

**PORT OF FT. PIERCE MASTER PLAN
PUBLIC INPUT WORKSHOPS**

**WORKSHOP IV
SUMMARY REPORT**

**January 30, 2002
6:00 - 9:00 PM**

ST. LUCIE COUNTY CIVIC CENTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
AGENDA	4
PORT AUTHORITY	4
SHOULD VS. SHALL	5
SPECIFICITY OF USES	5
PORT AUTHORITY	6
PORT DEPTH	7
OTHER COMMENTS	8
PROCESS OVERVIEW/TIMELINES	9

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

On January 30, 2002 the FAU Joint Center team preparing the Ft. Pierce Port Master Plan conducted the fourth in a series of public workshops to solicit input to be used in preparing the plan. Approximately 50 participants attended the meeting.

Building on the results of the first three workshops, the purpose of the fourth workshop was to solicit community feedback on key issues for which public comment indicated divergent views on policy. The team identified six key issues for discussion. The community was asked to provide feedback and possible options for resolving the six key policy issues identified by the team for discussion and possible refinement.

MEETING PROCESS

The meeting began with a brief review of the role of the Port Master Plan, overview of Plan development process to date, and remaining process timelines. The rest of the meeting dedicated to soliciting community input on key topical areas identified for possible refinements in the draft. In addition, time was left at the end of the workshop to solicit comments on other substantive issues relative to the current draft of proposed goals, objectives, and policies for the Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan.

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

AGENDA

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

- 6:00 Welcome and introductions
 - Agenda review
 - Review of previous workshop activities

- 6:10 Review of role of the Port Master Plan

6:20 Review of principal issues raised by comments from the public and from County and City Commissions

Port Boundary Area (Clarification)

Should vs. Shall (Clarification)

Specificity Regarding Uses

Port Authority (Including Intergovernmental Coordination)

Environmental Protections

Port Depth

6:45 Discussion of key issues

Participants will be asked to identify possible strategies to address each issue, and to discuss, evaluate and refine the strategies.

8:30 Comments on other substantive portions of the draft

8:55 Next Steps

9:00 Adjourn

ACTIVITIES

PROCESS

Review of principal issues raised by comments from the public and from County and City Commissions

The team identified six topical areas where comments from the community and elected officials suggested that additional review and refinements to the draft may be constructive.

Port Boundary

Jim Murley, director of the FAU/FIU Joint Center, offered clarification on the Port boundary based on distinction between Port operations and the Port study area.

The public was asked to offer feedback on the Port boundary issue as well as to ask questions and provide comments on the topic.

Following are the comments and options provided verbally by the community:

Port Boundary - Additional Questions

- ◆ Crosshatched area suggests operations area expansion.
- ◆ Mayor's comments were to stay in area between bridges.
- ◆ What funding sources are you considering? - FSTED.

- ◆ Question about area near North Beach Causeway – city or county?
- ◆ Concern about what is FSTED eligible.
- ◆ Concern about effect of having part of planning area in county.
- ◆ Eliminate aquatic preserve areas with Port Operations area.

Use of the Words Should vs. Shall in the Draft

Jim Murley, director of the FAU/FIU Joint Center, provided clarification of the use of should vs. shall in this version of the draft, and indicated that future versions would consider changes based on community feedback and elected officials’ direction.

The public was asked to offer feedback on the use of should vs. shall in the document as well as to ask questions and provide comments on the topic.

Following are the comments and options provided verbally by the community:

Should vs. Shall Options and Comments

- ◆ Put shalls in draft and let elected’s change.
- ◆ Need finality on issue relative to port uses.
- ◆ Should – too permissive.
- ◆ Shall – provides parameters for decision-makers.
- ◆ Use shall for strong statements and limited use issues.
- ◆ Eliminate areas with big loopholes – use shall.
- ◆ Should provides flexibility in Plan = keep shoulds in place.

Specificity Regarding Uses

Jim Murley, director of the FAU/FIU Joint Center, offered a range of possible options for defining specificity regarding uses based on review of all comments.

The public was asked to provide possible options for defining specificity regarding uses as well as to ask questions and provide comments on the topic.

