

The Olentangy Facilities Committee Meeting
May 7, 2025 @ 6:00 p.m.
Olentangy Administrative Offices- Berlin Room

In attendance for the Facilities Committee were:

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

Also in attendance were Bruce Runyon (Fanning Howey), Todd Boyer (Fanning Howey), Dr. Kevin Daberkow (BOE Representative), Ryan Jenkins (OLSD), Jeff Gordon (OLSD) 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 April 2, 2025 meeting.

Greg Rogers moved, and Jarrod Gilliam seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Wes Smith moved, and Greg Rogers seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2025 meeting. Motion carried.

Shanahan Middle School

Jeff Gordon shared a spreadsheet with members of projected renovation costs for Shanahan Middle School (SMS) that compared them to estimated construction costs for a new (replacement) middle school on the existing Shanahan campus.

Mr. Gordon noted that we do know at this time that the district needs at least seven middle schools for the next 40 years. To accomplish this, is it in the best interest of the district to renovate Shanahan Middle School (built in the 1950's) or to build a new middle school facility on the site using a variation of the building design for Berlin Middle School?

Projections in the spreadsheet pertaining to renovation costs are "ballpark" numbers based on OFCC costs. They are for discussion purposes only. Should renovation of SMS prove to be a viable option, more detailed "budgetary numbers" would be established.

Mr. Gordon asked Chair Frank Eisenhower to speak on the longevity of the existing HVAC system at SMS. While well maintained in condition, Mr. Eisenhower shared that to ask any mechanical system to last for another 40 years is asking a lot. It is likely that the HVAC system at SMS will need another major update in the next 20 to 25 years.

Mr. Gordon asked member Jarrod Gilliam to speak on the longevity of the existing electrical system at SMS. Mr. Gilliam shared the same sentiment about the electrical system as Mr. Eisenhower did about the HVAC system. It is expecting too much to get another 40 years out of

the existing SMS electrical system without replacing many of the essential components. He advised that while he sees functional older gear often, the industry typically finds the lifespan of most electrical equipment to be about 25 years. He also pointed out that it can be difficult to find compatible parts to service older systems. Additionally, the industry is seeing significant lead times in obtaining equipment and parts (especially those that are older). This could pose challenges for a renovation project with tight timelines. Committee members stressed the importance of keeping the electrical system updated for student safety and minimizing any issues that may result in disruptions to the educational process (or even having to close school for maintenance related reasons). It was also discussed that it would make more sense to go ahead and complete both the electrical and HVAC renovations with the rest of the building. The full OFCC cost estimates would apply.

Architect Bruce Runyon from Fanning Howey attended the meeting and helped to review the budget numbers proposed for renovations at SMS. He thought the initial plumbing projections to be low. He did not believe that they accounted adequately for unforeseen conditions with the existing piping. He shared that the OFCC estimates incorporate fixture replacement, but not for piping in the walls or underground.

In reviewing the renovation information for SMS he also shared:

- For the building exterior, the OFCC generally does not like EIFS. They would likely trend toward a metal panel exterior system or similar. Mr. Gordon shared that the existing EIFS is in poor condition.
- A complete replacement of the finishes would be likely. This would include flooring, cabinetry, bleachers, casework, kitchen equipment and more.
- The OFCC lists \$8.42 per square foot for lighting replacements. Both Mr. Runyon and Mr. Gilliam believed this to be low. Mr. Gilliam believes the cost to actually be around \$15.00 per square foot based upon recent projects that he has worked on.
- Mr. Gilliam would also add more money to the budget for new technology cabling. Many of the existing cables would be damaged during the renovation of the mechanical systems.
- The committee reviewed information provided by member Kevin McCaughey (in an email) relevant to the fire alarm and life safety systems. Mr. McCaughey believed the OFCC cost estimates for these components to be accurate (if not low). Please see his email attached with information regarding these systems for additional detail.
- It is likely that the local municipalities will ask for additional handicapped access updates to the facility.
- The OFCC cost for exterior doors appears to be low.
- Mr. Runyon is concerned for the water pressure on the SMS site. It is only a private water system at the rear of the building. There is limited public water available at the very front of the SMS site. There would need to be flow tests. Booster pumps and storage tanks may be necessary if sprinklers were a requirement of the renovation.
- It is important to note that SMS is not just a single building that was constructed in the 1950's. Because SMS was added onto many times over the years, it is more like ten buildings constructed over a span of decades.

