



## SCHOOL PLANNING STAFF WORKING GROUP (SWG)

Robert M. Keating, Indian River County  
Stan Boling, Indian River County  
Jason Nunemaker, City of Fellsmere

Al Minner, City of Sebastian  
Timothy McGarry, City of Vero Beach  
Susan Olson, School Board  
Dr. Dan McIntyre, School Board

---

The School Planning Staff Working Group (SWG) will meet at **9:00 a.m. ON FRIDAY, March 30 2007**, in **1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room "A"** of the County Administration Building, 1840 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Vero Beach.

---

### AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes from August 11, 2006
2. Updates
  - A. Status of School Concurrency Items
  - B. School Board planning, siting, and development activities
  - C. County large-scale planning and development activities
  - D. Municipalities large-scale planning and development activities
3. Presentation review, and approval of latest school enrollment projections.
4. Other Matters
5. Adjournment

#### Attachments:

1. Minutes from August 11, 2006 Meeting
2. Adopted Interlocal Agreement (2003)
3. Status of School Concurrency Comprehensive Plan Amendments & Schedule
4. School Utilization and Enrollment Projections
5. Excerpts from Currently Adopted School Board Capital Improvement and Facilities Work Programs

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY  
PUBLIC SCHOOL PLANNING STAFF WORKING GROUP**

There was a meeting of the Indian River County Public School Planning Staff Working Group (SWG) on Friday, August 11, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. in First Floor Conference Room "A" of the County Administration Building, 1840 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were members: Robert Keating, Indian River County (IRC) Community Development Director; Stan Boling, IRC Planning Director; Dr. Dan McIntyre, IRC School Board Assistant Superintendent of Planning & Operations; Susan Olson, IRC School Board Director of Facility Planning & Construction; and Timothy McGarry, City of Vero Beach Planning & Development Director.

Absent were: Al Minner, City of Sebastian City Manager and Joel Tyson, City of Fellsmere Councilman.

Also present were IRC staff: Bill Schutt, Senior Planner; and Darcy Vasilas, Assistant to Executive Aide. Others present were: Maria Aguilar, Town Manager, Town of Orchid; Jeanne Mills co-consultant and David DeYoung, with Kimley-Horn & Associates.

**Call to Order**

Mr. Stan Boling, IRC Planning Director, called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Minutes of March 17, 2006**

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Keating, SECONDED BY Dr. McIntyre, the Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the minutes of the March 17, 2006 meeting as submitted.**

**Updates**

**A. School Board facilities plan status, siting and development activities.**

Dr. Dan McIntyre, IRC School Board Assistant Superintendent of Planning & Operations, reported the School Board would be getting their annual revisions to the Five Year Plan approved at their August 22, 2006 meeting and would also be amending the School Plan Survey. He continued the Five Year Work Plan would be submitted by the end of September, 2006.

Dr. McIntyre related the IRC School Board had voted to pursue simultaneous construction of a new high school on Oslo Road and a new middle school on a site yet to be determined. Mr. Keating asked how long it took to build a middle school. Dr. McIntyre responded typically it took 24 months if replicating an existing school design.

Dr. McIntyre noted there were additions being made to Vero Beach and Sebastian River High Schools. He stated notwithstanding the controversy in the media, there were assets and resources available to get both of the new schools built as well as completing the additions to the two high schools.

#### **B. County large-scale planning and development activities.**

Mr. Boling reported there had been a large rush for home ownership in the past, but in the last year it had been mostly commercial projects. He noted permits for single and multi-family homes were down.

#### **C. Municipalities large-scale planning and development activities.**

Mr. Timothy McGarry, City of Vero Beach Planning & Development Director, explained Heritage Reserve had 780 units instead of the 700 reported at the March 17, 2006 meeting. He added the development was going before the Vero Beach City Council at their meeting scheduled for August 15, 2006.

Discussion was held regarding the potential numbers of school students that may be generated by the Heritage Reserve development; potential sites for other schools; and Dr. McIntyre reported it was likely another elementary school would be built somewhere between Sebastian and Fellsmere before the previously mentioned middle and high schools.

Ms. Maria Aguilar, Town Manager, Town of Orchid, reported there had been very little building activity in the Town of Orchid and there were over 30 homes for sale that had been on the market for a long time. She mentioned there were very few children, if any, in the Town of Orchid impacting the IRC School system.

**Presentation of Consultant's Final Drafts: Revised Interlocal Agreement (Includes School Concurrency), Public School Facilities Element, and Other Elements.**

Ms. Jeanne Mills, co-consultant with Kimley-Horn & Associates, gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is on file in the Commission Office.

Ms. Mills explained IRC had been selected by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) as a Pilot Project community to fast track draft school concurrency documents. She continued the Pilot Project required work completion by June 1, 2006, with several items necessary for submission in the interim to DCA. The following draft documents were submitted:

- Interlocal Agreement for Coordinated Planning and School Concurrency.
- Public School Facilities Element.
- Intergovernmental Coordination Element.
- Capital Improvement Element.

Mr. Dave DeYoung, with Kimley-Horn & Associates, explained the Interlocal Agreement was the foundation for the Residential Review Process for school concurrency. He continued the IRC School District did not have a Land Development Code or a Comprehensive Plan so everything that went into the Interlocal Agreement had to include the process so the residential projects could be reviewed and approved.

Mr. DeYoung reported when a residential development came into any participating municipality, they would submit an application for review with a

School Concurrency Application or a study which identified their impact on the school. The process was as follows:

- Residential application submitted to local government for review.
- Local government deems application sufficient.
- Application transmitted to School District for review.
- School District:
  1. Calculates the number of new students to School System.
  2. Applies the number of new students to School System.
  3. Determines capacity availability in School System.
  4. Allows negotiation for proportionate share mitigation.
- Local government completes the development review process.

Mrs. Olson inquired if the developer would be getting impact fee credits. Ms. Mills responded impact fee credits were being used for the developer's proportionate share mitigation.

Mrs. Olson expressed concern regarding the bookkeeping and staffing involved for the IRC School Board for the regulatory portion of the school concurrency process.

Mr. Boling noted the County had been able to get through the plan development process, which was the negotiating phase where public benefit was obtained. He continued staff was able to secure elementary school sites with no impact fee credits, and the land was brought up to buildable standards by the developers.

Mr. Bob Keating, IRC Planning Director, explained how the proportionate share mitigation formula was calculated and noted staff was currently working on several proportionate share agreements.

Dr. McIntyre was worried about getting his staffing lined up to manage the regulatory process. He also had concerns with how the municipalities, especially the smaller ones with limited staff, would be able to cope with those requirements. Mr. Keating related the IRC School Board would be dealing mostly with the City of Fellsmere and the City of Sebastian because the County did the permitting for the City of Vero Beach.

Mr. Keating stated his biggest concern was the need to coordinate with the other municipalities what information the County needed for entering vesting into the computer system. Mr. DeYoung interjected initially there would be some hand holding that needed to be done with the municipalities, but having a point person to handle the communication between all parties involved would improve the process.

Mr. Keating asked Dr. McIntyre if he was receiving information from the municipalities regarding the projects they were reviewing. Dr. McIntyre replied they received invitations to the City of Vero Beach Planning & Zoning meetings, but nothing from the City of Sebastian and the City of Fellsmere.

Dr. McIntyre reported he would have an opportunity in the next few months to prepare the IRC School Board for the need to hire additional staff to handle the regulation issues. Mr. Keating added there were cooperative municipalities in IRC and when a process was established, he felt they would all work well together.

Mr. Keating recommended when giving the presentation to the elected officials, to make sure when Level of Service was discussed that everyone understood the same thing. He continued the Level of Service would always be met but there would be portables sitting on the school grounds.

Ms. Mills clarified that only residential developments would be reviewed, wherever there was a residential component, and no commercial developments. Mr. DeYoung pointed out there would be no allowances for a development to claim age restrictions when trying not to comply with the concurrency requirements until they produced a covenant.

Mr. Boling reported there would be a School Concurrency Workshop for elected officials at the Richardson Center September 26, 2006 from 9:00 a.m. to noon.

### **Other Matters**

Dr. McIntyre reported the School Board had hired an architect to master plan the 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue school site. He felt it would be an excellent opportunity to try the joint use procedures, and recommended meeting with some of the County staff.

Mr. Keating asked if timeframes should be given for adoption and implementation of the School Concurrency Program. Mr. Schutt noted the amendments to the County and Municipal Comprehensive Plans could be initiated in July, 2007, with the final adoption in early January, 2008, and that the municipalities, County, and School Board should adopt the Interlocal Agreement by January, 2008.

Discussion was held regarding school bus stops and shelters. Mr. Keating felt the benefits to both the School District and municipalities while complying with concurrency issues should be emphasized.

Mr. Boling asked what the school projection figures were. Ms. Mills replied as of July 31, 2006, across the state, the projected enrollments were flat or declining in most counties. She opined the reason for the decline was the affordability of homes.

