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Introduction
Project Purpose

The City of Ormond Beach Parks and Recreation Master Plan will establish a vision for the continued enhancement and development of the parks and recreation system of the City of Ormond Beach. The Master Plan will achieve 4 primary goals:

- Position the City of Ormond Beach to build on the community’s unique parks and recreation assets;
- Identify new parks and recreation opportunities based on the needs and priorities of citizens;
- Prioritize future improvements to align with the desired needs of citizens; and
- Steer the future of the Leisure Services Department for the next 10 years.
1.1 Planning Process

The City of Ormond Beach Parks and Recreation Master Plan follows a modified strategic planning process. It consists of an analysis of the City’s existing Context, a Needs and Priorities Assessment, a Long Range Vision, and an Implementation Strategy. Each phase of the process builds on the findings and conclusions from the previous phases.

Following is an overview of each of the report chapters and a description of how the City of Ormond Beach Parks and Recreation Master Plan planning process is integrated into each chapter.

1 CONTEXT
Includes an assessment of both the community and the parks and recreation system. The community analysis focuses on understanding the context of the parks and recreation system. This includes the community’s existing and planned conditions as well as the existing and projected demographics. The parks and recreation system analysis focuses on understanding the Department’s organizational structure, parks system framework, and conditions.

2 NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Determines the gaps between existing and desired conditions of the parks and recreation system. The process is based on a proven “triangulated” approach to identifying needs and priorities. It includes various types of anecdotal, qualitative, and quantitative methods to determine top priorities from different perspectives.

- Qualitative Methods: Community Meeting; Stakeholder interviews; and Focus Group Meetings.
- Quantitative Methods: Statistically-valid survey; On-line survey; and Level-of-service analysis

3 LONG-RANGE VISION
Outlines a vision for Ormond Beach based on: 1) Findings from the first two phases of the process; 2) Best planning practices and principles; and 3) The unique desires and aspirations of the community. The vision includes a description of the parks and recreation “subsystems,” service delivery models, and level-of-service metrics. The Long-Range Visions also includes an estimate of costs to construct and maintain the capital improvements identified in the vision.

4 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
Includes a summary of revenue projections, and a phasing/funding plan to implement top priorities based on available and projected funding.
Planning Process Overview

1. **CONTEXT**
   - **PLANS**
     - Review of existing documents
   - **PEOPLE**
     - Demographics
     - Population, trends & projections
   - **PARKS**
     - Agency mission
     - Department organizational structure
     - Park system framework
     - Park site evaluations

2. **NEEDS ASSESSMENT**
   - Qualitative analysis methods
   - Quantitative analysis methods

3. **LONG-RANGE VISION**
   - Description of the Parks & Recreation “subsystems”
   - Service-delivery models
   - Level-of-Service metrics
   - Cost estimates

4. **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**
   - Summary of revenue projections
   - Phasing and funding plan
1.1 Overview

Context is defined as “the circumstances that form the setting for an event […] in terms of which it can be fully understood and assessed.” The term originates from two Latin words “Con” meaning together, and “Texere” meaning to weave.

Weaving together elements related to the City’s physical framework and its people is critical to understanding the essence of the City of Ormond Beach and establishing a strong foundation for the development of this Master Plan.

Parks and recreation facilities occupy a unique and powerful juncture between the physical framework of a place and its people. Besides road right-of-way, parks are commonly a leading proportion of a jurisdiction’s publicly-owned land, and frequently the public places citizens interact with most directly. Weaving together social culture with the built and natural environment, parks provide a critical opportunity to strengthen the fabric of society. In a dynamic environment like Ormond Beach, understanding the nuances of context is extremely valuable to contributing to the overall success of the community.

The overall context for Ormond Beach is understood through the review and analysis of the following three specific contexts:

**PLANNING CONTEXT**
Initiatives and projects previously proposed for the City of Ormond Beach.

**PEOPLE CONTEXT**
The make-up and characteristics of the people of Ormond Beach.

**PARKS CONTEXT**
The organizational structure, parks system framework, and conditions of the City’s existing parks and recreation system.
1.2 Planning Context

The City of Ormond Beach is a thriving municipality in northeast Florida’s Volusia County. Strategically located near the crossroads of Central Florida’s High-Tech Corridor, I-95 and I-4, the City has its own municipal airport (KOMN) and is also served by Daytona International Airport (DAB), Orlando International Airport (MCO) and Jacksonville International Airport (JAX).

The Florida East Coast Railway provides additional freight access, passing through Ormond Beach’s historic downtown which is situated along the Halifax River (the Intracoastal Waterway). The 2,000+ -acre Tomoka State Park is located just north of the city along the Tomoka River.

Ormond Beach has a long and rich history. Once the domain of the Timucuan Indians, the area began to experience consistent European settlement after 1842. In 1880, the city was incorporated as Ormond, named for a sea captain who helped the Spanish bring Franciscan settlers to northeast Florida, and who was a plantation owner in the area.

Ormond experienced growth with the arrival of the St. Johns and Halifax Railroad in 1886 and it became a popular destination for wealthy Northerners who traveled to the area during winter months. Industrialist John D. Rockefeller became a permanent resident when he purchased an estate called the Casements in 1918. The Casements now serves as a cultural center and park and is the community’s best-known historical structure.

In the early 1900s, the city also gained the nickname “The Birthplace of Speed,” due to some of the first automobile races occurring on the flat, compacted sand beaches from Ormond south to Daytona Beach. In 1949, the city was renamed Ormond Beach.

In recent decades, the city has become known for a high quality of life and for fostering a healthy business community. The city is home to a diverse array of companies and markets itself as “Central Florida’s Best Business Address.” Over the last 20 years, the City has also partnered with Volusia County and Tomoka Holdings to promote Ormond Crossings, a proposed 3,000-acre live/work planned development.

In order to understand how recent and ongoing planning efforts may impact the City in the future, plans with relevance to the parks, recreation, and cultural system were reviewed and are summarized below.
1.2.1 2025 Comprehensive Plan – Recreation and Open Space Element (Adopted 2010)

The Recreation and Open Space Element is a section of the City’s Comprehensive plan that provides Goals, Objectives and Policies related to all recreation areas and facilities. There is only one Goal, which is to:

Provide an acceptable quality, quantity, and variety of active and passive recreation areas and facilities necessary to meet the existing and future recreational needs of all the city’s residents and of its visitors.

Beyond this goal, there are 14 specific objectives, each with numerous policies. Most of the policies address common recreation goals (many following guidelines from the Parks and Recreation Master Plan), such as establishing equitable levels-of-service standards, providing appropriate maintenance, pursuing the acquisition and protection of valuable lands, etc. Specific policies with implications to this plan are noted.

OBJECTIVES:

1. LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS: The City shall require of new development activities concurrency with the adopted level-of-service standards according to the adopted Parks and Recreation Master Plan Study, as amended.

2. MAINTENANCE: To maximize the responsible use of existing public lands and facilities, City parks and recreation facilities shall be maintained by the City’s Leisure Services Department in order to promote public use and community pride, and discourage vandalism.

By 2025, the City shall develop a facility at Central Park to support after school programs and other activities.

3. LAND USE COMPATIBILITY: Balance the functioning value of the natural environment so there is an optimum combination of aesthetic, ecological, and recreation values.

4. ACCESS AND DEVELOPMENT: The City shall maintain and improve access to its parks, recreation, and open space areas, facilities, programs, and events and encourage development of facilities, programs, and events of state and regional excellence.

5. FUNDING: The City shall develop a fiscally sound public parks recreation facilities program.

6. BEACH ACCESS: The City shall recommend policies and programs to Volusia County that maintain and improve public access to beach recreational opportunities.

7. BICYCLING OPPORTUNITIES: Safe bicycling opportunities, for both recreation and transportation, shall be provided within the city where possible.

8. CONSERVATION: Active and passive recreation facilities shall be designed and used in a manner that protects the quality of the natural systems including, but not limited to, the surface waters, significant wildlife habitats, designated species habitats, and wetlands. The
permitting criteria of Federal, State, and regional agencies shall be met during the design and construction of active and passive recreation facilities.

9. ADA STANDARDS: Public recreation facilities shall both accommodate and integrate handicapped and disabled persons consistent with Federal and State standards.

10. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION: The provision of recreation programs and facilities shall be coordinated among adjacent local government jurisdictions and private sector providers to develop the most cost-effective services to the public.

11. DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES: The City shall periodically review and amend the Land Development Code relative to current open space definitions and standards to implement the Recreation and Open Space Element. The following policies shall apply to the review of development activities and the conduct of public activity.

12. LAND ACQUISITION: The City shall continue to increase the public provision, protection and enhancement of open space by utilizing the Volusia County Land Acquisition Program with the cooperation of the Florida Forever, Save Our Rivers, Land and Water Conservation Fund, County Port Authority, St. Johns River Water Management District land acquisition programs, and similar programs to acquire by purchase or donation those lands identified by the City Commission. Provision of open space by private enterprise shall be accomplished through donation or requirements for dedication of open and common space as specified in the Land Development Code.

13. SCENIC HIGHWAYS AND CORRIDOR CONNECTIVITY: Provide for recreational corridors to link the City-owned parks as well as other open space/conservation areas.

14. ORMOND CROSSINGS ACTIVITY CENTER: The City working with the Developer of the Ormond Crossings Activity Center shall develop a comprehensive approach to address existing and projected deficiencies so that there are adequate facilities to serve the residents of Ormond Crossings.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN**

The 2025 Comprehensive Plan provides a solid basis for structuring and quantifying the Department’s services. The plan’s objectives generally continue to offer a useful strategy for the provision of parks and open space in the City. However, given that the plan is now 15 years old, certain aspects must be evaluated to ascertain their effectiveness, either of their implementation or their levels of service, based on the demographic changes the city has experienced.
1.2.2 2025 Comprehensive Plan – Capital Improvements Element (Adopted 2010)

The Capital Improvements Element is a section of the City’s Comprehensive Plan (like the previous) that provides Goals, Objectives, and Policies related to parks and recreation facilities, in addition to other public services. There is only one Goal, which is:

Public facilities shall be provided in a timely and efficient manner as necessary to correct existing deficiencies in the level-of-service for potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, traffic circulation, and parks and recreation and to meet future demands generated from new development through the use of sound fiscal practices.

Beyond this goal, there are 8 specific objectives, each with numerous policies. Most of the policies address common public facility goals, such as establishing equitable levels-of-service standards, providing appropriate maintenance, pursuing the responsible development and protection of lands (especially Coastal High Hazard Areas), etc. Specific policies with implications to this plan are noted.

POLICY 1.3.2.

The City shall use the following level-of-service standards to determine the impacts of new development and redevelopment upon public facility provision:

b. Parks (acres per population): 13 acres per 1,000 population

A capital facilities recovery fee to develop lands dedicated by developers to meet the acreage level of service standards shall be pursued. The recovery fee may be either assessed to the developer of the subdivision or the builder of the home in the form of an impact fee.

Subdivisions which provide private recreation lands and facilities shall be provided a credit against the land dedication and capital facilities recovery fee.

POLICY 1.4.1.

Recreation impact fees shall be continued and refined as needed to adequately maintain adopted LOS standards.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN

The two policies noted above will be analyzed as part of this plan to determine their effectiveness over the past 15 years and determine whether they need to be modified to fit current and future needs.
1.2.3 Parks & Recreation Master Plan Study
(Adopted 2005)

The Parks & Recreation Master Plan provides a comprehensive assessment of the City’s parks and recreation system. Sections include:

- A review of existing policies and planning documents, with recommendations for changes;
- An inventory and analysis of all current parks and facilities, with recommendations for improvements and a customized series of park categories;
- Community attitude and citizen interest survey;
- Levels of Service (LOS) Recommendations;
- Benchmarking: comparison to similar communities, including:
  - Plant City, FL
  - Jupiter, FL
  - Coral Gables, FL
  - Hilton Head, SC
  - Park Ridge, IL
  - North Lauderdale, FL
  - Hurst, TX
  - San Gabriel, CA;
- Specific recommendations for future improvements;
- Capital Improvements Costs Summary and Options for Funding

IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN

A wide variety of elements from the 2005 Master Plan are relevant to this plan. In particular, determining to what degree the recommendations have been implemented is critical to understanding what needs identified in 2005 are still applicable today.

Recommendations that should be reviewed:

- Changes to text of 2010 Comprehensive Plan, City of Ormond Beach Land Development code, Volusia County Comprehensive Plan, 2003-2008 District Strategic Plan-School Board of Volusia County.
- Park specific recommendations from the “Park and Facility Inventory and Analysis”

Additionally, the results of the Citizen Survey also provide important insights that should be analyzed for their degree of system action over the last 15 years and compared to the results of the current survey.

Questions with particular relevance include:

- Physical Condition of City of Ormond Beach Parks
  - 38% rated Excellent
  - 55% rated Good

- Potential Improvements to City of Ormond Beach Parks
  - Top 3: Restrooms (45%); Drinking Fountains (33%); Walking/biking trails (32%)
- Need for Parks and Recreational Facilities
  - Respondent Households over 50% with a need for Various Parks and Recreational Facilities
  1. Beach access inside Ormond Beach (71%)
  2. Paved walking and hiking trails (65%)
  3. Nature trails/natural areas (61%)
  4. Parks on the Halifax River (59%)
  5. Small Community Parks (56%)
  6. Picnic areas/shelters (50%)
1.3 People Context

The demographics of the City of Ormond Beach provide important insights related to the role that the Parks and Recreation Master Plan can play in improving the quality of life of residents and guiding the parks system’s planning over the next 10 years.

Following is an overview of the key findings from the analysis of specific demographic attributes - Population and Projections, Population Density, Age Distribution, and Race and Ethnicity. City of Ormond Beach demographics are compared to Volusia County and State of Florida. Population and population projection data was obtained from the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR). Demographic data was collected from the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) and projected using linear regression.

1.3.1 Population & Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ormond Beach</th>
<th>Volusia County</th>
<th>Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38,137</td>
<td>494,593</td>
<td>18,801,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Rate 2010-2020</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>551,588</td>
<td>21,555,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>45,604</td>
<td>573,800</td>
<td>23,130,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>47,858</td>
<td>595,800</td>
<td>24,426,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1.3.1a: Population & Projections

IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN

Ormond Beach is projected to add another 6,000 people by 2030, for a total of nearly 10,000 since 2010. Despite this growth, the City will continue to represent under 8% of the County’s total population. The City’s steady population growth suggests a need to ensure that adequate facilities are developed to maintain or improve on the current service levels.
**1.3.2 Population Density**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ormond Beach</th>
<th>Volusia County</th>
<th>Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,124.1</td>
<td>446.5</td>
<td>328.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,428.2</td>
<td>472.8</td>
<td>350.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,498.8</td>
<td>541.1</td>
<td>455.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1.3.2b: Population Density**

**IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN**

Population Density is a critical metric for parks and recreation services, as dense areas require many parks facilities in urban settings that often lack ample recreation space. Compared to Volusia County and the State of Florida, Ormond Beach has a relatively high population density, and it is expected to increase by roughly 400 people per square mile by 2030. Analysis and coordination with the planning department to understand where increasing density is occurring will be crucial for ensuring that new facilities serve the city well.

**1.3.3 Age Distribution**

**FIGURE 1.3.3a: 20-Year Age Segments**
IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN

The proportion of age segments is a useful metric for prioritizing recreation amenities and services, as different age groups often have differing parks and recreation needs. Ormond Beach has a population that skews older than the County and State, with residents 60 and over constituting 40% of the population. The largest age group is 60-79, nearly 1/3 of the population. This is consistent with the Median age in 2020 of 53.4, which is older than the County and State. This may suggest a need for facilities, programs, activities, and services that cater to older adults, while still addressing the need for families.

1.3.4 Race & Ethnicity

![Race & Ethnicity Chart](image)

**FIGURE 1.3.4a: Race & Ethnicity**
IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLAN

Race and ethnicity—and the accompanying subject of diversity—has relevance to parks and recreation planning given different racial and cultural traditions related to recreation, and parks’ potential role as unifying places within a community. Ormond Beach has relatively low diversity, with nearly 90% of the population identifying as White. The City has much lower minority populations than the County or the State. This suggest a need to ensure that facilities, programs, activities, and services respond to the needs and priorities of all races within the City.

1.3.5 Summary

The proceeding tables and charts demonstrate that the City of Ormond Beach has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Attribute</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Implications for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>Steady growth of approximately 1% per year, but slightly slower growth than the County or State.</td>
<td>Ensure that adequate facilities are developed to maintain or improve on the current service levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>A much higher population density than the County or State—around 3 times denser than both—which will increase to approximately 1,500 residents per square mile by 2030 based on projected population growth.</td>
<td>Understand where increasing density may occur to ensure that facilities and services respond to the needs of residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Distribution</td>
<td>An older population—40% over 60—with a median age more than 10 years older than the State, and a smaller portion of residents under 18, just 14%, than the County or State.</td>
<td>Ensure facilities and services cater to older adults, while still addressing the needs of families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race &amp; Ethnicity</td>
<td>Much less racial/ethnic diversity than the County or State, with roughly half the minority population of the County and 1/3 the minority percentage of the State.</td>
<td>Ensure that facilities and services continue to respond to the needs and priorities of all races within the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1.3.5a: City of Ormond Beach Demographic Summary
1.4 Parks Context

Understanding the organizational structure, parks system framework, and conditions of the City’s existing parks and recreation system help establish an important foundation for the completion of the Master Plan and recommendations for future improvements.

1.4.1 Organizational Structure

AGENCY MISSION

The Mission of the City of Ormond Beach’s Leisure Services Department is to “Provide the citizens of Ormond Beach with quality services in a responsive, courteous, and cost-effective manner.”

ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Parks and recreation services in the City of Ormond Beach are provided through the Leisure Services Department. This Department is comprised of 10 Divisions. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, the Department had a total of 38.63 Full-Time Equivalent employees (FTEs) and a budget of $5,871,079 to operate 53 parks totaling 547 acres of park land and approximately 77,557 square feet of indoor recreation and meeting space. Following is a description of each Division.

- **Parks and Grounds Maintenance** is responsible for routine grounds maintenance, mowing, and general beautification and upkeep of all City parks and on-site buildings, including grass mowing, flower bed and shrub maintenance, trash collection, and maintenance of the median along A1A and State Road 40. With the exception of the Memorial Art Gardens, all parks and ground maintenance is performed on a contracted basis.

- **Leisure Services Administration/Registration** provides the executive leadership and guidance necessary to carry out the mission, goals, and policies for recreational, cultural, senior center, special events, special populations, and athletic field’s maintenance programs.

- **The Casements** is the flagship community enrichment center on the peninsula serving nearly one third of the City’s population. It is a historic facility that served as the home of John D. Rockefeller, Sr. and is on the National Register for Historic
Places. It serves as an important landmark and symbol for historic preservation for the community within an urban park setting for leisure services facilities. It also provides a variety of programs related to environmental education, arts, and person development for citizens and youth-at-risk.

- **The Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center (OBPAC)** consists of an auditorium, rehearsal room, studio, and music room for City-sponsored groups, professional theater and musical productions. The Center is also used for youth dance classes, recitals, senior shows, music events, and children’s theater.

- **The Senior Center** coordinates the activities of a multi-purpose center that includes programs in the area of health, arts, languages, nutrition, theater, personal finance, technology, and music for persons over 55 years of age. The Center also offers classes and activities for physically and mentally challenged citizens and those with other special needs.

- **Community Events** coordinates and produces community and City-sponsored holiday and cultural events. The division also coordinates various celebrations, dedications, remembrances, groundbreakings, historical celebrations, and various other official City events. The division also provides assistance to other City departments, boards and committees, outside agencies, and community service clubs with presentation of their event schedule.

- **The Environmental Discovery Center** provides visitors with a glimpse into the diverse ecosystem of Ormond Beach, specifically Central Park. It fosters awareness and appreciation of the natural environment by providing stimulating environmental education programs and inspires participants to be active stewards of their surrounding natural resources. The 2,000 square foot facility serves as a hub for the programming and special events that immerse visitors in these ecosystems through self guided experiences and hands-on education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure Services Department Divisions</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Ground Maintenance</td>
<td>$2,177,602</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Services Administration/Registration</td>
<td>$694,742</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Casements</td>
<td>$268,779</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>$268,580</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>$91,157</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>$202,910</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Discovery Center</td>
<td>$160,814</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Community Center</td>
<td>$326,843</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ormond Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>$272,173</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fields Maintenance/City Sponsored Sports</td>
<td>$1,407,479</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,871,079</td>
<td>38.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1.4.1a: Leisure Services Department Division Budget and FTEs**
- **Nova Community Center** is an air-conditioned facility that includes a gymnasium, family game room, fitness room, restrooms, classroom, and multi-purpose activity room. The Center provides classes and activities for children and adults throughout the year.

- **South Ormond Neighborhood Center** is also an air-conditioned facility with an indoor gymnasium, weight and game room, full service kitchen, concession stand, small theatrical stage for special events, multi-purpose room, and computer and learning center. The Center provides a variety of recreation, arts, and personal development programs for children and teens.

- **Athletic Fields Maintenance/City Sponsored Events** is responsible for turf maintenance and related athletic field repairs at the Nova Community Park, Ormond Beach Sports Complex, and the South Ormond Neighborhood Center. It also provides general maintenance and clean up of various hard courts and playgrounds. City Sponsored Events coordinates and schedules an array of activities for City sponsored sports, parent run sports, local high schools, colleges, and outside rentals. The Athletic supervisor also provides assistance to groups renting fields for tournaments.

Figure 1.4.1a identifies the budget and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) for each Division within the Leisure Services Department.

Since the completion of the last Parks Master Plan in 2005, the Leisure Services Department has implemented over $22 million worth of capital improvement projects that range from improving sea walls to building new parks, recreation, and sports facilities.

Figure 1.4.1b illustrates the amount that has been spent in the City’s parks. This Master Plan will help inform the improvements to be completed in the City’s parks and recreation system over the next 10 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Costs 2006-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB Sports Complex</td>
<td>$7,306,138.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Community Park</td>
<td>$3,138,462.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Romano Beachfront Park</td>
<td>$3,122,527.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassen Park</td>
<td>$2,597,023.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Gardens Park</td>
<td>$1,976,045.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ormond Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>$1,021,021.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casements</td>
<td>$525,839.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park I - Fleming Ave</td>
<td>$397,296.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park III - Division Ave</td>
<td>$339,558.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>$280,039.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park IV - Hand Ave</td>
<td>$271,385.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames Park</td>
<td>$210,574.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez Park</td>
<td>$172,271.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola Elementary School Park</td>
<td>$153,357.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB Senior Center</td>
<td>$143,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace of Speed Park</td>
<td>$137,893.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Gardens Park</td>
<td>$129,617.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Park</td>
<td>$129,403.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park II - Hammock Lane</td>
<td>$76,453.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Ormond Community Park</td>
<td>$75,406.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehouse Park</td>
<td>$65,604.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortunato Park</td>
<td>$43,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend Nature Park</td>
<td>$34,645.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton W. Pepper Mini-Park</td>
<td>$33,638.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Riverbridge Gardens</td>
<td>$32,703.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Mini-Park</td>
<td>$24,473.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td><strong>$22,438,526.37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1.4.1b: Park Capital Improvements (2006-2020)**
1.4.2 Community Inventory

PARK LAND & INDOOR RECREATION SPACE

The City of Ormond Beach parks and recreation system is comprised of 53 parks. The system totals 603.70 acres organized into the following nine park types:

1. Mini-Parks;
2. Beachfront Parks;
3. Passive Parks;
4. Neighborhood Parks;
5. Community Parks;
6. Special Use Facilities;
7. Walking Trails;
8. Sports Complexes; and
9. Civic Parks.

The City of Ormond Beach’s parks and recreation system includes 5 indoor facilities that provide residents with approximately 77,557 square feet of indoor recreation and meeting space. Most are indoor facilities with rooms for programs and meetings, though the Nova Community Center and South Ormond Neighborhood Center also contain gyms.

Other public and private recreational resources are located in the City of Ormond Beach. These include facilities provided by private providers, Volusia County, the State of Florida, private apartment complexes, and homeowner associations.

Volusia County operates 12 parks (totaling 85.52 acres) and one community center (1,287.77 square feet) located within the City of Ormond Beach’s limits. The County also manages the beaches along the coast.
## Parks & Facilities Inventory Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Number of Indoor Amenities</th>
<th>Number of Outdoor Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armes Park</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Romano Beachfront Park</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amory Drive Mini Park</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amory Parkway Passive Park</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Museum &amp; Memorial Gardens Park</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Riverside Gardens</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethpage of Speed Park (aka Granada Oceanfront Park)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casement Park (Including OB Tennis Center)</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caswell Park (Granada Bridge Underpass to Bailey Riverbridge Corridor)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park I, II, III, &amp; IV including Environmental Learning Center</td>
<td>152.49</td>
<td>5,950.00</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Avenue Passive Park</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dix Riverfront Park - OB Lions Mini Park</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehouse Park</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortunato Park (Underpass to Rockafeller Gardens Park)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas Park</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>Walking Trail</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Gardens</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Park</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Mound Park</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakebridge Drive Passive Park</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy Ave Park</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesnedek Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Pepper Park</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune Park</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Community Park (East &amp; West)</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td>33,565.56</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Road Passive Park - North</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1.4.2a: Parks & Recreation Facilities within the City of Ormond Beach**
## Parks & Facilities Inventory Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Park Type/Classification</th>
<th>Number of Indoor Amenities</th>
<th>Number of Outdoor Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nova Road Passive Park - South</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>Passive Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Beach Middle School Park</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Special Use Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Beach Sports Complex</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Parkway Park</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Shores Park</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Elementary School Park</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend Nature Park*</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>Passive Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Park</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Gardens</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosewood Avenue Mini-Park</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez Park</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Civic Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Lucia Park</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Center</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Special Use Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Old Kings Road Passive Park</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>Passive Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ormond Neighborhood Center &amp; Park (SOREC)</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizcaya Park</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadsworth Manor Senior Heritage Park</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ormond Community Park</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ormond Waterways Park</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>Passive Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodmere Park</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Totals</td>
<td>603.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,557.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`FIGURE 1.4.2a: Parks & Recreation Facilities within the City of Ormond Beach (Continued)`

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.*
### Parks & Facilities Inventory Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation Center</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation Center</th>
<th>Park Type/Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Weeks Sr. North Shore Park</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Beach Front Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs Drive Fishing dock</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Fishing Dock/ Pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Rendon Park</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Beach Front Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Croty Bicentennial Park</td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>1,287.77</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Ocean Drive fishing dock</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Fishing Dock/ Pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Strong Park</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>1,287.77</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose fishing dock</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Fishing Dock/ Pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabridge Riverfront Park</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Fishing Dock/ Pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsplash Park</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Beach Front Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Barck Park</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Beach Front Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomoka boat ramp</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volusia County</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,287.77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| State of Florida | | | State Historic Site | |
| Addison Blockhouse State Park | 5,587.00 | State Park | | |
| Tomoka State Park | 1,590.00 | State Park | | 7.00 |
| **State Totals** | **6,977.00** | **0.00** | | **8.00** |

### Summary

| City of Ormond Beach Park Facilities | 547.20 | 77,557.38 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1.73 |
| Volusia County Parks Facilities | 85.52 | 1,287.77 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 |
| State of Florida Parks Facilities | 6,977.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.07 |
| **Summary Totals** | **7,609.72** | **78,845.15** | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.00 |

**FIGURE 1.4.2a:** Parks & Recreation Facilities within the City of Ormond Beach (Continued)
FIGURE 1.4.2b: Parks & Recreation Facilities Base Map

CITY PARKS
1. Amos Park
2. Andy Romano Beachfront Park
3. Arroyo Fountain Park
4. Arroyo Oaks Mini Park
5. Arroyo Parkway Passive Park
6. Bailey Riverbridge Gardens
7. Birthplace of Speed Park
8. Cassen Park
9. Central Park I
10. Central Park II
11. Central Park III
12. Central Park IV including
   Environmental Discovery Center
13. Division Avenue Passive Park
14. Firehouse Park
15. Fortunato Park
16. Haas Park
17. Hospital Gardens Mini Park
18. Huguenot Park
19. Indian Mound Park
20. Lakebridge Drive Passive Park
21. Lincoln Ave Park
22. Main Street Park
23. Milton Pepper Park
24. Neptune Park
25. Nova Community Park
26. Nova Road Passive Park - North
27. Nova Road Passive Park - South
28. Optimist Park
29. Ormond Beach Lions Park
30. Ormond Beach Middle School Park
31. Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center
32. Ormond Beach Senior Center
33. Ormond Beach Sports Complex
34. Ormond Memorial Art
   Museum & Gardens
35. Ormond Parkway Park
36. Ormond Shores Park
37. Osceola Elementary School Park
38. Plaza Grande Park
39. Riverbend Nature Park
40. Riviera Park
41. Rockefelder Gardens
42. Rosewood Avenue Mini-Park
43. Sanchez Park
44. Santa Lucia Park
45. South Old Kings Road Passive Park
46. South Ormond Neighborhood
   Center & Park
47. Ted Porter Park
48. The Casements/Tennis Center
49. Vadner Park
50. Waldo D. Berry Senior Heritage Park
51. West Ormond Community Park
52. West Ormond Wetlands Park
53. Woodmere Park

COUNTY PARKS
1. Al Weeks Sr. North Shore Park
2. Briggs Drive Fishing Dock
3. Frank Rendon Park
4. Michael Croty Bicentennial Park
5. Riv-Ocean Drive Fishing Dock
6. Robert Strickland Park
7. Roberta Drive Fishing Dock
8. San Jose Fishing Dock
9. Seabridge Riverfront Park
10. Sunsplash Park
11. Tom Renick Park
12. Tomoka Boat Ramp

STATE PARKS
1. Addison Blockhouse State Park
2. Boulware Creek State Park
3. Tomoka State Park

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.
The State of Florida operates two parks within the City - Bulow Creek State Park and Tomoka State Park. The State also operates one historic site - Addison Blockhouse State Park. In total, these parks comprise 6,977 acres.

