CITY OF CORAL GABLES
405 BILTMORE WAY
CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 33134

MEETING OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

Thursday June 12th, 2025

4:00 p.m.

City Hall, Commission Chambers

Commission Members In Attendance:

MICHAEL MAXWELL

CESAR GARCIA-PONS

MICHELLE CUERVO-DUNAJ

XAVIER DURANA

PEGGY ROLANDO

DONA SPAIN

MARLIN EBBERT

CITY ATTORNEY:

STEPHANIE THROCKMORTON

CLIFF FRIEDMAN

(Excerpt of meeting:)

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Okay. We're going to open the public hearing, but I'd like everyone to know that our City Manager and Assistant City Manager are here with us today, and we are very honored to have them back. So thank you for coming and being a part.

Okay. Let's see, what have we got today. We have no designations today. The Board items are Historic Preservation Board Review of the Window Replacement Proposal for the City Hall complex, item number 24-8422.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good afternoon, Board. My name is Cliff Friedman, Assistant City Attorney. I am filling in temporarily for Ms. Throckmorton until she's able to make it to the meeting today.

The item regarding the City Hall windows here is before you at the City Commission's request. They are looking for review and feedback on the windows. It's not necessary to take a vote on this item either, but staff is here to make a presentation.

Do you want the images shown or do you want to speak? Can you put up the PowerPoint, please?

MR. IGLESIAS: Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here today with all of you. This is a presentation on the windows for City Hall. I know

that the Board has had a prior presentation. I just wanted to get into some of the issues, some of the time that we spent originally on the windows, and some of the problems that we have with the existing windows.

The mock up is downstairs. We couldn't bring it up because it weighed 550 pounds plus the frame. The windows at City Hall is something that we worked on for about a year, and the issue was to try to get a window as closely matching to the existing windows. We looked at wood windows; they would be too large, similar to the ones that are used on the Biltmore. Much heavier frame. We looked at aluminum, and then we finally decided to go with Hope windows because the windows are structural steel. And the reason we went with structural steel was -- at a very high cost, those windows are between three and four million dollars plus installation. And the reason that we went to those windows is because we could try to match the sections as much as possible with wood and then have structural loading, means the pressure, positive negative pressures of the hurricane.

We have, of course, the impact criteria, as we all know, and then we also have water infiltration. Water infiltration is a key issue. Some of the

problems that we're having with the building right now -- I took a look at some areas, additional areas that were exposed, and the structure looks in pretty good shape. The problems that we have all seem to be along the perimeter, which we knew we had because there's so much water infiltration that we have a problem with the stairs and we have a problem around some of the perimeter beams.

Overall, the structure looks in good shape. It's got some issues here and there where the additional cover on the reinforcement was not correct due to construction errors. Very minor. We've got concrete that's almost 100 years old, which means the concrete is really not protecting the steel.

It goes through, concrete, goes through a carbonation process where the alkalinity is reduced in the concrete to a point that it doesn't protect steel like new concrete does. And so those are things that we're looking to actually address; there's even products that can enhance that.

So where is our biggest issue is the actual windows and the water infiltration that we have along the perimeter of the structure. We also have, of course, structural loading. These windows are not very strong. They really can't take hurricane

loading. I know the building's been here for 400 years, but it's just a probability, right? I was just discussing that there is in Katrina, Athena has a beautiful colonial home that was there for 120 years, and gone after Katrina. So it's a probabilistic issue right, and how lucky we feel.

So we spent about a year looking at different Windows, getting, detailing the actual structural sections of these windows, and started working with Hope to get the mock up that you all saw below. Tried to bring it up, but too heavy, didn't fit in the elevator and too heavy to bring up the stairs.

So I'm here to answer whatever questions that you all have. And also, one important thing as far as the assessment of the existing windows are concerned, the existing windows can be repaired. I can tell you, it's wood, structural material, it can be repaired. But they don't have structural loading, they don't have impact resistance, and they don't have water infiltration resistance.

We actually put shutters up on this building. Those shutters are really for water intrusion in very Category One hurricanes and things like this, because we're actually anchoring to limestone, and there are no structural values for anchors in limestone. So we

put them up the best we can, but to expect those shutters to really work, they really don't because there are no values for that.

MS. SPAIN: How are these anchored? How are you planning on anchoring the new windows?

MR. IGLESIAS: These would be anchored similar to what we did on your house. We want to get into the --

MS. SPAIN: I knew he was going to bring my house up. I walked right into that. Yes, you were a big help on my house.

MR. IGLESIAS: Yes, and we've gotten some experience in terra cotta block. So we're going to have to fill in terra cotta block, high strength grout. We're going to reinforce as much as we can. Also, going to certainly work the building from the inside. We want to make sure that we protect the limestone lining. If we touch that, it's going to be, unless you're Michelangelo, it's going to be a problem to actually replace that. So we're going to try to work from the interior as much as possible and reinforce the actual frame opening. And so doing something similar, similar techniques that we've looked at for a number of years, working on historical homes. We've done that in a number of homes.

So we've gone to this window. We really did not

look at a cost when we did this window. We wanted to match these windows as close as possible. If we would have been looking for cost, we would not be using Hope, and we would not be using this custom window. And again, we went with Hope to use a structural steel window to try to make those moldings as much, as small as possible, meet the structural loading, meet the impact criteria and try to keep the building as dry as possible. And if we see some of the areas, the areas that you see on the stairs, that window on the side, just continuously, so it's hurting the building.

However, as you go inside, the structure looks quite good. Very repairable. I've seen much worse. This building is in good shape from a historical perspective. Do we need repairs? Yes. I mean, and especially in the perimeter where we've had leaks as far as the windows are concerned. But this was a building built by a very good architect under architect supervision, and you can tell from the construction. So we're dealing with a good structure that if we protect it, we're going to have a building for quite some time. So I'm here to answer any question on the building or anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Manager. That's really, that's very heartening to hear, and we're glad

to know that the building is in good structural condition. One of the, just to very quickly --

MR. IGLESIAS: It does have a few issues. It does have some issues, and those issues we can certainly correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm 74 years old and this building is 100, and I've got issues too. And just like all older things, you know, we do change a little bit. Just to bring you up to date, for the time that you've been out, the Board has looked at the window and we had a discussion. And Mr. Gomez, I'm not sure if you were at that discussion, and one of the things that we had recommended back to the City administration was to look at preserving the wooden windows and restoring them, and then placing the impact glass window behind them. Because the issue that was brought to us at the time was sealing the building.

And of course, you know, with the historic doors as well, we'll have the same -- with the same issue. So we highly encourage that as, to look very, very seriously at it, because this is one of the very few buildings that has that. And we realize that yes, they can be damaged, but they can also be repaired, but that the ceiling and the structural integrity would be from behind that. We don't open the windows

anyway. So, you know, it's like we think that we could, you know, look at something like that.

MR. IGLESIAS: It's not opening the windows, and I understand that we want to try to put some type of Plexiglass or something behind it. That is -- and I understand that that was. The problem with this type of window, it just leaks and leaks and leaks, and you really cannot control it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course we can. We would seal the window. I mean, I've restored lots of buildings.

