

Ohio School Facilities Commission
July 10, 2014 Meeting
William McKinley Room, Statehouse
1:30 PM

MINUTES

Chairman Keen called the meeting to order at 1:32 PM.

Roll Call

Members present: Chairman Keen, Vice Chair Blair, Dr. Richard Ross, Representative Ramos, Rebecca Cochran for Senator Manning and Cindy Peters for Senator Sawyer.

Adoption of the April 24, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve the April 24, 2014 meeting minutes.

Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

**School Security Grant Program Update and Guidelines Approval – Jeff Westhoven -
*Resolution 14-18***

Jeff Westhoven provided an update on the School Security Grant Program and presented the School Security Grant Program Guidelines for Commission approval. A year ago, the original School Security Grant Program was designed to be a \$12 M capital fund to improve safety in public schools in two areas: entrances and emergency communications. Features were built into the guidelines to ensure that the highest priorities were funded without running out of money. The safeguards were: as grant applications were received they were assigned a Priority 1 (funded first) or Priority 2 (funded with remaining funds). Deadlines were established for the applications and for reimbursement upon completion of the program. Application deadlines were March 15, 2014. Reimbursement deadlines are September 14, 2014. Those deadlines gave us the opportunity to take a look at the program and improve it for the next round. At our last update in April, we had closed Round 1. We received over 3,700 applications to the program totaling \$11.7 M and the limit was \$12 M. There were 54% for communications systems and 46% for security entrances. All the Priority 1 applications were approved before the deadline and all the Priority 2 applications as well. Completed applications (777 schools) of approximately \$3.5 M have been reimbursed. On the average \$5,000 grant, the average amount spent was \$4,200. It shows real fiscal responsibility on the part of the schools to only use the money that they feel they need for improving their schools. At this time, we have reached every county with this program. Districts/district entities served are 1,074. Public schools or a district, a community or charter school and ESC (Education Service Center) are considered a district for the purposes of this count. These approved grants equates to 1.3 M students are in safer environments because of this program. In April, we reported that we had expended \$11.7 M and that we would not open a Round 2 unless further funding came through. Under HB 483, there was a \$17 M

expansion of the program to include other schools including private schools and parochial schools. Since the funding source is a non-capital source that means community schools that were in non-public owned buildings are now eligible. If every one of those schools are approved for entrance in communications, that is the amount calculated as \$17 M. Preparation for Round 2 has begun. The law is effective in September and we expect to be accepting online applications in October. We enlisted the help of the Department of Education who has the database of all the buildings. Electronic links will be sent to all the eligible schools. The grant application will be pre-populated with all the information that is already there: address, superintendent's name, etc. They just answer a few questions and then submit. The approval time for the first round grant applications averaged seven days. Reimbursements were four days. We hope to continue that turnaround time. The deadline on submitting applications in this new round is more open because we want to ensure everyone participates and so that will be determined later as the money is spent.

Representative Ramos thanked OFCC for their hard work to keep our children safe. It is obviously a priority for all of us. He asked for clarification since we are now adding additional types of schools (chartered; non-public, community schools and non-public buildings) will there be enough money to handle 100% of the publicly held buildings. Jeff Westhoven responded the amount is calculated to be adequate for all remaining public schools and all private schools, so it really is adequate for all. Representative Ramos added with particularly non-publicly held buildings, to a lesser extent chartered non-publics, but to a great extent community schools, which open all the time, and for better or worse, some of them close, or operate only for a short time. Our laws are written so that if a community school is not performing that it will lose its charter, or a group that is chartering it could decide they do not want to be in business of educating anymore, and that is their right. Is there anything within these guidelines, as you understand them, that would allow for us to recoup our expenses if we provide security equipment to a non-publicly held building that then is used for another purpose, they are no longer an educational institution. Jeff Westhoven responded in the current guidelines there is no provision if someone would close the school that they would have to pay back the money or repurpose it. In our cultural facilities guidelines, we do have the provision, but it is not currently in guidelines for school security.

Dr. Richard Ross moved to approve Resolution 14-18.

