

Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting
June 10, 2015 @ 6:00 p.m.
Olentangy Administrative Offices

In attendance for the Facilities Committee were:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Au, Ralph | <input type="checkbox"/> Hart, Bob |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bull, Eric | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurawitz, Sharon |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bryant, Angie | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lowry, Alyssa |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cailteux, Andy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oliver, Gene |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eisenhower, Frank | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott, Mark |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fuller, Robert | <input type="checkbox"/> Seils, Rich |

Also in attendance were Dave King (BOE), Roger Bartz (BOE), Mark Ianotta (ABC Committee), Mark Raiff (OLSD Executive Director of Academics), Jeff Gordon (Business Office), and Michelle Murphy (Business Office).

Ralph Au called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the agenda and the minutes.

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

Mark Scott moved and Sharon Jurawitz seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2015 meeting. Motion carried.

Procedures for Projects Donated to the District

This agenda item was deferred for discussion until the August 5, 2015 meeting due to the large amount of meeting content needing to be addressed regarding district expansion options. A revised flowchart and documents detailing the process was handed out to members in attendance for review and discussion to take place at the August 2015 meeting.

ABC Committee Update

Mark Ianotta from the district's Attendance Boundary Committee (ABC Committee) was in attendance at the evening's meeting. Mr. Ianotta has been involved with the ABC Committee since 1997 and has seen many changes within the district throughout the years.

Recently, the ABC Committee held an organizational meeting in preparation to review the district's current enrollment situation. Mark Raiff shared that the meeting was very good and that several of the district's school principals were in attendance at the meeting. The building principals were actively involved in the meeting's discussion and were able to provide valuable insight to the ABC Committee members. It was speculated that if the district's previous parameters (of a maximum enrollment of 1600 students at each of the district's high schools) were used, that High School #4 would most likely already exist. To date, student populations at each of the district's high schools have been slightly over 1600 students and each have managed to maintain a quality educational environment. However, student enrollment within the district is anticipated to continue to rise. By the 2018-2019 school year, if High School #4 were to be open,

each of the four high schools would still have over 1600 students in each of them. He clarified that this scenario were if the students could actually be equally distributed within each of the high schools and also if the student growth rate were to continue within the district as anticipated.

Currently, the committee is focusing on both old and new parameters relevant to district growth. The old parameters for the ABC Committee focused on the opening of new school buildings within the district to best accommodate new student enrollment growth. The new parameters for the committee involve focusing on the impact of aging subdivisions within the district (in combination with new residential development) to identify student populations within the district.

The ABC Committee has noticed over the years that most members only understand the specific enrollment challenges and issues within their immediate area of the district. As a result, the committee strives to convey to its members information regarding issues that impact the entire district and school system.

The ABC Committee is anxious to start their review of the district's current student enrollment status. However, Mr. Ianotta explained that the best data for the committee to review will not be available until after 8/1/2015 (when the district obtains more accurate enrollment numbers for the 2015-2016 school year). As a result, the committee will not be able to commence with a detailed enrollment analysis and related recommendations for several months after the start of the new school year.

Building Expansion Options

Sharon Jurawitz led members in a discussion relevant to building expansion options at the middle school and high school levels for the district. A copy of the summary was provided to the Facilities Committee members at this evening's meeting and is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

If district growth continues as projected, the district's high school student population will be in excess of 7,000 students by the 2018-2019 school year. If the students could be equally distributed amongst the district's existing three high schools, each school would have to house in excess of 2300 students in 2018-2019. Per Ms. Jurawitz, each of the high school principals has already made internal adjustments to ensure that the current student populations (which are much less than 2300) can be accommodated. As a result, the "do nothing" option previously discussed by Facilities Committee members has been removed from the list of options that might have been considered for the management of district enrollment growth.

Ms. Jurawitz shared that she believed there to be significant risks associated with options #1 and #2 which rely on student participation and interest in a centralized "STEM" or "Academy" program to draw "student seats" away from the district's primary high schools. It is not thought that these programs in the short-term (or in the long-term) will be able reduce enough student seats from each of the sites to alleviate any over-crowding issues. Recruiting teachers to teach at centralized sites is also an issue. Teachers, like students, do not always have an interest in traveling to an off-site location. Transportation and scheduling issues are also created with a centralized STEM program and need to be addressed. It is believed that the best (and safest) way to reduce these risks is for students to be able to remain at their primary high school sites.

Members briefly discussed options available at the Delaware Area Career Center (DACC) as another way of reducing student seats at the three high schools. Similar to the "STEM" or "Academy" concept, Mark Raiff shared that it is just difficult to get students to leave their primary high school sites for these educational opportunities. Additionally, it was felt that there was a public stigma associated with career center programs in that students did not view them as a path

to four year college experience. As a result, it was determined that DACC programs would most likely not be able to effectively provide enough relief to the district in reducing student seats from each of the high schools.

