

City of Coral Gables City Commission Meeting
Agenda Item E-3
April 8, 2014
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

City Commission

Mayor Jim Cason

Vice Mayor William H. Kerdyk, Jr.

Commissioner Pat Keon

Commissioner Vince Lago

Commissioner Frank Quesada

City Staff

City Manager, Patrick Salerno

City Attorney, Craig E. Leen

City Clerk, Walter J. Foeman

Deputy City Clerk, Billy Urquia

Public Speaker(s)

Javier Vazquez, Berger Singerman

Dan Thompson, Berger Singerman

Steve Helfman, Special Outside Counsel for the City

Agenda Item E-3 [Start: 11:25:49 a.m.]

Zoning Code Text Amendment. An Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing for a text amendment to Article III “Development Review” of the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code to modify existing procedures and create new procedures to resolve disputes and provide relief from the application of the Zoning Code; providing for severability, repealer, codification, and an effective date.

Mayor Cason: E-3.

City Attorney Leen: Yes. E-3 first. E-3 is an ordinance of public hearing Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Cason: Yes. Let’s go to E-3.

City Attorney Leen: It's an Ordinance on First Reading - Zoning Code Text Amendment. An Ordinance of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida providing for a text amendment to Article III "Development Review" of the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code to modify existing procedures and create new procedures to resolve disputes and provide relief from the application of the Zoning Code; providing for severability, repealer, codification, and an effective date. I'd also like to read into the record a change to the item, this is Section 3-1803(a), it's on page 7. What the new 3-1803 paragraph (a) says is "that the City shall publish in a newspaper of general circulation in the City and shall display on the City's public notice bulletin board and not its website a notice of a request for City Commission review of government settlement and shall maintain copies of the request available for review in the Development Services Department and the City Clerk's office", that's the first sentence, that's been changed to say what I just said and I'll explain what that does in a second. The last sentence is that is being changed in 3-1803(a) is the last sentence, it now says, "a notification containing this information shall also be mailed by the City Clerk at least 10 days prior", it used to say 15. Finally, in 3-1803(e) City Attorney Recommendation, which I believe it's going to be re-lettered as (c), but it says, the City Manager – if you read it, it goes, after receiving consideration of the development review office of recommendation, the City Manager, the City Attorney, in consultation with the City Manager, the first City Manager will be removed, it will now say the City Attorney in consultation with the City Manager. The purpose of these changes is they were the changes that were supposed to be in this item, but there was a mix-up with the final version and the purpose of that is just to the Planning and Zoning Board had stated to me at the meeting that they would like a newspaper publication requirement and then the rest of it basically fixes scrivener's errors and makes the timeframe a little shorter for how much notice that we give, but it's still 10 days, which in my view is sufficient notice. I just wanted to briefly talk about this item and then I'm going to turn it over to Javier Vazquez who is outside counsel from Berger Singerman, who we've hired to give us special counsel on this specific issue and also note that Steve Helfman is in the audience, Steve has also been working on this matter with us as well, and we have the opinions of both counsel today in support of this item. What the item does – first, to be perfectly frank obviously this matter came up because of the trolley building litigation and one issue that's going to come before the Commission in the future, not now, is a potential settlement of that matter, but that agreement hasn't been reached yet, we are still in the process of negotiation and I don't think we should further go into it today, but that's where this came about. Now this ordinance though does not just relate to the trolley building litigation or any specific litigation. It is a more general ordinance that allows for the City Commission to basically review and approve or deny, but to consider development regulations or development approvals in connection with a settlement agreement. So for example, when a settlement agreement is reached there are often business terms to that settlement agreement, they'll be recommended to you for example, by the City Manager, those are the business terms, that's for you to decide basically in your legislative

