

Unedited Captioning Transcript of Metro Council Meeting - December 15, 2022

>> I would travel to different places and around the country.

Thank you, sir.

>> thank you.

Ronnie moore.

>> good evening.

I was going to go ahead and read off my phone but I work with local kentucky.

Okay.

And have for a number of years.

Okay.

And I continue to see that maybe we went from, you know we were just going to band together.

And we were going to see, and we as a group were going to have individuals sign for it.

Okay.

Because we have a bigger issue with signing people, you know.

We have an issue of drugs.

We have an issue of houselessness, hours incarceration and people with hepatitis and hiv.

We are trying to, you know, worry about what your constituents are worried about as the problem that valley, 31,000 houses short.

It still remains 19,000, you know.

So why don't we -- instead of putting this money towards incarceration, let's put it to care and let's actually give hope and other places like that a change instead of putting them out there and hanging themselves and people going on the wayside and going to the salvation army and not getting

what they need.

You know, coming to people and taking people where they need to go.

i say that we go with the road map because we are out here every day, you know, that is just downtown, and myself and other people, a burden, but we're not.

We are just as human as you guys are.

.

>> amy woods?

Amy woods?

C1

>> thank you for allowing me to speak.

I have lived under the college creek dry dock for two years.

I have been after having a seizure and detox.

I was in the hospital for a week.

I can only imagine what that price tag was.

And I wish this option was available on an outreach basis, like a mobile unit.

And I still struggle with bus fare and affordable housing.

I still struggle, and now, I would say struggling because I see no way into keeping my body clean because we were really lacking the showers, the services, the bus fares.

I would have to go back to the detox center if I relapse.

I would lose a lot of progress, and tailored homes with low barriers.

Please let us progress and not redegrees,

and don't put a price on being

homeless.

Raise the curtain.

Don't fine us.

We are just now trying to find out what works for unique people like myself.

Examples are low barriers, hope building, accountability, self care.

Help us.

Don't behind are hinder us.

H-bds sleep outside every night because we lack shelters.

We have seen an increase in homelessness in the past four years.

We have proposed amendments for constituents.

We need to shift our community response from a reactionary approach to proactive for the entire community.

We are vocal, and I ask you to table the proposed camping ordinance and develop a comprehensive plan that would address the homeless camps in louisville, and --

>> thank you.

>> thank you.

>> thank you.

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

>> thank you, and next, approval of the council meets?

>> motion to accept.

>> motion and second.

All in favor please say aye.

All opposed?

Minutes are approved as written, and we have the following community minutes, the regular committee as a whole, regular planning and zoning committee, NOVEMBER 6,

2022, labor and economic development committee NOVEMBER 6, 2022, regular government oversight and audit committee, DECEMBER 6, 2022, and the regular summary for community affairs and housing, DECEMBER 7, 2022, appropriations committee, DECEMBER 8, 2022. Parks and sustainability committee, damage is 8. Committee on equity and inclusion, DECEMBER 8, 2022. Budget commit I DECEMBER 8, 2022.

And we have a motion and a second.

All in favor say aye.

Opposed?

The motion passed.

>> matthew harrell has an incorrect term expiration.

The correct expiration date is DECEMBER 24, 2024.

I am a pointing following to the louisville metro advisory committee, elizabeth winlock, term expires NOVEMBER 29, 2024.

Dear PRESIDENT James, I am appointing the following, DR.

Kish I price, new appointment.

Dear PRESIDENT James I am a pointing and rea pointing the brightside board of directors, ashley Mccator, new term, expires DECEMBER 13, 2025, amy whelan, reappointment, and george fischer, new appointment, and metro council approval is not required.

Dear PRESIDENT James, I am appointing the following, patricia ramey, new appointment with term expires 2025.

Dear PRESIDENT James in accordance with the ordinance,

I am appointing to the
juneteenth jubilee commission,
wanda mitchell smith, new
appointment.

Sincerely, MR. Mayor.

Read in full.

>> thank you, and to be forked
forwarded to the audit
committee.

Any additions to the consent
scheduled?

MADAM Clerk, the reading of the
items, please.

C1

ordinance appropriating \$10,000
from district 26 neighborhood
development funds to th
louisville metro police
department ("lmpd") To fund
additional hours for lmpd
officers to provide speeding
and crime prevention in
district 26 during the holiday
season.

Primary brent ackerson, d-26.

An ordinance appropriating
\$15,000 from district 8
neighborhood development funds,
through the office of
management and budget, to
friends of beechwood park, inc.
For the construction of an
outdoor classroom in beechwood
park.

An ordinance appropriating
\$15,000 from district 4
neighborhood development funds,
through develop louisville, to
the louisville metro office of
housing for emergency winter
repairs for qualified
homeowners in district 4. A
resolution approving the
jefferson county sheriff's 2023
budget.

F0

c1

item 28 a resolution approving the jefferson county clerk's 2023 budget.

A resolution approving the schedule of the regular meetings of the legislative council of the louisville/jefferson county metro government council for the calendar year 2023.

A resolution amending the louisville metro council policies and procedures section 28 regarding member office selection.

Is

c1

the following legislation from the housing education

c1

resolution honoring george e. Fischer by dedicating the corner of east witherspoon street and north floyd street as "george e. Fischer way" in his honor.

A resolution honoring governor paul e. Patton for his contribution to the kentucky center for african american heritage.

F0

c1

the following legisl

c1

a resolution requesting the office of internal audit of the louisville/jefferson county metro government to conduct an audit of the louisville metro police department's compliance with records retention requirements.

Appointment of brian davis to the bardstown road overlay

district board.

Appointment of latosha perry to the domestic violence prevention coordinating council, term expires APRIL 26, 2025.

Appointment of rebecca fleischaker to the downtown development review overlay district.

Term expires JANUARY 31, 2026.

Reappointment of david hobbs to the louisville downtown management district board.

Term expires DECEMBER 15, 2025.

Appointment of william fischer to the planning commission.

Term expires OCTOBER 1, 2024.

Appointment of yolanda carter to the affordable housing trust fund board.

Term expires DECEMBER 31, 2025.

Reappointment of jd carey to the affordable housing trust fund board.

Term expires DECEMBER 31, 2025.

Reappointment of katharine dobbins to the affordable housing trust fund board.

Term expires DECEMBER 31, 2025.

Reappointment of kimberly sickles to the affordable housing trust fund board.

Term expires DECEMBER 31, 2025.

F0

c1

the following legislation was forwarded from the labor and economic development committee into a local participation agreement, thorizing the payment of the "released amount" pursuant to the terms and conditions of the local participation agreement, requiring the submission of

regular reports to the
louisville/jefferson county
metro government and
authorizing the execution and
delivery of any other documents
and the taking of any other
actions necessary to accomplish
the purposes authorized by this
ordinance.

A resolution approving the
granting of local incentives to
isco industries, inc.

And any subsequent assignees or
approved affiliates thereof
pursuant to krs chapter 154,
subchapter 32.

A resolution approving the
granting of local incentives to
process solutions and services,
inc.

D/b/a rapid industries and any
subsequent assignees or
approved affiliates thereof
pursuant to krs chapter 154,
subchapter 32.

A resolution pursuant to the
capital and operating budget
ordinances approving the
appropriation to fund the
following non-competitively
negotiated professional service
contract for a lego display at
the louisville zoo, imagine
exhibitions, inc., \$100,000.00.

F0

read in fu

c1

>> thank you.

Motion to accept.

>> we hae a motion there
triplett and second from
piagentini.

The motion before us.

And this requires a roll call
vote.

MADAM Clerk, please open the

roll for voting.

>> councilmember shanklin.

>> yes.

C1

>> MR. PRESIDENT, 22 yes votes.

>> thank you.

The consent calendar passes.

The next why business is old business.

MADAM Clerk, reading of item 47.

C

c1

uisville/jefferson county metro government code of ordinances chapter 119 regarding the registration of rental housing to include and assign the director of louisville metro codes and regulations, or ministration aduties regarding the registry of rental housing units.

As amended.

F0

c1

read if full.

>> the ordinance is before us.

Any discussion?

COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This was at the last council meeting and we had a healthy discussion and it was sent back to the committee for an opportunity to refine.

We made adjustments, but we need affordable housing that didn't put disproportionate burden on those with the least amount of able and COUNCILMAN Arthur will explain the amendment and councilmember dorsey will share a bit with her work.

She did a tremendous amount of work to get here, and after

the cosponsors speak, we can come back.

>> thank you.

And councilmember DR. Blackwell?

>> thank you, and in 2016, we put forth the registry and we were told the best way to get compliance was to make it as simple and possible and was no cost to it but there was a cost to the city, and there was transparency with the person making the information responsibility for the business having their information available to the public.

At the time we did not have the short term reg streer.

So it was a new venture.

We agreed to that and realized shortly therefore that it was a mistake because what we did there is the councilmembers could not be part of it.

The neighborhood could not be part of it.

And the neighbors could not say do we finish this is a rental or who is renting it?

None of that, and when we did the short term registry as a council, when we acknowledged was when you have a house and the owner is not the resident it becomes something different. it becomes a business in the neighborhood and for the short-term rentals, we decided we will put things in place to tell who the owner of the business is and we can hold the owner responsible for the business that he put in your neighborhood, and I supported that.

I don't have too many short-term rentals.

That's not a huge problem for me.

But at the time, I said we really need to re-visit the long-term rental because that's equally a business.

It can be -- like you can have just as many problems.

You can have a rental or an owner takes care of it and you never know it's a rental because it's taken care of in the same manner that the other houses are.

But it can.

But take care of it can be a real problem for neighbors.

So that's essentially what we're doing with this, near as best we can.

They are not exactly alike but near as best we can for short term rental.

It brings transparency.

And so now your neighbor can call and look up and see if the rental is on the registry and help code enforcement.

These three houses in our neighborhood are rentals, and they're not on the registry, and secondly it helps to hold the folks accountable for being able to keep the houses or apartments in good condition.

And last, then, we have some proactive inspections although COUNCILMAN Arthur will talk about the amendment that hopefully addresses folks' concerns about those inspections.

But tonight, I ask for your support.

It's been several months since it was dropped.

We are trying to address people's concerns as much as possible, and maybe not everyone will be in the same place on this one but I hope that folks who were -- who understand that concept of this is no longer a house, per se, but it's a business in the neighborhood and you need to hold folks accountable and know who that owner is.

This takes us in that direction.

>> they could, sir.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

>> thank you, and shout out to COUNCILMAN Blackwell and COUNCILWOMAN Dorsey for all the work that went into this.

If you see the life of the legislation, we are look at half a year of debating this, and they had been rolling up their sleeve and working on this way before so I'm glad to be part of this.

Code ofs and regulation has a plan to inspect 12,000 to 14,000 units across the city.

Our colleagues were concerned about resources in areas that didn't necessarily need proactive inspections.

So we have amended this to what other cities were doing when they had proactive programs and focus on the areas in need with proactive rental inspections, housing markets from our 2019 housing investment and attach side exhibit a. You will see all of the housing markets and 11 starred ones.

Those are rentals in your areas or areas with over 33% of the households renting.

Instead of 44,000, it will be closer to 7,000, and instead of 3.3 million the first year we are submitting a generous 1.4 million so almost two million saved and there were policy suggestions for better housing in Louisville and among those suggestions were proactive rental inspections.

So this will help our most vulnerable constituents for affordable housing.

I urge the passage.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

COUNCILWOMAN Dorsey?

>> thank you.

I will not repeat what I said last meeting but I want to read a bit of some items that were documented.

On this.

Safe and habitable housing is more than just physical shelter but the fundamental and more powerful social determinant of health and provides security and access to jobs and community resources.

Substandard housing category means deprivation, excuse me, across a range of social economic and poor housing is associated with health outcomes that far outweigh anything that we can ever understand, such as the point has clinical implications, cardiovascular disease, lead poisoning, mental illness, domestic abuse, fire risk, infectious diseases, impaired child development. These all stem from physical

aspects of the home's environment such as insect infestation is that can cause asthma aggravation.

