

Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting
April 3, 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 | <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 type="checkbox"/> Seils, Rich |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurawitz, Sharon | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Smith, Wesley |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lawrence, Dan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Troxell, Joe |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lowry, Alyssa | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yanka, David |

Also in attendance were Bruce Runyon (Fanning Howey), Bill O'Sullivan (Construction Analysis), Adam Belinger (OOHS Booster Treasurer), Matt Lattig (OLSD), Tracy MacDowell (Olentangy 4 Kids), Dave King (BOE), Missy Griffith (OLSD), 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 February 6, 2019.

Angie Bryant moved and Dan Lawrence seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Angie Bryant moved and Dan Lawrence seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the February 6, 2019 meeting. Motion carried.

Elementary Additions Update

Jeff Gordon shared that the classroom additions are now under roof and still progressing on schedule. Arrowhead Elementary is currently progressing the fastest. However, construction at Alum Creek Elementary and Wyandot Run Elementary is not far behind. Mr. Gordon has been pleased with the project to date and noted that working with Elford Construction has been a good experience thus far.

Security Vestibules

Jeff Gordon advised that the construction bid for the security vestibules at ACES, AES, WRES and SRES has been completed. McHugh Construction submitted the low bid for the project and BOE approval is anticipated on 4/11/2019. Design renderings for the vestibules were shown to the members in attendance. There are two styles of vestibules (due to space constraints at the different sites). The vestibules at ACES and WRES are wider than the vestibule designs for AES and SRES. Construction is anticipated to commence soon after BOE approval for the project.

New Facility Planning (Part One)

Mr. Gordon recently met with Joe Thomas from Metro Development, relevant to the status of land potentially available to the district for an elementary school in the Berlin Meadows subdivision. The subdivision is still pending review/approval with the township. If approved, it is likely that the developer will possibly be willing to donate a piece of land in the subdivision to the district to construct a new elementary school (#16). Due to the utility infrastructure available in the area, the district would have an interest in constructing the new elementary facility as soon as the summer of 2020 should all necessary funding and approvals be secured.

Due to a lack of existing utility infrastructure in the Curve/Sweeney Rd. area, it is anticipated that the land the district currently owns in this area would be utilized for Elementary #17 and Middle School #6. It is hoped that by the time that the schools are needed by the district, most of the necessary utilities will be at (or close to) the site owned by the district. This is preferred by the district in keeping project costs as low as possible for the new facilities.

In preparation for the construction projects, the district recently issued an RFQ for Surveyor-of-Record (SOR) services. The district will name one primary SOR, but will have the ability to utilize the services of any of the firms submitting qualifications to the district for the RFQ.

Proposed Hitting and Pitching Facility at OOHS

Adam Belinger (OOHS Booster Treasurer) and Matt Lattig (OLSD) were in attendance at the meeting to present preliminary design work to the committee for a proposed baseball hitting and pitching facility at Orange High School. The facility will be similar to the facility already constructed and in use at Liberty High School. A copy of the presentation documents is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

At this time, the project planners are trying to finalize a location for the facility on the OOHS campus. There are two locations on the site that could accommodate the facility well. An area with the flattest ground with little water run-off is preferred. General attributes of the facility at this time are as follows:

- Size of 70' x 104' x 14'.
- No concrete floor (turf to be installed).
- Four large garage doors.
- Two steel exit doors.
- Interior walls to be reinforced.
- No restrooms.

At this time, the approximate cost estimates for the project are as follows:

- Build estimate- \$86,893.67
- Site work- \$4,000-\$5,000
- Total Facility Cost- \$200,000

Logistics regarding the project are as follows:

- DIY pole barns is providing the structure.
- The Boosters would prepare the site.
- There is not a general construction contractor for the project.
- The Boosters and individual vendors would work through the permitting process.
- Utilities to be connected from the existing infrastructure on the adjacent hillside.

Facilities Committee members in attendance and Mr. Gordon expressed the following concerns:

- All in attendance advised the Boosters/project coordinators to hire a general contractor.
- Without a general contractor, members believe that the project will become unnecessarily more costly and that deadlines will not efficiently be met.
- Members worry about construction and site prep errors being made (due to the lack of a general contractor in charge of the project).
- The project may be too complex to implement without the assistance of a construction professional in charge of the project.
- Members shared their belief that a general contractor would actually save the Boosters money in the end. This is based upon the professional knowledge and experience that a professional contractor has with the site work, permitting and inspection processes.
- A turn-around for emergency response equipment will most likely be required.
- Time for softball practice in the new facility will likely be a requirement by the district.

