

**MINUTES
CITY OF ORMOND BEACH
CITY COMMISSION
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN WORKSHOP**

June 6, 2017

5:30 p.m.

City Commission Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Bill Partington called the meeting to order at 5:31 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, City Attorney Randy Hayes, Finance Director Kelly McGuire, and City Engineer John Noble.

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, explained that the workshop was being held to review the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She stated that staff had been working on the CIP closely for the past few months. She noted that the discussion would focus on the new projects or the projects that were scheduled to be funded for the fiscal year 2017-18. She explained that in Florida, the state only allowed a one year budget to be approved. She explained that staff had created the five year capital plan but noted that legally the Commission would only approve the first year of the CIP. She noted that the Commission was aware of the included projects, and that almost all projects were in the five-year plan, unless a project was shifted or moved back based on funding.

II. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FY 2017-18 TO FY 2021-22

Five Year Plan – Expenditure Categories and Funding Sources

Ms. Kelly McGuire, Finance Director, stated that the five year plan totaled \$53.3 million. She noted that \$14.5 million of that would become part of the FY 2017-18 CIP if the Commission directed staff to include the proposed projects. She noted that the final approval of the CIP would occur in August. She stated that all of the figures would be included in the budget for approval by the Commission in September. She explained that the majority of the CIP was water and wastewater projects. She stated that in FY 2017-18, the city was looking at spending around \$7.5 million in water and sewer projects. She noted that airport projects were the next largest part of the CIP. She stated that most of the funding for the water and wastewater projects came from user fees. She explained that those were the water and sewer fees that were on citizens' monthly water bill, along with storm water charges. She stated there were grants and donations tied the funding for the airport projects.

Airport

Ms. McGuire stated that \$995,661 was budgeted in FY 2017-18 for airport projects. She stated that those projects included \$40,000 for heliport improvement design, \$40,661 for control tower parking lot rehab, \$480,000 for airport access roads construction, and \$435,000 for rehabilitation and extended runway 8/26 design. She noted that the FY

2017-18 projects were largely funded by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the projects would be approved in August and that that would determine what would be put on the overall budget in September. She explained that in Ormond Beach, each project's bid would appear on a City Commission meeting agenda and be reviewed by the Commission. She noted that there were numerous times the Commission would see the projects and would be able to speak about them.

Downtown Improvements

Ms. McGuire stated that \$1,669,878 was budgeted in FY 2017-18 for downtown improvements. She stated that those projects included \$844,878 for the Cassen Park public dock (pending grant funding), \$535,000 for Cassen Park parking lot improvements and bathroom construction, \$225,000 for MacDonal House façade improvements, and \$65,000 for the annual allocation for upgrades and improvements, which for the FY 2017-18 were primarily focused on the Ormond Memorial Art Museum.

Commissioner Selby noted the proposal for Cassen Park restrooms noted the need for more capacity. He explained there were two restrooms on each side for men and women. He stated that the proposal was for three restrooms on each side. He noted that he believed the restrooms should be individual restrooms similar to what the Commission had approved at Andy Romano Beachfront Park. He explained that each restroom was male, female, or family and were almost identical. He stated that having individual rooms would better serve the community in the long run. He noted that having individual restrooms also helped address issues involving gender specific restroom facilities.

Ms. Shanahan asked City Engineer Mr. John Noble about the design of the restrooms; whereby, Mr. Noble stated that the design was about 30 to 40 percent completed. He explained that the parking lot improvements were most likely going out for bid in September or a little later.

Commissioner Kent stated that he did not know how he felt about the Cassen Park restrooms. He explained that he was not concerned with gender equality. He noted that he had not heard from citizens about that being a concern.

Commissioner Kent explained that he was not at a point where he could see spending \$225,000 for improvements on the exterior of the MacDonal house. He stated that the Commission had discussed the improvements of the MacDonal House previously; and discussed spending around \$25,000 to fix the leaks. He noted that they also discussed having the Historical Society and individual members of the community help raise funds to fix the house. He explained that \$225,000 was a lot of money for the improvements on the MacDonal House, noting that it was over \$200,000 more than previously discussed. He noted that he was not saying "no" to the project, and not changing his mind on the MacDonal House. He stated that circumstances had changed and he was not comfortable with the amount proposed for the improvements on the MacDonal House.