capacity, you are doing that on behalf of the City and you are determining what's in the best interest of the City as a matter of the business terms. There are parts of the settlement though that can involve development approvals and those need to go through a quasi-judicial process and that's what's this process establishes. The quasi-judicial process by which the City Commission can, (1) provide notice to the residents, (2) allow for a time period in which the residents can prepare their positions, (3) allows there to be a hearing in front of the City Commission as quasi-judicial in nature, and then (4) provides for the criteria by which the City Commission will determine whether to grant that development approval; and then lastly, allows for an appeal. In a certain period of time in which someone can appeal, once that period of time is over then there is finality and certainty because there can no longer be an appeal. That is the thinking behind this ordinance. I think it's important regardless of any other litigation to have something like this in our Zoning Code that allows us to resolve these complex types of disputes that have both a proprietary element, but also a development approval that is going to go through a quasi-judicial process. The other thing that this ordinance does is, it does makes some amendments to Division 17, which is a division that relates to Bert Harris Acts, it makes that provision more serviceable and easier to use for the City, it allows the City to initiate the process, but does not really result in substantive changes to that ordinance. There are a few provisions in there that just make it clear that the parties can reach a settlement that can be brought before the City Commission and the City Commission can resolve the matter. It also makes it clear that, as I recall, that these types of provisions don't subject – the City is not saying through these provisions that it's subjecting itself to the Zoning Code, for example, for City use or a City building. Basically, what it's saying is sometimes there will be private buildings that have a City use in them and we need an ability to resolve those issues and an ability to determine whether to grant that approval or not, particularly when it's part of a settlement. Anyhow, I would like Mr. Vazquez to talk to the Commission a little bit about how this is being constructed and why he is recommending its approval for form and legal sufficiency today.

Mr. Javier Vazquez: Thank you Craig. Good morning Mr. Mayor, Commission members, my name is Javi Vazquez, I am with the law offices of Berger Singerman and joining me today is my partner Mr. Dan Thompson and we are thrilled to have this opportunity to work with Craig and to work with Steve in assisting the City with the drafting of a text amendment, which basically like Craig mentioned accomplishes two things. First, modifies existing procedures, and secondly, creates new procedures to resolve disputes and provide relief from the strict application of your Zoning Code. As Craig mentioned, on March 12th your Planning and Zoning Board unanimously recommended approval of the text amendment in question and we have since been working to come up with an amendment which I'm just going to in summary form review before I ask Dan to come up and expand on it a little bit. Like I mentioned, it does two things; first, the proposed ordinance seeks to amend a procedure that's currently in your books that we know as Division 17, which addresses the dispute resolution agreements that are used to remedy a claim like Craig

said, that a private property rights have been inordinately burdened like government action and this amendment was going to allow the City to invoke the procedure for consideration of a settlement or consent order. The second thing that this ordinance will do and I think Dan's going to spend a little bit more time for your further understanding, it's creating a new procedure which we are going to refer to as Division 18, by which the City staff and ultimately the City Commission can facilitate a settlement of legitimate disputes, lawsuits, and administrative proceedings and like Craig said, this is not something that is case specific, this is something that will help the City on many, many other matters. So with that I'd like to briefly introduce my partner Dan Thompson for a little bit more on the ordinance.

Mr. Dan Thompson: Mr. Mayor, members of the Commission, I think this has been summarized very, very well. I basically can answer question, but very briefly the purpose behind drafting this in addition to the...taking objectives described by Mr. Leen were to make sure that the process protects the rights of third parties who might want to challenge a settlement, and I've had extensive experience working with trying to develop legislation to protect the rights of a third party. How that's done is by making this process consistent with the Zoning Code by modifying it to address these factors and put them into the Zoning Code and provide a procedure whereby a quasi-judicial process is taken care of in an expedited way, so nobody can come back at a later time and say, we were cut out of the process and also by amending the Zoning Code that it's designed to protect people from challenging through the citizens provision 163, going to court to try to challenge the resolution as being inconsistent with the Zone Code or the Comprehensive Plan. So that's basically the idea is to make the settlement as air-tight as possible by providing procedures, due process procedures along those lines.

Mayor Cason: Is this a model of any other city's ordinance?- is this unique?- is this common?- is this a hybrid?

Mr. Dan Thompson: It's kind of a hybrid. I have personal experience at the state level in settling a matter, Everglades lawsuit, that involved a challenge to clean up the Everglades, a challenge by all kinds of parties, and went into a settled court approval process where the issue was whether third party rights were protected, and the concept was that we explained to the court there is a process, that process is still there whereby the third parties can participate to make sure they are protected so it isn't two people getting together and settling something, a government and an entity settling something and cutting everybody else's rights out, they still have them but they are in an expedited and accelerated process.

