

**The Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting  
December 6, 2023 @ 6:00 p.m.  
Olentangy Administrative Offices- Berlin Room**

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

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryant, Angie    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rogers, Greg   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yanka, David |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Eisenhower, Frank           | <input type="checkbox"/> Scott, Mark               |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurawitz, Sharon | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Smith, Wesley  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> King, Dave                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Troxell, Joe   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> McCaughey, Kevin            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Totzke, Steven |  |

Also in attendance were Bruce Runyon (Fanning Howey Associates), Brandon Lester (BOE Representative), Jeff Gordon (OLSD Chief Operations Officer) and Michelle Murphy (OLSD).

**Sharon Jurawitz called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the night's agenda and the minutes from the October 4, 2023 meeting.**

**Dave Yanka moved and Joe Troxell seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.**

**Greg Rogers moved and Angie Bryant seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the October 4, 2023 meeting. Motion carried.**

**OFCC Analysis for High School #5 Project-**

Mr. Bruce Runyon from Fanning Howey Associates was in attendance at the meeting to share with members what the district's High School #5 project might look like if the district partnered with the state of Ohio to build the new high school facility using OFCC criteria. Fanning Howey Associates has many years of experience working with OFCC based projects with other districts. Mr. Runyon used a PowerPoint presentation to summarize the anticipated issues, changes and projected costs relative to the proposed project. A copy of the presentation is available upon request through the district's Business Office. Mr. Runyon advised that members and staff should use the information presented to determine if a partnership with the OFCC on the High School #5 project is a "good fit" for the district.

Mr. Runyon stated that a construction project using OFCC criteria would look very different for the district in many ways. When working with the OFCC, their construction rules and design criteria must be implemented and followed by OLSD. It is likely that the OFCC criteria will add additional cost and construction time to the project. Both the project cost and the total project time are subjective and difficult to determine because of the complexity of the OFCC process and lack of uniform standards for these projects. The OFCC project process is anticipated to impact the High School #5 project as follows:

**Pre-Design Phase-** OLSD provided its project application to potentially partner with the OFCC on a construction project in the early spring of 2023. The OFCC has not yet assigned an OFCC representative to the district for preliminary review of its project application to determine the district's

eligibility and “ranking” for the program. Our ranking would determine the potential percentage of funding/savings that the district may expect from participation in an OFCC project. It is the district’s understanding that the OFCC wants to partner with OLSD on a project, but is not accustomed to working with such a large district that is not in an urban setting. Historically, their projects have also been smaller in scale. As a result, they are communicating to OLSD that they are having difficulty finding an OFCC assessor that has the staffing needed to review and work with OLSD on a master plan. At this time, the district has already lost nearly nine months waiting on the OFCC to assign a representative to OLSD and to start their review process. Once started, their review process could take up to another year (or more) which is largely outside of the timeline that the district had hoped to begin construction on the High School #5 project. The district is close at this time to delaying the desired start of the High School #5 project, even if it chooses not to design it using OFCC guidelines.

**Design Phase-** OLSD would no longer benefit from “design replication”. The current design for Berlin High School does not incorporate all of the criteria required by the OFCC. As a result, Fanning Howey would need to redraw and re-engineer the current Berlin HS plans to meet OFCC requirements. The OFCC has minimum square footage requirements for all spaces throughout the building. Fanning Howey would need to add this square footage to the existing Berlin HS blueprint. The OFCC also has maximum square footage allowed in the design of K-12 facilities. If our existing Berlin HS floor plan exceeds the OFCC maximum square footage allocated in select areas, the district would be required to fund the excess square footage on its own at 100 percent of the cost of the space. Additionally, OFCC requirements would result in notable changes to the building’s HVAC systems, roofing systems, interior and exterior fixtures and finishes, as well as, technology systems. A summary of some of these requirements can be referenced in the PowerPoint presentation document provided by Mr. Runyon. When complete, a redesign of the existing Berlin High School facility using OFCC criteria would look substantially different than OLSD’s Berlin High School as it is currently designed and built. The OFCC would need to “approve” the district’s proposed high school design and a “master plan” for the entire district before the district could proceed with permitting or bidding the project out. It is unlikely to know at this time how long this process would take the OFCC to allow the district to commence with the construction phase of the project.

