



# **PROGRAM GUIDE**

## **FOR THE**

### **FY 2012/2013 – FY 2016/2017**

## **DISTRICT FACILITIES WORK PROGRAM**

---

The Brevard School District Five Year Facilities Work Program for School Years 2012/2013 through 2016/2017, is a detailed five-year plan of Major Repair and Renovation Projects necessary to “*maintain the educational plant and ancillary facilities*” and Capital Outlay Projects to “*ensure the availability of satisfactory student stations for the projected student enrollment in K-12 programs*”, with a Schedule of Estimated Capital Outlay Revenue to fund those projects. The Work Program also contains a Ten-Year and a Twenty-Year Long Range Plans.

The Work Program was developed by the Office of Facilities Services with input from the Office of Financial Services, the Office of Curriculum & Instruction and the Office of School Choice. Each year, the Work Program is updated, approved by the School Board and submitted to the Florida Department of Education (FDOE), as required by F.S. 1013.35.

This document is a guide for readers of the Work Program, containing the rationale, criteria and assumptions upon which the Work Program was based, including notes for sections that are not self-explanatory.

Prepared by: Jay Stannard

# **PROGRAM CRITERIA**

## **Statutory Requirements**

- **Educational Plant Survey (EPS):** The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) requires all projects in the Work Program to be contained in the District’s Educational Plant Survey (EPS) unless the project is funded with local funds (impact fees, sales tax, etc.). Brevard’s current version of the EPS was approved by the FDOE on January 7, 2011.
- **Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH):** Information contained in the current Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) database is required by the FDOE to be used as the basis for school capacity in the Work Program. This Work Program is based on the FISH database as of August 13, 2012.
- **Capital Outlay Full Time Equivalents (COFTE):** Capital Outlay Full Time Equivalents (COFTE) data is provided by the FDOE and is required to be used as the basis for capacity utilization in the Work Program. Note that COFTE is less than the actual student membership for District-owned (Capital Outlay) facilities since not all students are full-time equivalents (FTE). This Work Program is based on the COFTE data provided by the FDOE on June 13, 2012.

## **Financial Information**

- The FDOE requires the District’s FY2012/13 Adopted Tentative Budget, approved September 6, 2012, to be used as basis for all 2012/13 revenues and expenditures in this Work Program. Revenues and expenditures for 2013/14 – 2016/17 are based on the “Fiscal Year 2012-13 Capital Funding Plan -- Scenario #6” provided by the Office of Financial Services. It is assumed that revenues from *ad valorem* taxes, Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO), Capital Outlay and Debt Service (CO&DS), Impact Fees and other sources shown in the document will be received as projected to fund the projects shown in the Work Program in 2012/13 – 2016/17.
- There will be inadequate funds available to maintain a financially feasible plan in 2016/17 (see Page 1 of the Work Program). Note that the cost of the remaining projects in the Ten-Year Facility Improvement Plan (\$231,127,809) is contained in the financial section of the Ten-Year Long Range Plan (“Facilities Renewal” on Page 23) but it cannot be determined at this time if the necessary funding will be available for these projects.
- The \$279,672,000 for Facilities Renewal contained in the financial section of the Twenty-Year Long Range Plan (“Facilities Renewal” on Page 25) – is a projection of the funding needed to adequately renew our facilities on a 25-year cycle. It cannot be determined at this time if the necessary funding will be available for these projects.

## Significant Events

Several significant events have had, or will have, major impacts on the District's facilities.

- **2008-09** The 2008 Legislature reduced the maximum amount of ad valorem tax for Capital Outlay from 2.0 mills to 1.75 mills reduced the Capital Budget, resulting in a significant decrease in the capital funds available for renewal and equity projects at schools. Student enrollment in District facilities declined by 1,264 (-1.75%).
- **2009-10** Declining property values decreased the amount of ad valorem tax available for Capital Outlay; this was further exacerbated when the 2009 Legislature again reduced the maximum amount of ad valorem tax for Capital Outlay by 25 mills from 1.75 to 1.50 mills. Coupled with further declines in PECO and Impact Fee funding, no capital funds were available to continue renewal and equity projects at schools, effectively ending the 10-Year Facility Improvement Plan. The 2009 Legislature delayed implementation of Class Size Reduction (CSR) at the classroom level until the 2010/11 school year. Student enrollment in District facilities declined by 799 (-1.13%).
- **2010-11** The continuing decline of property values further reduced available capital funds. No capital funds were available for Educational Technology infrastructure improvements (Sunrise Standard), custodial equipment or furniture replacement. Inadequate capital funds were available for renewal of critical facility infrastructure (roofs, HVAC, electrical, gas, potable water, sanitary sewer, fire alarm, intercom, phones, data, security, stormwater drainage, etc.), effectively creating a "Repair at Failure" situation. Full compliance with the CSR maximums at the classroom level became a requirement. Student enrollment in District facilities declined by 693 (-0.99%). Attendance boundaries were changed at 36 schools to relieve over-crowding, better utilize existing capacity and provide adequate space to comply with the CSR requirements.
- **2011-12** The further decline of property values resulted in a shortfall of available capital funds to pay debt service and other minimum essential capital requirements. This shortfall was funded with \$3 million from the Operating budget and Capital Fund Balance carried forward from previous years. With no capital funds available for renewal of critical facility infrastructure, the "Repair at Failure" situation continued. Student enrollment in District facilities increased by 818 (+ 1.2%) students, in large part due to the closure of the Palm Bay Municipal Charter school and consequent absorption of its students.

