

1 MR. LEEN: Yes. And I also want to note  
 2 that there's a State -- my recollection is,  
 3 there's at least one State ethics opinion that  
 4 talks about that Members of Boards have to be  
 5 able to practice their profession within the  
 6 City. So if we're calling for architects or  
 7 certain professionals to be on Boards, we need  
 8 to be cognizant of that, so that it doesn't  
 9 prevent them from being able to practice.

10 At the same time, we need to make sure that  
 11 we're enforcing the ethical provisions that do  
 12 apply, which I think that this opinion does.

13 One other point that Mr. Coller made was,  
 14 there's another provision, which I wasn't  
 15 talking about, related to the County Zoning  
 16 Boards, which are largely elected, and then  
 17 they have an appointed member from the County  
 18 Commission. Those boards are not like you.  
 19 They make final decisions, which are then  
 20 appealable to the County Commission. Those  
 21 Board Members cannot appear before the County  
 22 Commission, but I don't have that provision in  
 23 our Code and I don't believe that provision  
 24 applies to you.

25 The provision that applies to you is the

1 Standards," Section 5-604, "Coral Gables  
 2 Mediterranean Style Design Standards," and  
 3 Section 5-1105, "Landscape Requirements;" and  
 4 Article 8, "Definitions," to increase the  
 5 requirements for landscaped open space and  
 6 clarify what constitutes open space; providing  
 7 for a repealer provision, providing for a  
 8 severability clause, codification and providing  
 9 for an effective date.

10 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Last time, we discussed this item, and I  
 12 promised that I would be back with additional  
 13 information.

14 The text of the amendments has not changed,  
 15 so from the -- and I did that for clarity. So  
 16 it's the same. And I wanted to have a more  
 17 theoretical discussion, to give a bigger  
 18 context and then perhaps see if I can help you  
 19 work through some of the details.

20 The text that we have prepared increases  
 21 the required landscaped open space for  
 22 Commercial and Mixed-Use districts. Also, very  
 23 important, it requires ground level open space,  
 24 which I think is one of the biggest ideas in  
 25 the proposed amendment, and also amends some of

1 one I've been talking about today. I just want  
 2 to be clear about that.

3 MR. COLLER: Yeah. And that would be  
 4 clear, that's only to Community Zoning Appeals  
 5 Board Members. It's a unique provision as to  
 6 them, not relating to the ethics provisions.

7 MR. LEEN: Yes, it's a unique provision.  
 8 This is not the general ethics provision that  
 9 applies to you.

10 Anyway, thank you very much.

11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.

12 Okay. Let's move on to the last item on  
 13 the agenda.

14 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 Can I have the PowerPoint, please?

16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, let me -- we'll  
 17 read it into the record.

18 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The final item on the  
 20 agenda is an Ordinance of the City Commission  
 21 of Coral Gables, Florida providing for text  
 22 amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official  
 23 Zoning Code, by amending Article 4, "Zoning  
 24 Districts," Section 4-201, "Mixed-Use District  
 25 known as MXD;" Article 5, "Development

1 the definitions, such as paseo, and I think you  
 2 had some other ideas for additional  
 3 definitions.

4 Now, I will give you a very brief  
 5 description of the history of open space, and  
 6 I'm going to start with Savannah, and Savannah  
 7 is the classic American example of the square  
 8 and the development around it.

9 And, as you can see, there's a very clear  
 10 pattern of design. You have very regularly  
 11 spaced squares. And that's because, in 1733,  
 12 Governor Oglethorpe designed that plan and made  
 13 it very clear.

14 I mean, that's one of the classic examples  
 15 that everybody who deals with open space thinks  
 16 about in America.

17 But even the more classic example that  
 18 explains all of these issues is this particular  
 19 drawing of Rome, and this drawing was prepared  
 20 in 1748, same time as Savannah, more or less,  
 21 and this is the Nolli plan of Rome.

22 Now, Robert is laughing, because he knows  
 23 exactly what I'm saying. The Nolli Plan of  
 24 Rome is what every person that deals with open  
 25 space studies to learn the relationship between

1 buildings, squares, arcades, and if you look  
2 closely, also the public spaces within  
3 buildings are depicted in that map.

4 So that is the theoretical basis for a lot  
5 of the concepts that we have in the Code, the  
6 fact that all of those elements work together.  
7 And this map was the first time this was laid  
8 out so clearly, and I want to focus, more  
9 specifically, on the different elements that we  
10 have.

11 If we look at a very particular project,  
12 which is the Campidoglio, designed by Michael  
13 Angelo, you can see the plaza, you can see the  
14 arcade, you can see the green, you can see the  
15 public art, and you can see the green within  
16 the buildings. That, I would argue, is what  
17 the Code already requires, that kind of  
18 coordination between the different elements of  
19 the buildings. Very sophisticated, and rather  
20 complex.

21 So that's why simple questions of, well,  
22 you know, what is the effect if we increase  
23 five percent or two percent or three percent  
24 are difficult to answer, because our Code  
25 depends very closely on the Board of

1 Architects' review, the very intense design --  
2 and Mr. Behar has experienced that multiple  
3 times and so has Mr. Bellin -- the kind of  
4 level of review that happens with projects at  
5 the level of the specific of the design, not at  
6 the level of the Zoning concepts and so on.

7 Now, the issue with all of this is that,  
8 when we look at the Code, when we look at the  
9 actual text in the Code, it may look confusing.  
10 It may look confusing because there are many  
11 ways that open space is dealt with indirectly.  
12 I mean, it's not as simple as in some of the  
13 suburban codes in some areas that don't have  
14 the complexity of Coral Gables, that have  
15 simple rules. We have very complicated rules.  
16 But I would say to you that they're probably  
17 the best rules that I have seen in a City this  
18 size. I mean, I haven't seen any Code that has  
19 such a sophisticated way of looking at these  
20 things. So that's the preamble that I want to  
21 propose.

