

Page 95

1 some time to --
 2 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Do you need a
 4 continuance from us or is this something you
 5 can bring back whenever you're ready?
 6 MR. TRIAS: I don't think so.
 7 MS. MENENDEZ: Bring it back whenever
 8 you're ready.
 9 MS. LEEN: Are you going to act today or do
 10 you want a continuance?
 11 MR. TRIAS: No, we don't need a
 12 continuance.
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: No, we're not ready to act.
 14 MR. BEHAR: No, we're not ready.
 15 MR. TRIAS: We will be back.
 16 MS. LEEN: So it's going to be continued?
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 18 MR. LEEN: So you can do it by unanimous
 19 consent.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Aye.
 21 MR. BEHAR: Aye.
 22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody object to
 23 continuing it?
 24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 25 MR. LEEN: There's objections?

Page 96

1 MS. MENENDEZ: No, no objections.
 2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No.
 3 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No nobody objects.
 4 MS. LEEN: Okay. So ordered.
 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So be it.
 6 MS. LEEN: Okay. So there's a continuance
 7 to the next meeting, by unanimous consent of
 8 the Board.
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Next, Item 9 --
 10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me. Wait a minute.
 11 It can be beyond -- I mean, depending on when
 12 Mr. Trias is ready.
 13 MR. LEEN: Oh, do you want to be continued
 14 to the next --
 15 MR. TRIAS: To whenever we're ready, which
 16 should be the next meeting. I really hope so.
 17 This is priority for us, so we'll get it to
 18 you.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 20 MS. LEEN: Why don't you continue it to
 21 next meeting, as you did, and then he has --
 22 just give him the discretion, he can move it if
 23 it's necessary.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Got it.
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

Page 95

1 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, the next item --
 2 I'll skip the PowerPoint, because I don't think
 3 it's helping in this case. We can look at the
 4 Staff Report.
 5 We're proposing a few amendments to the
 6 Mixed Use District. Just because we're
 7 proposing --
 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do we need to read
 9 these in? Are we okay?
 10 MS. LEEN: Well, you know, it's
 11 interesting, because it says 9 there and it
 12 says a resolution and here it says it's an
 13 ordinance.
 14 MR. TRIAS: It should be an ordinance.
 15 MR. LEEN: It should be an ordinance? Then
 16 it should be read.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. I'll read
 18 it in.
 19 Ramon, let me read it real quick.
 20 "An Ordinance of the City Commission of
 21 Coral Gables, Florida providing for text
 22 amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official
 23 Zoning Code, Article 4, "Zoning Districts,"
 24 Division 2, "Overlay and Special Purpose
 25 Districts," Section 4-201, "Mixed Use District

Page 96

1 (MX)," amending parking requirements for ground
 2 floor uses, adding shared parking reduction
 3 standard reference, and adding LEED
 4 certification standards for new mixed use
 5 developments; providing for a repealer
 6 provision, providing for a severability clause,
 7 providing for codification, and providing for
 8 an effective date."
 9 MR. TRIAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 10 The amendments are about the mixed use
 11 projects, because it was easy to deal with that
 12 topic. I'm not implying that those are the
 13 only projects that we will propose some
 14 amendments to, but I thought it was timely to
 15 deal with mixed use at once and deal with a few
 16 ideas that I think are fairly critical.
 17 If you look at the table, which is the
 18 table that is in the Zoning Code that is used
 19 to verify whether the project meets the
 20 requirements, we're proposing that LEED
 21 certification or similar be required for mixed
 22 use buildings. That's Item 5.
 23 Item 19 basically just codifies the current
 24 practice, which is that the Board of Architects
 25 may approve minor adjustments to design of

1 projects, and, then, under parking vehicle
2 storage, Item 5, we are dealing with the issue
3 of the commercial uses at the ground level, and
4 we're proposing a 300 -- one parking space per
5 300 square feet of floor area as a requirement.

