

**FORT PIERCE CITY COMMISSION
AND
ST. LUCIE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSION**

**JOINT WORKSHOP
SUMMARY REPORT
ON THE
PORT OF FT. PIERCE MASTER PLAN**

**February 19, 2002
1:30 - 3:30 PM**

St. Lucie County Commission Chambers

Meeting Design & Facilitation By:



**Report By Jeff A. Blair and Rafael Montalvo
Website: consensus.fsu.edu**

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

On February 19, 2002 the FAU Joint Center team preparing the Ft. Pierce Port Master Plan conducted a facilitated joint workshop with the Fort Pierce City Commission and the St. Lucie County Board of County Commission. The workshop was designed to allow Commissioners to provide feedback on the third draft of the Port Master Plan and to test Commissioners' level of support for the draft.

Prior to the joint workshop, Commissioners were asked to fill out a survey indicating their level of support for Draft II of the goals and objectives for the Port Master Plan. In response to the survey results and extensive public comment compiled during three facilitated public input workshops, the Joint Center prepared a third draft of the proposed master plan for review and discussion at the February 19, 2002 joint workshop.

Commissioners were asked to provide feedback on the refinements made between Draft II and Draft III, and to offer any further recommendations for changes to the third Draft.

WORKSHOP PROCESS

The team provided the Commissioners with an overview of the survey results, refinements made between Draft II and Draft III in response to member's and public concern, and then asked for comments and suggestions for refinements to Draft III. Commissioners were asked to express their comments and level of support on Draft III refinements and proposed changes offered during the workshop for the proposed Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan.

The workshop was facilitated by the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium and records of the discussions made on easel-pads during the course of the workshop. A more detailed description of the process used for each discussion is included in the corresponding sections of this report. This report presents the results of discussions and decisions made by the Commissioners at the joint workshop, based on transcripts of the easel-pad notes.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

- ◆ To review elected officials and public comments received since presentations to City Commission and County Commission.
- ◆ To review refinements made to the draft in response to input received.
- ◆ To discuss and agree on any additional refinements needed.

AGENDA

The following agenda was used during the workshop. The full agenda packet used by participants is available separately from the consultant team.

1:30 Welcome and Introductions

1:35 Introduction of Consultant Team

1:40 Agenda and Process Review

1:50 Review of Survey Results

Review of key issues identified in the survey.

Identification of additional issues for discussion, if any.

2:00 Discussion of Key Issues

For each of the key issues identified in the survey:

- ◆ Review and clarify draft responses to previous elected official and public comment;
- ◆ Discussion of further refinements, if needed;
- ◆ Consensus-testing, as appropriate.

3:20 Next Steps

3:30 Adjourn

MEMBERS PRESENT

St. Lucie County

Doug Coward, Chairman

Frannie Hutchinson, Commissioner

Cliff Barnes, Commissioner

Paula Lewis, Commissioner

John Bruhn, Commissioner

County Attorney - Dan McIntyre

County Administrator - Doug Anderson

Fort Pierce

Edward Enns, Mayor

Rufus Alexander, Commissioner
R. Duke Nelson, Commissioner
Christine Coke, Commissioner
Robert Benton, Commissioner
Dennis Beach - City Manager
Robert Schwerer - City Attorney

WORKSHOP PROCESS

- ◆ Review of workshop agenda and objectives
- ◆ Review of workshop participation guidelines, facilitators' role and consultant's role
- ◆ Orientation to workshop packet/materials
- ◆ Overview of survey results
- ◆ Overview of refinements – Draft II to Draft III changes
- ◆ Topic discussion order based on survey results
- ◆ Facilitator's will introduce each topic and team will provide an overview of refinements to draft II reflected in draft III
- ◆ Facilitator's will ask for clarifying questions first
 - ◆ Comments/Discussion
 - ◆ Proposed options
 - ◆ Pros and cons
 - ◆ Test for consensus

ACTIVITIES

REVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

(See Attachment 1)

The facilitators noted that in general the survey's indicated a high level of support for Draft II with most objectives receiving an average consensus-ranking of 4 or higher. Those objectives that received less than a 4 would be highlighted for discussion at today's joint workshop. In addition, it was noted that many refinements had been made in Draft III to address concerns identified in the survey results and through public comment. Commissioners were reminded that since refinements had been made in Draft III comments and suggested changes should be based on the third draft.

