

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD (HPAB) MEETING MINUTES

Date: Thursday, August 13, 2009

Time: 1:10 p.m.

Location: Pinellas County Planning Department Conference Room

Attendees: Commissioner Karen Seel (presiding), Brian K. Smith, W.H. (Wally) Clark, Gina Clayton, Terry Fortner, Marjie Haigler, Kim Hinder, Andrea Manson, Cyndi Tarapani, Gordon Beardslee, Marcel Mohseni, Alan Shellhorn, and Colleen Tracy

I. Call to Order – Commissioner Seel called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

II. Minutes of Thursday, June 11, 2009

Motion was made that the minutes be approved; motion approved and carried.

III. County Commission Action on Updated Advisory Board Membership List

In the past the Board of County Commissioners has approved advisory boards throughout Pinellas County; the BCC has officially approved the updated Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB) membership.

IV. Refinement of Charts on the Review Process

Discussion covered two different charts, the first one was entitled:

Proposal to Incorporate the Pinellas County Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPAB) into the 1992 Historic Code (Chapter 146) as an “Advisory” Board, Recommending Designation of Historic and Archaeological Resources to the BCC in Unincorporated Pinellas County

At the last meeting, lengthy discussion about the designation process involved the HPAB public meeting step and public hearing steps at the LPA and BCC levels. Brian Smith noted that the designation process could be started in three ways: by Pinellas County, by property owners, and by other individuals or groups. In order not to have a designation slide through too easily – because the property owner may or may not agree – perhaps there should be another measure in place. Because a property owner’s property is being affected, action that may be needed is a majority vote plus one on the County Commission; or there may be some other way to work with it.

An extensive discussion followed on this topic. It involved two aspects: (1) The process of determining the proportion of approval necessary in order to begin the initiation for the designation process; and (2) The proportion of approval required by the governing body (in this case, the Board of County Commissioners) to approve the application for local historical designation status. Kim Hinder noted that in St. Petersburg if there is not owner consent then a supermajority vote “yes” is required by the city council to approve it. If a district is involved, there has to be 66 percent approval of the neighborhood or district. The following question was raised: Approving or just agreeing to initiate the process? Kim’s response was: 66 percent approving. So when the vote is ready to be taken, there has to be 66 percent of the owners saying yes. Gina Clayton mentioned that Clearwater is not an historic district but with the conservation overlay, there has to be a certain number of owners to start the process – 55 to 60 percent – which starts the planning process. That’s comparable to starting the designation review process. Marcel Mohseni and Gordon Beardslee noted that about fifteen years ago, Pinellas County encouraged 60 percent of the property owners in

the Palm Harbor District to agree with the designation; in fact 100 percent were in agreement! HPAB members ultimately decided on a process similar to the one in St. Petersburg. The Pinellas County process will include 60 percent of the property owners approving the application for local designation with a majority vote of approval by the BCC. If there is an objection by the property owner, then a supermajority vote of the seven-member BCC would be required for approval. A supermajority calls for five out of seven votes.

Cyndi Tarapani raised a question about the chart outlining three public hearings: this Board, the Local Planning Agency (LPA), and the BCC. Is the LPA step required? Gordon stated that the LPA public hearing is required because a local designation is treated as a rezoning in the Pinellas County process. Brian commented that the HPAB step is really a public *meeting* – not a public hearing. Discussion ensued regarding the distinction between the two. Gordon explained that with public hearings there are notices placed in the newspapers within a certain time frame as required under the Florida statutes. If it is a public meeting, the public is still notified but the group (HPAB) would have the flexibility of how to do that. For example, because it is a public meeting, a mail out notice to interested parties would be in order. However, it is not necessary to put a notice in the paper.

Cyndi questioned including a LPA hearing in the process. The HPAB would be the most qualified to make the evaluation on the historic aspects of local designation. The HPAB is made up entirely of preservationists whereas the LPA is not. Kim indicated that in St. Petersburg the Preservation Commission is also the Planning and Zoning Commission. Although it would require a code change, Gina suggested a possible option. Perhaps the HPAB could be given the authority to make recommendations directly to the BCC rather than sending them to the LPA. In Clearwater, the Community Development Department is given that authority. If the Pinellas County process was changed, the result would be as follows: the Advisory Board would be responsible for making recommendations directly to the BCC; the LPA would cease to remain in the process; thus, the HPAB would be required to hold a public hearing per the Florida statutes. This would result in two hearings: one for recommendation (HPAB) and one for adoption or denial (BCC). The HPAB consensus was to eliminate the LPA from the process and change the HPAB public meeting to a public hearing. Marcel commented that the only Certified Local Government (CLG) requirement is that a qualified [Historic Preservation] Board review and make recommendations to a decision-making body.

