

City of Coral Gables City Commission Meeting
Agenda Item E-5
January 13, 2026
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

City Commission

Mayor Vince Lago
Vice Mayor Rhonda Anderson
Commissioner Melissa Castro
Commissioner Ariel Fernandez
Commissioner Richard D. Lara

City Staff

City Attorney, Cristina Suárez
City Manager, Peter Iglesias
City Clerk, Billy Urquia
Deputy City Attorney, Stephanie Throckmorton

Public Speaker(s)

Agenda Item E-5 [Start: 2:15 p.m.]

An Ordinance of the City Commission providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code by amending Article 14, “Process,” Section 14-200, “Procedures,” to amend Section 14-213.11, “Adoption Hearing,” to require a supermajority vote of the City Commission for adoption of comprehensive plan map amendments; and providing for a repealer provision, severability clause, codification, and providing for an effective date. (Sponsored by Commissioner Castro)

Mayor Lago: Item E-5.

City Attorney Suarez: E-5 is an Ordinance to the City Commission providing for text amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code by amending Article 14, “Process,” Section 14-200, “Procedures to Amend Section 14-213.11, “Adoption Hearing to require a supermajority vote of the City Commission for adoption of comprehensive plan map amendments and providing for repealer provisions, severability clause, codification, and providing for an effective date.

City Commission Meeting

Mayor Lago: Commissioner, this is your item.

Commissioner Castro: Thank you, City Attorney, for reading this ordinance into the record. This ordinance is very simple. This is requiring a four-fifth vote for most of land use approvals. This is basically about protecting neighborhoods and quality of life and from permanent land use changes. Right now, as we speak, a three-two vote can go ahead and change land use. But really what I'm proposing here is, well, let me just put something into perspective of really what I'm proposing here. Somebody buys a house. They know exactly that they are buying the house they are buying because of the zoning they are buying it, as if they're buying a townhouse, right? But then they want to go ahead and apply for a benefit. What do I call a benefit? An upzoning. That's not what they bought their house with. They're coming for something more to the city to require to upzone that property. Now, it is my belief that's not something you're entitled to. That is something that you apply to and that this Commission approves. So, I don't believe that by approving this, we are taking a benefit, or we are taking rights away from any owner because this is not something you are entitled to. That being said, I believe that we should protect the character of our cities and a four-fifth, especially when it comes to development, and this is not to make development disappear. This is actually to protect the character of our neighborhoods, to make it a little harder, stringent, okay, to keep on upzoning all our streets. This is just very simple. Hopefully my colleagues can indulge.

Mayor Lago: Okay, Madam City Attorney, before we have the Commission have discussion on this matter, what is your opinion on this matter?

City Attorney Christina Suarez: Mayor, as I've briefed each of you, I mean, I have some concerns that it could subject us to a potential challenge and there could be an interpretation that this would be a more restrictive or more burdensome regulation in our zoning code, which is, as we know, there's recent legislation from the state that prohibits that.

Mayor Lago: Okay. Do any other cities that you're aware of have this similar type of legislation in place?

City Attorney Christina Suarez: We are aware of, I believe it's Miami Beach, has different supermajority requirements for various specific land use changes or changes to their land development regulations. I know City of South Miami also has a supermajority requirement and I believe that one is in their Charter. It's a four-fifth requirement for changes to their land development regulations.

Mayor Lago: Mr. Manager, what is your opinion of your office?

City Manager Iglesias: Mayor, the administration, we don't support this. I do believe that the Commission has worked for many, many years on a three-fifths vote and I believe that's more appropriate and more in line to what the majority of the cities have, which is three-fifths.

Mayor Lago: So let me tell you where I stand and I'll be very brief so the Commission can have their discussion. I think that this is probably one of the most foolish, ridiculous ideas I've ever heard in my life, and I think it's dangerous. It puts a city in a position where we will see legal challenges from every property owner because people have property rights. That's number one. Number two, to bring this up again is another opportunity to grandstand and to political theater in an effort to get an article in one of the ridiculous media outlets that we have here. Why do I say that? Because how can you be in favor of Live Local and expanding Live Local throughout the State of Florida knowing very well that once you bring that legislation forward that same legislation will apply to the City of Coral Gables. You cannot say carve the Coral Gables out and put more development in other cities even though that was what was said in the Commission meeting. It's absolutely ridiculous and it shows no real understanding of the way that zoning works and in the least case scenario it's absolute corruption in favor of doing things for a client. So, at the end of the day this makes absolutely no sense. It's again more political grandstanding, more political theater and it's gotten so tiresome over these past few years to have to deal with this when there's actually nothing positive coming forward. At the end of the day.

