

**Ohio Facilities Construction Commission**  
**October 22, 2015**  
**William McKinley Room**  
**2:30 PM**

*MINUTES*

Chairman Keen called the meeting to order at 2:44 PM.

**Roll Call**

Members present: Chairman Timothy Keen, Mr. Paul Russell and Mr. Gary Mohr.

**Adoption of the January 22, 2015 Minutes**

Director Mohr moved to approve the January 22, 2015 minutes.

Paul Russell seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

**Authority to File Energy Rules Approval – Sarah Spence – Resolution 15-01**

Sarah Spence presented authorization for the executive director to file amended rules for energy services for Commission approval. Previously filed Administrative Code rules are now due for their statutorily required 5-year review through JCARR. Those rules include the requirements, procedures and guidelines for energy consumption and life cycle cost analysis of new, renovated and leased state facilities; certifying designated building operators of state funded facilities; and local administration of installment payment energy conservation contracts in accordance with ORC 123.22.

Commission staff has updated the rules to change references from DAS and the Office of Energy services to OFCC, consistent with changes in ORC. Language was also changed around the life-cycle costing, which used to be a separate financial submittal separate from design. Current industry practice is to incorporate energy modeling into the design process, and the rule now better reflects allowing that practice as well as giving more flexibility in evaluating alternative designs for new and renovated facilities.

Upon resolution approval, the Executive Director can file the rules with JCARR, which will begin the 65 day process of JCARR review and approval.

Director Mohr moved to approve Resolution 15-01.

Paul Russell seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

## **Electronic Surety Bond Rule Approval – Sarah Spence – Resolution 15-02**

Sarah Spence presented authorization for the executive director to file an amended rule for electronic bidding for the acceptance of electronic surety bonds for Commission approval. H.B. 64 of the 131<sup>st</sup> Ohio General Assembly allows the Commission to accept, for all bids filed electronically, a bid guaranty by means of an electronic verification and security system established under rules adopted by the Commission.

Commission staff has reviewed Administrative rule 153:1-8-01 and recommends making modifications to the rule to accept bid guaranties through the state's current web-based subscription service for electronic bidding. The electronic bidding service allows a verification code for a surety bond to be submitted at the time of bid. Companies can work with their surety company to decide which of the electronic surety bond systems it would like to use in order to receive the verification code.

Upon resolution approval, the Executive Director can file the rule with JCARR, which will begin the 65 day process of JCARR review and approval. The Commission can then set an effective date for the rule that will allow time for industry outreach and implementation.

Chairman Keen moved to approve Resolution 15-02.  
Director Mohr seconded the motion.  
Approval: Vote 3-0.

## **DRC Update – William Ramsey**

William Ramsey provided an update on the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (ODRC's) master plan. Chairman Keen expressed the Commission's anticipation regarding this plan and is looking forward to hearing how the OFCC partners with fellow state agencies to develop projects like this.

Mr. Ramsey introduced Jenny Hildebrand and Stuart Hudson from ODRC who joined him. Mr. Ramsey and Ms. Hildebrand began the presentation with a discussion of ODRC's request of the OFCC in 2014 to develop a plan to assess existing facility conditions and evaluate them to meet the agency's operational requirements and mission. These assessments and evaluations would become the basis of short and long-term facilities repair and renovation planning, and support the agency's capital planning and project development decision-making process.

The facilities activity began in the spring of 2014, assessing the physical conditions of each building. The assessments provided data to the facilities manager of each institution that can be used to develop capital facilities requests for current and long term improvements and manage the institution's operational repairs and replacements. The timing of the assessments supported the agency's target for development of the capital budget, and assisted the facilities team in prioritizing future operational and capital needs for each institution.

The operations and program activity began in the fall of 2014. Mr. Ramsey explained that this activity reviewed the various operations and programs of the agency and how the facilities support or hinder the operation. The activity has progressed throughout 2015 with a series of multi-disciplinary meetings within ODRC to review operations, policies and programs; and discuss the goals and direction of the agency. Facility options have been developed to support these goals and direction, and the team is currently reviewing these to develop a recommendation for implementation. Ms. Hildebrand added that an important consideration to implementation of the plan will be the level of construction that can be completed within each operating facility during a biennium, and the overall amount of work that can be requested by the agency. The two activities will be combined into the overall master plan and future decisions regarding repair, improvements or replacement of buildings within each institution can be made based on the condition and operational performance determined from these activities.