Mr. Keating announced several staff from IRC and the IRC School Board would be attending a Pilot Communities School Concurrency meeting in Gainesville the following week.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY  
PUBLIC SCHOOL PLANNING STAFF WORKING GROUP**

There was a meeting of the Indian River County Public School Planning Staff Working Group (SWG) on Friday, August 11, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. in First Floor Conference Room "A" of the County Administration Building, 1840 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were members: Robert Keating, Indian River County (IRC) Community Development Director; Stan Boling, IRC Planning Director; Dr. Dan McIntyre, IRC School Board Assistant Superintendent of Planning & Operations; Susan Olson, IRC School Board Director of Facility Planning & Construction; and Timothy McGarry, City of Vero Beach Planning & Development Director.

Absent were: Al Minner, City of Sebastian City Manager and Joel Tyson, City of Fellsmere Councilman.

Also present were IRC staff: Bill Schutt, Senior Planner; and Darcy Vasilas, Assistant to Executive Aide. Others present were: Maria Aguilar, Town Manager, Town of Orchid; Jeanne Mills co-consultant and David DeYoung, with Kimley-Horn & Associates.

**Call to Order**

Mr. Stan Boling, IRC Planning Director, called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Minutes of March 17, 2006**

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Keating, SECONDED BY Dr. McIntyre, the Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the minutes of the March 17, 2006 meeting as submitted.**

**Updates**

- A. School Board facilities plan status, siting and development activities.**



Dr. Dan McIntyre, IRC School Board Assistant Superintendent of Planning & Operations, reported the School Board would be getting their annual revisions to the Five Year Plan approved at their August 22, 2006 meeting and would also be amending the School Plan Survey. He continued the Five Year Work Plan would be submitted by the end of September, 2006.

Dr. McIntyre related the IRC School Board had voted to pursue simultaneous construction of a new high school on Oslo Road and a new middle school on a site yet to be determined. Mr. Keating asked how long it took to build a middle school. Dr. McIntyre responded typically it took 24 months if replicating an existing school design.

Dr. McIntyre noted there were additions being made to Vero Beach and Sebastian River High Schools. He stated notwithstanding the controversy in the media, there were assets and resources available to get both of the new schools built as well as completing the additions to the two high schools.

#### **B. County large-scale planning and development activities.**

Mr. Boling reported there had been a large rush for home ownership in the past, but in the last year it had been mostly commercial projects. He noted permits for single and multi-family homes were down.

#### **C. Municipalities large-scale planning and development activities.**

Mr. Timothy McGarry, City of Vero Beach Planning & Development Director, explained Heritage Reserve had 780 units instead of the 700 reported at the March 17, 2006 meeting. He added the development was going before the Vero Beach City Council at their meeting scheduled for August 15, 2006.

Discussion was held regarding the potential numbers of school students that may be generated by the Heritage Reserve development; potential sites for other schools; and Dr. McIntyre reported it was likely another elementary school would be built somewhere between Sebastian and Fellsmere before the previously mentioned middle and high schools.

Ms. Maria Aguilar, Town Manager, Town of Orchid, reported there had been very little building activity in the Town of Orchid and there were over 30 homes for sale that had been on the market for a long time. She mentioned there were very few children, if any, in the Town of Orchid impacting the IRC School system.

**Presentation of Consultant's Final Drafts: Revised Interlocal Agreement (Includes School Concurrency), Public School Facilities Element, and Other Elements.**

Ms. Jeanne Mills, co-consultant with Kimley-Horn & Associates, gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is on file in the Commission Office.

Ms. Mills explained IRC had been selected by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) as a Pilot Project community to fast track draft school concurrency documents. She continued the Pilot Project required work completion by June 1, 2006, with several items necessary for submission in the interim to DCA. The following draft documents were submitted:

- Interlocal Agreement for Coordinated Planning and School Concurrency.
- Public School Facilities Element.
- Intergovernmental Coordination Element.
- Capital Improvement Element.

Mr. Dave DeYoung, with Kimley-Horn & Associates, explained the Interlocal Agreement was the foundation for the Residential Review Process for school concurrency. He continued the IRC School District did not have a Land Development Code or a Comprehensive Plan so everything that went into the Interlocal Agreement had to include the process so the residential projects could be reviewed and approved.

Mr. DeYoung reported when a residential development came into any participating municipality, they would submit an application for review with a

School Concurrency Application or a study which identified their impact on the school. The process was as follows:

- Residential application submitted to local government for review.
- Local government deems application sufficient.
- Application transmitted to School District for review.
- School District:
  1. Calculates the number of new students to School System.
  2. Applies the number of new students to School System.
  3. Determines capacity availability in School System.
  4. Allows negotiation for proportionate share mitigation.
- Local government completes the development review process.

Mrs. Olson inquired if the developer would be getting impact fee credits. Ms. Mills responded impact fee credits were being used for the developer's proportionate share mitigation.

Mrs. Olson expressed concern regarding the bookkeeping and staffing involved for the IRC School Board for the regulatory portion of the school concurrency process.

Mr. Boling noted the County had been able to get through the plan development process, which was the negotiating phase where public benefit was obtained. He continued staff was able to secure elementary school sites with no impact fee credits, and the land was brought up to buildable standards by the developers.

Mr. Bob Keating, IRC Planning Director, explained how the proportionate share mitigation formula was calculated and noted staff was currently working on several proportionate share agreements.

Dr. McIntyre was worried about getting his staffing lined up to manage the regulatory process. He also had concerns with how the municipalities, especially the smaller ones with limited staff, would be able to cope with those requirements. Mr. Keating related the IRC School Board would be dealing mostly with the City of Fellsmere and the City of Sebastian because the County did the permitting for the City of Vero Beach.

Mr. Keating stated his biggest concern was the need to coordinate with the other municipalities what information the County needed for entering vesting into the computer system. Mr. DeYoung interjected initially there would be some hand holding that needed to be done with the municipalities, but having a point person to handle the communication between all parties involved would improve the process.

Mr. Keating asked Dr. McIntyre if he was receiving information from the municipalities regarding the projects they were reviewing. Dr. McIntyre replied they received invitations to the City of Vero Beach Planning & Zoning meetings, but nothing from the City of Sebastian and the City of Fellsmere.

Dr. McIntyre reported he would have an opportunity in the next few months to prepare the IRC School Board for the need to hire additional staff to handle the regulation issues. Mr. Keating added there were cooperative municipalities in IRC and when a process was established, he felt they would all work well together.

Mr. Keating recommended when giving the presentation to the elected officials, to make sure when Level of Service was discussed that everyone understood the same thing. He continued the Level of Service would always be met but there would be portables sitting on the school grounds.

Ms. Mills clarified that only residential developments would be reviewed, wherever there was a residential component, and no commercial developments. Mr. DeYoung pointed out there would be no allowances for a development to claim age restrictions when trying not to comply with the concurrency requirements until they produced a covenant.

Mr. Boling reported there would be a School Concurrency Workshop for elected officials at the Richardson Center September 26, 2006 from 9:00 a.m. to noon.

### **Other Matters**

Dr. McIntyre reported the School Board had hired an architect to master plan the 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue school site. He felt it would be an excellent opportunity to try the joint use procedures, and recommended meeting with some of the County staff.

Mr. Keating asked if timeframes should be given for adoption and implementation of the School Concurrency Program. Mr. Schutt noted the amendments to the County and Municipal Comprehensive Plans could be initiated in July, 2007, with the final adoption in early January, 2008, and that the municipalities, County, and School Board should adopt the Interlocal Agreement by January, 2008.

Discussion was held regarding school bus stops and shelters. Mr. Keating felt the benefits to both the School District and municipalities while complying with concurrency issues should be emphasized.

Mr. Boling asked what the school projection figures were. Ms. Mills replied as of July 31, 2006, across the state, the projected enrollments were flat or declining in most counties. She opined the reason for the decline was the affordability of homes.

Mr. Keating announced several staff from IRC and the IRC School Board would be attending a Pilot Communities School Concurrency meeting in Gainesville the following week.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

**Indian River County  
Interlocal Agreement For  
Public School Planning**

**Indian River County  
Indian River County School Board  
City of Fellsmere  
City of Sebastian  
City of Vero Beach**

**May 2003**

## **Table of Contents for the Interlocal Agreement**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction.....  | Page 1      |
| Section 1 - Committees.....  | Page 2      |
| Section 2 - Joint Meetings .....   | Page 2      |
| Section 3 - Student Enrollment Projections.....  | Page 3      |
| Section 4 - Coordinating and Sharing of Information .....  | Page 3      |
| Section 5 - School Site Selection.....   | Page 4      |
| Section 6 – School Facility Modification .....   | Page 6      |
| Section 7 - Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Re-zonings,<br>and Development Approvals.....         | Page 7      |
| Section 8 - Educational Facilities Report and<br>Five-Year District Facilities Work Program..... | Page 8      |
| Section 9 - Co-location and Shared Use .....   | Page 8      |
| Section 10 - Resolution of Disputes.....   | Page 9      |
| Section 11 - Oversight Process .....   | Page 9      |
| Section 12 - Amendment Process and Term of the Agreement .....                                   | Page 9      |
| Section 13 - Execution in Counterparts .....   | Page 9      |
| Section 14 – Effective Date .....  | Page 9      |
| Signature Pages.....   | Pages 10-11 |
| Appendix “A” – School Coordination Groups/Activities.....  | Page 12     |
| Appendix “B” – School Coordination Due Dates.....  | Page 13     |
| Appendix “C” – School Site Selection Flow Chart .....  | Page 14     |
| Appendix “D” - Indian River County LDR Section 971.14(4) .....                                   | Page 15     |

# **INDIAN RIVER COUNTY INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL PLANNING**

**This Agreement** is entered into between the **Indian River County Board of County Commissioners** (hereinafter referred to as “County”), the City Council of the **Cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian and Vero Beach** (hereinafter referred to as “Cities”), and the **School Board of Indian River County, Florida** (hereinafter referred to as “School Board”). Not participating in this agreement are the Town of Indian River Shores and the Town of Orchid. These jurisdictions are not participating in this Agreement because they qualify for exclusion pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes.

