

The Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting
March 5, 2025 @ 6:00 p.m.
Olentangy Administrative Offices- Berlin Room

In attendance for the Facilities Committee were:

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ Eisenhower, Frank | ☒ Rogers, Greg |
| ☒ Eisinger, Brian | ☐ Scott, Mark |
| ☐ Gilliam, Jarrod | ☐ Smith, Wesley |
| ☐ King, Dave | ☒ Troxell, Joe |
| ☒ McCaughey, Kevin | |

Also in attendance were Andrew Fouss (Member Candidate), Dr. Kevin Daberkow (BOE Representative), Jeff Gordon (OLSD Chief Operations Officer) and Michelle Murphy (OLSD).

Frank Eisenhower called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the night's agenda and the minutes from the February 5, 2025 meeting.

Brian Eisinger moved and Joe Troxell seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Greg Rogers moved and Joe Troxell seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2025 meeting. Motion carried.

Shanahan Middle School-

Jeff Gordon shared that the February Facilities Committee meeting was held at Shanahan Middle School (SMS). Members in attendance took part in an extensive tour of the building, which included both public and non-public area areas of the building. Overall, the facility is in good shape and still very functional for daily use. However, depending upon how long the district plans to continue to use SMS for educational purposes, there are improvements to the facility that need to be identified and implemented to support its continued use moving forward.

Mr. Gordon asked that members consider the following questions when assessing the future of SMS:

- Should SMS continue to be used long-term for educational purposes?
- What improvements are needed to support the use of SMS as an educational facility for the next ten years?
- What improvements are needed to support the use of SMS as an educational facility for the next twenty, thirty or even forty years?
- Should the district consider tearing down SMS when enrollment numbers drop at the middle school level in the distant future and not replace it?
- If SMS is torn down, should any sections of the building not be torn down?
- If parts of the SMS building are not torn down, what sections should remain and what should they be used for?
- Should SMS be replaced with a completely new middle school on the same site?
- What size of middle school floor plan should be constructed in the place of SMS? The larger floor plan like BLMS? Or even further modified?

Mr. Gordon next proceeded to share a PowerPoint presentation with members in attendance regarding district enrollment trends provided by Woolpert. A copy of the presentation is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

The district's preference for enrollment at the middle school level is about 950 students per building. OLSD's data (and past experience) supports the belief that enrollments around 950 students at the middle school level result in a better learning/activity environment for the students with less discipline or social issues.

Using Woolpert's projections (at various enrollment yield and permitting levels) the average enrollment 20 years from now at the middle school level with six buildings is a little under 1300 students per building. With seven buildings, the enrollment numbers average slightly under 1100 students per building. Both averages exceed the preferred enrollment number of 950 for OLSD buildings. Enrollments at the middle school level appear to remain elevated for the next thirty to forty years.

Given the information above, Mr. Gordon asked members to consider the following:

- Middle School #7 is still being planned for a location on the east side of the district. When is the need for this facility critical and what should it look like?
- Is there any merit to adding onto the district's existing middle schools to accommodate growing enrollment numbers?
- If the existing middle schools can be added onto, where do you expand them and how many classrooms do you add?
- Is Shanahan's central location in the district critical enough for a middle school to always remain at this site? A discussion ensued regarding the importance of a centralized middle school within the district when redistricting is required.
- How do you address the extra-curricular programs at the middle school level with elevated enrollments?
- How do you best address lunch service, cafeteria seating and other needs at the middle school level with elevated enrollments?

Mr. Gordon would like to bring Bruce Runyon to an upcoming meeting to discuss middle school design and expansion possibilities. Mr. Gordon would also like to have Berkshire Middle School Principal Carla Baker attend an upcoming meeting to share her personal experience with managing her middle school building at OLSD when it had an enrollment of about 1300 students.

A general discussion regarding the presentation commenced as follows:

- Member Greg Rogers believes Middle School #7 to be needed by OLSD soon.
- BOE Representative Dr. Daberkow asked OLSD to look into identifying the point where SMS becomes too costly to maintain.
- Prospective member Andy Fouss inquired as to where enrollment growth was in the district specifically. He also wanted to know if the district was building new schools in the right areas to support the growth where it is being experienced.
- Mr. Fouss also asked if the district tracked district maintenance costs by school building?

