

School Planning Work Group

March 14, 2007 - 10:30 a.m.

7th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Schedule Review

- Final draft will be mailed to DCA by March 30, 2007
- Presentation to the School Collaborative - April 4
- Early April - distribute to local governments and School Board for review and comments
- Workgroup completed proposed element and presents to School Collaborative - June 6
- Distribute to local governments for adoption - no later than March 1, 2008

Meeting Schedule

- Workgroup - April 11 at 10:30 - if needed - depends on results of Collaborative Meeting and if they "accept" the draft of the PSFE
- Policy subgroup - meet week of March 19

Review the Goals, Objectives & Policies (GOPs)

- Comments from legal staff by Paul Geisz (St. Petersburg):
 - Rather not reference the ILAs but put the actual provision of the ILAs into the Element so the Element would stand by itself.
 - Discussion followed - pros and cons - consensus was to attach the ILAs as Appendices and reference in the Element. This would require only one amendment when the ILA is updated but would require two amendments if it's in the element - the Element and the ILA. Also awaiting word back from DCA as Gordon has already posed this question to DCA.
 - Both the FLU Element and the PSF Element have objectives/policies regarding school siting requirements
 - Cross-reference these objectives from FLU to PFS element - must be exactly same when deleting from FLU to PSF and reference FLU to PSF.
 - Policies need to be added to the CIE (establishing the level-of-service standard) - the subgroup will come up LDR-type language and language that is needed in other elements of the Comp Plan such as the ICE & CIE.
 - Will draft language before the subgroup meets.
 - The CIE policies will be relatively straight-forward and will mirror some of the policies about the School District's 5-year work program
 - Also will include the adopted level-of-service standard

- Will need a brief discussion in the D&A of CIE rather than just have policies appear regarding to school and MPO plans ?? Summary information will be pulled.
- o Maybe have a Table of Contents or Index of the requirements and cross-reference the page where it can be found
 - i.e., after an objective or policy put in the statute reference - purpose being that when it's reviewed, they can readily see that we are covering what is required whether it's in 163 or 9J5, we have that cross-referenced right in the element. Readily shows that "we are covering it all!"

Page by page review:

Page 1

- Obj. 1.1 and Pol. 1.1.2 - why using "change" instead of "increase" or use net increase or net decrease and leave out the word zoning/rezoning - that would make it very clear.
 - o Discussion followed.
 - o [This is also a good topic for the Tracking System Subgroup - unit of analysis is the basis for how you measure.]

Page 2

- Policy 1.2.3 - the DATE - what is that dependent on? Is that from when the element is adopted by each city? Intend is that concurrency implementation would start shortly after the element is adopted. Can we come up with a date certain - countywide? This would be at the beginning of a school year and not in the middle of a school year? This will be further discussed in the subgroup.
- Policy 1.2.3 - please delete the underlined portion of that policy - "throughout the period."
- Insert Box between Policy 1.2.1 & 1.2.2 - delete last sentence altogether - "FISH ...August 2005." Gordon explained support for deletion. Discussion followed. Perhaps we could add a policy that says ... if these standards change, then the School District would notify us that the SREF Standards have been modified and we will be using new revised standards for calculating FISH capacity and give us some indication what impact that may have.

Page 3

Policy 1.2.7 - replace "new residential development" with "Residential Approvals"

Page 4

Policy 1.2.14 - "resolution provision provided in" to "resolution provision in"

Page 5

Policy 1.3.1 - "shall consider amendments to its Capital" to "shall amend its Capital".

NOTE: It will be necessary to amend your policy every year to say that you are adopting by reference the School Work Program "2006-7 to 2010-11". Every year it's necessary to update the Capital Improvements Element so you'll be required to update this with a "new first & fifth year."

Page 7

Policy 2.1.3 - There are some inconsistencies with the Countywide Rules ... discussion followed. List needs to be as broad as possible. Perhaps best way is to cut and paste your categories from your Future Land Use Element into this policy. Needs to be in both elements. Gordon will meet with the School District to discuss this further.

