

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ORMOND BEACH  
CITY COMMISSION  
CIP WORKSHOP**

---

**June 7, 2016**

**5:30 p.m.**

**City Commission Conference Room**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Ed Kelley called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Present were Mayor Ed Kelley, Commissioners James Stowers, Rick Boehm and Bill Partington, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director Ted MacLeod, City Attorney Randy Hayes, Finance Director Kelly McGuire, and City Engineer John Noble.

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, stated that this meeting was held annually to discuss the proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) with the City Commission. She noted that Finance Director Kelly McGuire and City Engineer John Noble worked closely on the CIP to determine cost estimates.

**II. PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 TO 2020-21**

Ms. Kelly McGuire, Finance Director, stated that staff had provided a 750+ page CIP document to the Commission for their review. She explained that staff's intention was to provide a fair amount of detail and noted that perhaps they went a little overboard. She stated that the CIP would be pared down before it came back to the Commission for adoption, any unnecessary backup information would be removed, and the estimates would be clearly explained. She addressed the back section of the document, which was entitled "awaiting funding." She explained that section would probably be taken and incorporated into the other sections of the document by being added as a "sixth year" or "out year". She noted that those projects did not have any funding sources at the present time, unless staff was directed to use reserves for them.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the PowerPoint presentation displayed five years, from Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 to FY 2020-21. She stated that there would be another column showing the out year projects but noted that there would not be a corresponding revenue source for them.

**Expenditures and Funding Sources – Five Year Plan**

Ms. McGuire stated that there was \$52.6 million worth of projects in the five-year CIP plan; she noted that \$14.4 million would be programmed for next year. She explained that the next year projects would be the ones focused on in the discussion. She stated that staff needed to know if the Commission agreed with the projects proposed to be included in next year's budget. She noted that the majority of the projects were water and wastewater projects, explaining that was not surprising as that was the largest portion of the city's operation. She stated that a large portion of the city's revenue sources came from user fees, which were primarily associated with water and wastewater. She noted that the dollar amounts shown on the funding sources graph

fluctuated during the five-year period. She explained that this did not mean that the amount of property taxes levied or the user fees collected would fluctuate in that way, but it meant that the portion that was dedicated to CIP projects changed throughout the years, with the remainder dedicated to operating costs. She noted that all of the figures provided were with the same tax rate, water rates, and stormwater rate. She stated that it did not mean that staff would not recommend a rate increase in relation to operating expenses.

### **Airport**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$449,000 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for airport projects. She stated that those projects included \$110,000 for wildlife hazard assessment, \$64,000 for airport access roads design, and \$275,000 for an assessment to extend runway 8/26. She noted that the FY 2016-17 projects were largely funded by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants. She stated that the city usually contributed a small 2.5% to 5.0% match. She noted that the wildlife hazard assessment was required by the FAA and would be paid for by grant funding. She stated that if the runway extension assessment was approved for next year, design would occur the following year and construction the year after that. She noted that none of these projects were new as all of them had been in the CIP for many years.

### **Beautification**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$1,080,000 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for beautification projects, noting that there were two projects scheduled for next year. She stated the projects were bridge side slope landscaping at State Road 40 (SR40) and Interstate 95 (I-95) for \$80,000 and North US1 landscape beautification at \$1 million. She stated that the projects were 80% funded by an FDOT Joint Participation Agreement (JPA). She noted that the bridge side slope landscaping was part of the Commission's 2014 goals.

Ms. Shanahan explained that the interest was to have lower maintenance in that area, utilizing Bahia and Asiatic jasmine rather than grasses that needed to be mowed frequently. She further explained that FDOT did not provide the city with enough funds to mow that area as frequently as it needed to be mowed. She noted that she believed FDOT provided for mowing 12 times a year and it was currently being mowed 18 to 20 times a year.

Ms. McGuire stated that a grant was being looked at for the North US1 landscaping. She stated that this would complete the US1 corridor landscaping projects.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the area Ms. McGuire was speaking of was from Airport Road to Lincoln Avenue and would extend the landscaping in that area south.

### **Downtown Improvements**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$1,286,000 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for downtown improvement projects. She stated that those projects included \$772,000 for the Cassen Park Public Dock, which was pending 90% grant funding review, \$49,000 for a stage shade cover for Rockefeller Gardens, \$50,000 for stormwater improvements, \$350,000 for sidewalk improvements, and a \$65,000 annual allocation for upgrades and improvements. She noted that these were reviewed by the Ormond Beach Main Street Board.

Mr. John Noble, City Engineer, stated that staff would meet with the Florida Inland Navigation District (FIND) to give a presentation regarding the Cassen Park public dock, and then FIND would be reviewing and ranking their grant applications.

Ms. McGuire stated that the fabric cover for the main stage at Rockefeller Gardens was a new project; whereby, Mayor Kelley asked if it had been designed yet.

Ms. Shanahan noted that there was a rendering on page 68 of the CIP packet. She explained that the cover would be made of the same fabric that was used at Andy Romano Beachfront Park. She noted that it needed to have some height to it because bands would perform underneath it.