Vice Mayor Anderson: Through the Mayor.

Mayor Lago: Yes.

Vice Mayor Anderson: Let me tell you my concerns before we move further on us. We're in 2026. Year after I got elected that first year, we had RTZ come forward. County doesn't care about what our zoning laws say, what our comprehensive plan says. It gets rezoned. Live Local had amendments proposed in the last legislative session that would have allowed Live Local projects on multifamily and special use properties. I don't think that's something that we want to encourage to happen, but it very well could happen if we start making it more difficult for people to be able to move forward on projects. I'd rather deal with it in our zoning code as it's an MF property than have some exterior force that doesn't live here or work here change our zoning to the point that we lose control of our city. Burt Harris is a much broader stronger law, and I've distributed this article during the last election cycle that ever existed in years past. So, at the time that the comprehensive plans were changed in South Miami and in other municipalities the strong Burt Harris law that exists now didn't exist. So, the legal interpretation is going to be based upon how we changed things from one point. So, these are my property rights now. How has the City of Coral Gables taken them away by making it so much more difficult for me to be able to get a zoning change? So, you have to look at these things in context. This is why I feel it's a bad idea.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner, on that point we've already had a Burt Harris case here in the city that the City Attorney can address. Well, we lost a few million dollars in that case, correct? Years ago.

City Attorney Christina Suarez: I think that was before my time though, Mayor. Yes.

Mayor Lago: That's what it was. But we lost a Burt Harris case here years ago. So again-

Vice Mayor Anderson: And the zoning - Zoning had to go up on that one too.

Mayor Lago: But look what we've seen right now in regard to preemption. We saw preemption in regard to historic properties in the flood zone. You saw preemption in regard to trees in your own, not in the city's right-of-way, in your own property. Where now it's been significantly reduced the ability for the city to control whether you can cut a tree down or not. So, it's just very simple to say, hey, let's just pass this law. And then when you're marred in litigation and when you're preempted, like we were with Live Local, why were we preempted with Live Local? What was the point of Live Local? Was to make it easier to develop projects. I mean, do we have consensus in that or no? Absolutely, right? So, when we have one member of this Commission advocating for Live Local, saying we need more Live Local, we need to increase the reimbursement, what's going to happen is more Live Local in our community. That's the fact. Those are facts. I mean, you can dispute it all you want, but those are facts. You can giggle, you can laugh, you can do it, but those are facts. I received innumerable amount of phone calls from people that could not believe that that was even proposed from the City of Coral Gables. So, my point is that Live Local and the RTZ are preemptions that take away our powers to be able to control our future in regard to zoning. Let me give you an example. The Codina Building here, it's 17 feet taller than what's allowed by the code. What do we negotiate? We slash the density by 50%. Is that fair, Mr. Manager?

City Manager Iglesias: Yes, yes.

Mayor Lago: Madam Zoning Director? Yes. 50%?

City Manager Iglesias: That's correct. So... About.

Mayor Lago: About. And we got a park out of it in the corner. Right?

City Manager Iglesias: Yes, 10,000 square feet.

Mayor Lago: 10,000 square foot park in the corner. We made a negotiation. So, the unit count was slashed by half. They didn't get any additional FAR or square footage, but they needed those 17 feet, one foot per floor to give a more amenitized in the sense of a more beautiful product to hopefully be more appealing to renters in that building. You know what? We decided that's a good

City Commission Meeting

idea for the city. We want a higher-end building. Less units, higher-end building with a park in the corner. What have we done? Over the last four years, five years, we've grown from having one open space in the downtown to having now almost seven open spaces that are forthcoming. But we control those zoning codes so we can have a negotiation. When it comes to the RTZ and the Live Local, we don't control anything. So, this is the type of situation that comes in and pushes that type of preemption even further, where people come together, they go to Tallahassee, and they preempt this type of legislation. Not thoughtful legislation. I think it's actually, in my opinion, legislation that hurts the city because it exposes us to litigation. Mr. Manager.