MR. IGLESIAS: But if you put a Plexiglas behind, certainly you're not, you know, and you're putting Plexiglass on the actual frame, how that's going to function, we don't really know because we don't know how the window is anchored properly. Is the window anchored properly? It's an old wood frame.

The window itself, it was done in an era where we didn't have air conditioning. It was not -- the gasketing is not there. The window is not there. It's small little panes. It just, it's a window that is very difficult to do. That kind of a solution is a difficult solution.

MS. SPAIN: I have a question.

MR. IGLESIAS: And not really, you know, not really from a structural perspective --

MS. SPAIN: I understand what you're saying. When we did the Merrick house, those were the original windows, and the people that did the restoration took the windows out, restored them off site, and then brought them and anchored them in properly. So that's what would have to be done with this building. And I wasn't thinking about Plexiglas, necessarily, behind it. I was thinking about during a storm, that the impact, whatever the City does -- I mean, it's scary, the panels that go up on City Hall now. I mean, I remember, my office has been in just about every office because I had so many jobs when I was working here. But they would get up and walk along the ledges, and so I'm not --

MR. IGLESIAS: It takes three days, it takes three days to do that.

MS. SPAIN: I know, and I'm not saying that. I was asking whether it was possible to do the hurricane shutters or the hurricane panel, or whatever it is you're going to put up, behind the historic windows once they get anchored. I mean, would that be possible? Because then you're just inside, and then you could have operable windows during, when it isn't hurricane season. But then -- and you know, if one of them gets hit during a storm, then you can repair it,

and the impact would be from behind.

And I don't think it's necessary to restore all the windows at the same time, you know, just do it little by little. Put something in the budget that you take care of, you know, ten windows at a time, and then you do it. We're not in that big of a rush.

MR. IGLESIAS: Speaker B: We are going to do a building. Our plan is to, is to potentially move out of City Hall next year and get the job done. It's about 25 to 30 million dollars.

MS. SPAIN: I think it's the wrong thing to do.

MR. IGLESIAS: We just want to, we are looking at a budget of 25 to 30 million dollars. We are looking at part of the Menorca garage. The plan in the Menorca garage was to move the Commission, City Manager, City Attorney and City Clerk to the bottom of that, of the garage.

We did some work, some work, temporary work for the passport office. The Tax Collector decided to rent that space because it was already done for them. And so we only have space now for the City Commission, and we'll be moving to a building on Ponce. The idea is to look at mechanical, electrical, plumbing, everything, upgrade the entire building, restore the entire building and even look at this space and see.

Because originally the Commission was on that side, right?

MS. SPAIN: Yes, there's photographs of that. Interesting.

MR. IGLESIAS: Correct, and you showed me those, to me.

MS. SPAIN: It works better acoustically to have it over there.

MR. IGLESIAS: So that's the idea, is to come in and get City Hall, give a major upgrade.

MS. SPAIN: I get it, and I agree with everything you're doing except the windows. I think it's a real pity to have this building even, even Hope, which are amazing windows. I just think someone should cost it out and see what it would take to keep these windows, because there's nothing like original windows in a historic building.

MR. IGLESIAS: The cost of windows are three to four million.

MS. SPAIN: I get it.

MR. IGLESIAS: We did not go to a cheap solution.

MS. SPAIN: I understand.

MR. IGLESIAS: We wanted to have the best solution possible. The idea was to, are we going to go to an impact product, impact product on this

building. We worked for over a year, did actual "as built" of the windows, tried to match those sections as close as possible, and used the strongest window, stronger material, which is steel, substantially stronger than aluminum, to actually keep those sections as small as possible.

MS. SPAIN: This building isn't going anywhere.

MR. IGLESIAS: I just want to say that we --

MS. SPAIN: I get it, and I know you're not scrimping.

MR. IGLESIAS: -- spared no expense on this.

MS. SPAIN: I know you well enough to know that, that you'll do a quality job when you do that, but I'm telling you, it's the wrong thing to do on this building. I know you and I have disagreed on a lot of things over the years.

MR. IGLESIAS: We're still friends.

MS. SPAIN: I know. It's amazing. But you really, you should at least talk to someone that can do that and just see what they say about restoring these windows. I don't think anyone has done that.

MR. IGLESIAS: No, I don't think there's an issue. I can tell you that from a structural perspective, it's wood. I deal with wood. They can be restored. The windows are -- it's tough on those

windows because we require from our knowledge of hurricanes now, right, and knowing what a hurricane can do what the structural loading is. I mean the wind loading on the windows, which we didn't know back then, the impact, the water intrusion. I mean if you see a water intrusion test on the window, it's not like putting a hose on there.

MS. SPAIN: I mean, this building isn't going anywhere. I mean you could knock out all the windows and the building itself isn't going anywhere.

MR. IGLESIAS: Well, I will say, we have a 1928 building. It was done, it's a fantastic building, but done with old technology. This is terra cotta block. It's unreinforced walls. We don't need to add internal pressure to the building. What happens in the building sometimes, they're barely hanging on, and the envelope is breached. And now you've got suction loads pulling it out and almost like a balloon effect inside. So now you have pulling and pushing and that's where things come apart.

And so from that perspective, the building will have a much higher ability to sustain a load. Once you breach the opening, what happens is the wind gets in, creates a balloon effect, and then as the wind goes around the building, it creates a suction effect.

So now you've got it pulling and pushing, and then things are barely hanging on and then they don't.

So from that perspective, the wall, even though the building, I mean the form work and everything else, I can see the building is great, except of course for those perimeter areas where you see that the water has affected the building. But they're terra cotta walls. They're unreinforced terra cotta walls. There's no way we would do anything like that now.

It wasn't, it's not that it was done, it was done based on a very good building, based on technology of 1928, right. And so from a -- the more you upgrade a building, the better statistically the building has for surviving. If you upgrade a building, let's say -- I'm going to use categories, even though it's not what we use in engineering, but everybody understands it better. We don't use categories in engineering, that's really for, Category 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 is used for planning, right? When you know it's a Category 5, you know, hell is breaking loose. If they're Category 1, then you know it's going to be a tree event, basically.

But as you go up that ladder, then statistically there's less and less events that can affect building.

So going from Category 1 to Category 2, you are now moving to a series of events that statistically are, from a statistical probability, are less likely to happen. So as you upgrade a building, we may not make the current code, but then we have a building that has a higher propensity to survive because we've statistically moved it up a level, right? And if you have a building that's Category 1 and you can get it to Category 2, now you got a little measure of safety. And maybe a Category 2, maybe a Category 3, and so you're giving yourself more higher probability of survival.

So when you upgrade some of these older buildings, you can't get to the current code; it's not possible. But if we up the survival, if we up the capacity from those kind of events, then we up the survival rate of the actual building because we are reducing the probability of a lower storm, which has more propensity to happen, and increasing the survival of the building.

