

The Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting
March 6, 2024 @ 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"/> Eisenhower, Frank | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott, Mark |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurawitz, Sharon | <input type="checkbox"/> Smith, Wesley |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> King, Dave | <input type="checkbox"/> Troxell, Joe |
| <input type="checkbox"/> McCaughey, Kevin | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Totzke, Steven |

Also in attendance were Mr. Bill O'Sullivan (Construction Analysis), Mr. Brian Eisinger (Guest), Mrs. Allie Totzke (Guest), Lizett Schreiber (BOE Representative), Dr. Kevin Daberkow (BOE Representative), Ryan Jenkins (Treasurer), 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 February 7, 2024 meeting.

Angie Bryant moved and Frank Eisenhower seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Greg Rogers moved and Angie Bryant seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the February 7, 2024 meeting. Motion carried.

New Facility Planning

Mr. Gordon commenced with a follow up discussion relevant to the Construction Manager-at-Risk (CMR) delivery process for district construction projects. At the February Facilities Committee meeting it was suggested that members email to Mr. Gordon any suggestions or concerns that they might have regarding the CMR process as a delivery method. Mr. Gordon shared the response information that he had received via email with all of the members prior to this evening's meeting allowing members to come prepared for a discussion on the information received.

Mr. Bill O'Sullivan from Construction Analysis had previously presented information relevant to the CMR (and other) construction delivery methods on 9/11/2019. A copy of this presentation was displayed on the audio-visual equipment in the room for the members to discuss and review. The information contained a list of pros and cons for the delivery processes that were discussed in depth by the committee back in 2019.

Members in the room appreciated the past information provided by Mr. O'Sullivan, but for the benefit of expediting the evening's meeting did not find it to be necessary to review each point of the past information which had already been reviewed by many of the members back in 2019. Members believed it to be a better use of the evening's time to focus on the district's current experience with the CMR process.

Member Steven Totzke asked the group what delivery method processes had been utilized by the district previous to CMR and what made the group/district move toward the CMR delivery method currently?

- Mr. Bill O’Sullivan explained that prior to the construction of Berlin High School, the State of Ohio required public entities (organizations using public money) to bid construction projects using a “multiple prime” or “single prime” delivery methods. It was not an option for the district to use a CMR delivery method at that time because state law did not allow for it.
- Mr. O’Sullivan further explained that this put much of the liability, bid package processing and GM service functions for construction projects on the district, which at times was very complicated and time consuming. It was also difficult to hold the trades to corrective work needed because they would just point a finger to another trade as being at fault.
- Mr. O’Sullivan clarified that the district built many of its elementary, middle and high school projects using the single prime and multiple prime delivery methods prior to the construction of Berlin High School. The construction process for Berkshire Middle School (single prime) was probably a notable “turning point” for the district when it experienced difficulty getting trades to complete their work as contracted, which ended in the district being involved in litigation between two contractors.
- Sharon Jurawitz explained that when the district determined that a 4th High School was needed (Berlin High School) the law had changed allowing CMR to be used as a delivery method for construction projects. This process was relatively new to the district and Facilities Committee members were somewhat skeptical to consider it as a delivery method at that time. However, members determined that meetings to further investigate the CMR process and compare it to the delivery methods that the district had been using were needed.
- Sharon further explained that the High School #4 project and planning meetings (at the end of 2015) gave the district a chance to re-evaluate the construction delivery processes that it had not previously had the opportunity to consider. It was during this time of review that the Facilities Committee discovered several notable benefits to the CMR delivery process over the methods that the district had previously been using.
- Benefits to the CMR process included:
 - Less liability and risk for the overall project (because the CMR takes it on in their contract).
 - The opportunity to work with better quality vendors (because the work is not entirely predicated on the submission of a low bid).
 - The ability for the district to get “extra” funds back due to the use of GMP documents (Guaranteed Maximum Price) utilized within the CMR process.
 - The ability to name and work with a CMR early in design process (which does not happen in the single and multi-prime processes).
 - The ability to use the districts building “replication process” as a way to closely monitor and control costs, as well as, minimize contingencies for the projects.

A general discussion commenced as follows:

- Bill O’Sullivan shared that the district’s experience with the CMR process has been more a “CMR lite” process. The district has remained very much a partner with the CMR and the district has been successful in controlling costs associated with the CMR process

(due largely to the district's building replication practices). Ironically, he noted that even with replication, every project has had some differences. He also noted that Robertson's CMR contract costs with OLSD have been markedly less than Gilbane's and Elford's which has amounted to additional savings for the district.

- Member Mark Scott added that Robertson's project books have been "open" to the district when others have not been.
- Member Steve Totzke supports a "programmatic" approach to the construction process when building things over and over. His three main project metrics are quality, schedule and budget.
- Mr. Totzke believes that the district could drive its cost down further by being its own General Contractor (GC). He does not believe that the CMR delivery method makes sense for OLSD with the amount of building replication that it is doing.
- Sharon Jurawitz asked Mr. Totzke to clarify if he was suggesting that the district proceed with the single prime delivery method for all of its construction projects, regardless of any low bid/low quality issues that may be encountered? Mr. Totzke responded "yes".
- Mr. O'Sullivan reminded members that by using the single prime method for Berkshire Middle School project that the district was constantly fixing problems, addressing issues and working with legal claims.
- Dr. Daberkow expressed that any time that the district enters into legal or courtroom situations, it is costly and inefficient.
- Mr. Totzke proceeded to express concern that the roofing contract nearly doubled in expense from the Elementary #16 to the Elementary #17 project. In his review, it appears to be mostly material cost.
- Mr. Gordon shared that the vendor for the Elementary #17 project bought all of the roofing that he was able to obtain at the time (due to supply chain issues) and was still the low bidder for the project.
- Mr. Totzke again stressed that the only way to avoid cost "gouging" is to "self-manage" the bid process/vendor submissions. This is not an option with the CMR process. He also does not believe that Robertson is getting enough vendor bids per trade.
- Sharon Jurawitz asked if there was any benefit to returning to the single prime delivery method after the completion of Elementary #18, Elementary #19 and High School #5. Mr. Totzke responded that "yes" he was in support of this.
- Lizett Schreiber expressed concern regarding the return to single prime because Mr. O'Sullivan has shared that even when replicating buildings, many of our construction processes and experiences have been different.
- Treasurer, Ryan Jenkins asked Mr. Totzke if he would like for the district to review the delivery method process for each new building. Mr. Totzke responded "no" because single prime makes the most sense for OLSD due to its replication of buildings.
- Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Totzke if the CMR process would ever be a good fit for OLSD projects. Mr. Totzke responded "no", not with replication.
- Mr. Totzke requested that the district cancel either the Elementary #18 or Elementary #19 contract with Robertson construction so that he could bid it out using the single prime delivery method to compare the two methods against each other.
- Mr. Jenkins was not in support of this request because it would put the district in a breach of contract circumstance.