Commissioner Partington stated that \$49,000 seemed to be an outrageous cost for that.

Ms. Shanahan asked Leisure Services Director Robert Carolin if he recalled what he paid for the one at the fire house, noting that she did not believe that they were inexpensive.

Mr. Robert Carolin, Leisure Services Director, stated that they were relatively expensive due to the foundation needed to support them.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the cover had to withstand 140-mile per hour winds, noting that she believed that the structure was taken down in the event of 90 to 110-mile per hour winds.

Commissioner Partington asked if it was left up during 90-mile per hour winds; whereby, Mr. Carolin explained that it was supposed to be able to withstand up to 90 to 110-mile per hour winds.

Ms. Shanahan noted that it was tough to take it up and down. She explained that the actual expenditure would be brought back to the Commission and bid out; she noted that the CIP was a planning document. She stated that the Commission would have lots of opportunities to review the referenced projects.

Ms. McGuire stated that the stormwater improvements listed were for the design work for the New Britain Avenue exfiltration system. She stated that the sidewalk improvements listed were from US1 to Beach Street. She noted that the annual allocation for upgrades and improvements were for smaller projects. She explained that when Ormond Beach Main Street ("Main Street") reviewed the projects they recommended additional lighting and electricity upgrades at Rockefeller Gardens. She noted that the CIP was modified to incorporate their request.

Commissioner Partington noted that he saw Cassen Park restroom improvements in the CIP but could not recall where; whereby, Ms. McGuire stated that they were included in the back unfunded section. He noted that they were really needed now and starting that tomorrow would not be fast enough.

Ms. Shanahan explained that the difficulty with the restrooms was that they had to be put in a different place as they could not be expanded where they presently were.

Commissioner Boehm noted that he would certainly agree with Commissioner Partington. He stated that if the Cassen Park dock was approved, the area would be more heavily utilized and would need facilities in good condition.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff should know before September where they were in the approval process for the dock.

Commissioner Partington noted that the city was a victim of its own success as far as facilities, noting the quality of the restrooms at Andy Romano Beachfront Park.

Ms. Shanahan stated that something else might have to be taken out of the CIP to accommodate that project if it was moved up.

Commissioner Boehm noted that it could also potentially be accommodated by going further into reserves.

Commissioner Stowers stated that he believed the sidewalk improvements listed included the full replacement of everything from US1 to Main Street. He noted that he understood that they were 20 years old but explained that he felt the \$350,000 would go further if it was used to spot fix in that corridor and spent on either Tomoka Avenue or New Britain Avenue.

Ms. Shanahan explained that they were only talking about replacing the brick edges of the sidewalk; she noted that they could not do anything to the construction and slope of the actual sidewalk because the roadway height and differential would be an American with Disabilities Act (ADA) issue. She noted that she knew that sounded crazy due to the cost.

Mr. Noble stated that they wanted to address the sidewalks from a maintenance aspect so that they did not get into ADA improvements.

Commissioner Boehm noted that \$350,000 was budgeted for this sidewalk project. He stated that if the Commission desired to upgrade the restroom facilities at Cassen Park it could move the sidewalk paver project back and move the Cassen Park improvements up.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she believed this project came to the city from Main Street; whereby, Mr. Noble noted that they were in favor of it when it was presented to them.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he was not arguing against the project happening but was considering when it would happen and what else could be done with the budgeted money. He noted that replacing the restrooms at Cassen Park might be more important.

Commissioner Partington asked whether the park located nearby with the bricks would be included; whereby, Commissioner Stowers noted a picture of that had been included in the CIP packet. Ms. Shanahan clarified that the picture was included to demonstrate the type of brick, but the park would not be included.

Commissioner Stowers noted that he worked for a development in New Smyrna Beach that had brick pavers everywhere. He explained that they went through and picked out each broken brick, chiseled it out, and replaced it. He stated that he was suggesting

doing something similar, and spot replacing, which might cost \$70,000 instead of \$350,000, enabling the remaining \$280,000 to be put towards a different use.

Ms. McGuire stated that \$350,000 was allocated for three years out in different areas. She explained that if they wanted to allocate \$100,000 to the repairs and use the \$250,000 elsewhere, there was still additional money allocated for future years.

Mayor Kelley noted that \$1 million was allocated for sidewalks. He stated that he was not in favor of spending money in the Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) that was not going to generate anything other than beautification. He noted that \$1 million could be used for something that would generate additional revenue. He stated that he had always been against the bricks used in the roadway and thought concrete would have been much better. He asked if the bricks were in such poor condition that they needed replacement.

Mr. Noble stated that a lot of them were faded. He noted that there were also broken and displaced ones.

Mayor Kelley asked how many bricks were broken; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that staff had an actual count of bricks but not of how many were broken. Ms. Shanahan explained that the bricks would not be able to be replaced with the same color bricks as they would not have the same tone. She noted that the Commission could put this project on hold if they desired and reserve some of the project's funding for replacing broken brick and some for other projects, like the Cassen Park restrooms.

