

**MINUTES
CITY OF ORMOND BEACH
CITY COMMISSION
STRATEGIC PLANNING**

March 7, 2017

4:15 p.m.

City Commission Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Bill Partington called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

Present were Mayor Bill Partington, Commissioners Dwight Selby, Troy Kent, Rick Boehm and Rob Littleton, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director Ted MacLeod, Leisure Services Director Robert Carolin, Planning Director Ric Goss, Public Works Operations Manager Kevin Gray, Information Technology Director Ned Huhta, Fire Battalion Commander Dave King, Economic Development Director Joe Mannarino, Finance Director Kelly McGuire, City Clerk Scott McKee, Grants Coordinator and Public Information Officer Loretta Moisiso, City Engineer John Noble, Utilities Manager Dave Ponitz, Police Captain Lisa Rosenthal, Human Resources Director Claire Whitley, and Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida.

II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, stated that the city had asked Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, to return and once again lead the City Commission in their strategic planning. She explained that Ms. Crotty had facilitated some citizen engagement meetings and a Strategic Planning Workshop with the Commission in 2015. She noted that Ms. Crotty performed such exercises all over the state. She stated that Ms. Crotty could attest to the fact that Ormond Beach was among the few cities that actually undertook a strategic planning process. She explained that having a strategic plan was enormously helpful for the staff, as it provided guidance during budget development, and detailed the vision and direction that the Commission had for the city.

Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, noted that Ms. Shanahan was correct in stating that Ormond Beach was in the minority of communities that engaged in this type of process. She explained that those that did not just functioned from meeting to meeting, being ruled by whatever the issue of the day was. She noted that the issue of the day was often driven by the most vocal minority in the base at the time. She stated that Ormond Beach had a plan, and noted that it appeared from the information that she received that the city had been actively working on their plan. She noted that that was another unique aspect of Ormond Beach. She explained that she often facilitated these types of workshops for cities and then had no idea whether they were implementing their plan at all. She stated that it was good to work with a community which took its planning seriously.

Ms. Crotty noted that there were two newly elected officials on the Commission, Commissioner Selby and Commissioner Littleton. She stated that it was important to undertake an updating of the plan now due to their addition. She stated that the new Commissioners could have a say in the plan now, and that the returning Commissioners

and the Mayor could reaffirm their goals, or change directions. She noted that she would not suggest that a lot be added to the plan, noting limited resources. She explained that every community only had so much money, time, and employees to dedicate towards its goals. She stated that the key to a successful strategic plan was that it was realistic and implementable. She noted that an unrealistic wish list would not help the city continue its success.

Ms. Crotty asked permission to refer to the members of the Commission by their first names. She noted that she would not request that leeway at a formal Commission meeting, explaining that since this was a workshop she preferred to be more informal. She stated that the city's directors were also in attendance and were available to add their knowledge and expertise to some of the issues that may arise or be discussed. She noted that she was very comfortable with staff interacting and that she may call on staff members if answers or additional information were needed.

Ms. Shanahan noted that Fire Chief Bob Mandarino and Police Chief Jesse Godfrey were unavailable and that Battalion Commander King and Captain Rosenthal were filling in for them.

Ms. Crotty noted that the Commission had a regular City Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. that evening and thus would need to complete their strategic planning prior to that time. She further noted that a brief dinner break would be taken around approximately 5:45 p.m.

III. REVIEW STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Ms. Crotty recapped the strategic planning process undertaken two years prior. She stated that there had been great public participation at the Community Conversation Workshops, which had been open for the public. She noted that there were no members of the public present at that evening's workshop. She explained that two years prior there had been quite a few audience members at the City Commission's Strategic Planning Workshop. She stated that there had been a huge interest at that time in historic preservation. She noted that she believed there had been some activity spurring that interest at the time, and that many advocates for that issue attended the workshops.

Ms. Shanahan explained that there was a workshop two weeks prior that focused on some of those historic issues. She noted that she believed that was probably the reason for the low attendance at this workshop, as that prior workshop had been very well attended.

Ms. Crotty stated that after the strategic planning, the Commission would end up with a series of goals. She noted that she usually recommended five to seven goals. She stated that the Commission determined seven goals previously. She explained that under each of those goals there would be a series of objectives, which were actually the implementable pieces of the plan. She noted that she would then request that the focus be narrowed because frequently a Commission would determine too many objectives. She explained that the Commissioners would be asked to select priorities from among the many objectives identified. She stated that the priorities were the tasks which the city's staff was to focus on.

Ms. Crotty noted that she was not surprised when she saw the update on the plan that Ms. Shanahan had provided. She explained that Ormond Beach contained a bunch of

overachievers who took on what they were asked to take on and more. She noted that she believed that she had clearly instructed the Commission not to expect that work would be performed on objectives that were not priorities, but explained that that was in fact done. She reiterated that the idea was to focus on the priorities, explaining that the rest of the objectives would stay in the plan but that there was to be no expectation for them. She noted that work had been performed on a lot of the objectives in the city's plan, in addition to the priorities.

Ms. Crotty explained that they would reassess the goals and objectives, adding and deleting as necessary, and that the Commission would again select priorities from the objectives. She noted that it was significant that the process was being undertaken at that time of year, as the budget would be driven by the results of the strategic plan. She reiterated that the expectation would be for the priority objectives to be funded. She asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Commissioner Selby referenced the seven goals. He asked whether there was a universal standard for the goals or if those were decided by what was important to the Commission at that time.

Ms. Crotty explained that those were determined by the Commission and also from input from the citizens. She noted that the previous Commission had participated in a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats environmental assessment, and then brainstormed strategic issues in order to form them into goal categories. She complimented Ms. Shanahan and staff for the goal statements that were written into the existing plan. She explained that "economic development," for example, was goal shorthand, and that the actual goal was the longer, more fleshed-out goal statement. She noted that staff was charged with writing a goal statement that was more meaningful to the community. She stated that she thought that the statements that had been written for each goal were rather good. She noted that she had just visited a city which she continually instructed to write goal statements, and which was still just using goal shorthand.

Ms. Shanahan stated that Mr. Ric Goss, Planning Director, was chiefly responsible for the goal statements; whereby, Ms. Crotty stated that Mr. Goss could probably contract with some other local governments to write their goal statements.

Ms. Crotty listed the seven goal areas previously identified – economic development, fiscal sustainability, infrastructure, technology, quality of life, human resources, and intergovernmental relations. She noted that some had priority objectives and some did not. She stated that she wanted to examine those goals. She stated that goals were not specific, and not measurable, but did identify a need. She referred to the fleshed-out goal statements defining the goals and read the one for economic development, as an example, as follows: "*To provide a thriving economic environment in Ormond Beach consistent with existing plans for development and redevelopment.*" She noted that that did not explain what the city would do, who was going to do it, how it would be done, or when it would be done. She stated that it just set out a goal.

Ms. Crotty explained that goals did not frequently change from year to year because they were timeless, global, and fairly expansive. She noted that they could change however. She stated that perhaps a goal would change if the city were no longer interested in a certain area, or if an area that was a focus point at the time could now be folded into another existing goal. She noted that "technology" was listed as a stand-

alone goal. She explained that many communities listed technology under “infrastructure”. She noted that technology could be an objective under an infrastructure goal if it did not require special attention. She explained that she was not telling them how to organize their goals, but was illustrating an example of how a goal could shift over time to an objective under another goal. She noted that there could also be something that was not addressed in the prior plan which was now a significant issue in the community and did not fit under any of the existing goals.