- Jeff Gordon expressed confusion because he originally understood Mr. Totzke to want the creation of some sort of CMR checklist to improve the process where able. He did not understand his original request to involve changing contracts for the current buildings that we are working on.
- Lizett Schreiber was in support of the creation of a CMR checklist for continuity purposes.
- Dr. Daberkow questioned Mr. Totzke if his request was contrary to the metrics (quality/schedule/budget) that he referenced earlier in the meeting. He was not in support of putting the district in a breach of contract situation.
- Sharon Jurawitz did not believe Mr. Totzke's request to work for OLSD due to the district's timeline for the buildings. Both new elementary facilities are ready to start if the levy passes in a couple of weeks. She also believes that we benefitted from better bid pricing on Elementary #19 because it is being built at nearly the same time as Elementary #18 and allows the contractors to buy in bulk.
- Frank Eisenhower shared that for future OLSD buildings there will be additional factors to consider when determining the construction delivery method. They were as follows:
 - Has OLSD staff changed and what is the impact?
 - Have any key vendors changed and what is the impact?
 - What is the construction market like?
 - Are there supply chain issues?
 - What is inflation like?
- Frank Eisenhower also noted that he generally is in support of the CMR delivery method because it mitigates risk to the district. He believes the district's risk with \$350 million dollars in proposed projects is too great at this time to not use CMR. However, he would be open to reviewing the delivery method for proposed new buildings.
- Mr. Jenkins noted that the CMR process can help to deliver a more reliable estimate for project costs, which provides the district with greater confidence that the par value of bonds proposed to be sold will adequately meet project budgetary needs rather than have to value engineer.
- Mr. Eisenhower continues to be amazed that the district keeps its costs so low.
- Members discussed that when single prime bids come in over 10 percent of the projected budget that the entire project is required to be re-bid.
- Mark Scott clarified that there is a risk associated with all of the construction delivery methods. However, he also believes that because Robertson is such a good partner to the district that the delivery method is more a "CMR lite" version of the traditional CMR process and comes with less risk than a traditional CMR process.
- Angie Bryant is concerned that the single prime delivery method would cost the district more for its projects when considering the success that the district has had with its CMR delivered projects.
- Steve Totzke understands the risk profile, but is concerned that the district is paying a big cost for it (like flood insurance in the desert).
- Mr. Totzke is supportive of Mr. Gordon and the district. He is just trying to make improvements where they can be made.
- Moving forward, Lizett Schreiber shared that she would like the Facilities Committee to continue to evaluate the delivery method for each project, create checklist for the CMR process and to prep for any upcoming staffing changes.

Mr. Gordon moved onto an update regarding the district's Elementary #17/Peachblow Crossing Elementary project. Construction is proceeding ahead of schedule. The district hopes to have occupancy of the building by early May of 2024. The district is also working on the installation of "private fiber" to the ES #17 facility so that we can avoid a lifetime of connectivity fees to a service provider for this site. This will result in a large cost savings to the district with a payback in cost avoidance of less than five years.

Relevant to the new elementary facilities, the levy will determine the next steps to be taken. If the levy passes, the district will be asking for approval in the near future for GMP #2 and GMP #3 for each of the projects.

Design work is being implemented for the High School #5 project. Input from the Berlin High School staff is being collected to check for any modifications to the plans that may be beneficial to the High School #5 project. Annexation discussions with Delaware City are starting. Some of the new land acquired adjacent to the district's original parcel of land was actually in the Buckeye Valley School district. Work is being completed to join the new parcels to the district's original parcel so that it is all in the Olentangy School district.

Steve Totzke is interested in helping the district with its OFCC project. Mr. Gordon advised that Schorr Architects has been contracted by the State of Ohio to work with Olentangy in collecting the initial information needed for the creation of a district master plan. Schorr has recently started this process with the district. More information will be forthcoming, as the district proceeds further into the process.

Influencers

Dr. Daberkow stressed that there is a lot on the line for the district relevant to the passage of the levy. With 5,000 or more students coming into the Olentangy system in the upcoming years, it is imperative that the community understand the district's need for new facilities to support the growth. Dr. Daberkow asked that committee members talk to and share levy facts with one person each day until the levy.

Facilities Committee members welcomed guest Brian Eisinger. Brian wanted to attend a Facilities Committee meeting to see if he had an interest in becoming a permanent member of the committee in the future.

Sharon Jurawitz called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Angie Bryant moved and Frank Eisenhower seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Facilities Committee meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

The next monthly meeting is tentatively, scheduled for 4/3/2024.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Gordon