

**Metro Council, March 25, 2021, Unedited Transcript**

[ROLL CALLED].

>> MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 24 PRESENT.

>> MADAM CLERK, ARE THERE ANY ADDRESSES TO COUNSEL.

>> LET ME REMIND YOU TO REFRAIN FROM MAKING DEROGATORY STATEMENTS PLEASE REFRAIN FROM MAKING COMMENTS RELATED TO THE CASES.

BRING THEM FORWARD.

>> ANDREA.

IT SEEMS LITTER AND TRASH IS A CONSISTENT PROP.

THE NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION, THE FOOD WRAPPER, CONTAINERS, AND NAPKINS INCLUDING STRAW WRAPPERS.

I RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING SOLUTIONS AND INSTALL BINS AND MAKE SURE PICKUPS ARE DONE ON REGULAR BASIS.

IT SHOULD BE AT ALL BUS STOPS AND WILL REQUIRE COLLABORATION.

THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY SAID IT SHOULD BE PLACED 25, 30 FOR PROPER DISPOSAL.

THEY WON'T BE SEEN ON ALL PUBLIC PROPERTY BUT HAS IMPORTANCE OF AS MANY RECEPTACLES AS POSSIBLE.

IF IT IS OFF THE BUSINESS PROPERTY, IT IS NOT ONLY THE BUSINESS OWNER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO CLEAR IT OUT.

LITTER A SQUARE MILE FROM WESTPORT COINCIDE WITH THOSE THAT SELL FOOD AND DRINK.

THERE'S A VAST DIFFERENCE ON THE OTHER END OF MURPHY WHICH HAS

NO SUCH BUSINESSES.

REGARDING MURPHY LANE I HAVEN'T SEEN ANY EVIDENCE THAT THE BUSINESSES PROFITING FROM THE SALE ATTEMPT TO CLEAN IT UP. I'M NOT SUGGESTING THE TAXPAYERS PAY NOTHING FOR CLEAN-UP. THE LITTER IS CAUSED BY THE BUSINESSES AND THEIR CUSTOMERS. WHAT I AM SUGGESTING IS THAT ALONG WITH THE TAXPAYERS THAT BUSINESSES THAT PROFIT FROM ITEMS AND CONTRIBUTE TOWARD LITTER PAY SOMETHING TOWARD CLEAN-UP.

REGARDING THE ARGUMENT THAT CHARGES BUSINESS A FEE IF SOMETHING THEY HAVE NO CONTROL IS FAIR.

IF IT WILL PARTIALLY DEFUND THE ROAD IS MORE FAIR THAN NOT CHARGING THEM ANYTHING AT ALL.

INCREASED NUMBER OF WASTE BINS AT STRATEGIC LOCATIONS.

PICKED UP REGULARLY AND ADDITIONAL FROM BUSINESSES THAT SELL FOOD AND DRINK DESIGNATED NOT TO BE CONSUMED ON THE PREMISES.

THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING ME TO SPEAK WITH YOU.

>> JEANNE CHRISTENSEN.

>> YES.

YOU CAN GO.

>> LOUISVILLE'S ENERGY FUTURE TO 100 PERCENT RENEWABLE.

A COPY WHICH EACH OF YOU HAS RECEIVED.

I'M URGING COUNCIL MEMBERS TO SUPPORT THE RESOLUTION FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY.

IT IS HARD TO GRASP THE COMPLEXITY.

THE DANGER POSED BY HUMAN CAUSED BY THE CRISIS THAT THREATENS ALL SPECIES IS MADE MORE COMPLEX BY INEQUALITY.

THE POOR ARE BORN THE BRUNT.

HIGHER MORBIDITY RATES FROM COVID-19.

THE EXPOSURE TO EXTREMES OF CLIMATE CHANGE WILL SHORTEN LIVES.

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE AND FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL INHERIT THE BURDEN OF EVERY PROBLEM THAT WAS NOT ADDRESSED TODAY.

WE NEED TO PROTECT HEALTH AND HOME, FOOD AND WATER SUPPLIES, OUR ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT AND EMISSIONS MA HAVE SEVERE EFFECTS ON THE PLANET AND ALL LIVING SPECIES AND DRIVE UP THE COST ENORMOUSLY.

THE COST OF INACTION MAY FAR EXCEED THE COST OF ACTION.

IN FEBRUARY 2020, METRO PASSED IF LOUISVILLE TO TAKE ON THE CHALLENGE OF TRANSFORMING CITY'S ENERGY SYSTEMS.

IT TOOK COURAGE TO SERIOUSLY CONSIDER THE EFFECTS OF NOT ACTING.

ENERGY PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION AND CONSTRUCTION INSTRUCTION.

WE NEED MORE IN CONSTRUCTION AND TRANSPORTATION UP SECTORS AND MODERNIZE ELECTRICAL GRILL THAT IS FLEXIBLE AND SUSTAINABLE MODE.

THE TRANSITION IS NOT GOING TO BE EASY AS LOUISVILLE FACES MAJOR CHALLENGE TO THE PROJECT.

LUMBERING MONOPOLIES WILL GET IN THE WAY.

KENTUCKY STILL LACKS THE STANDARD WITH OTHER STATES.

LOUISVILLE'S BUILDING CODES ARE CONTROLLED BY FRANKFURT.

THIS IS COMPARED TO THE PROMISE OF REAL BONUSES THAT CAN COME FROM RENEWABLE ENERGY.

THIS CAN BENEFIT ALL OF US.

A GREEN CITY CAN IMPROVE THE LIVES QUALITY OF THOSE THAT SUFFERED FROM EXPOSURE IT FOSSIL FUEL.

HERE ME OUT WHEN I SAY CLEAN AIR AND CLEAN SOIL AND WATER IS RELATED TO VERIFIED [INDISCERNIBLE].

>> THANK YOU.

I WANTED TO IT TALK ABOUT THE SAFETY ZONE FOR WOMEN.

EVERY MORNING THROUGH THE WEEK WE ESCORT PATIENTS TO THE WAITING ROOM OF THE MD UNIT.

THEY HAVE TO WALK THROUGH A HOARD OF PROTESTERS.

NOT ALL OF WHICH ARE FRIENDLY AND CAN BE QUITE COMBATIVE.

IT IS DANGEROUS.

I HAD A UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE AND NOT IN MY TOO DISTANT PASS, I WAS A PROTESTER AND I PROTESTED AT THE EMW CLINIC.

I STARTED TO GO TO THE CLINIC TO PROTEST BUT I QUICKLY BECAME DISCOURAGED BECAUSE I SAW THE UNHINGED NATURE OF THE PROTEST.

SOME GOT VIOLENT WITH WITH -- WITH -- WITH WITH SOME OF THE PATIENTS THAT ARE WALKING TO -- FROM THEIR CARS TO THE BUILDING.

THEY WOULD SHOVE PEOPLE.

THEY WOULD WITH KNOCK THEM OUT OF THE WAY.

THEY WOULD GET INTO THEIR BUBBLE, INTO THEIR PURSE AND -- GOAD PEOPLE TRYING TO GET THEM FOR FIGHT.

YOU I TURNED AWAY.

THIS IS NOT WHAT I CAME DOWN HERE TO DO.

NOW I -- I AM AN ESCORT BECAUSE OF MY EXPERIENCE AS PROTESTER.

I SAW HOW AWFUL THOSE PEOPLE WERE AND THAT THE TRAUMA THAT THE WOMEN WERE GOING FOR.

IT IS UNHINGED, THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE GO THROUGH.

THEY HAVE TO EXPERIENCE.

JUST THE OTHER WEEK, I WAS ESCORTING A WOMAN FROM THE PARKING GARAGE DOWN THE SIDEWALK AND TO THE WAITING ROOM.

ONE OF THE PROTESTERS LITERALLY SHOULDER RAMPED ME OFF INTO TRAFFIC SO SHE COULD GET IN WITH THE PERSON.

IT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT, SO MANY STREETS IT IS TIME FOR LOUISVILLE TO DO THE SAME.

>> I NEED TO ADDRESS AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

>> THIS IS 30 PERCENT OF MEDIAN INCOME.

THESE ARE UNABLE TO MEET BASIC NEEDS.

THIS IS LIKE WALKING FROM HERE TO CALIFORNIA AND THESE OPTIONS ARE LIMITED WITH A CONSTANTLY GROWING WAITING LIST.

CARE GIVERS ARE ARE DOING WHAT THEY CAN TO SUPPORT THEIR FAMILIES TO MAKE ENDS MEET BUT THEY'RE ALWAYS NAVIGATING OBSTACLES.

THE CLIENTS I WORKED WITH AT THE COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS, STRUGGLED TO MAKE END MEET.

THERE'S NO ROOM FOR ERROR, LUCKILY FOR MANY OF US, WE HAVE

EXPERIENCED THESE CLASSES OF PREFER HIERARCHY AND KNOW WHAT SAFETY AND LOVE AND BELONGING AND POSITIVE FOCUSING FEEL LIKE. I ENCOURAGE YOU TO ALLOCATE AT LEAST 20 MILLION DOLLARS TOWARD THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND AND PROVIDE TO COUNCIL DURING THIS PANDEMIC.

THIS IS TO HELP OUR COMMUNITY'S CHILDREN THRIVE AND HAVE A MORE SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITY.

SOMETHING CURRENTLY AS ADULTS WE'RE FAILING AT.

A DIFFERENT NARRATIVE.

OUR CHILDREN'S LIVES DEPEND ON IT.

MARTINA.

COURTNEY BENNETT.

COURTNEY BENNETT.

>> CAN YOU UNMUTE YOURSELF MAYBE?

>> SAYS I'VE BEEN UNMUTED.

CAN YOU HEAR ME?

>> YES.

THERE HAD TO BE ONE TECHNICAL DIFFICULTY AT THE START.

GOOD EVENING MY NAME IS COURTNEY BENNETT AND I'M THE MOTHER OF AN INCREDIBLE TODDLER.

WE FOUND OUT OUR BABIES WERE ANOMALIES AND I HAD ADOPTION.

I WAS FOREWARNED ABOUT THE PROFITERS, IMAGINE HAVING A GENETIC COUNSELOR HAVING TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THIS.

I WOULD NOT LET MY PARTNER WALK ME TO THE DOOR BECAUSE I DIDN'T

WANT HIM TO WALK THROUGH THE INDIVIDUALS TWICE.

I WAS DESCENDED UPON BEFORE WITH I MADE IT OUT OF THE CAR.

NO RESPONSE.

NO INTEGRITY.

THIS WAS NOT SOMEONE EXPRESSING THEIR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

MY EXPERIENCE WITH THE STAFF AT THE CLINIC, ALL THAT WENT INTO MY CHOICE AND THE PAIN I FELT MADE ME TO WORK FOR REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS AND WE LOOKED AT ACCESS TO APPORTION CARE AND ONE OF THEIR GOALS IS TO OFFER POLICY MAKERS SOLITARY EVIDENCE TO BETTER SERVICE THEIR COMMUNITY AND PROVIDE QUALITY REPRODUCTIVE SQUARE.

THIS SPECIFIC STUDY SPANS, HAWAII AND LOUISVILLE.

MORE THAN HALF OF THE EMW CLINIC REPORTED PROTESTERS AS CHALLENGES TO THE CARE.

THAT'S MORE THAN 15 ABOVE THE OTHER CLINICS.

THIS IS NOT THE DATA FOR A COMPASSIONATE CITY.

I TELL YOU OVER THESE MONTH, THE HEARTACHE THAT THEY SHARED WAS NOT ABOUT THEIR DIFFICULT PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES BUT ABOUT THE STRUGGLE OF WALKING THROUGH HARASSMENT.

I FEEL LUCKY WE HAVE A CLINIC IN OUR COMMUNITY.

THIS CARE MAY INCLUDE APPORTIONS AND CONTRACEPTIVE CARE.

OUR COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT FEEL UNSAFE OR THREATENED AT SUCH A FACILITY OR ANY MEDICAL CLINIC.

I HOPE YOU CAN COME TOGETHER TO RECOGNIZE THE LONG OVERDUE NEED

FOR A SAFETY ZONE.

AND RESPECTFUL SUPPORT BY INDIVIDUALS SEEKING AND PROVIDING THIS  
MEDICAL CARE.

THIS ALLOWED YOU TO FEEL COMFORTABLE AND YOU'RE NOT --

>> YOUR TIME IS EXPIRED.

>> THANK YOU.

>> MARTINA.

MARTINA.

>> YES.

>> CAN YOU HEAR ME?

>> YES, MA'AM.

>> MARTINA, SHOULD I GIVE MY ADDRESS?

>> NO MA'AM.

>> OKAY.

THANK YOU.

>> OBVIOUSLY THE COMMUNITY LIKE THE REST OF THE COUNTRY HAS  
HAD A VERY DIFFICULT YEAR.

I BELIEVE WE'RE LEARNING FROM OUR EXPERIENCES IN THE PAST YEAR,  
ESPECIALLY ABOUT WITH HOW OUT OF BALANCE WE REMAIN AS A  
COMMUNITY.

THIS IS A CHRONIC IMBALANCE THAT CRIPPLED ALL OF US AND ONE  
THING THAT KEEPS US IN THAT IMBALANCE IS CONTINUE TO GRASP WITH  
THE CHANGE OF WHAT WE SEE WE ARE AND OUR DEEDS SHOW WE ARE.

FOR EXAMPLE, AS A COMMUNITY, HOW CAN WE SAY THAT THERE'S PUBLIC



PARTICIPATION WHEN MANY CANNOT DEAL WITH WEBEX AND MANY LIKE ME  
HAVE A BROADBAND ISSUE.

I HOPE I DON'T GET CUT OFF TONIGHT.

IF WE SAY WE'RE COMPASSIONATE, HOW CAN WE SWEEP THE HOMELESS OFF  
THE CURB FOR CONVENIENCE RIGHT BEFORE COMPANY COMES.

AFTER WE SAY WE APPRECIATE OUR STRUCTURES AND WE KEEP TEARING  
THEM DOWN HOW CAN WE PRAISE OUR STRENGTHS WHEN MOST PEOPLE IN  
THE COMMUNITY ARE IN DESPERATE TROUBLE.

THE VACCINE THAT IS HERE AND COVID DOLLARS ABOUT BROKE DOWN MORE  
THAN EVER BEFORE.

SHOULD WE SPEND OUR MONEY AND TIME THE SAME OLD WAY.

AND A PURPOSE OF NEW INITIATIVE.

IT IS THE SAME OLD RUN AND SYSTEMATIC INEQUITIES.

WE ARE WASTING MONEY AND NOT SOLVING THE PROBLEM.

THE PUBLIC IS LOOKING AS THEY HAVE NEVER DONE BEFORE SO  
LEADERSHIP THAT SETS THINGS RIGHT.

NO MORE MAGICAL THINKING.

IN MORE DIVISIVE COMPLAINTS TO DISTRACT US.

STANDING HERE TONIGHT AND AS CONTENTIOUS AS THINGS ARE, I'M  
OPTIMISTIC.

IT IS A PRIVILEGE TO SERVE THE PUBLIC AND THE PUBLIC IS WATCHING  
LIKE NEVER BEFORE.

WE'RE LOOKING FOR LEADERSHIP THAT IS GOING TO VOTE FOR THE  
COMMUNITY'S VALUES AND NOT LEADERSHIP THAT IS PUSHING THE PUBLIC

IN A DIRECTION TO DISTRACT FROM OUR REAL ISSUES.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE TIME.

>> AMY.

>> CAN YOU HEAR ME?

>> I'M AMY, AND I LIVED IN LOUISVILLE MY ENTIRE LIFE.

I WAS PROUD OF THE CITY WHEN THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND  
ACCOUNTABILITY ORDINANCE PASSED LAST SEPTEMBER.

I FELT THE SAME AS COUNCILMAN MEMBER REED WHEN HE SAID HE HOPED  
THIS WOULD BE THE START OF THE OPENNESS, DIALOGUE AND TRUST AND  
THAT ALL SIDES WOULD GET TOGETHER AND EXAMINE THE WAY THINGS ARE  
ARE DONE.

