASSED. WE'LL RESUME THE MEETING. MADAM CLERK. THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS FORWARDED FROM BUDGET COMMITTEE. 20. AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A FORGIVABLE LOAN TO HABITAT OF HUMANITY OF METRO LOUISVILLE PURSUANT TO LOUISVILLE METRO CODE OF ORDINANCES ("LMCO") SECTION 39.131(B). THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS FORWARDED FROM COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, HEALTH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE. 21. A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT \$80,000 FROM CITIES FOR FINANCIAL EMPOWERMENT FUND FOR THE FINANCIAL NAVIGATORS PROGRAM IN PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN BANK ON LOUISVILLE AND THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES. THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION FORWARDED FROM LABOR AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 22. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACT FOR THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONCERNING ITS EMPLOYMENT OF A DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT - (UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE - \$80,000.00).

>> MADAM CLERK: ITEM 23. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACT FOR LMPHW CONCERNING ITS EMPLOYMENT OF A HEALTH ECONOMIST -UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE - \$64,250.00. 24. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FURTHER FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT FOR METRO SAFE FOR MAINTENANCE OF ITS NEWLY UPGRADED RADIO SYSTEM - MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC. - (\$623,681.00). ITEM 25. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACT FOR LOUISVILLE FORWARD CONCERNING FINANCIAL ADVICE AND COUNSELING ON COMPLEX FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS, DEAL STRUCTURES AND TAX INCREMENT FINANCING - COMMONWEALTH ECONOMICS PARTNERS, LLC - \$108,000. THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION FORWARDED FROM PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE. ITEM 26. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 109, SERIES 2018 RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2018-19 CAPITAL BUDGET, AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 082, SERIES 2019 RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 CAPITAL BUDGET, AND AMENDING ORDINANCE 072, SERIES 2020 RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT BY

REALLOCATING \$27,982.55 OF D24 FUNDING TO A NEW PROJECT TITLED  
D24 MCCAWLEY ROAD SIDEWALK PROJECT. READ IN FULL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. MAY I HAVE A MOTION AND  
SECOND FOR APPROVAL? MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI, SECOND  
BY COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH. IT'S BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND  
SECONDED. REQUIRING A ROLL CALL VOTE. WILL THE CLERK PLEASE OPEN  
THE ROLL AND CALL THE ROLL?

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GREEN. Q. YES, SIR.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN. YES, [ROLL CALL  
VOTE]

>> MADAM CLERK: PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY. COUNCILMAN COAN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MULVIHILL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL. YES

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN REED.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN WINKLER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PARKER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BENSON.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN ENGEL. COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN YATES.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN ACKERSON.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN -- [INDISCERNIBLE]

>> MADAM CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 24 YES VOTES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSES. NEXT ITEM OF BUSINESS IS OLD BUSINESS. COUNCIL MEMBER YATES, I THINK YOU HAD SOMETHING TO BRING UP FOR OLD BUSINESS.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. BEAR WITH ME ONE SECOND. I WANTED TO PULL SOMETHING UP TO READ INTO THE RECORD. MR. PRESIDENT, I WAS GOING TO BEFORE US, MAKE A MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ON THE VOTE THAT WE MADE LAST WEEK. AND PART OF THAT BECAUSE I MADE THE MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATING, WHICH YOU KNOW, I THINK WE WANT TO DO SO PEOPLE DON'T CARRY ON. WE GET A LOT OF -- SOMETIMES WASTED -- WELL, SOMETIMES WE GET COUNCILMEMBERS THEY MAY GO OFF ON TANGENTS AND WE WANT TO STICK TO THE BUSINESS. UNFORTUNATELY, THERE WAS AMENDMENTS BEFORE US. THERE WAS A SUNSET AMENDMENT BEFORE US ON AN ORDINANCE, WHICH IS 0-336-20, ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LOUISVILLE CODE OF ORDINANCE TO ENSURE SAFE OBSTRUCTED INJURY TO ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE FACILITY. HOWEVER, I'M GETTING MESSAGES NOW THAT IT APPEARS THAT THERE WON'T BE THE VOTE TO PASS THAT. SO I'VE BEEN -- LIKE I DO, I TRY TO WORK IN CONJUNCTION WITH MY COLLEAGUES TO MAKE SURE THERE IS AN OPEN HONEST DIALOGUE. AT THE LAST MEETING I WAS A NO VOTE PRIMARILY BECAUSE SEVERAL AMENDMENTS I FELT NEEDED TO BE DISCUSSED. ONE, PARTICULAR IS ABOUT SETTING A PRECEDENT. AND RIGHT NOW, WE WANT TO MAKE SURE ANYTHING WE DO CAN BE APPLIED IN OTHER AREAS. I WAS VERY PERTURBED THAT SO MUCH OF THE DISCUSSION HAD TO DO TO TALK ABOUT THE MESSAGING WHETHER FOR LIFE OR FOR

CHOICE AND ALL THOSE THINGS. I FELT THAT WAS -- IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN BY A FIRST AMENDMENT RESTRICTION SHOULDN'T BE ABOUT THE MESSAGE OR MESSENGER, SHOULD BE ABOUT THE NEED FOR SAFETY. APPARENTLY THERE IS A VOTE. WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO BRING IT BACK UP FOR RECONSIDERATION PER ROBERTS RULES. AND THAT WOULD BE UNDER AGAIN, 0336-20. THERE WAS A DECISION MADE BY THE COUNTY ATTORNEY THAT SAID THE AMENDMENT BEFORE US COULD NOT BE DISCUSSED BECAUSE OF THE MOTION TO LIMIT THE DEBATE, WHICH I MADE FOR THAT, I THINK THERE WAS A LEGAL CHALLENGE BEFORE US TO KIND OF NIP ALL THAT. I WILL MAKE THAT MOTION TO RECONSIDER.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, POINT OF ORDER?

>> [MULTIPLE SPEAKERS]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: STANDBY. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> I'M GOING TO READ THE COUNCIL RULES. I'M GOING TO ARGUE THAT IN THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER IS OUT OF ORDER BECAUSE IT'S NOT ON THE AGENDA. AND EVEN PROCEDURES, WHICH YOU WILL HEAR IN A SECOND, MUST BE DECLARED IN THE AGENDA PRIOR. SO THAT THIS IS NOT JUST A VOTE TO RECONSIDER. WHAT FIRST MUST BE DONE IS A VOTE TO SUSPEND THE RULES, WHICH REQUIRE US TO HAVE EVEN PROCEDURES ON THE AGENDA BEFORE THE MEETING. RULE, THE FIRST RULE IS RULE 6.02, DEADLINE FOR LEGISLATION AND PROCEDURES. THAT'S THE KEY HERE, LEGISLATION AND PROCEDURES, FOR THE METRO COUNCIL AGENDA. DEADLINE FOR LEGISLATION AND PROCEDURE FOR LEGISLATION RECEIVED AFTER DEADLINE, THE CLERK SHALL RECEIVE ALL ORDINANCES, ORDERS

AND RESOLUTIONS TO BE INTRODUCED BY MONDAY AT 12:00 P.M., PRIOR TO THE REGULAR THURSDAY MEETING OF COUNCIL. SHOULD A COUNCIL MEMBER REQUEST ADDITION OF ORDINANCE, ORDER OR RESOLUTION TO THE COUNCIL AGENDA AFTER THE NOON DEADLINE, THE REQUESTING COUNCIL MEMBER OR DESIGNEE SHALL APPEAR ON COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND PETITION THE COMMITTEE TO ADD IT TO THE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA. AS A STIPULATION, IF IT'S CANCELED. WHICH IT WASN'T THIS WEEK. THEN THERE IS RULE 5.12. MOTION TO REORDER. BECAUSE IT'S NOT ON THE AGENDA, RIGHT, WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN MADE ON MONDAY OR BEFORE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEES, TO PUT THIS OUT THERE. THERE IS 512, THE MOTION TO ADD SOMETHING TO THE AGENDA OR SUSPEND RULES, REQUIRING A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE COUNCILMEMBERS. I WOULD ARGUE THE REASON THIS EXISTS IS BECAUSE OF PRECISELY THIS, THE INABILITY OF THE PUBLIC OR COUNCIL MEMBERS OR ANYBODY ELSE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO RESEARCH, DISCUSS AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, ET CETERA. TO BE CLEAR ABOUT THE ORDER OF THE RULES, THERE IS A PROCEDURE IN WHICH THINGS MUST BE PUT ON THE AGENDA. THIS IS NOT ON THE AGENDA. AND INCLUDES PROCEDURES, THE RULES INCLUDE AGAIN TO BE CLEAR, LEGISLATION AND PROCEDURES. THIS IS A PROCEDURE. IF IT'S NOT ON THE AGENDA, WE NEED A TWO THIRDS VOTE TO ADD IT. TO ARGUE, THE METHOD WE NEED TO GO THROUGH, IS A TWO-THIRDS VOTE TO ADD THE RECONSIDERATION ONTO THE AGENDA. IF THAT PASSES, THEN WE'RE VOTING ON THE RECONSIDERATION AND WE CAN MOVE FORWARD, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, IF I MAY RESPOND BRIEFLY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES, SIR.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THIS WAS BROUGHT APPARENTLY, THERE MAY BE BASED ONLY THE DECISION MADE AT THE LAST MEETING, THERE MAY BE PENDING LEGISLATION OVER THE WAY OUR RULES WERE CONDUCTED. THIS IS BROUGHT TO ME AND ASKED TO MAKE THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER. AND I WOULD PUT IT BACK, THE FIRST QUESTION I HAD FROM OUR COUNTY ATTORNEY, WHETHER OR NOT OUR RULES WOULD, WHERE OUR RULES ARE GOVERNED AND WHETHER OR NOT THERE WOULD BE ROBERTS RULES TO TAKE PLACE. SO IT WAS SENT OVER FROM COLLEAGUES, JUST TO -- KIND OF A QUICK MOTION. I BROUGHT FORTH TODAY. IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A DISCUSSION OVER THE RULES THAT ARE GOVERNED AND THE LAW THAT APPLIES, I THINK WE WANT THE RESPONSE FROM OUR LEGAL COUNSEL. MR. PRESIDENT, I WOULD LIKE THAT ADDRESSED BY LEGAL COUNSEL TO SEE IF THEY HAVE TO LITIGATE THIS OR IF WE CAN FIX IT OURSELVES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, HOLLY, ARE YOU THERE?

>> I AM HERE, MR. PRESIDENT. HOLLY, WITH THE JEFFERSON COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. THIS IS IS COMPLICATED ISSUE GIVEN YOUR RULES AND ROBERTS AND HOW THEY DOVETAIL. YOUR RULES DO PROVIDE FOR A MOTION TO RECONSIDER A VOTE. RULE 5.12, PROVIDES THAT A MOTION TO RECONSIDER HAS TO BE MADE NO LATER THAN THE NEXT MEETING OF COUNCIL AT WHICH THE VOTE WAS ADOPTED. THIS

MEETING WOULD BE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER YOUR RULES. YOUR RULES ALSO PROVIDE THAT IN THE ABSENCE OF A STANDING RULE YOU LOOK TO ROBERTS FOR GUIDANCE. ROBERTS DOES NOT REQUIRE PLACING A MOTION TO RECONSIDER ON AN AGENDA. YOUR RULES WITH RESPECT TO ORDINANCES BEING ON AN AGENDA MAY OR MAY NOT SPEAK TO A MOTION TO RECONSIDER AN ORDINANCE THAT PASSED. YOUR RULES ARE NOT CLEAR ON THAT POINT. BUT ROBERTS GENERALLY WOULD NOT REQUIRE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER TO BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA. DOES THAT ADDRESS THE QUESTION THAT YOU HAD AT THIS POINT?

>> THE ONLY QUESTION, IT'S KIND OF BROUGHT UP AND OBVIOUSLY WE'RE JUST FOLLOWING THE ADVICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. BEFORE US IS IT PROPER TO MAKE THE MOTION THAT'S BEEN PROPERLY MADE, RECONSIDERED AND SECONDED, IS THAT MOTION BECAUSE -- WOULD IT TAKE A MOTION TO SUSPEND OUR RULES, IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU MADE, THAT WAS NOT AGAINST OUR RULES IN ANYWAY. SO IS IT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OPINION IT'S A SIMPLE MAJORITY ON THIS VOTE? TO RECONSIDER?

>> MR. PRESIDENT, IF I MAY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: STANDBY. LET'S -- [MULTIPLE SPEAKERS]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: STANDBY. LET THE COUNTY ATTORNEY ANSWER AND WE'LL GET TO YOU, MR. KRAMER.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER YATES, AND I APOLOGIZE, A SIMPLE MAJORITY ON A VOTE TO ADD IT TO THE AGENDA OR A VOTE ON A MOTION TO RECONSIDER?

