RESOLUTION 2017-94

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION
APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE CITY’S 2017
STRATEGIC PLANNING UPDATE; AND PROVIDING FOR
AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, in order to plan effectively for the future, the City of Ormond
Beach conducted a visioning and strategic planning process in April and May of 2015, which
was facilitated by Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the
University of Central Florida; and

WHEREAS, that process, involving two (2) “Community Conversation” events
to seek input from residents and businesses, and a Strategic Planning Workshop held by the
City Commission, resulted in the adoption of the 2015 Strategic Planning Report by Resolution
No. 2015-152, on July 28, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission held a Strategic Planning Workshop on
Tuesday, March 7, 2017, which was open to the public, and facilitated by Ms. Crotty, in order
to update the City of Ormond Beach’s Strategic Planning Report; and

WHEREAS, the workshop on March 7, 2017 resulted in the Commission
reviewing and updating priority objectives which are set forth in the Strategic Plan Update,
a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF
ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA, THAT:
SECTION ONE. The City Commission hereby approves the Strategic Plan Update outlining priority objectives, and hereby adopts same as the official Strategic Plan for the City of Ormond Beach.

SECTION TWO. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVED AND AUTHENTICATED this 16th day of May, 2017.

BILL PARTINGTON
Mayor

ATTEST:

J. SCOTT McKee
City Clerk
INTRODUCTION

The City of Ormond Beach conducted an extensive strategic planning process in 2015 that included two community visioning sessions and a workshop with the City Commission and senior staff. The city has been implementing the goals, objectives, and priorities that were established at that time.

On March 7, 2017, the Mayor, Commission, and staff participated in a workshop to update the 2015 plan. Since two new Commissioners were elected in 2016, this session allowed the newly elected officials to have input to the existing plan and gave direction to staff for continuing the implementation of the plan. Marilyn Crotty, director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida facilitated this session, as she did in 2015.

The Mayor, Commissioners, and senior staff participated in a three-hour workshop that was held at City Hall. After a review by staff of progress on the current strategic plan, Ms. Crotty asked the Mayor and Commissioners to affirm or revise the seven goals that had been established in 2015. The Commission agreed to maintain the existing goals, but broadened the scope of one of them.

The participants then identified what is working well in the city and areas that need additional work. This was followed by the identification of objectives under each of the goals and the selection of priorities for the next fiscal year.

This report is a summary of the discussions and conclusions of the workshop.
The Mayor and Commissioners reviewed the seven goals that had been established in 2015 and agreed that they were still appropriate to continue for the next year. The goal that had previously been identified as Intergovernmental Relations was broadened and renamed External Relations. The other six goals remained the same. Ms. Crotty suggested that statements should be written for each goal that would clarify the intent of each.

GOALS

• Economic Development
• Fiscal Sustainability
• Infrastructure
• Technology
• Quality of Life
• Human Resources
• External relations

WHAT’S WORKING
The participants identified issues, programs and policies that are currently working well in the city:

• Leisure Services
• Fiscal Management
• Transparency – builds trust
• Response time
• Police
• Fire
• Public Works
• City Manager – communication, concerns
• Economic Development
• Retention of existing businesses
• New businesses
• Electronic permitting
• Rates for service – pricing appropriate (millage, water, leisure services)
• Commission leadership
• Legal Department – effective and efficient
• Staff longevity – relationships
• Water/wastewater Master Plan
• Roadway millage
• Healthcare
• Pay and classification
• Union negotiations
• Repair and replacement of city facilities – allocation
• Airport – Master Plan
• GAP Plan – incentives
• Cleanliness
• Replacement of water pipes
• Reclaimed water program
• Police department – community outreach
• Height limits

WHAT NEEDS WORK

The group then discussed areas that need additional work:

• Enterprise software – implementation
• Assistance from Sheriff or additional personal to reduce theft (vehicles)
• Homelessness – need agreed upon plan
• Ormond Crossing
• Traffic – Granada
• Pedestrian and bicycle safety
• Crosswalks – A1A
• Rising healthcare costs
• Cell phone connectivity
• Succession Planning
• Beach Access
• Attracting and retaining young people – housing, career opportunities
• Housing stock – not diverse
• Well-paying jobs
• Old Food Lion property
• A1A facelift
• Implementation of SCADA, INC (instrumentation and control)
• Terms of Commissioners
• Height limit in charter
• Parking downtown ~ knowledge
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Mayor and Commissioners identified objectives for each of the seven agreed upon goals and then determined which of the objectives should be priorities for implementation. The number in front of the objective indicates how many of the elected officials supported it. Objectives receiving the support of three or more are designated as priorities. The rest of the objectives are listed as other objectives. There is no significance to the order of the goals.

GOAL - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

GOAL STATEMENT: To provide a thriving economic environment in Ormond Beach that is consistent with existing plans for development and redevelopment.

Priority Objectives

(3) Incentivize Ormond Crossing by coordination with city Utility Master Plan
(3) Updated Downtown Master Plan (livable, walkable)
(3) Improve – alternative East-West routes

Other Objectives

(2) Development of SW quadrant of airport
(1) Continue implementation of Economic Development Plan
(0) Improve US 1/I-95 Interchange
(0) Continue GAP funding
GOAL - FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY

Goals Statement: To ensure that our city has the fiscal resources needed to efficiently govern, provide services at levels consistent with community expectations, and to advance programs and services that further the City's Vision.

Other Objectives

(2) Adhere to long term Financial Plan

(1) Continue multi-pronged approach to pensions

(0) Continue appropriate annexations

GOAL - INFRASTRUCTURE

GOAL STATEMENT: To provide and maintain core physical assets including streets, sidewalks, medians, buildings, technology, utilities and parks to the highest standards and conditions.

Other Objectives

(2) Continue maintenance, repair, and replacement program

(2) Continue implementation of Utilities Master Plan (water, wastewater, storm water, reclaimed)

(1) Funding of redundant sewer and water lines in US 1

(1) Explore LED colored lighting on Granada Bridge

(0) Maximize efficiency of lighting facilities
### GOAL – TECHNOLOGY

**GOAL STATEMENT:** Service and civic engagement for all residents, visitors and businesses.

**Priority Objective**

(4) Facilitate opportunities from cell tower connectivity

**Other Objectives**

(1) Implementation of Master IT Plan

(1) Continue implementation of ERP

(0) Continue implementation of SCADA and INC

### GOAL – QUALITY OF LIFE

**GOAL STATEMENT:** To provide a superior quality of life for all Ormond Beach residents that will continue to make Ormond Beach the *Community of Choice* in Volusia County.

**Priority Objectives**

(3) Continue to explore feasibility Westside Community Center with Emergency Operations component

(3) Explore more beach access

**Other Priorities**

(2) Implementation of Historic Preservation Plan

(2) Implementation of Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
GOAL - HUMAN RESOURCES

GOAL STATEMENT: To recruit, develop and retain a well-qualified, highly motivated and diverse customer-centered workforce that delivers first class services to our community.

Priority Objective

(4) Continue dialogue for Healthcare Plan – Balance cost/effectiveness

Other Objective

(2) Develop Succession Plan

GOAL - EXTERNAL RELATIONS

GOAL STATEMENT: To build and maintain strong relationships with government partners (national, state and local) and other key stakeholders to support the City’s direction and to advance the City’s Strategic Initiatives.

Priority Objective

(5) Initiate discussion with County regarding ongoing relationships

Other Objectives

(1) Continue participation in addressing homeless issue

(1) Explore development of citizen’s academy
**SUMMARY PRIORITY OBJECTIVES**

The Commission confirmed the following as their priority objectives. The number identified by number in ( ) in front of each objective) is the number of the Mayor and Commissioners that deemed this goal a priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Initiate discussion with County regarding ongoing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facilitate opportunities from cell tower connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue dialogue for Healthcare Plan – Balance cost/effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Incentivize Ormond Crossing by coordination with city Utility Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Updated Downtown Master Plan (livable, walkable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve – alternative East-West routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continue to explore feasibility Westside Community Center with Emergency Operations component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explore more beach access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY MANAGER
MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Mayor Partington and City Commissioners

Through: Joyce A. Shanahan, City Manager

From: Joyce A. Shanahan, City Manager

Date: May 16, 2017

Subject: Ormond Beach Strategic Plan Final Report - 2017

Commission Goal: N/A

Introduction

This is a request for the City Commission to approve a resolution formally adopting the updated 2017 Ormond Beach Strategic Plan.

Background

The City of Ormond Beach began the process of developing a strategic plan in May of 2015.

Community Conversations
Two Community Conversations were held so that residents and businesses could share their ideas, hopes, and dreams for the city's future to help enhance the quality of life in Ormond Beach. The first Community Conversation was held on Saturday, April 18, 2015, at 9:00 a.m. at the Performing Arts Center's Blue Room Dance Studio, with 47 people attending. The second Community Conversation was held on Wednesday, April 22, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., in the Senior Center Ballroom, with 68 people attending. Both events were facilitated by Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida.

Strategic Planning
The Community Conversations were followed by a Strategic Planning Workshop on May 12, 2015, for the City Commission and senior staff. Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, designed and facilitated all of the workshops. The City Commission adopted the Strategic Plan by resolution in July 2015.

Discussion

Strategic Plan Update
The Mayor, City Commission, and senior staff participated in a three-hour workshop that was held at City Hall on March 7, 2017. After a review by staff on the progress of the current strategic plan, Ms. Crotty asked the Mayor and Commissioners to affirm or revise the seven goals that had been established in 2015. The Commission agreed to maintain the existing goals, but broadened the scope of one of them. The goal that had previously been identified as “Intergovernmental Relations” was broadened and renamed “External Relations”. The other six goals remained the same. Ms. Crotty suggested that statements should be written for each goal that would clarify the intent of each (see attached report).

The participants then identified what was working well in the city and areas that needed additional work. This was followed by the identification of objectives under each of the goals and the selection of priorities for the next fiscal year. The attached update report is a summary of the discussions and conclusions of the workshop.

The Commission confirmed the following as their priority objectives.

(5) Initiate discussion with County regarding ongoing relationships

(4) Facilitate opportunities from cell tower connectivity

(4) Continue dialogue for Healthcare Plan - Balance cost/effectiveness

(3) Incentivize Ormond Crossing by coordination with city Utility Master Plan

(3) Updated Downtown Master Plan (livable, walkable)

(3) Improve - alternative East-West routes

(3) Continue to explore feasibility Westside Community Center with Emergency Operations component

(3) Explore more beach access

*The number identified by number in ( ) in front of each objective) is the number of the Mayor and Commissioners that deemed this objective a priority.*

**Budget Impact**

As projects are identified within each goal statement, projects will be budgeted through the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Operating Budget process.

**Citizen Impact Statement**

Strategic planning is more than good government, it makes good sense. By strategically identifying the priorities for our community we have the ability to transform our visions
for today into what we want our community to be in the future. This process keeps staff focused on the Commission's vision for our community and helps us document key milestones in the process.

**Recommendation**

It is requested the City Commission approve the attached resolution formally adopting the 2017 Ormond Beach Strategic Plan Update.

**Attachments:**

- 17-94 Strategic Plan Update (P17-0085G) (PDF)
- Ormond Beach Strategic Plan Update March 2017 (PDF)
- Minutes CC 2017-03-07 Strategic Planning Workshop (PDF)
- Strategic Planning Report 2015 (with minutes)  (PDF)

**REVIEWED BY:**

Kelly McGuire, Finance Director  5/9/2017

**APPROVED BY:**

Joyce A. Shanahan, City Manager  5/10/2017
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 Moisio, 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 successful 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 incredulity 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 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
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INTRODUCTION

In order to plan effectively for the future, the City of Ormond Beach conducted a community visioning/strategic planning process in April and May, 2015. The first steps in the process consisted of two community workshops during which Ormond Beach residents shared their dreams and aspirations for the future of the city (see report). This was followed by a strategic planning workshop on May 12th for the City Commission and senior staff. Ms. Marilyn Crotty, director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida designed and facilitated all of the workshops.

The Mayor, four Commissioners, the City Manager, and the City Attorney participated in the workshop along with senior staff. Ms. Crotty shared the information that had been collected at the community conversation sessions to provide input and guide the discussions of the Commission and staff. After examining external and internal trends and issues that may impact the city, the participants conducted an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the city as well as opportunities and threats it faces. This led to the identification of strategic issues the city should address and a set of goals and objectives for the city to accomplish in the next few years. The final activity of the workshop was the selection, by the City Commission, of priorities for implementation.

This report is a summary of the discussions and conclusions reached at the workshop.
EXTERNAL TRENDS AND ISSUES

The group discussed trends and issues that are occurring in the international, national, and state environment that may have an impact on the city in the near future. The following external forces were identified as significant for the City of Ormond Beach:

EPA – regulations
   Clean air and water – will be very expensive
Global warming – cause, impact
   Climate change
Unknown cost of energy
   Fossil fuels
Water
   Quantity, quality, cost
State population growth
Septic tanks – regulations/inspection
   Cost of replacement
Amendment 1 implementation
Aging population
   Retirees moving to Florida – active seniors
   Living longer
   Need for services
Technology changes
   Working remotely
   Driverless cars
Internet of things – both positives and negatives
   Everything is connected 24/7
Privacy issues
Young people – open their lives on line
Communication
   Texting instead of talking
   Loss of social skills
State pre-emption – loss of home rule
Unfunded mandates – Federal, state, county
Homeland security
   Terrorism
Police/community relations
Technology costs for policing
   Radios
   Body cams etc.
Cyber security
Economy
   Interest rates increase?
   Inflation?
Improving, but not in all areas
National debt increasing
County development
  Low wage
  Service oriented
  Lags the state

INTERNAL TRENDS AND ISSUES

The participants analyzed internal trends and issues that may have an impact on the city. The following items were identified:

Hiring and retaining employees – police department
Seasoned city workforce
Privately owned Ormond Crossing – only area for significant economic development; airport – city owned land available
  Need for infrastructure; accessibility
  Need partners – state, county
Apathy – citizen
Demographics
  Not attracting young people
  Household size smaller
Non-traditional households
Local economy -
  Residential – bedroom community
  Growth of rooftops
Mobility – constrained
  Granada only East/West corridor
Crime from outside city
  Individuals with no regard for the law
Technology issues – apps; solutions
Potential for political upheaval – no staggered terms, 2 year terms, no term limits
Working relationships with neighboring jurisdictions – positive and negative
Revenue challenges
Transition – office space to personal services spaces
Annexation – provision of services, increase in police
  Increase in tax base
The Commission and staff then identified what they perceive as strengths and weaknesses of the city and its government. They also identified opportunities and threats that the city faces. The following chart is a compilation of these ideas. The number in parentheses () next to each comment indicates how many participants made this or a similar comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff (8) – city, seasoned, professional, dedicated; loyal committed, caring, responsive led by excellent city manager; employee empowerment</td>
<td>Jobs (4) – have low paying jobs; need good wage jobs; availability of living wage jobs</td>
<td>Ormond Crossings (4) – Commencement of project</td>
<td>Unfunded mandates (5) – state; liabilities; federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life (4) – balanced; very positive in our city</td>
<td>Revenue (3) – sources; limited</td>
<td>Bridge (2) – dockage at bridge for downtown walkability</td>
<td>Economy (4) – fragile; national; downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (4) – ocean, river, beach</td>
<td>IT staffing/infrastructure to stay competitive</td>
<td>Recreation/civic -community center West Ormond</td>
<td>State (2) – mandated legislation that adds to local burdens; state and federal fiscal policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable political environment</td>
<td>Employee (2) – turnover; competitive wages</td>
<td>Completion of airport business park expansion (taxiway and roadways)</td>
<td>County (2) – and state/federal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation (5) – high sense of community; involvement; concern; involved civic organizations and citizenry</td>
<td>Taxes (3) – desire/need to maintain lowest rate in county; ultra-low rate, insufficient revenue $; rate insufficient to cover desired service level long-term</td>
<td>History (2) - Our history and historic places (i.e. Three Chimneys, Loop); historic preservation</td>
<td>Crime (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency (3)</td>
<td>Public participation</td>
<td>Ocean, rivers</td>
<td>Deteriorating roads/infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic pride;</td>
<td>Limited ability for economic development due to lack of land available for development</td>
<td>Expansion and complementary uses around parks</td>
<td>Maintain/expand services but not funds to pay for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>East/West corridors</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well managed</td>
<td>Unfunded mandates</td>
<td>Improving economy</td>
<td>Statutory requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Competitive wages employee retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive commission</td>
<td>External controls</td>
<td>Natural resources</td>
<td>Other local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment – great place to live, work and play</td>
<td>Limited riverfront and oceanfront opportunities</td>
<td>Tomoka Ave., New Britain, Vining Court</td>
<td>The desire to keep a tax rate that won't support our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City size</td>
<td>Personnel resources (too few)</td>
<td>Responsible growth</td>
<td>Competing cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing more with less</td>
<td>Continued adding of demands with existing resources</td>
<td>Livability of city – low cost attracts retirees</td>
<td>Development outside Ormond Beach with infrastructure impacts to Ormond Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well diversified values for living here</td>
<td>Creativity of staff</td>
<td>Development of other communities</td>
<td>Aging of electorate in isolated residential community far from services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4
STRATEGIC ISSUES

The Commission and staff identified strategic issues and organized them into like categories:

**Economic Development**
- Transportation infrastructure - Ormond Crossings
- North US1 redevelopment
- Airport – abatement and safety improvement
- Parking – Lincoln Ave., New Britain

**Fiscal Sustainability**
- Appropriate annexations
- Tax rate – developing funding model
- Pension

**Infrastructure**
- Hand Ave. extension
- Maintenance – repair and replace facilities and equipment
- Street resurfacing
- Median improvements
- Sidewalk improvements
- Stormwater
- Reuse water expansion

**Technology**
- Cell tower connectivity

**Quality of Life**
- Park add-ons – complimentary uses
- Historical preservation
- West side recreation/civic center
- Tennis courts – Beachside, interconnectivity
- Homelessness
- Bicycle pathways – interconnectivity
- Off beach parking - beach access

**Human Resources**
- Staffing
- Additional resources for police department personnel
- Employee health care

**Intergovernmental Relations**

The Commission confirmed that the seven strategic issues listed above were appropriate goal areas for the city.

The Commission identified objectives under each goal and then selected priorities. Any objective that received support from at least 3 Commissioners (number identified by number in ( ) in front
of each objective) is considered a priority. The rest of the objectives are listed as other. There is no significance to the order in which the goals and objectives are listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide a thriving economic environment in Ormond Beach that is consistent with existing plans for development and redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Objectives**
- (3) Continue implementation of Economic Development strategic plan
- (3) Provide parking for Lincoln Ave and New Britain

**Other Objectives**
- (2) Adoption and implementation of airport master plan
- (0) Develop alternatives for infrastructure plans for Ormond Crossing
- (0) Continue North US1 redevelopment efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL - FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that our city has the fiscal resources needed to efficiently govern, provide services at levels consistent with community expectations, and to advance programs and services that further the City’s Vision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Objective**
- (5) Develop funding model that meets city’s needs

**Other Objectives**
- (2) Explore appropriate annexations
- (1) Continue multi-pronged approach to reduce pension liability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL – INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide and maintain core physical assets including streets, sidewalks, medians, buildings, technology, utilities and parks to the highest standards and conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Objective**
- (5) Continue/expand maintenance, repair and replacement plan

**Other Objectives**
- (1) Continue implementation of utilities master plan – stormwater reuse, wastewater
(0) Fund, design and construct Hand Ave. extension
(0) Continue implementation of median/sidewalk improvements and street resurfacing

**GOAL - TECHNOLOGY**
To create a technologically enabled community that fosters transparency, efficiency, effective service and civic engagement for all residents, visitors and businesses.

**Priority Objective**
(5) Develop master plan for IT

**Other Objectives**
(0) Improve opportunities for cell tower connectivity
(0) Continue expansion of fiber optic network
(0) Ensure website is transparent and up to date; easy to access
(0) SCADA system upgrade

**GOAL - QUALITY OF LIFE**
To provide a superior quality of life for all Ormond Beach residents that will continue to make Ormond Beach the Community of Choice in Volusia County.

**Priority Objectives**
(3) Update parks/recreation master plan including complimentary uses, tennis courts beachside
(3) Develop historic preservation plan

**Other Objectives**
(2) Explore feasibility of developing West side recreation/civic center complex
(2) Encourage greater beach access and East side parking
(0) Develop city-wide bicycle pedestrian path plan

**GOAL - HUMAN RESOURCES**
To recruit, develop and retain a well-qualified, highly motivated and diverse customer-centered workforce that delivers first class services to our community.
**Other Objectives**
(2) Address staffing needs related to capital projects
(2) Provide employee healthcare that balances cost with effectiveness
(1) Provide and fund staffing needed for police department

---

**GOAL - INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS**
To build and maintain strong relationships with government partners (national, state and local) and other key stakeholders to support the City’s direction and to advance the City’s Strategic Initiatives.

---

**Other Objectives**
(2) Continue active participation in Volusia Safe Harbor committee
(0) Continued participation, advocacy, and service on boards/committees at local, state, and federal levels
(0) Promote redistricting efforts for equitable representation of the city

---

**SUMMARY - PRIORITY OBJECTIVES**
The Commission confirmed the following as their priority objectives. The number identified by number in ( ) in front of each objective) is the number of the Mayor and Commissioners that deemed this goal a priority.