I AGREE WITH COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI THAT WE SHOULD NOT SEE  
EACH OTHER AS ADVERSARIES.

THEN HE CONTINUED TO SAY ONE OF THE WAYS TO DO THIS IS TO MAKE  
SURE THE ENTIRETY OF THE COMMUNITY IS REPRESENTED.

THIS IS THE PROMISE MADE TO THE CITIZENS OF LOUISVILLE.

I DON'T NEED TO REMIND YOU FOR THE MONTHS LEADING UP TO THIS OR  
WHY THE SOLE PURPOSE OF THIS ORDINANCE IS BECAUSE THE POLICE ARE  
NOT POLICING THEMSELVES.

I DON'T LOOK AT MY CITIES THE SAME.

I WANT TO SAY THANK YOU TO THE COMMUNITIES OF COLOR AND LEADERS  
LIKE STASHEO AND TAYLOR.

EACH COMMUNITY WAS THE DRIVING FORCE.

BECAUSE OF THEM WE NOW HAVE A WAY FORWARD.

YOU SHOULD BE SO GRATEFUL.

INSTEAD A SMEAR CAMPAIGN AND THEY'RE TRYING TO ERASE THE  
PROGRESS THE CITY HAS MADE.

AFTER EVERYTHING WE'VE BEEN THROUGH, IT IS REPREHENSIBLE.

THE COMMUNITY MEMBERS ARE ARE ON THE FENCE TONIGHT.

THEY'LL HAVE TO TO THE HEAVY-HITTING.

YOU'RE STUCK IN A TASK.

AND MOVING FORWARD AND THERE'S SOMETHING ABOUT THIS BROKEN  
SYSTEM MUST BE WORKING FOR THEM.

WE HAVE QUALIFIED NOMINEES BEFORE YOU THAT TRULY REPRESENT A  
PART OF OUR CITY THAT HAS BEEN REPEATEDLY NEGLECTED AND  
SILENCED.

IF THESE VOICES DON'T HAVE A SEAT AT THE TABLE WHAT ARE YOU  
DOING?

THE PROCEDURE TO REMOVE MEMBERS IF THEY DO NOT FULFILL AND AS  
NARRATIVE. DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES DO NOT CHANGE.

IT IS ALL IN THE ORDINANCE IF YOU LIKE TO READ IT.

I APPRECIATE IT.

YOU GAVE THE GENTLEMEN AS CHIEF OF THE BOARD WHEN YOU APPROVED  
HIS NOMINATION LAST THURSDAY NIGHT.

I DEMAND YOU PUT YOUR BIAS TO THE SIDE AND GET THAT SAME  
DEFERENCE.

IN CLOSING AS A QUICK SIDE NOTE, THE COUNCILPERSON WAS IN THIS  
PROCESS LAST TUESDAY AND IS UNACCEPTABLE.

IT HAS NO PLACE IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME TONIGHT.

>> THANK YOU.

REV REND RUSSELL AUKER.

ARE YOU THERE?

>> YES.

>> YES ARE YOU HEARING ME?

>> YES.

GO AHEAD.

>> GOOD EVENING PRESIDENT AND COUNCIL.

THIS IS MY SECOND TIME TO COME BEFORE YOU IN MY 48 YEARS AS  
PASTOR OF NEW ZION BAPTIST CHURCH.

THE FIRST TIME I CAME TO URGE THIS METRO COUNCIL TO ACT IN  
DEFENSE OF COUNCILWOMAN JESSICA GREEN.

NOW I WANT TO STRESS YOUR OBLIGATION FOR THE BLACK MAN AND THE  
BLACK WOMEN WHO ARE ARE ADVOCATING FOR THE POOR IN THE POLICE  
CIVILIAN REVIEW AND ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD WITH SO THAT ALL OF THE  
PEOPLE ARE REPRESENTED.

TONIGHT I SPEAK TO ENDORSE, BUSSEY AND IN ANTONIO TAYLOR.

BOTH OF THESE CITIZENS ARE ARE EXCELLENT CHOICES FOR THE  
ASSIGNMENT.

LIKE METRO COUNCIL, THIS GROUP DOES NOT REQUIRE UNANIMITY TO  
WORK TOGETHER.

FISHER RECOMMENDED THEM BECAUSE THEY'RE INTELLIGENT AND DECENT

AND RESPECTED COMMUNITY ACTIVISTS.

HE KNOWS THEY WILL PASSIONATELY REPRESENT THE UNDERSERVED AND THE UNDERREPRESENTED.

THIS BOARD MUST WIN THE TRUST OF THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY.

TO THAT END, MISS BUSSEY AND MR. TAYLOR WILL ENHANCE THE CREDIBILITY OF THE PANEL.

NEED FOR INPUT OF PERSONS WHO SPEAKS FOR THEIR MINORITY AND MARGINALIZED CITIZENS.

THIS IS ABUSIVENESS AGAINST BLACK PEOPLE.

PEOPLE THAT FEEL IN DANGER WHEN A POLICE CAR APPROACHES THEM.

OTHERWISE THE REVIEW, AND ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD WILL BE SEEN AS WINDOW DRESSING TO PROTECT THE STATUS QUO.

WITH ALL OF THE HIGH MY PUBLICIZED AND COURAGEOUS CRUSADE OVER THE LAST TEN MONTHS AND THE TRAGEDY OF TAYLOR WOULD BE SWEEPED UNDER A BED.

I PARTICIPATED WITH MR. BUSSEY AND TAYLOR TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS IN LOUISVILLE.

THEY'RE OUTSTANDING REPRESENTATIVES.

THEY'RE REASONABLE AND WELL INFORMED AND COMMITTED TO MAKING OUR CITY A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE.

MR. PRESIDENT AND COUNCIL MEMBERS, THANKING YOU AGAIN 0 OF THE OPPORTUNITY.

I URGE YOU TO APPROVE THE NOMINATION OF BUSSEY AND TAYLOR.

THEIR VOICES MUST BE HEARD.

>> THANK YOU.

>> AARON SMITH.

>> AARON SMITH, ARE YOU UNMUTED?

>> CAN YOU HEAR ME?

>> YES.

>> GREAT.

>> MY NAME IS AARON SMITH AND I'M DIRECTOR OF THE HEALTHY  
JUST NETWORK.

I'M RESIDENT OF DISTRICT 15.

I WORK IN DISTRICT 4 AND I WAS RAISED IN DISTRICT 10.

I'M HERE TODAY TO ASK FOR ALL OF YOU TO SUPPORT THE LOUISVILLE  
SAFETY ZONES.

YOU HEARD EARLIER THE SITUATION OUTSIDE THE CLINIC IS NOT  
IMPROVING.

AFTER HAVING SUCH A SUMMER AS WE HAD, HAVE HAD WITH THE -- WITH  
THE MURDER OF TAYLOR YOU WOULD THINK WE WOULD WANT TO DO WHAT WE  
CAN TO SUPPORT OUR RESIDENTS.

WE NEED TO KEEP INDIVIDUALS SAFE WHO ARE SEEKING TREATMENT NOT  
JUST FROM ABORTION CLINICS BUT EVERY MEDICAL CLINICS.

IT IS SOMETHING THAT WE HAVE -- WE -- WE WELL CONTINUE TO FIGHT  
OR ASK FOR SUPPORT.

IT IS SOMETHING NEEDED IN THE CITY.

SOME THINGS HAPPENED OUTSIDE OF THE CLINIC HAVE BEEN EGREGIOUS  
AND QUITE FRANKLY DISGUSTING TO THINK THAT PEOPLE WILL

PHYSICALLY TOUCH, TACKLE, AND JUST HINDER PEOPLE FROM SEEKING TREATMENT THAT THEY CHOSE AND THEY'RE CHOOSING TO GET.

IT IS SOMETHING THEY FEEL THEY NEED.

WE COULD DO BETTER.

WE SHOULD BE DOING BETTER.

JUST RECENTLY IN THE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, WE DISCUSSED THE SITUATION WHERE THERE WAS A POLICE OFFICER WHO WAS PROTESTING WITH THE ANTI-ABORTION PROTESTERS WHICH IS HONESTLY UNBELIEVABLE IN 2021.

I CAN'T REITERATE ENOUGH THAT THE NEED THAT THIS CITY HAS, THE NEED EVERY INDIVIDUAL HAS FOR A BUFFER ZONE JUST TO GIVE THEM BASIC PROTECTION.

WE HAD DISCUSSED LOUISVILLE BEING A COMPASSIONATE CITY.

WE TO HAVE A HUMAN DECENCY PROBLEM.

WE HAVE A HUMAN DECENCY PROBLEM THAT WE HAVE TO FIX TO BE A COMPASSIONATE CITY THAT WE WANT TO BE AND THAT YOU ARE AND WE DESIRE TO TAKE TO B THE LIEU LOUISVILLE SAFETY ZONE IS FOR THAT.

>> HELLO MEMBERS OF THE MOBILE METRO COUNCIL.

I'M JUAN.

I'M A RESEARCHER.

I WORK CLOSELY WITH THE LINER UNION.

I'M HEAR TO SPEAK ABOUT ACTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY BOARD HAS TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO AIRPORT CONCESSIONS AND HMS HOST.

THE COUNCIL HAS AUTHORITY TO APPROVE SEVEN OF THE 11 APPOINTEES

BY THE MAYOR OF THIS BOARD.

HMS WORKERS AND MYSELF HAVE TO PROVIDE COMMON AT THE MARCH 16TH MEETING.

WE WERE DISMAYED THAT THEY ALLOWED PUBLIC TO PARTICIPATE.

WE BELIEVE PUBLIC MEETINGS IS OUR POLICY AND WE HOPE THEM TO RECONSIDER.

THE AUTHORITY GRANTED THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR THE AUTHORITY TO RENEGOTIATE THE 1.8 MILLION REVENUE GUARANTEES THAT HMS HOSTS. ACCORDING TO A POST, THEY WON A CONTRACT FOR 11 LOCATIONS AT THE AIRPORT, VALUED AT 110 MILLION DOLLARS OVER EIGHT YEARS.

IT IS AN ITALIAN OWNED COMPANY WITH WITH REVENUES IN NORTH AMERICA THAT WERE ABOVE A BILLION DOLLARS IN FISCAL YEAR 2020. LAST YEAR HE RECEIVED 358 MILLION DOLLARS IN LOANS.

WE SOUGHT TO ADD TO THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY TO HALT ANY RELIEF AND THAT THE AUTHORITY PROVIDE WORKERS WITH WITH HEALTH BENEFITS AND THE RIGHT TO RETURN TO WORK AS A CONDITION OF ANY FUTURE RELIEF. OTHER AIRPORTS HAVE DONE THIS.

THE COUNTRY'S SECOND LARGEST AIRPORT THE COMMISSIONS.

THE CITY COUNCIL REQUIRED CONCESSION THEIRS THAT COULD RECALL THEIR EMPLOYEES.

THE DECISION TO GRANT RELIEF OUGHT TO CONSIDER WORKERS AND THEIR STRUGGLES AND FROM PHOENIX AND LAX ARE READY TO PROVIDE THEIR COMMENTS.

THEIR RESPECTIVE AUTHORITIES REQUIRE HMS POSTS AND HEALTH



INSURANCE AND RECALL RIGHTS.

WE WILL ASK YOU COMMUNICATE COMMENTS TO THE BOARD.

WHAT IS THE RELIEF BEEN GRANTED TO DATE?

HOW MANY POST EMPLOYEES AT LOCAL AIRPORTS HAVE BEEN AHEAD OFF OR  
SEPARATED FROM EMPLOYMENT.

HOW ARE RECALLED?

THIS IS WORKERS BY SENIORITY.

HOW MUCH OF CONTINUED HEALTH INSURANCE IF THEY PROVIDE FOR THE  
LAID OFF EMPLOYEES.

WHAT WAS THE EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION FOR THE COVERAGE.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, THAT CONCLUDES THE ADDRESS OF THE COUNCIL.

>> NEXT WE HAVE APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR  
MEETING.

ARE THERE ANY CORRECTIONS OR DELETIONS?

>> MOTION TO ACCEPT, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> SECOND.

>> MOTION AND SECONDED BY PIAGENTINI.

ALL IN FAVOR, AYE.

OPPOSED?

THE AYES HAVE IT.

NEXT WE HAVE THE APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE MINUTES,  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE HOLE.

REGULAR LABOR AND DEVELOPMENT.

REGULAR ARE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT AND AUDIT COMMITTEE, MARCH 16TH

2021.

AND HOUSING AND HEALTH AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

AND REGULAR PUBLIC SAFETY COMMIT MARCH 17, REGULAR

APPROPRIATIONS MARCH 17, REGULAR PARKS AND SUSTAINABLE

COMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON EQUITY AND INCLUSION, MARCH 17, TO 21.

REGULAR COMMITTEE ON COM COMMITTEES.

MOTION BY COUNCILMAN TRIPLET AND PIEDEN.

ALL IN FAVOR AYE.

>> THE AYES HAVE IT.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE MAYOR.

>> YES.

>> PLEASE READ IN THE RECORD.

MATERIALS ORDINANCE APPEALS AND

OVERSEERS BOARD, I AM APPOINTING

THE FOLLOWING:

MIKE LEHN, APPOINTMENT.

TERM EXPIRES JUNE 1, 2025.

THIS IS TO BE READ INTO RECORD

ONLY.

METRO COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THIS

APPOINTMENT AND THESE

REAPPOINTMENTS IS NOT REQUIRED.

SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR.

16.

DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES, IN  
ACCORDANCE WITH THE AFFORDABLE  
HOUSING TRUST FUND BOARD, I AM  
APPOINTING THE FOLLOWING:  
ADAM GALLAGHER, APPOINTMENT.  
TERM EXPIRES DECEMBER 31, 2021.  
YOUR PROMPT ACTION ON THESE  
APPOINTMENTS IS MOST  
APPRECIATED.  
SINCERELY, GREG FISCHER, MAYOR.

17.

DEAR PRESIDENT JAMES:

>> THOSE NEEDING COUNCIL APPROVAL WILL BE FARTHER.  
THE NEXT IS THE CONSENT CALENDAR.  
ITEMS 18 THROUGH 28, ANY ADISCUSSIONS OR DELETIONS.  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TARC  
ORDINANCE, I AM APPOINTING AND  
REAPPOINTING THE FOLLOWING.  
TAWANDA OWSLEY, APPOINTMENT.  
TERM EXPIRES MARCH 27, 2024.

[PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE]

AP031621MM.

APPOINTMENT OF MARIANNA MICHAEL  
TO THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND

ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2024.

26.

AP031621GS.

APPOINTMENT OF GUILLERMO SOLLANO

TO THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND

ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2022.

27.

AP031621TB.

APPOINTMENT OF TURNEY BERRY TO

THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND

ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2022.

28.

AP031621KW.

APPOINTMENT OF KELLIE WATSON TO

THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND

ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2024.

LEGISLATION FORWARDED FROM PARKS

AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE.

29.

READ IN FULL.

>> MOTION AND SECOND.

>> MOTION BY COUNCIL AND PIAGENTINI.

SECOND BY PIEDEN.

PROPERLY MOVED AND SECONDED.

CALL THE ROLL.

[ROLL CALLED].

>> YOU HAVE 24 YES VOTES.

>> THANK YOU.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSES.

NEXT IS OLD BUSINESS.

READ ITEM 29.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE  
MAYOR TO ACCEPT A DONATION OF A  
MINI PITCH VALUED AT \$100,000  
FROM THE U.S. SOCCER FOUNDATION  
TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN PETERSBURG  
PARK AND ADMINISTERED BY THE  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS &  
RECREATION.

OLD BUSINESS.

COMPRISED OF ITEMS 30-36.

30.

AP031621JG.

APPOINTMENT OF JENNIFER GREEN TO

THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND  
ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2022.

