



THE CITY OF MIRAMAR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

MARCH 12 2026

5:30 P.M.

A meeting of the City of Miramar Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) took place at 5:38 p.m. on Thursday, March 12, 2026, at the Economic Development & Housing Department, 2nd Floor Conference Room W-202E, 2200 Civic Center Place, Florida 33025.

I & II. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The following members of the EDAB were present:

Trever Wade, Chairperson
Margarita Morales, Vice Chairperson
Shawn Jones
Nancy Levros
Irina Pinos

The following members of the EDAB were absent:

Peter Apol (Excused)
Darryl Holsendolph (Excused)

A quorum was achieved.

Also present:

Richard Hughes, Assistant Director, ED&H Department
Frensky Magny, Building, Planning and Zoning (BPZ) Staff
Linda Hurtado, BPZ Staff

Chairperson Wade made a motion, seconded by Vice Chairperson Morales, to approve the excused absence of Mr. Apol. The motion carried 5-0.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Regular Board Meeting Minutes of February 12, 2026

Ms. Pinos made a motion, seconded by Vice Chairperson Morales, to approve the minutes of February 12, 2026, as presented. The motion carried 5-0.

IV. BOARD MEMBER ITEMS:

Chairperson Wade mentioned there was an email that came out regarding on March 11 about high school students being prepared to understand how government and businesses worked, asking which city department this came from.

Mr. Hughes indicated he, too, saw that, though he was unsure which city department generated it; his department had nothing to do with it.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked about any new developments in the city.

Mr. Hughes replied that he checked the DRC agendas to find out what was coming in, but nothing of a sizeable nature, only small projects.

Vice Chairperson Morales made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Wade, to approve the excused absence of Mr. Holsendolph. The motion carried 5-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. Permitting

Frensky Magny and Linda Hurtado of the BPZ Department gave a presentation on the City's permitting process, as detailed in the handouts provided, highlighting the following:

- BPZ launched the City's digital permitting process in July 2025
- The system being used was EnerGov by Tyler Technologies that did the City's previous system units; the new system was more refined, as it was specifically for digital submissions for plans, permitting, code enforcement, and inspections
- A video was shown
- Users had to register in the BPZ portal to use the platform; it was a simple

ten-step process for applying; users needed to register, log in, and then submit their documents

- BPZ originally required the submission of two to four sets of physical plans; that is, two for small residential, or four for all commercial projects, with sets being sent to BPZ, Fire, and Engineering staff, if needed
- The digital system allowed for all relevant city departments to review the documents at the same time; once the documents submitted were checked that they were complete, they were sent out accordingly
- The use of the new submission system shortened the timeframe of the permitting process
- The city's BPZ had contacts with Broward County, and a third-party provider; they provided assistance when the city was deficient in plan reviewers or inspectors, particularly in the area of structural, and electrical.

Chairperson Wade questioned the amount of turnaround time for residential, single-family, if all ten steps were completed by a user, and if the documents submitted were sufficient for the permit application to go forward.

Ms. Hurtado said the full review process took 15 working days or less for the full process.

Chairperson Wade said his recent experience was 45 to 60 days; a friend of his recently went through it, and it took 30 days. He thought the reason why some people did not pull permits for work that needed a permit was because the lengthy timeframe was frustrating. He asked if BPZ staff saw an uptick in the number of permits submitted since July 2024.

Mr. Magny thought it was about the same. They were getting faster, but the system was still new, and they were still tweaking the process, as it was taking staff time to adjust to the new system in terms of how it worked for the city in the city's process. The reason he said review, because there was no guarantee that approval would be granted the first time around.

Ms. Pinos asked if the permit application for fences, etc. was still the same process.

Mr. Magny answered yes; as of now, BPZ was still accepting quick permits on Tuesday, though they would be moving toward a standardized timeframe for all permit applications. Quick permits were physically submitted, then staff scanned them in; they found this was prolonging the process for digital permit applications, as the permit clerk at the counter focused on intake. He noted the digital system was 24/7, so they were actually getting more permits, so the quick permit service was being phased out to allow for standardized timeframes.

Ms. Pinos wondered if after the process was standardized, permits for different work, such as a site plan versus a fence permit, be reviewed differently.

Mr. Magny replied staff would be looking at each application type and standardizing how they would be handled.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked how many permit applications were submitted on a monthly basis.

Mr. Magny responded they received about 330 on a weekly basis.

Vice Chairperson Morales wished to know the number of BPZ staff members involved with reviewing permit applications.

Mr. Magny stated BPZ was still hiring staff at present, as part of the issue was the department was understaffed; they now had about fifteen permit clerks, compared to there being under ten of them, and this was just for intake. The hiring process took time, as they had to run background checks, though BPZ lost its structural chief through retirement, but a new one was just hired. He noted they were doing two-week training on the digital system, after which they shadowed the permit clerk supervisor; the same applied to inspectors.

