



City of Greensboro

Melvin Municipal Building
300 W. Washington Street
Greensboro, NC 27401

Meeting Minutes - Final City Council

Tuesday, July 24, 2018

5:30 PM

Council Chamber

Call to Order

This City Council meeting of the City of Greensboro was called to order at 5:30 p.m. on the above date in the Council Chamber of the Melvin Municipal Office Building with the following members present:

Present: 9 - Mayor Nancy Vaughan, Mayor Pro-Tem Yvonne J. Johnson, Councilmember Marikay Abuzuaiter, Councilmember Sharon M. Hightower, Councilmember Nancy Hoffmann, Councilmember Michelle Kennedy, Councilmember Justin Outling, Councilmember Tammi Thurm and Councilmember Goldie F. Wells

Also present were Assistant City Manager Chris Wilson, City Attorney Tom Carruthers, and City Clerk Elizabeth H. Richardson.

Moment of Silence

The meeting opened with a moment of silence.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Mayor Vaughan recognized Councilmember Abuzuaiter to lead the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Recognition of Courier

Assistant City Manager Chris Wilson recognized Mary McCollough of the Legislative Department who served as Courier for the meeting.

Council Procedure for Conduct of the Meeting

Mayor Vaughan explained the Council procedure for conduct of the meeting.

I. GENERAL BUSINESS AGENDA

1. [ID 18-0474](#) Ordinance Amending the Greensboro Code of Ordinances Chapter 16 With Respect to Motor Vehicles and Traffic and Chapter 18 with Respect to Offenses and Miscellaneous Provisions

Mayor Vaughan introduced the item and asked City Attorney Tom Carruthers to provide an overview.

City Attorney Carruthers provided the history of the repeal of Chapter 20; outlined what had taken place since that time; referenced community meetings; and recognized Attorneys Mac McCarley and Catherine Clodfelter with the Parker Poe law firm to speak to the item.

Attorney McCarley explained the Supreme Court history regarding content based regulations that could infringe upon civil rights; provided an overview of the research process and use of data to develop regulations; outlined the process for the four community meetings; provided an overview of meetings with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) attorneys; spoke to others involved in the discussions; stated they had provided a final report to Council; highlighted the three issues in the proposed ordinance, hereinafter referred to as the Parker Poe ordinance, that the City could legally address which included publically owned parking decks or lots; harassing conduct; public safety

concerns arising at an intersection or roadway; and recognized Attorney Clodfelter to provide additional information.

Attorney Clodfelter spoke to the charge given to the attorneys; reiterated the process and data used in their research; added that the three safety issues examined were specific to where conduct would occur in the City; spoke to the differences of safety concerns in different locations of the City; provided an in-depth review of the three issues; explained what the proposed ordinance amendments would address; that the proposal included definitions for specific actions and conduct; provided an overview of who they had worked with during the research process; and stated the proposal allowed for a better understanding for the public and law enforcement officers.

Councilmember Hightower thanked Parker Poe for their work; inquired if there were currently laws on the books that addressed loitering; and asked if the Depot was impacted by the amendments.

Attorney Clodfelter responded that the amendment had more clarity and definitions; and confirmed others had reviewed and provided input for the amendment.

City Attorney Carruthers explained that the amendments were based on Supreme Court actions; included suggestions of the ACLU; confirmed the framework was not to block or impede sidewalks and streets; and that the proposal did not address any issues with regard to the Depot.

Councilmember Hightower voiced support for the regulations in place at the Depot; and concern with Council not receiving documentation until this evening.

Councilmember Outling voiced concerns with Section 18-46.2(c)(1) "Harassment"; and asked for clarification with regard to what did, or did not, apply as a legitimate purpose.

Attorney Clodfelter responded that the ordinance would not prevent a lawful purpose; provided examples of what a lawful purpose would be; and stated they had looked at laws across the state.

Councilmember Outling referenced forms for solicitation that were protected under First Amendment rights; spoke to persons involved in solicitation being engaged in conduct that was prohibited; asked for clarity on the term "negative response"; and inquired about harassment by persons not soliciting.

Attorney Clodfelter spoke to what actions were protected under the Constitution; to discussions with the ACLU on the topic; and to what was necessary in order for the ordinance to be enacted.

Attorney McCarley spoke to the challenges of describing the defense without any content.

Councilmember Outling referenced two North Carolina cities that had adopted harassment ordinances post the Reed case; a policy developed by the Smith Moore law firm adopted by Piedmont Area Regional Transportation (PART); and voiced concern with other areas within the City limits having heightened protection.

City Attorney Carruthers stated he had spoken with Attorney Tom Terrell at Smith Moore who informed him that the firm relied on the City's ordinances; advised that PART had statutory ability to set its own policies; that he was not prepared to speak to areas regulating different from the City; and confirmed the ordinance did not prohibit asking for donations but applied to situations beyond solicitation that caused fear or intimidation for Greensboro citizens.

Councilmember Outling reiterated that the ordinance was not intended to prevent solicitation; spoke to how he read the ordinance; and voiced his concerns.

Councilmember Abuzuaiter asked for confirmation that the documentation in the final report had been forwarded to Council within the last two weeks; and requested Attorney Clodfelter to explain the statements in an email that had been sent by the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty (National Center).

Attorney Clodfelter confirmed the documentation had been forwarded to Council previously; and addressed the first

amendment issue.

Attorney McCarley spoke to the documentation they had reviewed; added that he could not speak to the research of the National Center; and emphasized that staff had provided amendments that addressed Council's concerns as well as the constitutional rights of all residents.

Councilmember Wells asked how creditable the National Center was; voiced her concerns with judges striking down ordinances; and stated she was concerned about the City doing something wrong.

Councilmember Kennedy provided the history of the National Center; explained that they were perceived nationally as experts on laws pertaining to homelessness; and emphasized their mission was to prevent and end homelessness.

City Attorney Carruthers added that the initial National Center letter was what prompted staff to bring in outside counsel; and stated the National Center letter received today did not have the same comments that had been included in their previous letter.

Discussion took place regarding the content of the letters; portions of the letter being read; the request from the National Center for a delay on the vote; conversations with National Center Attorney Eric Tars; involvement of those who expressed an interest; and the need to listen to the National Center.