Discussion then moved on to the second chart entitled:

**Proposed Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Review Process
by the HPAB per Chapter 146, Historic Preservation Code**

Cyndi stated that some of the codes she is familiar with establish certain items that staff can handle and certain items that have to go to the Preservation Board. This COA process does it by a dollar amount, which is one way to do it; but there is going to do a lot of work and some damage to historic property for \$50,000. Furthermore, if the staff is reviewing the COA, then why is it also going to the Board?

In Tarpon Springs and Tampa, staff can review certain minor items (even at the permitting counters). However, issues such as new construction, demolition, moving a building, major changes to the style and facade, changing out windows, and so forth are reviewed by the Preservation Board. On the other hand, staff may be responsible for the entire review and only appeals would go to the

Board. It depends on how much can be delegated to staff. But major changes would be reviewed by the Board. Cyndi indicated that Tarpon Springs has recently updated its staff review list, and she will forward that information.

HPAB consensus was to look at making changes in the review process in light of Cyndi's comments and suggestions. Make up a list of items that can be checked by staff and another list that would come under HPAB review. If approval is denied, the applicant has the right to take action and appeal to the BCC.

V. Historic Designations

A. Ozona Resolutions Concerning the Community and the Hall

Brian went over two resolutions (from 2001) in which Pinellas County recognized Ozona and the Ozona Village Hall as a historically significant community [Resolution 01-46] and structure [Resolution 01-47] respectively. These resolutions were not tied with any program and were passed before the current historic preservation process, so perhaps it's a good idea to flag these in case something more should be done via a formal process. The historical recognition was not an ordinance action and did not go through rezoning; therefore, they were not formally given local designation. Commission Seel suggested that "grandfathering" is appropriate as the Ozona community and the Hall have already received historic recognition, and it would be unfair to make Ozona go through the 60 percent approval for designation process.

Comment was made that grandfathering is a great idea but certainly define what properties are affected in the village, that is, define the boundaries. Grandfathering may be possible for the Village Hall; this may not be the case however regarding the resolution designating the community of Ozona as historically significant. This community, the survey of which found 62 historic property sites within a focused area, may now have to go through the local designation process that is being established. Brian reiterated that the community historic designation was also not tied to ordinance action; and Gordon stated that it did not go through the rezoning process, so it was not formally given a zoning designation. It was an informal recognition of the community's historic significance. Cyndi raised the question: if today Ozona wanted to become a district, how would that be accomplished? Gordon indicated that it would have to go through the current historic preservation ordinance. Cyndi commented that if you want it to be a district, you have to take it through [a formal process]; it just can not be grandfathered. You can not grandfather something that was not in existence at the time. But perhaps something can be done now before there is a change (that is, 60 percent approval of property owners required for designation) in the code amendments.

Brian indicated that consideration also has to be given to what it means to be included in a district. Especially in relation to the community, it is necessary to determine: what properties are contributing; what properties are not contributing; and what properties may require a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Additional concerns were raised during the discussion. Now are people going to have to meet certain criteria in order to make changes to their buildings whereas they did not know the resolution did not provide for that. They may have to be taken through the official process as that could be problematic.

Brian brought up the matter of more than one level of district; in short, a strict historic district and another softer definition that is not as rigorous but still recognizes some history there. Is it all or nothing? Gina asked is this an area that may be more appropriately defined as a neighborhood conservation district rather than an historic designation. Perhaps certain characteristics could be protected that are important and are historically based without requiring more rigorous building maintenance and rehabilitation and so forth.

Cyndi brought up the necessity of having design guidelines when considering districts. Marcel remarked that there are design guidelines for Old Palm Harbor that went through at the same time of the rezoning. The inquiry was also raised concerning should there be separate guidelines for different districts or one set of guidelines for all. Marcel explained that via the 1994 ordinance, certain criteria must be met for the property to be designated. He also mentioned that: in regard to the COA rehab previously discussed, standards for rehab from the Department of the Interior have been used in the ordinance. If the historic resource is designated under the Pinellas County local ordinance, then it is to comply (1) as to why is it being designated and it should meet all the criteria; and (2) if rehab is going to be done to the building(s), although it may not have design criteria, the standards will apply. These standards are in the 1994 ordinance.

