

SCHOOL PLANNING WORKGROUP
July 25, 2008
10:00 AM in the Pinellas County Planning Dept. Conference Room
7th Floor, 600 Cleveland Street
Clearwater, FL

MEETING SUMMARY

Gordon opened the meeting with a welcome and everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

- I. Gordon gave an overview of the status for the implementation of school concurrency. In the Interlocal Agreement, the Effective Date is defined as the date as of which each of the signatories has adopted the LDR changes to implement school concurrency. In light of the fact that a number of municipalities are still working on adopting their Public School Facilities Element, it is likely that everyone will not have their LDRs in place before the October 1st deadline the group had agreed upon. However, the creation of the development tracking system will continue on its current schedule so that it will be ready to be up and running when all of the local governments are ready to implement school concurrency.
- II. Jason walked through what the County's Business Technology Services (BTS) department has developed thus far in terms of the development tracking system. Jason and the BTS staff have developed some screen mock-ups of what the system would look like, and presented them to the group for their review and comment. The question of how to handle the smaller residential developments that do not require a site plan was raised, and the School District asked if we should even be worrying about them. While these projects will add up over the year, the District questioned if the resultant data acquired through tracking them would be worth the effort when the cumulative impact would likely be small compared to the larger developments. The District stated they would only want the residential site plan info for now, but advised the group to keep the smaller developments in mind so that if it is determined at a later date that there is a problem with not keeping track of them, the group can modify the tracking system at a later date to take them into account. The Workgroup decided to take this approach and not track residential development that does not require a site plan.

The question was also raised about how to handle proposed residential development that straddles two CSAs, as well as situations where the School District has to use available capacity in adjacent CSA(s) to satisfy the demands of a residential proposal. The School District would ultimately have to decide on when to draw capacity from an adjacent CSA, according to the Interlocal Agreement. When this occurs, it was decided that there would have to be some kind of manual entry into the development tracking system on the

part of the District. They would have to reserve the specific number of seats from each of the impacted CSAs to draw down on the capacity and reserve the seats.

Updating student capacity on a monthly basis was discussed. The group had previously discussed updating enrollment figures on a monthly basis, and the District mentioned that FISH capacity can also change on a monthly basis. As the student population at one school decreases, portables may be removed from that school and placed onsite at another, where capacity may increase. The District mentioned that until the system is up and running, we won't know whether the capacity figures should be updated on a monthly basis and what impact this may have on calculating available school capacity. The District determined that they would try the monthly updates for one year and then re-evaluate the system to see how it is working.

Moving through the screen mock-ups, it was noted that local governments and developers would like the tracking system to generate some kind of receipt for the school concurrency approval that could be printed out and attached to the site plans. It had previously been discussed that the system could automatically generate some kind of School Concurrency Approval form and BTS staff would look into how to incorporate this.

BTS staff would also work towards developing a screen that would show the real-time capacities of each CSA that local governments could check if they would like to, without entering data into the system. This would also allow for easy monitoring of the various CSAs and their capacities. Credits were discussed, and it was decided that the 'net' number of residential units is the number that should be entered into the development tracking system. The County will make a note and include a way to handle this in the Procedural Manual, as well as the fact that the credits are non-transferable. The Workgroup decided also that each local government should have the ability to review revised site plans without the revised plans being subjected to another concurrency review if the number of units for a site plan is the same or is being decreased. The tracking system needs to be able to be adjusted when there is a decrease in residential units between the time a School Concurrency Approval is issued and the final site plan is approved. This would free up additional available school capacity for other developments if they are not being used. If a site plan is being revised to increase the number of units, however, the revised site plan must go through the process of obtaining a School Concurrency Approval for the number of additional student stations that would be generated from the increased number of units.

- III.** There was a discussion on the length of the validity for school concurrency approvals and the reservation of student stations. Gordon provided a flow chart and went over it with the group to outline the process and critical steps for determining whether a School Concurrency Approval continues to be valid

after 24 months. It was suggested that the local governments add a line to their LDRs stating that school concurrency cannot be extended by variance or development agreements, to make sure that a project does not hold student stations for years beyond the initial 24 month validity period unless the project commences development and continues in good faith. According to the Public Schools Interlocal Agreement, a School Concurrency Approval is valid for purposes of issuing development orders or permits for up to 24 months from the date of issuance. Within the 24 months, a site plan must be approved, permits issued, and development have commenced, and then continue in good faith in order for the School Concurrency Approval to remain valid. The Workgroup concurred that if after 24 months the School Concurrency Approval becomes void and is terminated because the above conditions have not been met, the local government may grant an extension to the site plan, but the site plan would need to be re-reviewed for School Concurrency at that time. The details surrounding this will be outlined in the Procedural Manual.

- IV.** BTS staff outlined the next steps for the development tracking system, which will include final screen prints for the group's approval, a logic write-up and an approval to proceed with the final design. Staff is still moving forward with an Oct. 1 start date.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

In Attendance:

Paul Geisz	City of St. Petersburg
Marshall Touchton	Pinellas County School District
Bob Bray	City of Pinellas Park
Jim Underhill	Pinellas County School District
Steve Fairchild	Pinellas County School District
Ginny Haller	City of Tarpon Springs
Robert Jarzen	City of Largo
Michael Taylor	City of Gulfport
Karen Freggens	City of St. Petersburg
Mark Ely	City of Seminole
Steven Everitt	City of Oldsmar
Lauren Matzke	City of St. Pete Beach
Ron Rinzivillo	City of Safety Harbor
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County Planning
Liz Freeman	Pinellas County Planning
Chelsea Ross	Pinellas County Planning
Jason Graziano	Pinellas County BTS
Juan Butler	Pinellas County BTS
Roger McKenzie	Pinellas County IS