(5) Continue/expand maintenance, repair and replacement plan
(5) Develop funding model that meets city’s needs
(5) Develop master plan for IT
(3) Continue implementation of Economic Development strategic plan
(3) Provide parking for Lincoln Ave and New Britain
(3) Update parks/recreation master plan including complimentary uses, tennis courts, beachside
(3) Develop historic preservation plan
I. Welcome and Introductions

Present were Facilitator Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, Police Chief Andy Osterkamp, Economic Development Director Joe Mannarino, Information Technology Director Ned Huhta, City Clerk Scott McKee, Utilities Manager Dave Ponitz, and Executive Secretary Terri Hamsher; and 45 citizens that were distributed amongst seven (7) tables.

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, welcomed those in attendance and thanked them for being there, especially early on a Saturday morning. She explained that this was the first Community Conversation Workshop and that it would begin the strategic planning process for the City Commission. She noted that two Community Conversation Workshops would be held and explained that as both would follow the same format it was not necessary for any of those present to attend the second one in addition to this one. She explained that the feedback that the citizens provided in this workshop would be shared with the City Commission for their Strategic Planning Workshop. She welcomed the audience to the workshop and thanked them for attending on behalf of the City Commission.

Ms. Shanahan introduced Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida. She explained that Ms. Crotty held Community Conversations and Strategic Planning workshops throughout Central Florida and the state. She asked those in attendance to join her in welcoming Ms. Crotty.

Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, thanked Ms. Shanahan and the audience. She stated that Ormond Beach was a beautiful city. She stated that she lived in Seminole County and noted that on her drive into the city, she thought that Ormond Beach was a special place. She explained that she was a native of Florida and had grown up in Orlando and visited the beach in Volusia County every summer as a child. She stated that she was delighted to be there today to assist.

II. Overview of Strategic Planning Process

Ms. Crotty explained that she wanted to let those in attendance know that most cities did no strategic planning. She stated that only good cities undertook strategic planning and that the ones who most needed to do so usually did not. She noted that those cities that needed it were often focused just on the issue of the day without thinking of long term consequences and were usually more concerned with their own positions rather than the future of their community. She stated that Ormond Beach was going through a strategic planning process and was also engaging their citizens. She noted that most cities confined strategic planning to City Commission and staff participation only. She explained that Ormond Beach was starting their process by
asking citizens about their dreams, desires and interests for the community. She stated that she hoped it would be a pleasant experience and that the citizens would gain as much as they gave.

Ms. Crotty stated that the conversation would be totally participatory and asked that citizens be equipped to both talk and listen. She explained that the city staff present would observe but would not be a part of the discussion as this part of the process was just for citizens. She noted that there would be a repeat session of this workshop on Wednesday, April 22, 2015. She invited the citizens in attendance to share that information with their friends and neighbors so that they could take the opportunity to weigh in with their ideas, as well. She stated that the City Commission would have their Strategic Planning Workshop on May 12, 2015, beginning at 3:30 p.m. She explained that members of the public were welcome to attend and observe the session. She explained that all of the information generated at today’s session would be put into a report that she would write for the City Commission to use during their process. She stated that the city would use the contact information on the sign-in sheet to email or mail a copy of the report to those in attendance once it was completed.

Ms. Crotty noted that agendas with a worksheet on the back had been given to each participant. She explained that conversations would be held and ideas would be shared amongst the groups at each of the tables. She explained that in order to capture the conversations each table had a flip chart on an easel and markers. She stated that each table would need a volunteer to serve as the recorder or scribe. She noted that the only requirement to serve as the scribe was to have somewhat legible handwriting as she would have to interpret what was written in order to include it in her report. She explained that not everything said needed to be recorded but that the scribe should write down the key points discussed and the essence of what comments were made by the individuals in their group. She explained that reports would be made from each table to the overall group summarizing their discussions. She stated that someone at each table would need to serve as the speaker to make their report.

III. Identification of Community Treasures and Values

Ms. Crotty stated that she wanted the audience to think about treasures and values. She explained that this meant to think about the qualities, characteristics and things in Ormond Beach that made it a place that they loved. She asked them to think about the things in the community that mattered a lot to them and about the values that they would like to see continued in the future. She asked the audience members to introduce themselves to the other members of their table groups before beginning their discussions. She explained that some of the things discussed would be specific physical characteristics of the city and some would be qualities that made the city the place it was. She asked them to think about the values of the city and things that were guiding principles that people in the city subscribed to and wanted to see the city continue to have. She requested that treasures be discussed first. She noted that values underlie actions, activities and the sense of community in Ormond Beach.

The worksheet discussion question was presented as follows:
Part 1 – Treasures and Values
What are the treasures and values of Ormond Beach... the things (whether physical places, or intangibles like community character) you love about the city and want to see continued, protected or improved? What would you want to ensure is preserved as Ormond Beach plans for the future?

Ms. Crotty asked if there were any questions.

An individual from the audience asked if a roster of those participating in the workshop would be included in Ms. Crotty's report; whereby, Ms. Crotty stated that the city could add that information.

Ms. Crotty requested members of the audience to raise their hands if they had lived in the city for 50 years or more. She repeated the exercise with those that had lived in the city for 30 years, 20 years, 15 years, ten years, five years and less than five years. She noted that there were respondents for each category. She stated that a great mix was represented among those who had lived in the city long term and those that were fairly new to it.

An individual in the audience asked whether someone would be presenting the plan adopted by the city; whereby, Ms. Crotty explained that the city did not presently have a strategic plan in place but noted that they had many plans for different aspects. She explained that the citizens present had an opportunity to help the overall strategic plan that was being developed. She noted that at this session they did not want staff or elected officials to influence the citizens' input and wanted to hear from the citizens directly.

Another individual in the audience inquired about whether they could keep the agenda paper provided and another individual inquired about getting an extra agenda handout.

Ms. Crotty clarified that anything anyone said at the table was valuable and that the entire table group did not have to agree on an idea for it to be included on the flip chart. She stated that she would give the groups about 15 to 20 minutes to complete their first discussion and reminded them to give themselves time to discuss the values as well as the treasures.

Ms. Crotty instructed the group discussions to begin at 9:24 a.m.

Discussion among the groups at the tables ensued.

Ms. Crotty asked the groups to complete their discussions and to provide their reports at 9:54 a.m.

The citizens in attendance had been divided into seven tables. The table groups' reports were presented in no particular order. Ms. Crotty asked for volunteers and the groups presented in the order in which they volunteered to speak.

Table 4:
Mr. Jeff Boyle, 614 N. Halifax Drive, was the speaker for Table Four. He stated that history was a treasure in Ormond Beach, which included historical architecture such as the MacDonald House and Ames House, as well the historic heritage in the city.
such as the Tomoka and Timucuan Indians, Birthplace of Speed history, Three Chimneys site, Spanish and English area history, and Rockefeller era history. He stated that the city's history was unique, and they had listed it first on their list of treasures. He stated that Ormond Beach was well served aesthetically and in function by its parks, open spaces, and recreation. He noted that a real treasure was the city's unique natural beauty including its two rivers and an ocean. He stated that other treasures included Ormond Beach's small town flair, trees, and conservation areas in the city and bordering it to the north, eclectic residential neighborhoods both old and new, particularly along the river and in older communities, and efficient responsive government.

Mr. Boyle stated that people built Ormond Beach one brick at a time. He noted that values in Ormond Beach included a spirit of volunteerism and a positive community spirit. He relayed a story of two Ormond Beach residents rescuing others on boats in raging seas in 1896 and cited it as an example of people helping others in the city. He noted that spirit continued in the city and was evidenced by community members attending the session this morning to try and make the city a better place. He stated that other values in Ormond Beach included a sense of place, a small town atmosphere, and the responsibility and recognition to take care of seniors and children in the city. He noted that leisure activities served those groups well.

Table 7
Mr. Charles Ferguson, 44 Kent Drive, was the speaker for Table Seven, he stated that the outdoor recreational opportunities in Ormond Beach were wonderful. He stated that other treasures in Ormond Beach included true wildlife areas and wonderful parks including Central Park and Andy Romano Beachfront Park. He explained that his group felt that Ormond Beach was very unique and had a wonderful history. He lamented the destruction of the Ormond Hotel and noted that it had been the largest wooden hotel in the world. He stated that the loss of that hotel was a tragedy and a tremendous demonstration of ignorance. He explained that he knew money was a factor in its loss, but he felt that it could have put Ormond Beach on the world's map. He stated that another mistake like that should not be made with the history of Ormond Beach, noting that Ormond Beach still had a lot of historical sites such as The Casements.

Mr. Ferguson stated that City Hall and the library were beautifully combined with the river and Granada Bridge. He stated that Ormond Beach was blessed by God and nature to have treasures such as the Halifax River, Tomoka River and ocean. He explained that while Ormond Beach was a small town, it had a lot of culture and a level of sophistication. He clarified that sophistication was not snobbishness. He cited Palm Beach as an example of an area where the population felt very separated and were trying to outdo one another. He stated that Ormond Beach had family friendly values and remained affordable. He noted that Ormond Beach had sensible development and needed to continue to maintain that pattern. He stated that trees and historic buildings should be protected. He stated that the public school system was good and cited Seabreeze High School and the new middle school on the mainland as examples. He summarized that Ormond Beach was a wonderful city and should be kept that way.

Table 6
Ms. Shannon McLeish, 25 Live Oak Drive, was the speaker for Table Six, she noted that her table had discussions that were similar to Table Four and Table Seven. She
clarified that the treasures and values she would mention were not necessarily in any order. She stated that they discussed placing a high priority on river and beach access and public access to parks. She stated that other treasures and values included leisure services, celebrations and festivals, volunteerism, the library and museum, and history and historic buildings, such as The Casements, MacDonald House, and Ames House. She noted that walk-ability was also mentioned as well as neighborly values, the safety of city, the feeling of comfort and well-being, and the small businesses. She noted that her group discussed the responsiveness of city officials including the continued need for transparency without hidden agendas and the preservation of public space and history. She explained that what made Ormond Beach was that the community and community groups were committed to preserving the history of the city. She stated that they all discussed environmental preservation and family values. She also noted that blight remained in core areas but that would be a later topic for discussion.

An individual at Table Six noted that Ms. McLeish’s two young daughters were seated at the table and that they were two of the youngest Ormond Beach residents. She explained that the two girls had spoken up and had contributed the topic of environmental preservation to the discussion.

Ms. Crotty noted that strategic planning was important as it was for the future of Ormond Beach which included the young girls and their friends.

**Table 2**
Mr. Harold Briley, 902 Village Drive, as speaker for Table Two, stated that the first treasures they discussed were the city’s recreational facilities, noting that the citizens of Ormond Beach were blessed to have the finest recreational facilities in Volusia County and maybe even the east coast of Florida. He stated that other treasures and values in the City of Ormond Beach included the small town feel, strong sense of community, maintaining height limits on the beachside, parks and beautification, smart development, historic preservation of historical sites, such as the MacDonald House, historic Fire station and Ames House, the beach and river, first class facilities, parks, City Hall, library, and Performing Arts Center. He stated that Ormond Beach had the finest government services in the area and that citizen participation was a key value. He noted that the four corners of the bridge were also a treasure. He stated that other values discussed included the low crime rate, safe neighborhoods, community events and diverse population based on age. He noted that Mr. Rick Fraser, Executive Director of the Ormond Beach Chamber of Commerce, was seated at his table and had shared that 20 years ago the demography was much older than it was presently. He stated that environmental assets such as the Tomoka River were also city treasures. He stated that business diversity and the business park distinguished Ormond Beach from other communities.

**Table 3**
Mr. Jerry Valcik, 236 Ormwood Drive, as speaker for Table Three, stated that he was chosen to speak by default and noted that his hearing was limited. He explained that since this was a workshop his group’s intent had been to throw up ideas but not in any particular order. He stated that developers needed to provide more than minimal landscaping for aesthetic value and that the height limit should stay at 75 feet for buildings. He stated that the city should have appropriate signage announcing entry into Ormond Beach, but he noted that while it cost a lot of money to have a very nice
sign or signs they felt it was important to have. He noted that recreation facilities were a treasure in the city. He explained that the preservation of historic buildings was important to some and that the preservation of the MacDonald House was a big issue. He noted that many members of the Ormond Beach Historical Society could not attend this workshop session, but they would attend the following one to present their information. He explained that he had taken ten minutes to put together his own views on the MacDonald House, but he felt that this was not the venue to present that information and he would make it available electronically.

Mr. Valcik stated that the city took advantage of recycled water and charged $17 a month for all of the recycled water one desired. He noted how important that was especially in light of the water supply issues in California. He stated that there should be consideration in the city to expand recycled water and water conservation measures. He stated that road and utility improvements should be tweaked, as well. He noted that the city had a wonderful and solid capital program, but it needed some adjustments. He explained that years ago the city replaced concrete aprons when roads were improved, but those aprons were now cracking. He noted that he was a civil engineer and knew that expansion joints were necessary. He stated that 95% of driveway pads were cracking and that more attention needed to be placed on the good design of utilities. He stated that green spaces also needed to be preserved and noted that 75% of Florida voters voted for Amendment One in order to maintain more green spaces. He noted that there had been some resistance to that in the legislature.

Mr. Valcik stated that Ormond Beach had a fine quality of life and noted that the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) had designed Ormond Beach as the best place to retire several years earlier. He stated that Ormond Beach values were family-oriented and pet-friendly. He stated that another value was the responsiveness of the city government, noting that you could send a message and receive a response within a day. He stated that Ormond Beach needed to attract more young people without gray hair to the area. He stated that fiscal responsibility was another value, and he noted that the elected leadership was working hard to be fiscally responsible, which was appreciated. He noted that pension reform was an issue, however. He explained that State Representative Fred Costello was forward thinking in that respect and suggested that any changes in the pension system had to be made gradually and not abruptly. He stated that Ormond Beach had a nice appreciation for, and catered to, senior citizens. He stated that Ormond Beach also had values as a strong faith-based community. He noted that it was appreciated that Ormond Beach was open to citizen input.

**Table 5**

Mr. Al Jorczak, 679 N. Beach Street, as speaker for Table Five, noted that many items on his table group’s list had already been discussed. He stated that they valued the beach, recreation facilities and historic buildings. He explained that he had lived in many parts of the country and had yet to see another city that matched Ormond Beach with respect to its quality of life and resident involvement in the city. He noted that many groups participated in citizen involvement. He explained that there was an obvious attitude of being protective of nature as evidenced by maintaining nature facilities, the geographic area of The Loop, and the connection of the waterways in Central Park. He stated that the facilities and activities for seniors were a treasure in the city and very important due to an older population base and the amount of retirees in the city. He stated that one value was the safety of the city,
noting that while every city had elements of crime it was mostly controlled in Ormond Beach. He noted that significant improvements were made in the police department over the years to stay on top of the activities going on.

Mr. Jorczak stated that another value was transparency with respect to the city and communication with city leaders and the community as a whole. He explained that the city’s website was a great source of information and that the city did a good job of keeping the community apprised of what was going on in the city. He commended Ms. Shanahan for her reports to the City Commission and noted that they were extremely detailed, and he had never seen anything like them in other communities. He explained that those reports detailed meetings held and provided a broad framework of the workings of every department operating within the city. He stated that conservation activities and the small town atmosphere in Ormond Beach were also valued. He noted that Ormond Beach was a clean and orderly city.

Mr. Jorczak explained that zombie homes were still an issue but noted that the city was working on correcting that. He noted that it was a nationwide problem not exclusive to Ormond Beach. He explained that the city was doing what they could within the limits of the law to rein in the portion of Ormond Beach that was not up to standards. He stated that Ormond Beach had good quality schools and a diversified economic base. He explained that a hot button topic for him to tackle would be future planning and what was wanted and where it should be located. He stated that transitioning Ormond Beach from a bedroom community for the Daytona Beach area to something greater than that would be a very important part of the discussion.

**Table 1**
Ms. Elaine Tindell, 5 Riverside Circle, as speaker for Table One, explained that she was elected to speak for her table group because she was the longest residing Ormond Beach resident at her table, as she had lived in Ormond Beach for over 45 years. She stated that treasures in Ormond Beach included beach driving and preservation of historical sites, noting that historical sites had been discussed at length already by other tables. She explained that when she moved to the city, Granada Boulevard was a two-lane dirt road and that a lot of growth had occurred since then. She noted that while growth was often good, it was important to preserve history as well. She stated that other treasures in Ormond Beach which were discussed included parks, golf courses, The Loop, community activities, Granada Boulevard nightlife, the ocean and rivers, and the beautification on Granada Boulevard, which was quite important to their group.

Ms. Tindell stated that the lack of traffic, polite consideration citizens, fitness and recreation opportunities, and the preservation of trees were also valued. She stated that Ormond Beach had a lot of trees, especially in the Riverside Drive area and in The Loop. She explained that a lot of people looked for trees on their property when purchasing a home and as such would want to live in an older established neighborhood. She stated that other treasures mentioned included the airport and the quality of life in the city and its weather and climate. She noted that John D. Rockefeller thought that Ormond Beach was perfect. She stated that her group also valued the cleanliness of the city, lack of overcrowding, the abundance of churches, good schools, the Nova Skate Park, and the Ormond Beach Sports Complex. She noted that preserving history was especially discussed.
Ms. Crotty noted that there was obviously a great deal of consensus on several topics among all the table groups, which sent an important message. She noted that while there was much support for similar issues at each table group there was also a unique flavor from table to table.

Ms. Crotty announced that there would be a short break in the session. The break began at 10:23 a.m. and concluded at 10:38 a.m.

IV. Ormond Beach – 2025 Vision

Ms. Crotty noted that there had been a small amount of attrition during the break. She asked the group members at the least populated tables to fill in at the other tables wherever there were available seats, which resulted in the loss of one table.

Ms. Crotty asked the participants to redirect their focus from what they loved about the present day community to the future of the community. She asked them to think about Ormond Beach ten to 20 years into the future. She invited them to dream their best dreams. She asked them to think about their aspirations for the community in that timeframe, even if they were no longer there. She asked them to think about what the city would look like in ten to 20 years, specifically what residents will have, what businesses will be like, and what functions the government would provide.

Ms. Crotty explained that there were no restraints in this exercise and advised them not to get bogged down in what cost too much or was feasible. She stated that if they did not put forth their true dreams for the future, then they would not come close to getting the future that they wanted for their children and grandchildren. She noted that reality would set in during the strategic planning process and all of the developed goals and objectives may not all appear. She stated that this was their chance to inform the City Commission of their dreams so that they were aware of the things citizens wanted to see in the future. She stated that she wanted them to talk about the future of the city and how Ormond Beach could be better than it already was. She noted that these were brainstorming conversations so no topic was out of bounds and that every idea was valid. She noted that reports would be presented again after discussions as had been done for the previous topic. She stated that she would give the groups 40 to 45 minutes for this conversation and that this was their chance to dream.

The worksheet discussion question was presented as follows:

Part II – Visioning
It is the year 2025. In the years since 2015, the City of Ormond Beach has fulfilled all the hopes you had for the future of the community back when you attended the community meeting in 2015.

What is the City of Ormond Beach like? What does it look like? What is it like to live here, work here, raise a family here, retire here? What kinds of economic activity take place here? What else would you say to fully describe the City of Ormond Beach you would like to see in ten years?
Ms. Crotty instructed the groups to decide the three most important things that they would like the city to accomplish in the next ten years and would like the City Commission to pay attention to. She asked for the groups to identify them so that the City Commission received clear direction when planning for the future of the city. She explained that the groups could vote or agree on these items by consensus and asked for them to identify their top three priorities on their flipcharts with a star or check mark by them.

Ms. Crotty instructed the group discussions to begin at 10:42 a.m.

Discussion among the groups at the tables ensued.

Ms. Crotty asked the groups to finish their discussions and to provide their reports at 11:28 a.m.

Due to some attrition during the break, the citizens were now divided amongst six tables instead of the previous seven. The table groups' reports were presented in no particular order. Ms. Crotty asked for volunteers and the groups presented in the order in which they volunteered to speak.

Table 4
Mr. Jeff Boyle, 614 N. Halifax Drive, as speaker for Table Four, stated that his table sort of "cheated" on their first priority as they had named their first priority to be to maintain all of the treasures and values that were listed during their first report. He noted that maintaining those treasures and values would achieve a sense of permanence and predictability in the community and noted that change was not always good. He explained that their second priority was the main arteries in the city. He stated that they would be very critical as there was no opportunity to build new arteries into the city and named the present two arteries as US1 and State Road 40 (SR40). He noted that A1A was built out except for abandoned commercial properties. He explained that the city and the Ormond Beach Chamber of Commerce had been working on gateway concepts for 20 years and explained that it was hard for the government to get private property owners to do the right thing. He noted that they worried about the new development outside of the city along the city's border and how it would impact the city's traffic. He explained that while Granada Boulevard did not need to be six lanes presently, it may need to be expanded to that during the future 20 years. He noted that it was built to accommodate that change.

Mr. Boyle stated that the US1 corridor needed to be enhanced to better draw business and industry into the Ormond Crossings project. He noted that Ormond Crossings presently was not off of the ground due to the economy and market. He stated that their final priority was smart growth, and he explained that Ormond Beach needed smart growth and standards for residential and commercial properties both in form and function. He stated that smart growth also dealt with renewable energy sources and being a good steward of the water, noting that the city was already a good steward but could be even better. He noted that smart growth also covered biking and beach access. He stated that the city also needed government to still be responsive in the future. He explained that this exercise was indicative of the government wanting to know the feelings of the people. He noted that this was a new endeavor and explained that when he served as a City Commissioner the Commission sat in a room by themselves with staff during their planning processes.
He hoped the exercise would be perpetual and would still be done 20 years in the future.