31.

AP031621SB.

COUNCIL MAN KRAMER.

ACKERSON.

>> YES, MR. PRESIDENT, THIS ITEM WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT IS ON OLD BUSINESS SO ONE OF THE COUNCIL MEMBERS CAN ENTER AN  
ABSTENTION ON THE RECORD.

>> THANK YOU.

ANY OTHER DISCUSSION.

HEARING NONE THIS APPOINTMENT CALLS FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE.

[ROLL CALLED]

>> I NEED TO THANK THIS INDIVIDUAL.

I DON'T BELIEVE IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR ME TO VOTE ON THIS MATTER.

MR. PRESIDENT, YOU HAVE 24 YES VOTES, ONE ABSTENTION.

>> THE APPOINTMENT PASSES.

MADAM CLERK READING OF ITEM 30.

APPOINTMENT OF STACHELLE BUSSEY

TO THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND

ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2022.

>> THANK YOU, MOTION AND SECOND?

MOTION BY COUNCILWOMAN PURVIS.

SECOND BY COUNCILWOMAN GEORGIA.

THE APPOINTMENT IS BEFORE US.

ANY DISCUSSION?

COUNCILMAN ACKERMAN.

>> CAME OUT WITH A FAVORITABLE RECOMMENDATION ON A VOTE OF FIVE TO THREE.

>> THANK YOU.

ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION.

COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, TODAY MARKS ANOTHER STEP ON A JOURNEY TO IMPROVE PUBLIC SAFETY AS WE VOTE ON THE INAUGURAL MEMBERS.

THIS WILL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT COULD HAVE A PROFOUND EFFECT ON THE LIVES OF FAMILY IN THE COMMUNITY.

THIS IS THE FOREMOST OPPORTUNITY FOR THE GOVERNMENT.

ANYONE TASKED WITH THAT MUST BE READY TO ACCEPT AND UNDERSTAND AND JUST LIKE THE OFFICERS WHO SERVED THIS COMMUNITY, THEIR DECISIONS WILL AHEAD TO A BETTER COMMUNITY OR LARGER DIVISION.

FOR THIS REASON WE TAKE THE VOTE ON THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD VERY SERIOUSLY.

WE HAVE TWO CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD.

WE HAVE HAD MANY CONVERSATIONS OVER THE PAST WEEK TO GAIN AN UNDERSTANDING AND SEEK OUT COMMON GROUND.

I'M SURE THERE WILL BE MANY MORE DIFFICULT CONVERSATIONS TO COME AS WE TACKLE THESE CRITICAL ISSUES.

I'M CONSOLD THAT EACH COUNCILPERSON CAME TO THEIR DECISION BASED ON THEIR DESIRE TO IMPROVE OUR COMMUNITY AND TURN AROUND THE TREND OF VIOLENCE AS WELL AS MISTRUST THAT CURRENTLY EXISTS ON OUR STREETS.

WHEN THIS ORDINANCE WAS PASSED, IT PURPOSELY EXCLUDED MANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, SPECIFICALLY IT EXCLUDED FAMILY MEMBERS OF ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.

ARGUABLY, TENS OF THOUSANDS OF CITIZENS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY WERE EXCLUDED BECAUSE OF AN ASSUMPTION OF POTENTIAL BIAS IN FAVOR OF LAPD.

SOME OF US DISAGREED AND SORTED THE OVERALL ORDINANCE.

METRO COUNCIL WOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE MAYOR'S NOMINATION.

THE SECOND WHERE AS FOR THE ORDINANCE CALLS FOR AN OBJECTIVE AND INDEPENDENT BOARD.

WE HAVE EVERY REASON TO BE CONCERNED OVER THE OBJECTIVITY OF WHAT IS BEING VOTED ON THIS EVENING.

THEY HAVEN'T JUST MADE STATEMENTS OF PHILOSOPHICAL AGREEMENT.

THE ROLE OF THIS BODY IS OVERSIGHT.

THE MEMBERS OF THIS COUNCIL WHO ARE OPPOSED TO THE TWO

APPOINTMENTS BELIEVE IN OUR HEARTS THAT DESPITE THE MANY

WONDERFUL THINGS THAT THESE TWO -- THESE -- THESE TWO APPOINTEES



MAY DO THROUGH THEIR VOLUNTEER WORK AND THEIR BIAS VIOLATES THE INTENTION OF THE WHEREAS CLAUSE THAT ESTABLISHED THIS BOARD.

NO MATTER THE POLICY DISAGREEMENTS, AS A COUNTRY AND STATE AND CITY, WE MUST STOP CONFUSING THOSE DISAGREEMENTS WITH VIOLENCE. WE CAN AND SHOULD EXPRESS OUR DISAGREEMENTS THROUGH WORD AND EVEN FROM TIME TO TIME PASSIONATE WORD.

THAT PASSION SHOULD NEVER DEVOLVE INTO CALLING FOR PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AGAINST ANOTHER MEMBER OF THIS COMMUNITY INCLUDING THREATS MADE AGAINST THE CANDIDATES.

FINALLY NO MATTER THE RESULT OF THE VOTES WE WILL ALL CONTINUE TO PURSUE WHAT WE BELIEVE IS THE BEST DIRECTION FOR THE CITY. THAT MEANS WE ALL PRAY FOR BETTER DAYS AHEAD AND WILL WORK TOWARD THAT GOAL.

THAT MEANS THAT EACH OF US AND OUR CONSTITUENTS WOULD CONTINUE TO ADVOCATE FOR THE SOLUTIONS THAT THEY BELIEVE WILL MAKE OUR CITY A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE, WORK AND PLAY.

WE WILL ALL DO THIS IN THE REALM OF IDEA ROOTED IN RESPECT FOR OUR COMMON MUNICIPALITY.

THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILWOMAN GREEN.

>> THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT, WE KNOW THROUGH PAINFUL EXPERIENCES THAT FREEDOM IS NEVER VOLUNTARILY GIVEN BY THE OPPRESSOR UNLESS DEMANDED BY THE OPPRESSED.

THE AMERICANS MUST RECOGNIZE THAT JUSTICE TO BLACK PEOPLE IS IMPERATIVE.

WITH SOME OF YOU ALL, THESE ARE THE RADICAL WORD OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. AND FILTERED THROUGH A REVISIONIST LENS BUT HE'S A BOMB TODAY FOR POLITICAL CLIMATE.

WE LOOK BACK TO THE FRAMEWORK WHERE WE SAW HIM AS A PEACEFUL MAN OF GOD BECAUSE HE WAS.

HE WAS VERY MUCH MORE THAN THAT.

HE WAS RADICAL FOR HIS TIME AND OUR TIME.

IF THERE'S TWITTER AND SNAP CHAT BACK IN 67 WHEN KING MADE THESE COMMENTS, WHAT WOULD YOU EACH SAY ABOUT MARTIN KING'S SICKNESS AT THE REVIEW BOARD.

THE BOARD WAS A LONG TIME COMING.

OUR CITY AND COUNTRY HAVE PENDING THE LAST YEAR AT GROUND ZERO OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT.

WE HAVE TALKED, WE PASSED LEGISLATION.

TRY TO UNDERSTAND WHY PEOPLE ARE SO ANGRY.

REACHING THE GOAL REQUIRES INVITING THOSE IN THE ARENA TO THE TABLE.

THIS IS WHERE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITY TO EXIST TO MAKE THE MOST GAIN.

YES, THERE'S POSTS THAT WERE MADE.

WHO AMONG US WANTS TO BE REDUCED TO EVEN FIVE SOCIAL MEDIA CONTESTS.

IT IS A CONCEPT AMYING TO THE COLLEAGUES.

BUSSEY AND MR. TAYLOR ARE SO MUCH MORE THAN THE FOLKS THAT WERE PULLED OUT ABOUT THEM.

YOU LOOK ON FACEBOOK, YOU WOULD HAVE SEEN BUSSEY CELEBRATING THE GOODNESS OF GOD.

THERE'S HUNDREDS OF CIVILIANS WITH THE MOST INCREMENT WEATHER CRISIS WHICH WE AS OFFICIALS, SHE BOUGHT A BUS AND MOBILIZED AND GOT GROCERY ARES TO FAMILIES.

SHE STATED ANYTHING I DO, I LOOK AT AND WHAT WOULD IT BE FOR REAL?

YOU CAN'T SERVE JESUS WITHOUT ON THE CONVICTION OF JUSTICE.

THIS WAS ON MY GRANDMOTHERS SOCIAL MEDIA.

YOU KNOW HE AND HIS WIFE HAVE DEDICATED THEIR LIVES TO BEING GPS EMPLOYEES.

HE'S A KIND AND GOOD MAN.

YOU WOULD KNOW HE'S NOT SPEAKING OF THE RESIDENT WHERE HE RESIDES IN DISTRICT 23.

THERE'S DIVERSITY IN OUR CITY AND IN OUR DISTRICT AND THIS BOARD.

I WONDER IF ANY OF US WILL -- WILL HAVE A POSITIVE GROUP OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SPEAK ABOUT THEM IN TERMS THAT STILL IF WE WERE UNSUITABLE FOR THE BOARD.

THIS IS NOT A PROTECTED CLASS.

IN THE SAME WAY THEY SAY I HATE LAWYERS AND METRO COUNCIL

MEMBERS, IT IS OKAY FOR PEOPLE TO SPEAK ABOUT EXPERIENCES WITH  
LAW ENFORCEMENT THAT WERE POSITIVE.

JUST RELEASE A FEW STATEMENTS TO TALK ABOUT THEIR FRUSTRATION  
WITH THE SYSTEM.

NEAR SO MUCH MORE.

THE TIME TO BUILD BRIDGES IS NOW.

JOHN LEWIS'S TALK AT THE RIDGE WAS MET WITH VIOLENCE AND  
DESTRUCTION.

TAKEN OVER BY STATE TROOPERS.

THE STORY DOESN'T END THERE.

CONGRESS WROTE THE VOTING RIGHT ACT.

THE MESSAGE THAT THERE IS THE STRONGEST POSSIBILITY IN USING  
THIS BOARD AS A BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATER WITH US ACTIVELY AND  
BOLDLY BEING BRIDGED OVER THE CITIES I KNOW WE ALL LOVE.

THIS CITIZENS REVIEW AND ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD CAN TO JUST THAT.

IT IS NOT ABOUT REVIEW.

THERE'S NO CIVILIAN REVIEW AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

PLEASE GIVE THESE CANDIDATES THIS OPPORTUNITY.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION.

HEARING NONE, MADAM CLERK, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLE?

>> COUNCILMAN GREEN.

>> YES.

>> SHANKLIN.

[ROLL CALLED].

>> MADAM CLERK READING OF ITEM 31.

APPOINTMENT OF STACHELLE BUSSEY  
TO THE CIVILIAN REVIEW AND  
ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD.

TERM EXPIRES MARCH 25, 2022.

>> MAY I HAVE A MOTION AND SECOND.

>> SECOND.

>> WE HAVE A MOTION BY COUNCILMAN PURVIS AND SECOND BY  
WINKLER.

THE APPOINTMENT IS BEFORE US, ANY DISCUSSION COUNCILMAN  
ACKERSON.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT THIS CAME OUT OF THE GOVERNMENT  
ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE.

>> THANK YOU.

ANY DISCUSSION?

HEARING NONE, THIS APPOINTMENT REQUIRES A ROLL CALL VOTE.

MADAM CLERK WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL?

>> COUNCIL MEMBER GREEN. [ROLL CALLED].

>> YOU HAVE 15 YES VOTES AND TEN NO VOTES.

>> THANK YOU.

THE APPOINTMENT PASSES.

READING OF ITEM 32.

>> RESOLUTION OVERTURNING THE LANDMARK'S COMMISSION AT PROPERTY AT 211-215 WEST MOHAMED ALI BOULEVARD.

>> THANK YOU, THIS IS THE RESOLUTION OF THE BUILDING. WE WILL VOTE ON TONIGHT IS THE DECISION OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION TO DESIGNATE THAT AS A HISTORIC LANDMARK. I THINK COUNCILMAN ARTHUR WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THIS. COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> AS YOU SEE FROM THE RESOLUTION THERE'S CLEAR AND SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT THIS IS IN THE A LANDMARK. YOU CAN CALL INTO QUESTION THIS CRITERIA WHEN WE CONSIDER THAT THE FELLOWS HAVE A WHITE ONLY CLAUSE INTO WITH 1971. THE COMMISSION'S OWN REPORT POINTS TO -- TO SIGNIFICANT DESTRUCTIVE FIRE THAT REALLY DESTROYED THE INTERIOR OF THE BUILDING. IT IS NOT IN THE SAME FASHION AS IT WAS ONCE WHEN WE CONSIDERED IT HISTORICAL. OUR COMMISSION SAID THAT IT MET CRITERIA D. D THAT TALKS ABOUT THE EMBODIMENT OF A PARTICULAR TYPE. IT DOESN'T MEET THE STANDARD IN ITS ENTIRETY. WHEN WITH WE INTERPRET LEGISLATION, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO REALIZE, IF YOU COULD MEET PORTION OF IT THAT WOULD BE SPECIFIED IN THE ORDINARY NAPS OR IN A AND B THROUGH G. IT DOES NOT MEET ANY OF THOSE. THIS DOESN'T HAVE THE RIGHT CRITERIA AND IT CONTRADICTS THE

REQUIRED CRITERIA.

YOU CAN'T SAY IT WAS HISTORICAL WHEN IT BURNED 30 YEARS AGO.

THIS IS A MASTER BUILDER WHOSE WORK HAS SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY WHEN HE WASN'T SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH FOR US TO FIND PROOF.

WE KNOW THIS HAS BEEN ON THE WRONG SIDE OF HISTORY.

WE HAVE HISTORIC BUILDINGS BUT THIS IS NOT ONE OF THEM.

I'M VOTING YES.

>> COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU, IN PRESIDENT.

FIRST OF ALL I JUST -- THANK YOU COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

I THINK HE SPELLED OUT THE CASE BEAUTIFULLY.

I'M IN SUPPORT OF THIS RESOLUTION TO OVERTURN THIS -- THIS DESIGNATION BECAUSE OF ALL OF THOSE REASONS.

I DO WANT TO ADDRESS A BROADER THING AND COMMENTARY FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION.

I THINK THIS THIS NEEDS TO BE SAID AGAIN.

WE NEED PROACTIVITY RELATED TO THE LAND MARK DECISION.

IT IS -- I DON'T WANT TO SPEAK FOR EVERYBODY ELSE, BUT I KNOW THAT I'M NOT THE ONLY ONE THAT IS FRUSTRATED TO SEE LANDMARK DECISIONS COME AT THE 11TH HOUR WHEN THERE'S DEVELOPMENT AND DECISIONS BEING MADE SIMULTANEOUSLY.

IF WE HAVE LANDMARKS ACROSS THE CITY, I WOULD ASK THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION TO PROACTIVELY START DESIGNATING THEM NOW.

DON'T WAIT UNTIL THERE'S A POTENTIAL, THERE'S A DEAL PENDING  
DEAL PENNED AND OTHER PURCHASE AGREEMENTS HAVE HAPPENED.

THIS -- THEN THAT COMPOUNDED BY THE CASE THAT COUNCILMAN ARTHUR  
PUTS FORWARD TELLS ME THIS WAS RUSHED AND IS NOT THE INTENTION  
OF WHAT THIS COMMISSION IS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING.

I ASK PUBLICLY THAT THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION FOLLOW THE  
LEGISLATIVE INTENT WHICH IS TO BE PROACTIVE IN THE DESIGNATION,  
FOLLOW THE GUIDANCE WHICH I THINK WAS MISSED IN BOTH CASES HERE  
WHICH IS WHY I'M GOING TO BE JOINING MY COLLEAGUE AND VOTE TO  
OVERTURN THIS.

THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT.

>> COUNCIL MCCRANEY.

>> FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC I WOULD LIKE SOMEONE TO  
SPEAK TO THE SALE OF THE BUILDING.