Hurricanes are just, are still casting, events, they are totally random, and you can go 100 years or you can go five years. It's that way. So that's what we're looking at, and that's what we did, all that work. We spent a year looking at this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Garcia-Pons, you had a question?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Mr. Manager, thank you for coming out. So we had a presentation by staff probably last year, I forget what month it was. In December, so very recently. And I don't -- we had a pretty good discussion there, and we made some recommendations to the City staff and the administration, which is different at the time. But we ended up the conversation, and I don't think anything has changed since that particular meeting that we've seen, but we asked for an assessment of the existing windows. Because perhaps we don't need to replace all of the windows and we can figure something out where we may need to replace a few with the windows that you're proposing, and maybe there's some that we do not. And that can represent a different aspect of historic preservation.

Before you answer, though, I think the interest for us, I think of the Preservation Board, right, We have our charge and you have your charge, which is much more vast than our charge. Our charge is to talk about the care of this particular landmark. And the care isn't just the way that it looks, it's also, make sure that it lasts a long time, and all the things

that we need to take -- We look at it in both ways of how does it look and how is it going to function? How can we best protect it for the long run? So we have the same thoughts on how to protect this building, but maybe a different way to do it.

Part of the request for the assessment was, maybe there's a way to protect some windows to showcase the technology of 1928, because it has been 100 years. It is a beautiful building. These are beautiful windows. And we may be able to salvage windows that are in good condition that can then tell the story of how this building was built in 1928, how these windows have lasted for 100 years, how it was done before air conditioning, how all of those things are true, and protect the building for the future.

And I think the assessment was something that we all seem to agree on, that would help us maybe get to that solution. But if the assessment isn't done, you're saying it's all or nothing, and I don't -- this way.

MR. IGLESIAS: No, I'm not saying it's all or nothing. I think the word assessment is interesting because I can tell you that, what assessment are we going to do? Can they be repaired? Can they be put back? Yes, they can. I can tell you that.

Wood is a structural material. We can take care of it. That's not the issue. I don't think, honestly, I don't think we need an assessment, and that's why I came here, because I can tell you, yes, can we replace, can we restore the windows? Yes, yes, we can do that. I've looked at the windows; the vast majority of them, if not all can be restored. It's wood. It's a structural product.

I mean, so from an assessment perspective, you know, what are we looking at? Are we looking at can these windows, can we restore the windows? The answer is yes. The question is, should we restore the windows or should we go to a much stronger product? And that's the key, that's the key. So what, the assessment, what is that going to prove?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I got it.

MR. IGLESIAS: It's going to tell you, it's going to tell you exactly what I'm going to tell you.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: But I think it wasn't quite stated that way at the last presentation.

MR. IGLESIAS: I know it wasn't, that's why I'm here now.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I appreciate it.

MR. IGLESIAS: That's what I'm here now.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: An assessment, what might help

us make some decisions is the second part of my comment was, do we need to replace all the windows? Or an assessment might tell us, maybe some of the windows make sense to do the steel, and some of the windows that are maybe closer, that are more tactile, that can be more part of the story that's being told, can replace with, replacing the wood, fixing it and the Plexiglas. I think we can do some sort of a hybrid that can help tell the story of this building without just replacing everything.

MR. IGLESIAS: I understand. We don't need an assessment for that. We can decide --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: And that's fine.

MR. IGLESIAS: We can decide which windows we want to repair, which windows we want to restore. Now you have a building that's going to have some windows that are vulnerable, some windows that are not.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, none of the building, well, what we have talked about --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: To protect it differently.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was completely -- that we would seal the building, okay. And that the windows would be restored. We would put hurricane protection glass behind it. It would not be Plexiglas. It would be anchored the same way that the multimillion-dollar

windows are going to be anchored. And we could do it a different way, and it would be as a single pane behind those, which is what we talked about. And you know, you would see the existing windows and you would have your hurricane protection behind it.

Would it leak and be water resistant? Well, if we have a good contractor, no, but so will seal them just the way that we would. And also if you look at that, I think you'll find it's a much less expensive, you know, opportunity than redoing the entire thing out of these very, very expensive windows that do not match what we have.

MR. IGLESIAS: Putting a shutter behind a window --

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not a shutter, it's a hurricane window.

MR. IGLESIAS: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Exactly like what you're proposing to put in, except, it's just a sheet of glass. It's in a separate frame, okay? It's not any different. It provides the same sealing and the same --

MR. IGLESIAS: So you're talking about providing a storefront behind the window. Because basically if it's going to be hurricane, if it's going to be hurricane resistant, then it's got to be a storefront.

A storefront doesn't fit behind the window, I mean you -- it just doesn't. A code approved storefront does not fit behind the window because you need the aluminum sections, the aluminum mullions. And so it's very difficult to do and very difficult to actually anchor. We would have to go to some type of different system that, a shutter type system or something like that. To put a window behind the window, there's not enough, there's not enough room for that. And we would have to, of course, remove everything and do the same thing that we did in your house.

MS. SPAIN: Only behind.

MR. IGLESIAS: Yeah, right, and reinforce the frame. It's even hard to anchor because terra cotta, it's terra cotta. And when you try to drill, you can't even, it doesn't even accept an anchor. It doesn't. It doesn't. There's no values for terra cotta.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manager, you have to anchor the windows that you're proposing to put in the same way. You have to make a concrete fill all around the windows, so it doesn't matter, it's the same thing. So we're not talking about doing anything differently. We're talking about doing the exact same thing that you're speaking of, and putting this window there,

okay? And we can put it in whatever frame that can fit the space, and we can put back the other historic windows in front of it.

I mean, we, at our previous meeting, you know, even Mr. Torre was talking about, hey, that's really what we should be doing, and so we would highly encourage you to look at that. And we also think it would save our taxpayers a little bit of money.

MR. IGLESIAS: I think that that would be certainly -- I know Mr. Torre was looking at that. I've been working on the NOAs and windows since Hurricane Andrew, and I've looked at window testing. I've looked at structural testing, looked at impact testing. I've looked at water intrusion testing. And so it's not just simply just putting something on.

If we're going to get something to work, it's got to be done properly. It's also behind the window, which means the leakage still occurs. Because you can't, if you've ever seen a window test, then, I mean, when you have pressure and you have water, it just gushes right in, and it's very difficult.

Even modern windows have, one of the big issues that we're trying to do now in the Code is, how do we increase the water infiltration, excuse me, reduce the water infiltration of current windows. I was working

with University of Florida on a study of that. So water intrusion is a huge issue in the envelope, huge issue. It's a huge issue for this building because we have limestone that we're going to, that we need to correct, and we need to try to historically correct and minimize Infiltration on the limestone.

MS. SPAIN: I don't think that shutter or whatever it is that we're talking about behind the window has to be within the frame of the window. I mean, I think you're clever enough to figure it out. Peter, I have faith in you as an engineer, and I think it's an interesting problem for you to try to tackle. Before you spend $3 million and restore them, just look into it. Just look into it.

MR. IGLESIAS: You can't -- we can look, and the reason I'm here is because all this talk happened last time, and there was nobody technical to discuss it with, okay? And I've been involved in this NOA, in this window business. I was part of the High Rise Committee after Andrew, looking at the NOAs, the water infiltration. Water infiltration is a huge issue, huge issue.