Mr. Gordon agreed to meet with the Boosters on Friday, 4/5/2019 at 1:00 p.m. to further discuss the project. The Boosters/project coordinators were urged to take into account the suggestions made to them by the Facilities Committee and to work toward finalizing the details of their plan more. The group was invited back to present to the Facilities Committee again on 5/1/2019.

New Facility Planning (Part 2)

Mr. Bill O'Sullivan from Construction Analysis was in attendance at the meeting. He prepared a report comparing three construction delivery methods to share with the Facilities Committee. A copy of Mr. O'Sullivan's report is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

Mr. O'Sullivan is retired from Turner Construction and has also acted as Owner's Representative for the district on numerous construction projects. His lengthy professional history with the district (in various roles) has allowed him to compile the data for a unique report for the district. The report compares the following three construction delivery methods:

- Owner's Representative (OR)- (Method used to construct Orange HS in 2006.)
- Construction Manager Agent (CMA)- (Method used to construct Liberty HS in 2001.)
- Construction Manage at Risk (CMR)- (Method used to construct Berlin HS in 2018.)

The district has experience with each of the three construction delivery methods (as noted above for three of its newest high school facilities). This situation is unique for any school district to have experienced. Olentangy now has first-hand knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of each construction delivery process. This should allow the district to continue to make strong choices for the district that:

- Maintain construction costs for new district facilities as some of the lowest around.
- Procure competent and experienced construction professionals to build its new facilities.
- Secure a skilled and efficient vendor base.
- Limit construction errors and delays.
- Reduce the need for change orders and contingency expenses.
- Keep costs within the original budget identified for the project.

A quick look at each of the construction delivery methods finds the following:

Construction Manager at Risk (CMR):

- Typically the most costly of the construction delivery methods.
- Typical fee is around 2% of the project cost. (BHS was 1.8%).
- The CMR holds “contractual control” and risk and for the entire project.
- The CMR’s first priority is to obtain sufficient project estimates to protect/reduce their project risk/liability.
- OLSD is not contractually at risk with the subcontractors for the project..
- OLSD does not get to select the subcontractors for the project.
- OLSD could benefit from the influence of a well-respected CMR construction firm during times of “booming construction” (when subcontractors might not otherwise be readily available for new construction projects).
- Contingency funds are incorporated into the project contract and controlled by the CMR. These funds need to be monitored closely during the construction process because it is too easy for the CMR to want to default to the use of these funds (as a “slush-fund”) when challenges/non-conforming work is present during the construction process.

Construction Manager Agent (CMA):

- The CMA is not performing construction operations.
- The CMA is not contractually responsible for the project when it runs behind schedule or over budget.
- OLSD is contractually at risk with the subcontractors for the project.
- OLSD has control over the subcontractor selection for the project.
- OLSD could run into challenges securing subcontractors for a project during times of booming construction, but could benefit from professional vendor relationships that the CMA has established.
- OLSD maintains control over the contingency funds for the project.
- CMA management fees are typically lower than CMR fees.

Owner’s Representative (OR):

- The OR is not performing construction operations on behalf of the district.
- The OR is not contractually responsible for the project when it runs behind schedule or over budget.
- OLSD is contractually at risk with the subcontractors for the project.
- OLSD could run into challenges securing subcontractors for a project during times of booming construction.
- OLSD maintains control over the contingency funds for the project.
- The architectural firm for the project takes on the responsibility for change orders, pay applications and similar paperwork for the OR construction project.
- Due to lower construction management fees, a project delivered using the OR method is typically the least costly.
- OLSD has successfully delivered projects using the OR method in the past. However, very few school districts are able to achieve this because they are not fortunate enough to have the professional support and guidance of firms such as Fanning/Howey and Construction Analysis. The staff from these firms really goes

the “extra-mile” for OLSD (which has been the key element to delivering successful construction projects with low project costs).