>> BOTH.

>> ON THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER, UNLESS THE RULES REQUIRE SOMETHING OTHER THAN A SIMPLE MAJORITY, THEN THE DEFAULT WOULD BE A SIMPLE MAJORITY. I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH -- I SUPPOSE WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS YOU WOULD SUSPEND YOUR RULES TO ADD THIS TO THE AGENDA. NORMALLY WHEN YOU --

>> NO, NO. MY QUESTION WAS, I THINK YOU SAID WE DIDN'T NEED TO SUSPEND THEM BECAUSE IT WE WANT IN VIOLATION. I WANTED YOUR OPINION ON WHETHER OR NOT THE RULES NEEDED TO BE SUSPENDED OR WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE SO. IF THE RULES ARE SUSPENDED IT HAS TO BE A TWO THIRDS, IF NOT, IT'S A MAJORITY. WHICH PATHWAY NEEDS TO BE LEGALLY DONE?

>> AS I SAID, THERE IS NOTHING IN THE LANGUAGE ABOUT A MOTION TO RECONSIDER THAT WOULD INDICATE IT HAS TO BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA. ROBERTS DOES NOT REQUIRE THAT. DOES NOT REQUIRE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER TO BE ON AN AGENDA. IT CAN BE. BUT IT IS NOT REQUIRED TO BE.

>> MAY I SPEAK TO THE ROBERTS QUESTION YOU KEEP BRINGING UP? IT DOESN'T REQUIRE IT TO BE ON AN AGENDA.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN? COUNCIL MEMBER PED? COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN! [MULTIPLE SPEAKERS] [ GAVEL ]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN! THE COUNTY ATTORNEY WAS SPEAKING. YOU WILL GET A CHANCE TO SPEAK.

>> ROBERTS SPEAKS IN TERMS OF THE MEETING AT WHICH IT OCCURS OR IF IT'S A BODY OF CONTINUING SESSIONS. NOT -- THEN IT CAN BE TAKEN UP AT THE NEXT MEETING OF COUNCIL. YOUR RULES SPECIFICALLY PROVIDE IT CAN BE TAKEN UP AT THE NEXT MEETING OF COUNCIL. THERE MAY BE HAS BEEN AN INSTANCE IN THE PAST WHERE THE BODY HAS RECONSIDERED A VOTE ON AN ORDINANCE IN THAT INSTANCE, BEFORE MY TIME IN THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, IN THAT INSTANCE, IT WAS ON YOUR AGENDA UNDER A HEADING CALLED, ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION. THAT IS NOT REQUIRED BY ROBERTS. YOU ALL MAY HAVE INTERPRETED YOUR RULES WITH RESPECT TO YOUR AGENDAS TO REQUIRE THAT ITEM TO BE ON THE AGENDA.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE WITH COUNSEL'S INTERPRETATION HERE. I'VE BEEN ON THE COUNCIL SINCE THE BEGINNING. AND OUR RULES CLEARLY TRUMP ROBERTS RULES. IT SAYS PLAIN AS DAY, OUR RULES -- [MULTIPLE SPEAKERS]

>> ARE WHAT MATTER.

>> I AGREE.

>> AND OUR RULES REQUIRE THAT ANY BUSINESS CAN BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE COUNCIL HAS TO BE PUT ON THE AGENDA. OUR RULES SAY THAT. TO SAY THAT BECAUSE ROBERTS RULES DON'T REQUIRE THAT, IT SUGGESTS ROBERTS RULE APPLY TO RECONSIDERATION AND THEY DON'T APPLY TO RECONSIDERATION IN THIS INSTANCE BECAUSE ACCORDING TO ROBERTS RULES WE CAN'T BE HAVING THIS CONVERSATION BECAUSE THIS

IS NOT AN ON-GOING SESSION THAT PICKED UP IN A DAY. THAT ENDED. WE HAD TWO WEEKS BETWEEN THAT AND THIS ONE. IT'S A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT MEETING. THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN MOTION TO RECONSIDER, IS OUR RULES ALLOW FOR IT. AND THAT ALLOW FOR A RECONSIDERATION REQUIRE IF YOU ADD SOMETHING TO DO AGENDA, IT HAS TO BE DONE BEFORE COMMITTEE ON COMPLETE AND HAS TO GET ON THE AGENDA -- COMMITTEE. I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW YOU CAN ARGUE ON THE ONE HAND THAT ROBERTS RULES IS TRUMPED BY METRO COUNCIL RULES AND FLIP THAT AROUND AND SAY, ROBERTS RULES ARE NOT TRUMPED BY COUNCIL RULES IN THIS INCIDENCE. IT'S OUR RULES TRUMP ROBERTS RULES, WHICH CLEARLY THEY DO. OR MAKING AN ARGUMENT WE DON'T HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO CREATE OUR OWN RULES THAT ARE DIFFERENT THAN ROBERTS RULES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER, I APOLOGIZE IF THAT'S WHAT YOU UNDERSTOOD ME TO SAY. THAT'S NOT WHAT I INTENDED TO SAY. WHAT I WAS TRYING TO SAY WAS TO OUTLINE WHAT EXISTS IN ROBERTS AND WHAT EXISTS IN YOUR RULES AND OUTLINE FOR THE BODY HOW YOU HAVE PROCEEDED ON MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER BEFORE. YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY CORRECT. AND I WOULD NEVER DISPUTE YOUR RULES DO NOT TRUMP ROBERTS RULES PLAIN AS DAYS. ABSENCE OF STANDING RULE, REFERENCE MAYBE HAD TO ROBERTS RULES. I KNOW YOU DO THAT PERIODICALLY. THE ULTIMATE RULE COUNCIL INTERPRETS ITS OWN RULES. IF COUNCIL INTERPRETS ITS RULES TO REQUIRE THAT THIS SHOULD BE ON THE

AGENDA TO HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED TONIGHT AND IT WASN'T, THEN A VOTE TO RECONSIDER IT WOULD REQUIRE A TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

>> EXACTLY. THAT'S PRECISELY MY ARGUMENT. THANK YOU. THE FACT THAT YOU CAN LOOK BACK AND SEE PREVIOUS EFFORTS AT RECONSIDERATION WERE PUT ON THE AGENDA, I WOULD ARGUE IS PROOF THAT PRECISELY WHAT RULE 6.02 INTENDED. IF YOU WANT A MOTION TO RECONSIDER, ROBERTS RULES DOESN'T GENERALLY ALLOW, AT THE NEXT MEETING, TO WAY TO DO IS IS PUTTING ON THE AGENDA. ABSENT THAT, IT IS A VIOLATION OF OUR RULES AND THE ONLY WAY TO GET IT ON THERE IS WITH A TWO-THIRDS VOTE. MR. PRESIDENT, I'M ASKING YOU FOLLOW THE RULES THE WAY THEY ARE WRITTEN. IF WE INSIST ON HAVING THIS VOTE, YOU REQUIRE A TWO-THIRDS VOTE. [BEEPING]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER. COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> HOLLY HAS GONE BACK AND BASICALLY, AGAIN, SEMI CORRECTED HERSELF. THE FACT THE REASON ROBERTS DOESN'T REQUIRE A RECONSIDERATION TO BE ON THE AGENDA IS THOSE ITEMS ARE ALREADY ON THE AGENDA FOR THAT MEETING BECAUSE BY ROBERTS RULES YOU CANNOT ADDRESS -- YOU CANNOT TAKE AN ITEM UP FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER THE MEETING AS ADJOURNED. IT ALLOWS IT TO BE TAKEN UP THE NEXT DAY WHEN THE MEETING ROLLS OVER INTO THE NEXT DAY. IT'S PRETTY WELL DELINEATED. I HAD A CASE NUMBER EARLIER WHEN I LOOKED IT UP. THAT'S WHY ROBERTS RULES DOESN'T CONSIDER THE AGENDA ISSUE ON A RECONSIDERATION BECAUSE BY THAT RULE, ONCE THE

MEETING ADJOURNS, THERE IS NO RECONSIDERATION. OUR RULES CLEARLY SAY THE NEXT MEETING. PAST PRACTICE HAS BEEN YOU HAVE TO PUT IT ON THE AGENDA IN ORDER TO GET IT ON THE AGENDA TONIGHT, YOU NEED A TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN PEDEN. COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I HAVE GREAT CONCERNS ABOUT WHERE WE ARE RIGHT NOW ON THIS ISSUE. I THINK IT IS -- I AGREE WITH MY COLLEAGUES, IT'S CLEAR OUR ROLES PRESCRIBE THIS, IT NEEDS TO BE ON THE AGENDA. I THINK OUR PRESIDENT, OUR PAST PRESIDENT HAS SHOWN THAT IT NEEDS TO BE ON THE AGENDA. AND TO MAKE A DECISION TODAY TO NOT HAVE IT ON THE AGENDA WITHOUT A TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY, I THINK WE NEED TO REALLY THINK ABOUT THAT, COUNCILMEMBERS. WHENEVER YOU ARE ON THE ISSUE BEFORE US, EVENTUALLY WILL BE BEFORE US OR NOT, WHENEVER YOU STAND ON THAT, YOU REALLY NEED TO THINK ABOUT THIS VOTE OR THIS DECISION BY THE PRESIDENT HERE. BECAUSE THIS CAN REALLY MAKE THINGS VERY CRAZY FOR US MOVING FORWARD IF WE DECIDE THAT ANYTIME WE WANTED TO RECONSIDER SOMETHING, YOU CAN WAIT UNTIL THE LAST SECOND AND SPRING IT ON COLLEAGUES. AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, SPRING IT ON THE COMMUNITY. IT'S A DIFFERENT THING WHEN YOU ARE AT A MEETING THAT IS ADDRESSING SOMETHING THAT'S ON THE AGENDA. AND THEN WE TALK ABOUT IT. WE VOTE ON IT. SOMETHING COMES UP. WE MAKE A DECISION TO RECONSIDER THAT NIGHT WHILE THE COMMUNITY STILL KNOWS WE'RE

DEBATING THAT ISSUE, THAT'S A VERY DIFFERENT SITUATION THAN WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TONIGHT. WHERE WE HAVE FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES, PUT THE ISSUE TO REST AT OUR LAST MEETING. AND NOW WITHOUT COLLEAGUES KNOWING ABOUT IT, AND WITHOUT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY OBVIOUSLY KNOWING ABOUT IT, AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, WITHOUT OUR COMMUNITY KNOWING ABOUT IT, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT BRINGING THIS BACK UP AND HAVING ANOTHER DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLY ANOTHER VOTE. VERY, VERY SCARY PRECEDENT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE. AND I WOULD HOPE, MR. PRESIDENT, YOU DO NOT SIDE ON BREAKING OUR PAST INTERPRETATION OF THE RULE OR OUR PAST PRECEDENT WHEN IT COMES TO ENFORCING THAT RULE AS WE'RE GOING FORWARD. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN YATES.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'M NOT GOING TO JUMP UP AND DOWN EATING EITHER WAY. IT LOOKS LIKE THERE MIGHT BE A LEGAL CHALLENGE. I MADE A MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE AND STATE WHY I DID THAT. I AM FOR THE MOST MINIMAL RESTRICTIONS YOU COULD HAVE ON FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. BUT WITHIN ALLOWING A -- SOME VARIANCE TO MAKE SURE PEOPLE ARE SAFE. WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS RIGHT NOW WE'RE LOOKING CHURCHILL DOWNS AND OTHER PLACES WANTING TO HAVE A SAFETY ZONE, A BUFFER ZONE IN WHICH PEOPLE CAN PASS FREELY ON PUBLIC PROPERTY, WHERE THEY ARE COMING THROUGH. SO WHEN PEOPLE ARE PROTESTING, THEY HAVE A FREE PATH. THAT MAKES SENSE IN THE