Councilmember Outling spoke to the ordinance being constitutional; asked for clarification regarding conduct prohibited under the aggressive ordinance that would not be prohibited by the amendment; and voiced that the majority of Council agreed the aggressive ordinance was a good policy.

Attorney McCarley explained that the proposed amendment would become content based if it was referred to as a solicitation ordinance, which could result in possible review by the Supreme Court.

Attorney Clodfelter explained the differences between the aggressive ordinance and the Parker Poe amendment.

Discussion took place regarding the provisions of the proposed ordinance; overlap of the ordinances; free speech items being removed; getting clarification on the differences between the two proposals; and a request for staff to provide an analysis with regard to regulations mandated by state statute.

Councilmember Kennedy confirmed that Parker Poe informed Council they needed more time; referenced the urgency of Council; and asked how many times Parker Poe had been requested to defend similar laws.

Attorney McCarley spoke to the change in the law in 2015; referenced the number of communities making changes to their ordinances; and spoke to experts on law and advocates on policies.

Councilmember Kennedy voiced concern that the additional work had cost approximately \$32,000; added that the National Center assisted municipalities at no cost; emphasized that the process should have been managed differently; referenced miscommunication; and questioned the assumption that Council was clear on the Parker Poe ordinance.

Mayor Vaughan read an excerpt from the National Center letter; spoke to the ordinance failing to address persons begging on the streets; clarified the issues addressed in the proposal; agreed that the City needed housing and a workforce which was not the intent of the ordinance; and reminded Council of the issues they needed to focus on.

Councilmember Hoffmann asked Attorney McCarley to restate his earlier assessment of the letter received today.

Attorney McCarley provided his assessment that the letter was a request for more time to review; spoke to the claims of Attorney Tars; and to project deadlines.

Councilmember Thurm referenced questions brought forth from Councilmember Outling; the content of the proposed ordinance; and asked if the proposed amendments contained more than the aggressive ordinance.

Attorney Clodfelter confirmed the content of the proposed amendment.

Councilmember Kennedy added that Council had the same goals; spoke to the most cost effective solution; to the mental health issues of persons; added that the National Center was a known expert in the field; outlined her concerns; and spoke to the process Council should have taken.

Councilmember Abuzuaiter confirmed that harassment was the issue Council wanted to address; read a portion of the minutes from the May 15th meeting of Council; referenced that Council had worked with and listened to colleagues; respected what was said; and referenced hearing from the public on the issue.

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson inquired if there was any city who had done an ordinance of this type that had not failed in court.

Attorney Clodfelter spoke to the research they had done; and to the legal framework used in creating the ordinance.

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson commended the work of the attorneys; and restated her question.

Attorney Clodfelter stated she would provide a response to Council.

Attorney McCarley emphasized that it was their intent to not include any wording in the ordinance that had been found to be unconstitutional; spoke to the research that had been done; and stated Greensboro was on the cutting edge of the issue.

Councilmember Hightower spoke to the ordinances addressing harassment; and asked if the City had anything on the books that addressed that.

City Attorney Carruthers clarified the language regarding stalking and other harassment; spoke to Attorney Clodfelter's work with the ACLU; described what actions would divide an event; and confirmed that the language had been vetted with the ACLU.

Additional discussion took place regarding the enforcement of the amendment; use of the term harassment; the cities of Mebane and Fayetteville implementing ordinances post the Reed case; sister cities with aggressive ordinances in place; ordinances adopted prior to Reed; and aggressive ordinances in other states that had not been challenged.

Mayor Vaughan stated Council would hear speakers at this time; that the speakers would have three minutes each; and asked the audience to hold their applause.

Signe Waller Foxworth, 2506 Pinecroft Road referenced a society with upside down values; tax laws; asked Council where they stood on the morality index; and voiced the need for a solution for the issue.

Kriste Zayack, 211 North Cedar Street questioned the public safety for those doing the soliciting; provided her history of being homeless; and invited Council to come and serve breakfast to the homeless at Center City Park on Sundays.

Hester Petty, 3402 Canterbury Street voiced concern with not having time to review the proposed ordinances; asked Council to postpone voting on the items; suggested guidelines be developed for police officer conduct to protect the homeless population; referenced comments made at the community forums; the city of Duluth's policy; and spoke to the funding for the proposed parking decks.

Ryan Tardiff, 830 West Market Street stated he worked with the Homeless Union; asked Council to delay the vote;

referenced the letter sent from the National Center on Homelessness and Poverty; and voiced that the proposed ordinance was unconstitutional.

Sarah Sills, 6895 Sunrise Drive voiced concern with what persons could be accused of under the term "harassment"; stated the ordinance was not ethically sound; spoke to criminalization of poverty; and emphasized that experiencing homelessness was uncomfortable.

Gary Kenton, 1508 Worthington Place spoke to the letter from the National Center; emphasized that the City had a problem with homelessness and poverty; and voiced the need for a solution to the bigger issues.

Eddie Brewer, 407 East Washington Street stated he was currently working; that everyone needed a job; spoke to giving his spare change away; difficulty paying his phone bill; added that he did not beg; and referenced living in a tent.

Earl Zayack, 211 North Cedar Street made reference to the term solicitation; spoke to those who solicited for money; stated he volunteered with the homeless; and referenced laws already in place.

Richard Vaught, 409 East Washington Street voiced concern with too many gray areas in the proposed ordinance; requested the vote be delayed; and referenced comments made by Councilmember Kennedy.

Susan Farr, 407 East Washington Street spoke to the spirit of democracy; voiced that Council needed time to review the proposed ordinances; concern with rushing through the process; with interactions between police officers and the homeless; and asked that Council postpone the vote.

Janet Nagle, 2900 Northhampton Drive provided an overview of her background in public health education; stated that the ordinance was narrowly tailored; referenced interactions with police; community discussions; and voiced opposition to the proposal.

Nancy Lenk, 1005 South Aycok Street asked Council to delay the vote to allow time to study the proposal; voiced the need to establish police protocol; provided suggestions for changes; referenced discrimination; requested the City focus on housing; and invest money in the local community.

Cayce Birch, 2005 Walker Avenue emphasized that there was not enough time dedicated to the revision; spoke to the misdemeanor charges within the ordinance; asked why the City was fining people for solicitation when they were asking for money; and read a section of the ordinance.

Cindy Tennant, 1303 Forest Acres Circle stated she served at Center City Park on Sunday mornings; asked Council to take more time before voting; voiced concern with making quick decisions; and spoke to the persons the proposal would impact.

