

SUMMARY OF PINELLAS SCHOOLS COLLABORATIVE MEETING OF JUNE 6, 2011

The meeting was held on Monday, June 6, 2011, 9:00 a.m., in the Planning Department Conference Room. Those in attendance were:

Members Present:

Carol Cook	Pinellas County School Board (Acting Chairman)
Bill Dudley	City of St. Petersburg
Gigi Arntzen	City of Largo
George Cretekos	City of Clearwater
Peggy O'Shea	Pinellas County School Board

Members Absent:

Susan Latvala	Pinellas County (Chairman)
Joe Ayoub	City of Safety Harbor
Julie Ward Bujalski	City of Dunedin
Doug Mullis	Citizen Representative
Jerry Mullins	PSTA/Pinellas Park
Suzanne Vale	City of Oldsmar
John Counts	City of Seminole
Susan Slattery	City of Tarpon Springs
Carol Reynolds	City of Madeira Beach
	City of Gulfport
	City of St. Pete Beach

Others Present:

Brian Smith	Pinellas County Planning Department/MPO
Gina Harvey	Pinellas County Planning Department/MPO
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County Planning Department
Liz Freeman	Pinellas County Planning Department
Ryan Brinson	Pinellas County Planning Department
Sarah Ward	Pinellas County Planning Department/MPO
Bob Bray	City of Pinellas Park
Priyanya Thatte	City of Clearwater
Michael Bessette	Pinellas County Schools
Ginny Pannill	Pinellas County Schools
Robert Davis	Pinellas County Transportation
Dave Sadowsky	Pinellas County Attorney Office
Megan Carmichael	Pinellas County Health Department
Carolyn Kuntz	MPO/Recorder

I. CALL TO ORDER

Noting Chairman Latvala was out of town, Acting Chairman Carol Cook called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF APRIL 6, 2010 MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Arntzen moved, Councilman Dudley seconded, and motion carried to approve the minutes.

III. IMPACT OF HB 7207 ON IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL CONCURRENCY

Gordon Beardslee, Pinellas County Planning Department, indicated the Governor signed HB 7207 last Thursday, which is the Community Planning Act and includes over 300 pages of amendments to the Growth Management Act. There were substantial changes to the sections dealing with school planning and concurrency that impact the Pinellas Schools Collaborative. He distributed copies of a one-page handout that summarizes those impacts, as well as a copy of the existing Interlocal Agreement. The impacts include:

- The requirement for a Public Schools Interlocal Agreement is still retained and focuses on coordination between the School District and local jurisdictions, keeping the requirements of SB 1906 enacted in 2002;
- Removes the previous exemption for municipalities that met the criteria for having no significant impact on school attendance so that, now, all municipalities are required to be signatories to the Interlocal Agreement for sharing and coordination of information (these municipalities are Belleair, Belleair beach, Belleair Bluffs, Belleair Shore, Indian Rocks Beach, Indian Shores, Kenneth City, North Redington Beach, Redington Beach, Redington Shores, South Pasadena, and Treasure Island);
- School concurrency is no longer a requirement for local governments and, as a result, there is no longer a requirement that a local comprehensive plan contains an adopted Public School Facilities Element to implement a school concurrency program but does allow local governments the option of applying concurrency and a Public School Facilities Element;

Upon query by Commissioner Cretkos, Mr. Beardslee responded sharing of information and coordination are still required through a Public Schools Interlocal Agreement; however, the requirement for school concurrency has been eliminated. School concurrency applies to development site plans where local governments had to ensure there was adequate space in the schools before approving the site plan, which is now optional. Mr. Smith added the Interlocal Agreement has a provision on Page 3, Section 3 that indicates that each local government will inform the School District in advance of final approvals and there is the option that can be retained. Mr. Beardslee stated that Page 3, Section 2 of the Interlocal Agreement dealing with student enrollment and populations projections will still be required, as well as sharing of information and coordination and a review of the School District's Five Year Work Program. Local governments will be required to share information with the School District on any proposed land use or zoning changes that would impact or change residential densities that could impact the School District. The provisions on Page 4, Sections 4 – 8 would remain. The provisions on Page 5, Sections 9 – 13 deal with school concurrency and are optional as to whether they would be retained.

- If a local government decides to rescind the application of school concurrency, it would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment to remove the Public School Facilities Element and an amendment to the Public Schools Interlocal Agreement to remove those sections that pertain to school concurrency.
- In partnership with the County's Business Technology System, a Multi-Jurisdictional Residential Tracking System in the GIS was developed and is used by the local governments that are required to implement school concurrency to keep track of residential development, approved site plans, and progress with their development, which is a useful planning tool and there is a benefit to continue with this tracking system even if school concurrency is rescinded.

Mr. Smith indicated that staff would suggest notification to the other cities that are not part of the Interlocal Agreement to let them know of requirement that they are now required to be a signatory to the Interlocal Agreement and to ask the School Planning Workgroup to convene to discuss the

impacts of the changes and to develop a proposal or recommendations, with a report back to this Committee in September.

Commissioner Cretokos noted that a majority of those communities are beach communities and suggested that staff attend the next BIG-C meeting to let them know about the requirement. Mr. Smith responded he would contact them. Staff could develop a letter to notify the cities of the change and work with the BIG-C. These other cities would be part of the Collaborative Committee.

Upon query by Ms. O'Shea regarding whether there was a deadline for getting the Interlocal Agreement signed, Mr. Smith responded he did not believe so but it should be done in a timely manner. Mr. Beardslee indicated there are several areas where staff needs clarification of the bill requirements. Every local government needs to be a signatory to the required portions of the Interlocal Agreement (Sections 2 – 7) but not required to implement the sections dealing with school concurrency that that is optional. In addition, there is still an exemption for small communities from school concurrency. Ms. Cook indicated another clarification that is needed is whether the local governments can sign the Interlocal Agreement and then, later, decide not to adhere to the school concurrency provisions. Mr. Beardslee stated the legislation appears to indicate there is a requirement that there must be local governments representing at least 80% of the countywide population participating in school concurrency but there needs to be clarification.

By consensus, the Committee directed that the Workgroup convene to look at developing a proposal, keep school concurrency, and send a letter to the cities notifying them they are required to be signatories to the Interlocal Agreement.

OTHER

Commissioner Cretokos noted Pinellas County sold property where the City of Clearwater was not involved in that decision. The School Board is considering selling some of their property and he wanted to make sure, before the properties are advertised to be sold, the School Board notifies the appropriate local governments at the administrative level.

Ms. Cook stated the School District developed a matrix for vacant properties. Commissioner Cretokos restated his concern is not the list of vacant properties but that the local government should be notified before the property is advertised for sale. Michael Bessette responded that is part of the process to notify local governments. The School District is not actively marketing any property for sale. The procedure is that a representative would approach the School District with an interest in purchasing property; that request is taken to the Superintendent; if the property is not needed, the request is taken to a Board Workshop; if there is consensus on an agreement by the Board, than the process to sell the property would begin. Before the properties are advertised for sale, the School District gets appraisals; once they receive the appraisals, then they check to see if there is any interest by local governments. Currently, there are two properties: North Ward Elementary School in Clearwater and Euclid in St. Petersburg. Mr. Bessette stated he would make sure this information is given to the local municipality's Mayor and city manager.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.