MOST NARROWLY WAY IT COULD BE INTERPRETED. I DON'T THINK IT SHOULD HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE MESSENGER OR MESSAGE. MY CONCERN WAS LAST TIME THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE ANY TYPE OF OVERSIGHT OR ACCOUNTABILITY, I'M NOT WORRIED ABOUT THAT, IT LOOKS LIKE THERE HAVE BEEN AMENDMENTS, BEFORE THE COUNCIL WAS A MOTION, AN AMENDMENT THAT HAD BEEN FIRST AND SECONDED, BEFORE US, AND THEN THE TIME RAN. AND WE ONLY VOTED ON THE AMENDMENT. AND I DON'T WANT TO DEBATE THE LEGALITY OF THAT. IT WILL PROBABLY BE DONE IN COURT. WHAT I CAN DO BY ME BRINGING THIS BEFORE US, I THOUGHT WE COULD QUASH THAT. I COULD SAVE THE CITY ANOTHER LAWSUIT, SAVE MONEY AND HAMMER THAT OUT IN MAYBE 15 MINUTE OR SO. I SENT IT TO THE COUNTY ATTORNEY, AND ASKED IS IT APPROPRIATE OF MY READING OF ROBERTS RULES, WHERE NOT SUPERSEDED BY OUR RULES, THE RESPONSE WAS, IT WAS. SO IF -- SO IT WASN'T ON THE AGENDA. IT DIDN'T APPEAR TO BE A REQUIREMENT TO DO SO. TO BE ABLE TO FINISH THAT, I THINK IT MAY BE HAD ANOTHER FIVE OR 10 MINUTES. THERE WAS AN AMENDMENT BEFORE US, WE DID NOT VOTE ON IT. I TOTAL IT WAS THE RIGHT THING TO DO. -- FELT -- IT LOOKED THE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL AGREED. I DON'T KNOW, MR. PRESIDENT, I DON'T WANT TO DO ANYTHING OUTSIDE OF THE RULES. I WAS LOOKING FOR A WAY TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE AND SAFE THE CITY POTENTIAL LITIGATION COSTS.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. A FEW QUICK POINTS. BECAUSE I THINK COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL SUMMED UP JUST ABOUT EVERYTHING THAT

I'M THINKING AND AGAIN, THE PETITION HERE IS STRICTLY OUR DESIRE TO GUIDE OUR PRESIDENT TO MAKE THE RIGHT DECISION BASED ON OUR RULES. MY COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING UP WHAT HE WANTS TO DEBATE AND WHY HE'S TRYING TO DO IT. I WOULD POINT OUT THAT I VOTED AGAINST LIMITING DEBATE. I AM FOR DEBATING THE ISSUES IN THEIR ENTIRETY AND HAD THAT NOT BEEN LIMITED, WE WOULDN'T EVEN HAVE THIS PROBLEM. FURTHER, IT WAS THE COUNTY ATTORNEY WHO TOLD US THAT ONCE THE TIME EXPIRED, WE SHOULDN'T VOTE ON THAT AMENDMENT. SO NOW WE'RE USING THE SAME COUNTY ATTORNEY, AND THIS IS NOT A KICK ON THE COUNTY ATTORNEY. THE COUNTY ATTORNEY IS A HUMAN BEING LIKE ALL OF US, IS DOING THEIR BEST TO MAKE THEIR BEST JUDGMENT BASED ON PRECEDENT, RULE AND LAW. I SCREW UP ALL THE TIME. THIS IS NOT A QUESTION OF THAT. THIS IS SIMPLY A QUESTION OF, YOU ARE GOING TO THE COUNTY ATTORNEY TO JUSTIFY NOT FOLLOWING -- TO JUSTIFY THE DECISION ON THESE RULES WHEN IT WAS THE COUNTY ATTORNEY THAT MADE THE RULE AND GAVE US THE ADVICE AT THAT TIME NOT THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT BEFORE US AND GO RIGHT TO THE ORIGINAL LEGISLATION. IF THE COURTS NEED TO SORT THAT OUT, THEN THEY DO. MR. PRESIDENT, THE ONLY QUESTION HERE IS OUR RULES, COUNCILMAN PEDEN SAID, THE REASON ROBERTS RULES ARE SILENT FROM THE ISSUE, WE HAVE A SPECIAL RULE. I DON'T DISPUTE THAT, WE HAVE A SPECIAL RULE OF CONSIDERATION. I DISPUTE, PRECEDENT PENDING, IT SHOULD BE ON THE AGENDA WHEN THAT SHOULD BE BROUGHT UP. SINCE IT ISN'T, I BELIEVE WE REQUIRE A TWO-THIRDS VOTE. WE HAVE SEEN

PRECEDENT AT THE STATE RELATED TO PENSION REFORM. WHEN LEGISLATION DOESN'T FOLLOW A PROCESS IT WILL BE STRUCK DOWN. I DO NOT WANT TO SEE THAT HAPPEN HERE. WE NEED TO FOLLOW THE PROCESS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN KRAMER.

>> I JUST WAS GOING TO REITERATE THAT WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE RULES, IT IS IN OUR RULES. NOT JUST A MATTER OF PRECEDENT. I THINK THE PRECEDENT MAKES IT CLEAR. THE PREVIOUS PRESIDENT DECIDED ON THE ISSUE IT HAD TO BE ON THE AGENDA. THAT SOLIDIFIES WHAT THE RULE'S INTENT IS. IT'S IN THE RULE, 6.02, IT SAYS IF SOMETHING COMES BEFORE THE COUNCIL, IT HAS TO BE ON THE AGENDA. I DON'T KNOW HOW THAT'S IN DISPUTE. THANKS.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I JUST WANTED TO STATE THAT TOO, WHAT WE DID WHEN TIME WAS UP AND WE HAD TO VOTE ON THE ORDINANCE AS A WHOLE AND NO AMENDMENTS SHOULD BE TAKEN. THAT'S HAPPENED BEFORE AND WE HAVE ALWAYS ENDED WHATEVER AMENDMENT WE WERE CONSIDERING OR DEBATING OR A MOTION, TOLD BY THE COUNTY ATTORNEY AND WE'VE DONE IN THE PAST LEGISLATION, THAT ONCE THE TIME IS UP, TIME IS UP. AND THE VOTE IS ON WHAT IS ON THE TABLE AND HAS ALREADY BEEN APPROVED. NOTHING ELSE CAN BE DISCUSSED.

NOTHING ELSE CAN BE VOTED ON. I WAS REMINDING FOLKS OF OUR PAST HISTORY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MY COLLEAGUES REFERENCED A COUPLE OF TIMES POSSIBLE LITIGATION. AND SAVE THE PUBLIC FUNDING, WHICH I'M ALL ABOUT. BUT I FAIL TO SEE WHERE WE DID ANYTHING TO INVITE LITIGATION. AGAIN, CAN SOMEONE ENLIGHTEN ME WHERE WE WERE VULNERABLE? A MEASURE THAT GONE THROUGH COMMITTEE, CAME TO THE FLOOR AND VOTED. WE LIMITED DEBATE, WHICH IS WITH OUR RULES AND VOTED. CAN I BE ENLIGHTENED WHERE OUR CIVIL LIABILITY IS?

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN YATES, SINCE YOU MENTIONED THAT.

>> THE ONLY THING IS -- AND OF COURSE I HAVEN'T SEEN A COMPLAINT OR ANYTHING. WHETHER OR NOT WE CAN ENFORCE OUR VULNERABLES BUT THEY HAVE TO BE CONSISTENT IS WHAT I'M HEARING COLLEAGUES SAY OVER AND OVER. HERE WHAT WE HAVE BEFORE US IS A MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE AND THE MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE, AN AMENDMENT FIRST AND SECONDED AND FOR DISCUSSION. WHEN IT CAME TO CONCLUSION, THAT WAS NOT MADE. AND SO THERE WAS A QUESTION WHETHER OR NOT WHAT OUR DECISION, WE DID WAS IN VIOLATION OF OUR OWN RULES AND PREVIOUS INTERPRETATION. THE HISTORY IN THAT, I DON'T KNOW. AGAIN, WE'VE BEEN HIT WITH FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS

LATELY. WE TALK ABOUT THAT AND WHAT WE DO. I MADE THE MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE. I KNEW THERE WAS GOING TO BE PEOPLE ON TANGENTS AND TALKING ABOUT FREE SPEECH AND THE PEOPLE GIVING IT AND EVERYTHING ELSE. I THOUGHT IT WAS A GOOD MOTION. ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES MADE AN AMENDMENT BEFORE US THAT HAD NOT BEEN DISCUSSED. I THOUGHT BECAUSE I'M THE ONE THAT PUT BEFORE US TO LIMIT DEBATE, I WOULD LET HER FINISH THAT. I DON'T THINK SHE EVEN WANT TO TODAY. ONE OF MY OTHER COLLEAGUES WITH AN AMENDMENT, TO WHICH I VERY MUCH AGREED, I THOUGHT WAS A GOOD PRECEDENT NOT JUST FOR THIS RULES BUT OTHER THINGS IN SAFETY, NEW AGE. IT ALSO -- HE WAS OUT THIS WEEK WITH A PERSONALLY MATTER. WE TALKED TODAY AND I SAID, HE HAD BEEN OUT OF THE LOOP. IF HE HAD TALKED TO ANYBODY. I VOTED NO, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO PROFFER THIS FOR YOU. NO ILL INTENT ON THIS. AND THIS ISN'T ONE I'M STOMPING UP AND DOWN CALLING ME. I PUT IT BEFORE COUNCIL BECAUSE I THOUGHT IT WAS A SIMPLE FIX. THE PRESIDENT MAKES A DECISION ON WHETHER OR NOT THE REQUIREMENT TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON THAT. I DON'T WANT TO PUT HIM IN A BAD SPOT. HE'LL DO WHAT HE THINKS BASED ON THE RULES AND DISTRICT. I SENT A REQUEST ONCE I GIVEN THE COMMENT TO MY COLLEAGUES AND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. THEY SAID WHAT I NEED TO DO. I FOLLOWED IT TO A T. IF SOMETHING ELSE NEEDED TO BE DONE, SO BE IT. SOMETHING ELSE TO BE FILED IN THE FUTURE OR WHAT NOT. I'M SIMPLY TRYING TO DO WHAT I THINK IS RIGHT AND LET PEOPLE FINISH THE DEBATE IF IT'S OUTSIDE THE RULES

AND SCOPE, I RESPECT THAT. HOWEVER, I THINK THE DECISION SHOULD BE MADE BY OUR LEGAL COUNCIL AND GIVE US INSTRUCTIONS ON THAT. INTERPRETED BY THIS BODY, WHICH THE PRESIDENT HAS THE FINAL SAY ON. THANK YOU. [BEEPING]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN YATES. COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER. I THINK YOUR MUTE IS ON.

>> THANK YOU. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I HAD QUESTIONED THE DECISION OF TWO WEEKS AGO ON THE AMENDMENT THAT I PROFFERED. I'VE GOT A REPLY FOR CLARIFICATION FROM TRAVIS FLETCHER ON FRIDAY OF LAST WEEK. AND HE REPLIED THEN AGAIN ON MONDAY, GOOD MORNING, YOU MAY NOT HAVE HAD TIME TO READ MY COMMUNICATION FROM FRIDAY BUT I'M HAPPY TO RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS THAT COME UP. SPEAKING OF COUNCIL WEEK, COUNCIL RULES PROVIDE MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER MUST COME AT THE NEXT MEETING FOLLOWING ITS ORIGINAL VOTE. THIS MEANS THE SAFETY ZONE ORDINANCE WOULD NEED TO BE RECONSIDERED THIS THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3RD. THE COUNCIL FORMERLY ADDED A RECONSIDER ITEM TO IN THE AGENDA ITEM IN THE PAST. WHILE THIS IS NOT STRICTLY REQUIRED, IT DOES PROVIDE ADDITIONAL NOTICE TO ALL COUNCILMEMBERS AS WELL AS THE PUBLIC THAT AN ITEM WILL BE DISCUSSED. THE CLERK'S OFFICE NEED TO KNOW BEFORE THE FINAL AGENDA IS PUBLISHED ON WEDNESDAY, IF THAT WERE TO BE DONE. I THINK THAT'S PRETTY CLEAR THAT WE NEED TO FOLLOW OUR RULES AS THEY ARE WRITTEN. EVERYONE IS TALKING ABOUT AN OPINION. I THINK

THAT'S PRETTY CLOSE TO ONE. BUT I MAY BE WRONG. I'M NOT A  
LAWYER.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. COUNCILMAN  
WINKLER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I THINK GIVEN THE FOCUS ON  
TRANSPARENCY IN OUR COMMUNITY, GIVEN THE FOCUS ON HONESTY AND IN  
THIS CASE, I SHOULDN'T SAY HONESTY, THE IMPLICATION IS THAT IT'S  
DISHONEST, BUT THE FOCUS ON TRANSPARENCY. THE BURDEN ON THE  
MAJORITY IS TO PUT IT ON THE AGENDA BECAUSE WE DO -- OUR AGENDA  
DRIVES PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC INPUT. AND I THINK IT IS  
CRITICAL THAT BARRING MATTERS OF EMERGENCY, AND TO THE POINTS  
THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED BY MEMBERS IN OPPOSITION, THE REASON THAT  
YOU PUT THINGS, THAT THE BAR FOR ADDING THINGS IN AN EMERGENCY  
MANNER IS HIGH, TWO THIRDS BECAUSE IT REQUIRES SPECIAL  
CONSIDERATION, MORE THAN A SIMPLE MAJORITY. ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT  
WHEN YOU ARE IN THE MAJORITY TO HAVE DEFERENCE FOR THOSE IN THE  
MAJORITY BECAUSE YOU ESTABLISH PRECEDENT AND THAT CAN BE USED  
AGAINST YOU LATER. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT WE FOLLOW ESTABLISHED  
PRACTICES. THE QUESTION I WOULD HAVE FOR THE COUNTY ATTORNEY IS:  
IF THIS QUESTION IS NOT CONSIDERED TODAY -- AND WE VOTED FOR  
THIS ORDINANCE LAST TIME, I WOULD AGAIN TODAY -- MY QUESTION IS:  
IF IT IS NOT RECONSIDERED TODAY, WHAT ARE THE FUTURE ACTIONS  
AVAILABLE TO RECONSIDER THE ORDINANCE AT SOME FUTURE MEETING?

>> THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. COUNCILMAN WINKLER, YOU COULD NOT RECONSIDER THIS ORDINANCE-336-20, YOUR ONLY OPTION TO RECONSIDER THIS PARTICULAR PIECE OF LEGISLATION WITH THIS NUMBER IS TODAY. THE SUBJECT MATTER COULD BE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF FUTURE LEGISLATION. I WOULD NEED TO CONSULT THE RULES BECAUSE I HAVE NOT HAD TO LOOK AT THIS BEFORE, AS TO HOW LONG A PERIOD THERE MIGHT NEED TO BE BEFORE, I'M SEEING FINGERS, BEFORE -- TWO YEARS? COUNCILMAN FOX IS EDUCATING ME HERE ON THE SCREEN THAT YOUR RULES PROVIDE THAT YOU WOULD HAVE TO WAIT TWO YEARS BEFORE SIMILAR LEGISLATION ADDRESSING THE TOPIC COULD BE CONSIDERED AGAIN.

>> I WOULD ASK FOR CLARIFICATION ON THAT POINT SPECIFICALLY. HOW DOES ONE DEFINE SIMILARITY? IF FOR EXAMPLE, WE FAIL AN ORDINANCE ON POLICING. DOES THAT MEAN FOR TWO YEARS WE ARE PREVENTED FROM CONSIDERING ANY ORDINANCE ABOUT POLICING? OR WE FAIL AN ORDINANCE ON ZONING, DOES THAT MEAN FOR TWO YEARS WE CAN'T PASS A SINGLE ZONING CASE BECAUSE WE HAVE FAILED AN ORDINANCE ON ZONING? THERE MUST BE SOME MORE SPECIFIC LIMITATIONS THAN STRICTLY TO SAY, WELL, YOU HAVE NOW CONSIDERED AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED SAFETY ZONE AND FOR THAT REASON YOU MAY NOT CONSIDER A SINGLE OTHER LEGISLATION THAT HAS SIMILAR LEGISLATIVE INTENT. I THINK THAT IS TOO BROAD OF AN INTERPRETATION TO POSSIBLY HAVE STANDING.

>> [INDISCERNIBLE] RULE 7.03 REQUIRES THAT ALL ORDINANCES REJECTED BY COUNCIL SHALL NOT BE REINTRODUCED DURING THE TERM OF THE SITTING COUNCIL UNLESS BY SPECIAL REQUEST GRANTED BY A VOTE OF A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. I'M NOT HAD AN OCCASION TO RESEARCH THAT RULE. AND HAVE NOT DEALT WITH THAT RULE. THAT WOULD SEEM TO SPEAK TO SOMETHING LESS THAN TWO YEARS.

>> CORRECT. IF I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU SAID, I BELIEVE WE HAVE TWO OPTIONS. ONE, INTRODUCE A DIFFERENT PIECE OF LEGISLATION, VOTED UP OR DOWN. AS LONG AS IT'S NOT IDENTICAL, IT'S DIFFERENT. OPTION TWO, AT THE NEXT COUNCIL MEETING, A VOTE OF THE -- IT IS ON THE AGENDA, AND A VOTE OF THE SIMPLE MAJORITY WOULD BE SUFFICIENT TO RECONSIDER.

>> NO, SIR. I DON'T THINK OPTION TWO IS CORRECTLY STATED. AND I WOULD NEED TO LOOK AT OPTION ONE A LITTLE MORE CLOSELY. BEGIN, I'M TRYING TO READ THE RULES WITH YOU ON THE FLY. -- AGAIN -- AND THE RULE I JUST READ MAY NOT BE THE ONLY RULE THAT APPLIES. I UNDERSTOOD YOUR OPTION TWO TO BE, TO MAKE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER THIS PARTICULAR PIECE OF LEGISLATION AT THE NEXT MEETING. AND YOUR RULE 5.12 DOES NOT PERMIT RECONSIDERATION OF THIS PARTICULAR PIECE OF LEGISLATION AT THE NEXT MEETING. THIS PARTICULAR PIECE OF LEGISLATION HAS TO BE RECONSIDERED TONIGHT.

>> IN THE RULE YOU READ PRIOR TO THAT, THE ONE YOU SAID A DIFFERENT PIECE OF LEGISLATION CAN BE INTRODUCED, THERE WAS A SECOND COMPONENT THAT INCLUDED THE VOTE OF THE MAJORITY. CAN YOU

REREAD THAT. TWO OPTIONS. ONE IS A NEW PIECE OF LEGISLATION. THE OTHER WAS WHAT?

>> IT WAS THIS. ALL ORDINANCES, PROPOSITIONS, ORDINANCES, ORDERS OR RESOLUTIONS REJECTED BY COUNCIL SHALL NOT BE REINTRODUCED AS DESCRIBED IN RULE 102, WHICH IS PROBABLY WHERE THE TWO YEARS IS. BUT I HAVEN'T GONE THERE TO LOOK AT IT. UNLESS BY SPECIAL REQUEST GRANTED BY A VOTE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. YOU COULD NOT RECONSIDER THIS UNDER 7.03. 7.03 SEEMS TO SUGGEST THAT THERE IS A MECHANISM BY WHICH A SPECIAL REQUEST CAN BE MADE THAT WOULD ALLOW IT TO BE REINTRODUCED SOONER THAN THE REGULAR TWO-YEAR PERIOD THAT IS APPARENTLY CONTAINED IN RULE 1.02.

>> IT SOUNDS TO ME --

>> DOES THAT CLARIFY?

>> IT SOUNDS LIKE WE HAVE TWO OPTIONS FOR THE NEXT MEETING. INTRODUCE A DIFFERENT PIECE OF LEGISLATION THAT POTENTIALLY GETS ESSENTIALLY AT THE SAME THING. OR, AND CORRECT ME ON THE TERMINOLOGY, MAKE A MOTION FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION TO REVOTE - - TO VOTE ON THE FAILED ORDINANCE.

>> I THINK -- YOU HAVE TO MOVE TONIGHT TO VOTE ON THE FAILED ORDINANCE. IF YOU DO NOT VOTE ON THE 036-20 TONIGHT, YOU CANNOT VOTE ON 2036-2 [INDISCERNIBLE].

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: A POINT OF CLARIFICATION. HOLLY, I BELIEVE YOU MAY HAVE AN OLDER VERSION OF THE RULES. READING WHAT

YOU ARE READING, THERE IS ADDITIONAL WORDS IN THERE, IN THE MOST UP TO DATE VERSION OF THE RULES. I JUST WANTED TO DO A POINT OF CLARITY. IT SAYS ALL PROPOSITIONS, ORDERS, ORDINANCES OR RESOLUTION REJECTED BY THE COUNCIL SHALL NOT BE REINTRODUCED DURING THE TERM OF THE SITTING COUNCIL. AS DESCRIBED IN RULE 1.02, UNLESS BY SPECIAL REQUEST GRANTED BY A VOTE OF A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES, THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT I SAID.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: OKAY. I JUST DIDN'T HEAR YOU TALK ABOUT THE TERM PART.

>> OKAY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER.

>> A DIFFERENT VERSION OR A REQUEST MADE FOR A SPECIAL REQUEST COULD BE GRANTED BY A VOTE OF THE MAJORITY?

>> NO, COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER, I THINK IT CAN'T BE REINTRODUCED [INDISCERNIBLE] UNLESS A SPECIAL REQUEST IS GRANTED BY A VOTE OF MAJORITY OF COUNCIL. THERE IS A HARD STOPPED, AS I'M READING THESE, FLIPPING BACK AND FORTH. THAT YOU COULDN'T DO IT UNDER THIS TERM OF COUNCIL. SO THAT WOULD MEAN UNTIL NEXT JANUARY. EXCEPT IF THERE IS A SPECIAL VOTE GRANTED UNDER RULE 7.02.

>> THAT'S SPECIAL VOTE REQUIRES A SIMPLE MAJORITY?

>> IT JUST SAYS A MAJORITY, SO YES, THAT SHOULD BE A SIMPLE MAJORITY UNDER YOUR RULES DEFINING REQUISITE VOTE.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, POINT OF ORDER, COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: GO AHEAD.

>> COUNCILMAN WINKLER, I THINK YOUR SUPPOSITION THAT YOUR OPTION TWO WOULD BE IT WOULD ALLOW FOR THE SIMPLE VOTE TO PUT IT BACK. BUT I THINK WHAT IS BEING OVERLOOKED IS, IF THAT VOTE WERE TAKEN AT THE NEXT COUNCIL MEETING, WHAT THAT VOTE WOULD ALLOW WOULD BE THAT SAME ORDINANCE WOULD BE ABLE TO BE REINTRODUCED. WHICH MEANS IT WOULD BE BACK ON THE COUNCIL FOR FIRST READING THAT EVENING. AND THEN SENT TO COMPLETE. AND -- COMMITTEE AND GO THROUGH THE NORMAL PROCESS IF IT WERE REINTRODUCED. I THINK IT WOULD REQUIRE A MAJORITY OF THE COUNCIL TO ALLOW IT TO BE REINTRODUCED, MUCH LESS WHAT HAPPENED AFTER THAT. I THINK AS I HEAR MS. HOPKINS DESCRIBING THIS, THERE IS A HARD STOP. IT CANT BE REINTRODUCED -- VOTED ON AGAIN, IF THERE IS ANY HOPE, REINTRODUCE THAT OPTION A, WHICH IS CREATE A NEW ONE. OR IF THE COUNCIL TO AGREE TO ALLOW THIS TO BE REINTRODUCED, IN WHICH CASE IT WOULD GO THROUGH THE PROCESS. I BELIEVE MS. HOPKINS, THAT'S WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO SAY.

>> IT COULD BE A FOUR-WEEK PROCESS, BASICALLY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: OKAY. COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'LL BE BRIEF HERE. I HAVE BEEN IN YOUR SEAT BEFORE. THIS IS A TOUGH DECISION AND THE FACT WE'RE DEBATING THIS SPEAKS TO THE IMPORTANCE WE -- ALL OF US ARE PLACING ON THE DECISION YOU ARE ABOUT TO MAKE. I WOULD HOWEVER,

CAUTION YOU TO NOT CONSIDER HEAVILY WHETHER WE ARE BEING SUED NOW OR WE WOULD BE SUED LATER ON THIS. BECAUSE I THINK WE'RE GOING TO GET SUED REGARDLESS OF WHICH WAY THIS GOES. AND I WOULD SAY TO YOU, I'M NOT A LAWYER BUT I WOULD SAY MOVING TODAY AGAINST OUR DECISION TONIGHT BY YOU TO GO, I BELIEVE, AGAINST OUR RULES, AND CERTAINLY AGAINST OUR PRECEDENT AND AGAINST TRANSPARENCY, OPENNESS AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WOULD SET US UP FOR A LAWSUIT. GOOD LUCK WITH YOUR DECISION.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: NO PRESSURE. THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN, PRESIDENT, DR. BLACKWELL. COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, I DO WANT TO JUST REITERATE A COUPLE OF THINGS. I DO THINK COUNCIL MEMBER YATES SPONSORING THIS MEANT NO ILL INTENT. HE THOUGHT HE WAS TRYING TO, YOU KNOW, TAKE SOMETHING THAT WAS HAPPENING AT THE LAST MEETING THAT DIDN'T GET RESOLVED AND ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE IT TONIGHT. SITTING WHERE HOLLY SAT IN THE PAST FOR MANY YEARS IN HER CHAIR, AND SHE'S DOING AN EXCELLENT JOB TONIGHT, AND I THINK COUNCILMAN KRAMER STATED IT CORRECTLY, I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY TIMES OVER THE YEARS WHERE THERE WERE TWEAKS MADE BECAUSE IT FAILED. I THINK FIREWORKS WERE ONE, SMOKING CERTAINLY WAS, WHERE THINGS AND THE COUNCIL CHANGED. I THINK PROCESSES, IF IT'S NOT CONSIDERED TONIGHT, THAT IT CAN BE REINTRODUCED. IF IT IS, IT WOULD NEED TO BE CHANGED. UNLESS, THE REINTRODUCED THE VERY SAME ORDINANCE AND THE VERY SAME TERMS AND EVERYTHING IS THE SAME, THEN I THINK YOU NEED A