22 And when you look at Coral Gables, and you  
23 actually look at the same kind of graphic  
24 technique, what's called the figure ground, you  
25 can see the green and you can see the

1 buildings, et cetera. You can see that there's  
2 a combination of the two examples that I gave  
3 you. There's a little bit of the Savannah idea  
4 of having those greens interspersed through the  
5 city.

6 And, then, when you start looking at the  
7 larger projects or the Mixed-Use projects, you  
8 see that level of detail. You know, we have  
9 the arcade. We have the open space. We have  
10 all of that coordination that you saw on that  
11 Nolli Map of Rome.

12 And, for example, in this project, you can  
13 see some of those spaces, depicted as closely  
14 as I can to that original map. So, in black,  
15 is the bulk of the private areas of the  
16 building. In white, you can see some of the  
17 public areas, like the lobbies. Relatively  
18 small, but they're also public. And then we  
19 have a plaza, which is hardscape. We have  
20 green, which is mostly lawn and trees. And we  
21 have arcade and public art. I tried to  
22 simplify it and use it in the same exact  
23 language as that original Nolli Plan.

24 Now, in this case, for example, the  
25 hardscape is 32 percent, the landscape is 14

1 percent of the site.

2 Now, if you look at the Code, if you look  
3 at what the Code says, it doesn't tell you, you  
4 have to have 14 percent open space in  
5 landscape. That is the result of the design  
6 process and the result of all of the different  
7 individual requirements as they are worked  
8 through the process. So that's the way it  
9 works today.

10 If you look at this other project, the  
11 Paseo de la Riviera, similar issue. And,  
12 again, I don't believe that -- Coral Gables is  
13 the only city where I can give this  
14 presentation. I don't know of any other place  
15 where I could have multiple examples and  
16 compare them to the classic imagery of  
17 architecture, in terms of how to depict  
18 buildings and how to create open space.

19 Again, here we have a paseo that is rather  
20 wide, and it's a real paseo, in the sense that  
21 it's open to the sky.

22 MS. MENENDEZ: It's open to the sky?

23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. In this case, yes. In  
24 this case is what everybody would agree is a  
25 high quality paseo.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: Is Gables Station open to  
2 the sky?

3 MR. TRIAS: Many things. Many things. If  
4 we can go back to the -- for example, the  
5 plaza, open to the sky, yes. Now, the arcades,  
6 what's behind the columns, is not. So what  
7 happens is that there's that combination,  
8 plaza, open space in the arcade, lobby.  
9 There's a sequence of public spaces, from more  
10 public to less public.

11 MR. BEHAR: And how big is this site?

12 MR. TRIAS: I don't remember exactly.

13 MR. BEHAR: It's over four-and-a-half  
14 acres; is that correct?

15 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And  
16 that's a very good point. That's a very good  
17 point that I want to emphasize. This works  
18 really well when we have a big site. When we  
19 have a site that is over an acre, for example,  
20 like paseo or this one, the Gables Station,  
21 which is four acres, you can do all of these  
22 things without any difficulty, and end up with  
23 a very high quality project, as beautiful and  
24 as high quality as the Board of Architects, the  
25 Planning and Zoning Board and the Commission

1 would be able to review and approve.

2 So a project, in which one of your Board  
3 Members, his firm, designed, for example, which  
4 is 33 Alhambra, and many of you got a chance to  
5 review it, through the design process ended up  
6 having this green at the corner. And that  
7 green ended up being twelve percent of the  
8 site. And the hardscape, which is in yellow,  
9 is 16 percent of the site. Again, that was not  
10 in the Code. That was just a result of all of  
11 the indirect ways to design the project. And,  
12 also, very importantly, of the fact that the  
13 Board of Architects, the Commission, the  
14 Planning and Zoning Board requested changes and  
15 modifications through the process.

16 So that's the way the open space discussion  
17 takes place, and, in this case, for example,  
18 the paseo is not open to the sky. So from the  
19 point of view of what we are recommending, it  
20 wouldn't really qualify as open space, but in  
21 the Code today, it does. So there are some  
22 minor changes that we are recommending, some  
23 tweaks that I think will be beneficial, but --

24 MR. BEHAR: But you mentioned something,  
25 which I want to you to make sure we understand,

1 everybody understands, which I think this is a  
2 very good paseo. It brings a lot to the  
3 connectivity in the mid block, but yet what  
4 you're proposing, it would not be beneficial --

5 MR. TRIAS: It will not count. It will not  
6 count. And then that is the danger, in the  
7 fact that we will be discouraging a very good  
8 feature. Because, keep in mind, this is not  
9 just a paseo. This is a way to get from a very  
10 nice green, through the building, all of the  
11 way through --

12 MR. BEHAR: It's a mid block connector --

13 MR. TRIAS: Exactly.

14 MR. BEHAR: -- which we want to encourage  
15 that. But based on what we're doing, it sounds  
16 to me like we're discouraging it.

17 MR. TRIAS: That may be one of the  
18 outcomes, and that is why I want to warn you,  
19 that some of these changes have consequences  
20 that none of us really can predict, because  
21 they're way too complex, because they depend on  
22 many design issues.

23 Now, the good news and what I would like to  
24 emphasize, is that we have a very good Code.  
25 We have probably the best content of any Code

1 to deal with large buildings. It's  
2 complicated, it's confusing, true, but it's a  
3 very good Code.

4 Yes?

5 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, let me just mention  
6 that that paseo is required by the Code.

7 MR. TRIAS: Yes, it is. And what we're  
8 saying is that it may still be required. It  
9 wouldn't count as open space, unless it's open  
10 to the sky.

11 MS. MENENDEZ: To me, the open space  
12 concept, open to the sky helps with the massing  
13 of the building. I'm not an architect, but, to  
14 me, you know, ceiling it just doesn't -- it's  
15 not the same as when you open it to the sky,  
16 because of the massing of the building, you  
17 know. That's how I view it.

18 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Now, and what I would say  
19 to you is that, the reason -- I'm going to  
20 assume some things, but the reason why this is  
21 not open to the sky was because of the parking  
22 requirements. Because right on top of this  
23 paseo, we have a parking garage.