CAN SOMEONE PLEASE ADDRESS THE FACT THAT THE BUILDING WAS SOLD  
AND I DON'T KNOW OR SOMEONE PROTEST PROTESTED AND HAD IT BEFORE  
THE SELL.

I HAVE CONSTITUENT THAT IS ARE CONCERNED ABOUT WITH THIS BEING A  
DESIGNATED LANDMARK AND NOT UNDERSTANDING THE FACT THAT IT HAS  
BEEN SOLD AND WHAT ACTIVITY TOOK PLACE BEFORE THE SALE OF THIS  
BUILDING.

COULD SOMEONE SPEAK TO THAT PLEASE.

>> I'M A FEW MONTHS IN.

I COULD SPEAK TO IT BRIEFLY.



THANK YOU.

JUST A QUICK TIMELINE.

OUR CITY, YOU KNOW, INCLUDING LOUISVILLE FORWARD AND INCLUDING OTHER AGENCIES FROM METRO GOVERNMENT SIGNED A CONTRACT IN DECEMBER 2014.

AT THAT POINT MAHANY OWNED THE BUILDING.

PEOPLE ARE ARE TALKING ABOUT WHAT WE SHOULD AND SHOULDN'T DO.

WE DON'T OWN THIS BUILDING.

I DON'T THINK ANYONE ON THIS CALL OR ANYONE ACROSS THE CITY WANTS SOMEONE TO JUST TAKE YOUR PROPERTY.

A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE A LOT OF OPINIONS ABOUT THIS BUT WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT THE FACTS.

WE DO NOT OWN THIS BUILDING, NOT ONLY DO WE NOT OWN THE BUILDING, WE TURNED AROUND AND LANDMARKED THIS, CONSIDERING LIKE DECADES AFTER THE FACT.

IF THIS WAS A HISTORICAL HANDMARK HOW COME WE DID HAVE THIS DISCUSSION WHEN THE PRESERVATION ACT WAS PASSED OR THE 70S WHEN OUR OWN ALDERMAN WERE GOING TO LANDMARK BUILDINGS.

HOW ABOUT THIS CONVERSATION UNTIL 2019, YEARS AFTER THE HARMONY HAD PURCHASED THIS LIGHT AND THIS LAND.

THE INK IS DRY.

IT IS VERY CONCERNING TO ME THAT WE HAVE A WHOLE LOT OF PEOPLE ACROSS THE CITY THAT DON'T UNDERSTAND THE CHANGE THAT SEGREGATION HAS CAUSED THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE WHO ARE ASKING ME

ANDS OR TO SAVE A BUILDING THAT I COULDN'T EVEN GO INTO 50, 60 YEARS AGO.

I WANT TO SHOW THE FACTS WE DON'T OWN IT.

WHETHER WE DECIDED IF IT WAS A HISTORIC LANDMARK THAT FACT DOES NOT CHANGE.

>> COUNCILWOMAN MCCRANEY, DID THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION?

>> IT DID.

I WANT TO BE CLEAR THAT WE DON'T OWN THAT BUILDING AND IF IT WAS NOT DESIGNATED A HISTORIC BUILDING BEFORE WE SOLD IT AND IF SOMEONE GOT IT BEFORE IT WAS SOLD, I DON'T SEE HOW WE HAVE ANY SAY IN THE MATTER AT THIS MOMENT.

IT IS IN THE A RACIAL ISSUE AS SOME WOULD LIKE FOR IT TO BE. AND SOME ARE TRYING FOR ME TO BE INVOLVED IN FOR A DISCUSSION. FOR ME, IT IS PURE AND SIMPLY THE FACT THAT WE DON'T OWN THE BUILDING.

IT WAS SOLD BY THE CITY TO THE ARMY.

HOW CAN WE IN GOOD FAITH GO BACK AND TAKE CARE OF A BUILDING THAT WE DON'T OWN.

THAT'S MY ISSUE.

THAT'S WHAT I WANT THE COMMUNITY TO CLEARLY UNDERSTAND.

IF SOMEONE SOLD -- IF YOU SOLD YOUR HOUSE, YOU CANNOT GO BACK TO THAT PROPERTY AND THEY WILL THEM THEY CAN'T PAINT THEIRS GOLDEN. YOU CAN'T REGULATE WHAT THEY DO TO THE BUILDING ONCE YOU SOLD IT.

THAT'S WHERE WE ARE AND THAT'S THE DECISION I WILL MAKE WHEN I  
CAST MY VOTE BASED ON THOSE FACTS ALONE.

COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU.

METRO HAS A ROBUST NETWORK OF CITIZENS WHO ARE WILLING TO SERVE  
ON BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND IT IS NOT UNCOMMON FOR A LANDMARK  
COMMISSIONER TO SPEND UPWARD OF SEVEN HOURS A MONTH TO SERVE.

I'M A PROCESS PERSON.

THIS SPARKED QUESTIONS ABOUT WHOSE HISTORY IS RECOGNIZED.

IF WE DON'T LIKE THE COMPILATION OF THE COMMISSIONS WE HAVE THE  
ABILITY IT CHANGE IT.

IF WE DON'T LIKE THE CRITERIA THAT IS SET TO ESTABLISH A  
LANDMARK, WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO CHANGE IT.

WHAT WE SHOULDN'T DO IS ARBITRARILY UNDERMINE DECISIONS BECAUSE  
WE DON'T LIKE THEM IN THE MOMENT.

WE SHOULD INCENTIVIZE REUSE OF STRUCTURES AND SUPPORT MANNING  
THAT PROMOTES GRANULAR URBANISM THAT MAXIMIZES INTEREST TO  
DEVELOPMENT.

THIS IS NOT ABOUT WHAT I THINK.

I ASKED MY COLLEAGUE TO WORK TO CHANGE THIS WHERE NEEDED.

I'M HAPPY TO WORK ON CHANGES AS RELATES TO THE PROCESS.

NO DOUBT WE NEED REAL CONVERSATIONS AND COMMITMENTS AROUND  
RACIAL RECONCILIATION.

BUT IT SHOULDN'T COME AT THE ADDITIONAL COST OF A HISTORIC

STRUCTURE AND VIBRANCY OF OUR DOWNTOWN.

IF THAT REASON, I'LL BE A NO.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU COUNCILWOMAN.

COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER.

>> THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT.

I WANT TO EXPLAIN MY VOTE.

AS I SAID IN COMMITTEE, I BELIEVE THIS DOES MEET THE TWO  
CRITERIA A AND D.

I THINK D CLEARLY HAS A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT WAYS THAT IT CAN BE  
MET.

IT DOES MEET ONE.

THE PARTICULAR RESTAURANT TO THE MASTER ARCHITECT.

THE OTHER WAY OF MEETING D WAS MADE HERE.

AND I AGREE WITH COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

I WOULD JUST POINT OUT THAT OUR ORDINANCE IS SET UP SO BUILDING  
CAN BE SET UP AS LANDMARKS.

I LIKE TO SEE THAT EARLIER IN THE PROCESS.

I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT IN CONNECTION WITH THIS PARTICULAR  
BUILDING WHICH IS BEING DESIGNATED IN THE BECAUSE OF -- OF WHAT  
OCCURRED IN THE BUILDING BUT BECAUSE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL TYPE.  
IN THE CASE OF THIS BUILDING, THERE WAS TESTIMONY AT THE  
LANDMARKS COMMISSION THAT THERE WASN'T AN EARLIER EFFORT AT THE  
TIME THAT THE DISCUSSION WAS HAPPENING TO DECLARE THIS A

LANDMARK BECAUSE OF STATEMENTS MADE BY OMNI ABOUT THE BUILDING.

I WENT BACK AND THE FIRST MEETING WAS IN JANUARY OF 2015.

I WAS ON A SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND I ASKED MIKE SMITH WHO WAS THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF REAL ESTATE AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF TRT HOLMAN WHICH IS THE PARENT COMPANY OF OMNI ABOUT THE PROPERTIES ON THE SITE.

I WANT TO READ WHAT HE SAID.

PARK BUILDINGS, THAT'S THE BUILDING WE'RE TALKING ABOUT BECAUSE PARK WAS LOCATED THIS AT THE TIME.

THE PARK BUILDING DOWN ON TO LARGE MOHAMED ALI WILL STAY UNTIL IF YOU RECALL MANS ARE ARE DETERMINED IF THAT FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PARCEL.

ONE ACRE SITE DOWN THERE.

AND YOU KNOW AS WE LOOK AT IT, WE TALK ABOUT A LOT OF THINGS THAT THEY INCORPORATE THAT INTO IT.

IT MAY NOT BUT IT VERY WELL MAY.

THE TESTIMONY AT THE LANDMARK COMMISSION WAS THE SAME STATEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE THAT WANTED TO PRESERVE THE BUILDING AND THEY DIDN'T DO IT BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT THERE WOULD BE DISCUSSIONS AND THAT OMNI WASN'T INTERESTED AND AS WAS SAID TO ME THAT IT WILL STAY UNTIL THERE IS A PLAN FOR THAT DEVELOPMENT SITE.

THERE'S NO PLAN NOW.

IN PLANS FILED.

THE PLAN IS TO TEAR IT DOWN AND HAVE A VACANT LOT.  
THAT SEEMS INAPPROPRIATE FOR THIS TYPE OF BUILDING.  
SO I'LL VOTE NO ON THIS.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILWOMAN CHAMBERS ARMSTRONG.

>> THANK YOU, IN PRESIDENT, I'LL BE A NO VOTE FOR MANY OF THE  
REASONS ARCTIC HATED BY HOLLANDER AND GEORGE.

I BELIEVE OUR CITY, IT HAS A LOT -- A-LONG HISTORY OF RED  
LINING.

WE SHOULDN'T BE MORE THANKING SLAVERY OR SEGREGATION.

THE ORDINANTS ARE FOR MARGINALIZED COMMUNITY.

I THINK WE SHOULD DEVELOP CRITERIA FOR SEGREGATION AND  
DISCRIMINATION.

WE SHOULD EVALUATE EACH PROPOSAL.

AND THE COMMISSION WILL BE AT THE END AT THEERATEST STATED.

I HOPE THIS LEAD TO AN IMPORTANT CONVERSATION AROUND OUR LAND  
USE POLICIES IN THE FUTURE.

I'LL VOTE NO TONIGHT BUT I'M LOOKING FORWARD TO ONGOING  
DISCUSSIONS WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

>> COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> I'M AS SHORT AS POSSIBLE.

I WANTED TO POINT OUT WHAT HOLLANDER SAID AND THAT OMNI ALSO  
SAID SOMETHING ABOUT A GROCERY STORE.

IF YOU BELIEVED WHAT THEY SAID, THEN YOU GOT BAMBOOZLED.

I DON'T CARE ABOUT THE HE-SAID-SHE-SAID.

LET'S TALK ABOUT WHAT IS IN THE CONTRACT.

THE CONTRACT SAYS THAT PARCEL MUST BE CLEARED.

THE PARCEL SAYS THEY WILL ACQUIRE THIS HAND AND THEY HAVE TO  
CHEER THAT PARCEL FOR THEM WHEN THEY DECIDE WHAT TO DO WITH IT.

THEY SAID WHAT THEY WANTED TO DO WITH IT.

THEY NOTIFIED THE GOVERNMENT AND BODY AND PEOPLE STILL DECIDED  
TO HANDMARK IT.

THAT'S NOT MY FAULT OR PROBLEM.

WE DO NOT OWN IT.

SOME PEOPLE ARE TALKING ABOUT A WASTE OF MONEY.

400,000 PLUS.

THIS COUNCIL APPROVED A BUDGET TO REAL GET DISPOSITION OF THE  
BUILDING, YOU CAN DEMOLISH OR MOVE IT.

IT COSTS DOUBLE, AT LEAST TO MOVE THIS STRUCTURE.

SO IF THE CONCERN IS ABOUT THE LAND, WE DON'T OWN THE LAND.

FOR THE ONE MILLIONTH TIME, IF IT IS ABOUT THE BUILDING MAYBE  
SOME PEOPLE THAT ARE CONCERNED WOULD BE -- WOULD BE -- WOULD GET  
MONEY AND THEY CAN HELP MOVE THE BUILDING.

WE DIDN'T ALLOCATE FUND, AT LEAST ENOUGH FUNDS TO MOVE THE  
BUILDING UNTIL FISCAL YEAR 30.

I'LL ADD IT IS STRANGE THAT WE HAVE A COMMUNITY FIGHTING TO SAVE  
A BUILDING AS OPPOSED TO DISMANTLE.

THE SYSTEMS CREATED BY SEGREGATIONISTS THAT UTILIZED THIS

BUILDING.

>> ANY DISCUSSION.

THIS IS A RESOLUTION THAT WOULD NORMALLY BE A VOICE VOTE.

I'M SURE THERE'S OPPOSITION, TO WE'RE GOING TO DO A ROLL CALL  
VOTE.

[ROLL CALLED].

20 YES AND FIVE NO.

>> PASSES.

AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW  
SECTION OF CHAPTER 35 OF THE  
LOUISVILLE METRO CODE OF  
ORDINANCES REQUIRING THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF PAID FAMILY  
LEAVE, AMENDMENT BY  
SUBSTITUTION.

>> MOTION.

>> MOTION.

>> SECOND.

>> MOTION AND SECONDED.

ORDINANCE IS BEFORE US, ANY DISCUSSION.

COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY.

>> THANK YOU.

I WANT TO SAY THAT THIS IS A -- A PIVOTAL PIECE OF LEGISLATION  
IF LOUISVILLE METRO AND ITS EMPLOYEES.



THIS IS SOMETHING THAT DEFINITELY PUTS FAMILIES FIRST.  
ALWAYS SAY PUTTING OUR MONEY LITERALLY WHERE OUR MOUTH IS.  
WHEN WE PROMOTE FOR A LIVING WAGE AND EQUITY, THIS IS AER 0 THIS  
IS AN ORDINANCE THAT DOES JUST THAT INTERNALLY WHICH MEANS WE  
START IN OUR OWN BACKYARD.  
THAT'S HOW WE TRULY LEAD.

I WANT TO THANK MY CO-SPONSOR COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE AND GREEN AND  
PIAGENTINI AND COUNCILWOMAN CHAMBERS ARMSTRONG FOR WORKING  
THROUGH THIS.

I'LL LET THEM GO IN AND TAKE US THROUGH ANY SUMMARIES.

I'M PROUD OF THIS LEGISLATION THAT HAS COME OUT OF COMMITTEE AND  
I WANT TO TURN IT BACK OVER TO ANYONE THAT WORKS TO SUMMARIZE  
THE LEGISLATION.

THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU.

>> I HAVE FOUR WEEKS OF PAID LEAVE FOR METRO EMPLOYEES WHO  
GROW THEIR FAMILIES.

TWO WEEKS FOR FAMILIES OF CIRCUMSTANCE THROUGH EITHER FOSTER  
LEAVE OR KINSHIP CARE.

THAT'S AN IMPORTANT PIECE.

I'M GLAD WE WERE ABLE TO WORK THAT IN.

AT THIS POINT, I HOPE WE'RE ALL AWARE OF THE BENEFITS THAT ARE  
ASSOCIATED WITH PAID LEAVE IN TERMS OF ACTUAL MEDICAL OUTCOMES,  
AT LEAST BETTER HEALTH OUTCOMES FOR WOMEN AND FAMILIES AND

CHILDREN.

IT ALSO DECREASES TURNOVER IN THE WORK PLACE.

IT INCREASES PRODUCTIVITY WHICH EMPLOYEES AND FAMILY MEMBERS RETURN.

IT IS AN EQUITY ISSUE, AS WE KNOW PAID LEAVE IS TIED TO INFANT MORTALITY RATES.

WE HAVE MORE IN THE BLACK COMMUNITIES.

IT IS AN IMPORTANT WAY TO TACKLE THESE ISSUE THAT IS ARE SO IMPORTANT TO SO MANY OF US.