MAJORITY VOTE. STATING THAT, I THINK THERE ARE POTENTIAL OPTIONS IN THE FUTURE TO GO THROUGH THIS SIMILAR PROCESS. BUT AGAIN, I WANT TO SAY I APPRECIATED TALKING TO COUNCIL MEMBER YATES. WE HAD DISCUSSED THIS A LONG TIME AGO. AND IT'S PROBABLY OVERSIGHT, POTENTIALLY ON OUR PART TO NOT HAVE PUT IT ON A MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. BUT THAT BEING SAID, THERE WAS NOTHING WILLFULLY DONE TO TRY TO HIDE THIS OR ANYTHING ELSE. I THINK YOU ARE TRYING TO FOLLOW A PROCEDURE. BUT OUR RULES ARE COMPLICATED. AS YOU KNOW, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL, THEY CHANGE FROM TERM TO TERM . IN FACT, I KNOW COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL, HOLLANDER, MYSELF AND I DON'T KNOW WHO WAS LUCKY ENOUGH, COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER, WE SAT AND DID THESE RULES HERE RECENTLY. AND SO WE CHANGED THE ORDER OF WHEN PEOPLE GET TO PRESENT. WE NOW HAVE GUESTS BEFORE WE HAVE THE 10 SPEAKERS. AGAIN, I APPRECIATE EVERY BODY'S EFFORTS HERE. AND THANK YOU. AND I DO THINK THERE IS A WAY FORWARD IF IT'S NOT TONIGHT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN YATES.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I THINK WE'RE STARTING OFF TRYING TO MAKE THINGS SIMPLER AND THEY HAVE GOTTEN MUDDY AS CAN BE. OBVIOUSLY, EACH OF OUR COLLEAGUES ARE FLOOR WITH -- FAMILIAR WITH THIS AND A CONTINUED DISCUSSION, IN NO WAY DO WE WANT TO VOLLEY OUR RULES. THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASON IT'S BROUGHT BACK

FOR US. AND ONE OF THE REASONING I WAS COMMUNICATING BACK AND FORTH WITH OUR ATTORNEY. IT'S TOUGH TO BE AN EXPERT IN EVERY AREA AT ALL TIMES. SO I APPRECIATE THAT. AND COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL IS CORRECT THAT I THINK IT'S DANGEROUS FOR US TO TRY TO NAVIGATE AT ALL TIMES, TRYING TO -- WE DO NOT WANT TO TURN OUR NOSE UP BUT PEOPLE CAN SUE FOR ANYTHING ANYTIME. THE FACT WE HAVE GOTTEN THREATS IS PART OF THE POSITION WE'RE IN. I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE SETTING A PRECEDENT, THAT'S ONE OF THE REASONS I WAS SO SUPPORTIVE OF COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL'S AMENDMENT IS BECAUSE I WAS WORRIED ABOUT THE PRECEDENT FOR OTHER PROTESTS AND THROUGH THE THE CITY. AND I THINK THAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT. SOMETIMES WE GET VERY, PUT BLINDERS ON AND LOOK AT THE THING BEFORE US AND NOT FUTURE LEGISLATION. WITH THAT BEING SAID, I'M ALSO -- IF THE RULE OF THE BODY, THEY CAN PUT FORTH A MAJORITY, THEY CAN BRING THAT UP OR SOMETHING ADDITIONAL FILED. IT APPEARS TO ME NOW THAT IT IS NOT THAT SIMPLE REQUEST TO BRING IT FOR A MOTION TO CONSIDER. IT APPEARS THAT PER THE RULES, IT WOULD REQUIRE A TWO THIRDS TO SUSPEND OUR RULES. AND THEN AGAIN, I THINK AND I WOULD AGREE WITH COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL IT CREATES SOME PROBLEMS IN THE EVENT WE HAVE TO SUSPEND OUR RULES BECAUSE IT SEEMS THERE WOULD NEED TO BE AN EMERGENCY FOR DOING SO. WHILE THERE MAY BE A MAJORITY OF COLLEAGUES THAT WORRY ABOUT A SET PRECEDENT, WE CAN CORRECT IT IN THE FUTURE. IT MAY BE IN FOUR WEEKS, IT MAY BE AFTER THE NEW COUNCIL SITS AFTER JANUARY, WHICH

I WON'T BE THERE, BUT AGAIN, I DO WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE OPEN, TRANSPARENT AND HONEST. AND I ASSURE YOU THAT WAS NOT MY INTENTION TO DO ANYTHING OTHER THAN KEEPING IT CLEAR AND RESOLVING THE ISSUE THAT WASN'T AT THE LAST MEETING. WITH THAT, I WOULD WITHDRAW MY MOTION TO RECONSIDER. AND IF YOU COULD BRING IT UP IN A FUTURE TIME. THANK YOU. [BEEPING]

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. WE SHALL MOVE FORWARD. THE NEXT ITEM IS OLD BUSINESS. MADAM CLERK, A READING OF ITEM 27. COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY.

>> I WITHDRAW MY SECOND.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. I FORGOT. THANK YOU. MADAM CLERK, A READING OF ITEM 27.

>> MADAM CLERK: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LOUISVILLE METRO CODE OF ORDINANCES TO EXPAND AND ENHANCE THE ABILITY OF THE LOUISVILLE METRO GOVERNMENT TO COMBAT GRAFFITI AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION, AS AMENDED. READ IN FULL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. MAY I HAVE A MOTION AND SECOND?

>> MOTION TO APPROVE.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: MOTION BY COUNCILMAN REED. SECOND BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. IT'S BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED. THE ORDINANCE IS BEFORE US. IS THERE ANYWAY DISCUSSION -- ANY DISCUSSION? COUNCILMAN COAN.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. ROBERTS RULES OF ORDER BACK ON THE SHELF. THIS ITEM PASSED OUT OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY, I BELIEVE. BUT IT WAS AMENDED AFTER A FEW SESSIONS OF DEBATE. I'LL TURN IT OVER TO THE PRIMARY AUTHOR AND SPONSOR, COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. ALTHOUGH, I WILL SAY A FEW WORDS AFTER HE'S DONE. THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND COUNCILMAN COAN. I'M GOING TO WALK THROUGH THE CHANGES WE MADE. I WANT TO BACK UP FOR THE PUBLIC. WE DISCUSSED THIS SHORT BRIEFLY AT THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE. THE DISCUSSION ON AMENDING THIS ORDINANCE, WHICH DEALS WITH THE LEGAL GRAFFITI IN THE CITY, MORE BROADLY, VANDALISM, CAME OUT OF A SERIES OF VANDALISMS AND GRAFFITI THAT HAD HUGE SIGNS OVERPASSES AND DISTRICTS SUCH AS COUNCILMAN COANS THAT SAID, KILL COPS. AND AFTER MEETING WITH -- AND THIS HAPPENED MONTHS AGO. AND MET WITH CODES AND ORDINANCES, MET WITH LMPD. AND STARTED TALKING THROUGH THE ENFORCEMENT OF OUR GRAFFITI LAWS. AND HOW DID THAT WORK AND WAS IT AN EFFECTIVE DETERRENT OR NOT. AND BLUNTLY, THE ANSWER WAS FLOW -- NO. THERE WAS LITTLE DETERRENT FOR MOST OF THE GRAFFITI ISSUES. WE HAVE A SMALL GROUP, I WOULD ARGUE, OF REPEAT OFFENDERS BECAUSE THE PENALTIES WERE SLIM. WE STARTED TALKING THROUGH, WHAT CAN WE DO TO ALTER THE PENALTY. AND THIS LEGISLATION DOES THAT. TO BE CLEAR, EXISTING LEGISLATION. I'M ONLY GOING TO WALK THROUGH THE CHANGES

WE MADE TO IT. ANY OF THE PROVISIONS, I'M NOT HIGHLIGHTING, WE DIDN'T CHANGE, WE KEPT AS IS. THE FIRST THING WE DID IF YOU ARE WALKING THROUGH THE LEGISLATION ON PAGE 2, WE ALTERED THE DEFINITION OF GRAFFITI, THE WAY THIS WAS WRITTEN ORIGINALLY LUMPED GRAFFITI WITHIN A PILE OF DEFINITION WHERE ANYTHING THAT IS GRAFFITI YOU COULD ARGUE WAS AGAINST THE LAW. THAT IS OF COURSE NOT THE INTENTION. THERE ARE -- THERE IS GRAFFITI USED IN LEGAL MANNER TO REFLECT ART AS AN ART FORM IN ITSELF. WE AMENDING TO SAY THE DEFINITION FOR THE PURCHASES OF THIS CHAPTER IS NOT INTENDED TO DISCOURAGE LEGAL AND AUTHORIZED ARTISTIC EXPRESSION, INCLUDING STREET ART BUT INSTEAD MEANT TO ADDRESS VANDALISM IN THE FORM OF GRAFFITI. THAT WAS A CLARIFYING STATEMENT. THE NEXT AMENDMENT WAS ONE THAT GOT SOME DISCUSSION OF THE LAST COMMITTEE MEETING. AND THAT IS WORKING WITH COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE THROUGH THIS PROCESS, COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE BROUGHT UP A VERY NICE PIECE OF MODEL LEGISLATION FROM THE INDUSTRY AND FROM OTHER CITIES THAT HAVE LOOKED AT THIS EXACT ISSUE. IN ORDER TO CREATE A MORE COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTION, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CAME UP THE EXISTING LEGISLATION ALREADY REQUIRED THAT THESE ITEMS IN RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS WERE IN A PLACE THAT RESTRICTS PUBLIC ACCESS, WE SIMPLY MADE AMENDMENT THAT INDICATES THERE SHOULD BE A SIGN, HOW THAT IS DONE, WE'RE LEAVING LATITUDE THERE. BUT THE VERBIAGE ON THE SIGN SHOULD SAY, GRAFFITI IS AGAINST THERE LAW, ANY PERSON WHO DEFACES PROPERTY

WITH LIQUID OR DEVICES IS GUILTY OF A CRIME SUBJECT TO JAIL TIME, CRIMINAL FINES CIVIL PENALTY. ON PAGE 3, UNDER LETTER C, THIS WAS ONE OF THE TECHNICAL CHANGES REQUESTED BY CODES AND REGULATIONS. IN ORDER TO CLARIFY THE DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES TO BE CLEAR, WE'RE ONLY ADDRESSING THE CIVIL SIDE, CRIMINAL PENALTIES ARE ADDRESSED WITH THE STATE. THE NEXT CHANGE THAT WAS MADE ON THE TOP OF PAGE 4, UNDER NUMBER 3, GIVES THE ABILITY FOR ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR OFFICER OF LOUISVILLE METRO CODE ENFORCEMENT TO ENFORCE THE LAW, BROADENS WHO CAN ENFORCE IT. AND QUITE FRANKLY WE IMAGINE MORE OF THE CODE ENFORCEMENT DIVISION THAT LMPD. EXCEPT IN EXTREME CASES AND LARGER PROBLEMS. THERE WAS A CODES AND REGS CHANGES ON THE MIDDLE OF PAGE 4, WE STRUCK USING MATERIALS BY MITT ROW GOVERNMENT -- METRO GOVERNMENT. THE BIGGEST CHANGE WE MADE RELATED TO THE CIVIL PENALTY BECAUSE WE HAVE SEEN IT AS AN IMPROVED DETERRENT FOR ILLEGAL DUMPING, IN THE MODEL LEGISLATION THAT COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE OFFERED AS WELL, WAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO IMPOUND A VEHICLE WHEN USED IN THE FURTHERANCE OF THE VIOLATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THIS LAW ACCORDING TO THIS CHAPTER. IF YOU USE A VEHICLE AND DRIVE YOURSELF IN THE FURTHERANCE OF USING GRAFFITI AS VANDALISM, THAT CAR CAN BE IMPOUNDED. THIS SECTION IS QUITE LONG, YOU WILL SEE IT EXTENDS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, AND TO THE TOP OF PAGE 8, PAGE 9 IS PENALTIES. THIS IS A COPY/PASTE FROM THE CURRENT LAW WITHIN THE ILLEGAL DUMPING, WE MADE TWO YEARS