24 MR. BELLIN: That's a pretty good  
25 assumption.

1 MR. BEHAR: Well, and the size of the  
 2 property to do it.  
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, the size and the  
 4 intensity of the property. If you create the  
 5 intensity, you create the need for more  
 6 parking.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: Exactly.  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: So we can get into that and  
 9 debate it all night long.  
 10 MR. TRIAS: But, Ms. Menendez, the point  
 11 I'm making is that that's exactly the way that  
 12 quality is achieved, by going through all of  
 13 those issues and finding the right scale,  
 14 finding the right -- if you try to be too  
 15 prescriptive and predict the perfect solution,  
 16 you will be wrong. I will be wrong. I mean,  
 17 there's no way to say, you know, I know the  
 18 perfect number, if your goal is quality. Like  
 19 the goal in Coral Gables is quality, clearly,  
 20 the most beautiful buildings, in the best city.  
 21 Now, if I don't care about any of those  
 22 things, if I'm just looking for something  
 23 average, yeah, I can come up with some formula.  
 24 So that's the context that I would like  
 25 to -- yes.

1 MS. VELEZ: Would the paseo under the  
 2 proposed new definition, since it's not open to  
 3 the sky, would it qualify as an arcade or could  
 4 it then be re-classified as an arcade?  
 5 MR. TRIAS: We could do that, certainly.  
 6 The distinction is that the arcade tends to be  
 7 right next to open space. So it's an extension  
 8 of, let's say, a sidewalk or a park. A paseo  
 9 tends to be through the middle of the block.  
 10 But, again, you know, these are very good  
 11 elements. These are very good features of  
 12 anybody, all of them. None of this is  
 13 objectionable.  
 14 So those are the issues that I would  
 15 encourage you to think about and to make some  
 16 recommendations.  
 17 The design of that park is like this. This  
 18 is the corner park. Again, 12 percent of the  
 19 site ended up being like this. And keep in  
 20 mind, if I can go back, the light green is also  
 21 green. It's just that it happen to be in the  
 22 right-of-way. So we're not actually counting  
 23 that in the numbers, but the reality is that it  
 24 is part of the overall green design. So we  
 25 need to keep that in mind, that there's some

1 requirements that include enhancing landscape  
 2 on the street, in the street right-of-ways  
 3 already. So that is another aspect of this  
 4 discussion that I would like to emphasize.  
 5 At the end of the day, a building that is  
 6 open to the sidewalk and connects nicely to  
 7 trees on the public right-of-way, in my view,  
 8 that's very successful open space, also.  
 9 And here we have multiple things. We have  
 10 a historic building being preserved, an arcade  
 11 that is very visible behind the trees. We have  
 12 a real park, green, without any question. We  
 13 have sidewalks. We have bulb-outs. This is a  
 14 very sophisticated design solution.  
 15 One of the good news is that very soon,  
 16 hopefully, we will have a consultant on board  
 17 to help us come up with a world class Zoning  
 18 Code, which is one of the strategic goals of  
 19 the City. I'm not saying to do a new Zoning  
 20 Code. What I'm saying is, improving and  
 21 tweaking the one we have, so it's more clear,  
 22 and it's more direct. So that is coming up.  
 23 And hopefully it's going to be a different  
 24 experience than some of the experiences that  
 25 we've had in the past, because of the fact that

1 so much good work has already happened. I  
 2 mean, the challenge we have is just to make it  
 3 as good as we can.  
 4 Now, July 12th, you had some comments that  
 5 are, I think, pretty clear. One of the -- I  
 6 believe it was Ms. Menendez, we needed a better  
 7 definition of green space, yes, and, in  
 8 addition to a better definition of paseo, we  
 9 can define some other things better. There's  
 10 some issues about the setbacks and so on, that  
 11 you mentioned.  
 12 And we have to be careful with, again,  
 13 discouraging or encouraging things through  
 14 Zoning. The ability to enhance the  
 15 right-of-way, a very important concept, that  
 16 the BOA review open space more deliberately and  
 17 more clearly. I think that's very good advice.  
 18 And at some point there was an idea of having  
 19 some sliding scale, having some required open  
 20 space at the ground level, and then some  
 21 optional open space, maybe, in the upper areas,  
 22 which is one of the bigger issues right now,  
 23 one of the concerns.  
 24 If you provide open space in the top of the  
 25 parking garage, that may be very nice for the

1 building, but that's not really enhancing the  
 2 space.  
 3 So those are some of the ideas that had  
 4 been discussed. The actual text and the  
 5 details are minor changes, in general, from,  
 6 let's say, ten percent to fifteen percent, in  
 7 terms of requirements of open space, and part  
 8 of the reason I'm recommending relatively small  
 9 changes is that I do believe the Code is very  
 10 good and I also believe that it's hard to come  
 11 up with the perfect formula, because it does  
 12 depend so much on design and review.  
 13 So that is an introduction to the ideas.  
 14 Any comments or any suggestions would be  
 15 certainly forwarded to the Commission.  
 16 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, what tends to happen  
 17 is, we pull some numbers out of a hat,  
 18 basically.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 20 MR. BELLIN: We really don't know what the  
 21 implications are going to be with respect to  
 22 the design of these buildings, and I think the  
 23 only way to really find that out is to design a  
 24 building, on a specific piece of property, and  
 25 see what you would get.