Commissioner Littleton stated that he agreed with fixing the roof, noting that he believed that would cost around \$25,000 to \$30,000. He explained that he was hesitant to spend

\$200,000 more of tax payer's dollars on the MacDonald House. He noted that he had driven by the house twice in the last week and it did not look blighted.

Commissioner Kent referenced a situation a few years back with the Ames House. He explained that the exterior was being redone and that windows were being put in. He stated that he could not remember the outlandish number that was quoted for replacing the windows but explained that that Commission had decided not to replace the windows. He noted that that Commission had decided to scale back and had a painter come in and caulk the historic significance of the windows instead. He explained that that decision saved hundreds and hundreds of dollars. He noted that the MacDonald House needed to look presentable. He stated that he wondered if there was more that staff could research to be able to get the MacDonald House to look presentable on the outside without having to spend \$200,000 in the process. He stated that after speaking with staff about the MacDonald House, he was not comfortable with the proposed spending.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the MacDonald House was a city property and that the city had an obligation to maintain it. He stated that he did not agree with the amount proposed for the improvement of the MacDonald House. He noted that he thought staff would reach out to the citizens and that after doing so; the dollar amount would be considerable lower. He explained that what was troubling him about the dollar amount was that staff was relying on an estimate someone gave over the phone, noting that he believed it was a general number. He noted that the project should not cost anywhere near that amount when push came to shove. He stated that the MacDonald House needed more than just its roof done. He noted that the MacDonald House was a welcome center for Ormond Beach and that it was not presentable. He explained that the exterior of the house needed to look like Ormond Beach and noted that with the current state the house, it did not. He noted that the city did not need to spend \$225,000, but would need to spend more than the \$25,000 originally discussed.

Mayor Partington stated that he was not concerned about the number that would be going into the budget. He explained that it was the city's responsibility to fix and maintain the MacDonald House. He stated that the east side wall of the house needed to be replaced. He noted that the number would be closer to the \$150,000. He stated that the MacDonald House was not going to be an inexpensive project to fix. He noted that he was unsure of what staff's preference would be regarding the number in the budget. He asked if staff intended to leave the current number of \$225,000 in the budget, and to see what happened when it came back after bid submission.

Mr. Ted MacLeod, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director, stated that staff was in the process of getting quotes. He noted that the estimate was a conservative number and that the city would not spend the money if it was not necessary. He noted that the current number really did not matter. He explained that it was a matter of what staff came up with for quotes and what part of the project needed to be bid.

Ms. Shanahan stated that what she would like to know from the Commission was if they were interested in having staff explore cost estimates. She explained that if the Commission was not interested then the project should be pushed back another year. She noted that staff were currently gathering cost estimates and they would be coming back to the Commission to have a discussion about the project. She stated that staff wanted to receive the direction of the Commission. She noted that staff reviewed the cost estimates that were done in FY 2016-17 and this was the next step.

Mayor Partington stated that the Commission was going to make it happen and wanted to keep moving forward. He explained that if at some point the numbers came back high enough to cause a road block, then the Commission and staff would figure out where to go from there; whereby, Commissioner Boehm stated that he agreed with the Mayor.

Ms. McGuire explained that if staff bid out the project and brought it back to the Commission, and the Commission was unsatisfied with the cost, they would be able to reject that bid. She stated that there were no commitments with a bid.

Commissioner Selby noted that the threat of demolition on the MacDonald House had been hanging over the building for almost 40 years. He stated that there was a lot of deferred maintenance that could have been done over those years, noting that the city was now trying to catch up. He explained that the amount of \$225,000 was a lot of money to spend and noted that a really nice house could be built for that amount. He noted that the project was about painting the outside of the house and fixing the roof. He stated that if over the years, preventative maintenance had been done on the MacDonald House, then this would not be an issue; whereby, Commissioner Kent stated that he agreed with Commissioner Selby, noting that as a city building, it deserved to look better.