Following are the comments and options provided verbally by the community:

Specificity of Uses Options and Comments

- ◆ Mention Mega yacht concept explicitly in the Plan.
- ◆ Recreation, container cargo, and cruise lines.
- ◆ Continued use as- is. No expansion of cargo.
- ◆ Marine industrial research facilities.
- ◆ All options should contain security elements.
- ◆ Need jobs in Fort Pierce.
- ◆ County voters don’t want cargo expansion.
- ◆ Associations (homeowners) vision for Port – balance concerns but; expanded cargo not compatible.

- ◆ Use Port to attract positive people/activities.
- ◆ Majority against expanded cargo.

Port Authority Including Intergovernmental Coordination

Jim Murley, director of the FAU/FIU Joint Center, offered a range of possible options for Port authority and intergovernmental coordination based on review of all comments.

The public was asked to provide possible options for Port authority as well as to ask questions and provide comments on the topic.

Following are the comments and options provided verbally by the community:

Port Authority Options and Comments

- ◆ City or County could assign point of contact for port activities.
- ◆ City and County jointly establish agreement.
- ◆ Special act per local request.
- ◆ Dual responsibility for City or County board.
- ◆ 1/2 appointed by City and 1/2 by County.
- ◆ 1/2 local and 1/2 government appointed.
- ◆ Elected Body.
- ◆ Draft 2 would have let anything happen.
- ◆ County comments – County will remain Authority until vision is realized.
- ◆ More faith in local government than state.
- ◆ Keep Authority elected.
- ◆ Establish a structure that is not bureaucratic.
- ◆ Need good port staff regardless of structure.
- ◆ County purpose for RFP is to decide Port authority based on development.
- ◆ What regulatory authority does county have?

Environmental Protections

Jim Murley, director of the FAU/FIU Joint Center, offered a range of possible options for providing environmental protections in the draft based on review of all comments.

The public was asked to provide possible options for environmental protections as well as to ask questions and provide comments on the topic.

Following are the comments and options provided verbally by the community:

Environmental Protections Options and Comments

- ◆ Drainage and runoff – need holding area.
- ◆ Take strictest interpretation of State and Federal standards.
- ◆ Major economic impact to area dependent on healthy environment in lagoon.
- ◆ Minimize and mitigate should be replaced with protect (i.e., seagrass beds). Use shall in protection elements of Plan.
- ◆ Make a list of what we don't want (i.e., invasive species)
- ◆ How about standards more stringent than state and federal standards – shall.
- ◆ Recreational boating also causes degradation to the Lagoon.

- ◆ Remember Port is man-made and Inlet is as well - improvements needed to Lagoon - Keep Port's economic vitality in place.
- ◆ Begin restoring the Lagoon.

Port Depth

Jim Murley, director of the FAU/FIU Joint Center, offered a range of possible options for defining port depth in the draft based on review of all comments.

The public was asked to provide possible options on port depth as well as to ask questions and provide comments on the topic.

Following are the comments and options provided verbally by the community:

Port Depth Options and Comments

- ◆ Depth of channel should be 34' consistent with all sorts of ships.
- ◆ Cargo operations are not sustainable at current depth – to keep sustainable, must be deeper.
- ◆ Leave depth alone – lost lobster beds after last time. Also want to explore relation of dredging and erosion.
- ◆ County direction very clear (28') this will provide direction to ACOE.
- ◆ Commissioner has been unanimously re-elected on this – No more than 28'.
- ◆ No more than 28' has been consistent input for years.
- ◆ Was 25' before 28'. Agencies expressed concern, but economic impact was deemed more important. What has 28' done except open door to 34'?
- ◆ Written justification was safety and DEP specifically said they did not want to set precedent.
- ◆ Earlier comparison to Wilmington DE. They are going to 45'. Why would 34' be competitive?
- ◆ Why are we here tonight?
- ◆ Large percentage of sand dredged by ACOE, sucked in by inlet at current depth.
- ◆ Reaffirming input provided by coalition after last draft.
- ◆ Feel very strongly about Commission input because they are saying it for us.
- ◆ Support County in saying inlet should not be deeper.
- ◆ Chilling if decision has already been made – look for best profit center.
- ◆ Profit center not in law.
- ◆ Depth needs to be consistent with Cargo.
- ◆ Need independent Port Authority.
- ◆ Evaluate range of depth from 12' to 50'.

