

Page 1

1 CITY OF CORAL GABLES
 2 LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY (LPA)/
 3 PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
 4 VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
 5 CORAL GABLES CITY HALL
 6 405 BILTMORE WAY, COMMISSION CHAMBERS
 7 CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA
 8 WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2015, COMMENCING AT 6:05 P.M.

9 Board Members Present:
 10 Jeff Flanagan, Chairman
 11 Maria Alberro Menendez, Vice Chair
 12 Marshall Bellin
 13 Julio Grabiell
 14 Alberto Perez
 15 Frank Rodriguez

16 City Staff and Consultants:
 17 Charles Wu, Assistant Development Services Director
 18 Ramon Trias, Planning Director
 19 Craig E. Leen, City Attorney
 20 Scot Bolyard, Principal Planner
 21 Jill Menendez, Planning Administrative Assistant
 22 Craig H. Collier, Esq., Special Counsel

23 Also Participating:
 24 Jeffrey Bass, Esq., on behalf of Item 5
 25 Janet Gavarrete
 Jose Rodriguez, Keith and Schnars
 Mario Garcia-Serra, Esq., on behalf of Items 6 and 7
 Beatriz Hernandez, MSA Architects
 Joe Wilber, Gables Residential
 Eduardo Gutierrez, Bullrock U.S.A.
 ZW Jarosz, Architect

Page 2

1 Public Speakers:
 2 Maria Cruz
 3 Stephen Pearson
 4 Stan Birnholz
 5 Paul Savage
 6 Julio Webel
 7 Maria Ason
 8 Alain Yanes
 9 Kirk Menendez

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 3

1 THEREUPON:
 2 (The following proceedings were held.)
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Good evening. This is
 4 the December 9th meeting of the City of Coral
 5 Gables Planning and Zoning Board.
 6 I have to read some statements into the
 7 record. The Board is comprised of seven
 8 members. Four members of the Board shall
 9 constitute a quorum, and the affirmative vote
 10 of four members of the Board present shall be
 11 necessary for the adoption of any motion. A
 12 tie vote shall result in the automatic
 13 continuance of the matter until the next
 14 meeting, which shall be continued until a
 15 majority vote is achieved.
 16 If only four members of the Board are
 17 present, an Applicant shall be entitled to a
 18 postponement to the next regularly scheduled
 19 Board meeting.
 20 Any person who acts as a lobbyist, pursuant
 21 to the City of Coral Gables Ordinance Number
 22 2006-11, must register with the City Clerk
 23 prior to engaging in lobbying activities or
 24 presentations before City Staff or its
 25 Committees and/or the City Commission. A copy

Page 4

1 of the ordinance is available in the Office of
 2 the City Clerk.
 3 Failure to register and provide proof of
 4 registration shall prohibit your ability to
 5 present to the Board.
 6 I now officially call the City of Coral
 7 Gables Planning and Zoning Board of Wednesday,
 8 December 9th, 2015 to order.
 9 Jill, if you could call the roll, please.
 10 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 11 Marshall Bellin?
 12 MR. BELLIN: Present.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 14 MR. GRABIELL: Here.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Here.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 18 MR. PEREZ: Here.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Here.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Here.
 23 All right. We have a quorum.
 24 Please be advised that this Board is a
 25 quasi-judicial Board, and the items on the

Page 5

1 agenda are quasi-judicial in nature, which
2 requires Board Members to disclose all ex parte
3 communications and site visits. An ex parte
4 communication is defined as any contact,
5 communication, conversation, correspondence,
6 memorandum or other written or verbal
7 communication that takes place outside of the
8 public hearing between a member of the public
9 and a member of a quasi-judicial Board
10 regarding matters to be heard by that Board.
11 If anyone made any contact with a Board
12 Member regarding an issue before the Board, the
13 Board Member must state, on the record, the
14 existence of the ex parte communication and the
15 party who originated the communication.
16 Also, if a Board Member conducted a site
17 visit specifically related to the case before
18 the Board, the Board Member must also disclose
19 such visit. In either case, the Board Member
20 must state, on the record, whether the ex parte
21 communication and/or site visit will affect the
22 Board Member's ability to impartially consider
23 the evidence to be presented regarding the
24 matter. The Board Member shall also state that
25 his or her decision is only based on

Page 6

1 substantial competent evidence and testimony
2 presented on the record today.
3 Does any member of the Board have any such
4 communication and/or site visit to disclose?
5 MR. GRABIEL: No.
6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No? Seeing none.
7 Madam court reporter, if you could swear
8 everybody in.
9 Everyone who speaks this evening must
10 complete the roster at the podium with Jill.
11 We ask that you please print clearly, so the
12 official records of your name and address will
13 be correct.
14 And so now, with the exception of
15 attorneys, all persons who will speak on agenda
16 items before us this evening, please rise to be
17 sworn in.
18 MR. WU: This is for everyone who might
19 want to speak on any items today. Please stand
20 and be sworn in.
21 (Thereupon, the participants were sworn.)
22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
23 And in deference to those present, we ask
24 that all cell phones, pagers or other
25 electrical devices be turned off or silenced at

Page 7

1 this time, and we will proceed with the agenda.
2 First item on the agenda --
3 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, if I may.
4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
5 MR. WU: I would like to introduce
6 Mr. Craig Collier, who will be sitting in as
7 Special Counsel.
8 Craig.
9 MR. LEEN: Thank you, Charles.
10 Yes. I would just like to -- Mr. Chair, if
11 I may, I'd like to introduce Craig, as well.
12 Craig is our Special Land Use Counsel for the
13 City of Coral Gables. It's an honor to
14 introduce Craig, who has my name. We both
15 share the same name, as you know.
16 But it's an honor to introduce him, because
17 he really is one of the leading Land Use and
18 Zoning attorneys in Florida, and certainly in
19 this area of Florida, as well. He was the
20 Chief of the Miami-Dade County Attorney's
21 Office, their Land Use and Zoning Section, and
22 he's been a Land Use and Zoning lawyer for
23 many, many years, and also a government lawyer,
24 for the County, for many years.
25 So I think he's a great addition to Coral

Page 8

1 Gables. He's going to be coming to our Board
2 more and more often. I've asked him to be
3 involved with a lot of the Land Use and Zoning
4 issues. He works very well with Charles and
5 Ramon, and I know that they appreciate his
6 involvement, as well. And I will still be
7 involved, also, and I will still be attending
8 your meetings, but occasionally he will also
9 sit in.
10 So I just wanted to introduce you to him.
11 I don't think I could have found a more
12 experienced person to sit in my seat.
13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Craig Leen, thank you.
14 Craig Collier, welcome.
15 MR. COLLIER: Thank you. The name plate is
16 half right.
17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. The next
18 item on the agenda is the approval of the
19 minutes from our meeting of October 14, 2015.
20 Does anybody have any changes or comments?
21 If not, I'll take a motion to accept the
22 minutes.
23 MR. GRABIEL: I move to accept it.
24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.
25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There's a motion and a

1 second.
 2 All those in -- I always forget, do we do
 3 roll call on these?
 4 Jill, please.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 6 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 8 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 12 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 17 I think the first public hearing item on
 18 the agenda is Item Number 5. "An Ordinance of
 19 the City Commission of Coral Gables amending
 20 the City of Coral Gables and University of
 21 Miami Development Agreement, adopted by
 22 Ordinance Number 2010-31 on September 28, 2010,
 23 pursuant to Zoning Code Article 3, Division 19,
 24 entitled "Development Agreements", for the
 25 University of Miami, City of Coral Gables

1 which is, I think, what you say when you have a
 2 PowerPoint to bring up -- I would just like to
 3 -- thank you.
 4 I'd like to just give you an overview of
 5 the request that's before you, summarize it for
 6 you, and then march you through the actual
 7 details of it. There is an agreement, it's
 8 called the Development Agreement, between the
 9 University of Miami and the City of Coral
 10 Gables, and it does a lot of things. It was a
 11 negotiated agreement over a very extended
 12 period of time. It is a comprehensive
 13 agreement.
 14 There is a term in the Development
 15 Agreement that addresses this concept known as
 16 an Internal Road, and the application that we
 17 have before you this evening seeks to do the
 18 following: Amend the provision of the
 19 Development Agreement that relates to the
 20 Internal Road, specifically to conform with
 21 what we call Phase II of the Internal Road, to
 22 represent the current traffic conditions in the
 23 adjacent roadway network. And the amendment
 24 that we're seeking to do, and for which we ask
 25 your approval this evening to summarize it,

1 Campus, amending Paragraph 19 of the
 2 Development Agreement ("Internal Road and
 3 Access") that governs internal circulation on
 4 the Coral Gables Campus, to modify Phase II of
 5 the Internal Road; providing for a repealer
 6 provision, providing for a severability clause,
 7 and providing for an effective date. (Legal
 8 description is on file with the City."
 9 And this is a continuation from the October
 10 14 meeting of ours. We will start with the
 11 Applicant's presentation. Thank you and good
 12 evening.
 13 MR. BASS: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members
 14 of the Board. Jeffrey Bass is my name. 46
 15 Southwest First Street is my address. I'm here
 16 this evening representing the University of
 17 Miami. I'm joined by the Campus Planner,
 18 Ms. Janet Gavarrete, who typically does the
 19 meat of these presentations, but who has lost
 20 her voice, so I will do my very first
 21 PowerPoint presentation ever this evening.
 22 So please work with me. It's not something
 23 that I ever have used before.
 24 Before I do a PowerPoint for you -- and if
 25 I could ask that we bring up the PowerPoint,

1 seeks to eliminate two segments of the Internal
 2 Road.
 3 The first is the segment of the Internal
 4 Road that would run through the Gifford
 5 Arboretum. As originally conceived, the
 6 Internal Road Phase II would run through the
 7 Gifford Arboretum. We are asking your approval
 8 for a modification, so that we do not go
 9 through the Griffin Arboretum.
 10 So to be clear, the amendment that we're
 11 seeking is to not go through the Gifford
 12 Arboretum. We believe that there is ample
 13 justification for us not to go through the
 14 Arboretum and we believe it is neither
 15 necessary nor justified to compel us to go
 16 through the Arboretum, because it's such a
 17 precious resource, and we should really guard
 18 it, not put a road through it.
 19 The second aspect of the modification asked
 20 to adjust the scope of the Internal Road Phase
 21 II, to not traverse the waterway on the south
 22 of University, near the School of
 23 Communications, which was a prior configuration
 24 of the Internal Road.
 25 It makes no sense to bring a road through

1 there. It's dangerous. The utility of the
 2 road there, as it relates to diverting or
 3 minimizing roadway trips, is di minimums, and
 4 when studied, we believe the evidence is quite
 5 clear that whatever justification previously
 6 existed to perform that crossing at that
 7 location, it no longer exists today.

