

**CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE  
AMALGAMATED LOCAL 298 NEGOTIATIONS  
MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 15, 2026**

The meeting of Amalgamated Local 298 and the City of Port St. Lucie Negotiating Team was called to order by Attorney Milton Collins at 10:07 AM on April 15, 2026, at Port St. Lucie City Hall, Building A Training Room, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Present for City: Milton Collins, Attorney/Legal Counsel  
Natalie Cabrera, Director, Human Resources  
Kimberly Sala, Assistant Director, Human Resources  
Alyssa Figur, Human Resources  
Reyna Hahn, Human Resources  
Louis Johnson, Public Works  
Tracy Valure, Building Department  
Bryan Lloyd, Animal Control  
Shanna Donleavy, Deputy City Clerk

Present for Amalgamated Local 298: Richard Weiner, Attorney for Local 298  
Joseph Giovinco, Local 298  
Matt Boettcher, Building Department  
Rubin Rodriguez, Utility Systems  
Nelson Concepcion, Public Works  
Ahasuerus Nalls, PSL Utilities  
Brinton Black, PSLPD  
Chase Williams, PSLPD

**2. NEGOTIATIONS**

Attorney Collins opened the meeting and indicated the City has several proposals for the Union to consider. Copies of the City's proposals were distributed at this time.

Attorney Collins reviewed the Articles as follows:

**Article 1 - Recognition:** The City and the Union agreed Article 1 was TA'd previously.

**Article 2 - Dues Deduction:** Attorney Collins indicated this Article was not distributed, but the City's prior proposal of striking out the Dues Deduction Article still stands.

**Article 3 - Non-Discrimination:** Attorney Collins explained the City's proposed language/sentence to Section 3 regarding the grievance process. Union Attorney Weiner inquired if this change applied to group grievances, to which Attorney Collins responded in the affirmative. Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union was good with Article 3 as written and the clarified intent. Article 3 was TA'd by the parties.

**Article 4 - FOPE Representation and Activities:** Attorney Collins reviewed the language the City added to Section 3 and Section 5. Union Attorney Weiner and Attorney Collins discussed adding the word "primarily" to the language in Section 2. Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union was okay with striking the word "primarily" from the Union's proposal, but they needed to clarify the last sentence. Attorney Collins stated the City will caucus on this.

**Article 5 – Employee Rights:** The City and the Union agreed Article 5 was TA'd previously.

**Article 6 – Management Rights:** Attorney Collins indicated the City was proposing status quo. Union Attorney Weiner inquired about creating the classification for the additional level of seniority. Attorney Collin stated the City will come back to this.

**Article 7 – Prohibition of Strikes:** Attorney Collins stated the Union knows the City's position on this. Union Attorney Weiner indicated the Union will come back to this.

**Article 8 – Hours of Work and Attendance:** Attorney Collins stated the City was proposing status quo. Union Attorney Weiner inquired about the accrued bank, to which Attorney Collins indicated the City has rejected that request. Union Attorney Weiner questioned why the clarifying language was removed in Section 3 regarding comp time. Ms. Cabrera, HR Director, and Ms. Sala, HR Assistant Director, explained the payout process for comp time. Attorney Collins stated the City will review the Union's language during the caucus.

**Article 9 – Leave Provisions for Employees (Excluding Sick Leave):** Attorney Collins stated the City was proposing status quo. Union Attorney Weiner inquired if the City was willing to modify the Bereavement Leave, to which Attorney Collins explained the City believes it is a generous benefit as it stands.

**Article 10 – Wages and Incentives:** Attorney Collins indicated he had the City Manager's authority to propose a two-year wage offer of 4% for year one and 4% for year two, as well as raise the minimums and maximums by 4% each year. He stated the remainder of the Article is status quo and discussed the section regarding certifications.

Union Attorney Weiner confirmed this was a two-year proposal, to which Attorney Collins responded in the affirmative. Union Attorney Weiner inquired about the unfreezing and restoration, to which Attorney Collins indicated that was status quo. Union Attorney

Weiner asked if the longevity and proposed bilingual training was rejected. Attorney Collins stated the City only had the authority to give it to all employees across the board. Attorney Collins indicated the City deleted the minimum wage standard, as the Union wanted it removed as well. Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union had proposed deleting Section 5 – Duration, and Attorney Collins indicated the City wanted to maintain status quo. Union Attorney Weiner and Attorney Collins further discussed Section 5 at this time. Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union will come back to this.

