

**City of DeBary  
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP  
WEDNESDAY**

**February 16, 2005**

**7 PM**

Florence K. Little Town Hall  
12 Colomba Road DeBary, Florida 32713

**MINUTES**

**I. Call To Order**

**II. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** Mayor Carmen Rosamonda, Vice Mayor Richard Gunter, Council Member Christopher Carson, Council Member Danny Tillis and Council Member Patrick Fulton.

**Others Present:** City Manager Maryann Courson, Gary Warner - Glatting Jackson, and Jeffrey T. Larson - Kirkpatrick Pettis.

**III. Public Hearing**

*Members of the Council should disclose for the record the substance of any ex-parte communication that has occurred before or during the public hearings for the following items:*

1. Discussion of Rob Sullivan Park Master Plan.  
(Continued from 02/02/05 meeting)

Item No. 2 was heard prior to item No. 1 without objection.

Rob Sullivan was introduced and thanked for his service and involvement in the creation of the parks in DeBary. Gary Warner with Glatting Jackson discussed the revisions to the proposed Master Plan for Rob Sullivan Park; that there were changes to the design concept; that existing conditions in the current park and new property had affected design; that aerial photos had been taken and surveys done; that the scrub jay habitat required a 150-foot buffer; that if the habitat was left untouched it would not require mitigation; and that adding any trails or picnic areas would require mitigation.

Mr. Warner discussed further discussed active gopher burrows and signs of black bear; that it did not require protection but residents should be aware it was there; that the elevation of the land dropped off rapidly from the current park area and created design challenges; that the current park had good ball fields but playgrounds and drinking fountains were in need of upgrading; that parking areas did not meet ADA standards and basketball courts were in disrepair; and that open spaces and viewing areas needed enhancement.

Mr. Warner discussed that the concept plan included an overall theme of the history of the St. Johns River; that the plan included three new ball fields, two soccer/football fields, playgrounds,

a concession area, a stand-alone restroom building and maintenance yard; that parking recommendation was for 260 to 300 cars; that picnic, open space, pavilions, landscape buffer and storm water retention was included; that 3.5 acres was the habitat area; and that two entrances would be off of West Highbanks Road.

Mr. Warner elaborated on additional details of the amenities: that the hardscape design resembled the course of the river; that emergency access would be provided via a concrete walk; that shaded and recreation areas would be provided; that grading for the fields was challenging due to the topography; that retaining walls would be part of the design to handle grade changes and direct drainage; that the soccer fields would take advantage of terracing that could be used for viewing; that some retention could be placed in excess parking area; that all calculations were not yet available from the water management district; that it would be suggested to do grass parking to reduce costs and the amount of retention required; and that it was not yet known whether treatment of runoff water would be needed.

Mr. Warner answered other enquiries: that balancing the site and adding fill was difficult; that the soccer fields were staggered due to the slope of land for retention; that catch basins and drains would pipe some runoff to retention areas; that there were other possibilities for retention areas; that the topographical survey was done specifically for the property; that a track or path might be possible but would have to meet ADA requirements; and that walking trails were always requested at parks.

Costs were discussed; that they were reduced slightly to \$5.6 to \$5.7 million since the previous estimate; that clearing costs were estimated at \$192,000; that costs might be reduced if burning on site was allowed; that grading and fill was a high cost; that lighting estimates would probably be less when currently lighted fields were deducted; that costs for baseball fields could possibly be reduced; and that structures for concession, maintenance and restrooms would be another high cost.

Possibilities to reduce costs would be to have asphalt driving lanes and grass parking; making the concession stand a one-story building; that the freestanding restrooms could be built at a later date; that lighting could be done through a lease purchase program; that the soccer fields could be phased in at a later date; that the number of pavilions could be reduced; and that the contingency on costs was currently at 15%.

Mr. Warner discussed how much could be done for a \$2 million to \$3 million cost; that the basics could be completed including the entrances, some hardscape, playground and a one-story concession could be done; and that those areas could be utilized as future construction was undertaken.

It was discussed that the configuration of the entrance and fields could be scaled down with one entrance; that a simplified design might be possible with the ball fields contained in the flat 9-acre area; that a single entrance might cause congestion; that condensing the field areas would reduce the grading requirements; that the focus should be for the fields; that the concession could be centered; and that 144 parking spaces should be sufficient when compared with the current activity.