8 And the third aspect of our request before
 9 you this evening is, there was a prior
 10 condition that said, if you displace parking
 11 north of lake Osceola, by building the Internal
 12 Road, you shall replace that parking north of
 13 Lake Osceola.

14 MS. MENENDEZ: North?

15 MR. BASS: North.

16 And what we're asking your permission to do
 17 is to not replace that parking north. We will
 18 replace it, one-to-one, but we believe it would
 19 be contrary to everything that we have done
 20 through our various mobility strategies, which
 21 we will highlight, which have successfully
 22 diverted traffic away from the north part of
 23 the campus to the south part of the campus.
 24 What we've learned is that parking is a driver
 25 of traffic, and by eliminating parking, you can

1 Development Agreement.

2 And since the original conception of the
 3 idea of the Internal Road, the University has
 4 embarked on a vitally important commitment to
 5 mobility and a series of strategies to
 6 implement mobility, and when looking at the
 7 requirement of the Internal Road, through the
 8 lens of the present mobility strategies, you
 9 will see that the Internal Road, as previously
 10 conceived, is no longer necessary to go through
 11 the Arboretum, and go over the waterway.

12 I'd like to say, we did build and complete
 13 Phase I of the Internal Road. That is
 14 complete.

15 So this was the original configuration, on
 16 the slide, of the Internal Road, as conceived
 17 in the UMCAD approval. You'll see what I'll
 18 call the magenta line there, outlining its
 19 path.

20 The blue that you see on the screen is, as
 21 I mentioned before, Phase I of the Internal
 22 Road, which has been completed. Many aspects
 23 of that completion merit mention, that Internal
 24 Road Phase I eliminated the traffic signal at
 25 Miller, it installed the new roundabout and new

1 control where traffic goes.

2 So we're asking for the permission not to
 3 be forced to replace parking north of the lake,
 4 but, rather, to have the freedom to replace
 5 parking south of the lake, towards Ponce,
 6 towards the commercial frontage, where the
 7 chips should be, and away from the residential
 8 neighborhood.

9 So that said, let me begin the
 10 presentation. Just to give you an outline of
 11 the presentation, we're going to show you what
 12 the original conditions and configurations were
 13 for the road, highlight for you the
 14 justification, and we have our experts here
 15 from Keith & Schnars, if you have any technical
 16 questions about that; talk about the Gifford
 17 Arboretum, basically as the resource that it
 18 is, and then talk about the recommendations
 19 that we've heard from our neighbors, through
 20 the outreach that we've done.

21 The condition, as approved originally for
 22 the Internal Road, has a long history. I'm not
 23 going to go through it. Suffice it to say, it
 24 was a condition in an UMCAD approval in 2007,
 25 and from that approval, found its way into the

1 entrance to the University at Miller Road,
 2 re-configured the parking lots by the Music and
 3 the Law School, closed the entrance from San
 4 Amaro at the Law School, widened the sidewalks
 5 along San Amaro, and extensively landscaped and
 6 buffered the edge there.

7 We did lose a significant number of parking
 8 spaces when we did that, 350 parking spaces.
 9 We have replaced, in the Pavia addition -- the
 10 Pavia Garage, I should say.

11 On the screen you will now see another
 12 image of the Phase I, which has been completed,
 13 as required, and you'll see the green, just to
 14 emphasize for you, where the Arboretum is.

15 So Phase II, on the screen now, is what
 16 remains to be pending, and the relief that
 17 we're seeking from you this evening relates to
 18 this segment of the road. This is the proposed
 19 road that we seek to build, which you see,
 20 picks up just on the other side of the
 21 Arboretum, and connects all of the parking
 22 resources in that edge of the campus.

23 It eliminates the portion of the road that
 24 goes through the Arboretum, and it eliminates
 25 the portion that goes over the canal connecting

1 to Stanford.
 2 Here is a closer shot of the actual
 3 proposal, as well as the improvements that are
 4 part of the proposal. It includes a new 60 to
 5 70-parking space lot between 1300 Campo Sano
 6 and the Memorial Parking Lots, to replace some
 7 of the spaces lost as a result of the
 8 re-alignment.

9 We've taken a comprehensive look at this
 10 edge, and I'm going to talk about that a little
 11 bit more when we get to the conditions, but
 12 there are other improvements that we've talked
 13 about with the City, to this edge of the
 14 campus. And one of them, that I think, for
 15 anybody who has been on the campus can really
 16 appreciate, Bronson -- the entrance to Brunson
 17 is very wide, and notwithstanding that, there
 18 are no sidewalks there.

19 So for purposes of connectivity and for
 20 purposes of safety, one of the improvements
 21 that we're offering as part and parcel of this
 22 application is the narrowing of Bronson, which
 23 will have the effect of increasing driver
 24 safety, and adding a sidewalk, which will have
 25 the effect of providing for pedestrian safety,

1 37 percent. So we are incredibly proud of what
 2 we've been able to accomplish, in terms of
 3 managing and reducing traffic, and we were able
 4 to do that through a series of strategies.

5 And on the slide you see now before you,
 6 you'll see a summary of campus-wide traffic
 7 volumes over time, and what I'd like to
 8 highlight for you now is some of the strategies
 9 that we've used to reduce the traffic.

10 First and foremost, President Shalala
 11 believed that to turn the University of Miami
 12 into the type of institution to receive the
 13 recognition that it deserved, it needed to be a
 14 campus-based school, not a commuter school. So
 15 there was a very significant commitment to
 16 bringing students onto the campus to live and
 17 to improve the programs that we offer for our
 18 students on the campus.

19 So consistent with that, we did a few
 20 things. We built University Village during
 21 this period of time. And we converted that
 22 commuter population, that was otherwise driving
 23 to the school, to a resident population, and we
 24 house them in University Village.

25 If you live in University Village, you have

1 and that sidewalk, as configured, will connect
 2 to the bicycle path that exists right there,
 3 part and parcel of the University's commitment
 4 to connectivity.

5 Parking replacement, you could see here
 6 that 70 spaces will be lost as we build Phase
 7 II, the way we wish to build them. We will
 8 replace those spaces, as we said before, but we
 9 wish to be able to replace them south of Lake
 10 Osceola, not north. We believe that that's
 11 better for everybody involved.

12 Now, this request was not just hatched by
 13 us. There was a very long and technical
 14 justification for the request, that was
 15 documented and calculated by our professional
 16 traffic engineers, and we submitted a
 17 justification report, which should be in your
 18 plan. It's a very large technical document.
 19 I'd like to just summarize it for you, in terms
 20 of the trends.

21 It's important to note that the University
 22 has built a lot of buildings on its campus in
 23 the last 25 years. But despite that, we have
 24 been able to reduce the amount of traffic on
 25 the surrounding roadway, north of the lake, by

1 a restricted parking pass, so you cannot bring
 2 your car out of University Village during the
 3 day to drive to class. If you live in
 4 University Village, you're going to walk to
 5 class or you're going to take the shuttle to
 6 get there.

7 We also prohibited freshmen from having
 8 cars on campus. That was a very significant
 9 move. The elimination of freshmen cars on
 10 campus immediately served to significantly
 11 reduce the amount of traffic that we had on the
 12 adjacent roadway network.

13 But perhaps the most significant agent for
 14 change was the introduction of a Parking
 15 Management Plan, that assigned parking
 16 privileges to each specific parking resources,
 17 and the result of that is obvious to anybody
 18 who ever had to go to the University of Miami
 19 to do anything, as I did for Law School.

20 If you didn't have an assigned parking
 21 area, you drove onto the campus, you drove
 22 around. You looked for a parking space. You
 23 were unable to find it. You drove back out on
 24 the road. You drove around again. And you
 25 drove around again, and until perhaps your luck

1 changed and you found a spot.
 2 And in that hunting and pecking for a spot,
 3 you might drive all of the way around the
 4 campus looking for it.
 5 We have taken those choices away from you.
 6 You could only park, with your parking pass,
 7 where you have a parking privilege. So as a
 8 result, it's been a much more deliberate and
 9 targeted approach to having students come onto
 10 the campus once, and park once, and as a
 11 consequence of that, we have really limited how
 12 the students get to the campus, and we've
 13 marshalled where they go to the campus, by
 14 marshalling the parking privileges.
 15 And what we have done conceptually, through
 16 our Mobility Plan, is really shift the
 17 vehicular draw of campus, south of the lake,
 18 away from the residents to the north, and
 19 that's been very successful, in terms of
 20 driving the trips away from the neighborhood on
 21 the north.
 22 And as a result of that, we don't believe
 23 that there is any justification to go through
 24 the Arboretum or to connect south over into
 25 Stanford, as originally conceived.