Ms. Shanahan noted that staff would continue to look at cost estimates and bring them back to the Commission.

Facility Renewal and Replacement

Ms. McGuire stated that \$30,000 was budgeted in FY 2017-18 for facility renewal and replacement. She stated that the \$30,000 project was for South Ormond neighborhood center gym (HVAC). She noted that \$500,000 in property taxes were part of this budget. She stated that any project below the \$25,000 CIP threshold would be included in the operating budget. She explained that the other \$470,000 would come back as part of the operating budget.

Facility Construction and Renovation

Ms. McGuire stated that \$495,000 was budgeted in FY 2017-18 for facility construction and renovation. She stated that those projects included \$135,000 for community development block grant (CDBG) projects, \$135,000 for HVAC chiller replacement at city hall, and \$225,000 for the police department roof.

Commissioner Boehm asked if the police department roof was a cost estimate; whereby, Mr. Noble stated that the project would be bid out.

Commissioner Kent noted that the cost estimate to fix the roof was an astronomical number. He stated that he was anxious to see what bids came in.

Ms. McGuire noted that whenever staff went out to bid and brought it back to the Commission, it was in the Commission's discretion to say if it was too much money. She explained that staff did not want the Commission to feel that just because a project made it on the CIP that it was a committed project.

Commissioner Selby stated that the police department building was built in 2001. He noted that five years ago, a roof coat was placed on it. He explained that the roof was only 16 years old and that the original roof only lasted about ten years. He asked for insight as to why the roof was not lasting as long as it should.

Commissioner Kent noted that Commissioner Selby made a great point. He explained that his own roof was supposed to last 30 years. He noted that something may have been done wrong or that the design may have been wrong because the roof on the police department was not lasting.

Commissioner Boehm noted that there was a five-year warranty on the roof coat. He stated that the question would be if there had been a leak before the warranty expired. He explained that the roof coat would have some responsibility if the warranty was for five years with no leaks. He noted that if it were his home, and he had received a roof coat that leaked, he would be really unhappy.

Mr. Noble stated that the city could get a roof engineer to look at the roof and determine what was happening to it.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff aggressively pursued warranty issues. She noted that if there was not a sufficient number for replacing the roof in the budget then there would not be enough funds to cover the project. She stated that historically there was no overbidding that occurred because of the stated budget.

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Facility Improvements

Ms. McGuire stated that \$150,000 was budgeted for FY 2017-18 for parks, recreation and cultural facility improvements. She stated that the funding would go towards the Nova Community Park tennis court lighting project. She noted that it was unlikely to receive a grant and thus the project would be moved back a year.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the state had been limited to Florida Department of Recreation grants over the years. She stated that the city had been moved up on the list. She noted that if the grant was not received this year, the project would be moved back.

Stormwater Drainage Improvements

Ms. McGuire stated that \$921,750 was budgeted for FY 2017-18 for stormwater drainage improvements. She stated that those projects included \$141,750 for Coquina Court drainage, \$500,000 for stormwater piping replacement, and \$280,000 for the Wilmette Avenue pump station.

Commissioner Kent stated that these projects were the ones that the city needed to do. He noted that the city had been taking on these types of projects for a number of years and were in much better shape than their sister cities because of it. He explained that the city had taken care of pipe replacement, drainage, and sidewalks.

Ms. Shanahan noted that during the recession, sister cities had not gone performed some of the work that the city had. She noted that the city had set aside funding right off the top. She explained that these were the projects that citizens do not see but that kept the city out of hot water.

Commissioner Boehm noted that he could remember when Mr. MacLeod had stated before the water pipe replacements that the city could be losing up to 500,000 gallons of water per day due to leaky pipes. He noted that after Mr. MacLeod had stated that, he became a fan of having the pipes replaced. He noted that Mr. MacLeod thinks proactively.

Technology

Ms. McGuire stated that \$901,934 was budgeted for FY 2017-18 for technology. She stated that those projects included \$830,934 for P25 compliant radios and \$71,000 for backup server upgrades. She explained that the P25 radios were for the police, fire, and public works departments.