AND ADDITIONALLY, IT IS ALSO ASSOCIATED WITH DECREASED RISK OF SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME.

>> BEYOND THE NUMBERS WHICH I'M HAPPY TO TALK ABOUT WITH ANYONE.

THERE'S DISCUSSION ABOUT HOW THE -- HOW THE FISCAL NOTE MIGHT OVERESTIMATE THE COST.

WE KNOW NASHVILLE THAT TRIES THREE FOR FOUR TIME THAN US AND PAID MEDICAL LEAVE AT COST OF 2.8 MILLION WHICH IS LESS THAN WHAT WOULD BE ESTIMATED IF THE PARENTAL HEAVE WITH FEWER EMPLOYEES.

ADDITIONALLY, THERE'S LOTS OF DISCUSSION ABOUT THE WAY IT WAS CALCULATED.

I WANT TO SAY BEYOND THE NUMBERS, THIS IS TRULY THE RIGHT THING TO DO FOR OUR METRO EMPLOYEES.

COUNCILWOMAN DORSEY SAID.

WE SAY WE VALUE WORKING FAMILIES AND MUST LEAD WITH THAT VALUE.  
VALUE OUR WORKING FAMILIES.

WE WANT TO BE THE TYPE OF EMPLOYER THAT WE WANT THE BUSINESSES  
TO BE.

WE HAVE TO TAKE CONCRETE TANGAL STEPS TO SET CHILDREN AND  
FAMILIES UP FOR SUCCESS FROM THE BEGINNING.

AND DAVIS, ONE OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAYS THAT DATA CAN TO THAT.  
I'LL BE A PROUD YES VOTE.

>> COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> THANK YOU.

I WANT TO THANK THE OTHER CO-SPONSORS.

MY SCHEDULE IS DIFFICULT.

GIVEN MY DAY JOB AND ALL OF THAT AND COUNCILMAN GREEN INCLUDED  
ME THROUGH THE PROCESS AND SORT OF WORKED WITH ME A MUCH AS  
POSSIBLE.

FIRST I WANT TO SAY I APPRECIATE THAT.

I'M SUPPORTING THIS AS WELL.

LOOK TO BE CLEAR, THERE WAS EVEN AN AMENDMENT THAT I PUT FORWARD  
THAT DIDN'T PASS.

ONCE AGAIN, IT IS ONE OF THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES AND COMPLEX PIECES  
OF LEGISLATION LIKE THIS, NEVER EXACTLY HOW YOU HAVE IT IN YOUR  
HEAD.

IT IS A 26 MEMBER COMMITTEE.

I -- YOU KNOW, I THINK WE GOT THIS TO A GREAT PLACE THAT WAS

VERY SIMILAR TO WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DID UNDER THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION BEFORE THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION TOOK OFFICE.

IT IS IMPORTANT IT ALIGN WHEN YOU CAN.

IT IS NO SECRET THAT ON THE PRO-LIFE EDUCATOR AND THAT MEANS I TAKE SERIOUSLY POLICIES THAT -- THAT PROMOTE FAMILY, THAT PROMOTE CHILDREN.

AND THAT -- THAT -- THAT PRIORITIZE THEM IN OUR WORK LIFE AND IN OUR PERSONAL LIVES.

YOU KNOW ONCE WE SAW THE NASHVILLE NUMBERS AND ALL.

I DIDN'T HAVE THAT.

JUST FOR MY CAUCUS MEMBERS, ARMSTRONG GOT THAT AT THE 11TH HOUR.

I DIDN'T HAVE THAT.

THAT HELPS CLARIFY, THE IMPACT IS SMALLER THAN ORIGINAL ESTIMATES.

NO HIT ON OMB.

THEY WERE MAKING A LOT OF ASSUMPTIONS.

WHAT I'LL TELL YOU FROM MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE I WAS ABLE TO GET SIX WEEKS OF PAID LEAVE WHEN MY DAUGHTERS WERE ADOPTED.

AND WHEN I CAME BACK, I WAS A ZOMBIE IF ABOUT ANOTHER FOUR TO SIX, JUST BECAUSE OF SLEEP AND EVERYTHING ELSE THAT WAS GOING ON.

SO IF ANYBODY THINKS THAT BRINGING SOMEBODY BACK IN FOUR TO SIX WEEKS, RIGHT, GET BACK TO WORK.

IF WE THINK WE'RE GETTING FULL PRODUCTIVITY OUT OF THOSE PEOPLE,

IT IS NOT HAPPENING.

I LIVED THAT EXPERIENCE AND I KNOW IT IS NOT TRUE.

WITH THAT SAID I THINK THIS IS A GREAT OVERALL POLICY.

IT PROMOTES FAMILY.

IT WILL ASSIST WITH A BENEFIT STRUCTURE THAT IS PROYOUNG  
EMPLOYEE AND ENCOURAGE THEM TO STICK AROUND.

I'M IN FAVOR OF THIS AND GLAD TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.

ENCOURAGE EVERYBODY TO APPROVE THIS.

>> COUNCILMAN PARKER.

>> YES.

BEING FROM THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY BACKGROUND I -- I WOULD  
HAVEALIZED TO HAVE SEEN THIS -- SEEN THIS MAYBE SOME COMPROMISE  
IN BETWEEN BASICALLY WHAT THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY OFFERS WHICH IS  
FOUR WEEKS PAID LEAVE.

THE FEDERAL MANDATE, ANYONE CAN TAKE OFF FOR 12 WEEKS.

AND YOU GET THAT AS A BENEFIT.

WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THE COST OF THIS IS GOING TO BE, EVEN IF IT  
IS ONLY 3 MILLION DOLLARS IN THE OVERALL SCHEME OF THINGS.

PEOPLE ARE ARE GOING TO DO WHAT THEY WANT TO DO FOR THEIR  
FAMILIES ANYWAY.

SO I JUST THINK THAT IT IS -- IT IS A JUMP BETWEEN FOUR WEEKS  
WHICH IS WHAT HAPPENS IN THE PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL COMMUNITY TO  
12 WEEKS AND I KNOW THAT THE SPONSORS ARE GOING OFF OF  
WHAT -- OFF OF WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DID WHICH HAS BEEN

MENTIONED BEFORE, HAPPENED UNDER THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION.

ACTUALLY, I OFFERED THE TRUMP THE CHAMPION AND HELP PUSH IT THROUGH.

I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN MAYBE EIGHT WEEKS.

BECAUSE GOVERNMENT WORKERS, THEY GET A LOT OF BENEFITS AS FAR AS VACATION TIME, SICK TIME AND I KNOW IT IS MENTIONED OVER AND OVER AGAIN, GOVERNMENT WORKERS DON'T GET PAID AS MUCH AS PRIVATE SECTOR WORKERS DO BUT WHEN YOU ADD UP THE BENEFITS AND THE TIME OFF AND THE EARLY RETIREMENT, YOU KNOW A LOT OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS, THEY ONLY WORK MAYBE A QUARTER OF THEIR LIFE AND THE OTHER 50 PERCENT OF THEIR LIVES THEY'RE ON A PENSION.

YOU ADD ALL OF THAT UP.

IT IS A LOT MORE THAN WHAT MOST PEOPLE IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR GET.

I'M NOT GOING TO SAY I'M VOTING AGAINST IT.

I'M VOTING FOR IT AND I REALLY APPRECIATE LOOKING OUT FOR FOSTER PARENTS BECAUSE WE NEED FOSTER PARENTS SO MUCH.

THAT'S THE BEST PART OF THIS LEGISLATION THAT -- I TRULY APPRECIATE.

BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S -- IT IS -- AS FAR AS COMMUNITY, THAT'S REALLY GOING TO HELP MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE.

AND I WILL SAY ALSO WORKING IN THE MEDICAL PROFESSION, NOBODY GETS HIRED BECAUSE OF MATERNITY LEAVE AND NOBODY TYPICALLY LEAVES BECAUSE OF MATERNITY LEAVE.

IT IS A NICE PERK.

I WILL VOTE YES.

I JUST WANTED TO -- TO -- I JUST WANTED TO RELAY MY CONCERNS.

>> COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> I SPENT MY CAREER WORKING IN GOVERNMENT WATCHING DEDICATED EMPLOYEES START THEIR CAREERS WITH GREAT ENERGY AND ENTHUSIASM ONLY TO STRUGGLE WITH COMPETITIVE SALARIES, OVERWHELMING WORK LOADS AND ALL THE WHILE TRYING IT BALANCE THEIR FAMILIES.

WHAT I'VE SEEN MANY OF THE SAME EMPLOYEES ULTIMATELY LEAVE WORK IN GOVERNMENT TO TAKE A JOB THAT PAYS BETTER BENEFITS AND HAS BETTER SALARIES.

SO THIS ORDINANCE OFFERS -- OFFERS THE OPPORTUNITY IT INSPIRE THE HEALTH OF OUR WORKFORCE AND THEIR FAMILIES AND WILL TRANSLATE INTO POSITIVE OUTCOMES CREATING ENHANCED CITY SERVICES FOR ALL.

SEVERAL CO-SPONSORS WANTED TO MENTION AND RECOGNIZE KOHN'S WORK WHO DID THE HEAVY LIFTING TO DRAFT THIS ORDINANCE LAST YEAR.

I ALSO WANT TO SAY THAT THIS LEGISLATION MARKS SOMEWHAT OF A DIFFERENT APPROACH THAN HAS BEEN TAKEN.

I WANT TO RECOGNIZE THE CO-SPONSORED WHO WORKED COLLABORATIVELY TO GET US THROUGH A BETTER PRODUCT.

THERE WAS LOTS OF COMPROMISE THAT TOOK PLACE.

PERSONALLY I WOULD HAVE LOVED TO HAVE SEEN MORE TIME FOR FAMILIES OF CIRCUMSTANCE BUT AS IT WAS, WE HAVE A STRONGER

PRODUCT THAT WILL HOPEFULLY INSPIRE HEALTH AND AS WELL AS  
RESPONSIBILITY.

FOR THAT I'M A PROUD SPONSOR.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION.

>> MADAM CLERK, COULD YOU PLEASE LIST ME AS CO-SPONSOR.

>> NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, MADAM CLERK PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

[ROLL CALLED].

>> YOU HAVE 25 YES VOTES.

>> ORDINANCE PASSES.

ITEM 34, PLEASE.

AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW  
SECTION OF CHAPTER 35 OF THE  
LOUISVILLE METRO CODE OF  
ORDINANCES REQUIRING THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF PAID FAMILY  
LEAVE, AMENDMENT BY  
SUBSTITUTION.

35.

O-060-21.

AN ORDINANCE CREATING A CHAPTER  
OF THE LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON  
COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT CODE OF



ORDINANCES ("LMCO") TO PREVENT  
THE UNAUTHORIZED PUBLICATION OF  
INDIVIDUAL'S PERSONALLY  
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION IN A  
PRACTICE COMMONLY KNOWN AS  
"DOXING", AS AMENDED.

ANY DISCUSSION.

>> THANK YOU.

THE PRIMARY SPONSORS ON THIS ORDINANCE ARE PIAGENTINI AND  
COUNCILMAN WINKLER TO DECIDE PASS OUT OF COMMITTEE WITH A STABLE  
VOTE OF 4-3 IN ITS OLD BUSINESS FOR ALL OF US.

>> ANY DISCUSSION?

>> THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT.

THANK YOU COUNCILMAN GREEN.

COLLEAGUES.

THIS IS NEW TERRITORY.

I FIRST WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY THAT CONTRIBUTED TO THIS.  
EVERYBODY THAT ASKED QUESTIONS OVER A COUPLE OF COMMITTEE  
MEETINGS AND PRIVATELY TO HELP SORT OF FORM THIS AND CHALLENGE  
IT.

I WANT TO THANK JASON FOWLER AT THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE WHO  
DID MONTHS OF RESEARCH PREPARING WHAT IS A VERY, YOU KNOW  
WHICH -- WHICH IS A VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE OF OUR TIME AND THAT IS  
FOR GOVERNMENT TO KEEP UP WITH THE CHANGING TIMES AND

TECHNOLOGY.

FIRST LET ME ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS WHAT THIS BILL DOES AND WHAT IT ABSOLUTELY DOES NOT DO.

AND HOPEFULLY THAT WILL CLARIFY THINGS.

THEN I'LL ADDRESS OBJECTIONS.

NUMBER ONE, WHAT DOES THIS NOT TO?

THIS IS IN THE AN ATTACK ON FREE SPEECH.

PEOPLE CAN GET ONLINE, ON ANY SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORM AND TELL ME HOW TERRIBLE I AM ALL THE DAY.

THIS HAS IN IMPACT ON THAT.

THIS HAS NO IMPACT ON SOMEBODY THAT SHARES MINE OR ANYBODY IN THIS COMMUNITY'S PERSONAL IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION THAT IS IN THE ADDRESSED IN THIS AND THAT IS NOT CRIMINALIZED THROUGH THE ORDINANCE.

WHAT THIS ORDINANCE DOES IS IF SOMEBODY ON A PUBLIC PLATFORM COMBINES THE TWO THINGS.

RIGHT?

TAKES PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION LIKE YOUR HOME ADDRESS AND THEN POST A REASONABLE THREAT AND NOT SOMETHING THEY THINK IS A REASONABLE THREAT.

IT IS SOMETHING A REASONABLE PERSON DETERMINED BY A JUDGE WOULD DETERMINE A THREAT AND THAT IN COMBINATION ON SOCIAL MEDIA WOULD YOU SAY DOXING AND THE FINE IS 250 PER DAY THAT THAT POST IS UP. THE GAP IN THE LAW CURRENTLY.

IF I POST SOMEBODY'S INFORMATION AND SAY I WILL ASSAULT  
SOMEBODY.

THAT FALLS UNDER TERRORIST THREATENING.

THE CRIMINAL DIVISION IDENTIFIED IF COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI LIVES  
AT MY HOME ADDRESS AND -- AND SOMEBODY SHOULD -- AND IT WOULD BE  
TERRIBLE IF AND SOMEBODY PUT, THINK OF THE MOST HORRIBLE  
VIOLENCE THAT THEY WOULD BE ENCOURAGING IN THE REST OF THE  
STATEMENT TO MY FAULT OR MY IMMEDIATE FAMILY.

THERE'S NOTHING THAT LAW ENFORCEMENT OR THE PROSECUTORS OFFICE  
CAN DO ABOUT THAT.

AND THAT COULD BE SHARED FAR AND WIDE.

THAT'S WHAT THIS IS ADDRESSING.

WHAT THIS BASICALLY SAYS IS THAT COMBINATION OF THOSE TWO THINGS  
IS NO LONGER PROTECTED SPEECH.

THEREFORE, IT IS IN LONGER PROTECTED SPEECH FOR ANYONE.

THIS STARTED WHEN WE HAD A MEMBER OF THE CITY GOVERNMENT HERE IN  
CHAMBERS TALKING -- TESTIFYING AT A GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY  
MEETING LAST YEAR ABOUT INVESTIGATION WE WERE DOING  
ABOUT -- ABOUT THE INVESTIGATIVE UNIT, THAT EMPLOYEE TALKED  
ABOUT THREATS MADE TO THEIR PERSON AND HOME.

IT WAS HEARTBREAK.

IF EMPLOYEE, WHETHER I AGREE OR DON'T, WITH ANYONE, REGARDLESS,  
SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO THAT LEVEL OF TERROR IN THEIR HOME, THEIR  
PRIVATE LIFE.

THAT'S WHAT THIS SEEKS IT ADDRESS.

THERE HAS BEEN AN AMENDMENT TO THIS.

THIS IS AS AMENDED.

I WANT TO THANK ARTHUR AND THE ACLU.

ACLU E-MAILED US.

INTERACTING WITH A POST THAT IS IN VIOLATION.

SOMEBODY POSTS AND SAYS SOMEBODY LIVES AT SUCH AND SUCH ADDRESS.