Vice Chair Blair seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

Accelerated Urban School District Update and Approval – Melanie Drerup

Resolution 14-19, Resolution 14-20 and Resolution 14-21

The Commission approved a Master Facilities Plan in 2002 for \$1.51 B divided into 9 segments for 111 buildings to house 72,500 students. The Commission has approved 6 segments to date. The Commission amended the Master Facilities Plan in 2011 to a reduced 36,000 students and the projected enrollment is now 32,443 a decrease of 3,557 more students.

Resolution 14-19 Cleveland Segment 3, Amendment 2

Melanie Drerup presented the Cleveland Metropolitan School District Segment 3, Amendment 2 for Commission approval. The previously amended Segment 3 agreement provided \$133.7 M for 9 buildings. The proposed amendment decreases the allowance for abatement and demolition of schools (moves allowance for 1 building Wilson MS to Segment 6.) The Cleveland segment 3 budget is decreased by \$410,805 for an updated budget of \$133.3 M.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-19.

Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

Resolution 14-20 Cleveland Segment 6, Amendment 1

Melanie Drerup presented the Cleveland Metropolitan School District Segment 6, Amendment 1 for Commission approval. The previously approved Segment 6 agreement provided \$52.4 M for 3 new buildings. The proposed amendment deletes three buildings (3PK-8 Case, Empire & Buckeye Woodland); decreases the swing space allowance for 3 buildings (3PK-8 Case, Empire & Buckeye Woodland) and increases the allowance for abatement and demolition of schools (add A/D allowance for 7 buildings, delete A/D allowance for 6 buildings, delete demo allowance at 1 building Abatement only at Buckeye Woodland.) The Cleveland Segment 6 budget is decreased by \$40.7 M for an updated budget of \$11.6 M.

There are additional segments being planned for Cleveland which will be brought to the Commission at a later date. The estimated budget for the remaining segments is \$370 M.

Vice Chair Blair asked how far do these demographics go out. Director Hickman responded the original master plan originated in 2002 planned for 111 buildings and based on the enrollment decreases is now 63 buildings. The projection from 2010/2011/2013 of 63 has not changed for 2014. The school district has not provided us with the next segment on what they intend to build. We will continue to evaluate enrollment for each segment and as we progress and will *adjust the buildings* accordingly. Melanie Drerup added the number is the actual enrollment projection for when we expect them to be complete. It is a 10 year projection from January 2014.

Chairman Keen asked in regards to amending Segments 3 and 6, if these were active projects consistent with the available funding that the Cleveland School District now has. Director Hickman responded that the district currently has enough funding to complete the current segment, but they will have to go back to the voters in order to raise additional funds to continue their building program. It is our expectation that they will probably go to the voters in November. We will work with them to determine the size of the next segment, but there will be subsequent segments beyond what we look at in terms of our next building endeavor for the district.

Dr. Richard Ross moved to approve Resolution 14-20.
Vice Chair Blair seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 3-0.

Resolution 14-21 Cleveland Segment 6, Amendment 2

Melanie Drerup presented the Cleveland Metropolitan School District Segment 6, Amendment 2 for Commission approval. This amendment revises the language in the project agreement to change Article IV. Section F. Maintenance of Completed Facilities. When the first segment agreement was executed on April 16, 2003, the amount projected to be collected from the ½ mil maintenance requirement was greater than what the ½ mil generates today. The district, through this amendment, will be required to annually deposit an amount equivalent to the amount generated by a ½ mil levy, and no more than that.