And if you put something behind, and you're talking about something behind the actual window, these older windows, from a leakage perspective, it's

very difficult to actually control. They've done a decent job. I mean, it's been 100 years and we have some structural damage, but, you know it's -- And I understand what the Board, and I understand what the Board is looking at.

There is two issues here; one is preserving the existing windows, and one is helping the building survive. And those two things, we have to, and you know, I know, with all due respect, I know, I understand. So I'm here because the last time that somebody met, that person met with the Board, it wasn't a technical person that could answer some of these questions as to why we did it and why we're looking at it. And so you know, and I do, and I do understand that there was this assessment required. And I'm here to say it's, you know, I can tell you that we can, we can certainly restore the windows. However, is that something that we want to do or are we going to go with a very, and it's expensive.

We did not spare cost and try to use a cheaper window here. And as you know, with Hope windows, I believe they're the ones they used in Miami High, they used at the University of Miami in the old architectural school, right, which were replaced. Those original windows that were replaced. Why did

they replace the windows in the architectural school? Because they didn't work. I'm sorry?

MS. SPAIN: The architecture school was originally steel windows, though. And so it was --

MR. IGLESIAS: Yes, but they are new windows. They didn't keep the existing windows. They put new windows in because to protect the building, water infiltration --

MS. SPAIN: Part of that when I was here, so. They also used Hope in that project in the elementary school. Was it the elementary school that we were working with? Yeah.

MR. IGLESIAS: Coral Gables High School, let's not bring that one up.

MS. SPAIN: I'm not in any way saying anything bad about them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Ebbert?

MS. EBBERT: Mr. Iglesias, what's the total number of windows in the building?

MR. IGLESIAS: I don't remember. I just got back a week and a half ago. I don't remember.

MS. EBBERT: A range, I mean, a range.

MR. IGLESIAS: I'm working with Ernesto Pino, and we will have all that information. I can tell you that the windows -- gosh, I don't remember. But I can

tell you that the window cost is what I was dealing with.

MS. EBBERT: So a lot? A lot of windows, right?

MR. IGLESIAS: Three to four million dollars.

MS. EBBERT: No, no, I'm not, I'm asking how many windows are in this building that need to be replaced.

MR. IGLESIAS: We were looking at the entire replacement of all the windows. I don't remember. I think it was 60. Please don't quote me.

MS. EBBERT: No, I won't. I won't.

MR. IGLESIAS: I haven't looked at, I've been looking more at the technical aspect of it than the actual construction of it --

MS. EBBERT: Tell me what --

MR. IGLESIAS: -- as of the last two weeks.

MS. EBBERT: How would it affect your insurance costs? I mean, I'm sure there's insurance that you know, whether you have new windows or keep the old windows.

MR. IGLESIAS: Well, I can tell you because I do get involved in our insurance costs. And the way the insurance is calculated for our area, is there are, excuse me, wind studies for different parts of the state. The state is broken up into, instead of you can do a wind tunnel study on a specific building or

you can do a wind tunnel study on areas. And so our area, there is a wind tunnel study that was actually done; it looks at the statistical issues in our particular area.

And then historical buildings are always more expensive than a new building. Our police building would pay a lot less than an historical building because the chances of damage in a historical building are much, are much more. So yes, it will affect -- Well, anytime you enhance the building, you're reducing the cost of insurance. But it's done, when you have a policy as large as ours, because we have quite a number of buildings, then it's actually done much more of a sophisticated way than simply just going to an insurance company and getting insurance. We actually look at, and that's submitted to me, and I do look at it. And the state is actually divided into quadrants, small, and each area has a wind tunnel study done, and those wind studies are what generate our cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ms. Rolando?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes, typically steel rusts, unless it's stainless steel. What kind of steel is being used on these windows and what are the maintenance protocols?

MR. IGLESIAS: Well, we will use very durable finishes on them. For instance, Miami High are steel windows. The University of Miami School of Architecture, I'm not sure, those were there for quite a number of years. And there is maintenance, but I think it's something that we can provide.

It's a very high end finish, and it's going to last for many years, so I don't see that as an issue. It's a way of also, from an historical point of view, using the smallest sections possible.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: If painted and kept painted, it could be protected but the problem is, they don't maintain the paint well.

MS. ROLANDO: We have had maintenance issues with landmarks. A question for you; I've always perceived of engineers as very creative, problem-solving kind of people. That's their job. So are you saying there's no way that a solution can be found to preserve the existing windows plus make them less likely for water intrusion?

MR. IGLESIAS: Those windows, not only does it have water intrusion, they also have structural loading, which means a wind loading that pushes the building and sucks out of the building. And they also have impact resistance issues. I mean, there's no

impact resistance.

MS. ROLANDO: Yeah, I have impact. If we had the existing windows and then had a structure either in front of them or behind them, you're saying that would not work?

MR. IGLESIAS: I think in front, it would be, it would not be aesthetic.

MS. ROLANDO: It would not.

MR. IGLESIAS: In the front it would not be aesthetically the right thing to do, I think from a historical building, because we're affecting the aesthetics. Just the reason that we use shutters there, is just to try to lower the water intrusion. We have to put something in the back and then, but then again you have the window in the front. You can't --

MS. ROLANDO: But are you saying it cannot be done or you're saying that it's preferable or you would prefer that it not be?

MR. IGLESIAS: No, I just think that this type of window, after doing -- one of the biggest issues that we have is water intrusion in buildings in South Florida. We're in a subtropical climate, there is a lot of water.

MS. ROLANDO: I was born here. I get it.

MR. IGLESIAS: Yes, as you know.

MS. ROLANDO: I grew up here.

MR. IGLESIAS: There is a lot of water. So you can't simply take something and say, I'm going to make this work. You can't take a Model T Ford and have it go 200 miles an hour; it's not going to happen. No matter how good an engineer you are, you're not going to, you're not going to do that, and It's a similar situation.

MS. ROLANDO: So you're saying it cannot be done?

MR. IGLESIAS: I am saying that the water intrusion issue, the structural issue and the impact issue, that's not the window.

MS. ROLANDO: Aren't you saying it's making it more difficult to find a solution or are you saying there's no solution?

MR. IGLESIAS: No, that window, from a structural loading perspective, impact perspective and water intrusion perspective, you have to live with what you've got.

As I mentioned, you have a Model T, and you can't make a model T go 200 miles an hour. You live with the Model T.

MS. ROLANDO: But we've got Bugattis.

MR. IGLESIAS: It's a new Bugatti.

MS. ROLANDO: No, I'm, I know what you're saying is that it's more expedient to do, and we'd end up with a better envelope, building envelope. What I'm struggling with is how we accomplish, as Cesar said, both preserving our historical integrity of these windows and still finding a solution to the water intrusion.

MR. IGLESIAS: It's an interesting, what Mr. Paul says.

MS. ROLANDO: You're not quite convincing me.