IT WOULD BE TERRIBLE IF.

YOU'RE IN VIOLATION.

IF YOU INTERACT WITH THAT POST THAT'S NOT IN VIOLATION WITH THIS ORDINANCE.

BY INTERACT, I MEAN, LIKE COMMENT OR DO ANYTHING.

IF YOU REPUBLISH, THINKY PACE YOU'RE IN VIOLATION BECAUSE YOU'RE SHARING IT WITH YOUR NETWORK.

THAT WAS ONE AMENDMENT MADE ASKED BY ARTHUR IN THE COMMITTEE.

IT WAS A GREAT POINT.

ONLY OTHER THING WAS THE ACLU WE TALKED ABOUT THIS.

THERE'S A PORTION OF THIS WHERE WE IDENTIFY EXAMPLES PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

THIS IS LANGUAGE IN THERE THAT DOES SAY INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO.

WE LIST SEVERAL EXAMPLES.

THEY WANTED US TO IDENTIFY ALL INFORMATION AND INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THAT WOULD BE BORDERING ON IMPOSSIBLE.

YOU COULD THINK OF A SCENARIO WHERE I DIDN'T MENTION, PIAGENTINI GOES TO THE CRISPY CREAM AT 9 A.M. EVERY DAY AND SOMEBODY SHOULD DO X.

THE AMOUNT OF SCENARIOS THAT WOULD PLAY OUT.

WE DIDN'T THINK THAT WAS REASONABLE.

AND THE LAW ALLOWS TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM FROM THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND YOU KNOW, IT IS KNOWLEDGE THAT YOU CAN'T ASSUME EVERY SCENARIO THAT EXISTS ON EARTH.

I WANT TO THANK THE COUNTY ATTORNEY AND EVERYBODY ELSE THAT CONTRIBUTED.

I'M LOOKING FOR SUPPORT.

THANK YOU MR. PRESIDENT.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILWOMAN GREEN.

>> I'M AGAINST THIS ORDINANCE.

I DON'T BELIEVE IT WILL PASS CONSTITUTIONAL MUSTER.

I BELIEVE WE'RE LOOKING FOR A PROBLEM THAT IS COVERED.

OTHERS COULD BE A CIVIL PROCESS, AND DISTRICT COURT WHICH IS A CIVIL RESTRAINING ORDER AND VIOLATIONS OF THESE ORDERS COULD RESULT IN INCARCERATION WHICH IS A MUCH STRONGER CENTER THAN WE HAVE CONSIDERED HERE.

GOVERNMENT OVERREACH IN THE AREAS OF FREE SPEECH IS SOMETHING I'M CONCERNED ABOUT.

I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO EVEN BE ABLE TO

APPLY THE LAW.

HOW CAN WE APPLY THE LAW?

SOMEONE SAYS I WAS IN SHIVELY OR MIDDLE TOWN WHEN WITH I MADE THIS QUOTE, MAYBE A THREAT BUT IN THE REALLY A THREAT.

ARE WE SAYING WE HAVE RESOURCES FOR THE DEPARTMENT TO DESCRIBE AND DETERMINE THE LOCATIONS OF WHERE THESE STATEMENTS ARE POSTED FROM.

WE LIVE IN A CITY WHERE WE HAVE NOT SPENT THE FULL AMOUNT OF TIME OR RESOURCES TO PROSECUTE SEX CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN. THEY PREY ON OUR BABIES AND WE BEEN TOLD WE DON'T HAVE THE RESOURCES TO PROSECUTE THESE CASES BUT SOMEHOW WE PROSECUTE THIS.

WE DID NOT.

THE RESPONSE IS CLEAR THIS IS NOT A DIRECT NET.

DIRECT THREATS ARE RECOVERED BY STATE LAW.

IT IS ABOUT A SUBJECTIVE IDEA OF WHAT KIND OF AMOUNTS.

THIS MAY BE POSTURING IT A BASE.

>> I WANT TO SPEAK TO ACLU CONCERNS.

I'M GLAD THERE WAS CLARIFICATION ON THE SOCIAL MEDIA SIDE AS FAR AS REPUBLISHING AND REPOSTING.

I WANT TO BE CLEAR ABOUT THE WAY THAT THE SOCIAL MEDIA WORKS.

OF COURSE THIS IS EVER CHANGING AND COULD CHANGE OVER TIME.

WHEN YOU LIKE SOMETHING AND WHEN YOU COMMENT ON SOMETHING AND ENGAGE WITH WITH SOMETHING, SOCIAL MEDIA HAS ALGORITHMS THAT

RANK IT HIGHER, MAKE IT MORE VISIBLE FOR PEOPLE.

THIS IS INDIRECTLY REPUBLISHING.

I HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT US CREATING SOMETHING THAT IS BASED ON AN EVER CHANGING SYSTEM, THE INTERNET.

THAT'S THE FIRST POINT.

THE SECOND POINT, NAME AND AMPLIFY IS THE FACT THAT PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION IS NOT FINITE.

AND THAT REALLY OPENS THE DOOR IF SOMEONE TO BE CHARGED FOR A CRIME THAT THEY DIDN'T KNOW WAS A CRIME BECAUSE WE HAVE THIS LIST AND WE SAY IT IS NOT LIMITED TO THE LIST.

THE LAST POINT I WANTED TO BRING UP, KIND OF WHAT COUNCILWOMAN GREEN MENTIONED ABOUT CAPACITY.

WE KNOW THIS WILL NEED TO BE ENFORCED AND I TALKED ABOUT THE PROCESS OF ENFORCEMENT AND I HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT US BEING WITH ABLE TO ENFORCE SOMETHING THAT WHEN YOU COMPARE WITH WITH ALREADY BEING ENFORCED AND TAKEN CARE OF OR NOT TAKEN CARE OF, WE HAVE A POLICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS STRUGGLING TO SOLVE HOMICIDES.

IF THEY CAN'T DO THAT, HOW TO WE CHASE PEOPLE ON THE INTERNET WHO MAY OR MAY NOT BE IN THIS JURISDICTION.

I WANT TO EXPRESS THOSE CONCERNS.

I DON'T KNOW TO WHAT EXTENT THEY CAN ADDRESS THEM HERE.

WANTED TO LAY THAT OUT THERE.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

I DON'T WANT TO REPEAT WHAT MY COLLEAGUES, COUNCILMAN GREEN AND ARTHUR SAID, BUT I TO FEEL IT IS IMPORTANT TO JUST STATE FOR THE RECORD THAT WHILE I DO UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS A PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED HERE, I'M NOT CONVINCED IT COULD BE DONE THROUGH THIS LEGISLATION OR MAYBE ANY LEGISLATION.

IT IS NOT FROM A GOOD EFFORT MADE ON BEHALF OF COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI BECAUSE I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE WORK HE'S DONE. THIS LACKED CORE COM PONY THANES, WHAT REASONABLE FEAR MEANS AND INTENT.

HOW DO WE MEASURE INTENT?

IF I CAN'T EXPLAIN THAT TO FOLKS AND WITH GOOD FAITH AROUND WHAT THAT LOOKS LIKE I CAN'T IN GOOD CONSCIENCE SUPPORT THIS.

I BELIEVE IT IS A SETUP NOT JUST IN THE WAY WHO MIGHT BE PERPETRATING BUT A SETUP IN THE WAY THE DISCRETION IT LEAVES AND INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION.

FOR THOSE REASONS, I WILL BE A NO.

>> THANK YOU.

HOLLANDER.

>> THANK YOU.

I WON'T REPEAT THE CONCERNS EITHER.

I THINK IT WAS -- IT WAS A SUBSTANTIAL POSSIBILITY OF PROHIBITING AND CHILLING NONTHREATENING SPEECH.

I DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS CONSTITUTIONAL.



I HAVE GRAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE LANGUAGE.

I THINK IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

YOU HAVE TO TRY TO MAKE IT CONSTITUTIONAL, YOU HAVE TO GO TO THE FINDINGS AND INTENT SECTION.

I'M UNCOMFORTABLE FOR THE AUTHORITY TO READ THE OFFENSE.

I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE VAGUENESS OF THE ORDINANCE, PARTICULARLY CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT COUNCILMAN ARTHUR MENTIONED THE LACK OF CHARITY AS TO WHAT IS PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

I THINK IT IS WHY VERY VERY VERY FEW INJURES DICKS HAVE PASSED SOMETHING LIKE THIS BECAUSE OF THE ACTUAL PROBLEMS.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

I'LL BE BRIEF.

I THINK THIS WILL BE DIRECT TO PIAGENTINI BECAUSE REPEATEDLY ENFORCEMENT OF THIS IS PROBLEMATIC.

SO DID YOU CONSIDER THAT AND HOW WOULD YOU EXPLAIN THE ENFORCEMENT PART?

>> I WOULD SAY WE -- WE DISCUSSED WITH THE WITH CRIMINAL DIVISION.

IN BOTH CASES THEY WERE CLEAR THAT THEY AREN'T, THIS IS A GAP. THEY AREN'T DOING ANYTHING.

THEY SEE THESE THREATS AND THEY'VE BEEN OUT THERE AND THEY'VE BEEN WILLING BUT UNABLE TO DO ANYTHING BECAUSE OF EXISTING LAW.

COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER JUST SAID, THERE'S OTHER JURISDICTIONS THAT

HAVE DONE THINGS LIKE THIS.

WE READ THROUGH THOSE TO SEE WHICH WERE STRONGER THAN OTHERS AND MORE REALISTICS AS OTHERS.

BUT THAT'S -- AS FAR AS THE -- THE LAW ENFORCEMENT SIDE OF THIS, ALL OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THAT WE ARE ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENFORCING THIS INDICATED THAT THERE WAS A WILLINGNESS TO -- IT ADDRESS THIS ISSUE BECAUSE THERE WAS CREDIBLE THREATS MADE FRANKLY SOCIAL MEDIA FOLKS AREN'T STUPID.

THEY KNOW WHAT THEY'RE DOING AND WHAT GAP EXISTS.

THEY MAKE VERY CREDIBLE THREATS BUT USE VERY SMALL TERMS LIKE IT WOULD BE TERRIBLE IF, IT WOULD SUCK IF, AND THEN THE MOST HORRIBLE VIOLENT ACTIONS BEHIND THAT STATEMENT AS POSSIBLE.

AND BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE FEW WORDS BEFORE THAT, IN MATTER HOW CREDIBLE THAT THREAT IS BOTH COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND LMPD INDICATED THEY HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT THAT.

SO.

I HOPE THAT HELPS ANSWER YOUR QUESTION.

>> MY FEELING IS THAT -- I'M NOT A LAWYER.

I'M ESPECIALLY NOT A CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYER.

BUT IF THIS IS A CHANCE THAT THIS PASSES CONSTITUTIONAL MUSTER, THEN WE SHOULD TRY IT.

>> THIS IS A SITUATION WHERE PEOPLE REALLY ARE BEING THREATENED.

TO DO NOTHING WOULD BE THE WRONG APPROACH. I APPRECIATE WHAT YOU

PUT IN THE ORDINANCE.

>> THANK YOU.

ACKERSON?

>> THANK YOU.

FOLKS, I'VE GOT REAL CONCERNS HERE.

>> THIS HAS NO CRIMINAL PROSECUTION, 250 DOLLAR FINE.

IF THE CONCERN IS THAT THESE PEOPLE ON THE INTERNET ARE ARE  
CLEVER ABOUT GETTING AROUND THINGS, WORDING THINGS IN A MANNER  
THAT AVOIDS THE CHARGE, CLEARLY THEY'LL AVOID THE -- THE -- THE  
2 OR 300 DOLLAR FINE HERE ALSO.

WE'RE GOING TO LEAVE IT TO THE OFFICER'S DEPARTMENT IT DETERMINE  
INTENT.

IT FALLS WAY SHORT.

AND IF IT IS WHAT THEY'RE DOING IS WRONG, THEN WHY ARE ARE WE  
ALLOWING OTHER PEOPLE TO HIT LIKES.

MAYBE THEY'RE NOT SHARING BUT THEY'RE HITTING LIKES.

IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE.

THIS NEED TO BE DEALT WITH OUT OF FRANKFURT AND IT NEED TO COME  
WITH A LOT OF CLARITY AND IT NEED TO COME WITH CRIMINAL  
PROSECUTION ATTACHED TO IT.

I THINK ITS COVERED BY THE LAWS OUT THERE.

IF FOLKS ARE WORRIED ABOUT THREATS, I HOPE THE NUMBER OF THE  
FOLKS ON THE COUNCIL WILL TAKE CARE OF THE SAFETY ZONE.

THERE'S SOMETHING THAT HASN'T BEEN DONE THAT CAN BE DO NOT.

AND SO FOR ALL OF THOSE REASONS, I'M GOING TO A NO VOTE.

I'LL CONCLUDE, COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER RAISED AN ISSUE.

CHILLING EFFECT.

IF SOMEONE WANTS TO BE CRITICAL, I DON'T WANT TO SCARE THEM OFF.

I DON'T WANT IT SAY THEY'LL SHOOT SOMEBODY OR KILL SOMEBODY,  
THAT'S WRONG.

IF THEY WANT TO SAY ACKERSON, HERE'S WHERE HE LIVES.

THAT'S GOOD, THAT'S FINE.

WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE CRITICISM OF PEOPLE IN SOCIETY AND IN  
PUBLIC LIFE.

THAT COMES WITH A JOB.

SO YOU KNOW, I'M PROTECTED, OTHER FOLKS ARE PROTECTED BY THE  
CURRENT CRIMINAL STATUTES ON THE BOOKS.

I THINK THIS TAKES THINGS WAY TOO FAR.

MISSES THE MARK AND ULTIMATELY WE WANT TO TALK -- PROTECTION  
OF -- AND WE SHOULD TALK ABOUT THE BUFFER ZONES AND NOT INTERNET  
POSTINGS.

>> THANK YOU.

PIEDEN.

>> I'M GOING TO BE A YES VOTE TONIGHT.

I HAVE THE SAME CONCERNS AS EVERYONE ELSE REGARDING FIRST  
AMENDMENT ITEMS BUT -- I CAN -- YOU KNOW, I HAD A CONVERSATION  
EARLIER WITH THE COUNCIL ABOUT PEOPLE WANT TO COME AND STAND ON  
MY FRONT YARD AND CALL ME NAMES THAT'S FINE.

I COULD STAND HERE AND BE BIGGER AND UGLIER BUT MY YES VOTE IS FOR MY WIFE AND TWO DAUGHTERS WHO ARE ARE OUT WITH ME WHEN WE GO TO RESTAURANTS AND WHO HAVE TO CARRY THAT PIEDEN NAME AROUND WHICH AFTER 18 YEARS IN OFFICE CAN'T BE EASY ANYMORE.

AND THOSE -- THAT'S THE GROUP I'M VOTING YES IF.

AND YEAH, IT MAY NOT MAKE IT.

IF THERE'S COURT CHALLENGE AND SO ON.

ANYTHING I CAN DO TO PROTECT THEM, THEIR WELL-BEING, THEIR SENSE OF PEACE.

THAT'S THE PRICE THEY PAY IF BEING THE DAUGHTER OF AN OFFICIAL.

>> COUNCILWOMAN CHAMBERS ARMSTRONG.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'LL BE A YES VOTE TONIGHT AND I DON'T WANT TO REPEAT A LOT OF WHAT HAS BEEN SAID.

I DID TO A LOT OF FIRST AMENDMENT CASES AS AN ATTORNEY.

THIS VIOLATES THE FIRST AMENDMENT.

DOXING IS BAD.

THIS HAS BEEN CONSIDERING CONDUCT ON THE INTERNET AND THERE'S GUIDANCE ON HOW WE THINK ABOUT THESE THINGS AND THIS ORDINANCE IS WRITTEN AND CLEARLY SUSCEPTIBLE FOR A NUMBER OF CHALLENGES THAT I DON'T THINK IT WOULD WITHSTAND.

IF THAT REASON I'M GOING TO BE A NO VOTE.

