



AGENDA

SCHOOL PLANNING WORK GROUP

Meeting Location: Swisher Building

509 East Avenue S., Clearwater

May 12, 2006 at 9:30 am

- ✓ Welcome and Introductions
- ✓ Approve Summary of April 25, 2006 Meeting
- ✓ Review of Existing LOS Conditions
- ✓ Review Proposed updates to Interlocal Agreement
- ✓ Next Meeting Date June 1, 2006 at 1:30 pm



MEETING SUMMARY

SCHOOL PLANNING WORK GROUP Swisher Building - 509 East Avenue S., Clearwater May 12, 2006, at 9:30am

Welcome and Introductions

Gordon Beardslee welcomed everyone to the School Planning Work Group.

Summary of April 25, 2006 Meeting

Frank identified a Scribner's error. No other edits were made to the April 25, 2006 meeting summary.

Review of Existing LOS Conditions

Marshall explained his LOS summary level data report and said that he will do an individual school breakout in the actual reports. He stated that full-time exceptional education and charter schools are not included in the FISH capacity by area calculations. He defined seat balance as the number of seats available/unused, which is reached by subtracting the number of active enrolled students per area from the FISH capacity. He reminded everyone that when looking at the seat balance, they must look at the availability in elementary, middle, and high schools to see how new development will affect this. Jim Underhill supported the use of students that live in the area as a means of measuring capacity. Gordon stated they may want to clarify enrollment as the number of students that live in that choice area. Larry asked if a portable is included in this count and Marshall responded that yes, the portables are included if they are considered "satisfactory stations".

Review proposed updates to Interlocal Agreement (ILA)

Gordon went over the flow chart he created to illustrate the concurrency process, stating that the green boxes signify there are no concurrency issues and the developer can move ahead. Marshall and Jim Underhill suggested that the "determination of adequate capacity within the next three years" be done in the first yellow box as part of the school capacity study for affected choice areas, instead of waiting until after the developer submits their application. Gordon reviewed possible mitigation options, stating that mitigation banking was not likely for our area. He stated that he has left the language open to include future additional mitigation options. He suggested that the language read "may include, but is not limited to". He stated the applicant will need to work with the School Board to create a binding Development Agreement between the School Board, the applicant, and the local government. The law requires the local government to be a signatory to the agreement.

Jim Miller asked a question that some School Board members had asked of him. He questioned why you look at the capacity in adjoining areas. Gordon responded, stating that the law requires them to look at the capacity of adjacent areas. Jim noted that whatever we do, we will need to be consistent with the court order.

Larry suggested that we could include language in the ILA stating that municipalities designate a manager or director of the department or his/her designee to be responsible for keeping the

concurrency process on track. Marshall suggested including a definitive timeline. Jim Robinson asked how likely it is that we would get to the point of needing a school capacity study. Marshall responded that if one school closed we would need this, but as things are today it would be unlikely because we are experiencing contraction, not growth. Jim Miller suggested a 60 day time limit on production of the school capacity study and that we can amend that time if needed in the future.

David Sadowsky asked what happens if there are no viable mitigation options open to the developer. Gordon questioned whether there may ever be a situation where this could happen and that the ILA should state that approval of the development is conditioned upon mitigation. Marshall wanted to make sure there would be a uniform process for mitigation across municipalities. Bob Bray commented that there can be instances in which local governments permit construction before the developer's mitigation is entirely approved. Gordon replied that the ILA states that the local government cannot issue a development order until the Development Agreement is approved, so that problem shouldn't arise. Liz stated it would be the responsibility of the local government to make sure a development order is not issued before the Development Agreement is approved.

Gordon asked if the concurrency designation is good for 12 months in which time the developer must build their project, when this time frame should begin. The group agreed that the 12 month time frame should start from the date of the concurrency determination for the applicant. Gordon asked if the developer is required to mitigate but has not started their project and the next LOS report comes out as acceptable and no mitigation is required, does the developer get their money back? Ron stated that the School Capacity Study covers a prediction for the next year so there should not be a problem with this.

Jim Robinson pointed out a number of Scribner's errors and suggested some changes to phrasing in the ILA that Gordon will fix. Gordon asked if he needed to replace "School Board" with "School District". Jim Robinson replied that Gordon should continue to use "School Board" because that is the contracting entity, but that he would verify this with the School Board members.

Bob asked if it was consistent with other boards to reappoint a new member each year. He suggested making it consistent with the MPO and PPC membership practices. Marshall suggested that a person should have a lifetime appointment with replacements as needed and Liz suggested allowing the local governments to choose their own process for appointing representatives. Gordon stated that he would modify the ILA to make it clear that a person must be identified as the representative from each municipality each year, not how long that person must serve.

Frank asked why the question mark was left regarding FISH inventory and Gordon stated that he just needed more explanation. Frank explained that the FISH inventory is an inventory of all school house space and that maybe it would be clearer if it stated "inventory numbering system".

Next Meeting Date

Gordon stated that he will send out the document after he has made all of the necessary changes and everyone can let him know if they think another meeting is needed. If so, the next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 1, 2006 at 1:30 PM.