MR. IGLESIAS: Well, it's very difficult to say, I'm going to enhance this part of the building and not enhance this part of the building. You either enhance the building or you don't enhance the building. I mean, I understand what Mr. Pons is saying, however, it's, you enhance the building or you don't enhance the building. You don't -- because you don't know where the failure is going to occur, you don't know where the issues are going to be. And to say, I'm going to breach this opening and not breach that opening, it may be even worse because the --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Even the word "enhanced," Peter, is loaded, right? We're making a change. So you're enhancing some things and not enhancing other things. And I totally understand your point of view

100 percent, but even the word enhance is loaded, and I appreciate. It's almost like, we can't be sure of what's going to happen, so let's protect as best as we possibly can.

I don't remember, sorry, for -- What the charge is for this Board today is a recommendation. I just want to make sure we keep in mind what we're being asked to do.

MR. IGLESIAS: Correct. Correct, because the Commission has certain ideas but I'm not going to go to the Commission without coming to the Board and get the Board's recommendations.

MS. SPAIN: But we do have to vote.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: No, we don't have to vote. I think it's a recommendation. It's almost like we did last time, just last time we recommended for report. And the answer, well, not a good idea or not necessary.

My question, sorry, I'm jumping in. My last question is, I took a look at the letter by the architect Ferguson, Glasgow, Schuster and Soto, and I think part of the conversation we had last time was the second option, which was we're talking about now non-impact window protection, but really letter B, which is interior storm windows. And it had pros and

cons. And I think part of the request for the assessment wasn't just, can we fix stuff. We were under the impression that some windows could not be fixed. And that was one aspect of it was, we may need to do the new windows in some locations because they were unsalvageable.

The second part was, can we do, is there a hybrid system where we can actually take a look at what the impact of that solution was going to be? And it wasn't just believing you, that it's wood, we could do anything in the 21st Century, we can fix it. But it was the conversation that you're hearing many of us talk about is, that other solution that we kind of like, understanding that we'd have to take the window out. It would have to be sent off site. It would have to be completely repaired. We would then have to then reinsert it with either the new window, the old window that's fixed, and or the new particular piece.

I believe, engineering wise it can be done and there will be trade offs either way. But what we don't have is the other part of it, which is can we, you know, what would the task be in order to take the windows out, repair them and then protect them with another piece? And I know, we just really want to know.

MR. IGLESIAS: Okay. Well, I can tell you that that would be a half measure, okay? Realistically, because you still have the same structural system, it doesn't work. I mean, we have a little hook in the bottom, it's called a hurricane bar. I was the building official and I had kind of an interesting laugh on that. Because it's, you're again, you're trying to get a Model T, and trying to get it to go 200 miles an hour. You will never get it to go to 200 miles an hour.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: We would have to reframe. When we take out the windows and replace them, we're going to have to fix the frame, right, 100 percent no matter what we do. So whether we put it back in with the new one with the fixed frame or the old window with the new piece, it's the same construction, structural work that needs to be done to the windows. I understand completely.

MS. SPAIN: And fill seals.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: That all has to be done no matter what. It's just, what do we put in its place?

MR. IGLESIAS: I think the decision really is, do we want to keep the existing windows with the negatives of the windows? Really, that's what it is. I mean, look, you can't put a structural curtain wall

behind. It doesn't fit. You can't anchor it. Ideally, what would work would be, if we could reinforce the frames from behind and put some type of shutter outside. But then, but we've got an envelope that we can't touch, so we have a lot of constraints. If we touch that keystone, any structural issue that the building has, we're going to repair from the inside. We have to. Even though we have to, we may have to touch the walls, and we have to touch the floor, because if we touch that keystone, we'll never repair it correctly.

So and that's one of the key issues that we're working on is, is making sure that we try to preserve the exterior envelope, which is so beautiful and really very difficult. So how do you, if I have an old window, what can I do? Well, I can put a shutter outside, right? I can put a shutter outside.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: But Peter, that's not what we're asking you for.

MR. IGLESIAS: It's not, it's not, it's not. It's not something that we simply can't do. So we're trying. I can tell you that those half measures --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: You're making an argument for something that we're not asking for.

MR. IGLESIAS: Exactly. Exactly. I'm telling

you what works. I'm telling you what works, and I know, I know everybody, you know, I mean, the only thing I can do is tell you my years of experience since Hurricane Andrew and this; it's very difficult, it's very difficult to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're not asking -- I mean, we all understand that. Everybody on this Board absolutely concurs with what needs to be done, okay? And so no one is questioning that, okay? There's not a question. So let's just take that off the table, okay?

The matter is, we're in pre design right now. We're not in full architectural design. We're in the cheapest mode of looking at alternative solutions to something that's highly, that's already been said, hey, this is what we want. Without having to go through a process, we can look at this now, and we can take different approaches to it and come back.

I mean, I'm renovating a condo down here. I mean, a major building, it's 17 floors. I mean, we look at that every day about how we can not only keep the cost down, but how we can do exactly what it is that we need to do. We have doors to deal with. We have the same issue with the doors, okay? So how do we translate this?

We've suggested as a Board, and Mr. Gomez was there, to put a hurricane impact flat window behind this, and then reinstall the windows in front of them. There is no water leakage. There is no pressure, you know, pressure wave differential or anything because we have a hurricane protection behind it. But we've saved the existing windows that are 100 years old, that have served us. And so that's all we're talking about.

We're looking at, rather than make up our mind right now and say, this is what we're going to do, we need to look at alternatives. The Code of which this building is before is the National Register of Historic Places and the Secretary of the Interior standard, which is the code that we operate under as well. It says don't replace the windows if you can help it. So we need to know that that's the only solution of which we architects and contractors know that it's not.

We have alternative solutions, Peter. Let's look at those before we take a decision. That's what we're asking you to do. Don't close your mind. Open it up. And you always have an open mind. You're a great structural engineer; we know that and we trust you. So trust us back to help you come up with the best

solution for our City. That's all we're asking.

MS. SPAIN: I have another question and I apologize. This is my last thing I'll talk about. It sounds like you have marching orders from the City Commission, I don't know whether you do or not. Are you the only person on staff or your office that has talked to individual commissioners about this problem? Has the Preservation Office been involved with speaking to the City Commission?

MR. IGLESIAS: We've had, We've worked with historical.

MS. SPAIN: I'm asking whether the city commissioners individually has talked to the Preservation Office. Because if they're only getting your view on this, which is an absolute valid view, but if they don't understand that there's another viewpoint from the Preservation Board or whatever, where, I mean, we're asked even not to vote on this. I worked here long enough to know that the Commission Sometimes operates without all of the information that they need to make an informed decision.

MR. IGLESIAS: Well, I have not kept --

MS. SPAIN: And that's all we're asking.

MR. IGLESIAS: I have not kept anything from the City Commission.

MS. SPAIN: I know you have. I'm not saying that, Peter. I'm asking --

MR. IGLESIAS: We can restore the windows. We can restore the windows, do as much as we can to, to enhance the water infiltration, structural loading. You can't do impact; you just cannot do it. You just can't. Like I said, you can't make a Model T go 200 miles an hour, but we can try to work, work on that.

