

*Good afternoon. You are receiving this email because you are a member of the CIS Committee. I'm writing today to provide you with a brief overview of the meeting our board of education held last Thursday with representatives of the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission and our immediate action items moving forward. What follows is a summary that I shared last Friday with our board of education and district administrators. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you for your continued involvement in this process.*

*Andy*

Thank you for making time for yesterday's special meeting with representatives from the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission. The following are the initial action items Doug and I told you we would move forward with:

- Doug and I called Representative Hambley and Senator Obhof today to provide an update on yesterday's meeting. We spoke with Representative Hambley and Adam Pohlman in Senator Obhof's office;
- We will provide the OFCC with our current enrollment numbers and special education numbers;
- We will contact the LaBrea School District to see if they are in a situation like ours, per the statement made by Bill Prenosil at our meeting;
- We will schedule a meeting with Bill Prenosil to either complete the work written about below or review the work once he has completed it; and
- We will see if we can get an estimate on the cost per square foot to build a school that is not tied to the OFCC operating manual.

It is our understanding that the OFCC, in particular Bill Prenosil, will update the enrollment capacity limits for each building to be actual capacity limits, not those found in the master plan that included additions to Franklin, Lincoln, CIS and the middle school that never happened (the numbers he provided us in September and again yesterday include these additions, which in essence creates "phantom space" that does not exist). In addition, Bill will update our current enrollment numbers and factor in our special education population to arrive at a "true" number of where our need is.

While our issues with the OFCC are complex, I think the best way to summarize our main points are as follows:

We believe the OFCC has changed the rules on how the program operates after our community made a decision and locked into the master plan through segmentation in 2009. We believe we should be locked in to the rules that were in place when we segmented. As you heard yesterday, the OFCC acknowledges that they changed their guidelines and they believe their new guidelines trump any previous agreement.

We also believe that the OFCC previously viewed “excess space” by grade bands, not by total enrollment like they do now. If this is true, while the master plan called for a CIS building that could hold 867 students, the most that we believe should happen now is that the state helps pay for a new CIS that meets our projected future enrollment of 685 students (from the updated enrollment projection study completed by Future Think). Instead, the OFCC is now looking at total enrollment, not grade bands, to determine excess space. The result of this change in their excess space guideline is they will not pay for a new building because they believe we can disperse all CIS students into our other existing buildings through some type of grade level movement. We strongly disagree with this as we think this goes against our original agreement that was shared with us and our community and we disagree that we can displace all CIS students into our existing buildings if CIS were eliminated.

I have attached the following documents, which were discussed at yesterday’s meeting:

- October 6, 2009 Project Agreement- Segmenting; and
- October 19, 2016 1st Amendment to the Segment One Project Agreement.

In addition, you can find the sections of Ohio Revised Code referenced at yesterday’s meeting by clicking the following links:

- [3318.03 Facilities Construction Commission to Determine Need for Additional Classroom Facilities;](#)
- [3318.034 Division of District Classroom Needs into Segments;](#) and
- [3318.04 Conditional Approval; Encumbering Funds.](#)

We have asked our legislators to consider legislation that would lock a school district into the master plan created at the time of segmentation, regardless of the the OFCC guideline changes that have occurred during the time between segmentation of the original project and the request to continue the project with another phase. We told them it would make sense if the legislation allowed for adjustment for updated future enrollment projections on the buildings that were agreed to in the original master plan (e.g. build CIS for 685 students, not 867. This seems to be the fiscally responsible thing to do both for our community and the state).

We will provide updates to you as they occur. In the meantime, if you have any questions, let me know.