

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 511 Uses of the District School Tax
SPONSOR(S): Kendrick and others
TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 1750

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) <u>Committee on K-12</u>		<u>Gillespie</u>	<u>Ahearn</u>
2) <u>Schools & Learning Council</u>			
3) <u>Policy & Budget Council</u>			
4) _____			
5) _____			

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

House Bill 511 allows a school district to use revenues from the 2-mill nonvoted capital improvement levy for the district's health, property, and casualty insurance costs, if the district meets current-year class-size reduction requirements and the Commissioner of Education certifies that all of the district's instructional space needs for the next 5 years can be met from capital outlay sources that the district reasonably expects to receive within 5 years or from sound methods of meeting the district's space needs.

The bill also requires a school district, if the district anticipates using revenues from the 2-mill levy for payment of health, property, and casualty insurance costs, to list that anticipated use on the list of projects included on its annual public tax notice published in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the district.

It is anticipated that the bill's sponsor will file an amendment that removes provisions from the bill which allow a school district to use revenues from the 2-mill levy for the payment of health insurance costs.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

The bill does not appear to implicate any of the House principles.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Present Situation:

Section 9, Article VII of the State Constitution permits a school district, if authorized by law, to levy up to 10 mills¹ of property taxes for school purposes. From the 10 mills, current law authorizes a school district to levy up to 2 mills for the following uses without voter approval (commonly known as the “nonvoted capital improvement millage”):²

- New construction and remodeling projects;
- Maintenance, renovation, and repair of existing educational plants³ or leased facilities to correct nonconformity with the Florida Building Code or Fire Safety Prevention Code;
- Purchase, lease-purchase, or lease of school buses and other school vehicles;
- Purchase, lease-purchase, or lease of new and replacement equipment;
- Payment for educational facilities and sites under certain lease-purchase agreements;
- Payment of loans for specific school-related purposes;
- Payment of costs to comply with state and federal environmental laws, rules, and regulations;
- Payment of costs for renting or leasing educational facilities; and
- Purchase, lease-purchase, or lease of school buses or payment to a private entity to offset the cost of school buses.

In 1997, the Legislature limited the use of revenues from the discretionary 2-mill levy, phased out over 6 years. Thus, since July 1, 2003, current law limits the use of revenues from the 2-mill levy to the following projects:⁴

- Construction, renovation, remodeling, maintenance, and repair of the educational plant;
- Purchase, lease, or lease-purchase of equipment, educational plants, and construction materials directly related to the delivery of student instruction;
- Rental or lease of existing buildings or space converted for use as educational facilities;
- Opening day collection for the library media center of a new school;
- Purchase, lease-purchase, or lease of school buses or payment to a private entity to offset the cost of school buses; and
- Payments for certificates of participation⁵ issued before January 7, 2003.⁶

¹ A mill is 0.001 of one dollar. Thus, one mill of \$100,000 of taxable value is \$100.

² Section 1011.71(2), Florida Statutes.

³ Section 1013.01(7), Florida Statutes, defines the term “educational plant” to comprise the educational facilities, site, and site improvements necessary to accommodate students, faculty, administrators, staff, and the activities of the educational program of each plant.

⁴ Section 8, chapter 97-265, Laws of Florida; Section 35, chapter 97-384, Laws of Florida; section 1011.71(5), Florida Statutes.

⁵ A “certificate of participation” is an instrument evidencing a pro rata share in a specific pledged revenue stream, usually lease payments by the issuer that are subject to annual appropriation. The certificate generally entitles the holder to receive a share, or participation, in the lease payments from a particular project. Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, *Glossary of Municipal Securities Terms* 2d ed. (Jan. 2004), at <http://www.msrb.org/msrb1/glossary/default.asp> (last visited Mar. 7, 2007).

⁶ See sections 663 and 1065, chapter 2002-387, Laws of Florida.

A school district that spends revenues from the 2-mill levy in violation of these limits is subject to an equal-dollar reduction in funds appropriated to the district under the Florida Education Finance Program the fiscal year after an audit finds the violation.⁷

Current law exempts a school district from these limits, thereby allowing the district to spend revenues from the 2-mill levy on any of the projects listed, including those authorized before the 1997 restrictions previously discussed in this analysis, if the Commissioner of Education certifies that all of the district's instructional space needs for the next 5 years can be met from capital outlay sources that the district reasonably expects to receive within 5 years or from sound methods of meeting the district's space needs (i.e., alternative scheduling or construction, leasing, rezoning, or technological methodologies).⁸

A review by the Department of Education of the legislative history of the 2-mill nonvoted capital improvement levy shows that the levy "has always been restricted to costs associated with capital outlay, and not with operating expenses."⁹