Ms. Crotty stated that she wished to open up discussion to the Commission. She noted that if any staff member felt that there was anything out there, which could not be accomplished under the seven goal areas, she would allow them to raise that issue, but explained that it would be up to a member of the Commission to advocate for its inclusion.

Goals

Commissioner Boehm stated that Taxiway G was done and that the next step would be to open up the southwest quadrant at the airport in order to further develop the Airport Business Park. Commissioner Boehm stated that he thought one of their goals under economic development should be to further support the development of business at the airport. He stated that Taxiway G had not been completed two years ago during the prior strategic planning. He explained that Taxiway G had to be completed in order for the land to be opened up so that additional sites were available to develop more businesses out at the airport.

Mr. Joe Mannarino, Economic Development Director, stated that in this year’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP), two roads would be constructed to access the southwest quadrant from the Airport Business Park. He stated that they were in the process of having some engineering work performed, and some land acquisition worked on, explaining that there were some issues with one of the roadways that they needed access to. He stated that there would be designs for a roadway system and for parcels within the southwest quadrant.

Commissioner Boehm noted that there were limitations as to what sites the city owned that could be developed to encourage business. He stated that the past Commission had been strongly in favor of supporting business. He explained that this was one area that had been developed within the past two years. He stated that he felt that supporting the development of the southwest quadrant, and further business expansion at the airport, should be an objective under “economic development.”

Ms. Crotty noted that the goal was still “economic development” but confirmed that Commissioner Boehm felt this needed to be a new objective under that goal category. She explained that she did not want to move into the objectives yet and first wanted to affirm or change the seven goals. She further explained that after they decided upon the goals, then they would move into the objectives for each goal area.

Mr. Mannarino stated that the city had a Strategic Economic Development Plan which was approved by the City Commission on November 1, 2016. He noted that the objective that Commissioner Boehm mentioned was contained in that plan.

Mayor Partington noted that staff had done great work on many of the previously identified objectives, and referenced New Britain Avenue and Lincoln Avenue as an example. He stated that that could fall off the list.

Ms. Crotty stated that after they affirmed the goal areas, they would go through the objectives to improve and identify new ones.

Mayor Partington noted that Commissioner Selby and Commissioner Littleton were fresh off the campaign trail, and encouraged them to add items that they heard from the residents that were not submitted as part of the public process previously.

Commissioner Littleton addressed the “technology” goal area. He stated that it looked like every objective under that category had been completed.

Mayor Partington noted that the Information Technology (IT) Master Plan was not in place yet.

Commissioner Selby joked that the IT department could be done away with, since their objectives were all completed.

Ms. Crotty stated that she thought that perhaps Commissioner Littleton was suggesting that technology could be an objective under another goal, such as “infrastructure.”

Ms. Shanahan asked if there were any goals that the Commission wished to do away with; whereby, Commissioner Selby suggested reviewing the goals one-by-one.

Commissioner Selby asked if anyone objected to “**economic development**” remaining a goal; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted that there were no objections.

Ms. Crotty stated that the next goal was “**fiscal sustainability.**” She noted that it would be highly unlikely that that goal would no longer be needed. She suggested that goal remain.

Mr. Ned Huhta, Information Technology Director, noted that the description for the infrastructure goal referenced technology; whereby, Ms. Crotty confirmed the reference. She asked whether there were any objections to “**infrastructure**” continuing to be a goal area; whereby, no objections were recorded.

Ms. Crotty referenced the existing “technology” goal category. She addressed Mr. Huhta and asked his opinion; whereby, Mr. Huhta stated that he was comfortable with technology becoming an objective of the “infrastructure” goal area.

Mayor Partington stated that he felt that “technology” still needed to be focused on as a separate goal. He noted that a lot of younger residents strictly wanted to communicate through text messaging. He stated that he did not know that the government was set up to be responsive to their needs via text messaging yet.

Ms. Shanahan stated that it was not because those messages could not be captured to comply with public record laws. She explained that if she received a text message on her phone that was business related she had to e-mail it to herself to preserve it as a public record. She stated that she thought that the most important part of this particular goal was the civic engagement piece. She noted that she felt it warranted maintaining as a separate goal for issues of civic engagement and transparency. She stated that her opinion would be to continue to maintain it as a separate goal. She noted that the priorities would probably change.

Ms. Crotty asked if the goal was really “technology” or if it was “civic engagement.”

Mayor Partington stated that he felt it to be “technology”; whereby, Ms. Crotty asked if it should be able technology as a means for engaging the citizenry.

Commissioner Kent stated that he wished to keep “technology” as its own goal. He noted that he felt that the way that it was currently stated was perfect. He stated that some objectives may change.

Commissioner Boehm agreed with Commissioner Kent. He noted that cell phone connectivity was still an issue, as were some of the other objectives. He stated that he thought that “technology” needed to stand alone as a category, rather than be wrapped into another. He joked that Mr. Huhta should still have a department.

Ms. Crotty noted that it seemed like they wanted to keep “technology” as a goal and stated that that was fine. She explained that a lot of communities had public safety as a goal, and noted that it was not presently one of theirs. She noted that she was not suggesting that they should do that.

Commissioner Kent stated that “quality of life” was a goal; whereby, Ms. Crotty stated that that could be incorporated into “quality of life”. She noted that the police department and fire department’s inclusion into the “quality of life” goal did not diminish their level of service or public safety. Commissioner Kent stated that he would add that as an objective under “quality of life”. He noted that in order to provide a secure quality of life, the city had to have a superior police, fire, leisure services, and public works department.

Ms. Crotty reiterated that the majority of the Commission desired to keep “technology” as a goal. She referenced the “**quality of life**” goal. She noted that she doubted anyone wanted to eliminate that. She referenced the “human resources” goal. She explained that that goal was an acknowledgement that one of the city’s greatest strengths was its staff. She noted that the idea was to attract and retain a high quality staff. She asked if that goal needed changing.

Commissioner Selby noted that of the three objectives listed under the goal of “human resources”, the highest score any received from the Commission was two out of five. He asked what that said; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted that it did say something.

Commissioner Boehm explained that each member of the Commission was given stickers to place on the objectives that they felt should be priorities. He further explained that each member of the Commission only received a limited number of stickers to divvy up between all of the various objectives under all seven goal categories.

Ms. Crotty stated that again the Commission would be provided with stickers to select their most important priorities. She noted that if they were given too many stickers, everything would rise to the same level of importance. She explained that she did not think that the rankings those “human resources” objectives received were meant to be of diminishment to staff.

Mayor Partington asked if “human resources” was a goal that could fall under “quality of life”; whereby, Commissioner Kent noted that he was thinking the exact same thing.

Ms. Crotty noted that its placement there may subsume that category even further. She explained that there was always huge overlap between the categories, noting that everything was dependent on fiscal sustainability. She noted that most all of the objectives were dependent on staff, as it was staff's job to implement them. She stated that if everything was subsumed under "quality of life", some of the objectives could lose their importance. She noted that she felt that it would send a message to staff that there was no goal.

Commissioner Boehm stated that "quality of life" referred to all of the city's citizens while "human resources" dealt with, in essence, how the city treated its staff and what benefits they provided to them. He noted that it was a narrow area and he thought it was best served as its own independent goal. He explained that those areas were dealt with separately.