Financial impacts as a result of poor property maintenance and overcrowded conditions lead to strained interpersonal relationships.

The connection between health and housing is further evidenced by the programs where their number one question is housing security.

Tens of millions of americans are facing housing security issues right now.

We are look at poor unstable neighborhoods and overcrowding and as we will talk about later, homelessness, and inadequate policies have fell short of addressing this issue.

We are looking at a time, you all, where I am looking at a harvard study where it's quoting the average of folks in the U.S. Paying 47.5% of their annual income in rent, half of their income.

So a lot of the conversation has been around the landlord's perspective.

I chose to take the perspective from the tenant, from folks that are working every single day and yet we are still looking at interest rates, you can't buy.

Rents that are raising.

I know many are saying this will cause it to raise them more.

They are already raised.

The minimum we are asking for is a standard of living for

those in our community and now
with COUNCILMAN's amend in the
most vulnerable communities in
which you can drive down any
day -- if you don't know where
they are, jump in the car with
me.

You can drive down and
literally, visually right now
see the deplorable conditions
that folks are paying half of
their income to live in because
we have landlords who have
decided and made cler
decisions that it's not a
priority of theirs to make the
housing of our most vulnerable
population at least, the
minimum standard, livable.

We have children living in
roach and rats infested homes,
and people are afraid of losing
their basic housing.

They are not calling in and
reporting this because they
don't have anywhere else to go.

We ask ourselves, what is the
job of legislature?

This is it.

The buck stops with us.

Today we make a decision, and
it's not polarized.

It's not if you're against it,
you're against housing.

You are against poor and
impoverished.

This is a vote of perspective.

Whose perspective will you look
at?

The landlord?

I am a landlord, and I can
tell that you it's a privilege
to have disposable income.
And I live there.

I am owner occupied.

I will not look through that

lens but as a college student who had nowhere to live and went to live in her mother's basement after getting a master's degree and making \$30,000 a year because I could not afford an apartment in the city, and what I was offered was a room.

So I am asking you all today, it's not going to change the world overnight, and we have a bit of a runway before we get this implemented.

We know we have work to do, and with that being said, I am asking you to empower the administration, empower us to be able to go after this and to be able to fight for the most vulnerable of our city and I am asking for your support today, colleagues.

This is not a housing issue on its own.

This is a public safety issue.

This is the basics, and if we don't get this right, we don't get right on top of this, this is our foundation.

Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Councilmember george.

Councilmember george?

Oh, flood -- oh, no.

COUNCILWOMAN George making the -- the sponsor?

Yes?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> yes.

>> so this is specific to section two, paragraph e.

My colleagues in discussion and in committee were passionate about this idea so that we really understand what was

learned and how we are moving the needle.

So, as part of the floor amendment we need to make a minor correction that will allow for better reporting based on what data currently exists within codes and regs.

So, again, paragraph e, how it would read and what I would propose is the director shall assemble an annual report to council with the estimated total number of occupied rental housing units.

The new sword "estimated." then we would strike availability of units for rent.

Again, this allows us to infer that what we really want to see is how many rental units you believe there are versus how many are actually registered? This language would allow that to happen in the form of a motion.

>> second.

>> seconded by councilmember dorsey.

Hall in favor please say aye?

All opposed?

The ayes have it.

COUNCILMAN Flood?

>> thank you.

I would like to limit debate.

>> limit debate.

A second?

A second.

All in favor say aye.

All opposed?

The ayes have it is.

COUNCILMAN Ackerson?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

First of all, there is not a person on this council tht doesn't think that we need to

find better housing for people
and force the codes on
slumlords.

That's what we are talking
about here, slumlords that,
they are making money off the
hard work of lower income
people.

I really appreciate the passion
that the sponsors have had
tonight, but I cannot support
this tonight, and it's not
because I am not passionate
about bringing down slumlords.

It's because I think this is
one more layer of bureaucracy.
We have a new administration
coming up.

let's see where the mayor puts
the focus.

Part of the problem has been a
tight budget.

Ipl doesn't have enough
inspectors right now.

And this is an extra layer of
bureaucracy and it will
financially burden that
department.

We will either hire more people
from the budget or continue to
do a poor job of working the
codes and regs that already on
the books.

What is on the books now covers
all the things we talked about,
the poor living conditions and
things.

The question of getting out and
being proactive is funding ipl.

I am in favor of funding ipl
and putting more inspectors out
there, and I am not in favor
of more layers of bureaucracy.

I support the cause but I will
be a no vote tonight.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

My goal is not to make
everybody mad at me though
people will be a little bit I
think.

I care about people a lot.

I believe in the free
enterprise system.

I believe that somehow you --
if someone fixes up their
property, that they think the
property is worth more.

They say there is 170,000
rental units in jefferson
county or the city of
louisville and this ordinance,
I don't believe when we're
done, that come monday morning
or something that all the
people are lining up saying I
will rent my property without
because this is going to be
really great.

if you never rented property --
and most of the people I know,
you ask them about renting
property out and they say, are
you kidding me?

All that hassle?

And any time that you want to
move, you just give me a
month's notice, and I will to
the give you a cotract but at
a fair rate.

Most, they bought a house and
rented that property out and
have come to a conclusion that,
hey, this will help me in my
retirement.

When I was 18, I told my dad I
was going to retire at 40 years
old and he said you can't
retire at 40.

He said you know what you can
retire?

I said, when?

He said when you are making

more money on your investments
than your salary.

And I said you're right.

Some of you all don't know it
but I had a real estate license
for 50 years and and in my
view, I -- probably what I will
do is probably I will -- I
don't want to deal with someone
coming around and telling me if
I was still teaching school and
I had to have an inspection and
take off school, and I go out
and do this, and they say,
where is your permit?

I don't have a permit.

It's my house.

I can do about anything.

You don't want to do anything
immoral.

And right now, most people
don't believe there is a
heaven.

I think people are making
really bad mistakes but if you
are trying to make people do
better, what we need to do is
try to take that money -- it's
going to cost \$3 million the
first year.

If that money went to housing
somehow or another, and I
mentioned to a number of
people, and they don't believe
me but I said you know why we
don't have affordable housing?

We have people that don't have
skills to make money, and if it
was up to me, I would.

You have kids with jobs, and
they ask buy housing anywhere
they want.

Our affording is not affordable
housing.

Our problem is the school
system.

We produce people who, when
they get out of school, they
can't get a job.

And to me, that's the
importance of everybody.

You have to pay back to
society.

You go to school and somebody
pays for it,
and you start working and you
pay for somebody else.

And so, I -- I just believe
that the -- this policy --
there is nobody here I don't
believe really don't want to
help people.

Nobody wants to see someone
living in a bad situation, and
if I could, I will try and help
out however I could.

My church, we have workdays and
we go down and work on houses
who belong to someone else so
that person in that house has
a better standard of living,
and we end up having less than
170,000 rentals, you know, next
year and the year after that
and we keep going down and
maybe the government takes over
and has more rentals, I mean, I
know the government -- when you
go in their places, they always
have granite counter tops and
hardwood floors and everything,
and all the yards are pristine,
and everything is beautiful.

Not really.

I am being a little bit
sarcastic.

You know, it would be great if
everybody took care of
everything that needed doing.
But you try and help a person
and try and show them -- it's
better for a person to be self

sufficient and try and make
their life better, and you
know, feed a man a fish and
feed him for a day.

Teach him how to fish, feed him
for a lifetime.

I'll end with this.

In holland or the netherlands,
my wife's family is there, and
I said where are your old cars?
She said what do you mean old
cars?

She said after 10 years old, we
crush them up.

I said, really?

I would be out of luck.

I hardly had a car that was
under 10 years old.

I didn't know I was breaking a
law and when my kids were at
home we had nine cars and you
can only have five in one place
and one broke down I had to
have time to fix it so everyone
can get around, and there were
cars I had that were dented up,
but mechanically, they are in
great shape and work great and
I would hate to have someone
say we don't like you driving
that car.

Get you a bicycle.

I'm too old to ride a bicycle.

Really, I'm almost too old to
even walk.

So when we are trying to
control everybody, I think, you
know, it -- when they are going
to help you out, they say we're
hoping that we don't do any
harm.

This ordinance, is it going to
do any harm?

Are we really helping all the
people who in a bad situation?

And were going to -- if we

eliminate that rental unit, are we really helping them out? In my view, I don't think so. I can bring them to my house but I can only handle so many people and maybe that's an ordinance we need to do. Anybody with a spare bedroom that we have to get someone in that room.

We are going to -- let's make sure every bed is filled in everybody's house.

Maybe some people go to a smaller house because they don't want anyone else in it. But I -- I'm just -- I know you all mean well.

I am a no vote.

Thank you.

>> thank you, councilmember.

Any further discussion?

Hearing none this is an ordinance with a roll call vote.

Will the clerk please open the roll for voting?

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, you have 21 yes votes and four no votes.

>> thank you.

The ordinance passes.

MADAM Clerk, a reading of item number 48.

>>> an ordinance amending the c1

uisville/jefferson county metro code of ordinances and establishing the greater louisville lodging management district.

C1

read in full.

>> motion, arthur.

>> motion by arthur and

seconded by piagentini.

The ordinance before us.

Any discussion?

COUNCILWOMAN Dorsey.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I am excited about that.

That's a big win for our city.

MR. PRESIDENT, this was a very

-- not heated discussion but a

very informative discussion

coming out of committee, and

COUNCILMAN Brent ackerson had a

very prolific revelation coming

out of this.

Within that discussion, and

I'll let him highlight more,

there was some serious

consideration around the

feature of rent consideration

and I didn't say this to

COUNCILMAN Ackerson but I

support your amend and I think

it's thought-forward and a

harmonious amendment.

So MR. PRESIDENT, I would like

to -- in regards to the

amendment, I see someone else

in the cue, but councilmember

ackerson, I wanted to speak on

that.

Thank you.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I believe this was -- we'll

make an amendment?

There we go.

Have you ever known me to be

friendly?

Come on.

Let's start off with this.

i fully support what the hotel

industry is trying to do.

As I said in the committee,

they are voting to tax

themselves and put to work for

their industry.

Completely support that.

All in favor of it.

However, one of the things that

I learned, I agree with

COUNCILMAN Hollander in our
committee,

and COUNCILMAN Hollander was
right, and I was wrong.

I went and checked on the
legalities of it.

And I had the same wrong
position, and I thought, well,
if there is ever a problem, we
could just repeal the
ordinance.

That's not the case here.

So the question becomes, how do
we support the hotel industry
given this taxing authority but
at the same time, give us some
accountability and assurances?

I think the accountability and
assurances are important
because in the event that the
tax reform comes down the road,
and that could come in the form
of local tax and it could come
in the form of a hotel bed tax
that we could levy ourselves,
but we have to then work on
other taxing authorities to
find the other right
combination of working with the
city and it requires working
with the board also and the
power that we are willing to
give this board.

And one of the things that is
important is that the city have
some control and I will
remained the amendment and the
second.

Correct?

It will begin on page three,
section b-one that will now

include the language, we will strike shall and insert MAY. Everyone has a copy of this, and in the same sentence after the word individual, we are going to add as recommendation. And we will add in the language at his or her discretion.

We go down b 1-c, after the word two, we will add in the language other individuals appointed, and then appointed by the mayor.

Have the criteria that is required by the state statute. For the representative for dss lodging properties in the district, for owners or the representative assisting lodging properties, less than 150 rooms, et cetera, et cetera.

They still have those insurances, people in the industry were on the ward. Yesterday, we had the assurance that the mayor would be getting the right people to work with the city because this is going to be a partnership, we are taxing for them.

>> I think you have a motion by council member ackerson, to have a second?

Second by councilmember perez we have the proposed amendment is before, is there any discussion for councilmember bauer?

>> I would like to make for 11 b peer

>> limited debate to 90 minutes do I have a second?