City Manager Iglesias: The local mayor goes to the highest height that the city can go to, which is 190.5. It also has unlimited density, and it also has a FAR of five or more. My concern is that as municipalities get more and more restrictive, the state is going to preempt more and more, and we have to be very, very careful that we don't have more RTZ from the county. We don't have... it could be expanded RTZ, because right now it's a quarter mile. It's a quarter mile to half a mile, depending on it, they could expand it to a mile. They're going to expand it to two miles. And also, the Live Local can be even made even more restrictive as far as what the cities can do. So, I have a concern that if we, if the municipalities overdo some of these issues that we were going to -- and generally what happens with the state, it doesn't go to the middle. It goes way to the other side. And that's a big concern that I have with going too far, as far as the zoning is concerned, having a four-fifths would be a super majority for that. And it's concerning as to what's happening now and what can come out of Tallahassee this year and in the following years.

Commissioner Castro: Through the Mayor.

Mayor Lago: Before, would you like to say anything, Commissioner? Commissioner Lara, anything else? Where would you like to speak? Okay. Commissioner Lara, anything?

Commissioner Lara: Sure, sure. You know, and I think this one is, is somewhat easy, you know, to come down on, to oppose. And the Mayor said it, the Vice Mayor said it very, very well. I'm going to try and maybe spin it around a little bit, because it seems like it's the same theme and it's playing itself out over and over again. This is somewhat like a Chinese finger trap, right? You know, like the more you pull, the tighter it gets? On its face, you said this is something that will, I think you said something to the effect of like, this will protect against land use zoning changes by making it a super majority, as if the premise is any land use change is bad. And any land use change must be stopped. That's kind of what I think I heard from the earlier version of the P&Z, in delaying the process, in opposing anything that's seemingly development. But the result of such efforts is to actually open the door to out-of-control development, certainly to remove Coral Gable's standards from a project, which only now we've been made aware, in the case of the Mark, that we pulled it back from the abyss, right? I mean, it was a Hail Mary that was connected, but that's where we were heading. And this kind of legislation, similar to the other one that you had proposed,

City Commission Meeting

makes it more attractive for the developer, because you just keep showing the developer there's an easier and cheaper way to bypass Coral Gables. This may be inadvertent at best, and that's why I'm trying to sort of take the time to explain this to you, the move-in tier. And I certainly hope it's not something that's deliberate, because that would be decidedly in favor of the interests of the developers, whether they be in the city or outside of the city, because it won't make a difference. The RTZ won't discriminate. Live Local won't discriminate. That's preemption, and that's erosion of Home Rule. And we can't show the door to those two avenues by making it more difficult to do, which is much more adequately and appropriately governed by our existing zoning standards and a majority of our Commissioners voting on any particular project. I think that at four-fifths, you're giving, at that point, one Commissioner the ability to dictate the outcome in a dangerous way in favor of a developer's intended plan, if that developer's intended plan is to maximize profits and speed up a project and eliminate the red tape, which is precisely what is behind Live Local and RTZ. So, I don't see what you're selling as being delivered in this proposed legislation that this will be somehow protecting the residents, because it deprives them in the first instance of an ability to change the land use zoning designation by making it very difficult. And the character and the nature of an entire neighborhood could change because it's easier if it falls within the RTZ and in the Live Local ambit, which I believe this would be if it passed, achieving my thoughts.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Fernandez: I've been torn on this one. And the reason I've been torn is the preemption situation. I think had this legislation come up when we both got elected, I would have voted 100 percent for it. I'm just concerned now that taking that step will just make us a target in Tallahassee and in Miami-Dade County. Do I see the benefit? I do see the benefit. I still think every project that has come before the Commission since you and I got elected would have passed because what we have seen over the last two years and we're still seeing today is developers have realized that there's a different way of doing business in Coral Gables, and that is residents need to be included in the equation. And we're even seeing it in the Mark where now they're back on board trying to find something that works more towards the needs of the city and not so much maximizing what they can do with Miami-Dade County and the RTZ. So, the question is, do we want to add another target on Coral Gables going into this legislative session? Or do we just continue to vote our consciences and try to make sure that we hold the developers' feet to the fire on these designations that come before us? The question always is what happens the day that the five of us are gone? What happens with the next Commission? But I guess that'll fall down to residents. And if I'm going to make a decision today, I would have to make a decision based on my votes on prior four-fifths majority, super majority vote that we've taken on the Commission, and I would have to vote against it because I voted against all the other requirements of a four-fifths majority that have come before us. The other option, obviously, is to send it to voters. But at the same time, we're even adding a larger target on ourselves on whether we want to continue to

