

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

Purpose

The purpose of this workshop is to review the 5-year capital budget and capital plan and seek Board input on competing projects during the period 2011/2012 thru 2015/2016.

To accomplish this goal we'll do the following:

- Review the projected 5-year revenue stream
- Conduct a short, by department, review of appropriations and planned progress over the course of the 5-year plan
- Review the most recent COFTE projections
- Review the current Capital Projects Matrix
- Briefly discuss "high score" competing projects
- Introduce Sarasota High School as the next major renovation recommendation
- Look at a SHS renovation "Concept Plan"
- Discuss investments in energy saving technologies

Desired Outcomes

1. Ensure the Board has an understanding of the Capital budget—both revenues and appropriations
2. Seek Board support on the 5-year plan and key Capital projects

Discussion

Revenue. At Tab 1, page 1, are the latest revenue projections for the period of the 5-year plan. In summary, the projected Capital revenue, all sources, is:

<u>2011/2012</u>	<u>2012/2013</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
\$79,764,975	\$80,308,362	\$82,907,348	\$83,827,069	\$86,844,178

These projections are built, in part, on an assumption that property taxes for 2011/2012 will be 5% below that received in the current fiscal year, will be flat for 2012/2013, and will grow by 3% each of the remaining years in the 5-year plan.

Taking a look back five years provides a valuable perspective within which we can evaluate this revenue stream. That look-back is at Tab 2. Note that at its peak, total Capital Revenue exceeded \$176 million (in 2006/2007). The millage rate reduction and decline in property values account for the majority of the revenue decline. Current year (2010/2011) revenue of \$84,165,291 is about 48% of our 2006/2007 high.

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

Past 5-Year Capital Revenue

<u>2005/2006</u>	<u>2006/2007</u>	<u>2007/2008</u>	<u>2008/2009</u>	<u>2009/2010</u>
\$132,973,353	\$176,288,832	\$162,456,409	\$118,443,804	\$90,095,173

The good news in these numbers is that the Board had the foresight to, a) when revenues were high, invest in facility and equipment improvement that has us postured well to weather this fiscal storm; and b) borrow when rates were low to build when construction prices were low. As a result, you will see that we're confident we'll be able to maintain our facilities and capital equipment over the 5-year plan to a standard higher than other Districts and one that effectively supports our instructional programs.

Appropriations. Appropriations details are at Tab 1, pages 1 to 3. Note that total appropriations, before funding additional competing projects, are:

<u>2011/2012</u>	<u>2012/2013</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
\$100,258,598	\$80,233,069	\$81,771,382	\$80,854,865	\$81,925,631

Transfer to the Debt Service Fund

The 1.5 Capital Outlay Millage Levy may be used for the payment of loans and lease purchase agreements. The Certificates of Participation, Qualified School Construction Bonds, and the Computer Replenishment program are permissible uses of the 1.5 Capital Outlay Millage Levy. The amount is transferred to the Debt Service Fund to pay for the interest and principal payments. Anticipated Debt Service transfers over the 5-year plan are:

<u>2011/2012</u>	<u>2012/2013</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
\$27,891,530	\$28,886,555	\$28,888,205	\$28,788,846	\$28,694,791

Transfer to the General Fund

The 1.5 Capital Outlay Millage Levy may also be used for the payment of maintenance and equipment. The maintenance and equipment purchases incurred in the General Fund are permissible uses of the 1.5 Capital Outlay Millage Levy. Also, the Legislature appropriates funding for Charter Schools and maintenance appropriations through the Public Education Capital Outlay Fund. These amounts are included in the transfer to the General Fund as they are expenditures that must be reported in the General Fund. Anticipated transfers to the General Fund over the 5-year plan are:

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

Transfers to the General Fund

<u>2011/2012</u>	<u>2012/2013</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
\$21,486,895	\$22,048,435	\$22,634,121	\$23,244,503	\$23,880,167

Department Recurring Appropriations. Here we'll briefly discuss each Department's Capital Budget and the general uses of that budget. Recurring Department appropriations, in total, are summarized below. As a point of comparison, recurring costs in the Board approved budget for the current year (2010/2011) are \$24,527,481.