6 That's really a benefit for restaurants,
7 and what happens is, let's say you do a
8 building, a mixed use building, and it's
9 approved, and then later on somebody wants to
10 do a restaurant downstairs -- perfectly fine
11 use -- impossible to meet the Code requirements
12 for parking.

13 Our perspective is, once a mixed use
14 project is built and once there's a garage
15 there, then I think it's better to have some
16 flexibility, in terms of the changes of the
17 uses.

18 And, then, finally, Number 6 is, that we
19 just mentioned, the shared parking provisions
20 that hopefully will be approved in the future.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question.

23 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

24 MR. RODRIGUEZ: How is -- I mean, minor is
25 a relative term. I mean, how is that defined?

1 MR. TRIAS: This is really the current
2 practice, in the sense that as the project is
3 designed, we do have a little bit of
4 flexibility in some dimensions sometimes. I
5 know it's relative. I know, but with the kind
6 of standards that we have in the City, we don't
7 have design guidelines that tell you exactly
8 how things should be, because we aspire to a
9 much more higher quality of design, and that's
10 why we have the Board of Architects.

11 So, you know, there's some inherent
12 flexibility, that I think would be appropriate
13 just to have it in the --

14 MR. BEHAR: Whether you call it minor or
15 non-substantial, because some municipalities
16 call them non-substantial, but at the end --

17 MS. MENENDEZ: But I think the issue is,
18 shouldn't you describe it?

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: That could be something,
20 for example, because we're not architects --
21 maybe in the world of architects and building,
22 that's a term art, I don't know, but to
23 somebody like me, if I use -- if there's a word
24 like, minor -- you know, I'm a lawyer. And so
25 then, you know, that's -- you know, that's a

1 slippery slope, because minor is relative.
2 What can be minor to somebody, could be very
3 major to somebody else, and I can see that as a
4 potential for abuse. That's all.

5 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And Mr. Rodriguez, the
6 due process aspect of this is that the Board of
7 Architects listens to the applicant and the
8 request, and then they make a decision, and in
9 their judgment -- they're the ones that are the
10 experts, and I want to make this clear, if we
11 could legislate high quality design, I would.
12 I mean, I would follow Ms. Menendez's
13 recommendation, but high quality design, the
14 kind of design that this City aspires to, is
15 not possible to legislate. That's why we have
16 the Board of Architects.

17 Mr. Grabiell, you had a question?

18 MR. GRABIEL: Yeah. Well, I had the same
19 question.

20 MR. TRIAS: Oh, okay. Sorry.

21 MR. GRABIEL: I marked mine the same way.

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think we all did.

23 MR. GRABIEL: And I'm not an attorney, but
24 the rest of the sentence, which says, "Require
25 Mixed Use District Design Regulations," what

1 does that entail? I mean, are we talking
2 about --

3 MR. TRIAS: In order to enhance a
4 building -- maybe we should say aesthetics or
5 some better word.

6 MR. GRABIEL: Design regulation worries me,
7 because that could mean moving a setback line
8 or adding square footage.

9 MR. TRIAS: Aesthetics. Yeah, but I have
10 to say that, from a practical point of view,
11 this is really important, in the sense that
12 there's always some minor little things that
13 really make a difference.

14 MR. GRABIEL: If you change that to
15 aesthetic --

16 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that's a good idea.

17 MR. GRABIEL: You know, all of a sudden
18 minor becomes --

19 MR. TRIAS: Let's say, aesthetic
20 adjustments or something like that.

21 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Anybody
22 from the public wish to speak? Any other
23 comments from the Board?

