

**Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting**  
**August 5, 2015 @ 6:00 p.m.**  
**Olentangy Administrative Offices**

**In attendance for the Facilities Committee were:**

- |                                                       |                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Au, Ralph         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hart, Bob        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bull, Eric        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurawitz, Sharon |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryant, Angie     | <input type="checkbox"/> Lowry, Alyssa               |
| <input checked="" 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), Julie Wagner Feasel (BOE), Kevin King (Cost Efficiency), Bruce Runyon (Fanning Howey), Scott Leopold & Associates (DeJong-Richter), Randy Wright (OLSD), 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.

**Gene Oliver moved and Angie Bryant seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.**

**Sharon Jurawitz moved and Angie Bryant seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2015 meeting. Motion carried.**

***ABC Committee Update***

Angie Bryant of the district's Facilities Committee is also a member of the district's Attendance Boundary Committee (ABC Committee) and was in attendance at the evening's meeting. Angie provided an update to Facilities Committee members as to the progress of the district's ABC Committee to date. She advised that the ABC Committee has only had one additional meeting since June. At that meeting, redistricting "guidelines" that were compiled at the first meeting were summarized and discussed. The current redistricting focus for the committee has been for the 2016-2017 school year and to date only the elementary schools and middle schools have been reviewed. The ABC Committee really needs the actual district enrollment numbers for the 2015-2016 school year to begin their analysis in depth.

Scott Leopold of DeJong-Richter shared that building permits appear to be remaining constant at this time throughout the district. He believed the Olentangy School district to be approximately 60-65 percent "developed" at this time. Mr. Leopold's growth modeling has researched the Worthington School district as a comparison to the growth that OLSD is experiencing. He shared that the challenge is that housing does not turn over in a regular and predictable manner. As a result, creating district enrollment projections based upon subdivisions and subdivision age can be difficult. DeJong-Richter is watching older subdivisions like Oak Creek and HighMeadows Village closely for a "recycling" of new students in the district. He advised that he was currently

working on some redistricting guidelines to be shared with the Board of Education in September or October.

### ***Building Expansion Options***

Sharon Jurawitz shared with members in attendance a PowerPoint presentation relevant to building expansion options at high school level for the district. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

Page number two of Ms. Jurawitz's report explained that based on last year's enrollment modeling, that all three high schools in the district will be in excess of 2200 students by the 2019-2020 school year.

Page number three of Ms. Juarwitz's report detailed a 50 year high school enrollment projection for the district using three projection models. The "500" building permit model appears to be the model that most closely matches district enrollment projections based upon past data. However, it is predicted that this year's data might show an upward trend in the modeling somewhere closer to the 750 model than it has been in the past.

Page number four of Ms. Jurawitz's report focused specifically on the "500" building permit model and its projected data for the district. At this time, it appears that the 500 model most closely matches the 10-year forecast for the district, as well as, the actual housing starts for the district. The model also details that at the time that OHS is fifty years old (in 2040), that the district is predicted to have over 7200 high school students using this model.

Page number five of Ms. Jurawitz's report detailed some of the district high school expansion options that were initially reviewed by the Facilities Committee, but were not included in the final three option selections due to a lack of perceived compatibility or viability.

Page number six of Ms. Jurawitz's report identified three high school expansion options that were perceived to be the most viable by the Facilities Committee to date. The options considered to be the most viable at this time based upon current enrollment projections included the following:

Option A- New construction of one central "Academy" building or build a new middle school and turn Shanahan Middle School into an "Academy" site.

Option B- New construction of an addition to each high school building or one free-standing educational building at each high school

Option C- New construction of High School #4

It was noted that there may be some serious site development issues at Orange High School should Option B be selected.

Page number seven of Ms. Jurawitz's report provided an enrollment analysis of Options A, B, and C relevant to the 300, 500, and 750 unit building permit models for the district. Using the 500 unit model the following enrollments would be predicted for the options as follows:

Option A- The "Academy" would need to house approximately 1563 students and each of the three remaining high schools would have about 2000 students at each of them.