1 unbelievably successful as a place for our
 2 students to stay on campus, and still do what
 3 students want to do, which is to eat and
 4 congregate and participate in student
 5 activities.
 6 We have increased our dining options, and
 7 we've continued to invest in new courts,
 8 pedestrian improvements, and we have a farmer's
 9 market on campus.
 10 Consistent with these mobility strategies,
 11 we've executed a series of neighborhood
 12 improvements to traffic flow. We've closed
 13 streets along Red Road, from Mataro to Miller.
 14 We've made median improvements and traffic
 15 calming.
 16 I mentioned the Miller roundabout, and
 17 we've enhanced the streetscape on Miller and
 18 Ponce, and it just merits mention, since we're
 19 at City Hall, we donated the meter parking
 20 machines to the City, to help eliminate
 21 sidewalk clutter, making our sidewalks more
 22 useful for their intended purpose.
 23 As I mentioned before, we have 370 Coral
 24 Gables employees, who use our subsidized
 25 transit program. We have a trip sharing

1 So just to highlight a few of the aspects
 2 of our Mobility Plan, that we believe
 3 contribute to our success with reducing
 4 traffic, we have had 800 more on campus bed
 5 built since 2004. We have 4,200 on campus
 6 residents, 1,700 freshmen residents are not
 7 allowed to have their cars. We're very, very
 8 supportive of transit. We encourage and
 9 subsidize the use of transit for our employees
 10 and for our students.
 11 So we do have 1,630 students and 270 staff
 12 who live within walking distance, and as you
 13 know, if you're in any way familiar with the
 14 area, there has been an increase in private
 15 sector housing proximate to the University,
 16 still within walking or biking or trolley
 17 connection, that have taken trips off of the
 18 roadway.
 19 To have students come to the campus and
 20 still deliver the quality programs we wish to
 21 deliver, we've had to make investments in the
 22 programing on campus, as I mentioned.
 23 The Shalala Center, I hope everybody here
 24 has had an opportunity to see it. It is a gem
 25 of a piece of architecture. And it's

1 program, 1,550 Zip Car members at present, and
 2 we have a very aggressive bicycle and
 3 pedestrian program, with bicycle registrations,
 4 designated bicycle friendly aspects of the
 5 campus, and programs to help with bike sales
 6 and air pumps and safety education.
 7 As I mentioned before, we have reduced
 8 traffic by 31 percent -- 31.6 percent, in peak
 9 traffic, north of the Lake, just in the last
 10 four years. And we think that that was, by any
 11 measurement, significant.
 12 So when you look at everything that we've
 13 accomplished, the question presented is, given
 14 this reduction, why should we go through the
 15 community gem that is the Gifford Arboretum?
 16 And for those of you, who aren't familiar
 17 with the Arboretum, or for those watching on
 18 TV, the Arboretum is a living outdoor
 19 classroom. It is a critically important
 20 resource for the University, for the people of
 21 the University, and for the flora and fauna who
 22 reside in it. It was established in 1947, for
 23 educational purposes.
 24 The trees were selected for botanical and
 25 ethnobotanical and evolutionary interest. We

1 have eleven exhibits, in groupings, based on
 2 taxonomic distinctions and based on themes.
 3 We have somebody here from the Arboretum,
 4 who will speak to you a little bit more
 5 specifically about it.
 6 Twenty classes per semester are taught
 7 there. Community events are held there.
 8 Lectures occur there. There are tours and
 9 there's, of course, the annual picnic.
 10 We have engaged in some public meetings,
 11 large scale and small scale. We've heard from
 12 our neighbors. And the City has certain
 13 conditions that they would recommend. I would
 14 like to say that City Staff is recommending
 15 approval of our request. And the City has
 16 asked that we participate in some other public
 17 realm improvements, in and around this precinct
 18 of the campus, as part and parcel of this
 19 request.
 20 I've talked to City Staff, and we believe
 21 the specifics of those conditions will be
 22 worked out between here and Commission.
 23 We have heard that many residents are
 24 really very happy with the existing edge
 25 treatment of the campus near them, and would

1 not want us to make any improvements
 2 specifically to the side of the campus by
 3 Memorial, to Campo Sano, west of the Arboretum,
 4 and we've agreed to that. That's an edge with
 5 a residential look sidewalk, residential edge
 6 lighting treatment, and we don't want to do
 7 anything in the neighborhood, that's a benefit,
 8 that's perceived to be a detriment to our
 9 neighbors. So we've made the commitment that
 10 we wouldn't do that.
 11 We've talked conceptually with the Staff
 12 about the way to approach these City
 13 improvements, and, really, it's really going to
 14 be a program where the City decides what's
 15 appropriate. The City goes and scopes that,
 16 and we will pay for a portion of that, to be
 17 determined by the Commission.
 18 So that Janet's presentation. Thank you
 19 for allowing me to fumble through it with you.
 20 I do have the expert here from Keith & Schnars,
 21 if you have any technical questions.
 22 I know that there are a number of people
 23 here to speak, and I would ask for just a brief
 24 amount of time for rebuttal, if any is
 25 necessary.

1 Thank you.
 2 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You're welcome. Thank
 3 you.
 4 Ramon, you want to give the Staff's report?
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 7 If I could have the PowerPoint, please.
 8 Thank you.
 9 The first thing I want to say is that you
 10 will see that we have a different graphic
 11 design for the PowerPoints, and this is the new
 12 branding standard that the City is using.
 13 Thank you to the leadership of the City
 14 Manager, we're trying to see if we can improve
 15 the aesthetics of the presentations. So this
 16 follows that. If you like it, I'll continue to
 17 use it. If you don't, let me know, and we'll
 18 make it better.
 19 All right. So the issue is fairly
 20 straight-forward. In white, you can see the
 21 general area of that road, that Internal Road,
 22 which what it really is, is connections within
 23 existing parking lots. That's really what it
 24 was.
 25 And what happened is that the area of the

1 campus -- the northern area of the campus
 2 doesn't have too much circulation within it.
 3 So there was an idea originally that, that
 4 could be improved.
 5 Now, the Land Use and the Zoning, as you
 6 know, are unique. The campus has University
 7 Land Use, and then the Zoning has its own
 8 regulations, with the University Campus
 9 District. So everything we do at the
 10 University of Miami has its own logic, within
 11 the General Development of the campus.
 12 This particular request, as any other
 13 request, has been reviewed many times, and I
 14 want to just go over the different meetings
 15 very briefly. But it went to the Development
 16 Review Committee back in July. Then we had
 17 three Staff meetings, with all different
 18 departments, where we had a chance to review
 19 the technical data associated with, basically,
 20 traffic. Because I believe traffic is one of
 21 the most important issues that we can deal
 22 with, particularly the way that traffic impacts
 23 neighborhoods. That is one of the most
 24 challenging issues, in terms of quality of
 25 life.

1 And the original idea behind this road, and
 2 by, "Original," I mean, back in the 1950s, when
 3 the campus was first conceptualized, was to
 4 remove some traffic, by having it within the
 5 campus.

6 Now, as time went by, the campus changed,
 7 and different ideas were implemented, and that
 8 is what the attorney presented to you. So
 9 because the conditions are different today,
 10 than they were in the 1950s, I think it's a
 11 very reasonable thing to do, to review this
 12 request.

13 Now, in addition to the Staff review, we
 14 had a neighborhood meeting. Then we had our
 15 Planning and Zoning Board meeting last time,
 16 where we realized that there had been a
 17 mistake, in terms of the days of the
 18 advertisement. So we decided to have a second
 19 meeting. And that second meeting, in November,
 20 was sponsored by the City. And we facilitated
 21 that meeting. So it was something that -- it
 22 was an effort to provide additional input from
 23 the community in the process, and many or some
 24 of the people, who showed up at that meeting
 25 are here, and they can explain what we did.

1 property was posted, four times we had website
 2 postings, which is basically linking all of the
 3 information that we have on the request. We
 4 had postings at City Hall, two times. And then
 5 we had the actual official advertisement, two
 6 times, in the newspaper, because we've had two
 7 meetings.

8 Now, at the University, we notified
 9 everybody around the campus, which is many more
 10 people than typically would be in a project
 11 like this. So we really tried to make an
 12 effort to get the word out within the
 13 community, because there's a lot of interest in
 14 what happens with the campus.

15 Now, the Applicant showed the general
 16 layout of the road, the improved road, in 2007.
 17 As you can see, we had two phases, and it went
 18 all around the northern end of the campus.

19 And, like I said, it was an idea that made
 20 sense in the '50s, when the campus was mostly a
 21 commuter campus, and it was automobile
 22 oriented. Certainly it was a good idea. In
 23 fact, I would say, similar to the way that FIU
 24 is designed. It has an Internal Road, and so
 25 on, but the mobility element of the Comp Plan

1 The different departments that have
 2 reviewed this process, this project, are listed
 3 here, and you can see that Public Works is
 4 listed as Number One, because a lot of the
 5 projects have to do with potential improvements
 6 within the right-of-way or close to the
 7 right-of-way.

8 Again, we haven't finalized the design.
 9 That's still being discussed, like the
 10 Applicant said, but I think we have some really
 11 good opportunities to improve the neighborhood,
 12 with the consent and the ideas of the
 13 neighbors.

14 In terms of the public notification
 15 requirements, I just want to make everybody
 16 know that we did have a newspaper ad. We had
 17 the property posted for ten days, as required.
 18 And we had a letter sent to the neighbors, and
 19 the public information meeting was also held,
 20 as required by Code. Those are all of the
 21 requirements of the Code, and they apply to any
 22 request.

23 So the number of times that the public were
 24 notified, we had three times that we sent
 25 letters to the property owners, two times the

1 changed that approach to much more of a
 2 multi-modal and a more sophisticated way of
 3 looking at things, and that the University of
 4 Miami has followed up with a proper
 5 justification report.

6 Those ideas are explained -- have been
 7 explained by the Applicant, and basically mean
 8 that most of the parking happens in the south.
 9 The first one -- the Phase I of the Internal
 10 Road was completed, and that area is around,
 11 basically, San Amaro, parallel to it, and it's
 12 connecting several existing parking lots very
 13 effectively. So now cars are able to connect.

14 And as you can see, the top end of that red
 15 line is the Arboretum, and that is the main
 16 issue at hand. To continue that road would
 17 mean to go into the Arboretum, which is shown
 18 here.

19 Now, the University is building most of
 20 this road, most of it. The only thing is that
 21 they don't want to do the connection of the
 22 Arboretum, and then also the connection on the
 23 canal. So there are two areas that they would
 24 like to eliminate from the requirement.