Dr. Ross asked if a ½ mil maintenance requirement that was originally approved raised more money than it does now in Cleveland and then we are requiring them to meet a higher amount from another source available to them. Ms. Drerup responded we are modifying the project agreement to achieve consistency and equity across all districts. In the case of Cleveland, their ½ mil is raising less, but in some cases a ½ mil would raise more, so we want to make sure that everyone is providing a ½ mil. Chairman Keen asked if it was a set dollar amount instead of a ½ mil. Melanie Drerup responded that was correct. Dr. Ross asked if Cleveland has raised more than a ½ mil or less. Chairman Keen responded from his understanding it was that they have raised a ½ mil at each and every year, but when these agreements were first struck it was the practice of the Commission to convert the ½ mil into a dollar amount, but of course over time the ½ mil yield changes, down in this case, and up in others, so we are going to change our practice from saying this dollar amount shall be set aside to say you shall set aside your ½ mil amount. Ms. Drerup responded that was correct. Chairman Keen asked if these levies are subject to the reduction factor. David Chovan, OFCC Chief Operations Officer, responded that they are not. If the language specifies ½ mil, then there is no reduction in it. Vice Chair Blair asked if you know you need to raise a certain dollar amount can you have a milage rate that flows to that dollar amount. Mr. Chovan responded you could do that. There is nothing in law that would prohibit that, but we have never seen that. What we see more today is districts allocating maintenance funding from their permanent improvement fund or some other source.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-21.
Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 3-0.

Fiscal Year 2015 Projects Approval – Melanie Drerup

Historically, once a year, at the first Commission Meeting of the Fiscal Year, we present new projects based on what the Commission can afford given approved appropriations and cash, as well as forecasts for future funding. This involves a lot of analysis based on not just what we have this year, but what we will have in future years. Each project will spend money into the future. Each of these district projects was developed using a comprehensive planning process which includes a 10 year enrollment projection, a building condition assessment of each of the

districts classroom facilities, an enhanced environmental assessment and review of the educational adequacy and review for LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design). All of the projects are the result of partnerships with districts around the state. Massillon CSD is a great example of working with a district to arrive at an appropriate solution. In working with the district, the Commission could only support a 2 building plan due to excess space. The district felt due to commitments made to their constituents that only a 3 building plan was viable. Commission staff worked to decrease the delta between the preferred plan, and the Commission plan, through an evaluation of teaching stations at the middle school. The district elected to proceed with a three building plan covering the additional costs themselves. All projects have been approved by the school district boards. Upon Commission and Controlling Board Approval the districts have thirteen months to obtain the local share and maintenance funding to be able to move ahead with their project.

Overall there are 13 projects totaling \$532 M with an average state share of 47.4%. There are 5 segmented projects (Eastwood LSD, Groveport Madison LSD, Jackson Center LSD, Lakeview LSD, and Sandusky CSD) - most are addressing the worst building(s) in the district. The projects include 18 school buildings; of those all but 2 are new. 33 buildings will be taken out of service; plans call for 30 to be demolished and 3 to be abandoned. Average district budget is \$40.9 M. Buildings being replaced are at 2/3rds guideline with exceptions noted.

CFAP – Resolution 14-22

Melanie Drerup presented the Master Facilities Plans and Segment Facility Plans for seven school districts for the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program for Commission approval.

| School District | County | State Share | Local Share | Total Budget |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Groveport Madison LSD – Seg. 1 | Franklin | \$28,285,963 | \$25,083,779 | \$53,369,742 |
| Jackson Center LSD – Seg. 1 | Shelby | \$6,998,707 | \$6,724,247 | \$13,722,954 |
| Lakeview LSD – Seg. 1 | Trumbull | \$9,394,397 | \$21,920,260 | \$31,314,657 |
| Massillon CSD | Stark | \$33,533,842 | \$11,177,948 | \$44,711,790 |
| Miami Trace LSD | Fayette | \$11,009,438 | \$24,504,877 | \$35,514,315 |
| Sandusky CSD – Seg. 1 | Erie | \$27,683,754 | \$23,582,458 | \$51,266,212 |
| Urbana CSD | Champaign | \$36,934,422 | \$23,613,811 | \$60,548,233 |

Vice Chair Blair asked if it was cheaper to build new rather than renovate a building. Melanie Drerup responded the reason that we have that many new buildings is because of the condition of the existing building and the fact that we are consolidating a lot of the districts. Director Hickman added that in general, renovation is more expensive than a new build and measurably more difficult from a construction standpoint in order to make sure that the renovated building meets the education delivery objectives of the district. There is not a statutory provision that says whether a district builds new or renovates, it is really a decision made by the individual districts. Some districts have infinity for some buildings that have historical significance to a community and they would like to renovate those buildings as opposed to build new, but the state’s funding is capped at the cost of a new building. If a district chooses to renovate and the

renovation cost exceeds what we would build under a new building then the district is required to take care of the overage. Overall, 60% are new build and 40% are renovation. Dr. Ross asked about the term consolidation that Ms. Drerup used while describing the seven districts and in looking at those seven districts, he did not see districts that have consolidated. Ms. Drerup responded when she was using the word consolidate she meant that they are reducing the number of the buildings within the district, not joining with another district to consolidate.