Mr. Ramsey presented an update on the assessment activities. Fourteen architectural and engineering firms were hired based on the location within the state and the size of the facilities to make sure the assessments would be completed within the project window. The assessment teams covered 34 locations totaling over 700 buildings and 15 million square feet, making ODRC the largest agency caretaker of state facilities. Separate assessments were completed for farm operations, water treatment facilities and Community Based Correctional Facilities. One of the more significant findings of the assessment was the age of the buildings. Approximately one-half of the assessed buildings were found to be 30 years of age or older, and the average age of all institutions is 40 years. In general the buildings are structurally and physically sound, which Mr. Ramsey stated as a testament to the designs and materials used to construct the institutions. Equipment and operable materials across most of the institutions are nearing the end of their useful life. The assessments were reviewed with the facilities staff at each institution to determine whether building systems or equipment line items indicated as requiring repair or replacement should be addressed as an operational or capital cost. While the end of useful life is not an indicator of failure, it can indicate the likely-hood of increased repairs and loss of efficiency. Chairman Keen asked where the Youngstown facility was on the diagram. Mr. Ramsey indicated that it was listed as Ohio State Penitentiary (OSP). Chairman Keen asked why there was a limited amount of assessed need and whether that was due to the age of facility. Mr. Ramsey replied that yes, OSP has a smaller value of assessed need compared to other institutions due to an institutional age between 20 and 30 years. The newest ODRC institution is the Toledo Correctional *Institution* at approximately 25 years.

Mr. Ramsey and Ms. Hildebrand then presented the operation and program planning activities of the master plan. Working with a consultant, ODRC and OFCCC reviewed the programs and operations of ODRC to determine how the facilities support or hinder the agency's mission. Environmental factors such as population, increasing age of the inmates and medical/health needs as well as mandated programs were evaluated for the ability of the facilities to support these continuing changes. From this review 8 vision topics were developed with several focus areas added for facility review. Each institution was evaluated for its ability to support the vision topics as well as staff and program needs. Ms. Hildebrand added that the age and mental health concerns of the inmate population has become of prime concern, and the female inmate population is growing, all of which require more thoughtful planning to make sure these needs are met.

Once the facilities and visions were evaluated, a series of facility prototype solutions were developed. The prototype does not necessarily mean new construction, but what kind of facility model, existing or new, would the institution follow as the plan progresses.

Mr. Ramsey and Ms. Hildebrand presented three examples of how the OFCC and ODRC has progressed from prototype planning to institutional capital planning at the Franklin Medical Center, Ohio Reformatory for Women and Pickaway Correctional Institution. The level of detail developed at these locations will be used to support the capital requests developed by the agency as they move forward with the master plan.

Mr. Ramsey closed the presentation with a discussion of the next steps and further planning to be considered with ODRC. ODRC and OFCC will be developing logistical and management plans for implementation of projects for when funding is approved. The operational and program recommendations of the master plans still needs further development. The amount of data created through the assessments can become a resource to the institutions' and agency's facilities management staff, ensuring that informed decisions about each building's operational and capital needs.

Chairman Keen stated this is just an example of how the Facilities Construction Commission can be a resource and a partner with other state agencies. It was clearly very thorough, and a document to work from for a number of years. Director Mohr added that the challenge is the prioritization and fiscal planning which will then help DRC move into the budget process. First time in my tenure that I have any control in numbers. It will give us a place to get started. Chairman Keen added he had high hopes for this project, it sounds like a lot has come to pass and this is something that needs to potentially be talked about and how it has gone with some of our cabinet colleagues to make them aware of those that have intensive facility footprints to think about how to move forward with planning. David Chovan commented that it really is about partnership and we haven't done anything quite as extensive as we have been able to do with DRC, but we have quite a few planning efforts underway with Youth Services, Public Safety, Department of Transportation, Department of Health, Attorney General's Office, the school for the Deaf and the School for the Blind. We really believe there is going to be immediate fruit from this in what you will be able to see with capital requests coming in from the agencies.