24 MR. PEREZ: Yeah, I have one. On the
25 ground floor commercial uses, I understand that

1 you're including restaurants, but I think, for
 2 restaurants, it shouldn't be the floor area.
 3 In my opinion, it should be the patron area
 4 that the parking ratio should be tied into.
 5 Again, I mean, not to stereotype, but the
 6 majority of restaurant employees and chefs, et
 7 cetera, they ride their bikes or they take mass
 8 transit. I would, for restaurants,
 9 specifically, just base that ratio on patron
 10 area.
 11 MR. TRIAS: And I think that's a good
 12 point, and I will propose this: We were
 13 planning to bring restaurant parking
 14 requirements separately. And in this case,
 15 what we're really saying is that in a mixed use
 16 building -- let's just use 300 as a number, and
 17 just blend it, because it's mixed use.
 18 I mean, that's kind of like the thinking.
 19 If you're doing a restaurant, yes, you're
 20 right, and we need to refine it, so it's
 21 only --
 22 MR. BEHAR: Because the kitchen takes
 23 usually about 40, 50 percent of the floor area,
 24 and you're not going have the same number of
 25 users in the kitchen area.

1 now. It really impacts the project after it's
 2 built. What happens is that there are many
 3 times that a mixed use project is built, and
 4 then there's a change of use at the ground
 5 level, and at this point, the change of use
 6 would be easy to approve, if we had these
 7 regulations, because you already met the
 8 requirements, because it's blended.
 9 Right now, with the current regulations, if
 10 the change of use is from retail to restaurant,
 11 you have three times the parking requirements,
 12 more or less. So it's very difficult, because
 13 the building is already there. The garage is
 14 already there. It's very difficult to approve
 15 a restaurant in an existing mixed use building,
 16 years after completion.
 17 MS. MENENDEZ: But what do you do with
 18 parking?
 19 MR. BEHAR: If it's a mixed use, you're
 20 going to have that shared parking.
 21 MS. MENENDEZ: Right. So this is tied to
 22 the previous one that we talked about.
 23 MR. BEHAR: Pretty much. This is for mixed
 24 use buildings.
 25 MR. TRIAS: Right. They're all tied.

1 MR. TRIAS: We decided that the restaurant
 2 changes -- right now, I believe that the
 3 restaurant is about three times more than
 4 retail, more or less. So it's a real problem,
 5 and we need to find a solution that is
 6 reasonable, because in a mixed use building, it
 7 may be different than, let's say, on US-1.
 8 If you do a standalone restaurant on US-1,
 9 maybe we need to be a little bit more careful,
 10 in terms of the parking requirements.
 11 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. But you're right, and I
 12 think, you know, he's right. On the mixed use,
 13 you have an opportunity to be a little bit more
 14 flexible, but, I think, look at Alberto's
 15 comment. I think that's a good one, as well.
 16 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, but we intend to come
 17 back with restaurant issues and solutions.
 18 MR. BEHAR: Okay.
 19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
 20 MS. MENENDEZ: Can I just request that
 21 similar to the other one, that you bring
 22 samples of existing projects and how this
 23 change would impact those projects, if that's
 24 possible?
 25 MR. TRIAS: And I can answer that right

1 MS. MENENDEZ: The only difference is that
 2 this one is -- you're saying that this samples
 3 like when they're already built and the use
 4 changes, and then, you know, now, all of a
 5 sudden, the new use doesn't comply with the
 6 parking requirements?
 7 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: You've got to figure that
 9 out, though. I mean, we can't just --
 10 MR. BEHAR: But even in new buildings,
 11 Maria, it could also work, because today --
 12 today, currently, for example, a 10,000 square
 13 foot restaurant requires 120 spaces, 12 per
 14 1,000, where, in retail spaces, it would be
 15 only 33 spaces. So it's almost three times the
 16 amount or actually four times the amount. So
 17 if you had a mixed use building, a new
 18 building, you could benefit from it.
 19 MS. MENENDEZ: Right.
 20 MR. BEHAR: You know, the example that I
 21 gave you earlier. For the commercial, there's
 22 155 -- 186 spaces allocated to the commercial,
 23 you know, that never gets used.
 24 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay.
 25 MS. LEEN: Mr. Chair --