**WHEREAS**, the County, Cities, and School Board recognize their mutual obligation and responsibility for the education, nurture and general well-being of the children of Indian River County; and

**WHEREAS**, the County, Cities, and School Board recognize the benefits that will flow to the citizens and students of their communities by more closely coordinating their comprehensive land use and school facilities planning programs: namely (1) better coordination of new schools in time and place with land development, (2) greater efficiency for the school board and local governments by the reduction of student travel times and the placement of schools to take advantage of existing and planned roads, water lines, sewer lines, and parks, (3) improved student access and safety by coordinating the construction of new and expanded schools with the road and sidewalk construction programs of the local governments, (4) the location and design of schools so that they serve as community focal points, (5) the location and design of schools with parks, ball fields, libraries, and other community facilities to take advantage of joint use opportunities, and (6) the location of new schools and expansion and rehabilitation of existing schools so as to reduce pressures contributing to urban sprawl and support existing neighborhoods; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 1013.33, Florida Statutes, requires that the location of public educational facilities must be consistent with the comprehensive plan and implementing land development regulations of the appropriate local governing body; and

**WHEREAS**, Sections 163.3177(6)(h)1 and 2, Florida Statutes, require each local government to adopt an intergovernmental coordination element as part of its comprehensive plan that states principles and guidelines to be used in the accomplishment of coordination of the adopted comprehensive plan with the plans of the school board, and describes the processes for collaborative planning and decision making on population projections and public school siting; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 163.3177(6)(h)2, Florida Statutes, further requires each county, all the municipalities within that county, and the district school board to establish, by interlocal or other formal Agreement executed by all affected entities, the joint processes described above consistent with their adopted intergovernmental coordination elements; and

**WHEREAS**, the County and School Board have had a “Memorandum of Understanding” for joint review of new school sites and joint review of school site plans since 1986 and that agreement is being superceded by this interlocal agreement; and

**WHEREAS**, the County, Cities, and School Board enter into this Agreement in fulfillment of that statutory requirement and in recognition of the benefits accruing to their citizens and students described above; and

**WHEREAS**, the County, Cities, and School Board have mutually agreed that coordination of school facility planning and comprehensive land use planning is in the best interests of the citizens of Indian River County; and

**WHEREAS**, the County has jurisdiction for land use and growth management decisions within its unincorporated boundaries and the Cities have similar jurisdiction within their boundaries, and



**WHEREAS**, the School Board has the responsibility to provide school facilities to ensure a free and adequate public education to the residents of Indian River County, and

**WHEREAS**, the County, Cities, and School Board agree that they can better fulfill their respective responsibilities by working in close cooperation to ensure that adequate public school facilities are available for the residents of Indian River County, and

**WHEREAS**, the parties are authorized to enter into this interlocal Agreement pursuant to Section 163.01, Section 163.3177(6)(h)2, and Section 1013.33, F. S.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it mutually agreed between the Indian River County School Board, the Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County and the City Councils of the Cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian, and Vero Beach that the following procedures and requirements will be followed and met in coordinating land use and public school facilities planning:

### **Section 1. Committees**

The following committees are hereby established.

- 1.1 A staff working group Committee consisting of the Indian River County Community Development Director, the Indian River County Planning Director, the Planning or Community Development Director or City Manager of the cities of Sebastian and Vero Beach, a staff designee appointed by the Mayor of the City of Fellsmere, the Indian River County School Board's Assistant Superintendent of Operations, and the Indian River County School Board's Executive Director of Facilities.
- 1.2 An Elected Officials Oversight Committee (EOOC) consisting of the County Commission Chairman, the mayors of Vero Beach, Sebastian, and Fellsmere, the Regional Planning Council Chairman, the School Board Chairman, or designated representatives.
- 1.3 A School Planning Technical Advisory Committee (SPTAC) consisting of representatives from the following agencies:
  - a. Planning Director from the Indian River County Planning Division and, if applicable, any affected cities' City Planning or Community Development Director, City Manager or designated staff person;
  - b. County Engineer from the Indian River County Engineering Division and, if applicable, any affected cities' City Engineer;
  - c. County Traffic Engineer from the Indian River County Traffic Engineering Division and, if applicable, any affected cities' Traffic Engineer or Public Works director;
  - d. MPO Director from the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO);
  - e. Assistant Superintendent of Operations from the Indian River County School Board;
  - f. Executive Director of Facilities from the Indian River County School Board;
  - g. Director from affected water and sewer utility providers.
  - h. Director of the Indian River County Parks and Recreation Department and, if applicable, any affected cities' Park and Recreation Director, and
  - i. County Sheriff and, if applicable, any affected cities' police chief.
- 1.4 A citizen oversight committee consisting of five citizens appointed by the school board, the county, and cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian, and Vero Beach. Each jurisdiction or entity shall appoint one member.

### **Section 2. Joint Meetings**

- 2.1 The Staff working group shall, at a minimum, meet semi-annually (**2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in February and August of each year at the County Administration Building**) to set direction, formulate recommendations, and discuss issues regarding coordination of land use and school facility planning, including such issues as population and student projections, development trends, school needs, co-location and joint use opportunities, and on-site or off-site infrastructure improvements (e.g. roads, sidewalks and bikeways) needed to support schools and ensure safe student access. The County Planning Director will be responsible for making meeting arrangements and providing notification.

- 2.2 The Elected Officials Oversight Committee shall, at a minimum, meet every year (**2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in April of each year, at the County Administration Building**) in joint workshop sessions. The joint workshop sessions will be opportunities for representatives of the County Commission, the City Councils, and the School Board to set direction, discuss issues, and reach understandings concerning issues of mutual concern regarding coordination of land use and school facilities planning, including population and student growth, development trends, school needs, off-site improvements, and joint use opportunities. The County Planning Director will be responsible for making meeting arrangements and providing notification.
- 2.3 The meetings discussed in 2.1 and 2.2 of this Agreement shall ensure that this Interlocal Agreement is implemented in a timely and efficient manner. In addition, the meetings subject to 2.2 shall be noticed to the public, and public comment shall be received.

### **Section 3. Student Enrollment Projections**

- 3.1 The School Board shall utilize the Department of Education (DOE) countywide student enrollment projections. The School Board may request that the DOE projections be adjusted to reflect actual enrollment and development trends not anticipated by the DOE projections. In formulating such a request, the school board will coordinate with the municipalities and county regarding future population projections and growth.
- 3.2 The staff working group committee at its first meeting each year will review, adjust if needed, and approve school board's staff allocation of projected student enrollment into sub-county planning sectors. The planning sectors will be established by the staff working group.
- 3.3 The school enrollment projections and their allocation to sub-county planning sectors will be included in the educational facilities report provided to the county and cities each year as specified in subsection 4.2 of this Agreement.

### **Section 4. Coordinating and Sharing of Information**

- 4.1 The School Board shall coordinate and share information with the County and Cities as follows.
- 4.2 Educational Facilities Report: **By November 1 of each year**, the School Board shall submit to the County and each City its educational facilities report (five-year work program). The report will contain information in tabular, graphic, and textual formats detailing existing and projected five year school enrollment, existing educational facilities and their capacity to be expanded, their locations, the number of portables in use at each school, and projected needs. The report will also contain the board's capital improvement plan, including planned facilities with funding over the next 3 years, and the educational facilities representing the district's unmet need. The report will provide data for each individual school concerning permanent school capacity based on Department of Education criteria and enrollment at each individual school based on actual counts. The report will show the generalized locations where new schools will be needed. The report will indicate properties the School Board has already acquired through developer donation, or properties on which there is a developer obligation to provide property to the school board at the school board's discretion, or properties acquired through other means that are potential school sites.
- 4.3 When considering a significant renovation or a closure of a school facility, the school board shall notify the appropriate city in which the school is located or the County Planning Division prior to any significant renovation or closure activities. Significant renovations encompass projects that increase or decrease a school's capacity by 10% or more, or increase a school's total building square footage by 10% or more.
- 4.4 The County and Cities shall coordinate and share information with the school board as follows:

- a. **Project Review and Comments:** Within 5 days of the submittal of any new housing development project application (excluding 55 years and older projects), the County or City in which the project is located shall notify the School Board's Executive Director of Facilities that an application has been submitted and shall inform him of the location where the site plan can be reviewed. To ensure that the School Board is provided timely notice of all development projects proposed in the unincorporated county, the county will continue to send agendas for pre-application conference meetings, technical review committee (TRC) meetings, Planning and Zoning Commission (Local Planning Agency) meetings, and Board of County Commissioners meetings to school board representatives. Additional supporting documents shall be provided by county planning staff to the school board upon request.
- b. **Growth and Development: By June 1 of each year,** Indian River County and the Cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian, and Vero Beach will provide the school board with information, accurate as of March 31, regarding the number of residential demolitions and the type, number, and location of residential units which have received zoning approval, site plan approval, building permit approval, or certificates of occupancy, plus any age restriction information. Information regarding the conversion or redevelopment of structures into residential units likely to generate new students will also be provided. Indian River County and the cities will also identify any development orders issued which contain a requirement for the provision of a school site as a condition of development approval. The actual students generated from new residential units will be used in the data and analysis for the annual update of the school board's Five-year Capital Facilities Plan. In using the information provided by Indian River County and the cities, the School Board and local governments will take into consideration the actual level of commitment the different types of approvals represent.
- c. When considering the development of, or redevelopment of, an area (eg. neighborhood planning, enterprise zones, community redevelopment areas (CRA)), the county and cities will notify the school board. These entities will provide the school board with a copy of draft plans and any plans completed prior to this Agreement that are currently in the approval, funding, and/or implementation stage. This shall include maps of Historic Districts, CRA's, and other special districts not readily identified on land use maps.
- d. **Population Projections:** On an annual basis at the first staff working group meeting described in subsection 2.1 of this Agreement, committee members shall review and comment on the County's most recent population projections, their allocation into planning sectors, and conversion into projected student enrollment. All parties at the staff meeting will review the revised projections and variables utilized in making the projections.