### **Cultural Facilities Update – Jeff Westhoven**

Jeff Westhoven presented an update on Cultural Facilities to the Commission members. As part of HB59, the previous Cultural Facilities Commission became part of the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission in July 2013 and at that time the redesign of the program began. As a result in July 2014, we came to you for approval of the guidelines and shortly thereafter with the capital bill there were a total of 122 cultural projects totaling \$64M in projects to administer. Our first project was approved shortly after that. We really had two types of projects: previous appropriations and new appropriations. Of the previous appropriations there were 39 projects with about \$9M that had not been approved and those went back as early as the late 90's. One of the reasons a lot of those were not approved was they had to raise their local share before the project would be fully funded. Of the old ones there were 8 that raised their local share, made it through the financial sustainability and were approved and then we still have 31 that we consider not yet

submitted. We have reached out to some of those old projects. At least 5 of them we would recommend that they lapse this next year. Either the organization is no longer in existence or the facility is no longer in existence. We are reaching out to the others to see if whether we would recommend re-appropriation. In terms of status, about half the dollars are approved and the other half uncertain, but we are still working with them. Of the current appropriations, of the 122 projects we have 37 that have not yet submitted, 20 have submitted either partially or completely and 65 have been approved. Dollars approved now is just over \$20M. Over half of the new projects have been approved. Generally these projects seem to be in better shape in terms of their design going into the capital bill. It seems like the local project sponsors are more aware of the requirements. They seem more prepared with their applications and so we are seeing a lot smoother process. In terms of the work involved, a small project is about as much work as a larger project. We have a few larger projects that are close to being submitted so we expect the dollars to track pretty closely here with the numbers submitted. If you take the work done and project it through the end of the biennium, this is just intending to show that at the current pace by the end of the biennium, we will have administered 100 projects. We expect about that number to have their local share. We should be on pace to administer all the projects that have been put into the capital bill under cultural. If you would ask the local project sponsors it has gone more smoothly from their regard. We feel we are in good shape to administer all the projects that have been part of the capital bill.

Tim Keen commented that this is an example of the success of the creation of the Facilities Construction Commission. A lot of thoughtful work has been done on how to manage these cultural projects. This has gone very, very well. The fact that we are moving so many through is testament to the good work that has been done. The nature of these projects is there are going to be some that are not going to follow through and that doesn't reflect at all on the Facilities Construction Commission it reflects on the project and the realities on the ground of some of the projects that find their way into the capital bill.

### **Performance Metrics Update – Sara Freetage**

Sara Freetage provided a performance metrics update to the Commission members. In FY15, OFCC measured and tracked nearly 40 performance metrics covering a wide variety of the responsibilities of OFCC. As a construction agency, the most important metrics are those that measure the cost and timeliness of the construction projects for which we are responsible. In FY15, 67% of our projects were completed on or under budget. For these projects, the original budgets are established by the customers with little input from OFCC. Also, impacting this are the market conditions that prevailed at the time of bidding in comparison to when the original budgets were established 2 to 3 years earlier. This metric compares the actual costs of the completed projects to the original project budgets. 45% of our projects were completed on time. Even though construction completion was later than originally planned, the majority of the school buildings, for example, opened on time to allow the educational delivery to proceed uninterrupted. This metric compares the occupancy of the project to the original project timeline. We do believe that these project metrics can be improved. We are assessing the factors that impact both project cost and the schedule and are implementing measures to bring about the necessary results. The completed projects in FY15 were mostly built under the multi-prime model that was solely available prior to the implementation of construction reform. As we see the completion of projects under

construction reform, we anticipate these project metrics will improve based on the benefits provided from alternative delivery methods to complete projects in less time and to cap the costs with a guaranteed maximum price. Other results that support the OFCC mission and its customers include: Procured 76 professional service contracts in an average of 72 days; Closed out 54 school district construction projects; reduced backlog 32%; LEED certified 66 completed buildings; Enrollment projection accuracy within 4.2% of actual for current school district projects and 11.3% of expenses were made to EDGE firms, surpassing the 5% EDGE goal.