Vaughn Ramsey, 201 North Elm Street spoke in favor of the prior aggressive ordinance; stated a problem had been identified that needed to be addressed; and requested that a solution be found for the issue.

Dawn Chaney, 408 Blandwood Avenue asked Council to consider the safety for all residents of Greensboro; voiced concern for the homeless; referenced citizens who lived, worked and contributed to the City; stated she had witnessed panhandling; voiced concerns with aggressive behavior; spoke to the need for affordable housing; and the need to bring a resolution to the issue that would benefit the entire population of the City.

Lindy Perry-Garnette, 605 Montrose Drive questioned the effectiveness of the current ordinance; spoke to the use of the term solicitation; referenced comments at the community meetings; explained the de-escalation process when dealing with mental health and substance abuse; and emphasized the need for a solution.

Wesley Morris, 2621 Stratford Drive voiced agreement with comments that had been made; asked Council to delay the vote; referenced double talk between solicitation and public safety; reasons why the police were called; and

asked Council to take the concerns voiced this evening seriously.

Alan Hedrick, 3718 Manor Drive stated he was a native of Greensboro; that he had not seen an increase in panhandling Downtown; asked that Council vote 'no' on the item; do away with the entire ordinance; spoke to protecting human rights; and emphasized the money spent on the amendment could have been spent in a better way.

Moved by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson, seconded by Councilmember Abuzuaiter to close the public comment period. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson suggested Council vote on the ordinance.

Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson to postpone the item.

Councilmember Hightower voiced support for the delay.

Discussion took place regarding the length of time spent on the item; amount of money spent on outside counsel; community meetings; the need to vote on the item this evening; to hear from the National Center; concern for the homeless population; importance in finding a solution; representation of the entire City; advocates acting on behalf of their clients; and concern with special interest group opinions impacting Council decisions. Additional discussion ensued regarding tackling the issue one piece at a time; amending the ordinance in the future; the need to put this piece of the puzzle to bed; possible legal challenges of the proposed ordinance; concern with the rush to adopt the ordinance this evening; the need for additional funding for affordable housing; the ordinance being a discrimination policy focused on Downtown; harassment; human rights for City residents; results of conversations with the Homeless Union; and the irresponsibility of Council should the vote be delayed.

Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson, to postpone the Parker Poe ordinance. The motion FAILED on the following roll call vote:

Ayes, 4 - Yvonne J. Johnson, Sharon M. Hightower, Michelle Kennedy and Goldie F. Wells

Nays, 5 - Nancy Vaughan, Marikay Abuzuaiter, Nancy Hoffmann, Justin Outling and Tammi Thurm

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson requested clarification on the vote.

Mayor Vaughan asked that Council vote again on the motion to postpone.

Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson, to postpone the Parker Poe ordinance. The motion FAILED on the following roll call vote:

Ayes, 4 - Yvonne J. Johnson, Sharon M. Hightower, Michelle Kennedy and Goldie F. Wells

Nays, 5 - Nancy Vaughan, Marikay Abuzuaiter, Nancy Hoffmann, Justin Outling and Tammi Thurm

Mayor Vaughan declared a recess at 7:58 p.m. Council reconvened at 8:34 p.m. with all members in attendance.

Discussion took place regarding the voting process for the SECOND READING on the previous aggressive ordinance; and the voting process for the current proposed Parker Poe ordinance.

Moved by Councilmember Outling to adopt the previous aggressive ordinance on the SECOND READING.

Councilmember Thurm voiced the need to have an ordinance in place to protect the citizens; suggested that staff fine tune the proposed Parker Poe ordinance to allow for a SECOND READING in August; and stated she would vote in favor of the Parker Poe ordinance.

Councilmember Hightower voiced concern with the timing for bringing the aggressive ordinance before Council; the need to show good faith; the lack of full disclosure; moving too quickly; spoke to what democracy should look like; referenced the parking deck issues; spoke to the use of the word "aggressive"; and stated she would not support a SECOND READING of the previous ordinance.

Mayor Vaughan explained that the second vote would be a tactical move; spoke to the ordinances on the table; to the opportunity to fine tune the Parker Poe ordinance should it receive a 5-4 vote; voiced the need for citizens to feel safe; and reminded Council of their responsibility to the citizens of the City.

Councilmember Kennedy referenced comments that had been made this evening; classes of people; voiced disappointment with Council's leadership; concern with adopting an ordinance that was an act of discrimination; with the amount of money spent on outside counsel; and with adopting an ordinance in conflict with the United States Constitution.

Councilmember Outling emphasized who the ordinance was for; that it was about prohibiting wrongful conduct; provided information from a constituent's email regarding an experience with an aggressive person; added that the ordinance allowed persons to solicit for money but would prohibit aggressive behavior; and voiced the need for Council to recognize there was a problem.

Councilmember Abuzuaiter voiced concern with people being harassed at stores; referenced the need to abide by rules and regulations; reiterated that Council was responsible for all citizens of Greensboro; that the ordinance would not prohibit someone from soliciting for money but would prevent aggressive behavior; voiced concern with miscommunication in the community; and emphasized the need to move forward to ensure safety for the City.

Councilmember Hoffmann reminded Council of the six-three vote on the adoption of the original aggressive ordinance; spoke to a Councilmember changing their vote; emphasized that Council had heard from a significant amount of people throughout the City; and reminded Council of their obligation to provide safety and security to the citizens and businesses of Greensboro.

Councilmember Kennedy asked counsel's opinion on whether the motion was in line with the United States Constitution.

Attorneys Carruthers and McCarley spoke to the legal authority; and opinions of counsel when the elected body was considering adoption of an ordinance.

Councilmember Kennedy voiced disappointment in the process that a SECOND READING of the original aggressive ordinance was brought before Council this evening; spoke to the actions of Councilmembers; requested that Council not have the second vote this evening; asked for additional time; and moved that the item get moved to the next regular meeting of Council.

Mayor Vaughan stated that a motion was on the floor.

Councilmember Outling provided the history of the aggressive ordinance; added that he was opposed to hiring outside counsel; that there had been a work session on the issue; reminded Council that decisions were based on majority votes of five or more members; and reiterated that Council needed to vote on the issue to prohibit aggressive behavior.