Vice Chairperson Morales questioned what were the key performance indicators, as she assumed BPZ tracked the status of each permit application to know which ones were moving through the system, or lagging; she asked if the tracking was done by type of permit.

Mr. Magny said they were not doing this type of tracking as yet, noting they met earlier in the day, because they just acquired an additional software through Tyler called Executive Insights. He mentioned being in his new role since November 2025, and part of his first few months was just monitoring what was being done, and ensuring there was adequate staffing, and working through any lagging applications, which they were still doing. The next phase was seeing what worked for the BPZ, looking at performance indicators, then moving forward.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked if physical/manual submission of permit applications was being phased out.

Mr. Magny replied the BPZ would no longer be allowing the submission of physical applications as of summer 2026. Part of BPZ's struggle was that in addition to the digital system that allowed permit application submissions at any

time of day, people were being allowed to come in and submit applications physically. This tied up permit clerks at the front counter unable to process digital applications, so the aim was to focus all staff's efforts in one standardized method of submitting permit applications.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked the average number of permit applications that were approved on a monthly basis.

Mr. Magny said he did not have that number at hand.

Vice Chairperson Morales mentioned the conversation the board had with the owner of Juici Patties who described a very lengthy process, though there were some factors contributing to the long timeframe, she also told the board that they met with BPZ staff ahead of time, and there was a lot of communication between the parties; yet the process still took over a year. From her perspective of a homeowner, she wondered how BPZ was communicating to the Miramar businesses and residents that the City's permit submission process was going completely digital; she questioned if there was any training for them to use the system. Also, can the city be more proactive in educating the community, as many members of the community find the permitting process a hassle, and that BPZ staff was available to speak with the permit applicants about planning.

Mr. Magny responded with regard to educating the public, BPZ staff was exploring various methods, including looking at what other cities were doing; possibilities including doing workshops, as well as working with a concierge team positioned in front of the BPZ lobby. There was a computer with a scanner on either side of the BPZ lobby to help applicants with new applications, with staff helping them process their applications themselves. He said they were starting with smaller applications, such as tree removal, roofing, and fencing permits; they would eventually upgrade to helping applicants with building permits.

Ms. Levros suggested that the BPZ website offer a training video on its website, so applicants could learn about going through the process before trying to submit an application.

Vice Chairperson Morales thought the BPZ going to a digital permit application process was a good thing, but she thought there was a lot of opportunities to educate the community. It would be great to be able to tell the community that there would be a training about the permit application process, etc.; this could even be done at homeowners' association meetings to raise the community's awareness. She thought the perception of the permit application process was not a positive one, and this affected how the community approached it.

Mr. Magny affirmed BPZ staff was exploring the different ways to engage the community to raise awareness that the permit application process was going digital; at present, as the system was still new, staff was not ready to go out to the community, lest they had to change something after training the community. There were aspects to the digital method that the BPZ either didn't need, or it just did not work for the city's system; this was the conversation BPZ staff and other department staff were having daily in their efforts to standardize the system. He said learning what other cities were doing, particularly those utilizing the EnerGov system helped staff institute best practices with the permit application process, particularly with contracts who work with other cities, so see Miramar's system as following the industry standards.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked if the BPZ would be implementing the Executive Insights software while staff worked on standardizing the digital permit application process, or did that come later.

Mr. Magny responded that utilizing the new software would not necessarily fix the process, it was more likely to let BPZ staff know where they were in terms of, for example, were they processing in a timely manner; were they doing reviews, etc. This was taking place simultaneously.

Vice Chairperson Morales questioned if they were getting feedback from users of the system involved in the standardizing process, such as contractors, GCs, homeowners, etc.

Mr. Magny answered yes; staff was receiving a lot of feedback from contractors, who were very enthusiastic about giving their feedback on going to a fully digital permit application system; they were more than willing to help, as they dealt with the digital system in other locations.

Mr. Hughes asked if someone who submitted their digital permit application could go on the website to see at what stage their application was in the process.

Mr. Magny affirmed they could.

Mr. Hughes knew from the business side of things, the city was helping commercial applicants by recommending they have a pre-submission meeting with the various staff disciplines who would be involved in the issuance of their permit. This was the time that they could discuss the possibility of having an expedited permitting process, as time was always a challenge for them; the expedite service could include off hours inspections, such as on a Friday.

Ms. Hurtado added that applying for an expedited permit application had to be

done either via email, or via a form on the BPZ website; she witnessed permit applicants submitting the form among their permit application documents. She noticed that those who mostly used the expedited form were applicants whose previous permit application(s) had been rejected for some reason, and they were anxious to get their project underway. Many applicants did not need expedited permits, as they were going through the process in a timely manner.

Mr. Magny noted, with regard to the expedited process, the applicant was charged a fee per discipline involved, so the expedited request could cost upward of \$500.00 extra.