Cyndi said she understood that the only historic district in Pinellas County is the Palm Harbor District. Marcel added: and a number of individually designated structures. Cyndi requested to see the design guidelines at the next meeting in order to sense whether these guidelines can be adapted to the rest of the historic resources. Gordon indicated that, yes, the guidelines are pretty general; they are based around the Florida vernacular, which is the design criteria, so that is pretty general – just the basics.

The lengthy discussion continued regarding the status of historical significance bestowed on the community of Ozona and the Hall via resolutions. The crux of the matter is that both were identified as historically significant, but they were not designated through the formal public hearing/rezoning process. Thus, they may not be legally designated.

Brain commented that there were two resolutions. The resolution about the Hall is probably more doable because of all the improvements that have been made to the building. In fact, the consultant at the time indicated that the Hall should be a historically designated site. A major refurbishment of the Hall was accomplished through a Community Development (CD) block grant. When it came to moving the Hall through building code requirements as a historic structure, the Hall was able to be exempted from those regulations not appropriate to the building. This was done by citing the resolution designating the Hall as historically significant.

Two viewpoints arose during the discussion. The first, essentially favoring grandfathering, opined that the resolution of historic designation was obtained and granted in good faith years ago. A second viewpoint emerged. If the Hall is to be designated as an historic structure, then the process of local historic designation should be used, and the Hall did not go through that process. The question arose: Had there actually been a procedure already in place through which the Hall could have been processed for historic status? The answer was: yes, there was an established process; the process did allow for the designation of structures as historic; the Hall could have/would have had to go through the zoning process to be given a designation as a historic structure; and lastly, this was not done. Rather the Hall was

declared historically significant by resolution rather than by the public hearing process. Comment was made that the Hall then is probably *not* legally designated. Ask David Sadowsky of the County Attorney's office if this resolution can stand in place, especially as the process was not followed to obtain an official zoning on the property. Brian commented that "we can talk to the Board and see what the Board thinks about it, but I doubt if there will be a problem going forward and getting designation ..." Cyndi and Gina both stated the need to have David weigh in on the question, especially because a process had been in place when the resolution was adopted, and that process was not followed.

Regarding the historically designated community of Ozona, Commissioner Seel suggested consulting with the Ozona Village Improvement Society (OVIS) because the resolution [Number 01-46] specifically mentions 62 historic buildings. If OVIS wants the 62 historic buildings [to continue being designated as historic], the 60 percent approval rate by those 62 owners needs to be obtained via the process being established. Cyndi indicated that if a district is going to be done, there may be more than 62 sites. There will be the 62 historic structures and however many more sites in addition to those original 62. So, a 60 percent of that total number of property owners would have to be obtained for designation approval. The area could include "mega" mansions – in other words, noncontributing as well as contributing properties. Gordon indicated there is a map showing the location of the 62 properties within Ozona. No boundary lines are shown on the map, but it illustrates which properties have the historic structures on them.

Wally Clark summarized the two issues under discussion. First, there is the Village Hall. Perhaps it should be grandfathered in because it was designated as historical via what was thought to be the best way possible at the time. Second, the community, which has 62 sites, should fall within the procedure about to be established. Cyndi reiterated the necessity to check with Dave Sadowsky about what this Board can do.

Terry Fortner commented that if the historic community designation has to be redone, it will be an interesting process. There would be a number of people fervently interested in that happening, and others would be opposed. Commissioner Seel noted that it is up to OVIS how their members wish to proceed; it is strictly up to the community. Terri indicated an OVIS Board meeting is to be held in the near future. It was mentioned elsewhere in the discussion that OVIS presently owns the Village Hall. Cyndi commented that if the Society thought the site it owned should be a designated historic property and it initiated that process, this might pave the way for people to say we own this building as a group. We are therefore interested in it being designated and how about designation for the rest of these properties. Gina suggested to Terri that you may want to find out what your Board says about that before going to the neighborhood(s). Related to what Terri and Gina were saying, Marcel indicated the best way to tackle the community is to get the OVIS building [the Village Hall] designated first. Make contact with preservationists in Ozona; get some other properties designated; once there are three or four of them designated, then develop and establish a community education program (brochures and so forth). It is expected this will bring in other property owners, and the community will realize the benefit of preservation and move on. An opinion on the Hall will hopefully be rendered before the OVIS Board meeting, and then the community designation issue can be addressed.