City Commission Meeting

push this item. Because even if our Charter is changed, that doesn't remove the ability of Tallahassee and Miami-Dade County to preempt this. The only thing that would is the State Constitution. So, it's just how things have changed over the last two years with the level of preemption that has started coming our way. The way that they're thinking now is no longer, well, Coral Gables has done this for many years. They've been here for 100 years. They're protecting their city. No, it's you live in the State of Florida and you're going to do things the way the Florida does it. And it puts us in a tough situation because I think the sentiment that you and I gathered when we were knocking on doors two years ago was that residents wanted something like this. The question is whether we are hurting them more by passing this legislation today than if we were to continue to vote our consciences and hold developers' feet to the fire on every project that comes before us, ensuring that we get the best product for the city and for the residents in the neighborhoods.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner.

Commissioner Castro: Okay. A four-fifth super majority, I believe, raises the bar for irreversible decisions. And what do I mean by that? I mean that when somebody comes before the Commission, and I'm referring back to the Burt Harris, they're not entitled for us to go ahead and up-zone. So no, there would be no legal repercussion because this would be a benefit they are receiving. Now let's consider something else, right? After we approve that, how are we going to take it away? We can't take it away because that's when the Burt Harris kicks in, okay? So, I'm trying to protect us as a city before it actually happens. Remember, a property owner is not entitled to be up-zoned and they were very aware of the zoning they bought before they bought it, if they did their due diligence. And that's to the point that I'm getting to. It should be a little more stringent when it comes before us. And I think as a Commission, we should all be on the same page, at least a super majority should be on the same page. If that parcel or that neighborhood needs more noise, needs more traffic, has enough infrastructure, I think this is something that has a little more time and it shouldn't be approved so fast. That's the logic behind this, protecting the character of our neighborhoods and curbing the speed in which development is happening. Basically.

Commissioner Fernandez: I think I understand your-

Mayor Lago: Let's go through the Mayor.

Commissioner Fernandez: If I may, just to... I think I understand the argument behind it, but my concern isn't really Burt Harris. I think that if that was my concern, it would be a completely different argument. My concern is more preemption from Tallahassee, because the minute that we open the door on making it stricter, you're opening yourselves up to what else can we change? What else can we target Coral Gables for? We've seen it with other municipalities and other counties that are being targeted in Tallahassee because they're going against the will and the

City Commission Meeting

sentiment that they're trying to move as part of the agenda in Tallahassee. I don't think that we should put ourselves in a situation where we are becoming a larger target. I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

Mayor Lago: Yeah. So, if I may, I'd like to just add a few things, just for the record. You've been here three years, in April will be three years. Three years ago, we didn't have Live Local. This was a priority, and this is what you heard when you were walking through the door. You should have brought it at that moment. You didn't. So, here's the two issues. This is the way I'd interpret it, okay? Either you don't understand, which is perfectly fine. It's okay. What people are trying to explain to you, same thing as when you brought the Live Local legislation, I completely understand if you don't understand. It's okay. Or this is intentional. Just like the Live Local was. Let me tell you what I mean by intentional. It's reckless. And it sends a message that we're making it, like Commissioner Fernandez said, and Commissioner Lara said, we're going to make it even more stringent, kind of like what happened to us with the trees, trees on properties, where now it's a lot less stringent to remove a live oak specimen tree from your own property. Well, case in point, you had never heard in the history of the City of Coral Gables that a historic home in the flood district could be knocked down. You had a historic gem, one of the probably one of the most significant homes in the city, knocked down in Gables Estates because it was preempted by the State of Florida. So, either you don't understand or you have some sort of reason to push this forward to make the city look more stringent, in turn, having us be preempted even further. And I'll give you an example. The Commission voted four to one on 760 Ponce. All the residents were here, right where Mrs. Cruz is. They were all there and they all were saying, please, please vote in favor, vote in favor, vote in favor. Why? Because across the street was the new Shoma project that was being proposed that was using Live Local, which would give a 5.0 FAR. So, we can play a game of politics, or we can play what's in the best interest of the residents. But the idea is it's either you don't understand or you're intentionally doing this to push Live Local. And I don't understand why you're doing that because it only hurts the city and it puts us at risk for litigation, and it puts us at risk to be even further preempted. Madam Vice Mayor.