As a result, Committee members proceeded in a discussion relevant to new construction options for the district to address student enrollment growth. Options #3-#5 in Ms. Jurawitz's presentation addressed construction options ranging from additions to each of the high schools to the construction of High School #4 for the district. Each of these options had merit, as well as, pros and cons associated with each of them. None of the "construction" options were thought to be able to be ready "in time" to address the growing enrollment challenges at Liberty High School. Regardless of the final option selected by the Board of Education, it was thought that modular classrooms may be needed temporarily at LHS until a more permanent solution could be completed.

Operating costs for all five district expansion options discussed were found to be surprisingly similar. Construction costs and construction build time were noted to be the primary differences amongst all five expansion options identified. Should High School #4 be selected as the preferred option, it was felt that the soonest that it could be ready for use would be the 2018-2019 school year. However, for this to happen it would need to be fast-tracked onto the March 2016 ballot (with a submittal deadline of December of 2015). This would also require that drawings and site planning for the school commence immediately. A two-year construction period was the fastest that members believed that High School #4 could be accomplished. However, a three-year construction period for High School #4 was believed to be more manageable. After some discussion, members in attendance determined that it would be most realistic for High School #4 to be ready for operation for the 2019-2020 school year.

Should construction time be of great concern, members discussed that Option #1 (lease/build-to suit facility) would be the quickest to implement because it would not require a ballot issue to implement. BOE representative Dave King advised members that they should not consider Option #1 to be a "temporary solution" to the district's enrollment growth issues because the terms of the build-to-suit option would require a 20-year lease.

Going forward, both BOE representatives in attendance requested that arrangements be made by the district to share the information presented in Ms. Jurawitz's presentation with several other of the district's committees. They asked that the district's Finance and Audit committee be presented with the information so that they could establish the millage needed for the costs associated with each project. They also asked that the information be shared with the district's ABC Committee, as they have recently been charged with the task of analyzing the enrollment at each of the district's buildings. Jeff Gordon advised that he would share the information with the primary members of the district's Cost Efficiency Committee as well.

BOE members requested that Facilities Committee members be prepared to present the same District Expansion Options (including previous options ruled out) to the Board of Education at the August Board of Education meeting. BOE members will not be looking for an official recommendation from the Facilities Committee as to a single preferred option from the five options presented. Mr. King and Mr. Bartz believe the information and research provided by the Facilities Committee to date to be sufficient for presentation to the BOE and that the options and related costs will speak for themselves. BOE members shared that any of the five final options identified were viable in addressing the district's enrollment growth in some manner. They advised that after the Facilities Committee's presentation to the BOE, that the BOE would discuss and select the final option(s) to be used for for community surveys and ballot purposes. The BOE

will be looking to the OLSD Academic staff for their recommendation when making this determination.

BOE members in attendance clarified that regardless of the option(s) selected, that some boundary adjustments may still need to be made to better balance the enrollment numbers in each of the schools. Short-term boundary changes may also need to be made to alleviate enrollment at the most crowded district sites. The BOE will be looking to the ABC Committee for these recommendations.

General Business

Chairman Ralph Au shared with members in attendance that Facilities Committee member Mr. John Schuette had passed away recently. Mr. Schuette was a charter member of the Facilities Committee who had been volunteering on the committee since 1996.

Chairman Au called for a motion for the district to recognize Mr. Schuette's time served on the Facilities Committee and his contributions to the district.

All members in attendance were in support of the motion to recognize Mr. Schuette's contributions to the Facilities Committee. No members were opposed. Motion carried.

The Business Office will follow-up with materials in recognition of Mr. Schuette's contributions as a district volunteer and forward the items reflecting the committee's and the district's appreciation to Mr. Schuette's family.

Currently, there is not a Facilities Committee meeting scheduled for July of 2015. After brief discussion, it was determined that good progress had been made with the Building Expansion Options project and that a special meeting in July for all committee members would not be necessary. The next meeting of the Facilities Committee should remain as scheduled for August 5, 2015.

Non- Traditional Projects

The only non-traditional project incomplete at this time is the new baseball press box at Olentangy High School. There are a few construction issues that remain outstanding that are in contention between the project's construction company and the architect. A third-party such as Bill O'Sullivan may need to be brought in by the district to bring final resolution to this project.

Influencer's Update

BOE members advised that 1st and 2nd rounds of interviews for the position of district Superintendent are scheduled for the 2nd and 3rd weeks of June. The BOE hopes to extend an offer to one of the candidates and officially approve the new district Superintendent by the June 25, 2015 Board of Education meeting.

OLSD is still seeking "fairness in funding" from The State of Ohio. It is thought that the Senate's budget has been received. Information will be shared with the district and the committee once it is finalized and received from the State.

Chairman Ralph Au called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Robert Fuller moved and Sharon Jurawitz seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 p.m. Motion Carried.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 5, 2015. The meeting will be the district's Administrative Offices.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Gordon