Mayor Vaughan voiced concern with comments made regarding Council responding to a specific segment of citizens; spoke to the length of time Council had discussed the issue; emphasized the need to put an ordinance in place; reminded the public that input was received from across the City; spoke to discriminating legislation; and clarified that Council represented everyone, not just specific groups.

Councilmember Kennedy responded to Mayor Vaughan's comments; and voiced concern that the City would be

sued as a result of adoption of the aggressive ordinance.

Mayor Vaughan reminded Council to respect one another during discussion.

Councilmember Wells emphasized that Council represented the whole City of Greensboro; explained why she voted the way she had; voiced appreciation for Councilmembers' passions; the need to reach a compromise and do what was best for the citizens of Greensboro; and added that Council worked for the citizens of Greensboro.

Councilmember Hightower voiced the need for similar engagement around Minority, Women, and Business Enterprise (M/WBE) matters; concern with targeting a specific segment of the population; and stated that the aggressive ordinance was a target ordinance.

Councilmember Abuzuaiter referenced walking in people's shoes; spoke to times persons had been aggressive towards her; to the content of the aggressive ordinance; explained that an ordinance needed to be in place; and that Council needed to listen to comments from the people who had contacted them.

Councilmember Outling referenced comments regarding a possible lawsuit against the City should the aggressive ordinance be put in place; reminded Council that they had received a lot of community input; spoke to the legal process; voiced that aggressive solicitation had increased since the repeal of the ordinance; that it was incumbent for Council to take action; stated that people were scared; and spoke to enforcement.

Councilmember Thurm spoke to supporting the ordinance; added that this was not an entitlement issue but one of people being concerned and scared; spoke to the process this evening; and to the votes that were taken.

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson voiced that she served all of the people of the City; that Council needed to take action; concern with the City being sued; reminded Council of their obligation to the taxpayers; stated what she wanted in an ordinance; that she was not comfortable with the ordinance language at this time; and would vote 'no'.

Councilmember Hoffmann explained that Council needed to make the best decisions for the citizens of the City; that she took exception to statements that were made; voiced the ordinance impacted the citizens of Greensboro who did not elect the ACLU to govern the City; and spoke what a judge would decide should the aggressive ordinance be challenged.

Councilmember Thurm confirmed that the aggressive ordinance had been drafted based on the recommendations from the North Carolina School of Government with what they felt would merit expertise that would withstand being challenged in court; and stated she would vote in favor of the aggressive ordinance.

City Attorney Carruthers explained the research that the aggressive ordinance was based on; and what the author considered to be a middle road for regulation.

City Attorney Carruthers stated that the aggressive ordinance had been reconsidered on May 15th.

1. [ID 18-0474](#) Ordinance Amending the Greensboro Code of Ordinances Chapter 16 With Respect to Motor Vehicles and Traffic and Chapter 18 with Respect to Offenses and Miscellaneous Provisions

Moved by Councilmember Thurm, seconded by Councilmember Abuzuaiter, to adopt the ordinance. The ordinance was adopted on the FIRST READING. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes, 5 - Nancy Vaughan, Marikay Abuzuaiter, Nancy Hoffmann, Justin Outling and Tammi Thurm

Nays, 4 - Yvonne J. Johnson, Sharon M. Hightower, Michelle Kennedy and Goldie F. Wells

ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 16 WITH RESPECT TO MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC AND CHAPTER 18 WITH RESPECT TO OFFENSES AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO THAT:

Section 1. Chapter 16, Article 1, Sec.16-9., Soliciting business, etc., in streets is hereby repealed and reserved for future use.

Section 2. Chapter 18, Article III, Sec. 18-44 is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 18-44. - Blocking or Impeding Street and Sidewalk Access.

(a) Purpose and Intent. The City has the general authority and control over all public streets, sidewalks, and other ways of public passage within its corporate limits, except those ways of public passage that are owned or maintained by the State of North Carolina. The City has the duty to keep such streets, sidewalks, and other ways of public passage open for travel and free from unnecessary obstructions. G.S. 160A-296. This ordinance prohibits actions that block or impede the safe passage of pedestrians and vehicles on public sidewalks and streets.

(b) Definitions: The following words, terms, and phrases when used in this section shall have the meanings set forth in this subsection, unless the context of their usage clearly indicates another meaning:

(1) Block means to unreasonably obstruct passage on a sidewalk or entrance or exit to a building.

(2) Impede means to render the use of a street unreasonably difficult or dangerous, including the following actions:

i. Weaving or darting through, around, and in between multiple occupied vehicles, whether the vehicle is stopped or in travel, for a purpose other than passage to a sidewalk. This (i) subsection is meant to prohibit walking through a street parallel to the sidewalk but not meant to prohibit crossing lanes of a street to reach occupied vehicles when a stop light is red.

ii. Placing or throwing a tangible thing on or inside an occupied vehicle that is on the street, except if an occupant requests that the acting individual deliver the tangible thing to an occupant or consents to such exchange.

iii. Standing, sitting, or lying down on the portion of a traffic island that is less than 6 feet wide, except where using the traffic island to cross the street or during an emergency.

(3) Sidewalk means the part of a street improved for pedestrian traffic.

(4) Street means the entire width between property lines of every way or place of whatever nature, when any part thereof is open to the use of the public as a matter of right for the purpose of vehicular traffic. The terms "street" and "highway" are synonymous.

(5) Traffic island. A raised portion of the street in between lanes of traffic intended to separate lines of traffic or guide traffic, not to hold people or provide pedestrian refuge. A traffic island may be commonly called a median. For the purpose of this ordinance, a traffic island is any raised part of the street meant to separate lanes of traffic that is less than 6 feet in width. Width is measured as the length of the traffic in the direction of pedestrian travel if the pedestrian is traveling perpendicular to the street.

(6) Vehicle means every device in, upon, or by which any person or property is or may be transported or drawn upon a highway, excepting devices moved by human power or used exclusively upon fixed rails or tracks; provided, that for the purposes, of this chapter bicycles shall be deemed vehicles.

(c) It shall be unlawful for an individual to impede the use of a street or highway.

(d) It shall be unlawful for an individual to block a sidewalk.

(e) It shall be unlawful for an individual to block the entrance or exit to a building served by a sidewalk or street unless otherwise granted permission by the owner or tenant. Permission granted by the owner may be evidenced by verbal or written confirmation of permission from the owner or tenant.

