

Ohio School Facilities Commission
July 23, 2009
William McKinley Room 1:30 PM

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 1:36 PM.

Roll Call

Members present: Vice Chair Quill, Dr. Steve Puckett, Carrie Caveda for Representative Evans and Melissa Miser for Representative Matt Patten.

1. Adoption of the June 25, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Puckett moved to approve the June 25, 2009 meeting minutes.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

2. Executive Director's Report

The Executive Director updated the Commission members on the following: School District Close Outs, LEED Program, Responsible Bidder Criteria Districts, Qualified School Construction Bonds, Groundbreakings and Dedications, Project Status Report, Auditor's Management Letter and Cleveland Facilities.

Director Shoemaker acknowledged Tom Brannon, OSFC Senior Post Construction Administrator, for his work with Wayne Trace Local School District on their roof deficiencies. The Wayne Trace Board passed a resolution (attached) commending Tom Brannon for his work and cooperation in resolving building issues at Wayne Trace High School.

Director Shoemaker recognized Rob Slagle, OSFC Project Administrator, as a new team leader effective this week.

Dr. Puckett asked if OSFC was tracking the job creations from the Qualified School Construction Bonds. Eric Bode responded we were not because provisions in the Stimulus Bill that require a lot of the tracking relate to projects that are paid for by federal dollars, and since these are bond programs they do not fall under those reporting requirements. Dr. Puckett asked if that was something we want to do. Director Shoemaker responded that one of the things we will be looking at is to see how successful these districts are, particularly districts that have not passed levies yet, and try and get some feedback on how the lower interest rate made a difference. We will be reporting back on that particularly after some of these districts go to the ballot. Vice Chair Quill responded that it is important to report that back and track it.

Vice Chair Quill asked, relevant to the Auditor's Management Letter and OSFC's response, to have a report back on the progress of the remediation of these issues relative to reconciliation, inventory controls and basic internal controls by October.

3. FY 10 Projects – Presented by Eric Bode

Eric Bode presented the new FY10 projects. This group of 32 projects totals \$1.5 billion, which is 23% less than FY09. The average state share is 47%. There are 11 segmented projects. There are 45 new builds, 10 renovations/additions and 7 ELPP credits. The 55 buildings will be LEED silver bringing the total of LEED silver buildings approved to 250. The average building budget is \$25 million. Upon Commission and Controlling Board approval, the districts will have one year to obtain the local share and maintenance funding to be able to move ahead with their project.

Of the \$4.1 billion Tobacco Securitization money, we are now down to \$2.1 billion. We have spent about half of the total in just under two years and the remainder should take us through 2011. The projects before you today will have very little spending this year, as they are just getting under way. The bulk of the spending will happen in FY11 and FY12. With tobacco funding running out in FY11 and looking into FY12 that is where we will rely on future appropriations. We see the next Capital Bill, which will be starting up the process this fall and hopefully having the bill by next summer, as we would look for those future appropriations to fully fund what we are approving today.

Eric Bode also noted that unlike the past couple years where we have approved projects twice a year in July and November, we do not anticipate doing that this year. The number of districts for which we are requesting approval is based on what is anticipated for the entire year. This is what can be afforded for FY2010, with two exceptions. Orrville City School District and Greenville City School District will be presented for approval in the next month or two.

a. CFAP

Resolution 09-80 requested approval of 24 school districts for funding in the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program totaling \$1,181,903,741. Of the 25 school districts, 11 are segmented. This will take us to 384 on the equity list. Planning had gone through 410 on the equity list and there were 5 additional districts that wanted to move forward, but we could not afford them this year. Eric Bode recognized Superintendent Jay Arbaugh from Cory-Rawson Local School District who addressed the Commission regarding his project. (See attached letter from Superintendent Arbaugh.) Director Shoemaker thanked Superintendent Arbaugh for coming to the Commission meeting.