City Attorney Leen: And if I may add to that Mr. Mayor. Originally, the proposal was patterned on a proposal that existed in Sunrise, a provision a Sunrise related to zoning relief provided when federal law based on supremacy required a settlement. It's been amended though and there are

elements of that ordinance still in this ordinance, but it's different, it's more based on the case law which indicates that you need to have some type of quasi-judicial hearing at which to approve a settlement so that it won't be a form of contract zoning, that this is actually a quasi-judicial matter. The Commission will be sitting as judges, will evaluate the criteria, and make the decision. It's possible that you could find that as a matter of business terms this is a great deal and still deny it in your quasi-judicial capacity, that's what this provision allows for the Commission to consider that. The other thing I wanted to say about is, I think what's great actually about this provision is that many cities do something like this, but it's not in their Code. For example, the City of Miami, I actually was Special Counsel, the Commission allowed me to do that, the City Commission, recently with the City of Miami regarding the Tequesta site and their approval and what they did is they reached a settlement and then they had a quasi-judicial hearing in front of their Commission, but that really wasn't per their Code, because their Code didn't address that, doesn't mean it wasn't permissible by case law, it was in my view, but this gives a clear place in the Code to address this so it's clear to everybody what each person's rights are, what's going to be considered, what the criteria are, and then if a court is to consider it on sochiary review, what is the standard?

Vice Mayor Kerdyk: In that same vein of dotting all the I's and crossing the T's, Craig maybe you can tell me how much has changed from the Planning and Zoning to when we are getting it now?- because I know it's changed, I know it's changed, and the amount of change does that bother you?- should that go back to Planning and Zoning so they can take another look at it and come back here just from a procedural perspective?- We want to do everything right here and I don't want to be challenged later on and I should defer to you. The other thing is from the standpoint of making sure everything is done right, are you willing to give us an unconditional opinion that this is going to be good for the Astor group because this is what we are trying to basically do it for. I need some surety. I need to feel good and comfortable about that and those are two perspectives that I need some answers to.

City Attorney Leen: So Mr. Vice Mayor first, on the issue of the Planning and Zoning Board, the general rule of law is that you can change the proposed ordinance between the Planning and Zoning Board and the Commission as long as the changes do not take it outside the scope of the title. Here the title is very broad and in my view its well within the title of the changes. Also, I don't really view the changes as material, in the sense that it's achieving the exact same objective. Both of the provisions, the purpose of it was to allow for a hearing before the Commission whereby you could determine whether to approve a settlement and whether to provide zoning relief. What we did was some of the comments made at the Planning and Zoning Board related to publication I thought were good, we've added them, and then we made some modifications to it to make it more useful to the City in doing that, but I don't believe it makes any changes that would require it to go back to the Planning and Zoning Board or go against

something that the Planning and Zoning Board has told us to do. In fact, we tried to be consistent with what they told us to do.

Vice Mayor Kerdyk: I'm leaving it up to you as far as that's concerned.

City Attorney Leen: Now in the second issue I will as Dan, could you talk a little bit about the Vice Mayor's request regarding your view of whether this could be used to settle the Astor lawsuit.

Mr. Dan Thompson: I can't really comment on that to the extent that because I don't know the terms of the Astor settlement are. Understand that this is the type of issue that....

Mayor Cason: We don't want to talk about that here.

City Attorney Leen: Javier, could you come up. Javier Vazquez had more knowledge about this.

Commissioner Quesada: Could we also bring up Steve as well since....

City Attorney Leen: Steve will you come up? And I think the way I would to frame it if it's OK with you Mr. Mayor is, you are both aware of the trolley litigation. This was not drafted solely for the trolley litigation, however, we did spend a lot of time looking at – we wanted to make sure whatever was adopted could be used in the trolley litigation. Could you describe that a little bit to explain why we believe this could be used if there is a settlement in the trolley litigation for this to be brought before the Commission, that this mechanism could be used to resolve that matter.