4.5 All parties to this Agreement agree that any School Facilities Element that in the future is adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan of any jurisdiction in the county will be the same or consistent with this Agreement as adopted by the County, the cities, and School Board.

## **Section 5. School Site Selection**

5.1 When the need for a new school is identified in the district facilities work program, the School Board shall notify the County Administrator, the County Planning Director, a potentially affected city's city manager or city mayor, and the staff working group in writing that it is looking for a school site in a particular location. The School Board staff will provide a list of all potential sites to the School Planning Technical Advisory Committee.

The School Planning Technical Advisory Committee will meet to evaluate the need for the new school site and shall determine whether co-location opportunities are present. The School Planning Technical Advisory Committee will also perform an initial evaluation of all potential sites identified by the School Board.

5.2 The School Planning Technical Advisory Committee (SPTAC) shall meet and evaluate each of the proposed school sites. The SPTAC shall prepare an initial evaluation report for each potential school site,

addressing each site's locational criteria and impacts, as listed in 5.7 below, and shall submit initial evaluation reports to the School Board within 30 days of the receipt of the request from the School Board.

- 5.3 Through the SPTAC, Indian River County and appropriate cities shall advise the district School Board as to the consistency of any proposed new site with the applicable local comprehensive plan, including the appropriate process under which a district school board may request an amendment to the school siting policies of the applicable local comprehensive plan.
- 5.4 Following the receipt of initial evaluation reports from the School Planning Technical Advisory Committee, the School Board shall, within 60 days, narrow the sites down to three, and send the list of three sites to the SPTAC for a detailed impact evaluation.
- 5.5 The School Planning Technical Advisory Committee, shall complete an Impact Assessment Statement (IAS) and prepare a detailed Economic Analysis (EA) for each of the short-listed school sites. The IAS shall incorporate the required Florida Statute 1013.33 review regarding consistency of proposed school sites with the applicable local government comprehensive plan. The Economic Analysis shall, at a minimum, identify required on-site and off-site improvements, the costs associated with these improvements, and the entity responsible for the cost.
- 5.6 The School Planning Technical Advisory Committee (SPTAC) shall rank short listed sites and provide the IAS and EA reports and the ranking list to the school board. Using that information, the School Board shall make a final decision on site selection and may authorize acquisition of the selected site. The School Board shall notify the County and each affected City in writing when a site has been purchased.
- 5.7 The following criteria will be considered by the School Planning Technical Advisory Committee, the school board, and the local government(s) when evaluating a potential school site:
  - a. Potential to accommodate the projected additional student population by expanding or rebuilding existing schools instead of building a new school.
  - b. Consistency of the proposed site with any Court-ordered school desegregation mandate.
  - c. Extent to which the proposed site provides a logical focal point for community activities and serves as the cornerstone for innovative urban design standards, including opportunities for shared use and co-location of community facilities.
  - d. Extent to which an elementary or middle schools can be located internal to residential neighborhoods and discouraged from locating adjacent to major arterial roadways.
  - e. Extent to which an elementary school can be located within reasonable walking distance of dwelling units served by the schools.
  - f. Extent to which a high schools can be located on the periphery of residential neighborhoods, near thoroughfares so as to discourage traffic along residential streets in residential subdivisions.
  - g. Extent to which the proposed school site is compatible with present and projected uses of adjacent property and capable of accommodating buffers necessary to shield adjacent residences from school driveways, school drop-off and pick up areas, and school playgrounds.
  - h. Extent to which the proposed school site encourages community redevelopment and revitalization, provides efficient use of existing infrastructure, and discourages urban sprawl.
  - i. Extent to which the proposed site's acquisition and development cost is affected by the proposed location.
  - j. Extent to which the proposed school site provides safe access to residential neighborhoods by pedestrians and vehicles.

- k. Extent to which the proposed school is served by adequate public facilities and services to support the school, or the extent to which adequate public facilities and services will be available, concurrent with the impacts of the school.
  - l. Extent to which the proposed school site contains no significant environmental constraints that would preclude development of a public school on the site.
  - m. Extent to which the proposed school will have no adverse impact on archaeological or historic sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places or designated by the affected local government as locally significant historic or archaeological resources.
  - n. Extent to which the proposed school will be located on well drained soils which are suitable for development or are adaptable for development and outdoor educational purposes with drainage improvements.
  - o. Extent to which the proposed school site is not in conflict with local government stormwater management plans or watershed management plans.
  - p. Extent to which the proposed school site is not within a floodway as delineated in the affected comprehensive plan.
  - q. Extent to which the proposed school site is large enough to accommodate the required parking, circulation, and queuing of vehicles onsite.
  - r. Extent to which the proposed school site lies outside the area regulated by Section 333.03, F.S., regarding the construction of public educational facilities in the vicinity of an airport.
  - s. Extent to which the proposed school can serve as an emergency shelter by being built according to the appropriate standards and requirements that make it an appropriate emergency shelter.
  - t. Extent to which the proposed school, if it is to be located in the unincorporated county, can meet the requirements of the county's Land Development Regulations Section 971.14(4) (Appendix "D").
- 5.8 In conjunction with the school board approval for a new school site the school board and affected local governments will jointly determine the need for and timing of on-site and off-site improvements necessary to support each new school, and will enter into a written Agreement as to the timing, location, and the party or parties responsible for constructing, operating, and maintaining the required improvements.

## **Section 6. School Facility Modification**

- 6.1 The School Board shall notify the SPTAC, Indian River County, and appropriate cities of any proposed closure or renovation of existing schools.
- 6.2 The SPTAC shall review any proposed school closure or renovation involving building expansion or changes to major site improvements for consistency with the local comprehensive plan.
- 6.3 In conjunction with the expansion or renovation of an existing school, the School Board and affected local government will enter into a written Agreement as to timing, location, and parties responsible for constructing, operating, and maintaining required on-site and off-site improvements necessary to support each school.

## **Section 7. Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Re-zonings, and Development Approvals**

- 7.1 The County and each of the Cities will appoint a School Board representative, designated and approved by the School Board, to serve as a nonvoting member on their local planning agency. The School Board representative will be provided with an agenda, and invited to attend meetings and/or provide comments to the County and City planning agencies.
- 7.2 As described in Section 4.4 of this Agreement, the County and the Cities, agree to give the School Board notification of hearings for residential Comprehensive Plan amendments, residential rezoning requests, and residential development proposals (excluding 55 years and older projects) pending before them that may affect student enrollment, enrollment projections, or school facilities. Such notice will be provided pursuant to local notice procedures. This notice requirement applies to amendments to comprehensive plans, re-zonings, developments of regional impact, and other major residential or mixed-use development projects.
- 7.3 The School Board shall appoint a representative to serve on, or provide comments to, the County's Technical Review Committee (TRC). The School Board Representative will receive information packets in the same manner as other Technical Review Committee members. In addition, the School Board representative will be invited to participate in the Cities' development review committees when development and redevelopment proposals are submitted which could have a significant impact on student enrollment or school facilities.
- 7.4 After notification by the local government, the School Board Development Review Committee representative, typically within ten (10) working days, will advise the local government of the school enrollment impacts anticipated to result from proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, rezoning requests, and development proposals. There shall be a determination of whether sufficient permanent school capacity exists, or is planned, to accommodate the impacts, based on the Five-year District Facilities Work Program. School capacity will be reported consistent with Department of Education criteria.
- 7.5 If sufficient school capacity is not available or planned to serve a development at the time of impact based on the Department of Education definition of adequate permanent capacity, the School Board shall specify how it proposes to meet the anticipated student enrollment demand; alternatively, the School Board, local government, and developer shall collaborate to find means to ensure sufficient permanent capacity will exist to accommodate the development. These means may include: developer contributions, project phasing, and required facility improvements. School Concurrency is not the intent of this policy or this interlocal Agreement as a whole.
- 7.6 In reviewing and approving Comprehensive Plan amendments and development proposals, the county and cities will consider the following issues, as applicable:
- a. The compatibility of land uses adjacent to existing schools and reserved school sites.
  - b. The co-location of parks, recreation and community facilities in conjunction with school sites.
  - c. The linking of schools, parks, libraries, and other public facilities with bikeways, trails, and sidewalks.
  - d. The targeting of community development improvements in older and distressed neighborhoods near schools.
  - e. The development of traffic circulation plans to serve schools and the surrounding neighborhood, including any needed access improvements, sidewalks to schools, off-site signalization or safety-related signage.
  - f. The location of school bus stops and turnarounds in new developments.
  - g. The consideration of private sector action to identify and implement creative solutions to developing adequate school facilities in residential developments.