- **2012-13** Property values are projected to level off but capital funds available are insufficient to fund debt service and minimum essential capital requirements. This shortfall was again funded with \$4 million from the Operating budget and Capital Fund Balance carried forward from previous years. One elementary school was closed in the North Area due to declining enrollment after the Shuttle program termination and attendance boundaries were changed at 7 other schools in the area to accommodate the relocated students. Attendance boundaries at four secondary schools in the same area were changed to balance the populations and course offerings at those schools. In the Central Area boundaries were changed at 8 secondary schools to accommodate the continued growth in the Viera area. Finally in the South Area boundaries were changed at 8 elementary schools to better accommodate growth and balance utilization. On August 23rd the student membership in District schools was 67,507; with a forecast of 67,608 for the October FTE count, it seems likely the forecast will be met.
  
- **2013-14 to 2016-17** Property values are projected to begin to slowly rise after 2013-14 but capital funds are projected to continue to be insufficient to fund debt service and minimum essential capital requirements. This shortfall will be funded with Capital Fund Balance carried forward from previous years until it is depleted in 2016-17. The School Board approved a referendum on the 2012 November ballot for a county-wide half-penny sales tax increase to fund capital shortfalls. Student enrollment in District facilities is projected to continue to slowly decline an additional 1,056 (1.6%) by 2016-17.

## **PROGRAM NOTES**

### **Expenditures**

Expenditures shown on Pages 2 – 5 are based on the District’s FY2012/13 Adopted Tentative Budget and the “Capital Funding Plan -- Scenario #6”. Expenditures “necessary to maintain the educational and ancillary facilities of the district” are shown on Pages 2 – 4 with locations; other capital expenditures are shown on Page 5.

### **Revenue**

The revenues shown on Pages 5 – 8 are based on the District’s FY2012/13 Adopted Tentative Budget and the “Capital Funding Plan -- Scenario #6”. Note that the Work Program is not “financially feasible” in 2016/17.

### **Project Schedules**

Project schedules are shown on Pages 8-9. There are two elementary school projects planned for 2016-17. One school would be located in the south area of the county and the other in the central area; they are both areas of high student membership growth. While there is no funding currently available or projected to build these schools, impact fees from resumed growth in addition to the passage of the half-penny sales tax may make such construction possible.

There are no additional projects of any kind scheduled.

## **Capacity Tracking**

The capacity utilization shown on Pages 10 - 12 is based on the FISH database as of August 13, 2012 and the COFTE data provided by the FDOE on June 13, 2012.

- The capacity data includes relocatables.
- Because the FDOE provides COFTE by grade level, not by school, the COFTE data is ratioed to the student membership projections developed by the Facilities Planning Department for School Concurrency projections in order to input COFTE by school.
- Changes in the “New Student Capacity” and New Rooms to be Added/Removed” columns reflect permanent and relocatable classrooms added or removed from each school on the basis shown below.
  - Permanent
    - ✓ Permanent capacity was reduced at schools that did not have all of the ancillary (non-classroom) spaces permitted by the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF). This change of use coding was done to more accurately reflect the program capacity of those schools. This change was not made at all schools.
    - ✓ The new requirement that secondary students take at least one on-line class has made it necessary to convert classrooms into computer laboratories.
  - Relocatable classrooms will be added or removed from schools to meet the needs of program requirements and to accommodate population movements with a minimum of disruption to the students. The following general criteria guided these planned additions and removals of relocatable classrooms.
    - ✓ If a school had an increasing projection and existing relocatables, relocatable capacity was added to accommodate additional COFTE up to a utilization of 90% – it was assumed that the existing relocatables were necessary for special programs and the additional students would require additional capacity, regardless of the utilization.
    - ✓ If a school had an increasing projection but did not have existing relocatables, capacity was not added to accommodate additional COFTE unless additional relocatable capacity was necessary to prevent a school from exceeding 90% utilization.
    - ✓ If a school had a projected decline in student membership and had existing relocatables, relocatable capacity was removed in proportion to the decline in COFTE, up to the total existing relocatable capacity.
- The District’s projected COFTE utilization will decline from 74.65% in 2015/16 to 74.33% in 2016/17 (Page 13).