C1

>> do you have any comments? Councilmember ballard, did you

have any comments okay, thank you.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT i think councilmember ballard meant that, because I was to say -- no, I do want to voice my opposition to this event for a couple of reasons.

First of all, COUNCILMAN Ackerson is correct I'm glad to let that publicly, that they didn't understand, in fact, counsel for ackerson educated me on the solution process as stipulated in the state statute for these types of districts. So glad to be educated on that, that is fine.

The question is whether to not improve this entire board not. This amendment changes nothing, right?

Related to the process for absolving the board.

Before even the appointees are trying to make that decision.

But what this is really a question of is who are the right people, and what is the right makeup of the board members to make decisions on behalf of this district?

That is all that that is questioning.

I, personally believe, and regarding what we are seeing, metro council has oversight over every single one of these positions. So if we adopt the language before the event, it is true that two, there are two appointees by PRESIDENT Of chair or hotel assistant, and dissociation inappropriate for the sport, we can just reject it.

We can do that over and over and over again, if we don't think this is appropriate peoples to leave this board. So this council has plenty of oversight on every single member . What this is about delegating additional authority to the mayor's office.

I'm just going to throw out the concept, an alternative reality for everybody for two minutes and that alternative reality is mayor elect deirdre and COUNCILMAN Kramer, councilmember piagentini and COUNCILMAN Reed are the next three that don't have to work for him.

I question very seriously whether this will be the amendment that we would be looking at tonight.

That there would be a move to get more authority to those three deputy mayors and that mayor elect.

I like mayor elect very much, I am on his transition team, okay?

And I was honored that he selected me.

But I am a representative of special counsel.

I am not, it is not my, I am not in the business of delegating authority, getting more authority to the mayor's office.

So the question for me is so who, after our oversight do I think would be a better job on this board?

Experts in the industry that we have full oversight of, appointees of the mayor with no

control whatsoever to appoint anybody, he or she, could appoint anybody from any background, anything whatsoever.

And I just don't think that makes any sense.

So I'm going to be against this.

And I would appreciate your support in voting against this amendment. Thank you, mr.

president.

>> thank you.

>> thank you MR. PRESIDENT district 19, I wholeheartedly reject the idea for this move.

The reality is, even if you were deputy mayor, I would be supporting this.

The reality is, this is about the government.

You know, this city is going to have a republican mayor. And this guy is not going to fall.

We democrats will disagree with that mayor on some issues but the sky is not going to fall.

And so this is a long-term situation where it is not about party politics, it is about government, primarily chief administrator of this government, the mayor needing to control the situation, especially when future changes could come.

They can be stressful.

>> thank you, councilmember.

>> thank you, just briefly, first of all.

I don't think that all people that introduce this amendment, probably the last person that anyone would accuse of having party lines and doing this for partisan reasons.

Because he thinks it's benefits the party.

So as a complement.

I would also just add, you know, if we look into the history.

I mean, you know, I have heard my colleague from district 19 repeatedly argue that when we consider boards, particularly this sort of tactic authority and defending authority that he wants elected officials having oversight responsibility over that, not appointed representatives.

And I think this is the same thing.

We still have the oversight, it is not what the mayor recommend but still come to us for approval, so it is not a unilateral decision.

I am in the import of councilmember ackerson.

>> thank you, councilmember.

Need further discussion?

>> on fever, please say hi.

>> all post?

Is there any further discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I would like to make an amendment to the current under section one, letter c number two

. I would like that to read, I'm just going to read the whole section.

After the meeting, but I will read the entirety of it.

It'll read other individuals who defied the mayor, who shall be owners or the representatives of lining properties within the district.

Mayoral appointments, considered subsections will be

individuals by the local constitution and the subsection.

I will make that and the forward motion.

>> do I have a second?

We have a second.

Is there any discussion?

>> MR. PRESIDENT, just to collaborate, just to be clear about what this would do, this would still get the mayor's own appointment two persons as they would come from indicated, a short list of individuals that he can still select to the position.

Thank you.

>> thank you.

Is there any further discussion, counsel for ackerson?

>> thank you, MR. Preident.

I would speak out against this amendment, with mayor elect greenberg or mayor elect their own.

It still applies.

Try not to tie the hands of the administration.

The problem with this is amendment that is being proposed, a list of eight people.

That is going to come from the ford.

Now the best case scenario, this board has to come up with these eight folks.

In this case, worst case scenario, the list of eight members trying to stack the particular position on how they want to drive this board.

I would prefer that this body reject that and leave it in the hands of this administration to

make these appointments.

Thank you, sir.

>> thank you, counsel member.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

For those of us who have sat on committees to approve appointments, it won't come as any surprise that very often it is difficult to find qualified folks who are interested in taking these positions on the boards and commissions.

And quite honestly, it is helpful if someone who understands the work that is to be done were in fact offering the names of individuals.

And so it doesn't prevent the mayor from being able to make choices.

Actually, it offers the mayor a good bit of assistance.

I would propose to you that if the association sent over a list of eight names, and the mayor didn't like any of the names on that list, he could certainly send that list back and say you know, I couldn't find anybody on this list that I found acceptable.

And please send me a different list.

That is exactly the same opportunity that we have as special counsel members when the mayor sends over an appointment to the committee.

If we aren't satisfied with that appointment, we can certainly vote no and then send it back to the mayor and can propose someone else.

So I certainly don't see this in any way, shape, or form as a limit on the mayor's ability to

make choices.

I agree with my counsel in district 19 that it would seem more appropriate that folks who are more directly involved in the particular business would have some influence or some background.

I would encourage to vote yes.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN

>> yes, sir.

And regards to the district 11, I would say this.

As I would suspect any administration would be turning to the industry looking for the right people.

However, your concern, or your assurances that a mayor could reject or we could reject the language that has been proposed in this amendment, let's be clear about what that languages.

It says the word shall, not MAY.

Shall, which is a requirement. language that has been proposed in this amendment. The mayoral pointing considered under the sub section. Shall be made from a list of eight individuals submitted by the louisville hotel ministration.

So to me, if we don't like any of those, we are going to have to choose two of those eight because we shall.

So let's be clear about that.

Just on this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

>> thank you. Is there any further discussion?

All in favor please say aye all oppose?

MADAME Clark?

Please open the role for voting.

This is not the ackerson amendment, this is a vote on councilmember piagentini's opinion.

>> no.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, you have five yes votes and 19 no votes.

>> thank you the proposed amendment for councilmember piagentini fails.

Was there any further discussion?

MADAME Clark, please open the pole for voting.

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

You have 25 yes votes.

>> thank you, the amendment passes.

MADAME Clark, please read item number 49.

>> section 131.011 31.02 and 131.03 of the local metro code ellen seo relating to camping on metro property in sections 42.31, 40 2.32 and 42.99 of the local metro board regrading to the camping in metroparks and section 97.072 and 97.9999 of the ellen seo regarding the obstruction of sidewalk and public ways, amendment by substitution, as amended.

>> motion.

>> seconded by councilmember piagentini.

>> thank you.

I would like to invoke rule 511

d. Thank you.

>> thank you.

Motion to vote limits debate.

We have a second councilmember, all those in favor please say aye.

All oppose?

The ayes habit.

This counsel men, george?

>> thank you, PRESIDENT.

This ordinance has spent months in committee with lot of discussion to community.

To my knowledge I have not turned down one meeting request from anyone specific to support your concern and it comes after spending a significant amount of time in community related to engagement and assessment.

And before we open the discussion tonight, I want us to start with being on the same page which is to say there are lots of problems to be solved in our community.

Lots of problems.

Yes, it is true we have a significant deficit and an array of housing needs.

Yes, it is true that we have gaps in behavioral health services and our response we also have communities where our inability for standard related to use of public space has a disproportionate impact on those most reliant on that public space. Those who have less connection, less housing choice , and an array of collective disadvantage related with health, income, access, just to name a few.

If it isn't clear what this ordinance hopes to achieve, it is possible you MAY not live in a neighborhood where you see the challenges daily.

If anyone is interested in learning more, I would encourage looking at the publicly available data around

where we see high concentrations of neighbors in crisis and camped.

What you will find is that it is an issue not equally felt across our community.

It is disproportionately found in a qualified census tracts in areas with less opposable capacity to offset any challenges.

So the ordinance seeks to address the use of public space in three different forces of existing code.

The first section is in the protections section. And it essentially allows more time for outreach.

To respond before something constitutes an encampment.

It takes it from 48 hours to 72 hours.

And it also provides protections for those encampments that don't present imminent risk.

This request was made by our homeless services division in response to the fact that the target was largely arbitrary, and was not realistic in terms of what their capacity is to uphold.

The sextant subsidence change involves parks.

Parks have had an existing policy that says no camping.

What we had in ordinance was language that said only overnight camping was prohibited.

What this ordinance does is it clearly defines camping that is for the purposes of this subsection, camping shall mean

the use of a park location for temporary accommodation purposes or habitation.

It also includes facilities so that no person shall prevent the shared use of a park facility or asset, otherwise open to the public.

And again, if we are left wondering what the point is, as have been raised by the media, I would say the point is that those most dependent on parks and access to it MAY want to ensure access to, say, our ball field dugouts or pavilions in our parks system.

The third piece that this ordinance seeks to address is a section previously titled blocking sidewalks.

When we started down this path with our partners, we were told that this section was unconstitutional that it was a layover from premerger, and couldn't be enforced.

We have retitled it about personal property obstructing pedestrian traffic on public ways.

And has allowed for enforcement in a civil process which doesn't contain a fine, and instead, removes sessions in blocking access to the right-of-way.

With that, I am happy to answer questions and I would encourage any cosponsors to share experience and I appreciate all the work that has gone into this.

We have certainly shifted in response to this.

The feedback we have received from the community.

Not the same ordinance that we started with. And I'm confident we are in a much better place with it in terms of what it hopes to achieve and what is important to all community members. Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> I have a chair of the committee and this is something that is, we just have to think about all people of our community. You know, not just the homeless individual.

There are marginally people, marginal people that have struggles, as well.

And they can't just get up and leave their home to get away from problems that are in their neighborhood.

So this is just an equity issue, in my opinion.

And I will be against bote.

>> councilmember helen are?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I want to spend a few minutes discussing the ordinance passed 2018, and recounting the history of this legislation tonight I suspect you'll hear a lot tonight about the 2018.

I note there is a lot of frustration among councilmembers.

And let's be clear, the ordinance is not what most of you are complaining about and the changes being proposed tonight aren't going to fix those issues.

If you would like to see more camp fairings, there is no reason that can't be done under the existing ordinance.

It set no limits.

If you didn't like it, we now
have pd to stand is 2% almost
in, don't have the ordinance,
it has nothing to do that.

If you think we are seeing more
homeless people in ourstreets
and are frustrated by that,
don't blame the ordinance, it
didn't put them there and it
isn't keeping them there.

If you think the administration
can handle these issues well,
don't blame the ordinance.

If you don't like pd requires a
trespass waiver to remove items
from private property, don't
blame the ordinance.

It has nothing to do with this.

The ordinance is simple, it
says you shouldn't clear a camp
and discard people's belongings
without notice and an
opportunity to work with people
to get them into better
situations before their
belongings are destroyed.

Clearings and inappropriate
areas can and do happen, many
of them.

I first learned that changes
were being discussed on a
friday filing deadline in
SEPTEMBER.

It was wild by title only.

No one knew what was in the
ordinance for four days.

People who had been working on
the streets with our house was
neighbors on these issues for
years refreshed their browsers
through tuesday to find out
what was being proposed.

And it was almost unimaginably
bad. Not mentioning homeless,
dressed up as a furthering
managing public space and

environmental justice.

It was a dramatic and unworkable crackdown on anyone placing our story anything on any public property or way with no requirement that it impeded anyone's access or created any harm or threat to anyone in anyway. And providing for immediate compensation of those items.

New fines were also included for violating those provisions.

