

METRO COUNCIL MEETING 3/17/22

>>THE REGULAR LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH THE 17TH, 2022 WILL PLEASE COME TO ORDER. PLEASE RISE FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG.

>>I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND TO THE REPUBLIC FOR WHICH IT STANDS, ONE NATION, UNDER GOD, INDIVISIBLE, WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL.

>>THIS MEETING'S IS BEING HELD PURSUANT TO KRS 61.826 AND COUNCIL RULE FIVE A. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE NOTE THAT COUNCILMAN PARKER HAS AN EXCUSED ABSENCE.

>>SO NOTED.

>>AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PLEASE RECOGNIZE THAT WE HAVE A SPECIAL GUEST HERE TODAY, JUDGE JESSICA GREEN.

(COUNCIL MEMBERS APPLAUDING)

MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.

>>PRESENT.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>>PRESENT.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER PERVIS.

>>PRESENT.

>>PRESIDENT JAMES.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER MOVALHILL.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL, I'M SORRY, KRAMER. THANK YOU, I'M SORRY, COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLET.

>>HERE.

>>COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>>HERE.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER.
COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGONTINI.
>>HERE.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON.
>>PRESENT.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>>HERE.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER ENGLE.
>>PRESENT.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER PEIDEN.
>>HERE.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
>>HERE.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON STEWART.
>>HERE.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.
>>PRESENT.
>>COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER.
MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 22 IN DECORUM.
>>MR. PRESIDENT, COULD YOU CAUSE THE RECORD
TO REFLECT THAT I AM PRESENT?
>>YES.
>>I'M SORRY, I SKIPPED YOU
AND I THOUGHT YOU HAD ALREADY SAID YES. I'M SO SORRY.
>>NOT A PROBLEM.
>>YOU'RE MY FAVORITE, IT'S OKAY.
>>THANK YOU.
>>HE'S YOUR FAVORITE?
>>YOU WERE MY FAVORITE.
>>ALL RIGHT.
OH, THAT'S RIGHT, HE DID.
HE WAS SUCKING UP.
ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.
>>I THOUGHT I WAS YOUR FAVORITE.
>>ALL RIGHT, WELL, COLLEAGUES
LOUISVILLE IS FINALLY IN THE GREEN.
OUR COMMUNITY HAS DONE AN OUTSTANDING JOB
GETTING VACCINATED.
(MEMBERS APPLAUDING)
>>ALL RIGHT, I GOT MINE.
>>65% OF US HAVE COMPLETED THE VACCINE COURSE,
75.3 HAVE HAD AT LEAST THE FIRST DOSE.

WE HAVE STAYED PRETTY VIGILANT.
CDC GUIDANCE AND HAVE LOWERED OUR NUMBERS.
WHILE THIS IS A REASON TO CELEBRATE,
WE STILL NEED TO BE CAREFUL.
SINCE OUR LAST MEETING WE LOST 112 MORE
OF OUR COMMUNITY MEMBERS.
AND SO, AS WE GIVE THANKS FOR THE DECREASE IN THE NUMBERS
PLEASE KEEP THE FAMILIES WHO HAVE BEEN TOUCHED BY COVID
IN YOUR THOUGHTS AND YOUR PRAYERS
AND I ASK THAT WE HOLD THE PEOPLE OF THE UKRAINE
IN OUR PRAYERS AS THEY DEFEND FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY
IN THEIR COUNTRY.
PLEASE JOIN ME IN A MOMENT OF SILENCE.
THANK YOU.

MADAM CLERK, ARE THERE ANY ADDRESSES TO COUNSEL?

>>YES, SIR, THERE ARE.

>>LET ME REMIND THOSE ADDRESSING COUNSEL
TO PLEASE REFRAIN FROM USING ANY PROFANITY
OR MAKING DEROGATORY STATEMENTS TO COUNCIL MEMBERS.
MADAM CLERK.

>>JANE CHRISTENSEN.

>>HELLO, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR HEARING ME TODAY.
ON VALENTINE'S DAY IN 1990, HAVING PASSED NEPTUNE
ON ITS WAY TO OUTER SPACE, VOYAGER ONE WAS INSTRUCTED
TO TURN AROUND AND TAKE PHOTOS OF OUR SOLAR SYSTEM,
THE SUN AND THE PLANETS.
SOME OF YOU MAY HAVE SEEN THOSE PHOTOS.
EVERY TIME I LOOK AT ONE OF THEM,
I AM STUNNED AND OFTEN MOVED TO TEARS
FOR THERE IN THE DARKNESS, AT THE END OF A VAST SPACE,
ONE SEES ONLY A STREAK OF LIGHT WITHIN A MINUSCULE PALE DOT.
CARL SAGAN FAMOUSLY WROTE "LOOK AGAIN AT THAT DOT.
THAT'S HERE.
THAT'S HOME.
THAT'S US.

ON IT EVERYONE YOU LOVE, EVERYONE YOU KNOW,
EVERYONE YOU EVER HEARD OF, EVERY HUMAN BEING
WHO HAS EVER LIVED OUT THEIR LIVES
HAS LIVED THEIR LIVES HERE.

THE AGGREGATE OF OUR JOY AND SUFFERING,
THOUSANDS OF CONFIDENT RELIGIONS, IDEOLOGIES,
AND ECONOMIC DOCTRINES, EVERY HUNTER, FORAGER,
EVERY HERO AND COWARD, EVERY CREATOR
AND DESTROYER OF CIVILIZATION, EVERY KING AND PEASANT,
EVERY YOUNG COUPLE IN LOVE, EVERY MOTHER AND FATHER,
HOPEFUL CHILD, INVENTOR AND EXPLORER,

EVERY TEACHER OF MORALS, EVERY CORRUPT POLITICIAN,
EVERY SUPERSTAR, EVERY SUPREME LEADER,
EVERY SAINT AND SINNER IN THE HISTORY OF OUR SPECIES
LIVED THERE ON A MOTE OF DUST SUSPENDED IN A SUNBEAM."
THE RECENT REPORT OF THE IPCC,
THAT IS THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE,
A TOTAL OF 3,675 PAGES ASSESSES THE IMPACTS
OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON NATURE AND HUMANITY
AND CONCLUDES THAT THERE IS ONLY A SMALL WINDOW
OF OPPORTUNITY TO MODIFY SOME OF THE MOST DIRE CONSEQUENCES
OF CLIMATE DISRUPTION EVENTS THAT WILL AFFECT YOUR CHILDREN
THEIR CHILDREN, AND BEYOND.
IN FEBRUARY 2020, HERE IN THESE CHAMBERS,
LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL VOTED TO PASS A RESOLUTION
TO WORK ON AND ACHIEVE 100% RENEWABLE ENERGY
IN THE CITY BY 2050.
THE FIRST GOAL IS A HUNDRED PERCENT RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY
FOR METRO OPERATIONS BY 2030.
METRO COUNCIL MUST RENEW THE VOW TO SUPPORT THIS RESOLUTION
IN EVERY POSSIBLE WAY.
WE MUST FIND WAYS FOR THE CITY
TO GAIN SUPERVISION OF ITS ELECTRICAL USE.
WE MUST WORK ON THREE INTERACTIVE APPROACHES.
ENERGY CONVERSATION AND EFFICIENCY, ROOFTOP SOLAR,
AND LARGE SCALE UTILITY SOLAR.
ANYTHING LESS IS UNACCEPTABLE IN THE CURRENT CLIMATE.
I ENCOURAGE YOU ALL TO REGISTER
FOR A HUNDRED PERCENT REALS MAYOR'S FORUM
MODERATED BY TOM FITZGERALD ON MARCH 23RD.
FOR MORE INFORMATION, GO TO OUR WEBSITE REAL.ORG AND SIGNUP.
YOU WILL BE DOING A GREAT SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITY
AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE.
>>THANK YOU, EDWARD MORRIS.
>>GOOD EVENING, COUNCIL MEMBERS.
THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE HERE.
I LIVE IN DISTRICT 13 WITH MR. FOX AS MY COUNCIL PERSON,
I'M HERE TO SPEAK IN OPPOSITION
TO THE FIREARMS DISCHARGE ORDINANCE
THAT'S UP BEFORE YOU ALL.
I'M CURRENTLY THE PRESIDENT OF THE THIRD DISTRICT
FOR THE LEAGUE OF KENTUCKY SPORTSMEN.
WE REPRESENT THE 980,000 HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE HOLDERS
IN THE STATE OF OF KENTUCKY
AND 90,000 HERE IN METRO LOUISVILLE, ALONE.
WHILE I APPRECIATE AND UNDERSTAND THE INTENT
OF THE ORIGINAL BILL TO GET RID OF THE YAHOO'S

WHO LIKE TO GO OUTSIDE ON THE 4TH OF JULY
OR NEW YEAR'S EVE AND FIRE THEIR WEAPONS INTO THE AIR,
NOBODY WANTS THAT.
WE DON'T THINK THIS BILL IS THE OPPORTUNITY
OR THE RIGHT CHOICE FOR THAT TYPE OF LEGISLATION.
HUNTING AND FISHING IN KENTUCKY IS A \$6 BILLION BUSINESS
THAT GENERATES A \$800 MILLION A YEAR
IN STATE AND LOCAL TAXES.
WE ARE A FORMIDABLE FORCE
AND OF COURSE, WE HASTEN TO THE PULPIT
ON SECOND AMENDMENT ISSUES.
MY PARTICULAR CONCERN WITH THIS BILL IS THE WORDING.
I THINK IT'S A LITTLE VAGUE,
I THINK IT LEAVES A LOT TO ENFORCEMENT, A LOT TO DISCRETION.
WHEN YOU SAY THAT I CAN'T SHOOT
WITHIN 300 FEET OF A STRUCTURE, DOES THAT MEAN
I CAN'T WALK OUT ON MY 48 ACRES OUT IN FAIRDALE,
WHERE I HAVE AN OLD TOBACCO BARN
AND AN OLD SHED FALLING DOWN,
DO THEY CLASSIFY AS A STRUCTURE,
OR DOES IT HAVE TO BE A DWELLING HOUSE?
DOES IT HAVE TO BE INHABITED?
THAT WORD STRUCTURE LEAVES A LOT TO BE DESIRED.
IT COULD ELIMINATE ME GOING OUT THERE WITH MY GRANDDAUGHTERS
ON THE WEEKENDS AND SHOOTING CLAY TARGETS
BECAUSE WE SHOOT OUT IN THE AREA OF AN OLD BARN.
THERE'S A GENTLEMAN THERE IN FAIRDALE,
MR. AVIS, WHO PROBABLY SPENT \$10,000
TO BUILD A VERY, VERY NICE SHOOTING RANGE ON HIS PROPERTY
BUT IT SITS 75 YARDS OFF THE ROAD.
THE BOY SCOUTS USE THAT, FISH AND WILDLIFE
HAS YOUTH TRAINING EVENTS THERE
AND THEY TEACH CARRY CONCEALED LICENSE.
IT WILL PUT HIS STRUCTURE, IT WILL MAKE HIM ILLEGAL
FOR HIM TO BRING ANY MORE KIDS OUT THERE
AND SHOOT LIKE HE DOES ON A REGULAR BASIS
BECAUSE HE'S WITHIN 75 YARDS AND NOT 100 YARDS.
THERE'S A LOT OF EXAMPLES, ESPECIALLY THOSE OF US
WHO LIVE OUTSIDE THE GENE SNYDER,
I'M RUNNING A LITTLE BIT LOW, I CAN'T GET INTO EVERYTHING
BUT ONE OF THE THINGS I WANNA BRING UP, I SAID IN MEETINGS,
MANY MEETINGS BACK WHEN MERGER CAME ABOUT
AND THE FIREARMS BILL, THIS MIRRORS
THE OLD CITY OF LOUISVILLE ORDINANCE
ON DISCHARGING WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS.
AND DURING THOSE MEETINGS FOR MERGER

WE WERE PROMISED, THE SPORTSMEN WERE
THAT THIS BILL WOULD NEVER COME BACK
AND WE WOULD NEVER SEE ANOTHER FIREARM DISCHARGE BILL,
YET HERE WE ARE AGAIN.

AND WE'RE RIGHT BACK TO WHERE WE STARTED
AND WE WERE PROMISED THAT THAT WOULD NOT OCCUR.
SO AGAIN, I URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON THE BILL.

I THINK IT'S AWFUL VAGUE,
LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS HAVE TOLD ME
IT'S AN ENFORCEMENT NIGHTMARE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

>>THANK YOU, STUART RAY.

(MAN COUGHING)

>>GOOD EVENING,

I'M STUART RAY AND I LIVE IN EASTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY.

AND FIRST AND FOREMOST, I ECHO MR. MORRIS'S COMMENTS ABOUT
ALL THE SPORTING REASONS.

HE ADDRESSED HUNTING AND FISHING BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY
A LOT OF PREPARATION GOES INTO HUNTING AND FISHING.

AND EVEN IN JEFFERSON COUNTY, WITHIN THE CLOSE PROXIMITY
OF SOME STRUCTURES, YOUTH PRACTICE

THE SAFE DISCHARGE OF FIREARM.

THERE'S 100 ACRE FARMS IN JEFFERSON COUNTY

AND YOU CAN SAFELY DISCHARGE A FIREARM.

AND ALSO TO MR. MORRIS'S POINT, WE REALIZE THE INTENT
OF THIS BILL IS TO RESTRICT

THE FRIVOLENT DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS UP INTO THE AIR,
SOMETIMES CELEBRATORY WHICH IS JUST RIDICULOUS.

RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERS TOTALLY APPRECIATE THE INTENTION
OF WHERE WE DISCHARGE A FIREARM

AND ANYONE THAT WOULD DISCHARGE A FIREARM

FRIVOLOUSLY LIKE THAT, THEY'RE ALREADY COMMITTING

POTENTIALLY A CLASSY D FELONY AND WANT ENDANGERMENT.

SO IF YOU SHOOT A FIREARM UP INTO THE AIR

OR YOU DON'T KNOW ITS INTENDED DIRECTION,

YOU'VE ALREADY POTENTIALLY COMMITTED A FELONY.

AND THAT IS MY UNDERLYING POINT.

I DON'T THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE BENEFICIAL

IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM,

I THINK IT WILL BE A ENFORCEMENT NIGHTMARE.

AND WHAT PERSON THAT'S FRIVOLENTLY DISCHARGING A FIREARM
IS GOING TO THINK,

"OH THERE'S A JEFFERSON COUNTY ORDINANCE THAT PREVENTS ME
FROM DOING THAT

AS OPPOSED TO THE FACT.

SO THAT'S MY UNDERLYING POINT. I

REALLY APPRECIATE YOU ALL TRYING TO PASS SOME RESTRICTIONS THAT IMPROVES THE SAFETY WITHIN OUR COMMUNITY. BUT I DON'T BELIEVE THIS IS IT EITHER. AND I DO BELIEVE THAT WANTON ENDANGERMENT COVERS EVERY INTENTION. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> THANK YOU. ZOEY SWATTER.

>> HELLO. MY NAME IS ZOEY SWATTER. I CAN REMEMBER SEEING SAFE STREETS GROWING UP IN 1990S. BUT IT WAS SOMETHING I SAW REGULARLY IN DOWNTOWN LOUISVILLE. IT BECAME A PART OF MY EVERYDAY ROUTINE AS IT BECAME EVERYONE ELSE'S AND IT MADE TEACHERS AND STUDENTS ALIKE INCREDIBLY SAD TO WITNESS. NOTICE I DIDN'T SAY IT MADE US UNCOMFORTABLE, IT JUST MADE US SAD. HOMELESSNESS IN ALL AREAS. WHEN I SEE SOMEONE THAT'S HOMELESS, I SEE MYSELF IN THEM. I SEE MY FAMILY IN THEM AND MY FRIENDS IN THEM. I ALWAYS SEE HUMANITY IN THEM BECAUSE I KNOW IT TAKES ONE CRISIS TO MAKE US HOMELESS. I COULD EASILY SEE HOW IT COULD HAPPEN TO ANYONE IN AN UNFORTUNATE AND UNLUCKY TURN OF EVENTS. THINKING ABOUT THE HIGH COST OF RENT AND LACK OF SOCIAL SERVICES IN LOUISVILLE, STATISTICALLY EVERYONE IN THIS ROOM IS CLOSER TO BECOMING HOMELESS THAN BECOMING A BILLIONAIRE. IT'S A SYSTEMIC ISSUE AND A TOP REASON IS POVERTY. WHILE THE COST OF HOUSING IS HIGH AND HAPPENING EVERYWHERE ACROSS THE NATION, IT'S WORTH NOTING THAT INVESTIGATING LOUISVILLE'S VICTIM RATE WAS TWO TIMES THE NATIONAL AVERAGE. -- THIS IS A

RESULT OF OUR LACK OF 30,000 AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS IN OUR COMMUNITY HERE IN LOUISVILLE. IT MAKES BEING ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE LARGER COMPLEX BUILDINGS DIFFICULT. I WOULD LOVE TO SEE THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE TAKE ACTION FOR ITS CITIZENS AND ADMIT THE HOMELESS POPULATION ARE CITIZENS AND HAVE DIGNITY, TOO. HERE'S MY ASKS. ONE, I HOPE TO SEE LOUISVILLE CONTINUE TO FUND THE AFFORDABLE TRUSTFUND. TWO, APPROVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS AND ZONING CHANGES AND PROMOTE THE USE OF MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE. THREE, CONTINUE TO SUPPORT AND FUND THE RIGHT TO COUNCIL ORDINANCE IN LOUISVILLE TO HELP PREVENT HOMELESSNESS. I WANT TO SAY THAT I'M APPALLED AT THE LOSS OF HUMAN LIFE. I MOURN FOR THE FAMILIES OF THOSE AND I WORRY ABOUT HOW OUR UNHOUSED CITIZENS TOO. -- HOLD PEOPLE ACCOUNTABLE, ADDRESS THE BACKLOG OF BENCH WARRANTS THAT OFTEN FOLLOW PEOPLE THAT ARE HOMELESS. IF HOMELESSNESS IS NOT BEING ADDRESSED -- THANK YOU.

>> DR. SANDRA MAGUIRE.

>> OKAY. THIS IS DR. SANDRA MAGUIRE. I HAVE JUST MOVED TO LOUISVILLE ABOUT THREE YEARS AGO. AND I WANTED TO SPEAK IN FAVOR OF THE MIXED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES THAT ARE OUT THERE. IT HAS COME TO MY ATTENTION THAT MY COUNCILMAN, DR. PIAJ DENTE -- HAS SENT OUT PROPOSALS IN OPPOSITION TO THIS. I JUST WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT I AM VERY IN FAVOR OF THE MIXED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. WE DEFINITELY NEED MORE HOUSING

HERE IN LOUISVILLE. I AM ALSO SERVING ON THE LOUISVILLE, ONE OF THEIR INTEREST GROUPS. WE DEFINITELY -- ONE THING WE'RE FOCUSING ON IS MORE INTERGENERATIONAL HERE IN LOUISVILLE. SOME OF THESE OPTIONS FOR HOUSING COULD ACTUALLY HELP SUPPORT MORE INTERGENERATIONAL. THEY COULD HELP INCREASE OUR ISSUES WITH DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION. AND OFFER HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES MORE ACROSS THE LIFESPAN. I JUST THINK THAT THESE INCENTIVES WOULD BENEFIT EVERYONE. SO I JUST WANT TO SAY I SUPPORT THEM AND I DO NOT SUPPORT OPPOSITION TO THEM. SO THAT WAS MY STATEMENT. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, THAT CONCLUDES THE ADDRESS TO COUNCIL.

>> THANK YOU, MADAM CLERK.

>> I JUST WANT TO RECOGNIZE A COUPLE OF PEOPLE THAT CAME IN. WE HAVE THE MAYOR, BEVERLY BURTON. AND WE HAVE SHANELL THOMPSON, COUNCIL MEMBER THERE. RAISE YOUR HAND. THANKS FOR BEING HERE. COLLEAGUES, OUR FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS IS TO FILL THE VACANCY OF THE DISTRICT 1 REPRESENTATIVE. ON MONDAY, WE INTERVIEWED NINE FINE CANDIDATES TO FILL THE VACANCY OF THE DISTRICT 1 COUNCIL SEAT. I TAKE THAT BACK, EIGHT CANDIDATES. PLEASE NOTE THAT DUSTIN HEATH COX HAS WITHDRAWN HER NAME THIS MORNING. I'LL GO OVER THE PROCESS WE'RE GOING TO USE THIS EVENING TO SELECT THE CANDIDATE. ALL THE CANDIDATES ARE CONSIDERED NOMINATIONS.

THEREFORE, WE WILL NOT CALL FOR NOMINATIONS. MS. BURKE WILL CONDUCT A VOICE ROLL CALL. A CANDIDATE MUST RECEIVE 13 VOTES TO BE APPOINTED BECAUSE WE CURRENTLY HAVE 25 COUNCIL MEMBERS AND 13 CONSTITUTES THE MAJORITY. IN THE EVENT THAT NO PERSON RECEIVES THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF VOTES, WE WILL CONTINUE TO VOTE UNTIL A PERSON RECEIVES 13 VOTES. THE CLERK WILL CALL EACH COUNCIL MEMBER'S NAME. WHEN CALLED, EACH MEMBER WILL STATE THE NAME OF THEIR CHOICE FOR THE NEW DISTRICT 1 COUNCIL MEMBER. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCIL PRESIDENT. SHOUT OUT TO THE CANDIDATES. IT IS SO HARD RUNNING FOR OFFICE ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU COME FROM A LIFE OF STRUGGLE LIKE SO MANY BROTHERS AND SISTERS. CAN WE CLAP IT UP FOR THE CANDIDATES ONE TIME.

[APPLAUSE]

>> WITH THAT BEING SAID, I DO NOT LIKE THE PROCESS OF ELECTED OFFICIALS CHOOSING ELECTED OFFICIALS. I STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT THE VOTERS WITHIN. THAT'S WHY TONIGHT, I PERSONALLY WILL NOT BE VOTING FOR. -- OTHERWISE YOU WOULD BASICALLY GET ENDORSED BY ME OR WHOEVER ELSE VOTES FOR THAT CANDIDATE TONIGHT AHEAD OF A PRIMARY ELECTION. SO IF YOU LIVE IN DISTRICT 1 AND YOU ARE INTERESTED IN BEING POLITICALLY ENGAGED, PLEASE DO YOUR RESEARCH. TALK WITH CANDIDATES. ASK QUESTIONS. SHARE YOUR AGENDA WITH THEM. PLEASE ENGAGE IN THAT PROCESS. THAT IS DEMOCRACY.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. ANY
QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? ALL
RIGHT. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL
THE ROLL.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.

>> ANGELA --

>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> --

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> --

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.

>> -- WIGGINGTON.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER REID.

>> EDGINGTON.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.

>> --

>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.

>> KEVAN WINGINGTON.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.

>> KEVIN WINGINGTON.

>> --

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> --

>> ANGELA BOWEN.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 17
VOTES FOR ANGELA BOWEN.

FIVE VOTES FOR KEVIN WINGINGTON
AND ONE VOTE FOR CHARLIE BELL.

>> THANK YOU. ANGELA BOWEN,
CONGRATULATIONS, YOU'RE THE NEW

COUNCIL MEMBER.

[APPLAUSE]

>> ANGELA BOWEN, COULD YOU PLEASE COME FORWARD.

>> MADAM JUDGE.

>> PLEASE COME OUT HERE.

>> ACCORDING TO LAW AND ORDINANCE.

>> ACCORDING TO LAW AND ORDINANCE.

>> DO YOU SWEAR, MA'AM, YOU BEING THE CITIZEN OF THIS COMMONWEALTH --

>> --

>> AND DO YOU FURTHER SOLEMNLY SWEAR.

>> I SOLEMNLY SWEAR.

>> THAT YOU HAVE THE QUALIFICATIONS.

>> I HAVE THE QUALIFICATIONS.

>> AND THAT YOU ARE FREE OF DISQUALIFICATION.

>> I'M FREE OF DISQUALIFICATION.

>> DESCRIBED IN SECTION --

>> DESCRIBED IN SECTION --

>> OF THE KENTUCKY REVISED --

>> IF YOU'RE IN AGREEMENT, PLEASE SAY I WILL.

>> I WILL.

>> CONGRATULATIONS COUNCILWOMEN.

[APPLAUSE]

>> SO MS. BOWEN, I KNOW THIS IS A MOMENT. BUT WE'RE GOING TO GIVE YOU THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO OUT TO THE PODIUM THERE AND SAY A FEW WORDS TO EVERYBODY. INTRODUCE YOURSELF.

>> I'D LIKE TO THANK ALL OF Y'ALL.

AND I HOPE THAT I CAN DO WHAT YOU NEED ME DO. JESSICA, I WILL DO THE BEST TO CONTINUE WHAT YOU'VE DONE HERE. YOU HAVE SOME BIG SHOES TO FOLLOW. BUT I JUST DEFINITELY WANT TO REPRESENT DISTRICT 1, AND I CAN'T THANK

YOU FROM THE BOTTOM OF MY HEART.
THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

[APPLAUSE]

>> SO JUST A TECHNICAL
CORRECTION, I CALLED YOU MS.
BOWEN, IT'S ACTUALLY MS. BOWENS.
I APOLOGIZE. IF YOU CAN STAND UP
THERE AND TAKE A PICTURE. JUDGE
GREEN, IF YOU COULD ASSIST WITH
THAT, PLEASE.

>> AND JUST FOR EVERYBODY THAT
MAY BE WONDERING, THIS IS OUR
NEW COUNCILWOMAN'S HUSBAND. SAY
HI. WELCOME TO THE SHOW.

>> AND FOR THOSE THAT ARE
WONDERING, COUNCILWOMAN BOWENS'
HUSBAND NAME IS COLIN. WE'RE
GOING TO TAKE A FEW MINUTES AND
ALLOW THE CLERK TO INSTRUCT OUR
NEW COUNCILWOMAN ON A FEW
TECHNICAL THINGS. I'LL TAKE A
MOTION FOR A 10-MINUTE RECESS,
PLEASE.

>> MOTION TO STAND IN RECESS.

>> MOTION.

>> SECOND.

>> SECOND ARTHUR.

>> ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> 10-MINUTE RECESS.

>>> WE ARE BACK FROM OUR RECESS.
I'D LIKE TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR
BEING BACK IN 10 MINUTES. MADAM
CLERK, PLEASE LET THE RECORD
REFLECT THAT COUNCIL MEMBER
BOWENS HAS JOINED THE MEETING
AND WILL PARTICIPATE IN ALL
BUSINESS.

>> SO NOTED.

>> NEXT, WE HAVE APPROVAL OF
COUNCIL MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR
MEETING. FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
ON MARCH 3RD, 2022. ARE THERE
ANY QUESTIONS OR DELETIONS?

>> MOTION TO ACCEPT.