Mr. Vazquez: And Mr. Vice Mayor, if I could to your question, which is a little pointed and difficult to answer from the standpoint of when you ask for an opinion, but understand this, we have been engaged to draft language, enabling language that's as air-tight as possible in our opinion with regards to, like Craig said, not just the Astor matter, any matter that might find itself in a situation where a settlement might be in order, and it has been brought to your Zoning Code like Craig said. The reason I use the word "air-tight" cautiously obviously is because your Zoning Code consistency with your Comprehensive Plan, for example when you look in the Comp Plan in the mixed-use provisions, consistency comes through your Zoning Code. This is a provision that will be in your Zoning Code that calls for notice, it calls for a public hearing process or a quasi-judicial process, or a hearing, it calls for specific standards that this Commission must find. Like Craig said, you may find yourself discussing settlements and consent order that when you go through your conditions and the standards required by this written provision you may decide that it's not in the best interest of the City, and at the end it

also calls for an appellate process through.....which again makes this, I believe, and I'll ask Steve to expand on it, a very complete provision we worked completely through your Zoning Code and we would be recommending to you today to adopt this with a lot of confidence as it relates to the ability of this to sustain any type of challenge.

Vice Mayor Kerdyk: Let's hear what Steve has to say.

Commissioner Quesada: Steve question for you. I guess you can start with this. Can we use this vehicle – you're the one who's really been at the forefront with the negotiations with Astor and their attorneys, without waiving attorney-client privilege, without expending of that, what is your feeling on this provision with relation to how we can apply it to the Astor situation?

Mr. Steve Helfman: First of all, Craig has been gracious and I appreciate it. I didn't actually draft this, but I had been working with Dan and Javi on this. What's called Division 18 is really sort of the most applicable provision to what might come into play with the Astor lawsuit, OK, and that's the new language since your Board, I think it's called the Planning and Zoning Board, heard this item, OK. So what you see on page 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 is the work product of Berger Singerman and is this new concept that they've created and it's a good one. It's a mechanism for dealing with the zoning component of a settlement agreement and I think it works, and I think it will work. How it works with the Astor project specifically we don't quite know yet, but I think it may work and it should, but it depends on exactly how that settlement plays itself out, OK, and we are just in the process of working through that. The way this is drafted right now, this envisions that there will be a settlement between the City and what's known in the context of a governmental proceeding, they've come up with something called a governmental proceeding that you'll be settling, OK. So the exact parameters of the settlement and whether this will actually work for that we don't know quite yet, but it should, OK, it should as long as the structure of the settlement fits within the parameters of this ordinance. So I don't know that anybody can yet give you an opinion that this enabling act and this framework that's being put in place will precisely work, but it's certainly intended to do that, and as we go forward further with negotiating an ultimate settlement, I think that the intent is to try to work within this framework.

Commissioner Lago: So just a quick synopsis of a little more understanding in regards to what you are stating. In regards to what Berger Singerman has put forth is mechanism, you are telling me will not cure 100 percent the issue that's occurring with Astor Development, but this is not only for Astor, this is a mechanism for future litigation in regards to zoning.

Mr. Helfman: This ordinance does two things for you; it broadens and clarifies your existing Code on dispute resolutions, OK, and that is the division 17, which appears on page 2, and then it

creates an entirely new section called Division 18, which is really the work product of the Berger Singerman firm.

Commissioner Quesada: And one of the key provisions there is 3-1801(c) is the way I see it – what page am I on?– I’m on page 6.

Mr. Helfman: Well that’s certainly one of the important provisions.

Commissioner Quesada: The substantive rather than the procedurally.

Mr. Helfman: And what this Division 18 tries to do and what I think it does is it sets the framework for the Commission to be able to review a development proposal that is part of the settlement agreement, and to facilitate and expedite the review of the development proposal that comes as part of a settlement proposal, OK. So, if there was a proposal, forget about Astor, but if there was any type of proposal you might even be settling a dispute with the County, let’s say, which is a governmental proceeding. I don’t know what the dispute might be, but as its defined here you had a dispute with the County and as part of that there was a development proposal to build a particular building, OK, this says that this is the way we are going to handle the approval process in approving the building in that settlement proceeding. It sets out a special process for approving the development component of the settlement. Now the settlement might also say that you are going to exchange money, OK, but that’s not a development part of the settlement that’s just the exchange of money. So if a settlement with a governmental agency, which this contemplates, involves a development proposal this sets the framework for an expedited way that you all as a Commission can take original jurisdiction and make a decision on that.

City Attorney Leen: Can I add something to that?

Commissioner Lago: I just want to ask a quick question to Mr. Vazquez. Are you privy to any previous encounters in reference to something like is what is being done on Section 3-1801(c)?

Mr. Vazquez: I’ll defer to Mr. Thompson who is expert on that.

