



Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>

CIS/OFCC Update

Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>

Tue, Sep 4, 2018 at 10:55 AM

To: joe@wadsworthcommunityradio.com, Adrienne Krauss <adrienne@mainstreetwadsworth.org>, Amy Shank <kshank@neo.rr.com>, Anthony Day <agday1@gmail.com>, Barb Ott <ottbarb7@gmail.com>, Chris King <cking@nationalcarpetmilloutlet.com>, Dan Dietz <dandietz52@yahoo.com>, Daniel Slife <daniel.slife@wadsworthlibrary.com>, Douglas Beeman <dbeeman@wadsworthschools.org>, "Dr. Caesar Carrino" <cacarrino@carrino.us>, Eric Jackson <ejackson@wadsworthschools.org>, Felicity Wilson <felicitylrwilson@gmail.com>, Greg Stoner <gstoner@wadsworthschools.org>, James K Lawrence <jkl@uakron.edu>, Joanne Gahan <jgahan@wadsworthschools.org>, Joe Mendel <jmendel01@gmail.com>, Joseph Arpad <joearpad@gmail.com>, Joseph Magnacca <jmagnacca@wadsworthschools.org>, Joseph Magnacca <jrmagnacca@yahoo.com>, Julie Batey <jbatey@wadsworthschools.org>, Kyle Obendorf <Kyle@zucue.com>, Laura Maslyk <lmaslyk@wadsworthschools.org>, Michelle Boni <mboni@proswing.com>, Mike Deiwert <mdeiwert@ruhlin.com>, Mike Foore <wstr_mfoore@woostercityschools.org>, Mike Gahan <michael.gahan@neo.rr.com>, "Mr. and Mrs. Tony Solaro" <jsolaro@aol.com>, Nikki Madachik <mmadachik@gmail.com>, Patti Back <pback@wadsworthschools.org>, rebecca tetlow <rkatic@hotmail.com>, Rusty Kuse <rkuse14@gmail.com>, Shirley Casey <shirleycasey@icloud.com>, Shirley Casey <shirleycasey@me.com>, Stephen M Gill <sgill@firstenergycorp.com>, Sue Heideman <sheideman@wadsworthschools.org>, Tom Stugmyer <tstugmyer@gmail.com>, "Wagar. Michael. R" <MikeWagar@westfieldgrp.com>, Zachary Ockunzzi <zockunzzi@wadsworthschools.org>

Good morning. You are receiving this message because you are a member of the CIS Committee. On May 22 I sent you an email that provided an update on our meeting with Mr. Prenosil from the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission (OFCC) (see below for the content of the email).

A little over a week ago, we received the preliminary numbers that I wrote about in May. What is written below is taken from an update I sent to our board of education last Friday (8/31) and is being shared with you so everyone is on the same page with our process. Our board of education plans on discussing this issue at their next regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, September 10 at 7:00 p.m. in the James R. McIlvaine Performing Arts Center at Wadsworth High School; please feel free to attend the meeting if your schedule permits. I will continue to keep in touch with you as we move through this process, as I'm certain a committee meeting(s) will be needed. If you have any questions after you read the update, please let me know. Thank you for your continued involvement in the CIS process and for your continued support of our school district. I continue to trust that our process will ultimately lead to our desired result for our students.

Andy

From my August 31, 2018 Board of Education Written Update:

"Central Intermediate School (CIS)/Ohio Facilities Construction Commission (OFCC) Update

Last Friday (8/24), Doug received the long-anticipated "preliminary" numbers from Bill Prenosil at the OFCC (these are the numbers he promised to get us when Doug and I met with him on May 2). The following is what he sent:

"I finally have had a chance to look at your information and model the master plan possibilities. Sorry it has taken so long.

The bottom line is that because your district has been on an enrollment decline since at least 2010, there exists too much excess space in your current buildings (according to our OSDM standards) to allow us to co-fund any more space.

The tables below attempt to communicate that fact.

If you would like to meet to discuss this in detail let me know and I would be happy to come there and meet again.

| <i>Building</i> | <i>OFCC Capacity</i> | <i>Current Enrollment</i> | <i>Delta</i> | <i>Notes</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|
| <i>High School</i> | <i>1,875</i> | <i>1,608</i> | <i>(267)</i> | <i>Includes CT</i> |
| <i>Middle School</i> | <i>905</i> | <i>681</i> | <i>(224)</i> | |
| <i>Existing CIS</i> | <i>790</i> | <i>707</i> | <i>(83)</i> | |
| <i>Franklin ES</i> | <i>355</i> | <i>242</i> | <i>(113)</i> | |
| <i>Lincoln ES</i> | <i>355</i> | <i>266</i> | <i>(89)</i> | |
| <i>Isham ES</i> | <i>450</i> | <i>352</i> | <i>(98)</i> | |
| <i>Overlook ES</i> | <i>450</i> | <i>355</i> | <i>(95)</i> | |
| <i>Valley View ES</i> | <i>450</i> | <i>346</i> | <i>(104)</i> | |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | <i>5,630</i> | <i>4,557</i> | <i>(1,073)</i> | <i>Available for new construction</i> |