Together, City, County, and State parks and recreation offerings total 7,609.72 acres of land and 78,845.15 square feet of indoor space.

Figure 1.4.2a lists all of the parks and recreation facilities within Ormond Beach, and Figure 1.4.2b maps the entire parks and recreation system.

The YMCA also operates a facility in the City of Ormond Beach - The Ormond Beach Family YMCA. This center provides a variety of facilities including a heated outdoor 50-meter swimming pool, state-of-the-art cardio and strength equipment, group exercise studios, cycle studios, and an indoor basketball gymnasium.

Various homeowner associations within the City of Ormond Beach also provide their residents with access to private recreational facilities. Typical facilities include swimming pools, tennis courts, and playgrounds. While these facilities may address some specialized recreation needs, they typically do not address the community’s larger recreational needs such as multipurpose trails, natural areas, dog parks, and sports fields.
1.4.3 Park & Facility Evaluations

Research by park experts has shown that all successful parks and public spaces share common qualities:

- They are easily accessible;
- They are comfortable and have an attractive image;
- They allow users of all ages to engage in a variety of activities and allow people to gather and meet one another; and
- They are sustainable – meaning that they help meet existing needs while not compromising the needs of future generations.

Considering these qualities, the City of Ormond Beach's parks where evaluated based on 4 categories and 30 sub-categories illustrated and described to the right and on the following page.

Parks were evaluated collaboratively by City staff and the Consultant Team using a five point scale:

- **Visibility from a distance**
  Can one easily see into the park?

- **Ease of walking to the park**
  Can someone walk directly into the park safely and easily?

- **Clarity of information/signage**
  Is there signage that identifies the park, and/or signage that provides additional information for users?

- **ADA Compliance**
  Does the site generally appear to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) laws for accessibility?

- **Lighting**
  Is the park lighted appropriately for use at night? (if applicable)

- **First impression/overall attractiveness**
  Is the park attractive at first glance?

- **Feeling of safety**
  Does the park feel safe at the time of the visit?

- **Cleanliness/overall quality of maintenance (Exterior/Interior)**
  Is the park clean and free of litter?

- **Comfort of places to sit**
  Are there comfortable places to sit?

- **Protection from bad weather**
  Is there shelter in case of bad weather?

- **Evidence of management/stewardship (Exterior/Interior)**
  Is there visual evidence of site management?

- **Ability to easily supervise and manage the park or facility (interior)**
  How difficult it is to supervise the park and its facilities?

- **Condition and effectiveness of any equipment or operation systems**
  Is the equipment and/or operating system in good condition?

- **Branding**
  Does the park exhibit appropriate branding?

Figure 1.4.3a illustrates the results of this analysis and Figure 1.4.3b maps the results.
Use
Uses, Activities, and Sociability

- **Mix of uses/things to do**
  Is there a variety of things to do given the type of park?
- **Level of activity**
  How active is the park with visitors?
- **Sense of pride/ownership**
  Is there evidence of community pride in the park?
- **Programming flexibility**
  How flexible is the park in accommodating multiple uses?
- **Ability of facility to effectively support current organized programming**
  Is the site meeting the needs of organized programs?
- **Marketing or promotional efforts for the facility**
  Is the site being marketed effectively?

Buildings
Buildings and Architecture

- **Image and aesthetics**
  Is the building attractive?
- **Clarity of entry and connection to the park**
  Is the building integrated into its surroundings?
- **Interior layout**
  Is the layout functional?
- **Interior finishes, furniture, and equipment**
  Are the furnishings and equipment inside the building of good condition and quality?
- **Functioning dimensions of spaces**
  Does the organization of space support the building’s intended function?
- **Building enclosure**
  Is there any obvious need for repairs to the building shell?
- **Building systems**
  Are all the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems in working order?
- **Energy and sustainability**
  Is there evidence that the building is energy efficient?
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FIGURE 1.4.3a: Park Site Evaluation Analysis Summary
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| Building Systems | Building Enclosure | Structural Integrity | Functioning Dimensions of spaces | Equipment | Interior Finishes and Furniture and Interior Layout | Park | Clarity of Entry and Connections to | Image and Aesthetics | BUILDINGS AND ARCHITECTURE: |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|———|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2.6              | 2.9               | 4.2                | 2.6                             | 2.6       | 2.9                                           | 2.9 | 3.1                               | 2.5                 | 2.9                         |

**FIGURE 1.4.3a: Park Site Evaluation Analysis Summary (Continued)**
Based on the analysis of the City of Ormond Beach’s parks and recreation system using the criteria previously described, it appears that the parks and recreation system is meeting expectations with an overall score of 3.1. The system displayed a variety of strengths and opportunities that the City should build on and improve wherever possible. Following is an overview of these strengths and opportunities.

**PARK AND FACILITY EVALUATION SUMMARY FINDINGS**

**PROXIMITY, ACCESS, LINKAGES**

**(+)** Strengths

- Most of the City’s parks provide adequate visibility into the interior of parks and provide clear site lines into parks from at least two sides.

- Many of the City’s parks provide users the opportunity to walk to the park along sidewalks or low traffic streets that connect the parks to the surrounding neighborhood. A great example are the sidewalks along South Beach Street that connect Ames Park and Riviera Park to the surrounding neighborhood. The low traffic and low stress street where Lincoln Avenue Park is located is another good example of a street that has a sidewalk but due to the calm nature of the street, also allows users to walk along the street to get to the park. Some of the sidewalks are also separated from the road by a landscape buffer that provides an opportunity to install shade trees, pedestrian lights, and where appropriate, amenities and furnishings to enhance the walking experience.

- Most of the City’s parks and facilities appear to provide adequate ADA access for users.

- Many of the City’s parks and facilities are adequately lit to allow users opportunities to enjoy park amenities after dusk, including providing safety lights in parks where after-dusk activities are not appropriate.

**(-)** Opportunities

- While many of the City’s parks provide users the opportunity to walk to the park along sidewalks that are separated from the road by a landscape buffer, many of these landscape buffers lack shade trees, pedestrian lighting, and where appropriate, pedestrian amenities to enhance the walking experience along the streets. The City should look to enhance the walking experience for park users wherever possible by installing shade trees between streets and sidewalks and adding pedestrian lighting and furnishings where appropriate.

- Most of the City’s parks lack connections to transit, which limit the reach of parks to the broader community. The City should strive to provide transit stops with signage, wayfinding, up to date transit schedules, and comfortable and sheltered seating areas in, at least, the City’s larger parks.
Introduction

FIGURE 1.4.3b: Park Site Evaluation Analysis Summary Map

PARK AND FACILITY EVALUATION SUMMARY FINDINGS

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.*
• Most of the City’s parks lack a hierarchy of signage and wayfinding. Most of the signs in parks are limited to monument and regulatory signs. Additional signage opportunities that the City should consider including in parks are a park system location map, park amenity location map, amenity directional signage (depending on the size and complexity of the park), amenity signs, and educational interpretive signs. A great example is the signage and wayfinding in the Environmental Discovery Center that provides a variety of sign types to educate, orient, and direct park users. This hierarchy should be emulated throughout the park system.

COMFORT AND IMAGE

(+·) Strengths

• The first impression and overall attractiveness of most of the City’s parks and facilities meet expectations while some parks and facilities exceed expectations with a higher degree of design and quality standards than others. Andy Romano Beachfront Park, Environmental Discovery Center, Haas Park, Lincoln Avenue Park, Ormond Memorial Art Museum & Gardens, Riviera Park, Rockefeller Gardens, and the Casements are examples that stand out from the rest of the City’s parks. This positive first impression and overall attractiveness also translates into a feeling of safety in most of the City’s parks.

• Most of the City’s parks exhibit good signs of overall cleanliness, quality of exterior maintenance, management, and stewardship with some parks exhibiting a higher finish than others. Notable examples include Ames Park, Andy Romano Beachfront Park, Environmental Discovery Center, Fortunato Park, Lincoln Avenue Park, Ormond Memorial Art Museum & Gardens, Riviera Park, Rockefeller Gardens, and the Casements.

• Many of the City’s parks have adequate places to sit that are located in pleasant areas.

• Most of the interior spaces of City park buildings can be easily supervised and managed due to an interior design that is configured in a manner that allows for clear site lines to major amenities, entrances, and exists from a central location. Buildings in Bailey Riverbridge Gardens and Environmental Discovery Center are great examples of spaces that facilitate interior supervision. This translates into strong interior management/stewardship and cleanliness, which these parks exhibit.

• Most of the City’s parks and facilities contain equipment that is in good condition, well-maintained, and effective. Notable examples include Andy Romano Beachfront Park, Environmental Discovery Center, Fortunato Park, Hass Park, Rockefeller Gardens, and the Casements.
**Opportunities**

• While most of the City’s parks have an adequate first impression and overall attractiveness, some parks exhibit a higher degree of design and quality standards than others. The City should strive for all parks to exhibit the same degree of design and quality standards. Specific parks that have the potential to be improved are predominantly the Mini and Passive Parks such as Arroyo Oaks Mini Park, Arroyo Parkway Passive Parks, Lakebridge Drive Passive Park, Neptune Park, Ormond Beach Middle School Park, Santa Lucia Park, and Vander Park.

• While most of the City’s parks exhibit good signs of overall cleanliness, quality of exterior maintenance, management, and stewardship, some parks exhibit a higher finish than others. The City should strive for all parks to exhibit the same degree of finish. Specific parks that have the potential to be improved include Arroyo Parkway Passive Parks and Lakebridge Drive Passive Park, Neptune Park, Ormond Beach Middle School Park, Santa Lucia Park, and Vander Park. The parks that appear to have the highest degree of quality and finish are Andy Romano Beachfront Park, the Environmental Discover Center, Rockefeller Gardens, and the Casements. These parks could serve as the standard for the rest of the City’s parks and recreation facilities.

• While many of the City’s parks have adequate places to sit that are located in pleasant areas, some parks do not. The City should strive to incorporate a variety of seating options in parks including movable tables and chairs.

• Most of the City’s parks do not contain shelters where park users can go to find refuge from Florida’s inclement weather. The City should strive to incorporate more shelters and shade in parks including pavilions; shade structures for playgrounds, exercise stations, and seating areas; and shade trees to enhance park user’s experience and comfort. Notable park examples include Andy Romano Beachfront Park, Central Park II, Ormond Memorial Art Museum and Gardens, and Riviera Park.

• Many of the City’s parks have the potential to enhance their branding through the consistent use of high-quality materials, colors, textures, furnishings, signage, details, upkeep, and overall aesthetics. Andy Romano Beachfront Park, the Environmental Discover Center, Rockefeller Gardens, and the Casements appear to have the highest quality and consistency of branding elements that could serve as the standard for the rest of the City’s parks. The City should develop park standards that define the City’s brand and implement the branding throughout the parks and recreation system.
USES, ACTIVITIES, AND SOCIABILITY

(+ ) Strengths

• A variety of uses, activities, and things to do for park users of different ages are available in some of the City’s parks with some parks having more opportunities than others. These varying uses and activities help increase the level of activity in many of the City’s Parks. Notable examples include Andy Romano Beachfront Park, Central Park III, the Environmental Discovery Center, Fortunato Park, Milton Pepper Park, Nova Community Park, and South Ormond Neighborhood Center and Park.

• Many of the City’s park exhibit a high degree of pride and ownership with no signs of litter, vandalism, misuse or lack of use of facilities, or lack of maintenance and upkeep. Many parks appear to be actively used and enjoy a high level of volunteerism, signs of care, and upkeep. Notable examples include Andy Romano Beachfront Park, the Environmental Discovery Center, Fortunato Park, and Rockefeller Gardens, and the Casements.

• Many of the City’s parks are adequately planned and spatially organized to facilitate organized programming due to the proper size, location of facilities, and amenities. Additionally, many of the City’s parks provide opportunities for flexible use due to the presence of multi-purpose outdoor and indoor spaces. Notable examples include Rockefeller Gardens, the Casements, and South Ormond Neighborhood Center and Park.

(- ) Opportunities

• While some of the City’s parks provide a mix of amenities for a range of users to enjoy, some of the parks lack a mix of things to do, which leads to inactivity and at times, undesirable activities to take place in the parks. The City should look to increase the mix of amenities, things to do at appropriate parks and facilities, and inclusion of multi-purpose/multi-functional spaces. Parks that may need specific attention are the City’s Mini and Passive Parks. Specific examples where more things to do could be added include Arroyo Fountain Park, Arroyo Oaks Mini Park, Arroyo Parkways Passive Park, Division Avenue Passive Park, Hospital Gardens Mini Park, Lakebridge Drive Passive Park, Mainstreet Park, Neptune Park, Nova Road Passive Parks, Plaza Grande Park, South Old Kings Road Passive Park, Ted Porter Park, Vander Park, and Woodmere Park.

• Most of the evaluated parks lack marketing that make use of a variety of promotional tools to make residents aware of the park, its recreation facilities, activities, and programs. To the extent possible, the City should look to enhance marketing efforts through as many avenues as possible including traditional and digital means.
BUILDINGS AND ARCHITECTURE

(+) Strengths

• Most of the City’s park buildings exhibit a positive image and aesthetic through the use of appropriate proportions and materials, and contribute to the context of the park and surrounding neighborhood. Notable examples include the Environmental Discovery Center, and the Casements.

• Most of the City’s park buildings have clear entry points and connections to surrounding outdoor spaces as well pleasant entry and lobby spaces with an adequate sense of arrival. Additionally, most of the City’s park building interior layouts are well-organized to facilitate intuitive circulation, safety and security, and use. Notable examples include Bailey Riverbridge Gardens, the Environmental Discovery Center, and the Casements.

• Most of the City’s park buildings have adequate interior finishes, furniture, and equipment that are undamaged, well-maintained, and aesthetically pleasing. Notable examples are the Environmental Discovery Center, and the Casements.

• Most of the City’s park buildings have adequate and functioning dimensions that are ample in size and volume for their function. The most notable example is the Casements.

• Most of the City’s park buildings showed no visible evidence of loss of integrity of any structural members, building enclosure, and building systems. Notable examples are the Environmental Discovery Center and Ormond Beach Sports Complex.

(−) Opportunities

• While most of the City’s park buildings exhibit a positive image and aesthetic, some could be improved. Park buildings that could be improved are the Nova Community Center, Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center, and Ormond Beach Senior Center. These buildings may benefit from renovations in the future to enhance their aesthetic and curb appeal.

• While most of the City’s park buildings have clear entry points and connections to surrounding outdoor spaces, one in particular could be improved - the Nova Community Center. The Center has multiple entrances that can be confusing.

• While most of the City’s park buildings have adequate interior finishes, furniture, and equipment, Nova Community Center and Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center could use improvements. The interior finishes, furniture, and equipment are aging and could be renovated and brought up to date.
• While most of the City’s park buildings have adequate and functioning dimensions, the Environmental Discovery Center and Nova Community Center could be expanded to provide more room for programming and storage.

• While most of the City’s park buildings showed no visible evidence of loss of integrity of any structural members, building enclosure, and building systems, the Ormond Beach Tennis Center did. The Center should be renovated and improved. Additionally, the Nova Community Center appears to have building enclosure issues that need to be addressed.

• Most of the City’s park buildings contain systems that are aging and in need of repair. Additionally, most of these systems are not energy efficient. Overtime, the City should look to replace and upgrade building’s system to have energy efficient elements and use sustainable materials.

In addition to these park site evaluations, Staff completed more detailed park site evaluations that analyzed park specific amenities, facility strengths, weaknesses, and potential capital improvements. These are included in the following pages. Both sets of park site evaluations will be used to inform future park capital improvements that will be identified in the Visioning Phase.
Andy Romano Beachfront Park

**Acreage:** 3.47 Acres  
**Park Type:** Beachfront Park  
**Overall Rating:** Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W:1/M:1/U:6</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Beach Access
- Parking
- Good Amenities
- Restroom ADA compliant

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- None

**Possible Improvements:**
Ames Park

Acreage: 1.28 Acres  
Park Type: Mini Park  
Overall Rating: Good; Pleasant passive/interpretive waterfront park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom W:1/M:1</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Historic remnants with interpretive information
- Paved paths
- Cohesive design
- Gardens well kept
- Paved Parking Lots

Current Facility Weakness:
- Restrooms not ADA compliant
- Unpaved aisles & entry road(s)

Possible Improvements:
- Clean up edge along river
- Pave entry roads & aisles
- Provide grounds improvements
- Provide new signage

CIP Improvements:
- CDBG Landscaping Improvements, FY18-19
- CDBG Paved Parking Spaces North & South & North Clay Paver Walkway, FY 18-19
Arroyo Oaks Mini Park

Acreage: 0.24 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Poor

Current Facility Strengths:
- Open Space with Trees

Current Facility Weakness:
- No Signage
- No Benches or landscaping

Possible Improvements:
- Add Signage
- General / Grounds Improvements
Arroyo Parkway Passive Park

Acreage: 16.87 Acres  
Park Type: Passive Park  
Overall Rating: Poor

Current Facility Strengths:  
• None

Current Facility Weakness:  
• No improvements

Possible Improvements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorial Gardens Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>1 Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Cottage (1885)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches without backs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Features/Artwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Features</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquina Patio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Impressive ornamental gardens
- Peacock fountain
- Waterfall
- Pond with spray
- Bus stop available on Granada
- ADA accessible

CIP Improvements:
- Landscape Improvements (south entrance) & shell pavers, Phase 1 Split Retaining Wall North side parking edge, FY17-18
- Phase 2 Split Face Retaining Wall around parking perimeter, FY 18-19
- New Edgewater Pedestrian Lights (replaced wood Poles), FY 19-20

Possible Improvements:
- Better access to memorials.
- Bridges and Some Water Features need repair / replacement
- Enhance shoulder of Seton Terrace to provide additional parking.
- Provide grounds improvements
- Provide new signage
Bailey Riverbridge Gardens
(see Cassen Park for under the bridge inventory)

Acreage: 3.62 Acres
Park Type: Special Use Facility
Overall Rating: Good; Pleasant, passive use park with connections via Granada Bridge underpass & by boardwalk to Cassen Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliant Building with meeting space, kitchen &amp; rooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier/Dock/Boardwalk &amp; Gazebo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches without backs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Memorial</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Free Library</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Beautiful setting with small unique building on river
- Organized, paved parking lot
- Connected by land, or by boardwalk to Cassen Park

Possible Improvements:
- Conduct architectural & historical study of building to maintain its historic integrity.

CIP Improvements:
- CDBG - Landscape Improvements plus removal of high vegetation along the shoreline, FY18-19
Birthplace of Speed Park
(aka Granada Oceanfront Park)

Acreage: 0.68 Acres  
Park Type: Mini Park  
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W:4 M:2(U),2(T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign &amp; Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Grill</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica Garage/Exhibit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Markers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Deck / Ramp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
• Well maintained & heavily used
• Nice details-walks, walls, etc.
• ADA compliant-boardwalks/decks and restrooms

Current Facility Weakness:
• Sign not lighted
• No nearby public parking
• Poor indoor lighting

Possible Improvements:
• Signature facility should be ADA compliant.
• Provide public parking & pedestrian link to park.
• Provide sign light
• Provide grounds enhancements

CIP Improvements:
- Replace Wood Observation Deck, FY19-20 
  (Construction Staring in February 2021)
- Landscape Improvement to Park, FY18-19 
  (Installed 2020)
Casements Campus
(Including OB Tennis Center)

Acreage: 5.47 Acres
Park Type: Neighborhood Park
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8L</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Fantastic historic structure & grounds
- Paths: meandering, concrete & specialty paving
- ADA accessible
- Paved parking
Casements Campus Continuation

Current Facility Weakness:
- Front yard storm drainage
- Shared parking, both Casements & Tennis Center
- I.D. sign hard to find
- MacDonald House needs upper floors renovated
- At tennis center: shared parking with Granada commercial

Possible Improvements:
- Switch waterside benches to face river.
- Consolidate Casements, Rockefeller Gardens Park, O.B. Tennis Center & McDonald House to create one recognizable campus.
- Replace tennis complex tables & chairs with more sturdy furniture.
- Shade structures for all courts.
- Consider expanding parking for peak use and landscaping lot(s).
- Consider clearing invasive growth along River.
- Address shared parking issues.
- Provide new signage
- Provide grounds enhancements
Cassen Park
(Granada Bridge Underpass to Bailey Riverbridge Gardens)

**Acreage:** 3.66 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restrooms</strong></td>
<td>W:2/M:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gazebo</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bait &amp; Tackle Shop</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transient Boat Slips</strong></td>
<td>14+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance Sign</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Kiosk</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking-Cars</strong></td>
<td>18+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking-Boat Trailer</strong></td>
<td>40+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Ramp</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floating Dock</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picnic Tables</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benches with backs</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grills</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monuments</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kayak Launch</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Granada Underpass</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Pier w/ Gazebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pots with heavy plantings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Cleaning Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- River Access
- Large Fishing Pier
- Connected to Bailey Riverbridge Park
- Restroom ADA compliant
Cassen Park Continuation

Current Facility Weakness:
• Unpaved parking

Possible Improvements:
• Pave parking areas.
• Complete ADA accessible boat dock currently underway.
• Provide new signage and grounds enhancements

CIP Improvements:
- CDBG Canoe/Kayak Dock Launch, FY17-18
- CDBG Landscape Improvements to Park, FY18-19
Division Avenue Passive Park

Acreage: 3.80 Acres
Park Type: Passive Park
Overall Rating: Fair

Division Avenue Passive Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pond Fountain</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Condition Table" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Some Landscaping

Current Facility Weakness:
- No Improvements

Possible Improvements:
-
Dix Riverfront Park – OB Lions Mini Park

**Acreage:** 0.20 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Fair; waterfront park

**Dix Riverfront Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawall</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Provides visual access to Halifax River
- Benches

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- None

**Possible Improvements:**
- None
Central Park I, II, III, & IV Including Environmental Learning Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>W:2 M:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labyrinth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers/Decks/Bridges</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Grill</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Learning Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike Path</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad Floating Mats</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Stations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/Kayak Ramp</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Kayak Launch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond Fountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Rails/Fence (PH1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Park I, II, III, & IV Including Environmental Learning Center Continuation

Current Facility Strengths:
- Large Open Space
- Mix of active and passive facilities

Current Facility Weakness:
- Restroom not ADA accessible
- Playground located on edge of parking lot
- Playgrounds are mix of varied manufacturers.
- Playground safety surfacing needs regular attention.
- Boardwalks good, but residential grade which will require more long term maintenance.
- Add screening (hedge/wall) along houses with chain link fences.
- Need defined access to fishing area.

Possible Improvements:
- Add new signage
- Enhance transition between previous phases
- Open sight lines.
- Improve/add landscaping/ provide grounds enhancements
- Improve overall level of finish to create safer environment as well as a sense of cohesiveness. Open up sight lines (particularly at south end) so more visible, improve/add landscaping, create sense of entry at specific points.
- Add/improve lighting in parking areas.
- Expand resource management plan to include all park phases.
- Provide interpretive signage

CIP Improvements:
- CDBG Canoe/Kayak Dock Launch, FY17-18
- Floating Beemats (Water Study Project), FY19 to Current
Firehouse Park

Acreage: 0.31 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground w/ shade</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (add. at Fire Sta.)</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porta-Potty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Themed Playground
- Heavily Landscaped

Current Facility Weakness:
- Porta-Potty
- Broken Water Fountain

Possible Improvements:
-
Fortunato Park
(Underpass to Rockefeller Gardens Park)

Acreage: 4.29 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Pier</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/Kayak Launch</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Cleaning Station</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench Swing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grills</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground &amp; Swings</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Jogging Trail</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Landmark</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Repair Station</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Station</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Granada Park Underpass

| Benches with backs | Good |
| Pots with heavy plantings | Good |
Fortunato Park Continuation

Current Facility Strengths:
- Ormond Hotel Cupola-Historic Landmark
- Specialty pavement
- Paved walking trail
- Arbor
- Restroom ADA compliant
- Walking/Jogging trails paved

Current Facility Weakness:
- No shade for picnicking (benches)
- Playground not ADA compliant

Possible Improvements:
- Provide ADA compliant playground & improved safety surfacing, containment for playground.
- Provide shade shelter for picnicking.
- Provide grounds enhancements.
- Provide new signage.