AGO. THIS IS A COPY AND PASTE FROM THAT LEGISLATION. THERE IS DUE PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS FOR PEOPLE TO ENSURE THAT THEY ARE NOT BEING -- THEY HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROTEST IN AND APPEAL THEIR RIGHTS. ON PAGE 9, WE ADDRESS A CHANGE TO THE CIVIL PENALTIES. DID TWO THINGS, THE MOST SIGNIFICANT OR THE REAL THING WE DID HERE WAS CHANGING TO PROGRESSIVE FINES AND PENALTIES. WE HAVE AN INITIAL, ONLY ONE FINE AND PENALTY FOR \$500 FOR EACH OFFENSE. WE CHANGED THAT TO INITIAL PENALTY OF 255, TO 2500 -- 500 TO 1,000 IF YOU REOFFEND. IF SOMEBODY MAKES A MISTAKE AND GET CAUGHT FIVE YEARS LATER, WE'RE NOT COUNTING THEM AS PROGRESSIVE PENALTY. PAGE 10, THERE WAS CLARIFICATION AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE THAT WAS REQUESTED BY CODE SAID -- CODES AND REGS TO CLARIFY THE APPEALS PROCEDURES. AND THEN THE FINAL THING, THAT IS ON PAGE 10 AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE AND AT THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE, AGAIN, ALL TECHNICAL CHANGES MADE TO CLARIFY APPEAL RIGHTS. IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PAGE, YOU WILL SEE A LETTER "F." WE DID NOT LOOK AT THIS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE MONEY FOR THE CITY. IT IS OUR DESIRE THAT PEOPLE STOP VANDALIZING THE CITY. HOPEFULLY WE NEVER HAVE TO ENFORCE THIS. IF WE DO, I WANT TO THANK COUNCIL MEMBER COAN AS WE WORKED THROUGH THIS. THE IDEA WAS TO TAKE THE CIVIL PENALTIES GENERATED AS PART OF A COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT TO BATTLE VANDALISM WITH ART AND BEAUTIFICATION. THE NET FIND-- FINES AND FEES GENERATED FROM THIS ORDINANCE, WILL BE ALLOCATED DIRECTLY TO THE LOUISVILLE

PUBLIC SPACE ART FUND TO FUND AND IMPROVE A PUBLIC ART IN THE COMMUNITY. AGAIN, TO COMBAT VANDALISM WITH BEAUTY IN THE PUBLIC SPACE. THOSE ARE THE CHANGES IN THE ORDINANCE. I WANT TO THANK COUNCILMAN COAN AND COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE WHO SIGNED ON AS CO-SPONSORS. AND THROUGH ASSISTING IN THEIR WORK AND GUIDANCE ON THIS. I'M LOOKING FOR EVERY BODY'S SUPPORT. AS I DO THINK THIS GIVES MORE REASONABLE TOOLS TO ENFORCING THE LAW AND CREATING A DETERRENT. BUT ALSO DOING SO IN A REASONABLE WAY THAT HELPS WITH COMMUNICATION AND CREATES FUNDING FOR PUBLIC ART BEAUTIFICATION OF OUR CITY. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND ACTUALLY, I WAS IN THE QUEUE TO SPEAK ON THE FORMER DISCUSSION, PRIOR TO COUNCILMAN YATES WITHDRAWING HIS MOTION. I'LL COME BACK OUT OF THE QUEUE NOW.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILWOMAN PARKER.

>> YES. THANK YOU. I WANTED TO THANK COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI FOR HIS WORK ON THIS. AND I WOULD LIKE TO SIGN ON AS A COSPONSOR.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: OKAY. THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN, SIGNING ON AS A COSPONSOR. AND COUNCILMAN REED.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I WOULD LIKE TO CONGRATULATE THE AUTHORS OF THIS. AND CLEARLY YOU DID A LOT OF WORK ON IT. IT'S NECESSARY. I DO HAVE A QUESTION THOUGH. WE TALKED ABOUT

EXCEPTION FOR TREAT IS -- STREET ART. WHAT CONSTITUTES STREET ART? AND HOW IS STREET ART DIFFERENT THAN SOME FORMS OF GRAFFITI?

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. FOR EXAMPLE, THERE ARE -- THIS IS HAD A MATTER OF INTERPRETATION. RIGHT? SO HOW DO YOU DEFINE STREET ART? WE DIDN'T GET INTO THAT HERE. WHAT WE CLEARLY DEFINED IS THAT FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE SEEN MURALS SPROUT UP ALL OVER THE CITY. IN MANY CASES, THOSE MURALS USE SPRAY PAINT, USE TECHNIQUES THAT ARE FOUND IN WHAT YOU WOULD TERM VERY BROADLY IN GRAFFITI. AND THERE ARE MANY CITIES, AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE SKATEPARK FOR EXAMPLE, THERE YOU WILL SEE ARTWORK IN THE STYLE OF GRAFFITI THAT IS LEGAL IN THE SKATEPARK. SO THERE ARE VENUES MADE, A LOCAL RESTAURATEUR MIGHT SAY, FOR THIS SIDE OF MY BUILDING I'M GOING TO ALLOW A GRAFFITI ARTIST TO COME AND USE SPRAY PAINT AND THAT STYLE OF ARTWORK. YOU MIGHT CALL THAT STREET ART. THE WAY WE DEFINED THIS QUOTE, IS MEANT TO ADDRESS VANDALISM IN THE FORM OF GRAFFITI. WHAT I DIDN'T WANT TO DO, AND IF YOU READ IT THE WAY IT WAS ORIGINALLY DRAFTED, IT USES UBIQUITOUSLY THE WORD GRAFFITI AS IF IT'S ALL DESTRUCTION AND THAT'S NOT TRUE. IT CAN BE USED TO DESCRIBE A STYLE OF ARTWORK DONE LEGALLY AND COMMISSIONED BY THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY. WE TALKED ABOUT TAILORING THIS AND USING VANDALISM INSTEAD OF GRAFFITI, IT WOULD HAVE MEANT REQUIRES. REWRITES.

IT'S UP TO INTERPRETATION BUT THE PURPOSE IS ADDRESSING VANDALISM. STREET ART CAN MEAN A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS. AS LONG AS IT'S LEGALLY DONE ON A PIECE OF PROPERTY THAT ARE LEGALLY ALLOWED TO USE.

>> THAT WAS MY QUESTION. STREET ART TO BE USED AS ALLOWED BY THE PROPERTY OWNER?

>> THAT IS CORRECT.

>> OKAY. I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO BE ADDED AS A COSPONSOR.

THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: OKAY. COUNCILMAN REED TO BE ADDED AS A COSPONSOR. COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> QUESTION FOR COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. IT WOULD BE ADDRESSING HIS COMMENTS ABOUT THE SKATEPARK. IS THERE A SPECIFIC PLACE IN THE SKATEPARK FOR ART? YOU COUNT THE GRAFFITI ALL OVER THE SURFACES FOR SKATING. THE SKATERS HATE IT. THE PARKS DEPARTMENT HATES IT, ET CETERA. I WOULD HATE -- I MEAN, UNLESS THERE IS A SPECIAL PLACE FOR ART OR SOMETHING HAS CHANGED, I DON'T WANT TO GIVE ANYBODY THE ENCOURAGEMENT THAT'S A GIANT CANVAS.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> I MAY HAVE MISSPOKEN. IF IT'S NOT PERMITTED IN THE SKATEPARK, I TAKE BACK WHAT I SAID. THE POINT IS I'VE KNOWN PUBLIC SPACES IN CITIES AND QUITE FRANKLY TO SOME DEGREE, I ASSUMED THE SKATEPARK WAS ONE, I STAND CORRECTED IT IS NOT. IF

IT'S ON THE SKATE SURFACES AND IT'S ILLEGAL, PEOPLE SHOULD STOP AND IT WOULD FALL UNDER THE ORDINANCE. I'VE KNOWN OTHER CITIES THAT DESIGNATED PUBLIC SPACES FOR -- AND A LOT OF TIMES YOU HAVE TO RENT IT OUT. YOU EITHER PAY A FEE OR DESIGNATE A SPACE BUT IT'S IN A PUBLIC AREA WHERE THEY WOULD USE IT TO, AND USE THE FORM OF GRAFFITI IF IT'S LEGAL. IF IT'S NOT IN THE SKATEPARK, THOSE VIOLATIONS WOULD FALL UNDER THE ORDINANCE. THE QUESTION IS IF IT'S LEGAL IF IT'S PRIVATE OR PUBLIC PROPERTY, THAT IS PERMITTED. IF IT'S NOT, YOU FALL UNDER THIS ORDINANCE AND YOU COULD BE PUNISHED ACCORDINGLY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, COUNCILMAN PEDEN?

>> WHEN THOUGHT THERE MIGHT BE A NEW LEGAL SPOT THERE.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: I THINK WHAT COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI IS SAYING HE'S GOING TO QUIT SPRAY PAINTING THE SKATEPARK. THANK YOU. COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH.

>> YES. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. SINCE THERE HAS BEEN SO MUCH DISCUSSION ABOUT THE DAVE ARMSTRONG WORLD FAMOUS EXTREME SKATEPARK, LOCATED IN STRICT DISTRICT 4, I THOUGHT I WOULD WEIGH IN ON THE CONVERSATION. I WANT TO REITERATE ONE MORE TIME BECAUSE IT'S WORTH REPEATING WHAT COUNCILMAN PEDEN SAID. THE SKATERS HATE THE PAINT ON THE EXTREME SKATEPARK. THAT'S MY FIRST MESSAGE. I WANT EVERYBODY TO KNOW, IF THE SKATERS AREN'T PAINTING ALL OVER THE PARK BECAUSE IT IS VERY DANGEROUS.

SECONDLY, COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI, YES, IT IS ILLEGAL TO PAINT ON THE PIPES AND SURFACES OF THE SKATEPARK. THIRD AND LAST POINT IS, THE BEAUTIFUL ARTWORK THAT YOU SEE WHEN YOU DRIVE DOWN FRANKLIN STREET OR ALONG RIVER ROAD AND YOU SEE THE BIG BEAUTIFUL LOUISVILLE THAT SORT OF LOOKS STYLIZED LIKE THE WORD OF BELL OF LOUISVILLE DOES ON OUR BELL, THAT WAS A COMMISSIONED PIECE OF ART WE WORKED TOGETHER IN CONJUNCTION WITH SEVERAL GRAFFITI WRITERS AND MURALISTS, WHICH ARE LEGAL WORK. AND METRO PARKS AND DISTRICT 4 PARTNERED TOGETHER AND COMMISSIONED THAT WORK. -- METRO. IT WRAPS AROUND THE EXTERIOR OF THE SKATEPARK AND HAS NOT BEEN VANDALIZED. OUR HOPE WAS IT WOULD BE ABLE TO CONTINUE AND ANOTHER COMMISSION AND COME UP OVER IT THE ENTIRE SURFACE OF THE SKATEPARK. WE JUST HAVE HAD OTHER BUDGET RESPONSIBILITY AND NOT ABLE TO MOVE FORWARD ON THAT. THOSE ARE MY COMMENTS. AND CONGRATULATIONS, COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI AND COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE. I APPRECIATE AND VALUE THE HARD WORK YOU HAVE PUT INTO THIS. I THINK IT WAS JUST INGENIOUS TO HAVE THE VEHICLE APPREHENSION COMPONENT ADDED TO THIS AS WELL. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. AND MADAM CLERK, CAN YOU PLEASE ADD DAVID JAMES AS A COSPONSOR? IS THERE ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THIS IS AN ORDINANCE REQUIRING A ROLL CALL VOTE. WILL THE CLERK PLEASE CALL THE ROLL? [ROLL CALL VOTE]

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GREEN.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY. YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH. YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS FOSTER. YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: PRESIDENT JAMES.  
>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY. YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN COAN.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MULVIHILL.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN KRAMER.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN FOX.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.  
>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN REED.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN  
>> YES. WINKLER.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PARKER.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BENSON.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN ENGEL.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PEDEN.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN YATES.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN ACKERSON.  
>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 25 YES VOTES AND ZERO NO VOTES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. A READING OF ITEM 28.

>> MADAM CLERK: ITEM 28. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 072, SERIES 2020 AND ORDINANCE NO. 073, SERIES 2020 RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGETS, RESPECTIVELY, BY TRANSFERRING \$50,000 FROM THE DISTRICT 16 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUND TO THE DISTRICT 16 CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUND. READ IN FULL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. MOTION BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER, SECONDED BY COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. IT'S BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED. AND IS BEFORE US. ANY DISCUSSION? COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THIS PASSED OUT OF COMMITTEE, THE PRIMARY SPONSOR IS COUNCILMAN REED. MOVED TO OLD BUSINESS AT THE REQUEST OF THE SPONSOR. AS I UNDERSTAND, ALLOW FOR AMENDMENT FOR DISTRICT 18 TO TRANSFER FUNDS AS WELL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN REED.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT. THE BUDGET COMMITTEE APPROVED THIS AND AT THE REQUEST OF COUNCILWOMAN PARKER I ADDED AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE TRANSFER OF \$20,000 FROM THE DISTRICT 18NDF TO DISTRICT 18CIF FOR HER TO HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR A CIF PRESENTING TO A APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: OKAY. THANK YOU. COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER,  
DO YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO THIS?