Table 6
Ms. Shannon McLeish, 25 Live Oak Drive, as speaker for Table Six, stated that their first priority was to enshrine, perhaps in the city codes, permanent protections and the highest possible maintenance for the city’s cultural properties, public spaces and history. She stated that the city was not making the best use of what they had, much less adding to it, and it was important to do so for the future. She stated that another participant at her table would help her elaborate on this priority.

Ms. Alice Jaeger, 10 Beechwood Drive, as speaker for Table Six, stated that Ms. Alice Strickland wrote a book on the history of Ormond Beach that she encouraged all to read. She stated that Ormond Beach had a great colorful history and was once home to smugglers, shipwrecks, and even a bordello on Orchard Lane. She stated that “history sells” and cited the City of St. Augustine as an example. She suggested that Ormond Beach could have outdoor theatre performances of the history of Ormond Beach. She noted that The Casements and the Ormond Beach Historical Society both sold the book she had mentioned. She stated that Eileen Butts’ House was a beautiful jewel and noted that Ms. Butts’ daughter used to tell stories of riding horse carts to the beach. She stated that John D. Rockefeller and a female Olympic golfer had played on a local golf course.

Ms. Jaeger asked why these great ideas connected with Ormond Beach were not being marketed. She stated that highlighting the city’s history could lead to economic development and diversity. She hoped for a permanent answer to preserving the city’s historic buildings. She noted that groups of citizens had been fighting to save some of the mentioned buildings since 1993. She stated that all of the beautiful preserved historic sites in Ormond Beach had been kept because citizens fought for them. She stated that they did not want to lose the MacDonald House or the historic Fire Station, like they had lost the Ormond Garage. She stated that they did not want to lose The Casements, like the Ormond Hotel had been lost. She explained that the Ormond Hotel no longer existed and that ghostly images and remnants of old hotels did not add to the economy but real historic buildings did.

Ms. McLeish stated that these historic buildings should not be gotten rid of and that the time spent fighting to preserve them could be better spent. She noted that was why her group mentioned enshrining protection for them. She stated that their second priority was conservation, sustainability, and environmental efforts. She explained that this included reuse water, researching pesticide and herbicide usage, solar hot water heaters, and possibly grants for homes. She stated that public building roofs were wasted spaces that could be used for solar panels.

Ms. McLeish stated that their third priority was walk-ability and public open spaces for bicyclists and pedestrians. She explained that in cities such as Neptune Beach and Atlantic Beach those cities slowed traffic on their streets that would be similar to Beach Street in Ormond Beach, and it caused tremendous development in the area in those cities that were similar to US1 in Ormond Beach. She stated that natural areas close to the river were a booming community core and needed public open space to encourage walk-ability. She noted that also included underground wiring and more sidewalks. She explained that Buford, South Carolina, was an intercoastal city that made its downtown area by the river and implemented a promenade there.
which in turn caused business development. She noted that St. Augustine had many walk-able areas and the improvements there had branched into nearby neighborhoods which highlighted its history and architectural diversity. She stated that Ormond Beach had funding in the form of monies that came into the city earmarked to address blight, but they were not going where they should because of a lack of knowledge and participation. She noted that those funds were going to things like paving baseball diamonds instead of repairing homes which were falling down.

Ms. Crotty reminded everyone to focus on presenting their top three priorities.

**Table 3**
Mr. Jerry Valcik, 236 Ormwood Drive, as speaker for Table Three, stated that the first future priority for his table group was an emphasis on vocational and technical training. He explained that one of the participants at his table had a contracting business and had difficulty finding good people to do blue collar work. He noted that a lot of people were not college material, and they felt that there should be a good focus on vocational schools. He stated that their second priority was affordable medical care which included affordable and sufficient facilities for elder care, assisted living facilities, and facilities which were pet friendly. He stated that their third priority was to control environmental degradation. He explained that the latest technology should be applied to any wastewater discharges from Ormond Beach into the Halifax River. He noted that there recently had been a lot of focus on degradation in the lagoon system since it had finally gotten to a point where it was interfering with the economic well-being of the fishing industry. He noted that he had read an article in the religion section of the newspaper that day regarding the stewardship of the Earth. He stated that the environment should be a priority for the legislature and awareness of environmental issues should be increased.

**Table 7**
Ms. Kimberly Park, 911 Hibiscus Avenue, Holly Hill, as speaker for Table Seven, stated that one of their priorities was to preserve the beauty and quality of life in Ormond Beach and to improve and maintain sensible development and smart growth. She noted that they were referring to physical beauty in nature as well as architectural and historic beauty. She explained that she did not live in Ormond Beach and was new to Florida and noted that her table group contained someone who had lived in the city most of their life and also another couple who were newer to the area. She further explained that if she moved to a new city in the area she would decide between Daytona Beach and Ormond Beach and was weighing the pros and cons of both.

Ms. Park stated that another priority was to develop a Main Street area. She explained that they did not want a Main Street like Daytona Beach’s, but one more like the ones in Deland and Winter Park. She stated that Winter Park was too far to travel to visit that type of area. She noted that parking would be the key to creating a downtown Main Street community area. She noted that such an area would draw in diverse crowds. She stated that it would have to provide walk-ability. She explained that she presently drove 15 minutes to use the YMCA and felt it was a long round-trip coupled with the time it took to perform her exercise. She stated that in a Main Street type area citizens could talk to community members while they strolled and enjoyed restaurants. She stated that such an area would bring businesses to the area.
Ms. Park explained that she lived in California for a long time and that the new couple at her table was from New York. She noted that both places had more diversity in age and ethnicity. She stated that she thought that Ormond Beach could do better in that regard. She noted that the dilemma was how to do so. She stated that a diverse economic base would help achieve increased diversity in the population. She suggested that businesses beyond hospitals and retirement related businesses be targeted. She suggested the city get a technology-related employer, but they were not speaking about manufacturing as they wanted to preserve the clean air and water in the city. She explained that high paying jobs would bring in ethnically diverse individuals and attract a population who liked to go out and spend money after work hours. She noted that would allow businesses to stay open later and serve larger population groups. She stated that they desired businesses beyond the traditional economic base which was just professional uses and "mom and pop" type businesses. She explained that a large high-technology business would bring in a large number of families and individuals who could provide a different kind of life blood for the community.

**Table 1**
Ms. Elaine Tindell, 5 Riverside Circle, as speaker for Table One, stated that when she was living in Ormond Beach during the 1970s and 1980s she never gave a thought to the fact that the Ormond Hotel would not always be there. She stated that historic preservation was their top priority. She noted that she could not imagine the future of Ormond Beach without the MacDonald House, the historic Fire Station, and the Ames House. She explained that her group recommended that the MacDonald House be renovated, and that the Tennis Center and its parking area along with all other historical homes be maintained. She stated that their second priority was to encourage new business for clean development. She stated that members at the table had stated that there was not enough being done to attract new business in the area, especially at the airport, and they felt that the airport could be made more attractive to pilots coming in. She stated that their third priority was to develop more beach accessibility. She noted that all citizens needed to be able to get to the beach and that the beach needed to be accessible for citizens and not just tourists.

**Table 2**
Mr. Harold Briley, 902 Village Drive, as speaker for Table Two, stated that one of their priorities was to focus attention on older neighborhoods and areas that were blighted and run down. He stated that the other priorities were a walk-able downtown and no high rises on the beach. He stated that other topics discussed for the future were traffic issues, having more African American owned businesses in the Sudan area north of Granada Boulevard and US1, identifying more of the founding families in the Sudan area, and possibly naming streets after them. He explained that members of the table also spoke for and against dog-friendly beaches and businesses. He stated that the table discussed continued improvements on Beach Street and Granada Boulevard, including landscaping and redevelopment of existing businesses, and there was a suggestion to create a Birthplace of Speed museum, possibly in the old S.R. Perrott building on Granada Boulevard. He noted that they discussed having direction signage in the city, more outdoor event venues, more opportunities for higher paying jobs, the construction of Ormond Crossings, and redevelopment on north and south US1 and South Nova Road.
V. Conclusion

Ms. Crotty stated that there was a lot of consensus regarding several issues which would be reflected in her report. She noted that there would be a clear direction provided to the City Commission. She stated that some of the same comments and issues may come up again during the April 22, 2015, Community Conversation session, but some different subjects may also be discussed.

Ms. McLeish asked if she could add something that their table forgot to mention; whereby, Ms. Crotty stated that she could.

Ms. McLeish stated that her table group wanted to see parks and historic properties added to but not at the expense of losing current historic properties, and she cited the historic Fire Station as an example. She explained that the Fire Station had been a tremendous loss and should be returned to the city, but no other historic properties should be lost in order to do so.

Ms. Crotty thanked the reports and scribes from each group for volunteering. She asked the audience members how they heard about this session.

Various audience members stated that they heard about the session by mail, email, the newspaper, or at church. One individual noted that he heard about the session the prior Wednesday and thought there should have been more advance notification.

Ms. Crotty asked the audience members to please raise their hands if they felt that this was a worthwhile activity. All audience members raised their hands.

Ms. Crotty explained that she would be facilitating the session with the City Commission and that the feedback from the citizen sessions would be included. She explained that all of their ideas would be fed into the City Commission’s activity.

Ms. McLeish asked if the City Commission’s Strategic Planning Session would be open to members of the public.

Ms. Crotty replied that it would be. She stated that their session would be held on May 12, 2015, at City Hall. She explained that the City Commission’s session would be in the form of a workshop and not a regular meeting, and as such citizens would be welcome to attend but would be doing so in an observational role. She noted that any ideas the City Commission wished to adopt would be before them again at a regular City Commission meeting for a vote. She explained that the City Commission would not vote or make any final decisions at their session.

Mr. Briley stated that he wished to thank Ms. Crotty, Ms. Shanahan, and city staff for the session.

Ms. Crotty thanked the audience and noted that everyone had participated and added something to the discussion. She stated that everyone had listened to each other, and it had been a great opportunity for them to get to know someone else in their community and hear other opinions. She noted that it had been an outstanding atmosphere.
Ms. Shanahan applauded Ms. Crotty and thanked her. She noted that there was another Community Conversation being held on Wednesday, April 22, 2015, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. and that the City Commission’s Strategic Planning Workshop would be held on Tuesday, May 12, 2015, from 3:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. She explained that the Commission would have their discussion and develop a strategic plan which would be formally adopted at a later City Commission meeting.

Ms. McLeish asked if there was a date for that meeting available yet; whereby Ms. Shanahan replied that there was not, but an email list could be developed from the sign-in sheet from this session and notice could be provided as to the date when it was scheduled.

An individual in the audience asked if the City Commission’s Strategic Planning Workshop would be held straight through from 3:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.; whereby, Ms. Shanahan replied that while there may be a break in the session, the City Commission would not leave and the meeting would encompass that timeframe.

Ms. Shanahan explained that this session was a demonstration of active citizen engagement and volunteerism, which was what community was all about. She thanked the participants on behalf of her and the City Commission. She encouraged them to attend the Celtic Festival being held that day in Rockefeller Gardens.

The workshop ended at 11:58 a.m.

Transcribed by: Colby Cilento
MINUTES
CITY OF ORMOND BEACH
COMMUNITY CONVERSATION WORKSHOP

April 22, 2015 6:00 p.m. Senior Center Ballroom

I. Welcome and Introductions

Present were Facilitator Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director Ted MacLeod, Finance Director Kelly McGuire, Planning Director Ric Goss, Fire Chief Bob Mandarino, Human Resources Director Claire Whitley, Assistant Finance Director Dan Stauffer, Public Works Operations Manager Kevin Gray, Grants Coordinator and Public Information Officer Loretta Moisio, Leisure Services Director Robert Carolin, and Airport Manager Steven Lichliter; and 62 citizens that were distributed among eight (8) tables.

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, welcomed those in attendance and thanked them for being there that evening. She introduced herself as the City Manager. She explained that this workshop was an opportunity for the City Commission and staff to learn what is important about the community to its citizens and what the citizens wanted to see the community look like in the future. She noted that the first Community Conversation had been held on Saturday, April 18, 2015, and there had been a great turnout.

Ms. Shanahan introduced Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida. She explained that Ms. Crotty held Community Conversations and Strategic Planning Workshops throughout Central Florida and the state. She asked those in attendance to join her in welcoming Ms. Crotty.

Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, thanked Ms. Shanahan. She noted that there was a great turnout for this session. She stated that Ormond Beach was a fabulous city. She explained that the turnout was reflective of how much the citizens cared about the city.

II. Overview of Strategic Planning Process

Ms. Crotty explained that the City Commission had decided to engage in a strategic planning process. She noted that while some cities across the state engaged in such processes, there were unfortunately also a large number who did not. She stated that those cities that needed it were often focused just on the issue of the day without thinking of long term consequences and were usually more concerned with their own positions rather than the future of their community. She stated that it was fortunate that Ormond Beach’s City Commission was thinking more long term and trying to put in place plans that would move the city forward. She noted that most cities confined strategic planning to City Commission and staff participation only. She explained that Ormond Beach was starting their process by asking citizens about their dreams, desires and interests for the community. She stated that the citizens were the stars that evening.
Ms. Crotty stated that the conversation would be totally participatory and asked that citizens be equipped to both talk and listen. She stated that the City Commission would have their Strategic Planning Workshop on May 12, 2015, beginning at 3:30 p.m. She explained that members of the public were welcome to attend and observe that session. She noted that there would not be audience participation at that workshop as it would be the opportunity for the City Commission to have their discussion. She explained that all of the information generated at this session would be put into a report that she would write for the City Commission to use during their process.

Ms. Crotty noted that she saw some familiar faces and asked those that had attended the session the previous Saturday to raise their hands. She noted that a few participants raised their hands. She requested members of the audience to raise their hands if they had lived in the city for 50 years or more. She repeated the exercise with those that had lived in the city for 30 years, 20 years, 15 years, ten years, five years and less than five years. She noted that there were respondents for each category. She stated that a great mix was represented among those who had lived in the city long term and those that were fairly new to it.

Ms. Crotty noted that agendas with a worksheet on the back had been given to each participant. She explained that conservations would be held and ideas would be shared among the groups at each of the tables. She explained that in order to capture the conversations, each table had a flip chart on an easel and markers. She stated that each table would need a volunteer to serve as the recorder or scribe. She noted that the only requirement to serve as the scribe was to have somewhat legible handwriting as she would have to interpret what was written in order to include it in her report. She explained that not everything said needed to be recorded but that the scribe should write down the key points discussed and the essence of what comments were made by the individuals in their group. She explained that reports would be made from each table to the overall group summarizing their discussions. She stated that someone at each table would need to serve as the speaker to make their report.

III. Identification of Community Treasures and Values

Ms. Crotty stated that she wanted the audience to think about treasures and values. She explained that this meant to think about the qualities, characteristics and things in Ormond Beach that made it a place that they loved. She asked them to think about the things in the community that mattered a lot to them and about the values that they would like to see continued in the future. She asked the audience members to introduce themselves to the other members of their table groups before beginning their discussions. She explained that some of the things discussed would be specific physical characteristics of the city and some would be qualities that made the city the place it was. She asked them to think about the values of the city and things that were guiding principles that people in the city subscribed to and wanted to see the city continue to have.

Ms. Crotty asked for the definition of brainstorming and noted that one participant said “tossing out ideas.” She encouraged the participants to toss out as many ideas as possible and not to worry about being in total agreement. She clarified that anything anyone said at the table was valuable and that the entire table group did not have to agree on an idea for it to be included on the flip chart.
The worksheet discussion question was presented as follows:

**Part I – Treasures and Values**

*What are the treasures and values of Ormond Beach... the things (whether physical places, or intangibles like community character) you love about the city and want to see continued, protected or improved? What would you want to ensure is preserved as Ormond Beach plans for the future?*

Ms. Crotty instructed the group discussions to begin at 6:27 p.m. and stated that she would give them about 15 to 20 minutes for this topic. She encouraged the participants to introduce themselves to their group members.

Discussion among the groups at the tables ensued.

Ms. Crotty asked the groups to complete their discussions and to provide their reports at 6:44 p.m. She noted that there were eight tables and asked each table to take about three minutes or less in their reporting, if possible.

The citizens in attendance had been divided into eight tables. The table groups' reports were presented in no particular order. Ms. Crotty asked for volunteers and the groups presented in the order in which they volunteered to speak.

**Table 6**

Mr. Gary Libby, 723 N. Oleander Drive, Daytona Beach, as speaker for Table Six, stated that he was interested in the success of Ormond Beach as he had lived in Volusia County for 45 years. He explained that when his group discussed treasures they found that they were very interested in the library and the tennis center, as well as the Indian Mound and Bulow Park, which was on the border of Ormond Beach, and were also interested in the beach, rivers, and parks, which were adjacent to them both. He noted that Ormond Beach was unique and that there was a difference in Ormond Beach up and down the river and the ocean. He stated that Ormond Beach had historic sites such as the Three Chimneys, MacDonald House, Ames House and The Casements, which were jewels of the 19th century. He noted that Billy's Tap Room was another example. He stated that the new development on Granada Boulevard was positive, especially on the west side of the river, and the restaurants and lounges introduced there would be the Billy's Tap Rooms of the future. He stated that another treasure in Ormond Beach was the Ormond Memorial Art Museum.

Mr. Libby stated that Ormond Beach had a palpable civic character. He provided examples of other treasures in the city such as Oceanside Country Club and its outdoor recreation facilities, noting that some of those were supported by ECHO grants and that he had served as the first civilian chair of ECHO. He explained that Ormond Beach had historic groups which turned the city's heritage into first class locations such as Three Chimneys and the Anderson-Price Building. He further explained that there were a great number of civic groups in the city, such as garden clubs and men's organizations, and that they actively participated in the city at a greater rate per capita than any other city in Volusia County. He stated that it was unanimous in his table group that one of the key values of Ormond Beach was the sense of history, and he noted that the city had done a great job incorporating that history into its preliminary materials provided when someone moved here. He noted that other values included strong community buy-in, healthy citizen participation with
different viewpoints, and a low crime rate. He noted that Ormond Beach was different from its adjacent cities in that it had a very strong civic sense and good, accessible government, which could not be said for all Volusia County cities.

**Table 1**
Mr. Thomas MacDonald, 80 S. Capri Drive, as speaker for Table One, stated his group listed the following as treasures of Ormond Beach: The Loop, beach driving, with different participants both for and against it, the MacDonald House, all historical buildings in the city, beautiful landscaping, including the medians, the revitalized downtown, sport fields and ball parks, social groups, water and trees, natural environmental beauty, central geographic location relative to Jacksonville and Orlando, children and senior activities, and cultural events and restaurants. He stated that his group listed the following as values of Ormond Beach: friendliness, open government, family and retiree friendly, very veteran and military friendly, reasonable cost of living, strong faith-based community, government on top of infrastructure needs, cleanliness, sense of community pride, fiscally responsible city, city willingness to work with nonprofits, business-friendly city, government that sought citizen input, and a proactive government and citizenship.

Ms. Crotty stated that she did not live in Ormond Beach or Volusia County and lived in Seminole County. She noted that she heard all the great things being mentioned about Ormond Beach and could not help but wonder if this was a place she should consider moving to.

**Table 5**
Mr. Jerry Janaro, 1307 Northside Drive, as speaker for Table Five, stated that he had been a resident of Ormond Beach for five years and had become involved with Ormond Beach Main Street. He stated that some of the treasures that his table group identified in the city included the city’s nature and preservation, Tomoka State Park and The Loop, and he noted that the river was an underutilized treasure. He explained that they also discussed treasures such as beach parking and beach access, recreation facilities and the Airport Road area, which was a wonderful place to raise children and give them opportunities to play on good fields. He stated that other treasures included the great tree canopy, parks such as Central Park and the Granada Bridge area parks, and the downtown redevelopment efforts that were being consistently made. He noted that the Granada Bridge was great, but they thought that it could be made more even beautiful.

Mr. Janaro noted that Ormond Beach had a history of community and the residents were proud of it. He stated that Ormond Beach had values such as a small town feel, good educational advantages, a great feeling of safety due to good police and fire protection, community events that fostered a sense of togetherness, diversity, many fine religious institutions, and child recreational facilities, including playgrounds in the parks, especially at Cassen Park and the airport. He also highlighted the value of the city’s natural beauty, sunsets and sunrises, and the great friendliness of the residents.

Ms. Crotty stated that the attendees were fortunate to be in this community.

**Table 2**
Ms. Julia Truilo, 307 John Anderson Drive, as speaker for Table Two, explained that her group did not separate their values and treasures into physical and social
categories. She stated that her group discussed the small town feeling of Ormond Beach, the friendliness of the community, the active citizenry, its volunteerism and the physical beauty of the city, including the landscaping that had been improved over the years. She stated that her group also mentioned the affordability, friendly and accessible city staff, City Manager and police, and historic districts such as Sudan and the Rigby School, which were unique to the area. She noted that they also identified historic buildings, the laid back pace, cleanliness, easy access to water activities and parks, parks at the four corners of the river and at Central Park, the Ormond Memorial Art Museum, trees and tree canopy, The Loop, an active and growing downtown, the low crime rate, and good civic planning as other treasures and values in Ormond Beach which they cherished.

Table 4
Mr. Norman Lane, 1314 Northside Drive, as speaker for Table Four, stated that his group identified the following as treasures in Ormond Beach: business friendliness, beach and beach access, parks, the Ames House and MacDonald House among other historical jewels, and recreation centers, including fields and adult programs. He noted that his group also discussed low-income housing and a strong emphasis on the fine arts. He stated that Ormond Beach had values such as a strong sense of community and volunteerism, and also had many civic groups and held many special events. He noted that the city had a low density and was not too crowded. He stated that his group also discussed the city’s trees, which were vital to space, and keeping height limits low, along with preserving nature and The Loop.