Vice Mayor Anderson: So, and I know there's residents concerned about particular applications that are pending, but I'm going to remind you, and I know you weren't here, that RTZ at one point was going up Ponce de Leon Boulevard.

Mayor Lago: Yep.

Vice Mayor Anderson: Okay. We had a Planning and Zoning meeting before the last November election of the County Commission. At that Planning and Zoning meeting, the developer got tired of being berated, and the process being delayed. The vote was deferred. And with delays and more obstacles that you put in the place for a developer, they made a choice. They made a choice to wait till after the November election of the County Commission, and they went forward with the RTZ.

City Commission Meeting

By May, after that election, May, months later, a very short period of time, really, they had already had the legislation in place, and the County Commissioner was here preempting our zoning in the area. And I think you know the rest of the story there, so I don't need to repeat it, but we don't want to have another repeat of this where we purposely try to make it much more difficult for the process to happen, because the process needs to happen. We need to get these items here and vote on them. It's that same project that P&Z had delayed. I had met with the residents after, before that, and a lot of them, once I explained to them, well, you know, I can ask for this, I can ask for that, and we can add some trees, and we can expand the sidewalks. Do you need any drainage fixed? Do you need all those community benefits done? And I explained to them some of the things that we could ask for, and they said, oh, in that case, I'm in favor of it. But the water had already flowed past the dam. The damage had been done by the Planning and Zoning Board. And there was no bringing that one back, other than this Hail Mary that magically worked and connected. So, thank you again, City Manager, for your hard work on that. I didn't think we had a prayer on bringing that back. So again, I just want you to know the story so that you can think about these things when you're drafting legislation, because you need to think of the repercussions. A lot of what you do sometimes is a chess game. So, if you move this piece here, what's going to happen as a result? What are we going to lose as a result of doing this? You always have to think about that. What is the downside? You must think of the downside. And there's downside. There's a lot of downside. Then you add Live Local on top of it. We're going to end up with a highly dense city with not enough parking and too much traffic. And don't forget, Live Local projects don't contribute to our tax base in the same way as others, because they get a property tax reduction. So the rest of the residents of the City of Coral Gables end up paying for a lot of the services that we need to take care of the roads, the sidewalks, et cetera, on their dime, as opposed to the Live Local project carrying the water that it should for the amount of burden that it puts on our city.

Commissioner Castro: Through the Mayor.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner.

Commissioner Castro: Number one, I demand respect from you, okay? To say that I don't understand or to insinuate that I'm stupid is far beyond, number one. Number two, I want to go ahead and clarify, because you've spent, I don't know, how much money every day on sponsored ads, changing the narrative of what I propose about Live Local. So, let me go ahead and clear the air here a little bit, okay? Because I don't spend the money you do, and I'm not stalking me and cyberbullying me the whole time. The whole purpose of the Live Local proposal that I did was to go ahead and push Live Local projects out of Coral Gables, because maybe you might not understand, but there's something called supply and demand, okay? When people are only building in places like Coral Gables, that's where the developers are going to keep on coming. Developers are interested in making a profit. It is a business. And if we give them other opportunities to go

ahead and build somewhere else and make a bigger profit, what do you think is going to happen? That's a little common sense right there. So, they're going to fill the imbalance of supply and demand as easy as that. That's my clarification of that. Stop changing everything around. It's more than apparent that I'm a threat to you. I don't even know why. I'm not even filing to run. I have no idea why you keep on harassing me every single day. Just once again, go worry about your family.

Vice Mayor Anderson: Through the Mayor.