1 MR. TRIAS: And what I would say is that,  
 2 in the large projects, which I believe that's  
 3 what Mr. Behar was suggesting, in the large  
 4 projects, that is true. And what happens in  
 5 the small projects is that if you change the  
 6 numbers too much, you have an excessive effect  
 7 on the small projects.  
 8 MR. BELLIN: Tremendous, yes.  
 9 MR. TRIAS: So the ones that really suffer  
 10 more are the small projects, I believe.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: That's correct. That's  
 12 absolutely right.  
 13 MR. BELLIN: And most of the projects that  
 14 are going to take place in the North Ponce, in  
 15 that area, are going to be small projects,  
 16 because it's very difficult to assemble  
 17 properties that are 20,000 square feet.  
 18 MS. BALIDO-HART: My concern -- I keep  
 19 going back to the point that, like you said,  
 20 rightfully so, we are just pulling these  
 21 numbers out of a hat, and if the intent -- what  
 22 is our goal? If our goal is to have the City  
 23 as beautiful as possible, with the best green  
 24 space and open space that we can have, and  
 25 that's the goal, why do we need -- why do we

1 assume that the only way to achieve that goal  
 2 is with these percentages? What about another  
 3 solution? For example, is there a way to  
 4 require that applicants show and explain  
 5 up-front and demonstrate why their proposed  
 6 design -- explain whatever they're proposing  
 7 and explain why they believe and they have to  
 8 show that they are including adequate and  
 9 appropriate green space and open space, and  
 10 explain the rationale for that particular  
 11 space. That needs to be demonstrated. And if  
 12 it's not demonstrated, that there's some  
 13 mechanism for amending that, but it just really  
 14 needs to be on a case by case basis, and we  
 15 need some way to be able to say, "Hey, you've  
 16 got to show that you took this into  
 17 consideration and explain what you're proposing  
 18 why you're proposing." Does that make sense?  
 19 MR. TRIAS: That makes very good sense to  
 20 me, and I think that's very close to what we  
 21 have in the Code already. Now, we could make  
 22 it a bit more clear and more explicit. We can  
 23 say those things more directly. Right now we  
 24 say it indirectly. But I think that the Code  
 25 right now depends on the very thorough review

1 process of the design, and that's why we  
 2 achieve high quality projects.  
 3 MS. BALIDO-HART: Is there a way to fine  
 4 tune the Code, to make it so stark, black and  
 5 white clear, that this is the intent, that this  
 6 must be demonstrated, that we have a way for  
 7 ensuring that this is paid attention to in the  
 8 right way?  
 9 I keep going back to being concerned about  
 10 numbers, because there are no general rules,  
 11 every property is different. Some are bigger,  
 12 some are smaller, some are awkward. So how do  
 13 we skin that cat?  
 14 MR. TRIAS: I think that that's the best  
 15 advice you can provide to the Commission, that  
 16 that's what you believe. At this point, I  
 17 think that the Commission wants to hear our  
 18 ideas. They are certainly going to listen to  
 19 whatever Staff has to say, but I think your  
 20 views, if you're in agreement with some of the  
 21 things that I've described, will be very  
 22 helpful.  
 23 I think that we have a process to enhance  
 24 the Code. As I said, we have a consultant.  
 25 It's funded. Hopefully the Commission will

1 select a consultant in the August meeting. And  
 2 then we can pursue that process through  
 3 meetings and through more discussion. I think  
 4 my recommendation is that the Code needs to be  
 5 more clear. Not necessarily different, just  
 6 simply more clear.  
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Should we then not  
 8 wait until that consultant is on-board and  
 9 listen to his opinion?  
 10 MR. TRIAS: That would be my preference.  
 11 That would be my preference. If you agree with  
 12 that, you could suggest that to the Commission.  
 13 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, the benefit for some of  
 14 these projects, to the public, essentially, is  
 15 just eye wash, because if you have an MF-2  
 16 property, you build an apartment building, you  
 17 could provide as much green space as you want,  
 18 but it's not going to be accessible to the  
 19 general public. It's not a park. It just  
 20 makes the property look pretty.  
 21 So I think, you know, a good design is, to  
 22 me, the most important element in this whole  
 23 discussion.  
 24 MR. TRIAS: MF-2 requires 25 percent  
 25 already.

1 MR. BELLIN: Yeah.  
 2 MR. TRIAS: So MF-2 is the least of the  
 3 issues. But what we did do, though, if you'll  
 4 indulge me, we did make some changes on the  
 5 North Ponce to require that ten-foot green  
 6 along the front. That is meaningful. That  
 7 makes a difference. That helps the sidewalk.  
 8 And it's a relatively small change. So we did  
 9 make some changes already in the Code, based on  
 10 design ideas.  
 11 MR. BELLIN: But you still have that  
 12 provision, that elevated, such as balconies,  
 13 don't count towards the landscape requirements,  
 14 and amenities decks. I think the Code now is  
 15 sufficient -- you know, you can get to the 25  
 16 percent, but you can't put it all on the ground  
 17 without compromising the design of the project,  
 18 and I don't think you can get to what the Code  
 19 allows you, in terms of square footage,  
 20 density.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: And I think, professionally, if  
 22 you have an opportunity on the elevated areas  
 23 to provide some of that, you're going to get  
 24 the massing to be less bulky than if -- you  
 25 know, whether it's a balcony, whether it's

1 above the garage, if you could provide some of  
 2 those reliefs, it's going to be, I think, a  
 3 better massing to the project.  
 4 MR. BELLIN: If you're able to use the  
 5 balconies as green space. Then what happens  
 6 is, you have to create decent balconies, and  
 7 that helps the building quite a bit.  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: I can't visualize, though, a  
 9 balcony counted as green space, unless it  
 10 includes a pot and a planter. Is that what  
 11 you're looking at?  
 12 MR. BELLIN: That's what the Code says now.  
 13 You put a planter on the balcony, and it has to  
 14 be permanently connected to the slab, so people  
 15 can't just move it.  
 16 MS. VELEZ: But there doesn't have to be a  
 17 green plant inside it and you can't enforce  
 18 that. There's a planter and it's open, and at  
 19 some point, it's just collecting junk.  
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: And it can die.  
 21 MR. BEHAR: To me, the balconies is not as  
 22 effective as a deck would be, where, you know,  
 23 you start carving that massing and you have  
 24 more open areas above, because then you start  
 25 reducing the massing of the project.