- Dr. Daberkow would like input from OLSD's Dr. Fette as to enrollment numbers that are best for academic performance results. His initial thoughts are that too many students for too long of a time period in our buildings may not be a good thing.
- Dr. Daberkow noted that typically our enrollment projections have been amazingly accurate (typically within 1%). However, if the yields change or our projection calculations are off, how does this impact our planning discussions?
- Jeff Gordon shared that Woolpert has always supported the inclusion of a down-turn "pocket" in the enrollment numbers periodically. They historically have experienced this in OLSD and planning with other districts. However, this is not something that OLSD has experienced over the recent decade.
- Frank Eisenhower asked if there was merit to adding onto the existing middle schools. He also inquired about the number of classrooms that would need to be added to support 1300 students in a building at the middle school level.
- Andy Fouss asked for the identity and location of the other schools in the state of Ohio with large middle school populations for future discussions.
- Joe Troxell asked about the impact that six or seven middle schools would have on district transportation services. Mr. Gordon did not see a large impact with either situation.
- Joe Troxell also inquired about "perception issues" regarding students attending a new middle school versus a renovated older middle school. Mr. Gordon advised that this situation always exists in the district with one aspect or another.
- Kevin McCaughey asked for verification that a new middle school could fit on the same site as SMS. He also asked if the district was receiving any community pressure for the removal of SMS. Dr. Daberkow shared that the community is asking really good questions about SMS, but they are not putting pressure on the district to take any action at this time.
- Jeff Gordon shared that many of the expensive maintenance items at SMS have already been updated or replaced over the years. Much of the HVAC system is newer and the roof has been maintained. There is a water and sanitary line issue pending that would be a higher cost issue to address, but other than that, the school remains very functional and in good condition.
- Mr. Gordon also shared that the district is already in the process of replacing some flooring at SMS, updating the restrooms (and some casework) and replacing the school sign. This is an effort to give the building a bit of a "lift" for the short-term.
- Mr. Gordon asked members to think about what the district might do with SMS Preschool program if SMS was torn down or rebuilt.
- Mr. Gordon would also like members to think about what needs to be done at SMS for the district to be able to use it as an educational facility for the next 30 to 40 years.

Mr. Gordon had shared OFCC reporting results with members prior to the evening's meeting. He addressed some of the highlights of the reporting at the meeting. He asked members Jarrod Gilliam, Kevin McCaughey and Frank Eisenhower to review the OFCC mechanicals information provided.

A discussion ensued regarding what the OFCC report really means. Although many deficiencies were noted in the SMS report, some were listed because the building does not meet the specifications from the OFCC design manual.

A comparison of the OFCC reports for BHS and LMS was also discussed. Even Berlin High School had items like technology and roofing listed for replacement in the OFCC report, despite being fairly new and under warranty (roof). This is another example of district buildings not meeting OFCC design criteria, yet still remaining very functional for district needs. As a result, we will have to assess what the true replacement needs are at SMS.

Mr. Gordon will review the results from the other OFCC report categories. He would like to determine in a future discussion if the OFCC's numbers are high. If the numbers are high, he would like to determine what the true numbers are. He would also like to determine if it is cost effective for the district to pursue the OFCC's recommendations using the OFCC criteria (or if the district performs better with its own specifications and criteria).

Energy Conservation Program

Jeff Gordon shared a PowerPoint presentation with members updating them about the status of the district's energy conservation initiative. A copy of the presentation is available upon request through the district's Business Office.

Overall, the district has saved an estimated 5.8 million dollars since the last levy in 2020. The district's energy usage in units has remained steady, while the cost of energy per unit continues to climb. New capacity charges have been passed along to the district by the energy providers. The capacity charges are significant increases and are something that cannot be changed or controlled by the district.

The district has an overall Energy Star rating average in the 92 percentile, which is very high. Not only does OLSD outperform most schools in the state of Ohio with its Energy Star rating, but the rating is also very high on a national level for similar facilities.

Also important to note is that the district has opened many new schools since 2020. This impacts the original energy "baseline numbers" that were established for the district's energy conservation program. As a result, the district will work toward creating a new set of energy baseline numbers that incorporate the newest buildings in the district that are now operational.

General Business

Prospective member Andrew Fouss was in attendance at the evening's meeting as an observer. He is a mechanical engineer that resides in the district. Based upon his profession, he is hopeful that the Facilities Committee would be a good fit given his professional skill sets.

Members will vote on the recommendation for Mr. Fouss as a member at the April Facilities Committee meeting, as several members had to leave the meeting early to be able to attend other commitments.

Influencers

Members discussed that the completion date for the Intel project had been moved back to 2030. They were uncertain that the scale of the project would remain the same (or become smaller) as the facility nears its actual completion date.

Members also commented on the large number of data centers being constructed in the area.

Frank Eisenhower called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Joe Troxell moved and Kevin McCaughey seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Facilities Committee meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

The next monthly meeting is tentatively scheduled for 4/2/2025.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Gordon