CIP Improvements:
- Landscape Improvement to Park, FY18-19 (Installed in 2020)
Haas Park

Acreage: 14.95 Acres
Park Type: Walking Trail
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved Walkway</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path Lighting</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Links 2 neighborhoods to Granada Blvd
- Quiet Natural Setting

Current Facility Weakness:
- No Sign
- No parking

Possible Improvements:
-
Huguenot Park

Acreage: 0.67 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Fair; waterfront park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Walkway</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Provides visual access to Halifax River
- Paved paths
- Paved Handicap Parking
- Bench

Current Facility Weakness:
- No Sign
- Unpaved parking, aisles & entry road(s)

Possible Improvements:
- Add Signage
- Pave parking, roads & aisles
- Grounds Improvements

CIP Improvements:
- CDBG Park Renovation: Paved the H/C space & shell parking; Winding Concrete Walkway to ADA Concrete Picnic Pad & walkway continuation to Overlook bench viewing Halifax River; Landscape & Irrigation added, FY17-18
Hospital Gardens

Number/Size
Fountain 1
Landscaping 1
Paver Walks & Patio 1
Benches 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Small Garden with benches

Current Facility Weakness:
- No improvements

Possible Improvements:
-
Indian Mound Park

Acreage: 0.35 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Fair

Indian Mound Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Information Sign</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Green Space
- Benches

Current Facility Weakness:
- Mound limits activities

Possible Improvements:
- Add signage
Lakebridge Drive Passive Park

Acreage: 2.85 Acres
Park Type: Passive Park
Overall Rating: Poor

Pond Fountain

Current Facility Strengths:
• None

Current Facility Weakness:
• No improvements

Possible Improvements:
• None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lincoln Ave Park

**Acreage:** 0.42 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Good

![Image of Lincoln Ave Park]

**Lincoln Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info Sign</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Walks</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Garden</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Green Space
- Benches

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- 

**Possible Improvements:**
- 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mainstreet Park

**Acreage:** 0.37 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Table</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Green Space
- Benches

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- 

**Possible Improvements:**
- 
Milton Pepper Park

**Acreage:** 0.16 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Heavily Landscaped
- Entrance Sign
- Paved, meandering path

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- None

**Possible Improvements:**
- Add Signage
Neptune Park

Acreage: 0.19 Acres  
Park Type: Mini Park  
Overall Rating: Poor

Current Facility Strengths:
• View of River

Current Facility Weakness:
• Site of Lift Station, Generator, and Stormwater Treatment, uses most of the site
• Does not resemble a Park
• Lack of access
• No Benches
• No Paved Path

Possible Improvements:
• Add Signage
• Pave trail to river’s edge
• Add bench and grounds improvements
### Nova Community Park (East & West)

**Acreage:**
- West Nova 60.20
- East Nova 3.58
- Total 63.78 Acres

**Park Type:** Community Park

**Overall Rating:** Fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W:2/M:2</td>
<td>✓(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>✓(West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1L 1/2U</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2L 4U</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4L</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4LWest 1LEast</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Office</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Jogging Path</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Stations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center w/gym</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium (gymnastics)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park Office</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond Fountain</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nova Community Park Continuation

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Has lots of potential
- Wonderful unique playground, used heavily.
- New baseball fields in good condition

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- No organization to park
- Old facilities in need of renovation
- Some Parking not paved or adequate in numbers
- Restrooms not ADA compliant
- Picnic shelters need paint, has saggy beams
- Basketball court needs restriping
- Community Center 30 year old metal building

**Possible Improvements:**
- Prepare master plan for park that provides organization to phased improvements.
- Improve parking.
- Assess Community Center Building replacement vs. comprehensive renovation(s).
- Replace gym ceiling insulation and building roof.
- Add new comprehensive signage.
- Provide grounds enhancements.
Nova Road Passive Park - North

Acreage: 1.74 Acres  
Park Type: Passive Park  
Overall Rating: Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:  
• None

Current Facility Weakness:  
• No improvements

Possible Improvements:  
•
Nova Road Passive Park - South

**Acreage:** 11.05 Acres  
**Park Type:** Passive Park  
**Overall Rating:** Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pond Fountain</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- None

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- No improvements

**Possible Improvements:**
- •
Ormond Beach Middle School Park

Acreage: 2.40 Acres
Park Type: Neighborhood Park
Overall Rating: Poor

O.B. Middle School Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Shared with OBMS)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball</td>
<td>4U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Tennis</td>
<td>2U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Field</td>
<td>1U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>1U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
• Facilities available for public use, if could be maintained at Ormond Beach Leisure Services Dept. standards

Current Facility Weakness:
• Limited Access
• Lack of Signage & Obscure Entrance makes it unclear Public Access is Allowed

Possible Improvements:
• Renegotiate cooperative use agreement
• Improve Access
• Add new signage
Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center

Acreage: 0.60 Acres  
Park Type: Special Use Facility  
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Table</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:

- Impressive facility, ADA compliant
- Tomoka River Dance fountain
- Paved parking
- Accessible restrooms

Possible Improvements:

- Enhance landscaping.
- Consider elevator for second floor accessibility.
- Add new signage
Ormond Parkway Park

**Acreage:** 0.19 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Fair

### Ormond Parkway Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver Bench Pad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- River Access
- Decorative Bench and Pad

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- Provides access to 2 homes
- Shared, unpaved driveway access

**Possible Improvements:**
- Add Signage
- Add Paved Path
- Add Grounds improvements
Ormond Shores Park

**Acreage:** 1.32 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond Fountain</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**  
- Pond with Fountain  
- Benches

**Current Facility Weakness:**  
- Paved trail only on one side of pond

**Possible Improvements:**  
- Expand trail around park  
- Add new sign  
- Add Grounds improvements on other side of pond
Ormond Beach Sports Complex

Acreage: 130.35 Acres
Park Type: Sports Complex
Overall Rating: Fair

Ormond Beach Sports Complex

Restrooms
- W:6, M:6
  - Good: (4)
  - Fair: (2)
- Picnic Pavilion
  - 1
- Playgrounds
  - 2
  - Fair: (1)
  - Poor: (1)
- Baseball
  - 4L
  - Good
- Softball
  - 5L
  - Good
- Batting Cages
  - 7
  - Fair: (5)
  - Poor: (2)
- Football/Soccer
  - 10L 2U
  - Good
- T-Ball
  - 4U
  - Good
- Throwball/Horseshoes
  - 10L
  - Good
- Field House
  - 2
  - Fair: (1)
  - Poor: (1)
- Concession
  - 6
  - Fair: (4)
  - Poor: (2)
- Maintenance Yard
  - 1
  - Good

Parking
- 7 Lots
  - (1 Paved)
  - (1 old runway paved)
  - (5 unpaved)

Entrance Sign
- 3
  - Good

Picnic Table
- 19
  - (4)
  - (12)
  - (3)

Grills
- 2
  - Good

Current Facility Strengths:
- Athletic field turf
- Rotary field & soccer complex are well done/maintained

Current Facility Weaknesses:
- Lacks press boxes at baseball complex
- Lacks organization-no sense of arrival, no interconnectivity: walks, trails, etc.
- Needs trees & landscaping
- Roads & parking are noncompliant with City's development ordinances
- Lacks shade for spectators
- Restrooms not ADA compliant, floods
- Needs +/-200 more parking spaces
Ormond Beach Sports Complex
Continuation

- Softball infields (clay/sand mix) & turf irrigation need renovation

**Possible Improvements:**
- Move entry road & buffer from adjacent industrial land uses.
- Re-organize per proposed triangle master plan.
- Replace existing restroom/changing room building & provide concessions within.
- Add playground near soccer fields.
- Add fencing for controlled access to tournaments (gate fees).
- Need to assess real impacts of Airport Runway expansion & have park modifications done in advance of them to avoid disruption (access to softball complex, loss of soccer field, etc.).
- Renovate soccer restrooms
- Replace lighting at Kiwanis field.
- Add comprehensive signage package including new i.d. sign
- Provide general site enhancements: landscaping, paved walks, etc.
Osceola Elementary School Park

Acreage: 5.25 Acres  
Park Type: Neighborhood Park  
Overall Rating: Poor

Osceola School Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms &amp; Open-Air Structure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W:2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:1(U), 1(T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (shared w/ school)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Table</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball</td>
<td>2U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Tennis</td>
<td>2U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Handball</td>
<td>4U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>2U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Stations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- New playground is accessible & separated by age
- Heavily used facilities-after school program

Current Facility Weakness:
- Poor sense of arrival & no signage
- Restrooms are inadequate
- No swings at playground
- Limited Access

Possible Improvements:
- Needs organization & arrival statement (including signage).
- Replace 2nd backstop.
- Add walks & trees/plantings & buffers, general grounds improvements.
- Could use benches, trash receptacles, dugouts.
- Replace chain link fencing.
- Replace restroom/picnic shelter
- Add new signage
Plaza Grande Park

Acreage: 1.34 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Benches
- Landscaping/Trees
- Open Space

Current Facility Weakness:
- Overhead utility lines

Possible Improvements:
- Add signage
- Enhance Grounds
- Add Paved walks to Benches
Riverbend Nature Park

**Acreage:** 2.9 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Fair/Poor

### Riverbend Nature Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier/Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Grill</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Jogging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Bike Trail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Repair Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Deck on Trail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Beautiful site with large shade trees
- Abuts Tomoka River

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- Parking unpaved
- No paved walks/paths
- No access to restroom for ADA
- Walking/Jogging paths are not delineated
- Picnic tables needs replacing

**Possible Improvements:**
- Canoe/kayak launch
- Entry statements needed (columns, new signage)
- Provide paved parking/paths/access to restrooms
- Provide general grounds enhancements

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.*
Riviera Park

Acreage: 5.77 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk &amp; River Gazebo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches with backs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Grill</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Jogging Path</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawall</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Beautiful Riverfront site
- Anchor to Riverwalk
- Walking/Jogging paths are paved and linked

Current Facility Weakness:
- Playground is non-compliant with ADA
- Sign small & difficult to see

Possible Improvements:
- Bring playground into compliance and/or replace.
- Provide new sign.
- Consider conceptual planning for Veteran's Memorial.
- Provide grounds enhancements.
Rockefeller Gardens

Acreage: 2.24 Acres  
Park Type: Neighborhood Park  
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Stage w/ Shade Structure</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Waterwheel</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Statue</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Fantastic historic grounds
- Paths: meandering, concrete & specialty paving
- ADA accessible

Current Facility Weakness:
- Lower park storm drainage
- Shared parking, both Casements & Tennis Center

Possible Improvements:
- Switch waterside benches to face river.
- Add interpretive information to lower park strolling path(s).
- Consolidate Casements, Rockefeller Gardens Park, O.B. Tennis Center & McDonald House to create one recognizable campus.
- Complete practice wall & fencing project, currently underway.
- Address shared parking issues.
- Provide new signage
- Provide grounds enhancements
Rosewood Avenue Mini-Park

Acreage: 0.20 Acres
Park Type: Mini-Park
Overall Rating: Fair

**Number/Size** | **Condition**
---|---|---
| Good | Fair | Poor |

- 2 benches

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- None

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- No improvements

**Possible Improvements:**
- 
Sanchez Park

Acreage: 8.41 Acres
Park Type: Civic Park
Overall Rating: Poor

Sanchez Park

Number/Size

Restrooms
Entrance Sign
Small Picnic Shelter
Parking
Boat Ramp/Transient Dock
Boardwalk with benches
Picnic Tables
Benchs with backs
Gazebo
Outdoor Grill
Drinking Fountain
Playground & Swings, etc.
Nature Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W:4/M:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
• Beautiful waterfront site with “state park” feeling
• Restrooms

Current Facility Weakness:
• Nature Trails are Overgrown & Unmaintained
• Boardwalk is aging & needs repair
• Parking is unpaved
• Park is subject to flooding & drainage issues

Possible Improvements:
• Improve sense of arrival/provide new signage.
• Repair boardwalk, handrails, benches, etc.
• Add drinking fountain(s).
• Provide grounds enhancements, and defined walks/paths
Santa Lucia Park

**Acreage:** 0.27 Acres  
**Park Type:** Mini Park  
**Overall Rating:** Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Water Access
- Bench
- Open Space

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- No Paved Trail
- No Parking
- No Signage

**Possible Improvements:**
- Add signage
- Enhance Grounds
- Add Paved walks to Benches
Senior Citizen Center

**Acreage:** 0.40 Acres  
**Park Type:** Special Use Facility  
**Overall Rating:** Fair

### Senior Citizen Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center with Ballroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room/Bingo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Facility Strengths:**
- Lots of space–multiple uses
- Signage on building
- Paved parking

**Current Facility Weakness:**
- Facility needs investment in infrastructure, due to aging (ie. roof).
- Wayfinding

**Possible Improvements:**
- Fascia needs replacement
- Roof needs replacement/upgrades
- ADA compliance
- Facility study for structural integrity, interior layout, ADA, etc for building entrance.
- Add fire sprinkler system.
- Provide comprehensive wayfinding, signage system including new i.d. sign
South Old Kings Road Passive Park

Acreage: 4.22 Acres
Park Type: Passive Park
Overall Rating: Fair

Current Facility Strengths:
• Some Landscaping

Current Facility Weakness:
• Pond Fountain not working
• No improvements

Possible Improvements:
•
South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park (SONC)

Acreage: 6.99 Acres
Park Type: Neighborhood Park
Overall Rating: Good

South Ormond Neighborhood Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center w/ meeting room, gymnasium, kitchen, weight room</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Building</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Sign</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Grill (built-in)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Tennis</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Jogging/Bike Path</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Well organized & pedestrian friendly
- Trees/shade for playground & ballfield viewing
- Aesthetically pleasing building & environment
- Paved parking
- Location

Current Facility Weakness:
- Restrooms in Community Center not ADA compliant
South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park Continuation

Possible Improvements:
- ADA compliant restrooms (inside).
- Repair sun damage at splash pad
- Extend paneling in gym to bottom of roofline.
- Replace exposed roof on dugouts.
- Provide grounds enhancements
- Provide new signage
Vander Park

Acreage: 0.63 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Poor

Current Facility Strengths:
- Bench

Current Facility Weakness:
- No Parking
- Needs Pathway
- Needs Signage
- Landscape was torn up and not replaced

Possible Improvements:
- Pave trail
- Provide new signage
- Grounds improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Board</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waldo O. Berry Senior Heritage Park

Acreage: 0.24 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBQ Grill</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Trail</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (PAL ONLY)</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Facility Strengths:
- Paved Trail
- Landscaping/Trees
- Picnic Tables & Grill

Current Facility Weakness:
- Parking is restricted to PAL only

Possible Improvements:
-
West Ormond Community Park

Acreage: 17.30 Acres
Park Type: Community Park
Overall Rating: Poor

Current Facility Strengths:
• None

Current Facility Weakness:
• Undeveloped

Possible Improvements:
•
West Ormond Wetlands Park

Information Sign

Current Facility Strengths:
• None

Current Facility Weakness:
• Undeveloped

Possible Improvements:
•

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woodmere Park

Acreage: 0.25 Acres
Park Type: Mini Park
Overall Rating: Poor

Current Facility Strengths:
• Entrance Sign

Current Facility Weakness:
• No Signage
• No Benches or landscaping

Possible Improvements:
• Add Signage
• General / Grounds Improvements
Needs Assessment
2.1 Overview

The purpose of a Needs Assessment is to determine the gaps between existing and desired conditions. Each city must determine the appropriate needs assessment techniques and Level-of-Service (LOS) standards required to identify and meet the specific needs of its residents.

The Consultant Team used a "triangulated" approach to identify needs, including various types of anecdotal, quantitative, and qualitative techniques to determine top priorities from different perspectives. Anecdotal techniques were completed in Chapter 1: Context.

Quantitative techniques used for the City of Ormond Beach Needs Assessment included:

1. A statistically-valid survey;
2. An on-line survey;
3. An existing level-of-service analysis; and

Qualitative techniques included:

1. Public meeting;
2. One-on-one interviews; and
3. Focus group meetings.

The project was promoted via various on-line and social media outlets. Collectively, over 1,100 individuals participated in the process.

Findings from each of the needs assessment techniques, as well as a summary of top priority needs, are discussed in this chapter.

Triangulated Mixed-Methods Approach to Identifying Needs & Priorities

- Statistically Valid Survey
- On-line Survey
- Level-Of-Service Analyses
- Benchmarking
- Public Meeting
- One-on-One Interviews
- Focus Group Meetings
- Site Evaluations
- Demographic Analysis

Parks System Needs & Priorities

Anecdotal Analysis Methods

Quantitative Analysis Methods

Qualitative Analysis Methods
2.2 Findings

2.2.1 Statistically-Valid Survey

OVERVIEW

A statistically-valid survey is the most reliable and credible of the needs assessment techniques, as it involves a large, randomly-selected sample of residents. Barth Associates’ sub-consultant ETC Institute mailed a survey packet to a random sample of households in the City of Ormond Beach. Each survey packet contained a cover letter, a copy of the survey, and a postage-paid return envelope. Residents who received the survey were given the option of returning the survey by mail or completing it on-line at www.OrmondBeachSurvey.org.

Ten days after the surveys were mailed, ETC Institute sent emails and placed phone calls to the households that received the survey to encourage participation. The emails contained a link to the on-line version of the survey to make it easy for residents to complete the survey. To prevent people who were not residents of the City of Ormond Beach from participating, everyone who completed the survey on-line was required to enter their home address prior to submitting the survey. ETC Institute then matched the addresses that were entered on-line with the addresses that were originally selected for the random sample. If the address from a survey completed on-line did not match one of the addresses selected for the sample, the on-line survey was not counted.

The goal was to obtain completed surveys from at least 400 residents. The goal was exceeded with a total of 402 residents completing the survey. The overall results for the sample of 402 households have a precision of at least +/-4.8% at the 95% level of confidence. Following is an overview of the summary findings. The complete results can be reviewed in the Appendix.
Benefits of Parks and Recreation

Over half of respondents indicated that the most important benefits that parks and recreation facilities provide the community were: the conservation of natural areas (55.2%) and opportunities for physical exercise (53.7%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of Natural Areas</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Physical Exercise</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space in Communities for Social Interactions/play</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2.2.1a: Benefits of Parks, Recreations and Open Systems**

Facility Usage and Ratings

Eight of ten (83.5%) residents surveyed are satisfied with the parks and recreation facilities provided by the City Parks Department, and 60.2% are satisfied with the programs that are provided by the City of Ormond Beach.

**Figure 2.2.1b: Respondent’s Households Satisfaction Level for Parks and Facilities Provided by City of Ormond Beach**
Residents Currently Use Word Of Mouth, From Friends And Family, To Learn About City Recreational Programs And Activities

Residents Primarily Use Word Of Mouth—From Friends and Neighbors—to Learn About City Recreational Programs and Activities. Over half (56.2%) of residents learn from friends and family about City of Ormond Beach recreational programs and activities.

Figure 2.2.1c: The Ways Respondent’s Households Currently Learn About City of Ormond Beach Recreational Programs and Activities
Most Respondents Agree That Ormond Beach Parks And Recreation Facilities Enhance The Quality of Life for Residents In The Community

Surveyed residents indicated that the recreation resources that would have the greatest impact to the health and well-being of their household would be walking, jogging, or biking trails (68.7%).

Figure 2.2.1d: Top Resources That Respondent’s Households Think Would Have the Greatest Impact to the Health and Well-Being
Facility Needs and Priorities

Respondents were asked to identify if their household had a need for 36 facilities/amenities and rate how well their needs for each were currently being met. Based on this analysis, ETC Institute was able to estimate the number of households in the community that had the greatest “unmet” need for various facilities and amenities. The top four facilities/amenities with the highest percentage of households whose needs are currently being partly and not met are listed below.

1. Off-beach parking – 5,835 households (28.5%)
2. Public Wi-Fi – 5,778 households (28.2%)
3. Paved multi-purpose trails – 5,192 households (25.4%)
4. Outdoor stage/amphitheater – 5,020 households (24.5%)

Figure 2.2.1f: The Top Four Facilities/Amenities with the Highest Percentage of Households Whose Needs are Currently being Partly and Not Met
The estimated number of households that have unmet needs for each of the 36 facilities that were assessed is shown in the figure below.

![Figure 2.2.1g: Estimated Number of Households Whose Needs for Amenities are Being Partly Met or Not Met](image)

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Partly Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-beach parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Wi-Fi</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved multi-purpose trails</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor stage/amphitheater</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking &amp; hiking nature trails</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachfront park</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas/nature parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness center/spa</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pool/aquatics</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pool</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power outlets</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor exercise stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental for private events</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior center</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters/areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s indoor play area</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spraygrounds/splash pads</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/recreation/civic center</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV charging stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor gymnasium/game courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding area</td>
<td></td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/softball fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- Partly Met
- Not Met
Facility Importance

Facility/Amenity Importance. In addition to assessing the needs for each facility and amenity, ETC Institute also evaluated the importance that residents placed on each one. Based on the sum of respondents’ top four choices, the top three most important facilities/amenities to residents were:

1. Walking and hiking nature trails (39.6%),
2. Beachfront park(s) (31.1%), and
3. Natural areas/nature parks (30.1%).

The percentage of residents who selected each amenity/facility as one of their top four choices is depicted in figure below.

Figure 2.2.1h: Amenities that are Most Important to Households
Priorities for Facility Investments

The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) was developed by ETC Institute to provide organizations with an objective tool for evaluating the priority that should be placed on Park and Recreation investments. The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) equally weights

1. The importance that residents place on facilities and
2. How many residents have unmet needs for the facility.

Details regarding the methodology for this analysis are provided in Section 2 of this report. Figure 2.2.1i shows the Priority Investment Rating for each of the 36 facilities/amenities that were assessed on the survey.

Figure 2.2.1i: Top Priorities for Investment for Recreation Facilities Based on the Priority Investment Rating (PIR)
Programming Needs and Priorities

Respondents were asked to identify if their household had a need for 20 programs/activities and rate how well their needs for each were currently being met. Based on this analysis, ETC Institute was able to estimate the number of households in the community that had the greatest “unmet” need for various programs. The three programs with the highest percentage of estimated households whose needs are currently being partly and not met are listed below.

1. Summer concerts – 8,589 households (42.0%)
2. Adult fitness/wellness – 6,721 households (32.8%)
3. Nature programs – 5,192 households (25.4%)

Figure 2.2.1j: Estimated Households with Unmet Recreation Program and Activity Need
Program Importance

In addition to assessing the needs for each program, ETC Institute also assessed the importance that residents place on each program. Based on the sum of respondents’ top four choices, the four most important programs to residents were:

1. Summer concerts (43.2%),
2. Community events (32.5%),
3. Adult fitness/wellness (32.4%), and
4. Nature programs (27.1%)

The percentage of residents who selected each program as one of their top four choices is shown in the figure below.

Figure 2.2.1k: Importance of Various Recreation Programs and Activities to Households
Priorities for Programming Investments

Based on the Priority Investment Rating (PIR), which was described briefly in previous pages, the figure below shows the PIR for each of the 36 programs that were rated.

Figure 2.2.1I: Priority Investment Ratings (PIR) for Programs and Activities Assessed
Level of Support for Potential Actions the City Could Take

Respondents were asked to indicate how supportive they would be of 11 different actions, identified through previous public engagement opportunities, that the City of Ormond Beach could take to improve the Parks and Recreation system. Respondents’ results are shown below:

- Provide safe bicycle & pedestrian facilities throughout City including multi-purpose paths & safe crosswalks: 61% support, 20% neutral, 14% oppose, 4% strongly oppose.
- Upgrade existing parks: 51% support, 28% neutral, 18% oppose, 4% strongly oppose.
- Acquire land for preservation of greenspace, parks, & natural areas: 55% support, 20% neutral, 19% oppose, 6% strongly oppose.
- Continue renovation & Improvements of Historical Centers: 39% support, 32% neutral, 23% oppose, 6% strongly oppose.
- Provide additional beachfront parking: 49% support, 22% neutral, 21% oppose, 9% strongly oppose.
- Acquire more beachfront park land: 47% support, 21% neutral, 22% oppose, 10% strongly oppose.
- Continue renovation & Improvements of Performing Arts & Cultural Centers: 32% support, 34% neutral, 27% oppose, 7% strongly oppose.
- Develop a Multi-Purpose Indoor Community Recreation/Sports Centers: 22% support, 25% neutral, 39% oppose, 14% strongly oppose.
- Develop a Community/Civic/Events Center: 20% support, 27% neutral, 42% oppose, 12% strongly oppose.
- Develop an indoor kid play area, similar to a Discover Zone: 19% support, 20% neutral, 43% oppose, 19% strongly oppose.
- Develop an indoor eSports Arena: 6% support, 13% neutral, 49% oppose, 33% strongly oppose.

Figure 2.2.1m: Level of Support for Actions
Based on the sum of respondents’ choices the two actions that residents would be most willing to fund are:

1. Provide safe bicycle & pedestrian facilities throughout City including multi-purpose paths & safe crosswalks (47.6%),

2. Acquire land for preservation of greenspace, parks, & natural areas (45.2%)

Below are respondents’ results for all actions.

---

Figure 2.2.1n: Level of Support for Actions
Funding of the Parks and Recreation System

Respondents were given $100 to budget among eight different categories of funding. The figure below shows how respondents would allocate the $100 among the eight different categories.

![Park Funding Priorities (By Respondents)](image)

**Figure 2.2.1o: Park Funding Priorities (By Respondents)**

Respondents were also asked to budget what amount would they be willing to pay yearly to fund the types of parks, recreation facilities, and programs that are most important to their household. The figure below shows the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$12 - $60</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$61 - $120</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Willing</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$121 - $180</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$181 - $240</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$241+</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2.1p: Park Funding Priorities (By Respondents)**
Conclusions

To ensure that the City of Ormond Beach continues to meet the needs and expectations of the community, ETC Institute recommends that the Leisure Services Department sustain and/or improve the performance in areas that were identified as “high priorities” by the Priority Investment Rating (PIR). The facilities and programs with the highest PIR ratings are listed below.

Facility Priorities

- Walking and hiking nature trails
- Natural areas/nature parks
- Beachfront park
- Off-beach parking
- Paved multi-purpose trails
- Dog park
- Golf course

Programming Priorities

- Summer concerts
- Community events
- Adult fitness/wellness
- Nature programs
- Performing arts programs
- Adult sports programs
- Senior programs
- Water fitness programs
2.2.2 On-line Survey

The Consultant Team hosted an on-line, 35-question survey from April 12, 2021 through May 28, 2021. A total of 646 people participated in the survey. The survey was based on the statistically-valid survey, to support those results, but had some modifications to accommodate the on-line format. Following are the responses related to parks and recreation.

Location of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Ormond (West of I-95)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland (between I-95 &amp; Intracoastal)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachside (east of the Intracoastal)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Outside City Limits</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2a: Areas Where Respondents Live

Parks and Facilities Visited in Past Two Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames Park</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Romano Beachfront</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Riverbridge Gardens</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace of Speed Park</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassen Park</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park I - Fleming Ave</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park II - Hammock Ln</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park III - Hand Ave</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park IV - Division Ave</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortunato Park</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Community Park</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend Nature Park</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Park</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Gardens</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Casements and the Env. Discovery Center</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ormond Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez Park</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Sports Complex</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2b: Major Parks and Recreation Facilities Operated by the City of Ormond Beach that Respondent’s Households Have Visited During the Past Two Years, Including Before the COVID-19 Pandemic
### Rank of the Parks and Recreation Facilities Visited MOST OFTEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Romano Beachfront Park</td>
<td>Andy Romano Beachfront Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Community Park</td>
<td>Fortunato Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.2.2c: Top TWO(2) Parks and Recreation Facilities that Respondent’s Households Visited MOST OFTEN*

### Mini-parks Visited in Past Two Years

- Firehouse Park: 31%
- Mainstreet Park: 29%
- Lincoln Avenue Park: 25%
- Ormond Shores Mini-Park: 21%
- Ted Porter Mini-Park: 16%
- Huguenot Park: 14%
- Milton W. Pepper Mini-Park: 9%
- Hass Park: 8%
- Waldo Berry Park: 6%
- Vadner Mini-Park: 5%

*Figure 2.2.2d: Mini-Parks Operated By the City of Ormond Beach that Respondent’s Households Have Visited During the Past Two Years, Including Before the COVID-19 Pandemic*
Benefits of Parks and Recreation Facilities that are MOST IMPORTANT

- Opportunities for physical activity/exercise: 66%
- Conservation of Natural Areas: 63%
- Neighborhood/Community open space for social interactions and play (creating sense of community/bringing people together): 56%
- Community character (quality of the built environment, neighborhoods, streetscapes, etc.): 44%
- Community safety: 29%
- Education (arts, culture, science, etc.): 20%
- Economic development (helping the city to be more vibrant, increasing property values, and attracting/retaining business): 18%
- Accessibility/Special Populations benefits: 7%
- Food production education/community gardens: 6%

Figure 2.2.2e: Benefits That Are MOST IMPORTANT to Respondent’s Households

Sufficient Parks and Recreation Facilities within Walking Distance of your Residence

- Yes: 52%
- No: 41%
- Not Sure: 7%

Figure 2.2.2f: Respondent’s Perception of Whether There Are Sufficient Parks and Recreation Facilities within Walking Distance of Residences
Overall Level of Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation Facilities Provided by City of Ormond Beach Parks Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2.2g: Respondent’s Households Satisfaction With the Parks and Recreation Facilities Provided by the City of Ormond Beach**

Current Ways Used to Learn about City of Ormond Beach Recreational Programs and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From friends and neighbors</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary signage</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recreation website</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers at City facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail blasts</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper advertisements</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recreation brochures</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City magazine</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School flyers/newsletter</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations with Community Recreation staff</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable access television</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2.2h: Ways That Respondent’s Households Currently Learn About City of Ormond Beach Recreational Programs and Activities**
Programs Participated in Over the Last FIVE Years

Community Events 63%
Fitness 48%
Youth Sports 38%
Theatre/Performing Arts 37%
Tennis 17%
Other (please specify) 15%
Aquatics 14%
Pickleball 12%
Senior Programs 11%
Painting 11%
Martial Arts 4%
E-Sports 1%

Figure 2.2.2i: Programs Offered in the City of Ormond Beach that Respondent’s Households Have Participated Over the Last FIVE Years

Top Three Resources That Would Have Greatest Impact to the Health and Well-being of the Household

| 1st Choice                                      | Walking, jogging, or biking trails |
| 2nd Choice                                     | A peaceful place to enjoy nature, meditate, or worship |
| 3rd Choice                                     | Programs or events located at parks and recreation facilities |

Figure 2.2.2j: Top THREE Resources That Would Have the Greatest Impact to the Health and Well-Being of Respondent’s Households
Ways Used to Travel to the Parks and Recreation Facilities

- Drive: 95%
- Walk: 56%
- Bike: 48%
- Other Electric Motor Vehicle (e.g., scooter, cart, etc.): 4%
- Public Transportation: 1%

Figure 2.2.2k: Ways That Respondent’s Households Travel to Parks and Recreation Facilities (More than one could be selected)

Level of Satisfaction with Programs Offered by City of Ormond Beach Parks Department

- Satisfied: 41%
- Neutral: 27%
- Very Satisfied: 18%
- Haven’t Used City of Ormond Beach Programs: 8%
- Dissatisfied: 5%
- Very Dissatisfied: 1%

Figure 2.2.2l: Respondent’s Households Satisfaction With the Programs Offered by the City of Ormond Beach
Organizations Other than the City of Ormond Beach that Provide Recreation Programs and Facilities That Respondent’s Use

- Volusia County: 59%
- Private clubs/fitness centers: 41%
- League Sports: 25%
- Local schools/colleges/universities: 24%
- Churches or other religious organizations: 20%
- Non-profit organizations: 20%
- Subdivision Recreation Facilities: 13%
- Other (please specify): 9%
- None of these: 8%

Figure 2.2.2m: Organizations Other Than the City of Ormond Beach that Respondent’s Households Use For Recreation Programs and Facilities

Allocating a $100 Budget for the City of Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department

- Improvements/maintenance of existing parks and recreation facilities: $17.39
- Development of new parks and recreation facilities: $11.22
- Additional recreation activities, classes, and events: $5.86
- Improvements/maintenance of existing walking and biking facilities: $6.58
- Development of new walking and biking facilities: $16.94
- Acquiring more park land: $22.81
- Improvements/maintenance of existing indoor recreation centers: $4.53
- Development of new indoor recreation centers: $4.50