(f) Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted to prohibit the exchanging of objects into and out of vehicles where the vehicle is stopped or parked according to traffic laws and no blocking or impeding of a street or sidewalk occurs. Where an individual is engaged in lawful activity on the sidewalk and such activity evokes a response by a third party that is in violation of this ordinance or any other ordinance or state law, the individual engaged in lawful activity shall not be in violation of this section.

(g) This section shall not apply to actions taken by first responders; or to actions taken in response to an emergency or to prevent an accident.

(h) This section shall not apply to persons or entities granted a permit by the City for purposes, including, but not limited to, under Chapter 26 and Chapter 18 Sec. 2 of this Code.

(i) No action punishable under G.S. 20-174.1 shall be punishable under this section. This section shall only apply to public streets, sidewalks, and other ways of public passage within the City's corporate limits for which authority

and control is not vested in the North Carolina Board of Transportation.

(j) A violation of this section shall be a Class 3 misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to \$50.

State Law reference— Standing, sitting or lying upon streets or highways, G.S. 20-174.1. Pursuant to state statute, standing, sitting, or laying down upon streets or highways is unlawful.

Section 3. Chapter 18, Article III, Sec. 18-46 is hereby repealed in its entirety and reenacted as sections 18-46.1 and 18-46.2 to read as follows:

Sec. 18-46.1 – Solicitation and Distribution of Items in Public Parking Garages and Public Parking Lots Prohibited.

(a) Solicitation Permitted. Solicitation, where not otherwise prohibited herein or by State law, is allowed in the public spaces of Greensboro.

(b) Purpose and Intent. It is the purpose of this section to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the residents of the city through the proper management of the city's municipally owned parking garages and parking lots. The city is authorized to operate a parking enterprise to furnish parking services to the city and its citizens.

(1) The city council finds that municipal owned or operated parking garages and parking lots are not traditional public forums for First Amendment purposes and that the city may regulate conduct and use of the parking garages and parking lots through adequate and reasonable rules. The statutory authority is found in G.S. 160A-174 and 160A-312.

(2) The City finds it necessary to restrict certain activities, including solicitation and distribution within public parking garages and parking lots because of the increased potential for accidents in parking garages and parking lots, limited space for individuals walking to vehicles and engaging in transactions associated with solicitation and distribution, and due to the potential for individuals accessing their cars to feel a heightened level of intimidation when approached by a solicitor or distributor.

(c) Definitions. The following words, terms, and phrases when used in this section shall have the meanings set forth in this subsection, unless the context of their usage clearly indicates another meaning:

(1) Public Parking Garage and Parking Lot means lots, garages, or portions of lots or garages, owned or operated by the City of Greensboro which have the sole purpose of providing vehicular parking. On-street parking, including diagonal on-street parking, is not considered a garages or lot. The word "deck" has the same meaning as the word "garage."

(2) Enter or entryr. For the purpose of this section, entry into a Parking Garage or Parking Lot shall mean entry onto the paved parking portion where its the sole intended purpose is the parking of vehicles.

(d) Offense. It shall be unlawful to:

(1) enter a Public Parking Garage or Parking Lot for the purpose of soliciting for or distributing within the Parking Garage or Parking Lot any of the following: money, contributions, signatures, leaflets, or pamphlets for any purpose or use; and

(2) engage in the intended solicitation or distribution.

(e) Exemption for Sidewalks and Landscaped Areas Through and Adjacent to Parking Garages and Parking Lots. The prohibition under this subsection does not restrict solicitation or distributions on public sidewalks or landscaped areas that run through or immediately adjacent to a public parking garage or lot where such sidewalk or landscaped area is a path for movement other than for the purpose of getting to and from a vehicle in the parking garage. However, any solicitation along such sidewalk or landscaped area shall be confined to the sidewalk or landscaped area, and no solicitor or distributor shall follow physically an individual off the sidewalk or landscaped area and through the publicly owned parking garage or parking lot where the individual has declined the solicitation or distribution.

(1) This subsection is further clarified below, through example, as it applies to the Public Parking Lots located at Elm St. and McGee St. and Elm St. and Greene St. (referred to as the "Elm Street Lots"). This clarification applies in the same manner to all Parking Lots and Parking Garages with the same or similar features:

i. The Elm Street Lots are comprised of paved parking areas immediately adjacent to two commercial buildings, surrounded by sidewalks providing access to the street (the "Surrounding Sidewalks"), and with one large sidewalk running directly through the middle of the paved parking areas such that parking is allowed on either side of that middle sidewalk (the "Middle Sidewalk"). Many pedestrians, including those parking a vehicle, use the Middle Sidewalk. The prohibition in this subsection shall not apply to any individual using the Middle Sidewalk or the Surrounding Sidewalks, even where the individual is soliciting or distributing to a person who is standing on the paved portion of the Elm Street Lots. The prohibition in this subsection does apply if the individual soliciting or

distributing leaves the Surrounding Sidewalk or Middle Sidewalk, enters into the paved parking area with the intent to continue soliciting or distributing, and either engages in the soliciting or distributing or continues to engage in the soliciting or distributing when the individual being engaged has declined the solicitation or distribution. This prohibition is intended to prevent persons who have declined the solicitation or distribution from being followed from the sidewalk to their vehicles or from being approached and engaged in the paved parking areas while accessing their vehicles.

(f) Designation of Public Parking Garage and Parking Lots. Public Parking Garage and Parking Lots shall be designated by clearly posted signs. The City shall maintain and provide upon request a list of Public Parking Garages and Parking Lots, currently titled "Traffic Schedule 9, Public Off-Street Parking Lots."

(g) Other Solicitation Prohibited by State Law. This section shall not apply to any type of solicitation or distribution regulated, prohibited, or punishable under other applicable state law.

(h) Exceptions. This section shall not apply to any Parking Garage or Parking Lot adjacent to or used as the designed parking for a polling place during the time when City owned property is used by the Guilford County Board of Election as a polling place. This section also shall not apply when an event is taking place within the Public Parking Garage or Parking Lot due to a permit granted by the City.

(i) Penalty. A violation of this section shall be a Class 3 misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to \$50.

Section 4. Chapter 18, Article III Section 18-46.2 is hereby enacted to read as follows:

Sec. 18-46.2. - Harassment in Public Spaces Prohibited.

