

MEETING SUMMARY
**PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING
JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE (JPC)**

October 11, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT:

T.R. Hainline, Chairman, Rogers Towers, P.A.
Michael J. Hawk, Duval County Public Schools (DCPS)
Karen Nuland, DCPS
Elizabeth Feustel, Jacksonville Civic Council

STAFF PRESENT:

Kristen Reed, City of Jacksonville – Planning & Development Department (PDD)
Krista Fogarty, City of Jacksonville – PDD
Gloria Blake, City of Jacksonville - PDD
Sondra Fetner, City of Jacksonville – Office of General Counsel (OGC)
Don Nelson, DCPS
Andy Eckert, DCPS
Randy Gallup, DCPS
Tyler Loehnert, DCPS
Derek Reeves, City of Atlantic Beach

Public Present:

Chelsea Anderson, Gunster
Jessie Spradley, NEFBA
Curtis Hart, Hart Resources LLC

Called to Order:

The meeting was called to order by T. R. Hainline, Chairman, at 1:10 PM in the Duval County Public School Building; 1701 Prudential Drive, 3rd Floor, Conference Room 307, Jacksonville, Florida

Chairman Hainline welcomed everyone to the Public Schools Facilities Planning Joint Planning Committee Meeting. He opened the floor for introductions of the committee members, staff and others present.

I. Approval of the minutes – (July 10, 2017)

There was not a quorum present therefore the approval of minutes was tabled.

II. Recap (Staff/Chair)

Chairman Hainline gave a recap of the issues that JPC has discussed thus far.

The Chair noted since it has been approximately 2 months since the committee last met, he believed a recap would be a good idea.

1. Review of the 4 major concepts the committee was asked to evaluate.
 - Concurrency Service Areas
 - Level of Service
 - Adjacency and Capacity
 - Student Generation Rate
2. A tentative consensus has been reached on the following
 - The concurrence service areas – by school attendance zones
3. A consensus has been reached on the following
 - Level of Service - 100 % of permanent Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) and the ability to use an adjacent zone if it is under 95% for the LOS
 - Student Generation Rates
 - i. A student generation rate of .316 – which does not include Charter Schools
 - ii. That Generation rate will be reviewed every five years.
 - Portables as it relates to capacity numbers – It was decided not to include them
 - i. Was noted that Clay County included the portables but not if they are over 20 years of age.
 - ii. The State required DCSB to count the portables
 - iii. Every year the portable count is reviewed and some may be removed
4. A consensus has not yet been made on the following
 - Proportionate share calculations
 - i. What percentage attends magnet schools?
 - ii. What the DCSB staffs position on what CSAs to use?
 - iii. Should we use Attendance Zones as Concurrency Service areas?

III. Proportionate Share Mitigation (Randy Gallup, DCPS)

The Office of General Counsel asked a question - When we look at the adjacent CSAs for determining whether or not there is capacity, do we ever look at it as if the adjacency is at capacity? Would that be possible? If we ever change the CSAs and an adjacent

CSA is at capacity or exceeding that 95%, the concurrency or fair share could be applied in such a way so that it works both ways? (Funding wise)

Planning and Development Department staff reminded the committee... the statutory authority in 163 that allows us to implement school concurrency states LOS shall be applied district wide to all schools of the same type, however if we adopt it on less than a district wide basis then the burden is on us to demonstrate school capacity utilization is maximized to the greatest extent.

Randy Gallup gave a presentation on Proportionate Share Mitigation, key points

An example of what a real residential subdivision might pay under concurrency and proportionate share

- Gave a real scenario using a recently proposed subdivision (Price Park).
 - In CSA 4 – Wolfson High School (a dedicated magnet)
 - Subdivision is proposing 106 dwelling units
 - Student yield = 17.7 elementary, Mandarin Oaks 7.7 Mandarin Middle and 7.9 Mandarin High School
 - Looking at capacity without portables elementary school fails, middle school passes and high school fails
- FDOE student station costs change with inflation, the number will increase monthly
- The Subdivision passed using the current model
- The Capacity (COFTE) does not take into consideration any portables
- Concurrency Ordinance requires a 3 year projection, all the students will not arrive at the same time
- Student yields do not take into consideration where the students will go.
 - Does not include charter schools or magnet schools.
 - Overall, the student generation rate is calculated by student population divided by roof tops.
- Can we set it up like the mobility? And move it to an adjoining zone? It is possible but we can't cross the river.
- We can move school boundaries to accommodate some developments
- If we apply 105% and include the portables all three schools would pass
- Note: there are 20 portables at Mandarin High and they are using every one of them.
- Portables skew the numbers
- Moving a boundary may be a way to help mitigate cost on the front end
- Does this scenario take into account the adjacencies? No.