## **Executive Director's Report**

Director Chovan reported that provided in the meeting materials were listings of design and construction contracts that had been executed since the July meeting for agency, higher education projects, cultural facilities grant projects and the K-12 program. Also included in the meeting materials were the meeting dates for 2016.

David Chovan introduced Tom Baker, Project Manager, who provided a presentation of the Buckeye Agricultural Pavilion. Bill Ramsey provided the history. In 2013 a master plan was prepared. This is how they looked 10 years ahead, but also preparation for the FY15-16 capital request. Part of that request included looking at two new facilities. An equine building, to house up to 1,000 horse stalls primarily for use for horses at that point and also a multi-purpose building that would be used for exposition purposes. Many months were spent through the winter of 2014 developing this facility and we moved it forward as a successful project once the capital bill was passed. At that point, we turned it over to Tom Baker to see this project through.

Tom Baker reported that the Buckeye Agricultural Pavilion started construction December 16, 2014 and completed on time September 15, 2015. It was a very successful design build delivery project. The building itself is composed of two components. There is the enclosed actual barn stall building which is roughly 195,000 sf. Overall dimensions are 650 feet long by 300 feet wide. There is an open riding pavilion which is 39,000 sf. Those dimensions are roughly 130 feet x 300 feet. Within the enclosed barn facility, we were able to incorporate 1,026 horse stalls. Those horse stalls are 10 x 10 x 7 foot 6 inches high. In addition to that, there are 20 horse wash basins. There are two sets of men's and women's restrooms and two offices. Translucent panels were incorporated into the facility providing natural light throughout the facility. It is a very large facility. At the top there are four cupolas which exhausts the air. Heat is not provided within the facility, but air is being circulated. There are large fans and exhausts that brings the warm air through the cupolas. Two portals were incorporated to identify and signify where the entrance is. There is the open riding pavilion. The white walls are the actual temporary partition walls that extend about 5 feet high. On the inside of the facility there is a special soil. The soil is brought in and it is about 6 – 8 inches and it is special for the horses. The stalls inside the facility are 10 x 10 x 7 foot 6 inches high and a tan color was used that brings in more light to reflect throughout the space. Early on there was a very good design build team and part of that team included the architect of record. We also worked with the Ohio Expo and their representatives. Scott Myers was also very active and participated in our weekly progress meetings. Everyone coming together made this a successful project. Coming soon is Cardinal Hall at the Ohio Expo Center, the next project that I am overseeing as project manager. That project actually started construction around May 15, 2015 and we are looking at a completion date of July 15, 2016. This facility is roughly 100,000

sf and has three large open exhibition areas. It includes meeting rooms, conference rooms and an open walk-way concession area. Cardinal Hall currently has structural steel going up. We are looking at bringing in metal roof the end of October.

Chairman Keen commented that this project was of great interest. At the time that the last capital bill was being put together, the Quarter Horse Congress is a huge event for the state, the city and the county. In working closely with the Quarter Horse Congress, this project has enabled the state to keep this significant economic event here in Ohio. We are pleased that the project has gone so well and that they were able to successfully use the facility at the last Quarter Horse Congress. Chairman Keen commended the Facilities Construction Commission for their work along the way on this project. David Chovan added that Tom Baker did such a good job on a high profile tight deadline project that we decided to give him another one. The Cardinal Hall will also be his. It is amazing, 5.5 acres under roof. That prospective is pretty massive and the Quarter Horse Congress people just seemed to be very thrilled. This is a major step forward for them. They are very pleased with the product. In addition to this facility, we have had other facilities that we have been able to dedicate over the last quarter: Central State University, Department of Veteran Affairs and the Northcoast Behavioral Health Care Facility. Director Chovan concluded his report by sharing the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission Annual Report for FY15. It can also be found on the OFCC website. The report is full of great information about what the Commission has been able to do.

There was no public testimony.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:44 PM.



Timothy S. Keen, Commission Chair



These meeting minutes were prepared by  
Carolyn L. McClure, Secretary to the Commission