>> WE HAVE A MOTION BY
COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT. SECOND BY
COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> --

>> THESE MINUTES ARE APPROVED AS
WRITTEN. NEXT, WE HAVE APPROVAL
OF COMMITTEE MINUTES. MARCH 3,
2022. REGULAR PLANNING AND
ZONING COMMITTEE, MARCH 8, 2022.
REGULAR PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE,
MARCH 8, 2022. REGULAR
GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT AND AUDIT
COMMITTEE MARCH 8, 2022. REGULAR
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS HOUSING HEALTH
AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE MARCH 9,
2022. REGULAR PUBLIC SAFETY
COMMITTEE MARCH 9, 2022. REGULAR
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE,
MARCH 9, 2022. REGULAR
SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE,
MARCH 10, 2022. EQUITY AND
INCLUSION MARCH 10, 2022.
REGULAR BUDGET COMMITTEE
MARCH 10, 2022. SPECIAL
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE,
MARCH 14, 2022. REGULAR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
MARCH 15, 2022. ARE THERE ANY
CORRECTIONS OR DELETIONS?

>> MOTION TO ACCEPT.

>> MOTION BY COUNCILMAN
TRIPLETT.

>> SECOND.

>> SECOND BY COUNCILMAN
PIAGENTINI. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR
PLEASE SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSE. AYES HAVE IT. THESE
MINUTES ARE APPROVED. MADAM
CLERK, DO WE HAVE ANY --

>> YES, WE DO. -- REAPPOINTMENT
TERM EXPIRES MARCH 23, 2025. --
MATTHEW AYRES WITH A NEW -- TERM
EXPIRES APRIL 15, 2025. -- TANYA
MANGRUM, APRIL 15, 2025. -- I AM
APPOINTING THE FOLLOWING TO THE

-- THIS IS TO BE READ INTO THE RECORD. NO APPROVAL NEEDED. I'M APPOINTING THE FOLLOWING TO THE LOUISVILLE METRO TREE ADVISORY COMMITTEE. -- PRESIDENT JAMES, I'M REAPPOINTING THE FOLLOWING, JENNIFER GREEN, GUILLERMO SOLANO -- REAPPOINTMENT TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2025. -- READ IN FULL.

>> THANK YOU, MADAM CLERK. THOSE APPOINTMENTS NEEDING COUNCIL APPROVAL.

THE NEXT ORDER OF BUSINESS IS CONSENT CALENDAR. ITEMS 22 THROUGH 38. ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS? MADAM CLERK, A READING OF THESE ITEMS, PLEASE.

>> LEGISLATION SUPPORTED FROM THE -- ORDINANCE 08 -- RELATED TO THE FISCAL YEAR OPERATING BUDGET FOR LOUISVILLE METRO COUNTY GOVERNMENT. -- LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCIL. ITEM 23 -- THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS FORWARDED FROM THE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS HEALTH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE. HONORING THE WORK BY DEDICATING THE NORTHERN CORNER OF 25TH AND MONTGOMERY STREET SOON TO BE NAMED IN HIS HONOR. -- ITEM 26, RESOLUTION HONORING THE WORK OF BILLY AND SUSAN JOHNSON BY DEDICATING A PORTION OF THE STREET TO BE NAMED BILLY AND SUSAN JOHNSON WAY IN THEIR HONOR. ITEM 27, A REAPPOINTMENT OF LISA -- ITEM 26, REAPPOINTMENT OF EDWARD KUG -- TERM EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2023. ITEM 30, A REAPPOINTMENT OF HEROLD REYNOLDS TO THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD TERM EXPIRES MARCH 21, 2025. -- ITEM 32, RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE CAPITAL BUDGET. -- LOUISVILLE

METRO PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELLNESS
FOR ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR
LOUISVILLE METRO. 52,500 -- ITEM
33, RESOLUTION -- FOR CIVIC
INFORMATION IN TECHNOLOGY
CONCERNING UTILITY SERVICES.
\$100,000. ITEM 34, OPERATING
BUDGET ORDINANCES APPROVING
APPROPRIATION FUND -- 323,620.
-- ORDINANCES APPROVING THE
APPROPRIATIONS FUND FOR THE
OFFICE OF SAFE AND HEALTHY
NEIGHBORHOODS -- BEHAVIORAL
THERAPY PROGRAM UNIVERSITY OF
PITTSBURGH, 42,498. ITEM 36,
RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A
CAPITAL ENERGY INNOVATION FUND,
EIF TO SUPPORT CLEAN ENERGY. --
THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS
SUPPORTED PUBLIC WORK COMMITTEE.
ITEM 37, RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING
JEFFERSON COUNTY TURN TO BRING
ACTION AGAINST -- PARCEL NUMBER
60 IN CONNECTION WITH THE OHIO
RIVER LEVY TRAIL BASE THREE. --
REPLACEMENT PROJECT.
>> THANK YOU. CAN I HAVE A
MOTION AND A SECOND.
>> MOTION TO APPROVE BY FOX.
>> MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.
SECOND BY PIAGENTINI. MADAM
CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS. SHE
SAID PRESENT. THANK YOU. COUNCIL
MEMBER SHANKLIN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.
>> YES.
>> PRESIDENT JAMES.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.
>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REID.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
>> -- YES.
>> DR. PIAGENTINI.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON, I'M
SORRY.
>> --
>> IS YOUR VOTE YES?
>> YES.
>> THANK YOU. COUNCIL MEMBER
GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
>> YES. MR. PRESIDENT, YOU --
>> THANK YOU. THE CONSENT
CALENDAR PASSED. -- STATES THAT
AN ITEM MAY BE PASSED AT A
MEETING OF THE COUNCIL WHICH
INTRODUCED -- MAY I HAVE A
MOTION AND A SECOND.
>> SO MOVED.
>> MOTION BY COUNCILMAN PEDEN.
SECOND BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER.
AYES HAVE IT.
>> -- ASSIST WITH THE
INVESTIGATION REGARDING
LOUISVILLE METRO DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS -- READ IN FULL.
>> THANK YOU. MAY I HAVE A
MOTION.
>> MOTION TO APPROVE, INGLE.
>> MOTION BY INGLE. SECOND BY

COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. ANY DISCUSSIONS? COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> VOTING ON THE CONTRACT FOR DAVID BIER TO BEGIN THE INVESTIGATION THAT WE VOTED TO APPROVE LAST COUNCIL MEETING. I WOULD POINT OUT THAT TRAGICALLY ANOTHER INMATE HAS DIED IN CUSTODY AT METRO CORRECTIONS SINCE WE HAD THAT VOTE. BUT NOW THE COUNT IS HIGHER. IT'S NOW SEVEN. HIGHLIGHT A FEW PROCEDURAL MATTERS AND WHY WE'RE VOTING ON A CONTRACT WITH MR. BIER. WE TALKED OPENLY IF ANYBODY HAD ANY RECOMMENDATIONS. WE DID NOT RECEIVE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS. WE DID RECEIVE FROM SEVERAL COUNCIL MEMBERS, THANK YOU FOR THOSE REACHING OUT VOICING THEIR SUPPORT FOR MR. BIER'S WORK ON THE FIRST INVESTIGATION. HE DID OUR WORK ON THE PARK INVESTIGATION. I THINK HE DID A VERY GOOD JOB THERE. I DO WANT TO HIGHLIGHT A LITTLE BIT ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND. ALTHOUGH I DO WANT TO BE SUPER CLEAR ABOUT THIS. WE ARE HIRING HIM AS AN INVESTIGATOR. THAT IS THE PURPOSE OF WHAT WE ARE DOING. WE ARE NOT HIRING HIM EXCLUSIVELY REALLY -- I HAVE HIS CV, HIS BIO IN MY HAND. IN ADDITION TO BEING PRACTICING ATTORNEY AND A FORMER FBI INVESTIGATOR, HE IS CURRENTLY A UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE ADJUNCT PROFESSOR. TOPICS INCLUDING USE OF FORCE, CORRECTIONS LAW, UNEMPLOYMENT LAW. WHEN HE WAS FIRST DOWN IN THE OKLAHOMA CITY OFFICE OF THE FBI -- I'M QUOTING FROM HIS BIO, IN THIS ASSIGNMENT, WHITE COLLAR

INVESTIGATION, CIVIL RIGHT MATTERS, INCLUDING TREATMENT OF INMATES AT JAILS, FACILITIES, AS WELL AS BANK ROBBERIES AND DRUG INVESTIGATIONS. FINALLY, AGAIN, THIS IS SORT OF HIGHLIGHTING HIS WORK OVER AT UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE. HE PROVIDES INSTRUCTION TO CORRECTIONS ADMINISTRATORS ON VARIOUS TOPICS INCLUDING USE OF FORCE, CIVIL RIGHTS MATTERS -- IN ADDITION TO HIS EXPERTISE IN INVESTIGATIVE MATTERS, HIS HISTORY OF WORK WITH US, I WOULD ASK FOR A UNANIMOUS SUPPORT TO GET THIS INVESTIGATION MOVING AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE SO WE CAN GET TO THE BOTTOM OF WHAT'S GOING ON ACROSS THE STREET OVER AT METRO CORRECTIONS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN ARTHUR?
>> DEFINITELY IN SUPPORT OF THE INVESTIGATION. MORE IMPORTANTLY, HOW WE DO THAT INVESTIGATION. I KNOW THERE ARE SO MANY DOCUMENTS BURIED WITHIN OUR SYSTEM THAT I WOULD LIKE TO UNEARTH FOR THE PUBLIC THAT HAVE SHARED THEIR CONCERNS WITH ME. THE FIRST QUESTION I'D LIKE TO ASK IS THE INTENT GOING INTO THE INVESTIGATION AND THE OUTPUT COMING OUT OF THE INVESTIGATION. A NUMBER OF ARE -- REFORMS HAVE BEEN SHARED. GOING INTO THIS KNOWING THERE WILL BE RECOMMENDATIONS EITHER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OR FOR US LEGISLATIVELY TO APPROACH WHEN WE GET THE RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION.
>> CONGRESSMAN PIAGENTINI.
>> SO A COUPLE OF THINGS TO HELP PUT YOURSELF AND SOME

CONSTITUENTS WHO HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROCESS. FIRST OF ALL, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT DAVID DID DURING THE PARK INVESTIGATION, I'M SURE HE'LL DO IT AGAIN WITH THIS ONE, IS START OUT BY TALKING WITH COUNCIL MEMBERS. HE'LL START WITH COUNCILMAN ACKERSON AND MYSELF, I'M SURE HE'LL MEET WITH ANYONE TO DISCUSS INFORMATION YOU MAY HAVE. DOCUMENTS HE SHOULD BE LOOKING IN TO AND QUESTIONING. HE WILL, AS HE DID DURING THE PARK INVESTIGATION, IF THE ADMINISTRATION OR ANY MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATION BLOCKED HIS ABILITY TO GET THAT INFORMATION -- REPRESENTING US AS LEGAL COUNCIL BECAUSE THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE CONFLICTED. WE CAN SUBPOENA THOSE DOCUMENTS OR SUBPOENA TESTIMONY FROM PEOPLE WHO REFUSE TO COOPERATE WITH THE INVESTIGATION. WE HAVE ADDITIONAL LAYERS. AND THEN WHAT WE DID LAST TIME AND I THINK IT'S BEST PRACTICE. WE'LL BE DOING IT. WE'LL HAVE AT LEAST ONE INTERIM REPORT, MAYBE MULTIPLE DEPENDING. GIVE US BASIC UPDATES WITH HOW THINGS ARE GOING. DO THAT WITH PRIVATE COUNCIL MEMBERS AS WELL. AND THEN OF COURSE THERE WILL BE A FULL BLOWN WRITTEN REPORT OF EVERYTHING HE FOUND INCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS, WHICH IS WHAT HE DID FOR THE PARK INVESTIGATION.

>> I'VE HEARD CONCERNS ABOUT HIS EXPERTISE. -- NONE OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE BROUGHT FORTH, IS THAT CORRECT?

>> THAT'S CORRECT. AT THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING THERE WAS

QUESTIONS ABOUT LOOKING AT OTHER CANDIDATES. OF COURSE WE'RE OPEN TO HAVING ANY CANDIDATES. TECHNICALLY THE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT AND AUDIT COMMITTEE IS THE BODY THAT OVERSEES INVESTIGATIONS. I REACHED OUT TO SPECIFICALLY, EMAILED ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE JUST TO ASK IF ANYONE HAD ANY RECOMMENDATIONS. I DIDN'T RECEIVE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT WE DID GET SEVERAL EMAILS VOICING THEIR SUPPORT WITH MR. BIER. I INCLUDED CURRENTLY WHERE HE IS -- HIS BACKGROUND IN THE FBI, INCLUDING INVESTIGATING CIVIL RIGHTS MATTERS. HE DOES HAVE SPECIFIC.

>> COULD YOU SPEAK TO THE TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION.

>> THAT'S TOUGH. THAT'S GOING TO BE HARD TO KNOW THAT. AND ONLY BECAUSE IT IS PREDICATED ON -- NOW THE RESOLUTION THAT WE PASSED WEEKS AGO DOES SET PARAMETERS FOR THE INVESTIGATION. WHICH IS INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT PARTICULARLY WHEN WE GO TO DOCUMENTS AND THOSE TYPES OF THINGS. HE CERTAINLY WON'T DEVIATE AND VIOLATE THE BOUNDARIES OF THE INVESTIGATION. WITH THAT SAID, THAT USUALLY WHAT WE DO IS AFTER HE'S DONE SOME OF HIS INITIAL INTERVIEWS, HE'S DONE SOME OF HIS INITIAL DOCUMENT REQUESTS. USUALLY WHEN THAT'S ALL DONE, HE CAN GIVE BETTER SENSE ON TIMING. I WANT THIS DONE AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE, BUT AT THE SAME TIME YOU WANT IT DONE AS THOROUGHLY. THE TIMING IS GOING TO BE TRADE OFF DICTATED BY THE COMMITTEE ON

HOW MUCH FURTHER HE'LL GO VERSUS HOW MUCH HE CAN WRAP UP. THESE INVESTIGATIONS HAVE BEEN LIVE AS IN THE PARK INVESTIGATION. THERE WERE TIMES HE ASKED QUESTIONS, HEY, I LEARNED THIS. SHOULD I GO DOWN THIS WAY. WE MADE DECISIONS ON YEAH, THAT MAKES SENSE. NO, THIS DOESN'T. THIS IS FAR ENOUGH. RIGHT. OKAY. THINGS LIKE THAT. HARD FOR ME TO SAY RIGHT NOW. IT'S JUST GOING TO BE AS EXPEDITIOUS BUT AS THOROUGH AS POSSIBLE.

>> AND LAST QUESTION, IT MIGHT BE OPENED UP FOR ANYONE ON COUNCIL WHO WAS HERE AT THE TIME. I'M JUST CURIOUS ABOUT THE ACTION THAT THIS BODY TOOK OR ANY BODY TOOK AS A RESULT OF THE PARK INVESTIGATION.

>> I'LL JUST START JUST BECAUSE I INITIATED THE PARK INVESTIGATION AND I INITIATED ONE OF THE FEW LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS THAT WERE TAKEN. FIRST OF ALL, THE PARK INVESTIGATION WAS RUN SIMULTANEOUS TO -- AND TO COME DEGREE YOU CAN ARGUE THIS IS HAPPENING HERE AS WELL. AT THE TIME THE PARK BOARD ENGAGED WITH THEIR OWN INVESTIGATORS TO TAKE A LOOK AT WHAT'S GOING ON. SO WE COOPERATED WITH THEM. I KNOW THE MAYOR'S OFFICE HAS HIRED TWO NEW STAFF MEMBERS AND SOME EXPERTS AT CORRECTIONS. OUR INVESTIGATOR WILL COOPERATE WITH THEM. NOW WE'RE INVESTIGATING THE ADMINISTRATION. SO IT WILL BE A TRUST AND VERIFY. I WOULD ARGUE THAT THERE WAS EXECUTIVE ACTION AND THINGS THAT HAPPENED ALMOST IMMEDIATELY AFTER INVESTIGATION FROM BOTH INVESTIGATIONS CAME

OUT. BASED ON THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS. WHAT WE HAVE TONIGHT AND WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT JUST A LITTLE BIT LATER IS SORT OF THE LEGISLATION -- THE LEGISLATIVE CULMINATION OF THE INVESTIGATION. YOU KNOW, THE RECOMMENDATIONS LEGISLATIVELY. SO THAT HAS SOME MORE UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHY WE COULDN'T TAKE IMMEDIATE LEGISLATIVE ACTION. WHEN THIS INVESTIGATION IS OVER, OR QUITE FRANKLY, EVEN WHEN WE GET INTERIM REPORTS, IF WE FIND THERE ARE TIMES THERE'S ACTIONS WE WANT TO TAKE -- LEGISLATIVELY, WE CAN TAKE THEM IMMEDIATELY. BECAUSE WE HAVE JURISDICTION.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I WILL ASK FOR THE PUBLIC HOW MUCH IS THIS CONTRACT?

>> GOOD QUESTION. THIS IS CURRENTLY NOT TO EXCEED \$30,000. YOU KNOW, AGAIN, THE ONLY THING I WOULD SAY IS THAT'S VARIABLE IS DEPENDING ON WHAT THE INITIAL INTERVIEW, INITIAL DOCUMENTATION, HOW MUCH TIME AND ALL OF THAT. IT'S NOT IMPOSSIBLE THAT COULD BE AMENDED. BUT THAT WOULD COME BACK FOR A DISCUSSION AMONGST METRO COUNCIL BEFORE WE WOULD EXPAND THE CONTRACT. RIGHT NOW THIS CONTRACT WE'RE VOTING ON IS NOW TO EXCEED \$30,000.

>> JUST TO FOLLOW UP. IS THAT CORRECT? OKAY. SO ONCE WE GET THIS REPORT GOING, AND THERE ARE A FEW RECOMMENDATIONS, WHAT IS -- I MEAN, FOR \$30,000, YOU KNOW, WE PRETTY MUCH KNOW THERE'S A PROBLEM. SO WE'RE PAYING HIM TO DO EXACTLY WHAT?

TELL US THERE'S A PROBLEM. AND THEN, DID YOU SAY HE IS GOING TO BE CHARGED WITH COMING UP WITH WAYS WE CAN THINK OF LEGISLATIVELY TO FIX THE PROBLEM?

>> SO HE IS -- SO FIRST OF ALL, HE'S THERE TO IDENTIFY THE PROBLEM. TO GO DEEPER. WE COULD SPECULATE ALL THE LIVE LONG DAY, AND SOME OF US HAVE, AS TO WHAT'S GOING ON OVER THERE. BUT FOR EXAMPLE, WE DON'T HAVE PROOF OF WHAT THE PRECISE PROBLEMS ARE. WE DON'T HAVE PROOF, RIGHT, OF WHAT PROBLEM -- THINGS WE'RE NOT EVEN THINKING OF THAT COULD BE THE ISSUE. ARE THERE PATTERNS RELATED TO WHEN SOME OF THESE FATALITIES HAPPENED. RELATED TO PERSONNEL OR LEADERSHIP OR OTHER OPERATING PROBLEMS, RIGHT, THAT ARE HAPPENING OVER THERE. SO THIS IS ABOUT GETTING INTO -- AS COUNCILMAN ARTHUR SAID, THE DOCUMENTATION, GETTING INTO EVIDENCE. INTERVIEWS. GOING WHERE THOSE INTERVIEWS LEAD YOU RELATED TO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT COULD BE IMPACTING THE SAFETY AND CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE INMATES THAT WE HAVE AT METRO CORRECTIONS. AND AT THE END OF IT, WHAT THE RESOLUTION AS WELL AS THE CONTRACT STIPULATES, THAT HE WILL THEN PRODUCE A WRITTEN REPORT WHEN IT'S OVER. THAT REPORT WILL BE A COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY. SO A SUMMARY OF WHAT HE DID, THE FINDINGS HE HAD IS GOING TO HAVE A TON OF ATTACHMENTS. ULTIMATELY, THE VERY END IS A SERIES OF RECOMMENDATIONS. BUT IT'S ALL BASED OFF OF THAT FINAL WRITTEN

REPORT. BUT AGAIN, HE WILL HAVE INTERIM VERBAL REPORTS THROUGHOUT.

>> TO THE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

>> TO THE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT.

>> THANK YOU FOR THAT SO THE PUBLIC CAN CLEARLY UNDERSTAND WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO ESPECIALLY WITH THEIR DOLLARS. SO THE BOTTOM LINE FOR ME IS, WE KNOW THERE'S A PROBLEM. WE ABSOLUTELY NEED IT TO BE INVESTIGATED. BUT WE PUT FORTH A RESOLUTION ALREADY SAYING WE HAD NO CONFIDENCE IN THE LEADERSHIP THERE. AND NOTHING, NOTHING CAME OF IT. SO AFTER \$30,000, WE'RE EXPECTING WHAT? I MEAN, WE STILL COULD NOT GET THE MAYOR TO TAKE ANY ACTION ON THE LEADERSHIP. SO WHAT DO WE REALLY WANT OUR END RESULT TO BE? ALTHOUGH WE'LL HAVE AN INVESTIGATION. WE'LL KNOW DEEPER INTO WHAT THE PROBLEMS ARE. BUT HOW CAN WE EFFECT THE CHANGE IF WE WANT LEADERSHIP TO BE THAT CHANGE?

>> A COUPLE OF THINGS. YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. WE DON'T HAVE THE POWER OR JURISDICTION TO REMOVE EXECUTIVE MEMBERS. THE ONLY PERSONS THAT WE HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO REMOVE WOULD BE THE MAYOR. LET'S JUST ASSUME FOR A SECOND -- AND AGAIN, THIS IS HIGHLY SPECULATIVE. NOT ACCUSING ANYBODY OF ANYTHING. BUT THE ONLY THING -- THE ONLY PERSON IN THE ENTIRE EXECUTIVE BRANCH THAT WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO SAY WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS IS THE MAYOR. AS FAR AS THAT IS -- YOU'RE RIGHT, WE CAN'T DO THAT. WITH THAT SAID, COUNCILMAN ARTHUR IS ON TO

SOMETHING. UNLIKE TRYING TO REGULATE WHAT SOME OF OUR BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS WERE DOING BECAUSE THEY'RE ESTABLISHED BY STATE STATUTE, WE WERE SEVERELY LIMITED IN THE KIND CHANGE. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO LEGISLATE CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DIRECTIONS. -- TO OTHER POLICIES AND PROCEDURES THAT JUST LIKE TO GIVE AN EXAMPLE, THE NO KNOCK WARRANT. THE MAYOR TECHNICALLY BANNED NO KNOCK WARRANTS BEFORE WE LEGISLATED AFTER THE TRAGIC DEATH OF BREONNA TAYLOR. WE WENT THE STEP OF LEGISLATING IT BECAUSE WE DIDN'T WANT JUST TO RELY ON WHATEVER THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH WAS. -- RATHER THAN FORTUNATELY, WE'RE SOMEWHAT LIMITED RELATED TO THE BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS SO WE'RE DOING IT THE RESOLUTION.

>> POWER TO CREATE ORDINANCES NOW WITHOUT A \$30,000 INVESTIGATION. LET'S BE CLEAR.

>> IF WE WERE SUPER CLEAR IN WHAT THE EVIDENCE SHOWED AND WHAT PRECISELY THE ISSUES WERE THERE, AGAIN, WITH EVIDENCE. WE COULD START TAKING ACTION RIGHT NOW. WE JUST DON'T KNOW BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE -- NONE OF US HAVE THE TIME TO GET INTO THE WEEDS. SPEND OUR DAYS REVIEWING DOCUMENTS, INTERVIEWING ALL THOSE PEOPLE WHO KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON OVER THERE. OR FRANKLY, MAY NOT KNOW. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE GOING TO REVEAL THROUGH THE INVESTIGATION.

>> DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTIONS, COUNCILWOMAN? WELL ALL RIGHT. THERE YOU GO. THERE YOU GO. COUNCILMAN REED.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I JUST WANTED TO SAY VERY QUICKLY THAT WITH REGARD TO THE INVESTIGATION THAT WE DID WITH PARK, THEIR INTERNAL INVESTIGATION DIFFERED DRAMATICALLY FROM THE INVESTIGATION THAT WE PAID FOR. AND THERE WERE SOME REALLY GREAT THINGS THAT CAME OUT OF IT. BOARD TRAINING. BETTER COMMUNICATION WITH THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. AND YOU KNOW, WE'RE VERY MUCH MORE SELECTIVE NOW IN TERMS OF WHO WE APPOINT TO THE BOARD. SO I'M VERY EXCITED WITH SOME OF THE THINGS THEY'RE DOING. AND I THINK THIS IS \$30,000 VERY WELL SPENT. THANKS.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, THIS IS A RESOLUTION ALLOWING FOR A VOICE VOTE. ALL IN FAVOR PLEASE SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ALL OPPOSE? THE AYES HAVE IT. THANK YOU. RESOLUTION PASSES.

>> MADAM CLERK, A READING OF ITEM NUMBER 40.

SORRY. WE ARE IN TO OLD BUSINESS NOW. ALSO, MADAM CLERK LET THE RECORD REFLECT THAT COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY IS PRESENT. THANK YOU. MADAM CLERK, READING OF ITEM NUMBER 40.

>> DEVELOPMENT CODE -- 0013 AS AMENDED. READ IN FULL.

>> THANK YOU. MAY I HAVE A MOTION.

>> MOTION TO MOVE.

>> SECOND BY COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.

>> SECOND BY ARMSTRONG.

>> SECOND BY COUNCILWOMAN ARMSTRONG. COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.