V. Historic Designations

B. Refinement of Process for Doing Several Designations Per Year

This matter concerns doing about five designations per year, and this Board wanted staff to find five possibilities. The list includes: the Ozona Village Hall; the White Chapel in Palm Harbor, the Taylor property, an archeological site called the Yat Kitischee also known as the Moog site, and the Hartley House, which is home for the North Pinellas Historical Museum. Cyndi asked if all these properties are already on the National Register. The answer was: None. Cyndi commented that doing the local designation when there has been no National Register research means starting from zero, and that's a lot of work. Normally it starts the other way. Typically it is the National Register – a survey is done and then the surveyor will find sites – sites as listed in the “big book” [the New South Associates consultant study]. If the National Register research is completed first, then 95 percent of the work has been done for the local designation. Take advantage of the research that has already been done. Gordon Beardslee indicated that was a good point. The only exception is the Yat Kitischee. Even though it is not on the National Register, the research has already been done by a Pinellas County staff member who prepared an application for that site. So it could be done as a local designation because the research is already completed. Gordon mentioned other sites that are on the National Register but not designated locally, for example, Fort DeSoto and the Indian Mounds in Philippe Park. Kim mentioned that a lot of research has been done on the Hartley House, and Gordon commented that it has local designation.

At this time, Marcel indicated that he had spoken to a staff member from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) from Tallahassee. The SHPO staffer was working here with the person making an application for the White Chapel to be on the National Register. This gentleman indicated it is better to do a local designation first because it “beefs up” the application for the National Register, and the process takes about six months. The whole intent of what has been discussed here is to just pick five sites and have them locally designated and then do the National Register. As the Hartley House is already locally designated, it does not need to be on the list. There seems to be two schools of thought about which approach is the best. Regarding local designations of five properties, get a list of what is designated; if it is designated locally; and what is designated as National Register. The consultant study has pages of National Register designations.

Discussion shifted to other types of designation. Commissioner Seel inquired about Indian Rocks Beach, and Wally mentioned being a couple of commission meetings short, that they would take it under advisement, that the biggest problem discussed among the city commissioners is the lack of specific districts. There are not specific districts in Indian Rocks Beach, for example, a business district that we can say, okay, designate it.

Brian mentioned that the thinking in Ozona was to further the ambiance of the community; something that would not necessarily involve a historic district affecting multiple properties or historic designations affecting individual property owners. For example, the sidewalk that goes down Bay Street was originally wood. An idea that was considered involved putting the wooden sidewalks back and that was a concept of history. Comment

was made that it could be designated a conservation district/conservation subdivision and just regulate the public infrastructure.

Neighbor Conservation Overlay Districts (NCODs) also came up in conversation. Gordon said that Pinellas County has not done NCODs but rather community overlays instead. Gina indicated that Clearwater has completed two NCODs. These involved neighborhood plans (some capital improvements, underground utilities, and a variety of things the residents wanted to have done). There were some zoning regulations specific to the neighborhood but not architectural ones.

Kim mentioned the hex block preservation district in St. Petersburg, which protects the hexagon sidewalks within the district. If a new sidewalk or driveway is being put in then the hex blocks have to be replaced because they are officially protected. But this does not do anything to the architecture of the area. The brick streets and the hex blocks have to stay in place; if work is being done, the bricks either have to be taken up and preserved or put new ones back. So, there is this ordinance that applies to its national and local landmarks, brick streets and hex blocks.