Mayor Kelley stated that he would like to walk the area himself and make sure that the bricks warranted replacement. He noted that if it was hazardous to walk it would be a safety issue. He stated that if they were just faded or chipped they could be chiseled down. He noted that the bricks were not all the same color as it was.

Ms. Shanahan noted that they were mostly the same tone; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that colors close in shade could be obtained. Ms. Shanahan stated that colored concrete could replace the brick. Mayor Kelley noted that he would have preferred that had been done initially so that the bricks did not need to be replaced.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff would look at the percentage of bricks that were actually damaged and needed to be replaced, and do better photo documentation of that.

Commissioner Stowers stated that he was in favor of doing whichever option they chose quickly, whether it was spot replacement or the entire project. He noted that he was not suggesting the entire project be removed from consideration.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff would probably report back to the Commission regarding changes to the CIP during their operating budget presentation in July.

Commissioner Boehm noted that paving the parking lot at Cassen Park was also listed in the unfunded portion of the CIP. He stated that he would consider finishing that a much higher priority in terms of developing downtown than replacing pavers, if the Cassen Park dock project moved forward.

Mayor Kelley noted that was especially true since another \$750,000 was allocated for the paver replacement during the subsequent two years.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the Cassen Park dock would be heavily utilized and the first impression of Ormond Beach for many people.

Mayor Kelley asked Mr. Noble where the city stood with their grant applications for the Cassen Park dock.

Mr. Noble stated that in two weeks the city would meet with FIND to give a presentation and then FIND would determine their funding allocations. He noted that he believed they had 75 applicants.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city should know by the end of their fiscal year if they were eligible.

Mayor Kelley stated that he believed that the Commission wanted to try and find a way to move forward with the dock, regardless of grant funding. He noted that he believed that was what they had decided; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that staff would look at the minutes to determine if that was the case. He asked if there were any more places they could apply to for grant funding.

Mr. Noble stated that they had also applied to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Florida Boating Improvement Program for a grant. He stated that if they did not receive one of the two grants they had presently applied for, they could apply for another grant coming up in the next fiscal year from the Department of Environmental Protection.

Ms. Shanahan explained that they could possibly bridge two fiscal years with the grants, doing design work with one, depending on whether the granting agency allowed for that.

Mr. Noble explained that FIND was comfortable with design work starting and the city being reimbursed for it.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he felt that Main Street would consider the public dock and improvements at Cassen Park a higher priority than replacing sidewalk pavers; whereby, Ms. Shanahan suggested moving the paver project to an out year.

Commissioner Boehm stated that getting more people into the downtown and more people patronizing city businesses was the most important thing. He noted that he thought that improving Cassen Park and building the dock would be more valuable to the city and Main Street than pavers.

Mayor Kelley stated that he would agree to move the paving project out if funding for the dock was granted.

Ms. Shanahan suggested they wait to make a decision. She noted that staff would come back to the Commission in July, having already made their presentation to FIND, and would still have plenty of time for the Commission to give staff direction on the CIP items. She stated that in the meantime they would move back all of the pavers one year so that there was funding availability in 2016-17 for Cassen Park restrooms or parking lot paving.

Mayor Kelley inquired about the costs for the restroom facilities; whereby, Ms. Shanahan explained that the figures given in the CIP were estimates in the unfunded section and that staff would come back to the Commission with firmer costs.

Mayor Kelley stated that perhaps a private party could donate the restroom.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the facility would be on the waterway and that there were certain requirements and codes to meet, including wind loads. She explained that certain building standards had to be adhered to.

### **Facility Construction / Renovation**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$300,000 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for facility construction and renovation projects. She stated that those projects included \$56,000 for a roof and sally port replacement at the police department, \$94,000 for seawall repairs at Ames Park and Riviera Park, and \$150,000 for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) sidewalks and multi-use trails. She noted that the multi-use trails were in Central Park around Fleming Avenue and that the sidewalks would be ADA sidewalks on Ramsey Terrace and Fleming Avenue.

### **Facilities Renewal / Replacement**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$85,250 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for facilities renewal and replacement projects. She stated that those projects were the replacement of the dock walkway at Central Park I for \$50,250 and the renovation of sports fields for \$35,000. She stated that the renovations to the fields would be involving the soil and turf foundation. She noted that the CIP only contained projects which cost \$25,000 or more, and that projects below that threshold would be included in the operating budget.