| <i>Building</i> | <i>OFCC Capacity</i> | <i>Current Enrollment</i> | <i>Delta</i> | <i>Notes</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <i>High School</i> | <i>1,875</i> | <i>1,608</i> | <i>(267)</i> | <i>Includes CT</i> |
| <i>Middle School</i> | <i>905</i> | <i>681</i> | <i>(224)</i> | |
| <i>New CIS</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>707</i> | <i>707</i> | |
| <i>Franklin ES</i> | <i>355</i> | <i>242</i> | <i>(113)</i> | |
| <i>Lincoln ES</i> | <i>355</i> | <i>266</i> | <i>(89)</i> | |
| <i>Isham ES</i> | <i>450</i> | <i>352</i> | <i>(98)</i> | |
| <i>Overlook ES</i> | <i>450</i> | <i>355</i> | <i>(95)</i> | |
| <i>Valley View ES</i> | <i>450</i> | <i>346</i> | <i>(104)</i> | |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | <i>4,840</i> | <i>4,557</i> | <i>(283)</i> | <i>Available for new construction</i> |

According to our records, the district has been in a slight enrollment decline since 2010,

therefore a ten year enrollment projection would not yield higher enrollment numbers.”

Basically, their formula shows that we could eliminate the CIS building and have enough room for the displaced students in our other buildings, thus, they will not fund any additional construction in our school district based upon these “preliminary” numbers.

Doug and I participated in a phone conference with Mr. Prenosil yesterday (8/30) in order to ask questions and gain a better understanding of the OFCC process and what the numbers presented above mean.

The following is a summary of the questions we asked and the responses we received:

Question: So we are on the same page and not making assumptions, can you please explain what the numbers in the email you sent us mean to the OFCC?

Answer: The numbers demonstrate that there is no need for space (there is excess space currently). As a result, the OFCC will not fund additional construction based upon these numbers.

Question: When the original projections were completed in 2009 (I will share the Dejong Healy study with you through Google), a ten (10) year enrollment projection was used for determining the size of the facilities we would build to allow for future growth. While our enrollment has declined the last few years, we have been told Wadsworth is the third fastest growing city in Northeast Ohio. Shouldn't any decisions on future construction be based upon another enrollment projection study that looks ten (10) years out and not be based upon the study completed in 2009?

Answer: Yes, it should. The problem is the OFCC will not pay for the study until we have been accepted into the process again and the OFCC is not currently accepting applications for the program because there are one hundred (100) already accepted and those accepted have been told it could be up to six (6) years before the OFCC gets funding for their project. He said if we wanted to complete the study at our expense, having the company use the same formulas they use when they complete a study for the OFCC, that would help us know if we would be eligible for funding in the future. He said he would send us the contact information for the company.

Question/Statement: We believe that some of the numbers you shared are incorrect (e.g. capacity limits in the new elementary are higher than the amended plan from 2009 and our enrollment from Overlook Elementary School is missing preschool).

Answer: He will correct the numbers (the preschool error was on our end as we sent him the information). Mr. Prenosil used the original plan numbers from 2009, not the revised plan numbers. Even with the change, the bottom line only changes by approximately one hundred thirty (130) students, thus not changing the result.

Question: How will we know when the OFCC is accepting applications again?

Answer: Mr. Prenosil said we should check in with him in the spring and fall, after each election. He said he would also make a note to let us know if an application window opens. We suggested that the OFCC put out a formal announcement if/when the application window opens so no one forgets to notify us or so that we

don't call in May and then follow-up in November as suggested only to find out the window opened in June and now we are five (5) months behind others.

Question: We asked him a series of questions focusing on sections of Ohio Revised Code (3318.034 and 3318.04, in particular) to find out if somehow our segmented status either gave us higher priority for consideration or locked us in to the rules of the program when we segmented.

My Editorial: There appears to be a lot of leeway in the way Ohio Revised Code is written (e.g. use of the word "may" in relation to many actions of the commission).

Answer: While segmented districts do take some type of priority, Mr. Prenosil was not able to articulate what that actually looks like in reality. He said it was difficult to define because there are many factors that are considered in final decisions. Mr. Prenosil did state that even though our project was segmented years ago, the current rules apply, not the rules at the time of segmentation.