1 The balconies, in my opinion, and we may  
 2 disagree, is that it's more beneficial to the  
 3 specific owner of that unit.  
 4 MR. BELLIN: That's exactly the point.  
 5 It's beneficial to the owner of the unit.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: Where, in a deck, if you open  
 7 up the deck, the massing, it's more beneficial,  
 8 that you don't have a big mass, you could break  
 9 it up, and I think that for the perception of  
 10 openness, that's more effective.  
 11 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.  
 12 MR. BELLIN: I don't think how you provide  
 13 it, whether it's the balconies or decks, but to  
 14 take that provision away --  
 15 MR. BEHAR: I agree with you there. It  
 16 should not be taken away, because you're going  
 17 to discourage to break the massing. You know,  
 18 you're going to have bigger boxes. Yeah, I'm  
 19 going to provide the open space down below,  
 20 great, but then I could have a box.  
 21 And some of the examples that you showed  
 22 us, that has great open space, when you look at  
 23 the architecture of those buildings, they're a  
 24 big blocky building, and you've got to agree  
 25 with me there, it's a big mass. There's not

1 too many reliefs in those buildings.  
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes.  
 3 MR. BEHAR: So, yes, we get, at the ground  
 4 level, but then we get visually a big box.  
 5 MS. BALIDO-HART: Big box, yeah.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: I'm sorry, in my humble  
 7 opinion, that's not a good practice.  
 8 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, what I would suggest --  
 9 MR. WU: Marshall, please speak into the  
 10 mike.  
 11 MR. BELLIN: What I would suggest is, we  
 12 leave the Code the way it is, with a provision  
 13 that at least 15 percent of the required green  
 14 area be placed on the ground and the other 10  
 15 percent can be in the right-of-way, can be on  
 16 elevated decks --  
 17 MR. BEHAR: No, Marshall, he -- it depends  
 18 on the District you're talking about. Right  
 19 now, he's calling for 15 percent total on the  
 20 C, the I, the MXD, to be on the ground level.  
 21 That's not what I understood.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: There's different percentages  
 23 on each in the Zoning Code and so on.  
 24 MR. BELLIN: I'm just talking about  
 25 specifically the MF-2.

1 MR. TRIAS: Okay. MF-2.  
 2 MR. BELLIN: Where there's 25 percent  
 3 required. I think 15 percent ought to be on  
 4 the ground, and the other 10 can be on the  
 5 right-of-way, can be on amenities decks --  
 6 MR. TRIAS: Well, that was one of the ideas  
 7 that was discussed the last time, which is,  
 8 let's have a two-tier process, as opposed to  
 9 saying everything on the ground. No, let's  
 10 have most on the ground and some optional that  
 11 could be upstairs.  
 12 MR. BEHAR: I agree with Marshall. 15  
 13 percent on the ground, I think it will be --  
 14 now, that 15 percent on the ground, in my  
 15 opinion, then should be always accessible to  
 16 the sidewalk, to the public right-of-way --  
 17 MR. TRIAS: Okay. 15 on the ground and 10  
 18 percent upstairs.  
 19 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 20 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 21 MR. TRIAS: Okay. For MF-2.  
 22 MR. BELLIN: Not necessarily upstairs. It  
 23 could be in the right-of-way.  
 24 MR. TRIAS: Right, it could be downstairs,  
 25 too.

1 MR. BELLIN: Yeah.  
 2 MR. BEHAR: It could be either/or.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: At the ground level, yeah.  
 4 MR. BEHAR: Because that's going to be the  
 5 most beneficial to the public, you know, to  
 6 take advantage of that.  
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Does that promote  
 8 green roofs and so forth? How would you count  
 9 that?  
 10 MR. BELLIN: I wouldn't count that at all.  
 11 Green roofs are a different issue. It's an  
 12 issue of, you know, how you cover the building  
 13 and what the green roofs do, but certainly I  
 14 wouldn't count that as landscape.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. A green roof is not  
 16 accessible. It's not a park. It's really just  
 17 simply an environmental way to deal with water  
 18 and to deal with heat.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But does it provide  
 20 any type of benefits to the residents that live  
 21 in high-rises around those areas?  
 22 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 23 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. Yeah.  
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So there is a benefit  
 25 to it.

1 MR. TRIAS: They're very good things. It's  
 2 just that they're not open space.  
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: It's not accessible to the  
 4 public. It's more like the balcony issue,  
 5 where the planter, if maintained, it will be  
 6 there. If it's not --  
 7 MR. BELLIN: Well, it's a little different,  
 8 because if you have planters on balconies, you  
 9 see that. If you have a green roof, you don't.  
 10 MS. MENENDEZ: Well, but planters, if it's  
 11 up to the individual to maintain them, that's a  
 12 challenge.  
 13 MS. BALIDO-HART: That shouldn't count.  
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: My planter, dead. I have to  
 15 replant now, and each individual having to have  
 16 that --  
 17 MS. VELEZ: That doesn't work.  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: You shouldn't count it as  
 19 part of the green concept.  
 20 MS. VELEZ: When we're talking 25 percent,  
 21 15 percent, and we're saying, green, we're not  
 22 really saying, green, we're saying open. Am I  
 23 understanding that correctly? Or we have not  
 24 made a distinction between hardscape and  
 25 softscape?

1 MR. BEHAR: I'm glad you brought it up.  
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. That's why I had  
 3 asked for the definition of green, because of  
 4 that same issue.  
 5 MR. TRIAS: Ms. Velez, the specific request  
 6 of one Commissioner, Commissioner Lago, was to  
 7 enhance the green, as opposed to the arcade or  
 8 the hardscape.  
 9 MS. VELEZ: So we're talking, open space.  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Right.  
 11 MS. VELEZ: We're not talking, green space.  
 12 MR. TRIAS: Right.  
 13 MR. BELLIN: No, I don't think we are  
 14 talking, open space.  
 15 MR. TRIAS: And that would require, as Ms.  
 16 Menendez says, a better definition of open  
 17 space. I think that's something that we  
 18 certainly need to work on, because that is  
 19 really the issue. Right now, open space could  
 20 have no green, theoretically. I mean, it's not  
 21 likely to happen, but it could be an arcade --  
 22 MR. BEHAR: Or you could have planters.  
 23 And to use the example of the open space, the  
 24 green space, the plaza up on Le Jeune and Ponce  
 25 de Leon. There's a plaza there that has