(a) Purpose and Intent.

(1) The city is enabled, pursuant to G.S. 160A-174, to protect the health, safety and welfare of its citizens and to ensure the peace and dignity of the city. It is the intent of council in enacting this ordinance to recognize the rights of all citizens while at the same time protecting the coexistent rights for all citizens to enjoy safe and convenient travel in public spaces free from harassment. In the course of public hearings and debates regarding solicitation and safety in public spaces in Greensboro, the city recognizes that the dangerous effects of harassment may occur in the commission of or completely separate from an act of solicitation, where such conduct occurs in public spaces and includes following a person or cornering a person for the purpose of intimidating that person.

(2) The current state laws on stalking and harassment do not protect individuals who are harassed in public spaces where such harassment is confined to a single occasion but is also dangerous or intimidating. Such harassment causes intimidation and fear and may result in an interaction with dangerous or violent consequences. Free and safe passage on city sidewalks and streets is necessary. Therefore, the following ordinance intends to address harassment on sidewalks and streets by penalizing the following conduct:

(b) Definitions. The following definitions apply in this section:

(1) Public Space means streets, sidewalks, alleys, and other public property, as well as city-owned and city-controlled property.

(2) Reasonable person means a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances.

(c) Offense. A person is guilty of harassment in a public space if the person:

(1) knowingly and intentionally performs either of the following with no legitimate purpose;

i. Following an individual in or about a public space with the intent of threatening, intimidating, or causing fear for personal safety; or

ii. Surrounding an individual or intentionally and physically directing the individual's movement through or in a public space with the intent of threatening, intimidating, or causing fear for personal safety. This subsection includes crowding or cornering an individual with the intent of threatening, intimidating, or causing fear for personal safety and without that individual's consent as the individual is actively engaging or attempting to use an automated teller machine or parking meter and the individual must stand within the public space to access the automated teller machine or parking meter;

(2) the conduct described in subsection (c)(1)(i) or (ii) is directed at an individual in the individual's presence; and

(3) the person continues the conduct described in subsection (c)(1)(i) or (ii) after the individual to whom the conduct is directed has made a negative verbal response or taken action that a reasonable person would understand as a negative response.

(d) Penalty. A violation of this section shall be a Class 3 misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to \$50.

Section 5. Severability. If any provision of this article is declared invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions shall be severable and shall continue in full force and effect.

Section 6. This ordinance shall become effective as of 08/15/2018. Section 3., Sec. 18-46.1, shall become effective and enforceable at the later of: 8/15/2018, or the time at which the City has marked clearly the areas in which the prohibited activity may not occur as required under Section 18-46.1(e)(1)(iii).

THIS WAS THE FIRST READING OF THE ABOVE ORDINANCE. THE ORDINANCE WILL NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE UNTIL THE SECOND READING TAKES PLACE AND THERE IS A SECOND VOTE OF COUNCIL.

Moved by Councilmember Outling, seconded by Councilmember Abuzuaiter, to adopt the ordinance to Amend Chapter 13 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances with Respect to Licenses, Taxation, Business Permits and Miscellaneous Business Regulations and Chapter 20 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances With Respect to Peddlers, Solicitors, Etc. A SECOND READING of the item was done at the June 5, 2018 Council meeting. The ordinance was adopted on July 24, 2018 with the following roll call vote:

Ayes, 5 - Nancy Vaughan, Marikay Abuzuaiter, Nancy Hoffmann, Justin Outling and Tammi Thurm

Nays, 4 - Yvonne J. Johnson, Sharon M. Hightower, Michelle Kennedy and Goldie F. Wells

18-101 ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 13 OF THE GREENSBORO CODE OF ORDINANCES WITH RESPECT TO LICENSES, TAXATION, BUSINESS PERMITS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS AND CHAPTER 20 OF THE GREENSBORO CODE OF ORDINANCES WITH RESPECT TO PEDDLERS, SOLICITORS, ETC.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO:

Section 1. Chapter 13 is hereby amended as follows:

Chapter 13 - LICENSES, TAXATION, BUSINESS PERMITS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS

ARTICLE V. - BUSINESS PERMIT

DIVISION 1. - GENERALLY

Sec. 13-181. - Application of article.

The business permit issued under this article shall apply to persons operating or carrying on the businesses of massage, commercial soliciting, street performing, peddling, itinerant merchants, and mobile food vending which are physically located within the Greensboro city limits.

Sec. 13-202. – Commercial Solicitors.

Section 2. Chapter 20 is hereby repealed in its entirety and re-enacted as follows:

Chapter 20 - PEDDLERS, SOLICITORS, Panhandlers, Itinerant Merchants, ETC.

ARTICLE I. - IN GENERAL

Sec. 20-1. Regulations of Solicitation in Public Places

(a) Intent and Purpose.

It is the intent of Council in enacting this Ordinance to recognize free speech rights for all citizens while at the same time protecting the coexistent rights for all citizens to enjoy safe and convenient travel in public spaces free from

intimidating conduct, threats, and harassment that stem from certain types of abusive solicitation, or that may give rise to interference with other's activities if they occur in particular settings and contexts.

The purpose is to regulate certain conduct to preserve the public order, to protect the citizens of the City of Greensboro and to ensure the safe and uninterrupted passage of both pedestrian and vehicular traffic, without unconstitutionally impinging upon protected speech, expression, or conduct.

(b) Definitions.

(1) For the purpose of this section, solicit means actions that are conducted in the public place in the furtherance of the purpose of collecting money or contributions for the use of one's self or others. As used in this ordinance, the word, "solicit" and its forms shall include the following acts:

(a) Panhandling, begging, charitable or political soliciting means actions that are conducted in the furtherance of the purpose of collecting contributions for the use of one's self or others;

(b) Peddling means transporting goods from place to place and selling or exposing the goods for sale, or without traveling from place to place, selling or offering for sale any goods from any vehicle or device; provided, that any separation of the acts of sale and delivery for the purpose of evading the provisions of this article, the acts shall be defined as peddling.

(c) Commercial Soliciting means traveling from place to place taking or offering to take orders for the sale of goods for future delivery or for personal services to be performed in the future, regardless of whether samples are displayed or money is collected in advance, and using or occupying any building or premises for the sole purpose of taking or offering to take orders for the sale of goods for future delivery or for personal services to be performed in the future, regardless of whether samples are displayed or money is collected in advance.

