

School Planning Work Group

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

8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions by Gordon Beardslee. Introductions were made around the room.

Schedule Review

- Final draft is due by the end of March, 2007
- Presentation to the School Collaborative - April 4
- Then send to all cities, county and school board for comments
- Final to School Collaborative - June 6
- Back to local governments for adoption - no later than March 1, 2008

General Discussion on the Goals, Objectives & Policies (GOPs) as emailed on 2-7-07

- Basically three goals:
 1. School Concurrency
 2. Integration of schools in the community
 3. Public Safety, both for students and for schools serving as public shelters
- Interlocal Agreement (ILA) will be selectively referenced in the GOPs although all the "models" have rolled entire ILA into the GOPs - Gordon still working this out with DCA
- Policy 1.1.3 - define "major infrastructure" - discussion followed at length
 - Perhaps eliminate "major infrastructure" and just go with "projects that may impact public schools"
 - Link term to CIE or CIP projects?
 - Reference the STEPS Committee? (**S**chool **T**ransportation **E**nhancement of **P**edestrian **S**afety)
 - Would need to address HOW to incorporate STEPS into the GOPs
 - Need to be very careful using mandatory language like "should-shall-may"
 - Gordon to contact DCA regarding ability of local government to modify the verbs to match the formatting of their own Comp Plan as well as the fact that some local governments may have situations with the School District that others would not, which would create variations in their PSFE
 - This policy was recommended to go back to the Sub-Group for revision

- Policy 2.1.5 - Concerned about "new or expanded" in the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). Karl Holley mentioned schools like Gulf Beaches Elementary School -does reinvesting in that school mean "expanded"? Want to ensure that it is still possible to reinvest in public schools already located in the CHHA. Gordon stated that in 9J5 there is no prohibition on maintenance, so it should be alright.
 - This needs revision or clarification as many schools are in CHHAs/evacuation zones.
 - Schools must follow the DOE criteria - should we refer to that in the policy? The School District warned that we need to be cautious - DOE tells the schools what they can or can not do. The School District commented that some schools may flood in a storm for a day or two, but are beneficial to the community all other days.
 - Map the CHHA areas with schools and vacant land - perhaps with Evacuation Zones A-D - to see where schools are.
 - There is hesitation to take out "velocity flood zone or floodway" but may revisit CHHA.

- Objective 1.2 - "...throughout the five years covered by the 5-Year Work Program" - does that mean a new subdivision must be "consistent ... school concurrency" for all five years or the year brought in?
 - Gordon has read 9J5 and the Pilot Community Element and this section is very difficult to write to follow 9J5. We are still working on this and need more discussion with DCA.
 - You have to incorporate the 5-Year Work Program to insure that you are going to meet your level of service standard within the five year period.
 - Bob Bray has information on this that he will email Gordon.
 - The intent is - if there is available capacity when the project comes in and you issue a concurrency approval - as long as they do not lose that approval - they can build once they are ready to build.

- General Comments:
 - Watch consistency in verbage of School District and School Board - be clear when using Board that you mean the Board and otherwise it is the School District.
 - When it says "Pinellas County" doing something, does that mean the Pinellas County Planning Department? Make more clear.
 - Watch out when referring to "Chapter" ... in some cases we should be referring to "Section."

- New Goal Three - discussion of Sidewalks in Collaborative Meeting this morning
 - Public officials seem to want sidewalks to/from schools.
 - Not every citizen wants a sidewalk in front of their property.
 - Can local government go in and put a sidewalk on the right-of-way? Absolutely.

- Policy 3.1.1 makes perfect sense - 2-mile radius of schools - need to establish a priority system if this is to be implemented.
 - o Are we talking non-through streets - not carrying the traffic that collectors or arterials would be carrying?
 - o Currently way too broad - sounds like it would require sidewalks on every street - is that for one side or both sides, etc? There is no criteria and needs to be made more clear.
- Policy 3.1.2(?) - too broad of a policy.
 - This policy needs more work. "ensures the safety before, during and after school hours" - what does sidewalk connectivity have to do with during school hours.
 - "After school hours" - you need to be very careful of that terminology. After School Programs - do we need to have crossing guards two (or more) hours after school dismisses? - be very careful!
 - Sidewalk exemptions - need something to assist local governments with backing so they can deny the exemption. For example: "no waivers in this school route."
 - Safe Walk School Corridor? Plus there is a Safe Walk to School grant closing March 2007 and not open again until 2010. However, many local governments are reluctant to endorse a "safe route to school" as a liability issue.
- Is there a map that shows the sidewalk connectivity system? It would be nice to be able to show elected officials where they stand, then they know how many linear feet need to be installed and if there is TIF money/credit.
- Sub-Group will work on the sidewalk issue. Please email any comments or thoughts you have to Gordon. We have been in contact with the County's Public Works department and will include their comments. Each agency should have their own comments also.
 - Important to make sure to make it a priority but not to replace other priorities for community sidewalks - not an overriding priority.
 - Needs to be expanded so local governments can "adjust" for their community.
- Policy 3.1.4 - Does developer need to put in sidewalks and roadways on which they are not building? If they do, they will get a lot of TIF credit.
 - Local governments may already have regulations that differ. How to handle? Each local government will have to look into this.
 - Use TIF credits? - local governments may want to keep their TIF credits for other projects.
 - Has the School District prioritized routes? Local government agencies should be prioritizing major walk routes to school - School District assists by providing student data, etc. FDOT categorizes what local governments should be doing in terms of walker safety commutes.
 - o Perhaps setup something in PSFE that says local governments should-shall-may identify the routes and then apply the funds to protect those routes.