Commissioner Lago: Thank you.

Mr. Thompson: I have not had – well, I’ve had experience litigating zoning code issues; I’ve had experience with 163...

Commissioner Lago: Trust me; I'm not doubting your capabilities. Your firm is more than capable to handle the City of Coral Gables needs, but my question is, we are in uncharted waters basically.

Mr. Thompson: I've been involved in zoning litigation and also challenges by outside groups, environmental and neighborhood groups challenging changes to development approvals on the grounds that they are contrary to the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning Code, also been involved in litigation where people have challenged settlements on the grounds that they've taken away their rights to....so I've been involved in all those types of proceedings and those are what's driving my thoughts behind doing this to make sure that you all are protected from those types of challenges, so that's the experience. The other thing is the cautious and legislative drafting to make sure that the general applicability can have flexibility how you resolve things rather than focus on a specific pace because my experience in legislative drafting is too narrow, this happens a lot particularly on the state level, you get too narrow trying to solve a specific problem you might miss something else that might be slightly different and limit your flexibility there, or it may be that if this Astor case is settled the settlement may not be what people think it is right now, so if you do something you'll be putting the "cart before the horse".

Mayor Cason: So this might or might not get to where we want to be on Astor, we really won't know, because we don't know all the details. Is there any way you think that you could write something that's big enough for the general cases and for the Astor case or is this the best you can come up with?

City Attorney Leen: Wait, wait, Mr. Mayor, this should be able to and by should I mean almost certainly will be usable in the Astor case. It was drafted – I brought to them the Astor case, I said we need a mechanism that will settle the Astor case. Obviously, they are attorneys they can't give guarantees, because anything can be reviewed by a court, but this was drafted with that in mind and the idea here is – I don't see why this wouldn't be usable to resolve the Astor case because what will happen in the Astor case is there will be a settlement at some point, let's assume, again we have to reach an agreement, I want to make that clear, but let's assume hypothetically we were to reach an agreement. There is going to be business terms to that, it's going to have to come to the Commission, there is also going to be the development approvals that will also have to come to the Commission, they will likely come at once. You'd have to approve the business like you do anytime you approve something in your proprietary capacity. You'll also then have to have a hearing on the development approvals that will be subject to this provision; this provision will apply to that. In fact, if you look at some of the criteria that are looked at in 3-1805(a)(1), those criteria relate to this type of settlement where there is going to be, I don't want to get into the settlement, but it relates to this type of settlement. So, I think that the issue we see is that Zoning Codes do allow for variances, they do; you can have variances

from the Zoning Code, its well established that a Commission has that authority to grant variances to a Zoning Code. This establishes what essentially is a super variance provision that allows the Commission to have all of this authority wrapped into itself in one hearing to grant those variances, that's the legality behind it. There is also a lot of case law out there which says, that as long as the City Commission holds a quasi-judicial hearing, applies the standard and then approves it, and there is an ability to appeal that's sufficient, that's from the case law.

Commissioner Quesada: Craig, let me jump in for a second.

City Attorney Leen: Sure.

Commissioner Quesada: So you are saying – the question for all the attorneys in the room, is there any existing precedent that's similar that says that something similar 3-1801(c), is out there?- or you mentioned earlier that it was a hybrid of things you had seen in the past, so I guess the question is, obviously if you are proposing it to us and you are recommending it that's out there...

City Attorney Leen: Yes.

Commissioner Quesada:....that's a logical assumption. I guess I want to hear there is precedent out there for this, not the procedural aspect of it, not the procedural aspect of Section 18, the substantive portion.

City Attorney Leen: I want to be clear. Division 18 was taken...

Commissioner Quesada: Answer that question first.

City Attorney Leen:...no, I am – it was taken from the City of Sunrise, which has a zoning relief ordinance, which does provide waiver or relief under the Zoning Code where there is a federal element. That provision which was drafted by Susan Trevarthen, I reviewed it, and that provision was presented to the Planning and Zoning Board, we thought that that provision was not focused enough, it could apply to the trolley litigation, but I wanted it to be even more focused, but yes, it is the same principle. The principle is that a Commission can do this if there is a federal element or a state law element to the resolution. Here we have in the trolley building case, there is a matter with the Federal Transportation Board and there is also...