>> THAT'S OKAY. IT'S PRETTY CUT AND DRY. THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: OKAY. THANK YOU. IS THERE ANY FURTHER  
DISCUSSION? I NEED A MOTION AND SECOND ON THE AMENDMENT. I HAVE  
A MOTION BY COUNCILMAN REED. A SECOND BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. ALL  
IN FAVOR, SAY, "AYE." ALL OPPOSED? THE AYES HAVE IT. THE AMENDED  
ORDINANCE IS BEFORE US. WILL THE CLERK PLEASE CALL THE ROLL?

[ROLL CALL VOTE]

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GREEN. YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY. YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH. YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS FOSTER. YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY. COUNCILMAN COAN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MULVIHILL. YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN KRAMER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN FOX.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN REED.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN WINKLER.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PARKER. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BENSON.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN ENGEL.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PEDEN.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.  
>> YES.  
>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN YATES. YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN ACKERSON.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: 25 YES VOTES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: A READING OF ITEM 29.

>> MADAM CLERK: AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$5,835.00 FROM DISTRICT 6 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS, THROUGH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, TO METRO PARKS TO PROVIDE TO LUV-IT LANDSCAPING FOR MULTIPLE BEAUTIFICATION PROJECTS IN DISTRICT 6, AS AMENDED. READ IN FULL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. MAY I HAVE A MOTION AND SECOND. MOTION BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. SECONDED BY COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. IT'S BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION, DR. BLACKWELL?

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THIS IS ACTUALLY YOUR ORDINANCE. AND IT WAS AMENDED IN COMMITTEE TO CORRECT THE TITLE TO ADD THROUGH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET TO METRO PARKS. SIMPLE AMENDMENT. PUT IT ON OLD BUSINESS.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. THE AMENDMENT ORDINANCE IS BEFORE US. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL. [ROLL CALL VOTE]

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GREEN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS FOSTER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN COAN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MULVIHILL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN KRAMER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN REED.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN

>> YES. WINKLER.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PARKER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BENSON.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN ENGEL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN YATES.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON. YOU HAVE 25 YES

VOTES AND ZERO NO VOTES

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, MADAM CLERK. A READINGS OF ITEM THIRD, PLEASE.

>> MADAM CLERK: AN ORDINANCE AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 073, SERIES 2020 RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT BY TRANSFERRING \$1,000,000 OF RESTRICTED YOUTH APPROPRIATION FROM THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT & BUDGET TO THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE & COMMUNITY SERVICES, AS AMENDED. READ IN FULL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. MAY WE HAVE A MOTION AND SECOND. MOTION BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. SECONDED BY COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. THE ORDINANCE HAS BEEN HAS BEEN PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED. ANY DISCUSSION? COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THIS IS AN ORDINANCE --

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: STANDBY ONE SECOND. [MULTIPLE SPEAKERS]  
[BEEP]

>> WE PARKED -- AT THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WOULD NOT BE-- I THINK THERE IS AN ECHO IN THE CHAMBERS. WE PARKED THAT MONEY AT THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, UNDERSTANDING THAT'S NOT WHERE IT WAS BE MANAGED ULTIMATELY. THERE IS A -- MANAGED. THERE IS A COMMITTEE WHICH INCLUDES COUNCILMEMBERS DORSEY, GEORGE AND PEDEN, WORKING WITH PEOPLE FROM THE ADMINISTRATION ON HOW TO USE THAT MONEY. THEY HAVE A PLAN I THINK FOR A NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY FROM THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES. WHAT THIS DOES

IS MOVE MONEY TO THERE BUT PROVIDES AND THE REASON IT'S HERE IT PROVIDES THAT IT DOES HAVE TO COME BACK TO US WITH AN AMENDMENT. I'M TRYING TO FIND THE AMENDMENT RIGHT NOW. THE AMENDMENT WHICH SAYS, PLAN THE USE OF \$1 MILLION USE SHALL BE PRESENT TODAY THE METRO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL WITH THE UNDERSTANDING UP TO \$50,000 MAY BE USED IN ADVANCED BY THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TODAY STAFF AND ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE APPROPRIATION. IT'S A PRETTY SIMPLE MOVE TO KEEP THE PROCESS GOING. I KNOW WE THINK IT'S IMPORTANT WE GET THIS MONEY OUT THE DOOR AND IN USE. THIS CONTINUES THE PROCESS ALONG THAT PATH. THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER. COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I JUST NEEDED CLARITY ON THIS. THE \$950,000 HAS BEEN MOVED TO THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND COMMUNITY, I WANTED TO KNOW ARE THE FUNDS EARMARKED FOR ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR? EXAMPLE, THE AGENCY FUND, YES OR NO? IF NOT, HOW WILL THESE FUNDS BE DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY? AND WHAT IS THE PROTOCOL TO RECEIVE THESE FUNDS?

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> YES. I THINK I'M GOING TO DEFER TO COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY OR COUNCILMAN PEDEN. CLEARLY, HOWEVER, IT WILL COME BACK TO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. I THINK THE DISCUSSION WE HAD AT THE

BUDGET COMMITTEE WAS THAT A NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY WOULD BE GOING OUT. I THINK, I'LL SAY IT IS MY VIEW, THAT THESE FUNDS WOULD BE USED IN LARGE INCREMENTS. I DON'T THINK WE'RE TALKING ABOUT SPREADING A LOT OF MONEY TO PAY A LOT OF SMALL AMOUNTS TO A LOT OF ORGANIZATIONS. A NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY, A RECOMMENDATION AS TO HOW IT WOULD BE SPENT. AND IT WILL COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL. ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF THAT WORK GROUP MAY WANT TO CHIME IN HERE. I DON'T KNOW, EITHER COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE, PEDEN OR DORSEY.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> YES, I CAN ANSWER THE QUESTION. WHEN I RANGE IN THOUGH, RANG IN, IT WAS TO GET -- I DON'T WANT TO DIMINISH THE WORK OF MYSELF OR COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY. BUT OH, MY GOD, EVERYTHING THAT COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE PUT IN IS AMAZING. SHE GRABBED THIS AND RAN WITH IT AND IT'S AWESOME. TO ANSWER COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER IS CORRECT, THE MINIMUM SIZE GRANT IS \$300,000. WHAT WE THE COMMITTEE DID IS CREATE A SET OF PRIORITIES TO GRAB THESE AT-RISK YOUTH THAT ARE KIND OF POST-HIGH SCHOOL BUT ARE NOT IN THE WORKFORCE OR IN SCHOOL. WE EVEN BROUGHT IN GROUPS OF KIDS OF KIND OF A FOCUS GROUP TO FIND OUT WHERE CERTAIN NEEDS WERE AND PUT THOSE NEEDS AND MADE THOSE OUR PRIORITIES. COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE CREATED A SCORE SHEET TO QUANTIFY THE AWARDS. AND THEN DANIEL FROCK WITH FINANCE IS PUTTING OUT THE NOTICE OF FINANCE FUNDING AVAILABILITY, WITH

THIS SCORE SHEET AND CRITERIA SO EVERYBODY KNOWS, THIS IS WHAT THE CITY WANTS TO ACCOMPLISH. WHAT CAN YOU GROUP DO TO GET US TOWARDS THOSE GOALS? AGAIN, IT'S ALSO THE QUANTIFIABLE, THEY WILL BE REQUIRED TO COME BACK AND GIVE REPORTS. AGAIN, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER IS CORRECT, THIS IS NOT GOING TO BE SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY WITH LIKE 50,000 HERE AND 25,000 THERE. IT'S MEANT TO GO TO TWO OR THREE AT THE MOST, LARGE FUNCTIONING GROUPS WHO HAVE THE ABILITY TO REACH LARGE NUMBERS OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, WHO ARE KIND OF JUST IN THAT IN-BETWEEN PHASE. THE BEST EXAMPLE I CAN GIVE AND COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE INFORMED ME THAT SOME STATE LAWS HAVE BEEN PASSED TO DO AWAY WITH THE PROBLEM I'M ABOUT TO SITE. BUT IF EVERYBODY CAN REMEMBER, T IN THE OLD DAYS IF YOU ARE A FOSTER CHILD AND HIT 18, THAT'S LIKE THE WORST DAY OF YOUR LIFE. AT 18 YEARS AND A DAY YOU ARE OUT THERE. THERE WAS NO TRANSITION, NOWHERE TO GO. NO GOVERNMENT FUNDING, ET CETERA. AGAIN, THANKFULLY THAT HAS BEEN TWEAKED A LITTLE BIT. THAT'S THE GROUP OF KIDS WE'RE LOOKING FOR, THE ONES WHO ARE TRYING TO -- LACK IN DIRECTION. WE'RE GOING TO TRY TO HELP THEM IN THOSE GOALS AND GET THEM INTO THE PLACES THEY NEED TO GO. COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE OR DORSEY, WOULD LIKE TO CHIME IN, I'M SURE THEY CAN ADD TO THE CONVERSATION.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COUNCILMAN PEDEN SAID IT WELL. I DON'T NECESSARILY FEEL COMPELLED TO RECAP THE PROCESS

NECESSARILY UNDERTAKEN BY THE WORKERS. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS IF THERE ARE CONCERNS OR, AGAIN, QUESTIONS AROUND THE SERVICE, WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR AND WHAT INFORMED US. THANK YOU.

>> I'LL TAG ON. I KNOW IT'S PROBABLY A LITTLE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS' QUESTION, HOW TO ACCESS FUNDS. THE STRUCTURE IS GEARED TOWARD LOOKING AT NOT NECESSARILY YOUNG PEOPLE HAVING JOBS. I THINK THE CONSENSUS OF THE GROUP AND THE REASON WHY NICOLE'S EXPERTISE IS IMPORTANT, IF THE YOUNG PEOPLE HAD THE BACKGROUND OF SERVICES, THE INFRASTRUCTURE, THEY WOULD ALREADY BE SUCCESSFUL. WHAT WE'RE LOOKING TO DO IS LOOK AT THE REASONS THEY ARE NOT IN SUPPORT AND UNDERGIRD THOSE GAPS IN THE SYSTEM AND PROCESSES TO MAKE THEM SUCCESSFUL. THE JOB IS ONE COMPONENT OF IT. WHAT WE WERE LOOKING AT IS GEARING TOWARDS SERVICE AND LOOKING AT SERVICES AND PROVIDERS THAT CAN FILL IN THE GAPS TO PROVIDE SOCIAL SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE TO BE SUCCESSFUL WHEN THEY GET A JOB. COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS IF YOU KNOW GROUPS INTERESTED IN CREATIVE WAYS TO EMPOWER YOUNG PEOPLE DEALING WITH GAPS OR BACKGROUNDS IN TRAUMA, THEY ARE CERTAINLY WELCOME TO APPLY AND PRESENT A PRESENTATION OR PROPOSAL IN REGARDS TO THAT.

>> PRESIDENT? A COMMENT --

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: STANDBY. MADAM CLERK, NOTE FOR THE RECORD, COUNCILMAN WINKLER IS TAKING OVER THE CHAIR. CONTINUE ON, MA'AM. COUNCILMAN PURVIS, GO AHEAD.

>> THANK YOU. I DON'T CHALLENGE OR QUESTION THE PURPOSE OR MISSION, IT SOUNDS LIKE A GREAT PROGRAM. I JUST WANTED TO CONFIRM, WILL THESE FUNDS BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE EXTERNAL AGENCY GRANT THAT THEY DO ANNUALLY? AND ALSO, WANTED TO KNOW, WILL THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE BE THE ENTITY THAT WILL IDENTIFY THE AGENCIES THAT ARE IN NEED OF THESE FUNDS? [BEEP]

>> COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE. I'M SORRY.

>> THANK YOU. AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE NOF A WOULD GO OUT, AN AGENCY THAT SERVES THE YOUNG PEOPLE WITH THE SERVICE ARRAY, PEER SUPPORT, TRANSPORTATION, EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE, IT WOULD HAVE TO BE AGENCIES THAT WERE OBVIOUSLY WILLING TO STEP UP TO SERVE YOUNG PEOPLE WITH THAT SERVICE ARRAY. BUT AGAIN, THE IDEA IS THAT WOULD GO OUT AND FOLKS COULD COME TO US AND SHARE THEIR PROPOSAL TO SERVE KIDS IN THIS WAY.

>> COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY, DO YOU WANT TO ADD ANYTHING ELSE TO THAT?

>> YES. THAT WOULD NOT BE A PART OF THE TRADITIONAL EAS, THIS WOULD BE A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT PROCESS?