<u>2011/2012</u>	<u>2012/2013</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
\$19,705,053	\$19,231,472	\$19,887,985	\$19,741,883	\$19,579,711

Transportation. Transportation Capital Appropriations are mostly a function of vehicle purchases—both white fleet and school buses. Note that we have reduced the white fleet annual appropriation from \$500,000 to \$300,000 over the next three years. The school bus line allows us to bring our maximum vehicle life back to our goal of 13 years (currently moving toward 15 years) within the 5-year plan.

Construction Services and Long Range Planning. Last year we reduced manning (classified and administrators) in both Construction Services and Long Range Planning—in recognition of a dramatically declining capital budget and, as a result, fewer projects. For the 2010/2011 School year we reduced our professional planning staff by one third and eliminated four positions from Construction Services. However, the Board's decision to borrow to fund both Booker and Venice High Schools places continued demand on both Departments. The proposed 2011/2012 budget reflects the reduction of an additional Project Manager position as well as the District's Staff Engineer. Engineering services, when needed, will be outsourced. This summer Long Range Planning will move to Construction Services allowing us to right-size the departments. Note that the 5-year budget reflects the gradual drawdown/elimination of our Long Range Planning Department.

School Police/Safety and Security. Funds dedicated to School Safety and Security next year represent about one third of what they were in 2008/2009. Looking forward, the budget for School Safety and Security remains relatively flat for the duration of the plan. It funds the maintaining and upgrading of security alarms, electronic access control, employee identification systems and visitor management systems throughout the District. We have also built the budget to support maintaining and upgrading of two-way radios at schools, in schools buses, and in district support facilities/vehicles. We also anticipate the need to upgrade the existing 800MHz county public safety radio system, to which the school district is a subscriber.

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

Over the past several years we have also dramatically reduced the size of our fencing budget. Originally \$500,000 annually, we have reduced this line to \$100,000 annually throughout the 5-year plan. These funds have allowed us to provide fencing that incorporates single points of entry for Englewood, Ashton, Garden, Alta Vista and Brentwood which is underway this year. In addition, when we build new schools or conduct major renovations we attempt to include fencing in the capital project. For example, this has been done at Toledo Blade and Lakeview and is planned for Venice and Booker High Schools. These remaining funds will allow us to address the most significant fencing needs at about one school each year. Schools are selected based on an overall CPTED evaluation.

Finally, we currently we have approximately 3,000 cameras in schools and ancillary locations. These funds will be used to replace existing older cameras with improved technology and add additional cameras to schools that have identified needs. The addition of cameras will be phased beginning at the start of the new school year.

Information Technology. Since 2008/2009 the Capital budget for Technology has been reduced by approximately 48%. This is largely attributable to our multiyear investment in Active Technologies during that time period but also thanks to the continued efforts by Information Technology to move our district towards stabilization and preparing for the future of technology as new requirements demand at the local and state levels. Access to technology by our staff and students will increase over the coming five years as new requirements for courses, evaluations, assessment and end of course exams continue to develop and grow.

A portion of the funds dedicated to Information Technology represent the continued support of our infrastructure in all areas of Telecommunications and Networking including telephone, network, switches, cabling and audio/visual repairs, replacements, upgrades and installations. A concerted effort has been made to identify industry specific standard lifecycles of equipment and to define our schedule of activities necessary according to these standards, budget permitting. Over the next five years, we have a forecasted schedule of work and have looked toward performing this work in conjunction with other department activities as much as possible.

Our efforts continue throughout the District in supporting Technologies in the classroom. We are now approaching a time where we have to begin replacing our projectors in the classrooms as they reach the end of their useful life. This year we evaluated several different options and vendors for projector replacements and have selected a projector that will be our replacement as our current projectors reach the end of their useful life. This projector and our analysis will be presented at a board meeting in June so that we can begin the replacement of projectors reaching the end of their useful life this summer.

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

As you are already aware, we are in year 3 of the 5 year HP Refresh project and will soon be refreshing 5 additional schools with new technology. In 2007-08 we began analyzing the life of the computers purchased for use by students and staff and determined the life of a computer could be extended from a 3 year cycle (in place at that time) to a 5 year cycle. Having that foundation in place we worked with schools to define a model for Technology in the classrooms that provided equity to all and still maintained a viable and supportable structure for Technology. In 2008-09, we negotiated a 5 year warranty and lease agreement and replacement plan that included end of lease donations to our Textcellence program. Original plans were to refresh all schools over a 3 year period, however, further reductions for 2009-2010 were warranted, and our 3 year refresh model became a 5 year model.