Policy 2.1.2 - Add "Charter Schools" to the list. Need to add Charter Schools? Will doing this affect 2.1.3? Shouldn't affect anything at county level but may well affect local level. This will be discussed in the Subgroup and with the School District and get back to the whole group.

Page 10

Policy 2.1.11 - "2.1 are assumed to be consistent" to "2.1 are intended to be consistent with".

Policy 2.2.1 - "appropriate , consistent with Section 6 ... Interlocal Agreement." To "appropriate."

Policy 2.2.2 - How do we share information? Tracking system? Gordon to research further-perhaps use more language from the Interlocal Agreement to clarify.

Policy 2.2.4 - GOVERNMENT shall coordinate with" to "GOVERNMENT shall [cooperate or consider] with". Technical subgroup is working on how this cooperation/coordination will work. What if local government and school district can not reach cooperation/coordination? Gordon suggested taking the language right out of the Interlocal Agreement to clarify the policy more.

Page 11

Goal 3 - The STEPS Committee is reviewing Goal 3 and will let School District know if they have any problem with this (or other) Goal and that information will be passed on.

Objective 3.1 - change "to ensure that safe" to "to promote that safe".

Page 12

Policy 3.1.5 - some discussion - this is a local government decision-maker

Policy 3.2.3 - change "update the Capital" to "update its Capital"

Definitions:

- This whole section should be in Data and Analysis not *GOPs*. These were adopted in the ILA, so changes would go through the ILA.
- Cut and paste from ILA so they are exactly the same then add others.
- **ALSO** - definition of Concurrency Service Area with respect to the Choice Attendance Areas. Marshall noted that the attendance area boundaries will be changing with the changing of the Choice program. Our policies and discussion should reflect that boundaries may change significantly and school concurrency would follow those changes.
- Further discussion.

We will work on these with the subgroup. The biggest outstanding items are the locational stuff and the charter schools. The remainder shouldn't be too difficult to finalize. We will distribute this once the subgroup finalizes it or when we send it to the Collaborative.

Objective 2.2 - please look at that with reference to "coordinate" and "cooperate".

Data and Analysis:

- We have most of what we need. Still working with the School District to finalize a couple of things.
- Projections by type of school for the long term - out to 2025 - in five year increments - Jim Underhill is working on this - (discussion followed regarding projections led by Marshall Touchton)
- Page 10, last paragraph "The existing boundaries or the CAAs" should be "The existing boundaries of the CAAs".
- There are three schools where the FISH capacity for the school (C3 facility) so no capital improvement funds from the state. Because of that, their FISH capacity is set to 0 ... set at 30 because they might have portables on the campus that does meet the criteria. North Ward and South Ward (see chart on page 30). The schools are non-conforming except for the portables, but are on properties that represent good facilities, popular educational programs and there is a lot of public and political pressure not to close them, despite their age. School District does not directly use FISH when filling schools through the Choice software that is used. Discussion continued. Maybe not report the percentage utilization by site and only calculate based on enrollment for the area/capacity for the area. Perhaps, leave as is but footnote these and explain why.
- If there are other concerns with the Data & Analysis, let us know as soon as possible.

Subgroup will finalize the GOPs and email entire workgroup - hopefully before the Collaborative meets on April 4th.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35 P.M.

Meeting Attendees:

Lauren Marzke, St. Pete Beach

Jeffrey Dow, Dunedin

Robert Jarzen, Largo

Ginny Haller, Tarpon Springs

Fred Metcalf, Gulfport

Mark Ely, Seminole

Larry Pflueger, PPC

Paul Geisz, St. Petersburg

Marshal Touchton, Pinellas County Schools

Bob Bray, Pinellas Park

Ron Rinzivillo, Safety Harbor

Sandy Herman, Clearwater

Chelsea Ross, Pinellas County Planning

Gordon Beardslee, Pinellas County Planning