



REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA ITEM NO. VIII-A
COMMISSION MEETING 05-16-12

May 16, 2012

KE for

FROM: LT. DAVID NEWTON, Special Investigations Bureau
Police Department

THROUGH: MIKE SANCHEZ, Planning Manager
Planning Division *MS*

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATION NO. TA-11-001 AND
RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
NO. EA-11-001 PROHIBITING THE OUTDOOR CULTIVATION OF MARIJUANA

APPROVED BY
<i>[Signature]</i> DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR
<i>[Signature]</i> CHIEF OF POLICE

RECOMMENDATION

The appropriateness of the proposed text amendment has been examined pursuant to Section 12-402, and the Director has determined that the proposed text amendment is consistent with the goals and policies in the 2025 Fresno General Plan.

Upon consideration of staff evaluation, it can be concluded that proposed Text Amendment Application No. TA-11-001 is appropriate for the project area. Therefore, staff recommends the Planning Commission take the following actions:

1. RECOMMEND APPROVAL to the City Council of the environmental finding of exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061 (b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines which exempts projects that clearly will have no significant effect on the environment.
2. RECOMMEND APPROVAL to the City Council of Text Amendment Application No. TA-11-001.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Text Amendment No. TA-11-001 proposes to add Article 21 to Chapter 12 of the Fresno Municipal Code related to the outdoor cultivation of marijuana. Specifically, the text amendment would prohibit the outdoor cultivation of marijuana.

Currently, the City has no explicit rules or regulations governing the outdoor cultivation of medical marijuana. Numerous medical marijuana cultivation sites have been established in the incorporated areas of the city. The Public Works and Development and Resource Management Departments have received inquiries from prospective marijuana growers about marijuana cultivation in incorporated areas. There have been violent incidents associated with the cultivation of marijuana, including reports of four shootings within the city of Fresno, one resulting in death. Additionally, the police department believes numerous thefts and physical confrontations between marijuana growers and theft suspects are unreported. As a result, marijuana growers are constantly vigilant with many possessing handguns and/or rifles to protect their fields.

The term "outdoor" cultivation is not specifically enumerated in Proposition 215 (The Compassionate Use Act of 1996), Senate Bill 420 (Medical Marijuana Program Act), or Health and Safety Code Sections 11362.5 -11362.83. Under the proposed ordinance, cultivation would be limited to an enclosed and secure structure which has a complete roof enclosure supported by connecting walls.

extending from the ground to the roof, secured against unauthorized entry, and accessible only through a lockable door(s).

BORDERING PROPERTY INFORMATION

City-wide application.

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

The State Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act provide for the exemption of projects which will clearly have no significant effects on the environment. More specifically, Section 15061(b) (3) of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

"...CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA."

It has been determined that there is no possibility of significant adverse effects as a result of this proposal. On January 26, 2012, City Council adopted an interim urgency ordinance placing a moratorium on the outdoor cultivation of marijuana in the city of Fresno. The interim ordinance temporarily prohibits outdoor cultivation of marijuana in all districts in the incorporated areas of the City of Fresno (until December 15, 2012). As the outdoor harvest is completed, no new outdoor cultivation can occur during this time. The proposed text amendment will maintain the status quo for the purposes of CEQA.

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION ACTION

This text amendment was presented to the Airport Land Use Commission on April 2, 2012. The commission approved the City of Fresno Ordinance prohibiting outdoor marijuana cultivation as being consistent with the Compatibility Land Use Plans and Policies of the Fresno County Airport Land Use Commission.

COUNCIL DISTRICT COMMITTEES AND OTHER OUTREACH

The proposed ordinance was presented to all active Council District Plan Implementation Committees between January and April of 2012. In addition, presentations were made to the Kiwanis Club, the Citizen's Police Academy, and a couple of Neighborhood Watch groups. In general, the input received was in support of the proposed ordinance, however at least one committee member was opposed.