The 5-year Technology refresh plan remains vital as increased needs for access to Technology for students and staff in the classroom continue to grow and develop. Recent legislation requires schools to provide access to digital content (i.e. textbooks online) by the year 2014 and requires students to participate in online learning at a gradual pace commencing next year. Knowing our students and staff will be coming to school with many devices in the future (probably more than we can all imagine) our focus in the upcoming years will be to make digital content available regardless of type of device, and then look to providing technology to those that can't afford it rather than to all students. Our HP Refresh positions us nicely for this situation. As technologies further develop, a device of the future will likely become highly affordable for families and as such, a mandatory "school tool" for students.

The CrossPointe.net implementation is continuing and we are striving to reach a mid-summer implementation of the Finance/HR applications. This year we added five middle schools to our Gradebook pilot and for the start of the 11/12 school year all high schools will also be joining the efforts. As a result, we will also discontinue the use of SmartWeb. During the 11/12 school year our efforts on CrossPointe will continue with the implementation of the Student Information System. Though some hurdles had to be overcome, this project will still complete on budget.

While many Technology investments have been made over the past years, our direction is now stabilization, replenishment at end of life, and continual reevaluation of needs. We have revised our budgets accordingly for Technology tools to forecast replenishment over a longer period of time and thus extending the life of a particular product where possible.

Future capital projections include expansion of our Technology initiatives while still reducing costs overall. This is accomplished by continuing to improve methods for purchasing, continued

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

evolution of our shared data center with the County, maximizing our partnerships with current and future associates (ex. HP and Microsoft), continued exploration of virtualization capabilities and expanded use of cloud based products and resources. Our overall goal is to provide the most cost effective technology solutions to support our teachers, staff and students.

Facilities Services. The Facilities Services capital budget is targeted at projects earmarked for the preservation of asset value. The overall goal for these expenditures is to minimize the total life cycle cost for maintenance and operation of the asset. Therefore, funds are generally utilized to repair and replace building and site systems and components as they deteriorate over time, and at a point specifically within the life cycle which both minimizes the capital expense of replacement and daily maintenance and operational costs.

This deterioration of a system is predicable based on known lifecycles, industry standards and detailed in field inspections. As a basis for our expenditures, Facilities Services has developed condition life cycles for carpet and paint, heating and air conditioning systems, roofing, pavement, doors and windows, tracks, playgrounds, lighting, and most equipment in the District. In addition every space in the District is evaluated every five years for overall condition. This in-field evaluation is the basis for a facility condition index. This condition index rates the condition of the space. As this condition index rises, the condition of the space (building) is closely monitored and scheduled for renovation (the number rises as the building and associated systems age). The condition index scenarios, as well as the system lifecycles described above, are the basis for all capital expenditures within the Facilities Services budget. Over the next five years the department will continue to focus on asset preservation with an emphasis on reducing operational costs through investments which produce rebates through business partners like Florida Power and Light.

Carpet and Paint are currently based on a ten year life cycle. Expenditures for these items over the last five years have accounted for about 30% of the overall expenditures in Facilities Services. Over the next five years the expenditures will decrease. We have made a concerted effort to replace older carpet with upgraded carpet predicted to last 12-15 years. The carpet is easier to clean and is recyclable. Expenditures for carpet and paint will be about 16% of the total department expenditures for the next five years.

Our roofing budget has run about 17% of the department's expenditures over the last five years and will continue to run at that level. The focus has been to replace cap sheets on roofs which have reached the end of their lifecycle with reflective cap sheets. This allows us to extend the

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

warranty of the roof and receive a rebate from Florida Power and Light. It also decreases our utility costs for the building.