My Editorial: In the state budget bill that passed in June of 2017, there was language that would have given segmented districts the ability to use the higher state percentage when starting the next "phase" of their project (state share when segmented vs. current state share). The governor ended up vetoing this provision, which cost us (we were 37% when we segmented and our percentage in 2017 was somewhere around 53%). Our hope was that other rules were locked in to the rules at the time of segmentation, not just the funding.

Question: Doug asked if we could do an amendment to our project (high school and Overlook) because we are not officially closed out yet. Technically, because we are not closed out, we are still in the active phase of the program, thus, doing an amendment to add CIS would not be a "new" request that we would have to wait to make until they accepted new applications.

Answer: Mr. Prenosil said we could not do this.

Question: We asked if special education spaces and the OFCC capacity limits for elementary and middle schools were taken into consideration.

Answer: Mr. Prenosil said they were. He was not sure how the elementary vs. middle school capacity limits were calculated in our numbers because the OFCC considers elementary to be grades Pre-K-5 and middle school to be grades 6-8. That said, he told us these items were factored into the projected capacity numbers from 2009.

Question: We asked him if our understanding from 2009, that we had funding set aside with the OFCC for completion of our project when we decided to move forward, was incorrect (e.g. no issues with excess space, etc.).

Answer: Mr. Prenosil told us that it was not incorrect but that over time the rules of the OFCC have changed and those changes impacted our future project.

Background: In December of 2016, a few weeks after the first CIS Committee meeting, Joe Magnacca had conversations with Mr. Prenosil. At the time, the CIS Committee had recommended that a facility assessment be completed. Due to the response you will see below, we decided to pay for the assessment because we were not ready to commit to "phase 2" of the project. Committing to "phase 2" would have defeated the board's intention of engaging in a community process on how to proceed with CIS because it would have meant telling the state we were ready to build a new building. The following is the email correspondence:

"On Fri, Dec 9, 2016 at 3:46 PM, Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov> wrote:

Nice talking to you Joe.

As we discussed, attached is the 2008/09 Assessment that I updated to the 2016 cost set.

Page 7 is the overall cost summary, which is just under \$14M.

Construction cost have been very flat for the past few years...don't expect that to continue.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Merry Christmas to you and your family!

William Prenosil, R.A., LEED AP
Senior Planning Administrator

From: Magnacca, Joseph [mailto:jmagnacca@wadsworthschools.org]

Sent: Friday, December 09, 2016 3:52 PM

To: Prenosil, William <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov>

Subject: Re: Wadsworth Central Intermediate Assessment

Thank you Bill. Hope you have a great holiday season.

Joe

Joseph Magnacca
Director of Facilities
Wadsworth City Schools
330-335-1369 (Office)
330-335-1313 (Fax)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov>

Date: Thu, Dec 15, 2016 at 2:41 PM

Subject: RE: Wadsworth Central Intermediate Assessment

To: "Magnacca, Joseph" <jmagnacca@wadsworthschools.org>

Joe,

Got your other voicemail.

We cannot do another Assessment unless your district re-enters our CFAP program in order to "plan" for a "Segment 2".

That would be a formal process of your board passing a "Resolution of Intent" which is one of our standard forms. I have attached an example (Brunswick City Schools).

The soonest that could happen is in the spring and even then, because we have so many district waiting to get into the planning/funding stream, we may not be able to start until a year later.

Bill P.

On Thu, Dec 15, 2016 at 2:55 PM, Magnacca, Joseph <jmagnacca@wadsworthschools.org> wrote:
Andy,

See below from Bill Prenosil regarding them doing the assessment. As I discussed previously, WCS would have to pass a resolution to be placed within the program.

Joe

Joseph Magnacca
Director of Facilities
Wadsworth City Schools
330-335-1369 (Office)
330-335-1313 (Fax)

On Fri, Dec 16, 2016 at 6:41 AM, Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org> wrote:

I think we should find another company to do the assessment for us (or the same company OFCC would use but we pay). Can you get a couple quotes from different companies? We want something similar to the 2008 report.

Dec 16, 2016,
7:14 AM

Magnacca, Joseph
<jmagnacca@wadsworthschools.
org>

to me, Douglas

I will contact Schoor Architects who did the previous one for the district thru the OSFC. In addition, I will find a few others for quotes.

Joe”

In addition, we found a memo from the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission, dated December 2017, referencing a change the OFCC “excess space” policy.

Question: We asked Mr. Prenosil if we had known to ask about “excess space” in December of 2016, would he have told us it was an issue for our new project.

Answer: Mr. Prenosil told us no. He said that while the concept of “excess space” is not new, the policy on how it is applied to situations like ours did change after December of 2016, thus impacting us. In addition to the policy change, he also told us he was surprised to see our enrollment has had a slight decline.