### **Parks, Recreation and Cultural Facility Improvements**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$588,000 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for parks, recreation and cultural facility improvement projects. She stated that those projects included \$450,000 for Ormond Beach Sports Complex field nine and field ten lighting, \$88,000 for the design for upgrades to baseball field three and softball field seven at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex, and \$50,000 for a feasibility study for a West Ormond Community Center. She noted that the information obtained from that feasibility study would be used to put together an actual CIP item.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff had looked at what they thought could be fit on that space and now needed to refine what type of facility needs were present in West Ormond. She explained that the process would be similar to what was done for Andy Romano Beachfront Park and would involve active citizen engagement. She noted that they assumed that some type of ball fields would be located there as well as pickleball courts and passive recreation features like walking trails and a playground. She stated that the community center itself would likely contain one or two gymnasium floors. She noted that staff worked with Mr. Dwight Durant, President of Zev Cohen & Associates, and patterned their figures off of the ICI Center, which was a facility recently completed in Daytona Beach. She stated that the feasibility study would provide better cost estimates to help them understand what the need was in the community. She noted that the land was adjacent to Pathways Elementary, explaining that the plan was to get the Volusia County School District ("School District") to allow the city to have the land for no

cost, which would make the facility much more affordable. She stated that staff had an initial meeting with Ms. Sara Lee Morrissey, Director for Planning at Volusia County Schools, about the project. She explained that they were looking for a way to partner with Pathways Elementary so that the school could utilize some of the indoor gym space. She explained that the feasibility study was needed to define the needs of the space as well as the costs.

Mayor Kelley noted that they had discussed the location before. He explained that his thought was to buy the acreage across from the YMCA and put a community center there. He stated that it was not located on the west side of Ormond Beach, but he envisioned that to be a better location. He noted that he understood that the property was now sold, however.

Commissioner Partington suggested putting a gym out west and something more along the lines of the Sanborn Center in Deland on that property. He noted that the area Mayor Kelley mentioned was the center of town. He explained that the Sanborn Center, a multi-use facility in Deland with a large event room and classrooms, was very popular and successful.

Mayor Kelley stated that the Sanborn Center was used constantly and was a revenue generator. He noted that Ormond Beach did not have anywhere that could hold 250 people in the community and that the city certainly did not have any such facilities itself.

Commissioner Boehm noted that he agreed with what Mayor Kelley was saying and did not disagree with the idea of possibly having two buildings. He noted that the city had not built a new community center in 35 years. He stated that there were a lot of citizens living west of Interstate 95 and as such it was important to have a community center facility located in that area. He noted that there were also no city parks in that area. He stated that the city had not put in any facilities, even though that was where all of the growth in the city had occurred during the last ten to 15 years. He noted that he would be willing to listen regarding other locations and other uses, such as a civic center, but he felt strongly that a community center needed to be put in the west side of the city.

Mayor Kelley stated that there was a time when the city had looked at putting in facilities out west and that the decision was made that the Ormond Beach Sports Complex was where those would be located. He stated that surveys done at that time indicated that there was not a big demand or outcry from the residents. He noted that he represented Zone Three at that time. He stated that he had not heard an outcry from residents but noted that did not mean that it was not needed. He stated that both facilities were probably needed.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he would agree that a central location was needed for a civic center. He noted that there were two elementary schools within a mile of the Airport Road location and thousands of children. He stated that he envisioned that a community center would be heavily utilized there.

Commissioner Stowers stated that he did not characterize the west as having a massive deficiency. He stated that the largest developments out there incorporated recreation into their developments and had tennis courts, basketball courts, and playgrounds. He noted that those were gated subdivisions and he thought that the area was developed differentially, in a more suburban and planned way, than some of the older neighborhoods of the more core areas of Ormond Beach and Ormond Beach beachside.

He stated that certainly the time was now to balance out where the city allocated its resources.

Commissioner Partington noted that Mr. Edward Speno had owned some property across from Pathways Elementary where recreational facilities were potentially going to go. He stated that he agreed with Commissioner Stowers regarding the developments such as Breakaway Trails, which also had a hockey court and pools. He noted that the Riverbend Church had served as a community center in that area when one was needed.

Mayor Kelley stated that Daytona Beach had taken the consolidated land property, and had that not occurred he would be in favor of doing something. He noted that 3,000 homes would eventually go in out there and the fear would be that those homes would over utilize a city facility. He stated that he would be a lot more inclined if the city had that property as that was where the growth would occur.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he thought that the city could partner with the county and perhaps find a way to work together regarding that unincorporated area.

Mayor Kelley stated that a community center was needed and additional facilities were needed. He asked Mr. Carolin how many pickleball courts the city had.

Mr. Carolin stated that there were four located at Nova Community Center and people waited in line to use them daily. He noted that there were some outdoor ones as well, but they were less utilized in the summer heat.

Ms. Shanahan asked if the plan was to leave the feasibility study in the CIP presently.

Mayor Kelley stated that the other development in that area would come from Flagler County, noting that Hunter's Ridge and Breakaway Trails were built out.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the city charged non-resident fees for the utilization of its facilities. He noted that the fee amount could always be raised, if needed.

Mayor Kelley asked what the feasibility study would be for; whereby, Ms. Shanahan explained that it would be for the aforementioned School Board-owned property adjacent to Pathways Elementary and would see what the need was from the residents in the community. She noted that community meetings would be held like there was with Andy Romano Beachfront Park.