**Article 11 – Benefits:** Attorney Collins explained the City’s proposal and changes. He stated the unit would stay in the City’s health plan for one year and there would be an automatic reopener. He indicated there would be a minimum of two sessions between 2/2027 through 3/2027 and no more than four sessions, which is when the City will decide to join or not. Attorney Collins indicated that year one of the health insurance contributions would match the police contributions and begin in the upcoming fiscal year. He stated year two would mirror IUPA for 2027 to 2028, if the City does not join the Union’s plan.

Union Attorney Weiner inquired about the timeframe and number of sessions, to which Attorney Collins indicated that was for the Union’s benefit. Union Attorney Weiner suggested rewording the language to “reopen of bargaining shall occur commencing the first week of February 2027 with no fewer than two sessions.” Attorney Collins and Union Attorney Weiner further discussed the City’s proposed language, as Union Attorney Weiner expressed it was too restrictive.

Union Attorney Weiner recalled that Mr. Giovinco offered the employees the right to continue their coverage at the contribution rates being proposed by Local 298, if the City did not want to use Local 298’s plan. Union Attorney Weiner stated the City’s proposal does not offer this and gives the employees the 9% increase. Attorney Collins explained the City cannot do that because of the “me too” clause. Union Attorney Weiner stated these negotiations were between Local 298 and the City and not IUPA. He confirmed that the City’s tables reflect the 9% increase, to which Attorney Collins responded in the affirmative.

Union Attorney Weiner inquired about the City recognizing Juneteenth and giving a floating holiday for Martin Luther King Day. Attorney Collins indicated the City was status quo on the holidays, as it is not interested in increasing the number of holidays.

Union Attorney Weiner questioned the proposed deletion of Section 9, Health Insurance Review Committee, in coordination with the City transitioning from its existing health coverage to Local 298. Attorney Collins stated the Committee has not been convened, so the City would like to delete it. Union Attorney Weiner stated if the City is not going to transition, the Union would like to retain Section 9.

Union Attorney Weiner stated the rest of the Article is status quo and the Union has no other proposed changes. He indicated they will come back to this Article.

Attorney Collins called for a caucus at 10:46 AM and negotiations resumed at 11:07 AM.

**Article 12 – Retirement Plans:** Attorney Collins indicated the City discussed the Retirement Article during their caucus. He explained the City has proposed status quo, as they have some questions for clarification. Attorney Collins inquired about the Union’s 1931 Plan and if all three plans were options for the Union members. Mr. Giovinco indicated the Union will be merging the 1931 Plan into the 298 Plan, to make one stronger plan which should be 133% funded with more participants and contributions. He noted the 854 Plan is not an option, as it consists of school bus drivers at a certain percentage. Mr. Giovinco spoke to the rehabilitation plan at this time.

Attorney Collins confirmed the Union was asking for 8% and that vesting is five years, to which Mr. Giovinco responded in the affirmative. Attorney Collins inquired if past years could be bought back, to which Mr. Giovinco stated he would have to speak with the actuaries. Attorney Collins stated the City was also posing this same question to an outside legal counsel, to determine if the City can contribute to the health and pension plans. He indicated he will share these opinions with the Union.

**Article 13 – Sick Time:** Union Attorney Weiner stated that Article 13 is status quo and questioned the change in Section 8 regarding Donated Sick Time. Attorney Collins explained that “bargaining unit member” was changed to “employee.” The City responded to Union Attorney Weiner’s questions clarifying who is the donor and who is the recipient of sick time.

**Article 14 – Probationary Periods and Performance Evaluations:** Attorney Collins stated the City is proposing status quo. Union Attorney Weiner indicated the Union is asking for six months and not nine months, but he understood the City’s position.

**Article 15 – Promotion/Reclassification/Transfers:** Attorney Collins stated the City’s proposal for Article 15 will be provided later. Union Attorney Weiner indicated they will discuss this Article when the City’s proposal is received by the Union.

**Article 16 – Seniority:** Attorney Collins indicated the City is proposing status quo for this Article.

**Article 17 - Safety:** Attorney Collins stated the City will get back to the Union on this Article, as the City would like to amend the list of who the City has the right to randomly drug test. He indicated that some titles and classifications need to be changed or added, as they want to capture everyone with a safety sensitive position.

