



BLASTING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 20, 2025

6:30 P.M.

A meeting of the Blasting Citizens Advisory Committee (the Committee) took place on Thursday, February 20, 2025, at 6:46 p.m. at the City of Miramar Parks & Recreation conference room, 2200 Civic Center Place, 2nd floor, Miramar, Florida 33025.

I/II. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The following members were present:

Chairperson Ryan Millay, Sunset Falls
Rose Thompson, Miramar Resident
Audrey Tomlinson, Miramar Resident (late 6:59 p.m.)

The following members were absent:

Edward Daizovi, Sunset Lakes (Excused)
Jorge Solis, Riviera Isles (Excused)
Melissa Thomas, Huntington (Excused)

A quorum was not achieved.

City staff present:

Salvador Zuniga, Staff Liaison
Candice Cobb, City Attorney
Leah deRiel, Recording Secretary

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Regular Meeting of November 21, 2024**
- **Regular Meeting of January 16, 2025**
- **Special Meeting of January 30, 2025 * pending transcription**

Deferred to the next meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- Presentation from February 19 City Commission Follow Up

Discussion points: The City Clerk forwarded the board's meeting information to Commissioner Colbourne, so she might join the present meeting virtually; Mr. Millay thanked Mr. Solis and Ms. deRiel for their support on the board's presentation to the Commission; all Committee members' terms ended May 2025; the board should prepare to renew its activities after the City's March 11, 2025, elections, including giving the Commission another presentation, so new commissioners were updated on the blasting issue; Mr. Daizovi's and Mr. Solis' expertise should be utilized, along with the latter's report; the board could incorporate some of the guidance members of the Commission gave at the February 19 meeting; both Commissioners Colbourne and Chambers expressed an interest in the board's activities; though there was some interest evident from the Commission, they were very clear in pointing out the limitations; this left a feeling of more of the same would happen, with the possibility for some workshops; neither Mr. Millay nor Ms. Thompson could be present for the February 27, 2025, workshop; the board gave a great presentation to the Commission, taking an initial step to get some traction; there were numerous city advisory boards, making it hard for the Commission to keep up with all of them, so the presentation was an important reminder for elected officials to know that the Committee was still active; when new Committee members were appointed in May, the board should look at scheduling a workshop, after which a presentation could be made to the Commission; there was no clear direction from the Commission as to how the board should do workshops; it was likely the elected officials would speak with the City Manager to determine how to do the workshop(s); board members were free to contact State representatives, and invite them to speak at a workshop once a date was set, so they could hear directly from residents affected by the blasting; there could be later discussions about piggybacking on existing marketing efforts, along with the possibility of the Committee getting its own line of funding; in the digital realm, there were ways for the Committee to craft messages to disseminate to Miramar residents; there was some marketing that could be done in the very near future that did not cost much, such as placing messages to residents in the City's weekly newsletter, and include the link and QR code for residents to file complaints to the State; the messaging could include public noticing for the Committee's monthly meeting dates and time to keep residents aware that the Committee met on the third Thursday of every month, inviting them to attend the meetings whenever possible; board members could suggest outside speakers or additional education that could provide useful information for board members, and the public;