>> COUNCILMAN PURVIS, DOES THAT ANSWER EVERYTHING FOR YOU?

>> THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.

>> THANK YOU. I REALLY LIKE THIS PROGRAM. IT LOOKS LIKE [INDISCERNIBLE] TOGETHER. I HOPE YOU SPREAD IT OVER OVER THE WHOLE JEFFERSON COUNTY. DON'T LEAVE MY AREA OUT BECAUSE THAT

HAPPENS ALL THE TIME. AND I REALLY LIKE THE FACT IT WON'T BE GOING TO JUST SIMPLE OR EXTERNAL AGENCIES, IT WOULD BE SPREAD OUT TO AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE. BECAUSE IT'S REALLY NEEDED, WE HAVE HOMELESS KIDS IN THIS AREA LIKE THEY DO IN THE WEST END. I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE NOT OVERLOOKED WITH ANYTHING. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN, ONE OF THE CRITERIA WE SET FORTH IS THAT EACH AGENCY THAT SERVES WOULD GET POINTS FOR SERVING OUR ZIP CODES WITH THE MOST OPPORTUNITY USE. WANT TO MAKE NOTE OF WHAT YOU SAID, WHICH IS IMPORTANT, AND THAT IS THERE SHOULD BE INTENTION TO ENSURE THAT WE'RE TOUCHING OUR AREAS THAT HAVE THE MOST OPPORTUNITY USED AND THE MOST OPPORTUNITY FOR GROWTH.

>> SEEING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THIS ORDINANCE REQUIRES A ROLL CALL VOTE. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GREEN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS FOSTER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY. COUNCILMAN COAN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN MULVIHILL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN KRAMER. COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN KRAMER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN REED.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN

>> YES. WINKLER.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN PARKER.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN BENSON.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN ENGEL.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILMAN YATES.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.

>> YES.

>> MADAM CLERK: WE HAVE 25 YES VOTES AND ZERO NO VOTES.

>> LET THE RECORD REFLECT THAT PRESIDENT JAMES IS RESUMING  
THE CHAIR.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE READ  
ITEM ITEM 31 -- NUMBER 31.

>> MADAM CLERK: 31. A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO  
ACCEPT \$238,165 OF FUNDING FROM THE KENTUCKY NATURAL LANDS TRUST  
(KNLT) IMPERILED BAT CONSERVATION FUND (IBCF) FOR PURCHASE OF

TRACTS, WHICH WILL ADD TO JEFFERSON MEMORIAL FOREST (JMF) TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION. READ IN FULL.

>> MOTION TO APPROVE. KRAMER.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: MOTION BY KRAMER. SECOND BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. THE RESOLUTION IS BEFORE US. ANY DISCUSSION? COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER?

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THIS IS JUST A SIMPLE DISCUSSION FOR FUNDS, 283 -- I'M SORRY, \$238,000 FUNDING FROM THE KENTUCKY NATURAL LAND TRUST FOR PURCHASE OF TRACTS OF LAND IN JEFFERSON MEMORIAL USED FOR THE IMPERIL BAT CONSERVATION FUND, I'M SORRY, THAT'S RIGHT. IT'S JUST A SIMPLE ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS. WE'LL TAKE WHAT WE CAN GET. HOPEFULLY THOSE BROWN BATS WILL THRIVE IN THE JEFFERSON MEMORIAL FOREST. THANK YOU.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER. ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, THIS IS A RESOLUTION ALLOWING FOR A VOICE VOTE. ALL IN FAVOR, SAY, "AYE." PLEASE SAY AYE. ALL OPPOSED? THE AYES HAVE IT. AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES. OUR NEXT ITEM OF BUSINESS IS NEW BUSINESS. I WANT TO LET EVERYBODY KNOW THAT I KNOW THAT WE'RE HAVING SOME AUDIO DIFFICULTIES WITH ECHO. WE'RE WORKING TO TRY TO GET THAT RESOLVED. WE'VE GOT CONTRACTORS THAT WE'RE GOING TO MEET WITH THIS WEEK TO TRY AND SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO TO STRAIGHTEN THAT OUT. IT SHOULD BE BETTER SOON. I WOULD ASK THOSE COUNCILMEMBERS WHO WISH TO MAKE ANNOUNCEMENTS REMAIN

UNTIL AFTER NEW BUSINESS IS READ INTO THE RECORD. NEW BUSINESS COMPRISES ITEMS 32-46. AS YOU HAVE NOTICED THE CLERK IS HAVING SOME VOICE ISSUES. AND SO OUR SUBSTITUTE CLERK THIS EVENING WILL BE THE ONE AND ONLY COUNCILMAN TONY PIAGENTINI. WILL THE COUNCILMAN PLEASE READ THOSE ITEMS AND THEIR ASSIGNMENTS TO COMMITTEE.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. UNDER NEW BUSINESS. LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. 32. O-409-20. AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$10,000 FROM DISTRICT 19 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS, THROUGH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, TO THE CITY OF MIDDLETOWN TO PROVIDE NEEDED SAFETY EQUIPMENT FOR THE MIDDLETOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT. SPONSORS. OKAY. NEXT, 33. 412-20. AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$5,000 FROM DISTRICT 3 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS, THROUGH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, TO I WOULD RATHER BE READING FOR ASSISTANCE WITH A NON-TRADITIONAL INSTRUCTION (NTI) DAY CAMP FOR THE FAMILIES AND STUDENTS OF SHIVELY. 34. ORDINANCE 425-20. AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$5,000 FROM DISTRICT 18 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS, THROUGH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, TO PLAINVIEW RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION, INC. TO REPLACE TREES THAT HAVE DIED AS A RESULT OF THE EMERALD ASH BORER. THIS IS PART OF A LARGER PLAN TO ENHANCE THE TREE CANOPY, ADDING TO OVERALL QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE SURROUNDING AREA. LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO BUDGET COMMITTEE. 35. ORDINANCE 414-20. AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE LEVY OF TAXES

WITHIN THE LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT AND THE LOUISVILLE URBAN SERVICES DISTRICT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2021. LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, HEALTH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE. 36. O-413-20. AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW CHAPTER OF THE LOUISVILLE METRO CODE OF ORDINANCES TO PROHIBIT MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS FROM ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY CHANGE EFFORTS. LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO LABOR AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. 37. RESOLUTION 111-20. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACT FOR LMPHW CONCERNING SPECIALIZED PHYSICIAN SERVICES IN THE AREA OF CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY TREATMENT - DR. MARK JORRISCH, M.D. - \$183,960.00. . 38. RESOLUTION 112-20. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT FROM PARC CONCERNING MAINTENANCE SERVICE AND REPLACEMENT PARTS FOR PROPRIETARY PRODUCTS PURCHASED FROM - HUB PARKING TECHNOLOGY USA, INC. - \$299,140.74. 39. RESOLUTION 113-20. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT FOR PARC CONCERNING PARKING METER REPLACEMENT PARTS - POM, INCORPORATED - \$75,000.00. 40. RESOLUTION 114-20. A RESOLUTION

PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET ORDINANCES,  
APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE FOLLOWING  
NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT FOR EMS  
CONCERNING CPR, FIRST AID AND CARDIOVASCULAR CARE MATERIALS -  
AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, INC., - \$300,000.00. 41. RESOLUTION  
115-20. A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING  
BUDGET ORDINANCES, APPROVING THE APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE  
FOLLOWING NONCOMPETITIVELY NEGOTIATED PROFESSIONAL SERVICE  
CONTRACT FOR LMPD CONCERNING A COORDINATOR FOR THE SEXUAL  
ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAMINER PROGRAM - UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER,  
INC., D/B/A UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE HOSPITAL/JAMES GRAHAM BROWN  
CANCER CENTER - \$92,000.00. LEGISLATION FORWARDED FROM PLANNING  
AND ZONING COMMITTEE. 42. ORDINANCE 396-20. AN ORDINANCE CLOSING  
A PORTION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY KNOWN AS ANDERSON STREET AND AN  
ASSOCIATED, UNNAMED ALLEY CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 9,169 SQUARE  
FEET AND BEING IN LOUISVILLE METRO, CASE NO. 20STRCLOSURE0009.  
43. ORDINANCE 403-20. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE METRO LAND  
DEVELOPMENT CODE RELATING TO A REDUCTION OF MINIMUM PARKING  
REQUIREMENTS IN CERTAIN AREAS AS SUGGESTED IN PLAN 2040  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ("PLAN 2040") (CASE NO. 20-LDC-0001). 44.  
ORDINANCE 404-20. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 1.2.2 AND  
CREATING SECTION 4.3.24 OF THE LOUISVILLE METRO LAND DEVELOPMENT  
CODE ("LDC") REGARDING CHANGING IMAGE SIGNS (CASE NO. 20-LDC-  
0002). 45. ORDINANCE 405-20. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 1.2.2

AND CREATING SECTION 4.3.24 OF THE LOUISVILLE METRO LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE ("LDC") REGARDING SMOKING RETAIL STORES (CASE NO. 20-LDC-0003). LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE. 46. ORDINANCE 402-20. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SEVERAL SECTIONS OF THE LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT CODE OF ORDINANCES ("LMCO") SECTIONS 72.200 TO 72.999 (THE RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT PROGRAM ORDINANCE). THAT IS ALL NEW BUSINESS READ IN FULL. MADAM CLERK, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: WELL, COUNCILMAN, CLERK ASSISTANT, ANTHONY PIAGENTINI, THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR THAT.

>> MAKE THE CHECK OUT TO ANTHONY PIAGENTINI FOR THE EXTRA SERVICES, YOU'RE WELCOME, MR. PRESIDENT AND MADAM CLERK.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU SO VERY MUCH. COUNCILWOMAN BARBARA SEXTON SMITH.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I JUST WANT TO TAKE A MINUTE AND RECOGNIZE AND MAKE AN OFFICIAL STATEMENT ABOUT LABOR DAY COMING UP ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 7TH. THERE IS SO MANY THINGS GOING ON IN OUR CITY AND STATE AND OUR NATION AND WORLD RIGHT NOW. I THINK MAYBE FOLKS HAVE FORGOTTEN TO TAKE A BREATH AND THINK ABOUT ALL THE GREAT AMERICAN WORKERS. AND WE'RE GOING TO CELEBRATE LABOR DAY, AGAIN, ON THIS COMING MONDAY. AND FOR ANYONE WHO MAY NOT REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT THAT MOVEMENT IS ALL ABOUT, LABOR DAY WAS CREATED AND PLACED ON THE FIRST MONDAY IN SEPTEMBER TO CELEBRATE THE LABOR MOVEMENT. AND SPECIFICALLY, TO

THE DEDICATED AMERICAN WORKERS AND ALL THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS THEY HAVE ACHIEVED IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ACHIEVEMENTS. AND THIS CONSTITUTES THE YEARLY NATIONAL HOLIDAY. I THINK IT'S SAFE FOR ME TO SAY, I'M SURE MY COLLEAGUES ON THE METRO COUNCIL, JOIN ME IN THANKING THE GREAT WORKERS IN OUR COMMUNITY FOR ALL THE WORK THEY DO EVERY DAY. ONE DAY IS THE LEAST WE CAN DO TO STOP AND SAY THANK YOU. WE LOVE YOU, WE APPRECIATE YOU AND WE'VE GOT YOUR BACK. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN SEXTON SMITH. AMEN FOR LABOR. AND COUNCILMAN ENGEL.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND JUST WANT TO WEIGH IN ON OUR ASSISTANT CLERK. THE SPEED AT WHICH HE READ THOSE ANNOUNCEMENTS, I THOUGHT I COULD UNDERSTAND OUR CLERK WITH A TOUGHER VOICE RATHER THAN OUR PINCH HITTING ASSISTANT CLERK. BUT I REALLY APPRECIATE HIS TIME. BUT I WOULD SUGGEST PERHAPS THAT WE MAY CONSIDER MAYBE PARTIALLY PAYING HIS SALARY FOR THAT. BECAUSE HE READ SO FAST I WOULD LIKE FOR HIM TO REPEAT THE ANNOUNCEMENTS, IF I COULD. I'M JUST KIDDING. MR. PRESIDENT, THANKS FOR ALL YOUR WORK AND WHAT YOU DO. I WISH EVERYBODY A GREAT LABOR DAY WEEKEND. ALL THANK YOU ALL.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES: A GREAT LABOR DAY AND DERBY WEEKEND TO YOU TO. ANY FURTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS? ALL RIGHT. THAT CONCLUDES OUR MEETING. AND OUR NEXT COUNCIL MEETING IS THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER THE

17THAT 6 P.M. WITH NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO DISCUSS, WITHOUT  
OBJECTION, WE STAND ADJOURNED. [ GAVEL ]