Commissioner Kent asked if anyone else's jaw dropped when they read the amount for those; whereby, Ms. McGuire stated that it was a huge investment, but an investment that needed to be made. She noted that the purchase would be a lease purchase of five years.

Ms. Shanahan stated that new radios were bought eight years ago by the county. She noted that the city had not purchased radios yet and it was a costly expense. She stated that staff needed a way to communicate with each other.

Transportation

Ms. McGuire stated that \$891,200 was budgeted for FY 2017-18 for transportation. She stated that those projects included \$45,600 for Fluhart Drive roundabout design, \$40,000 for Main Trail bridge rehabilitation, \$50,000 for railroad crossings, \$590,000 for the road resurfacing program, \$18,000 for south A1A pedestrian safety improvement design, \$16,200 for Tomoka Elementary connector sidewalk design, \$50,000 for Tomoka State Park sidewalk study, \$55,000 for traffic signal maintenance, and \$26,400 for Williamson Boulevard and Hand Avenue pedestrian improvement design. She stated that the Fluhart Drive roundabout design was a new project.

Ms. McGuire stated that the railroad crossings were in the budget each year. She explained that if the Florida East Coast Railway (FEC) decided on a project the city needed funding set aside for it. She explained that she had received a notice that the FEC was going to do a railroad project that cost around \$80,000 or \$90,000. She asked Mr. Noble if that project was for this year or the following year; whereby, Mr. Noble stated that FEC was going to be doing Division Avenue this year.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the city was required to pay for the FEC. She stated that FEC did all the drawings and work for the railroad crossings. She noted that every city was in the same situation. She stated that the FEC had worked on State Road 40 (SR-40), Nova Road, and Hand Avenue.

Ms. McGuire stated that the road resurfacing program was ongoing. She stated that the \$590,000 was what was spent on an annual basis.

Ms. Shanahan noted there were considerable comments about the south A1A pedestrian safety project and requested that the Commission discuss on that topic.

Commissioner Selby asked about the house located on Fluhart Drive that had been hit several times and if it would be purchased in order to create the roundabout; whereby, Mr. Noble stated that it would not be sufficient right away as the project had already been sketched out.

Commissioner Selby stated that he had gone to look at the three new walkways at Rockefeller Drive, Seminole Avenue, and River Beach Drive. He explained that all three of those would be at non-controlled intersections, meaning there were no traffic lights. He noted that what would make sense to him would be that the sidewalks line up with the beach ramp. He stated the Commission had approved putting the walkways midblock. He noted that he did not understand that, as citizens were most likely going to cross where they come up from the beach. He noted that he would be concerned about the city's investment in this; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that there was a River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) grant.

Commissioner Selby stated that the grant was only for ten percent; whereby, Ms. Shanahan explained that the numbers were actually reversed, and that the grant would be for 90 percent.

Commissioner Selby stated that the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) noted that the walkways would be safer midblock. He stated that he had asked Ms. Lois Bollenback, Executive Director of TPO, where the walkways were safest and she stated at the intersection. He noted that at busy intersections, pedestrians were another hazard. He stated that he did not consider any of the intersections that the walkways would be built at to be busy intersections. He noted that human nature was going to overrule design, and that citizens would walk straight across when coming up from the beach ramps.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the biggest issue on A1A was that there were no medians. She noted that was why transportation workers did not believe it was safe. She explained that if a median was there, there would be some degree of protection for the pedestrians. Commissioner Selby stated that there was a left-hand lane; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that there was no curb or grass for pedestrians to go on for safety.

Commissioner Selby stated that the city could have rectangular rapid flash beacons (RRFB) which were pedestrian activated.