A general discussion about proposed renovations to SMS commenced:

- Jeff Gordon clarified that any renovations to SMS would need to take place over a period of several summers so that the building could continue to be used during the school year. This will add to the project costs.
- Mr. Gordon also stated that demolition costs of approximately 1.6 million (or more) need to be added to the budget for the project if the district were to replace SMS and build a new middle school on the SMS site.
- Dr. Daberkow inquired if furniture costs would need to be added to the project. It did not seem to make sense to renovate SMS then fill the space with older furniture and equipment.
- Members inquired about technology equipment updates that may be needed for the project. Mr. Gordon clarified that much of the cabling technology infrastructure at SMS was updated at the time that OOHS was constructed. The technology hardware is updated regularly.
- Member Wes Smith expressed concern that the amount that the OFCC allocated for the renovation project contingency may be too low. He anticipates many unknown or unforeseen circumstances if renovating SMS that would likely require additional funding. Mr. Gordon will adjust the projected costs for this upward.
- With adjustments to the budget resulting from the discussion at this evening's meeting, it was estimated that it would cost at least \$62 million dollars minimum to renovate Shanahan Middle School to a level that would bring it up to similar finish levels of the district's new middle school buildings.

After much review and discussion, members in attendance unanimously concluded that it would be more cost effective for the district to build a new middle school facility to replace SMS rather than to spend money to renovate the existing SMS structure. It was obvious to all participating that the most cost-effective way in which to provide the SMS students with an educational facility like Berlin Middle School (BLMS) is to construct a brand new building like BLMS. It is simply the best outcome for the students at SMS and use of district funds for the community.

As a result, members transitioned the meeting discussion from the renovation of SMS to the potential construction of a new middle school facility on the campus of SMS. The discussion commenced as follows:

- Jeff Gordon clarified that SMS does not necessarily hold more students than the other middle schools despite having more square footage.
- A discussion continued around renovations. If it is not cost effective to renovate the whole SMS building, it would likely not make sense to renovate any part of the building.
- SMS currently is home to a preschool program and the OASIS program. We will need to figure out the best place to locate these programs, should a new facility be constructed at SMS. The current building design at BLMS would not accommodate these programs as drawn. Dr. Jack Fette will need to address the future planning needs for these programs with the committee. Mr. Gordon will verify if Dr. Fette can attend the June 2025 Facilities Committee meeting.
- Treasurer Ryan Jenkins asked members if SMS should be the next site for Middle School #7? Members did not provide a response to his question.

- Dr. Daberkow shared concern about project timelines. If the district were to put a levy request on the November 2025 ballot, it would need to make facility and levy package decisions by no later than July of 2025. He is not sure that this provides sufficient time for the district to make all the decisions that it needs to make.
- Treasurer Jenkins shared that all budgetary information needed would not need to be available by July of 2025.
- Dr. Daberkow would really like more community input on the decisions that need to be made relevant to the future of Shanahan Middle School. He would like the community to feel that their ideas were heard and incorporated when going to vote.
- Frank Eisenhower asked if community thoughts about SMS could be gathered in some sort of coffee chat type format from various groups of community members.
- Greg Rogers discussed that there are five other middle school communities in the district other than SMS. He questioned the level at which these parents would care about changes impacting SMS when going to vote. He would like to see both MS #7 and MS #8 on the next ballot. Treasurer Jenkins did not believe this to be possible and still maintain a no new millage package. Project costs would need to be under the \$360 to \$380 million dollar range for a no new millage package at this time.
- Mr. Gordon thanked Dr. Daberkow for his input. He clarified that in the past the Facilities Committee (comprised of community members) had typically driven the facility count needs, facility type needs, and facility design needs on behalf of the community based upon their professional skills and analysis of enrollment projection data provided.
- Mr. Gordon also advised that he believes any decisions that need to be made relevant to keeping specific portions of the Shanahan structure could be made soon.
- Mr. Gordon voiced that solutions for the SMS Preschool and Oasis programs are the larger part of the project puzzle (if building a new SMS facility).
- Mr. Gordon commented that perhaps another elementary sized facility could be added onto the new middle school building on the SMS site via a “connector” like HMS.
- Treasurer Jenkins shared that the district could submit (and be more specific later in the summer) for bonds for a projected amount.
- Failure of the “clawback” legislation provision by the state is pivotal to the district’s levy planning. The provisions would not allow the district to carry over funds in excess of 30 percent of its expenses. Any additional funds would be returned to the taxpayers by the county and would not be able to be used by OLSD for future planning purposes. This would reduce the district’s five-year planning forecast to about three years and would require frequent (possibly annual) levy requests by the district from the community. It would also jeopardize the district’s AAA bond rating, which would impact the interest rate and amount of future bond acquisitions by the district.
- Overall, the clawback legislation provides false property tax relief to homeowners on the backs of all school districts in the state of Ohio.
- 2026 is the next property tax review year for Delaware County. This could once again negatively impact any levy asks by the school district by the community. It may benefit the district to avoid a new levy ask during this period.
- The failure of the last levy request by the district is thought to be because of a combination of the property valuation increases by the county auditor and a coordinated misinformation situation within parts of the community.