Figure 2.2.2n: How Respondent’s Household Would Allocate $100 for Services Provided by the City of Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department
Reasons that Prevent Households from Using the Parks and Recreation Facilities of the City of Ormond Beach MORE OFTEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues using parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/facilities are too far from our residence</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know where parks are located</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location far from my home</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are not well maintained</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel safe at parks/facilities</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks do not contain facilities or amenities that are appropriate for my family and me</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use private facilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other communities offer recreation facilities that are closer to my home or are higher quality</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks are not easily accessible by walking, biking, or driving</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use facilities offered by surrounding communities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park operating hours are not convenient</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks are not easily accessible to the disabled</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2a: Reasons that Prevent Respondent’s Household From Using the Parks and Recreation Facilities of the City of Ormond MORE OFTEN
Level of Agreement with Three Statements from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree

Ormond Beach parks and recreation facilities enhance the quality of life for residents in the community
- Strongly Agree: 58%
- Agree: 35%
- Neutral: 5%
- Disagree: 1%
- Strongly Disagree: .2%
- Don't Know: .5%

It is important to connect parks and recreation facilities in Ormond Beach
- Strongly Agree: 54%
- Agree: 29%
- Neutral: 12%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly Disagree: .1%
- Don't Know: 1%

Ormond Beach parks and recreation facilities increase property values in the community
- Strongly Agree: 52%
- Agree: 32%
- Neutral: 12%
- Disagree: 2%
- Strongly Disagree: .2%
- Don't Know: .2%

Figure 2.2.2p: Respondent’s Households Level of Agreement with Statements Using a Scale from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.”
## Parks and Recreation Facilities/Amenities Respondents NEED MORE of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and hiking nature trails</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved multi-purpose trails</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas/nature parks</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-beach parking</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Wi-Fi</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachfront Park</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power outlets</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pool/aquatics</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV charging stations</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor stage/amphitheater</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters/areas</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pool</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s indoor play area</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA accessibility</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray grounds/splash pads</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor exercise stations</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental for banquets/receptions/private parties</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s playgrounds</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf course</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness center/spa</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor gymnasium/game courts</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose fields</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Recreation/Civic center</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts facility</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior center</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding area</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball fields</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football fields</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2.2q: Type of Parks and Recreation Facilities that Respondent’s Households Indicated they NEED MORE Of**
Ranking of Facilities/Amenities Respondents NEED MORE of that are MOST IMPORTANT to households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>4th Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks</td>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks</td>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
<td>Fitness/Wellness Programs</td>
<td>Senior Leisure Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks</td>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2r: Top FOUR (4) Facilities/Amenities that are MOST IMPORTANT to Respondent’s Households

Ranking of Facilities/Amenities Respondents NEED MORE of that would be USED MOST if developed by City of Ormond Beach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>4th Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks</td>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks and Dog Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks and Baseball/Softball Fields</td>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks</td>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
<td>Off-Beach Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2s: Facilities/Amenities Respondent’s Households Would USE MOST if they Were Developed by the City of Ormond Beach
Parks and Recreation Activities/Programs Respondents NEED MORE of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Need More Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer concerts</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature programs</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult fitness/wellness</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth summer camps</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth learn to swim programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before and after school programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Crafts programs</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports programs</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sports programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for mentally/physically challenged</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts programs</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior programs</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth art/dance/performing arts classes</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit exercise programs</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special populations programs</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts programs</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Sports</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2u: Top FOUR (4) Activities/Programs that are MOST IMPORTANT to Respondent's Households

Ranking of Activities/Programs Respondents NEED MORE of that are MOST IMPORTANT to households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>4th Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature Programs</td>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
<td>Youth Summer Camps</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Learn to Swim Programs</td>
<td>Youth Summer Camps</td>
<td>Paved Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>Adult Fitness and Wellness Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
<td>Nature Programs</td>
<td>Youth Fitness and Wellness Programs</td>
<td>Arts/Crafts Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2t: Types of Parks and Recreation Activities/Programs Respondent's Households Indicated they NEED MORE Of
Ranking of Activities/Programs Respondents NEED MORE of that would be USED MOST if developed by City of Ormond Beach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Amenity</th>
<th>2nd Amenity</th>
<th>3rd Amenity</th>
<th>4th Amenity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Choice</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
<td>Youth Summer Camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Amenity</td>
<td>Nature Programs and Youth Learn to Swim Programs</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Amenity</td>
<td>Summer Concerts</td>
<td>Nature Programs</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Amenity</td>
<td>Youth Sports Programs</td>
<td>Before and After School Programs</td>
<td>Adult Fitness and Wellness Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2.2v: Top FOUR(4) Activities/Programs that Respondent’s Households Would USE MOST If they were Developed by the City of Ormond Beach

Amount Respondent Would be Willing to Pay Yearly to Fund the Types of Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Programs that are MOST IMPORTANT

- $12 to $60 per year: 85%
- $61 to $120 per year: 65%
- $121 to $180 per year: 35%
- $181 to $240: 22%
- $241 or more per year: 15%
- Would not be willing to pay more: 15%

Figure 2.2.2w: Amount Respondent’s Households Would be Willing to Pay Yearly to Fund the Types of Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Programs that are Most Important To Them
### Level of Agreement with the Following Three Statements from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the City including multi-purpose paths and safe crosswalks</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for the preservation of greenspace, parks, and natural areas</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade existing parks</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire more beachfront park land</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue renovation and improvements of Historical Centers</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional beachfront parking</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Multi-Purpose Indoor Community Recreation/Sports Center</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue renovation and improvements of Performing Arts and Cultural Centers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Community/Civic/Events Center</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an indoor kid play area, similar to a Discover Zone</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an indoor E-Sports Arena</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.2.2x: Actions that the City of Ormond Beach Could Take to Improve the Parks and Recreation System that Respondent’s Households Indicated they Would be VERY SUPPORTIVE, SOMewhat SUPPORTIVE, NOT SURE, or NOT SUPPORTIVE*
### Ranking of Actions that Respondents would be VERY SUPPORTIVE or SOMEWHAT SUPPORTIVE of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Amenity</th>
<th>2nd Amenity</th>
<th>3rd Amenity</th>
<th>4th Amenity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Choice</strong></td>
<td>Acquire land for the preservation of greenspace, parks, and natural areas</td>
<td>Acquire land for the preservation of greenspace, parks, and natural areas</td>
<td>Upgrade existing parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Amenity</strong></td>
<td>Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the City including multi-purpose paths and safe crosswalks</td>
<td>Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the City including multi-purpose paths and safe crosswalks</td>
<td>Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the City including multi-purpose paths and safe crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd Amenity</strong></td>
<td>Upgrade existing parks</td>
<td>Upgrade existing parks</td>
<td>Continue renovation and improvements of Historical Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Amenity</strong></td>
<td>Continue renovation and improvements of Historical Centers</td>
<td>Acquire more beachfront park land</td>
<td>Acquire more beachfront park land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2.2y: Top FOUR(4) Actions That Respondent’s Would Support the Most**
2.2.3 Level-of-Service (LOS) Analysis & Benchmarking

Using the inventory provided by the City, the consultant team analyzed existing LOS for the following elements:

- **Acreage** – Measures acreage in a ratio to the community’s population (acres per 1,000).
- **Facilities** – Measures facility capacity in a ratio to the community’s population.
- **Indoor Recreation Center Square Footage** – Measures the quantity of indoor recreation space in a ratio to the community’s population.
- **Access** – Measures travel distances to parks and individual facilities such as playgrounds, athletic fields, recreation centers, etc.

The Acreage and Facilities LOS were benchmarked to National Recreation Parks Association (NRPA) Park Metrics data and State of Florida Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Following are the findings from this analysis and potential implications for the City’s parks and recreation system. These findings will be further analyzed during the Visioning Workshop.

**ACREAGE LOS**

Acreage LOS is measured by dividing the number of park acres by 1,000 population. Park Acreage LOS was analyzed using the population estimates for the years 2020, 2025, and 2030 included in Section 1.3.1 - Population & Projections and acreage provided by the City. Figure 2.2.3a illustrates the findings from this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acreage LOS</th>
<th>Acreage LOS</th>
<th>Acreage LOS</th>
<th>Acreage LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (2025)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Volusia County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Volusia County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (2025)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Volusia County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2.2.3a: Park Acreage LOS Analysis**

Based on this analysis, the City of Ormond Beach park Acreage LOS in 2020 was 14.4 acres per 1,000 population, over the City’s established target of 13 acres per 1,000. The parks Acreage LOS would decrease to 13.1 acres per 1,000 population by the year 2030.
County-owned park land within the City’s boundary is counted, the park Acreage LOS in 2020 increases to 16.5 acres per 1,000 population. The park acreage LOS would be 14.9 acres per 1,000 population by the year 2030 if no additional park acreage is added to the park system.

Figure 2.2.3b compares these findings to NRPA Park Metrics Benchmark cities with similar populations and population density as the City of Ormond Beach.

Compared to the Median NRPA Benchmark, the City of Ormond Beach park Acreage LOS in 2020, 2025, and 2030 is above in 2020 and 2025 and 0.1 lower in 2030. This suggests that the City of Ormond Beach may have a need to purchase additional park land in the next 10 years.

When County-owned park land within the City boundary is counted towards total provision, the park Acreage LOS in 2020, 2025, 2030 is higher compared to Median NRPA Benchmark. This may suggest that a sum of City-owned park land and County-owned park land that is within the City boundary will be enough in the next 10 years. Based on these two scenarios, the need for additional park land will be discussed within the context of the other needs assessment technique findings during the Visioning phase of the project.

FIGURE 2.2.3b: Acreage LOS Analyses & Benchmarking
FACILITIES LOS

Facilities LOS is measured by dividing the number of residents by the number of parks and recreation facilities. The higher the number, the fewer facilities there are per resident, and the more of a need there may be for that particular recreation facility. The lower the number, the more facilities there are per resident, and the less of a need there may be for that particular recreation facility.

Facilities LOS is also analyzed using the population estimates for the years 2020, 2025, and 2030 included in Section 1.3.1 - Population & Projections and acreage provided by the City. Figure 2.2.3c shows the existing and projected Facilities for the City of Ormond Beach and compares them to NRPA Park Metrics Benchmarks.

Comparing the City of Ormond Beach Facilities LOS to the Median NRPA Park Metrics Benchmarks suggests that the City may be in need of the following facilities between 2020-2030:

- Senior center;
- Nature center;
- Gyms;
- Diamond fields: baseball - youth;
- Diamond fields: softball fields - youth;
- Dog park (managed by the YMCA);
- Playgrounds (by 2030);
- Tot lots; and
- Skate park

Additionally, the following facilities are listed in the NRPA Park Metrics Benchmarks but are currently not provided in the City of Ormond Beach, which may also suggest a need for these facilities:

- Stadiums;
- Arenas;
- Golf Course (18-Holes);
- Rectangular fields: multi-purpose (synthetic); and
- Swimming pools (outdoor only, one is currently provided by the YMCA).
## Facilities

### NRPA Park Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregated Benchmarks</th>
<th>City of Ormond Beach</th>
<th>Lower Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Upper Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Pop. 20k-50k; Dens. 500-1500/sq mi.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities Inventory

#### Indoor Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Lower Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Upper Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,978</td>
<td>11,538</td>
<td>10,063</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>30,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>43,913</td>
<td>46,153</td>
<td>29,005</td>
<td>35,309</td>
<td>40,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Amphitheaters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>43,913</td>
<td>46,153</td>
<td>22,010</td>
<td>28,342</td>
<td>37,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>43,913</td>
<td>46,153</td>
<td>23,233</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>41,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadiums</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,496</td>
<td>21,268</td>
<td>27,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,405</td>
<td>14,136</td>
<td>17,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,891</td>
<td>21,957</td>
<td>23,077</td>
<td>20,235</td>
<td>20,815</td>
<td>31,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outdoor Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Lower Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Upper Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>43,913</td>
<td>46,153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>6,564</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramps - Salt Water</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramps - Fresh Water</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,891</td>
<td>21,957</td>
<td>23,077</td>
<td>19,778</td>
<td>29,318</td>
<td>32,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter/Pavilion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: baseball - youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>6,220</td>
<td>9,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: baseball - adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>9,231</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>10,407</td>
<td>21,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: softball fields - youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td>21,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: softball fields - adult</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>17,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighted Fields</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>43,913</td>
<td>46,153</td>
<td>22,365</td>
<td>28,286</td>
<td>32,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course (18-Holes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,075</td>
<td>39,386</td>
<td>41,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddleball Courts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot lots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>8,848</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>16,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: football field</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>19,856</td>
<td>21,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: multi-purpose (synthetic)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>21,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: soccer field - adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>9,231</td>
<td>10,477</td>
<td>16,860</td>
<td>22,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: soccer field - youth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,969</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>5,384</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
<td>43,913</td>
<td>46,153</td>
<td>24,220</td>
<td>28,308</td>
<td>40,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pad / Water Feature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools (outdoor only)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,268</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>28,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts (outdoor only)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td>14,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts (outdoor only)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Path/Trail/Track. 1 Mile</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>24,105</td>
<td>25,334</td>
<td>26,627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIGURE 2.2.3c: City Facilities LOS Analysis & Benchmarking**
In addition to City-owned facilities, there are several County-owned facilities within the City’s boundary. Figure 2.3.2d shows the existing and projected Facilities LOS of combined City and County facilities.

Comparing these Facilities LOS to the Median NRPA Park Metrics Benchmarks suggests that the City may be in need of the following facilities between the years 2020 and 2030:

- Senior center;
- Nature center;
- Gym;
- Diamond fields: baseball – youth;
- Diamond fields: softball fields – youth;
- Dog park (currently managed by the YMCA);
- Tot lots; and
- Skate Park.

Additionally, the following facilities are listed in the NRPA Park Metrics Benchmarks but are currently not provided in the City of Ormond Beach by the County or the City, which may also suggest a need for these facilities:

- Stadiums;
- Arenas;
- Golf Course (18-Holes);
- Rectangular fields: multi-purpose (synthetic); and
- Swimming pools (outdoor only, one is currently provided by the YMCA).
## NRPA Park Metrics

### City of Ormond Beach and County of Volusia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>NRPA Park Metrics</th>
<th>Aggregated Benchmarks (Pop. 20k-50k; Dens. 500-1500/sq mi.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Amphitheaters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadiums</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramps - Salt Water</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramps - Fresh Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter/Pavilion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: baseball - youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: baseball - adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: softball fields - youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond fields: softball fields - adult</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighted Fields</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course (18-Holes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddleball Courts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot lots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: football field</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: multi-purpose (synthetic)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: soccer field - adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular fields: soccer field - youth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pad / Water Feature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools (outdoor only)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts (outdoor only)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts (outdoor only)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Path/Trail/Track. 1 Mile</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>4,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2.2.3d: City and County Facilities LOS Analysis & Benchmarking**
Figure 2.3.2e below benchmarks the City’s outdoor facilities to the available Florida Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) Facilities LOS for agencies in Florida’s Central East Region.

This analysis suggests that compared to SCORP Benchmarks, the City of Ormond Beach may be in need of the following facilities:

- Freshwater Boat Ramps, and
- Outdoor swimming pools.

### Table: City Facilities LOS Analyses Benchmarked to SCORP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Central East Region LOS x/1,000 residents (2025)</th>
<th># City Facilities</th>
<th>City (Need) / Surplus to Meet Central East Region LOS by 2020</th>
<th>City (Need) / Surplus to Meet Central East Region LOS by 2025</th>
<th>City (Need) / Surplus to Meet Central East Region LOS by 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Beach Activities (Linear Feet of Beach)</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>19,113</td>
<td>18,257</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>18,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Non-Boat Fishing (Linear Feet of Pier)</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Boat Ramp Lanes</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater Boat Ramps</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Trails (Biking)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball fields</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football fields</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This analysis suggests that compared to SCORP Benchmarks, when considering County facilities, the City of Ormond Beach may still be in need of the following facilities:

- Freshwater Boat Ramps, and
- Outdoor swimming pools.
INDOOR RECREATION CENTER SPACE LOS

Indoor Recreation Center Space LOS is measured by dividing the amount of indoor recreation center square footage available to residents by the number of residents in the City. Industry guidelines suggest that communities with high quality indoor recreation services should have between 1.5 to 2.0 square feet of interior recreation center space per resident.

Figure 2.2.3g illustrates the findings from this analysis considering the City of Ormond Beach’s 2020, 2025, and 2030 populations.

The City of Ormond Beach currently has approximately 77,557 square feet of indoor recreation center space. This equates to approximately 1.86 square feet of indoor space per resident in 2020, 1.77 sf in 2025, and 1.68 sf in 2030.

Based on this analysis, it appears that the City has been meeting and will continue to meet the minimum industry target of 1.5 square feet of indoor recreation center space per resident from 2020 to 2030.

To achieve 2.0 square feet of indoor recreation center space per resident, the City would need to expand its indoor facilities to approximately 92,306 square feet by the year 2030, equating to an additional 14,749 square feet.
Figure 2.2.3h combines City and County indoor recreation center space, which totals 78,845 sf.

Adding County facilities slightly increases the Indoor Square Footage LOS. Still, to meet the higher end of the industry target of 2.0 square feet per resident, an additional 13,461 square feet of indoor recreation space would need to be created, even when County facilities are counted, by the year 2030.

**ACCESS LOS**

Access LOS measures the distance residents have to travel to access parks and recreation facilities. It is used to understand how park access varies between different neighborhoods in a city. The distance used in the calculation of LOS is important; for example, should a City aim for all residents to have a park within 1 mile of their homes, within ½ mile, or even less?

Informed by industry best practices, the following distances were used to analyze Access LOS for the City’s park system and key recreation facilities:

- All City and County Parks – ½ mile, ¾ mile, 1 mile;
- All City Parks – ½ mile, ¾ mile, 1 mile;
- Baseball/Softball – 2 mile, 3 miles, 5 miles;
- Basketball Court – 1 mile, 2 miles, 3 miles;
- Boat Ramp – 2 mile, 3 miles, 5 miles;
- Community Centers – 2 mile, 3 miles, 5 miles;
- Cultural Centers – 2 mile, 3 miles, 5 miles;
- Playgrounds – ½ mile, ¾ mile, 1 mile;
- Football and Soccer Fields – 2 mile, 3 miles, 5 miles; and
- Tennis Courts – 1 mile, 2 miles, 3 miles.
Figures 2.2.3j - 2.2.3t provide the results from this mapping analysis while Figure 2.2.3i provides a summary of these findings.

Specifically, the summary suggests that while overall, the City may have a need for additional parks, the degree of need may be less based on the Access LOS Analysis distance used. The appropriate Access LOS distance that the City should establish will be further discussed in the Visioning phase of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type Analyzed</th>
<th>½ Mile</th>
<th>¾ Mile</th>
<th>1 Mile</th>
<th>2 Mile</th>
<th>3 Miles</th>
<th>5 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All City and County Parks</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All City Parks</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball and Softball</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer and Football</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O Partial Access  + Full Access

**FIGURE 2.2.3i: Access LOS Analysis Summary**
FIGURE 2.2.3j: All City and County Parks Access LOS Analysis - 1/2 mile, 3/4 mile, 1 mile

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.
FIGURE 2.2.3k: All City Parks Access LOS Analysis - 1/2 mile, 3/4 mile, 1 mile

*Note: Property was operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.
FIGURE 2.2.3I: Baseball/Softball Access LOS Analysis - 2 miles, 3 mile, 5 miles
FIGURE 2.2.3m: Basketball Court Access LOS Analysis - 1 mile, 2 miles, 3 miles
FIGURE 2.2.3n: Boat Ramp Access LOS Analysis - 2 mile, 3 miles, 5 miles
FIGURE 2.2.3o: Community Center Access LOS Analysis - 2 miles, 3 miles, 5 miles

COMMUNITY CENTERS
Level-of-Service Parameters

- 2-Mile LOS
- 3-Mile LOS
- 5-Mile LOS

LEGEND
- City Limits
- Roads
- City Parks
- County Parks
- State Parks
- Conservation Parcels
- Golf Course
- Residential
- Non-Residential
- Creeks, Storms, and Water Bodies
- Blueway
- MultiUse Trail
- Hiking Trail
- Trailhead
- Boat Launch
- Future Trails

CITY PARKS
1. Andy Park
2. Arroyo Fountain Park
3. Arroyo Oaks Mini Park
4. Arroyo Parkway Passive Park
5. Bayley Riverbridge Gardens
6. Birthplace of Speed Park
7. Cassen Park
8. Central Park I
9. Central Park II
10. Central Park III
11. Central Park IV including
   Environmental Discovery Center
12. Division Avenue Passive Park
13. Firehouse Park
14. Fortunato Park
15. Haas Park
16. Hospital Gardens Mini Park
17. Huguenot Park
18. Indian Mound Park
19. Lakebridge Drive Passive Park
20. Lincoln Ave Park
21. Main Street Park
22. Milton Pepper Park
23. Northside Park
24. Nova Community Park
25. Nova Road Passive Park - North
26. Nova Road Passive Park - South
27. Optimist Park
28. Ormond Beach Lions Park
29. Ormond Beach Middle School Park
30. Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center
31. Ormond Beach Senior Center
32. Ormond Beach Sports Complex
33. Ormond Memorial Art Museum & Gardens
34. Ormond Parkway Park
35. Ormond Shores Park
36. Ossola Elementary School Park
37. Plaza Grande Park
38. Riverbend Nature Park
39. Riveria Park
40. Rockefeller Gardens
41. Riverwood Avenue Mini-Park
42. Sanchez Park
43. Santa Luca Park
44. South Old Kings Road Passive Park
45. South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park
46. The Casements
47. Vander Park
48. Waldo D Berry Senior Heritage Park
49. West Ormond Community Park
50. West Ormond Wetlands Park
51. Woodruffe Park

COUNTY PARKS
1. All Wekks Sr North Shore Park
2. Briggs Drive Fishing Dock
3. Cool Breeze Park
4. Michael Cratty Bicentennial Park
5. Rio-Ocean Drive Fishing Dock
6. Robert Strickland Park
7. Roberts Drive Fishing Dock
8. San John Fishing Dock
9. Seabridge Riverfront Park
10. Sunsplash Park
11. Tom Renick Park
12. Tomoka Boat Ramp
Introduction

FIGURE 2.2.3: Cultural Centers Access LOS Analysis - 2 miles, 3 miles, 5 miles

CITY PARKS
1. Andy Romano Beachfront Park
2. Arroyo Fountain Park
3. Arroyo Oaks Mini Park
4. Arroyo Parkway Passive Park
5. Balboa Riverbridge Gardens
6. Birthplace of Speed Park
7. Cassen Park
8. Central Park I
9. Central Park II
10. Central Park III
11. Central Park IV Including Environmental Discovery Center
12. Division Avenue Passive Park
13. Firehouse Park
14. Fortunato Park
15. Haas Park
16. Hospital Gardens Mini Park
17. Huguenot Park
18. Indian Mound Park
19. Lakesbridge Drive Passive Park
20. Lincoln Ave Park
21. Main Street Park
22. Millie Pepper Park
23. Neptune Park
24. Nova Community Park
25. Nova Road Passive Park - North
26. Nova Road Passive Park - South
27. Optimist Park
28. Ormond Beach Lions Park
29. Ormond Beach Middle School Park
30. Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center
31. Ormond Beach Senior Center
32. Ormond Beach Teen Center & Complex
33. Ormond Memorial Art Museum & Gardens
34. Ormond Park
35. Ormond Seabreeze Park
36. Ormond Elementary School Park
37. Ormond Park
38. Riverbend Nature Park
39. Riviera Park
40. Rockefeller Gardens
41. Riverwood Avenue Mini Park
42. Sanchez Park
43. Santa Luca Park
44. South Old Kings Road Passive Park
45. South Ormond Neighborhood Center III
46. Ted Potter Park
47. The Casements
48. Vander Park
49. Waldo O Berry Senior Heritage Park
50. West Ormond Community Park
51. West Ormond Wetlands Park
52. Woodmore Park

FIGURE 2.2.3p: Cultural Centers Access LOS Analysis - 2 miles, 3 miles, 5 miles
FIGURE 2.2.3q: Playgrounds Access LOS Analysis - 1/2 mile, 3/4 mile, 1 mile

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.
FIGURE 2.2.3r: Football and Soccer Fields Access LOS Analysis - 2 miles, 3 miles, 5 miles
FIGURE 2.2.3s: Tennis Court Access LOS Analysis - 1 mile, 2 miles, 3 miles

CITY PARKS
1. Andy Roman Park
2. Arroyo Park
3. Arroyo Fountain Park
4. Arroyo Oaks Mini Park
5. Arroyo Parkway Passive Park
6. Balboa Riverfront Gardens
7. Belcher's Birthplace of Speed Park
8. Cassion Park
9. Central Park I
10. Central Park II
11. Central Park III
12. Central Park IV Including
    Environmental Discovery Center
13. Division Avenue Passive Park
14. Firehouse Park
15. Fortunato Park
16. Haas Park
17. Hospital Gardens Mini Park
18. Huntington Park
19. Indian Mound Park
20. Lakebridge Drive Passive Park
21. Lincoln Ave Park
22. Main Street Park
23. Milton Pepper Park
24. Neptune Park
25. Nova Community Park
26. Nova Road Passive Park - North
27. Nova Road Passive Park - South
28. Optimist Park
29. Ormond Beach Lions Park
30. Ormond Beach Middle School Park
31. Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center
32. Ormond Beach Senior Center
33. Ormond Beach Sports Complex
34. Ormond Memorial Art
    Museum & Gardens
35. Ormond Parkway Park
36. Ormond Shores Park
37. Osceola Elementary School Park
38. Orange Avenue Park
39. Riverbend Nature Park
40. Riviera Park
41. Rockefeller Gardens
42. Roosevelt Avenue Mini Park
43. Sanchez Park
44. Santa Lucie Park
45. South Old Kings Road Passive Park
46. South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park
47. Tree Top Park
48. The Casements
49. Vander Park
50. Waldo O Berry Senior Heritage Park
51. West Ormond Community Park
52. West Ormond Wetlands Park
53. Woodruff Park

COUNTY PARKS
1. At Weeks Sr North Shore Park
2. Briggs Drive Fishing Deck
3. Court Street Park
4. Michael Crafty Bicentennial Park
5. Rio-Ocean Drive Fishing Dock
6. Robert Strickland Park
7. Roberta Drive Fishing Dock
8. San Jose Fishing Dock
9. Seabridge Riverfront Park
10. Sunsplash Park
11. Tom Renick Park
12. Tomoka Boat Ramp

Parks and Recreation Master Plan

LEGEND
- City Limits
- Roads
- City Parks
- County Parks
- State Parks
- Conservation Parcels
- Golf Course
- Residential
- Non-Residential
- Creeks, Streams, and Water Bodies
- Blueway
- MultiUse Trail
- Hiking Trail
- Trailhead
- Canoe Launch
- Future Trails

TENNIS COURTS
Level of Service Parameters
- 1-Mile LOS
- 2-Mile LOS
- 3-Mile LOS

Barth Associates
Prepared for
Ormond Beach Parks & Recreation
Ormond Beach, Florida

FIGURE 2.2.3s: Tennis Court Access LOS Analysis - 1 mile, 2 miles, 3 miles
2.2.4 Public Meeting

To solicit input from residents and key stakeholders regarding needs and priorities for the City of Ormond Beach park system, one public meeting was held on Wednesday, May 31, 2021 at the South Ormond Neighborhood Center. Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, participants had the option to take part in the meeting in-person or virtually via computer or smart phone. All participants were asked the same questions, and all could respond simultaneously. In total, 78 people took part.

Following are results regarding people’s opinions about facilities and programs offered.

FACILITIES

Participants were asked:

“How often have you visited parks and recreation facilities in the City of Ormond Beach in the past two years, including before the COVID-19 pandemic?”

Respondents were frequent visitors to park facilities: 41% went daily, and 39% went weekly.

“What 3 parks do you visit most often?

The word-cloud generated from responses highlighted the most popular parks among participants: Central Park, Andy Romano, Fortunata, Casements, and Cassen.
“How satisfied are you with the parks and recreation facilities provided by the City of Ormond Beach Parks Department?”

Over three-quarters of respondents (77%) were very satisfied or satisfied with the City’s park facilities.

“How satisfied are you with the parks and recreation facilities provided by the City of Ormond Beach Parks Department?”

Participants largely had “other” reasons for not frequenting the City’s park facilities more often besides access, maintenance, and lack of things to do in parks.

“What prevents you from using the parks and recreation facilities of the City of Ormond MORE OFTEN?”