PUBLIC NOTICE

In accordance with Fresno Municipal Code Section 12-402-B, a notice of hearing was published in the Fresno Bee 10 days prior to the planning commission hearing date. No comments have been received by staff.

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

The proposed ordinance complies with applicable state law while imposing reasonable rules and regulations protecting the public health, safety, and welfare of the residents and businesses within the incorporated areas of the City of Fresno.

Unless adopted, marijuana cultivation can occur without any specific regulation and creates inconsistent and incompatible land use. Marijuana is considered the dried mature processed flowers or buds of the female cannabis plant.

Marijuana raises a number of difficult legal, social, safety, and medical issues for California cities. Marijuana use among adolescent students is increasing after a decade of gradual decline. This increase is perhaps attributable, in part, to conflicting messages imparted by the national debate over drug legalization and criminalization. Federal law prohibits the cultivation and use of marijuana, regardless of the reason for such use. However, California and fifteen other states (plus Washington DC) have legalized the medical use of marijuana. Under current California law, non-medical users, who possess not more than 28.5 grams (1 oz.) of marijuana, other than concentrated cannabis, are guilty of an infraction punishable by a fine of not more than one hundred dollars (Penal Code Section 11357(b)).

In 1996, the voters of the State of California approved Proposition 215 (codified as Health and Safety Code Section 11362.5 and entitled "The Compassionate Use Act of 1996"). The intent of Proposition 215 was to enable persons, in need of marijuana for medical purposes, to obtain and use marijuana without fear of criminal prosecution under limited and specified circumstances. It specifically exempted patients (or a patient's primary caregiver) from being prosecuted under Health and Safety Code 11357 (possession of marijuana) and 11358 (cultivation of marijuana) for specified amounts.

On January 1, 2004, the California State Legislature enacted Senate Bill (SB) 420 (the Medical Marijuana Program Act) to clarify the scope of The Compassionate Use Act of 1996 and to allow cities and other governing bodies to adopt and enforce rules, regulations, and laws consistent with SB 420.

On October 7, 2011, the four California US attorneys issued a news conference, stating many people in California had simply used the law as a cover for large-scale drug operations, with tens of millions of dollars' worth of marijuana being sent across state lines from California. Per Melinda Haag, the U.S. attorney in San Francisco, the voter-approved Compassionate Use Act, "has been hijacked by profiteers...using the cover to make enormous amounts of money" as California cities burgeon with marijuana storefronts purporting to serve suffering people. "This is not what the California voters intended or authorized," said André Biotte Jr., the U.S. attorney in Los Angeles. "It is illegal under California law."

Federal officials said they would also concentrate on properties used to grow marijuana, particularly in the agriculturally rich central part of the state.

The safe distribution of marijuana, as contemplated by the Act, should include the safety of all the citizenry of the city, not just the users of medical marijuana. The goal of the ordinance is two-fold: it ensures the safety of both medical marijuana users who cultivate marijuana and non-users who live in close proximity to the marijuana cultivation areas.

Examples of the public threat to health, safety or welfare are as follows:

