



# **PROGRAM GUIDE**

## **FOR THE**

### **FY 2014/2015 – FY 2018/2019**

## **DISTRICT FACILITIES WORK PROGRAM**

---

The Brevard School District Five Year Facilities Work Program for School Years 2014-15 through 2018-19, 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: Dane Theodore / Dave Lindemann

# **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. The Ten-Year and Twenty-Year Long Range Plans in the District Facilities Work Program are imported directly from the current EPS.
- **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 20, 2014.
- **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 approximately 95% of the 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 12, 2014.

## **Financial Information**

- The FDOE requires the District’s FY2014/15 Adopted Tentative Budget, approved September 4, 2014, to be used as basis for all 2014/15 revenues and expenditures in this Work Program. Revenues and expenditures for 2015/16 – 2018/19 are based on the Capital Funding Plan provided by the Office of Financial Services dated, August 22, 2014. 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.
- There will be adequate funds available for a financially feasible plan in in all years of the Plan based on the planned capital expenditures (see Page 1 of the Work Program).
- The cost of deferred capital renewal (\$231,127,809) contained in the financial section of the Ten-Year Long Range Plan (“Facilities Renewal” on Page 23) was based on the Facilities Assessment at the time the current Educational Plant Survey was approved on January 7, 2011. It is not consistent with the 2014 Facility Assessment (\$721,750,379), but this value cannot be changed until the Educational Plant Survey is updated. The necessary funding is not projected to be available for these deferred capital needs.
- The \$279,672,000 for Facilities Renewal contained in the financial section of the Twenty-Year Long Range Plan (“Facilities Renewal” on Page 24) 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**

Following are significant events that have impacted the District's facilities.

- **2008-09** The 2008 Legislature reduced the ad valorem tax for Capital Outlay from 2.0 mills to 1.75 mills, resulting in a significant decrease in the capital funds available for renewal and equity projects at schools. Student enrollment in District schools declined by 1,445 (-2.05%).
- **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 ad valorem tax for Capital Outlay by 0.25 mills, from 1.75 to 1.50 mills. Coupled with further declines in PECO and Impact Fee funding, capital funds were insufficient to continue renewal and equity projects at schools, effectively ending the 7-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 schools declined by 1,031 (-1.49%).
- **2010-11** The continuing decline of property values further reduced available capital funds. No funding was available for Educational Technology infrastructure improvements (Sunrise Standard), custodial equipment or furniture replacement; inadequate funding was available for renewal of critical facility infrastructure, effectively creating a "Repair at Failure" situation. Full compliance with the CSR maximums at the classroom level was implemented. 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. Student enrollment in District schools declined by 784 (-1.15%).
- **2011-12** The further decline of property values and no PECO funding resulted in a shortfall of available capital funds for minimum essential capital needs after paying debt service. This shortfall was mitigated 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 schools 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 once again declined slightly and no PECO funding was received, leaving available capital funds at a level insufficient for minimum essential capital requirements after paying debt service. This shortfall was mitigated with \$4 million from the Operating budget and Capital Fund Balance. A ½-cent Sales Surtax referendum estimated to generate \$32 of capital funds was defeated 49.5% to 51.5%. One elementary school was closed in the North Area due to declining enrollment after the Shuttle program termination and attendance boundaries were changed at seven 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 at those schools. Boundaries were changed at eight Central Area secondary schools to accommodate continued growth in the Viera area. Boundaries were changed at eight South Area elementary schools to balance utilization. Student enrollment in District schools declined by 482 (-0.71%).