Participants largely had “other” reasons for not frequenting the City’s park facilities more often besides access, maintenance, and lack of things to do in parks.
“Select the FACILITY TYPES that you believe are IMPORTANT, but NOT ADEQUATELY provided by the City. Select ALL that apply.”

Public meeting participants were presented with a range of park facility types and asked which ones are lacking that they would like more of. The top 10 facilities were:

1. Walking and Hiking Nature Trails (62%)
2. Paved Multi-purpose Trails (59%)
3. Natural Areas/Nature Parks (53%)
4. Rental for Banquets/Receptions/Private Parties (49%)
5. Public Wi-Fi (47%)
6. Outdoor Stage/Amphitheater (46%)
7. Picnic Shelters/Areas (45%)
8. Golf Course (41%)
9. Beachfront Park (38%)
10. Off-beach Parking (37%)
Participants were asked:

“Select the PROGRAM TYPES that you believe are IMPORTANT, but NOT ADEQUATELY provided by the City. Select ALL that apply.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-sports</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sports</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public meeting participants were presented with a range of program types and asked which ones are lacking that they would like more of. The top 5 programs were:

1. Community Events (45%)
2. Special Events (44%)
3. Theater/Performing Arts (31%)
4. Fitness (31%)
5. Aquatics (27%)
6. Pickleball (24%)
WILLINGNESS TO HELP FUND

Finally, participants were asked:

“How willing are you to pay additional taxes to fund the type of parks, recreation facilities, and programs that are most important to you and your household?”

Three-quarters of participants (75%) were very willing or willing to pay additional taxes to help fund parks and recreation facility and program improvements that are important to their households.

“How satisfied are you with the programs offered by the City of Ormond Beach?”

The majority of participants (61%) were very satisfied or satisfied with program offerings; almost a quarter were neutral, perhaps signifying lack of participation.
2.2.5 Joint Board Meeting

The City of Ormond Beach utilizes several advisory boards to solicit input from citizens and assist the work of the City Commission. Two boards are particularly engaged with this parks master planning process and have combined for this purpose to form a Joint Board. The Joint Board is comprised of:

- **Leisure Services Advisory Board**, established to foster cooperation and to provide assistance and recommendations to the City Commission in reference to all facets of recreation and recreational facilities for the City. The board is comprised of 13 volunteer members - five appointed by the City Commission, and an additional eight nominated by each of the following: Girls’ Softball Association; Gymnastics Association; Pop Warner Football Association; Ormond Beach PRIDE; Youth Baseball Association; Youth Basketball Association; Youth Soccer Association; and Ormond Beach Friends of Recreation.

- **Quality of Life Advisory Board**, consisting of seven members appointed by the City Commission, is responsible for the development of a community-wide consensus as to the relative need, priority and funding for the City’s programs in the areas of economic opportunity, educational and learning opportunities, and environmental and aesthetic standards for the City. In addition, the Board advises the City Commission on methods to preserve and vitalize property and prevent deterioration in the central business district.
A hybrid in-person/virtual meeting was convened to gain insight into the Joint Board’s priorities in regards to facilities and programs on Thursday, April 1, 2021. Twenty-two Joint Board members and City Leadership participated. Participants were asked the same questions as during the public meeting. Results are as follows.

FACILITIES

Joint Board members were asked:

“How often have you visited parks and recreation facilities in the City of Ormond Beach in the past two years, including before the COVID-19 pandemic?”

**“What 3 parks do you visit most often?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per week</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times per year</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were frequent visitors to park facilities: 45% went daily, and 30% went weekly.

The word-cloud generated from responses highlighted the most popular parks among participants: Central Park, Cassen, and Nova.
“How satisfied are you with the parks and recreation facilities provided by the City of Ormond Beach Parks Department?”

Joint Board members were overwhelmingly satisfied with park facilities, with 90% being very satisfied or satisfied.

“What prevents you from using the parks and recreation facilities of the City of Ormond MORE OFTEN?”

More than half of participants had “other” reasons for not frequenting the City’s park facilities more often besides maintenance and lack of things to do in parks, although 20% felt that parks were too far away for more regular use.
“Select the FACILITY TYPES that you believe are IMPORTANT, but NOT ADEQUATELY provided by the City. Select ALL that apply.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community/Recreation/Civic Center</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-beach Parking</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental for Banquets/Receptions/Private Parties</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor State/Amphitheater</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachfront Park</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Multi-purpose Trail</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Gymnasium/Game Courts</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Wi-Fi</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters/Areas</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas/Nature Parks</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool/Aquatics</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Exercise Stations</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Fields</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV Charging Station</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Course</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Playgrounds</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Indoor Play Area</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball Fields</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center/Spa</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Facility</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Outlets</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Grounds/Splash Pads</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Basketball Courts</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Parks</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding Area</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Hiking Nature Trails</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Board participants were presented with a range of park facility types and asked which ones are lacking that they would like more of. The top 5 facilities (including tying votes) were:

1. Community/Recreation/Civic Center (32%)
2. Off-beach Parking (32%)
3. Rental for Banquets/Receptions/Private Parties (27%)
4. Outdoor Stage/Amphitheater (27%)
5. Pickleball Courts (27%)
5. Beachfront Park (27%)
5. Paved Multi-purpose Trails (27%)
5. Indoor Gymnasium/Game Courts (23%)
4. Public Wi-Fi (18%)
4. Golf Course (18%)
4. Volleyball Courts (18%)
4. Community Gardens (18%)
4. Picnic Shelters/Areas (18%)
4. Natural Areas/Nature Parks (18%)
4. Outdoor Pool/Aquatics (18%)
5. Indoor Pool (14%)
5. Outdoor Exercise Stations (14%)
5. Multi-purpose Fields (14%)
5. Football Fields (14%)
5. EV Charging Stations (14%)
5. Disco Golf Course (14%)
5. Children’s Playgrounds (14%)
5. Baseball/Softball Fields (14%)
5. ADA Accessibility (14%)
5. Fitness Center/Spa (14%)
5. Performing Arts Facility (14%)
PROGRAMS

Joint Board members were asked:

“Select the PROGRAM TYPES that you believe are IMPORTANT, but NOT ADEQUATELY provided by the City. Select ALL that apply.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Sports</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sports</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Board meeting participants were presented with a range of program types and asked which ones are lacking that they would like more of. The top 5 programs were:

1. Special Events (55%)
2. Pickleball (50%)
3. Community Events (45%)
4. Theater/Performing Arts (27%)
4. E-sports (27%)
4. Fitness (27%)
5. Martial Arts (18%)
5. Aquatics (18%)
“How satisfied are you with the programs offered by the City of Ormond Beach?”

The majority of participants (86%) were very satisfied or satisfied with program offerings; no Joint Board members reported dissatisfaction.

WILLINGNESS TO HELP FUND

Finally, participants were asked:

“How willing are you to pay additional taxes to fund the type of parks, recreation facilities, and programs that are most important to you and your household?”

Joint Board members were overwhelmingly very willing (48%) or willing (43%) to pay additional taxes to help fund parks and recreation facility and program improvements that are important to their households.
2.2.6 Interviews & Focus Groups

Interviews were conducted with the following to ascertain needs and priorities for the parks and recreation system:

- City of Ormond Beach Mayor & City Commissioners;
- Joint Board Members; and
- Other key stakeholders in the community.

In total, the Consultant Team met and spoke with 43 people. Following are priorities identified by each group.

**CITY MAYOR & COMMISSIONERS**

The Consultant Team interviewed Mayor Bill Partington and City Commissioners during the week of March 22nd, 2020. Their stated top priority parks and recreation needs were:

- Upgrading sports facilities and adding a new gym;
- Keeping up with recreation trends, including provision of adequate pickleball facilities;
- Addition of a multi-purpose open space;
- Adding “another” Andy Romano Beachfront Park;
- Saving green space;
- Specific park improvements, including:
  - Granada Bridge enhancement and expanding “four corners” to include coffee, snack stand;
  - Water taxis to Cassen Park/restaurants;
- Providing adequate recreation opportunities in West Ormond, including a community center; and
- Overall, improving public safety, health, and quality of life through the parks and recreation system.
JOINT BOARD MEMBERS

Thirteen Joint Board Members were also interviewed during the week of March 22nd, 2020. Top priority parks and recreation needs are listed below; the number in parentheses indicates the number of times the need was identified:

- Need for improvements to and maintenance of existing parks and facilities to ensure high quality experiences. Ormond Beach Sports Complex was noted in particular to have drainage issues on the fields and be in need of stadium improvements (4);
- Parks and recreation facilities in West Ormond (2);
- Improve the performing arts center (2);
- A gymnasium/multi-purpose indoor center (2);
- A civic center/place for formal events (2);
- Safe bicycle paths/trails through city (2);
- Additional amenities in parks - restrooms in particular (2);
- Expansion of Cassen Park, possibly with a restaurant (2); and
- Pickleball courts (2).

STAKEHOLDERS & FOCUS GROUPS

Interviews were conducted with the following key focus groups:

- Community Development Block Grant;
- Ormond Main Street;
- Ormond Chamber of Commerce;
- Historical Society;
- Ormond Art Museum;
- EDC/Community Gardens;
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee; and
- Volunteer Committees.

Top priority parks and recreation needs are listed below; the number in parentheses indicates the number of times the need was identified:

- More connected walking, biking, and multi-use trails (7);
- Improved safety (improvement of pedestrian crosswalks, widening trails, lighting) (3);
- Improved marketing/communication to make people aware of current programming/facilities (3);
- Increase in accessible natural areas (2); and
- Greater accessibility - in terms of transit to facilities (1) and for people with disabilities (1).
2.2.7 Trends

AGE-FRIENDLY COMMUNITIES

Communities throughout the US are recognizing the benefits of developing age-friendly communities. The World Health Organization (WHO) states that "age-friendly environments foster health and well-being and the participation of people as they age. They are accessible, equitable, inclusive, safe and secure, and supportive. They promote health and prevent or delay the onset of disease and functional decline. They provide people-centered services and support to enable recovery or to compensate for the loss of function so that people can continue to do the things that are important to them" (http://www.who.int/aging/projects/age-friendlyenvironments/en/).

The American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) Network of Age-Friendly Communities targets eight “domains of livability,” including:

1. Outdoor spaces and buildings: availability of safe and accessible recreational facilities
2. Transportation: Safe and affordable modes of private and public transit
3. Housing: Range of housing options for older residents, the ability to age in place and home modification programs
4. Social participation: Access for older adults to leisure and cultural activities, and opportunities for social and civic engagement with both peers and younger people
5. Respect and social inclusion:

John Crompton at Texas A & M notes that “seniors are moving from being a relatively small fringe group to being a large central focus” of parks and recreation service.

“Five changes in the status of seniors suggest that recreation and park departments should...move them to the center of their service efforts: extension of active retirement time, enhanced discretionary income, contributions to economic development, enhanced leisure literacy and disproportionate political influence.”

Programs to promote ethnic and cultural diversity, as well as multi-generational interaction and dialogue

6. Civic participation and employment: Paid work and volunteer activities for older adults, and opportunities to engage in the creation of policies relevant to their lives

7. Communication and information: Access to technology that helps older people connect with their community, friends and family

8. Community support and health services: Access to home care services, health clinics and programs that promote wellness and active aging

This trend has direct implications for communities in the
Southeastern United States. Seniors are living longer and staying more active than ever before, requiring recreational facilities and activities such as pickleball courts and fitness classes. They also desire better multi-modal access to parks and recreation centers, particularly by bike or transit. They have more free time and are better connected than previous generations, and want to be kept informed via social media and the internet.

**IMPROVED CONNECTIVITY**

A trend directly related to Age-Friendly Communities is improved connectivity. Historically, many suburban communities like The City of Ormond Beach emphasized winding streets and cul-de-sacs rather than interconnected streets and sidewalks. Instead of an interconnected street and sidewalk network, wide 4-6 lane collector and arterial roads were built to accommodate automobile traffic with little regard to pedestrian or bicycle connectivity. Auto-dependent, congested communities were the result.

Trends such as Smart Growth, New Urbanism, and Complete Streets have been developed over the past two decades to try to reverse the suburban development patterns and improve connectivity. State Departments of Transportation, once leading proponents of just “moving cars”, now promote “complete streets”. Smart Growth America notes:

Complete Streets are streets for everyone. They are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities. Complete Streets make it easy to cross the street, walk to shops, and bicycle to work. They allow buses to run on time and make it safe for people to walk to and from train stations.

**FIGURE 2.2.7a: Complete Streets Diagram**
There is no singular design prescription for Complete Streets; each one is unique and responds to its community context. A complete street may include: sidewalks, bike lanes (or wide paved shoulders), special bus lanes, comfortable and accessible public transportation stops, frequent and safe crossing opportunities, median islands, accessible pedestrian signals, curb extensions, narrower travel lanes, roundabouts, and more.

This trend also has direct implications for the City of Ormond Beach Parks and Recreation Master Plan; residents ranked walking and biking trails as one of their top parks and recreation priority. This is consistent with findings from other needs assessments in communities throughout the United States.

ACCESS TO NATURE

Nationally, there is a desire for closer connection with nature in response to higher population densities, increasing congestion, and loss of environmental lands. In fact, during the COVID-19 Pandemic, now more than ever, park agencies across the country are seeing increased park use and an increased desire for residents to be out in nature.

Richard Louv notes in Last Child in the Woods that adults are the predominant users of natural lands, and that today’s youth are losing any sense of connection with nature: “in the space of a century, the American experience of nature [...] has gone from direct utilitarianism to romantic attachment to electronic detachment.” In response he calls for a new back-to-the-land movement, including green cities and towns “that, by their very design, reconnect both adults and children to nature.”

Numerous researchers and authors have noted the increasing lack of connection between Americans and the natural environment, and the need to make conservation more relevant to the citizens who must fund and support it. In an April 2014 interview with the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Dan Ashe stated that “building a connected conservation
constituency is a priority for the entire Service. This is grounded in the notion that we have to make conservation relevant to all American citizens, people who are becoming increasingly urban and increasingly disconnected from nature and wildlife. We have been trying to achieve this for years, and in my mind, it has been largely unsuccessful. Connecting to a new generation of Americans is vital. It is a vision that respects diversity and engages people in conservation stewardship. And there are abundant opportunities for cooperation to do this in city parks, local parks and state parks. We understand that much of this effort needs to be local.”

In order to reconnect residents to natural areas – and maintain their support for public spending- public agencies need to focus on creating quality outdoor experiences for all age groups. For kids, this may mean programs and activities that allow them the freedom to run around, have fun, explore, and get dirty. For adults, it may mean a greater focus on safety and security, clean facilities (e.g. restrooms), and interesting educational and fitness programs. Ease of access is important to all users, as studies show that closer proximity equates to higher levels of use.

**SPORTS TOURISM AND TRAVEL BALL**

Traditionally, local communities such as the City of Ormond Beach have focused on providing ball fields for youth/adult recreational league practice and games. Coaching and training were provided by parents and other volunteers, with a focus on sportsmanship, fundamental skills, safety, and life lessons. The most talented and competitive kids graduated to middle school and high school athletics programs.

With the advent of highly competitive, regional travel teams over the past two decades, participation in recreational leagues has declined. According to a national study by the Sports Fitness Industry Association, “participation among kids ages 6-to-17 has declined more than 9 percent in the last five years.” Meanwhile “with the best coaching, training and competition, the number of families shifting from community rec leagues to traveling
teams has soared — bringing the cost and time commitment up with it."

Rebecca Davis, executive director of the Atlanta-based Youth Amateur Travel Sports Association, notes that the “days of rec ball and local Little League, or just going to the park and playing ball — those days are nonexistent. They’re gone. Now, it’s all about travel.” Some teams, especially in warm climates, play nearly year-round, competing in as many as 120 games per year, more than most minor league players.

This shift from recreation to competition athletics has created the following dilemma for public agencies such as the City of Ormond Beach:

- Travel teams often have much higher expectations for field quality, as they travel and compete regionally. They also require multi-field venues for weekend tournaments. Typical needs include high quality natural or artificial turf fields; night lighting; concession/scorekeeper buildings; air-conditioned meeting space; and ample parking for multiple teams and spectators.
- Participants in travel teams may not be residents of the city or county providing the sports fields
- Travel programs often charge players more than recreational leagues, and many hire professional managers and coaches. Some families cannot afford to enroll their children in travel programs without financial assistance
- Travel teams do not typically own or maintain athletics fields or complexes. Instead, they rely on local governments to build and maintain these facilities. However, user/association fees only cover a fraction of the costs of construction, operations, and maintenance. Tax revenues collected from hotels and restaurants during tournaments or special events are not allocated directly to parks and recreation departments to offset the costs of the sports facilities, and are rarely significant enough to provide any meaningful return-on-investment.

As the City considers the appropriate response to the needs for athletics facilities, such as those identified by the Sports Group, it will be important to consider whose needs the City desires to serve.

**PLACEMAKING, HIGH PERFORMANCE PUBLIC SPACES**

Some of the City of Ormond Beach’s parks may have been developed within the “Recreation Era” between 1930 and 1965, characterized by architectural historian Galen Cranz as emphasizing basic, universal facilities to meet the increased demand for recreation, such as playgrounds, ball fields, and picnic shelters. According to Cranz, this era was epitomized by “the park bench and the cyclone fence.” While developed in later years, many of the City’s parks exhibit these same characteristics.

In 2004, Cranz and Boland identified a new trend in parks and recreation design, the ‘Sustainable Park,’ that responds to the need for communities to become more ecologically and socially sustainable. Characteristics of Sustainable Parks include self-sufficiency of resources
and maintenance; solving larger urban problems outside of park boundaries; and adopting new standards for aesthetics and landscape management (Cranz & Boland, 2004).

This trend is not limited to just “signature” parks, as communities are becoming more aware of the need to design all parks, preserves and recreation facilities as great public spaces.

The Project for Public Spaces, a recognized leader in placemaking, proposes nine strategies to help parks achieve their full potential as great places:

1. Use transit as a catalyst for attracting visitors
2. Make management of the park a central concern
3. Develop strategies to attract people during different seasons
4. Acquire diverse funding sources
5. Design the park layout for flexibility
6. Consider both the “inner park” and “outer park”
7. Provide amenities for the different groups of people using the park
8. Create attractions and destinations throughout the park
9. Create an identity and image for the park

The PPS chart in Figure 2.2.7b shows the four key attributes of great places (center circle); characteristics of each attribute; and metrics or indicators of success as a public space.

Building on PPS placemaking criteria and Cranz’ sustainable park concept of solving larger urban problems outside of park boundaries, David Barth developed the concept of “High Performance Public Spaces (HPPS)©” defined as “any publicly accessible space that generates economic, environmental, and social sustainability benefits for their local community. A HPPS can be a park, trail, square, green, natural area, plaza or any other element of the ‘public realm’ that generates all three types of benefits.” (Barth, 2014). Criteria for a HPPS include:

**Economic Criteria:**

- The space creates and facilitates revenue-generating opportunities for the public and/or the private sectors
- The space creates meaningful and desirable employment
- The space indirectly creates or sustains good, living wage jobs
- The space sustains or increases property values
- The space catalyzes infill development and/or the re-use of obsolete or under-used buildings or spaces
- The space attracts new residents
- The space attracts new businesses
- The space generates increased business and tax revenues
- The space optimizes operations and maintenance costs (compared to other similar spaces)

**Environmental Criteria:**

- The space uses energy, water, and material resources efficiently
- The space improves water quality of both surface and ground water
On September 7, 2017, Amazon, the second largest employer in the United States at that time, released a Request for Proposal (RFP) asking cities all across North America to submit their bids explaining why Amazon should consider their city to be the home of the company’s second headquarters (HQ2). According to the RFP, HQ2 was expected to include over fifty thousand (50,000) new full-time employees with an average annual total compensation exceeding one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) over the next ten to fifteen years. The Project was expected to have over $5 billion in capital expenditures.

One of Amazon’s key preferences and decision drivers in selecting a city was Community/Quality of Life. The RFP stated - “We want to invest in a community where our employees will enjoy living, recreational opportunities, educational opportunities, and an overall high quality of life.” This example illustrates the important role that placemaking through parks and open spaces play in attracting businesses and generating economic development.
• The space serves as a net carbon sink
• The space enhances, preserves, promotes, or contributes to biological diversity
• Hardscape materials were selected based on longevity of service, social/ cultural/ historical sustainability, regional availability, low carbon footprint and/or other related criteria
• The space provides opportunities to enhance environmental awareness and knowledge
• The space serves as an interconnected node within larger scale ecological corridors and natural habitat

Social Criteria:

• The space improves the neighborhood
• The space improves social and physical mobility through multi-modal connectivity – auto, transit, bike, pedestrian
• The space encourages the health and fitness of residents and visitors
• The space provides relief from urban congestion and stressors such as social confrontation, noise pollution, and air pollution
• The space provides places for formal and informal social gathering, art, performances, and community or civic events
• The space provides opportunities for individual, group, passive and active recreation
• The space facilitates shared experiences among different groups of people
• The space attracts diverse populations
• The space promotes creative and constructive social interaction

While it is not realistic to think that every public park or public space could meet all these criteria, every public space has the potential to generate some type of sustainability benefits either directly or indirectly.

Therefore, the City of Ormond Beach could use the HPPS criteria as a guide or checklist during the planning and design process to prompt discussions regarding the types of benefits desired.
2.3 Findings Summary

Based on all the needs assessment techniques, the following section provides a summary of the top priority parks and recreation needs for the City of Ormond Beach.

Figure 2.3a below indicates how the findings from the statistically-valid survey - the most reliable and credible of the needs assessment techniques, with the largest sample size – are validated by many of the other techniques.

**TOP PRIORITY ACTIONS**

- Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the City
- Upgrade existing parks
- Acquire land for preservation of greenspace pars, and natural areas
- Continue renovation and improvements of Historical Centers
- Provide additional beachfront paring
- Acquire beachfront park land
- Continue renovation and improvements of Performing Arts & Cultural Centers

**TOP PRIORITY FACILITIES/AMENITIES**

- Unpaved walking & hiking trails
- Off-beach parking
- Beachfront Parks
- Natural areas/nature parks
- Paved multi-purpose
- Public wi-fi
- Outdoor stage/amphitheater
- Dog park
### NEEDS ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH PRIORITY ACTIONS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the City</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Upgrade existing parks</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. Acquire land for preservation of greenspace, parks, and natural areas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Continue renovation and improvements of Historical Centers</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. Provide additional beachfront parking</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6. Acquire more beachfront park land</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7. Continue renovation and improvements of Performing Arts &amp; Cultural Centers</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIGH PRIORITY FACILITIES/AMENITIES:

| 1. Walking and hiking nature trails | ● | ● | - | ● | - | ● | - | - |
| 2. Off-beach parking | ● | ● | - | - | - | - | ● | - |
| 3. Beachfront Parks | ● | ● | ● | - | - | - | ● | - |
| 4. Natural areas/nature Parks | ● | ● | - | ● | - | - | ● | - |
| 5. Paved multi-purpose trails | ● | ● | - | ● | - | - | ● | - |
| 6. Public-wifi | ● | ● | - | - | - | - | ● | - |
| 7. Outdoor stage/amphitheater | ● | - | ● | - | - | - | ● | - |
| 8. Dog Park | ● | - | ● | - | - | - | - | - |

**FIGURE 2.3a: Findings Summary and Comparison**
### Needs Assessment

#### TOP PRIORITY PROGRAMS/ACTIVITIES

- Summer concerts
- Adult fitness/wellness
- Community events
- Nature programs
- Performing arts programs

Based on stakeholder input, other needs may include:

- Adding a new gym/multi-purpose center/civic center;
- Provision of adequate pickleball facilities;
- Addition of a multi-purpose open space;
- Providing adequate recreation opportunities in West Ormond, including a community center; and
- Providing additional amenities in parks, restrooms in particular.

Chapter 3 of this report discusses alternatives and recommendations for responding to the top priority parks and recreation needs.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. Summer concerts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Adult fitness/wellness</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. Community events</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Nature programs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. Performing arts programs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2.3a: Findings Summary and Comparison (Continued)**
3.1 Introduction

The City’s long-range Parks and Recreation Vision responds to residents’ needs and priorities; anticipates the needs of future residents; and aligns with the City’s mission and strategic focus areas.

The vision also seeks to integrate parks and open spaces with other elements of the city’s public realm, including streets, bikeways, and trails, civic spaces, and stormwater treatment facilities. Elements of the vision include a department mission statement, reaffirming the purpose and role of the parks and recreation department; trends and guiding principles that shape the vision; subsystem service-delivery models that define how the City delivers parks and recreation services to its residents; and proposed recommendations for each subsystem, including land acquisition, capital improvements, and recreation programs.

FIGURE 3.1a: Elements of a Long-Range Vision
MISSION STATEMENT

The City of Ormond Beach’s mission is:

“To ensure Ormond Beach is one of the most attractive, stimulating and innovative communities in Florida, while protecting our rich history and maintaining our unique charm. Boasting an environment where our children can thrive, with a prosperously diverse and balanced economy, within a fiscally strong community. All the while, delivering exceptionally responsive service to our citizens and cultivating the highest quality of life.”

Consistent with the City’s mission, the Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department’s mission is to:

“Provide the citizens of Ormond Beach with quality services in a responsive, courteous, and cost-effective manner.”

This means that each parks and recreation facility and program should be planned, designed, and maintained to provide a quality, cost-effective experience for every visitor and participant.

In addition to its mission, the Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department also believes that the City’s parks and recreation system could contribute to 14 of the City’s Strategic Plan objectives:

### Community Development

- Annexation – develop policy, growth potential
- Address Impacts of development on the south side SR40 beyond I-95

### Economic Development

- Continue bringing high wage jobs and businesses to the city

### Governance

- Better engagement with social media and public information
- Address ADA accessibility compliance for website
Quality of Life

- Update Parks & Recreation Master Plan
- Plan to replace old lighting with LED at sports facilities
- Create linear parks between Lincoln and Division, Mizner’s Creek – Granada to Hand
- Increase the size of Central Park
- Make upgrades to Cassen Park – floating pier, bait shop, bathrooms, parking
- Increase activities at the Environmental Discovery Center
- Determine redevelopment of the church property
- Bring back Santa Land

Transportation

- Develop additional bike paths according to plan
Guiding principles and trends are also an important component of a long-range vision, replacing standards as a basis for decision-making.

While the mission and vision statement define the raison d’être of the Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department, the guiding principles and trends provide high-level guidance for implementing a compelling vision for the parks and recreation system. The following guiding principles have helped shape the City’s vision.

**PARKS AS PLEXUS**

First, the principle of “parks as plexus” is to view the parks and recreation system as an integrated system, transcending individual departmental or organizational silos through collaboration.

For example, parks could be thought of as stormwater treatment areas within a larger stormwater and flood control system; as trailheads and training areas within a bicycle and pedestrian network; as exercise and fitness facilities within a community-wide wellness initiative; as wildlife habitat and tree canopy within a larger ecological system; as neighborhood stabilizers, job creators, and property value enhancers within a greater economic development initiative; as indoor and outdoor classrooms within the community’s education and job training systems; as unique visitor destinations, with exceptional dining and recreation experiences, within a greater tourism development initiative; or as exhibition sites within the community’s system of museums and botanical gardens. The City’s vision is to collaborate with as many other departments and agencies as possible to generate multiple benefits for residents while leveraging City resources.
FIGURE 3.2a: Integrated Public Realm

HIGH-PERFORMANCE PUBLIC SPACES (HPPS)

The concept of HPPS (Barth, 2015)—public spaces that generate multiple social, environmental, and economic benefits that contribute to a more sustainable and resilient community—is another innovative principle that has guided the development of the long-range vision.

Each of the 25 HPPS criteria (Figure 3.2b) can be used as an aspirational goal for every existing and proposed park, trail, natural area, sports complex, and civic space in the system. Meeting the criteria often requires collaboration with other public realm providers. For example, meeting the first criterion—“the space creates and facilitates revenue-generating opportunities for the public sector, the private sector, or both”—may require a public-private partnership working in conjunction with numerous other agencies or businesses.
ECONOMIC CRITERIA

- The space creates and facilitates revenue-generating opportunities for the public and/or the private sectors;
- The space creates meaningful and desirable employment;
- The space indirectly creates or sustains good, living-wage jobs;
- The space sustains or increases property values;
- The space catalyzes infill development and/or the re-use of obsolete or under-used buildings or spaces;
- The space retains/attracts new residents;
- The space retains/attracts new businesses;
- The space generates increased business and tax revenues; and
- The space optimizes operations and maintenance costs (compared to other similar spaces).

SOCIAL CRITERIA

- The space improves the neighborhood;
- The space improves social and physical mobility through multimodal connectivity – auto, transit, bike, pedestrian;
- The space encourages the health and fitness of residents and visitors;
- The space provides relief from urban congestion and stressors such as social confrontation, noise pollution, and air pollution;
- The space provides places for formal and informal social gathering, art, performances, and community or civic events;
- The space provides opportunities for individual, group, passive and active recreation;
- The space facilitates shared experiences among different groups of people;
- The space attracts diverse populations; and
- The space promotes creative and constructive social interaction.

ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA

- The space uses energy, water, and material resources efficiently;
- The space improves water quality of both surface and ground water;
- The space serves as a net carbon sink;
- The space enhances, preserves, promotes, or contributes to biological diversity;
- Hardscape materials were selected based on longevity of service, social/ cultural/ historical sustainability, regional availability, low carbon footprint and/or other related criteria;
- The space provides opportunities to enhance environmental awareness and knowledge; and
- The space serves as an interconnected node within larger scale ecological corridors and natural habitat.
THE EXCELLENT CITY PARK SYSTEM

Peter Harnik provides additional guiding principles in *The Excellent City Park System*, which states that there are seven measures of an excellent system:

- A clear expression of purpose;
- Ongoing planning and community involvement;
- Sufficient assets in land, staffing, and equipment to meet the system’s goals;
- Equitable access;
- User satisfaction;
- Safety from physical hazards and crime; and
- Benefits for the city beyond the boundaries of the parks.

Each of these measures could provide guidance for the development of a long-range vision.

PLACEMAKING

The Project for Public Spaces (PPS) defines the guiding principle of placemaking as “both a process and a philosophy.” First, “it is centered around observing, listening to, and asking questions of the people who live, work, and play in a particular space in order to understand their needs and aspirations for that space and for their community as a whole. With this knowledge, we can come together to create a common vision for that place.” Second, “placemaking inspires people to collectively reimagine and reinvent public spaces as the heart of every community... More than just promoting better urban design, placemaking facilitates creative patterns of use, paying particular attention to the physical, cultural, and social identities that define a place and support its ongoing evolution” (PPS).
One of PPS’s tools for placemaking is the Power of 10+, the idea that “places thrive when users have a range of reasons (10+) to be there. These might include a place to sit, playgrounds to enjoy, art to touch, music to hear, food to eat, history to experience, and people to meet. Ideally, some of these activities will be unique to that particular place, reflecting the culture and history of the surrounding community. Further, when cities contain at least 10 of these destinations or districts, their public perception begins to shift amongst both locals and tourists, and urban centers can become better equipped for generating resilience and innovation” (PPS). Therefore, the Power of 10+ can be used as the guiding principle for an entire city or region, the public realm, a parks and recreation system, or an individual park or place, as illustrated in Figure 3.2c.

**FIGURE 3.2c: Power of 10+**

HOW CITIES TRANSFORM THROUGH PLACEMAKING

City/Region
10+ MAJOR DESTINATIONS

Destination
10+ PLACES IN EACH

Place
10+ THINGS TO DO, LAYERED TO CREATE SYNERGY

**FIGURE 3.2c: Power of 10+**
10-MINUTE WALK CAMPAIGN

Another guiding principle applicable to the City’s system is the 10-minute walk. The 10-Minute Walk Campaign (https://10minutewalk.org/) is promoted by the Trust for Public Land in partnership with the National Recreation and Park Association and the Urban Land Institute to ensure that “there’s a great park within a 10-minute walk of every person, in every neighborhood, in every city across America.” This principle can also be adopted as a Level-of-Service metric (“Access LOS”) that can be incorporated into the City’s Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan - and Land Development Codes - requiring new development to provide a small neighborhood park within 10 minutes of every resident. Figure 3.2d illustrates a prototype of a small neighborhood park.

Example Park Amenities

- Pavilion + concession + restrooms
- Playground + shade structure
- Chess + checker table games
- Outdoor foosball table
- Outdoor ping-pong table
- Multi-purpose open space
- Basketball/Tennis/Pickleball/Multi-purpose court
- Pavilion
- Park zone traffic calming
- Crosswalk
- On-street parking
- Sidewalk + tree zone/buffer
- Picnic table(s)
## OTHER PRINCIPLES & TRENDS

Figure 3.2e below lists seven other guiding principles that are relevant to the City’s parks and recreation vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian access</td>
<td>All streets should be designed, built, and operated to enable safe use by everyone, regardless of age, ability, or mode of transportation.</td>
<td>Michelle Lieberman, “Complete Streets Policies + Bicycle + Pedestrian Plans: Key Tools for Supporting Healthy Communities,” November 2018, <a href="https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/completestreets-bicyclepedplans.pdf">https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/completestreets-bicyclepedplans.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green infrastructure</td>
<td>Green infrastructure should include an interconnected network of a wide range of landscape elements that support native species, maintain natural ecological processes, sustain air and water resources, and contribute to the health and quality of life for communities and people.</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure Center, “Green Infrastructure Principles and Planning Tools,” <a href="http://www.gicinc.org/PDFs/Richmond_Regional_Workshop_Show_mini_workshop.pdf">http://www.gicinc.org/PDFs/Richmond_Regional_Workshop_Show_mini_workshop.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and wellness</strong></td>
<td>Healthy communities decrease dependence on the automobile by building homes, businesses, schools, churches, and parks closer to one another so that people can more easily walk or bike between them; provide opportunities for people to be physically active and socially engaged as part of their daily routine; and allow persons, if they choose, to age in place and remain all their lives in a community that reflects their changing lifestyles and changing physical capabilities.</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health, Division of Emergency and Environmental Health Services, “Healthy Community Design,” fact sheet, June 2018, <a href="https://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/docs/Healthy_Community_Design.pdf">https://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/docs/Healthy_Community_Design.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change adaptation</strong></td>
<td>Responses should be sensitive to the wider context in which climate change is experienced, including multiple stressors.</td>
<td>Siri Eriksen et al., “When Not Every Response to Climate Change Is a Good One: Identifying Principles for Sustainable Adaptation,” Climate and Development 3 (2011): 7–20, <a href="https://www.cakex.org/sites/default/files/sustainable.pdf">https://www.cakex.org/sites/default/files/sustainable.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Parks and recreation systems are made up of numerous “subsystems,” reflecting the values and resources of the community.

Following are proposed subsystems for the City of Ormond Beach’s long-range vision developed in response to residents’ needs and priorities. They are:

- Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways
- Off-Beach Parking and New Beachfront Access Points
- Paved Multi-purpose Trails
- Indoor Recreation Centers
- Improvements to Existing Parks
- New Neighborhood Parks
- Sports Facilities and Programs
- Aquatics Facilities
- Community Events, Summer Concerts, and Programs
- Golf Courses
SERVICE-DELIVERY MODELS

Each subsystem has its own unique constituents, facilities, programs, amenities, and issues; therefore, services may be delivered differently between subsystems. Also, each subsystem provides different opportunities to help meet the City’s Strategic Plan goals. For example, parks may provide the greatest opportunity for stormwater treatment, while greenways and trails provide opportunities to increase fitness and multimodal connectivity.

Five common, alternative Service-Delivery Models (SDM) have been developed by Barth Associates to help define a community’s long-range parks and recreation vision: Centralized, Decentralized (Equity), Hub & Spoke, Venues, and Activities models. These models can apply not only to parks and recreation programs and facilities, but also to the distribution of social services, economic development initiatives, and conservation land programs.

CENTRALIZED SDM

First, the Centralized SDM (FIGURE 3.3a) assumes that residents and visitors from throughout the community will drive to the central facility. This model typically applies to regional or signature facilities such as the Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center, Ormond Beach Tennis Center, and The Casements.

FIGURE 3.3a: Centralized SDM

Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center

Ormond Beach Tennis Center
EQUITY SDM

A decentralized Equity SDM (Figure 3.3b), on the other hand, focuses on the equitable distribution of services, measured in terms of distance (Access LOS) or population served (Facility or Acreage LOS).

An Equity SDM assumes that facilities or parks will be distributed equitably throughout the community, as opposed to a single centralized facility. It applies to the City’s parks and community center subsystems.

**FIGURE 3.3b: Equity SDM**

- Firehouse Park
- Nova Community Park
- South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park
HUB & SPOKE SDM
A Hub & Spoke Model (Figure 3.3d) combines the Centralized and Equity Models. A common example is a large, centralized aquatics center such as the YMCA, supplemented with splash pads throughout the City. It also applies to a centralized location for recreation programs, supplemented by satellite programs offered throughout the City.

VENUES SDM
A Venues Model (Figure 3.3c) is a variation on the Centralized model, and is common to smaller towns and cities. It assumes that the system is comprised of specialized facilities that will serve the entire community, regardless of access distance or population densities. To some degree the City of Ormond Beach’s system fits the Venues Model with a single performance venue, tennis complex, and environmental center. Each venue is planned and designed to serve the needs of residents citywide.
ACTIVITY-BASED SDM

Finally, an Activity-based Model focuses on providing desired recreation opportunities throughout the community without regard for the type of park or recreational facility (Figure 3.3e). This model is most common in large, urbanized sites where land is at a premium. A dog park or tennis courts may be located on top of a parking deck; a playground may be provided through a local church; and an athletic field may be provided through partnerships with local schools. For example, the City of Seattle built the I-5 Colonnade urban mountain bike skills park under Interstate 5; and the City of New York tows a seven-lane swimming pool barge down the East River – dubbed the “Floating Pool Lady” – to serve the residents of the Bronx each summer. The emphasis is not on park or facility types, but on providing access to recreational opportunities wherever and however they can be provided.
3.4 Long-Range Vision

INTRODUCTION

Based on the previously discussed guiding principles and trends, the following section discusses the City of Ormond Beach’s long-range vision comprised of the following subsystems:

1. Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways
2. Off-Beach Parking and New Beachfront Access Points
3. Paved Multi-purpose Trails
4. Indoor Recreation Centers
5. Improvements to Existing Parks
6. New Neighborhood Parks
7. Sports Facilities and Programs
8. Aquatics Facilities
9. Community Events, Summer Concerts, and Programs
10. Golf Courses
1. Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

Existing natural areas and nature trails include Tomoka State Park, Riverbend Park, and other city, county and state sites. Existing blueways include the Halifax River Blueway, which is a 17-mile-long paddling trail along the Intracoastal Waterway that extends from Tomoka State Park south to Wilbur Boat House (in Wilbur-by-the-Sea). The statistically-representative mail survey indicated that two of residents’ top priorities are “walking and hiking nature trails” (#1), and “nature areas/ nature parks” (#4); and over 75% of residents indicated that they would be supportive or very supportive of “acquiring land for preservation of green space, parks, and natural areas”. These priorities may be indicative of the more passive recreation lifestyles preferred by the City’s majority older population, and the desire to protect the little remaining open space in the city.

What we’ve Heard

Walking and hiking trails (#1)

Nature areas/ nature parks (#4);

Over 75% of residents indicated that they would be supportive or very supportive of “acquiring land for preservation of green space, parks, and natural areas.”
The City conducted an on-line, follow-up survey to determine the type of experience residents were seeking within a nature park. Figure 1a shows that the majority of respondents (64%) favored a paved or stabilized, multi-use trail within a wooded area.

**What Does Nature Mean to You?**

- **64.20%**
  - respondents chose
  - **Paved Trail**

- **28.02%**
  - respondents chose
  - **Nature Trail**

- **22.57%**
  - respondents chose
  - **Passive Open Space**

**FIGURE 1a: Vision Survey Findings for Natural Areas**
VISION

The City’s vision for additional natural areas, nature trails, and blueways is to 1) expand trails (including mountain bike trails where appropriate) and access to blueways within existing sites, and 2) acquire additional natural areas where possible. There are very few undeveloped parcels remaining in Ormond Beach (see Figure 1c: Resident Vacant Lands Map and Figure 1d: Commercial/Industrial Vacant Lands Map). The City recently purchased the 28-acre Dunkin property at Central Park, for example, to connect trails and sidewalks from Hammock Lane to Division Avenue; and is also evaluating the potential use of the airport property to expand the trails system at Riverbend Park.

Proposed nature trails include:

Volusia County (Plantation Oaks Boulevard) and State Park
- Alignment in place
- Natural trail

Division Avenue to Environmental Discovery Center
- 420 linear feet (concrete) 670 linear feet boardwalk

Former Riverbend golf course property*
- Blueways launch
- Nature trail
- Mountain bike trails

Riverbend Nature Park**
- Blueways launch
- Expansion of mountain bike trails

West Ormond Wetland Park
- Boardwalk, trail, parking lot and fishing pier

Sanchez Park
- Blueways launch

Stormwater/reuse pond walking path
- Division Avenue and Old Kings Road
- North Nova Lakes
- Arroyo Parkway and Nova Road

*Note: It is important to note that a land use study is currently underway to determine potential aeronautical and non-aeronautical uses for this airport property. Any future land use considerations must be based upon the results of that study and in compliance with the City’s obligations as the Airport Sponsor.

**Note: These projects will require an airspace study and determination as to compatible land use. An appraisal will also have to be performed to determine appropriate remuneration to the Airport Fund for the use of the property, pending FAA approval.
Natural Area/Nature Trails Vision

1. Volusia County (Plantation Oaks Boulevard) and State Park
   - Alignment in place
   - Natural trail

2. Division Avenue to Environmental Discovery Center
   - 420 linear feet (concrete) 670 linear feet boardwalk

3. Former Riverbend golf course property (south of Airport Road)*
   - Blueways launch
   - Nature trail
   - Mountain bike trails

4. Riverbend Nature Park**
   - Blueways launch
   - Mountain bike trails expansion

5. West Ormond Wetland Park
   - Boardwalk, trail, parking lot and fishing pier

6. Sanchez Park
   - Blueways launch

7. Stormwater/reuse pond walking path
   - Division Avenue and Old Kings Road
   - Nova Road Passive Park - North
   - Arroyo Parkway and Nova Road

*Note: It is important to note that a land use study is currently underway to determine potential aero- or non-aero- uses for this airport property. Any future land use considerations must be based upon the results of that study and in compliance with the City’s obligations as the Airport Sponsor.

**Note: These projects will require an airspace study and determination as to compatible land use. An appraisal will also have to be performed to determine appropriate remuneration to the Airport Fund for the use of the property, pending FAA approval.
FIGURE 1c: Residential Vacant Lands Map

FIGURE 1d: Industrial/Commercial Vacant Lands Map
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following steps are recommended to protect and enhance the City’s remaining natural areas:

- Develop a Conservation Lands Acquisition and Management plan to identify the city’s most significant natural and cultural resources for conservation; identify which resources are most vulnerable to development or other threats; and identify which resources are adequately protected by existing or proposed policies, regulations, developer agreements, or other conservation tools.

- Create an advisory committee – or work with the existing Work with the Quality-of-Life Board - to develop prioritization criteria, evaluate sites, and seek options for protection.

- Determine costs for acquisition, trail and blueways development, and preservation.

- Determine available and projected funding sources and partners to assist with implementation.

- Work with a non-profit park land acquisition organization such as the Trust for Public Land or Conservation Fund to acquire the top priority sites.

- Budget adequate funds to manage lands once they have been acquired, including recreational access, trails, blueway launch sites, invasive species control, environmental restoration, and other management activities.

Water Lilies in Ames Park pond
2. Off-Beach Parking and New Beach Access Points

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

The City of Ormond Beach currently provides two beachfront parks with parking: Birth of Speed Park and Andy Romano Beachfront Park. Figure 2a and Figure 2b illustrate that Volusia County also provides parking at over a dozen locations along A1A. A total of approximately 550 beachfront spaces are available within the city.

Beach Parking East of A1A (beachside):

- Standish approach – 17
- Amsden approach – 10
- Neptune approach – 12
- Granada Blvd (at Birthplace of Speed Park) – 10
- Seminole approach – 15
- Cardinal approach – 2
- Milsap approach – 7
- Andy Romano Beachfront Park - 199

Beach Parking West of A1A:

- Cardinal – 134
- Grace Lutheran Church – 110
- Rockefeller Park – 34

Residents ranked off-beach parking, and a new beachfront park, as their #2 and #3 priorities respectively. Off-beach parking is consistently a top priority for residents living in Florida’s coastal communities, as both seasonal and full-time populations increase.
The vision for beachfront parks is to continue to increase equitable access to both residents and visitors wherever possible. While the development of a new beachfront park similar to Andy Romano Park may not be possible due to limited land, the City will continue to explore opportunities to add beach access points with limited parking, amenities, and pedestrian dune walkovers to the beach, north of Granada.

The vision for beach parking is similar; to provide equitable access to the beach. The most recent improvement is the new parking along the west side of the County’s Cardinal Drive beach approach. However, the County has no plans to expand any other beach parking areas within the city limits at this time, so it is not clear whether the appropriate response to the need for additional beach parking is to provide additional parking, pedestrian access points, beach shuttles, beach parks, or “all of the above.” Anecdotal information indicates that beach parking areas fill up quickly on peak weekends and holidays, forcing residents or visitors to park further away from the beach or return at another time.

The City’s vision is to work with the County and other partners – such as FDOT, the Trust for Public Land or Conservation Fund, the Daytona Beach Racing and Recreational District, and others - to adequately provide access to all users, including residents and visitors, able-bodied and disabled. To that end, the vision includes all available techniques to increase access, which will become more challenging as population increases. These may include:
Ormond Beach Parks Vision

- Traffic-calming of A1A, and the addition of crosswalks to provide safer beach access;
- Additional pedestrian dune walkovers;
- Expansion of existing beach-parking areas;
- New beach-parking areas;
- Development of off-beach parking areas within a 5-minute walk (approximately ¼ mile) of existing and proposed beach accesses;
- Shuttle buses from large public/private parking areas further than ¼ mile from the beach, such as office parks and schools, on peak weekends and holidays;
- Smart-phone apps to inform beach-goers of the locations of available parking spaces on peak weekends and holidays;
- Beach mats, carts, ramps, and sand-chairs to accommodate disabled users; and
- Beach parking fees – perhaps including reduced cost, annual passes for city or county residents – to generate additional revenues to meet beach parking needs.

Smart Phone Beach Parking App and Free Beach Shuttle Service
201
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FIGURE 2b: City of Ormond Beach and Volusia County Beachfront Parking Location

- City Limits
- Roads
- City Parks
- County Parks
- State Parks
- Conservation Parcels
- Golf Course
- Residential
- Non-Residential
- Creeks, Streams, and Water Bodies
- Volusia County Existing Off Beach Parking Location
- City of Ormond Beach Beach Front Park
- City of Ormond Beach Proposed Shuttle Parking Area
- City of Ormond Beach Proposed Shuttle Route
- Pedestrian Access Management, On-Street Parking, and Acquisition of Beachfront Park and Off-Beach Parking Areas where possible along the A1A Corridor

Birthplace of Speed Park
Andy Romano Beachfront Park

FIGURE 2b: City of Ormond Beach and Volusia County Beachfront Parking Location
Recommendations to implement the vision include:

- Conduct, partner, or advocate for a beach parking study to evaluate these alternative techniques, determine residents’ and visitors’ preferences, and make recommendations to the City Commission. Consider asking the county and other municipalities to jointly conduct a countrywide study.

- Identify alternative funding sources including the county’s ECHO grants program, FDOT grants, and others.

- Work with FDOT to create additional, safer crossings on A1A (See Figure 2c: SR A1A Access Management Plan).

- Evaluate potential acquisition of vacant or derelict beachfront parcels, particularly north of Granada.

- Evaluate opportunities to partner with other land owners for joint-use parking, such as churches, schools, and commercial properties that are closed during peak beach hours.

- Experiment with a beach shuttle service from City Hall or The Casements, using rented VOTRAN mini-buses. Invite food trucks, offer music, and provide kids’ programs to make it a special event.

- Consider on-street parking along A1A, where feasible, to provide additional parking while also calming traffic.
Enhanced Vehicular Parking, Pedestrian, and ADA Access Along the Beach
3. Paved Multi-Purpose Trails

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

Residents ranked paved, multi-purpose trails as their 5th highest priority in the survey, and over 80% of respondents said that they would be supportive or very supportive of “providing safe bicycle & pedestrian facilities throughout the city including multi-purpose paths & safe crosswalks”.

In an effort to meet residents’ need for safe bicycle and pedestrian circulation, the City’s Public Works Department prepared a ten-year Bicycle Master Plan in 2016. The Executive Summary of the Master Plan states:

In 2010 the City adopted a Multimodal Strategy that presented a balance between all roadway capacity improvements and all vehicle reduction strategies. A mobility fee was adopted to implement the Multimodal Strategy. The mobile fee contained three components: a road, transit and non-motorized fee component. The purposes for the non-motorized fee component are to be used to construct gaps in sidewalks between residential areas and transit stops, convert existing sidewalks from 5 feet to 8 feet for multi-use; and provide bike facilities. The proposed Bike Plan concentrates on the bicycle purposes of the non-motorized fee.

In 2015 the City Commission conducted a strategic planning exercise and from that effort a Strategic Planning Report was prepared. Seven goals along with a number of objectives were identified. One objective which is complimentary to the City Commission’s priority objective of updating the Parks/Recreation Master Plan is the development of a city-wide bicycle pedestrian plan.

In addition, the City of Ormond Beach Comprehensive Plan outlines the goals, objectives, and policies for a number of elements related to the topic of bicycle facilities. These elements include land use, transportation, parks and recreation, and capital improvements. In addition, within the Transportation Element the City’s Multimodal Strategy approved pursuant to SB 360ER contains Strategies to implement the Bicycle Vision Plan.

The bike plan identifies three levels of bike users that need to be considered in the design of bike facilities:

1. Advanced or experienced riders generally use bicycles for convenience and speed. They prefer direct access to destinations with minimum detour or
delay. The Ormond Loop, SR 40 or US1 could be considered routes for experienced riders due to the limited pavement width and/or vehicle volume.

2. Basic or less confident adult riders prefer comfortable riding on lower vehicle volume collector streets with designated bike lanes or wider shoulder lanes on busier streets.

3. Families and children who ride for fun and access to destinations like parks gravitate to neighborhood streets, where the speed limit is 25 mph, which are then linked to multi-use or shared use paths.

Currently, the City has about 10.65 miles of paved shoulders in the city which are 4 foot wide and two designated bike lanes totaling 17.42 miles in the city (SR 40 and US 1). In addition, there are about 2.5 miles of shared use paths (8-foot-wide sidewalk not part of the road rights of way) and 9.15 miles of multi-use paths in the City (part of the road right of way). In addition, there is a 33.98-mile Ormond Scenic Loop and Trail but this trail is considered a “shared use” with motorists. Four cross jurisdictional trails are planned that traverse Ormond Beach (Greenway Trail, SR40, Kings Highway Heritage Trail and the Tomoka State Park Trail). Finally, the City Land Development Code requires bike parking facilities for all new public and private development.

A crash analysis was conducted of all bike accidents from 2010-14. There were 90 bicycle crashes involving 1 fatality and 85 injuries. 26 injuries occurred on city roads. Most crashes occurred during the weekday between 4-6pm at major and minor intersections and driveways. Surprisingly, Ormond Beach has a higher per capita bike crash rate than Volusia County or the State of Florida (per 10,000 populations).

The Plan proposes 15.5 miles of multi-use path that connect multiple destinations. These are not paths or trails contained only in a park. One small fixed span bridge is proposed. The total cost of the plan is estimated to be between $4.3 million and $5.7 million depending on routes chosen and designed. FDOT’s Long Range Estimates (LRE) for bike paths was used to determine this number. These numbers will be better refined as the paths move from a planning state to a design stage. Finally, a cost benefit analysis was used. It is estimated that $14 million in reduced injury costs and health benefit costs over the 10-year horizon of the Plan.

Making it safer to walk and bike contributes to the community health, quality of life and future independence of residents as they progress in age. What has been proposed in this plan is doable. The implementation of this plan relies on the cooperation and participation of city residents, the county, the TPO and the State. There is no better time than now to begin this effort.

Several corridors have been improved since the development of the Master Plan, including approximately 1-mile Forest Hills Connector trail, and the approximately 2-mile Plantation Oaks Boulevard trail. Other projects, however, have been thwarted by resident opposition. The City approved funding of the expansion of the Tomoka State Park Trail, for example, but the project was stopped in 2019 due to resident’s objections.
The City’s vision for bikeways and trails is to develop an interconnected network of trails that allows residents to walk or bike safely and comfortably throughout the city. Priority projects from the 2016 Master Plan include:

**US1 Shared Multi-Use Path (Highest priority)**
- North US 1 – Wilmette Avenue and Broadway Avenue
- 27,139 linear feet
- 12 feet in width

**Thompson Creek Multi-Use Path**
- 6,550 linear feet
- 10 feet in width
- Parallels Thompson Creek – Wilmette Avenue to Division Street
- Connect Central Park to Granada Boulevard

**East Coast Greenway Trail**
- Alignment unclear
- 6,388 linear feet
- 10-foot path
- Neptune to Plaza Drive

**Hand Avenue Multi-use Path**
- Central Park to Williamson
- Central Park to Nova exists (8 foot)
- 12,830 linear feet from Nova Road to Williamson Boulevard (10 foot wide)

**Tomoka State Park Shared-Use Path**
- Sanchez Park to Tomoka State Park multi-use path at Inglesa via Tomoka State Park
- 12,667 LF of 10-foot sidewalk & 700 LF of boardwalk

**Kings Highway Heritage Shared Use Path**
- Continue where the Tomoka State Park multi-use path ends and proceed up Old Dixie Highway, Walter Boardman Lane, Highbridge Road and State Road A1A
Paved Multi-Purpose Trail Vision

1. US1 Shared Multi-Use Path
2. Thompson Creek Multi-Use Path
3. East Coast Greenway Trail
4. Hand Avenue Multi-Use Path
5. Tomoka State Park Shared Use Path Phase 2
6. Broadway Multi-Use Path
7. Kings Highway Heritage Multi-Use Path
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for achieving the City’s vision include:

• Update the 2016 Master Plan, and re-establish priorities and estimated costs.
• Conduct extensive public engagement to review and comment on proposed corridors.
• Work with the MPO to develop realistic funding projections that leverage city, county, state and federal funds.
• Adopt the updated Master Plan, including a phased funding and implementation strategy with dedicated funding sources.
• Initiate “safe walk to schools” and “safe walk to parks” campaigns, focused on providing safe pedestrian and bicycle access.
• Promote bikeways and trails as transportation alternatives to help reduce congestion.
• Wherever possible, widen existing trails to at least 8’ wide.
• Secure funding for the top priority improvements.

It is anticipated that the City’s Planning and Engineering Departments would lead this effort. The Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department will assist by promoting the planning process, assisting with the public engagement, and generally advocating for a safe, comfortable, interconnected network of bicycle/pedestrian trails and paths throughout the city.
Beach and Waterfront Multi-Purpose Trails
4. Indoor Recreation Centers

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

The City operates and maintains four indoor facilities that provide recreation and social programs: Nova Recreation Center, Ormond Beach Senior Center, South Ormond Neighborhood Center, and The Casements. Volusia County also operates a community building at the Michael Crotty Bicentennial Park.

Collectively, these centers provide a Level-of-Service (LOS) of approximately 1.7 square feet of indoor recreation space per resident based on the City’s projected 2030 population, well within the desired range of 1.5 – 2.0 square feet per capita (Figure 4a). However, the majority of the City’s indoor recreation space is located in the eastern or central areas of the city. An additional center is needed to provide equitable access to indoor recreation amenities and programs for residents of western Ormond Beach.

FIGURE 4a: City & County Indoor Recreation Square Footage LOS Analysis
Recommendations to provide equitable access to indoor recreation space include:

- Develop a Conceptual Master Plan for a new West Ormond Indoor Recreation Center to:
  - Determine the appropriate uses (development program) for the center - and possibly a surrounding park - considering that many western communities have private community centers and swimming pools.
  - Evaluate the suitability of potential sites to accommodate the development program for both the center and the park, such as the airport property and the Leeway Trail site.
  - Estimate both the capital and operating costs of the proposed alternatives, as well as anticipated revenues.
  - Evaluate alternatives for operations, maintenance and programming, including potential partnerships.
  - Make recommendations for a preferred alternative.

- Discuss partnership opportunities with Flagler County, potentially including a regional park site.

- Evaluate opportunities for e-sports programs and other alternative recreation activities.

VISION

The City’s vision is to provide equitable access to indoor recreation facilities and programs for all residents within 2 miles of resident’s homes in the City’s urban neighborhoods and 4 miles of resident’s homes in the City’s suburban neighborhoods as illustrated in Figure 4b.
Types of Indoor Spaces for Indoor Recreation Center
5. Improvements to Existing Parks

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

The City operates and maintains 53 parks totaling 603 acres. These spaces range from small pocket parks such as Firehouse Park, Vander Park, and Neptune Park to larger parks that function as neighborhood or community parks such as Ames Park, Fortunato Park, and South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park.

Based on the site evaluations of the City’s parks discussed in Section 1.4.3, it appears that the City’s parks are meeting residents’ expectations. While the system exhibited many strengths, there are opportunities to enhance the quality of the City’s parks as well as provide more amenities, facilities, and things to do for residents of all ages and abilities.