Mr. Lane explained that his group spoke about getting people to come back home to Ormond Beach, noting that so many young adults and residents moved away looking for more opportunities. He stated that his group also talked about the open City Commission and noted that people loved to retire in Ormond Beach. He explained that some of the values discussed were having the City Commission be representative of its constituents and voters and having them speak to their constituents, a sense of citizenship, preserving public properties, valuing children and the youth of the community, community involvement and neighborhood watches. He noted that their group believed that the community was a blessed one.

Table 7
Mr. Douglas Rand, 2208 Oak Hill Drive, Deland, as speaker for Table Seven, explained that he did not live in Ormond Beach presently, but he did in 1976 when he was 19 years old for four years. He further explained that he lived in Deland but owned Billy’s Tap Room in Ormond Beach. He stated that the treasures his group discussed included beach access, which was very important to them, further explaining that access and driving was important for the safety of the young and old. He stated that another treasure was the history of Ormond Beach and that it should be preserved in buildings like The Casements, MacDonald House, Ames House and the historic Fire Station. He explained that people came from the west side of Volusia County to spend money and do The Loop in Ormond Beach.

Mr. Rand stated that other treasures in Ormond Beach that were mentioned included the Ormond Memorial Art Museum and its gardens, Billy’s Tap Room and the gaslight shops, height restrictions on new construction, and family-owned businesses. He noted that other values discussed included the hometown atmosphere of downtown, the maintenance of parks and recreation, keeping the city’s ongoing designation as a Tree City USA, landscaping and improvements to the
gateways, and special events, in particular the Fourth of July Celebration and antique car parade. He stated that his table group also discussed the need for parking for special events and the Granada Bridge. He explained that the Granada Bridge was basically the only elevation in the county and people came from the west side of the county to run on the bridge. He noted that they also discussed having incentives for refurbishing buildings. He stated that community involvement was important, and they wanted to keep Ormond Beach quaint.

**Table 8**
Ms. Juliann Blanford, 36 Dix Avenue, as speaker for Table Eight, noted that three attendees at her table had lived in homes that had been renovated by one of the other attendees sitting at that table. She stated that some of the treasures and values discussed by her table group included the city’s historic sites, trees, the beach, river, restaurants, community feeling, school system, environmental awareness, art museum, walk-ability, Tomoka State Park, the Tomoka River basin, the accessibility of city government, community events and festivals, especially multicultural festivals and events, playgrounds, sports fields, farmer's market, cool neighborhoods, safe neighborhoods, helpful police and fire personnel, Andy Romano Beachfront Park, and boat ramps. She stated that her group discussed preservation of city treasures and in particular preserving the historic buildings such as the MacDonald House, water quality in the river, The Casements, Ormond Memorial Art Museum and Gardens, Emmons Cottage, and the historic Fire Station. She noted that participants at her table were divided on the subject of beach driving, some favoring no beach driving at all and some favoring driving in some areas being preserved.

**Table 3**
Ms. Joyce Benedict, 2 Sunny Road, for Table Three, stated that she had lived in Ormond Beach for 30 years and served as a tour guide for the bus tours given by the Ormond Beach Historical Society. She noted that her group also agreed with many of the previous groups. She stated that her table group wanted to save the MacDonald House and noted that it was built in 1895. She explained that her group noted many treasures and values in Ormond Beach, including the natural environment, quiet beachfront, rivers, ocean, and The Loop. She noted that they discussed that the city was not too congested and the traffic was not bad except for during Bike Week. She stated that they also mentioned the unique architecture, diversified selection of buildings, small businesses which they loved, the small town feel and clean water, which was very important, as other treasures and values. She stated that Ormond Beach had no racial problems, a low crime rate, good healthcare, sports and youth activities, 40 parks, low taxes, controlled growth, and natural beauty.

Ms. Crotty noted that a lot of the treasures and values were being repeated at each table, which showed consensus in the community. She stated that it was great that ideas were being shared. She explained that it was important for the participants to identify what was important to them in order to make their voices heard to the elected officials. She asked if Ormond Beach really had 40 parks. She noted that was an incredible feat for a city of its size. She noted that there were lots of wonderful things in Ormond Beach to praise and value.

Ms. Crotty announced that there would be a short break in the session. The break began at 7:08 p.m. and concluded at 7:23 p.m.
IV. Ormond Beach – 2025 Vision

Ms. Crotty explained that at the beginning of the meeting she did not point out that members of the city staff were present. She noted that city staff members were seated in chairs along the walls around the room. She explained that they were there to help and were interested in hearing what participants had to say since they would be the ones helping to implement the strategic plan. She stated that they were available to answer questions, if needed.

Ms. Crotty asked the participants to redirect their focus from what they loved about the present day community to the future of the community. She asked them to think about Ormond Beach in 2025, ten years into the future. She explained that they should imagine that it had been a wonderful ten years for Ormond Beach and that the city had prospered. She asked them to think about their aspirations for the community in that timeframe, even if they were no longer there. She asked them to think about what the city would look like in ten years, specifically what residents would have, what businesses would be like and what functions the government would provide.

Ms. Crotty explained that there were no restraints in this exercise and advised them not to get bogged down in what cost too much or was feasible. She stated that if they did not put forth their true dreams for the future then, they would not come close to getting the future that they wanted for their children and grandchildren. She noted that reality would set in during the strategic planning process and all of the developed goals and objectives may not all appear. She stated that this was their chance to inform the City Commission of their dreams so that they were aware of the things citizens wanted to see in the future. She stated that she wanted them to talk about the future of the city and how Ormond Beach could be better than it already was. She noted that these were brainstorming conversations so no topic was out of bounds and that every idea was valid. She noted that reports would be presented again after discussions as had been done for the previous topic. She stated that she would give the groups 40 to 45 minutes for this conversation and that this was their chance to dream.

The worksheet discussion question was presented as follows:

Part II – Visioning

It is the year 2025. In the years since 2015, the City of Ormond Beach has fulfilled all the hopes you had for the future of the community back when you attended the community meeting in 2015.

What is the City of Ormond Beach like? What does it look like? What is it like to live here, work here, raise a family here, retire here? What kinds of economic activity take place here? What else would you say to fully describe the City of Ormond Beach you would like to see in ten years?

Ms. Crotty instructed the groups to decide the three most important things that they would like the city to accomplish in the next ten years and that they would like the City Commission to pay attention to. She asked for the groups to identify them so that the City Commission received clear direction when planning for the future of the city. She explained that the groups could vote or agree on these items by consensus
and asked for them to identify their top three priorities on the flipcharts with a star or check mark by them.

Ms. Crotty instructed the group discussions to begin at 7:28 p.m.

Discussion among the groups at the tables ensued.

Ms. Crotty asked the groups to finish their discussions and to provide their reports at 8:01 p.m.

Ms. Crotty noted that this session was somewhat ahead of schedule, as the groups had completed their tasks before the end of the timeframe given. She noted that the meeting was scheduled to end no later than 9:00 p.m.; but she felt that it could possibly end before that, and she did not think there would be any objections to that.

The citizens in attendance had been divided into eight tables. The table groups’ reports were presented in no particular order. Ms. Crotty asked for volunteers and the groups presented in the order in which they volunteered to speak.

**Table 6**

Mr. John Anglea, 1 John Anderson Drive, spoke as speaker for Table Six, and stated that some of the ideas that his table group discussed for the future included more efficient public transportation options for seniors, making the city more attractive for economic development, expansion of historical education, including the Ormond Memorial Art Museum, The Casements, and MacDonald House. He noted that one idea they discussed was creating an Ormond Beach history museum at the MacDonald House as a cultural attraction and making it part of a museum block with the Ormond Memorial Art Museum. He stated that another idea was to put a city park at Three Chimneys, similar to the one that was at Sanchez Park. He explained that while the state owned the land there, the city was able to manage the park with state permission. He explained that other ideas included the lighting of the Granada Bridge, a marina at Cassen Park and a community art district. He stated that they had discussed making downtown more walk-able and noted that the location of a grocery store downtown would help to accomplish that. He explained that these ideas were all a part of their first priority, which was to make Ormond Beach a more livable community.

Mr. Anglea stated that their second priority was to save historic sites and the character of the city. He noted that the redevelopment of Ormond Beach needed to be addressed. He explained that Palm Beach was lovely but did not have character because it was all brand new. He stated that Ormond Beach had character because of its history going back over 100 years. He stated that his group discussed the promotion of solar, wave, and wind energy and noted that National Geographic Magazine had an entire issue the previous year devoted to clean energy that was very informative. He explained that local government had to get involved to make those new energies work. He stated that other ideas for the future discussed included better traffic control during large events like Bike Week and increasing cultural events to bring in people from outside the community. He noted that they did not want to completely run out bikers and race-goers, explaining that statistics showed that attendees at cultural events would spend more money. He suggested a Shakespeare festival and noted that the attendees of such an event would spend more than bikers.
Mr. Anglea noted that his table group also discussed having better design and control over new construction and remodeling, noting that sometimes he wondered about the oversight when he saw buildings next to each other. He stated that his group’s third priority was additional bridge access to keep up with the population and emergency needs. He noted that one of the table participants had mentioned bridge lighting. He stated that he lived at the Ormond Heritage at the base of the Granada Bridge. He explained that traffic and population increases would affect the Granada Bridge and that if the population increased, fire vehicles crossing the bridge would encounter issues. He noted that the problem would need a multimillion dollar solution and might involve building other bridges. He stated that the bridge was more important than one realized, unless they lived there and saw the problems.

**Table 4**
Mr. Norman Lane, 1314 Northside Drive, as speaker for Table Four, stated that his group’s first priority for the future was to put a swimming pool at the South Ormond Neighborhood Center on Division Avenue. He noted that the facility was nice, but it needed a pool. He stated that his group also discussed the need for a quiet walkable downtown. He explained that their second priority was to increase historic preservation and gain visibility for preservation efforts, specifically placing the Historic New Bethel A.M.E Church on the list of historic buildings. He stated that his group discussed implementing a bicycle path through the city which would connect to other communities and bringing in a higher level of sports competition, such as professionals. He stated that another priority was that they did not want uncontrolled growth in the city and wanted development to be controlled to preserve the city’s small town atmosphere.

Mr. Lane noted that they also discussed small beachfront parks that had some parking and maybe a shower or restroom facilities. He explained that while Andy Romano Beachfront Park was wonderful, there would be more beach access if other small parks such as the one at Neptune Avenue were expanded. He stated that another idea mentioned was to have a technology company or other large company move to the area that could attract young career professionals. He noted that there were not enough jobs in the area for young professionals and as such the best of the city’s youth was being exported. He noted that was their third priority. He stated that other issues discussed included improving drainage in the city, improving the lighting by Live Oak Avenue and the Historic New Bethel A.M.E Church, and purchasing more park land. He explained that more land would have to be purchased in order to preserve it. He stated that another idea mentioned was to have a more equitable distribution of services throughout the city as some felt that some places seemed to have more parks and improvements than others. He stated that they discussed the establishment of continued historic preservation funds and to look at a more forward thinking plan for supplying funds for historic preservation. He noted that improving code enforcement was also mentioned.

**Table 1**
Mr. Thomas MacDonald, 80 S. Capri Drive, as speaker for Table One, stated that his table group’s third priority was to have city-wide Wi-Fi. He stated that they discussed other ideas for the future including environmentally friendly transportation and utilities, synchronized traffic lights, better access to the city’s waterways, waterway access and bridge lighting. He noted that their second priority was holding owners accountable for blighted properties, both commercial and residential, citing the
former Food Lion property as an example. He stated that the group also discussed
improving the visibility of the visitor center and coordinating efforts to have more
resources in one place with better branding. He explained that they spoke about
more dog parks and play parks, as well having an Ormond Beach history museum at
the MacDonald House to complete a museum row in the downtown area on the
south side of Granada Boulevard. He stated that their top priority for the future was
the existence of Ormond Crossings, and he noted that that would increase jobs and
develop more well-paying jobs and more entertainment options.

**Table 8**
Ms. Judith Stein, 166 Orchard Lane, as speaker for Table Eight, stated that one of
her table group’s priorities was walk-ability on Granada Boulevard, which could be
achieved by having more alternatives to vehicular transportation, lower speed limits,
more crosswalks, better signs, and walkovers. She noted that more outdoor dining
options and dining on the ocean and riverfronts were also mentioned. She stated that
another priority they identified was historic preservation. She explained that their idea
was to have a new tennis building and new tennis courts on the beachside, have the
MacDonald House serve as a historic museum and that the historic Fire Station be
purchased by the city and house Ormond Beach Main Street, the Ormond Beach
Historical Society, and other civic organizations. She noted that their group also
discussed having the first block of Riverside Drive car-free as part of Rockefeller
Gardens, and that the trailer park be made into a park, housing, or multiuse building.

Ms. Stein noted that another suggestion was to have one block on either side of
Granada Boulevard from Beach Street to US1 for small shops, cafes, and mixed use
development, including housing. She stated that they thought that all city-owned
historic buildings should be preserved properly and be beautifully maintained,
including having termite inspections. She stated that their last priority involved
technology and explained that they felt that power lines should be underground and
there should be city wide Wi-Fi. She noted that they thought it would be nice if a
Trader Joe’s went into the former Food Lion building. She stated that she would also
like better acoustics in the Senior Center as they were having a hard time hearing
themselves speak.

**Table 7**
Ms. Lori Tolland, 5 Broadriver Road, as speaker for Table Seven, explained that her
table group was referring to itself as “small but mighty” as their table had lost some
participants during the intermission and now had only four members. She stated that
their top priority was to preserve historic sites and the city’s tree canopy, as well as
keep the recreational sports and seniors thriving. She stated that one of their other
priorities was to manage growth. She explained that infrastructure should grow with
the population and cited police and fire resources, roads, drainage, and schools as
examples. She stated that their third priority was to keep the city beautifully
landscaped and to save its trees. She noted that the city did a great job, but they
wanted it to be kept up in the future as well and for the gateways coming into the city
from Holly Hill and the west to have great landscaping.

Ms. Tolland stated that her table group discussed keeping the city environmentally
friendly with clean waterways and air, abundant gardens and creating a pedestrian-
friendly thriving downtown with outdoor dining, small family-owned businesses and
underground utilities. She noted that her group talked about planned development
and keeping city codes consistent to promote aesthetic appeal and height
restrictions. She stated that other ideas mentioned for the future included public transportation, possibly connecting the mainland to the beach, an off beach trolley, maintaining beach access and beach driving, keeping the small town quaint feeling with a lot of events for all ages, and preserving the strong faith-based community.

Ms. Crotty noted that she was noticing a lot of the same things being mentioned. She explained that interested her as some cities were torn apart by special interest groups with different agendas that she did not sense in Ormond Beach.

**Table 2**

Ms. Julia Truilo, 307 John Anderson Drive, as speaker for Table Two, explained that her table group had developed a long list and grouped some of those into priority groups. She noted that her group had bent the rules a little as they had identified four priorities instead of three. She stated that some of the ideas for the future which were mentioned but did not make the cut as top priorities included beach driving, both for and against, increasing taxes, both for and against, a welcome center for motorcycle enthusiasts and racing fans west of the city, a marina at Cassen Park with water taxis and extending Hand Avenue to handle traffic issues.

Ms. Truilo stated that their top priority identified was to improve environmental assets including reuse water, green energy, and undergrounding utilities. She stated that their second priority for the future was to grow industry with the creation of high technology jobs in the area and more youth training, noting that Ormond Crossings could help serve that need. She explained that their third priority was to create a new art and civic center for increased creative community, youth and art programs. She stated that the fourth priority they discussed was to preserve the historic core of the city and its historic and art assets through strict codes, as well as developing a walk-able community.

Ms. Crotty noted that she had noticed that there was no consensus on the topic of beach driving.

**Table 3**

Ms. Joyce Benedict, 2 Sunny Road, for Table Three, noted that her table group’s priorities would seem repetitive as they went along with much of what was already said. She noted that their first priority was to preserve history. She explained that she was not just talking about commercial properties as sometimes homes were also in jeopardy. She stated that their second priority for the future was to develop a promenade on A1A by removing strip malls and putting in boutiques or a boardwalk and to have more mixed-use development downtown to increase walk-ability. She stated that their third priority was to have more riverfront destinations, more restaurants and activities to do along Granada Boulevard, and to beautify the Granada Bridge.

**Table 5**

Mr. Jerry Janaro, 1307 Northside Drive, as speaker for Table Five, stated that his table group identified as their top priority to continue to develop city-wide beautification and improvements in all areas and neighborhoods, not just those that were easily visible. He stated that included improving the infrastructure in every community and area in the city and including universal code enforcement in all areas. He stated that his group identified as their second priority to expand downtown economic development back into Lincoln Avenue and have more parking
in the downtown area to make it more accessible. He noted that another idea that was mentioned was to get more direct flights to major cities into the Daytona Beach Regional Airport. He explained that large companies would be less likely to locate to the area if there was not a way for them to easily transport their personnel to visit or recruit clients in large cities out of state. He stated that the airport had a lot to do with the regional community maintaining a strong economic base. He stated that other ideas discussed included the city lobbying for bullet trains, affordable senior housing, senior recreation and clean manufacturing and training. He noted that their third priority was to improve diversity in city leadership and in hiring staff for city departments.

V. Conclusion

Ms. Crotty stated that there was a lot of consensus regarding several issues and that would be reflected in her report. She noted that there would be a clear direction provided to the City Commission. She stated that some of the same comments and issues may come up again during the April 22, 2015, Community Conversation session, but that some different subjects may also be discussed. She explained that the city had committed to make the report available to all of those who participated and would likely have it posted on the website for all to see, as well. She explained that she was struck by how practical the comments were, even though she instructed them that they could dream. She noted that she felt most of the ideas were not outside of the realm of possibility, although some of them may take some time and would be expensive to accomplish. She stated that while the ideas could not be accomplished overnight, the participants certainly proposed things that made sense and would generate a lot of interest from their elected officials.

Ms. Crotty thanked the reports and scribes from each group for volunteering. She noted that many citizens were apathetic and did not want to take the time to talk about or present their ideas and stated that the participants present were obviously interested and cared about their city.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the participants were terrific, exciting, and passionate. She applauded Ms. Crotty. She noted that this was the first time in years that a strategic planning process had been embarked upon. She explained that community involvement was key to making their vision a reality. She noted that the Mayor and Commissioners awaited Ms. Crotty’s report and would have their Strategic Planning Workshop on May 12, 2015, at 3:30 p.m. She noted that it was a public meeting and the public was welcome to observe their meeting. She explained that they would undertake a process similar to the one the citizens did, based on their results. She noted that the city believed strongly in transparency and the minutes from both sessions and Ms. Crotty’s report would both be available on the city’s website.

The workshop ended at 8:31 p.m.

Transcribed by: Colby Cilento
I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Present were Mayor Ed Kelley, City Commissioners James Stowers, Troy Kent, Rick Boehm and Bill Partington, Facilitator Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, City Attorney Randy Hayes, Leisure Services Director Robert Carolin, Planning Director Ric Goss, Public Works Operations Manager Kevin Gray, Information Technology Director Ned Huhta, Fire Chief Bob Mandarino, Economic Development Director Joe Mannarino, Finance Director Kelly McGuire, City Clerk Scott McKee, Police Chief Andy Osterkamp, Utilities Manager Dave Ponitz, Assistant Finance Director Dan Stauffer, and Human Resources Director Claire Whitley.

Mayor Kelley called the workshop to order at 3:37 p.m.

Mayor Kelley noted that Ormond Beach was one of only a few cities of its size to undertake a strategic planning process. He thanked Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, for facilitating the Community Conversation Workshops previously held for citizens.

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, introduced Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, and stated that she would recap the two Community Conversation Workshops that had previously been held for citizen participation in the strategic planning process. She noted that there had been about 110 participants attending the workshops.

Ms. Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Florida Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, stated that it was great to be back in Ormond Beach. She explained that she had facilitated the city’s Community Conversation Workshops and spoken to the citizens during that process. She noted that not every city engaged in a strategic planning process and stated that fewer than half of the municipalities across the county took part in any goals setting or strategic planning activities, and instead those cities ended up focusing on the issue of the day without looking purposely into the future. She stated that Ormond Beach was to be congratulated for undertaking such a process; but even more so because they had engaged their citizens in the process, which a lot of cities did not do. She explained that the city had started by involving their citizens during the Community Conversation Workshops and noted that was the right way to begin the process so that the information could be used during the Commission’s discussions.

Ms. Crotty explained that this workshop would be very informal and not follow Robert’s Rules of Order. She stated that there would be a lot of participation from the City Commission and the staff members. She noted that while staff’s ideas and input were welcome, there would be some times during the session where only the elected officials would be participating. She explained that this workshop was the time for the members of the public to observe the discussions that the City Commission and staff members had, whereas the prior Community Conversations had been the public’s time to provide
input. She stated that having one or two citizens attend these types of sessions was great, but she stated that the number of citizens attending demonstrated that the city was deeply loved by its residents and business owners.

Ms. Crotty asked the City Commission and staff members in attendance to introduce themselves. She requested that they each describe their job, if it was not clear from their title, and state how long they had been with the city.

Ms. Shanahan introduced herself as the City Manager. She stated that she had worked for the city for six and a half years and loved the community. She stated that Ormond Beach was a great place to live, work, and play.

Ms. Crotty stated that she knew that Ms. Shanahan had experience as a City Manager in other communities, as well.