- h. The consideration of School Board comments on comprehensive plan amendments and other land-use decisions.
  - i. The availability of existing permanent school capacity or planned improvements to increase school capacity.
- 7.7 In formulating neighborhood plans and programs and reviewing large residential projects, the county and the cities will consider the following:
- a. Encouraging developers or property owners to provide incentives to the School Board for building schools in their neighborhoods. These incentives may include, but not be limited to, donation of site(s), reservation or sale of school sites at pre-development prices, construction of new school facilities or renovation to existing school facilities, and provision of transportation alternatives.
  - b. Scheduling county and city programs and capital improvements that are consistent with and meet the capital needs identified in the School Board's school facilities plan.
  - c. Providing school sites and facilities within planned neighborhoods.

### **Section 8. Educational Facilities Report and Five -Year District Facilities Work Program**

- 8.1 At least one year prior to preparation of the Educational Plant Survey update (as defined in Chapter 1013, Florida Statutes), the staff working group established in subsection 1.1 of this Agreement will assist the School Board in an advisory capacity in the preparation of the update. The staff working group at one of its two annual meetings will evaluate and make recommendations regarding the location and need for new, or improvements to existing, educational facilities in terms of consistency with the local government comprehensive plan, and relevant portions of this Agreement.
- 8.2 As described in Section 4.2 of this Agreement the School Board by November 1<sup>st</sup> of each year will provide the proposed annual update of the five-year district facilities work program to each local government for review and comment. Each local government shall review the report for consistency with its local comprehensive plan. The School Board will provide adequate notification to local governments after placing the work program on the agenda. All affected local governments shall provide timely written comments to the School Board within 60 days following receipt of the proposed work program.
- 8.3 Capacity Reporting: The School Board's five-year work program will identify how each project meets capacity issues. This work program will provide for expansions and new school facilities based upon projected population and student growth within areas of the county. When funding for capital expansion is not available, the school board will identify alternative solutions within the work program (eg. year round or split session schools sites) when necessary to meet the public school demand.

### **Section 9. Co-location and Shared Use**

- 9.1 Co-location and shared use of facilities are important to both the School Board and local governments. When preparing its Educational Plant Survey, the School Board will look for opportunities to co-locate and share use of school facilities and civic facilities. Likewise, co-location and shared use opportunities shall be considered by the local governments when updating their comprehensive plan's schedule of capital improvements and when planning and designing new, or renovating existing, community facilities. For example, opportunities for co-location and shared use will be considered for libraries, parks, recreation facilities, community centers, auditoriums, learning centers, museums, performing arts centers, and stadiums. In addition, co-location and shared use of school and governmental facilities for health care and social services will be considered where applicable.
- 9.2 For each instance of co-location and shared use, a separate Agreement, addressing legal liability, operating and maintenance costs, scheduling of use, facility supervision or any other issues that may arise from co-location, will be developed.

## **Section 10. Resolution of Disputes**

- 10.1 If the parties to this Agreement fail to resolve any conflicts related to issues covered in this document, such dispute will be resolved in accordance with governmental conflict resolution procedures specified in Chapters 164 and 186, Florida Statutes.

## **Section 11. Oversight Process**

- 11.1 The staff working group shall be responsible for preparing an annual assessment report on the effectiveness of this Agreement. The report will be made available to the public and presented at the Elected Officials Oversight Committee meeting.
- 11.2 The School Board, the County and each City shall appoint a citizen member to serve on an oversight committee to monitor implementation of the interlocal Agreement. Committee members shall be invited to attend all meetings referenced in Sections 2 and 5 and shall receive copies of all reports and documents produced pursuant to this interlocal Agreement. The committee shall appoint a chairperson, meet at least annually, and report to participating local governments, the School Board and the general public on the effectiveness with which the interlocal Agreement is being implemented.

## **Section 12. Amendment Process and Term of the Agreement**

- 12.1 This Agreement may be amended by written consent of all parties to this Agreement. The Agreement will remain in effect in accordance with Florida Statutes. If the Florida statute as it pertains to school planning coordination is repealed, the Agreement may be terminated by written consent of all parties of this Agreement.

## **Section 13. Execution in Counterparts**

- 13.1 This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which so executed shall be deemed to be an original, but all such counterparts shall together constitute but one in the same instrument.

## **Section 14. Effective Date**

- 14.1 Effective date of this Agreement will be January 1, 2004.



**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, this Interlocal Agreement has been executed by and on behalf of **Indian River County, the Cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian, and Vero Beach, and the School Board of Indian River County** on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003.

**THE SCHOOL BOARD OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Mohler, Board Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness as to all Signatories  
Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST \_\_\_\_\_  
Roger Dearing, Board Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness as to all Signatories  
Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

(CORPORATE SEAL)

State of Florida, County of Indian River

**WITNESS** my hand and official seal this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ A.D. 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name \_\_\_\_\_  
My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_

(AFFIX NOTARY SEAL)

Approved as to form and correctness: \_\_\_\_\_  
Russell Peterson, School Board Attorney



**APPENDIX “A”**

**SCHOOL COORDINATION GROUPS/ACTIVITIES**

| <b>COMMITTEES</b>                                    | <b>SCHEDULED MEETINGS</b>  | <b>PURPOSE</b>   |
|--|--|--|
| Staff Working Group Committee                        | Semi-annually (2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday in February and August of each year) | Set direction, formulate recommendations, discuss issues, establish school planning sectors  |
| Elected Officials Oversight Committee (EOOC)         | Every year (2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday in April of each year)                  | Set direction, discuss issues, reach understanding   |
| School Planning Technical Advisory Committee (SPTAC) | As Needed  | Evaluate each potential school site and prepare an initial evaluation report to be submitted to the SSC<br><br>Prepare an Impact Assessment Statement (IAS) and Economic Analysis (EA) for each short listed school site |
| Citizen Oversight Committee (COC)                    | Annually   | Evaluate and assess the effectiveness of the interlocal Agreement  |

**APPENDIX “B”**

**SCHOOL COORDINATION DUE DATES**

| <b>Due Date</b>  | <b>Activity</b>  |
|--|--|
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday in February and August of each year | Working group meetings to set direction, formulate recommendations, and discuss issues                                 |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday in April of each year               | IRC, cities, TCPRC and school board representative workshop to set general direction and discuss issues                |
| November 1 of each year                                    | School board submits its educational facilities report (five-year work program) to the county and cities               |
| June 1 of each year  | The county and cities provide site plan and building permit information regarding residential projects to school board |

## APPENDIX “C”

### SCHOOL SITE SELECTION FLOW CHART

School Board identifies need for a new school and provides a list of potential sites to the SPTAC.

↓ Within 30 Days

School Planning Technical Advisory Committee (SPTAC) prepares initial evaluation report for each potential site, reviews sites for consistency with local comprehensive plans, submits reports to the School Board.

↓ Within 60 Days

The School Board narrows the sites down to three (3) sites and submits short list of sites to SPTAC.

↓

SPTAC prepares Impact Assessment Statement (IAS) and Economic Analysis (EA) for short listed sites. SPTAC rank short listed sites and provide IAS, EA, and ranking to the school board

↓

The School Board officially approves the site and authorizes acquisition of the site

**APPENDIX 'D'**  
**For Schools within the Unincorporated County**  
**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY LDR SECTION 971.14(4)**

*Educational centers including schools, primary and secondary (not including business and vocational schools) (special exception).*

- (a) *Districts requiring administrative permit approval (pursuant to the provisions of 971.04):* OCR, MED, CN, CL, CG.
- (b) *Districts requiring special exception (pursuant to the provisions of 971.05):* A-1 A-2 A-3 RFD RS-1 RS-2 RS-3 RS-6 RT-6 RM-3 RM-4 RM-6 RM-8 RM-10 ROSE-4 RMH-6 RMH-8 Con-1 Con-2 Con-3.
- (c) *Additional information requirements:*
  - 1. A site plan which denotes the location of all existing structures, parking facilities, and the proposed circulation plan, pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 914;
  - 2. A description of the anticipated service area and projected enrollment shall be provided;
  - 3. A copy of all requisite licenses from State of Florida.
- (d) *Criteria for educational facilities:*
  - 1. Sites for secondary schools shall be located near thoroughfares so as to discourage traffic along local residential streets in residential subdivisions. Elementary schools should be discouraged from locating adjacent to major arterial roadways;
  - 2. For the type of facility proposed, the minimum spatial requirements for the site shall be similar to standards utilized by the Indian River County school board and the State of Florida;
  - 3. No main or accessory building shall be located within one hundred (100) feet of any property line not adjacent to a street or roadway. No main or accessory building shall be located within fifty (50) feet of any property line abutting a local road right-of-way that serves a single-family area;
- 4. The applicant shall submit a description of anticipated service area and projected enrollment, by stages if appropriate, and relate the same to a development plan explaining:
  - a. Area to be developed by construction phase;
  - b. Adequacy of site to accommodate anticipated facilities,

enrollment, recreation area, off-street parking, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation on-site including loading, unloading and queuing of school bus traffic;