Discussion shifted to the list of properties owned by Pinellas County that are designated on the National Register but not locally designated. Gordon mentioned Philippe Park, the Fort DeSoto batteries, the Anclote Key Lighthouse, Bay Pines – there is an Indian mound there – the hospital site that is on the National Register, and Weedon Island. Philippe Park will not work because there can not be a local designation in the city unless that city has a historic preservation ordinance; there would be no way to designate it. At this time Safety Harbor does not have such an ordinance. There are only four resources that could be locally designated by Pinellas County: the Fort DeSoto batteries, the Anclote Lighthouse, the Bay Pines Indian mounds, and parts of Weedon Island that are in the unincorporated area. Then there is the Pinellas County Courthouse built in 1912. Gina will take on the Courthouse if an application is submitted. Also, the Capitol Theatre and the Lokey Building have submitted applications for local historic designation. Gordon had checked with the St. Petersburg-Clearwater International Airport a couple of years ago regarding the Moog site. The Airport was not interested in local designation of the Moog site at that time; Gordon will follow up to see if there has been a change. Also, check out the Village Hall, the White Chapel, the Hartley House, and the Taylor House, although the Taylor will probably take a lot of research. There are buildings in addition to the Taylor House that would also be of historical interest, and these structures are all located in Eagle Lake Park. Cyndi suggested also keeping in mind sites that are under development pressures and need some protection. Mention was made of the Belleview Biltmore and the Fenway Hotels. The Belleview Biltmore is on the National Register but has not been locally designated. The Fenway is applying for National Register status. However, the Fenway has been locally designated via a single building zone designation, so it has zoning for a single isolated historic structure. Cyndi will check with the Belleview Biltmore owners to see if they would like to work with the local designation through the Town of Belleair.

VI. Subcommittee Reports

A. Toolbox Subcommittee

Commissioner Seel has never heard back from Bob Jeffrey. Inquiry was made regarding the possibility of grants this year. Probably just small grants. Check with the State of

Florida regarding availability of grants. Kim indicated that grant applications open up from October 1 through December 15. Marcel still has a copy of the Toolbox grant application submitted last year. Cyndi requested that Marcel send it to her as she will try to secure the interest of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation in the Toolbox project.

B. Program/Education Subcommittee

Marcel went over the Historic Preservation brochure that was revised from when it was first published in 1994. Marcel took all the pictures of historic properties, which were located in Ozona, Palm Harbor, and Crystal Beach. Everything is up to date: the history of the Historic Preservation Task Force (HPTF) and the HPAB; what has been done; what has caused it; the historic preservation process; and additional questions and answers. Brian said to finalize the brochure.

Alan Shellhorn, GIS Department Applications Specialist with the Planning Department, discussed the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) project on the Countywide Historic Resources Database. The information that Alan and Marcel have been working with is from New South Associates. There are parcel numbers which will be easy to associate with the database; users will be able to look at a parcel and determine immediately if the parcel is an historic property or not. There are a little over 700 properties that are not associated with a parcel number. With some of the properties, it's as simple as an address that needs a correction. With others, it is obvious that at one point the parcels were larger and they have been subdivided. Those need to be looked at and it may take a little time to go through them.

There will be dot placed on each parcel in the system; each dot associated with the parcel ID will be tied to historic resource information. This is presently in process. Each dot will be tied into historic resource data received from the consultant (in Excel) containing information in 29 fields. There are also several box-like fields that staff and the general public can use to search the database in order to find a particular resource by a selected field. An example would be: request all the properties in Clearwater that were built between 1900 and 1910. Marcel asked for the HPAB's input regarding if there are enough fields and should fields be added or deleted.

Cyndi questioned what information would go in the box called Designation under the Search By heading. The information would denote if the designation was local or National Register; if it is both, it will say both; and if there is no designation, it will say none. Marcel mentioned that the box regarding style/architecture may or may not be that useful; this area is not like the large cities of Chicago or Boston that have strong architectural influences. Kim indicated the architecture field would be helpful for those doing historic research. Kim thought it would be good to also add the site name; so if individuals look for the Belleview Biltmore or the Vinoy, they can type in their common names. People do not always know the site addresses. Kim inquired if that the site information will only be for buildings; then archeological sites will not be on the GIS. Marcel indicated that we haven't got to that point yet; and yes, because of the Florida statutes, archeological information can not be released.

Kim's other comment was when locally designated properties are going through the COA process; you are probably going to want to flag them differently. This way when somebody is doing a site plan or project review, there will be a flag indicating that it needs

to be examined by the historic preservation planner. Marcel indicated that the tool to be employed to recognize these resources is to use the same dot and to put it on the future land use map. So, the cities or anyone may access it. If it were put on the zoning layer, the historic resource information would only show for the Pinellas County zoning layer for the unincorporated area. Gordon said that an feature was actually added that did not come from the consultant. A local designation characteristic has been added so that as properties are designated locally, the information can be added in the attribute field for those properties. For example, Kim explained, that if a property is a locally designated landmark, there has to be a COA for it. The COA application needs to go to the Planning Department. It is important that an historic resource is flagged whether it is on the GIS system or on the permitting system, or both. Gordon indicated that it is not a problem for Pinellas County; it would actually be on the parcel information. For the municipalities, it involves how the information shows up automatically on a map and alerts them. Kim commented regarding how many other Florida Site File Forms that the County has. There should be a separate layer that shows the local landmarks in Pinellas County, not the jurisdictions. Cyndi remarked while all this GIS work is being done, set it up GIS-wise, however the computers talk to each other, so that an individual has the tool as a County employee at the zoning counter. Gordon stated that for Pinellas County, there is no problem; Pinellas County already has the information.