Ms. Shanahan noted that she had worked in four states, not as a City Manager, and had worked in Florida for 17 years.

Commissioner Partington introduced himself as the City Commissioner for Zone 4. He stated that he had lived in Ormond Beach for 47 years. He explained that this was his 14th year of involvement with the city, as he had served on an advisory board for two years and on the City Commission for 12 years.

Ms. Crotty stated that she had noticed that there was longevity in this community and noted that was not something always seen around the state.

Commissioner Boehm introduced himself as the City Commissioner for Zone 3. He stated that he had lived in Ormond Beach for 39 years and had chosen to raise his children here. He explained that he had been involved with the city since 2004, first serving on the Leisure Services Advisory Board, noting that he was Chairman of the Leisure Services Advisory Board from 2007 to his election as City Commissioner in 2010. He noted that he had also served as claims counsel for the city in his capacity as an attorney starting in 1991.

Commissioner Kent introduced himself as the City Commissioner for Zone 2. He stated that he had lived in Ormond Beach for 40 years and had served as a Commissioner for 12 years. He stated that he had an eight-year old son and was also a schoolteacher and little league baseball coach. He explained that he held a monthly meeting called Coffee with Commissioner at this home and had done so for 11 years. He noted that he could always judge what was going on in the city by the attendance at that meeting.

Mayor Kelley introduced himself as the Mayor of Ormond Beach. He explained that in 1992 he had been appointed to a committee to review the workings of the city and its fiscal policies and productivity. He noted that he was elected chairman of that committee. He stated that the committee prepared a report to present to the City Commission at that time, who essentially threw it in the trash. He explained that lit a fire under him, and he then ran for the office of City Commissioner and was elected in 1993. He explained that he served for four years, was not reelected in 1997, but then was reelected in 2005. He explained that he had served continuously since 2005, first as a City Commissioner and then for the last five years as Mayor. He stated that he had lived in Ormond Beach for 35 years and joked that he discounted the longevity of Commissioner Partington and Commissioner Kent's residence in the city as they were
born and raised in Ormond Beach and were children fishing and playing with toys for some of the time period that they cited. He stated that Ormond Beach was a community that people chose to live in, and the schools, hospitals, and beach were an integral part of it. He stated that he had presented pins to fifth grade students at Tomoka Elementary earlier as part of their D.A.R.E. graduation and that it was very important to be involved with the schools. He stated that he loved Ormond Beach.

Commissioner Stowers introduced himself as the City Commissioner for Zone 1. He stated that he was first elected in 2010. He explained that he chose to live in Ormond Beach and had moved to the city with his wife in 2006. He stated that he had two daughters, one born in 2012 and one born just a few months ago that was raising in Ormond Beach. He stated that while he was not from the area, he enjoyed the community and it was a great place to live, work, and play. He noted that he worked as a land use attorney.

Mr. Randy Hayes, City Attorney, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for over 22 years and that he had been an attorney for almost 28 years. He stated that the City Commission made Ms. Shanahan and his job easy. He stated that he and Ms. Shanahan helped the Commission implement their vision and noted that the Commission was a fun group to work with, even on serious issues.

Mr. Robert Carolin, Leisure Services Director, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked in the field of recreation and leisure services for 30 years and that almost 20 of those years had been in an executive directing position with municipal governments. He noted that he had been Leisure Services Director in Ormond Beach for almost nine years.

Mr. Ric Goss, Planning Director, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked in planning for 38 years and had worked for the city for eight years.

Mr. Kevin Gray, Public Works Operators Manager, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for 27 years.

Mr. Ned Huhta, Information Technology Director, introduced himself. He stated that he had been an Ormond Beach resident for 37 years and had been a homeowner in the city for 28 of those years. He stated that he had worked for the city for over ten years.

Fire Chief Bob Mandarino introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for over 18 years. He explained that his family had come to Ormond Beach in 1962 and that other than when he attended college, he had always lived in the city, as well.

Mr. Joe Mannarino, Economic Development Director, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for 13 years and was from the Boston metropolitan area. He explained that he worked with the business community to encourage investment and performed outreach.

Mr. Dan Stauffer, Assistant Finance Director, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for eight years and had been an independent auditor for the city prior to that.
Ms. Claire Whitley, Human Resources Director, introduced herself. She noted that she had only been with the city for about one and a half months. She stated that she had previously worked in state government.

Mr. Dave Ponitz, Utilities Manager, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for almost eight years and had lived in the city since 1998. He noted that he had raised three boys in the area and that the schools were wonderful. He stated that he had been an engineer in Florida for 35 years and noted that he was originally hired to the area in 1998 by Zev Cohen & Associates.

Police Chief Andy Osterkamp introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for over 32 years, serving as Police Chief for the last five years.

Mr. Scott McKee, City Clerk, introduced himself. He stated that he had worked for the city for six years.

Ms. Kelly McGuire, Finance Director, introduced herself. She stated that she had worked for the city for ten years.

Ms. Shanahan noted that Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director Ted MacLeod was not present due to a medical issue.

Ms. Crotty explained that she would begin the workshop by reviewing the Community Conversation Workshops, then they would perform a traditional environmental scan, S.W.O.T. (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis, determine strategic issues, goals and objectives, and have the elected officials select priorities. She noted that there were always more things to do than resources to do them with, even in financially sound cities. She explained that the goal was to form a feasible plan that could be implemented and determine what could take Ormond Beach to the next level. She further explained that when the workshop ended they would not have a fully fleshed out plan but would have enough of a framework and direction that staff could fill in the blanks and bring back a work program to the Commission based on the discussion. She stated that ideas generated that day should be reflected in the budget that staff would be working on for the next fiscal year.

Mayor Kelley stated that he was under the impression that this was not a visioning process for one year but would be a forward thinking plan for the next five to ten years and was not specifically for the next fiscal year.

Ms. Crotty noted that nothing happened quickly in government. She explained that many projects and issues were multiyear and that this would help identify and determine priorities to figure out what things in the plan would need to be put into the next fiscal year’s budget in order to begin the process. She noted that periodically the plan would need to be reviewed and updated, as it would not be set in stone. She stated that a strategic plan needed flexibility as unexpected things could happen. She stated that the strategic plan was a guide that should be followed and implemented but noted that there was always potential for flexibility, if needed. She encouraged the Commission to think more than a year out.
II. REVIEW COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS

Ms. Crotty explained that two separate Community Conversation Workshops were held, one on a Saturday morning and one on a Wednesday evening. She stated that both workshops were well attended and noted that it was obvious from the outset that those in attendance had deep love, passion, and concern for the city. She noted that they were not angry or adversarial but came to talk and share their ideas. She explained that the set up was informal and that people were placed in small groups. She further explained that couples, friends and those who came together were assigned separate tables so that the groups were mixed up as cross communication was encouraged. She noted that common themes and consensus could then arise spontaneously in the groups.

Ms. Crotty explained that the first part of the workshop was to review treasures and values that the participants loved about Ormond Beach. She explained that those treasures and values could be physical attributes or qualities and characteristics of the city. She noted that each table group had a recorder who wrote their thoughts on the flip chart that was provided to each table. She explained that the groups were instructed to capture every idea presented at the table, even if others disagreed, as the goal was not to judge the ideas. She noted that some of the groups did try and engage in internal debates, and there were groups that had differing opinions on the same subject, such as beach driving.

Ms. Crotty explained that she categorized the treasures and values in her report and noted that many fell into the categories of environmental, city facilities and infrastructure, values, qualities and characteristics of the city, and community assets. She further explained that she combined the treasures and values cited from all groups and then put numbers next to each of them to denote how many groups had that item on their chart. She stated that there were 15 table groups in total between both sessions. She stated that nine of those table groups thought that the rivers, beaches and tree canopy were important environmental assets. She stated that 11 of the table groups marked the city’s parks as valued facilities. She explained that she was told at one of the sessions that there were 40 parks in the city, which she thought was outstanding for a city of this size. She noted that the city’s recreational facilities were prized. She stated that the values cited included transparency of government and its responsiveness. She stated that an often-mentioned characteristic of the city was the small town atmosphere. She noted that she lived in the Orlando metro area and that they had lost that feeling. She explained that it was a challenge to maintain that atmosphere and that the appearance of the city was important to its residents. She noted that the citizens appreciated the efforts the city had made to beautify the area and wanted to see more of that.

Ms. Crotty noted that the biggest consensus item brought up, and what was heard mentioned over and over again at both sessions, was the city’s historical sites. She stated that 14 out of the 15 table groups had mentioned that. She noted that she knew there was an impetus at the current time on an issue involving a historical site, which she truly felt the concern was deeply rooted and not a passing issue. She noted that it was fortunate that the city had wonderful historical assets that citizens wanted preserved and improved. She stated that the community events in the city were much loved and appreciated. She noted that she did not see many comments about government services which she almost interpreted them as perhaps being taken for granted. She stated that one individual stated that they liked the low taxes.
Mayor Kelley thanked goodness for that one person; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted that the problem with the tax bill was that citizens would look at the total bill and not look at what they paid to each individual agency or municipality.

Ms. Crotty stated that the second part of the Community Conversation Workshop was planning for the future. She explained that she asked the participants to dream for the future without constraints and to envision what they would like the city to be like in ten years. She noted that she cautioned them that at some point reality would set in but for this exercise she instructed them to act like money was no object and that there were no restrictions from the state or other entities. She noted that the participants felt that the environment was going to be the key for the future and that a lot of attendees had mentioned things like sustainability, increased reuse water, recycling, and solar panels. She explained that a lot of the emphasis from the groups had also been on walk-ability with walking to restaurants, entertainment, and shopping mentioned, as well as mixed use developments, wider sidewalks, and more beach access. She noted that the undergrounding of utilities was also mentioned by several groups.

Ms. Crotty explained that there had not been as much consensus when it came to quality of life as that meant different things to different people. She explained that one group took to calling their vision a “livable community” with an emphasis on the arts, cultural events, and museums. She noted that there was discussion for parks and beaches, both with and without dogs. She stated that in the area of government services items such as beautification, particularly for the Granada Bridge area, and citywide Wifi were mentioned. She stated that development and redevelopment of north and south US1 were also cited, as well as continued improvements on Granada Boulevard. She stated in the area of economic development, there were many mentions of Ormond Crossings. She noted the interest in downtown development options for shopping, dining, hotels, and in making that area pedestrian friendly. She stated that the need for well paying jobs had also been mentioned. She explained that again historic preservation was a large part of the discussion for the future. She further explained that groups had mentioned wanting to protect historic properties, including code changes if necessary, as historic properties were part of the character of the city and wanted to make sure that it was protected. She noted that better public transportation had also been mentioned.

Ms. Crotty stated that the reaction was affirmation of the wonderful city that Ormond Beach was. She explained that she had included an appendix in her report that listed the actual groups from each day and their individual reports. She explained that she had asked each group to prioritize their three most important visions for the future and that she had those identified priorities highlighted in yellow in her report. She noted that they reflected a consensus among the groups on historic preservation, clean development, and beach access, among others. She stated that the participants who attended the workshops seemed to be in alignment on many issues. She noted that some staff members were at the workshops observing, and she had welcomed their comments. She asked if the Commission had any questions.

Mayor Kelley stated that it stood out to him that transparency was mentioned. He explained that he did not believe that any city was more transparent than Ormond Beach. He noted that all of the materials he was provided with and had access to were available online. He cited the old adage “you can lead a horse to water but you can’t make him drink.” He noted that he responded to any questions he received, as did the
Commission and that any questions could likely be answered by the information available online, as well.

Ms. Shanahan explained that she thought that the citizens in attendance referenced the city's transparency in a positive way and were expressing that they appreciated and valued the transparency of the city; whereby, Ms. Crotty agreed.

Mayor Kelley noted that he did not get that impression.

Commissioner Boehm noted that he interpreted it the same way that Ms. Shanahan and Ms. Crotty did.

Mayor Kelley stated that Ormond Beach had 38,000 residents and noted that 100 had attended the workshops. He explained that he personally thought that the results were skewed by the percentage of attendees affiliated with the Ormond Beach Historical Society. He noted that at a City Commission Brainstorming Workshop preceding the Community Conversation Workshops, there had been discussion about the MacDonald House and that discussion created interest in the topic. He noted that it was good to get people talking. He estimated that 30% to 40% of the participants at the Community Conversation Workshops were members of the Ormond Beach Historical Society. He explained that their presence skewed the conversations in a certain direction as they were in attendance with an agenda to save the MacDonald House. He noted that he knew that he would be criticized for making that statement. He stated that Ormond Beach offered a lot to everyone. He noted that it would stay a small town, as there was no room for expansion in any direction.

Ms. Crotty noted that due to height limits, the city would not expand upwards either.

Mayor Kelley stated that Ormond Beach could not turn into Orlando, which he stated was not a bad thing in his opinion.

Ms. Crotty agreed that there were participants at the Community Conversation Workshops who came in particular to discuss the MacDonald House and historic preservation, but she noted that there were also concerned citizens in attendance who did not have agendas. She explained that when the issue came up others would agree with it when it was broached. She noted that they may have been influenced by those in attendance for that purpose but explained that the topic had been welcomed as an addition to the conversation.

Mayor Kelley stated that it was good for citizens to discuss what was important to them and the Commission wanted to hear it.

Ms. Crotty noted that 100 people was a small number; but she stated that in this day and age, it was good turnout as the individuals had to give up three hours of their time. She noted that there were citizens attending the present workshop, also.

Mayor Kelley stated that he believed some would stay for the entire six hours and some would switch off in shifts.

Commissioner Boehm noted the previously mentioned topic of transparency and responsiveness. He explained that he sent an email to Ms. Shanahan regarding a citizen complaint and that Ms. Shanahan had sent a detailed response to that citizen two hours
later, even with the workshop and other meetings being held that day. He noted that was a very good turnaround time. He explained that anything a citizen ever addressed to him he forwarded to staff and there was always a response. He stated that the city government was transparent and ultra responsive.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the city held public meetings for its citizens to comment on, such as Andy Romano Beachfront Park and John Anderson Drive. He stated that the city invested their citizens in all of its major undertakings. He noted that Commissioner Kent held meetings at his home where he would respond to citizens. He explained that the Commission considered what citizens thought. He noted that it was very evident that the MacDonald House was important to the citizens attending this meeting and to the ones who had attended the Community Conversation Workshops which would have to be factored into their thinking moving forward. He stated that it was encouraging to have citizens attend meetings in the city. He explained that it was important for the citizens to do so and to make their thoughts known.

Commissioner Partington noted that he believed that the strategic planning would be for planning at a 30,000-foot level and for the next 20 to 25 years. He noted that he read the report and stated that it was well done, and he appreciated the thoroughness of it. He explained that the items cited as important by the citizens such as the tree canopy, environmental resources, and transparency were guiding principles for what the Commission was trying to do and should also guide the city in its plans for the next 20 to 25 years. He noted that things changed and that there would be some growth and redevelopment but citizens' concerns should be kept in mind during those changes. He noted that a few ideas they formulated may be able to be implemented in the next two to three years. He explained that the Commission was one election away from their plans changing as they were all elected to two year terms. He reiterated that he thought the intent of this workshop was for more upper level strategic long-term planning. He noted that any new growth in the city would be at Ormond Crossings and the rest would be maintaining existing areas. He stated that the city needed to keep doing what they did well.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN – EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL ISSUES AND TRENDS

External Issues and Trends
Ms. Crotty stated that sometimes cities got focused on the day-to-day in their city and developed tunnel vision as to what was happening around them that impacted their city. She stated that she liked to start with the bigger picture. She encouraged the Commission and staff to think globally and to think about issues and trends happening now and in the next five to ten years that could impact Ormond Beach. She asked them to think about possible trends in the world, the United States, Florida, and in Volusia County. She noted that in the next exercise they would think about Ormond Beach specifically. She instructed them to scan the environment, noting that in most instances they had no or minimal control over the external environment but were definitely being impacted by it. She asked them to think about the legal and political environment, the social and cultural environment, the economic environment, the technological environment, and the competitive environmental. She noted that this exercise was totally brainstorming as no one had a crystal ball to accurately predict the future. She invited staff and the City Commission to offer suggestions.

Mayor Kelley stated an external issue was the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and explained that they imposed restraints and conditions fictitiously and made the city
operate under the Clean Water and Air Act, which would cost the city a lot of money. He stated that another external issue was the global warming hoax, which was now being referred to as “climate change.” He stated that Ormond Beach would be impacted because the more it was mentioned, the more it was believed to be reality and more restraints would be put in place. He noted that he had heard recently of a government proposal to prohibit individuals from repairing their own cars by federal law.

Commissioner Kent stated that another external issue was the unknown fluctuating costs of energy and fossil fuels.

Commissioner Boehm stated that an external major issue in the state and country was water. He noted that there was only so much water available. He explained that Ormond Beach would not grow much so the city was probably comfortable with its water production ability, but the ability to produce enough water for a growing population was becoming increasingly more difficult.

Ms. Crotty noted that Commissioner Boehm mentioned quantity and asked Commissioner Boehm if quality was also an issue.

Mr. Ponitz stated that Florida was now the third most populated state in the country. He noted that while Ormond Beach may not grow due to its constrained city limits, the rest of Florida’s growth would impact the water supply and water quality for the city.

Mayor Kelley noted the Volusia Aquifer was a sole source aquifer; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted the water troubles in California. She stated that the cost of water was another thing.

Commissioner Boehm noted an ancillary problem for the county and state was that the legislature was not properly addressing the septic tank issue. He explained that there were a huge number of septic tanks located on the north peninsula. He asked who inspected the bottoms of those tanks to make sure that they were not dumping chemicals into the waterway. He noted that the cost of replacing the tanks would be huge. He stated that he felt the state should use Amendment One funds to eliminate septic tanks, to the greatest extent possible, anywhere near navigable waterways. He noted that it was a major problem for Florida because of the sheer number of septic tanks located in the state. He stated that there was no maintenance or inspection performed on them to assess their viability or if they were dumping their contents into the ground or waterways.

Mayor Kelley stated that Volusia County was either second or fourth in the number of septic tanks in the state, depending on which number was cited. He stated that the Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials (“Roundtable”) discussed the issue when Amendment One was passed. He explained that State Senator David Simmons was coming to speak to the Roundtable about the issue, but he noted that it was a battle to try and receive any of the funding.

Commissioner Partington stated that another issue was the aging demographic in America. He explained that a lot more of the country’s population was retiring and would be coming to Florida wanting services. He noted that planning for that and how to maintain the quality level of services was an issue.

Mayor Kelley noted that people were also living longer.
Ms. Crotty stated that the fastest growing population was people over the age of 85. She noted that younger retirees were a lot different now than in the past in terms of their needs and the services they expected.

Mayor Kelley noted that the average median age in Volusia County was 45 years old.

Ms. Crotty asked if staff had any issues or trends that they wanted to contribute.

Mr. Carolin noted that Commissioner Partington mentioned the aging population stating that was extremely important. He explained that there were more active seniors now than in the past and that many seniors were focusing on their health.

Mayor Kelley suggested changing some soccer fields to croquet and pickle ball courts.

Mayor Kelley stated that another trend was the changes in technology. He noted that ten years prior he heard a speaker at the National League of Cities convention mention that the level of technology was at a level akin to the Jamestown settlement of the United States and that it would change dramatically in the future. He noted during another workshop, Commissioner Partington had previously mentioned the need for office buildings declining as employees worked from home or remotely.

Ms. Crotty noted that there were now driverless cars and that Florida was one of the states testing those cars. She noted that there were even 18-wheel vehicles that were being tested to operate without a driver.

Commissioner Kent noted that there was a person in the vehicle, but they were just not actively driving it.

Ms. Crotty stated that the person could be blind. She explained that the vehicles had sensors. She noted that technology had changed greatly just in the last several years.

Mr. Huhta stated that another concern was the "internet of things," which could be both a positive and a negative. He explained that everything was connected now, from one's refrigerator to smart phone to computer to car. He noted that sometimes the issue was that the technology would be applied without concern for the security or impact of its implementation. He explained that the expectation that one was always available and always connected could also take its toll on people.

Ms. Crotty asked if what Mr. Huhta referenced was a privacy issue; whereby, Mr. Huhta noted that there had been a court case involving an employer that had put an app on their employees' phones in order to track them 24 hours a day. He explained that the legality of doing so was being questioned.

Mayor Kelley stated that a friend of his did something similar years ago with his company.

Ms. Crotty stated that most local governments used a global positioning system (GPS) on vehicles; whereby, Mayor Kelley confirmed that the police department did utilize that.

Mr. Huhta explained that there was both positive and negative aspects to advancing technology and noted that it had to be managed correctly like any growth management.
Ms. Shanahan noted that young people often had their whole lives accessible online now and lived a different life than previous generations.

Ms. Crotty explained that communication was also changing because of the increased technology which concerned her.

Ms. Shanahan stated that younger individuals were not talking to each other and would text one another, even if they were in the same room.

Mayor Kelley noted that he used messaging a lot and that emails had almost adapted to the same level of correspondence as his messaging, which was short and sweet.

Ms. Crotty asked if children were losing their social skills.

Mayor Kelley stated that he was recently with a younger couple and the wife was messaging someone on the phone the entire time.

Ms. Crotty stated that she will see couples in restaurants where both halves of the couple were on their phones or devices. She asked if something was being lost.

Mayor Kelley noted that could affect what was expected of them.

Ms. Crotty noted that an instant response was expected. She explained that some of her young employees did not want to make phone calls and instead wanted to send emails or text messages. She noted that she believed that a better response was received through a phone call. She stated that she had a young employee who had never made a bank deposit with a paper check because everything was done wirelessly now.

