I.   Review Proposed Timeline for Implementing School Concurrency
a. Gordon opened the meeting with introductions around the table. He then gave a status update of where we are in the school concurrency process and reviewed the proposed timeline for the implementation of school concurrency. The final drafts of the model LDRs and the Procedural Manual will be presented to the full Workgroup in April and to the Collaborative in May. School concurrency will be implemented once each of the 13 local governments has adopted the PSFE and the associated LDRs.

II.   Development Tracking System
David James introduced his staff to the group and outlined how each of them would be contributing to the development of the tracking system.
a. Review High-Level Requirements Model-Juan gave an overview of the conceptual design of the tracking system, including the data requirements, what functions the system should be expected to be able to carry out and also the content management aspects of the system.
b. Review of High-Level Design – Juan discussed how the system will be designed so that it will automatically extract data from those local governments with advanced site plan and permitting systems, while it will also have the ability to accept the manual entry of data from those local governments without automated permitting systems. Juan will work with Marshall and the School District to determine how be to capture/update/utilize the School District data within the system and what data is needed from the local governments in order for the system to function effectively. The outline of the system presented today is their first, rough draft.
c. Nominations to Support Requirement Analysis – David asked for each person at the table to nominate someone to work closely with Juan and Jason on ironing out the details of the tracking system. David discussed how it would be more efficient if a small group of subject matter experts began working on the details, and then they could bring back another draft cut of the design to the larger group for more open discussion. Gordon suggested that each person email their nomination to him and he would get with David and his staff on developing a smaller group within the next week. The smaller group will begin meeting within the next couple of weeks and meet several times, as necessary.
   i.   A few questions were then raised regarding some of the intricacies of the system: If there is a rezoning with a development agreement that vests student stations, should those vested students be captured at the time of the rezoning or should they wait until the site

plan? And how will the system deal with multi-phase developments that may take 5 years to build out?

    ii. David suggested that such scenarios be sent to Juan so that he can ensure that everything is taken into account during the development of the system. Jim Underhill mentioned that he would like to see as much data up-front as possible. The School District will never turn a student away, and if they know that there are a significant number of potential students coming in 5 years, they can plan their facility construction accordingly to make sure that they have suitable facilities for those students. It was also brought up that Madeira Beach will be a special circumstance, as the city does their own site plans, but the County does their permitting. This will be discussed in greater depth at a later date when the smaller group is meeting to discuss details.

    iii. Juan will eventually be meeting with each of the local governments to determine the exact details of each situation in order to ensure that the system will work for all of the involved parties.

d. Discuss Agency to Agency Responsibilities and Agreement – David mentioned that it has been his experience, that it is very helpful to have some kind of agreement, either formal or informal, outlining the responsibilities that each local government has to the tracking system and binding them to agree on how to maintain the system. If a local government changes their internal systems in some way, the tracking system may no longer be able to access their data and the accuracy of the tracking system could be compromised. This will have to be discussed as the group progresses in the development of the system and it is more clear what will be expected of each local government.

e. Review Development Approach/Plan – It will be the goal to have the entire tracking system completed by the end of September, as discussed. However, David mentioned that it may be necessary to roll the system out in phases, having the most critical and high-priority aspects of the system in place at that time, and incrementally implementing other, less critical aspects. Jason then discussed the timeline for the project, highlighting how he anticipated it would progress over the coming months.

f. Communication Plan – Jason discussed the communication plan for the project and how it will be composed of three aspects: status reporting, to be done either weekly or bi-weekly and including progress reports; team meetings, also to be held weekly or bi-weekly; and ad hoc meetings as required. Jason is planning on developing one main portal-likely Microsoft SharePoint-in order to distribute materials and provide updates to the group without having to send out mass emails and distribute all of the documents electronically.

g. Next Steps – the County IS group will get together with the School District in the coming week, or so, to discuss the details surrounding how the School District data will play a role in the tracking system. After that,

they will begin to meet with the smaller group, to be assembled in the coming week.

III. Implementation of Interlocal Agreement, PSFE and School Concurrency
Gordon stated that April 25th may be the next meeting of the full Workgroup. This subcommittee will only meet if necessary, in the meantime. If anyone has any comments on the Procedural Manual or the LDRs, they were asked to get them to County staff so that they could be incorporated before the final drafts are presented to the Collaborative in May.

The question of allowing for credit was brought up by Gordon, asking how long credit for student stations should be allowed to remain on a parcel. One possibility is to let it run with the land and not expire. Marshall questioned the logic of assuming that if units are demolished, the students are no longer in the school system, while they could have moved to a vacant unit down the street. Marshall is going to work with Juan to determine if the tracking system shouldn't update the enrollment figures daily, instead of once a year with the LOS report, in order to ensure the most accurate information when deciding whether or not there is available capacity within the district.