Mr. Prenosil also suggested that we could meet with OFCC “higher ups” to ask some of our questions if we wanted to.

With all of this information, Doug and I recommend to you that our best course of action at this time is the following:

1. Have the enrollment projection company complete an updated study. Mr. Prenosil thought the study would cost around \$3000. We are waiting to get the information on the company from Mr. Prenosil but

he did give us the name (Dejong Healy is now Future Think). If we do not receive the information from him by early next week, we'll contact Future Think without his assistance.

2. Share this written update with our CIS Committee and let them know there may be a need to meet again at some point in the future to discuss the potential of either no state funding or the timeline we will have to wait to receive state funding if we are determined to be eligible.
3. Provide a brief presentation on the CIS process, from November 2016 until now, at our September 10 board meeting and then discuss the current situation at our meeting.
4. Schedule a meeting with the "higher ups" at the OFCC to ask some of our questions again with the hope of gaining a better understanding of their processes, where there may be leeway within their processes and how they relate to our situation.
5. Make future decisions once the updated enrollment projection study is completed, as the projection in ten (10) years will be critically important to whether state funding will be available. If the numbers are favorable to us and receiving state funding, then we can discuss the timeline we may need to wait through at the state level. If the numbers are not favorable for us receiving state funding, then we can discuss options that do not include state funding.

To sum all of this up, while I'm discouraged by where we are, I'm also convinced that our chance at state funding is not eliminated yet. Not only will the updated enrollment projection report be important, but, I think there remains a number of questions about how the OFCC operates and prioritizes projects that are not found in the Ohio Revised Code or Ohio Administrative Code. Someone at the OFCC should be able to answer these questions, to a level of understanding that we are satisfied with, before we stop asking them.

If you have any questions or concerns about what I have written, please let me know. I plan on sharing this summary with the CIS Committee on Tuesday (9/4)."

May 22, 2018 CIS Committee Email:

On Tuesday, May 22, 2018, 11:12:24 AM EDT, Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org> wrote:

CIS Committee,

On May 2, 2018 Doug and I met with Bill Prenosil from the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission (OFCC). The purpose of our meeting was to gain a better understanding from the OFCC on the time lines involved in their process of accessing the 37% of funds from the state that we are eligible for. At our May 14, 2018 board of education meeting, Doug provided the board of education with a summary of the meeting.

What follows is a brief summary of what Bill shared at our meeting:

- The OFCC is in an unprecedented time with the number of funding requests they are considering. As a result, they are not accepting new applications at this time. Mr. Prenosil's best guess is funding may be available for us in 2022; and
- The OFCC has a new rule where they calculate "excess space." This means that they look at total enrollment and available building space in determining what a district needs, not just replacement of a current facility as they have in years past.

When our building design plan was put together in 2008/2009, the OFCC based the projections on a future enrollment of 5900 students, currently we have around 4700.

Mr. Prenosil told Doug that he would run preliminary numbers and get them to us. The preliminary numbers will show what type of "space" they believe we need. We are waiting for these numbers before we engage the Board of Education in further conversation. In addition, Mr. Prenosil shared with Doug that he would look into other possibilities with our

"segmented" status (the state has the money designated for us from when we segmented the project, meaning we built some of the master plan previously and waited to act on the other part of the plan).

In summary, I feel that Mr. Prenosil delivered to us the worst case scenario of what could be and now he is working to see if there are better solutions. Only time will tell what he brings back to us.

All of this said, it brings to question, at least to me, what could we (district) have done differently in our process knowing now what we didn't when the CIS Committee began their work. I reviewed our correspondence with the OFCC which occurred in December of 2016, within a few weeks of our first CIS Committee meeting. At the time, we were told that if we wanted the OFCC to consider updating the facility assessment they completed in 2008, we would need to submit a letter to them officially stating we wanted to finish our project that was previously segmented. If we submitted the letter, we were told it could be a year before the study was completed. There was no mention of "excess space" and the numbers we provided you for a new building were based upon the OFCC square footage model. I made a decision (after consulting with the board of education) to not engage the OFCC at the time because it seemed that to do so would commit the district to a project that we were not sure we were ready to commit to. If we told the state we wanted to build a new CIS at that time, it would have countered the approach our board took in forming a committee and seeking community input prior to making a decision. Instead, our district paid to have the study completed. Once the board voiced support for our committee's plan this past April, Doug and I contacted the OFCC.

I will provide you with a further update once we hear back from Mr. Prenosil. In the meantime, I trust that our process will ultimately lead to our desired result for our students. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you for your continued interest and involvement in this process.

Andy Hill

Andrew J. Hill, Ed.D.
Superintendent
Wadsworth City School District
330-335-1301 (phone)
524 Broad St.
Wadsworth, OH 44281