>> SHE HAD SOME AMENDMENTS THAT WE NEED TO MOVE.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, IF IT'S OKAY, I'D LIKE TO SITUATE US QUICKLY IN TERMS OF WHERE WE ARE WITH THE ORDINANCE, AND THEN MOVE THE AMENDMENT. -- I WANT TO BE CLEAR THAT THIS IS A SMALL FIRST STEP BUT IT'S A REALLY IMPORTANT ONE TO MAKE. WE HAVE HEARD REPEATEDLY OVER THE PAST WEEK ABOUT THE CHALLENGES AROUND ACCESSING CHILD CARE IN OUR COMMUNITY. AND I DON'T THINK I NEED TO REITERATE THE STATISTICS EXCEPT THAT WOMEN ARE LEAVING THE WORKFORCE IN RECORD NUMBERS BECAUSE OF CHILDCARE ISSUES. WORKPLACES ARE STRUGGLING TO FIND EMPLOYEES BECAUSE OF WORKFORCE ISSUES. AND FAMILIES IN OUR COMMUNITY ARE STRUGGLING TO FIGURE OUT HOW THEY'RE GOING TO MAKE ENDS MEET. AND OUR CURRENT ZONING LAWS DON'T HELP THE PROBLEM. IN FACT, THEY ARE PART OF THE PROBLEM. WHAT THIS ORDINANCE DOES IS PROHIBITS -- NEAR WHERE PEOPLE WORK AND NEAR WHERE PEOPLE LIVE. IT MAKES IT EASIER FOR CHILDCARE CENTERS BE LOCATED NEAR EMPLOYMENT HUBS, WHERE PEOPLE WORK. -- TO ENCOURAGE EMPLOYERS TO PROVIDE ON SITE CARE. IT ALSO MAKES SMALL BUT IMPORTANT CHANGES TO FAMILY CHILD CARE HOMES. SO I WANT TO BE CLEAR RIGHT NOW IN EVERY RESIDENTIAL ZONE A PERSON CAN HAVE SIX CHILDREN IN THEIR HOMES AS A HOME OCCUPATION. AND IN SOME RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, YOU CAN SEEK A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW YOU TO HAVE MORE CHILDREN SO LONG AS YOU COMPLY

WITH STATE REGULATIONS.
HOWEVER, IN OTHER RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICTS, INCLUDING R4 AND R5,
YOU DO NOT HAVE -- SMALL BUT
IMPORTANT STEP OF ALLOWING ALL
RESIDENTIAL ZONES EQUAL ACCESS
TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT. I
WANT TO TAKE A MINUTE TO BRIEFLY
RUN THROUGH WHO HAS SPOKEN IN
SUPPORT OF THIS ORDINANCE AND
WHAT THAT MEANS. WE'VE HEARD
FROM THE GREATER LOUISVILLE
LABOR COUNCIL THAT REPRESENTS
MANY OF OUR UNIONS IN LOUISVILLE
BECAUSE CHILD CARE IS A WORKING
FAMILIES ISSUE. ACCESS TO HIGH
QUALITY EARLY LEARNING IS A
HEALTH AND WELLNESS ISSUE. WE'VE
HEARD FROM GLI BECAUSE ACCESS TO
CHILD CARE IS A WORKFORCE ISSUE,
AND PROVIDING IN-HOME CHILD CARE
IS A SMALL BUSINESS,
PARTICULARLY A WOMEN'S SMALL
BUSINESS ISSUE. NO BACK FAMILY
FOUNDATION BECAUSE THIS IS AN
EQUITY ISSUE THAT IMPACTS THOSE
IN NEED IN OUR COMMUNITY. WE'VE
HEARD FROM SO MANY RESIDENTS ALL
THROUGHOUT THE CITY OF
LOUISVILLE BECAUSE THIS IS AN
ISSUE THEY DEAL WITH EVERY DAY.
WE ALL HAVE A REASON TO CARE
ABOUT IT. IT TAKES A VILLAGE TO
RAISE A CHILD. AND OUR JOB AS
LEGISLATORS IN THIS VILLAGE IS
TO DO EVERYTHING IN OUR POWER TO
BUILD THE LEGAL INFRASTRUCTURE
FOR FAMILIES AND CHILDREN TO
THRIVE. BEFORE WE OPEN THE FLOOR
FOR DISCUSSION, I'D LIKE TO MOVE
THE AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO THE
CONVERSATIONS I'VE HAD WITH SO
MANY OF YOU ALL. FOR THE PUBLIC,
IT IS LOADED IN THE SYSTEM AS
PROPOSED FLOOR AMENDMENT FAM
031722 REFLECTING YESTERDAY'S

DATE. THE CHANGES IT MAKES ARE A SUMMARY IS ATTACHED TO THE AGENDA AS WELL. AND SO WITH THAT, MR. PRESIDENT, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO ADOPT FAM 031722.

>> SECOND.

>> THANK YOU. WE HAVE A MOTION AND A SECOND BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION ON ACCEPTING THE AMENDMENT? HEARING NONE. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> OPPOSED. THE AMENDMENT IS BEFORE US. CONTINUE ON COUNCILWOMAN.

>> I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER, MR. PRESIDENT. I'D LIKE TO THANK MY MANY COLLEAGUES WHO MADE THIS BETTER THAN WHEN IT WAS WHEN WE STARTED. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. AND I APPRECIATE YOUR ALL SUPPORT.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT JAMES. I WANT TO TAKE A SECOND TO THANK COUNCILWOMAN ARMSTRONG'S WORK ON THIS ISSUE. MANY PEOPLE HAVE CONCERNS AND TRYING TO FIND A SOLUTION THAT ADDRESSES THOSE CONCERNS. THANK ALL THOSE IN THE ADVOCACY COMMUNITY FOR THEIR WORK TRYING TO GET THIS TO MOVE FORWARD. I THINK IT FILLS A NEED IN OUR COMMUNITY. ONE THAT WILL HOPEFULLY INCREASE OUR WORKFORCE RATE, WHICH WE NEED. AND HOPEFULLY EVERYONE WILL SUPPORT IT.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT CHILD CARE FACILITIES FOR SO LONG, I ALMOST THOUGHT ABOUT TURNING MY

HOUSE INTO ONE. IT NOW HAS TWO KIDS IN IT. THANK YOU ALL FOR JUST WORKING ON THIS MAKING IT THE BEST ORDINANCE THAT IT COULD POSSIBLY BE. NOT JUST FOR ANY SPECIFIC AREA OR TOWN, BUT REALLY FOR OUR ENTIRE CITY. I'VE BEEN ON THE PHONE WITH SO MANY OF YOU ABOUT SO MANY DIFFERENT THINGS FROM THE CLUTTER, WHICH IS ADDRESSED WITHIN THE ORDINANCE ITSELF. AND THE NOISE COMPLAINTS, THE CONCERNS OF PARKING AND EVERYTHING. JUST THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR JUST MAKING SURE THAT WE TIGHTEN THIS UP. I WANT TO SHARE SOMETHING WITH YOU REALLY QUICKLY. BECAUSE WE TALK A LOT ABOUT CHILD CARE. AND I WANT US TO JUST GO FORWARD IN THE NEAR FUTURE OF HOW CHILD CARE REALLY IS GOING TO IMPACT OUR CITY. BECAUSE OFTENTIMES WHEN WE THINK ABOUT EDUCATION ISSUES, WE FEEL VERY HANDS OFF AND WE FEEL LIKE WE DON'T HAVE THE POWER. WE SAY THAT'S ON JCPS. BUT I WANT TO CONTEXTUALIZE WHAT CHILD CARE IS GOING TO DO WHEN WE THINK ABOUT JCPS, WHEN WE THINK ABOUT THEM STARTING KINDERGARTEN. AND HOW SOME OF OUR BABIES, HALF ON AVERAGE ARE USUALLY NOT PREPARED TO GO INTO KINDERGARTEN. WHEN YOU LOOK AT WHERE SOME OF THOSE CHILDREN ARE PRIOR TO EVEN STARTING KINDERGARTEN, OVERWHELMINGLY, THOSE THAT ARE NOT PREPARED FOR KINDERGARTEN, YOU LOOK AT THE VERY BOTTOM OF THIS CHART, THAT YELLOW LINE, THAT BOTTOM LINE, THOSE ARE CHILDREN WHO ARE JUST AT HOME. THE NEXT LINE ARE CHILDREN IN STATE FUNDED FACILITIES. THEN WE

HAVE CHILDREN IN HEAD START. WE HAVE CHILDREN IN OTHER PRIVATE SETTINGS. AT THE VERY TOP IS A RED LINE. TAKE A WILD GUESS AT WHO THOSE CHILDREN ARE. THOSE ARE CHILDREN IN CHILD CARE. OVERWHELMINGLY MORE PREPARED TO START SCHOOL TO BE IN KINDERGARTEN. TO ADVANCE IN LIFE. THAN OTHERS WHO DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO CHILD CARE. IF YOU LOOK AT A MAP OF HOW THIS IS BROKEN DOWN AROUND. IT'S VERY DIFFERENT BETWEEN THE CHILDREN WHO HAVE ACCESS TO CHILD CARE VERSUS THE ONES WHO DO NOT. I'M EXCITED AS AN EDUCATOR SAYING TONIGHT WE DON'T HAVE THE EXCUSE OF SAYING WE DON'T HAVE THE POWER. WE DO HAVE THE POWER. AND BEYOND JUST HAVING POWER, MERELY POWER, WE HAVE THE POWER TO END POWER. THE PEOPLE IN THIS CITY, THE PEOPLE YOU'VE HEARD FROM THIS WEEK, EVEN TONIGHT, HAVE THE WILL TO CARE FOR OUR CHILDREN ARE GOING TO HELP US CHANGE THIS MAP AND HELP US CHANGE OUR CITY FOREVER. I URGE PASSAGE. I URGE FOR YOUR SUPPORT. AND THANK YOU FOR WORKING WITH US TO MAKE THIS THE BEST ORDINANCE IT CAN BE FOR OUR BABIES. I APPRECIATE IT.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.
FIRST OF ALL, THE COMMITTEE AS A WHOLE -- BUT FROM A POLICY POINT OF VIEW, I ALWAYS DEFAULT TO HOW CAN WE SOLVE PROBLEMS IF REGULATION IS IN THE WAY? QUITE FRANKLY, I PROBABLY WOULD HAVE SUPPORTED AN EARLIER VERSION. BUT I'M GOING WITH COUNCILMAN WRINKLER. GET IT DONE WITH

BROADER, MORE WIDESPREAD
COMMUNITY SUPPORT.
CONGRATULATIONS, COUNCIL MEMBER
ARMSTRONG. BUT I WANT PEOPLE TO
REMEMBER THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY
TO -- THIS DOESN'T COST US A
DIME. RIGHT. AND IT GIVES PEOPLE
WHO I SEE AS SMALL BUSINESS
OWNERS, AND IT IS NOT USUAL THAT
WE GET TO DO SOMETHING THAT
HELPS SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS.
HALF THE TIME WE'RE DOING THINGS
THAT MAKE IT HARDER FOR THEM AND
EASIER FOR LARGE BUSINESSES TO
OPERATE. SO I THINK THIS IS A
WONDERFUL MARRIAGE OF THIS IDEA
OF SMALL BUSINESS SUPPORT,
DEREGULATION, ACHIEVING A GOAL
WITHOUT HAVING TO COME UP WITH,
YOU KNOW, SOME CRAZY FUNDING
SOURCE, SUBSIDIES. NOT SAYING
THAT WE DON'T NEED TO HAVE SOME
OF THOSE DISCUSSIONS, TOO. BUT I
LIKE THAT MENTALITY AND I THINK
WAS WONDERFULLY ACHIEVED HERE.
AND I HOPE TO USE THIS AS A
METAPHOR FOR OTHER PROBLEMS IN
THE CITY. KEEP LOOKING AT HOW
MORE CREATIVE WAYS TO SOLVE
PROBLEMS RATHER THAN, YOU KNOW,
WHAT SOMETIMES SEEM THE MORE
SIMPLE SOLUTION.
CONGRATULATIONS. THANK YOU FOR
EVERYTHING YOU GUYS DO. GLAD TO
SUPPORT THIS. CALLING EVERYBODY
ELSE TO SUPPORT AS WELL. THANK
YOU.
>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. AND
COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'D
LIKE TO BE ADDED AS A SPONSOR OF
THIS. I THANK THEM FOR THEIR
PATIENCE FOR GOING THROUGH IT
WITH ME QUITE A BIT ON THE
RESIDENTIAL PARAMETERS OF THIS.
AND PART OF MY INTENT WAS TO

MAKE SURE THAT RESIDENTIAL AREAS STILL FELT LIKE RESIDENTIAL AREAS. BEING PERSONALLY IMPACTED BY A LOT OF THE DAYCARES THAT HAVE HAPPENED AROUND DISTRICT 3 AND KIND OF SEEING THE EVOLUTION OF THAT. SO I WANT TO THANK THEM FOR ALL THE CHANGES THAT THEY MADE. I DO FEEL THIS PROTECTS THE INTEGRITY OF RESIDENTIAL AREAS ABOUT MAKING THEM LARGE, COMMERCIAL SCALE BUSINESSES IN THE MIDDLE OF HOMES OR EVEN IN APARTMENTS WHERE OTHERS MAY HAVE TO DEAL WITH KIDS OR PEOPLE COMING OUT AT NIGHT. THEY'VE MADE SIGNIFICANT ENHANCEMENTS TO THE LEGISLATION. AND I'M PROUD TO SAY I'D LIKE TO BE A SPONSOR OF IT. WITH ALL THE WORK THAT WE'VE DONE GETTING THAT DONE, AND COUNCILMAN CHAMBERS ARMSTRONG REALLY SPEARHEADING THE AUTHORIZATION. I THINK COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI SAID THAT WE OFTEN STRIKE A UNIQUE BALANCE IN LEGISLATION THAT EVERYONE IS HAPPY WITH. I THINK THIS HITS ALMOST THE BULL'S EYE. GOOD LEGISLATION, GOOD BIPARTISANSHIP, GOOD WORK. AND I DON'T SEE ANY MAJOR ISSUES, AT LEAST I DON'T AT THIS TIME. I DO WANT TO ADDRESS THE FACT THAT I ALSO -- WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT CHILD CARE, BUT A PASSION OF MINE IS ALSO SENIORS AND SENIOR CITIZENS. AND A LOT OF THIS COUNTS FOR ADULT CARE AS WELL. JUST GENERAL STATISTICS TALK ABOUT THE OLDEST BABY BOOMERS IN 2025 WILL BE TURNING 80. IF WE'RE LOOKING AT OUR CURRENT HEALTH CARE SYSTEM BEING ABLE TO EXPAND THE BANDWIDTH BECAUSE WE'RE NOT ONLY JUST TAKING CARE

OF OUR CHILDREN BUT WE'RE TAKING CARE OF THOSE WHO PAVED THE PATH FOR US. NOT ONLY AM I PROUD. THIS IS GOOD CHILD CARE LEGISLATION, BUT THIS IS GOOD FORESIGHT IN WHAT WE MAY BE SEEING IN OUR AGING BABY BOOMERS AND THE PARAMETERS WE PUT AROUND IT. AGAIN, I'D LIKE TO BE ADDED AS A COSPONSOR AND WANT TO CONGRATULATE THE PRIMARY SPONSORS ON THIS. I THINK WE HAVE SOME GOOD LEGISLATION.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY HAS A RESPONSE. COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I WOULD LIKE TO THANK COUNCILWOMAN -- COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR CALLS ME, WHERE ARE YOU NOW. I'M THERE NOW. BECAUSE I'VE BEEN TOLD IT'S BEEN REGULATED AND ALL OF THAT. I APPRECIATE THEM -- AND I JUST WANT TO THANK THEM. AND I WILL BE SUPPORTING. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN. COUNCIL MEMBER WINKLER.

>> MY WIFE AND I TOOK OUR CHILDREN TO A GREAT CHILD CARE. SO I WILL SUPPORT THIS. I ALSO APPRECIATE THE TIME THAT THE SPONSORS PUT IN TO THIS. -- HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATIONS BECAUSE I REPRESENT A LOT OF THOSE. THAT WAS ANSWERED QUICKLY. I'D LOVE TO MAKE SURE THE COMMUNICATION LINES ARE OPEN WHEN THESE DO GET PASSED IN VARIOUS COUNCIL DISTRICTS THAT THOSE COUNCIL MEMBERS WILL BE NOTIFIED THAT ONE HAS BEEN APPROVED. I SUSPECT THAT WILL HOPEFULLY BE HERE SOMEWHERE. THE AMOUNT OF WORK AND DETAIL THAT WAS PUT INTO THIS IS QUITE IMPRESSIVE. I

THANK THE SPONSORS AND I WILL BE SUPPORTING THIS.

>> I JUST WANT TO SHARE WITH COUNCIL MEMBERS, BUT REALLY TO THE PUBLIC. THERE IS GOING TO BE A BRAND NEW BUTTON ON 311, SO IF YOU HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT CHILD CARE FACILITIES, SHOUT OUT TO CODES AND REGS, 311. WE WILL BE ABLE TO KEEP TRACK OF CONCERNS OVERTIME AND TO SEE THE IMPACT THAT WE MAY HAVE HAD PASSING THIS LEGISLATION. THANK YOU ALL. I WANTED TO LET THAT BE KNOWN.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I, TOO, WANT TO ASK TO BE ADDED AS A SPONSOR. AND APPLAUD THE EFFORTS OF THE PRIMARY SPONSORS. ALL THE WORK THAT YOU ALL HAVE DONE, IT HAS BEEN VERY IMPRESSIVE. I JUST WANTED TO SHARE THAT MY MOTHER HAD AN IN-HOME DAYCARE CENTER THAT WAS CERTIFIED BY THE STATE FOR 30 YEARS. AND SHE MADE IT DIFFERENT TO THOSE KIDS THAT WERE ABLE TO BE IN HER DAYCARE. WHEN SHE PASSED AWAY, THERE WERE LIKE 30 OF THOSE KIDS THAT CAME TO HER FUNERAL. THEY DID GET SOMETHING FROM THAT DAYCARE THAT YOU DON'T GET -- THE NURTURING. THE SMALL FEEL OF THE ONE ON ONE. IT'S A DIFFERENT ANIMAL THAN WHAT SOME OF THE BIGGER DAYCARES ARE. I APPRECIATE THE EFFORT YOU ALL MADE. I KNOW SHE DIDN'T HAVE ANY PROBLEM GETTING HER CERTIFICATION OR HAVE ANY BARRIERS TO JUMP THROUGH, YOU KNOW, OTHER THAN THE STATE CERTIFICATION PROCESS. BECAUSE I GUESS WE DIDN'T HAVE THOSE RESTRICTIONS IN OUR CODE OF

ORDINANCES BACK BEFORE. ANYWAY,
GOOD JOB AND THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. AND
COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I
JUST WANT TO THANK EVERYONE WHO
WORKED ON THIS, PARTICULARLY
CASSIE ARMSTRONG. -- AND EVEN
LATER ON WHEN WE GET TO THE GUN
DISCHARGE BILL, I JUST WANT TO
SAY NOW I APPRECIATE THE FACT
THAT EVERYONE HAS BEEN WILLING
TO WORK TO AMEND, TO CHANGE, TO
COMPROMISE. IT ONLY TOOK ME
BEING ON THE COUNCIL 20 YEARS
THAT WE LEARNED HOW TO DO THAT.
I'M ON MY WAY OUT THE DOOR.
WE'RE FINALLY GETTING IT RIGHT.
ANYWAY. SO AGAIN, I WANT TO
TOTALLY CALL OUT THE COMPROMISE
THAT'S GONE ON OVER THE LAST 30
TO 60 DAYS ON BOTH OF THOSE
ORDINANCES SAYING IT HAS NOT
GONE UNNOTED.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? MADAM
CLERK, PLEASE ADD ME AS A
CO-SPONSOR, PLEASE. MADAM CLERK,
PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.

>> YES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER WRINKLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
>> YES. COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON. MR.
PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE -- YES
VOTES.
>> THANK YOU, THE ORDINANCE
PASSES. MADAM CLERK, READ ITEM
41.
>> -- RELATING TO THE DISCHARGE
OF FIREARMS WITHIN LOUISVILLE
METRO. AMENDMENT BY
SUBSTITUTION. READ IN FULL.
>> MOTION.
>> MOTION TO MOVE.
>> WE HAVE A MOTION BY
COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS. SECOND BY
COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT.
>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.
THIS MEASURE PASSED IN COMMITTEE
4-1 WITH ME BEING THE LONE
NO-VOTE. IT'S NOT ANYWHERE NEAR
WHAT THE ORIGINAL ITERATION WAS.
IT'S BEEN AMENDED HEAVILY

THROUGH A LOT OF COMPROMISE AS MY COLLEAGUE MENTIONED, IT WAS A GREAT ILLUSTRATION OF WORKING TOGETHER AS A TEAM. SO MR. PRESIDENT, IF YOU WOULD, I'D LIKE TO TOSS IT TO THE PRIMARY SPONSORS AND LET THEM SPEAK TO IT. AND IF YOU WOULD, I WILL VOICE MY DISSENSION ON THIS.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN MULVIHILL.

>> I WANT TO ECHO WHAT'S BEEN SAID. I DO APPRECIATE. I KNOW IT'S COMPROMISE BUT IT'S ALSO GOOD FEEDBACK. YOU WRITE A LAW OR COME UP WITH A LAW THAT WE DO THIS A LOT, WE COMPARE TO -- WE PARROT AFTER WHAT OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE. ONCE WE GOT INTO COMMITTEE, WE REALIZED A LOT OF THINGS BEING DISCUSSED MADE A SENSE. ESPECIALLY TRYING TO STRIKE A BALANCE BETWEEN I GUESS MORE RURAL LIVING AND THEN YOU KNOW, MORE DENSELY POPULATED LIVING. THIS COUNCIL, IT'S PRETTY UNIQUE WHEN YOU GO BACK. GOSH, I'VE BEEN AROUND A WHILE. I WAS HERE THE VERY FIRST COUNCIL, NOT AS A COUNCILPERSON BUT AS AN ATTORNEY. EVEN THEN YOU HAD TO STRIKE THE BALANCE BETWEEN COUNTY LAWS AND CITY LAWS. THE CITY DID HAVE A LAW. IT SAID THERE WILL BE ABSOLUTELY NO DISCHARGING OF FIREARMS IN THE CITY. THAT WAS A LAW. THE COUNTY DIDN'T HAVE ONE. THERE WERE COURT CASES THAT DECIDE WHO HAD THE SUPER LAW BETWEEN COUNTIES AND CITIES. IT WAS A DIFFERENT ISSUE. BUT THE SUPREME COURT OF KENTUCKY SAID THE COUNTIES DID. SO WHEN WE PUT TOGETHER THE FIRST BOARD OF ORDINANCES -- ALL THE ORIGINAL

COUNCIL. IT WAS A BIG BOOK. IT WAS THE PRIORITY LAW. BUT THE CITY DID HAVE THEIR MIXTURE OF LAW. SINCE THEN, THAT WAS, YOU KNOW, JANUARY 6, 2003. WE'RE NOW NEARLY 20 YEARS LATER, THE CITY -- THE COUNTY LOUISVILLE METRO, IT'S CHANGED. THERE'S ROUGHLY 100,000 MORE PEOPLE HERE NOW. WHAT WAS RURAL JEFFERSON COUNTY IS NOT AS RURAL. IT'S MORE DENSELY POPULATED. SO YOU KNOW, THERE IS THE ISSUE OF DISCHARGING FIREARMS IN DENSELY POPULATED AREAS. THAT'S WHAT THIS ORDINANCE WAS INTENDED TO DO. THAT'S WHAT IT'S STILL INTENDED TO DO AND TRYING DO. SO THE COMPROMISE THAT WE REALLY LOOKED AT IS HOW CAN WE SORT OF BALANCE THAT. I KNOW THE ORIGINAL FOLKS HERE, SORRY, COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD, YOU WERE HERE. I HANDED YOU A BOOK. I REMEMBER ISSUES BETWEEN WHERE HORSES COULD BE LOCATED. WHO COULD HAVE CHICKENS AND ROOSTERS. ALL ISSUES THAT CAME BEFORE THE COUNCIL BECAUSE CITIES AND COUNTIES HAD DIFFERENT STANDARDS. THERE WAS COMPROMISE. AS EVERYONE RECALLS, THERE WAS COMPROMISE. AND IT'S STILL ON THE BOOKS TODAY. I THINK 1.5 ACRES OR LESS ONE ROOSTER AND FIVE HENS. BUT MAYBE I'M WRONG. FIVE AND ONE. OKAY. -- I LOOK AT THIS AS A COMPROMISE. I THINK THE ISSUES ARE DIFFERENT. SO WITH THIS, WE TRIED TO COMPROMISE AND STRIKE A BALANCE OF RURAL LIVING OR VERSUS OR NOT AS DENSELY LIVING. THANK YOU FOR EVERYBODY WHO GAVE FEEDBACK. NOT ONLY FROM THE COUNCIL. I KNOW COUNCILMAN PEDEN

HAD THE FOOTAGE REQUIREMENT. I THINK HE SAID 200 TO 500. BUT THEN ALL THE FOLKS WHO WEIGHED IN AND EMAILED AND SAID THIS IS WHAT I THINK. SOME HAD GOOD SUGGESTIONS. WITH THAT, WE DO HAVE A NEW ORDINANCE AS COUNCILMAN FOX TALKED ABOUT. AND I WANT TO THANK COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY. SHE SAID IF YOU DO THIS AND YOU SEE IT'S A PROBLEM, LET'S SEE WHERE THE PROBLEM IS. IF WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AND TRY TO SEE IF THERE'S A PROBLEM, WE NEED TO KNOW WHERE THOSE PROBLEMS ARE. SO WE DID ADD THAT AS WELL. BUT THEN WE HAD LIKE ANY ORDINANCE, THERE'S ALWAYS ONE LAST CHANGE OR SOMEBODY WHO BRINGS UP ANOTHER POINT THAT MAYBE WE DIDN'T THINK ABOUT. AND THAT CAME UP VIA SOMEBODY ON THE OUTSIDE THROUGH EMAIL ABOUT CENSUS. CENSUS ESPECIALLY IN FARMLAND WHERE FOLKS WOULD SET UP BOTTLES FOR TARGETS AND WOULD DO TARGET PRACTICE. WE DIDN'T CONTEMPLATE THAT WHEN WE LOOKED AT THE ORDINANCE. WE'RE OFFERING A FULL AMENDMENT TONIGHT TO DEAL WITH THAT. THAT WOULD BASICALLY SAY IN THE DIRECTION OF A STRUCTURE CAPABLE OF BEING OCCUPIED THAT IS WITHIN 300 FEET OF THE PERSON DISCHARGING A FIREARM. IT DOES GO BACK AND ALLOW SOMEBODY WHO LIVES ON A FARM WHERE THERE'S NO STRUCTURES AROUND TO PUT BOTTLES UP ON A FENCE. SO WITH THAT, I DO WANT TO MAKE THAT FLOOR AMENDMENT IF I CAN.

>> WE HAVE A MOTION BY COUNCILMAN MULVIHILL FOR A FLOOR AMENDMENT. AND A SECOND BY COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. ANY

DISCUSSION ON THE FLOOR?

SEEING NONE SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ALL OPPOSED? AMENDMENT
PASSES.