- **2013-14** Property values rose slightly but no PECO funding was received, therefore capital funds remained insufficient for minimum essential capital requirements after paying debt service. Capital funding was augmented with \$6 million from the Operating budget and half of the remaining Capital Fund Balance. Two elementary schools were closed in the North Area and one middle school was closed in the Central Area to address budget deficits. One high school was converted to a Jr/Sr high school and attendance boundaries were changed at 8 elementary schools, one middle school and two high schools to accommodate the relocated students. Student enrollment in District schools declined by 1,152 (-1.70%), in part due to the opening of three new charter schools.
- **2014-15** Property values rose by 8%, due in part to the reopening of FPL’s power plant in Cape Canaveral, and PECO funding was received for the first time since 2010-11 but capital funds remain insufficient for minimum essential capital requirements after paying debt service. Capital funding was augmented with \$4.5 million from the Operating budget and a portion of the remaining Capital Fund Balance. A ½-cent Sales Surtax referendum estimated to generate \$33 of capital funds is on the November 2014 ballot. Student enrollment in District schools is projected to decline by 137 students (-0.21%).
- **2015-16 to 2018-19** Property values are projected to slowly rise but capital funds are projected to remain insufficient for capital renewal requirements after paying debt service. Capital funding will be augmented with \$8 - \$10 million from the Operating budget if the Sales Surtax is not approved in November 2014. The remaining Capital Fund Balance will be depleted after 2018-19. Student enrollment in District schools is projected to increase by 755 (1.15%) by 2018-19.

## **PROGRAM NOTES**

### **Expenditures**

Expenditures shown on Pages 2 – 5 are based on the District’s FY2014/15 Adopted Tentative Budget and the Capital Funding Plan provided by Financial Services. 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 Pages 4 – 5.

### **Revenue**

The revenues shown on Pages 5 – 8 are based on the District’s FY2014/15 Adopted Tentative Budget and the Capital Funding Plan provided by Financial Services.

### **Project Schedules**

Project schedules are shown on Pages 8 – 9. There are two elementary school projects planned for design in 2017-18 and construction in 2018-19. One school would be located in the south area of the county and the other in the central area; both areas of high student membership growth. While there is no funding currently available or projected to be available to build these schools, impact fees from resumed growth in addition to voter approval of additional local funding may make such construction possible.

## **Capacity Tracking**

The capacity utilization shown on Pages 10 – 13 is based on the FISH database as of August 20, 2014 and the COFTE data provided by the FDOE on June 12, 2014.

- The capacity data includes relocatables.
- Because the FDOE provides Projected 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 Projected 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.
  - Relocatable classrooms will be added or removed from schools to meet the needs of program requirements and to accommodate student membership changes. The following general criteria guided these planned additions and removals of relocatable classrooms.
    - ✓ If a school’s projected capacity utilization exceeded 85%, relocatable capacity was added to as necessary to limit the utilization to a maximum of 85%. (Note: Schools are effectively full when student membership is 90% of the total (permanent plus relocatable) FISH capacity. Because COFTE is approximately 95% of student membership, the functional limit for capacity utilization based on COFTE is, therefore, 85%.)
    - ✓ If a school had a projected decline in COFTE 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 75.65% in 2014-15 to 71.94% in 2018-19 (Page 13). Note that this is based on a projected decline of 3,240 COFTE during this period.

## **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 Pages 13 – 14 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 Pages 14 – 15 was provided by the School Principals.

## **Net New Classrooms**

On Page 15, a total of 5 surplus relocatable classrooms were utilized for additional classroom space during the last year.

## **Relocatable Student Stations**

Relocatable student station data shown on Pages 16 – 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 2018-19 (Pages 18 – 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 Pages 21 – 22.

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

The Ten-Year Long Range Plan for the five-year period 2019/20 – 2023/24 is shown on Pages 23 – 24. Note that this data is imported directly from the current Educational Plant Survey.

- **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** – Information for this section is imported directly from the current Educational Plant Survey (EPS), which was based on the 2010 Facilities Assessment. It is not consistent with the 2014 Facility Assessment (\$721,750,379), but this value cannot be changed until the Educational Plant Survey is updated. The necessary funding is not projected to be available for these deferred capital needs 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 2024/25 – 2033/34 is shown on Pages 24 – 25. Note that this data is imported directly from the current Educational Plant Survey.

- **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 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**