(d) Itinerant Merchandising means engaging in a temporary business of selling and delivering goods and using or occupying any premises; provided that no person shall be relieved from complying with the provisions of this article merely by conducting a transient business in association with any permanently established merchant.

(e) Street Performing means audible or visual entertainment including but not limited to reciting or singing, acting, dancing, miming, pantomiming, playing a musical instrument or performing a theatrical or literary work.

(f) Mobile Food Vending means preparing or serving food or beverages for sale to the general public from a mobile piece of equipment or vehicle.

(2) For purposes of this section, public place shall be defined as a place where a governmental entity has title, and/or to which the public or a substantial group of persons has access, including, but not limited to, any street, highway, parking lot, plaza, restaurant, theater, transportation facility, vendor location, school, place of amusement, park, or playground.

(c) It shall be unlawful to solicit aggressively in public places in any of the following manner:

(1) Approaching or speaking to someone in such a manner or voice including but not limited to using profane or abusive language as would cause a reasonable person to fear imminent bodily harm or the commission of a criminal act upon his or her person, or upon property in his or her immediate possession, or otherwise be intimidated into giving money or other thing of value;

(2) Intentionally touching or causing physical contact with another person without that person's consent in the course of soliciting;

(3) Intentionally blocking or interfering with the safe or free passage of a pedestrian or vehicle by any means, including unreasonably causing a pedestrian or vehicle operator to take evasive action to avoid physical contact;

(4) Using violent or threatening gestures toward a person solicited;

(5) Soliciting from anyone who is waiting in line for entry to a building or for another purpose without the permission of the owner or landlord or their designee;

(6) By forcing one-self upon the company of another by continuing to solicit in close proximity to the person addressed or following that person after the person to whom the request is directed has made a negative response; or blocking the passage of the person addressed; or otherwise engaging in conduct which could reasonably be construed as intended to compel or force a person to accede to demands;

(7) By soliciting within twenty (20) feet of an automated teller machine which is defined as a device, linked to a financial institution's account records, which is able to carry out transactions, including but not limited to cash withdrawals, account transfers, deposits, balance inquires, and mortgage payments.

(d) Violations.

Any violation of this article shall be a misdemeanor and may be enforced by any one (1) or more of the remedies authorized by the provisions of G.S. § 14-4 or G.S. § 160A-175.

(e) Severability

If any portion of this section is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.

State Law reference— Regulation of begging, G.S. § 160A-179.

Section 3. That all sections not amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 4. That this ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

(Signed) Justin Outling

2. [ID 18-0475](#) Ordinance Amending Chapter 13 of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances with Respect to Licenses, Taxation, Business Permits and Miscellaneous Business Regulations

City Attorney Carruthers recognized Assistant City Attorney Jennifer Schneier to speak to the item.

Assistant City Attorney Schneier outlined and explained the proposed provisions and changes in the ordinance; spoke to street performers, spacing requirements, and time limits; to commercial activity; stated that Collections Manager Teresa Childress had provided an affidavit regarding spacing and time limit requirements; and provided an overview of the ordinance.

(A copy of the Affidavit is filed in Exhibit Drawer A, Exhibit No. 17, which is hereby referred to and made a part of these minutes.)

Moved by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson, seconded by Councilmember Kennedy, to adopt the ordinance. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes, 9 - Nancy Vaughan, Yvonne J. Johnson, Marikay Abuzuaiter, Sharon M. Hightower, Nancy Hoffmann, Michelle Kennedy, Justin Outling, Tammi Thurm and Goldie F. Wells

18-100 ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 13 WITH RESPECT TO LICENSES, TAXATION, BUSINESS PERMITS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO THAT:

Section 1. Chapter 13, Article 1, Sec. 13-9 is repealed in its entirety and reserved for future use.

Section 2. The title of Chapter 13 Article II is hereby amended to read as follows:

Article II. – PRIVILEGE LICENSES FOR SELECT BUSINESSES: BEER, WINE, AND TAXICABS, AND
MOTOR VEHICLES MUNICIPAL VEHICLE TAX

Section 3. Chapter 13 Article V. Business Permit is hereby amended to read as follows:

Article V. – BUSINESS PERMITS FOR COMMERCIAL SOLICITING, PEDDLING, ITINERANT MERCHANTS,
MOBILE FOOD VENDING, AND MASSAGE

Division 1. Generally

Sec. 13-181. – Application of this article.

The business permit issued under this article shall apply to persons operating or carrying on the business of commercial soliciting, peddling, itinerant merchants, mobile food vendors, and massage and bodywork therapy which are physically located within the Greensboro city limits.

Section 4. Chapter 13, Article V. Section 13-202 is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 13-202. Commercial Solicitors.

Section 5. Chapter 13, Article V, Section 13-203 is hereby repealed in its entirety and reserved for future use.

Section 6. Chapter 13, Article VI, Section 13-206 is hereby enacted to read as follows:

ARTICLE VI. MISCELLANEOUS COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY: COMMERCIAL STREET PERFORMERS, ETC.

Sec. 13-206. – Commercial street performers.

(a) Definitions. As used in this section, "perform" or "performance" for commercial purposes, not charitable purposes, means audible or visual entertainment such as, but not limited to, reciting or singing, acting, dancing, miming, pantomiming, playing a musical instrument or performing a theatrical or literary work. "Street performer" means an individual or a group who performs on public property within the City of Greensboro.

(b) Intent and purpose. The Greensboro City Council finds and determines the following:

(1) Street performances are distinguished from panhandling activities by the commercial nature of the performer's actions which provide the benefit of a live performance of artistic value in exchange for gratuities given in appreciation of the performance. Therefore, the nature and character of a street performance differs from solicitation of a charitable contribution.

(2) Street performers are engaged in commerce as professional entertainers whose livelihood comes, wholly or in part, from gratuities received in exchange for the artistic value of the performance. Regulation of the commercial performances of street performers would enhance the character and culture of the city of Greensboro.

(3) Street performers have a right to perform on public property, but unregulated street performances are also likely to cause adverse impacts to the community such as: gathering crowds attracted to the entertainment offered in public locations not appropriate for street performances because of insufficient room for crowds; blocked sidewalks; blocked ingress and egress of buildings; the risk of disrupting nearby motor vehicle traffic; interference

with the operation of commercial activities; and disturbance of the quiet enjoyment of residents.