Mayor Kelley asked what the feasibility was that the School Board would give the city the land; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that was part of that process. She explained that the city would need to have a plan to present to the School Board as she did not believe that the School Board would just give the city the land without a plan and without some active involvement and engagement with the school.

Mayor Kelley stated that he believed that it would depend on how it was presented and what they were going to do; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that the feasibility study was needed to determine what the city's plan for the property would be.

Mayor Kelley noted that he hated to waste \$50,000. He explained that he knew community meetings were needed but that it all depended on whether the School Board

was going to give the city the land. He stated that he believed there should be an agreement up front stating that if “x” happened then “y” will happen.

Ms. Shanahan explained that staff asked Mr. Durant to speak to Ms. Morrissey; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that he could talk to Ms. Morrissey. Ms. Shanahan noted that Mr. Durant could answer technical questions. Mayor Kelley stated that the question was whether the School Board would let them have the land or not.

Commissioner Boehm stated that Ms. Morrissey was a member of Volusia County Schools’ staff. He noted that he was in favor of going to the School Board and sitting down with them. He explained that whether Ms. Morrissey agreed or not she was still a staff member and also not the superintendent. He asked Mayor Kelley whether he was going to go to a facilities director to ask whether or not he could do something.

Ms. Shanahan noted that staff was attempting to work the property challenges.

Commissioner Stowers stated that no decision was being made this evening and that it would be coming back to the Commission.

Ms. Shanahan explained that the Commission was making recommendations to staff and that staff would bring back the CIP as part of the capital budget in September.

Commissioner Stowers noted that by then the city would have spoken to Ms. Morrissey.

Mayor Kelley stated that he knew that Ms. Morrissey was a staff member, but it was beneficial to have staff on board. He noted that the city took its staff into consideration.

Commissioner Boehm clarified that he was not suggesting that staff be ignored or for their recommendations to be ignored, but noted that they were not the ones ultimately calling the shots.

Mayor Kelley stated that he went through negotiations with Ms. Morrissey in 1998 and 1999 and she does and did call many shots.

### **Stormwater Drainage Improvements**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$471,600 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for stormwater drainage improvement projects. She stated that those projects included \$171,600 for the Wilmette Avenue pump station, \$50,000 for the Fleming Avenue stormdrain study, and \$250,000 for the corrugated metal pipe rehabilitation project.

Ms. Shanahan stated that on page 218 there was a diagram of the Fleming Avenue storm basin.

Mr. Noble stated that it was not connected to the system and was influenced by the Hickory Village retention pond. He noted that there were some ideas to interconnect some of the systems to take care of the flooding problems and staff would like to have it modeled.

Commissioner Partington stated that this was the last big problem in that area. He noted that it did not take much to flood that area.

Mayor Kelley suggested that since the water ran downhill to the area perhaps they could figure out a way to make the water pump out north.

Mr. Noble stated that Fleming Avenue was one of the lowest roads in the city.

Mayor Kelley asked if anyone had looked at pumps or lower canals running back as a solution.

Mr. Noble stated that they would look at several options and explained that was why they wanted to do the study, in order to come up with a solution to solve the problem once and for all.

Mayor Kelley stated that the first lake did not flood and only flooded the further south that it went. He asked if there was some way to stop all of that from moving. He noted that he did not believe that there was a way to build any larger retention ponds than the one located on the north side.

Mr. Noble stated that there was a canal system that ran up to Center Street, where the water was trying to go. He noted that there was a private ditch located there that the city could not access to maintain.

Mayor Kelley asked why the city could not just tell the ditch's owner that it was causing problems; whereby, Mr. Noble stated that they did do that. Mayor Kelley asked what the response was.

Mr. Noble explained that their lawyers contacted the city's lawyers and it came to a stalemate. He stated that even though the city had ordinances which provided that the city could clean the ditch if the owner was notified that they needed to and failed to do so. He stated there had been legal issues.

Mayor Kelley stated that the canal was causing a lot of the problems.

Ms. Shanahan stated that a solution had to be figured out. She explained that the city thought they knew what the solution was but needed to engineer it to make sure that it would work. She stated that the city could not just go on someone's property and insist they cut trees down.

Mr. Randy Hayes, City Attorney, stated that the ditches were built a long time ago. He noted that most of them were located on private property and so the city could not access the property without the owners' consent. He explained that most of the time the city had good luck getting property owners to participate with the city; but in some cases, such as this, they were not so fortunate. He noted that there had been some claims that the city had to deal with. He stated that there were logistics which made it not as easy in practice as it sounded in concept.

Mayor Kelley stated that only four properties were affected.

Mr. Noble explained that the city had offered to purchase the property and get an easement. He noted that the property owners seemed to be of the opinion that the city was going to go into the property, clear all of the land, and throw dirt up on their banks to cause them flooding problems. He stated that this had been an issue since he began working for the city.

Mayor Kelley suggested that maybe they need to try something else.

Commissioner Partington stated that he agreed with Mayor Kelley and would rather find a way to make the \$50,000 work towards a solution rather than a study. He noted that the problem had probably already been studied.