It was further discussed that the two soccer fields would accommodate the popularity of the sport and could be used for football; that there were other sports that needed to be accommodated such as skateboarding; that that area would not be very large and the components easily moved; that a second entrance at another location would provide better traffic flow; that more amenities for other demographic groups should be included; that one ball field could be eliminated to allow room for other amenities in the more level area; that growth in the community would create more demand for a variety of sport fields; and that there were different field sizes needed for different age groups.

It was also discussed that pavilions could be sponsored out to obtain alternate funding; that they could also be a source of income; that some of the changes discussed would make project costs closer to available funds; that the concept plan presented was taking all desired elements into account; that the purpose of the workshop was to prioritize and plan elements to be phased in; that this was the sixth concept plan presented; and that ideas were being changed and refined to best suit the needs of the greater part of the community.

It was discussed that the proposed fields were large; that there did not appear to be small fields for the younger players; that the larger fields would accommodate tournament leagues; that T-ball fields could be added to the soccer/multi-purpose fields; that with the field at Keller Park, there would be four fields; that Keller Park might be more appropriate for a skateboard park; that Rob Sullivan Park could be more of a sports complex; that experience at other parks indicated that two entrances should be included and parking for over 200 cars; and that it could also provide a venue for fireworks due to the river location.

It was discussed that there was higher attendance at T-ball and younger Little League; that it had also been discussed to put softball complex at another location; that the overall cost could be planned out for a higher amount and designed to phase in over the course of several years; that sponsoring options, grants and yearly budgeting could be done; that it was desirable to design and plan the park in an appropriate fashion from the start; and that there were elements that could be added at a later time while still providing for the desired uses.

Guidance for the next revision of the concept plan was discussed; that the elements and revisions were listed as had been suggested; that comparison and experience at other community parks could guide the need for entrances and parking; that a quality park would draw more use; that planning for future use as needs changed was important; and that traffic and safety issues should be carefully considered.

It was clarified that Bill Keller Park was the more appropriate location for a skateboard park; that it should be addressed soon, as that sport was gaining rapidly in popularity; that T-ball fields were desirable and were approximately 125 feet and could be incorporated into the multi-purpose fields; that the project needed to be reduced or phased to meet budget constraints; that when City Staff was filled out, grants could be applied for; that additional revisions would be made by the consultant to streamline the plan and reduce additional costs; and that a future workshop would be held to review changes on March 16, 2005 at 7:00 PM.

There was some concern that phasing would not provide the facilities when needed; that costs would rise over time during phases; that it was still important to stay within budget constraints and be able to address other capital projects; and that a grant had been applied for from ECHO. There was also discussion of keeping the layout of the existing fields and refurbishing; that the reason for changing the current fields was an inefficient layout but it could be made somewhat more functional for less cost; that the design could still be altered to make a more efficient design and bring the project in at better cost; and that an appropriately designed park was better for existing residents and to attract new residents.

2. Presentation – Jeffrey T. Larson; Kirkpatrick Pettis  
Financing of Capital Projects

The item was heard prior to Item 1.

It was discussed that Kirkpatrick Pettis was a financial consultant for other communities; that future projects for the City required reviewing options to meet financial needs.

Jeffrey Larson, Senior Vice President and Regional Manager for Kirkpatrick Pettis, discussed his experience with the company and that of his company in Florida; that printed materials were provided for reference; that a debt capacity analysis for DeBary had been completed; that the firm could work either as investment bankers or as financial advisors; that comparable Florida communities they had worked with included Deltona, Sebastian, Tamarac, Palm Bay, Leesburg and Orange City; and that many of their situations paralleled that in DeBary.

Bill Spivey, investment banker with Kirkpatrick Pettis, discussed comparisons of three finance options available: pay as you go, lease options and short or long term capital markets; that each option would be suitable in specific situations; that a short term capital could be changed over to a long term; that a relationship with local banks could be established for short term capital; that for capital projects, bond issuances for up to 30 years could be considered; that there were both advantages and disadvantages; and that Kirkpatrick Pettis could provide guidance in selecting programs.