>> JUST WITH THAT, I WOULD TURN
IT OVER TO MY CO-SPONSORS.
COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER DID A LOT
OF INVESTIGATION OF WHAT OTHER
CITIES ARE DOING. THIS ISN'T
UNIQUE TO LOUISVILLE. I KNOW
NASHVILLE AND ANNAPOLIS, WE HAVE
FOUR CITIES IN KENTUCKY THAT
HAVE A DISCHARGE ORDINANCE. WE
CAN ALSO TALK IF WE WANT TO HEAR
ABOUT WANTON ENDANGERMENT. I
KNOW WE HEARD FROM POLICE. IT
SOUNDS GOOD BUT YOU HAVE TO HAVE
A VICTIM. THAT'S NOT ALWAYS
ISSUE. THAT WAS ONE OF THE
ISSUES THAT CAME OUT IS WELL IF
THEY'RE SHOOTING, WE'D LIKE TO
BE ABLE TO FIND THE VICTIM. BUT
IF YOU CAN'T FIND THE VICTIM,
MAYBE YOU CAN TALK TO THE
NEIGHBORS. IT ALLOWS POLICE TO
LOOK FURTHER INTO IF SOMEBODY IS
DISCHARGING A FIREARM. I'LL LET
COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER, AND
MAYBE COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'LL TRY TO BE BRIEF. I ALSO
WANT TO THANK ALL THE COUNCIL
MEMBERS. COUNCILMAN KRAMER, I
TALKED TO ABOUT THIS. BUT ALSO
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO SENT
US QUESTIONS, COMMENTS. I THINK
WE'VE BEEN RESPONSIVE TO ALL OF
THEM. THE LAST ONE TONIGHT ABOUT
THIS ISSUE ABOUT WHAT ABOUT
STRUCTURES. WE'RE MAKING IT
CLEAR. A COUPLE OF COMMENTS
ABOUT THINGS THAT WE'VE HEARD
RECENTLY AND THAT IS SOMEBODY
WHO IS SHOOTING ON AND FIRING

RANGE THAT MIGHT BE TOO --
WITHIN 300 FEET OF A PUBLIC
HIGHWAY. IF IT IS A PROPERLY
ZONED AND LICENSED FIRING RANGE,
IT IS EXCLUDED FROM THE LAW.
THAT'S THE PROVISION AT THE VERY
BEGINNING. UNLESS IT'S OTHERWISE
PERMITTED BY KENTUCKY LAW,
THAT'S ALL HUNTING. HUNTING IS
REGULATED BY KENTUCKY LAW. AND
THAT'S COMPLETELY EXCLUDED.
-- ALLOWED UNDER THE EXCEPTION
WHICH SAYS UNLESS OTHERWISE
PERMITTED BY KENTUCKY LAW. AND
ANYTHING ELSE THAT'S PERMITTED
BY KENTUCKY LAW. I DO WANT TO
JUST MENTION BRIEFLY WANTON
ENDANGERMENT. I KNOW COUNCILMAN
FOX IS PROBABLY GOING TO TALK
ABOUT THIS AS WELL. AND WE
TALKED ABOUT IT SOME IN
COMMITTEE, AND I'VE DONE SOME
RESEARCH ON IT. AND WE'VE HEARD
FROM LMPD ON IT. CERTAINLY
PICKING UP A GUN AND -- THERE
ARE CASES, TALKED ABOUT AT
COMMITTEE. THERE ARE CASES
WHERE, SWAN VERSUS COMMONWEALTH
CASE IN 2012 WHERE THERE WERE
SHOTS FIRED IN A HOUSE. AND THE
SUPREME COURT SAID THE JUDGE
SHOULD HAVE GRANTED A DIRECTED
VERDICT THROWING OUT THE CHARGE
BECAUSE IT WASN'T CLOSE ENOUGH
TO WANTON ENDANGERMENT. THEY
DIDN'T MAKE THAT CHARGE. AND THE
COMMONWEALTH ARGUED WELL GUNS
RICOCHET. AND THEY SAID, THEY DO
RICOCHET, BUT THERE HAS TO BE AN
AMENDMENT TO THIS. THE COURT
DOES CITE CASES WHERE FIRING A
GUN RIGHT BESIDE A VICTIM, POINT
BLANK AT ANOTHER, SHOOTING
WITHIN -- THAT COULD BE WANTON
ENDANGERMENT AND CERTAINLY OTHER
THINGS. BUT NOT ALL FIRING OF A

WEAPON COULD BE MADE AS WANTON ENDANGERMENT. THE LEADERSHIP OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS TOLD US THAT THIS IS ANOTHER TOOL THEY CAN USE. AND WITH THE GUN VIOLENCE THAT WE HAVE IN THE COMMUNITY, AND THE FRIGHTENING GUN DISCHARGE THAT WE HAVE IN THE COMMUNITY, NOT JUST ON NEW YEAR'S EVE BUT ON THE FOURTH OF JULY. WHEN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TELLS ME THAT THIS IS A TOOL THEY CAN USE, I WANT TO GIVE THEM THAT TOOL. I ENCOURAGE YOUR APPROVAL. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT. I JUST WANT TO SPEAK FOR A MOMENT. FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO THANK THE COSPONSORS, DONE TREMENDOUS WORK. I WANT TO SPEAK FOR A MOMENT ABOUT NEIGHBOR IMPACT. REALLY JUST WANT TO SAY THIS ORDINANCE SPEAKS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM OF GUNFIRE WHEN COMBINED WITH DENSITY AND GRAVITY. FOR YEARS I'VE HEARD FROM NEIGHBORS IN DISTRICT 21 WHO HAVE VOCALIZED CONCERNS ABOUT THE IMPACT INVOLVING EVERYTHING FROM PHYSICAL SAFETY, TRAUMA, DAMAGE TO VEHICLES, HOMES, IMPACT OF BUSINESS. WHEN YOU WALK INTO YOUR BUSINESS AND YOU SEE DAMAGE THAT COMES FROM THE ROOF. WE'VE RECENTLY HAD AN INCIDENT WHERE THERE WAS \$1,000 DONE TO THE AMERICAA COMMUNITY CENTER TO THEIR ROOF BECAUSE OF GUNS. ALL THAT TO SAY, IT COMES AT A COST AND IT COMES AT A COST TO THOSE NEIGHBORS WITH REAL IMPACT. THE LAST THREE YEARS, I'VE ATTEMPTED SOME LAYER OF OUTREACH THAT DID NOT INVOLVE LEGISLATIVE CHANGE.

THAT WAS A LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS. WE DID A DOOR-TO-DOOR OUTREACH WHERE WE WENT DOOR-TO-DOOR WITH FLYERS. WE DID SOCIAL MEDIA BUYS THAT WERE DIRECTED TO AREAS. WE KNEW WE HAD TO HAVE CALLS DURING HOLIDAYS WHERE THEY CELEBRATE WITH GUNFIRE. I WORKED WITH TRADITIONAL MEDIA OUTLETS. I'M EMBARRASSED TO SAY I THINK IT HAD VERY LITTLE IMPACT. LAST YEAR ALONE WE KNOW THAT THERE WERE 5,756 CALLS FOR SHOTS FIRED. AND THAT'S WHAT WAS CALLED. SO TO SAY THAT WE HAVE A PROBLEM AND THAT IT'S CONCENTRATED IN CERTAIN AREAS IS CERTAINLY BACKED UP BY THE DATA AS WELL AS BY THE EXPERIENCES THAT ARE SHARED BY NEIGHBORS. AND I WANT TO BE CLEAR TO SAY, YES THERE'S TIMES WHEN WE KNOW WE'RE GOING TO HAVE IT ON FOURTH OF JULY AND NEW YEAR'S. BUT QUITE FRANKLY, THERE'S A LOT OF PROBLEMS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS. WHEN WE HEAR LMPD SAY IT'S A TOOL THAT WILL MOVE THE NEEDLE. I THINK WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY, ERR ON THE SIDE OF CAUTION AND SAFETY. I KNOW WE HAVE DONE ALL WE CAN TO COMPROMISE AND MAKE SURE WE ARE IN NO WAY RESTRICTING ANYONE WHO WANTS TO HUNT AND/OR SHOOT WITHIN A PERMITTED AREA. THANK YOU.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, CAN I EXERCISE MY OPT IN NOW THAT THE COUNCIL MEMBERS HAVE SPOKE?

>> WE'LL LET YOU GET IN LINE. IS THAT OKAY?

>> I ASK THAT YOU COME BACK TO ME AFTER THE SPONSORS.

>> I FORGOT ABOUT THAT.

>> THAT'S OKAY.
>> GO RIGHT AHEAD.
>> THANK YOU. I RISE IN
OPPOSITION TO THIS. I TELL YOU
WHY. THE SIMPLE MATTER IS THE
PROBLEM WE HAVE IS NOT THAT WE
DON'T HAVE LAW. WE HAVE LAW. WE
SIMPLY DON'T HAVE THE MEANS TO
ENFORCE THAT LAW. HERE'S THE
REASON. THE MISDEMEANOR. A
MISDEMEANOR IN THE COMMONWEALTH
IN KENTUCKY HAS TO BE WITNESSED
BY A POLICE OFFICER. IT HAS TO
OCCUR IN THEIR PRESENCE. TO
PROSECUTE FOR A MISDEMEANOR OR
EVEN A FELONY, ANY PROSECUTOR
WORTH THEIR SALT IS GOING TO
REQUIRE TO HAVE A VICTIM. WHEN
SOMEBODY DOES CELEBRATORY
GUNFIRE, SIMPLY STICKS THEIR ARM
OUT OF A WINDOW AND UNLOADS THE
GUN OR ROUND. TO WITNESS THAT
ACT IS A VERY SMALL WINDOW.
WOULD BE ACTUALLY UNUSUAL.
HAVING A VICTIM FOR A
PROSECUTION WOULD ALSO BE
PROBLEMATIC. NOW IT'S NOT
IMPOSSIBLE. BUT IT'S
PROBLEMATIC. HEARD A NUMBER OF
TIMES THAT LEADERSHIP AT THE LPD
SUPPORTS ONE MEMBER OF THE LPD
SUPPORTS THIS. I'VE TALKED TO
OTHER MEMBERS THINK LIKE I DO,
THAT IT'S A REITERATION OF WHAT
WE ALREADY HAVE. -- WHEN THE
FIRST LEGISLATION ROLLED OUT, I
THOUGHT THIS IS A MIRRORED COPY
OF THE WANTON ENDANGERMENT
SECOND DEGREE. UNLESS I MAKE THE
NEXT STATEMENT, YOU WILL
PROBABLY NOT SEE A POLICE
OFFICER CHARGE. THAT IS IF YOU
SEE IT AND YOU HAVE A WITNESS,
WHY WOULDN'T YOU CHARGE WANTON
ENDANGERMENT. MUCH LIKE PARKING,
FOR EXAMPLE. WE HAVE PARKING

ORDINANCES. BUT MOST POLICE OFFICERS ARE GOING TO GO 186, 170 AND CITE YOU UNDER THE STATE STATUTE FOR PARKING. THAT'S GOING TO BE THE CASE FOR THAT. I THINK WHEN YOU FILE LAWS ON TOP OF LAWS, YOU ONLY REALLY IMPACT THE COMPLIANT. AND THE PEOPLE THAT FOLLOW THE LAW BECAUSE IT'S THE LAW AND IT'S THE RIGHT THING DO. I WILL REMIND MY COLLEAGUE THAT WE ALREADY HAVE A LAW THAT SAYS DON'T SHOOT A BULLET INTO ANOTHER HUMAN BEING. OVER 800 TIMES LAST YEAR, TRAGICALLY, THAT OCCURRED. SOMEONE MENTIONED EARLIER DO YOU THINK ANYBODY IS GOING TO THINK, WAIT A MINUTE, THEY'VE GOT AN ORDINANCE. I'M NOT GOING TO RATTLE OFF A COUPLE OF ROUNDS. THE ONLY PEOPLE THAT ARE GOING TO BE IMPACTED BY THIS ARE THE PEOPLE THAT WILLINGLY COMPLY. AND I THINK THAT QUITE FRANKLY, THERE ARE BIGGER FISH FOR US TO FRY LIKE OUR VIOLENT CRIME PROBLEM. LIKE OUR HOMELESS PROBLEM. LIKE OUR PANHANDLING PROBLEM. SO I WILL BE VOTING AGAINST THIS BECAUSE OF THE POINTLESS NATURE OF IT, I BELIEVE. AND I APPRECIATE YOU ALLOWING ME TO SPEAK IN OPPOSITION.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILWOMAN SHANKLIN.

>> -- WHAT I WANT TO SAY TO PAT, AND I WAS HERE WHEN THEY CHANGED ALL THE RULES AND ALL THAT. -- RULES WE MIGHT HAVE PUT IN PLACE BACK THEN IS COMPLETELY DIFFERENT NOW BECAUSE THINGS HAVE CHANGED FROM URBAN AND CITY. ONE OF THE THINGS HE SAID THAT BROUGHT MY ATTENTION TO WAS WHEN HE TALKED ABOUT THE

CHICKENS. IT WAS OKAY WHEN I'M IN THE URBAN AREA. BUT NOW IT'S IN THE CITY. THAT'S ONE OF THOSE LAWS THAT WE NEED TO BRING BACK AND CHANGE. BECAUSE IT'S ALMOST EVERY HOUSE OUT THERE HAS CHICKENS OUT IN THE YARD. BUT WHEN WE MADE THESE LAWS, THAT WAS YEARS AGO, AND THINGS HAVE CHANGED. SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO GO BACK IN THERE AND AMEND THEM. THAT'S WHAT I HAVE TO SAY. I'LL BE LOOKING FOR YOU PAT TO MAYBE AMEND SOME OF THOSE LAWS THAT WE HAD YEARS AGO. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> AS THE CO-SPONSORS KNOW I HAD A LOT OF CONCERNS WITH THE ORIGINAL ORDINANCE. BUT I THINK THIS AMENDED ORDINANCE IS MUCH MORE REFINED. AND I JUST WANT TO GO ON RECORD SAYING WE NEED TO CONDEMN VIOLENCE IN ALL FORM. WE TALK SO MUCH ABOUT THE PHYSICAL VIOLENCE. THIS INCLUDES FORMS OF VIOLENCE SUCH AS POLITICAL VIOLENCE THAT HAS TAKEN PLACE IN THIS CHAMBER, GOING BACK CENTURIES, INCLUDE PSYCHOLOGICAL VIOLENCE, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL ABUSE. IT INCLUDES ALL SORTS OF VIOLENCE. AND I THINK THAT DR. KING SAID IT BEST ABOUT LAWS NOT NECESSARILY CHANGING THE HEART BUT TAMING THE HEARTLESS. AND I BELIEVE THIS ORDINANCE IS AN EXAMPLE OF A LAW LIKE THAT. BUT BECAUSE OF THE WORK THAT HAS BEEN DONE TO MAKE SURE WE ADDRESS SOME OF THE INEQUITIES THAT COULD HAVE RESULTED IN THE ORIGINAL ONE, I WILL BE IN SUPPORT. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN WINKLER.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT JAMES. I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS I'M HOPING EITHER OF THE SPONSORS OR COUNCILMAN FOX CAN ADDRESS. I CAME IN HERE AS A YES VOTE GIVEN THESE PAGES, AND GIVEN COUNCILMAN FOX'S COMMENTS. I'LL BE HONEST, I'M NOT FOR SURE. THE QUESTIONS THAT I WILL SORT OF ASK RHETORICALLY, AND EITHER PARTIES COULD ANSWER AT SOME POINT, I WOULD APPRECIATE. I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE INTENT. I THINK WE'RE ALL FRUSTRATED WITH THE LEVEL OF VIOLENCE IN OUR COMMUNITY. I THINK THERE'S NO QUESTION ABOUT THAT. I THINK THIS HAS GIVEN THE LIMITED ABILITY OF LOCAL LAWMAKERS TO IMPACT THAT THROUGH POLICY. I THINK THIS IS ONE AREA WHERE WE HAVE THAT OPPORTUNITY, POTENTIALLY. RIGHT. I ALSO COMPLETELY AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT VOTES EARLIER AND WHAT COUNCILMAN FOX SAID THAT THIS ISN'T AN ORDINANCE FOR SOMEONE WHO IS GOING TO DO NEFARIOUS THINGS. I DON'T THINK THAT'S THE INTENTION. I THINK THE INTENTION AS COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE SAID IS THIS IS ANOTHER TOOL IN THE TOOLBELT. IF I'M AN OFFICER AND I COME UP TO A SCENE AND THIS IS OCCURRING, I HAVE ANOTHER TOOL IN MY TOOLBELT THAT I MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE HAVE TO CHARGE SOMEONE. THAT'S AT LEAST MY UNDERSTANDING. MY QUESTION IS SORT OF IF I UNDERSTOOD COUNCILMAN FOX CORRECTLY, IS THAT EXISTS ANYWAY, RIGHT? AND SO THE QUESTION IS IF I UNDERSTAND THE NUANCED DIFFERENCE, IT IS A QUESTION OF

THE OFFICER WITNESSING VERSUS NOT WITNESSING. SO I'M HOPING THE SPONSORS CAN SORT OF TALK ABOUT WHERE THERE'S POTENTIALLY A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT IS PROPOSED HERE AND THE WANTON ENDANGERMENT THAT COUNCILMAN FOX TALKED ABOUT.

>> YEAH. SO COUNCILMAN FOX MAY DISAGREE WITH ME ABOUT THIS. BUT I HAVE READ THE CASE LAW. I -- WE HEARD FROM JOSH. WE HEARD FROM THE CHIEF OF POLICE ON THIS ISSUE. THERE ARE ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS THAT HAS TO BE MADE TO CHARGE SOMEONE WITH WANTON ENDANGERMENT. AND THAT IS THAT YOU'RE CLOSE TO SOMEONE THAT YOU'RE ENDANGERING THAT PERSON. THAT IS NOT AN ELEMENT OF THE ORDINANCE THAT WE ARE TRYING TO PASS. THE ORDINANCE WE'RE TRYING TO PASS IS THAT YOU ARE FIRING A WEAPON. SO THERE ARE ELEMENTS THAT YOU HAVE TO MAKE THAT YOU WOULD NOT HAVE TO MAKE WITH THIS CHARGE. AND THE POLICE HAVE SAID THEY FIND IT VERY DIFFICULT TO MAKE WANTON ENDANGERMENT CHARGES. I'VE SEEN THEM TESTIFY THAT IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO MAKE THOSE CHARGES. I'VE SEEN ONE THROWN OUT IN KENTUCKY SUPREME COURT WHERE SHOTS WERE FIRED IN A HOUSE BECAUSE THOSE CONDITIONAL ELEMENTS WEREN'T MADE. POLICE HAVE TOLD US THIS IS A TOOL THEY CAN USE TO FURTHER INVESTIGATION. AND FRANKLY, THEY WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO SAY ON THE FOURTH OF JULY, NOT ONLY IS IT NOT GOOD PRACTICE, BUT IT'S ILLEGAL. NOW WHETHER THAT'S GOING TO STOP ANYBODY OR NOT, I DON'T KNOW. BUT THEY DON'T SAY THAT NOW

BECAUSE IN SOME CASES IT'S NOT ILLEGAL TO FIRE A WEAPON. SO I THINK THAT'S THE ANSWER. THERE ARE CLEARLY ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF WANTON ENDANGERMENT CHARGE THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE MADE UNDER THIS.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN MULVIHILL.

>> YEAH. JUST TO FOLLOW UP. IF YOU DO KNOW SOMEONE IS FIRING A WEAPON TWO DOORS DOWN, I'M NOT A VICTIM. BUT THERE COULD BE. IF NOBODY ANSWERS AND I MAKE THE CHARGE AND I FOLLOW THE OFFICER OVER. AND SINCE IT'S IN A DENSELY POPULATED AREA, I DON'T SEE ANY VICTIMS HERE. I CAN'T DO ANYTHING. I CAN'T EVEN HAVE A CONVERSATION. THIS ALLOWS YOU TO HAVE A CONVERSATION SAYING, HEY, WE DO HAVE AN ORDINANCE AND THIS IS UNSAFE GIVEN THE PARAMETERS. SO I DO THINK IT CHANGES -- COUNCILMAN FOX SAID. HE SAYS YOU HAVE TO HAVE A VICTIM. THAT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT. AND THERE IS ONE OTHER THING THAT'S NOT BROUGHT UP HERE IS KENTUCKY'S UNIQUE, AND IT'S NOT ALWAYS ENCOURAGED. FOLKS CAN ENFORCE THIS VIA THEMSELVES IF THEY FEEL TO BE A VICTIM. WHAT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY WILL SAY IS WELL IT NEEDS TO BE TETHERED TO A POLICE REPORT. SO THEY MAY NOT HAVE TO WITNESS IT BUT THEY CAN TAKE A WITNESS STATEMENT AND MOVE FORWARD IF A NEIGHBOR -- WHICH I KNOW COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE TALKED ABOUT A NEIGHBOR EXPERIENCING THIS -- COULD MOVE FORWARD. SO THAT IS ANOTHER AVENUE. AND SO IT IS VERY DIFFERENT FROM WANTON ENDANGERMENT WHEN YOU SAY I HAVE TO HAVE A VICTIM. IT COULD BE

SCARY TO YOU, WHICH IT IS FOR A LOT OF FOLKS IN DENSE NEIGHBORHOODS WHEN THEY HEAR GUNFIRE. BUT IF THERE'S NO VICTIM, THEY MAKE THE CALL. THERE'S NOTHING THE POLICE WILL DO. THEY WON'T EVEN PROBABLY GO OUT AND TALK TO THEM. IT WOULD CHANGE. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> THANK YOU. THAT LAST STATEMENT IS NOT WELL INFORMED. THE POLICE OFFICER CAN ALWAYS APPROACH AND TALK. YOU DON'T HAVE TO TALK TO THEM. YOU CAN SLAM THE DOOR IN THEIR FACE. BUT YOU CAN STILL SLAM THE DOOR IN THEIR FACE WITH THIS ORDINANCE. THE BOTTOM LINE IS THIS, AND READ IT, IT'S A MISDEMEANOR. IT HAS TO BE WITNESSED BY THE POLICE. MY COLLEAGUE IS ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. THERE ARE MORE ELEMENTS TO WANTON ENDANGERMENT. OF COURSE THERE ARE. BUT SHAKE YOUR HEAD YES IF YOU CAN MAKE A WARRANTLESS ARREST WHEN YOU DON'T WITNESS. THAT'S THE SHAKE WE DON'T SEE. BECAUSE YOU SIMPLY CAN'T. YOU CAN'T CHARGE FOR THIS IF YOU DON'T SEE IT. WHEN I REFERENCED HAVING A WITNESS, THAT'S FOR THE PROSECUTION. THE PROSECUTOR IN ALL LIKELIHOOD, IT'S NOT A REQUIREMENT UNDER LAW TO HAVE A WITNESS. OKAY. BUT ANY GOOD PROSECUTOR IS GOING TO WANT TO HAVE A VICTIM BEFORE THEY TAKE THE CASE TO TRIAL. AND BECAUSE THAT PLAYS WITH THE JURY AND SOLIDIFIES THE FACT. BUT IT'S NOT A REQUIREMENT UNDER LAW. AS I SAID. AND ANOTHER THING ABOUT THE POLICE. MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE POLICE, NOT

ONE RANKING -- I DON'T THINK THIS WAS THE CASE WITH THE POLICE. AND I MAY BE WRONG. I'LL DIFFER TO MY COLLEAGUES. I THINK WE WROTE THIS WHEN -- WANTON ENDANGERMENT SECOND DEGREE. A LOT OF WHAT MY COLLEAGUE SAYS IS ACCURATE ABOUT THE CHARGING. THERE IS NOTHING ABOUT THIS ORDINANCE THAT'S ANY DIFFERENT. ABSOLUTELY NOT. IT'S JUST ANOTHER PIECE OF LEGISLATION ON TOP OF WHAT WE'VE ALREADY GOT. -- THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. DOES THAT SATISFY YOUR QUESTION?

>> IT DOES. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I MADE SOME COMMENTS IN COMMITTEE THE OTHER DAY ABOUT, YOU KNOW, SOMETIMES WE CREATE INADVERTENT CONSEQUENCES, SITUATIONS. AND I THINK YOU RUN INTO UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES. -- I'M LISTENING TO THE DEBATE TONIGHT. I ASK THE VERY QUESTION THAT'S BEING DEBATED RIGHT NOW ABOUT -- AND I DON'T THINK I CALLED -- I THINK I JUST CALLED IT RECKLESS ENDANGERMENT. I CALLED IT AN INAPPROPRIATE TERM AND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT KIND OF LAUGHED AT ME BECAUSE I USED THE WRONG WORDS. WHICH IS FINE. BUT ALSO MADE IT CLEAR THEY'RE NOT GOING TO ENFORCE THAT. I APPRECIATE THE INFORMATION THAT COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER HAS MADE. AS A LAWYER, HE'S IN A MUCH BETTER PLACE TO DO THAT THAN I AM. BUT AS A PERSON WHO HASN'T STUDIED THE LAW, REPRESENTS A HUGE CHUNK OF THE -- VALUES A PERSON'S RIGHT TO

APPRECIATE FIREARMS AND TO ENGAGE IN A BEHAVIOR THAT'S SAFE. YOU KNOW, THE BOTTOM LINE IS WE CAN TELL THE POLICE THEY SHOULD ENFORCE WHATEVER ORDINANCES ARE ON THE BOOK OR NOT ENFORCING THEM. AND WE WERE TOLD BY ASSISTANT CHIEF BUDA THAT THAT WOULDN'T CHANGE. THEY'RE JUST NOT GOING TO DO THAT. THEY'RE JUST NOT GOING TO APPROACH FOLKS FOR SHOOTING INTO THE AIR BECAUSE THEY DON'T BELIEVE THEY CAN DO THAT. AND COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER GAVE YOU EVERY REASON WHY THE POLICE HAVE TAKEN THAT POSITION. I LISTENED TO THE GENTLEMAN SPEAKER TONIGHT ABOUT RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERS. THAT'S WHERE MY DISCUSSION IN COMMITTEE THE OTHER DAY CAME FROM. I SO APPRECIATE RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERS. AND I WANT TO MAKE SURE I'M DOING EVERYTHING I CAN TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERS TO USE THEIR WEAPONS IN AN APPROPRIATE WAY. BUT WE CAN'T JUST TURN A BLIND EYE TO WHAT'S GOING ON IN PARTS OF THIS COMMUNITY AND SAY, WELL RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERS WOULDN'T DO THAT. WELL OF COURSE RESPONSIBLE GUN OWNERS WOULDN'T DO THAT. THAT'S WHY THIS ORDINANCE IS NECESSARY. I APPRECIATE THE WORK ON THAT. -- TO CONTINUE TO BEHAVE THE WAY THEY'RE BEHAVING. THIS IS VERY NARROWLY ADDRESSES THE PROBLEM THE COMMUNITY IS FACING. I'M GOING TO VOTE YES AND I WOULD HOPE MY COLLEAGUES WOULD VOTE YES AS WELL.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN ACKERSON.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I HEAR THE WORDS FROM COUNCILMAN FOX VERY LOUDLY. WHAT WE'RE HEARING IS WE ALL KNOW WE HAVE A GUN PROBLEM. WE ALL KNOW WE HAVE A VIOLENCE PROBLEM. MY DISAPPOINTMENT IS WE'VE SPENT A LOT OF TIME HERE DOING SOMETHING THAT REALLY DOES NOTHING. AND I DON'T WANT MY CONSTITUENTS TO THINK THAT SOMEHOW PASSAGE OF THIS WE'RE TAKING STEPS TO CURTAIL VIOLENCE. IT OUGHT TO MAKE A GOOD HEADLINE TOMORROW. IT WILL MAKE A BAD HEADLINE TOMORROW WHEN IT READS ACKERSON VOTED NO. THAT'S OKAY. I'LL LIVE WITH THE HEADLINE. BUT I JUST DON'T SEE WHERE IT DOES ANYTHING TO ADVANCE THE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM. AS SUCH, SORRY TO WASTE OUR TIME. NO OFFENSE TO THE SPONSORS WHO HAVE GOOD INTENTIONS. AT THE END OF THE DAY, I'M A NO VOTE. AND THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN FOX FOR FURTHER EDUCATING ME ON THE SITUATION AT HAND.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN. AND COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT. I WANT TO TAKE A MOMENT AND JUST CAUTION, AGAIN, WHAT I WORRY IS A BIT OF FAULTY REASONING. I DON'T THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY THAT PEOPLE WHO ENGAGE IN CELEBRATORY GUNFIRE WON'T RESPECT LAWS BECAUSE PEOPLE WHO DISREGARD LAWS COMMIT HOMICIDE. I'VE NOT SEEN THE EVIDENCE THAT SAYS PEOPLE WHO ENGAGE IN CELEBRATORY GUNFIRE ARE LIKELY TO COMMIT HOMICIDES. AND I THINK ESTABLISHING LAWS HAVE THE ABILITY TO CHANGE CULTURE. ISN'T THAT WHY WE PASS RESOLUTIONS? WE