| School District | County | State Share | Local Share | Total Budget |
|-----------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Ayersville LSD | Defiance | \$20,291,730 | \$9,994,434 | \$30,286,164 |
| Eastwood LSD – Seg. 1 | Wood | \$7,007,419 | \$12,457,634 | \$19,465,053 |
| Winton Woods CSD | Hamilton | \$33,048,847 | \$67,099,173 | \$100,148,020 |

Chairman Keen moved to approve Resolution 14-22.

Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

CFAP Renewal – Resolution 14-23

Melanie Drerup presented Classroom Facilities Assistance Program renewal projects for three schools for Commission approval. Pursuant to ORC section 3318.054, the Commission is charged with establishing the new scope, estimated basic project cost and estimated school district portion of a local share for a lapsed project if the school district desires to seek a new conditional approval of its project. Each of these districts has requested a new conditional approval and the master facility plans have been developed by Commission staff and the local school district. The project scope and estimated costs established will be valid for one year. All three districts plan to be on the November ballot this year.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-23.

Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

CFAP Lapsed – Resolution 14-24

Melanie Drerup presented four school districts with a lapse of one year certification for participation in the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program for Commission approval. All were successful at the May 2014 election.

| School District | County | State Share | Local Share | Total Budget |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Defiance CSD | Defiance | \$44,069,423 | \$11,714,657 | \$55,784,080 |
| Johnstown-Monroe LSD – Seg. 1 | Licking | \$11,940,195 | \$29,232,892 | \$41,173,087 |
| Liberty Center LSD | Henry | \$23,385,350 | \$13,154,260 | \$36,539,610 |
| North Central LSD – Seg. 1 | Williams | \$4,341,600 | \$4,341,601 | \$8,683,201 |

Dr. Richard Ross moved to approve Resolution 14-24.
 Vice Chair Blair seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 3-0.

ENP – Resolution 14-25

Melanie Drerup presented two school districts for participation in the Exceptional Needs Program (ENP) for Commission approval. The ENP provides funding to school districts with a compelling need for immediate classroom facilities assistance. In September of last year applications were received by OSFC and then scored by architectural/engineering professionals, a short list of applicants was then developed and on site visits were conducted. In November of last year an evaluation Committee reviewed and ranked the shortlist. Master plans were then developed for those districts prioritized by need. The two districts listed below are both above the 75th percentile.

| School District | County | State Share | Local Share | Total Budget |
|-------------------|----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| North Olmsted CSD | Cuyahoga | \$8,987,528 | \$65,908,539 | \$74,896,067 |
| Southeast LSD | Wayne | \$5,663,097 | \$18,959,063 | \$24,622,160 |

Dr. Ross asked Melanie what was the criteria to qualify for the Exception Needs Program. Melanie Drerup responded that the exceptional needs looks at health and safety, condition of the facility and it also looks at extreme enrollment. The conditions of the buildings being replaced here are not appropriate to house children.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-25.
 Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 3-0.

Future Eligibility Approval - Presented by David Chovan
ELPP Eligibility - Resolution 14-26

David Chovan presented the changes to the Commission Expedited Local Partnership Program’s (ELPP) eligibility requirements for Commission approval. This allows school districts to fund a distinct portion of their master facility plan with local moneys prior to becoming eligible for CFAP. Once a district enters CFAP, it receives credit against its required local contribution for work completed under ELPP. By law, a district must be at least two years away from participation in CFAP to be eligible to enter ELPP. Based upon our assessment of districts that would be eligible for CFAP within two years, we have established the cutoff of priority order number at 150. Below this ranking, a district would be ineligible to enter the ELPP program.

Dr. Richard Ross moved to approve Resolution 14-26.
 Vice Chair Blair seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 3-0.