25 The actual implemented portion of the road

1 is shown here on this image.
 2 The type of improvements that they're
 3 proposing are going to enhance the aesthetics
 4 of the campus and the perimeter of the campus,
 5 which I think is beneficial to the neighbors.
 6 You want to make that edge look nicer. And
 7 it's also going to improve some of the internal
 8 circulation. And they've done that very well,
 9 in the aesthetics of the campus, with some
 10 landscaping.
 11 Now, in addition to that, as a condition of
 12 approval, Staff has been discussing with the
 13 Applicant some possible additional
 14 improvements, and we've had a chance to discuss
 15 them with the neighbors at length, and I think
 16 we have a fairly good understanding of what's
 17 acceptable to the neighbors, but we're not
 18 there yet a hundred percent. We're still
 19 working on that.
 20 But at no point I will recommend to do
 21 something that would be opposed by the
 22 neighbors. Clearly the projects within the
 23 campus are fairly easy to do, and make sense,
 24 and they're beneficial to everybody. Anything
 25 additional to that would have to be carefully

1 go back -- that the Arboretum continue to be
 2 enhanced, and there are some additional
 3 recommendations that we need to finalize, that
 4 deal with transportation, and, finally, after
 5 the meeting that we had with the neighbors, we
 6 realized that there was a real interest in
 7 trying to expand the Arboretum, which, I think,
 8 is probably the nicest element that really
 9 helps the neighborhood of this area, in terms
 10 of the University of Miami Campus, towards the
 11 neighborhood, and that there was an opportunity
 12 to restrict some of the delivery hours to the
 13 campus and the noise that is generated by
 14 trucks, which one of the issues was that they
 15 do disrupt the community. That was one of the
 16 issues, that we heard from the neighbors.
 17 The neighbors also said that they would
 18 support additional sidewalks, which, I think,
 19 is a good thing, as long as there's support for
 20 them, and also additional pedestrian lighting,
 21 and that the connectivity between the north and
 22 the south side of the campus was important, and
 23 we should separate that discussion, perhaps,
 24 from the Arboretum. Those are different.
 25 And that, in the future, as the Campus

1 discussed.
 2 Now, the standard of review is that the
 3 request must be consistent with the
 4 Comprehensive Plan, and we have reviewed that,
 5 and there are many multiple policies that deal
 6 with mobility and quality development, and
 7 trying to preserve and promote the aesthetics
 8 of this City, which this certainly would
 9 further.
 10 The actual mobility policies and goals also
 11 promote these better solutions that are more
 12 leading towards integrated parking and the
 13 actual location of people and the actual
 14 circulation within the campus, in more detail,
 15 not just in a general sense.
 16 So Staff has decided that upon review of
 17 the Comp Plan policies, the request satisfies
 18 the standards of review, and we recommend
 19 approval, with the condition that we continue
 20 to work with the community and City Staff, to
 21 finalize some of those improvements in the
 22 public realm and the streetscape; that there's
 23 an explanation of the way that the parking is
 24 being replaced.
 25 We also recommend that -- excuse me, let me

1 Master Plan is revised, that we need to
 2 continue to think in those terms, how to
 3 connect the north and south, and that we should
 4 implement some of the ideas of the Bicycle and
 5 Pedestrian Master Plan that are around the
 6 campus.
 7 So that is the presentation. If you have
 8 any questions, Staff is here to assist, from
 9 many Departments, and I believe some of the
 10 public may want to speak. Thank you.
 11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Ramon.
 12 One quick question for you.
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there a Phase III of
 15 the Internal Road?
 16 MR. TRIAS: No. No.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Because, in our
 18 Staff Report, the diagram we have shows Phase
 19 II, the original alignment stops at the canal.
 20 So it goes from the Arboretum, around the
 21 northeast corner, and then stops at the canal.
 22 So on reading this, I was of the impression
 23 that there was a Phase III, that would be
 24 continued at some point in the future.
 25 MR. TRIAS: No. No. There's a Phase I,

1 that is implemented. Phase II is mostly
 2 implemented. And those are the conditions.
 3 And the issue is that there are two aspects
 4 of Phase II, which the Applicant does not want
 5 to implement, the connection over the canal and
 6 the connection through the Arboretum.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Just the diagram
 8 we have, it's on Page 9 of my Staff Report, the
 9 dotted line for Phase II stops at the canal.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. It does stop at the
 11 canal, yes.
 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 13 MR. TRIAS: And that's the connection that
 14 I'm talking about, in terms of the -- yeah.
 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I just wanted to
 16 make sure I was clear. Thank you.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Now, the second aspect to that
 18 is that there may be some future Master Plan in
 19 that area, that goes beyond the canal, that may
 20 require re-thinking the street network in the
 21 future, maybe. I mean, that's one of the
 22 things that you need to keep in mind.
 23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So we'll

1 later on, two or three years down the road,
 2 they could come back and say, "Oh, we really
 3 didn't want to agree, but we agreed, because we
 4 were pushed to do it."
 5 Whatever we agree, I would hope, that we're
 6 not going to be -- if it's going to be agreed
 7 upon with the idea that we really do not want
 8 to do it, then they should say so from the
 9 get-go, so we don't waste our time. That's
 10 Number One.
 11 Number Two, I would hope that when people
 12 come before you, that they're honest and
 13 truthful. And I would like you to look at your
 14 transcript, on Page 19. When I was here last
 15 meeting, I talked about the fact that we did
 16 not get our letters in a timely manner, and
 17 Mr. Bass assured you that the letter was
 18 mailed -- the notices were mailed on the 31st,
 19 and that they had the postmark. There's only
 20 one problem, September does not have 31 days,
 21 okay. I just want you to know, that we expect
 22 truth.
 23 Now, we are very happy to see the
 24 recommendations from the Staff. We agree that
 25 the Arboretum is a community gem. We agree

1 open up the hearing for public comment.
 2 Jill, how many speakers do we have signed
 3 up for this item?
 4 THE SECRETARY: We have five.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Five, okay.
 6 For the speakers that have signed up, we
 7 will ask that you please keep your comments on
 8 point, and please try not to repeat what others
 9 have said. And we won't have an official time
 10 limit at this point, but if you could keep it
 11 within about three minutes in duration, we
 12 would appreciate that, please.
 13 So, Jill, if you would call the first
 14 speaker, please.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Maria Cruz.
 16 MS. CRUZ: Good evening. My name is Maria
 17 Cruz. I live at 1447 Miller Road. And I'm
 18 very happy that we have this opportunity to
 19 re-address this request.
 20 I have some housekeeping things to take
 21 care of first. My first concern is, whatever
 22 comes out of this request, whatever agreement
 23 is made between the University and the
 24 neighbors, I would like some assurances that
 25 the agreement is not done under duress, that

1 that it's a precious resource. Actually, we'll
 2 go one step further. It should not only be
 3 guarded, it should be improved, enlarged. We
 4 want a better, larger Arboretum.
 5 We agree that, based on the University
 6 studies, traffic has been diverted from the
 7 north to the south. Excellent. We would like
 8 to see less parking on the north. There are
 9 several parking lots adjacent to the Arboretum
 10 that we think would be better -- that land
 11 would better be used as an enhanced, improved
 12 Arboretum. That will be an oasis in our
 13 community, and we would be very pleased if that
 14 were to happen.
 15 We embrace the idea of having less parking
 16 on the north. We would like to see less
 17 parking on the San Amaro side. And we would
 18 like that land to be used, again, for more
 19 trees and more green. We want that area to be
 20 green. We really like the idea.
 21 Okay. I know that we've been told that
 22 parking is so much better. I wonder if anybody
 23 has taken the time to look at the parking or
 24 talk to the Parking Department or the Police
 25 Department, that has been issuing tickets to

1 all of the students that have been parking on
2 Miller, Zuleta, on all of our streets, because,
3 yes, parking in the University is better, but
4 the people that drive and do not park at the
5 University now park on our street.

6 And let me tell you, when you hear
7 University Village is restricted, yes, they're
8 restricted to park in the University grounds,
9 but, guess what, they park across the street,
10 across from my house, and I have pictures of
11 cars, with University Village stickers, parked
12 on Miller Road.

13 Okay. Now, the next thing that I would
14 like to say, okay, I do not know, and this is a
15 question, are all freshmen required to live on
16 campus? Because if they are not required to
17 live on campus, then they do drive, and maybe
18 they are the ones who are parking on our
19 streets. Okay. So maybe that's something to
20 be considered, all right.

21 In general, we are pleased with the
22 proposals from the Staff. I think that if we
23 could agree on an enhanced, better Arboretum,
24 we will all be happy, and this process will be
25 worth the time that we've devoted to it. We

1 We're all about education, not only for our
2 students, and research opportunities for the
3 students and faculty, but for education for the
4 entire community. We welcome the community.
5 All of our events are open to the public, and a
6 great deal of the neighbors do come to the
7 Arboretum regularly. They walk there. They
8 bring their children to play there.

9 And many of them are very interested in the
10 plants, and learning about the plants, and the
11 important role they play in our lives and in a
12 healthy environment.

13 So I really don't know what they mean by,
14 enhance it. I wish Mr. Trias would come out
15 and see the work that I've been doing for the
16 last two years and we're in the process of
17 completing. I think we have enhanced the
18 Arboretum, but it's been a great facility that
19 the University has provided to the community
20 for years and years now.

21 It's always been open to the public, and
22 the only thing I don't like about the
23 recommendation is this idea of bicycle
24 connectivity.

25 We do have paths through the Arboretum

1 look forward to seeing more green, less
2 parking, less asphalt on the San Amaro side.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

5 THE SECRETARY: Stephen Pearson.

6 MR. PEARSON: Good evening. I'm the
7 Director of the Gifford Arboretum. I reside at
8 9050 Southwest 69th Court, Miami, Florida.

9 I appreciate your interest in this
10 important issue. I appreciate the Staff review
11 and comments. I don't know whether expanding
12 the Arboretum is a practical thing, but, you
13 know, I'd love to see the Arboretum get bigger.

14 I don't know what they mean by enhancing
15 it. I've spent the last two years creating a
16 whole new catalog for the Arboretum. If you go
17 out there today, you'll see that ten of the
18 fourteen exhibits have new signage, on each of
19 the trees, not only a sign that tells you the
20 species botanical name, the common name, the
21 origin, but it also has what they call a QR
22 code on the sign. For anybody that comes into
23 that Arboretum with a smartphone that has a QR
24 reader app, they can now do self-guided tours
25 and learn about the plants.

1 right now, but it's for pedestrian use. You
2 know, we have one neighbor, in particular, that
3 comes there almost every day. He's a crippled
4 gentleman, that he comes with his assistant,
5 and they try to help him learn to walk. We
6 don't need bicycles in the Arboretum. Little
7 children play there.

8 I mean, we welcome the community, but I
9 don't think we need to expand or that would not
10 be an enhancement, in my opinion. It would be
11 something that would be detrimental to the
12 tranquility and all of the benefits of the
13 Arboretum.