Commissioner Kent noted that he agreed with Commissioner Selby. He noted that a city to the south of Ormond Beach, had recently installed pedestrian walkways, where a pedestrian could press a button and the crosswalk would light up for them to cross. He noted that the state of Florida did not want to put those in, but it was a safe idea. He stated that from Seminole Drive all the way down to Andy Romano Oceanfront Park, there were no medians. He stated that there should be medians all along A1A. He noted that he refused to go out in the left-hand lane now because of drivers using cell phones and texting. He explained that the city needed a combined approach to make the beach-side safer and more aesthetically pleasing. He noted that the project needed to be off of the back burner. He stated that the seat for the state representative in the city's area was filled by someone strong; there was a great Commission in office, and better County

Council leadership. He noted that those were major pieces in place to hopefully make the project happen.

Ms. Shanahan noted that this project was not unlike what the city experiences on State Road 40 (SR-40) in front of city hall. She explained that it took staff a long time to get FDOT to come around to the city's way of thinking. She noted that staff would need to lobby FDOT District Five and have a meeting with them. She stated that the project was on staff's radar and that they would continue to beat the drum about getting medians there. She explained that there needed to be some walkways that were push to stop. She noted that those were implemented in other cities around Florida and there was no reason why Ormond Beach could not also have them.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the city wanted to build medians from the county's off-beach parking to the county's beach. He stated that the county was not contributing to the project. He noted that the county bought the land off of the beach and were the ones who created the parking lot at Rockefeller Drive. He stated that the county should have put crosswalks up to begin with, and noted that it was now the city that had to fund it. He noted that the city should approach the county about the project before the city put funding down for it.

Commissioner Selby stated that it was not a large amount of money that the city was looking for. He noted that the amount was \$12,600. He stated that the rest of the funding would come from TPO. Ms. Shanahan stated that philosophically, she understood the need for the county to buy in and approach the project as unified. She noted that there needed to be a way to get pedestrians across the road safely.

Commissioner Selby noted that on the North Peninsula, new signs were recently installed that were rectangular, flashing, solar operated, and not pedestrian activated. He stated that the sign that was furthest south going north bound stated "pedestrian crossing next seven miles". He noted that it was the wrong sign as the crossing was not pedestrian activated. He explained that the more citizens' drove by those signs, the more likely they would not even realize the signs were there. He noted that it gave pedestrians a false sense of security.

Commissioner Boehm stated that a project that was not in the presentation was the downtown midblock crossing. He stated that staff had designed the project to be done next year or the year after. He noted that a number of citizens believed it was too dangerous to try and cross midblock at Granada Boulevard. He stated that it did not make sense putting RRFB's up three years from now if citizens were concerned and worried about the issue now. He noted that he would like to see the project moved up a year if possible.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff would need to speak with FDOT and coordinate with them.

Vehicle & Equipment Replacement

Ms. McGuire stated \$957,000 was budgeted for FY 2017-18 for vehicle and equipment replacement. She stated that those projects included \$293,000 for five General Fund vehicles, \$391,000 for four stormwater vehicles, and \$273,000 for six water and wastewater vehicles. She noted that vehicle 509 was the Chevrolet van and 121 was the

Ford Crown Victoria for the police department. She explained that those vehicles would not be in next year's budget, but would be reevaluated in a year.

Commissioner Boehm noted that a large portion of the General Fund vehicle costs were providing for new dump trucks.

Water and Wastewater System Improvements

Ms. McGuire stated \$7,493,275 was budgeted for FY 2017-18 for water and wastewater system improvements. She stated that those projects included the annual renewal and replacement projects which were \$243,000 for city-wide meter replacement, \$200,000 for general rehabilitation, \$90,000 for meter installation, \$100,000 for pretreatment effluent pumping (PEP) tanks, and \$250,000 for sanitary sewer inflow infiltration. She stated the new projects that were included were \$47,000 for A1A manhole repair, \$55,000 for Deer Creek reclaimed water connection, \$185,000 for lift station backup pumps, \$400,000 for lift station rehabilitation, \$253,775 for North US1 utility Improvement design and modeling, \$200,000 for process and instrumentation control improvements, \$115,000 for reclaimed water booster pump installation, \$171,000 for sanitary sewer for main upgrades, \$2,400,000 for secondary raw water main, \$110,000 for water storage tank repairs, \$83,000 for water treatment plant (WTP) aerator electric upgrades, \$350,000 for WTP lime slaker unit replacement, \$330,000 for WTP low pressure reverse osmosis (LPRO) membrane replacement, \$180,000 for WTP sodium hypochlorite generator, \$1,560,000 for wastewater treatment plant (WTTP) sludge dewatering, and \$170,000 for water and wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) influent pump station.