1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.
 2 MR. LEEN: -- I wanted to raise one legal
 3 issue. I was just thinking about what you were
 4 talking about with design regulations, and the
 5 whole discussion about major adjustments and
 6 aesthetic requirements regulations.
 7 I wanted to raise one issue that's come up
 8 occasionally, which is why I think that it's
 9 important that the modifications they be able
 10 to make be more than aesthetic, as long as it's
 11 for an aesthetic purpose.
 12 Here's the issue that can come up. I
 13 remember -- this has come up maybe two or three
 14 times, where there's some component of a
 15 structure that, for aesthetic reasons, needs to
 16 be moved, and the Board of Architects feels
 17 strongly about that, but the person, by Code,
 18 of as of a right, has a right to have that.
 19 And so they've asked that it be moved, and
 20 sometimes it may go into the setback a little
 21 bit, because of the move, but the Board of
 22 Architects believes that aesthetically it's a
 23 much better solution.
 24 I have opined that they're able to do that,
 25 and, of course, you know, ultimately the

1 Commission can change the Code and you can
 2 recommend a change to the Code, but I would
 3 like there to be -- at least I'd like to submit
 4 to you the idea that I think that there is a
 5 benefit to having that ability.
 6 MR. TRIAS: And Mr. Chairman, what I would
 7 recommend is, instead of "minor," use the word
 8 aesthetic. "It may approve aesthetic
 9 adjustments" or something like that.
 10 MS. LEEN: Adjustments for aesthetic
 11 purposes.
 12 MR. TRIAS: For aesthetic purposes, yes.
 13 MR. LEEN: That would make me comfortable,
 14 and it could be minor. It should be minor.
 15 They shouldn't be making substantial changes to
 16 the Code, obviously.
 17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So we're leaving minor,
 18 and changing it to aesthetic purposes.
 19 MR. BELLIN: Craig, I have a question.
 20 What you're saying is -- the Board of
 21 Architects, essentially, if they allow an
 22 encroachment into a required setback, that's a
 23 variance.
 24 MS. LEEN: No, it was not a variance,
 25 because it's allowed pursuant to the Code, if

1 you make this change.
 2 What the Code says is that Boards can --
 3 when they approve something, can impose
 4 conditions, and we've allowed the Board of
 5 Architects to give comments and conditions.
 6 There's no limitation on that authority, so the
 7 way I've interpreted it is, well, it can't be
 8 material, in the sense that it -- you can't
 9 essentially grant a variance to the Code, but
 10 minor ones, because their purpose is
 11 aesthetics, and that is a recognized purpose of
 12 our Code, in fact, it's central to our Code,
 13 the Board of Architects, I have opined that in
 14 the past.
 15 And I know that the Planning and Zoning
 16 Director has the same view.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 18 MS. LEEN: Now, obviously, anyone can
 19 always appeal that, and it's ultimately up to
 20 the Commission, but, yes. The answer to your
 21 question is, yes, but I don't consider it a
 22 variance. I consider it, they're trying to
 23 comply with the Code.
 24 MR. BELLIN: If the Board of Architects
 25 approves a building aesthetically that doesn't

1 conform to the Building Code --
 2 MR. WU: You meant the Zoning Code.
 3 MR. LEEN: Not Building Code. They have to
 4 comply -- what I'm saying is, if there's an
 5 application -- I think there's two different
 6 issues here.
 7 Someone who applies and has something that
 8 doesn't meet the Zoning Code, Zoning Staff will
 9 say that, and it doesn't go forward.
 10 What I'm saying is, there's very -- it's
 11 happened maybe two or three times, that I can
 12 recall --
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 14 MR. LEEN: -- where the Board of Architects
 15 says, "Look, we understood that the Zoning Code
 16 lets you put this here, but aesthetically this
 17 is not good, we can't approve it the way that
 18 it looks.
 19 For example, it could be some major
 20 structure right on the street, and they want it
 21 to be moved toward the back. We've allowed
 22 that, with minor adjustments to the Code.
 23 MR. TRIAS: And the issue here is simply,
 24 what kind of City do you want to have? If you
 25 really believe that the Board or Architects is

1 very component and does a great job, I want to
2 give them that authority, to really make a
3 judgment that is for aesthetic purposes, that
4 enhances the quality of the City.