Mr. Ted MacLeod, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director, explained that it was unfair to call the project a study. He stated that staff had some ideas as to how the problem could be solved. He explained that they wanted to make sure that when they did it they were solving the problem and not creating other ones so modeling had to be done to make sure that whatever they were doing was going to work. He stated that it was not a study but a scientific examination of what they thought would work.

Mayor Kelley asked if there were canals further south and east of there; whereby, Mr. Noble replied that it continued all the way to the railroad ditch.

Mayor Kelley asked if those were open; whereby, Mr. Noble replied that they were once you passed east of Center Street and that the city maintained those.

Mayor Kelley asked if they told the property owners that they were causing other people's homes to flood. He noted that their position seemed unreasonable.

Mr. Hayes explained that the only prescriptive part of the property was where the water was and heavy equipment had to be brought in through the private property in order to access it. He noted that they needed the consent of the property owner to do that. He stated that some individuals did not trust others and were not willing to work with the city. He stated that from a legal perspective it raised some interesting challenges as to whether the city might have a cause of action to file suit against someone to force them to let the city go into their property.

Mayor Kelley again noted that other properties were flooding as a result.

Mr. Hayes stated that the property that was flooded may have a cause of action against the other property owner, but he noted that it would be a civil dispute between those two individuals. He reiterated that the cooperation of the property owners was needed and noted that the city was still trying to obtain that. He stated that it was challenging.

Mayor Kelley suggested that the Mayor or the zone Commissioner should perhaps speak to them and plead with them. He noted that perhaps they did not trust city staff; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that she believed they did not trust government.

Ms. Shanahan suggested leaving the \$50,000 in the CIP as a placeholder for Fleming Avenue storm drainage improvements, whether those funds were used for hydrological modeling, purchasing easements, or for pumping. She noted that she believed there was some possibility of interconnecting some of the stormwater systems that Mr. Noble already believed existed.

Mayor Kelley stated that he would volunteer to talk to the property owners. He noted that the worst they could do was say "no," which they had already done before.

**Technology**

Ms. McGuire stated that the implementation of a replacement program was currently pending the recommendations of the Information Technology Strategic Plan, which was currently being developed.

**Transportation**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$1,540,388 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for transportation projects. She stated that those projects included \$223,000 for Amsden Road rehabilitation, \$589,288 for the Forest Hill Trail, \$50,000 for railroad crossings, \$500,000 for the road resurfacing program, \$40,000 for street light maintenance, \$61,700 for the design of the North US1 sidewalk, \$50,000 for the design of A1A mast arm installation, and \$26,400 for the design of Williamson Boulevard and Hand Avenue pedestrian improvements.

**Vehicle and Equipment Replacement**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$1,260,266 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for vehicle and equipment replacements. She stated that the projects included were the replacement of five advanced life support cardiac monitors for \$100,676, nine general fund vehicles for \$334,776, two stormwater vehicles for \$52,000, six water and wastewater vehicles including a TV inspection vehicle for \$429,885, and replacement of fire engine 94 for \$343,605.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the TV inspection vehicle had television camera equipment that went through the lines which helped to show where repairs needed to be made and what those repairs were.

Mayor Kelley stated that had been contracted out in the past; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that the city had such equipment currently.

Mr. Dave Ponitz, Utilities Manager, stated that there was a capital project to do a more expansive videoing of priority portions of the system, which had began last year. He stated that this TV inspection truck was used by sewer and stormwater crews for repair and troubleshooting on both systems. He confirmed with Public Works Operations Manager Kevin Gray that the truck was 21 years old and had outdated software.

Ms. McGuire confirmed with Mr. Ponitz that the CIP project he was referring to was being performed by a contractor.

Mr. Ponitz explained that he was working with engineering to bid roughly \$250,000 of TV reconnaissance that would culminate in a prioritized report for broken sewer pipes to repair to prevent infiltration.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the vehicle mentioned was mostly for repairing small pieces of the line. She noted that the project that Mr. Ponitz was talking about was a comprehensive citywide look at major lines.

Mr. Ponitz stated that the repair work would be put out to bid to line contractors on an annual basis.

Mayor Kelley stated that he thought that it was also used for water lines.

Mr. Ponitz stated that it was not used for that purpose; whereby, Mayor Kelley asked if they knew water lines had a leak when they collapsed; whereby, Mr. Ponitz stated that customer complaints and the number of leaks that needed to be repaired were also indicators. He noted that there were about a half dozen categories used to prioritize which sections of pipe to replace.

Mr. MacLeod stated that keeping track of the water lines was completely different as they were under pressure and could not be disconnected. He noted that there was also leak detection equipment for the water system.

Mr. Ponitz stated that a lot of time there were sinkholes or customer backup and the TV truck could confirm problems and help them determine the best repair method.

Ms. McGuire noted that a couple of years ago there was a request to replace two fire engines and one was replaced. She explained that when they were replaced they were replaced on a five-year lease purchase agreement. She stated that the current lease purchase agreement ran out and so they would continue that funding amount by purchasing another fire engine.

