



BLASTING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 16, 2025

6:30 P.M.

A meeting of the Blasting Citizens Advisory Committee (the Committee) took place on Thursday, January 16, 2025, at 6:35 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
Edward Daizovi, Sunset Lakes
Jorge Solis, Riviera Isles
Rose Thompson, Miramar Resident
Melissa Thomas, Huntington
Audrey Tomlinson, Miramar Resident

A quorum was achieved.

City staff present:

Candice Cobb, City Attorney
Salvador Zuniga, Staff Liaison
Leah deRiel, Recording Secretary
Miguel Martinez, Miami Lakes Blasting Advisory Board (MLBAB)
Franchesca Ortega, MLBAB

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **November 21, 2024**

Deferred to the next meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- Completion of the PowerPoint Presentation to the City Commission

Discussion points: Utilizing documents acquired from the MLBAB, and past Committee discussion, Mr. Solis drafted a plan of action for Miramar that the Committee discussed at that time with a mind of creating a presentation to give the City Commission.

Miguel Martinez, MLBAB, mentioned sending city staff two presentations; in February 2024, Representative Fabricio held a workshop to the **(unintelligible 6:10)** reviewing his bill, something that had never been done. Mr. Fabricio asked them to educate Miramar's Committee, for which they prepared a two-part presentation. Unfortunately, images and videos were removed from the first part of the presentation, though the second part was fine. In the hearing, Miami Lakes represented their side with facts; there were engineers from the other side who acknowledged damage to property had occurred from the energy produced by the blasting. He felt the outcome was a significant penetration to the armor; he presented the PowerPoint to the Committee, highlighting the following:

- The contents included facts on how blasting waves affected surrounding properties, methods of measuring blasting levels, blasting level discrepancies, monitoring agencies, facts, and testimonials from affected residents; the presentation included statistical data, including the State's
- The goal was not to shut the mine down, but to better regulate the industry; for every 100 blasts the quarry did, five of them were problematic, and it was the latter the citizens worked to address
- The Committee was welcomed to incorporate the statistical data in their report, as the information came from the State.

Discussion points: the mining company was presently blasting within legal parameters; affected residents were asking the quarry to blast at lower levels to reduce damage to their property; the mining company was providing erroneous data, regardless of whether it was unintentional; in light of blasting advisory boards failed attempts to work with the mining company to reduce blasting levels, the only option appeared to be to change state law; the information presented was impressive, so it was important to tie it into what the Miramar community was experiencing, and the work the board needed to do, which would be facilitated by a better understanding as to the purpose of the Miramar's Blasting Citizens Advisory Committee, which said to be: To facilitate communication between the city residents and the City of Miramar; the subject presentation seemed far outside the board's scope of responsibility; the bottom line was how to stop damage to people's houses from shaking caused by blasting, and that process would be facilitated by education, and learning about what was

happening, and reaching a consensus on working together to achieve a positive result, which was the intent of the Mr. Martinez's presentation; the council approved the PowerPoint unanimously, and they were acting on it, though they were not at liberty to discuss the finer details of the actions; the wish was for Miramar to do the same; the scope of Miramar's blasting advisory board, as stated on the City's website, should be changed, as it did not state it was to advise the City Commission; City Attorney clarification: the role of the board was to provide the City Commission with information and recommendations on the blasting issue, and this was listed on the City's website; the board had yet to meet with individual elected officials, or the City Commission as a whole to discuss forming a plan of action, as was the case in Miami Lakes; Miramar had not invested as much effort in gathering precise data on the effects of blasting in Miramar; part of the board's role would be to ask the Commission to help in this regard; the board was not in a position to call a community meeting, rather this had to be done through the City Commission; the board could recommend this as an action item, among others for which the board needed the Commission's help; residents and the mining company needed to find a common ground they could both agree to; there was evidence of damage based on the State's data, yet there continued to be gross mishandling, and a lack of monitoring; question as to why information could not be provided to residents if the purpose of the board was to facilitate communication between residents and the City; the approved document was the property of the council, and disseminating such information would be on behalf of the council, so they had to first authorize giving the information out; the priority was to formally present the information to the City Commission at a public meeting, so the information could be accessed by the public; it appeared Miami Lakes had closer touchpoints with some state elected officials; question as to how often the Miami Lakes Advisory Board met with their city leadership - their report was presented to their council, and they reviewed and approved each item after much discussion, then the revised document was approved as a whole; question as to what MLBAB recommended Miramar's Blasting Citizens Advisory Committee do next.