Ms. Shanahan noted that the North US-1 utility design was brought to the Commission during their strategic planning workshop. She noted that this year would contain the design work, which could take eight to ten months and that the construction would be scheduled to take place the following year.

Ms. McGuire stated that the largest project was the secondary raw water main. She noted that staff had spoken to the Commission individually about the need for the project. Mr. MacLeod noted that there was only one water main coming from Rima Ridge and that there should be a back-up. He noted that half of the city's water was produced out there.

Additional Projects Reviewed

Ms. McGuire stated that additional projects reviewed included decorative lighting on the westside of the Granada Bridge, improvements on the MacDonald House, purchase of land and new construction for the Police Athletic League (PAL) house, extending two-way paved roads from Harmony Avenue to Hull Road behind the fields, providing an encounter area and outdoor classroom at the Environmental Discovery Center, the Nova Community Park master plan, paved parking lots at the softball quad, Wendelstedt fields, and Kiwanis soccer fields at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex (OBSC), replaced lighting on the soccer fields at OBSC, providing art at various city facilities, sport complex access and drainage, construction of a new facility to serve the tennis center building, and construction of a parking area at Three Chimneys. She noted that a detailed project scope had not been developed at the time and that the site was not city owned explaining that it would not likely be funded in future CIP cycles. She stated that staff would continue to monitor this project for potential funding through grant sources.

Ms. McGuire stated that other additional projects reviewed included providing a park with athletic fields, open spaces, and playgrounds in the West Ormond Neighborhood Park. She noted that the Lisa Lake dredging was being pursued by staff and that they would recommend that the project be funded through a special assessment requiring 51 percent approval by the impacted property owners.

Ms. McGuire continued discussing additional projects reviewed; noting that phase two of the May 2009 flood study was included. She noted that the project would be contingent upon grant funding that had yet to be materialized. She stated that other additional projects reviewed included communications infrastructure, expanding of the city's fiber optic network, and 37 in-car cameras for police personnel vehicles. She stated that all the projects in the additional projects reviewed were not new and were ones that the Commission had seen in the past.

Ms. Shanahan noted an unfunded list was included in the CIP so that those projects were not forgotten about.

Ms. McGuire noted the soccer field lighting would be for fields one, two, and three because of Hurricane Matthew; whereby Ms. Shanahan stated that hopefully the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) would help fund some of the project.

Board Recommendations

Ms. McGuire stated that the draft CIP was reviewed by the Aviation Advisory Board (AAB), Leisure Service Advisory Board (LSAB), Ormond Beach MainStreet, "Mainstreet", and Quality of Life Advisory Board (QLAB) and was approved by all as it was presented. She noted that the LSAB recommended funding an additional \$1,500,000 in projects to the five-year plan. She stated that some of those projects that LSAB would like to see included were the PAL House, soccer field number four through six lighting, OBSC access and drainage, and Three Chimneys parking.

Other Business

Ms. Shanahan noted that she had sent the Commission an email explaining that the Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials and the Volusia City Managers had a meeting and had asked the CEO Business Alliance for a brief survey of what cities would be interested in funding regarding transportation. She stated that they were asking cities to answer the questions that she had provided in the email about what the priorities were in their communities. She asked the Commission to let her know if they had any different answers than what she had included, otherwise she would submit the survey as it was presented to them.

Commissioner Selby noted that he had not responded to the email and wanted to know if Ms. Shanahan wanted the Commission to provide input on the questions; whereby, Ms. Shanahan explained that the Commission should be looking at the questions and providing input on what they believed was the city's major transportation priorities.

Mayor Partington asked when Ms. Shanahan needed the information by; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that she needed it that week. She noted that she was looking for

consensus from the Commission as she wanted to submit something that they were comfortable with.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Transcribed by: Colby Cilento and Courtney Culver