Future Eligibility Approval - Presented by David Chovan
VFAP ELPP Eligibility - Resolution 14-27

David Chovan presented the changes to the eligibility requirements for the Commission's Vocational Facilities Assistance Program for Commission approval. The VFAP ELPP Program allows vocational school districts the opportunity to move forward with facility improvements prior to their participation in VFAP. Once a district enters VFAP, it receives credit against its required local contribution for work completed under VFAP ELPP. By law, a district must be over two years away from participation in CFAP to be eligible to enter the VFAP ELPP program. Based on our assessment of districts that would likely be eligible for VFAP within two year, we have established the cutoff at priority order number at 9 on the list for the vocational school districts. Below this ranking, a district would be ineligible to enter the VFAP ELPP Program.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-27.
Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 3-0.

Fiscal Year 2015 Project Agreements Approval
David Chovan – Resolution 14-28

David Chovan presented the Project Agreement Templates for Fiscal Year 2014 for the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program (CFAP), Classroom Facilities Assistance Program (CFAP) Segmenting, Exceptional Needs Program (ENP) and Vocational Facilities Assistance Program (VFAP) for Commission approval.

All OSFC programs require the Commission and the school district to enter into a project agreement once funding has been approved by the Commission and Controlling Board. The project agreement defines the scope of the project, the project budget, and other requirements. Each completed project agreement must be approved by the Commission and the local school board. This resolution approves the standard language or template to be used in future project agreements. For FY15 five changes were recommended to reflect recent law changes and to improve the agreement:

- Limit LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) allowance to energy saving measures
- Return of state funds for buildings not used for public education – protection against private use issues of bonds and funds used differently than intended by the program
- District identification of project and maintenance funding source – making sure there are no contingent ownership issues tied to a funding source
- Consistency of annual half mil maintenance requirement – when a district is using an alternative source for the annual maintenance requirement, the amount required to be deposited by the district will be the same amount that would be generated by a half mil levy in that same tax year and it brings consistency between all participants in the program
- Ineligibility of district legal fees

This language will be included in all future project agreements associated with any Commission program.

Vice Chair Blair asked if we are throwing too much money at the LEED allowance and are people not using it correctly. Mr. Chovan responded that we put a 3% allowance in the budget and in the past it has always been used for a LEED items, but what we are trying to do here is just say that it is specifically for something that is leading to a cost reduction in the program. Director Hickman added looking back when the Commission started adding 3% for a district to incorporate LEED design within their project, we had a situation where LEED was not all that familiar with the design community. We had many firms that did not have LEED certified architects that were employed by the firm and it required incremental costs to a district and the project in order to meet this LEED requirement. What has happened over time is architectural firms have become familiar with LEED and embraced LEED and so they have not had to go out and hire a separate firm or employees to come in and to help them regarding LEED requirements. Many of the buildings being built are meeting our requirement for LEED silver, but the incremental cost in order for them to design and build the buildings to meet that LEED requirement is really not necessarily an incremental cost of the full 3% to the project. We have seen some districts want to use that additional money to do other things and this is just to make sure that the 3% is used for meeting the LEED requirement.

Dr. Richard Ross moved to approve Resolution 14-28.
 Vice Chair Blair seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 3-0.

Master Facilities Plan Amendment Approval – Bill Ramsey – Resolution 14-29

Bill Ramsey presented Amendments to the Master Facility Plans for two school districts for Commission approval.

| School District (County) | Recommended Modifications to the Master Facilities Plan | Recommended Modifications to the Project Budget |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Louisville CSD (Stark) Amendment 1 | The final Expedited Local Project Program Closeout Credit Report was executed December 11, 2009 in the amount of \$27,201,863, a state increase of \$40,176. | \$37,770,002 State Share \$34,864,617 Local Share \$72,634,619 TOTAL |

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-29.
 Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 3-0.