- c. Safety features of the development plan;
5. No rooms within the school shall be regularly used for the housing of students when located in a single-family residential district;
  6. The facilities shall have a Type "C" buffer in the A-1, A-2, A-3, RFD, RS-1, RS-2, RS-3 and RS-6 districts;
    - a. The board of county commissioners may waive or reduce the buffer requirements where the educational facility is located next to an existing cemetery, place of worship, child care facility, adult care facility, community center, or school. Consideration shall be given to security, noise, and visual impacts. Where a waiver or buffer reduction is granted, normal perimeter landscaping requirements shall apply, and alternative requirements (such as fencing) may be required.
  7. The facilities shall have a Type "D" buffer in all other residential districts not listed in subsection 6 above.
    - a. The board of county commissioners may waive or reduce the buffer requirements where the educational facility is located next to an existing cemetery, place of worship, child care facility, adult care facility, community center, or school. Consideration shall be given to security, noise, and visual impacts. Where a waiver or buffer reduction is granted, normal perimeter landscaping requirements shall apply, and alternative requirements (such as fencing) may be required.

## **Status of Indian River County** **School Concurrency Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

- School Concurrency Comprehensive Plan Amendments include:
  - A new Public School Facilities Element
  - Revisions to the existing Capital Improvements Element
  - Revisions to the existing Intergovernmental Coordination Element
  
- School Concurrency Implementation Schedule approved by the Board of County Commissioners, School Board, and applicable City and Town Council representatives on February 15, 2007 (see attached schedule)
  
- School Concurrency related Comprehensive Plan Amendments were initiated during the January 2007 Comprehensive Plan Amendment application window
  
- Scheduled for April 12, 2007 Planning and Zoning Commission public hearings
  
- Tentatively scheduled for Board of County Commissioners transmittal public hearings in June 2007
  
- Tentatively scheduled for Board of County Commissioners final public hearings in October 2007



School Utilization to SY 2013-14

| SCHOOL NAME                        | Current FISH Capacity | SY 06/07     |              |             | SY 07/08     |              |             | SY 08/09     |              |             | SY 09/10     |              |             | SY 10/11     |              |            | SY 11/12     |              |            | SY 12/13     |              |             | SY 13/14     |              |             |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
|                                    |                       | 1st FTE      | Cap.         | Util.       | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.       | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.       | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.       | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.      | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.      | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.       | Enroll.      | Cap.         | Util.       |
| <b>Elementary</b>                  |                       |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |            |              |              |            |              |              |             |              |              |             |
| Beachland Elementary               | 555                   | 549          | 555          | 99%         | 556          | 555          | 100%        | 549          | 555          | 99%         | 552          | 555          | 99%         | 554          | 555          | 100%       | 553          | 555          | 100%       | 555          | 555          | 100%        | 555          | 555          | 100%        |
| Citrus Elementary                  | 573                   | 518          | 573          | 90%         | 510          | 573          | 89%         | 515          | 573          | 90%         | 530          | 573          | 92%         | 523          | 573          | 91%        | 534          | 573          | 93%        | 540          | 573          | 94%         | 550          | 573          | 96%         |
| Dodgertown Elementary              | 608                   | 583          | 608          | 96%         | 584          | 608          | 96%         | 622          | 608          | 102%        | 672          | 608          | 111%        | 759          | 608          | 125%       | 806          | 608          | 133%       | 900          | 608          | 148%        | 945          | 608          | 155%        |
| Fellsmere Elementary               | 543                   | 567          | 543          | 104%        | 578          | 543          | 106%        | 613          | 543          | 113%        | 627          | 543          | 115%        | 633          | 543          | 117%       | 644          | 543          | 119%       | 654          | 543          | 120%        | 630          | 543          | 116%        |
| Glendale Elementary                | 623                   | 626          | 623          | 100%        | 634          | 623          | 102%        | 642          | 623          | 103%        | 660          | 623          | 106%        | 685          | 623          | 110%       | 707          | 623          | 113%       | 711          | 623          | 114%        | 722          | 623          | 116%        |
| Highlands Elementary               | 584                   | 595          | 584          | 102%        | 585          | 584          | 100%        | 573          | 584          | 98%         | 585          | 584          | 100%        | 604          | 584          | 103%       | 591          | 584          | 101%       | 635          | 584          | 109%        | 665          | 584          | 114%        |
| Liberty Magnet Elementary (B)      | 688                   | 542          | 688          | 79%         | 550          | 688          | 80%         | 566          | 688          | 82%         | 570          | 688          | 83%         | 570          | 688          | 83%        | 570          | 688          | 83%        | 600          | 688          | 87%         | 600          | 688          | 87%         |
| North Central Elementary (C.)      | 550                   | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%         | 0            | 550          | 0%         | 0            | 550          | 0%          | 0            | 550          | 0%          |
| Fellsmere Area Elementary(E)       | 550                   | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 550          | 0%         | 0            | 550          | 0%         | 0            | 550          | 0%          | 0            | 550          | 0%          |
| Osceola Elementary(Magnet)         | 558                   | 541          | 558          | 97%         | 545          | 558          | 98%         | 547          | 558          | 98%         | 547          | 558          | 98%         | 549          | 558          | 98%        | 547          | 558          | 98%        | 545          | 558          | 98%         | 545          | 558          | 98%         |
| Pelican Island Elementary          | 583                   | 453          | 583          | 78%         | 495          | 583          | 85%         | 503          | 583          | 86%         | 516          | 583          | 89%         | 512          | 583          | 88%        | 519          | 583          | 89%        | 524          | 583          | 90%         | 534          | 583          | 92%         |
| Rosewood Elementary(Magnet)        | 561                   | 543          | 561          | 97%         | 542          | 561          | 97%         | 543          | 561          | 97%         | 544          | 561          | 97%         | 544          | 561          | 97%        | 544          | 561          | 97%        | 544          | 561          | 97%         | 544          | 561          | 97%         |
| Sebastian Elementary               | 637                   | 578          | 637          | 91%         | 556          | 637          | 87%         | 580          | 637          | 91%         | 617          | 637          | 97%         | 641          | 637          | 101%       | 654          | 637          | 103%       | 665          | 637          | 104%        | 673          | 637          | 106%        |
| South County Elementary (D)        | 550                   | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 550          | 0%         | 0            | 550          | 0%         | 0            | 550          | 0%          | 0            | 550          | 0%          |
| Thompson Elementary                | 557                   | 419          | 557          | 75%         | 546          | 557          | 98%         | 636          | 557          | 114%        | 690          | 557          | 124%        | 772          | 557          | 139%       | 830          | 557          | 149%       | 865          | 557          | 155%        | 900          | 557          | 162%        |
| Treasure Coast Elementary          | 568                   | 673          | 568          | 118%        | 710          | 568          | 125%        | 743          | 568          | 131%        | 765          | 568          | 135%        | 808          | 568          | 142%       | 845          | 568          | 149%       | 865          | 568          | 152%        | 900          | 568          | 158%        |
| Vero Beach Elementary              | 551                   | 509          | 551          | 92%         | 500          | 551          | 91%         | 508          | 551          | 92%         | 518          | 551          | 94%         | 540          | 551          | 98%        | 546          | 551          | 99%        | 554          | 551          | 101%        | 555          | 551          | 101%        |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>9839</b>           | <b>7696</b>  | <b>8189</b>  | <b>94%</b>  | <b>7891</b>  | <b>8189</b>  | <b>96%</b>  | <b>8140</b>  | <b>8189</b>  | <b>99%</b>  | <b>8393</b>  | <b>8189</b>  | <b>102%</b> | <b>8694</b>  | <b>9289</b>  | <b>94%</b> | <b>8890</b>  | <b>9839</b>  | <b>90%</b> | <b>9157</b>  | <b>9839</b>  | <b>93%</b>  | <b>9318</b>  | <b>9839</b>  | <b>95%</b>  |
| <b>Middle</b>                      |                       |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |            |              |              |            |              |              |             |              |              |             |
| Gifford Middle                     | 1122                  | 1318         | 1122         | 117%        | 1342         | 1122         | 120%        | 1397         | 1122         | 125%        | 1416         | 1122         | 126%        | 1481         | 1122         | 132%       | 1506         | 1122         | 134%       | 1580         | 1122         | 141%        | 1620         | 1122         | 144%        |
| Oslo Middle                        | 1118                  | 1119         | 1118         | 100%        | 1101         | 1118         | 98%         | 1111         | 1118         | 99%         | 1125         | 1118         | 101%        | 1140         | 1118         | 102%       | 1162         | 1118         | 104%       | 1180         | 1118         | 106%        | 1220         | 1118         | 109%        |
| New Middle School (BB)             | 1196                  | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 1196         | 0%          | 0            | 1196         | 0%         | 0            | 1196         | 0%         | 0            | 1196         | 0%          | 0            | 1196         | 0%          |
| Sebastian River Middle             | 1083                  | 1382         | 1083         | 128%        | 1402         | 1083         | 129%        | 1445         | 1083         | 133%        | 1459         | 1083         | 135%        | 1509         | 1083         | 139%       | 1548         | 1083         | 143%       | 1565         | 1083         | 145%        | 1585         | 1083         | 146%        |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>4519</b>           | <b>3819</b>  | <b>3323</b>  | <b>115%</b> | <b>3845</b>  | <b>3323</b>  | <b>116%</b> | <b>3953</b>  | <b>3323</b>  | <b>119%</b> | <b>4000</b>  | <b>4519</b>  | <b>89%</b>  | <b>4130</b>  | <b>4519</b>  | <b>91%</b> | <b>4216</b>  | <b>4519</b>  | <b>93%</b> | <b>4325</b>  | <b>4519</b>  | <b>96%</b>  | <b>4425</b>  | <b>4519</b>  | <b>98%</b>  |
| <b>High</b>                        |                       |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |            |              |              |            |              |              |             |              |              |             |
| New High School (BBB)              | 0                     | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%         | 0            | 0            | 0          | 0            | 0            | 0%          | 0            | 0            | 0%          |
| Sebastian River High               | 1933                  | 1977         | 1933         | 102%        | 2030         | 1933         | 105%        | 2052         | 2083         | 99%         | 2102         | 2083         | 101%        | 2133         | 2083         | 102%       | 2145         | 2083         | 103%       | 2177         | 2083         | 105%        | 2335         | 2083         | 112%        |
| Vero Beach High                    | 2933                  | 2742         | 2933         | 93%         | 2724         | 2933         | 93%         | 2630         | 2771         | 95%         | 2612         | 2771         | 94%         | 2655         | 2771         | 96%        | 2712         | 2771         | 98%        | 2850         | 2771         | 103%        | 2935         | 2771         | 106%        |
| Alternative Education (Gifford)    | 284                   | 117          | 284          | 41%         | 123          | 284          | 43%         | 125          | 284          | 44%         | 135          | 284          | 48%         | 144          | 284          | 51%        | 145          | 284          | 51%        | 150          | 284          | 53%         | 150          | 284          | 53%         |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>5150</b>           | <b>4836</b>  | <b>5150</b>  | <b>94%</b>  | <b>4877</b>  | <b>5150</b>  | <b>95%</b>  | <b>4807</b>  | <b>5138</b>  | <b>94%</b>  | <b>4849</b>  | <b>5138</b>  | <b>94%</b>  | <b>4932</b>  | <b>5138</b>  | <b>96%</b> | <b>5002</b>  | <b>5138</b>  | <b>97%</b> | <b>5177</b>  | <b>5138</b>  | <b>101%</b> | <b>5420</b>  | <b>5138</b>  | <b>105%</b> |
| <b>Other</b>                       |                       |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |            |              |              |            |              |              |             |              |              |             |
| Wabasso School                     | 60                    | 53           | 60           | 88%         | 59           | 60           | 98%         | 62           | 60           | 103%        | 68           | 60           | 113%        | 76           | 60           | 127%       | 77           | 60           | 128%       | 87           | 60           | 145%        | 94           | 60           | 157%        |
| <b>Student Total</b>               | <b>19568</b>          | <b>16404</b> | <b>16722</b> | <b>98%</b>  | <b>16672</b> | <b>16722</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>16962</b> | <b>16710</b> | <b>102%</b> | <b>17310</b> | <b>17906</b> | <b>97%</b>  | <b>17832</b> | <b>19006</b> | <b>94%</b> | <b>18185</b> | <b>19556</b> | <b>93%</b> | <b>18746</b> | <b>19556</b> | <b>96%</b>  | <b>19257</b> | <b>19556</b> | <b>98%</b>  |
| <b>OE Capital Outlay FTE Forca</b> | <b>19568</b>          | <b>16302</b> | <b>16722</b> | <b>97%</b>  | <b>16643</b> | <b>16722</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>17051</b> | <b>16710</b> | <b>102%</b> | <b>17529</b> | <b>17906</b> | <b>98%</b>  | <b>18076</b> | <b>19006</b> | <b>95%</b> | <b>18670</b> | <b>19556</b> | <b>95%</b> | <b>19379</b> | <b>19556</b> | <b>99%</b>  | <b>20010</b> | <b>19556</b> | <b>102%</b> |