14 But other than that, I have no qualms with
15 what the Staff is recommending, and I
16 appreciate everybody's, you know, interest in
17 preserving this great resource, not only for
18 the University, but also for the entire
19 community. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

21 THE SECRETARY: Ron Weeks.

22 Peter Ostrosky.

23 Stan Birnholz.

24 MR. BIRNHOLZ: Hello. My name is Stan
25 Birnholz. I live at 1450 Baracoa Avenue, half

1 a block away from San Amaro and the University
 2 of Miami. I'm not against the Arboretum. In
 3 fact, I was at one of the meetings with
 4 Mr. Pearson, and I won a plant, and he warned
 5 me, it has thorns on the bottom. So when I
 6 tried to take out of pot, I forgot, and my hand
 7 was full of thorns. But it's going in my front
 8 yard now.

9 Since 1957, I've been crossing the street
 10 to the University. I have a few degrees there.
 11 And the traffic is constantly worse. The
 12 police have always referred to San Amaro Drive,
 13 around the University, as like a raceway. All
 14 kinds of people, from all over, are driving,
 15 and what you have on that side of the
 16 University, going all around, by Robbia,
 17 Certosa, right around -- past the Arboretum,
 18 and into the other parking lots, you have lots
 19 of dead end parking lots at the University.

20 You park there. There are a lot of
 21 exclusive parking lots. And the only way to
 22 get out is to go back on San Amaro or Campo
 23 Sano.

24 And, again, I'm not against the Arboretum,
 25 but the traffic is a mess, and part of it is

1 And, again, it looks like the deal is done.
 2 Pretty much nobody is going to object to it.
 3 I'm just letting you know what I've experienced
 4 since 1957. It's worse. You can't even cross
 5 San Amaro. One reason is, the University
 6 traffic.

7 And the buses, their equipment, everything
 8 is on the outside. They've done a lot of work,
 9 not to save the Arboretum, but because of their
 10 own internal requirements, in my opinion.

11 I think my three minutes are up. Thank
 12 you.

13 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.

14 No more speakers?

15 THE SECRETARY: No.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Mr. Bass, do you
 17 want any rebuttal?

18 MR. BASS: Unless there are any questions.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.

20 That will close the public hearing process,
 21 and we'll now open it up to Board Members for
 22 discussions and questions.

23 Go ahead.

24 MR. GRABIEL: Am I on? Hello? Yeah.

25 I may be kind of an old fashioned

1 because the University has put all of their
 2 traffic on the outside. Everything goes around
 3 the main streets, not within the University.

4 When I came here, you were able to go right
 5 through Miller to Ponce to US-1. They've
 6 closed all of that. They made more of a campus
 7 out it.

8 Now, I walked the area where this Internal
 9 Road is. This is the subject here. Most of
 10 the area that you see on the map is a huge
 11 parking lot, with a double road going through
 12 the parking lot, up until Certosa, where the
 13 Arboretum goes. So there is that road already
 14 built.

15 The Arboretum, I walked -- it's either 400
 16 or -- by my steps, 400 or 420 feet. Then
 17 there's another parking lot there, a huge
 18 parking lot, at the back end of the University.

19 The intent originally by Dr. Pearson, the
 20 second administrator of the University of
 21 Miami, President, when I went there, was to
 22 have an Internal Road go all around the
 23 University. So the traffic, the buses, the
 24 equipment stays within a road, rather than
 25 being on the public road.

1 architect, but I've always thought that the
 2 internal perimeter roads on a campus are
 3 important to have, because they remove traffic
 4 from the streets.

5 The Arboretum question, I think it's a
 6 balance between what's best for the community
 7 and that connection, even though I think it
 8 would improve circulation with the campus, but
 9 the benefit to the Arboretum is worth making
 10 that road not be built, but I question the not
 11 crossing the canal issue.

12 To me, it is something that would help and
 13 improve the traffic not going through the
 14 neighborhood. So please convince me that I'm
 15 not right.

16 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Grabiell, I'm going to
 17 convince you that you're correct. I think it's
 18 a very valid discussion, to separate those two.
 19 I think they're different.

20 The only thing I would say is that right
 21 now it's a condition that they have to meet. I
 22 think, if I had a choice, I would review this
 23 issue in the context of the Master Plan, in the
 24 future, if that becomes an issue. And that's
 25 the subtlety of this discussion.

1 We're not saying that the idea should go
2 away. We're just saying that we agree with the
3 Applicant, that it shouldn't be a condition of
4 this Development Agreement, but, rather, an
5 issue of future master planning.

6 MR. BASS: If I may --

7 MR. GRABIEL: Still not convinced.

8 MR. BASS: Let me do my best, but as the
9 Director stated, the time to address the
10 building of that engineered crossing, in all
11 fairness, would be if and when there is an
12 amendment to the Campus Master Plan that
13 justifies it.

14 Let me explain to you the reasons against
15 it at this point in time. If you're familiar
16 with the location, the location would be
17 determinus of University, back towards the
18 school of Communication.

19 It would then cut over the canal, basically
20 behind West Lab, at a point -- I'm going to
21 just eyeball it. Please, it's not to scale --
22 but it feels like a hundred yards, I'll call
23 it, east of the existing pedestrian crossing
24 that exists at present over the canal, that you
25 would walk from the School of Communications

1 towards the Lowe Art Museum.

2 If you were to build the bridge,
3 Mr. Grabiell, and have cars go there, you would
4 be creating a significant, significant
5 dangerous conflict, because the road, at that
6 point, would dump into the parking of Mahoney
7 Pearson, which is the residential dense center
8 of where students are moving all day, all of
9 the time, at campus, and to introduce vehicles
10 through that very congested position would
11 create a conflict between vehicles,
12 pedestrians, that is unjustified.

13 Also, if I may, by entering the campus at
14 University and traveling down University on
15 that path, you would be doing something at a
16 point of campus that you can't do anywhere
17 else, which is enter our campus without passing
18 through a secured gate control point.

19 All of the other access points into the
20 campus, we have security, with gates that come
21 down at eleven o'clock, so people coming into
22 the campus have to go through security.

23 If we were to build a bridge there, one
24 would be able to enter from University, come
25 right into the heart of where our dorms are,

1 without passing through any of the security
2 points that we have on our campus.

3 And the last point is, I think, a point
4 that you can really appreciate if you go out
5 there and walk it. If that were to be a
6 bridge, and that would to be turned into a
7 major mover of circulating traffic, you would
8 be about as far from West Labs playgrounds as I
9 am from Mr. Coller.

10 There's a little fence. Then you have the
11 West Lab playgrounds. And we don't believe
12 that it would be justified, by any condition at
13 present, to have cars cutting through here,
14 potentially, running along there, close to West
15 Lab, and then dumping them into where all of
16 our students live.

17 And so while I can certainly appreciate the
18 skepticism, I can tell you, as somebody who has
19 walked it today, that when you look at the
20 conditions of the Mahoney Pearson lots, as they
21 are at present configured, there would be no
22 way to have that serve as a functioning aspect
23 of circulation, because the circulation just
24 wouldn't work.

25 And, importantly, a road there would

1 basically conflict with how our campus
2 functions in that precinct, which is very
3 residential, and we've talked to the City, and
4 we've talked to the Police Department, we've
5 talked about the ability to get vehicles in and
6 out in the case of an emergency, and at
7 present, the City Staff and its professional
8 team, I believe, are very comfortable with us
9 not building that engineered crossing at this
10 point in time at that location.

11 MR. GRABIEL: Just one more.

12 Has anybody done a study of how building
13 the bridge would affect the traffic on the
14 neighborhood streets, positive or negative?

15 MR. BASS: It's in the justification
16 report, which is very thick, and the conclusion
17 was that on either approach, from the east or
18 from the west, it would not be an attractor to
19 divert traffic through the campus here, because
20 it's not an efficient connection point, which
21 is a way to say that a passenger otherwise
22 traveling either from the east or from the
23 west, around that edge of the campus, the
24 analysis was, they would probably not be
25 changing their behaviors to go through the road

1 there, and that was the reason that the
 2 professionals, in their professional reviews,
 3 supported the proposition that we're asking
 4 your approval, which is to delete this little
 5 segment, because it wouldn't serve any useful
 6 purpose, in a meaningful way, as a traffic
 7 diverter, and I have Mr. Chow (phonetic), here,
 8 if you'd like, Keith and Schnars, to further
 9 elaborate on that. It's a thick justification.
 10 MR. GRABIEL: I tried.
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: I had a question.
 12 You mentioned Staff, but yet I remember
 13 reading in the report that the Police
 14 Department wanted the roadway over the bridge
 15 to connect both sides. So has that changed?
 16 MR. BASS: Well, I'll just report to you
 17 what the statement was, that was made at the
 18 outreach that occurred in the Police
 19 Department. The Chief was there, and I'll let
 20 the Chief's words speak for himself, but
 21 basically, on the safety concern that I just
 22 addressed, about having cars coming in to where
 23 all of the students live, there was absolute
 24 agreement.
 25 And there was the statement that as it

1 relates to an emergency situation, that they
 2 are able to move over the -- what we call the
 3 pedestrian bridge, that you now walk over to,
 4 that exists there. If they needed to access
 5 that area at present, they could, without us
 6 having to build this.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: You mentioned security and
 8 the gate, but isn't that all open, all along
 9 that side? The east side of the campus, from
 10 Campo Sano, that's all open.
 11 MR. BASS: Yeah, that's open, but that's
 12 not the residential part of the campus. The
 13 south part are all controlled.
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: There's other connections
 15 that I see that crosses the bridge. Isn't
 16 there a way of perhaps connecting to one of
 17 those connections, so that you don't have to
 18 create a new bridge in the student living area,
 19 as you mentioned?
 20 MR. BASS: There is an existing connection
 21 there right now.
 22 MS. MENENDEZ: There seems to be a
 23 pedestrian, and then there seems to be two
 24 roadway connections, if I'm not mistaken. I'm
 25 not sure. I'm just looking at the drawing.