Comments on Other Substantive Aspects of the Draft

To conclude the discussion, the facilitator opened the floor to comments about any of the goals, objectives and policies. The following comments were offered:

- ◆ Sub element should replace Charette – plan should begin with statement of community vision – don't refer to Charette in Plan.
- ◆ Security is important – containers transfer weapons, etc.
- ◆ Plan should review a full range of views – not limiting.
- ◆ Charette should not be used as a vision.
- ◆ Charette does not reflect what is at the Port today or what new potential is at the port.
- ◆ Survey client (County) first and let public respond later.
- ◆ Security for Port based on local dynamics and is under review by State as part of a larger Port system.
- ◆ Port is economic vehicle for County as a whole.
- ◆ Plan should provide recommendations and alternatives for decision-makers.
- ◆ Cargo vs. other development – don't subsidize cargo from taxpayers.
- ◆ Need to be visionary – look at economic health of community – for future.

PORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS OVERVIEW

July 18, 19, and 20, 2001

Assessment interviews conducted with representatives of interested stakeholders to determine their issues, concerns, and desire to participate in the Master Plan development process. (Business, property owners, local government managers/planners, minority community, and environmental interests).

September 14, 2001

Process overview and update with Harbor Advisory Council and the Waterfront Council.

September 19, 2001

Meeting with minority community to explain process and determine/solicit commitment to participate in the development workshops.

PUBLIC INPUT WORKSHOPS

Over 100 citizens attended each of the three workshops.

Workshop I – October 30, 2001

Futures Exercise – From your perspective how would the Port look in 2010.

Activities and effects on the community.

Issues Identification – What issues should the community address through the Port Plan process. Needed background information.

Comments were captured on flipcharts and compiled in a report.

Workshop II – November 14, 2001

The Community was asked if they agree with the following Assumptions:

- ◆ Some cargo even if limited to existing operations
- ◆ Recreation and commercial uses (i.e., walk areas, hotels, shops, restaurants, office, condo; aesthetically consistent with City's redevelopment – charette)
- ◆ Marine industries (i.e., mega yacht)
- ◆ Protection of the environment of the Indian River lagoon.

There was unanimous agreement from participants on the assumption guiding the development of the Plan.

Following the consensus testing of the above assumptions the community was asked to provide guidance for considering proposals for developing the Port (Future of the Port) through development of a series of goals, objectives, and policies.

Seven key issues were discussed and feedback given. These areas are key components of the outline provided in Rule 9J-5:

- ◆ Activities
- ◆ Environmental Issues
- ◆ Public Access
- ◆ Disaster Planning
- ◆ Landside Infrastructure
- ◆ Navigation Channels
- ◆ Responsibility for the Port
- ◆ Other

Following the workshop the team compiled a preliminary set of goals, objectives, and policies for community review and discussion. The draft was based on community input received at Workshop II.

Workshop III – November 29, 2001

During the Workshop the Community was asked to prioritize goals and objectives for discussion and refinement, and to offer comments and suggested refinements.

Following the workshop the team provided a window for receiving additional comments and following the comment period refined the draft of goals, objectives, and policies for the proposed Port of Ft. Pierce Master Plan.

Workshop IV – January 30, 2002

This workshop will be to review and evaluate key substantive issues identified through public comment and by local officials prior to compiling the final draft of the Plan.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS SCHEDULE

County Commission, City Commission, and Harbor Advisory Council Update – January 22, 2002

The team met separately with each group to provide them with an overview of the Plan and solicit any feedback. In addition, County Commissioners, City Commissioner, and Harbor Advisory Council members were given a survey to solicit their specific comments on the draft.

Third Draft – February 14, 2002

County to distribute 3rd draft of Port Master Plan with goals, objectives and policies to County and City commissions and consultant to post 3rd draft of Port Master Plan with goals, objectives, and policies on project WEB page.

Joint City County Workshop – February 19, 2002

Ft. Pierce City Commission and Board of County Commissioners to hold a joint workshop to review the status of the Port Master Plan.

Public Hearing on Draft Four – March 19, 2002

County Commission to hold public hearing on, and approve, through a resolution the final draft of Port Master Plan with goals, objectives and policies.