

School Planning Workgroup Meeting Summary
February 27, 2009, at 9:30 a.m.

Gordon welcomed the group and introductions were made around the room.

- I. It seems like everyone is moving forward with the adoption of their land development regulations (LDRs) amendments. Only one local government has yet to adopt their Public School Facilities Element, but it has been transmitted to DCA for review. About five local governments have already adopted their LDR amendments and the rest are in some stage of adoption. The last local government to adopt the LDRs should do so in July 2009. At this rate, everyone will be ready to implement school concurrency this summer, in time for the start of the next school year.

- II. Phase I of the Development Tracking System is now live and ready for use. Phase II is currently being tested internally by the County's BTS Department, which will continue through March 18th (estimated). User acceptance testing may be ready starting March 19th, with a tentative roll out on April 24th. Jason Graziano stated that the user testing dates are tentative, and more time can be allocated to testing if the group desires. He also stated that the roll out date may need to be pushed back about one week, so the dates are a bit flexible. The Phase II test site will look like the final live system, so everyone should be using the test system to get a feel for how the live system will function. The file upload function may be removed in the future. No local governments have expressed an interest in using the feature, and no one has actually tested it. Jason then gave an overview of how the next phase of the system will work on the computer, showing the group how to add permits, attach them to site plans, and how to use the demolition permit function.

In entering CO data, the group discussed making the entry of the CO date and number of units optional. This way, permits can be entered as they are issued, and then the COs can be entered later. The understanding was that this way, a local government will not be able to approve permits for more residential units than they receive a School Concurrency Approval for. However, when taking credits from demolished property into account, a local government may very well issue permits for more units than they are seeking an Approval for, as the Approval will be for only the *net* number of units, not the gross. Gordon stated that the Planning Department will look more into this and meet with BTS to discuss a solution and present it back to the Workgroup.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of the demolition permit function. When a developer comes in the future to construct a residential development, they may receive credit for any residential units demolished on the site after the Effective Date (i.e., when school concurrency is initiated this summer). The onus is on the developer to prove the number of units that were demolished, but if the data was entered into the tracking system, the local government should easily be able to locate that information. Local governments can use the tracking system to keep track of this information so that it can be easily accessible in the future. It was reiterated that residential credits would be valid in perpetuity from the Effective Date. Gordon stated that the Planning Department and BTS would look into putting notes on the screens to highlight critical steps, as it was mentioned that users may not necessarily read the user manual before inputting data.

The question was raised as to whether or not the District would still require a complete site plan with the development tracking system in place. The District said it would not need a site plan to check for school concurrency. If District staff determine that they need a copy of a site plan to complete their review, they will request a copy from the local government.

- III. Most of the municipalities have provided the Planning Department with updated user and contact lists for the development tracking system. It was stated that this list will be used to ensure that each user of the system has access and that any changes should be provided to the Planning Department as soon as possible.
- IV. Marshall Touchton handed out a draft School Capacity and Level of Service (LOS) Report. He stated that he has yet to develop any corresponding text to go with it, and that he still wanted to synchronize the terms he used with those in the Public School Facilities Element, but that this is what he was thinking the LOS Report would look like in the fall when it is done officially. He explained each of the column headings and the data contained within to the group and asked for any feedback on organization and content. The group agreed with the organization and content, but it was noted that the final LOS Report in the fall should include both 5-year and long-range projections to be able to update all of the tables within the Element at the same time. Marshall noted that even with the closing of five elementary and two middle schools, there are still no Concurrency Service Areas that are facing capacity issues. He even stated that if the current budgetary conditions continue, there may be some areas where additional school closures could be carried out without impacting school concurrency.

- V. In regard to how the boundaries of each CSA match with the boundaries of the individual school attendance areas, Marshall stated that the boundary lines have never been a perfect match. The uneven lines are the result of the old Choice Attendance Areas, where it was understood that students often attended schools outside of their attendance zones. With the new system, it may be a number of years before the attendance boundaries around each school are finalized, and these may also change again over the years if schools close, programs change, or development changes the number of students in a given area. If the group wants to match the attendance areas exactly, they may need to amend the CSA maps each year. For this reason, he recommended leaving the CSA boundaries as they are and maybe revisiting them in the future, as the new attendance program takes root. The members of the Workgroup agreed with this approach. Marshall also noted that the County has the school attendance zone layer within its GIS system, and he will send out a link to the Workgroup members so that they can access it if they so choose.
- VI. Al Navaroli mentioned that he has recently received three site plans for substantial renovations and additions to school facilities, and wanted to know how other local governments were handling such projects. The City of Largo stated that they do not review District projects, while the City of Gulfport is in the process of reviewing two District site plans. Pinellas County would like to comment on the three site plans and Al noted that the County was still discussing what would be the best process for reviewing District site plans for substantial renovations. Since the District does not go through a public hearing process, it was not clear how the District receives and incorporates comments from local governments and the public into their site plans. Frank Frail recommended contacting Michael Bessette at the District about this and he may be able to provide an answer.

Gordon noted that the next meeting of the Collaborative is scheduled for May 6th. If it is determined that there should be another Workgroup meeting before then, Workgroup members will be notified via email.

In Attendance:

Frank Frail	Pinellas County School District
Bob Bray	City of Pinellas Park
Paul Geisz	City of St. Petersburg
Fred Metcalf	City of Gulfport
Sandra Herman	City of Clearwater
Lydia Moreda	City of Clearwater
Cate Lee	City of Clearwater

Robert Tefft
Robert Jarzen
Marshall Touchton
David Sadowsky
Karen Freggens
Jenna Ferrin
Ron Rinzivillo
Gordon Beardslee
Liz Freeman
Chelsea Ross

City of Clearwater
City of Largo
Pinellas County School District
Pinellas County Attorney's Office
City of St. Petersburg
City of Dunedin
City of Safety Harbor
Pinellas County Planning Department
Pinellas County Planning Department
Pinellas County Planning Department