- Creates a legal mandate to do it in some fashion, but creates an avenue for advocates to be able to use the Comp Plan to advance the public interest.
- When is the next Sub-Group meeting planned? Not yet set, but needs to go to the Collaborative Meeting, and need to get the information to them a week ahead, so need to meet in the next week or week and a half. Email will go out to set up the meeting.
- What happens if "a commission" says they don't like two or three of the policies/ sections, etc. or they want to add or delete? - What is the difference between what this committee sends and what a local government wants to send to DCA?
 - These are the "core" elements of the PSFE.
 - Since the Collaborative is involved and they are elected officials, this should afford "buy-in" - plus we have the two month period where the draft goes to the local governments, etc. to review, then they give feedback back to the work group and the Collaborative, so we can craft a final version in June that will be acceptable to all local governments.
- Policy 1.2.1 - Model communities are incorporating a specific reference to the utilization rate which is used to calculate the FISH School Capacity. That rate can be changed administratively. Models recommend that you refer to a specific utilization rate established by the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF). We will use "effective August 2005" - but need to get with School District staff to make sure that is the date - Gordon will contact Jim Underhill or Frank Frail for that information. So if the rate is changed administratively, then we have control over our level of service standard and the capacity calculations.
- Policy 2.1.2 - Do we need to specifically add charter schools in the section?
- Policy 2.1.3 - List of LU categories. Add Planned Redevelopment Residential and Commercial categories.
 - There are charter schools in shopping centers and St. Petersburg even has a proposal for a school in an old bowling alley which is commercial office / retail.
 - There are places where a school could fit in Commercial, or a heavier use than is there now.
 - Should we refer to Countywide Rules, Local Land Development Regulations and/or Special Area Plans rather than try to list them out?
 - Perhaps use the language: "all categories except as limited by the requirements of DOE" ?
 - Will DCA have any heartburn with NOT listing the land categories? Perhaps list all except Rec & Open Space and Preservation. Done in the 1990's to avoid a land use amendment change and to expedite school construction.
 - "...based on best building practices" ?

- Policy 1.2.3 - Date reference. March 1, 2008? We may have a more general date as this Element will have to be adopted and amendments to land regulations would occur after that. EAR-based amendments due a few months after that? Can it be done all at once? Paul Geisz stated that Ray Eubanks of DCA has sent letter saying you can combine all in one - that letter will be sent to Gordon for distribution to the group.
- Policy 2.2.2 - Not the best wording. There may still be things down the road that would be needed after construction completion. We will revise this policy.
- Next meeting set for Wednesday, March 14th (before the MPO). Before then, Gordon will email the Sub-Group responsible for dealing with the GOPs and set a meeting to go over comments and refine policies.
- Paul Roberts has put together a form regarding our Permit Tracking. Need to find out how the local governments collect information and get an idea of their procedures. That form will be sent out and any comments you have would be appreciated so we have a good template.

There was not sufficient time remaining to discuss the PSFE Data & Analysis.
Meeting adjourned at 12:05 P.M.

Meeting Attendees:

Karl Holley, St. Pete Beach
 Lauren Matzke, 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
 Steve Fairchild, Pinellas County Schools
 Marshal Touchton, Pinellas County Schools
 Bob Bray, Pinellas Park
 Ron Rinzivillo, Safety Harbor
 Sandy Herman, Clearwater
 Chelsea Ross, Pinellas County Planning
 Paul Roberts, Pinellas County Planning
 Liz Freeman, Pinellas County Planning
 Gordon Beardslee, Pinellas County Planning