1. There are numerous reports of violent incidents associated with the cultivation of marijuana, including reports of five shootings within the City of Fresno. One incident resulted in the death of a victim who attempted to steal marijuana plants. The grower, who shot the victim, was convicted of voluntary manslaughter and sentenced to 25 years in prison. This shooting occurred in the 900 block of West Belmont Avenue, directly across from the Fresno Zoo Playland and the paddle boats on Lake Washington inside the zoo.
2. Based on anecdotal evidence received from the narcotics and intelligence units, numerous marijuana-related thefts and physical confrontations between marijuana growers and theft suspects are unreported.
3. As a result, the growers are constantly vigilant with many growers possessing handguns and/or rifles. The chance of an innocent victim, who lives near a marijuana field, being injured by stray gunfire is high.
4. Depending on the type of marijuana harvested and the willingness of a grower to wait for plants to reach an optimum state of ripeness, most outdoor harvesting begins in August and (depending on the weather) ends in late November. The peak harvest is in October. During this time, marijuana buds are heavy with THC (delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol) resin and produce a strong scent. There is sufficient evidence that marijuana cultivation attracts a considerable amount of non-residents who, by following the scent, drive or walk into these neighborhoods in search of marijuana cultivation fields, i.e., grows. Marijuana-related threats and conflicts involving the growers and their neighbors continue to escalate.
5. The unregulated cultivation of outdoor marijuana close to residences and schools poses a current and immediate threat to public health, safety, and welfare. During the 2010 fall harvest, the Fresno Police Department received 52 complaints from citizens calling on the Narcotics Hotline, specifically complaining of the strong odor of marijuana and increased pedestrian/vehicular traffic. School administrators have complained of students, after they have walked by marijuana fields, smelling strongly of marijuana. During the current 2011 harvest, the department received 198 complaints from citizens. During the recent annual harvest, the Southeast District administrative supervisor received approximately three to five marijuana harvest-related complaints per week involving thirteen grows.
6. California's medical marijuana laws have unwittingly created a profitable cultivation industry fueled by high profitability and high demand. Marijuana production requires little investment and produces large profits. Marijuana costs approximately \$75.00 per pound to produce and can be sold for up to \$6,000 per pound at the wholesale level, depending on the quality of the processed marijuana. As a result, there is significant interest in developing illegal (but highly-profitable) interstate marijuana distribution rings from California to the other 34 non-medical use states. Many marijuana grows are nothing more than profit making schemes.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE

There are several California cities that currently are working on or have moratoriums on medical marijuana cultivation. They are: Anderson, Live Oak, Long Beach, Redding, South Lake Tahoe and Tracy.

California cities with permanent bans are San Bernardino, Moraga, and Lakespoint.

In the City of Fresno, an interim ordinance is in effect until December 15, 2012 that prohibits outdoor cultivation of marijuana in all districts in the incorporated areas of the city. The ordinance being reviewed would act as a permanent prohibition through an amendment to the municipal code. The proposed text amendment would add the following to Chapter 12 (Land Use Planning and Zoning) of the Fresno Municipal Code:

SECTION 12-2102

DEFINITIONS: As used in this Article, the following words and phrases shall have the meaning given them in this Section, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

- (a) "City" shall mean the City of Fresno, California.
- (b) "Cultivation" shall mean the planting, growing, harvesting, drying or processing of marijuana plants, or any parts thereof.
- (c) "Fully enclosed and secure structure" shall mean a space within a building, greenhouse or other structure which has a complete roof enclosure supported by connecting walls extending from the ground to the roof, which is secure against unauthorized entry, and which is accessible only through one or more lockable doors.
- (d) "Outdoor" shall mean any location that is not totally contained within a "fully enclosed and secure building" that is permitted and zoned for that location.
- (e) "Person" shall mean any individual, group of two or more individuals, collective as defined in the Compassionate Use Act, corporation, partnership or any other legal entity.

SECTION 12-2103. OUTDOOR CULTIVATION OF MARIJUANA PROHIBITED.

No person owning, renting, leasing, occupying, or having charge or possession of any real property within the City limits shall cause or allow such real property to be used for the outdoor cultivation of marijuana.

SECTION 12-2104. PENALTY AND ABATEMENT.

- (a) A violation of this chapter shall be prosecuted by the City Attorney through the civil enforcement process, including injunctive relief. Each day a person is in violation of this Article shall be considered a separate violation.
- (b) Any property upon which a violation of this Article is found shall be subject to immediate abatement by the City.
- (c) In addition to any administrative penalty assessed for a violation of this Article, any person found in violation of this article will be charged abatement, actual, administrative and enforcement costs as defined in Section 1-503, calculated to recover the total costs incurred by the City in enforcing this Article.