IV. Magnet Schools (Randy Gallup, DCPS)

Randy Gallup gave a presentation on Magnet Schools, key points

- Presented the 2017-2018, 20 day count data – currently our enrollment is 113,069
 - 15,848 attending dedicated magnets
 - 33,041 non-dedicated magnets
 - 64,108 – neighborhood schools
- 2017/2018 (-827) Student Loss for DCSB students
- 10,633 – Charter School count (numbers provided by the Charter Schools)
- 2017-2018 (-2,285) Student Loss for Charter Schools students
- How do you create a pot of money for dedicated magnet schools if you are always excluding them?
 - It was stated that through the lottery we control the numbers of students that go to the magnet schools. They will never be over capacity.
- How do you calculate for non-dedicated magnets?
 - Seats for the magnets are controlled through the School Choice program
- If there is a dedicated magnet in the CSA it is included in the capacity for that CSA even if the kids from that CSA don't go there.
- If there is a certain given percentage that is going to attend the Magnet Schools would there be a standardized magnet ratio?
- A list was provided of all the Charter Schools in Duval County

Office of General Counsel asked a question. How do you calculate for the non-dedicated magnets? What percentage is open to magnet verses the neighborhood students? Answer: It varies, because the neighborhood schools can never turn students away. They service the neighborhood schools first and then the magnet schools.

- How many high school enrollment attendance centers are there? Ans: 14 or 15

The chairman asked for a recommendation from the school board staff as to what attendance zones / CSAs do you want to use? Would like this recommendation by the next meeting. (How this money comes in and how it will be spent.)

V. Follow Up Item

The chairman requested that all the committee members be present at the next meeting. If we are going to vote on what could be a \$6500 payment per unit going forward we definitely need the DCSB and the City Council representatives present. Our vote is only a recommendation but everyone needs to be here.

- The chairman will work with Kristen and Krista to draft an email to let everyone know how important it is to attend the next meeting.

IV. Next Steps

- Tentative date 11/1/17 at 10:00 am room 307
- If we vote on these concepts, that the CSA are high school attendance zones etc. If we vote on that, is the next step The OGC and PDD draft the ILA and Comp Plan policies that put that into place?
- We have to understand how these policies would impact the other cities in Duval County, such as the Beaches and Baldwin.
- Once the ILA is amended and adopted they would follow with amending and adopting the Concurrency Ordinances.

VII. Public Comment

Questions from Jessie Spradley, NEFBA

- How did St. Johns County get around the issue with using High School attendance for the CSA's that shared elementary schools?
 - Randy will have that information at the next meeting.
- Do we have the numbers of how many students are coming out of their neighborhood to the dedicated magnet schools?
 - We will have to get that information from School Choice
- Strongly encourage some thinking about the portables, to use those as student stations with no anticipation of removing them, but calculating them.
- On the example you used it was stated that the projected number \$669,000 is more than what the land cost and there would be no houses and no development. So those 106 homes would not be built in Duval County.

Other comments

- If the portables have been there for more than 20 years it is difficult to not count them.
- If concurrency funds are collected to build permanent structures to replace the portables we have to count them or we would not get the funds needed to replace them.
- What is going on with the site development criteria for charter schools?
 - It is moving forward, but that does not come under review of this committee. OGC will provide a courtesy copy upon approval.
- Fees are not paid for existing deficiencies but for future deficiencies that arise as a result of the development. The fact that the portables are there today to cover a deficiency, are we asking the people who are paying the fees to fix an existing problem that will be made worse by them coming?
- So are impact fees being applied to help get rid of the portables?
 - Portables are more difficult to get rid of in the high schools. There are so many course selections and you need so much room to accommodate them.

- Portables are helpful as enrollment changes. They can be moved where needed as opposed to building a 20 million dollar wing that may be sitting empty.

Next meeting date... November 1, 10:00 am.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:32 pm.