THANK YOU.

>> ARTHUR.

>> I WANTED TO ADD WHEN I ORIGINALLY HEARD ABOUT THIS, I WAS SUPPORTIVE FOR WHAT IT WAS INTRODUCED TO ME THROUGHOUT LAST YEAR.

THROUGHOUT MY LIFE BUT REALLY LAST YEAR, I WAS DOXED, THREATENED.

I HAD MY PROPERTY DAMAGED.

SOMEONE BROKE INTO MY HOME.

I REASONED WITH EVERYTHING PRESENTED TO ME.

YOU IDENTIFY WITH SOMEONE AND YOU PULL THE THREAT OR ALLUDE TO IT BUT THE ORDINANCE GOES WAY BEYOND THAT.

THAT'S VERY PROBLEMATIC AND GETS IN TO SLIPPERY YOU SLOPES.

I WANT THAT TO BE KNOWN.

THANK YOU.

>> COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

>> I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY A FEW THINGS FOR MY COLLEAGUES. FIRST OF ALL, I'VE BEEN OPEN TO -- TO -- TO ANY SUGGESTION TO APPROVE THIS.

AGAIN, OTHER THAN THOSE THAT I CITED I DIDN'T RECEIVE OTHER FEEDBACK ON HOW NO IMPROVE THIS OR TIGHTEN UP THE LANGUAGE.

FIRST OF ALL, I THINK COUNCILMAN HOLLANDER SAID THIS.

OTHER CITIES HAVE IT.

I WOULD BE HAPPY IF WE DON'T HAVE TO ADDRESS THIS.

I'M PRAYING FOR THE DAY THAT SOME COMBINATION OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE COURTS ADDRESS THIS SO WE DON'T HAVE

TO.

THIS IS A VERY TIGHT RETAILERED WAY TO START MOVING THE ISSUE FORWARD AND HAVE THE DISCUSSION AND THE DEBATE.

I WANT TO DISCUSS THINGS BROUGHT UP.

NUMBER ONE, THIS IS NOT.

ANYBODY COULD -- ANYBODY COULD GO TO SO-AND-SO'S ADDRESS AND DAM THAT PERSON, AND YOU CAN SEE, TRUTH LETS -- WELL THE DEFINITION, JASON FOWL ESTABLISHED A COMMITTEE AND THIS DEFINITION HAS BEEN USED IN MANY LAWS.

THE COURT SYSTEM HAS A DEFINITION TO THAT.

THIS IS NOT SOMETHING THAT -- DOESN'T HAVE, LANGUAGE AND ORDINANCE DOESN'T HAVE PLENTY OF BACKGROUND AND JURISPRUDENCE TO IT.

IT IS IN THE DESIGNED TO BE A SCENARIO WHERE SOMEONE SAYS LET'S GO TO HIS HOUSE AND YELL AT THAT PERSON.

THAT'S CLEARLY NOT IN VIOLATION OF THIS.

THE AMENDMENT WE MADE ABOUT INTERACTION.

I'M GOING TO READ IT HERE.

I THINK IT IS WORDED IN A VERY WELL DEFINED WAY TO PROTECT EVEN -- NO MATTER WHAT THE SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORM DOES, RELATED TO THAT POST, IT WOULD NOT BE TAKEN AS REPUBLISHING.

SO NOTWITHSTANDING INDIVIDUALS SHALL NOT BE FOUND TO REPUBLISH INFORMATION CONTENT PROVIDER WHEN THE ORIGINAL CONTENT IS UNALTERED AND REMAINS WITHIN ONE INTERACTIVE SERVER SYSTEM.

IF YOU DIDN'T CHANGE THE CONTACT, NO MATTER WHAT, IF YOU DIDN'T CHANGE IT AND IT RETAINS IN THE COMPUTER SYSTEM, NOT REPUBLISHING.

WE WERE TRYING TO BE EXPLICIT THAT THERE'S IN INTERACTION WITH IT AND ANY SYSTEM THAT EXISTS CURRENTLY AND ANY THAT WE COULD IMAGINE, RIGHT, BECAUSE OF HOW THE ALGORITHM WORKS WOULD PUT THEM AT RISK OF BEING IN VIOLATION.

>> COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE.

>> I JUST WANT TO DO CLARIFY, WE KEEP USING THE WORD THREAT TO DESCRIBE DESCRIBE THE GAP.

I HEARD FOWLER TESTIFY TO BEFORE PUBLIC SAFETY WITH SPECIFIC THREATS ARE COVERED BY THREATENING.

AND WHAT DOXING IS ABOUT IS IMPLIED INTIMIDATION.

AND THE IMPLIED INTIMIDATION SEEMS MORE BROAD AND FOR THAT REASON I'M A NO.

>> I ASK FOR CLARIFICATION BETWEEN WHAT IS THE MAIN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN -- BETWEEN A TERRORIST THREAT AND THE THREAT WITH WITH DOXING ISSUES INCLUDED.

CAN YOU HAVE A TERRORIST THREAT WITHOUT AND IT BE CONSIDERED A TERRORIST THREAT WITHOUT ANY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION COMING FORTHWITH.

>> THANK YOU FOR THE QUESTION.

COUNCIL WOMAN.

JASON FOWLER ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY.



LEGISLATING ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT IS DIFFICULT.

AS THE DEBATE HAS OCCURRED, I'VE SAT HERE WITH NO SMALL AMOUNT OF TREPIDATION.

THE LAW ON THE BOOKS IS FOR EXPRESSING FROM ONE PERSON TO ANOTHER.

IN OTHER WORDS, I SAY TO SOMEONE, I'M GOING TO MURDER YOU.

THAT'S A DEFINED THREAT.

AND COUNCILWOMAN GEORGE IS CORRECT.

THE JURISPRUDENCE AROUND THIS IS NOT SPECIFIC BUT INTIMIDATION.

WE ARE A GOVERNMENT THAT HAS AN INTEREST IN PROVIDING ITS CITIZENS, A COMMUNITY FREE FROM INTIMIDATION.

IT IS NOT PROTECTED SPEECH.

IT IS OUTSIDE.

CATEGORIES THAT AREN'T PROTECTED AND THAT'S A TRUE THREAT.

SO -- SO THERE'S CONFUSION BETWEEN THE TERMS.

THERE'S SOMETHING CALLED TRUE THREATS.

WHAT THEY'RE LOOKING FOR IS INTIMIDATING LANGUAGE.

THAT'S NOT CONFIDENCE IN OUR CURRENT LAW AS COUNCILMAN

PIAGENTINI HAS DESCRIBED, THERE'S A GAP BETWEEN SOMEONE VERY

EXPRESSLY THREATENING SOMEONE AND SOMEONE CONVEYING INTIMIDATING LANGUAGE THAT A REASONABLE PERSON WOULD CONSIDER TO BE A THREAT.

THAT'S THE WAY THE ORDINANCE IS WRITTEN TO ADDRESS THAT GAP

BETWEEN HAVE I EXPRESSED IT AND THE INTIMIDATING LANGUAGE USED

TO CONVEY WHAT A REASONABLE PERSON WOULD CONSIDER A NET.

UHM HAPPEN TO PROVIDE ANY FURTHER CLARIFICATION OF THAT.

>> TO ME, THIS ORDINANCE, YOU SAID IT IS -- IT IS -- IT IS DIRECTED AT THE GAP.

THIS ORDINANCE TO ME SEEMS LIKE IT ADDRESSES THREATS, INTIMIDATION AND IT ADDRESSES PUBLISHING A PERSON'S PRIVATE -- IN ADDITION TO THAT IT MAKES IT THREE FOLD AND IT PUBLISHES THEIR IDENTIFYING INFORMATION WHICH MAKES THAT THREAT MUCH EASIER FOR SOMEONE TO ACT ON.

I MEAN, I WOULD HATE IT IF -- HOW -- HOW WOULD SOME OF US MEMBERS FEEL IF SOMEONE PUT OUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER OUT THERE.

YOU -- YOU WOULDN'T WANT THIS TO HAPPEN TO ANY ONE OF US.

I KNOW PEOPLE THAT HAVE HAD THAT HIRED SECURITY GUARDS AND HAVE TO MOVE BECAUSE OF SOME OF THIS STUFF.

A YOUNG GIRL THAT WENT THROUGH A SIMILAR SITUATION AS WHAT WE'RE DESCRIBING AND SHE HAD TO HAVE HER -- HER COMPANY HAD TO HIRE SECURITY FOR HER TO COME TO AND FROM WORK AND SECURITY AT WORK AND AT HOME.

I THINK THAT THE TIMES WE'RE LIVING IN, THIS IS -- THIS IS IMPORTANT MORE NOW THAN EVER.

I WILL BE A YES VOTE.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILWOMAN.

BLACKWELL.

>> THANK YOU I HAD A QUESTION, COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI ALREADY

ADDRESSED THE ONE WITH COUNCIL MACK ACKERSON'S EXAMPLE.

THE EXAMPLE OF SAYING HERE'S THE ADDRESS, GO PROTEST OR WHATEVER  
WOULD NOT BE COVERED.

I AM A LITTLE CONFUSED WITH THE EXAMPLE THAT COUNCILMAN PARKER  
JUST USED.

YOU COULD STILL -- CAN YOU STILL PUBLISH THAT PERSON'S ADDRESS  
AS LONG AS YOU DON'T HAVE THE IMPLIED THREAT.

YOU DON'T HAVE TO SAY AND IT WOULD BE A SHAME IF.

IS THAT CORRECT?

>> COUNCILMAN STAND BY.

COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI, CAN YOU ANSWER THAT?

>> YES, HERE'S THE WORKS PUBLISHING BY ITSELF PERSONALLY  
IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION IS NOT IN VIOLATION.

YOU COULD PUSH THEIR SOCIAL SECURITY, ADDRESS, AND ANYTHING  
ELSE.

THAT'S NOT IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDINANCE.

YOU COULD PUBLISH ANYTHING THAT SAYS, IT WOULD BE TERRIBLE IF  
SOMEONE DID HORRIBLY BAD THINGS TO HIS WIFE AND CHILDREN AND  
THAT WOULD NOT BE IN VIOLATION.

IT IS ONLY THE COMBINATION OF BOTH, PUBLISHED TOGETHER THAT IS  
IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDINANCE.

YOU HAVE TO DO BOTH.

IT STATES, CERTAIN MY ANYTHING AVAILABLE.

WHEN YOU BUY A HOUSE, IT IS PUBLISHED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE.

YOU CAN -- WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR IN THE MOST OF YOUR PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION IS OUT THERE.

MAKING THAT ILL LEGAL BY ITSELF WOULD BE A VIOLATION.

YOU'RE RIGHT, IT HAS TO BE BOTH THAT IT IS HAPPENING SIMULTANEOUSLY, ONE OR THE OTHER IS NOT ENOUGH.

AND THE LANGUAGE USED MUST CONSTITUTE [INDISCERNIBLE].

>> WERE YOU FINISHED COUNCILMAN BLACKWELL.

>> SORRY.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILMAN MULVIHILL.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, CAN I -- STILL AVAILABLE TO TALK?

>> I'M HERE, YES.

>> CAN YOU BRIEFLY TALK BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN ALL OVER THE BOARD IN USING HARASSIVE COMMUNICATION AND NOW CAN YOU TALK ABOUT THE LEVELS, IN ALL OF THESE CASES THERE'S GOT TO BE AN INTENT TO DO SOMETHING.

AT LEAST THE FIRST TWO, A CRIMINAL INTENT.

BUT IT IS TO HARASS THE COMMUNICATION.

BUT IS THE SAME STANDARD YOU LOOK AT WHO RECEIVED THESE COMMUNICATIONS AND SOMEBODY GOING TO OBSERVE AND JUDGE IT WHETHER THEY BELIEVED IT WAS.

IS THAT A REASONABLE PERSON STANDARD THAT THEY HAD THE INTENT TO DO SO.

HOW ARE THEY DIFFERENT?

HOW IS IT PROVEN?

>> CERTAINLY, I'LL DO MY BEST COUNCILMAN.

THERE'S A SPLIT IN FEDERAL AUTHORITY WHETHER IT IS THE INTENT OF THE PERSON MAKING THE THREAT OR THE PERSON WHO PERCEIVES THE THREAT THAT CONTROLS THE INTENT OVER WHETHER OR IN THE A NET WAS IN FACT MADE.

THE RECENT GUY THAT WAS FOLLOWED IN THE ORDINANCE WAS TAKEN TO THE CONNECTICUT SUPREME COURT, WHERE THEY INTERPRETED THE CASE IN THE UNITED STATES, EXCUSE ME, EXCUSE ME -- I MIGHT GET IT WRONG.

IT SAID IT IS NEITHER BUT WHETHER A REASONABLE PERSON WOULD CONSIDER THE LANGUAGE USED TO BE A THREAT.

THE INTEND PORTION REMAINS.

YOU IT INTEND TO PUBLISH AND INTIMIDATING LANGUAGE.

AND THAT INTENT IS THIS, WHETHER OR NOT THAT -- THAT INTIMIDATING LANGUAGE WAS ACTUALLY A THREAT WOULD BE VIEWED BY A REASONABLE PERSON ON WHETHER IT CONSTITUTES A THREAT.

THAT WOULD TAKE A PROSECUTING ATTORNEY AND A JUDGE TO MAKE THAT DETERMINATION.

>> SO IT WOULD BE SOMEWHERE TOO TO PUT IF SOMEBODY HARASSED OR WAS HARASSING SOMEBODY THROUGH COMMUNICATION, THEY'RE GOING TO LOOK AT THE INTENT AND IT COULD BE A JURY.  
IT COULD BE A JUDGE.

IT COULD BE A PROSECUTOR, CORRECT?

AND ALSO IT SIGN THE DISPOSITION?

>> CORRECT.

THERE'S OVERLAY.

WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT -- THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND LANGUAGE AND  
THREATENING AND HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS THE DISTINGUISH -- WE  
MADE THE DISTINGUISHMENT FROM HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS.

SEVERAL OF THOSE -- OF THOSE MATTERS CAN BE CONSIDERED BEHAVIOR  
BY THE CLERK.

IN OTHER WORDS YOU SHOULD REPEATEDLY DIAL SOMEONE.

THAT'S GOING TO BE CONDUCT AND ANALYZED UNDER CONDUCT INSTEAD OF  
SPEECH.

WE LEFT HARASSING OUT OF THE LANGUAGE OF THIS ORDINANCE.

WE STUCK WITH -- YOU KNOW, THE LANGUAGE THAT IS THERE IS GOING  
TO NEED TO BE INTERPRETED BY A FACT FINDER, A JUDGE OR A JURY.  
AND A PARTICULAR SET OF FACTS THAT SURROUND THE OFFENSE.

>> THEY HAVE TO HAVE INTENT.

I KNOW I WAS TRYING TO -- UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN  
THE TWO.

I DO BELIEVE ANDIAN IF WE LOOKED AT THIS AND MAYBE THIS IS  
COUNCILMAN PIAGENTINI.

I KNOW THE STATE, WELL THE STATE, WE NEED WAY FOR THE STATE TO  
DO IT.

I KNOW THE STATE CONSIDERED A BILL THIS YEAR.

I DON'T KNOW HOW FAR IT GOT.

I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS MODELED AFTER THAT AT ALL.

I KNOW THEY WERE CONSIDERING SOMETHING SIMILAR.

>> THERE'S LEGISLATION IN THE STATE IS IN COMMITTEE.

I DON'T THINK IT WILL MAKE THE DEADLINE THIS YEAR.

>> THANK YOU.

>> PIAGENTINI DID YOU WANT TO RESPOND?

>> I WOULD ADD THAT YES, WE WERE WATCHING THAT, COUNCILMAN MULVIHILL AND WE WERE LOOKING AT THE SIMILARITIES AND ACTUALLY ASKED JASON TO -- TO SORT OF THROW THEM IN IF THAT WOULD MAKE THIS OBSOLETE.

WHAT IS IT.