1 MR. BASS: I don't believe that there's a
 2 roadway connection, but let me sign language
 3 with Ms. Gavarrete.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Pedestrians?
 5 MS. GAVARRETE: No. There is no
 6 connection, vehicular connection, from north of
 7 the lake to south of the lake.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: There is none?
 9 MS. GAVARRETE: No, there's none.
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: So to get from one side to
 11 the other, you obviously have to go to the
 12 outside?
 13 MS. GAVARRETE: If that's what you want --
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: You know, I hate for you to
 15 talk, Janet.
 16 MS. GAVARRETE: That's okay. No, but let
 17 me tell you something, it's important for
 18 everyone to understand that we're not -- we
 19 don't have a blank campus, okay. We have a
 20 collection of development decisions that have
 21 been made over many years, and we have what we
 22 have, and we manage it in such a way that we
 23 send people to specific areas to park.
 24 When you get there, you have a little decal
 25 that says, I'm in the red zone, I'm in the

1 yellow zone, in the purple zone, in the white
 2 zone. You don't get in your car to go anywhere
 3 else. And that is one of major reasons why we
 4 have been able to decrease the noise of traffic
 5 in the area, because you don't wake up in the
 6 morning and go try and hunt and peck for
 7 parking.
 8 You wake up in the morning, and you go to
 9 campus, and you go to that one lot. And the
 10 way that we issue parking permits, okay, we
 11 issue parking permits based on the inventory
 12 that's there. So you always find parking. And
 13 so you're not driving around to the north, and
 14 then getting in your car, you know, to change
 15 class and go somewhere else. You walk. And we
 16 also have the shuttle.
 17 MR. BASS: Ms. Menendez, but the premise to
 18 your question is that you would be looking to
 19 reposition your car on campus, which what
 20 Ms. Gavarrete was saying would be
 21 impossibility, without the parking privileges.
 22 And, as I said, in response the Mr.
 23 Grabiell's question, the engineers have
 24 concluded, in their professional opinion, that
 25 you would not -- if you were seeking to

1 otherwise leave the campus, you wouldn't do so
2 by driving down University, because it would be
3 a very inefficient movement for you to make to
4 leave the campus and get on to where you were
5 going.

6 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Bass -- Jeff, you
8 said you reduced traffic 31 percent in the
9 past, I think, four years, north of the lake.
10 What's the calculation for traffic on the south
11 side of the lake?

12 MR. BASS: For that, I may need Jose.

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, good evening. Jose
14 Rodriguez, Keith and Schnars, 6500 North
15 Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale.

16 Ladies and gentlemen, good question.
17 During the last few years, the University has
18 had a program, a traffic monitoring program,
19 which we've included all of the access points
20 along Ponce de Leon, San Amaro, Campo Sano and
21 Pisano, in order to find out the traffic.
22 That's why much of this is included in the
23 reports you've seen.

24 One of the issues we found was that
25 overall, and even the report mentions that,

1 mentioned about 50 percent of the campus
2 density, about 50 percent students, but we
3 still maintain the traffic at basically a
4 level. There have been peaks. Back in 2000, I
5 think was the highest peak you had, around
6 16,000 vehicle trips.

7 And let me clarify, too, this is peak hour
8 period. We're talking about three hours in the
9 morning and three hours in the afternoon, the
10 maximum traffic during the periods. And that's
11 corresponding, of course, to all of the
12 classes, et cetera. So we've experienced a
13 very, very minor change in all of those years.

14 In the last three years, yes. Once the
15 implementation of the policies were put in
16 place, the effectiveness was very evident, the
17 shift of the traffic to the south, the
18 reduction in traffic on the north. It's even
19 helped, in some ways, shift the traffic away
20 from Campo Sano. The general traffic that you
21 have there is your basic neighborhood
22 cut-through traffic for other reasons,
23 non-University reasons types of things.

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So we had a
25 precise number about the reduction in traffic

1 since 1992, we really haven't had a change in
2 traffic overall, it was about a half -- a less
3 than one percent change, in 25, 27 years,
4 whatever, in that sense. Why? Because of all
5 of the changes mentioned by the University
6 personnel, parking programs, traffic
7 improvements in the area, policies implemented.

8 So what we see now is, the traffic is
9 basically the same as it was back in 1992, but
10 the distribution of the traffic has changed.
11 It used to be 60 percent of the traffic, for
12 the University, entering the campus, was
13 through Campo Sano and San Amaro. Now it's
14 about -- it was about 60 percent, 62 percent,
15 back then. Now it's reversed. It's about 45
16 percent in the north.

17 So all of these programs have actually
18 shifted over the traffic. And I don't have the
19 total number. We recently did some counts
20 here. We were down about 14,000 overall, in
21 the campus itself, the main campus traffic,
22 during 2015. That's about the same volume that
23 was present back in 1992, at the same access
24 points, in the main campus itself.

25 So with the increase of, what, I think they

1 on the north side of campus.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do we have a percentage
4 of whether its an increase or reduction for
5 traffic on the south side of the campus?

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Let me see if I have that
7 information in here. Like I said, we do the
8 counts and all of that. I just don't have the
9 recent ones here.

10 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And, then, if those are
11 historical counts, do we know what they're
12 projected to be after the completion of the
13 UHealth building and whatever else is planned?

14 Jeff -- Mr. Bass, where I'm going with
15 this, as I'm sure you know is, as we slowly
16 whittle away the volume on the north half of
17 campus, which I can fully appreciate, and the
18 neighbors appreciate, and that is important,
19 between taking -- I think, our packet or your
20 packet says it was 400 that were lost during
21 Phase I, we've lost 70 now in Phase II, so
22 we're slowly moving that to the south. Combine
23 that with all of the other activity that the
24 University is doing, building, contributing on
25 the south side of campus, along with just the

1 natural increase of development in the
 2 surrounding area, I'm just trying to get a
 3 better idea of what the impact is. While it
 4 helps the north, what is it doing to the south?
 5 Sorry, Janet.
 6 MS. GAVARRETE: It's okay.
 7 A few years ago, like three years ago, we
 8 added two floors to one of our parking garages.
 9 We added almost 300 parking spaces to the Pavia
 10 Garage. We now have a building permit to add
 11 860 parking spaces in the new Merrick garage.
 12 So that's another thousand spaces.
 13 That, together, will have been built by the
 14 end of next year.
 15 In addition to that, as part of these
 16 Internal Road modifications that we're doing,
 17 internal improvements, we are losing about 68
 18 parking spaces in this second phase of the
 19 road, and we're replacing it, right in that
 20 same area.
 21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So it should be
 22 easier to find a parking space even on the
 23 south side of campus?
 24 MS. GAVARRETE: That's correct.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But we still have those

1 vehicular trips, going in and out of Ponce,
 2 which has very limited capacity?
 3 MS. GAVARRETE: It is the appropriate place
 4 to put any additional traffic, is in that
 5 corridor.
 6 The other thing is that the Master Plan
 7 also calls for additional campus housing. And
 8 when one converts commuters to residents, there
 9 is an immediate drop in traffic. We have
 10 started the process, with the City, to modify
 11 our campus Master Plan, to move forward with
 12 additional campus housing, which converts
 13 commuters to residents, and this is one of the
 14 tools in our tool box.
 15 MR. GRABIEL: And how many units?
 16 MS. GAVARRETE: In 2004, with UV, and then
 17 we will use again, starting hopefully
 18 construction in the next couple of years.
 19 MR. GRABIEL: How many residential units,
 20 how many beds?
 21 MS. GAVARRETE: 1,100 beds get converted.
 22 So if that's is 1,100 people driving to campus
 23 and going, that's going to be twice, one trip
 24 in, one trip out. That's 2,200 trips. They're
 25 going to be walking.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I ask a question? What
 2 is the urgency of getting this done now and not
 3 wait for a Master Plan to eliminate or to
 4 provide another means of trying to accomplish
 5 what was trying to be accomplished?
 6 MS. GAVARRETE: Because the
 7 justification -- we have been living with this
 8 mandate for many years.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: Does it have a deadline?
 10 MS. GAVARRETE: Yes.
 11 MR. WU: Yes. I can answer that. The
 12 deadline is the end of this year to file for
 13 construction drawings, and to complete
 14 construction within two years. So that is the
 15 deadline they're working with.
 16 And we've decided, since they filed an
 17 application, to toll that deadline.
 18 MR. GRABIEL: I'm sorry?
 19 MR. WU: To toll the deadline. We
 20 suspended the deadline, pending the application
 21 to change the Development Agreement.
 22 MR. BASS: I've asked Mr. Rodriguez to do
 23 the calculation for you, which he is doing, to
 24 answer your question.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, thank you very

1 much.
 2 MR. BASS: Which you didn't get an answer to.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Based on the numbers, we
 5 have 2015, the total campus volumes, six-hour
 6 volumes, there, was 13,508. In the north, we
 7 have 5,893. So that means we had about 7,600
 8 along Ponce de Leon.
 9 I just want to show you, this is before any
 10 UHealth or anything coming into play there.
 11 Back in 2012, the volume along Ponce de Leon
 12 was around 8,300, but you had about 7,000 along
 13 Campo Sano and San Amaro.
 14 So we show a reduction in both areas,
 15 actually, both, the north and the south.
 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So your
 17 calculation show 8,300 on Ponce in 2012, and
 18 then down to 7,600 in 2015?
 19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.
 21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But I will echo Julio
 23 Grabiell's comment and concern, that with
 24 everything going on, I'm not sure -- well,
 25 maybe we can make it a Phase III or create a

1 different deadline for that portion of it.

2 I think, once it gets wiped off of a map,
3 getting it back on, I think, is a difficult
4 proposition. And so if it stays there -- I
5 mean, Ramon, is your condition -- it's your
6 Condition Number 5 to maintain and promote
7 connectivity between the north and the south.

8 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and the question from
9 Ms. Menendez was actually the right question,
10 which is, there's a need for urgency, because
11 of that deadline, as it relates to the specific
12 condition of the Internal Road. That's a fact.

13 Now, the issue of master planning, the
14 network of streets, the issue of better
15 connectivity, that's an ongoing discussion. In
16 fact, currently we're reviewing an amendment to
17 the Campus Master Plan, in a different area,
18 and we're looking at different street layouts
19 and so on. So that's an ongoing discussion.

20 So if you want to be very specific about
21 that, you should. I think it's a good
22 opportunity. However, like I said, the request
23 from the Applicant is not to have to comply
24 with that deadline in December. I mean, in a
25 nutshell, that's what the request really means.

1 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Ramon, I have a question.
2 What do you mean by, enhance the Arboretum?

3 MR. TRIAS: The Arboretum?

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Arboretum, yeah.