**Construction Phase-** Once the pre-construction design, permitting and bidding phase of the project is approved by the OFCC, OLSD and the local municipalities, the district would be able to commence with the construction phase of the project. The construction phase of the project will not look like it has in the past for the district. The OFCC will be part “owner” of the project (with the district) while the new building is being built. The OFCC will maintain a voice in all construction issues, costs, timelines and processes during the construction phase of the project. It is difficult to know exactly how “co-ownership” of the project with the OFCC may slow down the project timeline, add unforeseen costs or impact the district’s ability to open the new facility when desired. Once construction of the project is complete, full “ownership” of the project is released to the district.

**State Funding-** The state of Ohio funds OFCC projects based upon a formula using project square footage and student capacity count for the proposed project. The OFCC will also use and apply their “ranking” to the above formula to finalize the projected amount of funds that the state will contribute to OLSD for the project. There is a risk that the “ranking percentage” could change until it is locked in by the district when the districtwide master plan is approved. This makes it very

difficult to determine the actual amount of funding that OLSD can expect from the state. Please refer to the last page of Mr. Runyon's PowerPoint presentation for projected funding calculations. Using the information that the district has at this time, there is a possibility that OLSD might receive an estimated 20 million to 23 million dollars for the High School #5 project if OLSD elects to partner with the OFCC on the project.

**Added Cost Potential-** There are a myriad of extra costs that would likely be added to the Berlin High School project to make it compliant with OFCC requirements. Major cost increases will be seen in design/engineering and planning fees, additional square footage requirements, new/modified HVAC and electrical requirements, LEED requirements, casework/fixture requirements, roofing requirements, interior classroom wall to deck requirements and more. Please see Mr. Runyon's PowerPoint for additional details on the projected costs foreseen with an OFCC partnership on this project. Mr. Runyon conservatively estimates the cost to the district to partner with the OFCC on the proposed High School #5 project to be estimated between 25 and 26 million dollars at this time.

Mr. Runyon and members in attendance at the meeting believed it important to note:

- At this time, the cost to partner with the OFCC on the High School #5 project appears to be nearly equal to the funding amount that the district would receive from the OFCC for the project. This would potentially make the funding benefit "a wash".
- Some OFCC requirements, while costing more, could potentially add some benefit or increased functionality to the project.
- Some of the OFCC requirements discussed appear to be unnecessary or produce little or no improvement to the current design that is successfully utilized by the district in three locations at this time.
- Partnership with the OFCC on the High School #5 project appears to drastically delay the timeline in which the project can be designed, constructed and completed.
- Delay in the current timeline will result in additional inflation costs added to the High School #5 project.

A general discussion regarding Mr. Runyon's OFCC presentation proceeded as follows:

- Mr. Gordon (OLSD Chief Operations Officer) hoped that "partnering" with the OFCC on a district construction project meant that the district received reimbursement from the state for a completed construction project based upon its application submission. He has concerns that it actually involves a "co-ownership" with the state during the building's design, bidding and construction processes.
- Mr. Gordon is also concerned that the OFCC could use the district's enrollment numbers against OLSD. He fears that the OFCC may require the design of a facility that is much more facility than is needed in reality by OLSD.
- Member Angie Bryant shared that she was not comfortable straying from the district's "replication process" for any of our district buildings. She believes that the designs have proven to be functional and to work well for the district. The district has made adjustments to the plans over the years based upon valuable feedback from the staff in the buildings. She also expressed concern that other districts have elected to "pass" on the funding support offered by the OFCC. She believes this to be a cautionary indicator of the possible challenges involved in a "partnership" with the OFCC.