Over the last five years the Facilities Services Department has renovated several buildings across the district. The buildings were selected for renovation based on the FCI described above. These renovations included; five classroom buildings at Glenallen, the cafeteria at Bay Haven, repiping of potable water systems at Pineview and Laurel Nokomis, media center at Brentwood, restrooms at Venice Middle, Sarasota High, Booker High and North Port High, as well as upgrade of generator fuel tanks across the district and installation of new bus lifts at Transportation. Currently Building 3 at Alta Vista is under renovation (FCI 57). Over the last five years the funding for these renovations has run between 35- 50% of the total Facilities capital budget. Over the next five years the funding in this line item will be reduced. This reduction is a direct result of past renovations and rebuilds. Most of our buildings are in very good condition. Our 5-year plan for this fund includes renovation of Building 4 at Bay Haven (FCI = 62), Building 2 Alta Vista (FCI 43), and numerous lighting retrofits around the district as we transition from T12 fixtures to T8. In our 5-year plan this line item will be about 10% of our total budget.

One of the major expenditures in the 5-year Facilities budget is the renovation of the entire HVAC system at Booker Middle. Much like the projects currently funded as sister schools, Laurel Nokomis and Sarasota Middle School, the HVAC equipment at Booker Middle is beyond its useful life and we are experiencing a host of problems on a daily basis. Over the next five years we propose to transition a large portion of the Facilities Services Department budget to HVAC to concentrate our efforts on Booker Middle School. In addition, we will focus on adding Thermal Storage capabilities to several of our schools. Not only will we drastically reduce the cost of heating and air conditioning on those sites, we will capitalize on Florida Power and Light rebates. Specifically we plan to install these systems at Fruitville, Taylor Ranch, and Lamarque Elementary Schools and Oak Park School. On these projects alone we anticipate receiving approx. \$280,000 in direct rebates as well as a conservative estimate of \$80,000 per year in utility savings--more on this later. As we move through these projects in the next few years the HVAC funding line item in the Facilities Services budget will be approximately 36% of our expenditures each year.

Fund Balance. Given the revenues discussed earlier and the appropriations just discussed, leaves the District with a fund balance reflected at the top of the next page (also see page 3 of Tab 1): The amounts that are listed are only from the 1.5 Millage Fund and the Sales Tax Fund. The Fund 3397 Other Capital Funds and the Sale of Property Fund is restricted for unforeseen emergencies—much like a restricted fund reserve. This number, for the 2011/2012 budget

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

year, represents about 8.7% of total capital revenues. Please note these balances are cumulative. For example if the \$13,903,410 is appropriated in 2011-2012 all the other balances are then reduced by that amount.

<u>2011/2012</u>	<u>2012/2013</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
\$13,903,410	\$13,864,346	\$14,965,626	\$17,903,144	\$22,787,004

This fund balance remains after the following actions have been taken:

- Fully fund the rebuild of Booker High School
- Fully fund the rebuild of Venice High School
- Fully fund Phase III of the rebuild of the Sarasota County Technical Institute
- Fully fund the complete HVAC renovation at Sarasota Middle School (the current Board approved Capital Budget funds replacement of chillers but no renovation in the facility itself (including the air side of the HVAC system)). We've added \$8,400,000 to this project to complete the HVAC renovation.
- Fully fund the purchase of the seventh elementary school site in North Port (the Haberland site)
- Hold back a voluntary unrestricted fund reserve equal to 7.5% of the Millage and Sales Tax revenues.

In addition to this programmed fund reserve we believe we will be able to make additional funds available by delivering several projects under their Board approved budget. Collectively we estimate we will save between \$10 and \$14 million on the combination of the projects at Lakeview, Toledo Blade, Venice High, and SCTI. These numbers will firm up as we award GMPs.

What to do with this reserve? If we add the projected fund balance to the estimated savings above it suggests we expect to have between \$24 and \$28 million available for competing capital projects. Staff recommendation is that we invest the bulk of these funds at Sarasota High School. Let's review why.

COFTE. At Tab 3 are the latest Capital Outlay FTE projections from the State. At least two important conclusions can be drawn from this chart. First, though our total student enrollment projections decline marginally over each of the next three years, our COFTE projections decline by more than 1,000 as more students enter charter schools. In the 2014/2015 school year our total projections begin to show slow growth, but our COFTE projections decline for another few years. As a result, there is very little chance the Board will need to build any growth related schools for the foreseeable future. Second, given the COFTE projections in this chart it's clear that we will not be able to obtain state approval to add, or even replace, student stations in the

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

near future. We need to keep this in mind as part of any discussion of demolishing current facilities—once gone we won't be able to get them back—at least in the near term.

