

Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting
September 11, 2019 @ 6:00 p.m.
Olentangy Administrative Offices- Berlin Room

In attendance for the Facilities Committee were:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Blythe, Chuck | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> McCaughey, Kevin |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryant, Angie- Proxy Votes | <input type="checkbox"/> Owens, Mark |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eisenhower, Frank | <input type="checkbox"/> Rogers, Greg |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fuller, Robert | <input type="checkbox"/> Scott, Mark |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hart, Bob | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Smith, Wesley |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurawitz, Sharon | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Troxell, Joe |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lawrence, Dan | <input type="checkbox"/> Yanka, David |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lowry, Alyssa | |

Also in attendance were Bruce Runyon (Fanning Howey), Bill O’Sullivan (Construction Analysis), Roger Bartz (BOE), Dave King (BOE), Emily Hatfield (OLSD), Jeff Gordon (OLSD) and Michelle Murphy (OLSD).

Sharon Jurawitz called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the agenda and the minutes from August 7, 2019.

Robert Fuller moved and Frank Eisenhower seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Wes Smith moved and Dan Lawrence seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the August 7, 2019 meeting. Motion carried.

New Facility Planning

Sharon Jurawitz commenced with a discussion relevant to new facility planning for the district. In a meeting that she recently attended with DLT members, a request was made to refer to the new facilities as follows:

- Elementary #16- please refer to as New Elementary #1
- Elementary #17- please refer to as New Elementary #2
- Middle School #6- please refer to as Middle School #6

District Treasurer, Emily Hatfield, was in attendance at the evening’s meeting. She shared that on 8/22/2019 she provided a bond update to the Board of Education. Members can view the presentation on the district’s website. At this time, she believes the bond request to be calculated at 126 million. This would include placing all three of the proposed new buildings on the ballot, as well as the purchase of the OAO building and other anticipated district expenses. It is believed that the district’s current facility needs would result in little to no new millage for residents, due to existing debt that is complete or nearly complete. The intent is to present the bond as a “stepped approach” to fund the district’s monetary needs. Using this method, the debt would be applied to the taxpayers as the debt is gradually incurred by the district.

Jeff Gordon thanked Ms. Hatfield for her update. He addressed the group and shared his concern regarding the creation of accurate price projections for the new buildings. Bid pricing across central Ohio continues to be coming in much higher than anticipated for projects, due to the booming construction market. As a result, Mr. Gordon is concerned that previous cost projections for new district buildings (\$238 per square foot) may be too conservative for the current market conditions. Based upon what they are seeing first-hand in their own professions, members in attendance were in agreement with Mr. Gordon's assessment of the volatile market conditions.

It was discussed that the district might want to increase its projected cost per square foot calculations, so that sufficient project funding is available for all three of the proposed new facilities. Ruscilli Construction indicated to Bruce Runyon that they would probably not bid on projects in the Spring of 2020 at a cost less than \$275.00 per square foot. Roger Bartz loosely calculated that the cost of New Elementary #1 would increase by about 3 million dollars using \$275.00 per sq. ft.

Members entered into a lengthy discussion as to the cost per square foot to use for New Elementary #1. While members believed that the district's bid cost would come in less than \$275.00 per square foot, they suggested that the district modify its cost per square foot calculations closer to \$275.00 per square foot, so as not to run short on funding for the sizable projects. Roger Bartz shared that he would like to see a range of prices from \$238.00 per sq. ft. to \$275.00 per sq. ft. in 5% increments. Frank Eisenhower, Bruce Runyon, Bill O'Sullivan and Jeff Gordon discussed that increasing the price per square foot for the proposed projects presented a minimal, but controllable risk to the district.

At this time, Bruce Runyon's largest concern for New Elementary #1 is the finalization of a site for the project. Jeff Gordon shared that he had attended a Berlin Township zoning meeting on 9/10/2019. At the meeting, the developer had obtained the necessary approvals for their subdivision on Peachblow Road (Berlin Meadows). Unfortunately, little to no site development will be complete in the subdivision at the time that the district will need to commence with the construction of New Elementary #1. It is likely that the school district will be the first entity on the site and will need to install a temporary road to be able to proceed with the construction process for New Elementary #1.

While members were glad to hear that the subdivision was finally progressing forward, they believed it to be unfortunate that the site development would not be further along at the time that the district would need to commence with construction on New Elementary #1. Wes Smith expressed concern that the district would lose leverage with the developer by needing to start construction on New Elementary #1 prior to any of the site infrastructure being completed by the developer first. He encouraged the district to account for additional site costs in the project budget that might result from needing access to the site so early in the site development process.