Mayor Partington asked if new objectives were needed; whereby, Ms. Crotty stated that new ones may be determined.

Commissioner Selby stated that it seemed pointless to have a goal with no objectives.

Ms. Crotty stated that it currently contained objectives; whereby, Commissioner Boehm noted that some things were still being worked on. Ms. Crotty noted the lack of priorities.

Commissioner Selby stated that there had been reference to the objectives being accomplished and some doubt about new objectives. He stated that there should only be a goal if there was something to accomplish.

Commissioner Littleton noted that he was concerned that it seemed that the goals were rather concrete.

Ms. Shanahan stated that goals could be removed; whereby, Commissioner Littleton noted that none had been removed yet.

Ms. Crotty explained that a strategic plan was never set in stone and needed to be flexible. She stated that it had to be able to adapt and change as situations and circumstances changed. She noted that there was no compulsion just to change for the sake of change either. She explained that goals frequently continued on year after year, noting that objectives changed more regularly.

Ms. Shanahan stated that once they drilled down to objectives, they would find new things rising to the surface. She noted that there would likely be different objectives, even under the category of "human resources". She stated that she was sure that Human Resources Director Claire Whitley had some ideas. She noted that the goals were meant to be very broad statements. She explained that specificity was obtained through the formulation of objectives.

Ms. Crotty stated that the goals sent a message to the community, and to staff, about what was important to the Commission. She asked what the Commission wanted to do with the "**human resources**" goal.

Commissioner Selby stated that they could reserve judgment until later.

Ms. Crotty stated that another goal category without priorities was “intergovernmental relations”.

Commissioner Kent stated that they could get rid of that one; whereby, Mayor Partington stated that he felt it should be kept. Mayor Partington noted that it was exhausting to cooperate with sister cities and the county, but explained that it was important to keep those relationships. He noted that they had benefitted the city over the last 13 years, as opposed to a prior period where the city was rather isolated and not as cooperative with others.

Ms. Crotty noted that there were also regional entities, such as the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO), the St. John’s River Water Management District (SJRWMD), and others, that the city dealt with. She stated that it was up to the Commission whether they wanted that as a goal area or not.

Commissioner Kent explained that they would still do be a part of those organizations, and participate with other governments, but he was not certain it needed to be one of the city’s goals.

Commissioner Littleton stated that he did not know how much more the city could accomplish in that arena. He noted that the county recently bought land out from Daytona Beach.

Ms. Crotty stated that she would think any advocacy efforts the city was making, whether supporting or opposing legislation, would fall under this category. She noted that, as Commissioner Kent stated, that could still be done without it being a goal.

Ms. Shanahan explained that she felt that it sent a message to other communities that the city valued those relationships and treated them as a priority. She noted that she fundamentally believed that some of the presently listed objectives would change.

Ms. Crotty noted that ultimately the Commission determined what goals and objectives remained.

Commissioner Selby questioned the title of the goal. He stated that this was sort of the golden rule category, noting that they would want others to treat them the way that they would want to be treated. He stated that the city was not an island unto themselves, and noted that they depended on a symbiotic relationship with other entities. He suggested that there might be a better term than “intergovernmental relations”, noting that that sounded very bureaucratic.

Ms. Crotty noted that that was the shorthand term and that the goal statement was more fleshed-out.

Commissioner Selby stated that their relationships were not just with other intergovernmental agencies. He suggested something more along the line of “community relations”. He noted that their relationships also included working with the United Way and other agencies.

Ms. Crotty noted that that was a good point. She suggested that the goal could be expanded and reference building and maintaining strong relationships with the community and government partners.

Mayor Partington suggested calling it “**external relations**”; whereby, Commissioner Selby agreed.

Ms. Crotty suggested adding building and maintaining strong relationships with the community and government partners to the goal statement.

IV. WHAT’S WORKING / WHAT NEEDS WORK

Ms. Crotty stated that she wanted the Commission to quickly brainstorm about things that were going really well in the city, which they were pleased with the progress on, and about things that needed work still. She noted that staff could participate in this discussion.

Commissioner Kent stated that leisure service activities were going very well.

Commissioner Boehm stated that in last year’s budget the city took in more revenue and spent less money in every department. He noted that he thought that the entire city staff was on board with only spending money when it was necessary. He stated that Ms. McGuire was an award winning Finance Director and had proven year after year how to manage a budget well. He noted that Ms. Shanahan had done a great job overseeing that also. He stated that fiscal management was working well in the city; whereby, Commissioner Kent agreed.

Ms. Crotty stated that that was really great. She asked if the city was building its reserves; whereby, Commissioner Boehm noted that there had been a hurricane the previous year.

Commissioner Selby stated that transparency worked well in the city. He noted that Ormond Beach had a philosophy of transparency. He stated that that the city was incredibly good about being transparent, noting that that helped to build trust.

Commissioner Kent noted that the city’s response time to emergencies, in the police, fire, and public works departments, as well as the City Manager’s office, was commendable. He stated that the response time for emergencies, and also Commissioner’s concerns, was very good.

Ms. Crotty asked if police and fire were well within the national standards; whereby, Commissioner Kent explained that they consistently beat national standards and made another organization, which performed transport services, look ridiculous.

Mayor Partington stated that he thought that economic development was going well. He noted that Mr. Mannarino had earned awards. He stated that new businesses were coming in and noted that current businesses were being retained.

Ms. Shanahan stated that electronic permitting was working very well and was well received by the community. She noted that she had received a few questions that week, and was able to share answers to the inquirer, regarding when a permit was received and reviewed, based on that system. She stated that it helped track the process.

Ms. Crotty asked if the public had access to that; whereby, Mr. Goss confirmed that access was provided to the public.

Commissioner Kent stated that he believed that the city's millage rate, water rates, and waste rates were working. He noted that there were not throngs of people, or anyone in recent memory, coming in to complain about the city's price structure for its services. He noted that leisure service fees could be included in that as well. He stated that the pricing was appropriate, and noted that the city's rate was consistently one of the lowest in the area. He stated that this Commission, and prior Commissions, had done a great job in making sure that Ormond Beach's financial house was in order.

Ms. Crotty noted that that also helped with economic development.

Ms. Shanahan stated that Commission leadership had been important in the community. She explained that the Commission set the agenda and worked to consensus. She noted that that had lent support in economic development because businesses felt safe investing in a stable community.

Commissioner Kent noted that that had also kept a good manager like Ms. Shanahan in a position for a decent amount of time, when compared to national and state norms. He stated that the city also had a very effective and efficient legal department.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the entire staff could be credited. He noted that all of the city's senior leadership staff in attendance was also with the city two years ago during the last Strategic Planning Workshop. He stated that that was reflective of Ms. Shanahan and Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director Ted MacLeod's leadership. He noted that the senior staff stayed with the city and did not have discourse and battles between departments.

Commissioner Kent stated that there had been very little turnover in Ms. Shanahan's senior staff and that many of them were very long-serving.

Ms. Crotty noted that when the economy was in the downturn jobs were unavailable, but explained that now that it was recovering there was greater demand for some of the expertise that the city staff had. She noted that they were choosing to stay with Ormond Beach because it was a good environment.

Commissioner Kent stated that there was also a benefit in working for a Commission that worked together well and supported them.