Mayor Lago: Okay, I'd like to respond if I may.

Vice Mayor Anderson: I know you do.

Mayor Lago: I'd like to respond, because I want to... Yeah, perfect, okay. So, number one, in regard to Live Local, I'm going to try to explain this one more time, okay? See if you understand this.

Commissioner Castro: Yeah, I'm going to use the restroom. I'm sorry.

Mayor Lago: There are no projects, there's no projects currently that are Live Local being built in the city, except for one that's being proposed on 8th Street. Why? Because the formula doesn't work. If you were to adopt Melissa Castro's formula, it would require, it would require, it would require that an increase in the amount of reimbursement from the state. That would make it more appealing to do Live Local projects in the City of Coral Gables. Live Local is not applied by county or by city. It is applied throughout the entire state. She doesn't understand it. If you were to increase it by 20 percent, the reimbursement rate, it would be more attractive to do Live Local projects here in the city. Everybody says it. And I don't know what it is. You talk about this, this absolute infatuation. I don't know why she keeps bringing up my family continuously. In politics and in service, keep your family out of it. And it's constant. So, I'm going to make a move to censure Commissioner Castro. Do I have a second? So, everybody's families available now on board? Yes or no? Say I'm asking now for the third time it happens. Is everybody's family available right now? Yes or no? Yes or no?

Commissioner Fernandez: No family should be on the table.

Mayor Lago: This is the third or fourth time this happened.

Commissioner Fernandez: It should not.

Mayor Lago: Are we going to do this again? Yes or no?

Commissioner Fernandez: We should not have any discussion.

Mayor Lago: You're the one that says you want to be the peace speaker.

City Commission Meeting

Commissioner Fernandez: I'm the first one to tell you, we should not have any involvement of anybody's family.

Mayor Lago: You want to do this again? Yes or no?

Commissioner Fernandez: Do it again.

Mayor Lago: So then make a motion. Second the motion.

Commissioner Fernandez: Do what again?

Mayor Lago: The continued denial of what's being done here. Yes or no? Are you going to make a second of the motion? Yes or no? You want to show leadership? You want to show you change? You want to change? Then second the motion.

Commissioner Fernandez: Have her come in and address it. Give her an opportunity to address it.

Mayor Lago: I see how it is.

Commissioner Fernandez: No, give her an opportunity to address it.

Mayor Lago: Not a problem.

Commissioner Fernandez: I think we need to move past things and I think, just give me a couple seconds.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner, no, no, stop.

Commissioner Fernandez: Because it has nothing to do with you. It has nothing to do with you.

Mayor Lago: We're not moving past anything. We're not moving past anything at all. When you talk about someone's family, there's no discussion.

Commissioner Fernandez: I agree.

Mayor Lago: Maria Cruz giggles and laughs and wears ridiculous shirts and heckles and it's constant and constant and constant. It will end here. You want to talk about policy. You want to talk about things. Everything, it's constant. Enough. You will show respect to employees, and you will show respect to the Commission family and employees' families at the end of the day. Enough. If I don't have support from my Commission, that's fine. At the end of the day, it's okay. No problem. That is what it is. But it's very simple. Very simple. No one's going to tell me that a Live Local project is not going to come to the Gables when you increase the reimbursement by 20 percent. It's just simple math. You can continue to lie and say, that's why we all voted 4 to 1 against it. It's obvious. And I would appreciate it if we stopped the charade about the Live Local process,

City Commission Meeting

especially when three days later, when her client comes out in favor of it in the Miami Herald op-ed.

Commissioner Castro: Not my client.

Mayor Lago: Pretty ridiculous.

Commissioner Castro: Not my client.

Commissioner Lara: Commissioner, you want to speak?

Commissioner Castro: Please correct the record. He is not my client.

Commissioner Lara: So, I think I need to step in and say, I'm not in favor, thank you, I'm not in favor of resorting to censure without at least trying to address the issue with the individual here present, right? So, Commissioner, I was unaware, if you were aware when you stepped out, that the Mayor moved to censure you for making references to his family in your commentary during the discussion on your ordinance. I did not second it, but I don't think it was appropriate for you to do so. So, I think the appropriate thing to do is to say to you, do you think that was appropriate and do you wish to take it back?

