

School Planning Workgroup Meeting Summary
October 23, 2008, at 1:30 p.m.

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

1. Tarpon Springs and Gulfport were the only local governments that have yet to adopt their Public School Facilities Elements. Gulfport's PSFE was just sent to DCA and is currently under review. In terms of the Land Development Regulations, the County, Safety Harbor, Oldsmar, and St. Pete are believed to be the only local governments who have adopted the LDRs. Gordon reminded the group that according to the Interlocal Agreement, school concurrency does not go into effect until the last local government has amended their LDRs. The state is expecting us to have school concurrency underway very soon and each local government should be working on getting their LDRs amended so that the governments of the County can remain in compliance with state law and not lose the ability to amend the Comprehensive Plan and so that the School District does not lose funding.
2. Jason gave an update on the status of the development tracking system, noting that some problems have been identified and that the County's Business Technology Services (BTS) department is addressing them. A number of Workgroup members stated that they have been having problems accessing some parts of the system once logged in and those issues are being addressed. Because of the problems encountered, Jason believes that an additional week past 10-31 may be needed for user acceptance testing to make sure that the users are comfortable with the system. He stated that the final roll-out date of 11/17 will likely not have to change.
3. Jason stated that the final contact list is going to be needed by early November for the users of the system. This would allow enough time for BTS to develop the access accounts and ensure that everyone that needs access to the system will have that access. The contact list will also be categorized to differentiate between those users who will have 'edit' capabilities and those will be able to view only. Additional contacts who will need to be added to the list must be authorized by and come from the Workgroup members.

Discussion followed regarding the Effective Date and credits. It had previously been decided by the Workgroup that credits for school concurrency would function similarly to those of transportation, running for perpetuity with the parcel and based on what is on the ground on the Effective Date (which is defined in the PSFE). After discussion and clarification, it was determined that this method will work for now, and that the issue may be revisited in the future.

4. Gordon began the discussion on the incorporation of demolition permits into the development tracking system. It was believed that we would need to include demo permits in our tracking because at the time, the Workgroup did not know that the system would be receiving monthly student count updates from the School District. As the system has developed, however, it no longer appears necessary to track these permits through the system. Many local governments track demolitions through their own internal systems, so doing so here may be a duplication of efforts. This information is not necessary for capacity information so it was determined that while the demolition screens and functions would remain within the development tracking system, it is not necessary for local governments to utilize this aspect of the system, but still have the option to if they so choose.
5. Discussion began regarding how to handle development agreements that may be valid for up to 20 years, while ensuring that student stations are not tied up and reserved for that entire period of time. Gordon stated that for Pinellas County, development is subject to the rules that are in place when a development agreement is approved. With this in place, any School Concurrency Approval would have to expire within 24 months after it was first issued, so long as the local government did not authorize an extension of the Approval.
6. The Planning Department has worked with BTS to put together a draft User Manual. Some edits were noted that should be made, including the clarification of net versus actual housing units. Any other comments on the manual should be forwarded to the Planning Department for incorporation.
7. Steve Fairchild presented the Workgroup with a Major Projects Update table. This is a cross between the one-page summary of the Five-Year Work Program and the Work Program itself. It lists school capacity projects, as well as other projects that impact other agencies, such as a driveway re-alignment that may impact municipal traffic plans.
8. It was noted that an update on the new Educational Plant Survey should be given to the Collaborative and Gordon stated that it could be placed on the Collaborative meeting agenda for their November 5th meeting.