Mr. Hughes pointed out that the applicant could pick the specific discipline for which they needed the expedited review.

Vice Chairperson Morales thought BPZ should consider including the expedite as part of the permit application process, as some applicants might not know it was even available for them to consider requesting it.

Mr. Magny explained that this was something staff was looking at including in the standardized permit application process.

Mr. Hughes asked if the EnerGov system had a metrics portion, so it could track what the typical turnaround time was for permit applications submitted for different types of projects.

Mr. Magny affirmed it did have a tracking from permit application submission to issuance; staff found it was not accurate, so they were looking at from submission to review, as an application could be initially rejected. They were trying to figure out a way, so time could be subtracted if an application was rejected, tracking only when the application was active.

Mr. Hughes thought it would be helpful to track the activity, so staff could see if there were specific areas that the system was getting bogged down, build up a sample size that helped devise ways to address such occurrences. This would help discern and communicate to applicants a true average time for them to receive their permit.

Mr. Magny concurred, as staff was looking at the number of rejected applications, why they were rejected, etc. to discern if there was a pattern; this applied to all kinds of permit applications.

Mr. Hughes said that even with the permit application system going digital, it was still a two-way system, and the applicant had to do their own follow up as well to

ensure all the documents they needed were submitted.

Ms. Hurtado agreed, stating that when an application was rejected, BPZ staff worked with the applicant to explain the process, what was needed, etc., so they gained a better understanding of the permit system as well.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked how BPZ staff would deal with the new development, the Cove, when the number of permit applications would increase greatly; the existing BPZ staff would definitely be stretched.

Mr. Magny reiterated BPZ was actively working on staffing itself adequately, so he was unable to explain the details of what that entailed at present, as it was in the process of being finalized. They met with the developers of that project about two weeks prior; it would be a phased project, and staff anticipated they would begin submitting building permits for the first phase in 2026.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked if it was possible for BPZ to attend another EDAB meeting in the summer to update the board, adding that the board would love to be a part of the process of helping the BPZ to spread the word about the digital permit application system.

Mr. Hughes commented that for businesses going through the permitting process for tenant improvements, there were two parts; one was the zoning certificate of use, (ZCU) and this was followed by the business tax. When a business went through the process, most of the disciplines would be out there inspecting, as the ZCU inspections would be taking place.

Vice Chairperson Morales questioned when a permit applicant found out this information.

Mr. Magny replied that at the time of tenant improvement, it could be at several points: possibly at the preapplication meeting if they did one; at the time of the zoning review that would provide the applicant with the comment that they needed to do a ZCU for a new business. That comment would not be made if it was a renovation, as the inspection would only be for the renovation, as the owner already had a ZCU.

Mr. Hughes added that it was the businesses that were going into an empty space that had to get the ZCU first. He was thinking of points along the application process that a businessowner might get tripped up, and try to institute changes to minimize such occurrences.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

1. BTR Letter

Mr. Hughes showed the board a business tax letter staff prepared that was now digital and under business resources; clicking on the business tax link took users to a digital form, which he went through to show the board how it would be used.

Vice Chairperson Morales asked Mr. Hughes if staff could look at getting the form to businesses via email, as that would be useful.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION:

1. Sip of Wine/Taste of Heaven Event
Miramar-Pembroke Pines Chamber of Commerce
Saturday, March 14, 2026, 7:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.
Miramar Regional Park Amphitheater
2. Reaccreditation

Mr. Hughes indicated this was for the City's ED&H Department.

Mr. Jones asked about the city's Shop Local initiative, stating he spoke with the lady at Blutot about a rewards program, which she was very excited about; he explained that his main line of business was in the automotive industry, and they circulated, on average, 5,000 to 6,000 customers a month. He wanted to have an opportunity to have those customers patronize businesses in Miramar using a similar platform to what the city already has in place. Targeting many businesses in Miramar, particularly the mom and pop, and middle-sized businesses to get them more exposure beyond Miramar. He was asking the EDAB to ask ED&H staff to find out if the local businesses were interested in participating in offering an incentive of their choice to his clientele. They would then, in turn, promote these offerings to their clients, either through their standard advertising at their business, or via a link. Additionally, the local businesses had a chance to make some money through a business referral program. Mr. Jones mentioned working with some Miramar churches that promoted his businesses to their congregation, and the churches made \$500.00 for each referral to his business; it was a win/win situation.

Vice Chairperson Morales suggested Mr. Jones could sell the spots.

Mr. Jones replied that he thought about that, but he did not want to complicate

things.

Vice Chairperson Morales remarked that though her company could not offer incentives to Mr. Jones's customers, they could advertise at his business.

Mr. Jones mentioned wishing to make Miramar the brainchild of the subject initiative, and after it was up and running, he would consider expanding to other cities after.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Next meeting: Thursday, April 9, 2026 @ 5:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.



Trevor Wade, Chairperson

TW/cp

MARILENE MORALES