Ms. Crotty noted that they all knew of other communities where there was a toxic environment.

Mayor Partington stated that water and wastewater functioned well. He noted the updated Utilities Master Plan. He explained that he had been with the city at a time when those entities were not functioning as well and thus was appreciative of how they currently operated. He stated that another area which was working well was the dedicated millage.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the city had internal dedicated millage rates.

Mr. Ted MacLeod, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director, stated that some of the major issues they had tackled were the health care issue and the pay and classification plan update.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the Airport Master Plan was adopted, being effectuated, and that there was an overall long-term goal that they were working towards.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city's growth assistance plan (GAP) to incentivize businesses to grow and remain in the city was working well and had been very effective.

Ms. Crotty noted that frequently communities looked for new businesses and neglected to support existing ones.

Mr. Mannarino stated that some of the comments he received when new companies visited the area was about the cleanliness of the city. He noted that they compared it to Disney World.

Commissioner Kent explained that he observed two city employees in orange vests on the Granada Bridge picking up debris every morning when he drove to work. He stated that another thing that was working well was the replacement of watermains throughout the city.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the city's reclaimed water program was also successful.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the police department's community outreach had been very effective.

Ms. Crotty asked what was not working as well as it could be or should be. She asked what needed improvement.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city's enterprise software solution was being implemented, and a portion of it would be going live on May 1, 2017. She noted that great work had been done so far but that they needed to press on with it. She stated that this was year one of a three-year project.

Commissioner Selby noted that Ms. Shanahan did not have a problem with it and that it just needed more work.

Commissioner Kent stated that the city needed assistance from the Volusia County Sheriff's Office and/or more boots on the ground in the police department, in order to keep thugs and thieves out of the community. He noted that this was a national problem and not unique to Ormond Beach. He stated that he could become quickly incensed when hearing about the number of vehicles in the city that were broken into. He noted that the police department had been addressing that, but felt that additional assistance could help. He explained that he thought that the city's police department did a great job, and noted that he could tell stories about the city's officers throwing stop sticks out to try and stop the criminals. He noted that the police were operating within the confines of the law and their resources. He stated that that was an issue that concerned him often.

Commissioner Boehm stated that Ormond Beach was part of the county, state, and national problem of homelessness. He noted that the city was willing, and had budgeted, to participate, but explained that no entity had successfully developed any sort of plan that could be widely agreed upon.

Commissioner Boehm stated that everyone would like to see Ormond Crossings become something other than a myth. He noted that the specter of Ormond Crossings had been in existence since Commissioner Kent and Mayor Partington had been on the Commission.

Commissioner Littleton mentioned the traffic on Granada Boulevard.

Mayor Partington stated that help was on the way with that. He noted that a traffic control integration system would be installed in 2019.

Ms. Shanahan explained that that system would integrate the traffic lights to coordinate them to move the traffic more efficiently; whereby, Commissioner Kent expressed incredulosity that that was not already being done.

Mr. John Noble, City Engineer, stated that pedestrian safety was also a big issue that was being worked on.

Ms. Crotty noted that a report was recently released regarding that topic; whereby, Mr. Noble that Volusia County had ranked fairly low in that report.

Commissioner Littleton suggested adding bicyclist safety as well.

Ms. Shanahan referenced crosswalks, noting that that was part of pedestrian safety, and explained that the city had been working with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) regarding those. She noted that it felt like it took several years to get anything from FDOT. She stated that they were discussing crosswalks on A1A and other areas that needed assistance to get pedestrians safely across roadways.

Commissioner Kent thanked Ms. Shanahan for mentioning that. He stated that rising healthcare costs were another issue.

Commissioner Boehm brought up cell phone connectivity, noting that it had been discussed numerous times over the years.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city had an aging workforce. She explained that the city needed to have a plan to replace those workers. She noted that there were two individuals in the room that were retiring that year.

Commissioner Kent noted that one of those individuals was Mr. MacLeod and asked Ms. Shanahan, who the other was; whereby, Ms. Shanahan identified Mr. Goss.

Ms. Crotty stated that Ms. Shanahan was talking about having succession plans. She noted that there was a huge wave of baby boomers leaving the workforce and taking their institutional knowledge along with them.

Mr. Robert Carolin, Leisure Services Director, stated that another thing to be worked on in the community was beach access; whereby, Commissioner Kent enthusiastically agreed.

Commissioner Selby referenced Ms. Shanahan's comments about an aging workforce. He stated that Ormond Beach had a very senior population. He noted that the city's

median age was very high. He explained that the community did not do a very good job of retaining young people, or attracting young people, to the area. He stated that the community's youth was being exported. He noted that that related to career opportunities as well as housing. He stated that the city also did not have a very diverse housing stock. He noted that Ormond Beach was pretty monolithic with regards to the type of housing that it contained.

Mayor Partington referenced the Olive Grove Apartments, located on Granada Boulevard. He explained that those were fixed income apartments and affordable housing. He noted that he called looking for a one-bedroom apartment for someone and was told that they had 400 people on a waiting list, and 250 on a waiting list for a two-bedroom apartment. He stated that homes in the area were also selling as fast as they were put on the market, maybe even faster.

Commissioner Boehm noted that Ormond Renaissance Condominiums was getting ready to be built. He stated that he read that there would be a 100-unit complex on Interchange Boulevard. He noted that one of problems that the county had was that it was attracting businesses like outlet malls and distribution warehouses, which all created low-paying service jobs. He stated that, like Commissioner Selby said, there were not jobs in this area for college graduates who grew up here to return home for. He noted that industries that paid well were not coming to the area. He explained that Mr. Mannarino worked towards that and had managed to bring in businesses with above-average wages in the Airport Business Park. He stated that without jobs for younger people, no one would build housing for younger people.

Commissioner Selby stated that the problem was made more complex because the educated young people would leave the area, and those who were left would be uneducated, perhaps even without their high school diplomas. He noted that employers needed a capable workforce. He stated that it was a big problem and they needed to seriously consider how to turn that ship in a different direction.

Ms. Crotty noted that the only light she could see was that there were many jobs now that could be done remotely by telecommuting. She stated that if Ormond Beach was seen as a safe, clean, quality community, people could choose to live there and telecommute to work.

Commissioner Kent stated that the former Food Lion property needed work. He noted that A1A also needed to continue to receive a facelift. He explained that that would happen with continued beach access so that locals and visitors could utilize the beach. He noted that only when that happened would there be a transformation on A1A. He explained that former New Smyrna Beach Mayor Adam Barringer had told him that New Smyrna Beach's beachside would become a ghost town if the Flagler Avenue beach ramp was shut down, like some of Ormond Beach's ramps were.

Mr. Dave Ponitz, Utilities Manager, stated that, similar to the enterprise resource system implementation, his department was working on the implementation of a supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system and instrument controls, which was also a three-year program.

Commissioner Selby noted that he had a couple issues that he saw potentially on the horizon. He stated that one was the fact that all five of the elected officials in Ormond

Beach had two year terms and that they were all the concurrent terms. He noted that that was a potential disaster waiting to happen.

Ms. Crotty agreed, referring to the situation as a time bomb. She noted that Ormond Beach had been fortunate to not yet have the entire Commission turn over in an election. She stated that that was a possibility and could be a disaster, noting that it could potentially be a disaster every two years. She noted that she and Ms. Shanahan had spoken about it before. She stated that she believed that Ormond Beach was the only city she knew of that did not stagger their terms. She noted that many cities were also moving away from the two year terms to longer term lengths.