Option B- Each of the three high schools would have a projected enrollment of approximately 2521 students at each campus.

Option C- Each of the four high schools would have a projected enrollment of approximately 2035 students.

Page number eight of Ms. Jurawitz's report presented a list of non-monetary considerations to be evaluated when considering Options A, B, or C. The items to be considered relevant to each option included land availability, parking, transportation/shuttle needs, class scheduling, educational approach, program availability, extra-curricular impact, district boundaries, public

opinion, and voting considerations. The over-all construction timeline should also be considered when determining which option best meets the district's needs.

Page number nine of Ms. Jurawitz's report provided an analysis by cost for Options A, B, and C. The costs provided included base construction costs, related remodeling costs, and soft costs such as required tap and inspections fees. Using the data identified above, the projected costs for Options A, B, and C were projected to be as follows:

Option A- 65.8 million construction cost and 6.1 million annual operating cost

Option B- 53.5 million construction cost and 8.7 million annual operating cost

Option C- 68.5 million construction cost and 12.3 million annual operating cost

Page number ten of Ms. Juarwitz's report illustrated the anticipated construction timelines. The preferred construction timeline for Options A, B, or C is 31-34 months after community voting. Realistically, the construction timeline might closely resemble that of Orange High School which was a 32 month process after the vote was approved. The construction timeline for Liberty High School was 28 months after vote approval, but the project was "fast-tracked" and it is unlikely that this timeline could be replicated for a new project.

At the conclusion of Ms. Jurawitz's presentation, a general discussion was held by Facilities Committee members relevant to the information and options presented. Jeff Gordon of the district's Business Office was quick to point out to members that regardless of the long-term options preferred, that short-term challenges would need to be identified and addressed to accommodate the rapidly growing student population at Liberty High School. Members in attendance were in agreement and thought that these challenges could be discussed and resolutions identified at future Facilities Committee meetings in the fall of 2015.

Mr. Dave King of the BOE shared that he believed that early enrollment projections that were developed for the district (during the growth boom) projected that the district would top out at a total of 4.5 high schools. In retrospect, these early numbers seem to closely resemble the modern day calculations currently being developed and reviewed. Chairman Ralph Au added that he believed that according to past data, High School #4 was actually predicted to be open originally in the fall of 2015 for the 2015-2016 school year (this year)! Consequently, if the need for High School #4 is determined, the district has essentially been able to defer its construction by 4 to 5 years.

Sharon Jurawitz shared that her cost per square foot data was created using previous high school construction cost data from the district and current OFC cost data. The costs for Option A were created in collaboration with the developer, using a developer "concept drawing". It is important to note that the building proposed by the developer for Option A involves a long-term lease and that it is being built primarily as an "office space" and not as an "educational space". This being said, there would be additional costs associated with Option A (equipment, inspections, security, etc.) that would be involved so that the space could be used as an educational space. In discussing Option A, members felt that it may be the most difficult to implement because students overall appeared to be very reluctant to leave their primary high schools. As a result, there was skepticism as to whether or not the district would be able to draw enough students out of their primary high schools to be able to successfully off-set student enrollment numbers at the district's three high schools to be able to justify the larger Academy facility as a viable option at this time. BOE representative Julie Wagner-Feasel stressed the importance of reviewing the dynamics of the first class at the current Academy to get an overall idea of the future viability of this option. Additionally, land for this option has not been determined at this time.

In discussing Option B, members agreed that there was some flexibility and general appeal to this option. Whether all three buildings were constructed at the same time at each of the high schools or the construction was staggered at each site based on enrollment needs was yet to be determined. Member Eric Bull mentioned that construction of the free-standing buildings during the school year may pose some distractions to students. As a result, it would be important to time the first phases of construction to start at the beginning of summer break when the students are out (as the early stages of construction are the most visible phases of the construction process.) Chairman Au also pointed out to members that construction for this option would be taking place on already crowded high school campuses during peak enrollments. This could pose a variety of challenges ranging from student distractions to the staging of construction materials. Specific worries were expressed for the limited land available at the Orange High School site. Members felt that OOHS would be the most challenging site in which to add another structure without losing some other valued attribute (such as parking or a practice field). Bruce Runyon of Fanning Howey was confident that a structure could be designed to fit the space at the OOHS campus should Option B be pursued by the district. Chairman Au added that he believed Option B to be the hardest option to “undo” long-term if needed and supported concern that the option only allowed for additional academic space, but not common area and extra-curricular space that would be needed as well.