Mayor Kelley stated that he himself was angry if he had to write out a paper check or send a fax now; whereby, Ms. Crotty replied that Mayor Kelley was unusual for his generation.

Mayor Kelley stated that another issue of concern was regulations from the state. He explained that the state was taking away the city’s ability to fund programs that people expected and taking away home rule. He stated that the city could not be as responsive to residents as a result and would be blamed for the actions of others.

Ms. Crotty noted that there were unfunded mandates at the county, state, and federal levels; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that the federal government hammered the states and the states in turn hammered the counties and cities.

Ms. Crotty asked what was happening in public safety and noted that crime was down; whereby, Chief Osterkamp stated that homeland security and city infrastructure for security were issues.

Ms. Crotty asked if terrorism was on the rise; whereby, Chief Osterkamp stated that there was a need to be more aware of it and ready to respond. He noted that community relations were another big issue.

Ms. Crotty stated that police and community relations issues were being seen around the country.
Chief Osterkamp stated that policing was tied into the technology changes. He noted that there were costs to buy into technological upgrades plus additional reoccurring costs. He explained that unfunded federal and state mandates, such as having a particular radio system, would cause the city to incur the cost. He noted that the state was also looking at mandating body cameras. He stated that another big issue was finding and retaining qualified applicants.

Ms. Crotty asked Chief Osterkamp to hold his thought about the applicants, as that was more of an internal trend and to reference it later during that portion of the exercise.

Mayor Kelley noted that he had viewed a television program called "CSI: Cyber" which showcased some of the new technology. He explained that individuals could control their televisions and door locks remotely and that individuals could also hack into baby monitors or Smart TVs and watch what was going on. He noted that technology affected crimes.

Ms. Crotty stated that cyber security was a big industry.

Mayor Kelley stated that it would affect the city in that having to find the funding to take care of those issues could adversely impact the wishes and wants of the community. He cited the body cameras as an example. He explained that they could possibly become mandated and then the city would have to have the ability to care for the technology, store data, and retrieve the video, as well.

Chief Osterkamp stated that equipment would have to be purchased and stored, which would be a costly aspect. He noted that when the technology changed, it would have to be updated and the body cameras could be damaged in the police officer’s line of work.

Mr. Huhta stated that managing the video would be an endeavor and that purchasing the equipment was just the tip of the iceberg.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the financial markets and economy in general were external issues with which they would have to deal.

Ms. Crotty noted that the economy was recovering, but it seemed to still be really fragile, as the situation with the European economy was not great.

Mayor Kelley stated that inflation was approaching 2%. He stated that the Federal Reserve was considering raising the rate this year or next. He noted that ten-year bonds were going up.

Mr. Huhta stated that the economy was healthier than it had been, but it consisted of pockets that were doing well and others that were not doing well at all. He noted its fragility.

Mayor Kelley stated that all of that would affect the general population’s retirement plans and disposable income; whereby, Mr. Huhta noted that the national debt was one and a half times what it was a year ago.

Ms. Crotty stated that she would be writing a report summarizing the results of the workshop.
Commissioner Boehm stated that another trend was that a lot of the new development in Volusia County was for fairly low-wage occupation projects such as distribution centers and outlet malls. He noted that Volusia lagged the state in average income.

Commissioner Kent stated that there would be more of the same as the county was rolling out the red carpet for those kinds of jobs; whereby, Commissioner Boehm noted that the county was giving those types of developments a lot of money.

Mayor Kelley noted that the Roundtable had a similar discussion the previous day about the wages in the area and the economic situation. He stated that 50% of the county’s homeless were located in Daytona Beach. He explained that Daytona Beach’s economy was established with tourism and service industry occupations which paid low wages. He stated that he would rather have high paying technology jobs.

Commissioner Partington stated that creating more living wage jobs would hopefully be a focus for Ormond Crossings. He noted that there were many higher education institutions in the area which would lead one to think it would be a good place for that.

Mayor Kelley noted that children were educated in the area, but then left for other parts of the state or country in order to find work.

Internal Issues and Trends
Ms. Crotty asked that the discussion switch gears and now focus on internal issues and trends. She asked the Commission and staff to think along the same category lines but to think about issues and trends specifically in Ormond Beach.

Ms. Shanahan stated that an issue was hiring, training, and retaining employees. She noted that there was an aging local population; whereby, Mr. Huhta stated that the employees were “seasoned.”

Mayor Kelley referenced the issue that Chief Osterkamp had mentioned previously about finding and retaining qualified applicants.

Ms. Crotty noted that could particularly be an issue in police departments in smaller cities as it was harder to be competitive with bigger agencies.

Chief Osterkamp explained that the younger culture often wanted to get a job in order to be trained and then leave to go to a bigger agency with more opportunities and better pay. He cited the old adage that the “grass is greener on the other side.”

Ms. Crotty noted that she had read that millennials did not have the same kind of loyalty as past generations.

Chief Osterkamp stated that when asked in interviews where they wanted to be in five years, many of the applicants said that they did not want to be in the city but instead in a bigger agency.

Commissioner Boehm stated that a problem in the city was that all of its eggs were in Ormond Crossing’s basket. He explained that there was no other land for development. He noted that Ormond Beach could not compete for an outlet mall, or a Sam’s Club or Trader Joe’s distribution center unless they had the property available at Ormond.
Crossings. He noted that the city would not be competitive until Ormond Crossings made progress.

Mr. Mannarino noted that the airport business park was built up, but there was land to be leased which was under the city’s control. He explained that Ormond Crossings was privately held and that the parent company was more interested in energy investment than in real estate investment, so it was a challenge to get them to work towards putting infrastructure in the commerce park so that the property could be marketed for economic development purposes. He noted that there had been some ideas, but they were still being hashed out. He explained that the biggest challenge was to get roads over the railroad to that land. He further explained that it was different than in other places like Daytona Beach where roads were being put in on existing roads. He explained that the city needed a partnership with the county to get infrastructure funding and would be working with the county to do that. He hoped that economic development would be at the site sooner rather than later.

Commissioner Partington stated that he knew that Mayor Kelley bent over backwards and twisted arms to help Mr. Mannarino with Ormond Crossings and stated he believed that the county department of economic development needed to help start something with the infrastructure to open that area up for access.

Mayor Kelley stated that Commissioner Kent and Commissioner Partington went to Washington, D.C., to get funding for an initial study of the I-95/US1 interchange eight years prior. He explained that at least the state was now willing to recognize that the interchange was the worst in the system. He stated that they were slowly working together to create economic development but they needed private help.

Commissioner Kent noted that the issue came down to private landownership. He stated that he had been a Commissioner for 12 years and had been talking about Ormond Crossings for ten years. He explained that ten years ago when Ormond Crossings was pitched as a 20-year build out, the developer spoke about jobs, homes, and the future. He noted that the build-out was still currently at 20 years, but ten years had now passed. He stated that it was embarrassing to talk about and there was only so much that the city could do and should have to do. He stated that other entities had to get on board. He noted that he and Commissioner Partington had done a great job lobbying their congressman to get on board, and now he was embarrassed by the lack of progress.

Ms. Crotty asked that the focus of discussion to tighten up and that the issues not be debated. She stated that she appreciated the comments she was hearing.

Commissioner Stowers stated that a blanket issue topic was citizen apathy. He explained that if there was a focused interest in accomplishing a goal, it could be achieved by citizens showing up. He noted that residents were not asking about it.

Ms. Crotty asked if Commissioner Stowers’ comments about citizen apathy were mostly related to economic development; whereby, Commissioner Stowers replied that he was speaking across the board and it tied into the earlier comments about technology. He explained that real matters were complicated and took 20 years.

Ms. Crotty asked if the city’s demographics were changing; whereby, Mayor Kelley explained that they had changed from the projections issued five years prior. He noted
that the *Daytona Beach News-Journal* had stated that the demographics would be getting younger but that it certainly was not happening.

Ms. Crotty asked if the ethnicity was changing; whereby, she was told that it was not by members of the Commission.

Mr. Goss stated that household size was getting smaller.

Mayor Kelley suggested that maybe some households wanted smaller homes on smaller lots.

Ms. Crotty stated that older residents may not live with families and therefore there would be less people in the home.

Ms. Shanahan noted that a lot of younger people were not having children.

Mr. Goss stated that the household size was projected to be lower than two.

Ms. Crotty noted that, as Ms. Shanahan mentioned, a lot of the younger population was delaying having children or only having one child.

Mr. Goss stated that there were also an increasing number of non-traditional households.

Commissioner Partington asked what that could be attributed to and whether it was a breakdown in moral social structure or for financial reasons; whereby, Mr. Goss replied that he did not know, but he noted that there were more non-traditional households now.

Ms. Crotty noted that there was a big movement for single seniors to live together. She stated that a lot of stigma related to what used to be considered a family was gone and so some families looked different now.

Mayor Kelley stated that a representative at the Roundtable from Deltona had stated that they had many homes with multiple families living in them; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted that was not always legal. Mayor Kelley noted that Deltona had one of the highest foreclosure rates and so several families were moving in together.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the local economy was an issue to think about; whereby, Mayor Kelley asked what drove the Ormond Beach economy.

Ms. Shanahan replied that Ormond Beach was mostly a bedroom residential community. She explained that Ormond Beach had a limited business area at the Airport Business Park and Ormond Crossings. She noted that the *Land Development Code* (LDC) was being reviewed to be revised to be reflective of changes regarding the need for office and retail space.

Ms. Crotty asked if the city was likely to continue to be largely residential; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that 76% of the city’s tax base was residential.

Mr. Goss stated that the number of rooftops in the city drove the economy; and if that was not growing, then the same pie was just being split.
Ms. Crotty noted that if the number of residents increased, then more businesses would come to serve them.

Commissioner Stowers stated that a continuing trend was future difficulties with Granada Boulevard being the city’s only east-west corridor. He explained that as Daytona Beach built up to State Road 40 west of Interstate 95, it was going to increase traffic volume.

Commissioner Kent stated that another issue was that criminals and thugs from surrounding communities were coming into Ormond Beach to break into cars and wreak havoc in the city’s neighborhoods. He noted that the city was not alone in this as other cities in the area had also been targeted. He explained that the perpetrators came from Daytona Beach and went to surrounding communities on a nightly basis to commit these crimes. He noted that they would run off from the police but would not be chased in their stolen cars as their crime was not a chase-able offense.

Commissioner Partington stated that these events occurred on both beachside and mainland Ormond Beach. He noted that Mr. Huhta lived close to him. He stated that criminals would look into cars in that area and break windows to steal their contents. He stated that he went on a ride along with the police department and the first call they responded to was teenagers from Ponce Inlet who had been joyriding in a Cadillac which they totaled near Fleming Avenue and almost killed one of the passengers.

Commissioner Kent noted that it was a major issue for him and would be for the entire city as well as other cities in the area. He explained that these individuals had no regard for human life and travelled at high rates of speed while almost running over officers and children. He noted that there was no appropriate prevention plan. He stated that this activity was consistently happening most nights a week and that every night some city was getting hit by this group from Daytona Beach.

Commissioner Stowers stated that trends in technology were something that the city needed to internally focus on. He noted Commissioner Kent and Commissioner Partington’s comments and wondered if there was an app available that allowed vehicles to be turned off remotely and which would provide GPS data on that vehicle in order for police to locate it. He noted that having an information technology (IT) employee who dealt solely with computers was almost something from the 1990s and that it was important to be proactive in researching technology now. He stated that it was up to everyone to start doing that.

Ms. Crotty noted that criminals were utilizing technology as well; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that the criminals could have an app that would show where police were located.

Ms. Crotty stated that she had a keyless car ignition system. She explained that there was a device that could be purchased for $100 that would send a signal to a car key fob, even if it was stored in a home, and cause it to unlock the car in the driveway. She explained that the criminal could then rob the car, or if there was a keyless ignition system, start the car and drive it away. She noted that she was told that a solution to combat that was to place the key fob in a freezer so that it could act as a barrier.

Mr. Huhta stated that utilizing that app causes the lights in the car to be turned on first so that the potential criminal would know when the car had successfully been unlocked. He stated that he would guarantee that similar technology was being used for some of the local break-ins and explained that it was one of the negative aspects of the internet
connecting everything. He explained that industries applying new technologies were not keeping up with the security that was needed for them.

Mayor Kelley stated that there were political ramifications involved with the Commission all serving two year terms.

Ms. Crotty noted that she had used Ormond Beach as an example before when speaking about Commission terms, primarily the fact that Ormond Beach City Commission members did not have staggered terms. She explained that it was unheard of for the terms to not be staggered. She explained that conceivably the entire Commission could be elected out of office in two years. She noted that she did not know of any other city in Florida who had that situation.

Commissioner Kent explained that the issue of terms had been before the public twice during elections and both times there had been an overwhelming response voting to leave it as it was.

Mayor Kelley stated that the Commission had previously had staggered terms and then they were removed and now all of the terms were up for election at the same time.

Ms. Crotty noted that it was good that the City Commission did not have limits on the number of terms they could serve. She noted that the Commission had been serving together for a long time. She noted that it was highly unusual that the entire Commission’s terms expired at the same time.

Mayor Kelley stated that term limits had also been voted down. He stated that the composition of the Commission could theoretically change in 2016, explaining that everything that the current Commission was planning and working towards would then go out the door.

Ms. Shanahan stated that working relationships with other governments in the area was another issue that could be both positive and negative, depending on the issue being worked on.

Commissioner Partington noted that another issue increasingly difficult in the current environment was limited revenue.

Mayor Kelley stated that revenue was a big internal problem that would have to be faced in the future years.

Ms. Crotty asked if Mayor Kelley was speaking about inadequate revenue; whereby, Mayor Kelley replied that it was.

Commissioner Stowers stated that another trend he anticipated was the transition of building space from office, commercial, and retail uses to personal care uses. He explained that there were many more yoga studios than there had been five years prior and also more cross-fit centers and gyms. He stated that a lot of retail stores were being replaced as most items could now be purchased online.

Ms. Shanahan stated that another issue would be annexations. She noted that they could be positive as they would grow the tax base.
Ms. Crotty asked if there was some potential for growth with annexations.

Ms. Shanahan noted that there was some potential, but it was limited. She explained that the issue with annexations was the responsibility to provide services to those areas that were annexed. She stated that when properties were annexed into the city they would have to be accommodated through existing police coverage, and she stated that eventually the Police Chief would be looking at hiring new officers to provide services to those facilities being annexed into the city. She noted that the city already provided water and sewer to those locations but would also have to provide more police presence. She explained that some of the future tax dollars from those annexations would already be obligated to providing services.

Ms. Crotty stated that it was a balancing act to determine if specific annexations were good for the city.

Mayor Kelley stated that in 1996 the city looked into annexing Ormond-by-the-Sea. He stated that the city would have gotten an additional $1 million in revenue by annexing that area, but he noted that it could be different now.

Commissioner Partington noted that there was an issue with septic tanks in Ormond-by-the-Sea; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that the septic tanks were not as much of an issue back in 1996. He stated that the city would not necessarily have to absorb those costs. He explained that if there was a stronger push for funding it could help alleviate the costs of replacing the septic tanks. He noted that County Councilman Doug Daniels was pushing for funding along with State Senator David Simmons.

Mr. Carolin stated that another important trend to recognize, which seemed to be unique in Ormond Beach as compared to other communities, was that the City Commission was on the same page and did not have agendas they pushed outside of the needs of the city.

Mayor Kelley stated that the Commission worked well together because of the City Manager and City Attorney acting as the glue.

IV. S.W.O.T. (STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS) ANALYSIS

Ms. Crotty handed out a worksheet to the staff members present and the City Commission. She explained that she wanted to do a traditional S.W.O.T. (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis activity. She handed out post-it notes to the staff members present and the City Commission. She instructed them to write one strength, weakness, opportunity, or threat per post-it note and to put a S, W, O or T somewhere on that post-it note so that it was clear what category it would go under. She stated that it would be good if each participant came up with at least one item for each category. She noted that this would be done anonymously and no names needed to be put on the post-it notes. She asked everyone to be very honest and direct about what needed to be said. She noted that a secret issue could not be fixed.

Members of city staff and the Commission each filled out their post-it notes and provided them to Ms. Crotty to organize in charts under the categories of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. She asked if there was any reaction just by looking at the distribution of post-it notes on the charts.
Mr. Goss stated that there were more strengths than weaknesses and more threats than opportunities.

Ms. Crotty noted that she it made her nervous whenever a city would not have weaknesses listed, as she believed them to be in denial or unaware. She explained that there were not as many of each category as there appeared to be as there was a lot of repetition in each category. She noted that the repetition lent more credibility to an issue.

The worksheet described strengths as follows:

**Strengths** are internal resources or capabilities that help those responsible for carrying out the mandate or mission of the city.

Ms. Crotty read the post-it notes under the category of **strengths**:
- Very positive quality of life in our city
- Responsiveness
- Well managed
- Parks & Recreation
- Cohesive Commission
- Employee Loyalty
- Committed responsive staff led by excellent City Manager
- Seasoned staff
- City staff
- Dedicated staff
- Professional staff
- Professional staff
- Employees who care
- Employee empowerment
- Sense of community
- Transparency
- Transparency
- Transparency
- Location / beach
- Location
- Environment, great place to live, work & play
- Beach
- City size
- Doing more with less
- River & Ocean
- Well diversified values for living here
- Balanced quality of life
- Quality of life
- Quality of life
- Public participation
- Involved civic organizations & citizenry
- Community concern / involvement
- Civic pride
- Community involvement
- Technology
- Stable political environment
Commissioner Kent noted that great staff and the quality of life were repeatedly cited as strengths; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted the mentions of the involved and engaged citizenry.

Ms. Crotty noted that “doing more with less” was listed as a strength and remarked that she found that interesting.

Mayor Kelley stated that the City Manager did a lot with a reduced workforce. He noted that the city’s workforce had been reduced by about 100 employees at one point. He stated that a lot of the staff members had more responsibilities than they did previously and wore many hats. He stated that the department heads and staff felt like a part of the community and that all of the employees felt like part of a team due to Ms. Shanahan.

Ms. Crotty noted that dedicated staff had stepped up to the plate. She explained that she wondered if that was a real strength as the expectation for those employees was greater, and she wondered if they would burn out and want to work elsewhere where they did not have to carry as much responsibility.

Mayor Kelley stated that he had used the phrase “get a bigger plate or eat faster.”

Ms. Crotty stated that a bigger plate would be good.

The worksheet described weaknesses as follows:

**Weaknesses** are internal deficiencies in resources or capabilities that hinder the ability of those responsible for accomplishing the mandate or mission of the city.

Ms. Crotty read the post-it notes under the category of weaknesses:

- Low paying jobs
- Employee competitive wages
- Jobs
- Good wage jobs / room for new growth
- Availability of living wage jobs
- Public participation
- Limited riverfront and oceanfront opportunities
- Desire / need to maintain lowest tax rate in county
- Unfunded mandates
- Limited ability for economic development due to lack of land available for development
- Creativity of staff
- Ultra low tax rate insufficient revenue $ (too few)
- Tax rate insufficient to cover desired service level long-term
- Limited revenue sources
- Revenue
- Revenue sources
- External controls
- Personnel resources (too few)
- Employee turnover
- Continued adding demands with existing resources
- East/west corridors
- Budgetary constraints
- IT staffing / infrastructure to stay competitive
Ms. Crotty asked what staff and the Commission noticed about the weaknesses listed. She noted that some of the weaknesses the city had more control over than others. She stated that she assumed the comments about low wage jobs in the community had more to do with the community than jobs in city government.

Commissioner Kent stated that the tax rate was not sustainable to provide the level of services in the city. He stated that he had a citizen who called him frequently to tell him that the city was beautiful, but all he really needed was safe roads and for 911 to respond to emergencies. He explained that the city kept adding beautiful amenities such as Andy Romano Beachfront Park and the forthcoming Environmental Learning Center, but there was an impetus to keep the millage one of the lowest rates in the area. He noted that the city was projected to have a $1 million deficit in the future. He stated that they could not eat fast enough and that they did not have bigger plates. He explained that taxes would have to be increased, services would have to be cut, or a new revenue stream would have to be created. He noted that he was pleased that the issue came up as a weakness.

Mayor Kelley stated that Commissioner Kent was right.

Ms. Crotty referenced the resident Commissioner Kent had mentioned speaking of who wanted limited services and noted that Commissioner Kent probably would have other residents call him with the opposite opinion that they were willing to pay for a higher quality of life.

Commissioner Kent replied that was true. He noted that the residents voted to tax themselves for 20 years in order to have Andy Romano Beachfront Park.

Mayor Kelley stated that a lot of the more vocal opponents of the tax rate did not pay much in taxes themselves. He explained that he had listened to the beach driving discussion at a recent County Council meeting and had researched the tax bills for some of the speakers who spoke, noting that the speakers provided their addresses at the beginning of their comments. He explained that a lot of the speakers who were opposed to economic development were paying $100 to $500 a year in total taxes.

Ms. Crotty stated that those individuals probably paid more for their cell phone bill or cable bill each year.

Commissioner Kent stated that there used to be a larger number of individuals who would complain about their taxes to the Commission when the millage rate was set. He noted that Mayor Kelley now ran the most efficient and effective meeting and theorized that was why he was always elected chairperson of the various boards on which he served. He explained that now when an audience member came to speak to the Commission about their taxes at a City Commission meeting, Mayor Kelley would pull up their tax bill on the property appraiser’s website. He stated that it was then hard for that speaker to combat the reality of their tax bill as read to them by Mayor Kelley. He noted that often the speaker would be paying something like $380 to Ormond Beach for taxes and paying $900 to Volusia County Schools and more to other agencies, as well.