The proposal was so extreme that it drew the immediate attention and opposition of national and local organizations the national homeless law center, and the ACLU.

Most of which included the proposal of existing law in multiple ways.

I know that the sponsors have the best intentions, and I say that especially to the call George who has led this effort and with whom I've had very spirited discussions.

On my side, maybe too spirited eventually the sponsors agreed to modify the proposal.

Entirely deleting the storied section, modifying the new sidewalk access division and agreeing that items would be confiscated from sidewalks unless they impeded someone's access.

Even later, they agreed to modified the section to include language which triggers the ordinance only when accessed in substantially impeded pickling but from an Indianapolis ordinance, which has long protected house was neighbors

in that city.

Another suggestion from the ordinance, however, finding what a substantial impediment was was ignored.

The proposal before us also continues to say that only property attributable to a specific individual needs to be stored if it is confiscated?

Which means that most things owned by our house was neighbors won't be stored unless we can somehow get them to put their names on all their belongings.

That is of course is completely impractical.

The community was told that we needed a new law prohibiting blocking of public sidewalks because there was no state law prohibiting that.

But ellen pd testifies that on further examination, that just wasn't true.

And that existing state law already covered these issues.

And allowed for clearing sidewalks.

The ordinance was opposed by some of our very best partners.

Social service providers throughout the community who have stated it will make it more difficult to help house was neighbors and ultimately get them off the street.

We all received a letter from a broad coalition going way beyond those focused on homeless services from the association of community ministries.

Goodwill industries of kentucky.
Home of the innocent.

Metro united. The center for women and families.

Women and children, volunteers of america.

Wellspring, and the coalition for the homeless and 20 others all of those organizations understand, like all of us, and agree that sidewalks cannot be blocked, but they believe there are other ways to see that they aren't.

Several of the most organizations have suggested a joint large meeting where all concerns, suggestions, and ideas can be freely aired and that meeting simply has not occurred.

In a later move, the puzzle extends the prohibition on being in a more motor vehicle in a park, any motor vehicle, to any time of day.

It is already illegal in the nighttime hours.

But the new prohibition in the daytime, extends to individuals using the park for a temporary living accommodation purposes in other words, people who have no home and live in a car. And we have a lot of those people in this community.

That has drawn the attention of the washington fair housing council which litigates fair housing cases in kentucky and has written us all just this week to state that laws that create different penalties and rules for individuals because they are homeless have a clear disparate impact on many of the protected classes under the fair housing act.

And therefore, also violates the law.

Just last week, another lawyer, one of three sponsors of this ordinance moved to delete two sections of the ordinance on the grounds that they are confusing state power. That amendment was subjected to by the other two sponsored and ultimately ejected.

Today, the 12 organizations I mentioned above and the 20 others wrote us again say to disable this ordinance until the administration has a coordinated plan with service providers, the metro council, and the greater community. In eight years here, I don't recall us dismissing such a play from so many knowledgeable people that we respect.

But here we are.

The ordinance is certainly an improvement from the taccone inversion we introduced in SEPTEMBER.

And I thank you for that and particularly COUNCILWOMAN George.

Fines, including for the entirely new section councilmember mona he'll try to delete have been left.

I thank the sponsors, but I especially thank the hundreds of loyal civilians who spoke up for the house was neighbors and for what is protected and what is counterproductive.

I don't know how this ordinance will be enforced by the greensburg administration assuming it passes tonight.

I am grateful that the community

and lawyers who protect the right of our most vulnerable citizens will be watching closely. And I hope metro council will be watching too. After all, we were the body that said nearly unanimously, 19-2 in 2018, and more recently when a camp was cleared on market street in one of the coldest night of the year, that destroying possessions of house was neighbors was unaccountable. We'd talk tonight a lot about our memories of being and counsel I'm going to tell you one of my memories and one of the biggest ones that will live with me forever.

In 2020 at 4:00 A.M.

On langford avenue, I went to a tent and we were encouraged, of course, to try to get the people in the tent to talk to us and fill out forms.

There was a gentleman in the tent who didn't want to speak and I was encouraged to go talk to him.

He looked at me through his tent and said I know you, you were there when I was last cleared from camp. And he was right, I was.

I had gone to that camp clearing.

I had gone to lots of camp clearings and then I started talking to him about all the camps he had been cleared from. And there were multiple camps. Moving people from place to place isn't a plan, and it's cool.

As hud secretary marsha recently in houston, no

community has ever solved homelessness by banning it, sweeping, and moving encampments from one area to

-

another the style of homelessness, we must offer people housing and services they so desperately need.

C1

>> thank you.

>> we know there are policies in the mayor's administration laws locally and laws of the state level to address concerns that this ordinance tries to come in a few weeks, will have a new merrill administration that will enforce these policies and laws delay.

That being said, I motion to table this ordinance so we can make a more informed decision in the new year.

>> second, are strong?

>> thank you, second, motion.

All those in favor, say aye.

All those opposed?

>> no.

>> motion fails.

COUNCILMAN Arthur?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I don't think anyone disagrees that public space should be accessible to all members of the public.

The disagreement is what happens when that is challenged by a housing crisis where this city is missing over 31,000 units of household at the very bottom, and we have a shelter shortage, but we have only 750 units but just last year we saw over 10,000 people experience in helplessness.

Our housing is unaffordable. If it exists, our shelters are at capacity, and our constituents who are unhoused are in survival mode.

The stricter we get with camping, the harder we make it for the people who already have it the hardest because there is nowhere for them to go.

We know encampments are more impoverished communities. No one should have to be burdened with poverty directly or indirectly.

But as of last month, most Americans, 53% are living paycheck to paycheck. So many of our house constituents are one missed payment away from being in the same spot as our unhoused constituents.

Instead of passing policy about where they can't go, we need to focus in on policy to give them a place to go.

And that is why I will be a no, thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you, councilmember COUNCILWOMAN Chambers?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'm also to be a no vote tonight, and like the people who have spoken before me, I too understand the desire to make sure our public space is

-

accessible to everyone.

And I too believe that all of us have a right to share and enjoy our public space.

But I also believe that this ordinance is not going to accomplish that.

As the people we spoke before me said there laws on the books that could be used to address

the challenges that folks have suggested this ordinance is meant to address, things like ensuring everyone can walk freely on our sidewalks and that an individual is less to bring public safety issue to public spaces.

There at least the three laws on the books that ensure our public rights-of-way remain clear.

A state law which prohibits someone from obstructing a highway or public passage.

The passage is defined very similarly to how it is in this ordinance.

Additionally, there are two metro codes of ordinances that address specific behavior that could lead to obstructing a sidewalk, street, and alley, or a public way.

I have no citations if anyone would like to see them.

There are also numerous laws to ensure that everyone can enjoy our public space.

I have a list of about 10 here, I'm just going to read excerpts from a couple.

Disorderly conduct in the second degree inhibits anyone from creating a hazardous physically conditioned by any act that serves no legitimate purpose in the public space.

We have harassment laws which say no one in the public they should make a sickly forced utterances, gestures, or displays or addressing abusive language to anyone present.

Also have heard concerns about people with substance use

issues, using needles, things like that, loitering under state law, prohibits them from remaining in a public place for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance so the laws on the books offer all of the tools needed to address the challenges the sponsor seeks to solve.

And we aren't utilizing the potential of the roles we already have and I hope that we would all be suspect of creating new laws and new roles when the old ones aren't being enforced or used to their potential.

When I asked earlier about the value add of this new law, I was given an answer about how this is going to set a community standard around how we share our public space.

But I am not sure how this new law will set community standards better or differently than these other long standing laws have.

I also truly believe the laws aren't going to solve any of the problems it sets out to.

Let's be clear this ordinance authorizes the city to find poor people.

For people with very few possessions, monetary fines will be ineffective at changing their behavior.

I think even the sponsors acknowledge that earlier because they have nowhere else to go and no other option to take.

But although these fines will not and if it the public, they will not change their behavior,

they will hurt our most vulnerable neighbors.

The city can bring a collection action for unpaid fines, they can garnish someone's very minimal wages a person can be kept out of housing until outstanding fines are paid.

Even if the city never takes the collection action, a person is left worried that any day the city will come and take the few things they might have if they finally start to get there fighting.

If someone tries to appeal these fines, they will go to civil court where they have no right to an attorney and no ability to challenge the appropriateness, execution, or legality of these fines.

Courts that have considered similar types of ordinances have found that they are often up wide in unconstitutional ways and are most vulnerable neighbors are unlikely to know how to protect their rights in the circumstances.

At the end of the day, I have the same question I still had earlier, what is the purpose of this ordinance actually?

If it is not just to find people who are poor, there are other laws on the books we could utilize and other strategies we have not fully examined.

Because I am worried about the constitutionality of this law, and quite rightly, the message it sends to our most vulnerable residents about their value and their place in our community,

I will be a no vote tonight.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'm a big supporter of funding
for the least among us, are
homeless or any other group of
folks that are less fortunate
than the average person.

I have been supporting of that
and I think my voting record is
pretty consistent on that.

But this is really not a
homeless issue.

It's a mental illness and
substance, addicting issue that
we need to address.

And I believe that a large
number of the folks that we are
talking about, if we had houses
for them, they probably
wouldn't be in them, at least
not the 45 I've seen today.

These are not people that are
in our sidewalks and their
eddie bauer sleeping bags.

These are people shooting heroin
, shooting methamphetamine,
urinating, defecating in a
bucket outside of an elementary
school in the case of a woman
that COUNCILWOMAN Ballard and I
kind of shared back and forth.

Homeless, it's an issue because
her family put her out due to
the substance abuse, due to
mental illness. They could no
longer take care of her, they
were unable.

And now the government has
become enable her.

Government is doing what the
families saw the entire ship
sinking, the actions of a few.

And that is what we've got on
our street with mental illness.

Substance abuse, and if we can attack that, which is a big attack, trust me, I read a study out of California, we went to a house in, and it was an absmal failure because people going into housing still , with thir mental illness untreated, their drug addiction , and they were becoming a problem there until they burned the place down.

Because so many neighborhood complaints so we've got to deal with the core of the issue, just throwing money at this is not the answer.

And I agree it is our job to defend the least among us, the substance abuse, the mentally ill.

But when I raise my right hand and took this job I also swore to take up and speak on behalf of everyone else.

There was 32, 33 advocates fighting that speak for these folks, one of my colleagues said nobody speaks for Jane down the street who has this in her front yard.

I do, that is why she elected me.

It is my job to speak for Jane. Lives down the street from that.

I will be supporting this and I will be voting yes because I am thinking of everyone else at least, well, everybody, if I'm right on that but to direct the homeless issue, it just keeps getting worse and worse and worse and that is because homelessness is really not the issue.

It is something else and we are missing that.

>> thank you.

>> thank you, counsel man.

COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> thank you, PRESIDENT.

I want to circle back to the piece unlocking sidewalks.

It was mentioned that during committee there had been a move to strike and have her tonight that there are questions about enforcing existing roles all ready on the books.

We heard several terraces mentioned, blocking sidewalks, trespassing, loitering my understanding is that 525.140 is a misdemeanor.

It is in this demeanor.

So if we want to strike, the current process around blocking sidewalks, that leaves us with the ability to enforce with a misdemeanor.

The current ordinance allows for another way. Allows for another approach that potentially, that doesn't even exist yet, that potentially is in between somewhere what we have in the way of outreach and what we would see with law enforcement.

No one has addressed the concerns of our partners but there is a question to be asked about whose shoulders the challenges of those being in survival mode?

Who speaks, who speaks for them?

We do our house was community a disservice and, quite frankly, anybody labeled as poor, when you lump everyone together around these activities that we

seek to address related to access to public space. I have said this before and I will say it again, unfortunately I know many people who are either housing insecure or who are homeless and these are not the same people who, quite rightly, will camp in an unmanaged alley across the street from a grandmother raising her grandkids.

And finally, I would say again, if we are unconvinced of what the problem is and the goal, I would encourage anyone to visit the 300 block of Florence.