MS. SPAIN: Has the Preservation Officer spoken individually to the City Commission about the windows? Do you -- I mean you may not have been here. So I mean, you just started back, so you're not aware of whether she did or not.

MR. IGLESIAS: But I do think they are aware of the Board's view on keeping the windows. Working a window from the inside, we can try to do some things there. It's certainly not going to be, give us the same protection, water infiltration, et cetera, et cetera that a new, that a proper, a structurally new window under today's technology, under today's testing is going to do. When you put something behind it, we can't, I can tell you we cannot put a store, we cannot put a storefront; it just doesn't fit. An impact resistant storefront, it just does not fit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Peter, don't say that. You need

to keep an open mind.

MR. IGLESIAS: I've seen --

THE CHAIRMAN: And that's what we're asking, keep an open mind.

MR. IGLESIAS: I've seen thousands, I don't know how many hundreds of NOAs, hundreds.

THE CHAIRMAN: I restore buildings all the time. I can tell you it, I mean, I can tell you, it absolutely can be done. And I can also tell you that restoring the windows and putting a storefront, as you said, behind these, will absolutely be a lot less expensive than those windows and it will do the very same thing. Okay, excuse me. Ms. Dunaj?

MS DUNAJ: Sorry, I just wanted to point out that the December letter from Ferguson is very well stated. And it actually sets forth all the pros and cons and specifically to the issue of placing an interior type of window protection. It also notes that this would create some issues with humidity in the cavity and that the exterior windows would still be subject to damage during a hurricane, things of that nature. Some maintenance problems and with wood and things like that.

So I think everything we're talking about has been set forth in this detailed letter on the pros and

cons. But possibly, there's some additional research that you could do to address the issues that we have raised and that might be helpful. Thank you.

MR. IGLESIAS: I think what we put in the back is something that, yes, that is correct, you still have the cavity, you still have the water infiltration, you still have a cavity. You have dual windows. There is a number of issues in putting something permanent in the back.

Mrs. Spain said something about putting a shutter that we take out and put back in, that would alleviate some of those issues. However, you still have the water infiltration. We just have so much water in South Florida and we get summer storms that are 40, 50, 50 miles an hour, and it's hard, it's hard to keep the water out if you've seen a water infiltration test at that limit.

As a matter of fact, most windows during a hurricane, even current windows, all bets are off; you're going to have water intrusion, period. Windows, current modern windows are not waterproof for a hurricane. There's no -- it's understandable that, that they will leak. But to have these older windows, they, you know, most of these windows are going to leak at very, at a summer storm.

When you have a summer storm, you have driving rain, that is, water gets in everywhere. And if you've seen a water infiltration test that just -- a water infiltration is for a summer storm at 50 miles an hour. A summer storm, it just gushes right in. Sliding glass doors, sliding glass doors, not hurricane rated. They're rated for a summer storm.

The water intrusion is a huge, is a huge issue in South Florida. It's hard to keep the water out. I've been dealing with that for many, many, many years. I've been involved in some research project with the University of Florida that I was involved with. We came to the conclusion that it's just so expensive that the current rating kind of remains. So to expect that these windows are going to provide that kind of hurricane protection, excuse me, water infiltration protection, yes, that will be in the back. The window is subject to water intrusion. The back is subject to water intrusion. It's very difficult to put a frame in there. We have to bring it out and create some type of subframe to the, to the mainstream. So it would be sticking out the back. I mean, so but it's --

And then of course the window is still subject to damage. The window is subject to structural damage,

impact damage, and certainly you've got water intrusion because the window, there's not enough gasketing. And if you look at one of the windows, if you look at the window that we have down there on the first floor, there's a tremendous amount of gasketing. There's a tremendous amount of structural sealant used and things like this to try to keep, to try to keep that water infiltration.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're there, Peter. I mean, you know, we understand that. And what Ms. Dunaj said, what Ms. Spain and with Mr. Garcia-Pons, I mean, we're all there. I mean, we understand that the wood windows don't prevent, you know, water intrusion. We understand that. We know that, and we know that they won't. You're perfectly correct, we don't need to beat that horse anymore. But we also know that if we put hurricane protection behind them, that that would alleviate the problem and it would solve the problem that you're seeking.

Now, here's the other part of the problem that we haven't addressed; we have the same problem with the doors, and the doors are historic, too. So we need to look at alternative solutions that are going to allow us to do this without removing the things that make the building the most historic. Look, we haven't gone

to design yet. You and I, I mean, we haven't, okay, we're in assessment still. We don't have one architectural plan. The only thing that we have right now is a very expensive window mock up that nobody on this Board seems to think that meets the criteria that we need. We have several alternatives.

Let's go through a process. Rather than take this decision and say, now we're going to make that decision, let's do it the way we would normally do it in a building. Let's go through the architecture, come up with some alternatives that we can test and look at and validate.

I'm not for spending $30 million on restoring the building. I'd really like to spend a lot less, and I think we can. So let's focus on those, and focus on how we solve the whole problem. We're here to help. We're here to help the City do what the City says it does to everybody, which is preserve and maintain the historical character, which has made Coral Gables.

We're with you. We want what you want. It's just that we think that the solution with the windows is not the appropriate one to take unilaterally and uniformly. We're trying to suggest something else that would go along with that. We're not saying no to that window permanently and positively. We're saying,

let's look and see what we can do to restore the windows, continue to have the envelope that you need, that we need as a City, but we also have to look at doors and other things. So let's look at this a little more comprehensively, please. That's everything that this Board has asked you and will continue to ask you.

Mr. Durana?

MR. DURANA: I've got a question. I saw the letter says the wood windows by Luxbaum, they didn't meet the profiles; is that accurate? Like Historic looked at it and said they couldn't match the same window profiles of the muntins?

MR. IGLESIAS: We try to match as closely as possible.

MR. DURANA: But did you guys see a wood one? Because I mean, that's, to me, I mean, I think the biggest battle here is the wood. If you can get an impact window.

MR. IGLESIAS: No, it would be -- okay, we looked at wood and we looked at aluminum, and what we try to do, and the sections start getting too big. For instance, it's like the window that the Biltmore is using, so it's a much, it's a larger window.

MR. DURANA: Yeah, the frames.

MR. IGLESIAS: The frames you need larger sections. The glass would actually be smaller. So the reason we went to steel and this expense --

MR. DURANA: Is a thinner frame.

MR. IGLESIAS: -- is to minimize as much as possible and try to match the windows as much as possible.

MR. DURANA: But I mean, it may be worth a shot to look, to show them the wood product, yeah.

MR. IGLESIAS: We looked at, we spent a year and we looked at extensively wood, aluminum, and we thought that those, we didn't want to bring that to the Historical Board because we thought that it was just too big a change and that's why we went to Hope.

MR. DURANA: And what would it cost to do -- because you can get like a one time NOA approval, right, for a product if you create something?

MR. IGLESIAS: Yes.

MR. DURANA: What would it take to build, rebuild a window, like an exact replica but make sure that it's impact?