Ms. Crotty noted that limited revenue sources and an unsustainable tax rate were weaknesses repeatedly noted. She stated that there were also employee related concerns. She noted that staff had been cited as one of the greatest strengths but there
appeared to also be concerns about too few personnel resources, turnover of staff and added demands on staff.

Ms. Shanahan stated that it was a balancing act.

Ms. Crotty noted that one of the weaknesses mentioned was "lack of creativity of staff." She asked what that meant.

Mayor Kelley theorized that someone could be saying that staff might have creative ideas that were not being heard.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she had written that weakness. She explained that she thought that sometimes staff did not think outside the box and did not push themselves enough. She stated that she felt that staff had great potential but were constrained by trying to stay in their current box.

Mr. Hayes noted that he typically did not participate and served in an advisory role. He explained that he felt that sometimes staff was restrained by the regulatory framework in which a public government had to operate. He stated that there were fewer resources completing more work, which was both a strength and a weakness. He stated that creativity would be nice but noted that staff did not always have the tools to work with.

Mayor Kelley stated that he interpreted that "doing more with less" could also mean doing more with less revenue. He noted that the city only took in $9 million in property taxes. He stated that he thought it was a positive from a financial standpoint.

Ms. Crotty stated that she had seen in organizations where the environment seemed to be one that did not encourage risk taking; and therefore, no one would attempt to step out of the box. She noted that she was not saying that was the case in Ormond Beach. She suggested that in her example a colleague might have attempted to try something creative and was blocked from doing so. She noted that it started at the top with the Commission looking for creativity and innovation and sending a message that was something they were open to. She noted that any creativity and innovation had to be responsible as the city did have fiduciary responsibilities to its citizens.

Ms. Shanahan stated that sometimes the resources were limited and explained that she did not mean just staff resources but also technological and environmental ones.

Commissioner Partington stated that the city had periodic programs to encourage innovation and rewards for suggestions. He suggested the Commission should make a broad statement that they were willing to listen to new ideas and no one needed to be afraid of losing their job for suggesting something.

Mayor Kelley stated that the Commission was not afraid of change and was open to it. He noted that the Commission held brainstorming sessions. He stated that the Commission got out of the box, and he felt it was evident that they were open-minded.

Commissioner Stowers stated that doing more with less could make things more difficult. He explained that he went to Portland a few years prior and saw their bicycle paths and had an idea for a bicycle corridor. He noted that there were many other issues to deal with and those types of ideas sometimes were not high on the priority list and would fall by the wayside. He stated that was sometimes the case with creative ideas. He
explained that it was often easier to do things the way they had been done because of the limited resources.

Ms. Crotty stated that doing more with less raised expectations that it could continue. She noted that if there was any positive side to the economic downturn, it was that people had to learn to do things a little differently.

Mr. Gray stated that he had written the “doing more with less” strength. He explained that Public Works had taken on a lot that they should not realistically have and that the mindset of “this is how it used to be done” had gone by the wayside in light of that. He further explained that they had listened to employees and were working to do things smarter and not harder. He noted that employees took their jobs seriously and performed their jobs more efficiently and effectively than in the past. He explained that the public perception of seven city workers standing around holding shovels on the side of the road was not an accurate one. He stated that the resources needed to help do the job were being obtained and that machines performed tasks that used to be performed by employees. He explained that employees were giving back by being smarter and it made employees feel wanted and part of the team.

Ms. Crotty stated that she hoped those employees were acknowledged, recognized and appreciated. She noted that it might not be possible to do so monetarily but she hoped it could be done in other ways.

The worksheet described opportunities as follows:

**Opportunities** are external factors or situations that can affect the city in a favorable way

Ms. Crotty read the post-it notes under the category of opportunities:
- Ocean, rivers
- Technology
- Improving economy
- Downtown
- Commencement of Ormond Crossings project
- Ormond Crossings
- Ormond Crossings
- Ormond Crossings
- Completion of Airport Business Park expansion (Taxiway G / Roadways)
- Dockage at bridge for downtown walk-ability
- Expansion & complimentary uses around parks
- Natural resources
- Responsible growth
- Historic preservation
- Development of other communities
- Bridge
- Livability city with low cost to attract retirees
- Our history & historic places (i.e. Three Chimneys, Loop)
- Tomoka Ave, New Britain, Vining Court

Ms. Crotty stated that a big opportunity mentioned was Ormond Crossings.
Ms. Shanahan noted that developing the core areas of downtown and the Granada Bridge were also mentioned.

Mayor Kelley stated that New Britain Avenue and Lincoln Avenue were areas that had development opportunities.

Ms. Crotty noted that natural resources were mentioned, as well as the expansion of complimentary uses around parks. She noted that she was not sure what uses were being referred to.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she thought it may be referring to potential recreational opportunities at the four corners of the Granada Bridge and in all city parks.

Commissioner Stowers stated that he had added that opportunity. He explained that he was thinking along those same lines. He noted that he had recently met with staff about the Environmental Learning Center and had been thinking about the zip line suggestion offered by a citizen at a meeting. He stated that it would be wonderful to have zip lining, canoeing, and paddle boarding activities in the Central Park area, possibly with a farmer’s market nearby to drive activity.

Mayor Kelley noted that one located in that area would be close to the community gardens.

Commissioner Stowers stated that the fields on north US1 continued to be expanded, as well as the docks at Cassen Park. He noted that there were many opportunities.

Commissioner Partington noted that the airport was mentioned. He stated that he agreed with that opportunity suggestion and thought that a connector road for the Airport Business Park to Pineland Trail, noise abatement, and safety tweaks could impact the airport greatly while not expending a lot of effort.

Ms. Crotty stated that rich executives could use the airport to fly in and out of the city.

Commissioner Partington hoped that they would be flying in to their businesses that were located in Ormond Beach.

Mayor Kelley stated that those executives could create jobs in Ormond Beach.

Commissioner Partington stated that he agreed with Commissioner Stowers’ comments about the parks. He noted that any changes to the parks should stay consistent with the close residential neighborhoods located near them.

Ms. Crotty noted that an opportunity mentioned was “development of other communities.” She stated that she was not sure what that meant.

Mayor Kelley stated that he wrote that one. He explained that there were opportunities with the proposed warehouses and shopping centers being constructed in other local areas. He stated that the individuals coming to work in those facilities might want to live in Ormond Beach. He suggested that they may even get some people coming from the Trader Joe’s distribution center that was being put in.
Ms. Crotty stated that maybe Ormond Beach would get a Trader Joe’s store; whereby, Mayor Kelley explained that Trader Joe’s had said that there would be no store as the demographics for the area were not right. He noted that Ormond Beach had a $12,000 higher median income than the rest of Volusia County, but they were still told that it would not work.

The worksheet described threats as follows:

**Threats are external factors or situations that can affect the city in a negative way.**

Ms. Crotty read the post-it notes under the category of threats:
- Unfunded mandates
- Unfunded state mandates
- State/federal fiscal policy
- County / state / federal government
- Unfunded mandates
- State mandated legislation that adds to local burden
- Unfunded mandates from state and federal government
- County
- Fragile economy
- Economy
- Economic downtown
- National economy
- Density
- Other local governments
- Competing cities
- Development outside Ormond Beach with infrastructure impacts to Ormond
- Aging electorate in isolated residences far from services
- Statutory requirements
- Maintain / expand services but not funds to pay for them
- Deteriorating roads / infrastructure
- The desire to keep a tax rate that won’t support our community
- Competitive wages, employee retention
- Crime

Commissioner Kent stated that he wanted to high-five whoever wrote “county.”

Ms. Shanahan noted that some were more diplomatic and included county with other government entities in their post.

Ms. Crotty noted that crime was mentioned again and referenced in the earlier discussion. She asked about one of the threats being listed referring to development outside of Ormond Beach impacting Ormond Beach infrastructure.

Mayor Kelley stated that he knew what that was in reference to. He explained that it was put on the city by a decision that others made; whereby, Ms. Crotty noted that it was unfortunate that the impacts to the city were not looked at by other entities.

Ms. Crotty asked if there were any further questions. The workshop adjourned for a dinner break at 6:03 p.m. The workshop reconvened at 6:41 p.m.
Civic Center Proposal
Ms. Crotty explained that before they would move on to strategic issues, Commissioner Boehm had requested to speak about an opportunity.

Commissioner Boehm explained that Ms. Shanahan had allowed him the opportunity to speak about something he had been working on. He noted that it was an unusual setting to introduce it, but he explained that he had been working for months with city staff and Mr. Dwight Durant, President of Zev Cohen & Associates. He stated that he would like to see the item included in the strategic plan and for staff to be allowed to explore options for it. He noted that this idea was rather specific as opposed to a generality. He explained that the city had two needs that had not been met in years. He stated that the first one was that while all of the city’s recent growth had been in the West Ormond Beach area there were no recreation facilities in that area. He noted that putting a community center in West Ormond Beach had been discussed in 2007, but it was not included in the CIP. He stated that a community center was needed in West Ormond Beach. He noted that there was also no facility in the city that could seat and hold more than 200 people for an event and he thought that there was a great need for one. He explained that he was talking about building a civic center/community center which could hold 500 people along with two regulation high school basketball courts.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he went to the ICI Center with staff and noted that the ICI Center held 650 people and housed basketball games and civic events. He stated that he had information that could be included in the CIP if the Commission wished to discuss it. He noted that the city of Deland had the Wayne G. Sanborn Center and that New Smyrna Beach had the Brannon Center and that both of those cities were half the size of Ormond Beach. He further noted that the Ormond Beach Chamber of Commerce had to hold their gala outside of the city as the city had no venue in which to hold it and that the Mayor’s annual State of the City Address, held at Oceanside Country Club had to cut off reservations because they would run out of seating room. He stated that the Ormond Beach YMCA would be undergoing a renovation and would be eliminating their gymnasium and therefore the city would be losing a gymnasium. He noted that the city had not built a community center in over 30 years. He explained that the city had grown a lot in the last 30 years and nothing had been added to accommodate the citizens and nothing had been added in west Ormond Beach.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the Volusia County School District owned 19 acres of land next to Pathways Elementary School in Ormond Beach. He explained that Mr. Carolin had spoken to Ms. Sara Lee Morrissey, Director of Planning for Volusia County Schools, and found out that the school district did not have any plans for that land. He noted that Mr. Durant had stated that there was not enough acreage at that site for Volusia County Schools to do anything with the land, explaining that it was not enough acreage on which to build a middle or high school. He explained that the possibility of working with the school district to locate the proposed facility next to Pathways Elementary was available. He explained that the benefits of locating the facility there was that there was already an existing lift station, 125 parking spaces at Pathways Elementary and a road developed there. He stated that the city owned land on Leeway Trail and Airport Road that was approximately the same acreage. He explained that putting in a lift station and additional parking would significantly add to the project cost. He noted that putting it next to Pathways Elementary made more sense. He stated that the Volusia County School Board Chairman Linda Costello endorsed the project as did her husband Florida State Representative Fred Costello.
Commissioner Boehm stated that if the Commission supported the idea, they should allow staff to speak to the school board to see if they could work something out. He explained that Pathways Elementary could potentially utilize the facility for events and coordinate programming with the city. He noted that the school district could also hold periodic events there. He stated that Mr. Durant put baseball fields into his design but they could be part of a second phase and not initially developed. He noted that pickle ball and tennis courts could also be options. He explained that the design did not have to be exactly as he had projected.

Commissioner Boehm stated that he had spoken to Ms. Shanahan and Budget Advisory Board member Rafael Ramirez about financing. He noted that New Smyrna Beach had borrowed money recently to finance their civic center. He stated that there was a league of cities low income fixed interest rate loan pool and banks willing to finance at low interest rates. He reiterated that the project met two of the city’s needs, a community center within a three mile radius of thousands of West Ormond Beach residents and a civic center. He noted that unlike Hinson Middle School, which was in the middle of nowhere, the proposed location for this facility would be located in the center of the community.

Ms. Crotty stated that it was not the time to have an in-depth discussion of this project; whereby, Mayor Kelley agreed that there were time constraints.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the CIP Workshop would be coming up, and he wanted to gauge the Commission’s interest in letting staff explore their options for this proposal. He explained that if it was included in the CIP, then they could study what the cost would be, noting that the cost would be a big factor in whether or not the project moved forward. He noted that there were more and more people moving to the West Ormond Beach area all of the time.

Commissioner Kent asked who would own the building, the city or the Volusia County School District; whereby, Commissioner Boehm replied that hopefully the city would.

Ms. Crotty stated that the topic was appropriate to mention during the workshop and to have in the strategic plan. She added it under the “opportunities” marker. She stated that if it received enough interest from the rest of the Commission, it could certainly be something that action would take place on.

Commissioner Boehm noted that the Sunshine Laws did not allow for an opportunity for this subject to be broached with the other Commission members unless they were in a public meeting such as the present workshop.

V. STRATEGIC ISSUES IDENTIFICATION

Ms. Crotty stated that staff and the elected officials had discussed what was happening in the external and internal environments and had performed a S.W.O.T analysis. She explained that they would now make a list, and then later condense it further, regarding the strategic issues that were to be addressed in the new few years. She noted that addressing these issues could overcome weaknesses and seize opportunities. She stated that both staff and elected officials could offer suggestions for the strategic issues list.
Ms. Shanahan stated that transportation infrastructure for Ormond Crossings was one of the strategic issues.

Mayor Kelley stated he wanted to add pursuing all annexation possibilities; whereby, Ms. Crotty asked if she should put down all *appropriate* annexations.

Mayor Kelley explained that some annexations were no-brainers and that some required study. He noted that the larger the community was, the more they could receive in state funding and that the larger communities carried more weight at the decision table due to their size.

Commissioner Boehm stated that the tax rate would always be an issue each year. He also noted that another issue was pension costs and joking that was Mayor Kelley’s favorite issue; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that pension costs were a problem because of the tax rate and the state regulations.

Commissioner Partington stated that park add-ons, for example bridge improvements such as allowing docking or having canoe and kayak rentals at the four corners, was a strategic issue and also requested to include Commissioner Boehm’s West Ormond Beach Center proposal.

Commissioner Boehm stated that another issue was the redevelopment of the north US1 interchange.

Commissioner Partington stated that another issue was airport safety improvements and noise abatement procedures.

Ms. Crotty noted that the Commission should keep in mind what the citizens wanted to see.

Ms. Shanahan stated that a strategic issue would be the extension of Hand Avenue.

Commissioner Boehm stated that historic preservation was an issue, noting that there were citizens in attendance for that reason.

Ms. Shanahan noted that some other issues were staffing, technology, and cell tower connectivity.

Commissioner Stowers explained that the interconnectivity of the beachside area was an issue, particularly in the area of the beachside tennis courts, Vining Court, and the whole area of Halifax Drive south of Granada Boulevard.

Mayor Kelley stated that parking and connectivity to downtown were also issues along Lincoln Avenue and New Britain Avenue. He noted that 21 years ago the issue was looked into. He explained that the Anderson Price Building had parking issues, as well. He stated that they should work towards ways to solve that so that the historic building that the Historical Society owned could be better utilized.

Commissioner Kent stated that another issue was obtaining more resources for police department personnel.
Commissioner Boehm noted that while Ormond Beach did not deal with it as much, homelessness was a countywide issue that would affect the city.

Mr. Carolin stated that renewal and replacement (R&R) funds were an issue. He explained that there had to be continued maintenance on aging buildings, facilities, and equipment.

Ms. McGuire stated that the city needed an overall funding model to be established for all services. She also stated that employee health care costs were an issue.

Ms. Shanahan stated that another issue was street resurfacing.

Ms. Crotty told a story of one city where she facilitated their planning process that told her that they had no infrastructure problems.

Mayor Kelley stated that most of the city’s streets were in good shape because of the resurfacing program that the city had in effect presently, but he noted that there was aging infrastructure on the county roads.

Ms. Shanahan stated that a related issue was median improvements on non-city roads that ran through the city.

Mr. Carolin stated that sidewalk improvements throughout the city was another issue. He noted that the city had a sidewalk replacement program, but he felt that it was not hitting some of the rural areas.

Mr. Gray stated that another issue was stormwater improvements.

Ms. Crotty noted that there had been a lot of conversation previously regarding intergovernmental relations. She asked what some of those issues were.

Mayor Kelley noted that intergovernmental relations were very important. He stated that Commissioner Partington was the President of the Volusia League of Cities (VLOC), that Commissioner Stowers served on the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) and that he served wherever he could. He explained that they served to build relations and that “if you weren’t at the table you were on the menu.” He stated that more could be done together as opposed to individually.

Ms. Shanahan stated that another issue was reuse water expansion.

Mayor Kelley noted that he believed that at some point the government was going to want reuse water recycled and made potable.

Ms. Shanahan stated that another issue was bicycle pathways, increased walk-ability and mobility; whereby, Mr. Carolin stated that the interconnectivity of bicycle paths was an issue as a lot of them presently lead to nowhere.

Ms. Shanahan encouraged staff and the Commission to “ring the bell” on any issues they wanted, as this was the opportunity for them to do so.

Commissioner Kent suggested off-beach parking; whereby, Commissioner Boehm and Mayor Kelley mentioned beach access.
VI. ESTABLISH GOALS

Ms. Crotty explained that now some of the suggestions would be grouped into different broader categories. She noted that this would be the information used for the remainder of the workshop. She explained that as she facilitated these sessions around the state she found that sometimes individuals had different definitions of strategic planning terms, such as goals and objectives, because of other experiences they had had and sometimes they thought that they would be writing full blown mission statements and organizational values. She clarified that they would not be doing that this evening and would instead be focusing on setting goals. She explained that a goal was a broad directional statement of emphasis or intention to accomplish something in the future. She further explained that a goal was global, timeless, and did not detail what would be done but instead addressed a need.

Ms. Crotty stated that she made up a goal statement as an example and had looked at Mayor Kelley’s State of the City on the city’s website for inspiration. She provided her example goal as “Meet infrastructure needs of the City of Ormond Beach now and in the future.” She noted that her statement did not provide specifics. She stated that goals frequently did not change. She explained that occasionally there would be a very specific goal that could be accomplished to finality, but generally most of the goals would be timeless and continue on. She stated that the objectives would have more detail for the strategic plan and state specific desirable outputs or results, which could be measured in a timetable for accountability. She provided as an example objective “the Public Works Director will implement phase two of the watermain upgrade project by the end of fiscal year 2015-16.” She noted that the director would have a lot of strategies and action steps in order to accomplish that but they would not be part of the objective and would instead be the responsibility of staff and professionals.

Ms. Crotty stated that no organization needed more than five to seven goals. She noted that she once worked with a county government that named three goals, which she felt was small for a county, and that everything imaginable was being put under the category of “quality of life.” She explained that their citizens were not understanding of their goals. She stated that another small city she worked with had already undertaken a strategic plan process in the prior year and she had asked their City Manager how many objectives they had in place. She stated that the manager responded that they had 130. She explained that they had set no priorities among those 130 objectives and noted that 130 goals for a small staff caused a lot of a little bit being done and nothing being done well or truly being accomplished. She stated that she got them to come down to five to seven goals with a few objectives under each goal and to prioritize the objectives. She explained that the task was to move the strategic issues mentioned into goals areas to identify what needed to be focused upon. She asked for suggestions on overarching topics for goal category areas and noted that several issues should be able to fit into those categories once they were determined.

Commissioner Stowers suggested “infrastructure” as one of the goal categories.

Ms. Crotty noted that there would be some objectives that could overlap into multiple categories. She explained that it was up to the City Commission to determine under which goal category to put the objective.
Mayor Kelley suggested “economic development” as one of the goal categories.

Mr. Goss suggested “quality of life” as one of the goal categories.

Ms. Crotty stated that “technology” could be its own goal category, if desired, or made a part of the “infrastructure” category; whereby, Commissioner Partington and Ms. Shanahan agreed that “technology” should be its own goal category.

Ms. Crotty suggested “human resources” as one of the goal categories, noting that issues such as staffing, police resources and employee health care had previously been mentioned as issues. She noted that there had been some discussion regarding some of the strategic issues that were fiscal in nature and suggested “fiscal issues” as a goal category. She noted that “intergovernmental relations” had also been discussed and suggested that it be added as a goal category.

The goal categories determined were as follows:

- Economic Development
- Fiscal Issues
- Human Resources
- Infrastructure
- Intergovernmental Relations
- Quality of Life
- Technology

VII. DETERMINE OBJECTIVES

Ms. Crotty explained that next objectives would be identified by the Commission for each goal area. She noted that they may or may not be items that already appeared on the previous lists. She further explained that for the purpose of the workshop, they would be using shorthand goal category titles such as "human resources," but for the strategic plan there needed to be goal statements written out for each of those categories. She noted that talented staff members could write the goal statements. She explained that the City Commission would be the ones to decide the objectives for the goals and staff members' suggestions would only be added to the list if they were also approved by a member of the City Commission.

Infrastructure Objectives
Ms. Crotty noted that the first goal category was “infrastructure” and asked for objectives suggestions. She stated that several of the infrastructure items would be large and lengthy projects. She asked the elected officials which they would most like to see be focused on in the next few years. She referenced the strategic issues identified previously.

Mayor Kelley noted that he did not believe that Ms. Crotty wished for them to expound on the steps that had to be taken for each project and as an example he explained that the Hand Avenue extension had to be presented to TPO and placed in their long-term plans.

