

The mission of the Washington County School District is to empower all students to become well educated, productive citizens by providing appropriate, high quality, and rigorous educational programs in a safe learning environment.

**WORKSHOP  
of the  
WASHINGTON COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD  
September 24, 2008 – 10:00 a.m.  
Board Room - Administration Building  
Chipley, Florida**

**MINUTES**

The Washington County School Board met in a workshop session at the designated time and place. Mr. Vann Brock, Mr. Wayne Saunders, Mr. John Hawkins, Mr. Terry Ellis, Ms. Susan Roberts, and Superintendent Stevenson were present. Mr. Gerald Holley, School Board Attorney was unable to attend.

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Brock opened the workshop. The agenda was unanimously approved on a motion made by Wayne Saunders and seconded by John Hawkins.

II. **ITEMS TO DISCUSS:**

A. **Washington County School District Facilities Survey (DOE)** – Mr. Tom Inserra, will cover the Educational Plant Survey, and Ms. Tracy Suber, will discuss School Concurrency. They are here from the Florida Department of Education.

Mr. Inserra addressed the Board. He is familiar with some of the issues in Washington County; with not knowing what the impact is going to be but it's still important to be ready just in case the new development takes off, and the airport south of our county comes into play.

Mr. Inserra, along with a group from Office of Education Facilities (OEF), travel to school districts/schools to evaluate their projected needs (i.e., 5 years out).

He discussed the following:

- **OEF Role and Responsibilities**
  - FLDOE assists the districts with
    - Meeting growth management requirements
    - Maintaining the 5-year work plan (due October 1<sup>st</sup>)
    - Assuring that all information in the educational facilities inventory data base is accurate and current

- FLDOE/OEF role shall include at least the following:
  - Providing leadership
  - Knowledgeable technical assistance, and
  - Arranging, coordinating, and producing survey reports
  
- Educational Plant Survey process:
  - Validation (100%) – OEF comes to the district and measures everything that has a door (closets included) compared to the District’s FISH
  - Update FISH – Changes will be made based upon measurements conducted during the validation process
  - Facilities List – OEF works with the District on comparing what the District currently has to what the district could have
  - Needs assessment (Future needs)
  - Recommendations
  - Educational Plant Survey Schedule (Washington County is currently scheduled for 2011-2012)
    - ***Mr. Inserra indicated that Washington County would be rescheduled. Sometime between now and the summer of 2009. We would have to wait until the 2011-2012 school year***

Mr. Inserra indicated that if the District wants KMS to be considered for special facilities money, do not perform any new construction on the school site (i.e., building a new wing, remodeling of the cafeteria, etc.) The more that is put in now, it would not be considered a critical need. Do not pour money into the facility because it would indicate to DOE that the current facility has a future. However, the facility cannot go down the tubes, so it must be maintained in some manner.

**Mr. Stevenson:** Our desires are to build on the same site at KMS. If you do build a wing, it must fit in with the tearing down and rebuilding of the new school. It must be located on that same site.

- Legal Requirements
  - Section 1013.31, F.S. – plant survey
  - Section 1013.35, F.S. – educational facilities plan
  - Section 1013.64, F.S. – funds for plant needs
  - State Requirements for Educational Facilities (State Board of Education Rule)
  - Section 1013.33 – coordination with local governments

**Mr. Inserra:** In regards to critical needs, when the District requests a special facilities funding from DOE, a committee is formed (2 people from OEF and 2 people from districts that do not qualify for special facilities) and they go into the actual facility to determine if any one area meets the critical need areas, then a recommendation is made.

Then the following August Washington County School District, with our architect, would come before a committee to give a presentation; at which time it would be determined whether or not the District would receive special facilities money.

Further discussion was conducted.

- Needs Assessment
  - Section 1013.35(2)(b)2.f., F.S. – For determining future needs, student capacity may not be assigned to any relocatable classroom that is scheduled for elimination or replacement with a permanent educational facility in the current year of the adopted district educational facilities plan and in the district facilities work program adopted under this section. Those relocatable classrooms clearly identified and scheduled for replacement in a school-board-adopted, financially feasible, 5-year district facilities work program shall be counted at zero capacity at the time the work program is adopted and approved by the school board.
  