(4) NCGS 160A-178 authorizes a city to enact an ordinance that regulates, restricts or prohibits the business activities of itinerant merchants, salespersons, promoters, drummers, peddlers, or hawkers. NCGS 160A-174 authorizes a city to enact an ordinance that defines, prohibits, regulates or abates acts, omissions, or conditions detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of its citizens and the peace and dignity of the city. NCGS 160A-296(5) gives a city the power to regulate the use of public sidewalks and public streets.

(5) For these reasons, it is the intent of the Greensboro City Council to permit street performances subject to careful regulation in order to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts associated with unregulated or poorly regulated street performances. The purpose of this ordinance is to create a means of regulation which ensures the ability of street performers to perform in public spaces and to promote harmony among street performers, local businesses, permitted event sponsors, residents, and visitors of Greensboro by balancing the interests of performing artists with Greensboro citizens through the careful regulation of street performances.

(c) Regulations. Street performers shall comply with the following regulations:

(1) Street performers shall not unreasonably block, or cause the unreasonable blocking of any sidewalk, passageway, street, or any ingress or egress to any building, structure, driveway or other passage.

(2) Street performers shall not perform on private property without written permission of the property owner. Street performers are required to keep the writing granting such permission on their person during any performance on private property.

(3) No street performer shall make any use in any way of fire, sharp instruments or objects, spray paint, aerosols, firearms (real or simulated), dangerous weapons or any form of harmful chemicals during a street performance.

(4) Street performers shall stay at least seventy-five (75) feet away from other street performers and twenty five (25) feet from outdoor seating or dining areas. If a citation is issued for violating the seventy-five foot separation, the citation shall be issued to the performer arriving second-in-time.

(5) Street performers shall not commit any violation of chapter 18, article IV, offenses of unreasonable or disturbing sound. A violation of chapter 18, article IV shall not be punishable under this article, but a law enforcement officer may instruct a street performer to cease the chapter 18, article IV violation.

(6) While conducting a street performance, street performers shall not use language or gesture, or display any matter which:

a. Is obscene as prohibited by G.S. § 14-190.1;

b. Incites or urges riot as prohibited by G.S. § 14-288.2;

c. A violation of G.S. § 14-190.1 or G.S. § 14-288.2 shall not be punishable under this article, but a law enforcement officer may instruct a street performer to cease the G.S. § 14-190.1 or G.S. § 14-288.2 violation(s).

(7) Street performers shall not remain at one location for a total duration of more than four (4) hours during any one-day period. When a street performer leaves a location, the street performer shall not return to that location for at least one (1) hour.

(8) No street performer shall claim a greater right to perform at any location over a street performer who arrives first at the same location.

(9) Street performances are not permitted before 10:00 a.m. nor after 11:00 p.m.

(10) Signs used by a street performer shall be in a location at least three (3) feet away from any curb and not in any location which impedes any foot traffic, parking or persons entering or exiting any motor vehicle. Street

performers shall remove such signs from any location at the conclusion of their performance. No sign, handbill, flyer or other advertisement shall be left at any location after the conclusion of a performance.

(11) Notwithstanding the provisions of chapter 18, article IV, section 18-50, a street performer or group may use small, portable and self-powered amplification devices for the purpose of conducting a street performance. All street performers will comply with all remaining provisions of chapter 18, article IV of the Greensboro Code of Ordinances.

(d) Enforcement and penalty.

(1) Any person who fails or refuses to comply with the regulations contained in this article upon request of a city official or law enforcement officer, shall be guilty of a class 3 misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to \$50. Except as otherwise provided herein, a law enforcement officer shall issue a citation for a violation of this article.

(e) Applicability. The provisions of this article do not apply to any person engaged in a special event as that term is defined in Greensboro Code of Ordinances section 26-247.

Section 7. Severability. If any provision of this article is declared invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions shall be severable and shall continue in full force and effect.

Section 8. This ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

(Signed) Yvonne Johnson

Councilmember Hightower asked if the aggressive ordinance would be defensible.

City Attorney Carruthers provided the history of the creation of the ordinance; stated that staff would defend it should the City be sued; that he anticipated the second vote of the Parker Poe ordinance would take place at the August 21st meeting; and spoke to a majority vote at that time.

Matters to be discussed by the Mayor and Members of the Council

Councilmember Thurm placed the name of Janie Silvers in the databank for future service on a board or commission.

Councilmember Abuzuaiter recognized Police Chief Wayne Scott to speak on the lip sync challenge.

Police Chief Scott stated he would not show the video; spoke who had produced the video at no charge; and thanked Councilmember Abuzuaiter for the recognition.

Mayor Vaughan placed the name of Andrew Young in the databank for future service on the Minimum Housing Standards Commission; and stated she would appoint Mr. Young at a future meeting.

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson congratulated the classes at Dudley High School for their recent reunion; and thanked the Police Department for assisting with traffic during the event.

Councilmember Wells spoke to the progress at the Summit Avenue apartments; announced an upcoming meeting on August 4th at 12:00 noon at the PACE Center; spoke to the tornado recovery efforts; and to the challenges in East Greensboro. Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson to remove Gayland Oliver from the Participatory Budgeting Committee. The motion carried by voice vote. Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson to appoint Jocelyn Bryant to the Human Relations Commission. The motion carried by voice vote. Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson to appoint Blake Odum to the Parks and Recreation Commission. The motion carried by voice vote. Moved by Councilmember Wells, seconded by Councilmember Hightower to reappoint Bob Davis to the Solid Waste Commission. The motion carried by voice vote.

Councilmember Kennedy spoke to the recent Thrive Greensboro Job Fair; to the representation of employers and staff; and voiced the commitment for creating job opportunities.

Councilmember Hoffmann stated that the Cultural Arts Master plan discussions had taken place; and that a public meeting on the final plan would take place in September.

Matters to be presented by the City Manager

There were no items for discussion by the City Manager.

Matters to be presented by the City Attorney

There were no items for discussion by the City Attorney.

Adjournment

Moved by Mayor Pro-Tem Johnson, seconded by Councilmember Abuzuaiter, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

THE CITY COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 9:38 P.M.

ELIZABETH H. RICHARDSON
CITY CLERK

NANCY VAUGHAN
MAYOR