Ms. Crotty stated that the strategic plan was in addition to the city's CIP. She explained that there would be more objectives named than they could feasibly accomplish so they would have to narrow down what was most important. She stated that staff would
determine how long the objectives would take and what was involved in accomplishing them.

Mayor Kelley noted that Ms. Crotty had mentioned thinking about what they wanted to focus on in the "next few years." He asked for clarification. He noted that several of the projects that had been discussed had a lot of steps involved to even get them started.

Ms. Crotty explained that the logistics should be left up to staff to figure out. She stated that if it became a priority staff would come back to the Commission with a timeline and action steps for approval.

Mayor Kelley cited Ormond Crossings as an example that would be an economic development objective but explained that it could not start progressing until it received the necessary infrastructure. He noted that it was important to have as an objective.

Ms. Shanahan stated that facilitating the infrastructure at Ormond Crossings could be the priority objective under the economic development goal category. She stated that staff would then come up with a work plan associated with that. She explained that she believed it was fair to say that there would be a three to five year window in order to get the infrastructure projects started but noting that they would not necessarily be completed in that timeframe.

Ms. Crotty stated that some of the infrastructure projects would be exploratory, some would be implemented, and some would be ongoing. She stated that some projects could be accomplished more quickly than others.

Commissioner Boehm noted that there were a number of strategic issues mentioned that were already being worked on, such as street resurfacing and median improvements. He referenced the Utility Master Plan, which was in the process of being updated, and contained a lot of expensive infrastructure projects in it including ones that were short term and long term goals. He noted that while expensive, some of those items were necessary. He stated that street resurfacing was in the budget every year as part of a plan. He stated that the maintenance R&R budget was something that had to be maintained and not created. He noted that a number of items discussed were already parts of ongoing programs that the city already had in place which may need to be tweaked. He stated that the Utility Master Plan contained millions of dollars in stormwater projects and that stormwater was one of the most important infrastructure objectives.

Ms. Crotty asked what it would mean to staff if an item was not in the strategic plan. She stated that by putting an item in the strategic plan, it told staff that there was an emphasis on that item and the continued need to budget for it.

Commissioner Boehm stated that nothing got residents excited faster than inadequate stormwater. He noted that he had read about Daytona Beach and Port Orange's flooding issues recently. He stated that stormwater issues directly and adversely affected citizens immediately when they happened and explained that adequate stormwater was a constant long-term goal.

Ms. Crotty asked if an objective should be to continue to implement a stormwater master plan.
Mayor Kelley stated that he was unclear about what they were trying to accomplish.

Ms. Shanahan explained that they were defining broad overarching goals for the city in order to establish accountability and budgeting priorities. She further explained that accountability was needed for the budget process and that planned objectives would provide reasoning for projects and help them get accomplished.

Ms. Crotty stated that the strategic plan would allow citizens to see what the city was doing, where they were heading, and what was important. She explained that it would send a clear message about how the city functioned and it would hopefully discipline elected officials on their agreed goals and objectives to allow them to focus and not put off objectives because of a small interest group trying to push a different agenda. She noted that type of scenario happened in some other cities.

Mayor Kelley stated that the squeaky wheel got the grease.

Ms. Crotty stated that the Commission could say “no” to such groups if the resources to address their issue were not in the strategic plan.

Mayor Kelley stated that the Commission reviewed all that was brought to them and that there had to be flexibility; whereby, Ms. Crotty agreed that the plan would not be set in stone and could be deviated from but noted that it would not be preferable to be constantly deviating from the plan.

Mayor Kelley stated that the city had not been operating in the manner that Ms. Crotty described; whereby, Commissioner Kent noted that he could not recall one time that scenario had happened.

Ms. Shanahan noted that Ms. Crotty was not saying that they had been operating that way but was just providing framework.

Commissioner Stowers stated that he was also a little lost himself. He noted that he was not sure if he was repeating it but stated that the Hand Avenue overpass was a priority. He noted that it was far more than a road, as it was also a pressure release valve.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that the objective be to fund, design, and construct the extension of Hand Avenue.

Commissioner Stowers stated that accessibility on the beachside was another issue. He stated that pedestrian crosswalk improvements, roundabouts, and consistency in blinking lights needed to be looked into. He noted that TPO was looking at it, but it also needed to be on the city’s radar.

Commissioner Boehm asked if that was something that the city would fund or if it was something that would be brought up to other governments to try and get them to fund it; whereby, Mayor Kelley noted that A1A was a state road and that the city had little to do with its improvements.

Ms. Shanahan noted that it had to be a priority; whereby, Commissioner Stowers agreed and stated that if it was not it would just be an issue they would assume someone else would address.
Commissioner Boehm stated that it should tie in with beach access and off-beach parking, as well. He stated that the whole idea of pedestrian accessibility was to get pedestrians from the west side of A1A to the east side.

Ms. Crotty stated that beach access was a quality of life issue and suggested that this topic be put under that category, as well.

Commissioner Partington stated that continuing to expand the maintenance R&R funding was an objective. He noted that there was an amount in place, but it was probably not adequate.

Commissioner Boehm stated that a schedule needed to be developed to demonstrate when things became obsolete and needed to be replaced.

Ms. Crotty noted some of the other infrastructure issues mentioned included street resurfacing, sidewalks, and medians.

Commissioner Kent noted that a plan was already in place for those.

Ms. Shanahan stated that an objective that would encompass those areas could be called “continuing existing capital plans.”

Commissioner Boehm stated that the city was in the midst of replacing all of its water piping which was a long-term project that would have to continue.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that the objective be to continue the implementation of the Utilities Master Plan, which contained stormwater, reuse water, and wastewater projects.

Economic Development Objectives
Mr. Mannarino stated that the City Commission had approved a Strategic Economic Development Plan which included Ormond Crossings but also the expansion and retention of businesses in the city. He suggested that an objective could be to continue to implement that plan which would be updated in 2016.

Ms. Crotty suggested putting Ormond Crossings as a separate objective to provide more emphasis to it.

Mr. Mannarino noted that there may be some alternatives to discuss with the City Commission in regards to Ormond Crossings.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she noted two previous items mentioned that should have special consideration and emphasis as separate objectives, which were transportation infrastructure for Ormond Crossings and airport safety and noise abatement improvements.

Commissioner Stowers asked if the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) that was just extended was precisely for the spine road for Ormond Crossings. He noted that was the very thing they had been discussing.

Mr. Mannarino explained that to get funds the CRA had to borrow from Tomoka Holdings and that Tomoka Holdings would not lend it because there was no repayment mechanism. He explained that valuation in the project had to be built up in order to pay
back the bond. He stated that they were not willing to trigger that presently but there might be other things they would be able to do.

Commissioner Boehm stated that implementation of the updated Airport Master Plan should be an objective, and he noted that plan was being put together presently.

Ms. Crotty asked if redevelopment on US1 should be included, noting that it was mentioned previously. She asked if it was part of the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Mayor Kelley stated that it probably should be added as it was fairly new and there had been some long range discussions about the area with private groups, the county, and the city.

Ms. Shanahan stated that a standalone objective under the economic development category should be to continue north US1 redevelopment efforts.

Commissioner Boehm mentioned improving the walk-ability of downtown and parking.

Mayor Kelley stated that recently he was made aware of some parking issues and the lack of parking in some areas. He explained that he looked at expanding and creating parking areas for local businesses. He noted that there were now businesses in the downtown area that did not have parking. He stated that the Anderson Price Building had parking issues, as well. He noted that there could be some fairly simple solutions to improvement parking availability for the Anderson Price Building, as well as the Yacht Club. He stated that these were all drivers for economic development, quality of life, and the redevelopment of downtown.

Ms. Crotty asked Mayor Kelley if he wanted an objective to be to provide parking for Lincoln Avenue and New Britain Avenue.

Mayor Kelley confirmed that he did. He stated that he was working with the Historical Society to help alleviate the parking issue and also with some of the local businesses. He explained that it could be tied together. He noted that the church located there did not allow parking, and as a result the Anderson Price Building was not able to be utilized.

Technology Objectives
Ms. Crotty asked if there was a master plan for IT; whereby, Mr. Huhta replied that there was not.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that creating a technology master plan for IT should be an objective; whereby, Commissioner Kent stated that it was absolutely needed.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that improving cell tower connectivity could be an objective.

Mayor Kelley stated that four to five years prior the city had looked at the feasibility of citywide Wifi service but it would not work. He noted that Bright House Networks was creating more and more Wifi availability locations as was AT&T.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that continuing the expansion of the fiber optic network should be an objective.
Mayor Kelley stated that maintaining the website was another objective and continuing with transparency.

Mr. Goss suggested finalizing the enterprise software solution as an objective; whereby, Ms. Shanahan replied that would be part of the IT master plan; whereby, Mr. Huhta stated that it would be a large part of it.

Mayor Kelley noted that he liked the city's new water bills; whereby, Ms. McGuire replied that the city had changed providers.

Mr. Huhta suggested that updating the SCADA system, which controlled utilities functions, should be an objective.

Human Resources
Ms. Shanahan suggested that additional resources for police personnel should be an objective, as previously mentioned; whereby, Ms. Crotty asked if the objective should be specific to police or if overall staffing needed assessment.

Commissioner Kent explained that he had not felt the need to assess overall staffing, but he had felt that the police department needed additional resources so that thugs did not come into the city and then get away with stolen property. He stated that the objective should be to provide and fund staffing needs for the police department. He asked how long it had been since additional police officers were added; whereby, Chief Osterkamp stated that it had been about seven to eight years.

Ms. Shanahan stated that when capital projects were developed, appropriate staffing models should also be provided and considered at that time. She explained that when Andy Romano Beachfront Park and the Environmental Learning Center were developed, there was no consideration for the staffing of those facilities or for such other facility enhancements projects, such as the Doug Wigley fields. She noted that in that instance there had been four new fields and no additional staff to mow them.

Commissioner Kent stated that he agreed with Ms. Shanahan's suggestion to address staffing needs related to capital projects. He noted that the fields might not be the best example but that Andy Romano Beachfront Park and the Environmental Learning Center were good examples of doing more with less and perhaps pushing staffing too thin.

Ms. Crotty asked if employee healthcare should be an added objective.

Ms. Whitley stated that the issue with employee healthcare was balancing between the plan design and the cost. She noted that she did not know the City Commission's opinion on the matter. She explained that the city had to identify what would be coming up in subsequent renewals and also identify costs.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that an objective be to provide employee healthcare that balanced cost with effectiveness.

Commissioner Boehm asked if all employee benefits should be included in that objective; whereby, Ms. Shanahan noted that those benefits had to be bargained with the unions.
Ms. Crotty asked if succession planning was an issue as she noted that it had been discussed prior that the workforce was “seasoned” and aging.

Ms. Crotty adjourned the workshop at 7:59 p.m. for a short break and reconvened the workshop at 8:05 p.m.

Fiscal Issues Objectives
Mayor Kelley stated that operating within the budget was a fiscal objective.

Ms. Shanahan suggested that developing a funding methodology be an objective, like Ms. McGuire had mentioned. She stated that in the past the goal had been to maintain the same tax rate, but it was becoming increasingly more difficult to do so. She explained that the financial trends indicated that the city would either have to find new revenue sources or cut funding.

Mayor Kelley stated that Ms. Shanahan was correct and that the city was at a point where they had an inability to control their financial income. He noted that some ideas would have to be evaluated on the basis of whether or not the city could afford them.

Ms. Crotty noted that all other goals depended on finances.

Mayor Kelley stated that the Commission had taken the stance to operate with the funds that the city had.

Ms. Crotty asked if they were looking into alternative funding sources outside of the tax rate.

Mayor Kelley explained that revenue was continually being cut by the state and continually taxed by both the county and state.

Ms. Crotty stated that fees and grants could be sources of revenue; whereby, Mayor Kelley noted that grants were not new funding sources and Ms. Shanahan noted that grants did not pay for operating costs.

Ms. Crotty asked if an objective should be to develop a funding model to meet the city’s needs.

Commissioner Kent replied that it should absolutely be the objective. He noted that at election time it was nice to tout that the city had the second or third lowest tax rate in the area. He stated that when it came to employees, the city did not want them to be paid the lowest wages or the highest wages in the area but wanted them to be mid-range. He explained that was acceptable for employee compensation but not for the millage rate as there was an emphasis on keeping the millage rate one of the lowest in the area. He stated that within a year the city would be in financial trouble if they did not make any changes. He explained that they either had to cut back expenses or increase the millage rate, as uncomfortable as that was. He noted that during the last election cycle the city had to legally advertise a tax increase, and he had no problem explaining why he had voted for it.

Ms. Crotty asked if exploring appropriate annexations should be added, noting that it was mentioned previously.
Mayor Kelley noted there were recent and upcoming annexations on US1 and stated that he felt that annexing Ormond-by-the-Sea still needed to be explored, even with the dire septic tank issue. He stated that he also wanted to explore annexing Plantation Bay and Halifax Plantation. He noted that there were areas between the city limits and Halifax Plantation that would come into the city and tie Ormond Beach to that area. He stated that the county was still willing to talk to the city about it. He explained that bringing those areas in would expand the need for police and fire personnel but provide other benefits.

Ms. Crotty asked if pensions needed to be an objective as that was mentioned earlier.

Commissioner Partington stated that continuing a multipronged strategy to reduce pensions should be an objective.

**Quality of Life Objectives**
Mayor Kelley stated that park add-ons should be an objective. He stated that he would be willing to explore the idea of a western civic center; whereby, Commissioner Boehm explained that all he wanted was for it to be explored.

Ms. Crotty noted that she would add exploring the feasibility of a West Ormond Beach Civic Center.

Commissioner Kent stated that he would want the city to control that center but have the school district help pay for it. He noted that was the problem he had with the recreation area at Osceola Elementary and explained that the school board kept the property locked up so it could not be utilized by residents.

Mayor Kelley stated that park add-ons could go into an overall visioning.

Ms. Shanahan stated that staff was looking into additional things which were fundraising and economic development.

Commissioner Stowers stated that new projects were approved and did not incorporate the ongoing annual staffing costs into them as Ms. Shanahan mentioned earlier. He stated that the add-ons would potentially be a way to eat into some of that.

Mr. Carolin suggested updating the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which had last been updated in 2004.

Mr. Goss suggested creating a citywide Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Master Plan separate from the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. He noted that staff was working on it presently, but it would not be completed for another year; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that such a plan would have to tie into the county and state’s plans, which already existed. Mr. Goss stated that there was a lot in between that was not on either the county or state plan. Ms. Shanahan and Mr. Goss named various connection locations such as Central Park, Tomoka State Park, Sanchez Park, and the Greenway Trail.

Ms. Crotty asked if the city needed their own plan to fill in gaps in the state and county plans; whereby, Mr. Goss replied that they did.
Mayor Kelley stated that Mr. Goss could present the plan to the TPO to see if funding could be obtained; whereby, Mr. Goss stated that it would help for funding purposes to have a master plan that was consistent with the county and state plans.

Commissioner Boehm noted that there were citizens in attendance who had sat through the previous five hours of the workshop waiting to hear about historical preservation.

Mayor Kelley stated that historical properties needed to be evaluated to see what could be done to preserve them. He noted that there had been citizen input from those desiring to preserve such sites, but the question was how to pay for that preservation and for what use would they be preserved.

Ms. Crotty suggested adding evaluating, preserving, and promoting historical sites as an objective; whereby, Mayor Kelley stated that evaluating the preservation of historical sites should be the objective.

Ms. Shanahan asked if that included all sites; whereby, Commissioner Partington replied that it should be all sites and mentioned the Three Chimneys, and Commissioner Boehm noted the problems with the Anderson Price Building.

Mayor Kelley stated that those sites were historical as was the Ames House. He suggested that the Historical Society could possibly pay the $380,000 that the city paid for the MacDonald House in 1979 and the $250,000 that had been spent on the building, or the city could possibly give them the building and then they could take care of it.

Mr. Goss suggested developing a historic preservation plan which would assess the historical resources, their conditions, eligibility for historical designations, and place them on the state inventory plan.

Commissioner Kent asked why this was so hard; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated that the subject was being danced around.

Commissioner Stowers stated that he agreed with Mr. Goss’ suggestion. He stated that he had heard over the years that the city was missing out on some value by not having an integrated network of its historic places for visitors to the community. He stated that a historic preservation plan would at least start that process and then fiscal discussions could be had based on its findings. He noted that the city had many sites with a rich history and that a lot of them were not publicized.

Ms. Crotty stated that citizens at the Community Conversation Workshops had mentioned that their fear was losing some of the city’s historic properties, like some other historical properties that had already been lost.

Mayor Kelley asked what was lost; whereby, Ms. Crotty replied that the Ormond Hotel was referenced. Mayor Kelley explained that termites had finished that hotel. He stated that if that had not been removed and the Ormond Heritage Condominiums not developed, then Granada Boulevard would not be what it was as it funded the CRA. He stated that the Commission did not want to be guilty of demolition by neglect.

Ms. Crotty noted that homelessness was mentioned previously as a countywide issue and noted that the city’s role was still somewhat unknown.
Mr. Mannarino suggested that it be put under the category of intergovernmental relations.

Mayor Kelley explained that there presently was a plan for 2016-17. He noted that three of the communities would not buy into it.

Mr. Mannarino stated that they had discussed encouraging greater beach access and eastside parking as an objective.

Ms. Crotty confirmed that the county was in charge of the beaches; whereby, Mayor Kelley explained that all the city could do was try to work with them and make beach access a focal point.

**Intergovernmental Relations Objectives**

Ms. Shanahan suggested that to continue to actively participate in Volusia Safe Harbor should be an objective, explaining that was the proposed homeless solution.

Ms. Crotty explained that intergovernmental relations involved the state, local, and federal governments and taking on a potential advocacy role to make their voices heard and keep open the channels of communications so that they could work together.

Mayor Kelley stated that a mission statement was developed 21 years ago; whereby, Ms. Crotty explained that a mission statement was the business the city was in and that a vision was a dream for the future.

Commissioner Partington stated that continuing to participate and serve on boards, as well as advocates, at the local, state, and federal level was an objective.

Commissioner Stowers stated that zone boundaries needed to be focused on. He stated that Ormond Beach was sliced up in redistricting efforts so that any candidate would not have Ormond Beach as their focus.

Ms. Shanahan asked how that could be addressed; whereby, Commissioner Stowers noted that the city hired a lobbyist each year and they could pay attention to when the opportunity to address that arose.

Ms. Shanahan stated that the city felt disenfranchised when the state and federal districts split up the city so that it had no single elected person to represent their interests; whereby, Commissioner Stowers noted that they were fortunate in their representation in some areas but not in others.

Ms. Crotty noted that there had been a citizens' initiative to address that, but it did not help. She suggested that promoting efforts to redistrict for equitable representation of the city be the objective. She noted that it would have to be worked on well in advance.

Mayor Kelley stated that this time it worked better on the state level as it eliminated two splits.

**VIII. SET PRIORITIES**

Ms. Crotty distributed nine dot stickers to each member of the Commission. She instructed them to place them next to their priorities among the objectives listed. She
noted that they each received dots of the same color and could initial and mark them if they desired so that they did not put a dot down twice on the same objective unintentionally. She explained that they could only put one dot sticker on each objective they chose. She relayed a story of one elected official at a workshop she facilitated that would not participate because he wanted to put all of his dots on the same item.

The City Commission placed their dot stickers next to their individual priorities among the listed objectives.

Ms. Crotty noted that there was tremendous consensus among the distribution of the dot stickers, which was reflective of how cohesive the Commission was. She noted that the items with three or more dot stickers constituted priorities. She listed them as follows:

- 5 dots – Continue to expand maintenance R&R
- 5 dots – Develop funding model
- 5 dots – Develop IT Master Plan
- 3 dots – Continue Strategic Economic Development Plan
- 3 dots – Provide parking at Lincoln Avenue and New Britain Avenue
- 3 dots – Update Parks and Recreation Master Plan
- 3 dots – Develop Historical Preservation Plan

Ms. Crotty noted that the other items listed could still be objectives, if desired, but that those she just named were the ones that had been designated as priorities. She explained that the Commission should expect to see action primarily on the priorities and that the other objectives would depend on if staff had the time and money to work on those. She noted that the objective was to focus the resources on the priorities. She explained that usually the City Manager could appoint a champion to oversee each of the priority objectives. She stated that a goal statement needed to be written for all seven goal categories. She noted that she could review the statements, critique them, and send them back, if that was the desire.

Ms. Crotty stated that this session had been a workshop with no formal decisions made and that a strategic plan would be created by Ms. Shanahan and staff to be brought back to the Commission for their review. She stated that the strategic plan would detail what staff envisioned for the priorities. She explained that the priorities would need to be funded at some level during the budget process. She explained that the Commission could expect regular reports from Ms. Shanahan regarding the strategic plan. She noted that the plan would have measurable objectives and timeframes. She suggested quarterly reports be given, which was up to the Commission and Ms. Shanahan

IX. Adjournment

Ms. Crotty stated that the Commission and staff did a great job participating and she thanked them, as well as the members of the public who stayed for the duration of the workshop. She noted that it was not easy to get through the workshop. She stated that Ormond Beach was a great city and their goals and objectives would continue that.

Commissioner Partington thanked Ms. Crotty and joked that working with the Commission could be like herding cats or butterflies. He noted that he had attended a detailed meeting earlier in the day that Ms. Crotty facilitated, and he did not know how she was still standing. He stated that at times he was not sure where the workshop was
going, but he was pleased with the outcome and that the Commission bit the bullet even though it constituted a lot of time and effort to do so.

Mayor Kelley adjourned the workshop at 8:49 p.m.
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