



MEETING SUMMARY
PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING
JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE (JPC)
Duval County Public Schools Building 1701 Prudential Drive CR #307

Wednesday, February 15, 2017 9:00AM – 10:30 AM

MEMBERS PRESENT:

The Honorable Al Ferraro
T. R. Hainline, Chairman
Josh Cockrell, IGS
Warren Jones, Duval County School Board
Elizabeth Feustel, Jax Civic Council

Monique Tookes, DCPS
Karen Nuland, DCPS
Michael J. Hawk, DCPS
Drew Frick, Gate Petroleum

STAFF PRESENT:

Kristen Reed, COJ-PDD
Rosario Lacayo, COJ-PDD
Susan Grandin, COJ- OGC
Don Nelson , DCPS
Tyler Loehnert, DCPS

Laurie Santana, COJ- PDD
Lurise Bannister, COJ- PDD
Randy Gallup, DCPS
Andy Eckert, DCPS

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 AM

I. Approval of Minutes (2-15-17)

The Chairman: **called for a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of February 15, 2017.**

Motion: to approve the meeting summary of February 15, 2017. The motion was made, properly seconded, and unanimously approved.

II. Welcome New Member and Recap

The Chairman then welcomed everyone to the Public School Facilities Planning Joint Planning Committee (JPC) meeting including members that were not present at the previous meeting. The Chairman introduced one new member was introduced to the commission – Elizabeth Feustel

III. Action Item (Susan Grandin – Office of General Counsel)

ILA Update : Site Development Review

Discussion: 2008 draft was handed out by Susan Grandin, OGC – Other updates were discussed. It was noted that Charter schools cannot have any restrictions that are not imposed on Duval County School Board Schools.

- Major renovations are defined as (50% percent improvements on value) or new schools
- ILA has to be approved by all the participating entities
- Preference is to vote to amend the ILA and then the COJ would amend the Ordinance Code
- Should the ILA follow the Ordinance? Yes, they should match. Which comes first? Question was not answered. ILA was changed first and then the Ordinance was attached to it.
- Definitions – the recommendation was to include a list in the ILA
- It was suggested that all schools submit new and major renovation site plans to the COJ for review focusing on traffic circulation.
- Councilman Ferraro asked: How do the charter schools represent themselves... will elementary schools and high schools be under the same guidelines? Is the Parking requirements the same?
- Ms. Santana... there is a difference in the requirements for Elementary and High School based on age.
- Who will acceptance the maintenance – Councilman Ferraro has been trying to get stripes painted for a long time. (unsuccessfully)
- It was pointed out there is a School Safety Department that can handle that issue.
- Chairman asked for the DCSB's view -DCSB feels they police themselves very well already.
- How DCSB deal with state requirements? There is a compliance officer that reviews. The City could make sure the charter schools comply. DCSB would wave their exemption if they were to agree to site development review in ILA.
- City requirements for parking are far more intense that the State requirements. State regulations are filled with safety issues – but not detailed

- Proposed changes would require schools to demonstrate that you have areas that can handle the capacity for special events.
- City has to apply criteria to both DCPS and Charter Schools. The state law does not require the Charter schools to follow the same SREF
- Can each entity make a code enforcement side? It would be preferable to resolve this issue before the schools are constructed.
- This would affect all new schools- which there are 20 pending Charter Schools. DCSB has no plans for new schools at this time.
- Disagreement on proposed Policy 4.3.2 and the numerical criteria. Staff needs to work on a formula /criteria together that could be used
- Could you use an either or policy... SREF or the City's Requirements?
- If you don't follow SREF you have to follow City standards (The City does not have school site development review standards therefore need to create City standards.)
- Working group will get together and see if you can follow SREF or COJ standards
- It was determined that Charter Schools should have representation on the committee. The Chair knows someone that he can call. Councilman Ferraro stated we need to get the Charter School representation involved.
- The criteria in other counties works (Hillsborough, Broward)
- It was noted that what is put in place will be reviewed in the future – the emphasis was on getting criteria in place. Adjustments could be made later.
- The Chair stated we need to include the school contactors/who put the site plans together –
- Alternative to site development review requirement: requiring all schools to be in a PBF Zoning and land use

IV. Follow up discussion of School Concurrency and Recommendations (ILA Team)

LOS update

CSA's: School attendance zones

Adjacency with 95% LOS and closest proximity

- Most use their measurements on these attendance zones – to determine if they are over capacity or not.
- Each group has its own attendance zones (Elementary, Middle and High)
- Must have less than 95% in order to use neighboring attendance zones

- Which Attendance zones straddle a Concurrence service area overlap? The wish is to use CAS's based on attendance. Our unique situation because we split the river.

Student generation rates

- LOS – is at 105% of permanent FISH
- Recommending 100% of permanent FISH and No portables
- County does not have school impact fees and a high level of service unlike other large counties
- 5.4.1.3 Language about the definition section – with clear explanation of these terms
- Generation rates are used per each school level.

V. Next Steps

Dates for next meeting

- The chair noted the urgency in the charter school criteria
- Next meeting: March 8 at 1:00 – 2:30

VI. Public Comment

VII. Adjourn – 10:35 AM.