South Rutland or any, there is an array of street in district 21.

I know I'm not alone because I'm looking at the numbers.

Of where it is affordable housing, and is not uncommon to see an encampment behind someone's house.

Or in an unmanaged alley or an apartment or at a bus stop.

So again, I am encouraging support of this ordinance and for us to rethink the way we think about access to public space and, again, who is most at need, in need of access and whose shoulders the challenges that come with our cities and ability to address the needs that we both equally have to do which is to uphold the standards for those communities, as well as ensure needs for our most vulnerable.

Thank you.

>> thank you.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I will try to be brief a lot

of this has already been said
but I do want to acknowledge
COUNCILMAN Allender makes a
good point.

Something I think that many of
us believe, we have all believe
for quite a while.

The strategy in dealing with
encampments, we just keep
moving the problem and that is
not a solution, not a long-term
solution.

I am pleased with this counsel
that they are looking at more
permanent solutions, looking at
for the most vulnerable and
permanent housing in the
future.

I know that has been done in a
number of places.

Unfortunately we are not there,
I think it is 2025 on a project
that will come online.

In the meantime, you know, we
do have this ordinance that was
adopted by this counsel and I
do want to say the sponsors,
the three of us committed to do
this in a vacuum.

We heard from our enforcement
agencies, every agency that

-

touches this.

We heard from them.

We had a meeting and they said
things aren't clear to us. What
was ironic to us, because we
kept seeing the same problems
we see no camping signs and we
say there has been a risk
assessment done here and we
would expect them, somebody
could come and camp there.
But what repeatedly happened
was somebody would go, they
would turn, they would go, the

would return.

They would go and return.

We would ask what is going on
and they would say well,
police, because apparently you
don't have to do, the divisions
would apply.

They say it wasn't clear to
them that they could enforce
it.

So this ordinance, in some
ways, tries to take the intent
of what was done in 2019 and
make it a reality.

Again, it is not a perfect
solution.

Is not going to solve
everything.

It is designed, though, when
there is placing to be a high
risk place, to be able to clear
it quickly.

And that is not happening.

That hasn't happened, and it
doesn't happen.

So I do think long-term, we got
to look at more solutions.

You know, I think we hear about
tight budgets.

I know in 2019, we all took a
difficult boat.

We closed places like the
living room.

The living room could still be
open today but it is not.

We made some tough choices.

And so some of this rests with
us.

We don't have the right
resources.

We don't have the resources,
maybe, that we need in this
area and other areas.

At that is for another day.

I just, I do support this
ordinance.

I support this ordinance
because not only if we think it
might be a problem, it was our
agencies that came to us and
said it was a problem.

Again, I've talked to social
service agencies on that list.

So again, we didn't do this
without having input.

So I would ask for your
support.

Thank you.

>> jing you..

>> thank you MR. PRESIDENT.

I will keep it short and sweet.

I support this ordinance is not
at this time I said this in
caucus.

The easiest and most concise
way is a battle between poor
and working poor.

And it is a question of who we
prioritize COUNCILMAN Winkler
says what comes first, the
chicken or the egg?

I support this ordinance
because I understand the
premise.

I live in the community where I
have said in millions of times,
I have mothers, living in
subsidized housing.

Who have camps next-door to
their housing, camps with her
kids outside.

Playing outside of their front
yard.

The kids cannot come outside.
But at the same time, when you
sit down and have a
conversation with a lot of
these folks, they are battling
mental illness.

They are battling substance

-

abuse. The question is where do

we send this?

And until we have better options, I heard member molehill speak about the living room. Until we provide options, the question is where do you go? We can't keep moving them around.

I am not sure that this is a solution but I'm going to say I'm not sure if any of our ordinances are the right solution.

That said, I feel like this goes halfway.

And I have said I would really welcome greenberg administration coming in here, the new ministration coming in, coming together with the solution that complements this ordinance.

And that is why I will be supporting, complementing this ordinance with options to be able to provide resource.

Right now my fear is that if we move in and they come back, you find them and then COUNCILMAN Armstrong did point out that even though we haven't necessarily find them, we could.

And then that puts people in the very precarious situation.

I cannot support this at this time but I do told COUNCILMAN George this, I support the effort.

I understand the premise.

But there is something about this in which does not sit right with me. We have people that are battling for their lives. And we are worried about decorum.

And for that reason, I can't put decorum before the health and safety of folks that are struggling.

No one wants to be out in the streets.

That is the first issue that I have to prioritize.

So I will be a know at this point, but I think everyone for their work.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> thank you.

I just want to say, I think regardless of what happens with this ordinance, I don't make any of us believe that one, I don't think anyone has the intention or desire to criminalize homelessness.

I don't think any of us believe that this is the last action that we are or need to take on the issue.

I think we all recognize that there is a significant challenge before us.

that there is a significant gap in access to housing, access to mental health services, access to substance abuse services.

I think everybody in the advocacy community should know that I think we are all committed to continuing work towards that goal or with a new administration.

And hopefully have a plan for how we are going to address and ensure that we can help house those most warble among us.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

Is there any further discussion?

Hearing none, this is important

required roll car vote.

MADAME Clerk, please call the
role for those not present?

>> council member shanklin?

>> no.

Know.

>> I got you, ma'am, I'm so
sorry.

MR. PRESIDENT, 16 yes votes and
ate no boats.

>> thank you, th ordinance

passes.

MADAME Clerk, read item number
50.

>> a resolution urging the
implementation of the parks for
all action plan recommendations
to equitably invest in and
advance the louisville metro
public parks system and the
louisville parks and recreation
department.

(Amendment by substitution)

Read in full.

>> motion by COUNCILMAN
Winkler, seconded by clement
ingle.

The ordinance to support the
resolution, is there any
discussion, councilmember ella?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

this resolution is urging the
implementation of the parks for
all action plans.

So that this ensures the
equitable investment throughout
our park system that has been
lacking for such a long time.

Investment in our system parks,
where there hae been a few if
any investment made in the last
20 years.

So I am looking forward to
seeing what becomes of our
parks now.

It is going to be refreshing. So

I urge your support.

>> thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN Dorsey?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT

MADAME Clerk I would like to be added as a sponsor

COUNCILWOMAN Skyler, if I MAY, I am in support of this.

It is a evidence based approach that has been taken a couple of years to accomplish but brooke and her team have gone about a very strategic and intentional way of honing through mounds of data to provide for us a pathway forward as to how we move with our parks.

It is not political, it really is the best way in which we view a equitable approach to looking at how we invest in our parks.

But really that is just an arm of our community.

And so COUNCILWOMAN Fowler, I applaud your work in making sure that this has gone all the way through.

I know it has taken a couple of years to do that.

But I really would encourage my colleagues to support this.

To me, having a group like parks foundation, that feeds some of the weaknesses within our own internal government takes it upon themselves to take on a project like this and then give it back to us in the true commitment of a community partner.

I also want to shout out for seeing that within our metroparks, taking it on, giving it back to govnrnment so that we as legislators can make

an informed decision.

So please add me as a sponsor,
COUNCILWOMAN Fowler,
congratulations.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Councilmember piagentini?

>> I appreciate being able to
also be added as a cosponsor.

Part of the reason, I wanted to
sign onto this, as I mentioned
during the community hold, I
think it is important to
distinguish their initial
calculations for the cif money.

I'm not sure if you have a
second guess or question how to
spend their money, everybody
has prioritize but they can
prioritize.

Some of them, including myself,
have put some of that money
into, up until redistricting, I
think I had a very town at long
run.

Had anything going on.

I got called like hey, the air
conditioning went out.

You can't do confessions unless
somebody does this.

And pull it out. Just general
maintenance.

So you know, the point is
saying that I think if you took
those numbers out it's even
worse, right?

And again, what I do also like
about this plan, and I'm going
to make this plea to my
colleagues across the street,
is that like we did in rose,
we're not going to fix this
overnight just like
homelessness, but parks for
maintenance on facilities.

Pick a topic that we know we
have not had strategy on.

We need strategy, met
strategies that transcend the
term of all of us sitting here.

Okay?

That includes the mayor and his
two term limits.

That includes many of us.

We need to get ourselves on a
trajectory we can make the
budget we know what decision
they are making and how these
next three and five years play
out.

Not like hey great I got this
thing and I have no idea what
exterior is like.

So I really like that about it
realistic expectations for a
multiyear plan to try to get
back to different approaches.

So thank you, again, to
COUNCILWOMAN Fowler that
spearheaded this. I appreciate
to join as cosponsor.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

The men are there?

>> thank you.

I am proud to be a sponsor.

-

I just want to encourage the
public to stay involved. This
plan is the plan because people
responded to surveys.

People give their input and
really helped create something,
reinforce what a lot of us
already saw and experienced and
felt and new and now I want to
take that plan and actually
take action on it.

So alliance.Org, you can see
the timeline of that engagement
you can also sign up to get
notifications throughout next
steps, and you can see the
action plan there, as well.

So I encourage that, thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN Fowler?

>> I just want to say that we have already passed something allocated funding to make sure that there is a nationwide search for a director that will be able to implement this plan. And to, you know, in the way that needs to happen so that we see the outcomes that we need here.

So I'm excited about that and also I think that without our funding from cis, I mean, so many parks would just be without.

I mean, I know when I first came into office, you know, the events that I had to put in and I got nothing from the parks department to help with the, you know, the revamping of some valley park's.

So I appreciate everybody here that has invested in the parks in their districts because without that, we just really would be in a whole lot worse shape than we are now.

Thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'm going to ask you echo some of the colleagues about city funding and the way that some of the parks have seen improvements. I will take you just one step further.

It doesn't take much searching through but it's to see where the majority of the money in parks has been spent and it has not been in areas that this community, where the largest

percentage of the population lives.

And that is one of the things that this study addressed was where are we actually spending the money?

And for those, for some of them again to my colleagues, and, there was no money in the mayor's budget for some of the parks in our community.

The only resources spent there were spent because council members chose to use their city money.

I would caution not my colleagues so much but as folks carry on conversations around the question of equity and the way we spend money on parks, let's don't get confused and think that equity equals spending more money in urban parks.

I was talking to a resident of what used to be my district before redistricting, he lives just the other side of breckenridge lane for my district.

And he was commenting that an african-american, and someone who understands what goes on, he has seen where resources not come anywhere near where he lives.

I used to, before redistricting, again, I represented klondike lane, and there is a park there that we spent a little bit of capital infrastructure fund to take care of some of the equipment and the park and take care of a few things.

But demographic of that

neighborhood has shifted considerably. There are more folks who are in minority status , living in and around that area then there are folks and what would be considered the majority of the population. And yet, that park would not, has not received any funding except money that was put in through construction funds. I think today that part is now COUNCILMAN Ackerson's district. It wouldn't surprise me if he hasn't spent his own cif in that park because if you didn't, it wouldn't be funded, and there were roads in there, at least there were, colleague and 26.

At there were people who played soccer over there all the time. The only way those fields are maintained.

Through cif money.

So again, I am supporting this.

This report that is before us with an eye towards what it truly means to support parks all across metro louisville within I specifically.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

Is there any further discussion?

Hearing none, this is the resolution allowing for a voice mode, all those in favor, please aye.

All opposed?

The ayes habit.

The resolution passes.

Please note that COUNCILMAN Winkler will have the chair.

>> MADAME Clerk, a reading of item 51.

>> an ordinance relating to the

decision of the planning commission to improve the revised district proposed in case number 22 ddp 0098 for the property located at 13905 aiken road as amended.

>> a motion of the second, the emotion, COUNCILMAN Triplett, the motion is for us.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

The planning and zoning committee reviewed the development plan on this piece of property, the applicant is proposing to construct a concrete bastion mixing plant just north of lake forest.

The property was owned in 1982 for m3 on 168 acres next to an existing quarry for these type purposes.

In 1984, cup wa obtained for quarry operations.