MR. IGLESIAS: That's not the problem. The problem is -- the problem is it just won't work. The impact loads are about 1.1 kip, about 1,100 pounds. You can't make that window, you can't make a window of

wood that looks like that, work. It doesn't work. I mean we could, I'm not going to do an impact test to fail. It's going to fail.

And so from a structural loading -- when you do an NOA, you just don't do an NOA, you calculate that to make sure your structural loading is correct. You design for impacts about 1,100 pounds of load and then you look at your gasketing and make -- So before you actually go to the expensive testing, you have all this design.

You design the window, and then you test the window to make sure it works. But that would be a waste of time because it just doesn't work. Those structural sections in wood, I mean, I've gone through this, you know, so many times, you just can't do it.

MR. DURANA: And there's no, like, window company that would want to partner with us to do something where maybe they embed steel and then you cover it with wood?

MR. IGLESIAS: We looked at that. We looked at wood. We looked at embedded steel, embedded aluminum. We looked at all aluminum window, and so --

MR. DURANA: And clad the steel windows with wood, there's no fabricator that will do some sort of? I don't know, I'm just trying to think of anything.

MR. IGLESIAS: The problem is that you've got the structural loading, which is --

MR. DURANA: I mean, my thing is this, I think a window company, if you could produce an impact window that looks like a historic window, like, those windows will sell.

MR. IGLESIAS: That would be fantastic but you can't do it, okay? I can't put 1,000 pounds on a toothpick. You can't.

MR. DURANA: I mean, it depends what it's with.

MR. IGLESIAS: No.

MR. DURANA: If you put a steel rod inside and then you cut it with wood, I mean, it might be a little bit thicker.

MR. IGLESIAS: Well, that's very common. A lot of windows have steel reinforcement. A lot of wood windows have steel reinforcement to keep the, to keep it in wood and make it -- A lot of windows have aluminum reinforcement, right. You even put steel reinforcement inside aluminum windows, right. So a lot of mullions you've probably built have steel reinforcement inside, right? Right? And so those options have all been looked at, and you just have limits. So in order to get close to these limits, we've had to go to steel. So we spent a long time, a

long time.

If you look at some of the windows that you, I'm sure you've installed in some of your projects, you saw that the wood reinforced with either aluminum section and sometimes steel sections, you put in mullions, you put steel reinforcement. That's all done because of impact and structural loading, right. And also, if the window bends too much, then your gasketing doesn't work and it leaks, and it leaks even more. So all those requirements are done through a design phase. And then when you test, you want to make sure. Sometimes you, you know, sometimes you have issues.

MR. DURANA: Then I think, then I think you go back to the Commission, and you say, look, this is the option. Historic wants to restore the wood windows. These are the cons; they can possibly leak, the maintenance, and all these issues. And then they can either, they make the decision. I mean, I understand you're going to be remodeling the whole inside of the building, a storm comes, it's going to cause damage, it's going to cause money. I get it. I mean, I think everyone on this Board understands that. I think their preference is wood, original, restore the original wood windows. I mean, I think present it to

the Commission and let them make a decision. I think, you know, if they want to go with the steel, I mean, that's their choice.

MR. IGLESIAS: But I don't want, I want to give the Commission the options. But I wanted to come to the Board first because I just don't want to do an assessment that's not necessary.

MR. DURANA: I'm not saying, I know, I don't think we need to do an assessment.

MR. IGLESIAS: Because it's a matter of --

MR. DURANA: If it's up to me, I would say restore the wood windows the way they are. Do not bother with something behind it. Do not bother. It's not going to work, it's going to create more problems. Just restore them, and we run the risk that when a storm comes, we can cause a lot of damage or go with the steel. I don't think there is any middle ground there.

MR. IGLESIAS: And those are probably, those are realistically, probably, the options we have.

MR. DURANA: Yeah, I think that's, those are the two options.

MR. IGLESIAS: Because we've looked at all those. You know, if we would have found the window like that in wood, that works.

MR. DURANA: Of course.

MR. IGLESIAS: But then we have to defy the laws of physics, it's just not going to work.

MR. DURANA: I get it.

MR. IGLESIAS: It's just not going to work.

MR. DURANA: I get it. That's fine. I just think, to me there's two options. I wouldn't do some sort of a mock middle in between; you're going to cause more problems. And the humidity thing, it rots the window from the inside, then you're going to have more issues. I think I would either restore them, make them look really nice and know that you run the possibility that a storm comes and can cause a lot of damage, but I don't know.

MR. IGLESIAS: I mean, I think Mrs. Spain knows about the rot from the inside of windows. Happened to your windows, right?

MR. DURANA: But I definitely want this building to be restored. I mean, looking up there, you can see water damage on the crown molding. I mean, this building needs --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, originally, we had a blue ceiling.

MR. DURANA: I would love to see the building restored. I would prefer for it to be restored in a

more historic way than the Building Department over there. That one is a little kind of modern inside.

MR. IGLESIAS: That was not an historical building.

MR. DURANA: No, no, I know, that's a different building. I'm saying in here, obviously, I would prefer that we restore --

MR. IGLESIAS: That was not deemed a historical building.

MR. DURANA: I know, I know.

MR. IGLESIAS: That was just --

MR. DURANA: I know. I know. I know.

MR. IGLESIAS: We're just trying to create a one-stop shop there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Peter, thank you. I think we're going to, you've made an excellent presentation. Thank you very much. We're all glad you're back.

MR. IGLESIAS: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you know, you're always very thorough. And what we'd like to do, is we'd like to make a recommendation to the Board, I mean to the Commission and to you, and Mr. Garcia-Pons would like to put that into the record.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thanks, Mr. Maxwell. So I think, I'm listing as priorities, and I think there's

three priorities. And number one is unanimous; protect the building to last another hundred years, right, that should be number one on the list. And the Commission is going to make that decision based on whatever the input they get. And we all agree that no matter what the answer is, that is the most important thing.

Number two, I think the consensus of the Board is to try to keep the existing 100 year-old windows that are an important character defining element of this historic landmark. And three, have the City's consulting architect explore the hurricane protection that solves the, in the best way, that complies with numbers one and two, to protect the building and to try to maintain the existing windows as an important character of the building.

Mr. Maxwell, if you wanted to add to that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we would, and to add to that, it would be, let's have the architect give us some options with that. I mean, I understand that you're hiring Mr. Heisenbottle to prepare plans for this. I mean, I've never bought windows before. I had an architectural plan. So I would like to, you know, add to Mr. Garcia-Pons that we have the architect come up with some alternatives for that for

us, and that we can price them and look at them from exactly the points that are there.

Mr. Manager, no one is trying to do anything but exactly what it is that you want to do, so please let us look at this and make these recommendations.

MR. IGLESIAS: Yes, we are looking at the historical architect now, the only thing that I'm thinking about is speeding up some of the work, sort of go into a two-phase work. Look at programming, schematic design along with the assessment of the building to try to get into design development as much as we can and get this building, really -- This is an incredible building. I mean, it's just fantastic.