PASS ORDINANCES ALL THE TIME THAT WE KNOW HAVE A TON OF ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS. AND WE SAY, AT LEAST I'VE HEARD MY COLLEAGUES SAY, IT'S OUR JOB TO ESTABLISH THE EXPECTATION. AND SO FOR SOMEONE TO SAY, I MEAN, I THINK THE OTHER PIECE TO THINK ABOUT IS FOR PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY IN THE EVENT THAT IT IS ACTUALLY IMPLEMENTED AND THERE IS ACCOUNTABILITY. IF SOMEONE IN THE COMMUNITY FEELS A CONSEQUENCE AND THAT WORD SPREADS TO SOMEONE ELSE, THAT HAS THE ABILITY TO CHANGE CULTURE. AND SO I GUESS I WOULD JUST SAY, YOU KNOW, WHEN I HEAR THAT THIS DOES NOTHING, I'M NOT SURE THAT'S REFLECTIVE OF THE POSSIBILITY THAT EXISTS AND WHAT WE PASS ALL THE TIME IN RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. THE COUNCILMAN BENSON.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I FOUND OUT TONIGHT THAT MY HOUSE IS 290 FEET FROM THE ROAD. AND IF I SHOOT IN MY BACKYARD, I'M BREAKING THE RULES. MY NEIGHBORS, YOU KNOW. WHAT? I DIDN'T HEAR WHAT YOU SAID. ANYWAY, WE MAKE -- LIKE COUNCILMAN FOX TALKS ABOUT, WE HAVE ALL KINDS OF LAWS. YOU KNOW, COUNCILMAN KRAMER MADE YEARS AGO ABOUT NOISE ORDINANCE. ABOUT KIDS RIDING DOWN THE STREETS WITH THEIR RADIOS GOING LOUD OR MOTORCYCLES OR WHATEVER. THEY DIDN'T ENFORCE IT. BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE ENOUGH PEOPLE. AND YOU KNOW, TO ME, WHEN HE MENTIONED 800 PEOPLE HAVE BEEN SHOT LAST YEAR. I MEAN, THAT'S A

REAL PROBLEM. WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT PEOPLE NOT GETTING HURT? I THINK SOMEBODY SHOOTING UP IN THE AIR IS STUPID. AND IF YOU COULD SEE SOMEBODY SHOOTING UP IN THE AIR, SOMEBODY NEEDS TO TAKE CARE OF THOSE PEOPLE REAL QUICK BECAUSE THAT IS STUPID BECAUSE THAT BULLET DOES HAVE TO COME DOWN. ANY TIME I SHOOT, I KNOW EXACTLY WHERE MY BULLET GOES. AND SO I APPRECIATE PEOPLE TRYING TO REGULATE. I MEAN, YEARS AGO, PEOPLE DON'T LIKE TO HEAR ME SAY THIS, BUT GOD MADE THINGS CALLED THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE MADE 10,000 MORE. PEOPLE ARE PEOPLE. THEY FIND A WAY TO GET OUT OF SOMETHING. PEOPLE WHO HAVE GUNS AND WORK WITH THEIR GUNS MAKE SURE THEY DON'T DO ANYTHING WRONG OR TRYING TO TEACH OTHER PEOPLE SAFETY. THEY'RE NOT OUR PROBLEM. BUT WE WANT TO KEEP REGULATING THEM. AND ALL THE PEOPLE WHO ARE TRYING TO CATCH THEM SHOOTING SOMETHING. I'VE NEVER SEEN ANYBODY WHO HAS A GUN, IF THEY ARREST THEM, LET THEM GO. WE HAVE LAWS THAT WE OUGHT TO ENFORCE. TRY TO GET THE ILLEGAL GUNS THAT SOMEBODY'S BOUGHT FROM SOME PLACE AND TAKE CARE OF THEM. LET'S HELP THE PEOPLE IN THE AREAS WITH ALL THE GUNFIRE IS GOING ON. ONE TIME I SAID -- SOMEBODY SAID WE'RE NOT GETTING ALL THE POLICE PROTECTION WE NEED OUT IN OUR AREA. I SAID YOU ALL REALIZE THERE'S A LOT OF PEOPLE ON THE WEST END THAT HAVE BARS ON THE WINDOWS AND DOORS. THEY'RE WILLING TO GO TO JAIL EVERY NIGHT TO BE PROTECTED. I

SAID IF YOU DON'T THINK THERE'S SOMETHING WRONG WITH THAT, THEN SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH YOU. EVERYBODY OUGHT TO BE SAFE IN THEIR PLACE. AND WE NEED TO HELP THEM HOWEVER WE CAN. IF IT TAKES MORE ENFORCEMENT OR MORE WHATEVER IT TAKES IN AN AREA WHERE THERE'S A PROBLEM, LET'S ADDRESS THE PROBLEM. JUST DON'T GO AFTER PEOPLE WHO AREN'T REALLY THE PROBLEM. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN REED.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.
SOME OF YOU MAY KNOW THAT I WORK FOR A COMPANY BY MY FAMILY. IT'S AT 12TH AND KENTUCKY. IT'S ALMOST A RUNNING JOKE -- IT'S NOT FUNNY AT ALL -- BUT IT'S ALMOST A RUNNING JOKE THAT EVERY MORNING WE WALK THROUGH THE PARKING LOT AND WE PICK UP EMPTY SHELL CASINGS FROM BULLETS THAT HAVE BEEN FIRED FROM ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOOD. WE HAVE BULLETS THAT COME DOWN INTO THE ROOF OF THE FACILITY. YOU KNOW WHAT? I DON'T KNOW HOW ENFORCEABLE THIS IS BUT I'M GOING TO VOTE YES BECAUSE IF WE CAN REDUCE THAT BY 50%, THAT'S A NET VICTORY. YOU KNOW, COUNT ME IN THE YES CATEGORY. I DO UNDERSTAND FROM THE ARGUMENTS ABOUT IT BEING REDUNDANT AND HAVING LAWS ON THE BOOKS. BUT AT THE SAME TIME, YOU KNOW, WE'RE A GOOD EMPLOYER. WE HIRE FROM THE CITY. AND OUR EMPLOYEES DESERVE BETTER THAN THAT. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. AND COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.
JUST ONE COMMENT. AND I AGREE,

COUNCILMAN BENSON, THAT WE NEED DO SOMETHING WITH SOMEBODY WHO IS SHOOTING UP IN THE AIR. BUT I CAN PROMISE YOU THAT SHOOTING UP IN THE AIR IS NOT ALWAYS A CRIME IN THIS COUNTY. WANTON ENDANGERMENT LAW DOES NOT COVER THAT IN ALL CASES. LET ME JUST CLOSE BY SAYING THIS, AND AGAIN, I WANT TO THANK ALL THE PEOPLE WHO HELPED US COME TO A BETTER ORDINANCE. WHAT WE HEARD MAINLY IS THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING LAW ABIDING THINGS, PARTICULARLY IN OUR RURAL AREAS, AND IT'S NOT FAIR FOR THEM TO GO HAVE TO GET PERMITS TO DO WHAT THEY'VE ALWAYS DONE AND NOT HARMED ANYBODY. ALL OF THAT IS OUT OF THE ORDINANCE NOW. NOBODY HAS TO GET A PERMIT FOR THAT. WE TOOK ALL OF THAT OUT. WE LISTENED TO THE GOOD SUGGESTIONS. I WANT TO THANK THE MEMBERS WHO MADE THOSE SUGGESTIONS. AND I WANT TO THANK THE PUBLIC WHO MADE THOSE SUGGESTIONS. I THINK THIS IS A GOOD ORDINANCE AND I HOPE YOU'LL APPROVE IT.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN WINKLER.

>> THANK YOU. AND I JUST WANT TO COME BACK TO ONE ISSUE THAT WE SORT OF KEEP COMING BACK TO WHICH IS THE ENFORCEMENT QUESTION. RIGHT. OUR BODY IS NOT CHARGED WITH ENFORCEMENT. ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW IS NOT THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH. THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH WRITES THE LAW. ENFORCEMENT FALLS UNDER THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. SO THE QUESTION FOR US IS NOT WILL IT BE ENFORCED OR NOT. THE QUESTION FOR US IS IS

IT RIGHT OR NOT. I THINK COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE MADE A COMPELLING ARGUMENT ABOUT WHY IT IS RIGHT OR ISN'T, DEPENDING ON WHICH WAY YOU'RE LOOKING AT THE ARGUMENT. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. SO I JUST, YOU KNOW, I'M SHAKING MY HEAD THINKING OF ALL THE PEOPLE THAT WERE SHOT LAST YEAR, HOW MANY OF THOSE WERE SOLVED? AND HOW OVER TAXED ARE THOSE DETECTIVES THAT WERE TRYING TO SOLVE THOSE SHOOTINGS. I MEAN WHETHER SOMEONE DIED OR WHETHER THEY WERE JUST SHOT, THERE'S NOT ENOUGH DETECTIVES TO INVESTIGATE THOSE. I HAVE A HARD TIME MAKING ANOTHER LAW THAT WE HAVE ALREADY ON THE BOOKS THAT PROHIBITS THIS. I DON'T KNOW. I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY THAT WE CONTINUE TO MAKE LAWS THAT WE CAN'T ENFORCE. COUNCILMAN WINKLER, I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. BUT YOU KNOW, IT'S JUST CONSTANT BARRAGE OF RESOLUTIONS, OF LAWS THAT WE DON'T HAVE REALLY ANY CONTROL OVER. YOU'RE RIGHT. BUT WHY ARE WE MAKING THEM? I'LL BE A NO. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, IT'S AN ORDINANCE REQUIRING ROLL CALL VOTE. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>> COUNCILMAN BOWENS.

>> --

>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.
COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.
>> YES.
>> PRESIDENT JAMES.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> --
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>> -- OKAY. THANKS. --
>> ARE WE ON FREEZE? -- REED?
>> YES, SIR. COUNCIL MEMBER
REED.
>> --
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
>> BENSON.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.
>> NO.
>> I'M HERE.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.
>> YES.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 18 YESES, SIX NO VOTES AND ONE PRESENT VOTE.

>> THANK YOU, THE ORDINANCE PASSES. MADAM CLERK, A READING OF ITEM NUMBER 42.

>> AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW SUBSECTION OF LOUISVILLE JEFFERSON COUNTY -- SECTION 72-033 REGARDING THE OBSTRUCTION OF CURBSIDE MAILBOXES AS AMENDED. READ IN FULL.

>> THE ORDINANCE BEFORE US. ANY DISCUSSION? COUNCILMAN FOX.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I PROMISE THIS WILL BE QUICKER. IT WAS PASSED A VOICE VOTE. IT WAS HERE BECAUSE THERE WAS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. WHICH I BELIEVE THERE WILL BE ANOTHER FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. --

>> COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> THANK YOU. AGAIN, I CAN ONLY PROBABLY REPEAT WHAT COUNCILMAN FOX JUST SAID. IT IS AN ISSUE WHEN IT CAME UP IN COMMITTEE. EVEN BEFORE WE GOT TO COMMITTEE, THERE WERE SEVERAL COUNCILPEOPLE GIVING ANECDOTAL STORIES. HAVING THE SAME SITUATION. MAYBE EVERYBODY STAYING HOME FOR COVID HAD EVERYTHING TO DO WITH IT WITH CARS PARKED EVERYWHERE BECAUSE NOBODY IS GOING ANYWHERE. WITH THE LACK OF MAIL CARRIERS. NOBODY IS GETTING OUT OF THE CAR. IF THEY CAN'T DRIVE TO YOUR MAILBOX, THEY ARE DRIVING BY. I THINK THE BIGGEST COMPLAINTS I WAS GETTING AND READING ABOUT ON SOCIAL MEDIA WAS THAT'S NOT EVEN MY CAR. CONTACTED THE COUNTY ATTORNEY. SHE LOOKED IT UP. THERE'S ACTUALLY SOME OTHER CITIES WHO BEAT US TO THE PUNCH. SHE

MODELED THIS ORDINANCE AFTER THOSE. THE ONLY THING THAT'S REALLY CHANGED AT THIS POINT IS THE ENDING TIME. SHE SAID THE GOING RATE WAS 6 O'CLOCK. I MUCH LIKE EVERYONE ELSE SAID I SEE OUR MAIL CARRIER TO 7:00. LET'S MOVE IT TO THAT. MOVED IT TO 8:00. THE HOUR MAY CHANGE AGAIN. I'M NOT ATTACHED TO ANYTHING. SO AGAIN, I THINK IT ACTUALLY IS, YOU KNOW, A PROBLEM IN SEARCH OF A SOLUTION. AND THIS IS ACTUALLY A PRETTY GOOD THING. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT. I WANT TO SAY ON THE FRONT END OF THIS COMPLETELY SUPPORT THIS ORDINANCE. I JUST WANT TO DRAW ATTENTION TO SECTION C. THE EXCEPTIONS I THINK UNDER NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES MAKE REALLY GOOD SENSE AND WOULD APPLY. I THINK IN LIGHT OF THE ONGOING STAFFING ISSUES THAT WE HEAR FROM THOSE IN NEIGHBORHOODS IN TERMS OF WHEN THEY'RE GETTING THEIR MAIL AND WHEN THEY'RE NOT GETTING THEIR MAIL AND WHAT THE U. S. POSTAL SERVICE IS ABLE TO DO MEANS THAT AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THEORETICALLY, THERE ARE LOTS OF INSTANCES WHERE THEY COULD BE DELIVERING MAIL TO TRY AND CATCH UP. AND THAT INCLUDES -- I WOULD ENCOURAGE SOMEONE TO FACT CHECK ME BECAUSE I'M BY NO MEANS AN EXPERT IN POSTAL SERVICE. BUT THERE DOES SEEM TO BE SOME CONSENSUS THAT YOU WOULD THEORETICALLY HAVE A DELIVERY BEYOND 8 O'CLOCK AT NIGHT GIVEN THE STAFFING ISSUES, AS WELL ON SUNDAY. FOR THAT, I WOULD OPEN IT UP FOR COLLEAGUES TO CONSIDER

THAT THERE REALLY IS NO NEED FOR AN EXCEPTION BEYOND A FEDERAL HOLIDAY. AND I CAN APPRECIATE LIKE IF SOMEONE ROLLS UP TO THEIR PROPERTY AT 11:00 P.M., THE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE MAIL IS GOING TO BE DELIVERED IS LOW. BUT I DO THINK THE WAY IT'S CURRENTLY DRAFTED, IT'S NOT TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE ABILITY THE POST OFFICE WOULD DELIVER NONTRADITIONAL TIMES. THANK YOU.
>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN. ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.

>> I WOULD PUT THAT IN THE FORM OF A MOTION, OR AN AMENDMENT. I WOULD AMEND -- I'M DIFFERING DOWN HERE TO OUR COLLEAGUE, COUNCILMAN PEDEN, SINCE THIS WAS HIS ORDINANCE.

>> I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING IN FRONT OF ME. YOU FEEL -- IF YOU JUST WANT TO CHANGE THE TIME TO 9:00, AGAIN --

>> HOW DO WE ADDRESS SUNDAY? OKAY. SO IF WE COULD AMEND TO SAY EXCEPT -- WITH THE EXCEPTIONAL OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENTAL HOLIDAYS. DOES THAT SOUND -- I'LL DIFFER TO THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO SEE WHERE WE'RE GOING. 9:00 P.M. TO 7:00 --

>> IS THAT IN THE FORM OF A MOTION?

>> SECOND.

>> SECOND ARTHUR.

>> WE HAVE A SECOND BY COUNCILMAN ARTHUR. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT? HEARING NONE. ALL IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ALL OPPOSED. THE AYES HAVE
IT. THE AMENDED ORDINANCE IS
BEFORE US. IS THERE ANY FURTHER
DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, MADAM
CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS.
>> PRESENT.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.
>> YES.
>> PRESIDENT JAMES.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.
MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 21 YES
VOTES AND ONE PRESENT VOTE.

>> THANK YOU, THE ORDINANCE
PASSES. MADAM CLERK, A READING
OF ITEM NUMBER 43.

>> A RESOLUTION DETAILING THE
EXPECTATIONS OF METRO COUNCIL
FOR ALL -- FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES
GOVERNED BY BOARDS AND
COMMISSIONS. REGARDING BEST
PRACTICES FOR BOARD TRAINING
EXPENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR
PROCUREMENT AND HIRING. READ IN
FULL.

>> MOTION.

>> SECOND.

>> THE ORDINANCE -- THE
RESOLUTION IS BEFORE US. IS
THERE ANY DISCUSSION. COUNCILMAN
ACKERSON.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MY
UNDERSTANDING THIS MAY BE TABLED
OR SENT BACK. I WOULD TENDER THE
FLOOR TO THE ITEM SPONSOR,
COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> MADAM CLERK PLEASE LET THE
RECORD REFLECT THAT COUNCILMAN
WINKLER IS GOING TO TAKE THE
CHAIR.

>> -- SO YES, I'M GOING TO MAKE
A MOTION TO TABLE HERE AT
COUNCIL BECAUSE THE CHANGES THAT
HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED ARE --
I'LL JUST CALL IT WORDSMITHING.
NOT CHANGING THE SUBSTANCE THAT
WAS VOTED ON AT COMMITTEE. I'M
GOING TO MAKE A MOTION TO TABLE
HERE AT COUNCIL.

>> SECOND, ARTHUR.

>> -- ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY
AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ANY OPPOSED.

>> AYE.

>> THE AYES HAVE IT.

>> ALL RIGHT. MADAM CLERK, A
READING OF ITEM 44.
>> AN ORDER -- RELATED TO TRUCK
PARKING REQUIREMENTS. CASE 21
LCD 0100 READ IN FULL.
>> MAY I HAVE A MOTION.
>> MOTION BY INGLE.
>> SECOND BY COUNCILMAN
TRIPLETT. THE ORDINANCE IS
BEFORE US. ANY DISCUSSION?
COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.
>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT PRO
TEM. CURRENTLY HEAVY TRUCKS WERE
ALLOWED. THIS LEGISLATION WOULD
MAKE REFORMS TO ALLOW IT TO --
IN C2 AND C3 WITH CERTAIN
SPECIAL STANDARDS.
BUT EXCLUDED SEVERAL DISTRICTS.
THERE ARE SEVERAL OF MY
COLLEAGUES THAT WISH TO TAKE A
LOOK AT DIFFERENT FORM DISTRICTS
TO SEE WHERE THEY SHOULD OR
SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED. SO I'M
GOING TO ASK THIS BE SENT BACK
TO COMMITTEE AND ASK MY
COLLEAGUES TO PLEASE PAY CLOSE
ATTENTION TO THE EMAILS THAT
WILL BE GOING OUT FROM JOE
HABERMAN TO INFORM WHICH
DISTRICTS ARE WHERE SO THIS
DOESN'T BECOME AN URBAN VERSUS
SUBURBAN ISSUE. IT BECOMES A
BEST PRACTICES FOR THE ENTIRE
CITY. BECAUSE THIS IS A
CITY-WIDE PROBLEM. IT'S NOT JUST
IN ONE AREA OF TOWN.
>> I SECOND THAT.
>> MOTION BY COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD
TO SEND IT BACK TO COMMITTEE.
>> SECOND.
>> SECOND BY FOWLER. ALL THOSE
IN FAVOR SAY AYE.
>> AYE.
>> ANY OPPOSE. ALL RIGHT. THE
ITEM IS SENT BACK TO COMMITTEE.
MADAM CLERK, READING OF ITEM 45.

WE'RE MOVING NOW.

>> RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE
PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW
SECTION 4.3.2.0 OF THE LAND
DEVELOPMENT CODE TITLE MIX
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT --

>> MOTION.

>> SECOND INGLE.

>> MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER
TRIPLETT. SECOND BY INGLE. IS
THERE A MOTION TO SEND THIS BACK
TO COMMITTEE?

>> COUNCILMAN COUNCILWOMAN
FLOOD.

>> THE METRO COUNCIL ADOPTED THE
MRDI WHICH IS MIXED RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE. AND THE
PURPOSE OF THIS WAS TO GIVE
INCENTIVES IN R4 AND R5 ZONING
CLASSIFICATIONS TO GET MIXED USE
AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING. YOU GET
POINTS FOR MEETING CERTAIN
CATEGORIES, CERTAIN CRITERIA AND
POINTS FOR CERTAIN CRITERIA. IT
HAS NOT BEEN USED UNTIL LATELY.
IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THERE ARE
THREE APPLICATIONS IN THE
PIPELINE. AND WE DON'T EVEN KNOW
IF THOSE PARTICULAR ZONING
REQUESTS WILL EVEN -- NOT ZONING
REQUESTS, A REQUEST FOR THE MRDI
WILL EVEN MEET THE THRESHOLD
WITH THE DEVELOPER WITH WHAT TO
DO. AGAIN, THIS INITIATIVE
ALLOWS FOR MULTI-FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS TO
OCCUR IN CERTAIN ZONING
DISTRICTS R4 AND R5 WITHOUT
REQUIRING A ZONING CHANGE. --
MULTI-FAMILY UNITS AND
AFFORDABLE UNITS. IF YOU LOOK AT
THE HIGHLIGHTS AND YOU LOOK AT
THE SDENSITY, THEY'RE NOT
GETTING THAT MUCH DENSITY EVEN
WHEN THEY'RE GETTING THE
BONUSES. THE RESOLUTION BEFORE

US IS ASKING THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO TAKE A LOOK AT THE GUIDELINES FROM MRDI BUT WE'VE NOT BEEN ALLOWED TO APPLY THEM YET. RESOLUTION IS SPONSORED BY COUNCILMAN ANTHONY PIAGENTINI. SO I'M SURE HE'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THAT, TOO.

>> COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. I ASSUME YOU DO HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY.

>> YEAH. I'M GOING TO APOLOGIZE FOR GRINDING THIS PROGRESS TO A HALT HERE FOR A MOMENT. BUT I AM GOING TO ASK FOR YOUR INDULGENCE FOR A FEW MOMENTS BECAUSE I DO HAVE A SERIES OF FACTS THAT I THINK WILL HELP YOU UNDERSTAND WHY I'M ASKING FOR THE REVIEW OF THIS MRDI CODE. I WANT TO BE CLEAR ABOUT WHAT THIS RESOLUTION DOES. IT IS SIMPLY ASKING FOR THE INITIAL STAGES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO REVIEW THE CODE PARTICULARLY NOW THAT WE DO HAVE A FEW EXAMPLES OF THESE DEVELOPMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN APPLIED. -- IF WE ARE SEEING TRENDS THAT ARE NOT IN LINE WITH THE INTENT OF MRDI. WHICH I'LL TALK ABOUT IN A SECOND. I DID RECENTLY SEND YOU ALL ANALYSIS CONDUCTED -- MR. O'BRIEN WAS ABLE TO SPLIT THAT DATA -- SPREADSHEET. FINAL TAB SHOWING A TOTAL COUNT OF ALL UNITS. THE DATA IS ONLY FROM 2019 TO 2020. THERE WAS A SYSTEM CHANGE MAKING IT DIFFICULT TO GO BEYOND THAT DATE. BUT HE WAS ABLE TO PULL 2019 TO 2020 DATA. WHICH SHOWS THE FOLLOWING. DISTRICT 19 WITH 1,608 TOTAL UNITS BUILT IN THREE YEARS. TO PROVIDE SOME CONCEPT AND SCALE, THE SECOND PLACE IN TOTAL UNITS

IS DISTRICT 22 WITH 957 UNITS COMPARED TO 1600. AND THIRD PLACE IS DISTRICT 23 WITH 732 UNITS. LESS THAN HALF OF THE AMOUNT THAT WERE DEVELOPED IN MY DISTRICT IN THAT SAME PERIOD OF TIME. OF MY 1,608 TOTAL UNITS, 611 ARE FOR MULTI-FAMILY HOUSES. SECOND ONLY TO DISTRICT 24, COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD, WITH 630 UNITS BUILT IN THE SAME TIME FRAME. AND THIRD PLACE IS DISTRICT 13 WITH 375 UNITS. SO 611 AND 640 DOWN TO 375. DISTRICT 19 BY ITSELF ACCOUNTS FOR 20% OF ALL THE HOUSING GROWTH IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS WITHOUT BEING LESS THAN 4% OF THE POPULATION. FOR MULTI-HOUSE FAMILY HOUSING, DISTRICTS 7, 12, 18, 21, 25 AND 26 ALL HAD ZERO NEW UNITS BUILT IN THEM. ZERO. SEVEN DISTRICTS DIDN'T HAVE ONE UNIT FOR MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING BUILT IN THREE YEARS. -- A LITTLE OVER 200 UNITS EACH BUILT. FOR SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING, 4, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 23, 23, AND 22 HAD AT LEAST 100 UNITS BUILT. ALL OTHER DISTRICTS HAD LESS THAN 100 UNITS BUILT FOR SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING. -- IN 2019 ALONE, DISTRICT 19 HAD AN 80-UNIT, 100% DEDICATED AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMPLEX BUILT. THAT'S MORE MULTI-FAMILY UNITS OF ALL TYPES THAN 15 DIFFERENT DISTRICTS. 15 DISTRICTS DIDN'T EVEN HAVE 18 UNITS. WHEREAS I HAD 80 UNITS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS BUILT IN THAT SAME TIME FRAME.