There was a development plan approved earlier under docket number 21 ddp 011 subsequently , the applicant has proposed a new development plan that opposed additional screenings, planting, and it also reduces the scale of operations from the previous plat on the 5.4 acres that are in front of us today.

We also added a binding element number 16 to add language for future approval by metro council if additional changes were to occur in the development plan for the use of the property.

It is the standard, I am just paraphrasing the standard language that we put on there. COUNCILMAN Piagentini's district, he MAY wish to

address us.

[Laughter]

>> I've got news, colleague,
and I got bad news.

The good news is we're going to
request to table this because I
want to publicly thank all
parties involved, public as
well as the applicant for
continuing to negotiate the
discussions the county attorney
today.

As of this afternoon, all
parties requested a little more
time to sort things out.

We do have until JANUARY the
30th, which is the deadline for
action. So the good news is,
I'm going to request, a motion
to table this. All parties a
little more time to agree on an
additional element of this that
they are working on.

The bad news is, of course,
that if you are sticking
around, we will have to vote on
this on the JANUARY 3rd
formation meeting.

But what I commit to you is one
of only two things were going
to have at that meeting.

It will be this same version
with just one abiding element
or there will be a fully agreed
to concluded amendment to bring
to the form all parties agree
to.

So it should not be an issue
once we get there should be a
pretty quick vote.

With that, I'm going to motion
to table.

>> motion to table, is there a
second?

All those in favor say aye any
oppose?

The ayes habit. The motion is tabled.

MADAME Clerk, a reading of item 52.

>> an ordinance relating to the decision of the planning commission to approve the revised district development plan proposed in case no. 22-ddp-0067.

(As amended)

>> a motion to second?

Motion becomes a triple the second, any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This, again, is the front of us , a change in the development plan.

It was brought back to us by resolution of last council meeting.

Two continuous parcels were rezoned in 2021 from r42r5 a.

That patio home cell development.

Revised development plan for poses a total of 47 units, townhouse style developments on 7.34 acres.

The density, we also added binding element number 10, which states that the density shall not exceed 7.49 units per acre, and we also added binding element number 11 that states, again, if there is a change in the use, if there's a change in the development plan that it comes back to metro council for final approval.

This is COUNCILMAN Denton's district, he MAY wish to address us.

>> thank you, 10.

I appreciate the counsel looking at this.

I appreciate if you all would vote, sometimes you just cannot let things that we go to zoning and people think of, they come back and they let fire changes, and nobody knows about it. So this is a good amendment and we really appreciate y'all support.

>> any further discussion?

Hearing none, an ordinance requiring a roll call vote for the chambers.

MADAME Clerk could you please record my vote as a yes?

>> sure.

Councilmember Shanklin?

>> yes.

PRESIDENT, oh, sorry.

>> yes.

>> 23 yes votes and zero no votes.

>> thank you.

The item passes.

MADAME Clerk, a reading of item 53?

>> an ordinance amending ordinance no.

168, series 2021 relating to the second round of the American Rescue Plan (ARP)

Local fiscal recovery by transferring a portion of the funds relating to compliance and reporting (Lat-0059) To premium pay (Lat-0056) To be administered by the office of management and budget and amending ordinance no.

090, series 2021 relating to the first hundred days of the American Rescue Plan (ARP)

Local fiscal recovery by transferring a portion of the funds relating to residential services for substance abuse

and addiction (Lat-0004) To winter 2022 crisis mitigation program to be administered by the office of resilience and community services (Amendment by substitution).

Read in full.

>> motion to second?

>> council member piagentini, the ordinance the force, was there any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

The amendment by substitution moves money from compliance and reporting to previous bay, so we have \$15 million reserved in arp money for compliance and reporting, this is \$6.4 million that premium pay, that money has already been spent.

It also moves \$300,000 from public health, which is inappropriate for some covid needs to homelessness and affordable housing to community services, the agency to provide services to homeless individuals and families.

During this winter.

Pack. I urge your approval.

>> thank you, is there any further discussion?

Seeing none, this is an ordinance requiring a roll call vote, MADAME Clerk, please open the role.

MADAME Clerk, please record my vote as a yes.

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

MR. PRESIDENT?

>> thank you, motion passes.

, reading, item 54.

>> an ordinance establishing a development area pursuant to provisions of krs 65.7041-

65.7083 to be known as the 811-823 west main street development area, designating the metro development authority, inc.

As an "agency", adopting a development plan, approving entering into a local participation agreement, authorizing the payment of the "released amount" pursuant to the terms and conditions of the local participation agreement, requiring the submission of regular reports to louisville/jefferson county metro government and authorizing the execution and delivery of any other documents and the taking of any other actions necessary to accomplish the purposes authorized by this ordinance (As amended).

Read in full.

>> motion to second?

>> motion by council member piagentini, the ordinances of course, is there any discussion ?

>> yes.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This was added to open this to allow for the solution at the M.O.U.

For the community benefits agreement.

I'm going to turn this over to the primary sponsor, council member offer.

>> thank you so much. The approval, we just had to look here to see that we had this agreement was attached you could review that port memorandum with the ordinance itself.

Benefits are retiring, the reduction program for food but also insurance, appliances, wage floor, emergency shelter, a lot of businesses want to work with us on the benefit constituent in the district but also localized, thank you.

>> thank you.

Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, this is an ordinance requiring a roll call vote.

Will open up the voting in chambers.

MADAME Clerk, will you please record my vote as a yes?

>> council member shaklin?

>> yes.

>> MADAME Clerk, will you please call for James Byrd?

>> council member James?

>> okay, the voting is closed.

>> 24 yes votes and zero no.

>> okay, the ordinance passes.

-

MADAME Clerk, please let the record reflect that I am giving the chair back to PRESIDENT James.

C1

an ordinance relating to the
>> zoning of properties located at 6500 Forest Cove Lane, 7301 River Road and parcel ID no. 020600480000 containing approximately 9.76 acres and being in Louisville Metro (Case no.

22zone0002).

(As amended) Read in full.

>> COUNCILMAN Arthur, the ordinance as reported, any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.
You MAY recognize the name of

this prospect home, and that is because under 60 zone 1056, that was in 2016, we had a change in zoning from our seven that was approved by the planning commission that recommended for approval the metro council denied the change in, changes, we now have a new prospect home development in front of us, the proposal calls for hundred and 70 acres multi family unit built on one three-story complex.

It looks like two horses meeting together.

The proposed density is 18.23 dwelling units per acre.

Our seven perits 34 for 34.8 points per unit.

So it is less than what could be built on the property we did a binding element number nine, which is standard language about the change development changes building like et cetera that must require metro council approval.

This is elfman and scott reed's district

>> thank you.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I have a statement to read.

In 2017, the metro council denied a proposal for developing a property that we are in review today.

in making our decisions, at that time, we listened to reason the new proposal before us today includes the most concerns . An effort to compromise, I request that this be reduced by five feet.

This change would not require the production of levels of the

building, and I also saw they have the maximum number of units capped at 60.

The proposal being reduced to 61,150 square feet.

Unfortunately, we are heading into a long break in transitions of seven or more new members of the metro council set to join us on the new year.

These factors reduced our time to try to work out our concerns in time for tonight's meeting have led me to refrain from voting on the matter.

I very strongly feel that this is a request made reasonable and its effect on the profitability of the project that reflects the concerns of tonight long held regarding proposals for the property and they were clearly identified as our concerns.

Just today, the developer for this project proposed binding elements offered through an attorney to find an accessible compromise leaving us with a proposal as was passed out of committee.

Because of the unwillingness to developers to find any compromise of these proposals, and because this building will be taller than his adjoining properties and will be completely out of place with the area, voting against the proposal, I ask for your

-

support of upholding the denial of zoning for this property for the defining the fact that it will now offer the motion.

>> so motion being made by
COUNCILMAN Reed, do we have a
second?

>> yes.

>> second, member piagentini.

>> in denial of the --

>> go ahead, concilman.

>> I'm sorry?

>> would you like me to go
ahead?

>> not yet, not yet.

>> I apologize.

-

>> standby.

So you made the motion?

Oh, councilmember piagentini,
thank you.

Under discussion, COUNCILMAN
Reed.

>>, to turn over to travis for
sending the fact.

>> thank you all, city council
attorney.

It is fairly lenthly so bear
with me but I will get through
it as best as I can.

Whereas the legislative counsel
overturns county metro
government, the council has
considered the evidence
presented at the public health
by the louisville planning
commission and the
recommendations of the staff
set out in minutes and the
record of the planning
commission for 22 zone 0022 and
whereas the council rejects the
findings of the planning
commission for the zoning change
in case 22 zone 0002, and has
made alternative findings that
based on the planning
commission's record the support
maintaining the existing armed
force single-family residential

and O.R.

One office residential zoning designation.

And whereas the council makes the following findings based upon the record established, 22 zone 0002, rejects the recommendation for the planning commission and maintains the existing single family residential and O.R.

One office residential zoning designations on property located at 7301 river road and parcel I.D.

020600 or 00 and being in piagentini louisville metro.

More subsidence piece.

Whereas the proposal is not going to play out in the community forum because the scale and the site different substantially from the nearby development very compatible.

Whereas the proposal is not entirely, subset section 7 and public transportation exists on or near the site despite the high density and the low parking spaces per unit mentioned in the proposal.

Whereas the proposal does not go out with the proposal one subsection nine, they already provide a range of density for our six.

Some of which are admitted along longer property lines with nearby nonresidential uses.

As a result, increasing density rather than providing a more appropriate transition.

And whereas the proposal does not cloud the committee form goal one, subsection 16, because the opposition rates to

predict extras that speak about potential health concerns regarding residential development, the particulars and omissions which would have the potential to impact a great many more people than would be allowed under the current zoning.

And whereas the proposal occupied the community forum section 20, we had individual intrusion of the building does not, and likely cannot be mitigated as it proposed height and size.

And where the proposal for subsection four because they already existing activities there located already existing postemployment center or the transit available nearby. And whereas the proposal for goal three, subsection 14 because while it will be compliant, nearby parking proposed serving development, giving lack of transit availability and whereas the proposal does not comply the housing goal one, subsection two, because proposed transportation exists on or near the site. And whereas the proosal for housing goal to subsection two because mode of transportation exists on or near the site despite the identity of the proposal.

And whereas one of those reasons that the proposal does not comply with the abducted conference a plan of 2040 and as such should not be improved. Now the government as follows, section 1 of the zoning

properties located at six 500 south lane and river road, 020600 480000 containing a properly.6 acres in louisville metro as people will describe. 22 zone 0002 shall remain part four, zero family residential, residential building, and O.R. One, officer residential at the recommendation of the planning commission is in that case, is rejected section 2 of the ordinance will take effect, take effect on its approval or otherwise. I'm available for any questions.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN Reed.

>> I think I have nothing further to add questions to me?

>> thank you, councilmember.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I oppose this amendment. Plan 2040 provides for a diverse range of housing choices in all neighborhoods.

The village formed district states that a diversity of housing types that MAY be higher in density than the rest of the district are encouraged.

This is a property with affordable housing units that are within walking distance of banks, restaurants, kroger store, churches, and fire and ems.

I have been an advocate for housing and more density in housing throughout this community.

I know I have spoken about projects in blackwell's district.

I have spoken about projects and councilmember tipper's

district. I spoke about projects in my district, all of which were opposed by many neighbors who said this is not compatible. The site lines aren't the same. There's not enough separation. We simply are not going to solve our housing issue in this community if we don't build housing everywhere. there has already been, my on this project. The original project which we turned down was 198 unit. This is 178 units . The original project we turned down was four stories, this is three stories. The impact, clearly, has been learned. I want to close just by speaking about chief carlson. I know we all watch how much the entirety of this project. I know we have all watched many planning commission meetings and how we speak of chief carlson a lt. Chief carlson closed his comments at the public hearing by saying he is not shy about opposing apartments. But that this area is very close to services has a better shot than many other remote areas where apartments have been approved and he noted the need for expanding and ensuring a diverse range of housing choices in everyday. Prospect, or near prospect cannot be an exception. So I would urge people to vote no. >> thank you, COUNCILMAN. COUNCILWOMAN Grady?