**Article 18 – Layoff and Recall:** Union Attorney Weiner stated this was status quo, to which Attorney Collins responded in the affirmative.

**Article 19 – Discipline:** Attorney Collins stated the City previously provided its proposal to the Union. Attorney Collins reviewed the Union’s objections and the City’s concerns regarding those objections. Attorney Collins and Union Attorney Weiner discussed the legalities and what is required by law regarding discipline for police officers versus general employees.

Union Attorney Weiner questioned the striking out of 3.F under Section 3. Attorney Collins explained the City abides by just cause and it would be up to the arbitrator to decide if the information is relevant. Attorney Collins and Union Attorney Weiner discussed their opinions and positions on the matter.

Attorney Collins indicated that **Article 20 – Grievance Procedure, Article 21 - Arbitration, and Article 22 – Savings Clause** have been TA’d, to which Union Attorney Weiner responded in the affirmative.

**Article 23 – Service to the FOPE:** Attorney Collins indicated this Article was not provided to the Union, but the City is proposing removing Article 23. Union Attorney Weiner proposed the following language: “The City agrees to furnish Local 298 with access to the following documents.” Attorney Collins stated the City will look at this language.

**Article 24 – Duration:** Union Attorney Weiner inquired if the City was proposing a two-year proposal. Attorney Collins stated the term of the agreement would be decided at their final negotiation session.

At this time, Mr. Giovinco inquired why the City is proposing to change the language in the discipline article. Attorney Collins explained he was unaware of a specific reason. Attorney Collins and the Union further discussed their positions and opinions.

Mr. Giovinco asked for the City’s current thoughts on allowing all City employees to enter the health plan, not just the members. Attorney Collins stated they received the Union’s legal opinion, but the City was not convinced. He said they need to review it further, as the burden and liability is on the City.

Union Attorney Weiner discussed trying to schedule negotiation sessions with the City since November and questioned why the research has not been done. Attorney Collins stated the City had to review the data and understand the plan.

Ms. Cabrera inquired as to when the updated disruption analysis would be available. Union Attorney Weiner stated the information will be available next week. Mr. Giovinco indicated there is no disruption, as it is going from Blue Cross to Blue Cross. He explained the insurance can cover anything at a cost, if they find the employees have specific needs.

Attorney Collins stated the Union’s proposal is that non-dues paying are charged an extra fee. Mr. Giovinco explained that for non-dues paying, there will be an administration/ participation fee. He noted the dues paying members get the Union’s representation. Mr.

Giovinco emphasized that this was negotiable, as the majority of the City's employees want the Union's plans and he would like to come to a resolution. Attorney Collins stated the City's health plan is dependent on the Union's plan. Mr. Giovinco explained how the Union's health plan can benefit the City's plan and stated he wanted the City to realize the Union is an asset to the City.

Attorney Collins stated that the Union's plan was only as good as the viability of the Union. He indicated that Florida is a Right to Work state, and the Union will likely require an annual recertification election. Mr. Giovinco reviewed the cost savings to the City. Union Attorney Weiner and Mr. Giovinco discussed the recertification process.

Union Attorney Weiner inquired if the City understood the Union was offering the health insurance program to all employees. Attorney Collins indicated there would be participation fees for non-members and he did not think the City could have different contribution rates based on union membership. Union Attorney Weiner stated there were two different issues, as there are contribution rates and the participation rate. Mr. Giovinco explained the contribution rates would be the same and the City would pay additional for the participation fee to offset the cost.

Ms. Cabrera noted that the Union's proposal has the potential to increase up to 10% per year. Mr. Giovinco indicated the City would still be way ahead. He reiterated that the Union is willing to work with the City.

Union Attorney Weiner indicated the City is selecting a law firm to provide them with a legal opinion based on whether any restrictions would impact the City's ability to participate in the Union's health and pension plans. Attorney Collins stated he will inform the Union when the opinion is received by the City. Union Attorney Weiner requested a deadline, which prompted further discussion and inquiries by both parties. Attorney Collins noted the City will need to hold a shade session with the City Council at some point.