>> --

>> I HAD MORE MULTI-UNIT FAMILIES BUILT THAN 18 DISTRICTS COMBINED. -- THE FACT IS THAT

DISTRICT 19 IS BUILDING MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING THAN AT LEAST 15 DISTRICTS. PROBABLY MORE THAN 20 DISTRICTS BUT WE COULDN'T GET THE DATA -- I'M THE SECOND LARGEST BUILDER OF MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING IN THE CITY. -- THE FACTS ARE CLEAR. MY CONSTITUENTS AND I ARE ONE OF THE MOST PRO AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND THE MOST PRO DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT IN THE CITY BAR NONE. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT ISSUES THAT OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS ARE EXPERTS OF, I TEND TO LISTEN TO THEM A LITTLE MORE CLOSELY. FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN WE TALK ABOUT HOMELESSNESS, I TEND TO LISTEN MORE TO COUNCILMAN ARTHUR BECAUSE HE'S MORE IMPACTED AND KNOWS MORE ABOUT THE ISSUE THAN I DO. GIVEN THE ABOVE FACT, WHEN WE TALK ABOUT NEW DEVELOPMENT, I HOPE EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS AND HOPEFULLY SOME OF YOU HAVE HEARD FROM MY CONSTITUENTS ABOUT THE IMPACT THIS HAS HAD IN OUR COMMUNITY AND WHY WE'RE ASKING THUS FOR A REVIEW. I'VE CONSISTENTLY SAID I -- I THINK IT'S ACTUALLY RATHER CREATIVE WAY OF DOING IT. THE PROBLEM HERE AND WHAT WE'RE GOING TO BE DISCUSSING IS WHETHER OR NOT THE FIRST PROPOSED MRDI DEVELOPMENTS ARE IN LINE WITH OUR EXPECTATIONS AND THE INTENT. AND IF THE CURRENT CODE NEEDS TO BE ADJUSTED TO IMPROVE SUSTAINABILITY. ONE OF THE FILE CASES WAS ORIGINALLY A REZONING CASE THAT WE REJECTED AS COUNCIL. OVERTURNING THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S ORIGINAL -- I CAN'T POSSIBLY BELIEVE -- IN THE CASE THAT WAS FILED ON

JOHNSON ROAD IN MY DISTRICT, WE ARE PLACING HIGH DENSITY HOUSING ON ARGUABLY THE MOST RURAL, UNSAFE ROAD IN MY DISTRICT. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE NOWHERE NEAR COLLECTOR OR ARTERIAL ROAD. IT ALIGNS WITH ALL OF MY OTHER HIGH DENSITY HOUSING. THERE ARE VALLEYS AND ROADS SO DRASTIC THAT REGULAR PASSENGER VEHICLES BOTTOM OUT. AND THERE ARE MULTIPLE TURNS IN THE ROAD THAT ARE SO ACUTE THAT A ANY TRUCK LARGER THAN THE F-150 -- COMPLETE LACK OF SHOULDER -- FINALLY, THE DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED UP AGAINST -- AND THE DEVELOPER AT A PUBLIC MEETING DIDN'T MAKE ANY HARD COMMITMENTS TO ABIDE BY THE DRO CODE. ONCE AGAIN, I CAN'T BELIEVE THAT WHEN MRDI WAS APPROVED, IT WAS COUNCIL'S INTENTION WITH HIGH DENSITY HOUSING IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA, NOWHERE NEAR ARTERIAL OR COLLECTOR ROAD -- TO HANDLE THE ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC. THE FIRST DEVELOPMENTS USING THIS CODE -- SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OR ANY ALIGNMENT WITH PLAN 2040. THE BUILDER ITSELF ACKNOWLEDGE MRDI WAIVE -- THE BUILDING COMMUNITY ADMITTED THAT AT THE MEETING. ONE OF THE OTHER CONCERNS MY CONSTITUENTS HAVE IS COMPLETE LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE SPENDING PROPERLY SUPPORTING THIS NEW DEVELOPMENT, WHICH IS CREATING INCREASINGLY MORE DANGEROUS ROADS. THE 80-UNIT AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT THAT I TALKED ABOUT EARLIER WAS IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO SHELBY ROAD. ACCESS TO RETAIL AND OTHER AMENITIES. THERE WAS NO

SIGNIFICANT OPPOSITION TO IT. IT WAS A GREAT SUSTAINABLE IDEA. MADE A LOT OF SENSE. WITH THAT SAID, THE CITY HAS SPENT SO LITTLE AND DONE SO LITTLE IN THE EXECUTION OF BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE THAT THEY FAILED TO BUILD A SIDEWALK CONNECTING THOSE APARTMENTS TO SHELBYVILLE ROAD. I GOT A CALL FROM MAYOR -- WHO HAD TO NAVIGATE ON TO THE SHOULDER OF CERTAIN LANES ON THE ROAD BECAUSE THE CITY DIDN'T BUILD A SIDEWALK. IT WASN'T UNTIL I PUT \$50,000 INTO THE BUDGET THIS LAST CYCLE DESIGNATED TO THE SIDEWALK SO THAT IT WAS BUILT. THE CITY HAD PLANS TO PUT IN ONE \$50,000 SIDEWALK TO SUPPORT. A RECENT STUDY SHOWS THAT THE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT -- SOUTHEAST INTO COUNCILMAN PEDEN'S AREAS. NEED APPROXIMATELY \$70 MILLION IN LOCAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES TO KEEP UP WITH DEMAND. WHERE IS THE PLAN FOR THAT? HAVE WE PUT \$1 IN THE BUDGET TO SUPPORT ANY OF THAT? WHY IS THAT REMOTELY -- OR IN THE CODE FOR MRDI BEFORE WE KEEP LOADING UP HOUSING IN THE SAME AREAS OVER AND OVER. WHY IS IT CONTROVERSIAL TO ASK FOR ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL NEEDS BEFORE DEVELOPER GETS APPROVED TO BUILD WITH ZERO OVERSIGHT BY METRO COUNCIL. THIS CODE IS A REMINDER -- I AM SIMPLY ARGUING THAT THIS IS NOT CONTEMPLATED IN THE CODE. THE CODE IS WRITTEN. NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED UPON. THINGS LIKE THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS, SURROUNDING INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

TO BE PART OF THAT INSTEAD OF THINGS THAT THE CODE EITHER WAIVED OR MAKES NO MENTION. I'M JUST ASKING -- A PORTION OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE THAT HAS NEVER BEEN USED IN SEVEN YEARS, NEVER. I HAVE PROVEN THAT IT HAS SIGNIFICANT UNADDRESSED SUSTAINABILITY, ENVIRONMENTAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE. MY DISTRICT IS DOING MORE THAN ANYONE TO ADDRESS OUR HOUSING, INCLUDING AFFORDABLE. -- THAT THIS VOTE IS DOING WHAT WE INTENDED. NOT ASKING FOR THE CODE TO -- JUST CONSIDER THESE IMPACTS. THOSE IMPACTS, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACTS, AND THE -- I WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR SUPPORT ON THIS RESOLUTION. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEM. SO COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI, I ALMOST FEEL SORRY FOR YOU BECAUSE YOU'VE GOT SO MUCH GROWTH IN YOUR DISTRICT. IT'S JUST AMAZING. YOU'VE GOT EVERY TYPE OF RESTAURANT. EVERY TYPE OF BUSINESS THAT YOU CAN IMAGINE IN YOUR DISTRICT. YOU KNOW, PEOPLE JUST WANT TO LIVE THERE. THEY WANT TO LIVE THERE SO YOU CAN BE THE REPRESENTATIVE, I GUESS. IT'S THE PLACE TO BE. BUT SOME OF US HAVE GOT PLACES THAT ARE REALLY LACKING. AND WE'VE GOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOING UP. WE'VE GOT UNITS. AND BY THE WAY, THE UNITS THAT ARE LISTED ON YOUR CHART ARE TOTALLY WRONG FOR WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE LAST THREE YEARS IN MY DISTRICT AS FAR AS APARTMENTS. I MEAN, I JUST, I DON'T KNOW. I THINK IF

WE CAN GET SOME DEVELOPMENT STARTED AND MIXED USE, I THINK IT'S A GOOD THING. I DON'T WANT TO SOUND LIKE A SMART ALEC, BUT I JUST SAT HERE AND LISTENED TO ALL OF THAT, IT JUST SLAPS ME IN THE FACE. AND I KNOW I'M NOT ALONE. BUT ANYWAY, I'LL BE A NO.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER. COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEM. I WAS HERE IN AUGUST OF 2015. I'VE GONE BACK AND LOOKED AT THAT DATE. I SPOKE IN FAVOR OF THIS. I WORKED ON IT IN AN AD HOC COMMITTEE WITH COUNCILMAN PEDEN FOR A LONG TIME. IT WAS PASSED 18-2. THERE WERE TWO NO-VOTES. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI'S PREDECESSOR WAS ONE OF THE TWO. COUNCILMAN PEDEN WAS THE OTHER. WE KNEW AT THAT TIME WE WERE PASSING SOMETHING THAT IN ORDER TO ADVANCE AFFORDABLE HOUSING COULD ALLOW MULTI-FAMILY TO BE DEVELOPED WITHOUT COUNCIL APPROVAL. IT APPEARS SOMEBODY HAS USED THAT ORDINANCE, WHICH WE PASSED AND KNEW WHAT WOULD HAPPEN. WE'RE SAYING WE GOTTA GO BACK AND LOOK AT -- I THINK WE SHOULD LET PEOPLE USE IT. I ALSO SHOULD SAY I THINK THERE'S SOME MISUNDERSTANDING, I'LL PUT IT THAT WAY, BY PEOPLE WHO HAVE CONTACTED US ABOUT THIS ORDINATE. THE DRO GUIDELINES MUST BE FOLLOWED. I DON'T CARE WHAT THE DEVELOPER SAID AT THE MEETING. HE WILL BE REQUIRED TO FOLLOW THE DRO GUIDELINES BY PLANNING AND DESIGN. THAT'S THE LAW. THIS DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE DRO GUIDELINES, AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE IS REALLY JUST TRUMPED UP HERE, FRANKLY. I

THINK WE SHOULD LET THIS ORDINANCE PLAY OUT. EVELYN LOU HAS TOLD US SHE WILL REVIEW THIS AS IT BEGINS TO BE USED. AND WILL RECOMMEND CHANGES IF THEY ARE NEEDED. BUT TO SAY THAT NOBODY IS GOING TO LOOK AT THIS ORDER NONCE OR SEE HOW IT'S GOING TO BE USED IS JUST NOT TRUE. THAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN. I THINK WE OUGHT TO BE FRANK HERE. THERE WERE TWO DOCUMENTS FILED. THERE WAS THIS RESOLUTION AND THERE WAS AN ORDINANCE TO STOP ALL DEVELOPMENT WITH MRDI. AND WHEN THIS ORDINANCE CAME OUT OF COMMITTEE WITH A NEGATIVE VOTE, THAT ONE WAS HELL BECAUSE WELL IT DIDN'T LOOK GOOD TO HAVE THAT ORDINANCE GO FORWARD IF THIS WASN'T GOING TO BE APPROVED. I THINK THESE TWO ARE TIED TOGETHER. AND I'M NOT FOR A MORATORIUM TO STOP THE USE OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCENTIVE THAT WE PASSED IN 2015 BY AN 18-2 VOTE. I URGE PEOPLE TO VOTE NO. I WANT TO BE CLEAR. I BELIEVE THIS WILL BE REVIEWED AND I THINK THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED, PARTICULARLY THE ARGUMENTS THAT SOMEHOW THIS IS INCONSISTENT WITH 2040 OR THAT THE DRO DOESN'T AFLY -- APPLY ARE JUST SIMPLY FALSE.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER. COUNCILMAN BENSON.
>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEM. I THINK I GOT THAT RIGHT. 19 YEARS AGO WHEN I WAS ELECTED, I GOT THE PERSON WHO WAS HEAD OF PUBLIC WORKS, I SAID CAN YOU SHOW ME YOUR PLANS FOR THE NEXT 50 YEARS ON ROADS. HE SAID WHAT? I SAID WHAT'S YOUR PLANS FOR THE

NEXT 50 YEARS ON ROADS. HE SAYS WE DON'T HAVE NOTHING LIKE THAT. I SAID WHY NOT? WE DON'T HAVE NO MONEY. I SAID YOU GOT A PENCIL? PROBABLY MY VIEW OF GOVERNMENT IS A LOT DIFFERENT THAN EVERYBODY'S ELSE. GOVERNMENT -- IF WE'RE GOING TO GROW, HOW SHOULD WE GROW, AND SHOULD WE HAVE INFRASTRUCTURE. OR ARE WE JUST GOING TO BUILD, TEAR DOWN A BUNCH OF HOUSES AND MOVE A ROAD INTO IT. I THINK IS VERY, VERY POOR PLANNING. YOU LOOK AROUND THE CITY AND THINK THE ONLY TIME WE EVER GOT IT RIGHT, 1778. THEY SAY WE'RE GOING TO HAVE FIRST, SECOND, THIRD. MAIN MARKET. WE HAD A GRID. AND PEOPLE ARE GOING TO LOAD WAGON. SOMEONE KNEW HOW TO GET AROUND. OUT IN THE COUNTY. BUFFALO WENT THIS WAY OR DEER OR WHATEVER. THERE WAS A TRAIL SO WE BUILT A ROAD THERE. WE LET ANIMALS CONTROL OUT WE'RE DOING. NOW I TOLD HIM, I SAID I USED TO BE A TOOL MAKER. I STILL AM I TOOL MAKER. THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT IS. BUT EVERYTHING WE GOT HERE IN THIS ROOM, IF IT WASN'T FOR A TOOL MAKER, WE WOULDN'T HAVE IT. I NEVER BUILT ANY TOOLING WITHOUT A DRAWING. I NEVER CUT ANY STEEL UNTIL I MADE SURE ALL THE NUMBERS ARE RIGHT. BECAUSE ONCE YOU CUT THE STEEL AND IT'S WRONG, SOMEBODY ADDED SOME NUMBERS UP WRONG. SO YOU NEED A BALANCE. OUR GOVERNMENT MAYBE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH PLANNING AND ZONING. THEY'VE GOT SOME PEOPLE WHO ARE PRETTY CAPABLE. WHERE SHOULD WE GO. HOW SHOULD WE BUILD OUR ROADS. WE DON'T. AND WE NEED TO LOOK AT OUR PLANS A LITTLE BIT BETTER IF YOU'RE

GOING TO BUILD OUT IN
PIAGENTINI'S AREA, IT'S OKAY.
MAKE SURE WE HAVE INFRASTRUCTURE
SO WE DON'T HAVE TO SPEND A
WHOLE BUNCH OF -- WHEN THEY
BUILD, WE GET TAXED. AND WE
OUGHT TO BE MAKING SOME MONEY.
WE OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO STORE UP
SOME STUFF. WE SHOULDN'T BE SO
FAR BEHIND THAT WE GOTTA TELL
THE DEVELOPER IF YOU DON'T BUILD
US THIS ROAD, WE'RE NOT GOING
PASS YOUR PLANS. WHAT WE DO, WE
BLACKMAIL THESE PEOPLE INTO
DOING SOMETHING INFERIOR -- WE
SHOULD FIGURE OUT HOW TO DO THAT
SO WE HAVE GOOD QUALITY
DEVELOPMENT. I MEAN, I'M
EMBARRASSED SOMETIMES TO TELL
PEOPLE I WORK FOR GOVERNMENT.
YOU'D SAY LOOK HOW WELL WE RUN
OUR GOVERNMENT. POOR. POOR. I
THINK. THAT'S JUST MY OPINION
BECAUSE NOBODY EVER ASKS IT. SO
SOMETIMES, YOU KNOW, WHAT HE'S
TALKING ABOUT, WE MADE SOME
THINGS TO TRY TO MAKE ZONING A
LITTLE BIT EASIER. MAKE IT SO
THAT PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO RUN
AWAY AND WE CAN HELP THEM. I
THINK DEVELOPERS HAVE GOT THE
IDEAS, CREATIVITY. THAT'S THEIR
MONA LISA. THEY WANT TO BUILD
SOME QUALITY. AND SOMETIMES WE
CAUSE THEM NOT TO. AND WE SHOULD
BE SUPPORTING THEM, HELPING THEM
OUT. SO WE NEED THEM TO BE ON
OUR SIDE INSTEAD OF TRYING TO
SNEAK AROUND TO DO SOMETHING
BECAUSE THEY THINK THEY'RE NOT
GOING TO BE ABLE TO WORK WITH
THAT. AND SOMETIMES WE NEED TO
HAVE THEM, YOU KNOW, I THINK
THIS THING OF LOOKING OVER IT
AGAIN, ARE WE REALLY RIGHT ON
WHAT WE'RE SEEING? COUNCILMAN

HOLLANDER SAID THE DRO AND STUFF. IN MY AREA YOU CANNOT BELIEVE HOW MANY PEOPLE SKIRT THE RULES AND WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH INSPECTORS AND PEOPLE TO KEEP ON TOP OF STUFF THAT PEOPLE DO WRONG. THEY WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO DO AS MUCH WRONG IF WE WAS MORE IN A PARTNERSHIP AND WITH THEM AND WE'RE WATCHING WHAT'S GOING ON. WHAT I'M SAYING IS WE NEED A MORE TEAM EFFORT OF BRINGING EVERYBODY INTO THE FOLD AND TALKING ABOUT THE ISSUES. YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT BOTHERS ME A LOT ABOUT SOMEBODY SAID DRO OR THAT KIND OF BULL. WHAT ABOUT DOING IT RIGHT. -- SO I THINK SOMETIMES NOT A BAD IDEA. FUNDED A LOT NEW TRIPS JUST TO MAKE PEOPLE SEE IT AND GOES OUT THERE AND USE IT BECAUSE THE MORE PEOPLE USE IT, THE SAFER IT IS. SOME THUGS DON'T COME ALONG AND HURT SOMEBODY. REVIEW. LOOK OVER THINGS. -- WE STATE WHAT WE THINK WE NEED AND CAN YOU ALL HELP US. AND SO I'M KIND OF THINKING SOMETIMES WE NEED TO REVIEW THINGS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEM.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN BENSON. COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEM. FIRST OF ALL, MOST OF THE DEVELOPMENT ALONG THE DRO HAVE -- TO SAY THAT THIS DEVELOPMENT WILL HAVE TO ABIDE BY IT IS HISTORY IS AN INDICATOR OF THE FUTURE. WELL BECAUSE THE CURRENT ONES, MANY OF THEM DON'T. AND I KNOW STEVE HENRY IS SOMEBODY WHO IS VERY FAMILIAR WITH THIS. HE'LL TELL YOU THE EXACT SAME THING. BUT I ASK YOU, COUNCILMAN

HOLLANDER BECAUSE YOU WERE THERE AND YOU REVIEWED THIS CASE. WAS IT CONTEMPLATED DURING THE DEBATE, IF YOU DON'T MIND IF I ASK A QUESTION TO COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER. WAS IT CONTEMPLATED IN THE DEBATE THAT IF A DEVELOPER HAD THEIR DEVELOPMENT REJECTED BY EITHER COUNCIL AFTER OVERTURNING A PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION THAT THIS WOULD BE A TOOL THAT THEY CAN THEN USE AND MAKE SMALL MODIFICATIONS TO --

>> I THINK AFFORDABLE HOUSING, ABSOLUTELY. IT WAS CLEARLY CONTEMPLATED -- WOULD QUALIFY FOR MRDI. THIS WAS NOT THE SAME PROJECT THAT WAS REJECTED. AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS I UNDERSTAND THE PROJECT. -- AS I UNDERSTAND IT AT THAT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING. ABSOLUTELY. IT WAS VERY CLEAR TO EVERYONE HERE THAT THIS WAS ALLOWING MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL --

>> LET ME REPHRASE THE QUESTION. IT DID AT 5%, WHICH I THINK WAS THE MINIMUM. I THINK DEVELOPMENTS 5% WHICH IS EXACTLY THE MINIMUM. SO AGAIN, THE QUESTION IS NOT THAT THE MRD -- BECAUSE I AGREE. ALSO I THINK I WAS MISCHARACTERIZED -- NOWHERE IN HERE IS DOES IT STATE THAT WE DON'T WANT TO CONTINUE WITH MRDI. THE QUESTION IS WAS IT CONTEMPLATED THAT AFTER A REJECTION OVERTURNED BY COUNCIL THAT THE DEVELOPER, THE INTENTION OF MRDI IS YOU CAN THEN GO BACK AT 5% HOUSING --

>> I DON'T KNOW THAT THAT SEQUENCE WAS DISCUSSED. CLEARLY, BECAUSE I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT. WE'RE SAYING THIS ALLOWS THINGS

TO BE DEVELOPED WITHOUT METRO COUNCIL APPROVED. THERE WERE 18 OF US WHO AGREED WITH THAT THAT NIGHT. ACTUALLY, THERE WERE 20 OF US WHO KNEW IT. THERE WERE 18 WHO AGREED WITH IT. THAT WAS CLEARLY PART OF THE LAW. NOW WE'RE SAYING WE DON'T LIKE THAT. BECAUSE IT'S AFFORDABLE HOUSING, WE'D LIKE TO HAVE THAT KIND OF CONTROL. I THINK WE SHOULD LET THE LAW PLAY OUT. WHEN WE HAVE A SITUATION WHERE WE PASSED AN ORDINANCE TO ADVANCE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THIS COMMUNITY, THE FIRST TIME IT'S USED, WE SAY WE DON'T LIKE IT ANYMORE. WE WANT TO STUDY IT. AND AT THE SAME TIME, WE ALSO WANT TO HAVE A MORATORIUM ON EVERYTHING THAT'S BEEN FILED.

>> SO A COUPLE OF THINGS. I GOTTA BACK UP A LITTLE BIT BECAUSE THERE'S MULTIPLE MISSTATEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL ADVOCATED TO GET RID OF MRDI.

>> YOU ARE ADVOCATING FOR A MORATORIUM.

>> NO. NOT RIGHT NOW. -- I'M AGAINST MORATORIUMS FOR NO REASON. THAT'S STUPID. WHAT I'M FOR IS IF WE'RE ACKNOWLEDGING FOR EXAMPLE THE CODE DOESN'T ADDRESS INFRASTRUCTURE -- IT IS COMPLETELY AT THE DISCRETION OF PLANNING COMMISSION TO ESTABLISH WHATEVER HE WANT OR REQUIREMENT THEY WANT. WE'RE ASKING FOR THAT. SO IF THIS PASS, WE'RE SAYING A REVIEW, THEN WOULD YOU ONLY DISCUSS. -- WE DIDN'T MOVE FORWARD WITH THE DEBATE ABOUT IT BECAUSE IT DIDN'T MAKE SENSE UNTIL WE DEBATED THIS. AND I WOULDN'T MOVE FORWARD WITH THAT UNLESS THIS IS APPROVED. IT

MAKES NO SENSE. AND THAT WILL BE DEBATED ON ITS OWN MERIT. WHETHER OR NOT THE PERSON CAN AGREE WHETHER OR NOT THE MRD SHOULD BE DONE AND DISAGREE THAT THE MORATORIUM SHOULD BE DONE. WHICH IS WHY THEY'RE SEPARATE ISSUES. WHICH IS WHY I'M DEBATE -- WHICH IS WHY THAT IS NOT IN FRONT OF US. ANYWAY, I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY THOSE THINGS.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI. COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> THANK YOU. TWO THINGS ON THIS TOPIC: NUMBER ONE, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER ALLUDED TO ABOUT HAVING CONTROL. IT HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO SPECIFICALLY WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING. I EVEN IN EARLIER DISCUSSIONS BEHIND THE SCENES REFERENCED THIS EXACT SAME THING WITH THE DAYCARE ORDINANCE. THAT IS WHENEVER WE DO ANYTHING BY RIGHT, THAT MEANS THEY CAN DO IT ANYWHERE, ANY PLACE, ANY TIME THEY WANT AND NO ONE CAN TELL THEM NO. AND MY COMMENT TO THAT IS, THERE ARE OCCASIONS WHERE COMMON SENSE SHOULD KICK IN AND SOMEONE SAY NO. I'M NOT SAYING 99 TIMES OUT OF 100, 999 OUT OF 1,000 IT SHOULD BE OKAY. BUT THERE IS ALWAYS THAT ONE SOMEBODY SHOULD BE ABLE TO LOOK AT THE PROJECT. IT'S NOT ABOUT THE SCORE THEY GET WHEN THEY START FILLING OUT THE TALLY SHEET. ARE YOU PRESERVING THIS MANY TREES. OH, LOOK AT THAT. AT SOME POINT SOMEBODY IS GOING TO PICK A LOCATION THAT'S JUST WRONG. AGAIN, I USED THE DAYCARE ANALOGY EARLIER AND IT SEEMED CUTE AND EQUIPPED. -- IT JUST HAPPENS TO BE LOCATED BY

ZEON CHEMICALS IN RUBBERTOWN.
SOMEONE, I'M NOT SAYING ANYBODY
WANTS TO, BUT WHENEVER YOU LABEL
SOMETHING BY RIGHT, THEY CAN.
IT'S JUST HOW IT IS. THEY CAN.
SO AGAIN, SO JUST ANY TIME -- I
AM JUST DECIDED -- PROBABLY WHY
I WAS ONE OF THE TWO PEOPLE WHO
VOTED NO SEVEN YEARS AGO. IT'S
OUT WHERE I AM TAKING
PIAGENTINI'S CHART INTO ACCOUNT.
I HAVE ENOUGH BUILDINGS AND
DEVELOPMENT TO KNOW IF THERE'S
AN OFF PLACE -- THEY'LL FIND IT.
THAT'S JUST HOW IT ROLLS OUT OUR
WAY. I MEAN, IT'S NOT QUALITY. I
DROVE THROUGH YOUR DISTRICT THE
OTHER DAY. JUST TODAY, REALLY
COOL APARTMENTS BEING BUILT.
SOMEWHERE RIGHT AROUND PAYNE
STREET. WHY AREN'T WE INSISTING
ON THAT TYPE OF ARCHITECTURE
EVERYWHERE?
THEY DON'T SEEM TO BE
PARTICULARLY EXPENSIVE. THEY
JUST LOOK REALLY NICE. IT HAS
SIDEWALKS. IT'S ON A MAIN ROAD.
THERE'S PARKING UNDERNEATH THE
BUILDING. WE'RE NOT BULLDOSING.
-- PAVE OVER EVERY BIT OF GREEN
SPACE. WE HAD TO PASS A LAW THAT
MADE THEM PRESERVE 20% OF THE
TREES. AGAIN, IF YOU LET THEM
BUILD SOMETHING CHEAP AND
CRAPPY, THEY WILL. MY SECOND
COMMENT ON MRDI SPECIFICALLY IS
-- AND THIS IS JUST MY
PREDICTION THAT WAY SOME TIME
NEXT YEAR I GET TO COME BACK AND
SAY I TOLD YOU SO. BECAUSE I
KNOW THE ONE DEVELOPER THAT IS
IN ANTHONY'S DISTRICT IS THE GUY
WHO -- ALL OF THEM ARE APARTMENT
BUILDER. THEY'RE NOT HOME
BUILDER. WELL THE RULE IN CASE
ANYONE KNOWS WITH THESE

PROJECTS, YOU CAN ONLY BUILD UP TO HALF OF YOUR APARTMENT. THEN YOU HAVE TO BUILD UP TO HALF OF YOUR HOUSES. SO MY PREDICTION IS THEY'LL GET THEIR APPROVAL FOR MRDI. THEY'LL GET THEIR APPROVAL FOR HALF OF THEIR APARTMENT. AND THEN THEY'LL COME BACK AND SAY CHANGE OUR MINDS. WE JUST WANT TO GO R7. -- NO, YOU'RE JUST GOING TO GRANT THEM THEIR ZONING CHANGE AND MOVE ON. JUST LETTING YOU KNOW THAT'S WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN. THEY WILL GET TO WHERE THEY NEED THE HOUSING. AND THEN THEY'LL SAY YEAH, YOU KNOW WHAT, I DON'T NEED THE HOUSING. THIS WAS THE SAME GUY, COUNCILMAN FOX, WHO STARTED BEHIND THE COALS WITH 200 APARTMENT BUILDINGS AND 80 SOMETHING UNITS. NOW SUDDENLY, 668 APARTMENTS. HE SAID, WE DON'T EVEN HAVE TO PRETEND HERE. WE'RE GOING STRAIGHT TO R7. AGAIN, IT'S JUST WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN. SO I'M NOT PICKING A CASE. I'M NOT EVEN NECESSARILY AGREEING WITH THE MORATORIUM. I'M JUST TELLING YOU NOW'S THE TIME TO ACTUALLY VOTE FOR THE STUDY. NOW'S THE TIME TO ACTUALLY LOOK FOR THE REVIEW. BECAUSE YOU HAVE THREE IN THE PIPELINE. TRUST ME, WE KNOW HOW MOVING AT THE SPEED OF GOVERNMENT, THE STUDY OUGHT TO COME OUT ABOUT THREE YEARS AFTER THESE PLACES OPEN. SO I'M JUST SAYING NOW'S THE TIME TO TAKE A LOOK. NOT WAIT UNTIL THINGS GET REALLY BAD AND YOU HAVE 20 OF THEM OUT THERE. THE FIRST THREE IS PROBABLY A GOOD NUMBER. ANYWAY, THANK YOU.
>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> THANK YOU. YOU ALL KNOW I LOVE CHARTS. SO THIS CHART REMINDED ME OF ANOTHER CHART THAT I WANT TO SHARE REAL QUICK. BECAUSE OFTEN WHEN WE TALK ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING, WE HIGHLIGHT FAMILIES AT THE LOWEST LEVEL OF INCOME. FAMILIES AT 30% AREA MEDIAN INCOME. AKA, FAMILIES OF ONE MAKING ABOUT \$16,000 ANNUALLY. USUALLY SENIORS, DISABLED, FIXED LOW INCOME. BUT WHEN YOU GO UP THE LADDER, THE INCOME LADDER, WE START TALKING ABOUT FAMILIES AT 50% AREA MEDIAN INCOME. FAMILIES AT 80%, EVEN FAMILIES AT 100% AREA MEDIAN INCOME THAT HAVE AN UNMET NEED OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING. WHEN YOU CONSIDER THE CONTEXT OF ALL THE UNMET NEEDS OF AFTERWARDABLE HOUSING, THAT NUMBER REALLY DOUBLES. -- ABOUT \$5 BILLION. OF COURSE THAT DOUBLES WHEN WE ADD THE CONTEXT FOR OTHER HOUSING NEEDS. JUST TO CONTEXTUALIZE HOW MANY UNITS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT WHEN WE THINK ABOUT THAT 61,000. IF ALL OF THEM WERE PEOPLE, ALL OF THESE UNITS WERE PEOPLE, THAT WOULD BE ALL NINE OF THE WEST END NEIGHBORHOODS COMBINED IN TERMS OF POPULATION. THAT WOULD BE TWO COUNCIL DISTRICTS. THAT WOULD BE SELLING OUT FREEDOM HALL THREE TIMES OVER. THEY COULDN'T EVEN FIT IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINAL STADIUM. THAT'S A LOT OF UNITS. AT THIS RATE, THE WAY WE DO AFFORDABLE HOUSING, WE'RE TALKING THOUSANDS OF YEARS BEFORE WE EVER CLOSE THAT GAP IF WE DON'T GET HELP FROM THE STATE, THE FEDS, OR FROM GOD.