Capital Projects Matrix. Tab 4 is the latest Capital Projects Matrix. For purposes of this discussion we've included only those schools whose combined score is above 50. Recall several years ago we developed this matrix to help guide our discussions of competing projects based on several quantifiable factors. Note that as we address SCTI, Booker and Venice High Schools, and begin major renovation projects at both Sarasota and Booker Middle Schools, the list narrows to Sarasota High School, Pine View School and, Bay Haven, Gocio, and Garden Elementary Schools. Let's discuss each. To aid in this discussion we've included a Campus Comparison at Tab 5 and a summary of Recent Capital Investments at Tab 6.

Garden Elementary School. The facility at Garden Elementary is in great shape. The overall FCI on that campus is "8" (on a scale of 1-100). They are on this list largely because of the number of students still housed in portables and the fact that their core facilities will remain somewhat undersized. Last summer we undertook a portable project of nearly \$787,000. That project addressed long standing storm water run-off challenges and upgraded all the portables on the campus. Today this campus is in very good shape.

Gocio Elementary School. Gocio, like Garden, is on the list largely because of the number of students still housed in portables and the fact that their core facilities will remain somewhat undersized. At Tab 6 you can see that over the past several years we've made significant investments in the Gocio campus—including a major HVAC renovation project. While the portables at Gocio are not as new as those at Garden, they do remain clean, dry, and instructionally adequate and we believe we can keep them that way for relatively low cost. With the addition of a covered walkway to the portables the Gocio campus will be sustainable over the course of the 5-year plan.

Bay Haven School. Again referring to Tab 6 you can see that we've invested heavily in this campus over the past several years—including a new classroom wing and a major HVAC renovation. There remain four key areas of concern on this campus:

- the 1965 Media Center (Building 2);
- the 1953 Kitchen/Cafeteria (Building 3);
- the 1965 Art/Music building (Building 4); and
- the six portables on our smallest campus.

There has been some amount of renovation in buildings 3 and 4 which have improved them aesthetically. In addition, we plan a more extensive renovation of building 4 which will include

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

all new flooring, paint, lights, ceiling, cabinetry and HVAC. This work is scheduled to be accomplished during summer 11/12. While these permanent facilities are old and undersized relative to today's Educational Specifications, none are having a significant impact on the school's instructional program. Bay Haven does however have a real capital improvement need which will eventually need to be addressed.

Pine View School. Pine View School can be viewed as three capital needs. They are: 1) a classroom wing including adequate science labs: 2) core facility to accommodate current and projected enrollment: and 3) HVAC. The core capacity is small for current student enrollment but we are able to successfully feed all the students. HVAC systems are aging. The chiller plant is less a concern than individual air handlers. What this means is that we believe we can respond, at least in the near term, to HVAC needs on the campus within the current budget and without a major renovation. The challenge most impacting the instructional program at Pine View today is the need for more adequately equipped science labs. There are six labs currently in portables—four for middle grades and two high school. These portables lack sufficient water, power, and ventilation necessary for adequate science labs. We believe with some investment in the science labs on this campus, currently funded in the Facilities budget, Pine View School's instructional program will continue to be among the best in the country. At some point this campus will require some major renovation but pushing it outside the 5-year plan is acceptable.

That leads us to Sarasota High School. This campus has many facility challenges. Buildings 4, 5, and 42 have among the highest Facility Condition Indices in the District. The chiller plant on the west side of the campus is beyond its useful life. There are inadequate science labs on the west side of the campus and an insufficient number across the campus. While there are two gymnasiums, neither meets the current Educational Specification and the one air conditioned gym is very small with no ancillary facilities. There are two small, aging cafeterias. Building 4 was built in 1958 and contains 515 student stations. Its air handlers drown out instruction, the foundation is settling, and the instructional program has been removed from the entire second floor. This summer four science labs will be moved out of the first floor to allow teams to address facility concerns. The Castaldi formula would allow Building 4 to be demolished but DOE would not allow student stations to be rebuilt due to COFTE projections. Additionally, this structure is an architectural asset which the community expects the District to keep. There are excess student stations on this campus but they are not in the places to support a cohesive instructional program nor are some of them conducive to learning.