Mr. Larson further discussed details relating to needs in DeBary; that charter limitations might need to be addressed to become capable of financing options; and that examples were provided showing impact on taxes if current limits were used as compared to longer terms. It was discussed that this example was based on funds required if budget funds were not available and that this was not currently the case in DeBary. Mr. Larson further discussed how bond financing was used in other communities; that it appeared the City of DeBary could benefit from bonds; that charter and tax issues would have to be addressed in certain scenarios; that the City of DeBary had no current debt and had revenues; and that the City had financial capability to take advantage of bond funds.

Mr. Larson discussed other scenarios for bonds and payment through revenues; that the firm could advise what number of projects that could be done based on the amount of funds elected; that Kirkpatrick Pettis could advise and guide what projects could actually be completed based on current restraints and funds; that another option would be to present a referendum to voters to

pay additional taxes for funding; that it was not typically successful; and that a Charter review process would probably be beneficial.

It was discussed that a Charter review was done in 2001; that it was required every seven years; that another review could be done if so desired by the City Council; that a Charter Review Committee could be formed; that it was unlikely that the process could be completed prior to elections; and that the list of proposed Capital Improvement Projects would exceed the annual budget and included storm water issues, proposed civic buildings and as well as park projects.

It was further discussed that in 2001 the Charter had amended financing from 36 months to 60 months; that it was not unreasonable to consider extending that term further; that the process of Charter review should not be rushed; that the electorate of DeBary would make the final decision on any amendments; that the last budget had included borrowing \$3.1 million for Capital projects for the coming fiscal year; that the amount would not meet project costs; that a special election could be held if a Charter review process was completed; that the review process would include assurances that good stewardship practices were included; and that it would probably be a year long process.

Mr. Larson discussed short term funding: that, typically, bank financing could run up to ten years; that Kirkpatrick Pettis would present desired rates and terms to various banks to obtain the appropriate funding; and that a loan would be more desirable than a line of credit. It was further discussed that utilizing the services of such a firm as Kirkpatrick Pettis would be helpful in determining how to obtain financing under current restrictions; that they could also look into starting a Charter Review Committee in the future; and that guidance be provided to the City Manager to look into obtaining the services of Kirkpatrick Pettis and formation of a Charter Review Committee.

It was discussed that utilizing financial services and performing Charter review was appropriate; that a cautionary view should be used when selecting projects; that storm water was crucial; that Kirkpatrick Pettis could provide a typical agreement for further review; that a retainer was not required and work was provided as needed; that the firm could also assist with investment management of City revenues; and that there had not been an opportunity to present that information yet to the City Manager and Finance Administrator.

It was the consensus of the City Council to authorize the City Manager to review the contract with Kirkpatrick Pettis and begin formulating a resolution for a Charter Review Committee in preparation for presentation to the City Council.

### 3. City Manager Annual Goals and Objectives. (Continued from 02/02/05 meeting)

City Manager Courson discussed that a consensus was desirable; that a summary of current projects was provided by category for review; and that a list of projects should be selected and prioritized.

It was discussed that each Council Member would present their suggestions and that a list could then be compiled for consensus by priority. It appeared that the Storm Water Master Plan and facilities was a priority on all lists; that the City Manager was following up on completing removal of the duplicate street lights; that the Saxon Boulevard extension was important to all Members; and that a new City Hall and civic facilities were also important on all lists. Other issues included an emergency plan in place for the upcoming season, streetscaping, a skateboard park, completion of Rob Sullivan Park, obtaining the burrow pit, improving City Staff, improving communication and response between City Hall and the public; and that getting schools into DeBary was an ongoing project for the City Council.

It was discussed that the final lists included the Storm Water Master Plan, the City Hall and Administration building, development of Rob Sullivan Park (fka Community Park), extension of Saxon Boulevard, Hurricane Emergency Plan, storm water facilities, streetscape and a skate board park; that a business association could be formed with the help of the Chamber of Commerce or DeBary business owners might be encouraged to form an association; that groups formed during the CRA discussions might be brought back together; and that for the list of goals discussed, action plans, timelines and deadlines should be provided.

It was also discussed that the Public Safety Advisory Committee was scheduled to do a presentation of an emergency plan in April; that Staff was already researching additional parking at Gateway Park; that the easement under the power lines was privately owned and staff would be contacting the power company to negotiate use of the parcel; that minimal improvement would be needed to the area; that the legal ramifications should be reviewed; and that tax certificates might be purchased.