- Members discussed that community members at this time are not likely seeing much negative impact at the building level due to the failure of the last OLSD levy ask. As a result, they may not see the benefit of the additional tax dollars being sought.
- Members commented that by 2027, the district is projected to need about 20 classroom trailers throughout the district. It is at this time that the community may start to see negative impact due to the failure of the last OLSD levy request.
- Mr. Gordon reminded members that the district had plans for theater, stadium and other PI improvements with funding from the failed levy request. These needs still remain and should be incorporated into future discussions and planning.
- Mr. Gordon also shared that elementary student enrollment growth is now shifting more to the west side of the district and that this should be considered with timing and placement of new buildings. It certainly solidifies the urgent need for Elementary #18.
- Mr. Gordon believes that OLSD still needs two new elementary schools (in the next five years), one new middle school and another high school. However, this does not account for a new building to replace SMS.
- A brief discussion commenced relevant to potential millage ask amounts for the next levy. Treasurer Jenkins is in support of a no new millage package. Dr. Daberkow would like to see a millage ask with a minimal millage (perhaps .25 mills). Mr. Gordon shared that the district could use at least 1.5 mills to fund permanent improvement needs for the district.
- Dr. Daberkow shared that he has met with Delaware County to discuss an increase to the sales tax in Delaware County that would be shared with all Delaware County schools. The maximum increase available to the schools is a $\frac{1}{4}$ percent sales tax increase. Some schools already have an income tax in place in their communities to assist them with funding needs. We do not have an income tax and as a result do not benefit from such consistent funding for our planning and growth needs.
- Dr. Daberkow and members would like for the next levy ask to be based upon the simple fact that OLSD is running out of space for kids in its existing buildings due to overwhelming growth that continues throughout the district. Is it possible for a levy request to be successful with such an honest and matter-of-fact approach without making negative lists of things that will be cut and taken away?

Tariffs

Mr. Gordon transitioned the evening's discussions to address the possible impact of pending tariffs on district improvement and new construction projects. It is too soon to know the overall impact of potential tariffs, however, some of the other school districts are being advised by their architects and engineers to add a one-time five percent tariff increase to their quotes and construction budget costs.

Members were not quite certain how to feel about this but discussed that they were glad that Roger Bartz had recommended a ten million dollar contingency line be added to the last bond package for new buildings. The money was needed for the construction of those new buildings due to the unforeseen impact that COVID brought upon the economy at that time.

Members would support increasing the contingency budget line to a future levy ask. They were uncertain as to the amount. Mr. Gordon suggested adding ten million dollars to the contingency

line (for a total of twenty million dollars in contingency). This is due to the number of new school buildings being proposed and to offset the impact of any potential tariffs that may be upcoming.

Influencers

Some changes have been seen in the construction market due to Intel announcing a delay in its New Albany area facility. Currently, members are seeing a greater availability of contractors and lower quote amounts. Some vendors are even implementing layoffs. Due to this, the district could potentially see better bid results for projects in the short-term.

Frank Eisenhower called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Greg Rogers moved, and Andy Fouss seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The Facilities Committee meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

The next monthly meeting is tentatively scheduled for 6/4/2025.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Gordon