IF I THOUGHT IT WOULD BE PASSED OR SIGNED BY THE GOVERNOR, I WOULD TABLE THIS REPORT.

BUT -- AS YOU SAID, AT THIS POINT I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY, BECAUSE IT GETS STUCK IN COMMITTEE, THERE'S NO LEGAL METHODOLOGY TO MOVE FORWARD THIS SESSION AT LEAST.

>> THANK YOU.

AND COUNCILMAN ACKERSON.

>> THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

JASON, I'VE GOT A QUESTION FOR YOU.

WE TALKED ABOUT -- THERE'S THE TERRORIST THREATENING, YOUR STATUE OUT THERE.

AND MULVIHILL BROUGHT UP HARASSMENT AND I PULLED IT UP, 5251070.

THAT TALKS ABOUT A PERSON CAN BE CRIMINALLY GUILTY OF HARASSMENT.

IF A PERSON IS -- HARASS TO INTIMIDATE OR A LARGE ANOTHER PERSON, HE OR SHE AND WE GO DOWN HERE TO C AND IN A PUBLIC PLACE MAKES OFFENSIVE COURSE GESTURE OR DISPLAY OR ABUSIVE LANGUAGE TO ANY PERSON THE INTERGET IS -- IS A PUBLIC PLACE, IS IT NOT?

>> THANK YOU FOR THE QUESTION.

AGAIN THERE'S SUBSTANTIAL OVERLAY WITH -- WITH OTHER PROVISIONS AS WELL.

HOWEVER, THE -- THE ORDINANCE WAS WRITTEN TO -- TO DIRECTLY ADDRESS DOXING.

>> SO -- WOULD THAT BE PUBLISHING SOMEONE'S HOME ADDRESS IS THE DIFFERENCE?

>> THE PUBLICATION OF THAT ADDRESS WAS INTIMIDATING LANGUAGE.

>> OKAY.

SO IT BOILS DOWN TO WE GOT CRIMINAL STATUTES THAT -- THAT -- TO PROSECUTE THREATS.

CRIMINAL STATUTES THAT CAN PROSECUTE HARASSMENT WHICH IS DOING THINGS THAT ARE ARE MEANT TO BE -- MEANT TO BE -- TO BE -- ALARM SOMEONE OR HERE SPECIFICALLY ENGAGES IN A COURSE OF CONDUCT. EXTENSIVE COURSE UTTERANCE.

THE ONLY DIFFERENCE HERE, WE'RE SAYING YOU CANNOT MISH SOMEONE'S ADDRESS WITH THE INTENT OF TRYING TO INTIMIDATE.



CORRECT?

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

>> ALL RIGHT.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILMAN.

HOLLANDER?

>> MR. PRESIDENT I THINK THE DISCUSSION HERE REALLY IS -- IS -- IS -- IS EVEN MORE TO THE FORETHE ARGUMENT ABOUT CHILLING EFFECT OF THIS KIND OF ORDINANCE.

THERE HAS TO BE A SERIOUS REVIEW BY PROSECUTORS AND MISS DEPARTMENT, IT IS VERY FOREIGN WITH WHETHER THIS COULD BE ENFORCED.

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT ANYBODY THAT PUTS SOMETHING THAT GET CLOSE TO THIS ON THE INTERNET, IS GOING TO SAY BUNCH OF LIES, I DON'T WANT PEOPLE IT DEBATE IT.

I SHOULD BACK OFF.

I THINK THAT'S WHAT CHILLING EFFECT ON AMENDMENT SPEECH IS.

IS THE GRAY SHOT CASE STILL GOOD?

DO YOU HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THAT CASE BEING FOLLOWED AND -- BEING FOLLOWED BY THE KENTUCKY COURTS.

I BELIEVE THAT CASE STRUCK DOWN AN ANTI-DOXING LAW.

IS THAT CORRECT?

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

THAT LAW CONTROLS.

IN KENTUCKY THERE'S IN SUPPORT CASE OR SIXTH CIRCUIT DECISION  
THAT HAS TAKEN UP RAY SHAW OR THIS ISSUE.

IT IS A DIFFICULT LIST.

AND I THINK PART OF THE TASK HERE IS TO DO SOMETHING TO MOVE  
THIS CONVERSATION FORWARD.

>> I UNDERSTAND, THANK YOU.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

I REALLY JUST BRING THAT POINT UP.

COUNCILMAN SAID I MENTIONED SEVERAL TIMES THAT OTHER CITIES  
ADDRESSED THIS.

OTHER CITIES HAVE IT BROUGHT DOWN BECAUSE OF AN ORDINANCE LIKE  
THIS.

IN KENTUCKY LAW THERE'S NOTHING THAT SAYS IT IS CONSTITUTIONAL.  
THE CHILLING EFFECT IS SIGNIFICANT.

WITH WE HAVE THE DEBATE ABOUT WITH WHAT WOULD BE COVERED AND  
WOULDN'T.

MCCRANEY.

>> I MOVE TO CALL THE QUESTION, PLEASE.

>> THANK YOU.

>> SECOND.

IN FAVOR AYE.

>> AYE.

>> ALL OPPOSED.

NO.

>> THE AYES HAVE IT.

THIS WILL REQUIRE A ROLL CALL VOTE.

[ROLL CALLED].

>> THANK YOU.

>> I'M CHANGING GEORGE TO A NO AND ENGEL AS A YES AND PIEDEN  
AS A YES.

FLOOD, HOLTON STEWART.

>> NO.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.

>> NO.

>> YOU HAVE 12 YES AND 12 NO VOTES.

>> THANK YOU THE ORDINANCE FAILS.

MADAM CLERK READING OF ITEM 35.

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE  
ZONING OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT  
1311 SOUTH SHELBY STREET  
CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 1.58  
ACRES AND BEING IN LOUISVILLE  
METRO, CASE NO. 20ZONE0111, AS  
AMENDED.

>> MOTION AND SECOND.

>> MOTION TO APPROVE.

>> MOTION BY TRIPLETT AND ENGEL.

THE ORDINANCE IS BEFORE US, ANY DISCUSSION.

>> THANK YOU PRESIDENT, THIS IS ON SHELBY STREET AND THAT'S  
IN ARTHUR'S DISTRICT.

IT CALLED IF A CHANGE OF ZONING TO C1.

>> COUNCILMAN ARTHUR.

>> WE PULLED IT OUT OF COMMITTEE, I'M VOTING TO SUPPORT IT  
ONLY BECAUSE THE SHELBY PARK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION AND  
RETURNING RESIDENTS FELT COMFORTABLE WITH MOVING FORWARD BECAUSE  
WITH OF THE BINDING ELEMENTS.

READ THE LETTER THAT IT IS EXCLUSIONARY TO CERTAIN GROUPS.

AND HOW THE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING FELT LIKE IT PROVIDED A FALSE  
SENSE OF SECURITY.

I'M CLEAR I'M VOTING YES ON THIS.

OUR ZONING PROCESS IS VERY MUCH A CONCERN OF MINE.

>> ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION?

HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THIS IS AN ORDINANCE REQUIRING  
ROLL CALL VOTE.

[ROLL CALLED].

>> MR. PRESIDENT, I NEED TO ABSTAIN.

AT PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING, I WILL BE ABSTAINING FROM THIS  
MATTER.

>> THANK YOU.

>> KRAMER.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER BLACKWELL.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER FOX.

>> YES.

>> FOWLER.

>> YES.

>> TRIPP LET.

>> YES.

>> REED.

>> YES.

>> WINKLER.

>> PARKER.

ARE YOU THERE?

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER PIAGENTINI.

>> YES.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER BENSON.

>> YES.

COUNCIL MEMBER GEORGE.

>> YES.

>> ENGEL.

>> PIEDEN.

>> YES.

FLOOD.

>> YES.

>> HOLTON STEWART.

>> COUNCIL MEMBER ACKERSON.

>> YES.

>> YOU HAVE 23 YES VOTES AND -- 23 YES VOTES, ONE ABSTENTION.

>> THANK YOU THE ORDINANCE PASSES.

THE NEXT ITEM IS NEW BUSINESS.

AS YOU LEAVE THE CHAMBERS, TO SO QUIETLY.

THE COUNCIL MEMBERS THAT WISH TO MAKE ANNOUNCEMENTS PLEASE  
REMAIN.

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE  
ZONING OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT  
AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING  
\$6,000 FROM DISTRICT 24  
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS  
TO THE JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC  
EDUCATION FOUNDATION TO PAY FOR  
PROGRAM EXPENSES ASSOCIATED WITH  
PROVIDING INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP  
COUNSELING SERVICES AT THE YOUTH  
SERVICES CENTER AT SOUTHERN HIGH  
SCHOOL.

38.

O-120-21.

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING  
\$15,000 FROM DISTRICT 8

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS,  
THROUGH THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT  
AND BUDGET, TO TREESLOUISVILLE,  
INC. TO FUND THE CREATION OF  
SIDEWALK CUTS FOR TREE WELLS FOR  
THE PLANTING OF 100 TREES ALONG  
BARDSTOWN ROAD BETWEEN EASTERN  
PARKWAY AND LONGEST AVENUE.

39.

O-121-21.

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING  
\$15,200 FROM NEIGHBORHOOD  
DEVELOPMENT FUNDS IN THE  
FOLLOWING MANNER: \$8,800 FROM  
DISTRICT 15 AND \$6,400 FROM  
DISTRICT 21, THROUGH PUBLIC  
WORKS, TO INTEGRATED SERVICES,  
INC.  
TO CONDUCT SPRING AND FALL  
LANDSCAPING SERVICES AT THE S.  
3RD ST. AND TAYLOR BLVD.  
INTERCHANGE RAMPS AND THE S. 3RD  
ST. AND SOUTHERN PKWY.  
INTERCHANGE RAMPS.

40.

O-130-21.

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING  
\$3,750 FROM NEIGHBORHOOD  
DEVELOPMENT FUNDS IN THE  
FOLLOWING MANNER: \$1,500 EACH  
FROM DISTRICTS 6 AND 17; AND  
\$750 FROM DISTRICT 9; THROUGH  
THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND  
BUDGET, TO KENTUCKY SHAKESPEARE,  
INC FOR THE SHAKESPEARE IN THE  
PARKS ROMEO AND JULIET 2021  
TOUR.

41.

O-131-21.

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING  
\$11,975 FROM DISTRICT 6  
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT FUNDS  
TO METRO PARKS TO PAY FOR  
PROFESSIONAL LANDSCAPING  
SERVICES, BEAUTIFICATION  
PROJECTS, AND PRODUCTION  
SERVICES FOR THE ANNUAL JAZZ IN  
CENTRAL PARK EVENT.



LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO BUDGET  
COMMITTEE.

42.

O-127-21.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE  
NO. 073, SERIES 2020 RELATING TO  
THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021  
OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE  
LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY  
METRO GOVERNMENT BY TRANSFERRING  
\$725,000 TO THE BELLE OF  
LOUISVILLE TO FUND OPERATING  
EXPENSES.

43.

O-132-21.

AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW  
CHAPTER OF THE  
LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY  
METRO GOVERNMENT CODE OF  
ORDINANCES ("LMCO") PROVIDING  
FOR LIMITED LEGAL REPRESENTATION  
TO THE INDIGENT IN EVICTION  
COURT.

44.

O-133-21.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE  
LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY  
METRO GOVERNMENT AUTHORIZING AND  
DIRECTING THE PARKING AUTHORITY  
OF RIVER CITY, INC. TO ISSUE ITS  
MORTGAGE REFUNDING REVENUE  
BONDS, IN ONE OR MORE SERIES,  
WHETHER TAXABLE OR TAX-EXEMPT,  
TO FINANCE (I) THE REFUNDING OF  
ALL OR A PORTION OF THE  
OUTSTANDING PARKING AUTHORITY OF  
RIVER CITY, INC. FIRST MORTGAGE  
REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2010B,  
(II) THE REFUNDING OF ALL OR A  
PORTION OF THE PARKING AUTHORITY  
OF RIVER CITY, INC. FIRST  
MORTGAGE REVENUE BONDS, SERIES  
2013A, AND (III) THE REFUNDING  
OF ALL OR A PORTION OF THE  
PARKING AUTHORITY OF RIVER CITY,  
INC. FIRST MORTGAGE REVENUE  
BONDS, SERIES 2013B; AUTHORIZING  
THE EXECUTION OF A TRUST

INDENTURE AND ANY SUPPLEMENTAL  
THERE TO.

THE EXECUTION OF A LEASE  
AGREEMENT AND ANY SUPPLEMENTAL  
LEASE NECESSARY TO EFFECT THE  
ISSUANCE OF SUCH BONDS; AND  
TAKING OTHER RELATED ACTION.

45.

O-134-21.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE  
NO. 073, SERIES 2020 RELATED TO  
THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021  
OPERATING BUDGET BY TRANSFERRING  
\$374,600 TO THE JEFFERSON COUNTY  
SHERIFF'S OFFICE TO FUND  
OPERATING EXPENSES.

46.

O-135-21.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE  
NO. 073, SERIES 2020 RELATING TO  
THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021  
OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE  
LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY  
METRO GOVERNMENT BY TRANSFERRING

\$11,000 TO THE JEFFERSON COUNTY  
CORONER TO FUND INDIGENT BURIAL  
EXPENSES.

LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO LABOR  
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE.

COMMITTEE.1

47.

R-023-21.

A RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THE  
CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGET  
ORDINANCES APPROVING THE  
APPROPRIATION TO FUND THE  
FOLLOWING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE  
CONTRACT FOR THE ZOO CONCERNING  
AN ANIMATRONIC DINOSAUR DISPLAY  
- (DINO DON, INC. - \$225,000.00)

48.

R-025-21.

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE  
GRANTING OF LOCAL INCENTIVES TO  
FIVES INTRALOGISTICS CORP. AND  
ANY SUBSEQUENT ASSIGNEES OR  
APPROVED AFFILIATES THEREOF

PURSUANT TO KRS CHAPTER 154,  
SUBCHAPTER 32.

49.

R-026-21.

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING AND  
APPROVING A COLLECTIVE  
BARGAINING AGREEMENT (MARCH 5,  
2021 - JUNE 30, 2023) RELATING  
TO WAGES, HOURS, AND OTHER TERMS  
AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT  
BETWEEN THE LOUISVILLE/  
JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO  
GOVERNMENT AND LOUISVILLE  
PROFESSIONAL FIREFIGHTERS  
ASSOCIATION, LOCAL UNION 345,  
IAFF, AFL-CIO-CLC.  
LEGISLATION ASSIGNED TO PARKS  
AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE.

50.

R-024-21.

RESOLUTION HONORING THE BRADLEY  
FAMILY BY DEDICATING THE CLIFTON  
HEIGHTS GREENWAY AS THE CLIFTON  
HEIGHTS BRADLEY GREENWAY IN

RECOGNITION OF THE BRADLEY  
FAMILY'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO  
LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY  
METRO GOVERNMENT PARKS.

IT WAS ASSIGNED TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING.

50.

5800 AND 5802 WATTERSON TRAIL AND BEING IN LOUISVILLE METRO AND  
ZONED 0096.

THIS WAS ASSIGNED TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE AND THE  
ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 131.1 AND 02 AND THE LOUISVILLE  
METRO KID OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO THE DISPLACEMENT OF HOMELESS  
PERSONS FROM CAMP.

>> ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM ANY COUNCIL MEMBERS?

ALL RIGHT.

HEARING NONE, THAT CONCLUDES OUR MEETING AND OUR NEXT COUNCIL  
MEETING WILL BE THURSDAY APRIL 22ND, 2021 FOLLOWING THE MAYOR'S  
BUDGET ADDRESS AT 4 P.M. SO FOR THE COUNCIL MEMBERS, I HOPE YOU  
ALL HAVE A VERY SPECIAL GOOD SPRING BREAK WITH YOUR FAMILIES AND  
ENJOY YOURSELF.

TAKE CARE.