Cyndi proceeded to cover various GIS fields. Field number 26 will say St. Petersburg, Tarpon Springs, and Largo. It was confirmed that any appropriate jurisdiction that can be put in that field will be entered. Field number 27 will have the date. The information in the fields will only be as good as the data obtained from the cities. Hopefully there will be a network of shared information that will be kept up to date on a countywide basis. Another question concerned the box for Structure Use and whether it pertained to current or past use. According to Marcel, the structure use is what was noted in the Master Site File at the time the survey was taken. If it is anything other than that, Pinellas County needs to be notified. Cyndi commented that there were also three fields, numbers 18, 19, and 20, all referring to structure use. Marcel indicated that those are probably prior use. The site form has prior use, immediate use, and then current use. The question was asked: So, which one are you going to query? Marcel replied: The current one, I would think. Kim mentioned that for somebody doing research, it might be helpful to have historic use. Numbers 18, 19, and 20 (referring to structure use 1, 2, and 3 respectively) will be changed to terms that people can understand. The same thing should be done with field numbers 14 through 17: exterior fabrication 1 through 4.

C. Demolition/Finance Subcommittee

Commissioner Seel commented that the whole COA review process was really followed up today, and it had been discussed in conjunction with this subcommittee's report given at the last meeting. She also mentioned necessary follow up with assisting local municipalities in preparing historic preservation ordinances and identifying properties for local historic designation. Work on that, possibly send out a letter to the mayors, and be put on the agenda of the Mayors' Council. Do a presentation before that whole group; inform the members where the Board is now, what the Board is working on, and that the Board is willing to help in historic preservation efforts.

VII. Other Business

Commissioner Seal, Cyndi, and Gina met with Julie Janssen from the School Board and some of her Property staff about North Ward School and South Ward School. It was a very productive meeting. They may be willing to look at an ordinance and/or a local bill. Either type of legislation would exempt historic school sites from having to automatically go to charter schools that have first right of refusal. They seem to be very interested in that.

Commissioner Seal has been exploring possible uses for South Ward School including if Morton Plant Hospital might be interested in the former school as a community clinic. She has talked with Carlen Peterson of the Clearwater City Council about accompanying her to Morton Plant. The City of Clearwater is looking at setting up a health clinic for its employees. Commissioner Seal was going to then determine if Pinellas County might be interested in partnering such a project for its employees. She did inquire whether the Pinellas County Health Department was in the process of obtaining a building site, but it was too late. The Health Department is too far along in the process, and actually it is on Tuesday's agenda to approve the purchase of the building.

There was still some question on Julie's part regarding if another government wanted a school property whether there was a way to sell it or give it to the government for another use versus having it go to a charter school. If the School Board declares property as surplus then it has to offer the property to the charter schools. If the charter schools want it, the School Board has to bring the property up to code. That is why the School Board is sitting on all this property because it is afraid that it will cost too much money to deal with the charter schools.

In order to take the charter requirement out, changes would have to be made at the legislative level, working on a local bill with the Pinellas County delegation. There was talk about doing this on a statewide level; however, such an effort would be too arduous. Why not deal with our own issue here, and they seemed very supportive of doing that. Commissioner Seal will follow up to see if Julie has approached the School Board. The School Board may want to take the lead on working with the Legislative Delegation or perhaps the School Board may want this Board to work on its behalf. This would be on a countywide basis and would be for any historic assets of the School Board. There are a number of historic schools that are vacant in St. Petersburg and Kim "will test the waters" in the city. At present, the legislation pertaining to charter schools having first right of refusal applies statewide. Marcel thought he knew of schools that had been converted to other uses rather than charter schools. Cyndi commented those conversions preceded the charter school movement in Florida and then the charter school requirement came into effect via state law.

The next meeting of the HPAB will be held on Thursday, October 8, 2009, at 1:00 pm.

VII. Adjournment

Commissioner Seal adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.