Commissioner Colbourne suggested the board identify like communities statewide, and nationwide to see what they were doing, as it seemed the Committee lived in the shadow of the Miami Lakes Blasting Advisory Board; subsequent research by Ms. deRiel showed there were places in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Appalachia experiencing similar issues to those of Miramar residents, though due to coal mining; the mining companies in those regions had the rights to blast under a certain limit, and their activities had similar adverse effects, and though residents could submit complaints, nothing was resolved; the spot in Tennessee seemed most stringent, as each time a complaint was filed, an investigation was triggered, and the claimed damage investigated, but the results of such investigations came to nothing, as the blasting remained within allowed limits, and there was no way to completely link the cause of the damage seen to blasting activities; the results of this research should be included in the board's future presentation to the Commission to show that an effort was made to answer Commissioner Colbourne's question; working with Miami Lakes Blasting Advisory Board allowed the Committee to make an apples-to-apples comparison, since Miami Lakes residents were being affected by the same blasting activities as Miramar residents, but it was good to have such information from outside communities affected by blasting; as mining was once allowed in Broward County, and later banned in the '90s, the board could research earlier mining in the County, and how residents dealt with the situation that resulted in mining being banned in Broward County; earlier blasting in Broward County might not have been for mining purposes, but to create lakes as part of residential developments; question asked on whether modifications to the board's scope was a Commission or Committee decision; this would be a Commission decision, as it would require a change to the ordinance that created the Committee; Mr. Millay had some ideas for recommendations he wished to discuss with the City Attorney, such as modifying the number of board members, along with the scope, and purpose of the Committee; attrition was a problem, so some adjustments could be made with regard to how board members were recruited, and proper interest in the board's purpose was a problem; as an example, explore the possibility of garnering more community support by pooling efforts regarding the incinerator, and blasting activities; the incinerator issue could be short lived, as it was based on whether or not Miami-Dade County selected the old Opa-Locka West Airport site; the board's scope did not include Committee members not being there to promote the cause, or force action, but more of a place for residents to communicate their concerns; if the Commission wished Committee members to be more active in the affected Miramar communities, working to promote change, this was an angle to explore; the incinerator issue, due mainly to its potential health impacts seemed to take on a life of its own, but the effects of nearby blasting on Miramar residents seemed unable to achieve the same momentum on the Commission, and Miramar community; a great fear was if insurance companies found out about the nearby blasting, and saw the potential for damage to homes in affected areas as an

increased risk, leading to insurance issues for property owners; over the years, the blasting was getting closer to the permitted limit, and it would not be surprising to find that some blasts exceeded that limit, and this was likely the reason residents were feeling the effects even more; one of the purposes listed in the board's scope was facilitating communication, and this included communications with the Miami Lakes Blasting Advisory Board, the City Commission, Miramar HOAs, etc., and this was pretty broad; from a science perspective, the question was why no one thought the blasting limits set when the blasting was further away might no longer apply with regard to potential for damage to homes with the blasting being closer to those residential homes; the limit set was, supposedly, a safe limit regardless of the proximity of the blasting; the challenge was to get the Florida Legislature to lower the blasting limit; not all blasting was felt by the residents, so the question was why the mining company could not blast only at the limit at which residents could not sense the blasting; it was not that they were blasting more, it was the intensity of the blasting that was increasing; mentioned made of the bill Representative Fabricio included in what he would propose in the 2025 legislative session; Ms. deRiel would email copies to board members; all the bills advocating lowering the blasting limits to a .15 failed, but the most recent bill was a little different, as it proposed a three-mile radius; that is, residents located within a three-mile radius of blasting had a right to claim damages to their home due to blasting, and their proof had to include: evidence of ownership and damages to their home, prove a link between the two, and file their claim within two years; no reference in the proposed bill was made to blasting limits, and their reduction; the bill proposed setting up a state coffer with a budgeted amount to cover the cost of repairs to damaged homes, with the funds awarded to homeowners whose claims were proven; claims would still go before the Division of Administrative Hearing; it would be good, based on the outcome of the February 27th workshop if the Committee issued a statement in solidarity with the Miami Lakes Blasting Advisory Board to support what the bill proposed; providing funds to help homeowners repair damages due to blasting activities would incentivize the miners not to exceed the blasting limits when their activities were closer to people's homes; proposed bills were usually presented to multiple subcommittees before they reached the floor; the State Legislature could be asked to lower the blasting limit based on increased scientific evidence showing that damage was likely due to blasting; this was the discussion the proposed bill sought to avoid, as mining companies usually had data to counteract such evidence, forcing residents to prove the mining evidence was not true; board members could watch the February 19 Commission meeting to see the Committee's presentation, and the feedback from the Commission.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION: NONE

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION: NONE

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

Next meeting: March 20, 2025, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.



Ryan J. Millay

Ryan Millay, Chairperson
RM/cc