The values shown above are "raw" values. As the School District works through the development of the FY '08-'12 Five Year Plan, the utilizations above 100% will be redistributed to meet the requirements of concurrency. Current and future projected Middle School overcrowding will be resolved with the opening of Middle School "BB", within the 'first 3 years' time frame provided for by state concurrency legislation. Other overages (e.g. Sebastian River High) will be addressed by School Board action on building additions within the FY '08-'12 Five Year Plan.

# Summary of Capital Improvement Program

| Project  | Total              | Prior to          | FY 2007 -          | FY                 | FY                | FY      | FY       | FY                |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|-------------------|
|  |                    | 2007              | FY 2011            | 2007               | 2008              | 2009    | 2010     | 2011              |
| <b>New Construction</b>                        |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>New Construction and Additions</b>          |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| Elementary School "D"                          | 18,000,000         | 0                 | 18,000,000         |                    |                   |         |          | 18,000,000        |
| New Liberty Magnet ES                          | 17,438,044         | 17,438,044        |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| New Middle School (BB)                         | 35,000,000         |                   | 35,000,000         | 35,000,000         |                   |         |          |                   |
| North County Area El School "C"                | 18,000,000         | 0                 | 18,000,000         | 1,000,000          | 17,000,000        |         |          |                   |
| Oslo Road Area HS (BBB)                        | 70,000,000         | 0                 | 70,000,000         | 70,000,000         |                   |         |          |                   |
| Sebastian River HS Addition                    | 5,827,500          | 1,950,000         | 3,877,500          | 3,877,500          |                   |         |          |                   |
| Simon Mall Facility                            | 325,000            | 0                 | 325,000            | 325,000            |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>Subtotal New Construction and Additions</b> | <b>164,590,544</b> | <b>19,388,044</b> | <b>145,202,500</b> | <b>110,202,500</b> | <b>17,000,000</b> |         | <b>0</b> | <b>18,000,000</b> |
| <b>Modular Classrooms</b>                      |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| Modular Classroom Additions                    | 500,000            | 500,000           |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| Sebastian River Middle Addition                | 4,550,000          | 425,000           | 4,125,000          | 4,125,000          |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>Subtotal Modular Classrooms</b>             | <b>5,050,000</b>   | <b>925,000</b>    | <b>4,125,000</b>   | <b>4,125,000</b>   |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>Site Acquisition</b>                        |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| Site Acquisition                               | 17,056,150         | 14,556,150        | 2,500,000          | 2,500,000          |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>Subtotal Site Acquisition</b>               | <b>17,056,150</b>  | <b>14,556,150</b> | <b>2,500,000</b>   | <b>2,500,000</b>   |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>Subtotal New Construction</b>               | <b>186,696,694</b> | <b>34,869,194</b> | <b>151,827,500</b> | <b>116,827,500</b> | <b>17,000,000</b> |         | <b>0</b> | <b>18,000,000</b> |
| <b>Comprehensive Needs</b>                     |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| <b>Modernizations &amp; Replacements</b>       |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| County Office Transition                       | 1,500,000          | 0                 | 1,500,000          | 1,500,000          |                   |         |          |                   |
| Dodgetown Cafeteria Replacement                | 1,512,500          | 62,500            | 1,450,000          |                    | 1,450,000         |         |          |                   |
| ESE Renovations to Leased Space                | 360,744            | 40,744            | 320,000            | 60,000             | 60,000            |         |          |                   |
| Furniture and Equipment                        | 5,763,045          | 1,341,464         | 4,421,581          | 696,000            | 779,520           | 873,062 | 977,830  | 1,095,169         |
| Gifford Alternative School                     | 7,966,040          | 7,966,040         |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |
| Gifford MS Gymnasium                           | 6,133,050          | 6,133,050         |                    |                    |                   |         |          |                   |

