

SCHOOL PLANNING WORKGROUP

MEETING SUMMARY

December 7, 2011

PINELLAS COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT CONFERENCE ROOM, 9:30 A.M.

Member Attendees: Gordon Beardslee, Pinellas County; Liz Freeman, Pinellas County; Ryan Brinson, Cynthia Watkins, Pinellas County; Pinellas County; David Sadowsky, Pinellas County Attorney; Marshall Touchton, School District; Tom Moore, City of Largo; Jenna Duncan, City of Dunedin; Lauren Matzke, City of Clearwater, Paul Geisz, City of St. Petersburg; Fred Metcalf, City of Gulfport; John Incorvia, City of Pinellas Park; Ana Mena, City of Safety Harbor; Frank Frail, Pinellas County Schools; Danny Taylor, City of Indian Rocks Beach.

Welcome and Introductions:

Gordon Beardslee, with the Pinellas County Planning Department, facilitated the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting's agenda. Introductions from those in attendance followed.

Public Schools Facilities Elements:

Ryan Brinson, with the Pinellas County Planning Department, briefly discussed the proposed amendments related to the County's Public School Facilities Element which would eliminate references that dealt with school concurrency implementation. Ryan also pointed out some of the goals, objectives, and policies the County is planning on retaining since they are still required for school planning and coordination purposes between the local governments and the School Board, as outlined in Florida Statute Chapter 163. Lastly, Ryan reviewed additional amendments the County is planning on making to both the Intergovernmental Coordination Element and the Capital Improvements Element.

John Incorvia, with the City of Pinellas Park, suggested that the County retain Policy 1.2.17, because the County still intends to utilize a student generation rate, which will be maintained by the School District when determining the anticipated number of students that could be generated by a residential development. Marshall Touchton, with the School District, was agreeable with retaining the Policy; however, he did not want to add specific dates or a time table regarding the updating rates. Liz Freeman, with the Pinellas County Planning Department, also agreed that the Policy should be retained, but suggested slightly modifying it since the language is currently still tied to the Tracking System.

Gordon emphasized that the County will make sure to retain the goals, objectives and policies that are tied to the implementation of the Public Schools Interlocal Agreement in its Public School Facilities Element. In response to concerns raised by Paul Geisz with the City of St. Petersburg, Gordon confirmed that each local government does not have to maintain a separate Element just because the County does. It's an individual decision for each local government as to where to maintain the required policies and whether to keep a stand-alone School Element.

Land Development Regulations:

Gordon walked through the proposed amendments to the County's Land Development Code that would remove the requirements which implement school concurrency. Gordon mentioned that the County's regulations were modeled after the Collaborative's recommendation and that many jurisdictions appear to have also adopted a similar format. Basically, the entire section (134-262 through 266) of the Public School Facilities Concurrency Procedures would need to be "un-adopted" from the County's Code.

Public Schools Interlocal Agreement:

Gordon referred everyone to the attached draft strike-through underline version of the Interlocal Agreement (ILA). Gordon then went over the additional municipalities that are now required to be signatories of the Agreement (i.e. the beach communities, Kenneth City and South Pasadena) and noted that the ILA's existing reference to the term "Cities" would need to be replaced to read "Municipalities", as some of the new signatories are not cities.

Gordon then reviewed the proposed deletion of applicable definitions/terms that are tied to school concurrency. The term "School Planning Area" was discussed in detail. Marshall recommended that in the future he could provide annual student capacity and enrollment information for the schools within each jurisdiction. Marshall noted that when doing an aggregate level of analysis for planning purposes the best way would be to use the original Concurrency Service Area boundaries (proposed to be renamed Student Planning Areas). Marshall indicated he would develop a recommendation on the Student Planning Area definition. *[Marshall has subsequently indicated that School District staff does wish to include a definition for Student Planning Area – refer to the draft ILA for the proposed definition.]*

Marshall went on to note that in the near term, given our current forecasting projections, the County is anticipated to continue to see a decline in public school student enrollment, however is expected to see an increase in Charter School enrollment. Gordon asked Marshall if Charter Schools would be included in the annual capacity report. Marshall responded that the Charter Schools are included in the report, but they are not considered to be public facilities for capital outlay planning purposes. Marshall also noted that since we already have the term FISH (Florida Inventory of School Houses) defined, we should also include the term Fall Enrollment Count and definition as well.

Paul Geisz asked Gordon about the sequencing and scheduling of all of the changes involving school concurrency and wondered if the ILA should be the first item to be approved. Gordon suggested the easiest way, might be to transmit a package of amendments all at one time to each respective Local Board. County Attorney, David Sadowsky, mentioned that we typically would adopt the ILA first in this process and the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan would follow after, just in case the ILA was not approved. All agreed that there might be more than one way of adopting these. Gordon mentioned that Planning staff would research the question and report back to the workgroup with the appropriate steps.

Gordon then highlighted the changes to **Section 8** regarding the composition of the Collaborative, and asked the workgroup if anyone had comments regarding the proposed language that would allow a group of municipalities to collectively appoint one member to represent their interests as one group. No one had questions or comments about the new language, but Mr. Incorvia suggested that the last sentence should be revised to describe what type of power or authority the Collaborative has responsibility over. Gordon agreed that the sentence should be rewritten to specify that the Collaborative mainly oversees the implementation of the ILA and ensures intergovernmental coordination. Gordon re-emphasized that the remaining sections of the ILA still maintain our existing process for coordinating and sharing of information between local governments and the School District, which are still requirements under the Community Planning Act.

Gordon concluded the item and told the workgroup that County staff would revise the ILA to include the changes based on their discussion and would email it out to everyone for their review. Gordon also suggested that everyone have their City Attorney review the revised agreement as well.

Development Tracking System:

Gordon provided a status report on the Tracking System's anticipated changes to allow local government users the ability to view what residential projects have been approved in other jurisdictions as well (not just their own) and said that within the next couple months we will have it completed. Marshall indicated

that he still owes an enrollment count and capacity update to the System and will contact Ed McWaters to complete this update.

Review proposed timeline/schedule:

Gordon then reviewed the proposed timeline of events. He mentioned that we would cancel the Workgroup meeting in January since all of the revised materials and information can be distributed by email and we can coordinate that way. We will shoot for May to finalize the new ILA.

Given the political implications that these amendments could have, Paul asked Marshall if the School Board wouldn't mind transmitting a countywide repeal Resolution for school concurrency, so that local elected officials understand that this is a unified effort. Marshall was agreeable to a District letter of some sort and suggested that Paul follow-up with him to provide him with language to include in a letter.

Other items from members:

There were no other items brought up and the meeting was concluded.

DRAFT