These factors lead us to believe the prudent place to invest remaining capital dollars is Sarasota High School. Toward that end we began a master planning process, and have developed initial

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

concept drawings. This process asked the question, “What are the challenges we’re trying to address and how do we best address them?” Very early on in this process it became obvious that planning to a “best case” campus layout was not fiscally feasible even in the long term so we looked at how we might impact the largest number of students over the longest time.

At Tab 7 are enrollment trends and projections for Sarasota High School. Based on these projections we started the planning process with a philosophy of supporting 2,000 students and a core of 2,400—to accommodate future growth—much like we did at Venice and Booker High Schools. Some of the assumptions we made are:

- Demolition of the following buildings is supported by Castaldi
 - Building 3 – west cafeteria [built 1970]
 - Building 4 – classrooms [1958]
 - Building 5 – west gym and lockers [1958]
 - Building 5 – classrooms [1970]
 - Building 6 – classrooms and offices [1969]
 - Building 15 – auditorium [1951]
 - Building 16 – east cafeteria [1951]
 - Building 17 – kitchen [1951]
 - Building 18 – PE lockers [1951]
 - Building 19 – east gym [1972]
 - Building 42 – classrooms [1958]
- Building 4 will be part of any long term solution
- School Avenue remains an open issue
- Eliminate the need for portables
- Solution must accommodate AICE
- For security and customer service reasons, improve traffic flow and create a recognizable and findable Main Office
- Plan to accommodate 2,000 students
- Core to accommodate 2,400
- Must be fiscally feasible in the mid- term
- Address instructional needs in the short-term
- Consider how to impact the most students over the longest time

Our master planning effort yielded many different “concepts” relative to renovations, demolition, rebuild, classroom utilization, and many other factors—all with an eye toward a solution that impacts the most students in the most significant way, and is fiscally feasible in the mid-term. Staff will present the concept plan at the workshop. Note that this will be a

Board Read-Ahead
Capital Plan Workshop
May 17, 2011

concept plan—meaning still a work in progress—but is intended to give the Board a feel for the direction we're recommending.

Energy Management. The last topic we'd like to discuss is our goal to invest in energy smart technologies. You see in the Facilities Department budget a fairly major change in spending philosophy. This change is due to two primary shifts. First, as a result of the construction of new schools and the renovation of many others, our need for funds to support future renovation has declined fairly significantly. Second, we recognize additional opportunities to invest some of those funds in technologies that will, in part, drive down our energy costs. Our plan is this. First, we create a revenue line funded in part with what once was renovation dollars and in part by FPL rebate dollars. Then we use that revenue stream to invest in energy saving technologies with an eye toward those technologies that produce a rebate and/or a high return on investment. Once installed, we'd recycle the new rebate back into this account to purchase more energy saving technologies (you can see one possible plan at Tab 8). Four examples of the kinds of technology we're looking to increase are: thermal (ice) storage, CO2 monitors, energy efficient lights, and reflective roofing. Each of these investments will not only generate the revenue associated with rebates but will drive down energy demands and our energy bill—paid for with general operating dollars.

Conclusion. While Capital Revenues are down dramatically, past decisions of the Board have postured us well to maintain our capital assets to efficiently and effectively support the success of our instructional programs. Past renovations of existing facilities, an aggressive rebuild program, and planned future investments that are within the scope of the 5-year budget are just a few examples of those decisions. We believe the most pressing large renovation need today is the campus of Sarasota High School. We also believe that we can significantly impact that campus within current revenues. Once complete at Sarasota High School, we'll need to keep an eye on both Pine View School and Bay Haven School but we're confident quality instruction will not be impacted by capital needs. Finally, there are some exciting developments regarding energy saving technologies. With a bit of foresight we can take advantage of many of those technologies in a way that has them both paying for themselves and significantly reducing demands on the general fund.

At this point we'd like to hear from the Board thoughts on:

- Competing interests;
- Is Sarasota High School the right next campus renovation;
- Does the 5-year plan make sense?