| Project   | Total             | Prior to 2007     | FY 2007 - FY 2011 | FY 2007           | FY 2008           | FY 2009          | FY 2010           | FY 2011           |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| VBHS Freshman Learning Ctr Renov.                   | 0                 | 0                 |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Vero Beach High School Restoration                  | 50,717,750        | 18,817,750        | 31,900,000        | 20,200,000        | 11,700,000        |                  |                   |                   |
| Wabasso School Renovation                           | 50,000            | 50,000            |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| <b>Subtotal Modernizations &amp; Replacements</b>   | <b>74,003,129</b> | <b>34,411,548</b> | <b>39,591,581</b> | <b>22,456,000</b> | <b>13,989,520</b> | <b>933,062</b>   | <b>1,037,830</b>  | <b>1,175,169</b>  |
| <b>Subtotal Comprehensive Needs</b>                 | <b>74,003,129</b> | <b>34,411,548</b> | <b>39,591,581</b> | <b>22,456,000</b> | <b>13,989,520</b> | <b>933,062</b>   | <b>1,037,830</b>  | <b>1,175,169</b>  |
| <b>Other Items</b>                                  |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| <b>Capital Maintenance</b>                          |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Capital Maintenance                                 | 25,625,277        | 1,479,300         | 24,145,977        | 3,955,050         | 4,350,555         | 4,785,611        | 5,264,172         | 5,790,589         |
| Capital Maintenance Transfer                        | 17,512,230        | 2,893,500         | 14,618,730        | 2,895,170         | 2,895,170         | 2,942,170        | 2,943,110         | 2,943,110         |
| Glendale Reroof Project                             | 2,307,500         | 2,307,500         |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Highlands Reroof Project                            | 1,331,100         | 1,331,100         |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| HVAC Repair and Replace                             | 2,100,000         | 600,000           | 1,500,000         | 300,000           | 300,000           | 300,000          | 300,000           | 300,000           |
| Minor Capital Projects                              | 13,680,525        | 5,682,744         | 7,997,781         | 1,310,100         | 1,441,000         | 1,585,100        | 1,743,610         | 1,917,971         |
| <b>Subtotal Capital Maintenance</b>                 | <b>62,556,632</b> | <b>14,294,144</b> | <b>48,262,488</b> | <b>8,460,320</b>  | <b>8,986,725</b>  | <b>9,612,881</b> | <b>10,250,892</b> | <b>10,951,670</b> |
| <b>Safety, Security, and Environmental</b>          |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| ADA Compliance                                      | 2,005,000         | 625,000           | 1,380,000         | 420,000           | 240,000           | 240,000          | 240,000           | 240,000           |
| Beachland EI HVAC Renovation                        | 2,425,000         | 400,000           | 2,025,000         | 2,025,000         |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Environmental Needs                                 | 490,000           | 140,000           | 350,000           | 70,000            | 70,000            | 70,000           | 70,000            | 70,000            |
| North County Bus Parking Facility                   | 250,000           | 0                 | 250,000           | 75,000            | 175,000           |                  |                   |                   |
| Osceola Magnet Activities                           | 2,750,000         | 2,750,000         |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Pelican Island HVAC Replacement                     | 2,625,000         | 425,000           | 2,200,000         | 2,200,000         |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Sebastian EI HVAC Replacement                       | 2,747,000         | 2,747,000         |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Small School Projects (under \$200K)                | 542,688           | 542,688           |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Vero Beach EI Renovation                            | 2,625,000         | 85,000            | 2,540,000         | 2,540,000         |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| <b>Subtotal Safety, Security, and Environmental</b> | <b>16,459,688</b> | <b>7,714,688</b>  | <b>8,745,000</b>  | <b>7,330,000</b>  | <b>485,000</b>    | <b>310,000</b>   | <b>310,000</b>    | <b>310,000</b>    |
| <b>Relocatables</b>                                 |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Relocatable Leasing                                 | 13,285,000        | 4,035,000         | 9,250,000         | 2,750,000         | 3,000,000         | 2,000,000        | 1,500,000         |                   |
| Relocatable Renovation                              | 1,776,450         | 576,450           | 1,200,000         | 300,000           | 300,000           | 300,000          | 300,000           |                   |
| <b>Subtotal Relocatables</b>                        | <b>15,061,450</b> | <b>4,611,450</b>  | <b>10,450,000</b> | <b>3,050,000</b>  | <b>3,300,000</b>  | <b>2,300,000</b> | <b>1,800,000</b>  |                   |
| <b>Educational Technology</b>                       |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |

| Project                                     | Total              | Prior to          | FY 2007 -          | FY                 | FY                | FY                | FY                | FY                | FY                |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|   |                    | 2007              | FY 2011            | 2007               | 2008              | 2009              | 2010              | 2011              |                   |
| Communications                              | 700,000            | 200,000           | 500,000            | 100,000            | 100,000           | 100,000           | 100,000           | 100,000           | 100,000           |
| District Technology                         | 4,796,263          | 717,100           | 4,079,163          | 642,100            | 719,152           | 805,450           | 902,104           | 1,010,357         | 1,010,357         |
| School Technology                           | 8,702,729          | 964,961           | 7,737,768          | 1,218,000          | 1,364,160         | 1,527,859         | 1,711,202         | 1,916,547         | 1,916,547         |
| <b>Subtotal Educational Technology</b>      | <b>14,198,992</b>  | <b>1,882,061</b>  | <b>12,316,931</b>  | <b>1,960,100</b>   | <b>2,183,312</b>  | <b>2,433,309</b>  | <b>2,713,306</b>  | <b>3,026,904</b>  | <b>3,026,904</b>  |
| <b>Furniture &amp; Equipment</b>            |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Ancillary Fac. & FS Equip                   | 544,139            | 107,000           | 437,139            | 84,000             | 85,680            | 87,394            | 89,141            | 90,924            | 90,924            |
| School Buses/Vehicles                       | 10,222,945         | 1,398,945         | 8,824,000          | 1,229,000          | 1,570,000         | 2,025,000         | 2,000,000         | 2,000,000         | 2,000,000         |
| <b>Subtotal Furniture &amp; Equipment</b>   | <b>10,767,084</b>  | <b>1,505,945</b>  | <b>9,261,139</b>   | <b>1,313,000</b>   | <b>1,655,680</b>  | <b>2,112,394</b>  | <b>2,089,141</b>  | <b>2,090,924</b>  | <b>2,090,924</b>  |
| <b>Debt Service and Operations</b>          |                    |                   |                    |                    |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| COPs Closing Costs                          | 2,352,711          | 1,064,278         | 1,288,433          | 1,288,433          |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Debt Transfer                               | 78,967,149         | 10,452,587        | 68,514,562         | 10,250,311         | 14,583,008        | 14,584,808        | 14,591,402        | 14,505,033        | 14,505,033        |
| Works in Progress - Carryover               | 76,754,834         | 32,740,780        | 44,014,054         | 44,014,054         |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| <b>Subtotal Debt Service and Operations</b> | <b>158,074,694</b> | <b>44,257,645</b> | <b>113,817,049</b> | <b>55,552,798</b>  | <b>14,583,008</b> | <b>14,584,808</b> | <b>14,591,402</b> | <b>14,505,033</b> | <b>14,505,033</b> |
| <b>Subtotal Other Items</b>                 | <b>277,118,540</b> | <b>74,265,933</b> | <b>202,852,607</b> | <b>77,666,218</b>  | <b>31,193,725</b> | <b>31,353,392</b> | <b>31,754,741</b> | <b>30,884,531</b> | <b>30,884,531</b> |
| <b>Total Projects</b>                       |                    |                   | <b>394,271,688</b> | <b>216,949,718</b> | <b>62,183,245</b> | <b>32,286,454</b> | <b>50,792,571</b> | <b>32,059,700</b> | <b>32,059,700</b> |

# Summary of Estimated Revenue

| Estimated Revenue                  | Prior to<br>2007 | Five Year<br>Total | FY<br>2006        | FY<br>2007       | FY<br>2008        | FY<br>2009        | FY<br>2010        | FY<br>2011 |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
|                                    |                  |                    | 2007              | 2008             | 2009              | 2010              | 2011              |            |
| <b>Local Sources</b>               |                  |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Impact Fees                        |                  | 13,200,000         |                   | 3,300,000        | 3,300,000         | 3,300,000         | 3,300,000         | 3,300,000  |
| Property Tax                       | 27,192,302       | 216,424,770        | 34,067,365        | 38,155,449       | 42,734,103        | 47,862,195        | 53,605,658        |            |
| Interest Income                    | 150,000          | 5,750,000          | 1,150,000         | 1,150,000        | 1,150,000         | 1,150,000         | 1,150,000         | 1,150,000  |
| Liberty Letter of Credit           | 509,544          |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Insurance Loss Recovery            | 4,800,000        |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| <b>State</b>                       |                  |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| PECO Bonds - Const.                | 692,137          | 2,033,204          | 1,704,432         | 328,772          |                   |                   |                   |            |
| PECO Bonds - Maint.                | 1,089,471        | 3,962,112          | 1,378,105         | 576,463          | 311,826           | 690,201           | 1,005,517         |            |
| Classrooms for Kids                | 604,513          | 8,183,025          | 8,183,025         |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Federal Grants                     | 500,000          |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Misc State Sources                 | 30,000           | 150,000            | 30,000            | 30,000           | 30,000            | 30,000            | 30,000            | 30,000     |
| <b>Proposed COPS/Bond Proceeds</b> |                  |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| COP Proceeds                       | 81,000,000       | 100,838,434        | 100,838,434       |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| <b>Reserve Fund Balances</b>       |                  |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Reserved Balance                   | 32,740,780       | 44,014,054         | 44,014,054        |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Unreserved Balance                 | 6,786,005        |                    | 50,085,328        | 24,501,025       | 5,858,464         | 21,097,939        | 23,337,764        |            |
| <b>Appropriations</b>              |                  |                    |                   |                  |                   |                   |                   |            |
| Appropriations                     |                  | 394,271,688        | 216,949,718       | 62,183,245       | 32,286,454        | 50,792,571        | 32,059,700        |            |
| <b>Available Fund Balance</b>      |                  |                    | <b>24,501,025</b> | <b>5,858,464</b> | <b>21,097,939</b> | <b>23,337,764</b> | <b>50,369,239</b> |            |