5 Otherwise we can have a very simple set of
6 guidelines, that, hey, you have 45, 25,
7 whatever, and we're done. And then we are not
8 going to have the City that we all aspire to
9 have. We will have a City that is not as
10 excellent. So that's really -- that's what
11 this is about.

12 It deals with mixed use projects. It deals
13 with significant -- it doesn't deal with every
14 other building or building permit that may show
15 up. This is a very specific process, that
16 requires Commission review -- Planning and
17 Zoning review, Commission approval. It's
18 significant.

19 MS. LEEN: It's come up -- I remember it
20 came up on the restaurant on US-1. It didn't
21 go forward. But there was an issue about
22 moving -- the restaurant that it's in the
23 McFarland Homestead. Remember that issue?

24 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

25 MS. MENENDEZ: It finally didn't move

1 would recommend that -- a lot of these are
2 not -- these are not things that would go to
3 the Commission. You know, these are as of
4 right projects.

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I thought we had agreed on
6 the language of approve minor adjustments for
7 aesthetic purposes.

8 MR. TRIAS: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.

10 MR. TRIAS: Very good.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: With that, any further
12 comments?

13 MR. BELLIN: I have a question. Just as a
14 for instance --

15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: On this item?

16 MR. BELLIN: Uh-huh.

17 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.

18 MR. BELLIN: In general. What if the Board
19 of Architects approves a metal roof and metal
20 roofs are not allowed in Coral Gables? What
21 happens?

22 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sorry, Marshall. Can
23 we finish this item first, please?

24 MS. LEEN: Yes. Just briefly, that's not a
25 minor adjustment. That can't be. Based on

1 forward?

2 MS. LEEN: Well, that restaurant did not
3 move forward. I don't know what the current
4 status is. And I remember that the Board of
5 Architects -- there was some structure they
6 wanted to put, and they aesthetically were very
7 strongly -- the Board of Architects had a
8 strong view about it, and felt it needed to be
9 moved.

10 Basically impose that -- they said, "This
11 needs to be moved," but they said, "Well, but
12 if we move it, it's going to go a little bit
13 into the setback," and I gave the opinion --
14 I've done this a couple of times -- that if
15 it's done for aesthetic purposes and it's
16 required by the Board because of an aesthetic
17 purpose, they have the authority to do that.

18 Obviously that can be appealed by any
19 aggrieved party. In that particular case, no
20 one appealed, as I recall.

21 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should
22 say that the Board of Architects may recommend
23 adjustments for aesthetic purposes to the City
24 Commission?

25 MS. LEEN: Well, that's up to you, but I

1 what the Commission has said, that is not a
2 minor -- that's not even close to a minor
3 adjustment, I would say. So that can't happen.

4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Any further
5 comments on this item? Anybody want to move
6 it?

7 MS. MENENDEZ: I would like to continue it.
8 I wanted to get some --

9 MR. TRIAS: Which issues --

10 MS. MENENDEZ: I saw your eyes go up.

11 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What is there to
12 provide?

13 I mean, this talks about buildings that are
14 already existing. They were built in
15 compliance at one to 300.

16 MS. MENENDEZ: I was hoping to get some
17 case scenarios, but if you all don't agree,
18 but --

19 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, the only thing
20 they can come back with is, putting in a
21 restaurant use, but the building exists. It's
22 built to comply at one to 300.