Commissioner Boehm noted that there were two generators listed within the vehicle replacement section. He stated that he did not know where the backup for them was in the document and noted that he did not see a real justification for why they should be replaced. He noted that he was looking at page 390 of the CIP packet.

Mr. Ponitz stated that there was a section in the water and wastewater section that included the detail about those generators.

Ms. McGuire noted that she believed they intended to consolidate all of the generators together as they were in different places in the CIP. She stated that they would do that before bringing the CIP back to them.

Commissioner Partington asked if engine 94 was at station 93; whereby, Fire Chief Bob Mandarino stated that it was stationed at station 94. He stated that the current engine 94 would go to a reserve status and that the current reserve vehicle would be removed from the fleet.

Mr. Ponitz noted that the detail for the generators that Commissioner Boehm had referenced began on page 440.

### **Water and Wastewater System Improvements**

Ms. McGuire stated that \$7,337,000 was budgeted in FY 2016-17 for water and wastewater improvement projects. She noted that some of the projects were annual or multi-year projects in process and some were new. She stated that those annual or multi-year projects included \$161,000 for phase III of the hydrant replacement project, \$543,000 for phase IV for the city-wide meter replacement program, \$200,000 for general system upgrades, \$690,000 for water storage tank repairs, \$400,000 for lift station rehabilitation, \$100,000 for PEP tank replacements, \$1,575,000 for water main replacement, and \$300,000 for process and instrumentation control improvements. She stated that those new projects included \$193,000 for auxiliary power generators 6M and

4P, \$35,000 for water treatment plant lime slaker unit design, \$18,000 for water treatment plant sodium hypochlorite generator design, \$25,000 for wastewater treatment plant influent pump station VFD engineering, \$720,000 for outfall pipe replacement, \$30,000 for MLS comminutor study, \$562,000 for North Peninsula water system improvements, \$195,000 for sludge dewatering engineering, and \$1,200,000 for water treatment plant solids handling facility upgrades.

Mayor Kelley stated that staff was very efficient in fixing the PEP systems. He noted that he often received compliments regarding that.

Ms. Shanahan asked how many units were located out there; whereby, Mr. Ponitz replied that it was roughly 16,000 to 20,000 in Breakway Trails and nearby areas. He stated that he would be sure to pass Mayor Kelley's compliment on to his crews the next day. He explained that they were one of the more challenging aspects of utilities.

Mayor Kelley noted that he had someone tell him they called at 9:08 and had a member of the crew out there at 9:14. He explained that one resident told him that she had called at night while alone and the crew member had the presence of mind to direct his flashlight onto himself to show his identification to her so that she was not frightened. He noted that he thought that was very good customer service.

Ms. Shanahan stated that all of the projects listed came from the water and wastewater master plan document.

### **Additional Projects Reviewed**

Ms. McGuire stated that additional projects reviewed included replacing the existing restrooms and paving the entrance and roads at Cassen Park, decorative streetlight lighting on the west side of the Granada Bridge in the Ocean District, repairs or demolition of the MacDonald House building, purchase of land and construction of a new facility for the Police Athletic League (PAL), extending the two-way paved roads from Harmony Avenue to Hull Road behind fields nine to 12 at Doug Thomas Way, providing an encounter area and outdoor classroom at the Environmental Discovery Center, converting the Nova Community Park one-way access road to a two-way road, Nova Community Park Master Plan projects, paving the parking at the softball quad, Wendelstedt fields, and Kiwanis soccer fields at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex, replacing the lighting on soccer fields four, five, and six at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex, a public art project providing public art at various city facilities, construction of a new facility to serve the tennis center, construction of a parking area at the Three Chimneys, providing a park with athletic fields, open spaces, and playgrounds in West Ormond, dredging Lisa Lake, phase II of the May 2009 Flood Study, purchasing body cameras for police personnel, expansion of the city's fiber optic network, purchasing in-car cameras for police vehicles, and extending the reclaimed water main on the south peninsula and connecting existing dry lines. She noted that all of those projects were listed on page 650 and totaled almost \$33 million.

Ms. McGuire noted that the Cassen Park improvements were already mentioned earlier in the workshop. She explained that the PAL House project was brought to the city very recently and that as such staff did not have a lot of time to development it. She noted that an estimate was developed based upon the request they received. She explained that the request they received was for a two-story 3,000 to 4,000 square foot building. She noted that staff did not know if that was really the need. She stated that the request

came in just as the CIP was being finalized. She explained that the need would be looked into, including whether purchasing land and building a new facility was the way to go, or if an existing property could be purchased which would be sufficient.

Ms. McGuire stated that the public art project came up at a Leisure Services Advisory Board meeting. She explained that staff would attempt to address that on a smaller scale within the operating budget. She noted that the body cameras were a new request as were the in-car cameras.