>> I just need a clarification.
Did the planning commission
approved this case?

Thank you.

>> that MAY be to me.

Yes, the planning commission
did recommend the approval of
this matter.

Unanimously, I believe.

>> did that answer your
question, COUNCILWOMAN?

C1

COUNCILWOMAN Mccready, did that
answer your question?

>> yes, I'm sorry, I was
answering another question in
my tim.

Absolutely it answers it thank
you for

>> thank you.

Council member piagentini?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

I'm going to bring up two
points of clarity.

One is, council member
hollander's point about this
site being a site that has a
best chance of getting
additional services. But my
district, again, shares numbers
with you, you can go to develop
louisville to provide the
numbers.

The second fastest, the second
most past three and half years
multi family housing units built
than any other district, second
only to, and I have lost tark
stopped in my district,
including those that adjoin
multi family housing areas.

As a matter of fact, with
councilmember cohen,
councilmember armstrong, we got
the old stadium seats and I put
them at a turn stopped in my

district right along shelby
road near some housing, and
eliminated that stop so now
I've got the seats in the
middle of nowhere and I've been
trying to move them for the
past two years because that is
how long it has been there.
And every time we have approved
multifamily housing in more
suburban areas, we yet to see
one delivery.
Of them proved public
transportation of the areas.
Again, I tel you my district
news.
And this is the other thing I
want to say, I have supported
mixed housing in my district,
and in many cases, on similarly
, again, some constituents who
didn't want to see all that
development but I generally try
to keep a prodevelopment mind.
But it occurs to me that this
argument that we want to see
different types of housing built
is false. That is not what is
happening, it is not what
anybody is advocating for.
We are subsidizing and
advocating one type of housing
and that is dense, multifamily
housing to be built in suburban
areas. That is the only way tha
we are addressing this concept
of improving mixed use housing.
I don't hear anybody in this
council trying to ease zoning
restrictions or create
subsidies for, I don't know,
single-family housing
subdivision in urban areas.
Nobody is proposing it.
I know everybody is saying well
yeah, nobody is proposing it,

that is ridiculous.

Yes.

I totally agree.

It is a ridiculous idea.

But that would be just as trying to solve this idea of creating different types of housing in similar geography. That is putting multifamily housing in rural or suburban areas.

So which is now heavily subsidized.

So I am getting a little leery of that being the only way we are trying to solve a problem, not being accompanied by tar, not being accompanied by road improvements and dollars and even the state, and I will gladly push to the state and say not so much road funding but in my district, I now have multiple projects, state road projects that were funded over a decade ago and they haven't moved or shoveled dirt in it.

It is at the point where councilmember winkler knows about some of those.

Some of them did not order our district to redistricting where we are being asked the city to repave roads to improve things to waste money because we are not getting them improved.

So this is the issue, that there is only one way we are solving this tried mixup housing thing.

Nobody is looking at it the other way.

Until we do, I will say we are not being honest about what we are attempting to do.

We are only doing one thing.

And number two, infrastructure related to transportation is not just tar, does the road issue, as well.

Not seeing deliverance from the state or the local government and I can tell you that in the current administration, in 12 years, there has been one year, that was last year, that the lobbying request from the mayor's office included road project request outside. It was the first year in 12.

So until we see the support, that is what is making it so difficult.

Again, even where I have, I've got affordable housing developments that have been bulldozed in the last four years my district.

Because they were put along in a reasonable way.

But we can't doing this without infrastructure the public transportation, the road, and be more comprehensive in solving the project was one way, which is the apartments in suburban areas without considering multifamily housing . Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

Thank you.

>> I would like a rule to limit

.

>> motion to limit debate.

All those in favor say aye?

All opposed?

The ayes habit.

Councilmember reed.

Thank you.

>> earlier I referenced the 2019 housing assessment which was passed with ordinance.

I would like to reference it again and focus on an area that is not a rental tenure area but it is one of our housing market areas and that is the area that we just so happen to be discussing right now.

The housing market area is called north east metro, and I like to share some info about the housing need in this housing market.

On the 17% of families at north east metro earn 50% or less, less than 6% of homes are affordable to those low income families.

North east metro does not have enough affordable and available homes for an estimated 407 of its 30% ami families and 527 of its 50% ami families. Almost 1000 families that do not have access to affordable housing.

The shortage of affordable and available units makes it physical for louisville families whose income is below 50% ami to find a home in northeast metro.

He goes on to say that northeast metro is home to a majority of very high income household and its medium gross rent and home value are amongst the highest in the city.

And access to opportunity is high.

So all the excuses around why this should not be there are what our PRESIDENT Calls, malarkey. And at the very top of the long list of potential strategies, it says dedicate a funding source to sustain affordable housing initiatives.

The time to improve this is now
. We shouldn't overturn it, we
shouldn't table it.

We are in a housing crisis in a
deficit.

That is why I can't wait to
support this housing, to
defeat this amendment, thanks
so much for

>> thank you.

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

And in deference to COUNCILMAN
Hollander, the same height and
larger footprint is not
authorized let's just be honest,
this is a monstrosity. It does
not fit to the area.

And the developer at any point
come back with a reasonable
compromise, we wouldn't be
having this discussion.

I would be proposing finding
the facts.

So we did, so we are where we
are, and I agree with COUNCILMAN
Piazza teeny.

We have this fiery mentality in
the city when we start building
and to with infrastructure,
tarc lines, et cetera.

So I, you know, again, had
this been half the size and
scope, we would be doing this
now.

So I urge your support and i
appreciate everyone's point of
view, thank you.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN.

Any further discussion?

Hearing none, this is an
ordinance requiring a roll call
vote.

MADAME, this is about?

>> oh, I'm sorry.

All in favor say aye.

All opposed?

MADAME Clerk, please open the role so we can be assured.

>> councilmember shanklin?

I'm sorry, man.

>> know.

>> thank you.

Thank you, ma'am, I'm so sorry.

MR. PRESIDENT, you have seven yeses and six no votes.

>> thank you.

The amendment failed.

Is there any further discussion?

Councilmember kramer?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This is more the question.

I understood that there were binding elements that came out of the committee and wasn't finding elements was that if there is a change in the development and it would have to come back to the council.

Does that include, so the property zones according to this will be zoned to allow for more units than what is actually going to be or what is being proposed. Should they decide to add more units that would be included by the 11th, right?

They would have to go back, just wanting to be certain.

>> I mean, I can read the entire language.

>> that's fine.

, thank you.

>> thank you

is there any further comment or question?

Hearing none, MADAME Clerk, please open the role foreboding.

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

Thank you, ma'am.

Okay.

Is that everyone?

You have 21 yeases and two nobles and one visit phone for

>> thank you, the ordinance passes.

And read item number 56.

>> an ordinance relating to the zoning of property located at approximately 1.91 acres and being in louisville metro (Case no.

22zone0086).

Read in full.

>> thank you.

The ordinance is reported, any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

, excuse me. The proposal on this site is to demolish a residence that is already there and construct a 95,625 square foot mini warehouse.

Most of the acreage within the city of saint matthews, this is a portion of it in the city of louisville, therefore we will, we have to also recommend approval or denial.

The planning commission recommended denial of this proposal.

The committee also voted in favor of upholding the planning commission's recommendation to deny this, so tonight vote would be to deny this zoning change.

A yes vote is to uphold the planning commission.

I will state that the city of saint matthews received a letter withdrawing the proposal.

However, we don't do that here when it gets to this point.

So therefore, it requires us to vote to either uphold or to deny

the planning commission.

But I think this, this is
COUNCILMAN Mccranie's district
I know she has much to say.

>> thank you, COUNCILMAN
Mccranie?

>> MR. PRESIDENT.

This is a case, a classic case
of the public getting involved
in our community. And I want to
urge everybody on the council
to educate their constituents on
the process of development on
whether to deny it or to
support it and how important it
is for the community to get
involved.

And they also need to
understand our role in the
process.

Because oftentimes we get an
email or a phone call to ask us
to deny development. And we are
just not in the business of
denying all development.

And this attitude of not in my
backyard has grown so wide that
we need to educate our
community on what the process is
. And gear them towards
understanding the importance of
reading the comprehensive plan,
knowing what the plan 2040 has
in it, and it is also important
for us to show up at those
meetings and hear our
constituents.

I attended every meeting
associated with this project
and I heard the voice of the
constituents. And the planning
commission understood the
dynamics of this demolishing
the community of homes and
putting these storage units
there.

While it MAY have been a great project, and it was beautiful the way they presented, it was absolutely gorgeous and they listened to the community and they changed the plan several times. But the truth of the matter is, the community got involved, they knew what they wanted and they brought their opinions. So for that reason, I encourage my colleagues to support and uphold the planning commission's recommendation to deny this project.

Thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Is there any further discussion?

Hearing none, this ordinance requiring a roll call vote.

MADAME Clerk, will you please open the roll for voting and please call the roll for those not resident in the chambers

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

MR. PRESIDENT, you have 24 yeases.

>> thank you.

The ordinance passes, MADAME Clerk, a reading of item number 57.

>> an ordinance relating to the zoning of properties located at 423 echappe lane and 9418 pirouette avenue containing approximately 10.6 acres and being in louisville metro (Case no.

22zone0004).

(As amended) Read in full.

>> motion by councilmember winkler.

Second it by council member triplett.

Any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

The applicant is requesting to rezone properties that adjoin the previously approved plan, 20 zone 0017 the proposal adds two things with a total of 32 units on 1.71 acres. This brings the total units for the entire development to 152. We also added binding elements number 15, which is the standard language about, again, about the change in density and the change of the property will come back into the metro council this is a case and point of why that binding element is so important is this is the third time we've had something come up on this piece of property. And that is why. He did vote in support of its in the community but I see that he is not here now to address us.

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

Is there any further discussion?

Hearing none, this is an ordinance requiring a roll call vote.

MADAME Clerk, please open role for voting and please call the role for those who are not present in chambers.

>> member shanklin?

>> yes.

>> thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT, you have 24 yeases.

>> thank you, the ordinance passes.

In part, the reading of item number 58

>> appropriating \$1,500 from

neighborhood development funds in the following manner: \$1,500 from district 10, to the 6th division of the louisville metro police department for the shop with a cop event this holiday season.

Read in full.

>> motion by councilmember triplett, seconded by councilmember piagentini, the appropriations, of course, is there any discussion, counsel man blackwell?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This came at a committee, was on business because the amount was amended.

Councilmember mulvihill is the primary sponsor for

>> this is something our district has been participate in in several years.

It is case to also have the sixth division to participate.

>> thank you.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN Purvis?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

\$500 from district five.

>> 500 dollars from district number five.

And council member ackerson?

>> MR. PRESIDENT, \$500 from district 26

>> \$500 fro district number 26.

And COUNCILWOMAN Flood?

>> \$500 from district 24

>> \$500 from district 24.

And COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> 250 from district 21.

>> could you repeat that?

250 from district 21.

And COUNCILWOMAN DR. Shanklin?

>> yes, I just want to know,

don't already put in my right?

>> yes, you're correct.

>> o he is there, okay.

Okay, thanks.

>> thank you, councilmember
triplett?

>> thank you.

And double checking, did I not
add on there?

Okay, very good, \$500 from
district 15, please.

>> \$500 from district 15.

And COUNCILWOMAN Fowler?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

250 from district 14, please.

>> 250 from district 14.

Do we know what the request was
5000.

>>'s right now we have \$500
left, it is 4500.

We also had a commitment in an
email written email from
district 14, from district 18
for \$250.

Are you okay with that?

>> sure.

>> thank you.

>> 50 short.

>> \$1750.

>> COUNCILWOMAN Fowler?

Oh already said 250.

COUNCILMAN Read?

>> I will pick up the 250,
district 16, \$250.