Commissioner Kent noted that that question had been brought to the city's voters at least twice, possibly three times. He stated that each time it had failed to pass. He explained that neighboring cities had been granted staggered or longer terms by their constituents in referendums, but that Ormond Beach residents had not approved similar measures.

Ms. Crotty noted that trust was mentioned earlier. She stated that obviously the citizens did not trust them if they wanted to maintain the ability to turn them all over at the same time.

Commissioner Kent stated that that depended on how they looked in the mirror. He explained that he had been told by constituents that they trusted him very much and that was why they elected him, but they also noted that as soon as they did not trust him, they would vote him out.

Ms. Crotty stated that it was an interesting dichotomy. She noted that she was unsure how aware the citizens were about what would happen if the entire Commission was taken out of office and some crazy political movement captured those seats.

Mayor Partington stated that staggered three year terms may be something to talk about.

Ms. Crotty noted that she was not sure they could do anything else about it other than periodically educate their citizens. She stated that it was a lurking danger, and again noted how fortunate the city had been to be so stable.

Commissioner Selby stated that the other item lurking out there was the 75-foot height limitation in the city's charter. He noted that he believed they would look back on that and see that it stymied the redevelopment of the city, particularly in the oceanfront area.

Ms. Crotty asked whether the limitation was throughout the city; whereby, Commissioner Selby replied that it was.

Commissioner Littleton stated that downtown parking was also an issue. He noted that people needed to at least be made aware of what parking there currently was available.

Commissioner Kent noted that he would put the height limitation in the charter on the list of what was working. He explained that that decision had been the most expensive election in Volusia County history and that the other side was walloped in it. He noted that the members of the Ormond Beach community wanted to keep a low-rise character

in the city. He stated that part of that conversation would also be looking at how well that was working out for Daytona Beach.

Ms. Crotty stated that she had worked with many beach communities in different counties. She noted that this was a very emotional issue. She stated that St. Augustine revised their charter and strengthened their height limit. She noted that their citizens trusted their current City Commission but did not know what the next one would do.

Commissioner Kent noted that it could be changed but it had to go back to the citizens for a vote.

Ms. Crotty stated that some cities had height limits just in certain parts of the city. She noted that Titusville had some development on Interstate 95 that they could not allow because of it.

V. AFFIRMATION / REVISION

Ms. Crotty stated that some of the ideas they just discussed should spur their thoughts for objectives.

Objectives – “Economic Development”

Commissioner Boehm stated that an objective under the “economic development” goal should be the “**development of the southwest quadrant at the airport.**” He noted that Mr. Mannarino was working towards it, but he thought that supporting that development should be a priority objective. He stated that it was important to attract businesses there and noted that the type of business that Mr. Mannarino attracted paid more than the average.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she believed that the “**continued implementation of the Strategic Economic Development Plan**” needed to remain an objective. She noted that it had just been updated.

Ms. Crotty noted that staff could make suggestions but explained that for it to be added to the list a member of the Commission must approve it.

Commissioner Boehm explained that what he had suggested was actually part of the Strategic Economic Development Plan but that he had selected for it to be focused on separately because he felt it was very important. He agreed with Ms. Shanahan that the plan should be continued to be implemented.

Commissioner Littleton stated that he would like to make Ormond Crossings a priority objective. He noted that he believed that to be in the Strategic Economic Development Plan and did not just want to repeat aspects of it, but explained that he felt strongly about that being a priority.

Ms. Crotty noted that it was fine to identify elements of the plan that needed additional focus or were of a higher priority.

Commissioner Littleton noted that presently one of the listed objectives was to develop alternatives for infrastructure and transportation plans for Ormond Crossings. He asked what the alternatives were.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the plan that had been laid out by Tomoka Holdings had contained their water, sewer, and transportation infrastructure. She noted that it was a very costly plan. She explained that the city had encouraged them, and worked with them, to look at ideas to reduce the costs. She noted that some of those ideas included eliminating the flyover and looking at doing at-grade crossing.

Mayor Partington explained that he and Commissioner Kent had traveled to Washington, D.C. to help obtain an \$800,000 grant for an interchange justification study between US 1 and Airport Road in 2004. He noted that it would have been an exit north and south on both sides with an overpass. He explained that after the 2008 market crash, things really scaled down there. He stated that they were in the process of figuring out where to go from there. He noted that he believed that everyone agreed that it was an important item.

Ms. Crotty asked if there was a new owner; whereby, she was informed that there was. She asked what the city could do to advance the development.

Mr. Mannarino stated that the new owners had not provided the city with any of their new ideas as to what they wanted to do. He explained that it was a matter of working with them to facilitate feasible alternatives.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the city could look at their own infrastructure on US 1, which they had control of, and could help that whole corridor, not specifically just Ormond Crossings.

Commissioner Selby stated that the future of mass commercial development in the area was in Ormond Crossings and the north US 1 corridor. He noted that the city needed to get their utilities and capacity in there, and needed to help make it feasible and attractive. He stated that it really needed to be elevated to the point where there were buildable lots which were shovel ready with a paved road, utilities in place, and proper zoning.

Ms. Crotty asked if the objective should remain the same; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that she believed it needed more specificity. She noted that what she thought she heard was that perhaps they should look at incentivizing in a greater capacity.

Commissioner Selby noted that there was one deal which might soon be announced in Ormond Crossings.

Mayor Partington asked if infrastructure was incentivized with S.R. Perrott; whereby, Ms. Shanahan confirmed that they had.

Commissioner Selby stated that he thought that the city needed to be as proactive as possible, as this was so big and so important to the future. He noted that it was important to get more commercial tax base into the city.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the city's tax base was 75 percent residential and 25 percent commercial presently.

Mr. Ponitz stated that there were several offsite watermain and sewer extensions that were identified in the Ormond Crossings plan. He noted that the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) had always identified those by development. He stated that those

projects were not identified in the current CIP. He explained that those were strictly running parallel lines up US 1, which was a very narrow corridor. He stated that an opportunity existed to parlay the Airport Master Plan, noting that there were benefits financially from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regarding utility improvements, to find meaningful other alternative paths for water and sewer, which might make sense for looping and bolstering the city's system and serving the areas that those new pipe routes may pass.

Ms. Shanahan suggested looping opportunities and expanding infrastructure in existing areas.

Mr. Ponitz stated that he and Mr. Noble had met with their water and sewer consultants and looked at various models and scenarios which might make sense for additional routes which they had not yet considered.

Ms. Shanahan explained that she was trying to get the language for a succinct objective.

Mr. MacLeod suggested **“incentivize Ormond Crossings by coordination with the city’s Utilities Master Plan.”**

Ms. Crotty asked if they were looking at more than Ormond Crossings; whereby, Commissioner Selby stated that he liked it as is as Ormond Crossings needed to be done.

Commissioner Boehm noted that Ormond Crossings was also a Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) and that they could get some money back if they put some money in.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the CRA dollars in Ormond Crossings were just dedicated for transportation; whereby, Mr. Mannarino clarified that it was for the bridge only. She noted that the city may need to look at revisiting that CRA with the county.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he would add a walkable, livable downtown as an objective. He noted that it was an overriding objective for Ormond Beach MainStreet and the city to develop the downtown area so that people could live there.