1 landscaping, but it's not all green; it's  
 2 paved, with planters.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: And that may be the appropriate  
 4 solution there, because it has a building with  
 5 arcades. Very nice building, by the way.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: It's an urban area, so you may  
 7 want to consider -- it may not be a park  
 8 like --  
 9 MR. BELLIN: I don't think these  
 10 percentages mean open space. I think they mean  
 11 green space. Because a parking lot is an open  
 12 space, and if that's all it is, open to the  
 13 sky, then --  
 14 MR. TRIAS: No.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: No, no, Marshall.  
 16 MR. BELLIN: It's green. It's not open.  
 17 The paseos --  
 18 MR. TRIAS: They include certain things,  
 19 but not parking lots.  
 20 MR. BELLIN: No, but they don't include  
 21 arcades, either.  
 22 MS. VELEZ: No, we're talking about --  
 23 MR. TRIAS: No, they do. The open space  
 24 includes arcades.  
 25 MR. BELLIN: Open space --

1 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. No, what we're saying  
 2 is, the challenge we have is to bring some  
 3 subtly or some nuance to that discussion. We  
 4 need to have some green. We need to have some  
 5 arcades. How do we say that more clearly? And  
 6 the only way that I know how to do it is really  
 7 through the design process through the Board of  
 8 Architects.  
 9 I have to be very honest with you, in the  
 10 sense that Zoning is not exactly a very  
 11 sophisticated tool. That's why we have Zoning,  
 12 plus review of Board of Architects.  
 13 I mean, with Zoning, you can do a few  
 14 things, but not everything.  
 15 MR. BELLIN: These requirements pertain to  
 16 landscaped areas, not open space. You know,  
 17 the paseos don't count, the arcades don't  
 18 count, because, you know --  
 19 MR. TRIAS: They may count. I mean, it  
 20 depends on what we propose. I would not  
 21 recommend to say that we're not going to count  
 22 arcades and paseos, et cetera.  
 23 MR. BELLIN: I hope you do. It certainly  
 24 helps.  
 25 MR. TRIAS: I will not recommend that.

1 Now, but I think that probably if we go back to  
 2 Ms. Balido-Hart's comments, we have to say more  
 3 directly that if you do an arcade that is next  
 4 to a sidewalk that has trees, that's open  
 5 space. If you do an arcade, that is, you know,  
 6 in the back alley, that nobody is going to use,  
 7 maybe that's not open space. I mean, that's  
 8 really, I think, the level of discussion.  
 9 MR. BEHAR: And I think the definition of  
 10 the green space and the open space, because if  
 11 we use, for example, the Village of Merrick  
 12 Park, that central space that they have, which  
 13 is a beautiful space, when you look at the  
 14 percentage of actual green to everything else,  
 15 it's very little, but that's a beautiful open  
 16 space, and that's what we -- you know, I know  
 17 Commissioner Lago wants to add more green  
 18 surfaces, but that may not be --  
 19 MS. BALIDO-HART: But, again, I keep going  
 20 back to this very basic point. I understand.  
 21 I don't think anybody here is going to say, no,  
 22 to having as much green space as possible.  
 23 Green space is beautiful. But why can't we  
 24 just achieve that same goal by doing what I  
 25 said earlier? Why do we have to keep going



1 back to these percentages every time? Why not  
2 just have it in black and white, that  
3 applicants have to show that they are putting  
4 in the maximum possible green space, and have  
5 it written up-front?

6 For example, maybe the Village of Merrick  
7 Park, if the Code had been so clear back then,  
8 maybe there would be greenery now in that  
9 beautiful open space that you now referenced,  
10 you know, in the open courtyard, but it wasn't  
11 exactly contemplated at the time.

12 Is there a way to amend the language as  
13 such?

14 MR. TRIAS: Well, some of the new urbanism  
15 codes talk about greens, plazas, and they  
16 define those terms. A plaza has more  
17 hardscape. A green has more green, lawns and  
18 so on. And, in some instances, you are  
19 required to do a plaza, like if you're in  
20 Downtown. If you're in a neighborhood, you're  
21 required to do a green. I mean, that's the way  
22 that some of the codes have addressed that  
23 issue, by having a typology of spaces that is  
24 clearly defined.

25 And the fact of the matter is that, you

1 makes no sense to me.

2 MR. TRIAS: It's a lot. It seems to work  
3 well. I mean, the last couple of duplexes that  
4 I've worked with, with the architects, it was  
5 okay, but that's a good point. That's a very  
6 different scenario than, for example, a  
7 townhome, which is comparable in density. I  
8 mean, maybe it's a little bit more dense, but a  
9 townhome doesn't have -- it has five feet or so  
10 required in the front, and it gives you a  
11 totally different aesthetic.

12 So what happens is that, at Ponce de Leon,  
13 for example, there's a lot of duplexes and so  
14 on. Recently there was a design, and they  
15 applied that percentage, and that worked okay.  
16 And those duplexes were conceptualized  
17 originally as big houses. That's what the Code  
18 actually says, that they have to look like  
19 houses, it's just that they are two units.

20 Yes?

21 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, the way the Code reads,  
22 40 percent is easily achievable in an MF-1,  
23 because you can only cover 35 percent of the  
24 area.

25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

1 know, if you're Downtown, grass may not be --  
2 for example, in Miracle Mile, more grass is not  
3 going to be the solution.

4 MR. BEHAR: It's not good.

5 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right. Right.

6 MR. TRIAS: I would not recommend having  
7 more grass, instead of sidewalks, on Miracle  
8 Mile.

9 MS. BALIDO-HART: So it all comes down to  
10 the specific case at hand. So why are we  
11 trying to come up with generalities when it all  
12 comes down to whatever is appropriate for that  
13 specific use?

14 MR. TRIAS: I think that's the most helpful  
15 comment that we can forward to the Commission,  
16 that, in fact, the simple percentages is not  
17 nuance enough for a City like Coral Gables.