We're trying to save as much of it as we can, believe me. It's been a pleasure for me to address this Board today. And everything that you all say, will be taken to the Commission. And I thank you all very, very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: And thank you, Mr. Manager. We appreciate you being here. And we're going to take a vote on our, on our motion here. And we recognize that Mayor Lago has joined us, and so we're appreciative that he has come into the, to the conversation as well. Thank you, Mr. Manager, and welcome back.

MR. IGLESIAS: Thank you very much. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All right, we have a motion that Mr --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So it's not a motion, it's a recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's a recommendation, excuse me.

MS. THROCKMARTIN: So for ease of the Commission's digestion of your recommendation, it may be helpful -- and I took notes on what you said, Mr. Garcia-Pons. So if that's your motion to make that the official recommendation of this Board, those three priorities, you could state that as a motion and a second, if you'd like.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: I would, but can you read them back as to what you wrote?

MS. THROCKMARTIN: I understood them and I can go back to the transcript as needed, but that there are three priorities. The first one is to protect the building, to have it last an additional 100 years; that is the most important priority of this board. The second one is to try to keep the existing windows. And the third one is to work with the City's architectural consultant to explore other options to maintain the existing windows in order to achieve that first goal.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: And I would check the record because I think I would like the second one to make sure that it states, as an important character defining element of this historic landmark.

MS. THROCKMARTIN: If that's your motion, I understand that motion.

MS. SPAIN: I'll second that, if that was a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. We have a recommendation by Mr. Garcia-Pons, a second by Mrs. Spain.

MR. DURANA: I just want to like, understand the logic behind like, what, what exactly. So you're saying, protect the building?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: At all costs.

MR. DURANA: That's, that's when they're making their decision, that should be priority one?

THE CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

MR. DURANA: And then priority two would be, maintain the original windows. And then priority three would be, if there's a way to somehow protect them a little bit better when a storm comes, like either a shutter or a windscreen or something.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Is to have the architect that's being hired, the professional, to explore ways to

accomplish priorities one and number two.

MR. DURANA: I just think if you're giving priority number one, protect the envelope, they're going to go with the steel window.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: That's not true. And that's the thing, that's the reason I put it in that order, is we all want the same thing.

MR. DURANA: All right.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: We just want it possibly in a different way.

MR. DURANA: Maybe in the, yeah, okay.

MS. SPAIN: I think number one, though is about having this building last for another 100 years, period, just that.

0THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So do we need to call the roll?

MS. THROCKMARTIN: If you're ready, Mr. Chair, of course, if discussion is done, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please call the roll?

THE CLERK: Mr. Durana?

MR. DURANA: Yes.

THE CLERK: Ms. Dunaj?

MS DUNAJ: Yes.

THE CLERK: Ms. Rolando?

MS. ROLANDO: Yes.

THE CLERK: Ms. Ebbert?

MS. EBBERT: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Maxwell?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Garcia-Pons?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Yes.

THE CLERK: And Ms. Spain?

MS. SPAIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, thank you, ladies and gentlemen. And Mr. Manager, Mr. Gomez, thank you. We sincerely appreciate your coming to us. And we sincerely appreciate your desire and your openness to working with the Board, as you always have, so thank you very much.

MR. IGLESIAS: Thank you very much. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We appreciate it. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to pass --

MS. EBBERT: Could I just add one point of interest? Coral Gables City Hall was added to the National Register of Historic Places on July 24th, 1974, so it's been 51 years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All right. I need to pass the gavel. Ladies and gentlemen, I have another meeting that I have to go to, unfortunately. So our vice chair is not here, so I'm passing it to our

previous chair, Mr. Garcia-Pons.

So thank you all very much. We sincerely appreciate all of your assistance and help.

MS. KAUTZ: Mr. Garcia-Pons, if you guys will indulge me for a two-second break, a two-minute break?

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Please. Okay, yeah, let's take a five-minute break. We'll be back in five minutes, not 20 minutes.

MS. KAUTZ: I also would indulge you all to allow me to shift the agenda to allow these poor folks who are here with children to be --

MR. GARCIA-PONS: What item is that?

MS. KAUTZ: It's the last one on the agenda to move first.

MS. THROCKMARTIN: Mr. Vice Chair, before we take our brief recess, I understand that there were a few members of the public who wish to speak on the previous item.

It's my understanding that public comment is not required. This was non-binding review of this Board. But to the extent the Board would like to hear from that comment, there are people who have asked to speak. I leave that to you as the Chair.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Let's take the five-minute break.

(Break taken and then the meeting continued.)

MR. GARCIA-PONS: So before we take the next item, there was a couple of pieces of input, public input that we received regarding the previous item. The first one was an email from Ms. Vicky Ceduda (phonetic) that was in support of a complete assessment of the original windows. I want to read that into the record. And then there was also a letter from the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables. Ms. Carbonell is here and I would like for her to read it into the record, please before we get on to the next item.

MS. CARBONELL: Thank you, Mr. Garcia-Pons for allowing me to read my letter into the record. I know the vote has, or the recommendation has been taken, but I know somebody mentioned Vinnie Torre. And Vinnie Torre is 100 percent behind the restoration of the original windows, and this has been going on for many years, so I just wanted to say that.

On behalf of the Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables, please accept this letter in support for the original windows at City Hall to be restored and preserved. The windows are original and have withstood every storm since the 1920s, including Andrew and Wilma, which devastated the area.

This recommendation is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior standards and recommendations of the current and former Coral Gables Historic, and the current and former Coral Gables Historic Preservation Officers. City Hall, if there is no record that the windows were not replaced, then they are presumed to be original.

The fact that they are wooden, likely indicates they are very old. The existing windows and doors should be restored and preserved. Missing windows could be constructed to be sympathetic to match the original.

City Hall is one of the most significant structures in the city and occupies one of the most visible and traversed locations at Biltmore and LeJeune. It should also be remembered that this was the last major structure in the City which George Merrick was involved with.

MS. CARBONELL: It is a star in our downtown area. City Hall was designed by premier architects, Paist and Steward, and is one of the few buildings included in the City's official Mediterranean handbook.

Furthermore, this is one of the few buildings in the City that is both locally and nationally

designated. Simply put, City Hall is one of the most recognized and iconic buildings in Coral Gables.

On top of this, City Hall is one of the few buildings in the City that retains its original fenestration.

The Secretary of the Interior notes, "As one of the few parts of a building serving as both an interior and exterior feature, windows are nearly always an important part of the historic character of a building. In most buildings, windows also comprise a considerable amount of the historic fabric of the wall plane, and thus are deserving of special consideration in a rehabilitation project. Respectfully submitted, Historic Preservation Association of Coral Gables.

Thank you for allowing me to read it into the record.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Thank you, Ms. Carbonell.

MS. CARBONELL: Thank you.

MR. GARCIA-PONS: Okay, we're going to move on.

(End of the excerpt of the meeting.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Avonne White, a Notary Public and Reporter for the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place, and on the date herein before forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative, nor employee, nor attorney, nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

Notary Public State of Florida

Commission No.: HH489503

Commission Expires: February 6th, 2028