ANY TOOL THAT UNDERMINES THE
PROCESS OF BEING ABLE TO MAKE
SURE THAT WE BUILD IS
PROBLEMATIC. WE HAVE TO DO
EVERYTHING WE CAN RIGHT NOW,
OTHERWISE THIS ISSUE IS GOING TO
CONTINUE TO GET WORSE AND WORSE
AND WORSE. I KNOW WE'RE NOT
TALKING ABOUT THE MORATORIUM.
BUT THIS RESOLUTION IS TRYING TO
OPEN THAT DOOR ON TOP OF
DIRECTOR EMILY LOU ALREADY
SAYING SHE IS GOING TO WORK ON
THE PROCESS. I JUST URGE YOU ALL
TO REALLY CONSIDER THE CITY-WIDE
IMPACT OF DISMANTLING A TOOL
THAT WAS ESTABLISHED YEARS AGO
AND HAD OVERWHELMING SUPPORT TO
ADDRESS THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING
NEED IN THIS CITY. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.
COUNCILMAN INGLE.

>> THANK YOU, PRESIDENT PRO TEM.
IN COMMITTEE, IT PAINED ME TO
ACTUALLY SEE THE OPENING
STATEMENT THAT ALMOST -- MY
IMPRESSION WAS THE IDEA OF
AFFORDABLE HOUSING OR NOT
AFFORDABLE HOUSING. THAT'S WHERE
THIS DEBATE IN MY ESTIMATION
STARTED AT COMMITTEE LEVEL. AND
IT'S JUST SO FAR FROM THE TRUTH.
MY DISTRICT, I MAY NOT BE AS
HEAVILY WEIGHTED ON DEVELOPMENT
AS MY COLLEAGUE IN DISTRICT 19.
BUT I'M SECOND IN LINE. SO I
HAVE IT. YOU ALL HEAR ME OFTEN.
YOU HEAR COUNCILMAN PEDEN
TALKING ABOUT THE DESIRE FOR US
TO GET SOME AFFORDABLE HOUSING.
BUT WE HAVE TO GET OUR PEOPLE
THAT ARE GOING TO BE LIVING IN
THESE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS
SOME INFRASTRUCTURE, SOME ROADS,
SOME TART BUSES. SOME GROCERY
STORES. WE HEAR NOTHING ABOUT

THAT TONIGHT.
THAT'S QUIET. THAT'S GONE TO
SILENT. WE'RE PITTING OURSELVES
IN A CORNER. IF WE THINK WE
BELIEVE THAT JUST BY A REVIEW
THAT WE ARE AGAINST AFFORDABLE
HOUSING AND THAT MIGHT BE ON THE
FRONT PAGE OF THE COURIER
TOMORROW. I LOVE YOUR CHART. I
WANT TO CHALLENGE YOU AND ASK
YOU FOR HELP. THIS IS DOWN THE
ROAD THAT I'M GOING TO SPEAK
HERE. BUT YOUR AFFORDABLE
HOUSING, I DO LIKE IT. BUT IT
SEEMS TO ALWAYS EQUAL APARTMENT,
CORRECT? WILL I CAN TELL YOU
RIGHT NOW THAT WE HAVE A VERY
BIG NEED FOR SINGLE FAMILY HOMES
IN THIS COMMUNITY AS WELL.
HERE'S WHAT I'D LOVE TO DO IS TO
GET FOLKS IN AFFORDABLE HOMES
AND APARTMENTS. BUT THEN FOCUS
HEAVILY ON EMPLOYMENT, ON JOB.
TO GET THEM OUT OF THAT
AFFORDABLE APARTMENT INTO A
SINGLE-FAMILY HOME. THAT'S WHAT
I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO DO TOO.
SO I NEED YOUR HELP AND
GUIDANCE. ARE YOU ALWAYS JUST
TALKING ABOUT GETTING AND GIVING
PEOPLE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS AN
APARTMENT? I'M FOR GIVING THEM A
HEAD START. BUT WE HAVE GOT
FOCUS ON GETTING OUR PEOPLE TO
WORK IN THIS COMMUNITY. THEY'RE
PAYING TAXES. AND ALSO WE'VE GOT
TO GET PEOPLE INTO HOME. I WANT
TO SEE PEOPLE -- FOLKS, I
STARTED IN 1986 IN THIS TOWN. I
DIDN'T KNOW A SOUL. I CAME HERE
AND I RENTED. I HAD AN APARTMENT
FOR THREE YEARS. PEOPLE THOUGHT
I WAS FOOLISH. WHY DON'T YOU GET
A HOUSE? YOU'RE THROWING YOUR
MONEY AWAY. I'VE BEEN THERE.
I'VE BEEN THERE. SO LET ME JUST

HAVE YOU PUT THIS IN YOUR DISTRICT RIGHT NOW. I'M TRACKING A DEVELOPMENT THAT STARTED OUT FROM RURAL R4 TO PRD WITH 805 RESIDENTIAL, 441 DETACHED, AND 336 ATTACHED HOMES. MY OFFICE WAS TRACKING IT. IT MET HUGE RESISTANCE. SO THAT NOW HAS NOW GONE FROM 2021. TRY THIS, RURAL RURAL TO R4 TO R5. 590 DETACHED HOMES AND 51 ACRES OF OPEN SPACE. IT WAS MET WITH RESISTANCE, LETTERS. I HAVE 86 PAGES OF TESTIMONY RIGHT HERE. MY OFFICE. REAL CONSTITUENT. I LOVE YOUR GRAPHS. BUT I'VE GOT REAL CONSTITUENTS CONCERNED ABOUT THIS DEVELOPMENT. A LETTER JUST CAME IN TODAY. 2022, REMEMBER, IT STARTED IN 2020. 2021. IT'S NOW 2022. AND GUESS WHAT WE NOW ARE LOOKING AT? RURAL RURAL TO R4 TO MREI. 243 DETACHED, 190 MULTI-FAMILY, PRESERVES -- 38 LETTERS. 82 PAGES OF GRIEVANCES FILED BY THE CONSTITUENTS THAT LIVE IN THIS AREA. PUT YOURSELF IN MY POSITION. NEIGHBORS ON THE RECORD. ALL OF THIS TESTIMONY OUT THE DOOR WITH MRDI. OVERSIGHT BY YOU AS THE COUNCIL MEMBER TO SPEAK OR TO NEGOTIATE A SIDEWALK OR A DEVELOPMENT OR A TURNING LANE FOR A DEVELOPMENT. COUNCILMAN BENSON PAID OUT OF HIS OWN CIF FUNDS TO PUT A LEFT-TURN LANE IN WHERE IT'S LOGICAL A LEFT-TURN LANE SHOULD HAVE GONE. WE LOSE ALL OF THAT. THAT OVERSIGHT IS OUT THE DOOR, FOLKS, WITH THIS. SO I ENCOURAGE BUILDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING. A GREAT LOCATION WOULD ENHANCE MY RESIDENTS. HOPING IT'S EASIER TO TRAVEL, AS I MENTIONED, TO WORK,

GROCERY STORE, HEALTH CARE, AUTO SHOP, MANY OTHER RESOURCES. I'VE SEEN A SURGE IN APARTMENTS IN DISTRICT 22. ARTS TOWN ROAD, YOU'VE PASSED IT. THE CORRIDOR HAS PARK ROUTES, SIDEWALKS, GROCERY STORES, PLACES OF EMPLOYMENT. THIS EXAMPLE THAT I'M WORKING ON IS NOT CLOSE TO ANY INFRASTRUCTURE, WHICH ENABLES HOUSING RESIDENTS -- HOW DO YOU EXPECT THESE FOLKS, COUNCILMAN PEDEN, WAY OUT IN COOPER CHANNEL ROAD TO GET TO A GROCERY STORE? TO GET TO A TARTE ROUTE? WHY ARE WE NOT FOCUSING, FOLKS, LIKE ACKERSON DID. I BELIEVE IT WE KEEP THIS TOGETHER, WE FOCUS TOGETHER ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING, EQUALLY ON INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT IN OUR DISTRICTS, WE COULD DO BIG THINGS. AND JOB, AND JOB OF COURSE. THIS IS SUCH A REMOTE LOCATION. WE ALL HAVE THEM. THEY'RE COMING TO A DISTRICT NEAR YOU. IF THIS PASSES. THIS PARTICULAR DEVELOPER, I SUSPECT, IS BANKING -- OR EXCUSE ME. THIS DEVELOPER IS BANKING ON THIS PROPERTY NEIGHBORING BROAD RUN PARK. WHY? BECAUSE HE GETS POINTS FOR THAT. THEY'RE PROMOTING THIS DEVELOPMENT TO HELP PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT. BUT IT IS AT THE EXPENSE OF THE CURRENT AND FUTURE RESIDENTS. YOUR CONSTITUENTS. THIS LOCATION IS IT A MILE FROM DOWNTOWN? NO. IS IT A MILE FROM A TRADITIONAL MARKETPLACE CORRIDOR? NO. IS IT A MILE FROM TRADITIONAL WORKPLACE? NO IS IT A MILE FROM -- 3.9 MILES FROM A TARKE ROUTE. BROAD RUN ROAD WILL NEED TO BE WIDENED FOR THE TRAFFIC VOLLEY.

FOLKS, WE HAVE FARM MARKET ROAD
IN OUR DISTRICT. WE LISTENED
VERY CLOSELY TO OUR COLLEAGUES
THAT ARE IMPACTED BY CHILD CARE.
WE ALL COMPROMISED ON THAT. ALL
WE'RE ASKING FOR AS MEMBERS OF
THE RURAL JEFFERSON COUNTY THE
MERE REVIEW. I RESPECT THE HECK
OUT OF COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER, AND
HE KNOWS I DO. BECAUSE HE
STUDIES. HE'S SMART. HE
RESEARCHES AND HE'S A LEGAL
SCHOLAR. BUT I MUST SAY
SOMETIMES DON'T GET IT RIGHT OR
YOU MAY JUST BE BOMBARDED. AND
IN 2015, WHAT COUNCILMAN
HOLLANDER DIDN'T SAY, AND I'M
NOT SAYING HE INADVERTENTLY LEFT
THIS OUT, BUT FOLKS, WE WERE
ADDRESSING MULTIPLE CHAPTERS OF
THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AT
NIGHT. AND WE ALL KNOW WHAT
HAPPENS WHEN IT GETS TO BE
11 O'CLOCK, 1 O'CLOCK IN THE
MORNING. COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER, I
APOLOGIZE. I WAS ONE OF THOSE
VOTE. -- SACRIFICING AND GIVING
AWAY MY OVERSIGHT TO NOT HAVING
A SAY SO IN MY DEVELOPMENT IN MY
DISTRICT. I APOLOGIZE. I WILL
SAY THAT RIGHT NOW I WAS ONE OF
THOSE IN 2015 MAYBE UNINTENDED
CONSEQUENCES. SO A REVIEW IS NOT
KILLING ANYTHING. A REVIEW IS
ALLOWING OUR PLANNERS TO PERHAPS
TWEAK MRDI SO THAT MAYBE IT WILL
BECOME EVEN BETTER IN THE
FUTURE. SO I AM JUST --
COLLEAGUES, I'M ALL ABOUT
CONSTITUENT INPUT. AND I KNOW
YOU ARE, TOO. ESPECIALLY WHEN IT
COMES TO ZONING CASES. AND I
FIND IT VERY DIFFICULT TO THROW
38 LETTERS, AND 82 PAGES OF
INPUT FROM A PARTICULAR
DEVELOPMENT. COUNCILWOMAN

FOWLER, LET ME JUST TRY TO DEFEND A LITTLE BIT. AND I KNOW HE CAN DO IT HIMSELF. BUT I THINK I CAN DO IT MAYBE IN A SHORTER TIMELINE. MY COLLEAGUE FROM DISTRICT 19 IS VERY SIMILAR TO COUNCILMAN ARTHUR WITH CHART AND FACT. SO WHAT I BELIEVE I TOOK FROM HIS PRESENTATION -- FIRST OFF, I LIKE TO DO THINGS A LITTLE DIFFERENT M MIDDLETOWN BECAUSE I THINK I CAN DO IT BETTER ECONOMICALLY. BUT WHAT I HEARD FROM MY COLLEAGUE IN 2019, HE IS BEARING THE BRUNT OF A LOT OF DEVELOPMENT. I DON'T THINK IT WAS IN YOUR FACE TYPE BECAUSE ALL YOU OTHER DISTRICTS ARE NOT WORTHY OF DEVELOPMENT. I WOULD ASK YOU TO REALLY LOOK AT WHAT HE PRESENTED, AND WHAT HE PRESENTED IS SIMPLY THE ABILITY TO REVIEW THIS MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT THAT POTENTIALLY COULD BE COMING TO ALL OF OUR DISTRICTS WITHOUT OVERSIGHT. WITHOUT INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT AND INVESTMENT. WITHOUT SIDEWALKS. WITHOUT ROAD IMPROVEMENT. THAT'S KIND OF WHAT I THOUGHT HE WAS SAYING THERE. SO I DON'T THINK IT WAS REALLY TO SAY THAT EVERYBODY ELSE, YOUR DISTRICTS AREN'T WORTH A DARN. I THINK IT WAS THAT MANY OF OUR DISTRICTS HAVE CERTAIN THINGS THAT ARE UNIQUE TO THEM WHETHER THERE BE CHILD CARE. WHETHER THERE BE SERIOUS ISSUES WE KNOW THAT ARE UNIQUE TO YOU. SO I ASK THAT YOU WOULD RECONSIDER YOUR THOUGHTS THERE. MAYBE NOT, BUT I'M JUST ASKING. I THINK I DID THAT IN A SHORTER TIME MAYBE THAN MY COLLEAGUE IN 19. BUT ANYWAY, COUNCILMAN MR. PRO TEM,

THANK YOU FOR INDULGING ME. I DID TALK A LITTLE LONG TONIGHT. BUT THANK YOU BECAUSE THIS AFFECTS MY DISTRICT IN A BIG WAY. THANK YOU.

>> MADAM CLERK, IF YOU COULD PLEASE NOTE THAT WE WERE JOINED SOME TIME AGO BY COUNCILMAN --

>> I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS FOR THE SPONSOR. MR. SPONSOR, DID YOU SAY YOU WERE FOR DISMANTLING MRDI?

>> NO.

>> OKAY. DID YOU SAY THAT WE HAVE A MORATORIUM ON THE DOCKET TONIGHT?

>> NO.

>> OKAY. ARE YOU SAYING THAT REALLY WHAT WE WANT TO DO HERE IS TO TAKE NOT A READY, FIRE, AIM APPROACH AT GOOD DEVELOPMENT BUT TO TAKE OUR TIME AND TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE THE PROPER INFRASTRUCTURE, HAD THE PROPER ROADS, UTILITIES, ET CETERA. BECAUSE I'M GOING TO TELL YOU RIGHT NOW I'VE BEEN TO OTHER CITIES AND THEY RUN RINGS AROUND US. I MEAN, SOMETIMES I WONDER, LIKE COUNCILMAN BENSON, IF WE PLANNED AT ALL. I'M VERY PRO DEVELOPMENT. BUT ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS DRIVE AROUND THE CITY AND YOU CAN SEE WHERE WE PUT THINGS IN AREAS WHERE THEY JUST DON'T BELONG BECAUSE OF LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE, BECAUSE OF LACK OF RESTAURANTS, LACK OF JOBS, LACK OF TRANSPORTATION, LACK OF TARC LINE, ESPECIALLY. I DON'T THINK ANYBODY HERE IS OPPOSED TO MRDIS. I DON'T THINK ANYBODY HERE IS OPPOSED TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING. WE NEED IT. BUT SOMETIMES YOU CAN CREATE MORE PROBLEMS FOR THE PEOPLE THAT ARE

ACTUALLY MOVING INTO THESE DEVELOPMENTS. TAKE A STEP BACK. NOBODY IS INSIDE MRDI. TAKE A STEP BACK. LET THEM DO THE REVIEW PROCESS AND SEE WHAT COMES FROM IT. I DON'T SEE ANY HARM WITH THAT. I'M GOING TO BE SUPPORTING THIS. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN REED. COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> I JUST WANTED TO RESPOND TO A QUESTION ABOUT OUR AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT FROM 2019. WITH 61,000 UNITS THAT ARE REFERENCED INCLUDE RENTER AND OWNER UNMET NEED OF UNITS. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> COUNCILMAN BENSON.

>> MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEM, EXCUSE ME, I USUALLY DON'T -- MOST PEOPLE AREN'T GOING TO LISTEN. BUT 19 YEARS AGO WHEN I FIRST GOT ON THE COUNCIL, THAT WAS ON COMMUNITY SERVICE DR. SHANKLIN TALKING ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING. I SAID YOU ALL KNOW WHAT THE PROBLEM IS? YOU ALL KNOW WHY PEOPLE NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING? DON'T HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY A HOUSE. WHO DOES THAT PROBLEM BELONG TO? IN MY CAREER TEACHING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SOUTHERN HIGH SCHOOL, OVER AND OVER ALL -- I SAID HOW MANY PEOPLE FROM HIGH SCHOOL GO TO COLLEGE. 18%. I SAID YOU THINK THAT THOSE 18% MIGHT STILL BE GOING TO COLLEGE IF WE DIDN'T MENTION IT. I SAID DOES ANYBODY CARE ABOUT THE 82% THAT'S NOT? I PUT OVER 500 KIDS IN JOBS. I PUT EVERYBODY WHO WANTED A JOB IN MY CLASS. THEY DON'T WORRY ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING. WE CONSTANTLY GO AFTER -- WE SHOULD

BE HELPING PEOPLE. WE WANT PEOPLE TO HAVE A PLACE TO LIVE. I MEAN, WHO WOULDN'T. THAT'S INHUMANE. IT'S NOT RIGHT. BUT I THINK ALMOST EVERYBODY HAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING HAS TO BE SAID WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY A HOUSE WHEREVER YOU WANT? I THINK YEAH, I WANT TO DO THAT. WHY DON'T WE? I TAUGHT SCHOOL FOR 28 YEARS AND I DON'T THINK I HAD KIDS THAT COULDN'T BE SUCCESSFUL MAKING A LOT OF MONEY. OTHER THAN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM GIVING THE FALSE INFORMATION THEY COULDN'T AFFORD IT. I REALLY WORRY -- I SHOULDN'T USE THIS EXAMPLE. MY GRANDSON COME LIVE WITH ME. HE'S GOT SOME PROBLEMS, A LITTLE BIT. HE HAD A LITTLE BIT OF A RECORD. TRIED TO GET A JOB. TRIED TO HELP HIM OUT. COULDN'T GET A JOB. HE SAID, PAPPY, WHAT ABOUT THIS NIGHT WELDING SCHOOL. \$4,300. I SAID OKAY, LET'S GO. SO I TOOK HIM EVERY DAY. HE'S WORKED THREE WEEKS MAKING \$17.90 AN HOUR. I DON'T KNOW HOW SUCCESSFUL HE'S GOING TO BE. I MEAN, YOU CAN'T BELIEVE HOW -- I'M A DRILL SERGEANT LOOKING FOR SOLUTIONS. BUT I THINK IF SOMEBODY TAKES TIME TO HELP EVERYBODY, WE CAN REALLY GO. I DON'T KNOW -- THERE'S A GUY NAMED CHARLIE SCOTT HE'S DOING SOME THINGS WITH SOME KIDS. AND I'M GOING TO SEE IF I CAN HELP HIM. BECAUSE WE NEED SKILLS. Y'ALL DON'T KNOW THIS, BUT MECHANICAL ENGINEER GRADUATED FROM SPEED SCHOOL, MAYBE 300 A YEAR, 500, I DON'T KNOW. ONE MECHANICAL ENGINEER CAN KEEP TWO DRAFTSMAN BUSY. ONE DRAFTSMAN

CAN KEEP FOUR TOOL MAKERS BUSY.
GENERAL ELECTRIC WHERE I WENT
FOR MY APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM,
THEY PRODUCED MAYBE 25 BACK IN
THE '60S. THERE'S PROBABLY NOT
60 OR 70 TOOL MAKERS A YEAR COME
OUT OF LOUISVILLE. AND YOU
THINK, THAT'S WHAT I THOUGHT
WHEN I FIRST GOT ON METRO
COUNCIL. HELP PEOPLE NAVIGATE
GOVERNMENT AND TRY TO CREATE
JOBS. YOU KNOW, THEY ALWAYS
THINK YOU GOTTA GET SOMEBODY
FROM SOME PLACE OUT TO COME
HERE. WE GOT THE SMARTEST PEOPLE
AS ANYBODY. BUT IF WE DON'T HELP
TRAIN THEM AND GIVE THEM PURPOSE
THAT MAKE THEIR LIFE BETTER,
WE'RE NOT GETTING ANYWHERE. --
MAYBE THERE'S SOMEBODY OUT IN
SPACE THAT WILL HEAR WHAT I'M
SAYING. WE NEED SKILLS. AS LONG
AS WE'RE IN AN ENTERPRISE
SYSTEM, PEOPLE -- IF THEY CAN'T
MAKE A PROFIT, YOU'RE NOT WORTH
ANYTHING. YOU GOTTA MAKE A
PROFIT. ONLY THING PEOPLE CAN
LOSE IS GOVERNMENT. MAYBE WE ALL
HAVE THE GOVERNMENT TAKE CARE OF
EVERYTHING. MAYBE EVERYBODY HAS
EXACTLY THE SAME. MAYBE NOTHING.
I DON'T THINK THAT'S REALLY THAT
GOOD. I REALLY BELIEVE WE OUGHT
TO THINK ABOUT SOLVING THE
PROBLEM. WORK TOGETHER. LOOK AT
THE ISSUES.
MAKE PEOPLE ACCOUNTABLE WHAT
THEY DO. YOU KNOW, I TELL PEOPLE
ALL THE TIME, ANYBODY WANTS TO
RUN AGAINST ME, I HOPE YOU DO.
BECAUSE IF YOU CAN DO A BETTER
JOB THAN ME, I HOPE YOU DO.
PEOPLE ARE TOO IMPORTANT NOT TO
HELP OUT. AND I'M JUST KIND OF,
YOU KNOW, REVIEWING AND LOOKING
AT WHAT WE'RE DOING. EVERYBODY

KIND OF HAVING THEIR EYES OPEN.
ARE WE TRYING TO HELP OR ARE WE
JEALOUS OF OTHER PEOPLE? NO, NO,
WE DON'T WANT THEM TO HAVE
ANYTHING. THAT'S NUMBER TEN,
THOU SHALL NOT COVET THY
NEIGHBOR'S PROPERTY. MY DAD
ALWAYS SAID IF YOU FIND SOMEBODY
WHO GOOD, COPY THEM. LOOKING
OVER A REVIEW OR SOMETHING.
SEVEN YEARS AGO, HAVE WE LEARNED
ANYTHING IN THAT PERIOD OF TIME?
I HOPE WE HAVE. I HOPE EVERY
MOMENT WE LEARN SOMETHING NEW.
AND WE DO BETTER. SO I KIND OF
THINK WE OUGHT TO REVIEW. I'M
ONLY ONE AND MAYBE I'LL BE THE
NO VOTE OR SOMETHING, OR THE YES
VOTE. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN
GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU. ANY TIME MY
COLLEAGUES MENTION THE LACK OF
COMMUNITY INPUT OR PLANNING, YOU
KNOW MY EARS PERK UP. THOSE ARE
TWO THINGS NEAR AND DEAR TO MY
HEART. BUT I WANT TO REMIND
FOLKS THAT NOT HAVING CONTROL
OVER DEVELOPMENT IN YOUR
DISTRICT FOR SOME OF US IS NOT
NEW. FOR ANY OF US WHO HAD
PUBLIC HOUSING FIGHT IN THEIR
DISTRICT, THEY'LL BE VERY
FAMILIAR WITH. AND SOMETHING
THAT COMES TO MIND FOR US IS
WHAT I WILL REFERENCE FROM
DISTRICT 15 AND THAT IS THE
FORMER -- HOUSING FIGHT. IT'S
CURRENTLY IN PREDEVELOPMENT
PHASE WITH HOUSING AUTHORITY. WE
LEARNED A COUPLE OF MONTHS AGO
THERE'S NO REQUIREMENT -- NONE.
THE ONLY THING THAT DICTATES
WHETHER OR NOT THEY ENGAGE IN
THE COMMUNITY IS THE FUNDING
STRING THEY GO AFTER.