18 MS. BALIDO-HART: Right.

19 MR. TRIAS: It's not.

20 MS. VELEZ: This is totally different from  
21 what we're talking about, because we seem to be  
22 looking at the Commercial and the Mixed-Use and  
23 the MF-2s. But when I look at MF-1, 40 percent  
24 in a duplex, that seems to be that it's more  
25 than in a Single-Family residence, so that

1 MR. BELLIN: So just the setbacks alone  
2 that are required gives you over 40 percent.

3 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And the challenge is not  
4 that or even MF-2. The concern is really with  
5 the Commercial and the Mixed-Use. And I think  
6 the concern has to do with the fact that the  
7 Code is not clear and is not obvious, because  
8 of all of the different layers, upon layers,  
9 upon layers of requirements. So it's not clear  
10 to a person that, oh, yeah, you're required to  
11 do, you know, 14 percent open space that has to  
12 be green and 16 percent, like 33 Alhambra ended  
13 up. It doesn't say that.

14 It says that indirectly. It says that in  
15 terms of FAR, in terms of lot coverage, in  
16 terms of requirements for arcades, et cetera,  
17 if you want to get a Med Bonus. I have to say  
18 that, as codes go, there are few codes that are  
19 that sophisticated in the way that they deal  
20 with architecture and the way it fits within a  
21 site.

22 MR. BELLIN: Ramon, then what we have to do  
23 is change the wording, because it says very  
24 specifically that 25 percent is open landscaped  
25 area.

1 MR. TRIAS: Right.  
 2 MR. BELLIN: If we can use the paseos and  
 3 we can use the arcade by good design, I'd  
 4 really like it to be in the Code, to spell that  
 5 out for us.  
 6 MR. TRIAS: Like I said, the easiest way to  
 7 achieve this is to do it through the process  
 8 that we have coming up, in which we have a  
 9 consultant and we have a structured way to deal  
 10 with these things. That's the easiest thing.  
 11 So if you are comfortable with that, that could  
 12 be the recommendation.  
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Well, that's how we've  
 14 done it in the past. I remember, when we  
 15 rewrote the previous Code, we went through --  
 16 Robert, you were on the Board with me.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: I was on the Board.  
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We went through that  
 19 whole process, but wouldn't that be the time to  
 20 tackle this, when we're looking at different --  
 21 you know, we go through definitions, we go  
 22 through language and sections of the Code. I  
 23 would think that that's the more appropriate  
 24 time.  
 25 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, we have members of the

1 open space that's being required -- for  
 2 instance, I know that the MF-2 District was  
 3 talked about. You know, right now you could be  
 4 providing ten percent, twelve percent of that,  
 5 at ground level. We're just going to say,  
 6 okay, now it has to be twenty-five percent.  
 7 We're taking out certain hardscapes and we're  
 8 requiring it all to be green.  
 9 That could really impact, (A) the ability  
 10 to effectively accommodate and efficiently  
 11 accomodate your building footprint. It could  
 12 affect your ability to break down the massing.  
 13 And if you have a parking pedestal, it could  
 14 also affect the ability to properly accommodate  
 15 vehicular circulation within that parking  
 16 pedestal. So there's a lot of factors that  
 17 need to be considered, because -- especially  
 18 after all of the hard work that the City did in  
 19 order to spur re-development in the North Ponce  
 20 area. Some of these changes could have drastic  
 21 consequences in that those projects may not  
 22 move forward anymore.  
 23 So it's just something that I think needs  
 24 to be considered. I know we talked about the  
 25 sliding scale. It's not only in terms of being

1 public.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I'm sorry?  
 3 MR. WU: We have members of the public.  
 4 MR. TRIAS: I mean, you can open the  
 5 hearing, if you want.  
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sorry about that. I  
 7 apologize.  
 8 I'm going to go ahead and open it up to the  
 9 floor. Thank you. State your name and --  
 10 MR. NAVARRO: Thank you.  
 11 Mr. Chair and Board Members, thank you very  
 12 much, Jorge Navarro, with offices at 333  
 13 Southeast 2nd Avenue. I think I'm going to  
 14 echo some of the comments and concerns that  
 15 were raised by the Board Members.  
 16 I think that, and I agree that there's ways  
 17 of achieving this by focusing on the quality of  
 18 design and focusing on good design of projects,  
 19 and on the quality of the ground level open  
 20 space that's currently being provided, as  
 21 opposed to an across-the-board increase in just  
 22 the amount of ground level open space.  
 23 I think it's a very important issue, that  
 24 needs to be studied further. By just going  
 25 ahead and increasing the amount of ground level

1 able to provide a percentage of that, either in  
 2 the right-of-way or the upper levels of the  
 3 building, so you can provide an amenity to  
 4 actual residents. If not, you're just going to  
 5 have buildings that just go straight up,  
 6 without any kind of amenity decks, but, also, I  
 7 think, that you need to provide flexibility to  
 8 the architects that are going and designing  
 9 these projects. And for that, I think, that,  
 10 you know, this issue should be further studied.  
 11 We should have a sliding scale. It's much  
 12 easier for smaller -- or it's much easier for  
 13 larger projects to provide additional open  
 14 space than it is for smaller properties.  
 15 I think, if you saw the examples that were  
 16 given today on the PowerPoint, all of those  
 17 projects are over an acre in size. And when  
 18 you have a blank slate of an acre size  
 19 property, you could have the flexibility to  
 20 provide up to 25 percent open space, but when  
 21 you're dealing with 20,000 to 30,000 square  
 22 foot lots, and you're talking about 25 percent  
 23 of your area being devoted to open space, it  
 24 really impacts your ability to design a project  
 25 in the way that I think the City of Coral

1 Gables demands.  
 2 So these are just things that I would ask  
 3 that you consider this evening in making your  
 4 recommendations to the City Commission, and I  
 5 thank you for your time.  
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.  
 7 MS. BALIDO-HART: Thank you.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there anybody else  
 9 that would like to speak?  
 10 I'll go ahead and close the floor to the  
 11 public hearing.  
 12 We've spoken -- comments?  
 13 MR. BEHAR: I like the idea that perhaps we  
 14 should bring the consultant in and further  
 15 explore these possibilities.  
 16 MS. VELEZ: What is the time frame for the  
 17 consultant?  
 18 MR. TRIAS: The item is before the  
 19 Commission on the August 29th meeting, and if  
 20 they select the consultant at that time, then  
 21 immediately we'll start the process. So it's  
 22 coming up soon.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: They've already  
 24 narrowed down their choices?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Staff and outside people