5 MR. TRIAS: Well, what I mean is that the
6 neighbors said that the Arboretum could be
7 larger and could have more landscape and could
8 have better connections with sidewalks, better
9 access. Now, that's a very general concept. We
10 have not worked that in detail. We need to
11 discuss that further with the University, but
12 that's what we meant by that.

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I guess I'm just -- sorry
14 to be thinking out loud here, but, I mean,
15 who -- I just find -- I mean, it sounds like it
16 would be great to have -- you know, it sounds
17 like the community and everybody would benefit
18 from a larger and a nicer Arboretum, but, I
19 mean, who are we to tell the University that
20 they need to put or enhance their Arboretum?

21 I mean, I just don't see the connection
22 between --

23 MR. TRIAS: No. The connection is very
24 clear. They're saying, we are not going to
25 spend money building this road.

1 MR. TRIAS: Okay. So that's what -- you know.

2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I see. Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Any other questions?

4 MR. GRABIEL: I think, of the three points,
5 personally, the elimination of the connection
6 through the Arboretum, I think it's a good
7 point. I was the architect for the Physics and
8 Chemistry Building, and I know that when we
9 were designing that building, the Arboretum was
10 prime into maintaining that open space and
11 green space.

12 So we placed the building in such a way
13 that we didn't touch a single tree at that
14 time. So I'm all for it.

15 MR. WU: Mr. Grabiell, can I pause for a
16 minute? You said you were the architect for a
17 UM project?

18 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah, many years ago.
19 Physics and Chemistry Building.

20 MR. WU: Let's make sure Mr. Coller is
21 aware of that.

22 MR. COLLER: Yes. You don't currently have
23 a relationship with the University, correct?

24 MR. GRABIEL: Not at all. This was even
25 with a previous firm.

1 MR. COLLER: I don't think that's a problem.

2 MR. WU: I just want to make sure we have
3 that into the record, that you do not have a
4 conflict.

5 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, I have to enter into
6 the record, I have a daughter that goes to the
7 University of Miami. Does that matter?

8 MR. COLLER: I don't think -- you're not on
9 the Board. You don't have a fiduciary duty to
10 the University. So I don't think that's an
11 issue.

12 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.

13 MR. TRIAS: And, Mr. Chairman, I went to
14 that building while I was a student, so this
15 has been some time ago.

16 MR. COLLER: And I'm a graduate of the UM
17 Law School, but I don't think any of those
18 things are --

19 MR. GRABIEL: You passed all of your physic
20 courses?

21 The other point, which is the bridge over
22 the canal, I worry about it. I mean, I go back
23 and forth. I think if it would help to
24 eliminate any traffic from the residential
25 streets, it's an improvement. At the same

1 time, I have to tell you, that I worry about
 2 traffic from the south, going north, and then
 3 affecting the neighborhood negatively.
 4 So, hopefully, before the City approved a
 5 bridge and this University built it, I would
 6 think an analysis would have to be made, that
 7 there's not a negative impact to the
 8 neighborhoods to the north by creating that
 9 bridge, so we don't want to work it both ways.
 10 But, at the same time, if the University is
 11 going through continuous reviews of the Master
 12 Plan, I don't want to eliminate the idea of the
 13 bridge until further down the line, when other
 14 studies can be made.
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And that's my
 16 recommendation, and had I been involved in that
 17 discussion some years ago, that's probably what
 18 I would have recommended. It's an issue that
 19 is more related to the Master Planning and the
 20 activities, than just an abstraction.
 21 By itself, it doesn't really accomplish
 22 much; however, in the context of an amendment
 23 to the Master Plan, it could be a better
 24 design.
 25 Now, what the Applicant mentioned, as far

1 as the Police Chief saying that currently, for
 2 emergencies, they could drive on that bridge is
 3 true. That's what he said during the
 4 neighborhood meeting. So I think that, that
 5 concern --
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: They could drive on which
 7 bridge?
 8 MR. TRIAS: The existing pedestrian bridge.
 9 The existing pedestrian bridge, which Ms.
 10 Menendez raised as one of the issues. We asked
 11 that question. Staff asked that question. And
 12 the Police Chief said, "No, it works fine for
 13 emergency purposes right now." So that's not
 14 an issue right now.
 15 Now, it may be an issue later on, depending
 16 on how that area develops and how buildings are
 17 planned, fine, and that's when we need to look
 18 at it again, in the context of the Master Plan
 19 Amendment, if that happens.
 20 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Any further
 21 comment? Anybody want to make a motion?
 22 MR. GRABIEL: Do we have to have one motion
 23 for each of the three issues or --
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's all one item.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: All in one. Three issues.

1 MR. GRABIEL: The parking going to the
 2 south --
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 4 MR. GRABIEL: -- the elimination of the
 5 road through the Arboretum, and the bridge.
 6 I need some help with the legalities. I
 7 would move to approve, with a motion that all
 8 of the parking -- allow the University to move
 9 all of the parking that is eliminated from the
 10 north side, to move to the south side of the
 11 campus, not to build the road through the
 12 Arboretum. And, Third, I would like to keep
 13 the option of the bridge for future Master
 14 Planning.
 15 So I might leave it to you to write it up,
 16 but that would be the way I would --
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and, then, if you could
 18 add the discussion about the improvements in
 19 the neighborhood that is ongoing, to finalize
 20 that.
 21 MR. GRABIEL: Okay. And to have the
 22 University continue to work with the City and
 23 the neighbors to improve all of the issues that
 24 they have identified.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: That was in your conditions,

1 right?
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: So I would --
 4 MR. GRABIEL: With all of the conditions,
 5 yeah.
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: With the conditions set
 7 forth by Staff.
 8 MR. GRABIEL: There you go.
 9 MS. MENENDEZ: That last item that you
 10 mentioned, not the condition item, but the one
 11 related to the bridge, what are you saying,
 12 you'd like to allow it for a future discussion,
 13 as part of the Master Plan?
 14 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah. That remains as part
 15 of a Master Plan of the University, and to be
 16 looked at, at a future date, when they've come
 17 back to the City with other changes to the
 18 Master Plan.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: I'll second his motion.
 20 MR. WU: Can you clarify your motion with
 21 Staff, whether it mirrors Staff's ordinance
 22 proposal? Is that correct?
 23 MR. TRIAS: You're incorporating Staff's
 24 conditions.
 25 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

Page 73

1 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.

2 MR. WU: And there are no additional

3 changes, based on Staff's conditions?

4 MR. TRIAS: I guess a more detailed

5 discussion about the Master Planning in the

6 future, consideration of connection.

7 MR. WU: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. TRIAS: I think that's fine.

9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have a motion and a

10 second. We're clear on what the motion is?

11 MR. COLLER: I just have, actually, a

12 question of Staff.

13 Mr. Trias, with respect to the Master

14 Planning of the road across the lake, which

15 seems to be one of the issues, does this

16 ordinance address that Master Plan or is that a

17 separate document?

18 MR. TRIAS: No.

19 MR. COLLER: So the context of this comment

20 about consideration of the bridge across the

21 lake is really not actually part of the issue

22 that's here.

23 MR. TRIAS: Right. Right.

24 MR. COLLER: Is that my understanding?

25 MR. TRIAS: That is correct.

Page 74

1 MR. COLLER: But I think it's a

2 recommendation -- take it as a recommendation

3 from the Board, but it doesn't -- this item

4 that's before you today doesn't really impact

5 that. I want to make sure I understand it.

6 MR. TRIAS: Right. The request is very

7 narrowly focused. It has to do with the

8 condition in the Development Agreement for the

9 building of the Internal Road, and the request

10 is to eliminate two segments of that road.

11 That's it.

12 Now, in terms of the Master Planning, I

13 think it's a very good idea to review that

14 connection to the south, if need be, in the

15 future, and I think that's a very valid

16 discussion.

17 MR. COLLER: Okay. So they can add that,

18 but just understand, it's not part of the

19 Master Plan. The Master Plan is not before

20 them.

21 MR. TRIAS: Right.

22 MR. BASS: Correct. Correct.

23 MR. COLLER: Okay. I just want to make

24 sure I understood.

25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the request before

Page 75

1 us is to delete that Internal Road from the

2 canal south.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.

4 MR. BASS: Correct, as a -- let me back up.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah.

6 MR. BASS: I'll always be very candidly.

7 Let me tell you where we are and where we need

8 to be. We have a condition imposed in the

9 Development Agreement, not by the Master Plan.

10 Our amendment is to the Development Agreement,

11 not to the Master Plan. We need to manage

12 closure on this issue, because there is a time

13 obligation for the submission of construction

14 drawings and building permit plans for a road

15 that we wish not to build at this time.

16 So our request for you now is simply

17 targeting an amendment to the Development

18 Agreement to delete that. What I've heard said

19 is, I think, that while you may, I hope, be

20 favorably inclined to grant our application to

21 amend the Development Agreement, to delete that

22 condition at this time, the Planning Director

23 says he would still like to keep, as an option

24 for Master Planning, the re-visiting of that

25 structured crossing, at an appropriate point in

Page 76

1 time, but that's not part of the application

2 that's before you.

3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Now I'm more confused.

4 MR. COLLER: But I think the Board's

5 resolution could include a recommendation that

6 consideration of the bridge --

7 MS. MENENDEZ: As part of the Master Plan.

8 MR. COLLER: -- as part of the Master Plan.

9 MR. TRIAS: As a future discussion to be

10 discussed.

11 MR. COLLER: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Hold on. I'm sorry, if

13 the Development Agreement requires construction

14 of Phase II of the Internal Road, which goes

15 from the end of Phase I, around, down, over the

16 bridge, right?

17 MR. WU: Yes.

18 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. And so the

20 request before us is to extend the time frame

21 for submission of permits?

22 MS. MENENDEZ: No. They want to kill it.

23 MR. WU: No. They want to delete those two

24 connections.

25 MR. BASS: No. No. No.

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But then I'm being
2 told, no, the request before us to amend the
3 Development Agreement, does not include that
4 portion of the Internal Road, but I'm
5 understanding that it does.

6 MR. BASS: Let me make it very clear.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Like I'm a
8 two-year-old, please.

9 MR. BASS: I've known you almost that long.
10 We're building Phase II of the Internal Road.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

12 MR. BASS: There are two parts of Phase II,
13 the Internal Road, that we're asking for
14 permission not to build. So we're asking to
15 approve a modified scope of Phase II of the
16 Internal Road. Not the elimination of the
17 obligation. We've already built Phase I and we
18 intend to build Phase II. We are not seeking
19 the elimination of that obligation.