In discussing Option C, members clarified that the land for this option was purchased many years ago and is located on Berlin Station Road. While the cost of this option is the highest of the three expansions options identified, members discussed that it appears to be the option that can offer the district the greatest overall flexibility and space to meet the needs of the growing district high school population for the next several decades. This option also provides the district with the best opportunity to downsize long-term when the buildings at Shanahan Middle School or Olentangy High School exceed their life-spans and become too costly to maintain or operate.

Scott Leopold of DeJong-Richter spoke to the viability of Option C and shared that it was the option that best supported (and offered the most flexibility) in regard to the enrollment data that he was seeing in his company’s reporting. Regardless of personal preference for one district expansion option or another, member’s in attendance were in agreement that it appeared that the district was going to continue to increase in student enrollment for the next 39 years and that such growth is not just “a bubble” in which temporary fixes could be applied to.

At this time, Chairman Ralph Au called for a resolution for Ms. Jurawitz to present her report of District Expansion Options to the Board of Education at the August 18, 2015 Board of Education Meeting on behalf of the Facilities Committee.

**Be it resolved that Ms. Jurawitz present the District Expansion Options Report to the Board of Education on August 18, 2015 as moved by Eric Bull and seconded by Mark Scott. All members in attendance were in support of this resolution. None were opposed.**

Members in attendance also requested that Mr. Bruce Runyon of Fanning Howey Associates and Mr. Scott Leopold of DeJong-Richter be in attendance at the August 18, 2015 meeting in case any technical questions arose in which they could best assist.

In response to millage concerns, Jeff Gordon shared with members that the district Treasurer and applicable committees had been provided with this preliminary Expansion Options Report and that they were currently in the process of working on millage calculations that would apply to the

expansion options identified. It was hoped that this information would also be available for discussion at the August 18, 2015 Board of Education meeting.

Member Bob Hart discussed with members that funding for district Permanent Improvement projects should definitely be included in any levy calculations. If Permanent Improvement funds are not included in the levy, the district would be setting itself up to fail because it would not be able to support any of its new buildings, let alone the existing buildings. Members in attendance were in agreement and advised that district operating expenses should also be packaged into a levy for the same reason.

Members also noted that all three options presented in the report would involve some form of redistricting. Randy Wright clarified that while it appeared that Option A did not involve formal redistricting in the form that we are used to, that it is a subtle form of redistricting in itself. Chairman Au shared that based upon the predicted enrollment numbers that the district would most likely be in a perpetual cycle of redistricting over the next 50-60 years. As a result, the Facilities Committee looks forward to the upcoming findings from the district's ABC Committee for recommendations relevant to redistricting in the near future.

### ***Non- Traditional Projects***

The only non-traditional project still incomplete at this time is the new baseball press box at Olentangy High School. Jeff recently met with Bill O'Sullivan and the architect for the project regarding a few construction issues that remain outstanding. Mr. O'Sullivan provided several ideas for remedy of the outstanding issues. At this time, the Boosters are planning to "seal" the masonry on the entire structure. Once this is complete, they plan on deeming the project complete and officially donating it to the district.

### ***Influencer's Update***

Jeff Gordon took a moment to thank Ralph Au, Sharon Jurawitz, and Angie Bryant for all of their work on the district Expansion Options Project. Special recognition was given to Sharon Jurawitz for all of her reporting and analysis work on the project.

Mr. Gordon also thanked Frank Eisenhower and Bob Fuller for their work with the district's energy initiative. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Fuller were recently instrumental in seeing that Heritage Elementary School became the district's first Energy Star certified building.

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

**Robert Fuller moved and Mark Scott seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m. Motion Carried.**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 2, 2015. The meeting will be the district's Administrative Offices.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff Gordon