Commissioner Selby asked Commissioner Boehm if he would be amenable to updating the downtown master plan. He noted that it had been ten years since it was updated.

Commissioner Boehm stated that **“updating the Downtown Master Plan would work towards a walkable, livable downtown”**; whereby, Commissioner Kent asked if the master plan already stated those objectives.

Commissioner Boehm confirmed that it did. He noted the changes in downtown since the last strategic planning, including the improvements on Lincoln Avenue and New Britain Avenue. He encouraged updating the master plan.

Commissioner Selby suggested **“improving alternative east-west routes”** as an objective. He explained that they had to determine a way to take the traffic pressure off of State Road 40. He noted that the Latitude Margaritaville development in Daytona Beach would heavily impact traffic.

Commissioner Boehm asked how many years the Hand Avenue extension was in the works.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she believed that an objective should be to **“improve the US 1 and Interstate 95 interchange”**; whereby, Commissioner Selby agreed.

Commissioner Boehm noted that that was another of those things that had been in the plans forever. He noted that there had never been any federal funding for it.

Mr. Mannarino suggested **“continuing the GAP funding”**; whereby, Mayor Partington agreed.

Commissioner Littleton asked if they had enough objectives for “economic development” yet, and suggested moving on to “fiscal sustainability”.

Objectives – “Fiscal Sustainability”

Ms. Crotty asked for “fiscal sustainability” objectives.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the Commission adopted a long-term financial plan the previous year. He suggested **“adhering to the long-term financial plan.”**

Ms. Kelly McGuire, Finance Director, stated that that plan would be brought back to the Commission each year during the Financial Trends Workshop.

Ms. Crotty asked if that plan addressed all of the Commission’s policies, such as their reserve policy or debt policy; whereby, Ms. McGuire confirmed that it did.

Ms. Shanahan noted that she would add continuing the city’s long-term strategic health care planning activities.

Ms. Crotty asked if that objective should be listed under “fiscal sustainability” or “human resources”; whereby, Ms. Claire Whitley, Human Resources Director, stated that she believed it was fine under “human resources”.

Mayor Partington stated that **“continuing appropriate annexations”** should still be an objective. He noted that they kept coming as individuals realized they saved money by annexing into the city.

Mayor Partington suggested **“continuing the multipronged approach to pensions”** as an objective. He noted that the changes implemented thus far had made a reasonable impact.

The meeting was recessed at 5:41 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 5:56 p.m.

Objectives – “Infrastructure”

Ms. Crotty referenced the “infrastructure” goal and asked for suggestions for objectives.

Commissioner Littleton noted that Ormond Crossings was mentioned under “economic development” but stated that funding the extension of sewer and water lines to that area would benefit Ormond Crossings and the entire north US 1 corridor.

Mr. Mannarino stated that right now that area was very limited with its current infrastructure. He noted that water and sewer in that area were very much at capacity.

Ms. Crotty asked if this would be an extension or replacement of those lines; whereby, Mr. Mannarino replied that these would be new. Ms. Crotty added **“funding of redundant sewer and water lines to north US 1”** as an objective.

Commissioner Selby stated that he would like to see LED streetlights. He explained that he wanted to look at not just LED streetlights, but how to overall reduce energy consumption and what the trends were in technology that could assist with that. He noted that he was concerned with sustainability.

Ms. Crotty suggested adding an objective to increase sustainability with city structures.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the new lights going on the bridge would be LED lights. She stated that the city would also be participating in webinar entitled “LED: Does It Really Work?” which would explore the issues with LED and whether there was a downside. She stated that she thought that general sustainability was too broad of an objective. She noted that she believed that LED was focusing on that. She asked Mr. Noble whether the small walking lights on city streetlights were LED; whereby Mr. Noble replied that the ones along Granada Boulevard were upgraded to LEDs. Ms. Shanahan noted that the side street streetlights could be upgraded to LED.

Commissioner Kent asked if the LED lights were worth it. He asked how long it would take to recoup the initial cost of installing them. He asked if it would take 20 years; whereby, Mayor Partington replied that he believed it might be about eight years.

Ms. Crotty noted that she believed the price of those lights had come down.

Mr. MacLeod suggested **“maximizing efficiency of lighting facilities”** as an objective.

Commissioner Selby stated that LED lights were also much brighter.

Mayor Partington stated that he believed that **“continuing the maintenance repair and replacement program”** should be an objective. He stated that **“continuing the implementation of the Utilities Master Plan”** was also an objective.

Mayor Partington confirmed that Hand Avenue was listed on the “economic development” goal, noting that it had been previously listed under the “infrastructure” goal category. He stated that the area around Hand Avenue from US 1 to Nova Road was hugely residential. He noted that in the area of Central Park there were lots of pedestrians. He explained that he had heard from those residents during his 13 years on the Commission how important it was for the speed limit in that area to remain at 25 miles per hour.

Commissioner Boehm stated that anything that went over Interstate 95 would have to be coordinated with the federal government. He noted that the federal government would have to fund such an interchange.

Mr. Ponitz suggested an objective of the offsite utility infrastructure to support the needs of the Hunters Ridge and Flagler County development of regional impact (DRI) area that

was just starting to develop. He noted that they currently were developing a utilities master plan for that area. He explained that there would be some offsite infrastructure extensions to that corridor.

Ms. Shanahan asked if that was part of the Utilities Master Plan already; whereby, Mr. Ponitz replied that there were associated projects that were. Ms. Shanahan noted that implementing the Utilities Master Plan was already suggested as an objective. She asked if Mr. Ponitz was suggesting that that project be accelerated; whereby, Mr. Ponitz noted that it was another area of growth, similar to north US 1. Ms. Shanahan asked whether it needed to be added as a separate objective or whether it could be kept contained in the master plan as part of that objective; whereby, Mr. Ponitz replied that it could be left in the master plan objective.

Commissioner Selby stated that he thought that the Granada Bridge should be lit with LED lights, with the ability to change the colors of the lights based on the season or holiday. He noted that bridges in other areas, such as Jacksonville, had such lights. He suggested to **“explore LED colored lighting on Granada Bridge”** as an objective.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the Commission had previously explored doing that.

Commissioner Kent explained that they were supportive of the idea but the cost estimates they received were very high; whereby, Commissioner Boehm noted that it was estimated to have cost nearly \$3 million to do so with LED lights.

Commissioner Boehm explained that the concept was studied and plans were reviewed. He noted that it was a great idea and explained that he had brought it to the city before. He stated that the cost was prohibitive.

Objectives – “Technology”

Ms. Crotty referenced the “technology” goal category and asked for suggestions for objectives.

Commissioner Boehm noted that cell tower connectivity was a prior objective; whereby, Mr. Mannarino stated that there was a cell tower company that was working with the city to construct a cell tower at the airport. He noted that that would help improve the entire cellular service system in that area.

Mr. Huhta explained that that was actually a really key cell tower in that it would serve a void as well as assist in the enhancements for the business park.

Mr. Mannarino and Ms. Shanahan suggested **“facilitating opportunities for cell tower connectivity”** as an objective.

Ms. Crotty noted that there was a chance that the legislature could make it so that the cities could not control that.