Response from MLBAB representatives: Miramar should team up with Miami Lakes, as stated in the last recommendation, to take legal action as municipalities; effort was being made to determine if Miramar had legal standing, and the cost for each municipality if such an action were taken; many suggestions made in the Miami Lakes document were based on years of data gathering from previous lessons, actions, interactions, improvements to their process, etc.; the MLBAB members were experts in each facet, so when they met they created the perfect execution of communication to the public, as well as advising their council; they were big on educating the public on the scientific side, and legal strength; the City of Miramar would receive a letter from a Miami Lakes councilmember requesting the City Attorney participate with their legal team to devise a future solution; many of their lobbying efforts were done outside of their

MLBAB, for example, they attended HOA meetings as individual citizens, informing residents, and giving presentations without board member restrictions; MLBAB members combined being board members with being residents to get the message out to the community; they created marketing material that targeted different audiences, meaning whether information was being given to residents, local elected officials, state elected officials, etc.; their work could be viewed on the miamilakes.gov website; similar City of Miramar resources could be utilized to take some actions to get information out to Miramar's elected officials, and the affected communities; the more upset residents there were, the more power the Committee had.

- Determination of Presentation Title & Presenters

No discussion.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION: NONE

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION:

1. Presentation scheduled for City Commission meeting on February 19, 2025

Chairperson Millay recalled the agreed upon date for the Committee's presentation was the February 19, 2025, Commission meeting to ask for guidance, and support for recommended actions. He questioned if including the information from the MLBAB presentation into the action report might cause the Commission to lose interest due to the large volume of information provided. That is, should the Committee begin with something lighter to attract their interest, then delve deeper when the Commission desired more information.

Discussion points: Would adding the MLBAB information to the Committee's action report could stir up questions on the Commission as to why the Committee was using information another advisory board in the report; the damage to Miramar homes, and those in Miami Lades was similar, so the photographs could be used, as the MLBAB shared the pictures and information they gathered locally with other municipalities affected by blasting, as their goal was the same; the MLBAB could send staff high resolution files that could be easily interested into the action report, as their aim was to help; utilizing pertinent information another municipality would illustrate to elected officials that other entities conducted extensive research, which the Committee chose to utilize to help their purpose; it was important to present data that was easily understood; doubt was expressed as to whether Miramar's city officials had a full understanding of the damage to affected Miramar homes; it was important to note the Committee lost communication with the City Commission, while the MLBAB was in constant

communication with their council, so there was a need to establish dialog; unless the law was change, any resolution was unlikely, so the question was how to get the law changed; the steps could include Miramar partnering with Miami Lakes, and what actions that would entail; about 15 minutes would be allowed for the presentation, after which the commissioners could have questions; questions to ask the Commission should include if one of them was willing to sit in on the monthly Committee meetings, if they supported the City joining forces with Miami Lakes to get a resolution, and was the City willing to dedicate a lobbyist to the cause; affected residents needed to be educated, informed, and encouraged to complain to their elected officials to start the process; MLBAB reports were previously shared with Miramar communities affected by blasting; residents might be more than willing to voice their concerns to the Commission, as well as submit pictures and videos of damage to their homes due to the blasting; using such information in the Committee's presentation would garner even more attention and support from the Commission; create a document and/or method to gather resident feedback when Committee members attend HOA meetings, etc., and include the forms among the documents presented to the City Commission; based on the discussion, the presentation at the February 19 Commission meeting should be postponed to allow the board and staff to rework the current version of the report to include additional information; suggested to have a two-hour meeting dedicated to finalizing the action report; the report submitted at the February 19 meeting need not be the only meeting at which the Committee would present to the Commission, it could be a preliminary report to inform elected officials of what the Committee was working on, the specific asks, and the need for Commission support in what the Committee planned to bring before the Commission in the near future; the approaching City elections could affect Commission support, so it might be necessary to do one-on-one meetings with the elected officials to get the ball rolling; the a meeting should be scheduled before the next regular board meeting on February 20 to better frame the context of the report, in light of the information just received from the MLBAB.

Chairperson Millay made a motion to approve holding a meeting on Thursday, January 30, 2025, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. to do supplemental planning and modification of the action report to finalize the report for presentation at the City Commission meeting on February 19, 2025; Mr. Solis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. deRiel reminded board members to email her their input/information, but they should refrain from emailing anything to each other; she would compile the information she received, then distribute it to the board for their review, so they could be prepared for the discussion at the January 30 meeting.

- Committee consensus for members to send their feedback on the current action report, and the additional information supplied by the MLBAB no

later than Thursday, January 23, 2025; Ms. deRiel would compile, and send Committee members the information by Monday, January 27, 2025.

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.



Ryan Millay, Chairperson
RM/cc