>> that is \$5000.

>> all right.

I will entertain a motion for
an amendment.

You said first.

>> made by winkler, all those
in favor, 10 say. All those
opposed, the eyes have it.

All those in favor of the
appropriation, please say aye
all opposed?

The appropriation passes.

MADAME Clerk, a reading of item number 59.

>> appropriating [\$1,500] \$2,000 from neighborhood development funds in the following manner: \$1,000 from district 14; and \$500 each from districts 13 and 21, to the 3rd division of the Louisville metro police department for the shop with a cop event this holiday season (As amended).
Read in full.

>> motion by Councilman Triplett?

Do we have a second?

>> second.

>> second by Councilman Blackwell.

The appropriations before us, Councilman Blackwell?

>> thank you, this was central business for additional support and we do have a couple of, we do have an amendment tonight that we will finish up the total request.

I will, district 12 will at \$375

.

>> district 25 will add the additional 375.

>> 25 will add the additional \$375 that finishes the request.

>> motion. \$375 from Councilwoman Stuart?

>> 375 from district number eight

>> 12.

>> 12. I'm sorry.

>> eight can pay for it, that is fine with me.

[Laughter]

>> we have a motion by Councilman Blackwell for the amendment and we have a second by Councilman Winkler, all

those in favor say aye.

All opposed?

The amendment before us, all

those in favor please say aye.

All those opposed?

The ayes have it, the

appropriation passes and now

they clerk of item number 60.

>> an ordinance appropriating
[\$10,000]

\$12,000 from neighborhood
development funds in the
following manner: \$10,000 from
district 15; and \$1,000 each
from districts 10 and 13,
through the office of
management and budget to equine
trail advocates, inc.

For repair costs at the
iroquois park equine area (As
amended).

read in full.

>> counsel member piagentini,
ordinance before us, any
discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This was amended in committee
and also the request would
have been in any way, all
business from possible
additional support.

They are ask was 67,953 dollars
and we are at 12,000.

So there's plenty of room for
additions.

Council member triplett was a
primary sponsor.

>> thank you, counsel member
triplett?

>>. Thank you MR. PRESIDENT,
and DR. Blackwell.

Collies, what this is, we just
had a discussion just a few
moments ago about parks and
what we want to do and our
struggle for parks.

And think about our parks, if we did not step in, when we do with the dollars for maintenance and from everything.

Just simple maintenance to the things that we have much less brand-new amenities.

This, I want to remind you that the equine element of iroquois park is very very important element, and historical part of iroquois parks nature and who they are. I should have really done this a while bac but the equine area at iroquois park is in very bad shape. Now the equine advocates have, they approached me with a huge ask. Originally it was 80,000 dollars.

And they had a list of things that they wanted to see done.

The big ticket item was the barn, if you have been there and you have seen the barn, huge thing, it has been there for about 40 years, maybe longer.

It is in bad shape.

But I told them I said, guys, forget about the barn.

We can't do that.

We don't have that kind of money plus, we don't have the type of usage to constitute or substantiate that kind of renovation for that.

I said but what is also on your list?

They had a bevy of things on the list and one of which I chose, I thought okay, that when we can do and this is a wooden ring, a writing ring where the horse clubs, 4h and all the others do

their activities and hold their event.

Now to fix this ring and replace it, it costs 17,500. I said okay, I'm going to help you with that money. They had some other things on the list that they want to do that told them would make good eagle scout project, perhaps.

But to get them started, I said I will help you with the rank.

So that is why I pledge to \$10,000 and hopes that we can raise the other monies from a few others and since I have the bat with me tonight, I just thought I would just start with some of the councilmembers whose districts border iroquois park. We do have commitments from district 13 and district 10, as well.

So we are looking for more.

>> all right.

COUNCILWOMAN Fowler?

>> my district doesn't border but it's close and I am very supportive of the eqine people and have neighbors that are part of this group so I am in for 1000, please.

>> \$1000 for district 14. And COUNCILWOMAN Stuart?

>> the horse stables are literally in district 25 backyard. So I'm going to be adding 1500.

>> \$1500 for district number 25 . COUNCILWOMAN George?

>> thank you compressor.

Despite the hostile work environment, \$1000 from district 21.

>> COUNCILWOMAN Reads?

>> in spite of my colleague

being embarrassed, I am a
packer fan, district 16, \$500.

>> district 16, \$500.

COUNCILWOMAN Dorsey?

>> you drove one heck of a
negotiation with them. And you
guys as a counsel have always
been a supportive of our
proposal district three,
thousand dollars.

>> district three, \$500.

And COUNCILWOMAN Flood?

>> district 24, thousand point

>> district 24, \$1000.

And counsel man piagentini?

>> just because of the women's
volleyball team just won their
first set in the ncaa final
four, so put district in for
500.

>> disrict 19 for \$500.

Thank you.

Go cards.

COUNCILMAN Ingle?

>> yes, thank you MR.

PRESIDENT.

We heard a lot about deferred
maintenance support of parks
and everything and so that was
getting very close to me here.

I don't order this area but I
am a supporter of parks and I'm
going to give a going away
gift, \$500.

>> \$500 from COUNCILMAN Ingle.

Where does that leave us MADAM
Clerk?

>> we are \$18,500.

>> \$18,500.

Good job with the math.

All right, MAY I have a motion?

Oh, standby.

>> I will add 25.

>> COUNCILMAN Winkler will add
to and \$50.

>> district it will add 250,

as well.

>> district 8 will add 250, as well.

District number two?

>> \$500.

>> \$500 from district number two. All right, where does that leave us?

>> \$19,500.

>> \$19,500.

We have a motion?

COUNCILMAN Ingle made the motion, do we have a second?

We have a second by council member kitten, all in favor say aye. All opposed?

The ayes habit.

The amended ordinance, MADAM Clerk, will you please open role for voting?

>> COUNCILMAN Percent?

>> yes.

Okay, yes, one second.

Anyone else?

Okay, hold on one second.

>> I didn't get the vote.

>> one second, I'm going to -- hold on one second.

I'm going to start all the way over.

Here we go.

>> okay, we're going to do that one over again.

>> councilmember shanklin, I have you for a yes, thank you, ma'am.

Are you able to vote?

all right, MR. Prsident, you have 23 yes votes.

>> thank you and the ordinance passes MADAM Clerk, a reading of item number 61?

>> an ordinance appropriating [\$12,500]

\$17,500 from neighborhood development funds in the

following manner: \$12,500 from district 8; and \$5,000 from district 9, through the office of management and budget, to highland commerce guild for materials and labor costs for its graffiti abatement and clean up program (As amended).
Read in full.

>> motion by COUNCILMAN Winkler, seconded by council member present in.

Is there any discussion?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

This is amended in committee and this is COUNCILWOMAN Chamber armstrong. She MAY want to speak to a peer

>> thank you

>> I don't need any money from y'all it is only here because the amendment, thank you.

>> [Laughter]

>> thank you, COUNCILWOMAN.

The ordinance before us, MADAM Clerk, please open role for voting.

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

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

>> thank you, the ordinance passes, MADAM Clerk my reading of item number 62.

>> an ordinance amending ordinance no.

083, series 2022, and ordinance no.

084, series 2022, relating to the fiscal year 2022-2023 operating and capital budgets, respectively, by transferring [\$78,821]

\$85,350.16 from the district 25 neighborhood development fund to the district 25 capital

infrastructure fund.

(As amended) Read in full.

>> motion by COUNCILMAN

Winkler.

Second by council member
triplett, the ordinance before
us, any dicussion, counsel
for blackwell?

>> so this was amended in
committee as well, which is why
it is on old business

COUNCILWOMAN Stuart MAY or MAY
not want to speak to this.

>> well, this is the same as
COUNCILWOMAN Chambers
armstrong, I don't need your
money.

Just here because of amendment.

This is the remainder of the
funds that are needed for our
new park in district 25 for the
playground. And so I would
appreciate your support, thank
you.

>> thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN, MADAM Clerk?

Would you please open the role
for voting

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

>> MR. PRESIDENT, yes-man,
MR. PRESIDENT, you have 23 yes
votes.

>> thank you, the ordinance
passes MADAM Clerk, a reading
of item number 63.

>> an ordinance appropriating
[\$33,458.32]

\$38,665.62 from district 10
neighborhood development funds,
through the office of
management and budget, to
audubon park for the purchase
of seven police radios to be
used by audubon park police to
communicate with louisville

metro police department
officers (As amended).
Read in full.

>> motion by councilmember
winkler, seconded by
councilmember piagentini, any
discussion, COUNCILMAN
Blackwell?

>> thank you MR. PRESIDENT.

The others amended in
committee, the primary
sponsor.

>> thank you.

>> yes.

This had to be amended because
between the paperwork that
cost the radios went up and
this is being split by district
10 and then audubon park also
police department park wide
village so three have made
enough to buy 15 radios. Thank
you.

>> thank you.

This is an ordinance requiring
a roll call vote.

Will you please open the role
for voting?

>> councilmember shanklin?

Thank you.

>> yes.

MR. PRESIDENT, you have 23 yes
votes.

>> thank you, the ordinance
passes.

A reding of item number 64?

>> an ordinance appropriating
\$82,401 from district 23
neighborhood development funds
to public works for
installation of street lights
throughout district 23, and a
five-year contract with
louisville gas and electric
company.

Reading paul.

>> motion by COUNCILMAN Winkler.

Seconded by councilmember piagentini.

Is there any discussion?

>> thank you, mission MR.

PRESIDENT.

Councilmember from district 10.

>> thank you.

COUNCILMAN Mulvihill, due to my wife's influence, will be abstaining from item 64 and five thank you.

>> thank you and I myself will be abstaining from this because of my wife's employment..

MADAM Clerk, please open the role from voting.

>> councilmember shanklin?

>> yes.

Anyone else?

Okay, MR. PRESIDENT, you have 19, I'm sorry -- 20 yes votes and two attentions.

>> thank you, the ordinance passes.

Adam clarke, a reading of item number six five.

>> an ordinance appropriating \$75,570.60 from district 3 neighborhood development funds to public works for the installation of additional lighting throughout district 3 to enhance public safety, and a five-year contract with louisville gas and electric company.

Reading paul.

>> motion by councilmember winkler, seconded by councilmember piagentini, the ordinance is before us, is there any discussion, number blackwell?

>> thank you, MR. PRESIDENT.

Same as last

>> thank you, councilmember
mulvihill, same as last,
extending for the same reason.

>> thank you, I too will be
abstaining because of my wife's
employment.

>> council member shanklin?

>> yes.

MR. PRESIDENT, you have 19 yes
votes and two of sentence.

>> thank you, the ordinance
passes colleagues, we did not
get everybody a chance to sign
on to councilmember hollander
back, I have a sharpie here.

If you would like to sign on
counsel back if you get a
chance to, please come get the
sharpie.

>> and if you would like your
boxes right over here.

>> if you want your box it is
right up there.

Otherwise -- and we are still
looking.

Otherwise, I want to thank
everybody for a great year.

This is our last meeting of the
year.

Love you guys.

I will see you all next year.

Merry christmas.

>> thank you.

>> I want to wish everybody a
merry christmas, happy
holidays, happy new year's
congratulate all those who just
took their last vote

>> thank you.

>> all right, ma'am.

>> new business comprise of
items number 66 and 67.

Clerk, please read these items,
and their assignment to
committee.

>>

c1

>> the following much elation was assigned to the budget committee.

An ordinance to address item number 66 under budget council-approved american rescue plan ("arp") Projects through reappropriations of arp funding the following legislation was on the community fairs help in education committee.

Item number 67.

An ordinance amending louisville/jefferson county metro government code of ordinances chapter 151, eviction court.

Read in full.

C1

>> next we have announcements, do any counselors have any announcements?

Well, this concludes our meeting.

Our next metro council meeting is the organizational meeting on tuesday, JANUARY 3rd, 2023 at 4:00 P.M.

. With no further business to discuss, without objection,