Mayor Partington suggested continuing the development and **“implementation of the IT Master Plan.”**

Ms. Shanahan explained that the plan was still presently being developed, and that it would probably not go before the Commission for approval until September.

Commissioner Littleton asked whether the enterprise resource system should be listed as an objective under “technology” or “human resources”; whereby, Ms. Shanahan replied that she believed it belonged under “technology”.

Mr. Huhta explained that implementing the enterprise resource system was a three-year project and was being heavily focused on. Ms. Crotty added “**continue implementation of ERP (enterprise resource planning)**” as an objective.

Ms. Shanahan suggested adding “**continued implementation of SCADA system and instrumentation control**”; whereby, Mayor Partington agreed.

Mayor Partington asked where the city was with its fiber optics; whereby, Mr. Huhta explained that the low-hanging fruit was built out. Mayor Partington asked whether fiber optics was part of the master plan; whereby, Mr. Huhta replied that it would be. Mayor Partington noted that that probably did not need to be listed as a specific objective then.

Objectives – “Quality of Life”

Ms. Crotty referenced the “quality of life” goal category and asked for suggestions for objectives.

Mayor Partington asked about updating the parks and recreation master plan.

Mr. Carolin explained that doing so did not make the cut in last year’s budget. He noted that in last year’s budgeting workshop, they had decided not to fund that update because of concerns over the cost. He stated that he believed it was estimated to cost \$160,000 to \$200,000 to do so, depending on the chosen options.

Ms. Crotty stated that that was a priority that did not get funded. She asked if this was something that the city could afford to do now.

Mayor Partington asked how old the master plan was; whereby, Mr. Carolin replied that it was from 2004. Mayor Partington asked if that plan could be created by staff or if outside consultants had to be involved.

Commissioner Kent noted that he was not opposed to a master plan but explained that spending \$200,000 gave him pause. He stated that the city’s quality of life was high. He noted that he did not receive complaints that the city was not providing services that residents were interested in.

Commissioner Littleton stated that he was not sure whether it was a priority either. He noted that leisure services was doing as well as it could be.

Mayor Partington stated that if they were to spend \$160,000 on leisure services, he would be more inclined to use those funds to allow Mr. Carolin to hire an additional staff member who could handle all of the tasks that Mr. Carolin performed which he considered to be more of a public works nature. He noted that that could allow Mr. Carolin to really focus on leisure services. He stated that perhaps they did not need a master plan, but explained that the potential danger was there to go astray and not have a plan to review and follow.

Ms. Shanahan explained that part of the process of a master plan was citizen involvement and engagement.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the consultants hired to work on the 2004 Parks and Recreation Master Plan made phone calls to residents between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays. He explained that, due to that, recreation fields like baseball and softball fields were at the bottom of the survey, while facilities like shuffleboard courts and pickleball courts were at the top. He noted that he liked the idea of citizen meetings but explained that that was not how the data was collected in 2004. He stated that he was not exactly a fan of that master plan, explaining that he did not like the way it was put together.

Ms. Crotty stated that the use of technology could totally change how the feedback was gathered now. She noted that she thought that a variety of methodologies had to be utilized.

Mayor Partington suggested **“continuing to explore the feasibility of a west side community center, with an emergency operations center,”** as an objective. He also suggested **“encouraging greater beach access”** as an objective, noting that Commissioner Kent had mentioned it.

Commissioner Boehm explained that developing a historic structures plan was previously an objective, but noted that the report on historic structures would be presented to the Commission at an upcoming meeting.

Ms. Crotty suggested implementing be substituted for developing, and added **“implementation of historic preservation plan”** as an objective.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the dog park had also been an objective. He stated that the City Attorney was working on that. He asked him when the appraisal would be completed; whereby, Mr. Randy Hayes, City Attorney, replied that it would be about 45 days.

Commissioner Boehm stated that ground may break this year on the park; whereby, Mr. Hayes noted that he certainly hoped that it would. Mr. Hayes explained that the YMCA would construct the park and be reimbursed by the city.

Commissioner Selby suggested developing a master plan for the MacDonald House and gardens.

Ms. Crotty asked if that was part of the historic preservation plan; whereby, Ms. Shanahan replied that the historic preservation plan was essentially about the MacDonald House, and had taken the form of the historic structures report. She suggested that the title of the objective might need rewording.

Commissioner Selby noted that the report was an interesting beginning but explained that he would not take the report carte blanche. He stated that it was good to have consultant input but he believed there was a community conversation occurring which could make for a totally different outcome.

Commissioner Littleton asked where the gardens Commissioner Selby referred to were.

Commissioner Selby explained that he viewed the area where the MacDonald House was located, with the parking lot and the tennis courts, as the whole MacDonald House location, not just the house itself.

Commissioner Kent asked if the gardens were the parking lot and the tennis courts, or if the gardens were the Ormond Memorial Art Museum gardens; whereby, Commissioner Selby stated that it had nothing to do with the Ormond Memorial Art Museum.

Commissioner Boehm asked what gardens that area had.

Commissioner Selby replied that there were no gardens located there presently. He explained that part of the conversation was that if the MacDonald House was relocated, a presence for the house could be created in that same area, which could include gardens.

Ms. Crotty noted that safety issues had been mentioned before when discussing quality of life. She asked if there were any to be added as objectives.

Commissioner Littleton stated that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan should be an objective; whereby, Commissioner Boehm suggested changing the existing objective to reference the continued implementation of the plan, rather than the adoption of such a plan. Ms. Crotty added **“implementation of Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan”** as an objective.

Ms. Shanahan asked if anything about public safety should be added, referencing the earlier discussions. She suggested a citizens’ academy; whereby, Ms. Crotty suggested that might go into the “external relations” goal category instead.

Commissioner Kent asked about the citizens’ academy; whereby, Ms. Shanahan explained that it would provide citizens with an introduction to the whole city. She noted that many cities had such a program. She stated that Ormond Beach presently just had one for the police department.

Commissioner Kent stated that he thought that that type of information was offered during Ms. Shanahan’s Walking with the Manager event.

Ms. Crotty stated that that academy could be a great recruiting tool for the city’s advisory boards. She reiterated that she thought this objective would be best under the “external relations” goal category.

Commissioner Boehm asked if the Ormond Beach Chamber of Commerce’s Leadership Academy performed a similar service; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that it did but that it had a cost associated with it. She explained that this service would be free and opened to any citizen.

Objectives – “Human Resources”

Ms. Crotty referenced the goal area of “human resources”, and asked for suggestions for objectives.

Ms. Shanahan offered **“developing a succession plan”** as an objective; whereby, Mayor Partington agreed.

Commissioner Littleton noted that he would be slightly concerned if there were names involved with the succession plan.

Ms. Crotty explained that that was not how it generally worked, noting that the Florida Institute of Government provided such a service. She stated that part of the planning was assessing where the city's employees were in their careers and when retirements would be occurring. She explained that after that the competencies that those individual had would be identified so that the city could ensure those were being provided to other employees. She further explained that such planning would provide a career path to those that were in the system, in order to see what kind of training and mentoring was needed in order for advancement. She noted that it would not guarantee that any individual would move into a position, but would prepare them to be able to apply for openings and potentially move up. She stated that it was a very organized program to get employees ready for ascension. She explained that it also helped the city determine where their gaps existed. She noted that sometimes it was better to bring in someone from outside. She explained that the idea was that a person could start with the organization and have an opportunity to grow.