Legal Requirements for Regulating the Outdoor Cultivation of Marijuana

California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.83 expressly allows Cities and Counties to adopt and enforce ordinances that are consistent with Senate Bill 420. The City has no explicit rules or regulations governing the outdoor cultivation of marijuana to prevent impacts on nearby residents

and businesses. The proposed ordinance complies with the applicable state law, as well as imposes reasonable rules and regulations protecting public health, safety, and the welfare of the residents and businesses within the incorporated area of the City of Fresno.

Nothing contained in the proposed ordinance conflicts with Federal law as enumerated in the Controlled Substances Act, Title 21, U.S.C. Section 841, nor does it permit any activity that is prohibited under that Act.

Nothing in the proposed ordinance shall be construed to (1) allow persons to engage in conduct that endangers others or causes a public nuisance, (2) allow the use of marijuana for non-medical purposes, or (3) allow any activity relative to the cultivation, distribution, and/or consumption of marijuana that is otherwise illegal.

Two recent decisions in state appellate courts ruled that local jurisdictions can ban dispensaries. In *Riverside v. Inland Patients* (filed November 9, 2011); the court ruled that nothing in state law prevents cities or counties from banning dispensaries. In a similar case in Long Beach, the court went even further and ruled that only the federal government can regulate marijuana and any attempt by a local jurisdiction is illegal and a violation of the Controlled Substance Act.

California laws “do not provide individuals with inalienable rights to establish, operate or use” dispensaries, nor do they say that dispensaries “shall be permitted within every city and county,” wrote Justice Carol Codrington for a unanimous court decision in *City of Riverside v. Inland Empire Patients Health and Wellness Center*. The court ruled that California law expressly allows localities to regulate dispensaries and restrict their locations. Codrington stated a total ban is “simply a means of regulation or restriction.”

Conclusion

Staff believes that the proposed text amendment is in the best interest of the City of Fresno. Staff supports Text amendment No. TA-11-001 as proposed in the attached Draft Ordinance.

Attachments: Exhibit A: Environmental Assessment No. EA-11-01, dated March 15, 2012
Exhibit B: Proposed Ordinance

Exhibit A
Environmental Assessment

**CITY OF FRESNO
ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING OF NO POSSIBILITY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. EA-11-01**

THE PROJECT DESCRIBED HEREIN IS DETERMINED TO HAVE NO
SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 5 OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) GUIDELINES

APPLICANT: City of Fresno
Fresno Police Department
2323 Mariposa Mall
Fresno, California 93721

PROJECT LOCATION: The prohibition of the outdoor cultivation of medical marijuana is on a city-wide basis.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A permanent prohibition of the outdoor cultivation of marijuana through an amendment to the municipal code. Under the proposed ordinance, cultivation would be limited to a fully enclosed and secure structure, with a foundation, solid walls and a roof. The purpose is to contain the odor of the marijuana plant and remove the attractive nuisance, reducing the chance of theft, physical confrontation, and violence.

This project is exempt under Section 15002(k) (1), Section 15378(a) and Section 15061(b) (3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

EXPLANATION: **CEQA Section 15002(k) (1):** The Lead Agency examines the project to determine whether there is a project subject to CEQA. The City has determined that the activity associated with the text amendment does not pose an impact on the environment such that it constitutes a project under CEQA.

CEQA Section 15378(a): A "Project" means the whole of the action, which has the potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. The proposed ordinance complies with applicable state law while imposing reasonable rules and regulations protecting the public health, safety, and welfare of the residents and businesses within the incorporated areas of the City of Fresno. The proposed amendment does not pose a direct or indirect effect on the physical environment.

CEQA Section 15061(b) (3): The activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects, which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. Here, there is no possibility of significant adverse effects as a result of this proposal. On December 15, 2011, the City Council adopted an interim urgency ordinance placing a moratorium on the outdoor cultivation of marijuana in the City of Fresno. The interim ordinance was then extended by the City Council on January 26, 2012. The interim ordinance temporarily prohibits outdoor cultivation of marijuana in all districts in the incorporated areas of the City of Fresno until December 11, 2012. As the outdoor harvest is completed, no new outdoor cultivation can occur during this time. The proposed text amendment will maintain the status quo for the purposes of CEQA. No activity associated with the proposed amendment

has been identified with any certainty as causing a potential or significant effect on the physical environment.