It was discussed that the City Manager would bring back the list with action plans and deadlines.

Members of the West Volusia Chamber of Commerce appeared to discuss the position of the City in regard to the proposed conference center; that it was understood that there were more urgent priorities for City funds to address, such as storm water issues; that the City Council was asked to provide a vote of confidence that they would like to continue with the project; that \$1.6 million had come from the County who contributed 37.5 acres; that ECHO grants had been requested in the amount of \$2.4 million; that financial information regarding the project had been provided to the City Council; and that there was strong support in many areas for the project.

It was discussed that the City Council had previously voted that City contribution would be contingent on an Interlocal agreement; that the City had not received complete information on the project and the ECHO application copy had just been received; that the Chamber simply wished to affirm that the City of DeBary still had an interest in participation; and that a letter could be provided not committing to funds but stating that the project was supported conceptually. It was discussed further that the Chamber would be providing the information requested by the DeBary City Council regarding the project and that the Chamber wished to alleviate concerns that there was adequate support for the project.

It was discussed that there were many reasons to support the concept; that future details would determine what participation the City would be able to provide; that the issues were complex and

creating the Interlocal agreement had been slowed by circumstances; that the facility would be unique in having DBCC to assist in operating the facility without running deficits; that, if a participant, the City would be able to use the facility at discounted rates; that the services to be provided and potential economic benefit for the community were important; that the opinion of the City Council had been stated at the meeting of February 11, 2004; that information was slow in being provided due to the magnitude of the project; that the East Central Florida Planning Commission was expected to have the information needed within two to three weeks; that it appeared to be the consensus of the City Council that a letter in support of the concept was appropriate; and that the City Council had pledged \$1 million pursuant to approval of an Interlocal Agreement contingent upon information being received at Vice Mayor Gunter's request.

It was also requested by the Chamber that a City representative participate with the project team; that someone would be appointed in the near future; that information should be communicated to City Manager Courson until someone could be appointed; and that Parks Administrator Anthony Gonzalez would be attending the meeting for the ECHO grant.

It was discussed that Mr. Malcolm Johnson had contacted the City regarding a building for City Hall; that more information was needed from him before the City could consider the project; that the building could possibly serve the City for several years and might be available in a few months; and that other options for the current City Hall could then be considered to provide revenue for the project.

It was also discussed that the Streetscape Committee had been discussing concepts for City entry signs; that in ten days DeBary Hall would be having their Hoedown; and that this event was popular with residents.

It was discussed that the new Economic Development Advisory Committee needed some direction and objectives from the City Council; that the Council Members could compile ideas for them; that they could be charged with creating a business group and a marketing strategy for the City; and that a brochure for the City was desired. It was also discussed that Mayor Rosamonda, City Manager Courson, and Planning Administrator Gonzalez had met with DeBary Golf & Country Club regarding their condominium proposal and had persuaded them to consider other options with less density and perhaps a village center concept; that concerned citizens had been contacted about the discussions; that no concept plan had originally been provided to the City Council; that there was concern with an appropriate elevation in relation to US Highway 17-92; and that the Club would be coming back before the City Council.

There was discussion of interviews with local municipalities for bids for contract services; that once bids were public it was difficult to get competitive pricing; that the level of service was the important issue; that research had been done for obtaining private contracts for services and was typically higher; that the process should be opened to both private and public; that the deadline should be made for the same day for all; that growth management services was the most active area currently; and that the guidance of the Council was to have a formal bid process for fair competition.

City Manager Courson discussed that there was a conflict with the March 1, 2005 meeting with the School Board; that the meeting would be changed to March 23, 2005 at 4:30 PM. The Council was reminded that depositions would be held on February 17, 2005. It was discussed that 110 resumes had been received for the Assistant City Manager position; that the City Clerk position had been advertised and 11 resumes had been received to date; that City Manager Courson had sent letters to local homeowner associations to provide her availability to appear at their meetings for question and answer sessions; and that three meetings were set up for March.

**IV. Adjournment** The meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.

**APPROVED April 13, 2005  
CITY OF DeBARY  
CITY COUNCIL**

**Carmen Rosamonda, Mayor**

**ATTEST:**

**Stacy Tebo, City Clerk**