20 We're seeking, at this time, for you to
21 approve something very simple, which is the
22 connection that we showed, as what will the
23 Phase II for now, and that's the request that's
24 before you, for which we ask for your favorable
25 vote. That's it.

1 he's saying, you can delete that portion that
2 went through the Arboretum, no problem, but I
3 don't think he's agreeing to approve the
4 deletion of the portion that goes over the
5 canal, such that, that portion and that
6 requirement to build it, remains, and maybe we
7 would have to have a deadline for construction
8 further down the road for that portion.

9 MR. BASS: That would not acceptable to us.
10 I understand our position may be not acceptable
11 to you. What I would suggest, along those
12 lines, would be that you approve our
13 application, as filed, and you offer a
14 recommendation to the Commission with respect
15 to the inclusion of an engineered crossing over
16 the canal, at that point in time, in connection
17 with a future Master Plan amendment, to which
18 that would rationally relate.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Which, playing out as
20 we do as lawyers, may never happen.

21 MR. BASS: At which point, it would never
22 be done.

23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. You may never
24 come back. Chances are slim, but you may never
25 come back in front of us.

1 This whole other Master Planning issue is
2 not before you. I understand you can offer any
3 recommendation that you wish, but that's not
4 part of our application.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. Okay. So --

6 MR. BASS: Did I clarify it?

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think maybe I have
8 it. So you're going to you -- you want to
9 build a portion of Phase II, and you're keeping
10 the balance of Phase II in the Development
11 Agreement.

12 MR. BASS: Yes.

13 No. We're amending the Development
14 Agreement, to take the old Phase II and
15 substitute the new Phase II.

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. Right.

17 MR. BASS: So that we could build the new
18 Phase II and be done.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. Okay. Let me
20 try and rephrase, at least how I understand it,
21 Julio.

22 Assuming everybody votes in the
23 affirmative, you can build your amended -- you
24 can build your amended Phase II, the red line
25 that's in the packet before us, and I think

1 MS. MENENDEZ: We just heard they're going
2 to introduce some more housing, so --

3 MS. GAVARRETE: May I offer a friendly
4 amendment and a way in which to see how we
5 bring closure to one thing, yet still be
6 respectful and mindful about always wanting to
7 have the appropriate connectivity, both, for
8 pedestrians and for vehicles, if there is a
9 rational nexus?

10 Let me explain something to you. I would
11 offer that you should say that the City and the
12 University continue to rely on the traffic and
13 parking monitoring requirements that are
14 already in your Zoning Code, okay, that apply
15 to the University of Miami, and that those
16 reports inform us, in terms of modifications
17 that we make of the Master Plan in the future,
18 that would include the appropriate vehicular
19 and pedestrian campus circulation enhancements.
20 That's the responsible wording, in my opinion,
21 that is principled based on a need that may
22 surface in the future, and that's a condition.
23 That's fine. That's acceptable, because it
24 then would respond to that moment in time in
25 which that may be needed, but there's a

1 rational nexus to it.

2 So additional transportation management
3 actions, having a rational nexus to a
4 demonstrated connection needs, can be
5 considered, in conjunction with future
6 amendments of the Master Plan, and then that's
7 how you deal with being responsible, you know,
8 Planning Board Members.

9 And it also makes us, as Campus Planners
10 and Developers, be responsible. And it also
11 makes us look at the regulations that you have
12 for us to enforce this, which are our traffic
13 studies, our parking demand studies, our
14 mobility studies. You focus us back on the
15 instruments that you already have residing
16 within your power to make us do that, and I
17 would offer that that's the responsible and
18 principal thing to do. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: For the Board, my view
20 point is, right now we're taking one big bite
21 at the apple, and I'd rather take a couple of
22 smaller bites. And if you extend the deadline
23 for that portion of the roadway -- nobody is
24 saying it won't be deleted in the future or
25 changed in some way in the future, but right

1 now, let's see what happens, as we take -- when
2 we take one more small bite, let's see what
3 happens, and then come back and look at it
4 again.

5 MR. WU: I think you have a motion and a
6 second.

7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do.

8 MR. WU: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We've had a lot of
10 discussion. So does that motion still stand?

11 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

13 MR. COLLER: In your motion --

14 MS. MENENDEZ: Did you ask for a friendly
15 amendment?

16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No, and I think -- we
17 got into the discussion, because I think we
18 started the conversation about clarifying what
19 the motion was and what, in fact, was or was
20 not before us.

21 MR. COLLER: Well, your motion was not to
22 approve the deletion of the bridge over the
23 lake?

24 MR. GRABIEL: Right.

25 MR. COLLER: So there's still, on top of

1 that, the end of December deadline under your
2 motion. New construction drawings. I don't
3 think that's what you want.

4 MS. MENENDEZ: No, I didn't understand
5 that. I thought your motion was to grant the
6 request; however, recommend that as part of the
7 Master Plan discussion, that this road be
8 considered.

9 MR. GRABIEL: Correct.

10 MR. COLLER: Oh, okay. That's different.
11 That's different.

12 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. He's approving the
13 request; however, he wants to give a
14 condition --

15 MR. COLLER: He's recommending in the
16 Master Plan further consideration.

17 MS. MENENDEZ: As well as the conditions
18 that have been set forth by Staff. That's how
19 I understood it.

20 MR. COLLER: Okay. That's fine.

21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I thought he said, not
22 the deletion of it.

23 MR. GRABIEL: I'm sorry?

24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I want to make sure
25 Julio's -- we've got the motion that's clear.

1 MR. GRABIEL: Maria explained it. That's
2 what I want.

3 MS. MENENDEZ: Now you mentioned something
4 that's different from him.

5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I thought he was
6 recommending against the deletion of the
7 Internal Roadway over the canal, but that's not
8 what he's --

9 MR. GRABIEL: No.

10 MS. MENENDEZ: No.

11 MR. GRABIEL: I just don't want it to
12 disappear. I want it to be seen in the future,
13 and I think the University agrees with that,
14 and I assume Staff, also.

15 MR. TRIAS: Yes. If I can explain what I
16 understand. You're recommending approval of
17 the request, and, in addition, you're reminding
18 everyone to review this in the future, if it's
19 needed, in the Master Plan. Is that pretty
20 much what we're talking about here?

21 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.

22 MR. TRIAS: Okay. Very good.

23 MR. BASS: We understand that. Just, as
24 phrased, I don't agree with it.

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is it you don't agree

1 with, what aspect of how it's phrased?
 2 MR. BASS: That there's an obligation --
 3 it's fine as phrased, but it was stated that we
 4 agree with it.
 5 MR. GRABIEL: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you
 6 were not --
 7 MR. BASS: But there's a motion. There's a
 8 second. There's discussion.
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But you don't agree
 10 with it?
 11 MR. BASS: As Janet said, we believe that
 12 when we come forward with an application,
 13 that's reviewed, and it would be appropriate in
 14 connection with the review of that application
 15 to consider a range of mitigation, which may or
 16 may not include that. Then we'll have that
 17 discussion at that time. But we don't want to
 18 have a specific, hanging over our head,
 19 obligation to do that for eternity, maybe or
 20 may not.
 21 But I understand the motion. There's a
 22 second. There was a statement that we agree
 23 with it in concept. The bigger, bigger concept
 24 of having the planning decisions about
 25 connectivity consider a whole bunch of things,

1 project referred to as "Gables Ponce III" on
 2 the property legally described as Tracts A-C,
 3 Block 16, Industrial Section, with an address
 4 of 363 Granello Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida;
 5 including required conditions and providing for
 6 an effective date.
 7 MR. GARCIA-SERRA: Good evening, Mr. Chair,
 8 Members of the Board, Mario Garcia-Serra, with
 9 offices at 600 Brickell Avenue, representing
 10 this evening LG Ponce III, LLC, a subsidiary of
 11 Gables Residential, the owner of the 1.69 acre
 12 lot located at 363 Granello Avenue.
 13 I'm accompanied today by Joe Wilber, of
 14 Gables Residential, Beatriz Hernandez, our
 15 project architect, of MSA Architects, Hugh
 16 Johnson, our landscape architect, and John
 17 McWilliams, our traffic engineer.
 18 We have a PowerPoint presentation, and I'd
 19 ask the Audio Visual Department to bring it up
 20 on the screen.
 21 As you can see in the aerial photograph,
 22 this is a triangular shaped property, located
 23 between Greco and Granello Avenues, and to the
 24 east of the alley that bisects the block. It
 25 is located immediately to the north of the

1 we agree with that. Having a specific
 2 preordain obligation, that we don't agree with.
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Any further
 5 discussion? Motion and a second. Jill, if you
 6 would call the roll, please.
 7 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 8 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 12 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?
 16 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 19 Next item on the agenda is Item Number 6.
 20 It's a Resolution of the City Commission of
 21 Coral Gables, Florida requesting Mixed-Use Site
 22 Plan review pursuant to Zoning Code Article 4,
 23 "Zoning Districts", Division 2, "Overlay and
 24 Special Purpose Districts", Section 4-201,
 25 "Mixed Use District (MXD)" for the Mixed-Use

1 Gables Ponce I and II buildings, which have
 2 been very successful, and we want to keep
 3 building on that success, with another third
 4 phase of luxury rental apartments.
 5 The proposed building is nine stories in
 6 height, and will include 204 apartments, along
 7 with ground level retail and live-work units.
 8 Following the lead of the first two phases,
 9 there is a considerable amount of pedestrian
 10 plaza and park like spaces, and this project
 11 will be another major step towards fulfilling
 12 the long-time goal of the City, to convert this
 13 area from an industrial area, to a Mixed-Use
 14 Village, centered around the Village of MERRICK
 15 Park.
 16 Our only request today is Mixed-Use Site
 17 Plan Review, and I'll ask Beatrice Hernandez,
 18 our project architect, to do a brief
 19 presentation on the plans that she has
 20 proposed, including the Site Plan and
 21 elevations.
 22 Beatriz.
 23 MS. HERNANDEZ: Good evening. Can you hear
 24 me okay? Beatrice Hernandez, MSA Architects,
 25 7695 Southwest 104 Street, Miami, Florida.