Finally, there is no substantial evidence in the record that any of the exceptions set forth in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15002(k)(1), Section 15378(a) and Section 15061(b)(3) apply to a prohibition on marijuana cultivation. Therefore, staff has determined that a no possibility of significant effect is appropriate for the proposed project.

Date: May 16, 2012

Prepared By: Lt. David Newton, Police Department

Submitted By: 

Lt. David Newton
City of Fresno
Special Investigations Bureau
Police Department
(559) 621-5901

Exhibit B
Proposed Ordinance

BILL NO. _____

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA, ADDING ARTICLE 21 TO
CHAPTER 12 OF THE FRESNO MUNICIPAL CODE
RELATING TO PROHIBITING OUTDOOR CULTIVATION OF
MARIJUANA IN THE CITY OF FRESNO

WHEREAS, in 1996 the voters of the State of California approved Proposition 215 which was codified as Health and Safety Code Section 11362.5, et seq., and entitled “The Compassionate Use Act of 1996” (“the Act”); and

WHEREAS, the intent of the Act was to enable persons who are in need of marijuana for medical purposes to obtain and use it under limited, specific circumstances; and

WHEREAS, on January 1, 2004, Senate Bill 420 became effective to clarify the scope of the Act and to allow cities and counties to adopt and enforce rules and regulations consistent with SB 420 and the Act; and

WHEREAS, California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.83 expressly allows Cities and Counties to adopt and enforce ordinances that are consistent with Senate Bill 420; and

WHEREAS, the City has no explicit rules or regulations governing the outdoor cultivation of marijuana to prevent impacts on nearby residents and businesses; and

WHEREAS, the City of Fresno is the fifth largest City in California and has a substantial percentage of non-owner occupied rental properties and vacant foreclosures. The numerous rental properties and foreclosures have attracted unauthorized marijuana cultivation activities resulting in damage to these properties.

WHEREAS, federal law prohibits use of marijuana, regardless of the reason for such use; while state law decriminalizes under state law the use of medical marijuana on limited terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, this Ordinance complies with the applicable state law, as well as imposes reasonable rules and regulations protecting public health, safety, and the welfare of the residents and businesses within the incorporated area of the City of Fresno; and

WHEREAS, The City of Fresno Police Department, City residents and other public entities have reported adverse impacts from the outdoor cultivation of marijuana within the City, including offensive odors, increased risk of trespassing and burglary, and acts of violence in connection with the commission of such crimes or the occupants' attempts to prevent such crimes; and

WHEREAS, the strong odor of marijuana plants, which increases as the plants mature, is offensive to many individuals and creates an attractive nuisance, alerting people to the location of valuable marijuana plants and creating an increased risk of crime; and

WHEREAS; children are particularly vulnerable to the effects of marijuana use, and the presence of marijuana plants has proven to be an attractive nuisance for children, creating an unreasonable hazard in areas frequented by children such as schools, parks, and similar locations; and

WHEREAS, to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, it is the desire of the City to modify the City of Fresno Municipal Code by prohibiting the outdoor cultivation of marijuana within the City; and

WHEREAS, it is the Council's intention that nothing in this Chapter shall be deemed to conflict with federal law as contained in the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. Section 841,

by permitting, or otherwise allowing, any activity which is lawfully and constitutionally prohibited under the Act.

WHEREAS, mindful of the fact that marijuana possession and use is prohibited under federal law and partially decriminalized under state law, it is the Council's intention that nothing in this Chapter shall be construed, in any way, to expand the rights of anyone to use or possess marijuana under state law; engage in any public nuisance; violate federal law, or engage in any activity in relation to the cultivation, distribution, or consumption of marijuana that is otherwise illegal.

THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FRESNO DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Article 21 is added to Chapter 12 of the Fresno Municipal Code to read as follows:

ARTICLE 21

OUTDOOR CULTIVATION OF MARIJUANA

Section	12-2101.	Purpose.
	12-2102.	Definitions.
	12-2103.	Outdoor Cultivation of Marijuana Prohibited
	12-2104.	Penalty and Abatement.

SECTION 12-2101. PURPOSE. The purpose of this section is to prohibit the outdoor cultivation of marijuana in order to protect the public health, safety and welfare. Without this prohibition, plantings of new crops of marijuana will occur without the City's ability to control the negative effects to the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the City of Fresno. Those negative effects include, but are not limited to, offensive odors, alerting people to the location of valuable marijuana plants and creating

an increased risk of crime such as trespassing and burglary, and acts of violence in connection with the commission of such crimes or the occupants' attempts to prevent such crimes.

The Council further finds and declares that this Ordinance is found to be categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

SECTION 12-2102. DEFINITIONS. As used in this Article, the following words and phrases shall have the meaning given them in this Section, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

(a) "City" shall mean the City of Fresno, California.

(b) "Cultivation" shall mean the planting, growing, harvesting, drying or processing of marijuana plants, or any parts thereof.

(c) "Fully enclosed and secure structure" shall mean a space within a building, greenhouse or other structure which has a complete roof enclosure supported by connecting walls extending from the ground to the roof, which is secure against unauthorized entry, and which is accessible only through one or more lockable doors.

(d) "Outdoor" shall mean any location that is not totally contained within a "fully enclosed and secure building" that has been approved by special permit, pursuant to section 12-405 of the Fresno Municipal Code, and has been issued by the Development and Resource Management Department. All proposed buildings and structures constructed on the property must comply with the prevailing California Building Code Standards.

(e) "Person" shall mean any individual, group of two or more individuals, collective as defined in the Compassionate Use Act, corporation, partnership or any other legal entity.

SECTION 12-2103. OUTDOOR CULTIVATION OF MARIJUANA PROHIBITED. No person owning, renting, leasing, occupying, or having charge or possession of any real property within the City limits shall cause or allow such real property to be used for the outdoor cultivation of marijuana.

SECTION 12-2104. PENALTY AND ABATEMENT.

(a) A violation of this chapter shall be prosecuted by the City Attorney through the civil enforcement process, including injunctive relief. Each day a person is in violation of this Article shall be considered a separate violation.

(b) Any property upon which a violation of this Article is found shall be subject to immediate abatement by the City.

(c) In addition to any administrative penalty assessed for a violation of this Article, any person found in violation of this article will be charged abatement, actual, administrative and enforcement costs as defined in Section 1-503, calculated to recover the total costs incurred by the City in enforcing this Article.

SECTION 2. SEVERABILITY. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase or word of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, unlawful or otherwise invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance. The Council hereby declares that it would have passed and adopted

this Ordinance and each and all provisions thereof irrespective of the fact that any one of more of said provisions be declared unconstitutional, unlawful or otherwise invalid.

SECTION 3. EFFECTIVENESS. This ordinance shall become effective and in full force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on the thirty-first day after its final passage.

* * * * *

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF FRESNO) ss.
CITY OF FRESNO)

I, YVONNE SPENCE, City Clerk of the City of Fresno, certify that the foregoing ordinance was adopted by the Council of the City of Fresno, at a regular meeting held on the _____ day of _____, 2012.

AYES :
NOES :
ABSENT :
ABSTAIN:

Mayor Approval: _____, 2012

Mayor Approval/No Return: _____, 2012

Mayor Veto: _____, 2012

Council Override Vote: _____, 2012

YVONNE SPENCE, CMC
City Clerk

BY: _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

BY: _____
Michael D. Flores, Deputy