23 MS. MENENDEZ: It's complying presently at
24 one to 300, you're saying here?

25 MR. BEHAR: Now, when they change the

1 use --
 2 MS. MENENDEZ: But then you're bringing in
 3 a restaurant.
 4 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: So are you saying that the
 6 restaurants is less intense --
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: The existing Code says the
 9 restaurant is more intense.
 10 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, the existing Code
 11 requires three times the parking for a
 12 restaurant than it does for a retail store, and
 13 what we're saying is that that is not working,
 14 and that is not working especially in mixed use
 15 buildings.
 16 And it's not working in missed use
 17 buildings, because when there's a change of
 18 use, and a restaurant wants to be located at
 19 the ground level, there usually is not enough
 20 parking.
 21 MR. BEHAR: Maria, I feel personally
 22 comfortable, if it's for mixed use buildings,
 23 because he's right, you know, you have the
 24 excess parking --
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: I understand. For a mixed

1 use building, I understand.
 2 MR. TRIAS: And that's all it is, it's just
 3 for mixed use.
 4 MS. MENENDEZ: Just mixed use. Okay. Got
 5 it.
 6 MR. TRIAS: Okay.
 7 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody want to move
 8 it?
 9 MR. BEHAR: I'll make a motion to approve.
 10 MR. WU: Mr. Chair, just be aware, there's
 11 also a LEED requirement.
 12 MS. MENENDEZ: I saw that, yeah.
 13 MR. WU: I just want to make sure we are
 14 comfortable with the LEED requirement.
 15 MR. BEHAR: The LEED requirement is --
 16 MR. TRIAS: Or similar.
 17 MR. BEHAR: Or similar.
 18 MR. WU: Equivalent.
 19 MR. BEHAR: Equivalent, yes.
 20 And, typically, today, just about any
 21 project you do, you've got to comply with that
 22 by Code, just standard. So that's okay.
 23 MR. GRABIEL: I'll second it.
 24 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And a second.
 25 MS. MENENDEZ: But where does it say,

1 "similar," because in the chart, it says, "LEED
 2 certification."
 3 MR. BEHAR: "Or similar rating agency."
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 5 MS. MENENDEZ: Where are you reading that?
 6 MR. TRIAS: That's the third line. The
 7 third line, "Or similar rating" --
 8 MS. MENENDEZ: Okay. Got it.
 9 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Motion and a second.
 10 Anything further?
 11 All right. Jill, call the roll please.
 12 THE SECRETARY: Maria Menendez?
 13 MS. MENENDEZ: Yes.
 14 THE SECRETARY: Alberto Perez?
 15 MR. PEREZ: Yes.
 16 THE SECRETARY: Frank Rodriguez?
 17 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
 18 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 19 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 20 THE SECRETARY: Marshal Bellin?
 21 MR. BELLIN: Yes.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Julio Grabiell?
 23 MR. GRABIEL: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Jeff Flanagan?
 25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes.

1 All right. Last item, Number 10 on the
 2 agenda, "An Ordinance of the City Commission of
 3 Coral Gables, Florida providing for text
 4 amendments to the City of Coral Gables Official
 5 Zoning Code: Article 2, "Decision Making and
 6 Administrative Bodies", Division 3, "Board of
 7 Architects", Section 3-301, "Powers and
 8 Duties"; Section 2-302, "Membership, Terms;
 9 Vacancies; Removal"; and Section 2-303,
 10 "Meetings, Quorum; Required Vote", repealing
 11 Section 3-303, "Reconsideration of City
 12 Architect Administrative Determination" of
 13 Article 3 "Development Review"; by updating the
 14 membership and certain procedures of the Board
 15 of Architects; providing for severability,
 16 repealer, codification and an effective date."
 17 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very
 18 much.
 19 As you know, the Board of Architects'
 20 process is probably the most important process
 21 that we have for the aesthetics of the City.
 22 We have made a few changes that I believe are
 23 going to streamline the process and provide a
 24 better service to our community.
 25 The first change is that we are adding