IF THEY GO AFTER A FEDERAL FUNDING STREAM THAT REQUIRES ENGAGEMENT, THAT -- EFFECTIVELY THEY CAN START DEVELOPING. THEY RELOCATED SOME OF THE TENANTS, SO TO SPEAK THAT WERE USING THE SITE. NOBODY IN THE COMMUNITY WAS NOTIFIED. I LOOK DOWN TO MY COLLEAGUE COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT. I DON'T KNOW THAT HE WAS NOTIFIED UNLESS HE INITIATED THAT REQUEST. SO I KNOW THERE ARE PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED. I CERTAINLY FEEL THAT IN THE WAY OF PLAN, GROWTH, THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS THAT I HEAR THAT'S CERTAINLY FELT. AND THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY INPUT. I WISH MY NEIGHBORS HAD THE CAPACITY TO WRITE 80 LETTERS. IT'S INCREDIBLY ENVIOUS, QUITE FRANKLY. BUT BECAUSE OF THE CONCENTRATION OF NEED WITHIN METRO. AND NONE OF US NEED A CHART FOR THAT, I CAN TELL YOU THAT EVEN IF LMHA WERE TO SEND OUT NOTICES TO RESIDENTS AND NEIGHBORS NEAR THE IROQUOIS HOUSING SITE, WE -- IT'S EFFECTIVELY THE SAME AS NOT HAVING INPUT IF YOU DON'T HAVE THE CAPACITY TO BE ABLE TO WRITE THE LETTER OR ATTEND THE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING OR THE PLANNING COMMISSION. I SEE REAL PROBLEMS AND I WISH WE WERE SPENDING THE SAME AMOUNT OF ENERGY TONIGHT TALKING ABOUT THOSE REAL PROBLEMS. BUT WHAT I'M NOT CONVINCED IS THAT OUR FOCUS ON MRDI IS THE ANSWER. WE HEARD DIRECTOR LOU SAY IN COMMITTEE THAT SHE WOULD REEVALUATE WHATEVER POINT OF CONSIDERATION WAS NEEDED. FOR THAT REASON, I WOULD ASK THAT WE

REEVALUATE GIVEN THE FEW DEVELOPMENTS THAT HAVE MOVED FORWARD AND TRY AND WORK ON THE PLAN TO CHALLENGE NOT JUST MRDI BUT IN GENERAL WITH THE CHALLENGES OF GROWTH THAT MAY NOT BE WELL PLANNED, AND THAT IS CAUSING FRICTION POINTS FOR RESIDENTS IN DISTRICT 19 OR DISTRICT 22. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE. COUNCILMAN KRAMER.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'LL BEGIN BY ACKNOWLEDGING THAT I WAS PRESENT THOSE NUMBER OF YEARS AGO WHEN THIS WAS VOTED ON AND I WAS IN THE SUPER MAJORITY THAT WAS POINTED OUT. BUT I'LL ALSO POINT OUT THOSE WHO ARE VIEWING THAT THIS ORDINANCE WHEN WE DEBATED IT ALL THOSE YEARS AGO WASN'T ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING. IT DIDN'T COME TO US AS AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING ORDINANCE. THAT WASN'T THE IMPETUS FOR IT. WE WERE LOOKING AT PROJECTS THAT WERE TAKING A LONG TIME TO GO THROUGH. COUNCILMAN INGLE READ OFF A COUPLE OF THINGS THAT WERE INCLUDED IN THERE. THERE WERE THINGS THAT JUST MADE SENSE AND WE WERE LOOKING FOR THINGS TO STREAMLINE. WE AGREED THAT WE SHOULD INCLUDE IN THAT CONVERSATION -- BECAUSE WE REALIZE THAT STREAMLINE THE PROCESS THAT THAT'S AN IMPORTANT PIECE. IN WORKING ON LARGE DEVELOPMENTS, WE ALWAYS WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THERE. WE DIDN'T WRITE IT UP FOR THAT PURPOSE. WE HAD THIS ORDINANCE WE WERE LOOKING AT AND THAT WAS A PIECE OF IT. COUNCILMAN INGLE, I WON'T REPEAT ALL OF HIS WORDS,

BUT ACKNOWLEDGE THE FACT THAT THIS WASN'T GOING TO COME BACK BEFORE US WAS NOT THE CENTER OF THE DEBATE. IT'S NOT WHAT WE WERE ARGUING OVER AT THE TIME. IT WASN'T SOMETHING THAT WE WERE TRYING TO HASH OUT. IT WAS MORE WE WERE TRYING TO LOOK AT HOW DO WE DO BETTER. FOR SEVEN YEARS, NO ONE USED IT. NO ONE'S APPLIED TO DO THIS. IT'S ONLY AFTER AN EFFORT TO GET SOMETHING DONE THAT COULDN'T BE DONE THAT WE FIND A DEVELOPER WHO HAS DECIDED TO TRY TO USE THIS AS A PROCESS TO DO IT. REVIEWING IT I THINK IS A GOOD IDEA. I CONTINUE TODAY TO BE PHILOSOPHICALLY OPPOSED TO MORATORIUMS. I'VE HAD COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI THREE TIMES TONIGHT. HE CAN CONFIRM TO YOU. WE ARE NOT VOTING ON A MORATORIUM. WE'RE NOT VOTING ON A MORATORIUM. SO THAT'S A DIFFERENT DISCUSSION FOR ANOTHER NIGHT. I'VE HEARD PEOPLE SAY IF THIS PASSES, YOU KNOW, THAT'S THE NEXT CONVERSATION. SHOULD WE HAVE THAT CONVERSATION, I THINK THAT'S GOING TO BE A CHALLENGING VOTE. AGAIN, MANY OF US ARE PHILOSOPHICALLY OPPOSED TO MORATORIUM. BUT MOST OF US ARE NOT OPPOSED TO CODIFYING PROMISES THAT ARE MADE BY DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS WITHIN THE ADMINISTRATION. WE'VE DONE THAT LOTS OF TIMES. A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT EXAMPLES ALREADY TONIGHT ABOUT GOING BACK AND CODIFYING POLICY. SO YEAH, I'M GRATEFUL THAT MS. LOU HAS SAID THEY'RE GOING TO LOOK AT THAT. I'M HAPPY THAT'S TRUE. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY -- WHY IS IT SUCH A BAD THING TO SAY OKAY, YOU'RE

NOW GOING TO HAVE TO LOOK AT IT.
IT SEEMS TO ME A PRETTY
REASONABLE SOLUTION. SO I WOULD
ASK MY COLLEAGUES PLEASE, LET'S
FOCUS ON WHAT WE'RE REALLY
TALKING ABOUT HERE. IT'S NOT
ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING. IT'S
NOT WHAT THIS ORDINANCE WAS EVER
ABOUT. THE OBJECTION TO THE WAY
MRDI IS BEING USED IS NOT
BECAUSE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.
IT'S NOT WHAT THIS IS ABOUT.
IT'S NOT MORATORIUM. IT'S NOT
WHAT THIS IS ABOUT. SIMPLY
SAYING THERE HAVE ALREADY BEEN
COMMENTS MADE BY FOLKS IN CHARGE
OF THIS PROCESS WHO RECOGNIZE
THAT THE PROCESS DOESN'T WORK
THE WAY IT'S DESIGNED. AND
THEY'VE ALREADY SAID IT NEEDS TO
BE REVIEWED. WHY DON'T WE JUST
AGREE WITH THEM AND VOTE TO
REVIEW IT. I'M BEGGING MY
COLLEAGUES PLEASE VOTE YES.
>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN KRAMER.
COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS.
>> THANK YOU.
>> -- BECAUSE OF THAT, I'M GOING
TO REQUEST A CALL TO QUESTION.
I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION. CALL
THE QUESTION.
>> SECOND.
>> MOTION BY COUNCILWOMAN
PURVIS. SECOND BY COUNCIL MEMBER
TRIPLETT.
>> MADAM CLERK, WILL YOU CALL
THE ROLL.
>> ABSOLUTELY. ONE MOMENT.
COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS. I'M SO
SORRY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>> HOLLANDER HAD SOME FIRE TO CLAP BACK WITH US BUT YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.
>> ABSOLUTELY YES.
>> PRESIDENT JAMES.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MULVIHILL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.
>> IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT TWO PEOPLE REMAINING HAVE BOTH SPOKEN, I VOTE YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> TO CLARIFY THIS IS THE CALL TO QUESTION VOTE?
>> RIGHT.
>> YES, MA'AM.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER WRINKLER.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.

>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON. MR.
PRESIDENT PRO TEM, YOU HAVE 23
YES VOTES AND THREE NO VOTES.
>> THE MOTION PASSES. THE
QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED. MADAM
CLERK, THIS IS AN ORDINANCE
REQUIRING A ROLL CALL VOTE.
PLEASE CALL THE ROLL. SORRY,
IT'S A RESOLUTION. BUT WE WILL
CALL THE ROLL OUT OF AN
ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION HERE.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS.
>> PRESENT.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.
>> NO.
>> PRESIDENT JAMES.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLLANDER.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> RELUCTANT NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER WRINKLER.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.

>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON. MR.
PRESIDENT PRO TEM, YOU HAVE 18
NO VOTES. SEVEN YES VOTES AND
ONE PRESENT VOTE. THE RESOLUTION
FAILS. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE LET
THE RECORD REFLECT THAT
PRESIDENT JAMES IS RETAKING THE
CHAIR.
>> MADAM CLERK, THE READING OF
ITEM 46, PLEASE.
>> AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE
PROPERTIES 10212 AND 10302 OAK
GROVE ROAD CONTAINING
APPROXIMATELY 68.57 ACRES --
AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION AS
AMENDED READ IN FULL.
>> THANK YOU, MAY HAVE A MOTION.
SECOND PLEASE.
>> --
>> COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT AS THE
MOTION AND SECOND COUNCILMAN
ARTHUR. THE ORDINANCE IS BEFORE
US. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION?
COUNCILWOMAN FLOOD.
>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.
THIS WAS A CHANGE IN ZONING THAT
WAS REQUESTED FOR 263-LOT SINGLE
FAMILY SUBDIVISION DECIDED IN
THE STUDY AREA OF THE FERN CREEK
AREA. IT WAS DOWNSIZED FROM R4

TO RR DOCKET NUMBER 9868 UNDER RECOMMENDATION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN. STAFF FOUND THIS PROPOSED ZONING DID NOT MEET THE GUIDELINES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LOCATED IN A LESS DEVELOPED AREA. THE FERN CREEK RECOMMENDED AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THIS AREA. THE SCALE OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS OUT OF THE PROPORTION TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT'S AVAILABLE. THESE COMMENTS CAN ALSO BE FOUND IN THE FIRST WHEREAS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S DENIAL OF A 5-2 VOTE. AT THAT TIME BEFORE THE VOTE WAS TAKEN, THE APPLICANT COULD HAVE ASKED FOR A CONTINUANCE OF THE HEARING, THEY DID NOT. IT PASSED ON TO US WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL. SUBSEQUENTLY, COUNCILMAN INGLE HAS AN AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION WHERE HE HAS ASKED THAT TO BE REMANDED BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO START OVER AT GROUND ONE. NORMALLY THESE REQUESTS COME TO US WHEN WE GET THEM. SOMETIMES THEY'RE SIX WEEKS TO EIGHT WEEKS ALREADY, AND THE 90 DAYS HAS ALREADY CLICKED IN. BUT I WILL TURN THIS OVER TO COUNCILMAN INGLE SINCE IT IS IN HIS DISTRICT.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN INGLE.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I THINK THIS WILL BE SHORTER THAN THE LAST ONE. THIS WAS AN INTERESTING CASE THAT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY WANTED RESPECTFULLY ASK US TO SEND IT BACK. IN WHICH THERE WAS PLENTY OF DIALOGUE AS TO, I MEAN, WHY, ET CETERA. AND I WAS IN AGREEMENT WITH COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER THAT IF

WE'RE GOING TO SEND IT BACK, WHY SHOULD THERE BE TWO BITES AT THE APPLE BY ONE SIDE AND ZERO BITES AT THE APPLE ON THE OTHER SIDE. AND SO WE DISCUSSED THE FACT THAT I ASKED THE QUESTION IS THERE TIME AND CAN WE HAVE A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING. SO IT'S JUST NOT GOING BACK. AND THE NEIGHBORS HAVE NO SAY. THE SO THE GOOD NEWS IS THIS IS GOING TO GO BACK. BUT IT'S ALSO GOING TO REQUIRE, IF I GOT THAT RIGHT, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER, IT'S GOING TO REQUIRE A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING. IT'S AN INTERESTING CASE. IT'S GOING BACK. WE'RE SENDING IT BACK. IT'S GOING TO GET ANOTHER LOOK, IF YOU WILL, BY BOTH SIDES. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN INGLE. IS THERE ANY OTHER DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, THIS IS AN ORDINANCE REQUIRING A ROLL CALL VOTE. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS.

>> PRESENT.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.

>> YES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.

>> YES.

>> ARMSTRONG.

>> YES.

>> HOLLANDER.

>> YES.

>> KRAMER.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.

>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER WRINKLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN. COUNCIL
MEMBER FLOOD.
>> NO.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON. MR.
PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 20 YES
VOTES. FOUR NO VOTES AND ONE NOT
VOTING.
>> THANK YOU, THE ORDINANCE
PASSES.
>> I ENDED UP UNDERNEATH THE CAR
AND IT WAS JUST GOD'S GRACE THAT
I WENT TO. IT WAS SOMETHING
PASSED TIME AND I APPLAUD YOU
FOR GOING FORWARD WITH THE
RESOLUTION. I KNOW IT'S
RESOLUTION. BUT THIS IS ONE OF
THE THINGS THE STATE GOVERNMENT
IS DOING THAT I'M WHOLE
HEARTEDLY IN SUPPORT AND I HAVE
TO BE A SPONSOR AS WELL.
>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN.
MADAM CLERK, YOU WILL PLEASE ADD
SPONSOR.
>> I'M GOING TO BE A NO. THERE'S
A PILE OF LEGISLATION PENDING IN
FRANKFURT THAT IS LIKELY TO BE
-- THIS IS A WEIRD MESSAGE SOME
HOW TRAFFIC LIGHTS ARE MORE

IMPORTANT -- VARIOUS PIECES OF LEGISLATION THAT WE'RE NOT SAYING ABOUT IN FRANKFURT -- WITHOUT DOING THAT IN A MORE STRATEGIC WAY, I THINK IT SENDS A MESSAGE. SECONDLY, I REALIZE -- SYSTEM ITSELF WHICH WE'VE IMPLEMENTED. WE SHOULD GET MONEY, FUNDS WHERE WE DON'T HAVE TO USE IT. THE EASY PASS SYSTEM ITSELF WHICH IS JUST SUPPOSED TO PAY TOLLS HAS BEEN OVER AND OVER AND OVER AGAIN BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS. AND ALSO ATTORNEYS AND JUDGES FOR EVERYTHING FROM ALLEGED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY TO TRACKING PEOPLE WHO EVER ALLEGATIONS, CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, ALL THE WAY TO CIVIL CASES. DIVORCE CASES. CIVIL TRIALS WHERE YOU'RE TRYING TO PULL WHO SOMEBODY IS SO THEY PULL EASY PASS RECORDS. I HAVE SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS WITH ANYTHING THAT GIVES THE AUTHORITY FOR VIDEOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE.

-- UNTIL THAT'S DONE AND WE HAVE A FULL DEBATE ON THAT, AGAIN, I THINK THERE'S MANY OTHER THINGS I WOULD LIKE TO VOTE ON. BEFORE THAT, AND SECONDLY, I THINK I DO HAVE SERIOUS CONCERNS ARE VETTED -- THANK YOU.

>> YOU HIT THEM WITH A BIG HEFTY FINE, THAT'S ONE LESS THING THEY'RE GOING TO BUY THAT MONTH OR ONE NIGHT THEY'RE NOT GOING TO GO OUT. THEY'RE GOING TO THINK TWICE. WE COULD USE THE MONEY AND TEACH THEM A LESSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN BENSON.

>> 13 YEARS AGO, I LOOKED IN TRYING TO HOW DO THIS. -- IN 1940, WE DID. AND NOW WE DON'T.

WE NIGHT HAVE ENOUGH -- CAMERAS MIGHT BE GOOD ENOUGH THAT YOU ONLY NEED ONE LICENSE PLATE. FROM WHAT I HEARD, YOU HAVE TO HAVE TWO. WHEN YOU PASS IT, YOU HAVE TO HAVE THE WHOLE STATE DO THAT. THAT'S WHY ONE OF THE HANGUPS IS YOU HAVE TO VOTE FOR THE STATE. IF WE HAVE GOOD ENOUGH CAMERAS, I KIND OF BELIEVE IN THE BROKEN WINDOWS CONCEPT, IF YOU'RE BREAKING SOMETHING AND YOU DON'T OVERLOOK THE SMALLER CRIMES, WE'LL GET THE BIGGER CRIMES. AND PEOPLE WILL BE MORE LIKELY OF DOING WHAT'S RIGHT. SPEEDING IS A BIG PROBLEM. AND DANGER. THIS SPRING, I HAD SOMEBODY -- I ALWAYS LOOK RIGHT USUALLY. SOMEBODY WAS GOING TO A FUNERAL. THE LIGHT CHANGED, AND I TOOK OFF. HE HIT ME IN THE SIDE. IF I COULD HAVE JUST LOOKED RIGHT, IT WOULDN'T HAVE HAPPENED. IT IT WAS MY FAULT FOR NOT PAYING ATTENTION AS I USUALLY DO. I KNOW EVERYBODY IS WORRIED ABOUT THEIR FREEDOMS AND STUFF. BUT I THINK THIS WILL BE GOOD IF WE CAN DO IT WITH ONE LICENSE PLATE. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.
COUNCILMAN PEDEN.

>> THANK YOU. I WAS ONE OF THE NO VOTES IN COMMITTEE. COUPLE REASONS. NUMBER ONE, NOT ENOUGH RESOLUTION. MY ISSUE ISN'T -- IF WE WERE JUST SOLVING WHAT COUNCILMAN BLACK -- AGAIN, THE STORIES OF HIRING THIRD PARTY AGENCIES TO DO THE BILLING, SENDING BILLS TO PEOPLE WHO HAVE TWO INCHES OF BUMPER OVER THE WHITE LINE, THOSE KIND OF THINGS, QUITE FRANKLY, IF WE'RE

GOING TO TARGET RED LIGHTS ARE PEOPLE WHO ARE ON THEIR PHONES WHO WAIT AND CAUSE THE LIGHT TO CHANGE SO THE THREE CARS BEHIND THEM FEEL COMPELLED TO RUN THE RED LIGHT JUST SO THEY CAN GET TO WORK IN THE MORNING. SO THAT GOES BACK TO STEWART, WE NEED A FRONT LICENSE PLATE FOR THAT. THAT'S THE ONES I WANT IT CHASE DOWN. RUN THE RED LIGHT AND JUST GO GET THEM KIND OF THING. I UNDERSTAND ALL THE FRUSTRATION WITH THIS. BUT I NEED A LITTLE MORE DETAIL ON HOW AND WHO. AGAIN, IF SOMEONE WANTS TO USE THE TOLLING SYSTEM ON THE BRIDGE AS AN EXAMPLE, WE ALL KNOW HOW THAT WORKED.

>> THANK YOU. COUNCILMAN WINKLER.

>> I CAN JUST CONFIRM 100% CERTAIN THAT YOU DON'T -- THAT I KNOW FOR AN ABSOLUTE FACT IT'S NOT REQUIRED. I WOULD ALSO SAY TO COUNCILMAN PEDEN. THE PARAMETERS WERE GET SET AT THE TIME -- HOPEFULLY WE WOULD HAVE A VOICE.

>> THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, THIS IS RESOLUTION ALLOWING FOR A VOICE VOTE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR PLEASE SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ALL OPPOSE. AYES HAVE IT. THE RESOLUTION PASSES. MADAM CLERK, READING OF ITEM NUMBER 50, PLEASE.

>> RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO -- TO COMBAT THE EFFECTS OF -- \$75,000. READ IN FULL.

>> MOTION BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER. SECOND BY COUNCILMAN TRIPLETT. THE RESOLUTION IS BEFORE US. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION?

COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER.

>> I BELIEVE THIS NEEDS TO BE ON TABLE. IS THAT CORRECT?

>> YES. WE JUST CALLED IT OFF THE TABLE.

>> I DIDN'T KNOW IF YOU HAD TO SAY THAT.

>> OKAY.

>> ANYWAY, I DID HAVE PROCUREMENT -- COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE TO EXPLAIN HOW THIS WOULD WORK GOING FORWARD, AND THE NEED FOR DIFFERENT VENDORS FOR DIFFERENT TREES. I HOPE THAT EVERYONE'S QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED DURING THAT MEETING. IF THEY WEREN'T, I'D LIKE YOU TO JUST ASK ME NOW. OTHERWISE, I'D APPRECIATE YOUR SUPPORT.

>> THANK YOU. ANY QUESTIONS FOR COUNCILWOMAN FOWLER? ALL RIGHT. HEARING NONE, THIS IS A RESOLUTION THAT ALLOWS FOR A VOICE VOTE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR, PLEASE SAY AYE.

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ALL OPPOSED. THE AYES HAVE IT. THE RESOLUTION PASSES. MADAM CLERK, READING OF ITEM NUMBER 51.

>> IN ORDER TO APPROPRIATE \$26,000 -- 26,250 FROM NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE FOLLOWING MANNER, \$3,000 FROM DISTRICT 6, 2,300 FROM DISTRICT 9 -- I'M SORRY, FOR DISTRICT 9. -- \$1,500 EACH DISTRICTS 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17 -- DISTRICTS 20, 22, AND \$375 EACH FROM DISTRICTS -- OFFICE AND MANAGEMENT BUDGET. -- AS AMENDED. READ IN FULL.

>> SECOND.

>> MOTION BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER.

SECOND BY COUNCILMAN PEDEN. THE ORDINANCE BEFORE US. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION? COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THIS CAME OUT OF THE COMMITTEE WITH ALL POSITIVE VOTES. BUT IT WENT TO OLD BUSINESS BECAUSE IT WAS AMENDED IN COMMITTEE --

>> THANK YOU. IS THERE ANY ADDITIONAL SPONSORS OR FURTHER DISCUSSION?

>> YES.

>> WHAT? OKAY. ANY ADDITIONAL FUNDING? YES, I THINK WE'RE AT THE MAX. OKAY. SO WE'RE THERE.

>> YES.

>> ALL RIGHT. ANYBODY WANTS TO ADD, THEY'LL HAVE TO DO ANOTHER. YEAH, IF ANYBODY NEEDS TO ADD FROM THIS POINT, YOU'LL HAVE DO YOUR OWN ORDINANT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR, NO I TAKE THAT BACK. MADAM CLERK, PLEASE TAKE THE ROLL.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.

>> YES.

>> PRESIDENT JAMES.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANY.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER WRINKLER.

COUNCIL MEMBER PARKER.
COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PEDEN.
COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON STEWART.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.
MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 24 YES
VOTES.
>> THANK YOU. THE ORDINANCE
PASSES. MADAM CLERK, READING OF
ITEM 52.
>> -- READ IN FULL.
>> MOTION BY COUNCILMAN WINKLER.
SECOND BY COUNCILMAN
PIAJENTINI.
IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION?
COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY.
>> THANK YOU. I'M GOING TO PASS
THIS OVER TO PRIMARY SPONSOR
COUNCILWOMAN NICOLE GEORGE.
>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN
GEORGE.
>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.
WE'LL BE VERY QUICK.
MANY OF US HAVE BEEN WORKING
HARD AND VERY EXCITED ABOUT THE
DEPROGRAMS WHICH WE LEARNED WILL
BE ROLLING OUT NEXT WEEK.
THIS SIMPLY ALLOWS FOR THE
EVALUATION.
WE KNOW WE NEED TO HAVE PROGRAM
EVALUATION GO HAND IN HAND WITH
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION. WE'RE
EXCITED TO LEARN WHAT IMPACT
WE'RE HAVING WITH DEFLECTION AS
WELL AS WHAT THE COST OFFERS.
WITH THAT, WE ASK FOR YOUR
SUPPORT. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THE
REASON WHY IT'S IN OLD BUSINESS
TONIGHT IS BECAUSE COUNCILMAN
CHAMBERS ARMSTRONG --
>> I WILL BE OBSTAINING DUE IT

MY EMPLOYMENT WITH LOUISVILLE.
>> THANK YOU. IS THERE ANY
FURTHER DISCUSSION? THANK YOU.
THIS REQUIRES A ROLL CALL VOTE.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BOWENS.
>> PRESENT.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER SHANKLIN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER DORSEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARTHUR.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER PURVIS.
>> YES.
>> PRESIDENT JAMES.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER MCCRANEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER ARMSTRONG.
>> OBSTAINING FOR THE REASONS
PREVIOUSLY STATED.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER KRAMER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOWLER.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER TRIPLETT.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER REED.
--
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER INGLE. COUNCIL
MEMBER PEDEN.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER FLOOD.
>> YES.
>> COUNCIL MEMBER HOLTON
STEWART.
COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.
22 YES VOTES, ONE ABSTENTION AND
ONE --
>> THE RESOLUTION PASSES.

THE NEXT ORDER OF BUSINESS IS
NEW BUSINESS.

ITEMS 53 THROUGH 69.

WILL THE CLERK PLEASE READ THOSE
ITEMS IN ASSIGNMENT TO THE
COMMITTEE. AS YOU LEAVE THE
CHAMBERS, PLEASE DO SO QUIETLY.
I HAVEN'T GOT TO SAY THAT FOR A
LONG TIME.

>> THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS
ASSIGNED TO THE APPROPRIATION
COMMITTEE -- AND TOMBSTONE
REPAIR FOR A NEIGHBORHOOD
MAINTAINED CEMETERY.

ITEM 54 IS AN ORDINANCE
PROERPTING -- \$5,000 FROM
DISTRICT 12, \$3,000 FROM
DISTRICT 14 \$750 EACH -- I'M
SORRY, ITEM 55 IS AN ORDINANCE
APPROPRIATING 6,600.

>> FOR THE ANNUAL RIVERSIDE
MAYOR BRUNCH ON THE RIVER.

>> THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATION WAS
ASSIGNED TO THE HOUSING
COMMITTEE. ITEM 60, A RESOLUTION
HONORING REVEREND.

REVEREND WALTER LANG SR. WAY.
61, RESOLUTION COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING AGREEMENT MARCH 1,
2022 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2026.

>> RESOLUTION APPROVING THE
GRANTING -- DOING BUSINESS AS --

>> ITEM 63 IS.

>> GAS REQUIREMENTS DURING THE
CURRENT BAN ON OIL IMPORTS FROM
RUSSIA.

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION WAS
SENT TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING
COMMITTEE.

>> READING ITEM 67.

>> READING ITEM 68.

>> READING ITEM 69.

>> READ IN FULL.

>> THANK YOU.

NEXT WE HAVE ANNOUNCEMENT. WE
HAVE NO COUNCIL MEMBERS WISHING

TO MAKE ANNOUNCEMENTS.
THAT CONCLUDES OUR MEETING. OUR
NEXT COUNCIL MEETING WILL BE --
OUR NEXT FULL METRO COUNCIL
MEETING WILL BE THURSDAY,
APRIL 14, 2022 AT 6:00 P.M. NO
FURTHER BUSINESS TO DISCUSS,
WITHOUT OBJECTION, WE STAND ADJOURNED.