VISION

The City’s vision is to upgrade its existing parks in response to the site evaluations conducted by city staff and consultants (Section 1.4.3); residents’ priority needs (Section 2.0); and the guiding principles previously outlined. It is a general goal to improve all the City’s parks to the same level of quality as Andy Romano Park, The Casements, and other parks that scored a 4.0 or higher on the site evaluations (Section 1.4).

The specific facilities and amenities to be provided at existing parks should be based on residents’ input, to be provided through a conceptual master planning process for each park. Typical amenities to be considered by residents might include (in alphabetical order):

- ADA Access
- Amphitheater, outdoor stage
- Bike racks
- Bioretention, rain gardens
- Bus shelter
- Butterfly gardens
- Canoe/ kayak launches and rentals
- Community garden
- Connecting sidewalks and crosswalks
- Covered picnic pavilions with grills
- Dog park, waste stations
- Drinking fountains
- Fitness equipment
- Food concessions and food trucks
- Game tables
- Landscaping
- Large group pavilion
- Lighting
- Movable tables and chairs, benches, trash receptacles
- Multi-generational, shaded playground
- Multi-purpose fields
- Multi-purpose/ tennis, youth basketball, and pickleball courts
- Natural areas
- On-street food truck parking
- Outdoor fitness equipment
- Paved walking paths and trails
- Phone charging stations, Wi-Fi
- Picnic shelters with grills
- Public art, sculpture, fountains
- Quiet seating areas
- Recreation center/ concession building
- Restrooms
- Shade trees, umbrellas, awnings, and/or covers
- Signs and exhibits
- Splash pad
- Wi-Fi

More specifically – in addition to the improvements recommended in the city staff evaluations - city commissioners and board members recommended the following improvements (In alphabetical order):

- ADA accessibility
- Additional boat launches
- Additional indoor and outdoor basketball courts
- Community gardens
- Complete the build-out of the Nova Community Park Master Plan (see Figure 3.8a)
- Explore the potential of former airport property to function as a park with trails, picnic areas, playgrounds, and boating*
- Engage residents in re-design of pocket parks
- Improve drainage, add restrooms and amenities, and a splashpad at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex
- Improve maintenance
- Improve under-utilized, private neighborhood parks, e.g., Hunter’s Ridge and Breakaway Trails through partnerships or grants
- Multi-purpose fields
- New sports field lighting
- Repair Andy Romano beach ramp and stairs
- Spaces for food trucks
- Tennis and pickleball courts
- Update South Ormond Neighborhood Center
- Update the performing arts center
- Upgrade Nova Recreation Center
- Upgrade senior center, include pickleball courts
- Waterfront restaurant at Cassen Park

*Note: It is important to note that a land use study is currently underway to determine potential aeronautical and non-aeronautical uses for this airport property. Any future land use considerations must be based upon the results of that study and in compliance with the City’s obligations as the Airport Sponsor.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish prioritization criteria, and work with the advisory boards to prioritize parks for improvement.
- Develop conceptual master plans – including extensive public involvement – for each of the top priority parks.
- Develop a standard “amenities list” and updated design standards to ensure a consistently high level of quality.
CONCEPTUAL LONG RANGE MASTER PLAN

Nova Community Park

Ormond Beach, FL

FIGURE 5a: Nova Community Park Conceptual Master Plan
6. New Neighborhood Parks

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

City of Ormond Beach residents have access to 603 acres of park land. Based on the City’s projected 2030 population, this will equate to an Acreage Level-of-Service (LOS) of 13.1 acres per 1,000 population in 2030. As illustrated in Figure 6a below, this LOS is below the City’s 2020 Acreage LOS and just below the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) national median benchmark Acreage LOS of 13.2 and upper quartile benchmark of 27.8 per 1,000 population for cities with a similar population and density as the City of Ormond Beach. This suggests a need for additional park land in the future.

Consistently, Figure 6b shows that there are various areas in the City that do not have access to a Park with a 10-minute walk (1/2 mile). As the City continues to grow, it will be important to ensure that all residents have access to a quality park within 1/2 mile of their home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach Parks</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach+Volusia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Parks (2020)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach+Volusia</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Parks (2025)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ormond Beach+Volusia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Parks (2030)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Benchmark Lower Quartile
NRPA Benchmark Median
NRPA Benchmark Upper Quartile

FIGURE 6a: Acreage LOS Analyses & Benchmarking
CITY PARKS

1. Ames Park
2. Andy Romano Beachfront Park
3. Arroyo Fountain Park
4. Arroyo Oaks Mini Park
5. Arroyo Parkway Passive Park
6. Bailey Riverbridge Gardens
7. Birthplace of Speed Park
8. Cassen Park
9. Central Park I
10. Central Park II
11. Central Park III
12. Central Park IV Including Environmental Discovery Center
13. Division Avenue Passive Park
14. Firehouse Park
15. Fortunato Park
16. Haas Park
17. Hospital Gardens Mini Park
18. Huguenot Park
19. Indian Mound Park
20. Lakebridge Drive Passive Park
21. Lincoln Ave Park
22. Main Street Park
23. Milton Popper Park
24. Neptune Park
25. Nova Community Park
26. Nova Road Passive Park - North
27. Nova Road Passive Park - South
28. Optimist Park
29. Ormond Beach Lions Park
30. Ormond Beach Middle School Park
31. Ormond Beach Performing Arts Center
32. Ormond Beach Senior Center
33. Ormond Beach Sports Complex
34. Ormond Memorial Art Museum & Gardens
35. Ormond Parkway Park
36. Ormond Shores Park
37. Osceola Elementary School Park
38. Plaza Grande Park
39. Riverbend Nature Park*
40. Rivera Park
41. Rockefeller Gardens
42. Rosewood Avenue Mini-Park
43. Sanchez Park
44. Santa Lucia Park
45. South Old Kings Road Passive Park
46. South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park
47. Ted Porter Park
48. The Casements
49. Vander Park
50. Waldo O. Berry Senior Heritage Park
51. West Ormond Community Park
52. West Ormond Wetlands Park
53. Woodmere Park

*Note: Property is operated within a leasehold area upon airport property as a prospective use.
VISION

The City’s vision is for a neighborhood park – either public or private – to be within walking distance of every resident in the city.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Investigate potential areas in need of a park within 1/2 mile Access LOS as illustrated in Figure 6b.
- Evaluate opportunities to fill the gaps through public and/or private investment considering the prototypical park illustrated in Figure 6c.
- Consider partnering with Homeowners Associations to improve existing, underutilized HOA parks through grants, leases, joint-use agreements, or other mechanisms.
- Consider providing portable recreation amenities and programs in underserved areas, for example, provide different “recreation packages” such as a movie-night package, adult fitness package, or playground package.

Example Park Amenities

1. Pavilion + concession + restrooms
2. Playground + shade structure
3. Chess + checker table games
4. Outdoor foosball table
5. Outdoor ping-pong table
6. Multi-purpose open space
7. Picnic table(s)
8. Basketball/Tennis/Pickleball/Multi-purpose court
9. Pavilion
10. Park-oriented residential development
11. Park-oriented mixed use (residential/commercial development)
12. Park zone traffic calming
13. Crosswalk
14. On-street parking
15. Sidewalk + tree zone/ buffer

FIGURE 6c: Prototypical Neighborhood Park
PROTOTYPICAL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK DESCRIPTION

Size:
Generally, 5 to 10 acres.

Location + Context:
Residential and Mixed-Use Areas.

Access Level of Service:
Walking distance, approximately 1/2 mile

Function:
Neighborhood Parks are the core green space of the parks system and serve the basic needs of nearby, neighborhood residents for passive and active, at-will and programmed social, cultural, and recreational uses. Programmed events should be limited to neighborhood serving events focused on the surrounding neighborhood.

Neighborhood Parks can also provide opportunities to address environmental challenges such as local stormwater management issues, biological diversity, and ecological, and habitat restoration.

Design Considerations:

• Neighborhood Park design should reflect the existing or anticipated needs of neighborhood residents.
• 50% of the park should be dedicated to active uses and 50% to passive uses.
• Restrooms should be integrated with a pavilion or shelter near the playground.
• A concession stand with movable tables and chairs may be developed within parks in urban areas.
• Parking should be limited to on-street perimeter parking. No off-street parking should be provided within the neighborhood park.
• Well-marked and signed crosswalks that ensure safe access to the parks.
• Park zones that encourage motorists to reduce their speed should be incorporated on roads that surround the park.
• Development surrounding the park should face onto the park. Wide sidewalks with shade trees should extend from the park into the surrounding neighborhood.
• An indoor recreation facility may be developed in a Neighborhood Park. If developed within the park property, it should be developed on one of the corners of the property to address and frame the street and provide a public face to the park edge.
7. Sports Facilities and Programs

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS
The City offers an extensive sports program, including youth sports, clinics, special population sports, and adult sports. Youth sports programs include:

- Basketball
- Baseball - Competitive OBYBSA
- Baseball/T-Ball - Recreational OBYBSA
- Flag Football
- Football/Cheerleading - Ormond Beach PRIDE
- Football/Cheerleading - Pop Warner - Ormond Beach Sandcrabs
- Soccer - OBSC
- Softball - Competitive OBYBSA
- Softball/T-Ball - Recreational OBYBSA
- Volleyball

Special Population sports programs offered in the Nova Community Center include:

- Gym Friends
- Challenger Basketball

Adult sports programs include:

- Coed Kickball
- Coed Flag Football
- Coed Volleyball
- Fall Coed Softball
- Spring Coed Softball

Existing sports facilities include 2 indoor basketball courts; 10 outdoor basketball courts; 21 diamond fields for T-ball, baseball, and softball; and 17 rectangle fields.
VISION

The City’s vision is to continue to meet the needs for both youth and adult sports programs, with an emphasis on recreational sports including special populations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for sports facilities and programs include:

- Develop the Conceptual Master Plan for a new West Ormond Indoor Recreation Center and park, as discussed above. Uses may include pickleball courts, a walking track, community meeting rooms, gymnasium with basketball and volleyball courts, indoor fitness center, space for large gatherings and events (seating for more than 200 people), youth basketball, and other amenities. Include amenities for cheer and dance.

- Upgrade fields and amenities at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex and Nova Community Park, including LED lighting, drainage, restrooms, benches, walks, fencing, roadways, and parking.

- Complete the build-out of the Nova Community Park master plan to provide additional multi-purpose fields. Consider adding a Miracle Field and making improvements to the indoor center and park to enhance special populations programming.

- Construct additional outdoor basketball courts.

- Evaluate opportunities for the use of the former Gymnastics Center at Nova Recreation Center, such as a multi-purpose space for pickleball, youth basketball, cheer, e-sports, and other high-priority or emerging trend needs.
8. Aquatics Facilities

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

The Volusia Flagler Family YMCA is the only publicly-accessible swimming pool in Ormond Beach available for lap swimming, swimming lessons, and aquatics programs. Monthly membership fees range from $25 (youth) to $68 (family), and the YMCA makes the pool available one day per week for lap-swimming on a daily fee basis.

Additionally, the City of Ormond Beach offers residents access to two splash pads, one in Andy Romano Beachfront Park and the other in South Ormond Neighborhood Center & Park. However, these facilities are located in the south eastern portion of the city. Additional facilities are needed to provide equitable access to splash pads for residents of western and northern Ormond Beach.

VISION

The City’s vision is to continue contracting with the YMCA to provide swimming lessons, and promoting the YMCA as the primary aquatics provider through a single, centralized location. The City will also continue to offer splash pads equitable across the City. Figure 8a illustrates the City’s aquatics vision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Promote the YMCA programs and facilities to make residents more aware of what is being offered.
- Consider partnering with the YMCA to offer additional days for public lap swimming and additional aquatics programs.
- Develop two additional splash pads in areas identified in Figure 3.11a as having a need for splash pads.
FIGURE 8a: Aquatics Vision
9. Community Events, Summer Concerts, and Programs

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

According to the City’s website, the Community Events Division of the Ormond Beach Leisure Services Department organizes or co-sponsors more than thirty events throughout the year, including:

- Arbor Day
- Mayor’s Health & Fitness Challenge
- Native American Festival
- Starry Starry Night
- Art in the Park
- Memorial Remembrance Service
- July 4th Celebration
- Summer Sounds Concerts in Rockefeller Gardens
- Kids Fishing Tournaments
- Senior Games
- Halloween Highway: Family Friendly Drive-Thru Trunk or Treat
- Veterans Day Drive-Thru Celebration
- Home for the Holidays Parade
- Holidays at The Casements
- Breakfast with Santa
- Letters to Santa

The City also offers adults, special populations, and youths a variety of educational and fitness classes throughout the year. Adult programs include:

- Art Classes
- Cooking Classes
- Fitness Classes:
  - Pilates - The Casements
  - Yoga - The Casements
  - Zumba Gold - The Casements (not currently offered)
- Language Classes
- Jazzercise
- Open Gym (Nova and South Ormond Neighborhood Center)
- Fitness Room (Nova and South Ormond Neighborhood Center)
- Senior Center (Council on Aging activities, classes, events, etc.)
Special Populations programs offered in the Nova Community Center include:

- Calling All Creators
- Friday Night Dances
- Lunch Bunch Club
- Special Events
- Valentine Dance
- Prom
- Shining S.T.A.R.S Pageant & Fashion Show
- Sock Hop
- Halloween Party
- Hoedown

Youth programs include:

- Children’s Musical Theater Workshop, Inc.
- Dance/Acting - 2021 Flyer
- Junior Jazzercise (not currently offered)
- Play Unplugged (not currently offered)
- Tutoring Program (South Ormond Neighborhood Center)
- Learning Center (South Ormond Neighborhood Center)
- Open Gym (Nova and South Ormond Neighborhood Center)
Specifically, residents ranked the following special events and programs as top priorities:

- Summer concerts
- Adult fitness and wellness programs
- Community events
- Nature programs
- Performing arts programs

Figure 9a below indicates that Ormond Beach residents have a much higher need for community events and recreation programs than other residents nationwide. For example, a whopping 57% of Ormond residents have a need for community events, compared with just 37% in other communities.

**FIGURE 9a: City of Ormond Beach vs. National Benchmarks: Percent of Households with Needs for Recreation Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Ormond Beach, FL (2021)</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult fitness/wellness</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature program</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior programs</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/crafts programs</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports programs</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth summer camps</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before &amp; after school programs</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth learn to swim programs</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts programs</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSports</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISION
The City’s vision is to continue providing residents and visitors with the types of high-quality, affordable events and programs that make Ormond Beach such a great place to live and visit.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Residents indicated that they prefer special events to be provided in small or medium parks, rather than large county-wide parks. Small, neighborhood events generally draw 300 or fewer attendees, and include events such as Movies on the Halifax, Once Upon a Storytime, Reel in the Fun Kids’ Fishing Tournament, and the Mayor’s Health and Fitness Challenge. Medium, city-wide events generally draw 300-750 people, and examples include the Senior Games, Jewish Heritage Festival, Taste of Ormond, Summer Sounds/Swing into Spring Concert Series, and India Day. The preference for smaller events and venues may be due in part to increasing traffic congestion, long travel times to larger destinations, difficulties in finding parking and navigating large crowds, and the desire for more activities and events closer to home (see Figure 9b, below).

Specific recommendations include:

- Experiment with offering events and programs in non-traditional locations, particularly in western Ormond.
- Work with neighborhood HOAs to offer events in smaller neighborhood and community venues; it is estimated that 60% of residents live in HOAs.
- Survey attendees at programs to develop a better customer profile, including the area in which they live, how they traveled to the event, needs for specific types of programs, etc.
- Continue to partner with other providers such as Destination Daytona, the Bandshell, and others to provide concerts and special events.
- Provide more programs to neighborhoods with young families.
- Inform residents of programs offered by both the city and other partners; for example, attendance at the Summer Sounds concerts doubled after city promotion.
- Coordinate with Destination Daytona, Chamber, Main Street and other providers to advertise and promote events through the monthly cultural events calendar.
- Experiments with mini-bus or trolley service from hotels to downtown for special events.
- Add amenities to accommodate special events at smaller local parks, such as electric service, portable stage areas, etc.
- Offer incentives to encourage residents to ride bikes to parks and special events.
- Conduct Cyclovia events that close certain streets to cars for the day.
10. Golf Courses

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

While not considered a high priority for investment in the statistically-representative survey, “golf course” ranked as residents’ 10th priority (see Figure 10a below). Part of the reason for the demand may be that 2 of the city’s 3 courses closed within the past four years. First, the Tomoka Oaks Golf and Country Club closed in early 2018, and then the Riverbend Golf Course closed in late 2020, leaving only the private Oceanside Country Club within the city limits. Still, public courses remain nearby, including the Riviera Golf Course and Country Club to the south of the city in Holly Hill, and the Halifax Plantation Golf Course and Country Club to the north, both of whom list an Ormond Beach mailing address.

VISION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The City’s vision is to continue promoting opportunities for golf courses and programs within the community, including learn-to-golf programs, links on the city’s website, and special events. The city may also wish to arrange for discounts for residents to play at nearby, publicly-owned golf courses.
Implementation Strategy
4.1 Introduction

Implementation comes in many forms, including new capital improvements, additional staffing, new programs, and increased maintenance. Other forms of implementation include updates to the comprehensive plan or land development regulations; partnerships with other agencies, businesses, or nonprofit organizations; refocused delivery of programs and services in response to the agency’s mission or residents’ priorities; and changes to maintenance and operations procedures.

The following sections include recommendations for:

- **CITY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**
  Recreation and Open Space Element and Capital Improvement Element

- **CITY’S LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE**
  Section 2-35 related to Recreation Facilities

- **FUNDING**
  Four scenarios considering a variety of sources and amounts.

- **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) AND STAFF ACTIONS**

- **PHASING OF IMPLEMENTATION**
  Recreation and Open Space Element and Capital Improvement Element
4.2 Revisions to Comprehensive Plan

Recreation and Open Space Element, Capital Improvement Element

It is recommended that the following items be reviewed in relation to the City’s parks level-of-service (LOS) standards, which are mentioned in the Recreation and Open Space Element and included in the Capital Improvements Element:

1. **Existing Capital Improvement Element Policy 1.3.2.:**

   Item (b) states:

   Parks (acres per population): 13 acres per 1,000 population A capital facilities recovery fee to develop lands dedicated by developers to meet the acreage level of service standards shall be pursued. The recovery fee may be either assessed to the developer of the subdivision or the builder of the home in the form of an impact fee. Subdivisions which provide private recreation lands and facilities shall be provided a credit against the land dedication and capital facilities recovery fee.

   The City may wish to amend the LOS standards as follows:

   - Clarify and specify what types of park land or improvements the City will accept in lieu of impact fees. Prescriptive prototypes, illustrations, and text could be included in either the comprehensive plan or the land development codes.

   - Add other LOS metrics to assure that residents’ needs are being met. These may include metrics related to access, quality, capacity, equity, sustainability, resiliency, and other desired future conditions.
2. **Modify Policy 1.1.6 of the Recreation and Open Space Element:**

   The City’s facility needs and program planning shall be determined through a continuous assessment of facility capacities and community needs, thorough surveys, citizen responses, civic interaction, and population growth. Surveys shall be completed by April of each year by the Leisure Services and Planning Departments. The following criteria shall be applied in implementation of this policy:

   a. Coordination with other City departments and civic groups of studies (e.g., continuing education) programs, special events and referral services. Such programs shall be available for all ages and not limited to any level of proficiency;

   b. Coordination of or liaison to the development of other community enhancement projects (e.g., Santaland Art in the Park, and Easter Egg Hunt);

   c. Develop an outreach strategy that provides recreation activities and programs on a neighborhood basis;

   d. Determine the need for additional multi-diversified leisure facilities to better accommodate existing and future needs;

   e. Survey of the use of recreation facilities by developmentally disabled and physically handicapped people. The plan shall further contain specific recommendations for correcting existing deficiencies and meeting future needs;

   f. Assess the special population needs and provide structured activities for youth and adults that would interface with mainstream youth programs.

3. **Modify Policy 1.1.6 of the Recreation and Open Space Element:**

   By 2025, the City shall continue to develop programs and activities at Central Park to support after school programs and other activities.

4. **Modify the text within Objective 1.9 of the Recreation and Open Space Element:**

   Objective 1.9 - Public recreation facilities shall both accommodate and integrate handicapped special populations and persons with disabilities consistent with Federal and State standards.

   Policy 1.9.1 - The City shall provide physical programs for the handicapped special populations and persons with disabilities of all ages, based upon demand.

   Policy 1.9.2 - Recreation facility construction or renovation shall be designed to accommodate and integrate the handicapped special populations and persons with disabilities consistent with Federal and State ADA standards.

   Policy 1.9.3 - When possible, handicapped special populations’ and persons with disabilities’ access to the beach shall be improved by the process of handicap accessible parking spaces and pedestrian beach access ramps.
Policy 1.9.4 - Playgrounds shall include handicap special populations and disability accessible and usable facilities, to integrate handicapped special populations’ children into the mainstream.

Policy 1.9.5 - The City shall construct playgrounds oriented towards handicapped special populations children.

5. Include an Objective and Policies that implement the recommendations of the 2022 Park and Recreation Master Plan update.
4.3 Revisions to Section 2-35 of Land Development Code

The City is currently performing an Impact Fee update that includes Park and Recreation impact fees. The park and recreation impact fees should be amended based on the impact fee consultant recommendation in order to maintain the current service level of parks and recreation.

Under Planned Residential Development:

Paragraph “(h) Recreational facilities”, of Section 2-35 of the City’s Land Development Regulations, includes numerous LOS requirements. These should be reviewed to determine if they are meeting the City’s recreation goals and objectives, as expressed in the comprehensive plan. Potential revisions include:

1) Expand the land area required for the dedication of private subdivision recreation areas.

2) Clarify that private subdivision recreation areas would not qualify for impact fee credits.

3) Establish criteria of land or facility requirements that would qualify for impact fee credits.

Residential Development outside a Planned Residential Development

There are no recreation requirements for developments outside of the Planned Residential Development process. Consideration should be given to establishing minimum recreation requirements for developments, such as multifamily projects, that do not require a planned development approval.
4.4 Funding

The ability to implement the City’s long-range Parks and Recreation Vision is based on the amount of funding that will be available over the next 10-years.

Barth and Associates representatives met with City staff to discuss realistic funding strategies for the implementation of parks and recreation capital improvements. Figure 4.4a below provides a summary of the three different 10-year funding projection options that were developed for the City Commission’s consideration. These options ranged from the existing, Pay-As-You-Go funding strategy that the City has historically used to fund parks and recreation capital projects, to options that consider extra ordinary funding sources. The following pages provide a detailed description of each of these funding options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>10-Year Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO, State and Federal Grants for Trails</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia County ECHO Grants</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia County ECHO Grants (Exceptional Grant)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parks and Recreation Grants*</td>
<td>$3.5 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Grants</td>
<td>$500 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>$1 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Millage for Parks and Recreation Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Dedicated Millage for Parks and Recreation Projects (20-Year Pay Back)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Obligation Bond (20-Year Bond) (Considers $50 per household annually)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Funding FY 2022-2031</td>
<td>$11 MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recommend hiring or contracting for a dedicated parks and recreation grants coordinator (e.g., RMPK Funding)

FIGURE 4.4a - Funding Options Summary
Funding Option 1 (City’s Existing Funding Strategy)

Funding Option 1 is the most conservative funding strategy. It is based on the City’s existing funding strategy for parks and recreation projects, which uses Pay-As-You-Go funding sources. Based on the amount that the City has historically used to fund parks and recreation projects and services, Figure 4.4b below illustrates what this strategy has the potential to generate over the next ten years. This amounts to approximately $11,000,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Funding</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>10-Year Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO, State and Federal Grants for Trails</td>
<td>+/- $196,800</td>
<td>Trails implementation led by other departments and agencies</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>+/- $196,800</td>
<td>$1,312.24 current impact fee times 150 single-family homes per year. Note that this impact fee is currently being reviewed.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvements</td>
<td>+/- $200,000</td>
<td>A portion of the general CIP dedicated millage.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia County ECHO Grants</td>
<td>+/- $200k</td>
<td>Maximum amount allowed is $600,000. ECHO allows one exceptional grant request of $2.5 million through the life of the ECHO program.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parks and Recreation Grants*</td>
<td>+/- $350k</td>
<td>50-year average, includes FRDAP, FIND, LWCF, DB Racing District, FDOT, FDCA, Ponce DeLeon Inlet &amp; Port District;</td>
<td>$3.5 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Grants</td>
<td>+/- $50k</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Lump sum</td>
<td>Based on 10-year average</td>
<td>$1 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Funding FY 2022-2031</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$11 MM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recommend hiring or contracting for a dedicated parks and recreation grants coordinator (e.g., RMPK Funding)

**FIGURE 4.4b - Funding Option 1 (City’s Existing Funding Strategy)**
Funding Option 2

Funding Option 2 considers allocating a dedicated millage for parks and recreation projects. A dedicated millage provides consistent and ongoing property tax funding for a specific purpose. The City of Ormond Beach currently has five dedicated millages:

- General Capital Improvements
- Facilities Renewal & Replacement
- Transportation
- General Vehicle Replacement, and
- Public Safety Vehicle & Equipment Fund.

The annual amount provided through a dedicated millage can be set as a fixed dollar amount or as a specific millage rate. The dedicated millage is part of the overall general operating millage. Therefore, it is not subject to voter approval. Instead, the rate is set annually by the City Commission.

A dedicated a millage could provide additional funding for parks and recreation projects and would help leverage additional grants such as Volusia County’s ECHO Grants, State, Federal, and specific parks and recreation grants that require local matches. Illustrated in Figure 4.4c, this scenario has the potential to generate approximately $17,000,000 over the next ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Funding</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>10-Year Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO, State and Federal Grants for Trails</td>
<td>+/- $196,800</td>
<td>Trails implementation led by other departments and agencies</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>+/- $196,800</td>
<td>$1,312.24 current impact fee times 150 single-family homes per year. Note that this impact fee is currently being reviewed.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvements</td>
<td>+/- $200,000</td>
<td>A portion of the general CIP dedicated millage.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia County ECHO Grants</td>
<td>+/- $400k</td>
<td>Maximum amount allowed is $600,000. ECHO allows one exceptional grant request of $2.5 million through the life of the ECHO program.</td>
<td>$4 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parks and Recreation Grants*</td>
<td>+/- $350k</td>
<td>50-year average, includes FRDAP, FIND, LWCF, DB Racing District, FDOT, FDCA, Ponce DeLeon Inlet &amp; Port District;</td>
<td>$3.5 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Grants</td>
<td>+/- $50k</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Lump sum</td>
<td>Based on 10-year average</td>
<td>$1 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Millage for Parks and Recreation Projects</td>
<td>+/- $400,000</td>
<td>A portion of collected revenue dedicated specifically for parks and recreation projects.</td>
<td>$ 4 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Funding FY 2022-2031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17 MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recommend hiring or contracting for a dedicated parks and recreation grants coordinator (e.g., RMPK Funding)

FIGURE 4.4c - Funding Option 2
**Funding Option 3**

Funding Option 3 considers allocating a dedicated millage for parks and recreation projects and then bonding that amount to generate additional revenue. Similar to Funding Option 2, since the dedicated millage is part of the overall general operating millage, bonding the amount would not be subject to voter approval.

Similar to Funding Option 2, a dedicated millage that is in turn bonded, could provide additional funding for parks and recreation projects and would help leverage additional grants such as Volusia County’s ECHO Grants, State, Federal, and specific parks and recreation grants that require local matches. Illustrated in Figure 4.4d, this option has the potential to generate approximately $18,500,000 over the next ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Funding</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>10-Year Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO, State and Federal Grants for Trails</td>
<td>+/- $196,800</td>
<td>Trails implementation led by other departments and agencies</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>+/- $200,000</td>
<td>$1,312.24 current impact fee times 150 single-family homes per year. Note that this impact fee is currently being reviewed.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Capital Improvements</td>
<td>+/- $200,000</td>
<td>A portion of the general CIP dedicated millage.</td>
<td>$2 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia County ECHO Grants</td>
<td>+/- $400k</td>
<td>Maximum amount allowed is $600,000. ECHO allows one exceptional grant request of $2.5 million through the life of the ECHO program.</td>
<td>$4 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parks and Recreation Grants*</td>
<td>+/- $350k</td>
<td>50-year average, includes FRDAP, FIND, LWCF, DB Racing District, FDOT, FDCA, Ponce DeLeon Inlet &amp; Port District;</td>
<td>$3.5 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Grants</td>
<td>+/- $50k</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Lump sum</td>
<td>Based on 10-year average</td>
<td>$1 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Dedicated Millage for Parks and Recreation Projects (20-Year Pay Back)</td>
<td>+/- $400,000</td>
<td>A dedicated millage of $400,000 per year would pay for a bond of $5.5 million with a 20-year payback.</td>
<td>$ 5.5 MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Funding FY 2022-2031</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$18.5 MM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recommend hiring or contracting for a dedicated parks and recreation grants coordinator (e.g., RMPK Funding)

**FIGURE 4.4d - Funding Option 3**
Another option for the City to consider is the use of an extra-ordinary funding source, such as a 20-year Obligation Bond. The inclusion of this extra-ordinary funding source is based on the responses from the Statistically Valid Survey (SVS) where 69.5% of respondents expressed a willingness to pay $12-$60 annually to fund the types of parks, recreation facilities, and programs that are most important to their household.