The team suggested a discussion order based on survey responses to Draft II. All objectives that received an average score of under 4 on a scale of from 5 to 1 – with 5 indicating agreement and 1 indicating disagreement – would be discussed first.

The following discussion order was suggested and approved by Commission members:

Goal 1 – Responsibility for the Port including boundary area

Objective 1.1

Objective 1.2

Goal 7 – Navigation Channels

Objective 7.1

Goal 6 – Landside Infrastructure

Objective 6.1

Goal 2 - Port Activities

Objective 2.3

Goal 3 – Environmental Protection
Objective 3.1

The following objectives, which received high consensus-test results, were also identified by Commissioners as priorities for discussion.

Objectives: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.3, 4.1

Following discussion and agreement on refinements to the above referenced objectives, Commissioners would be asked to identify any additional objectives they would like to discuss.

DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUES

Goal 1 – Responsibility for the Port including boundary area Objective 1.1

Comments

Objective 1.1

Re: Goal 1 – Does “vested by Law” modify ownership?

Role of title? Flag for clarification.

Critical that Ft. Pierce have major input on Port Authority

Was “conjunction” stronger than “cooperation”?

2004 – Need 2 years?

Yes, from County’s perspective.

If we don’t know who “Port” is, how can we say what it should do?

Policies 1.1-1.15

Does deletion of “unless Port Authority legislatively established” make it harder to do this?

Policy 1.1.1

Add “local” elected officials (Policy leaves open possibility of working with city later)

Leave authority as is for now

Approved Refinements to 1.1

Add local officials to policy 1.1.1

Test for Consensus on 1.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 1.1 including the approved refinements listed above.

Objective 1.2

Comments

Objective 1.2

Port of Ft. Pierce is a geographical area. This requires a person to be in charge.

Policy 1.2.2

Does this eliminate the possibility of using northern section for megayachts? Make sure it doesn't.

Use "tourist, commercial and recreational uses" to give more flexibility.

Approved Refinements to 1.2

Use "tourist, commercial and recreational uses" in 1.2.3

Test for Consensus on 1.2

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 1.2 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 7 – Navigation Channels

Objective 7.1

Comments

Does this exclude "future needs"? Does this mean we will adamantly stay with this even if a future need that is different comes up?

Goal and objective language inconsistent with each other.

Seems to create a legal duty to maintain at 28' – may create liability for port if not maintained.

Heard from Harbor Branch yet?

Shall maintain maximum channel depth and maximum channel width – important to worm reefs and ledges – economically important and important to fish and lobster.

Survey, document and protect worm reefs. (See prepared statement)

Require EIS to change width.

There is opportunity to promote high quality economic development within current depth and width. Ditto comment on width.

Concern about future needs someone in future may not be concerned about snook or snooper.

Concern about including specific #s – what if needs change – but probably won't make a difference.

Change goal language – “existing and limited (?) – future needs”?

Any concerns about width-
One concern, may need to change.

If change needed, can be changed.

Concerns about deleting “future need”.
Don't agree – 28' will meet future needs
“Future needs as outlined in this plan” – General agreement.

What would be reaction to military use to Port?

~~Maintain~~ support a maximum channel depth

Approved Refinements to 7.1

~~Maintain~~ support a maximum channel depth

Research, define, and specify a maximum channel width in the Plan.

Test for Consensus on 7.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 7.1 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 6 – Landside Infrastructure

Objective 6.1

Comments

Why were DCA and OTTED left off? Add

6.1.2 Assumption – St. Lucie County as port authority? Yes

Better to say Port of Ft. Pierce.

Little need to link airport and seaport – no objection, but should not be a priority to increase link or invest.

To city's benefit to keep link concept in plan.

Approved Refinements to 6.1

Add DCA and OTTED to list.

Replace St. Lucie County with Port of Ft. Pierce.

Test for Consensus on 6.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 6.1 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 2 – Port Activities

Objective 2.3

Comments

2.3.1

Does removal of repair yards and marine facilities preclude those for megayachts?

Related service needs covers those?