- Special Facilities Construction Account (Sec.1013.64(2)(a)1., F.S)
  - Purpose – provides construction funds to school districts which have critical needs but lack sufficient resources at present, and cannot reasonably anticipate sufficient resources within the period of the next 3 years, for these purposes from currently authorized sources of capital outlay revenue
  - Critical Need – the committee shall consider:
    - The capacity of all existing facilities within the district as determined by the Florida Inventory of School Houses;
    - The district’s pattern of student growth and projected COFTE student enrollment;
    - The district’s existing satisfactory student stations;
    - The use of all existing district properly and facilities;
    - Grade level configurations; and
    - Any other information that may affect the need for the proposed project
  
- Special Facilities Construction Account (Section 1013.64(2)(a)1., F.S.)
  - Must meet a critical need
  - Must be survey recommended
  - Must appear in the approved project priority list
  - Must have selected a site

**Additional Discussion:**

**Mr. Stevenson:** CHS and RMS is considered a combined school and it would be better if those two schools could be separated.

**Mr. Inserra:** When our team comes that will be looked at in detail and if a need is identified it will be recommended to separate the schools (i.e., two cafeterias)

**Ms. Tracy Suber: School Concurrency**

Ms. Suber works closely with the Department of Community Affairs. She is primarily working on documents dealing with school concurrency and revised in the local agreement. Part of the review is completing the technical support ensuring the plans will work for that particular district at a real practical level; that the plans are feasible and implementable.

In regards to Washington County and the small cities plan has gone through the DC review. Recently WCSB approved revisions to the plan and revised reasonable refinements to the inter-local agreement. Now it will head back to the State for the final approval.

Ms. Suber discussed what the school district would do with our overall facilities plan; relationship back with the local governments. Need to start making a list of items that need to go through the local city government and start discussions.

**She provided the following information:**

### **School Concurrency**

#### ***OEF Role and Responsibilities***

- **Join reviews with the Department of Community Affairs**
  - **New Public School Facilities Elements and Inter-local Agreements**
  - **Comprehensive plan amendments**
  - **Capital Improvement Element updates**
  - **Comprehensive plan amendments**
- **Provide technical support to school districts**
- **Provide translation services for local governments**

### **School Concurrency**

#### ***Legal Requirements***

- **“School concurrency” required statewide December 2008**
  - **Must adopt according to DCA schedule**
- **All counties and cities must adopt:**
  - **Public School Facility elements of growth plans;**
  - **Financially feasible plan to provide schools at adopted levels of service;**
  - **Inter-local agreements with school boards for planning & implementation**
  - **Exemption and waiver allowed in some cases**
- **Failure to adopt results in penalties:**
  - **Local government – loses ability to amend plan to add allow more residential development**
  - **School Board – loses portion of capital outlay funds**

### **School Concurrency**

#### ***Implementation Status***

- **Statewide**
  - **About 450 plans expected for the 67 school districts**
    - **32 “in” compliance; 4 “not in” compliance**
    - **27 in review or still to be adopted**
  - **Waivers and exemptions**
    - **Three counties have receive (includes cities); another application is pending**
    - **40 cities have approved exemptions**
  - **Palm Beach Deistric – Optional element**

- **Washington County**
  - **County and small cities proposed plan**
    - **DCA completed review – ORC Report**
    - **Approved revisions to address DCA recommendations and DCA finding on the Chipley plan**
  - **Chipley adopted plan**
    - **ILA is “not consistent”**
    - **Plan Amendment is “not in compliance”**
    - **FLDOE and DCA will work with city to adopt remedial revisions to bring plan into compliance**

### **School Concurrency**

#### *New Role for School Board*

- **New responsibilities and dynamics**
  - **Local Governments – plan updates; school siting**
  - **Developers**
- **Board members need to know**
  - **District 5-year facilities work plans**
  - **Proportionate share mitigation**
  - **Cost of the concurrency management system**
  - **School impact fees**
  - **Funding for public infrastructure improvements**
  - **Growth management plans**

### **School Concurrency**

#### *What’s Next?*

- **Implement school concurrency**
  - **Guided by ILA – joint meetings and review of plans**
  - **Tracking capacities**
- **Role on local planning agencies**
  - **County and city comprehensive plan amendments**
  - **County and city annual updates of capital improvements elements and capital improvement schedules**
- **Coordinating School Facilities Planning**
  - **School siting**
  - **New educational plant surveys**
  - **New district 5-year facility work plans**

### **School Concurrency**

#### *Technical Support*

- **Technical support:**
  - **DOE-DCA partnership created technical assistance framework**
  - **District facilities planners created a peer support network**
  - **DOE growth management liaison**
  - **DOE website:**  
<http://www.fldoe.org/edfacil/concurrency.asp>

The Board thanked Mr. Inserra Ms. Suber for coming.

**III. ADJOURN:** With no further business to discuss, the workshop was adjourned.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Vann Brock, Chairman**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Wayne Saunders, Vice-Chairman**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**John Hawkins**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Terry Ellis**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Susan G. Roberts**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Superintendent/Secretary**