The department reports that, for 2006-2007, the value of 1 mill of school taxable value is \$1.56 billion. Thus, the 2-mill levy could generate a statewide value of \$ 3.11 billion. The following table shows the millage rates levied by Florida's school districts for 2006-2007:¹⁰

2006-2007 Capital Improvement Millage Rates	
<i>Levy of Discretionary 2 Mills</i>	<i>School Districts</i>
Three school districts do not levy millage	Calhoun, Holmes, and Jackson
Three school districts levy 0.001 to 0.500 mills	Gulf, Madison, and Monroe
Seven school districts levy 0.501 to 1.500 mills	Bay, DeSoto, Orange, Pasco, Santa Rosa, Walton, and Washington
Two school districts levy 1.501 to 1.999 mills	Citrus and Okaloosa
<i>The remaining 52 school districts levy the maximum of 2.000 mills</i>	

Class-Size Reduction:

In 2002, the voters of Florida approved an amendment to the State Constitution requiring the reduction of class sizes by the 2010 school year so that the maximum number of students per public school classroom assigned to a teacher is:¹¹

- Eighteen students for prekindergarten through third grade;
- Twenty-two students for grades 4 through 8; and
- Twenty-five students for grades 9 through 12.

The constitutional amendment requires the Legislature, beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year, to provide funds for reducing the average number of students in each classroom by at least two students per year until reaching the maximum class sizes.¹²

To implement the constitutional amendment, the Legislature required a school district that did not comply with the maximum class sizes to reduce its average number of students per classroom¹³ by at least two students per year. The Legislature also specified how the averages are calculated:

⁷ Flush-left provisions of section 1011.71(5), Florida Statutes.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Florida Department of Education, *2007 Bill Analysis of HB 511 2* (Feb. 6, 2007).

¹⁰ Florida Department of Education, Office of Funding and Financial Reporting, *Florida Education Finance Program 2006-07 Third Calculation* 47 (Dec. 15, 2006), available at <http://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-4169/coefo-07-12c.pdf>.

¹¹ Section 1(a), Article IX of the State Constitution.

¹² *Id.*

- For fiscal years 2003-2004 through 2005-2006, the average number of students per classroom is calculated at the district level.
- For fiscal years 2006-2007 through 2007-2008, the average is calculated at the school level.
- For fiscal year 2008-2009 and thereafter, the average is calculated at the individual classroom level.

Thus, for fiscal years 2003-2004 through 2005-2006, a school district that did not meet the maximum class sizes for its classrooms was required to reduce the district's average number of students per classroom by two students. A school district was permitted to have a school whose average class size was not reduced as long as the district's average showed an overall reduction by two students.

For fiscal years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, a public school (including a charter school) that does not meet the maximum class sizes for its classrooms is required to reduce the school's average number of students per classroom by two students. A school is permitted to have individual classrooms that are not reduced as long as the school's average shows an overall reduction by two students.

Beginning in fiscal year 2008-2009, an individual classroom that does not meet the maximum class size must be reduced by two students to meet the maximum class size.

Under current law, if the Department of Education determines for any year that a school district has not reduced average class size as required, the department must calculate an amount of the district's operating funds that is proportionate to the amount of class-size reduction not accomplished. Once the department's calculation is verified, the Executive Office of the Governor transfers the operating funds to the district's fixed capital outlay account for class-size reduction.¹⁴ If, however, the Commissioner of Education recommends that the State Board of Education has reviewed evidence indicating that a school district was unable to meet class-size reduction requirements despite appropriate efforts, current law allows the Legislative Budget Commission to approve an alternative amount of funds to be transferred from the district's operating funds to fixed capital outlay for class-size reduction.

For 2006-2007, if a school district had at least one public school (including a charter school) that did not meet the class-size reduction requirements, the Department of Education allowed the district to appeal the department's calculation of the amount of operating funds to be transferred to fixed capital outlay. The Commissioner of Education subsequently recommended an adjustment to the transfer calculations if the district demonstrated that one of the following affected the calculation:

- Correction of data errors;
- District was actively recruiting (e.g., advertising of vacancy) a teacher to fill a vacancy before the class-size calculations and subsequently filled the position; or
- District experienced unexpected student enrollment growth.

¹³ The State Constitution specifies that the class-size requirements do not apply to "extracurricular classes." *Id.* Section 1003.03(1), Florida Statutes, specifies that the maximum class sizes apply to "core-curricula courses," which section 1003.01(14), Florida Statutes, defines as "courses defined by the Department of Education as mathematics, language arts/reading, science, social studies, foreign language, English for Speakers of Other Languages, exceptional student education, and courses taught in traditional self-contained elementary school classrooms."

¹⁴ Section 1003.03(4)(a), Florida Statutes.