Figure 4.4e below illustrates the range of bond revenue that would be generated based on a range of annual household contributions. This increased amount would further help leverage additional grants such as Volusia County’s ECHO Grants, State, Federal, and other parks and recreation grants that require local matches, including a one-time, $2,500,000 grant from Volusia County’s ECHO Grants. The inclusion of the extra-ordinary funding source could also reduce the use of Pay-As-You-Go funding sources to pay for parks and recreation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Funding</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Obligation Bond (20-Year Bond) | N/A | $15 per household = $10 MM  
| | | $30 per household = $20 MM  
| | | $45 per household = $30 MM  
| | | $60 per household = $40 MM  
| | | $75 per household = $50 MM |

FIGURE 4.4e - Extra-ordinary Funding Source

A challenge with Option 4 is that the City would have to spend the bond revenue within a three-year time frame. Unless the City increased its staff or procured the services of a Program Management firm to help administer the bond and plan, design, and oversee the implementation of proposed projects, spending the bond revenue within the required time frame may not be possible with the City’s existing staff.
4.5 Capital Improvement Plan and Staff Actions

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is comprised of projects previously identified for completion and Capital Improvement Projects and Staff Actions proposed in Chapter 3: Vision. Projects previously identified for completion are listed in Figure 4.5a below. These projects should be implemented first followed by Capital Improvement Projects proposed in the Parks and Recreation Vision. Previously identified projects total $11,041,616; $3,667,450 of which are currently funded and $7,374,166 of which are currently not funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Creek, Phase 1</td>
<td>$666,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassen Park (Carryover)</td>
<td>$865,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>$607,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Beach Sports Complex Access &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>$484,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Discovery Center Trail System Connection</td>
<td>$455,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova LED Baseball Lighting</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Parking &amp; Fitness Stations</td>
<td>$901,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Beach Sports Complex Parking</td>
<td>$632,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAL House</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Complex Challenge Course</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Thomas Way</td>
<td>$792,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomoka Elementary Connector Sidewalk</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineland Trail Roadway Improvements (Sidewalk)</td>
<td>$925,566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 1 North Sidewalks</td>
<td>$1,995,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Totals</td>
<td>$3,667,450</td>
<td>$7,374,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$11,041,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5a - Existing Capital Improvement Projects
### Parks and Recreation Vision Projects and Staff Actions

Figure 4.5b below identifies proposed Parks and Recreation Vision Projects and Staff Actions discussed in Chapter 3: Vision. Projects identified in the Parks and Recreation Vision should be implemented as funds become available considering the Prioritization Strategy included in Section 4.6 - Proposed Prioritization and Phasing Strategy. These are organized in the order of the subsystems and the subsystem recommendations presented in Chapter 3: Vision. Proposed Parks and Recreation Vision projects include estimated, order of magnitude, planning level costs for implementation of each “sub-system” of the long-range vision; estimated park operating and maintenance costs; and potential administrative staff time for Staff Actions.

*It is important to note that all estimated capital and operating costs are approximate and should not be used for individual project budgets. Detailed site analyses, master plans, design/permitting/ construction documents, and cost estimates will need to be prepared in order to establish actual construction budgets.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways</td>
<td>1.1. Develop a Conservation Lands Acquisition and Management Plan</td>
<td>$50,000 (Consultant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resource Management Plans should be created for each natural area to manage against non-native species in and on natural lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Create an Advisory Committee to review and prioritize lands</td>
<td>Staff and Commission</td>
<td>Administrative staff time may be 12 meetings a year plus prep and follow-up time of at least 3 hours per meeting Total of 36 hours a year, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Determine costs for acquisition, trail development, and preservation</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Determine available and projected funding sources</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>State funding for conservation grants for purchasing of land and for the development of natural trails and trail head sites. Most will require at least a 20% match from the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</td>
<td>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</td>
<td>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways (Cont.)</td>
<td>1.5. Work with a non-profit organization to acquire the top priority sites</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Natural Land Management costs are approximately $400 to $500 per acre annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6. Budget adequate funds to manage lands once they have been acquired</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Schedule monthly or quarterly meetings with County and State Park representatives to discuss potential projects, monitor progress, and support where possible. May require administrative staff time for 4 - 12 meetings per year, 3 hours per meeting including preparation and follow-up time. Total of 12 - 36 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7. Advocate for Volusia County and State Parks to implement nature trails.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia County (Plantation Oaks Boulevard, and State Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8. Develop 420 linear feet of concrete and 670 linear feet of boardwalk (10’ wide)</td>
<td>$3,998,304</td>
<td>$1,300 annually</td>
<td>Capital: $400 SF for boardwalk; $230 LF for trail; + 20% Contingency; + 20% Permitting &amp; Engineering (P&amp;E). Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) Costs: $6,000 per mil, per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Avenue to Environmental Discovery Center Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Riverbend Golf Course Property</td>
<td>1.9. Evaluate opportunity for site to function as a park.*</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with airport representatives to explore and evaluate opportunities. Administrative staff time will vary based on length of process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: It is important to note that a land use study is currently underway to determine potential aeronautical and non-aeronautical uses for this airport property. Any future land use considerations must be based upon the results of that study and in compliance with the City’s obligations as the Airport Sponsor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverbend Nature Park</td>
<td>1.10. Construct floating dock and 1-mile mountain bike trail expansion*</td>
<td>$930,000 + Airport Engineer Consultant Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital: $750,000 floating dock; $25,000 for mountain bike trail; + 20% contingency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ormond Wetland Park</td>
<td>1.11. Boardwalk, trail, parking lot, and fishing pier</td>
<td>$4,320,000</td>
<td>$150,000 annually</td>
<td>Capital: 30 acres @ $100,000 per acre; +20% Contingency; + 20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $5,000 per acre, annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez Park Boat Launch</td>
<td>1.12. Floating dock</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital: $750,000 floating dock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Avenue and Old Kings Road</td>
<td>1.13. Parking area, multi-purpose trail, exercise equipment, fishing piers, lighting, furnishings, landscaping</td>
<td>$778,000</td>
<td>$18,000 annually</td>
<td>Capital: 1.8 Acres @ $300,000 per acre; +20% Contingency; + 20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $10,000 per acre annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Road Passive Park - North</td>
<td>1.14. Parking area, multi-purpose trail, exercise equipment, fishing piers, lighting, furnishings, landscaping</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$30,000 annually</td>
<td>Capital: 3 acres of developable area $300,000 per acre; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $10,000 per acre annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Parkway</td>
<td>1.15. Parking area, multi-purpose trail, exercise equipment, fishing piers, lighting, furnishings, landscaping</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$30,000 annually</td>
<td>Capital: 3 acres of developable area $300,000 per acre; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $10,000 per acre annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,376,304</td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: $229,300 Administrative Staff Time: Minimum 48 hours, annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: These projects will require an airspace study and determination as to compatible land use. An appraisal will also have to be performed to determine appropriate remuneration to the Airport Fund for the use of the property, pending FAA approval.
### 2. Off-Beach Parking and New Beachfront Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Conduct, partner, or advocate for a beach parking study to evaluate alternative techniques, determine residents’ and visitors’ preferences, and make recommendations to the City Commission. Consider asking the county and other municipalities to jointly conduct a countrywide study.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Schedule monthly or quarterly meetings with County and adjacent municipalities to complete and participate in a regional off-beach parking study. May require administrative staff time for 4 – 12 meetings per year-Total of 12 – 36 hours annually including preparation and follow-up time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Identify alternative funding sources including the county’s ECHO grants program, FDOT grants, and others.</td>
<td>Staff or Contract Grants Writer</td>
<td>Hire or contract for a grants writer to assist with pursuing grants for parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Work with FDOT to create additional, safer crossings on A1A</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Schedule monthly or quarterly meetings with FDOT project manager to review progress, assist with public relations and communication, and support where possible. May require administrative staff time for 4 – 12 meetings per year- Total of 12 – 36 hours annually including preparation and follow-up time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Evaluate potential acquisition of vacant or derelict beachfront parcels, particularly north of Granada.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Review property listings weekly to identify potential land sale opportunities. Organize a Park Land Acquisition Review Team to meet monthly and include staff from Leisure Services, Planning, Finance and the City Manager’s office to review potential land to acquire. May require administrative staff time for research (4 hours weekly, for 48 weeks per year) and 12 meetings per year (3 hours per meeting including preparation, execution, and follow-up)- Total of 228 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Evaluate opportunities to partner with other land owners for joint-use parking, such as churches, schools, and commercial properties that are closed during peak beach hours.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with potential land owners to discuss and identify suitable opportunities, identify necessary R.O.W improvements, establish Memorandums of Understandings (MOU), and monitor program. Staff time may vary based on opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</td>
<td>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</td>
<td>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6. Experiment with a beach shuttle service from City Hall or The Casements, using rented VOTRAN mini-buses. Invite food trucks, offer music, and provide kids’ programs to make it a special event.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with shuttle rental providers, food truck vendors, and other program providers to establish schedules, develop necessary contracts, and support where possible. Solicit volunteers to assist where possible.</td>
<td>Shuttle Rental Costs: $1,500 - $2,000 per day for major holidays (Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: TBD Administrative Staff Time: Minimum 492 hours, annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL: Off-Beach Parking and New Beachfront Park

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Paved Multi-purpose Trails</td>
<td>3.1. Update the 2016 Master Plan, and re-establish priorities and estimated costs.</td>
<td>$200,000 for Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct extensive public engagement to review and comment on proposed corridors.</td>
<td>Covered in Recommendation 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work with the MPO to develop realistic funding projections that leverage city, county, state and federal funds.</td>
<td>Covered in Recommendation 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adopt the updated Master Plan, including a phased funding and implementation strategy with dedicated funding sources.</td>
<td>Covered in Recommendation 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. Initiate “safe walk to schools” and “safe walk to parks” campaigns, focused on providing safe pedestrian and bicycle access.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of at least 40 - 80 hours per month – Total of 480 - 960 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Promote bikeways and trails as transportation alternatives to help reduce congestion.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff time included in Recommendation 3.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. Wherever possible, widen existing trails to at least 8’ wide.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet monthly with Public Works to discuss opportunities, monitor progress, and support where possible. May require administrative staff time for 12 meetings per year, 3 hours per meeting including preparation and follow-up time – Total of 36 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</td>
<td>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</td>
<td>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Secure funding for the top priority improvements.</td>
<td>Covered in Recommendation 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US1 Shared Use Path</td>
<td>3.6. Develop 5.1 miles of 12'-wide concrete multi-use path</td>
<td>$8,812,800</td>
<td>$30,600 annually</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $1,200,000 per mile; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $6,000 per mile annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Creek Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>3.7. Develop 1.2 miles of 10'-wide concrete multi-use path</td>
<td>$2,073,600</td>
<td>$7,200 annually</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $1,200,000 per mile; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $6,000 per mile annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>3.8. Develop 1.2 miles of 10'-wide concrete multi-use path</td>
<td>$2,073,600</td>
<td>$7,200 annually</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $1,200,000 per mile; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $6,000 per mile annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Avenue Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>3.9. Develop 2.4 miles of 10'-wide concrete multi-use path</td>
<td>$4,147,200</td>
<td>$14,400 annually</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $1,200,000 per mile; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $6,000 per mile annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomoka State Park Shared Use Path Phase 2</td>
<td>3.10. Develop 2.4 miles of 10'-wide concrete multi-use path</td>
<td>$4,147,200</td>
<td>$14,400 annually</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $1,200,000 per mile; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $6,000 per mile annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Highway Heritage Shared Use Path</td>
<td>3.11. Complete Concept Study that identifies preferred route, costs, funding sources, and implementation strategy.</td>
<td>$150,000 for Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Paved Shared Use Trails Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,604,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: $73,800 Administrative Staff Time: Minimum 516 hours, annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Indoor Recreation Centers</td>
<td>2.4 4.1. Develop Feasibility Study and Conceptual Master Plan for new West Ormond Indoor Recreation Center:  - Determine the appropriate uses (development program) for the center – and possibly a surrounding park - considering that many western communities have private community centers and swimming pools.  - Evaluate the suitability of potential sites to accommodate the development program for both the center and the park, such as the airport property and the Leeway Trail site.  - Estimate both the capital and operating costs of the proposed alternatives, as well as anticipated revenues.  - Evaluate alternatives for operations, maintenance and programming, including potential partnerships.  - Make recommendations for a preferred alternative.</td>
<td>$150,000 for Consultant</td>
<td>Administrative staff time may vary based on the length of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. Discuss partnership opportunities with Flagler County, potentially including a regional park site.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with Flagler County to discuss opportunity.  Administrative staff time may vary based on partnership potential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.</td>
<td>Evaluate opportunities for e-sports programs and other alternative recreation activities.</td>
<td>$25,000 Consultant</td>
<td>Administrative staff time may vary based on length of project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.</td>
<td>Develop 30,000 SF Indoor Recreation Center</td>
<td>$13,824,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $320 SF for Indoor Recreation Center; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $1,200,000 a year to operate 360 days a year for 16 hours a day. At least 80% of the cost should be cost recoverable at a minimum if designed and managed correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL:</td>
<td>Indoor Recreation Center Vision Costs</td>
<td>$13,999,000</td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: $1,200,000 Administrative Staff Time: TBD, annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Improvements to Existing Parks</td>
<td>5.1. Establish prioritization criteria, and work with the advisory boards to prioritize parks for improvement.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with Boards over at least 3 meetings to develop prioritization criteria, rank parks, and present findings. May require administrative staff time of at least 160 hours of preparation, execution, and follow-up time -Total of 160 hours of non-recurring task specific time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2. Develop conceptual master plans – including extensive public involvement – for each of the top priority parks.</td>
<td>$15,000 for Mini Parks for Consultant $25,000 for Neighborhood Parks for Consultant $45,000 for Community Parks for Consultant</td>
<td>Administrative staff time may vary based on number and length of project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3. Develop a standard “amenities list” and updated design standards to ensure a consistently high level of quality.</td>
<td>$50,000 for Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Improvements to Existing Parks Vision Costs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: TBD Administrative Staff Time: 160 hours of non-recurring task specific time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. New Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>6.1. Investigate potential areas in need of a park within 1/2 mile Access LOS as illustrated in Figure 3.9b page 221 of report.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of at least 80 hours of re-search, meetings, and development of recommendations -Total of 80 hours of non-recurring task specific time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2. Evaluate opportunities to fill the gaps through public and/or private investment considering the prototypical park illustrated in Figure 3.9c page 221 of report.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of at least 160 hours of re-search, meetings, and development of recommendations -Total of 160 hours of non-recurring task specific time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3. Consider partnering with Home-owners Associations to improve existing, underutilized HOA parks through grants, leases, joint-use agreements, or other mechanisms.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of at least 80 hours of re-search, meetings, and development of recommendations -Total of 80 hours of non-recurring task specific time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4. Consider providing portable recreation amenities and programs in underserved areas; for example, provide different “recreation packages” such as a movie-night package, adult fitness package, or playground package.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of at least 80 hours of re-search, meetings, and development of recommendations -Total of 80 hours of non-recurring task specific time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Administrative Staff Time: 320 hours, non-recurring, task time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Sports Facilities and Programs</strong></td>
<td>7.1. Develop a Conceptual Master Plan for a new West Ormond Indoor Recreation Center and park, as discussed above. Uses may include pickleball courts, a walking track, community meeting rooms, gymnasium with basketball and volleyball courts, indoor fitness center, space for large gatherings and events (seating for more than 200 people), youth basketball, and other amenities. Include amenities for cheer and dance.</td>
<td>Included in Indoor Recreation Center Vision Costs in Recommendation 4.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2. Upgrade fields and amenities at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex and Nova Community Park, including LED lighting, drainage, restrooms, benches, walks, fencing, roadways, and parking.</td>
<td>Included in City RR Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3. Complete the build-out of the Nova Community Park master plan to provide additional multi-purpose fields. Consider adding a Miracle Field and making improvements to the indoor center and park to enhance special populations programming.</td>
<td>$3,865,000</td>
<td>$120,000 per year</td>
<td>Capital Costs: Park Master Plan $3,864,800 in 2012 x 15.47% inflation. O&amp;M Costs: $18,000 per field annually at Level 1; $10,000 per acre annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</td>
<td>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</td>
<td>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4. Construct additional outdoor basketball courts.</td>
<td>Included in Nova Community Park costs (7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5. Evaluate opportunities for the use of the former Gymnastics Center at Nova Recreation Center, such as a multi-purpose space for pickleball, youth basketball, cheer, e-sports, and other high-priority or emerging trend needs.</td>
<td>$25,000 for Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL:</strong> Sports Facilities Vision Costs</td>
<td><strong>$3,875,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: $120,000</strong> <strong>Administrative Staff Time: TBD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Aquatics Facilities</strong></td>
<td>8.1. Promote the YMCA programs and facilities to make residents more aware of what is being offered.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with YMCA monthly to discuss opportunities to promote programs and facilities and support where possible including promoting programs and facilities in City’s website, social media site, and cross-promotion during City programs. May require administrative staff time for 12 meetings annually, at least 9 hours per meeting including preparation, execution, and follow-up time—Total of 108 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2. Consider partnering with the YMCA to offer additional days for public lap swimming and additional aquatics programs.</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 8.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3. Develop two additional splash pads in areas identified in Figure 3.11a page 227 as having a need for splash pads.</td>
<td>See Recommendations 8.4-8.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Splash Pad in North Central Ormond</strong></td>
<td>8.4. Explore opportunity to build splash pad in Ormond Beach Sports Complex.</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$15,000 per year</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $500,000 for Splash Pad; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $15,000 annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pad in West Ormond</td>
<td>8.5. Explore opportunity to build splash pad in West Ormond Community Park site or West Ormond Wet-lands Park site, or future new park site.</td>
<td>$1,152,000 or included in Project 1.11 costs.</td>
<td>$15,000 per year or included in Project 1.11 costs.</td>
<td>Capital Costs: $500,000 for Splash Pad; $300,000 for infrastructure, parking area, pavilion, restroom, and furnishings; +20% Contingency; +20% P&amp;E. O&amp;M Costs: $10,000 per acre annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,872,000</td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: $30,000</td>
<td>Administrative Staff Time: 108 hours annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSYSTEM</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</td>
<td>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</td>
<td>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Community Events, Summer Concerts, and Programs</td>
<td>9.1. Experiment with offering events and programs in non-traditional locations, particularly in western Ormond.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Based on Recommendation 6.4. provide at least 2 new programs per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2. Work with neighborhood HOAs to offer events in smaller neighborhood and community venues; it is estimated that 60% of residents live in HOAs.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Attend at least 4 HOA’s meetings monthly to discuss opportunities to offer events in smaller neighborhoods based on Recommendation 6.4.</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time for 48 meetings annually, at least 8 hours per meeting including time preparation, execution, and development of recommendations and action plans– Total of 480 hours annually, minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3. Survey attendees at programs, including performing art center to develop a better customer profile, including the area in which they live, how they traveled to the event, needs for specific types of programs, etc.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Develop brief Survey Monkey or similar survey, review findings, and provide recommendations.</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of 4 hours per week including time for preparation, execution, and development of recommendations and action plans– Total of 192 hours annually, minimum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.4.</td>
<td>Continue to partner with other providers such as Destination Daytona, the Bandshell, and others to provide concerts and special events.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet monthly with partners to discuss opportunities, monitor progress, and support where possible. May require administrative staff time for 12 meetings annually, at least 3 hours per meeting including time for preparation, execution, and development of recommendations and action plans – Total of 36 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.</td>
<td>Provide more programs to neighborhoods with young families.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Based on Recommendations 6.4. and 9.1, provide at least 2 new programs per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6.</td>
<td>Inform residents of programs offered by both the city and other partners; for example, attendance at the Summer Sounds concerts doubled after city promotion.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Collect city and partner programming information and develop promotional materials. May require administrative staff time of 24 hours per month to collect and develop relevant materials – Total 288 annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7.</td>
<td>Coordinate with Destination Daytona, Chamber, Main Street and other providers to advertise and promote events through the monthly cultural events calendar.</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 9.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.8.</td>
<td>Experiments with mini-bus or trolley service from hotels to downtown for special events.</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 2.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.</td>
<td>Add amenities to accommodate special events at smaller local parks, such as electric service, portable stage areas, etc.</td>
<td>Coordinate with Recommendations 5.2 and 5.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.</td>
<td>Offer incentives to encourage residents to ride bikes to parks and special events.</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11.</td>
<td>Conduct Cyclovia events that close certain streets to cars for the day.</td>
<td>Included in Recommendation 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Events, Summer Concerts, and Programs Vision Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Staff Time: 996 hours annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS/PROJECTS (As discussed in Section 3: Vision)</th>
<th>EST. CAPITAL COSTS</th>
<th>EST. ADDITIONAL OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Golf Courses</td>
<td>10.1. Continue promoting opportunities for golf courses and programs within the community, including learn-to-golf programs, links on the city’s website, and special events.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>May require administrative staff time of at least 16 hours per month including meeting with partners and development of pro-motional materials - Total of 192 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2. Explore potential to arrange for discounts for residents to play at nearby, publicly-owned golf courses.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Meet with nearby golf courses bi-annually to discuss opportunities, develop potential strategies, and promotional materials. Staff time may be 2 meetings per year plus prep and follow-up time of at least 16 hours per meeting - Total of 32 hours annually, minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL: Golf Course Vision Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,732,704</td>
<td>Annual Park O&amp;M Costs: $1,731,900 Administrative Staff Time: 2,384 hours annually. 460 hours of non-recurring, task time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.5b - Proposed CIP and Staff Actions (cont.)
In collaboration with City staff, Barth Associates developed a prioritization strategy to identify which projects should be implemented first as funding becomes available. Figure 4.6a below identifies the seven (7) prioritization criteria, criteria source/ consideration, and criteria scale and application that were used to prioritize projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritization Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria Source/ Consideration</th>
<th>Criteria Scale and Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implements Commission Objectives</td>
<td>City of Ormond Beach Strategic Plan</td>
<td>1 = No, the project does not implement a specific project or objective identified in the City of Ormond Beach Strategic Plan. 3 = Yes, the project indirectly helps implement a project or objective identified in the City of Ormond Beach Strategic Plan. 5 = Yes, the project implements a project or objective identified in the City of Ormond Beach Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage Existing Resources</td>
<td>Staff Time/ Physical Asset</td>
<td>1 = No, the project does not leverage staff time or a physical asset. 3 = Yes, the project leverages staff time or a physical asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects Existing Assets</td>
<td>Existing Physical Asset</td>
<td>1 = No, the project does not relate to a specific and existing physical asset. 3 = Yes, the project relates to a specific and existing physical asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Priority Needs</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Statistically Valid Survey</td>
<td>1 = Low Priority - The project is identified as a Low-Priority in the Statistically Valid Survey Priority Investment Rating. 3 = Medium Priority - The project is identified as a Medium-Priority in the Statistically Valid Survey Priority Investment Rating. 5 = High Priority - The project is identified as a High-Priority in the Statistically Valid Survey Priority Investment Rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding is Available</td>
<td>City Budget</td>
<td>1 = No, funds are not currently allocated for the project in the City’s budget. 3 = Yes, funds are currently allocated for the project in the City’s budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverages Funds from Other Sources</td>
<td>Alternative Funding Sources/ Grants</td>
<td>1 = No, the project does not have the potential to leverage alternative funding sources or grants. 3 = Yes, the project does have the potential to leverage alternative funding sources or grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Unique Environmental, Economic, and Social Benefits</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>1 = Low - The project is not unique in that similar experiences can be experienced elsewhere or it does not improve an existing experience. 3 = Medium - The project improves an existing experience or advances the potential for the provision of a unique experience. 5 = High - The project provides or increases access to an experience that is unique.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.6a - Prioritization Criteria and Scale

Using this prioritization strategy, Figure 4.6b (next two pages) illustrates the scoring and prioritization of proposed Parks and Recreation Vision Projects. Projects identified with an Asterisk (*) are projects that were identified by the Quality-of-Life Advisory Board (QOLAB) as high priority projects. Projects identified with an arrow (^) are projects that were identified by the Leisure Services Advisory Board (LSAB) as high-priority projects.
## Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Planning Level Costs</th>
<th>Implements Commission Goals</th>
<th>Leverages Existing Resources (Staff Time/Physical Asset)</th>
<th>Protects Existing Assets</th>
<th>Meets Priority Needs (Statistically Valid Survey)</th>
<th>City Funding is Available</th>
<th>Leverages Funds from Other Sources</th>
<th>Provides Unique Environmental, Economic, and Social Benefits</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Natural Areas, Nature Trails, and Blueways

1.3. Division Avenue to Environmental Discovery Center Trail - Develop 420 linear feet of concrete and 670 linear feet of boardwalk (10’ wide).

1.4. Former Riverbend Golf Course Property (Operated within a leasehold area upon airport property) - Evaluate opportunity for property to function as a park. Non-aeronautical use of airport property must be approved by the Federal Aviation Administration and include remuneration to the Airport Fund.

1.5. Riverbend Nature Park - Construct floating dock and 1-mile mountain bike trail expansion in coordination with Airport Engineering Consultants and FAA.

1.6. West Ormond Wetland Park - Boardwalk, trail, parking lot, and fishing pier.

1.7. Sanchez Park Boat Launch - Floating dock.

1.8. Division Avenue Old Kings Road - Parking area, multi-purpose trail, exercise equipment, fishing piers, lighting, furnishings, landscaping.

1.9. Nova Road Passive Park North - Parking area, multi-purpose trail, exercise equipment, fishing piers, lighting, furnishings, landscaping.

1.10. Arroyo Parkway - Parking area, multi-purpose trail, exercise equipment, fishing piers, lighting, furnishings, landscaping.

3. Paved Multi-Purpose Trails

3.4. Wherever possible, widen existing trails to at least 8’ wide.

3.6. US-1 Shared Multi-Use Path - Develop 5.1 miles of 12’ wide concrete multi-use path.

3.7. Thompson Creek Multi-Use Path - Develop 1.2 miles of 10’ wide concrete multi-use path.

3.8. East Coast Greenway - Develop 1.2 miles of 10’ wide concrete multi-use path.

3.9. Hands Avenue Multi-Use Path - Develop 2.4 miles of 10’ wide concrete multi-use path.

3.10. Tomoka State Park Shared Use Path Phase 2 - Develop 2.4 miles of 10’ wide concrete multi-use path.

---

**FIGURE 4.6b - Scoring and Prioritization of Parks and Recreation Vision Projects**
### Implementation Strategy

#### Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Planning Level Costs</th>
<th>Implements Commission Goals</th>
<th>Leverages Existing Resources (Staff Time/Physical Asset)</th>
<th>Protects Existing Assets</th>
<th>Meets Priority Needs (Statistically Valid Survey)</th>
<th>City Funding is Available</th>
<th>Leverages Funds from Other Sources</th>
<th>Provides Unique Environmental, Economic, and Social Benefits</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = No, Indirectly 3 = Yes, Directly</td>
<td>1 = No 3 = Yes</td>
<td>1 = Low Priority 3 = Medium Priority 5 = High Priority</td>
<td>1 = No 3 = Yes</td>
<td>1 = No 3 = Yes</td>
<td>1 = Low Priority 3 = Medium Priority 5 = High Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Score = 7 High Score = 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,824,000</td>
<td>5 1 1 1 1 3 3 15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4. Indoor Recreation Centers</td>
<td>4.4. Develop 30,000 SF Indoor Recreation Center.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 3 11.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indoor Recreation Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,864,885</td>
<td>1 3 3 5 1 1 3 17.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7. Sports Facilities and Programs</td>
<td>7.2. Upgrade fields and amenities at the Ormond Beach Sports Complex and Nova Community Park, including LED lighting, drainage, restrooms, benches, walks, fencing, roadways, and parking.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 3 11.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sports Facilities and Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,864,885</td>
<td>1 3 3 5 1 1 3 17.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4. Construct additional outdoor basketball courts.</td>
<td>7.3. Improve/complete the build-out of the Nova Community Park master plan to provide additional multi-purpose fields. Consider adding a Miracle Field and making improvements to the indoor center and park to enhance special populations programming.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 3 11.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.6b (cont.) - Scoring and Prioritization of Parks and Recreation Vision Projects