Ms. Whitley stated that the city started partnering with the Commission for quarterly workshops reviewing healthcare. She noted that it had been going very well. She explained that it was difficult to develop a static strategic plan on healthcare due to the dynamic changing nature of it.

Ms. Shanahan suggested continuing the dialogue and engagement with the Commission on healthcare as an objective; whereby, Commissioner Littleton agreed.

Commissioner Selby asked if there was an objective to the dialogue; whereby, Mayor Partington replied that it was to balance the cost with the effectiveness. Ms. Crotty added "**continue dialogue for healthcare plan, to balance cost and effectiveness**" as an objective.

Commissioner Littleton noted that depending on what happened, or did not happen, at the federal level, the whole landscape could change.

Ms. Crotty noted that the city performed a pay and classification plan update and that that had been implemented.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city was in the process of finalizing three-year union agreements.

Ms. Whitley explained that all of the peer cities were also coming out of the recession and performing pay and classification studies. She noted that she anticipated changes over the next few years and that the city's plan was to continue monitoring its compensation as it related to other cities, to stay abreast of any changes that were occurring.

Ms. Crotty noted that it was not always about compensation when it came to attracting and retaining employees. She explained that sometimes there were other considerations which would make a place to work particularly attractive. She noted that she assumed the city had good training opportunities and educational benefits.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city did and noted that those were decided upon as part of the collective bargaining process.

Objectives – “External Relations”

Ms. Crotty referenced the goal category of “external relations” and asked if there were any suggestions for objectives.

Mayor Partington suggested to **“continue participating in addressing the homeless issue”** as an objective. He noted that the city should stay engaged so they could determine what solutions they wished to participate in.

Ms. Crotty asked if any member of the Commission wanted to consider adding the development of a citizens’ academy, as Ms. Shanahan had mentioned, as an objective.

Mayor Partington asked whether Ms. Shanahan envisioned that being a daytime or evening activity.

Commissioner Selby noted that he had not reviewed a specific agenda for the Ormond Beach Chamber of Commerce (“Chamber”)’s Leadership Program. He stated that he went through the Daytona Beach version and noted that it was quite long and extensive, and covered a lot of government information. He wondered if the city should work with the Chamber to fortify their program. He explained that he would hate to duplicate an existing program. He noted that Ms. Shanahan had mentioned that the Chamber’s program carried a cost.

Commissioner Kent stated that it cost around \$250 to participate in that program.

Ms. Crotty noted that it was essentially a fundraiser for the Chamber, noting that many Chamber of Commerce organizations hosted similar programs.

Commissioner Selby noted that he did not realize the cost was that high.

Ms. Crotty stated that she believed a citizens’ academy would be a different type of program.

Mayor Partington stated that he believed that Palm Coast put on a citizens’ academy.

Commissioner Selby stated that he was in favor of the idea of **“exploring the development of a citizens’ academy.”**

Mayor Partington noted that that the academy would get citizens excited about participating in government and explained that his only concern would be that there was such consistency on the city’s advisory boards that there would not be many openings.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that it might generate greater participation at meetings.

Commissioner Boehm asked if such an academy would run the risk of taking away from the Chamber’s program; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted that the focus would be very different. She explained that a citizens’ academy would get citizens to understand how city government worked and would cause them to become cheerleaders for the city.

Commissioner Littleton asked how much the county had helped the city. He referenced the city having to cover fire services for the county on short notice due to training schedules.

Fire Battalion Commander Dave King explained that it depended on the shift and on the battalion relationships.

Commissioner Kent noted that Commissioner Littleton brought up a good point for conversation. He explained that the city used to provide life-saving medicines and be reimbursed by the county, noting that the county received the funds for transport. He noted that a few years ago, the county decided not to do that anymore.

Commissioner Boehm stated that occasionally more emergency personnel were needed in the back of an EVAC ambulance than the county had on staff at the time. He explained that in those instances, an Ormond Beach firefighter went with them to a hospital. He noted that fire personnel then had to retrieve that firefighter from whatever hospital they traveled to, or wait for the EVAC ambulance to finish and have occasion to return to Ormond Beach. He explained that during that time, the city's department was short staffed, and noted that the county did not, and had never, reimbursed the city for that.

Commissioner Kent stated that the city hoped that some things could be changed and that there could be a warmer reception with the county now that former Ormond Beach Mayor Ed Kelley was serving as County Chair.

Ms. Crotty asked if the terms of that relationship were negotiated, or if the county informed the city how it would go; whereby, Ms. Shanahan replied that the county told the city how things were.

Commissioner Kent noted that now the city had someone at the table. He suggested that the city needed to be reimbursed and not treated unfairly by the county.

Mayor Partington suggested maximizing the positive change in relations with the county as an objective. He noted that it was presently the right time to push Ormond Beach.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the Commission had a Brainstorming Workshop coming up. She suggested that the Commission could identify a list of issues and then prioritize those issues that the city could discuss with the county.

Commissioner Kent encouraged that county relations be an objective.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the city had mutual aid agreements, which worked well. He explained that by reviewing the statistics, one could see that Ormond Beach's fire department spent a lot more time in Holly Hill and in the unincorporated areas of Volusia County than anyone from Daytona Beach, Holly Hill, or elsewhere, spent in Ormond Beach. He noted that the city did a whole lot more for everyone else than anyone did for them.

Commissioner Kent stated that Ormond Beach staffed their fire engines a lot differently than neighboring communities; whereby, Mayor Partington noted that there were other reasons for that too.

Ms. Crotty suggested putting something generic as the objective, such as continuing or initiating conversations or communications with the county regarding a variety of partnerships or relationships. She added “**initiate discussion with county regarding ongoing relationships**” as an objective.

Priority objectives

Ms. Crotty noted that there were 28 objectives identified between the seven goal categories. She provided each member of the Commission with ten dot-shaped stickers, noting that she was being generous this time with the sticker allocation. She noted that each Commissioner received a different color dot sticker, and thus would know where they had chosen to put their dot stickers. She explained that they could only each put one dot per objective, and could not weight their selections. She further explained that this was so there could be clear consensus among the Commission as a whole.

The members of the Commission then went and placed their dot stickers beside objectives on the charts that Ms. Crotty had been formulating during the discussion.

Commissioner Selby was given red dot stickers, Commissioner Kent received light blue dot stickers, Commissioner Boehm had dark blue dot stickers, Commissioner Littleton used yellow dot stickers, and Mayor Partington worked with green dot stickers.

Ms. Crotty identified the objectives which received at least three stickers, representing a majority of the Commission, and were thus identified as priority objectives, as follows:

- Economic Development – Incentivize Ormond Crossings by coordination with the city’s Utilities Master Plan (3)
- Economic Development – Update Downtown Master Plan (liveable, walkable) (3)
- Economic Development – Improve alternate east-west routes (3)
- Technology – Facilitate opportunities for cell tower connectivity (4)
- Quality of Life – Continue to explore feasibility of west side community center with EOC component (3)
- Quality of Life – Explore more beach access (3)
- Human Resources – Continue dialogue for healthcare plan – balance cost/effectiveness (4)
- External Relations – Initiate discussion with county regarding ongoing relationships (5)

Ms. Crotty explained that she would compile a report summarizing these results.

The Commission thanked Ms. Crotty for her efforts.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

Transcribed by: Colby Cilento