Based on the adjusted calculations resulting from the appeals, operating funds of 24 school districts are subject to transfer to fixed capital outlay:¹⁵

School District	Transfer Amount
Bay	\$68,834
Brevard	\$2,474
Broward	\$954,157
Clay	\$37,392
Collier	\$2,573
Miami-Dade	\$518,149
Duval	\$34,210
Gadsden	\$4,294
Hendry	\$35,956
Lee	\$37,685
Levy	\$7,392
Manatee	\$596,123

School District	Transfer Amount
Monroe	\$13,041
Orange	\$1,766,907
Osceola	\$444,463
Palm Beach	\$59,831
Pasco	\$7,226
Pinellas	\$153,569
Polk	\$120,551
Putnam	\$7,151
Sarasota	\$20,623
Seminole	\$722
Sumter	\$193,466
Washington	\$19,220

In addition to these school districts, five districts had at least one public school that did not meet the class-size reduction requirements, but, as a result of the department's appeals process, are not subject to the transfer of operating funds to fixed capital outlay: Alachua, Franklin, Lake, Okaloosa, and Walton.

Tax Notices:

Current law requires a school district to annually publish certain notices of its tentative budget, tax increases, and budget hearings in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the district, which is of general interest and readership in the community and not one of limited subject matter.¹⁶ If a school district levies the nonvoted capital improvement millage (up to 2 mills), current law requires the district to publish a second notice of that tax, which also must appear in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the district.¹⁷ The notice must include a list of the projects anticipated to be funded by the capital improvement tax.¹⁸

Proposed Changes:

The bill allows a school district to use revenues from the 2-mill nonvoted capital improvement levy for payment of the district's health, property, and casualty insurance costs, if:

- The district has met the current-year class-size-reduction requirements; and
- The Commissioner of Education certifies that all of the district's instructional space needs for the next 5 years can be met from capital outlay sources that the district reasonably expects to receive within 5 years or from sound methods of meeting the district's space needs (i.e., alternative scheduling or construction, leasing, rezoning, or technological methodologies).

Since current law provides for the calculation of class-size reduction requirements at the school level for fiscal years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008,¹⁹ the bill is unclear when a school district is considered to have met the current-year class-size reduction requirements, especially in light of the appeals and adjustment process being implemented by the Department of Education, which is previously discussed in this analysis. Moreover, beginning in fiscal year 2008-2009, the class-size reduction requirements will be calculated at the level of individual classrooms, further obscuring whether a school district is considered to have met the current-year class-size reduction requirements.

¹⁵ Florida Department of Education, *2006-07 Class Size Reduction Transfer to Fixed Capital Outlay: All Schools* (Feb. 2007).

¹⁶ Section 200.065(2)(f) and (3), Florida Statutes.

¹⁷ Section 200.065(9)(a), Florida Statutes.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ Section 1003.03(2)(b)2., Florida Statutes.

The bill also requires a school district, if the district anticipates using revenues from the 2-mill levy for payment of health, property, and casualty insurance costs, to list that anticipated use on the list of projects included on its annual public tax notice published in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the district.

The bill provides an effective date of July 1, 2007.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends section 200.065, Florida Statutes, requiring the addition of specified information in an annual tax notice.

Section 2. Amends section 1011.71, Florida Statutes, to allow revenues from the 2-mill nonvoted capital improvement levy to be used to pay certain insurance costs.

Section 3. Provides an effective date.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

The bill allows a school district to use revenues from the 2-mill nonvoted capital improvement levy for the district's health, property, and casualty insurance costs, if the district meets current-year class-size reduction requirements and the Commissioner of Education certifies that all of the district's instructional space needs for the next 5 years can be met from capital outlay sources that the district reasonably expects to receive within 5 years or from sound methods of meeting the district's space needs.

The bill accordingly allows a district that does not confront short-term capital outlay demands to use revenues from the levy to support the operational costs of paying the district's insurance premiums, thereby allowing the district to use operational funds for other purposes. If, however, the school district confronts unexpected long-term capital outlay demands, the district could experience challenges in shifting expenditures for the district's insurance premiums back to its operational funds after an extended period of supporting these expenses with revenues from the 2-mill levy.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not applicable. The bill does not appear to require a county or municipality to spend funds or take an action requiring expenditures; reduce the authority that counties and municipalities had as of February 1, 1989, to raise revenues in the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of a state tax shared in the aggregate with counties and municipalities as of February 1, 1989.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

As previously discussed in the EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES (I. B.), the bill is unclear whether a school district meets the current-year class-size reduction requirements, thereby causing the bill to be unclear whether a district is eligible to use revenues from the 2-mill nonvoted capital improvement levy for the district's health, property, and casualty insurance costs.

D. STATEMENT OF THE SPONSOR

No statement submitted.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COUNCIL SUBSTITUTE CHANGES