Commissioner Castro: Thank you for giving me a chance to respond, okay? No, I do not believe anybody's family, but you know what? I don't think it was in a derogatory form, okay? I said, "Take care of your family, okay? I know that that might've just, is this done in a positive way, it's done in a negative way, it's a neutral way. I'm just asking you, stop harassing me. Stop and worry about your own things, okay? Just a moment, Commissioner, but- Number two, hold on. I'm sorry, number two.

Mayor Lago: This is unacceptable.

Commissioner Castro: Number two, he is-

Mayor Lago: Listen, we're taking a one-hour break.

[The Commission took a break and later resumed the meeting]

Mayor Lago: Madam City Attorney.

City Attorney Christina Suarez: Yes, Mayor. As you requested, I've asked the Deputy City Attorney to please just kind of give us a summary of our rules of debate and some of our procedural rules for meetings and the various different procedural matters that sometimes come before you all. So, Deputy City Attorney, thank you.

City Commission Meeting

Deputy City Attorney Throckmorton: Thank you, Madam City Attorney. Mr. Mayor, as requested, just a very brief overview about the rules of our code and a few points of Robert's Rules of Order, just for clarification for everybody as we move forward with the rest of the meeting. Just as a note that the Mayor serves as the chairperson of the meeting, the Mayor's duties include announcing the business to come before the Commission in accordance with the prescribed order of business to recognize all Commissioners, the Manager, the Attorney, and the Clerk, and everyone who seeks the floor under correct procedures. All questions and comments are to be directed through the Chairperson and restated by the Chairperson. And finally, that the chairperson has the duty to expedite business in every way compatible with the rights of the members. Separately, our code provision, Section 281, the Rules of Debate, sets forth that every Commissioner desiring to speak should address the Chairperson, and upon recognition, should confine discussion to the question under debate, that a member, once recognized, shouldn't be interrupted unless being called to order, that any member shall be deemed to have yielded the floor when the member has finished speaking, and it returns to the Chair as the Chairperson of the meeting, and a member may only claim the floor when recognized by the Chairperson, that all motions shall be made and seconded before we have debate, and that any Commissioner can move to close debate and call the question, but that's a motion that must be seconded and voted on by the members. We have established in our code and through practice here that when we have items called before the City Commission for consideration, as you know, the City Attorney reads the title, we then have a presentation by either the sponsor or staff, followed by public comment. After public comment, we should have a motion and a second before we have debate among the Commission. Every member of the Commission should be recognized by the Chair, and then once everyone has had a chance to debate, the question is normally called by the Chairperson. So, happy to answer any specific questions as we move forward. As previously shared, a point of order is when you think something has been done procedurally incorrect, your vote was skipped, there was not a second, you can interrupt the speaker, there is no second needed, and the Chair, as Chairperson, rules on a point of order. A point of personal privilege is generally to ask for something specific, perhaps a time to speak, a time to get a copy of something, a time for a brief recess, same thing that's ruled on by the Chair, there is no second needed. Points of parliamentary inquiry are made by the Chair to the City Attorney, acting as Parliamentarian, so if there is a specific question, the Chair, working with the City Attorney, rules on those items. So again, happy to answer any specific questions as we move through, but generally that's the order of business that we have prescribed for public hearing items and all Commission items.

Mayor Lago: Thank you very much. To be very clear, I served on the Commission for 10 years. It was an impeccable Commission with multiple different members. It was flawless. We had many different views, but it was done respectfully. I've been left with no resort after the circus that we had before, almost as bad, probably worse than what we had during Amos Rojas' time, that I will have no other choice but to conduct it in a way that followed parliamentary rules 280. There will

City Commission Meeting

be no debate. It will be one, two, three, four, the Mayor, and it comes to an end, and we'll be voting.
Mr. Clerk, we have a motion and a second.

City Clerk Urquia: No, Mr. Mayor, we do not have a motion and a second.

Mayor Lago: We don't have a motion and a second?

City Clerk Urquia: For agenda item E-5, I do not.

Mayor Lago: Give me a motion.

Commissioner Castro: I'm not going to move it. I don't have the support.

Mayor Lago: Done. Moving on to the next item.