May also need repair yard to service small or regular sized boats – already there. Leave in –

2.3.2

Add research vessels.

Add or specify port for tall ships (sailing ships).

2.3.2

Why was “Charrette reference” kept here? And not elsewhere? Not needed.

Approved Refinements to 2.3

Indicate Port's designation as a tall sailing ship port.

2.3.1 – Add additional examples of activities, i.e., boat service and repair yards, and marina facilities.

2.3.2 – add; i.e., research vessels.

Remove reference to Port of Ft. Pierce Charrette.

Test for Consensus on 2.3

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.3 including the approved refinements listed above.

Objective 2.2

Comments

Policy 2.2.3

Move eminent domain.

Better define “appropriate unit of government, mechanisms”

Should or shall? Shall?

Legal issue - mandatory to spend \$'s for eminent domain.

Consultant or Attorneys.

Approved Refinements to 2.2

Move eminent domain to end of 2.2.3

Test for Consensus on 2.2

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.2 including the approved refinements listed above.

Goal 3 – Environmental Protection

Objective 3.1

Comments

Storm water systems not currently adequate – need to invest to retrofit.

Approved Refinements to 3.1

None made.

Test for Consensus on 3.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 3.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 2.1

Comments

“Enhance economic prosperity” instead of “exceed average salary. That is a sliding scale.

Test for Consensus on 2.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 2.4

Test for Consensus on 2.4

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 2.4 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 3.3

Test for Consensus on 3.3

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 3.3 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 4.1

Test for Consensus on 4.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 4.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Goal 8 – Manatee Protection

8.1.1

Comments

Adjusting future and proposed? If so specify.

Approved Refinements to 8.1

Policy 8.1.1 applies to future and proposed docks and not existing.

Test for Consensus on 8.1

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 8.1 as proposed in Draft III.

Objective 5.2

Comments

No language addressing types of materials we don't want to see?

Agree, but we need history (info).

Oremulsion, aregonite.

How do you specify which?

How do you enforce? Can you legally?

Environmental protection policies may suffice.

This may be a reason for port to be in public ownership, so public.

Would like to see at least broader language that we do not want to see hazardous materials commerce going in and out. Would provide direction for RFP.

Would like to see height limit \cong 100'. Conditional use above that.

Hazardous materials and heights land - use and zoning issues. Would policy infringe on this?

Leave with city.

Approved Refinements to 5.2

Draft should reflect general policy that Port will not be used for hazardous materials commerce.

Test for Consensus on 5.2

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for Objective 5.2 as proposed in Draft III.

New Goal 3 policy

Comments

Do not want to see north south bulkheads – whenever we improve shoreline would rather do so in a way that absorbs energy.

Test for Consensus on new policy to Goal 3

The 10 Commission members unanimously expressed their support for a new policy in Goal 3 that would encourage wave energy absorbing bulkheads in the Port area.

ATTACHMENT 1
Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan
Draft Goals, Objectives, and Policies Survey

	<u>Objective</u>	<u>City Average</u>	<u>County Average</u>
<u>Goal 1 - Responsibility for the Port</u>			
	<u>1.1</u>	1.33	2.33
	<u>1.2</u>	2.5	4.7
<u>Goal 2 - Port Activities</u>			
	<u>2.1</u>	4.67	4.33
	<u>2.2</u>	4.83	4.0
	<u>2.3</u>	4.8	3.7
	<u>2.4</u>	5.0	5.0
	<u>2.5</u>	4.83	4.0
<u>Goal 3 - Environmental Protection</u>			
	<u>3.1</u>	4.83	3.7
	<u>3.2</u>	4.67	4.7
	<u>3.3</u>	4.5	4.33
<u>Goal 4 - Public Access</u>			
	<u>4.1</u>	4.5	4.33
<u>Goal 5 - Emergency Management</u>			
	<u>5.1</u>	5.0	5.0
	<u>5.2</u>	4.8	5.0
<u>Goal 6 - Landside Infrastructure</u>			
	<u>6.1</u>	4.5	3.0
<u>Goal 7 - Navigation Channels</u>			
	<u>7.1</u>	4.2	1.67

Overall Reaction to the Draft

4.0

3.33