ELPP Master Facilities Plan Amendment Approval – Bill Ramsey – Resolution 14-30

Bill Ramsey presented a Project Agreement for the discrete portion project scope for Trotwood Madison CSD for Commission approval.

| School District | Amendment Type | Discrete Scope Change | Total Amendment Cost Change | Total Revised Project Budget |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Trotwood Madison CSD (Montgomery) | 1 ST | Budget adjustment due to market conditions at the new high school. Amended scope includes 45.7% of the site work only at the new PK-K elementary school. Removed the project scope for the new 1-5 elementary school and the existing Trotwood Madison High School. | (\$6,079,870) | \$27,251,488 |

Dr. Richard Ross moved to approve Resolution 14-30.

Vice Chair Blair seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

Settlement Agreement Approval - Jon Walden - Resolution 14-31

Jon Walden presented a settlement agreement with Lend Lease (US) Construction, Inc. on the Wheelersburg Local School District project for Commission approval. Lend Lease served as the construction manager on the project. In January we sought an authority to file suit for the project and subsequent to getting that authority; we have had several discussions and negotiation sessions with the construction manager and were able to reach a settlement. The general trade's contractor on the project brought a lawsuit seeking substantial additional costs on the project. There were counter claims by OFCC. The case went to trial and appeal. There was a judgment that netted out against the state although we prevailed on the counterclaim portion of the case. Part of the decision by the court raised questions about the fulfillment of duties by the construction manager on the project. An agreement was reached between the co-owners and Lend Lease with Lend Lease agreeing to pay the State \$200,000. In exchange for this payment, the co-owners have partially released Lend Lease with respect to claims stemming from the general trade's contractor's litigation and project.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-31.

Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

Settlement Agreement Approval - Jon Walden - Resolution 14-32

Jon Walden presented a settlement agreement with McMillan Construction Company and Merchants Bonding Company on the Grand Valley Local School District project for Commission approval. Following completion of the Project, Grand Valley Local School District began to experience problems with the newly constructed parking lots. Testing was done and it was determined that it was neither designed nor constructed properly. Litigation commenced against McMillan, Merchants, the Buehrer Group and Jack Gibson Construction. That litigation was removed from Ashtabula County and is now pending in the Ohio Court of Claims. Buehrer Group and its carrier have refused to step up and are now in litigation. McMillan is out of business so the \$200,000 settlement is from its surety, Merchants Bonding Company. They have been responsive in resolving this in a timely manner to avoid the cost and uncertainty of

litigation. The settlement reserves claims against other parties. Grand Valley approves the settlement.

Vice Chair Blair moved to approve Resolution 14-32.

Dr. Richard Ross seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 3-0.

Executive Director's Report

Director Hickman reported that since the last meeting, there were 13 groundbreakings. There were 3 closeout reports for St. Henry Consolidated LSD, Graham LSD and Franklin-Monroe LSD.

Director Hickman reported on contracts executed since the April meeting. Executed were 6 HB264 projects; 5 contracts, 1 amended contract and 2 Locally Funded Initiatives (LFI) contracts for design services for school districts; 1 contract, 4 amended contracts and 4 LFI contracts for CM as Agent; 3 contracts and 3 amendments for CM as Agent; 3 contracts for General Contractors; 42 trade contracts and 1 Consulting Service contract. He also reported that the Commission was given authority to amend project agreements as long as those project agreements do not increase the master facility plan and there was one for Strasburg-Franklin Local School District.

Director Hickman presented proposed dates for the 2015 Commission meetings and concluded his report with upcoming events.

Public Testimony

Nadja Turek presented public testimony in response to the discussion of the 3% fee regarding LEED certifications of the schools, but did not provide any thing in writing to the Commission.

Director Hickman and Chairman Keen thanked Ms. Turek for her comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM.



Timothy S. Keen, Commission Chair



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



Ohio School Facilities Commission
30 W. Spring Street, 4th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

John R. Kasich
Governor

Richard M. Hickman
Executive Director

Testimony Request Slip

Commission Meeting Date 7/10/14

Please return the completed form and fourteen (copies) of your testimony and materials to the Commission Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

Name: Nadja Turek

Title/Organization Representing: None

Address: 4454 Idea Center Blvd
Dayton OH 45430

Phone: 937-531-1287 E-mail: nadja.turek@woolpert.com

Topic to be addressed in testimony:

LEED

Check if handouts or materials are provided