Mr. Bill O'Sullivan from Construction Analysis was in attendance at the meeting. He shared a PowerPoint presentation with members discussing the Construction Manager at Risk construction delivery process versus the Single Prime construction delivery process. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

Mr. O'Sullivan discussed both construction delivery processes, as they would apply to the district's New Elementary #1 project. He reviewed the pros and cons of each delivery process (as it would

apply to the elementary project) in current market conditions. A general discussion followed the presentation with comments as follows:

CMAR

- Members believe the CMAR professional fee to be about 2% in Ohio for educational facilities and 3-4% for non-educational facilities.
- Construction contingency is generally 2% of the project cost and is at the sole discretion of the CMAR to spend during the construction process.
- OLSD arranged for an “informal” approval process with Gilbane Construction for construction contingency expenses when building Berlin High School. OLSD somewhat successfully controlled the construction contingency expenditures for Berlin High School using this process. However, it is typically very difficult to control the CMAR’s spending within the construction contingency amount allotted.
- Most of the design work for New Elementary #1 would be completed by the time that the CMAR would be contracted for the project. As a result, the CMAR would have little to no involvement in the design process for the project.
- The biggest risk to the district using the CMAR process for New Elementary #1 would be cost.
- The benefits to the district using the CMAR process for New Elementary #1 would be the ability to secure a contractor base for the project in the current booming construction market, which would potentially attract more contractors to the project and better meet the construction schedule.
- The CMAR is able to be “selective” when choosing bids submitted. This should result in better qualified contractors for the district.
- GMP would not be determined until there was a completed design and specification package available for the project.

Single Prime

- Cost is the largest benefit in using this delivery method for New Elementary #1.
- The district would be required to select the low bidder for products and services related to the construction of the project. This could result in less than qualified vendors working on the project. This could ultimately slow down or delay the construction timeline.
- The ability to secure qualified construction contractors for each phase of the building process (in this booming construction market) is believed to be the largest risk to the district using this construction delivery method.

Member Wes Smith asked Bill O’Sullivan and Bruce Runyon which construction method they would recommend the district use for New Elementary #1 in the current construction market.

Mr. O’Sullivan believed the CMAR delivery method to “make the most sense” in the current construction market. This is because the district has built this elementary design before and as a result, he was confident that the district would be able to keep costs down using the CMAR delivery method.

Mr. Runyon shared that under normal construction market circumstances, he would typically find the CMAR process to complicate the construction process. However, in this unusual construction market, he too believes the CMAR delivery method to “make sense” for the district’s Elementary #16 project, due to the CMAR’s ability to attract more and better contractors to the project.

Member Kevin McCaughey was in agreement with Mr. Runyon’s assessment to use the CMAR delivery method for the New Elementary #1 project.

Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to recommend that the district proceed with the CMAR delivery method for New Elementary #1, with an option for a CMAR addendum for New Elementary #2 and Middle School #6. Wes Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Fuller was opposed to the motion. All remaining members were in support of the motion. Angie Bryant provided a proxy vote in support of the motion. Motion carried.

The discussion commenced forward to address the need for an Owner’s Representative for the New Elementary #1 project.

Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to recommend that the district contract the services of Bill O’Sullivan of Construction Analysis as the Owner’s Representative for the district for New Elementary School #1 project with the option to contract additional services through an addendum for New Elementary #2 and Middle School #6. Frank Eisenhower seconded the motion.

All in attendance were in support of the motion. None were opposed. Angie Bryant provided a proxy vote in support of the motion. Motion carried.

Enrollment Planning

Angie Bryant and Sharon Jurawitz volunteered to participate on the Enrollment Planning Subcommittee to create and report this year’s enrollment projection calculations to the Board of Education. The subcommittee met with district staff on 9/9/2019 to discuss this year’s enrollment reporting. Using various data from the meeting, consultants, district staff and area municipalities, Sharon created a PowerPoint summarizing this year’s enrollment projections to share with members at the 9/11/2019 Facilities Committee meeting.

The projections were based upon 700 new housing units per year, which is the same model utilized for projections in 2018. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available upon request through the district’s Business Office.

Sharon reviewed the report with members in attendance and noted some of the following changes from the 2018 reporting:

- Some preschool classroom space has been added for the district to use at the new DACC facility.

- Kindergarten enrollment is slightly high this year. It is believed that this is an anomaly and a drop in kindergarten enrollment is predicted for next year.
- Middle School space is needed even sooner than previously anticipated. Lunch room space is running at full capacity. Additional middle school space could be used at this time.

A general discussion commenced relevant to the information shared within the reporting. The district's margin of error is very minimal using the current projections model. For the past several years, the reporting data closely parallels the actual enrollment data. As a result, the subcommittee is hopeful that they might be able to utilize the current projections model for the next five years.

Sharon advised that the BOE and the district would like the enrollment projections reporting presented to the BOE in September of 2019 instead of November of 2019 as normally scheduled.

Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to approve the enrollment projections reporting reviewed at this evening's meeting for presentation to the Board of Education at the 9/26/2019 meeting. Joe Troxell seconded the motion.

All in attendance were in support of the motion. None were opposed. Angie Bryant provided a proxy vote in support of the motion. Motion carried.

Influencers Update and General Business

Jeff Gordon shared that the coordinators for the OOHS Indoor Batting Facility failed to obtain the financing needed for the project. The Boosters are not committing the funds for the project in the amount that the project coordinators presented. As a result, the project is now on hold until all financing issues can be resolved.

Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to adjourn the Facilities Committee meeting at 8:21 p.m.

Kevin McCaughey moved and Wes Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The next tentatively scheduled meeting is for Wednesday, October 2, 2019 at 6:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Berlin Room at the district's Administrative Offices.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Gordon