- Member Wes Smith shared that the extra square footage required by the OFCC appears largely to be non-classroom space. He also expressed concern for differences in our current design plans that the OFCC might elect not to cover.
- Member Greg Rogers advised the district to use caution in its consideration to partner with the OFCC on a project. He was previously employed by the government for many years in a construction related capacity. He does not believe OLSD to be important to the OFCC. He believes that OLSD already has building designs that are functional and based upon common sense. He believes that it might be best to stick with a design that we know works.
- Member Joe Troxell shared that professionally he does not have a great impression of OFCC projects. His experience is that the OFCC has a “one size fits all” approach to its projects that is not realistic. He believes OLSD to be a very educated construction client due to the volume of new buildings that it constructs nearly annually. Because OLSD is somewhat of “a unicorn” in the construction arena, he does not believe that a partnership with the OFCC would benefit OLSD as it might a smaller district (that rarely constructs new school buildings). He would prefer that the district keep doing what it does successfully regarding its construction practices, rather than changing paths at this point.
- Member Steven Totzke believes there to be benefit in the construction design and material criteria required by the OFCC. He acknowledges that there may be cost increases to the project that result, but he feels that the district will benefit in the functionality of the building as a result. He expressed possible operational cost benefits and savings from the LEED requirements, as well as, the OFCC square footage and material requirements for the proposed building.
- Several members commented that they felt many of the area construction companies and vendors prefer to bid on OLSD construction projects because OLSD is not partnered with the OFCC.
- BOE Representative Brandon Lester expressed that the entirety of the OFCC requirements proposed for this project make him “nervous”. His concern is that the district has too much “risk” at stake for an OFCC partnership project of this size. He noted that it is too late to go on the March ballot with a different millage request. He would want to see a “clear savings benefit with a low risk to the district” to consider a partnership with the OFCC on a district project.
- Several members in attendance expressed an interest to possibly partner with the OFCC in the future on a much smaller district project, but not for the High School #5 project. They believe the district to have too much risk on a large project to move forward prior to OFCC approval.
- Members also supported exploring a possible partnership with the OFCC on a district renovation project.
- Mr. Gordon shared that our HVAC vendor’s would likely argue that the district is already about as energy efficient as you can get. The district uses energy efficient equipment and is Energy Star rated at most of its buildings at an energy star score of 92.
- Mr. Runyon clarified to members that to stay on the established timeline for the district’s High School #5 project, he would need to start non-OFCC design work for the project in early January of 2024. He added that there are some small environmental issues to be addressed relative to the site.

- Professionally, Chair Sharon Jurawitz believes that the OFCC delay for the High School #5 project will likely be significantly in excess of a one-year time period and that the costs to partner with them will exceed the funding that the district receives from them.

After a spirited discussion, Chair Jurawitz attempted to call for a motion to recommend that Fanning Howey Associates be allowed to proceed with the design of the district's High School #5 facility not using OFCC design standards (and to not partner with the OFCC on the project).

Member Steven Totzke was not in support of the motion. He asked to be given the upcoming weekend to review the information presented at the meeting by Fanning Howey Associates. He also requested additional information from Mr. Gordon to be able to complete his review. He believed it to be a "fair ask".

Chair Jurawitz agreed to hold the motion to allow Mr. Totzke to further analyze and review the information provided at the evening's meeting. She shared that a "proxy vote" might follow in December via email regarding the motion temporarily placed on hold.

### **New Facility Planning**

Jeff Gordon advised that Elementary #17 is still progressing well and on track to open in August of 2024 at this time. The bid for loose furnishings for the facility is currently advertised and will be received the first part of January 2024.

Construction is starting this month on a two-story classroom expansion project on the east end of the Olentangy Academy. Orange Township recently approved a variance request related to the project. As a result, the project was granted permission to proceed. Completion is planned for August of 2024.

Site testing is in progress for the district's Elementary #18, Elementary #19 and High School #5 project locations.

### **General Business**

A hard copy of the updated charter for the Facilities Committee was provided to members in attendance. It will also be emailed to members. Members were asked to review the charter and to provide any revisions or additions to the charter over the next week. Brandon Lester shared that the charter will require approval by the Board of Education at its organizational meeting at the start of January 2024.

Members were also asked to verify their continued membership on the committee for 2024. Members wishing to resign should send a resignation via email to Michelle Murphy in the district's Business Office in the next week.

Members were asked to appoint or re-appoint a committee chair and co-chair for the Facilities Committee for 2024.

**Member Dave Yanka motioned to re-appoint Sharon Jurawitz as the Chair for the Facilities Committee and Angie Bryant as the Co-Chair.**

**Member Wes Smith seconded the motion. All in attendance were in support of the motion and none were opposed. Motion carried.**

The meeting schedule for 2024 was distributed to members in attendance. It will also be emailed to members not in attendance.

### **Influencers**

Jeff Gordon shared that the district's levy planning committee has been meeting and is in the process of getting information out to the public relevant to the district's March levy request.

BOE Representative Brandon Lester questioned members about what they were hearing regarding the district's levy ask for March of 2024. Members shared that residents seemed to be hearing the need for "five new buildings" louder than the "no new millage" message. Members also shared that they may be "too close to the issue" to provide candid feedback.

**Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.**

**Greg Rogers moved and Joe Troxell seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

**The Facilities Committee meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.**

The next monthly meeting is tentatively, scheduled for 1/3/2024.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff Gordon