In a general discussion following Mr. O’Sullivan’s presentation the following was reviewed:

- Frank Eisenhower shared that professionally he does not prefer the CMR method of construction.
- Members discussed that it would appear that the CMR process makes the client pay for unforeseen construction errors/expenses in advance as a part of the contract. The CMA and OR processes do not.
- Joe Troxell advised that professionally he can see the advantages of the CMR process when the construction schedule is tight and the job needs to be built quickly. However, he shared that there are so many disclaimers within the CMR contract that the actual risk to the CMR vendor is very little.
- Kevin McCaughey mentioned that most construction projects over 30 million dollars in cost are now contracted using the CMR process.
- Joe Troxell added that most new school building projects in Ohio are now contracted using the CMR process.
- Jeff Gordon added the following to the general discussion:
 - He like working with Gilbane during the CMR process and would work with them again. They had some good contractors that the district benefitted from.
 - However, he felt that the district did not benefit from Gilbane’s preconstruction knowledge for BHS, due to the replication factor of the building design. Because the design was previously used at OOHS and LHS the district was already familiar with the project specifications and cost per square foot for the project.
 - Gilbane did try to get OLSD to reduce its scope of work for the BHS project because their cost projections were higher, but the district would not do it.
 - Fanning/Howey and Construction Analysis really held Gilbane accountable for all of the contingency dollars spent on the BHS project.
 - The busy construction market may have resulted in Gilbane proceeding more tentatively on contractor issues than they might have under normal conditions.
 - Again, Fanning Howey and Construction Analysis have been the key to the district’s success with construction projects. With their guidance, the district is able to successfully deliver projects using the OR or CMA delivery methods. Without them, the CMR process would probably be the preferred delivery method for construction projects.
 - In a booming construction market, Mr. Gordon is not certain that the district will be able to get quality vendors to bid on a project if it is OR or CMA. This is a unique circumstance that the district has not had to address for many years.
- Bruce Runyon agreed. Securing a vendor base for new district construction projects is important. He is concerned that the local vendors may not be as familiar with district construction projects at this time (as they were when the district was building one school per year).
- Joe Troxell also shared concern in securing a vendor base for upcoming district construction projects. However, he advised that if the district were to plan three construction projects, that they would not all need to use the same delivery method.

Members thanked Mr. O'Sullivan for compiling the information for this unique reporting opportunity and for sharing it with the Committee. Members in attendance agreed that each delivery method had its strengths and its weaknesses (dependent upon the economy and other circumstances surrounding the proposed construction project). Members were also in agreement that the cleaner the project plans and specifications were up front, the more the construction process would benefit from them, regardless of the delivery method.

Jeff Gordon proceeded to share an updated version of the project pricing for new elementary and middle school facilities for the district. A copy of his cost estimates are available upon request through the district's Business Office. His costs are not based upon using the CMR process at this time. Construction costs for projects bid out by other school districts are coming in high at this time. As a result, OLSD project costs have been escalated upward to \$230.00 per square foot (in anticipation of higher than normal bid costs). The new storm shelter requirements are also causing the "footprints" for the districts new building designs to become larger, resulting in higher project pricing for the district than experienced in the past.

Members discussed that both Big Walnut and Dublin would have projects far enough along to provide good cost information soon to OLSD (prior to the start of any of its projects). Kevin McCaughey shared that he would also reach out to Southwestern City Schools for information relevant to any current projects that they are working on.

Members stressed the importance of finalizing locations and the drawings for its proposed projects soon. It was felt that accurate pricing for levy planning purposes could not be achieved without this information. Bruce Runyon hoped that the district would be able to obtain approval to proceed with the design/project drawings soon, as he will be drawing much of the structure "from scratch" due to new energy code and storm shelter requirements. Mr. Gordon hoped to obtain approval to proceed with the architectural process in May 2019.

Influencers Update and General Business

Emily Hatfield was in attendance at the meeting and discussed the new millage model to date. She shared that it would likely be difficult to proceed with a no new millage levy for both elementary facilities and a middle school due to the purchase of OAO and other operating expenses that will need to be included. The amount of state funding provided to the district will largely impact the millage that is brought to levy in March of 2020. The district will likely not have final information regarding the state funding that will be provided to OLSD until June of 2019. A levy resolution and costs will need to be approved by the Board of Education in November of 2019. Until that time, her office will be working on several financial models in preparation for the levy. These models will be shared with the Facilities Committee as they are closer to being finalized.

Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to adjourn the Facilities Committee meeting at 8:32 p.m.

Frank Eisenhower moved and Dan Lawrence seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The next scheduled meeting is for Wednesday, May 1, 2019 at 6:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Berlin Room at the district's Administrative Offices.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Gordon