1 were part of a committee and we recommended a  
 2 team, yes.  
 3 MS. MENENDEZ: Who?  
 4 MR. TRIAS: I'm not allowed to speak of  
 5 it --  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: It's public record.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: No, but I'm --  
 8 MR. BEHAR: Do we know the three  
 9 consultants --  
 10 MR. TRIAS: I'm personally within the cone  
 11 of silence.  
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: Oh, the cone of silence.  
 13 Sorry. Forgive me. You're right. We're still  
 14 in the cone of silence.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Do we know -- the City  
 16 Attorney, do we know who those firms are?  
 17 MR. WU: I can tell you, when the item is  
 18 published, it will be public record.  
 19 MR. TRIAS: I don't think the agenda has  
 20 been published.  
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. The Manager hasn't  
 22 issued a memo of recommendation.  
 23 MR. WU: It's under review now.  
 24 THE TRIAS: The Procurement Department has  
 25 prepared the memo --

1 MS. MENENDEZ: And it hasn't been signed.  
 2 MR. BEHAR: So the only thing in the record  
 3 is who submitted, not who has been --  
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: -- selected.  
 5 MR. TRIAS: We had five very qualified  
 6 firms that submitted. So we had a really nice  
 7 process.  
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: What type of firms put in,  
 9 planning firms, architectural firms?  
 10 MR. TRIAS: Planning firms, with extensive  
 11 experience in this kind of work, the people  
 12 that you would think typically would want to do  
 13 this. So I'm very happy with the  
 14 recommendation.  
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Local?  
 16 MR. TRIAS: Yes.  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a motion or  
 18 any further discussion?  
 19 MR. BEHAR: I would make a motion that we  
 20 table this item until a consultant is in place  
 21 and more studies are performed, before it comes  
 22 back to us.  
 23 MS. MENENDEZ: Is the consultant going to  
 24 be looking at the entire Zoning Code?  
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

1 MS. MENENDEZ: So maybe they can provide  
 2 this as priority when they start  
 3 addressing these items.  
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yes. And one of the  
 5 requirements is to set up a public  
 6 participation process, that will give you an  
 7 opportunity to explain the priorities, and my  
 8 goal is to do a new Zoning Code. Here, we're  
 9 just trying to make it better, because it's  
 10 very good already.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: And if you remember, last time,  
 12 when Eibi and I were on the Board, and we were  
 13 dealing with the consultant, they would come  
 14 here, and, you know, we would have a lot of  
 15 interaction with them and give them our input.  
 16 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: And I think that should be,  
 18 also, because --  
 19 MR. TRIAS: Absolutely.  
 20 MR. BEHAR: -- should happen with the new  
 21 consultant.  
 22 MR. TRIAS: That is the expectation. We'll  
 23 negotiate a contract, whenever that happens,  
 24 that includes a significant public  
 25 participation effort.

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: They were coming  
 2 constantly here through a whole --  
 3 MR. BEHAR: And we were doing two or three  
 4 times a month, if you remember.  
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.  
 6 MR. BEHAR: You know, and it was -- at  
 7 times, we would go until eleven o'clock, twelve  
 8 o'clock at night.  
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yeah, with public  
 10 input.  
 11 MR. BEHAR: We don't want to do that in  
 12 this instance.  
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: You guys used to get dinner  
 14 at that time.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: No, we didn't.  
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes, you did.  
 17 MR. BEHAR: No, we didn't.  
 18 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes, you did.  
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We may have.  
 20 MR. TRIAS: Well, something to look forward  
 21 to, then.  
 22 MR. BEHAR: I don't want dinner. We want  
 23 to keep it short.  
 24 MR. COLLER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to  
 25 the motion, I think the motion should be

1 directed to the City Commission, that they  
 2 should table this item until such time as a  
 3 consultant has been retained to review the  
 4 Code, if that's what the desire of the Board  
 5 is.  
 6 MS. MENENDEZ: Yeah, I think that's what  
 7 Robert said.  
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert, is that your  
 9 motion?  
 10 MR. COLLER: I wasn't sure whether he was  
 11 saying, I think I should table it, or his  
 12 recommendation to the Council.  
 13 MS. BALIDO-HART: That was his motion.  
 14 MS. MENENDEZ: That was exactly his motion.  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Thank you.  
 16 MS. MENENDEZ: But it was better said by --  
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion.  
 18 MR. BELLIN: Before we vote on the motion.  
 19 MR. COLLER: I apologize.  
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Before we're going to  
 21 vote, is there a second?  
 22 MS. BALIDO-HART: I second it.  
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second.  
 24 Discussion?  
 25 MR. BELLIN: No. I'd like a definition,

1 because I'm not clear as to what it really  
 2 means by open urban space.  
 3 MR. TRIAS: That needs to be defined  
 4 better, yes.  
 5 MR. BELLIN: Yeah, I don't know what it is.  
 6 Okay.  
 7 MR. TRIAS: We did not make any changes  
 8 from the last time and that was one of the  
 9 things that you pointed at.  
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion. We  
 11 have a second. Any other discussion?  
 12 MR. BEHAR: No.  
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Call the roll, please.  
 14 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?  
 15 MR. BEHAR: Yes.  
 16 THE SECRETARY: Marshall Bellin?  
 17 MR. BELLIN: Yes.  
 18 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?  
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.  
 20 THE SECRETARY: Maria Velez?  
 21 MS. VELEZ: Yes.  
 22 THE SECRETARY: Jolie Balido-Hart?  
 23 MS. BALIDO-HART: Yes.  
 24 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?  
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.

1 MR. TRIAS: Thank you.  
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you very much.  
 3 The next meeting is set for September 13th.  
 4 This meeting is adjourned.  
 5 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07  
 6 p.m.)  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25