## **Relocatable Replacement**

The school board has not adopted a financially feasible plan to replace any relocatables in the next five years.

## **Charter Schools Tracking**

Charter school data shown on Page 13 was provided by the Office of School Choice.

### **Special Purpose Classrooms Tracking**

Special purpose classroom data (classrooms not used for educational purposes and co-teaching classrooms) shown on Page 14 was provided by school principals.

### **Net New Classrooms**

On Page 15, no new classrooms were added during the last year.

### **Relocatable Student Stations**

Relocatable student station data shown on Pages 15 – 18 is consistent with the changes in student capacity shown in the New Student Capacity column of Capacity Tracking on Pages 10 – 13 after the appropriate Utilization Factor is applied.

### **Leased Facilities Tracking**

There are no leased facilities with student stations planned through 2016/17 (Pages 16 – 21).

### **Failed Standard Relocatable Tracking**

No relocatables are identified as “Failed Standards” (Page 21).

### **Planning**

Planning for Class Size Reduction and School Closures are discussed on Page 21.

### **Ten-Year Long Range Plan**

The Ten-Year Long Range Plan for the five-year period 2016/17 – 2020/21 is shown on Pages 22 – 24:

- **Capacity** – No capital outlay projects are necessary to ensure the availability of satisfactory student stations for the projected student enrollment in K-12 programs for this period.
- **Infrastructure** – No new, remodeled or additions to facilities are proposed for this period. No closures of schools or disposition of facilities is planned for this period.
- **Maintenance** – The costs for the maintenance and repair projects are assumed to be the necessary annual costs for five years with no escalation. The cost for Facilities Renewal is based on the cost of the remaining projects in the 10-Year Facility Improvement Plan with no escalation. Based on the amount of funding projected to be available for Facility Renewal in the Sources and Uses document, these are effectively unfunded projects if no additional sources of revenue are found.

- **Utilization** – Information for this section is imported directly from the current Educational Plant Survey (EPS), which is based on 2008/09 COFTE data from the FDOE. This information cannot be changed unless the EPS is amended to incorporate more recent COFTE projections. The Projected Utilization at the High School level is caused by the software’s inclusion of our Jr/Sr high schools into the High School category instead of assigning the COFTE for Grades 7 and 8 to the Middle School Category – we do not project utilization at the High School level to be a problem at the end of this period.

### **Twenty-Year Long Range Plan**

The Twenty-Year Long Range Plan for the ten-year period 2021/22 – 2030/31 is shown on Pages 24 – 26:

- **Capacity** – No capital outlay projects are necessary to ensure the availability of satisfactory student stations for the projected student enrollment in K-12 programs for this period.
- **Infrastructure** – No new, remodeled or additions to facilities are proposed for this period. No closures of schools or disposition of facilities is planned for this period.
- **Maintenance** – The costs for the maintenance and repair projects are assumed to be the necessary annual costs for ten years with no escalation. The cost for Facilities Renewal is based on the capital reserve cost necessary to renew the District’s facility inventory on a 25-year cycle with no escalation. It can not be determined at this time if the necessary funding will be available for these projects.
- **Utilization** – Information for this section is imported directly from the current Educational Plant Survey (EPS), which is based on 2008/09 COFTE data from the FDOE. This information cannot be changed unless the EPS is amended to incorporate more recent COFTE projections. Note that the FDOE provides COFTE data for the first ten-year period only. COFTE projections for the Twenty-Year Long Range Plan in the EPS were developed by extending the trend contained in the ten-year projections. The Projected Utilization at the High School level is caused by the software’s inclusion of our Jr/Sr high schools into the High School category instead of assigning the COFTE for Grades 7 and 8 to the Middle School Category – we do not project utilization at the High School level to be a problem at the end of this period.

### **End of Program Guide**