Ms. Shanahan explained that they were waiting for the Volusia County Sheriff's Office to make a decision on the contract provider that they were going to use. She noted that the cameras themselves were not very expensive but explained that storing the data from the cameras was where most of the costs would be allocated. She stated that the data also had to be redacted for public records requests and explained that it had to be redacted frame by frame. She stated that she was unsure whether they would be ready to move forward this year with the cameras and noted that she hoped to apply for some grant opportunities for them.

Ms. McGuire stated that the draft CIP was reviewed by the Aviation Advisory Board, Leisure Services Advisory Board, Public Works Advisory Board, Quality of Life Advisory Board, and Ormond Beach Main Street. She noted that all boards approved the CIP as it was presented. She explained that the Leisure Services Advisory Board recommended funding an additional \$1.5 million in projects to the five-year plan. She stated that those projects included the construction of a PAL House, the lighting for soccer fields four through six, Ormond Beach Sports Complex access and drainage, and Three Chimneys parking.

### **Commission Comments**

Commissioner Partington stated that if there was a way to move up the completion of the perimeter road at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex, he would be in favor of doing so.

Ms. Shanahan asked which year Commissioner Partington would prefer it be moved to; whereby, Commissioner Partington replied next year or the year after that.

Commissioner Partington stated that there was almost \$1 million or more budgeted for parking lots. He noted that the parking lot that was completed for the overflow for the northwest soccer field near the Harmony Avenue entrance was done for about \$40,000. He stated that it was not paved, but it was working extremely well. He suggested replacing the other scheduled parking lots with something similar, which was more cost effective, and could free up funds to complete the perimeter road.

Commissioner Partington stated that he did not understand the \$700,000 figure for the PAL House. He noted that he thought that was a wild estimate. He stated that he understood that it was hard for staff to determine an estimate when they did not know exactly what the facility would entail. He explained that he would prefer that a number not even be assigned to it and that it just be included as an unbudgeted request that could cost up to x amount of dollars. He noted that he would prefer to see that project moved forward within the next year or two, if possible.

Commissioner Partington stated that a suggestion for traffic calming at the north entrance road to the Nova Community Center was brought to his attention. He noted that

traffic calming was in place at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex. He explained that people late for practice or rushing were speeding through that area. He asked if there was a way to implement all LED lighting at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex and wondered what the savings would be from doing so. He noted that those savings could potentially be used to complete some of the projects listed in the out years. He noted that a Leisure Services Advisory Board member brought that up and it made a lot of sense to him.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the PAL House request was made when the CIP was already completed. She noted that PAL provided their wish list and staff did not have a chance to vet it and just attempted to put a number to it. She explained that it was not a vetted project and did not have a vetted cost associated with it. She stated that staff did an admirable job vetting the costs of all the current year CIP projects. She noted that staff focused their efforts on projects which would receive funding next year.

Mayor Kelley noted that Commissioner Boehm had once made the point that items put in without good cost estimates often would be pushed out and would not be done. He stated that he believed that this was what Commissioner Partington was suggesting.

Commissioner Partington noted that Ms. McGuire had mentioned putting in a sixth year for the unfunded projects. He asked her if those sixth year items would receive priority from staff for grant funding applications.

Ms. Shanahan stated that if there was a grant funding opportunity staff would look for it. She explained that they wanted to get away from the unfunded list, which contained some ridiculous items like the dredging of Lisa Lake. She noted that this was a private project involving property owners.

Commissioner Partington asked to not get started on Lisa Lake. He noted that he could speak about the history of that and about what the city did for those residents that they did not really deserve.

Ms. Shanahan noted that there were some such projects that had been on the unfunded list forever. She stated that many projects did move from the unfunded to the funded list. She explained that staff's goal, for greater transparency and less confusion, was to create a sixth year, or an out year--beyond the five-year window, where no revenue source would be attributed but the project would be included with the rest of the CIP.

Commissioner Stowers stated that personally he did not like the idea of creating a sixth year as it would give the impression that those projects were approved or scheduled somewhere. He noted that he liked the separate list. He explained that he would like to go through and have some sort of informal consensus vote regarding where they stood on those projects. He explained that some of the projects just continued to linger, and he had no idea if one or any Commissioners were behind them or not. He noted that one size did not fit all with regards to the projects on the list and that some of them clearly had more merit than others. He suggested that if projects like Lisa Lake had to stay on the list that they are assigned a zero out of five, or some similar ranking, to denote that the current Commission was not interested.

Ms. Shanahan stated that most of the unfunded projects came from the advisory boards.

Commissioner Stowers noted that he struggled over the years with certain projects always being on the list and being kicked down the road year after year.

Mayor Kelley stated that he did not know if there needed to be a sixth year. He asked if the sixth year projects would move up to the fifth year the following year. Ms. Shanahan and Ms. McGuire stated that they would not necessarily. Ms. Shanahan stated that the category would be called future years and not sixth year. Mayor Kelley stated that calling it out years was also acceptable.

### **III. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:51 p.m.

Transcribed by: Colby Cilento