Union Attorney Weiner inquired if they will be able to discuss the legal opinion before May 1, 2026. Mr. Giovinco explained the City will still have their plan of benefits.

Union Attorney Weiner called for a caucus at 11:56 AM and negotiations resumed at 12:19 PM.

Union Attorney Weiner reviewed the Articles as follows:

**Article 3 – Non-Discrimination:** Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union signed this Article.

**Article 4 – FOPE Representation and Activities:** Union Attorney Weiner stated the City is to get back with the Union on who the Union has the opportunity to speak with, as the City's position is the Union does not need to speak with the managers, and the

interpretation is that it is at the purview of the City Manager, Human Resources, etc. Attorney Collins stated this Article was not discussed during the caucus.

**Article 6 – Management Rights:** Union Attorney Weiner stated this Article was tabled, as the Union wanted to add language regarding seniority. Attorney Collins indicated the City was not going to budge on this Article.

**Article 7 – Prohibition of Strikes:** Union Attorney Weiner stated if they discuss the cases consistently, with regard to repealing the language that is evident by statute/code provisions, the Union is okay with this.

**Article 8 – Hours of Work & Attendance:** Regarding Section 3 – Compensatory Time, Union Attorney Weiner stated the City was rejecting the Union’s proposed language and inquired if the City was willing to permit the employees to increase the allowed cap or replenish it during the year. Attorney Collins stated the City was proposing status quo and indicated the current language is to not replenish. Union Attorney Weiner inquired if the City would permit employees to roll over any unused comp time to subsequent years as other employees are allowed to do. The Union and the City discussed which employees are authorized to rollover comp time. Union Attorney Weiner asked the City to look at this, so it can be discussed at the next session.

**Article 9 – Leave Provisions (Excluding Sick Time):** Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union was going to stand firm on their proposal at this point.

**Article 10 – Wages and Incentives:** Union Attorney Weiner indicated the Union and the City do not have a deal at this point regarding the rate increases. He stated the Union also does not agree with the two-year contract term and would like a three-year contract with an increase in wages. Regarding longevity, Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union wants their proposed language but are willing to remove their training and bilingual request. For Section 3 – Minimum Wage Standard, Union Attorney Weiner indicated the Union is in agreement with striking through and removing the existing language that is consistent with the Prohibition of Strikes. Regarding Section 5 – Duration, Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union did not agree with the City’s proposed language, so they will come back to this Section. He noted the certifications will be reviewed at a later date.

**Article 11 – Benefits and Article 12 – Retirement Plans:** Union Attorney Weiner stated they could not discuss benefits and retirement, as the City needs their legal opinion. He suggested providing the Union’s legal opinion to the Attorney being retained by the City to decide if the legal opinion is accurate or not.

**Article 13 – Sick Time:** Union Attorney Weiner indicated the City changed “bargain unit member” to “employee,” to which Attorney Collins responded in the affirmative. Union Attorney Weiner stated he would sign the Article.

**Article 14 – Probationary Periods & Performance Evaluations:** Union Attorney Weiner stated the City is proposing nine months and the Union is proposing six months, and the Union has not changed its position.

**Article 15 – Promotion/Reclassification/Transfers, Article 16 – Seniority, Article 17 - Safety:** Union Attorney Weiner stated the City will be providing the Union with the proposals. Attorney Collins indicated the Union agreed to the City’s proposed status quo of Article 16.

**Article 18 – Layoff and Recall:** Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union and the City have agreed to the status quo of this Article, to which Attorney Collins responded in the affirmative.

**Article 19 – Discipline:** Attorney Collins indicated the Union had issues with the summary and written reprimands. Union Attorney Weiner stated the Union was not changing its position regarding the investigations, written summaries, and 36-month period.

For the record, Attorney Collins indicated Articles 3, 7, 13, and 18 have been TA’d by both parties.

Union Attorney Weiner inquired as to when the City plans to receive its pending legal opinion regarding participating in privately based health and retirement plans. Attorney Collins indicated the City needs the legal opinion and to meet with the legislative body prior to their next negotiation session with the Union. Union Attorney Weiner suggested meeting again in May 2026, and May 15<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM was agreed to by both parties.

**3. ADJOURN**

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 12:44 PM.

---

Shanna Donleavy, Deputy City Clerk

---

Typed by: Traci Mehl, Deputy City Clerk