Commissioner Quesada: So these types of provisions have been challenged with a state or federal law element related to litigation, is that what you are telling me?

City Attorney Leen: No. I'm telling you that there is a provision that exist that there is precedent for. The precedent that I've looked at which were in the interpretation I gave on this topic is that we have a Third District and I believe a Fourth District decision saying in situations where a Commission approves either, I think it may have been a consent order in that case, which very well may be used here, but in situations where a Commission approves something after a quasi-judicial hearing or through a court settlement that, that can be effective, that's what it's based on.

Commissioner Quesada: Got it. That answers my question, it makes me feel better.

Mr. Vazquez: Let me say something really quickly for the Mayor and then get back to Mr. Lago for a second. I think to answer your question in a different way, I think if you were to charge us with asking us to go back and perhaps making it more specific as to any matter, whether the trolley matter or not, I'm not sure we would come back with a different ordinance and I want you to feel very confident about that; and with regards to Mr. Lago, I think where you are going to, I think nobody wants us to be hanging out there forever, if you do make a decision of this type and I think Dan has done a great job in Section 3-1808 with regards to the appeal because it specifically calls for anything that is approved pursuant to such a settlement to be reviewable for petition for _____ that has to be filed with 30 days, so you have a specific timeframe for an appeal. It's going to open, it's going to close and you are not going to have this cloud hanging over you for an undefined period.

Commissioner Quesada: What section is that again?

Mr. Vazquez: 3-1808, it's the last....

Commissioner Quesada: There is a typo just for clarification. Standing is also 1808, but no big deal.

Mayor Cason: Craig, do you want to add anything else?- and our other lawyer before we...

City Attorney Leen: Ultimately, I think what's important about this and I think why we would be able to defend it if it were ever to be challenged is we are trying to do the right thing here. We are presenting the public with the ability to question a settlement, to debate a settlement, to present evidence regarding a settlement. We have a set of criteria that are being applied by the City in its quasi-judicial capacity; we have the right to an appeal. If someone doesn't appeal, that appeal then is lost, is waived. I think it does provide certainty, if we do get a challenge we would defend it, but ultimately this is the best I think we can do, we feel confident that we could defend this.

Commissioner Quesada: Craig, last question for you. Does this have to come back on a Second Reading?

City Attorney Leen: Yes.

Commissioner Quesada: OK. I want to make a motion to accept it as proposed.

City Attorney Leen: There needs to be a public hearing too. You need to open the public hearing.

Mayor Cason: Do we have any public input on this?- any speaker cards?

City Clerk Foeman: No, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Cason: So we'll close the public hearing portion.

Commissioner Quesada: Let me just say one thing before, I'll hold off making the motion so you can speak, but one thing I want to say is, I want this version, I want Steve to communicate it to Allan Diamond and give us any feedback, if we have to do that in a private setting, an Executive Session to get into the details, I just want them to be aware of it, because maybe there is some additional tweaks. Again, because of the nature of this lawsuit, we are all very cognizant.

Mr. Helfman: I did that yesterday.

Commissioner Quesada: Oh, you did. OK.

Mr. Helfman: I sent to Mario and Allan yesterday and I have to review what we are talking about today.

Commissioner Quesada: OK. Did they give any feedback?

Mr. Helfman: Unfortunately, I did not hear back, but that does not mean...

Commissioner Quesada: OK. Then follow-up again prior to the next meeting.

City Attorney Leen: I want to assure you Commissioner, I have kept Mario updated regarding this, and I know that they are happy that we are addressing it through our ordinance.

Commissioner Quesada: OK. Sounds good.

Commissioner Keon: I want a simple answer to my question. It strikes me that this gives us the ability to deal with zoning or land use conflicts in resolving disputes, that's what it does. Thank you.

Mr. Vazquez: Yes.

Commissioner Keon: That's what it does.

Mr. Vazquez: It builds flexibility.

Commissioner Quesada: OK. I'll make a motion.

Commissioner Lago: I'll second.

Mayor Cason: Commissioner Quesada makes the motion, Commissioner Lago seconds.

City Clerk

Commissioner Keon: Yes

Vice Mayor Kerdyk: Yes

Commissioner Lago: Yes

Commissioner Quesada: Yes

Mayor Cason: Yes

(Vote: 5-0)

Mayor Cason: Thank you very much.

[End: 11:59:12 a.m.]