School District	County	State Share	Local Share	Total Budget
Austintown LSD – Seg. 1	Mahoning	\$23,661,484	\$26,682,099	\$50,343,583
Bellefontaine CSD – Seg. 1	Logan	\$21,352,310	\$13,651,477	\$35,003,787
Bellevue CSD	Huron	\$23,105,019	\$33,248,685	\$56,353,704
Circleville CSD	Pickaway	\$27,457,590	\$37,917,624	\$65,375,214
Cory-Rawson LSD – Seg. 1	Hancock	\$6,811,891	\$6,287,899	\$13,099,790
Coshocton CSD – Seg. 1	Coshocton	\$16,132,558	\$7,945,887	\$24,078,445
Covington EVSD	Miami	\$13,564,575	\$12,521,146	\$26,085,721
Eaton Community SD	Preble	\$24,243,963	\$32,137,347	\$56,381,310
Elgin LSD	Marion	\$20,103,937	\$15,795,950	\$35,899,887
Euclid CSD – Seg. 1	Cuyahoga	\$24,735,683	\$35,595,251	\$60,330,934
Garfield Heights CSD – Seg. 1	Cuyahoga	\$16,947,057	\$48,233,930	\$65,180,987
Green LSD	Wayne	\$22,956,884	\$12,361,399	\$35,318,283
Hopewell-Loudon LSD	Seneca	\$13,435,977	\$13,984,384	\$27,420,361
Logan Elm LSD – Seg. 1	Pickaway	\$10,879,502	\$17,750,766	\$28,630,268
Loudonville-Perrysville EVSD	Ashland	\$15,467,739	\$21,360,212	\$36,827,951
Madison LSD – Seg. 1	Richland	\$23,165,346	\$31,990,240	\$55,155,586
Northeastern LSD	Clark	\$47,756,028	\$65,844,040	\$111,600,068
Northwestern LSD	Clark	\$23,105,545	\$28,240,110	\$51,345,655
Norton CSD	Summit	\$29,850,005	\$48,702,641	\$78,552,646
Otsego LSD	Wood	\$22,185,621	\$18,151,872	\$40,337,493
Shelby CSD – Seg. 1	Richland	\$21,453,521	\$21,453,521	\$42,907,042
Triway LSD – Seg. 1	Wayne	\$13,013,752	\$16,562,956	\$29,576,708
Van Wert CSD	Van Wert	\$26,547,695	\$26,547,695	\$53,095,390
Wadsworth CSD – Seg. 1	Medina	\$38,111,083	\$64,891,845	\$103,002,928

1990 Look Back

Resolution 09-80 also requested approval of one 1990 Look Back school district for funding: Southern Local School District. They had funding back in the 1990s under the Department of Education to do a project that was actually a K-8 building and now under the Look Back Program we are going back and adding on to that K-8 building to do a space for their high school and career tech students.

<u>School District</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Southern LSD	Meigs	\$ 7,410,108	\$ 2,470,036	\$ 9,880,144

The Commission staff recommended Resolution 09-80.

Dr. Puckett asked about 2011 funding. Eric Bode responded that the projects being approved today take us up through 384. Of course there are quite a few school districts below 384 that are deferred or lapsed, but we do anticipate taking approximately 25 districts next year and so perhaps we will be beyond 400 at that point. That is about where tobacco money will carry us through.

Dr. Puckett sought to clarify if there were approximately 200 school districts remaining. Eric Bode responded that he certainly would not say 200 school districts because up through the 410 that we are working with there are still about 150 that we have not funded yet. So in addition to those we have the higher wealth districts. Director Shoemaker added that when talking about status reports he did not mention that right now we have served 148 districts with all the facilities. In some cases we have touched 246 districts and in some cases there have been partial fixes where they have done ELPP projects or ENP projects. Realistically when you get finished with the tobacco money, we are probably going to be close to that 250-300 range in terms of total serving the district. Obviously we are reaching a lot higher in terms of districts that we are offering funding to and we have a traffic jam of about 100 districts waiting to see who gets their money first before they step forward and we can do their projects. A pretty good assessment is we are about somewhere in that 50-50 range when we get finished with all the tobacco money that we will have served those districts. We are offering funding obviously to a lot more and we are up in the range that Eric is talking about 400-420 range.

Dr. Puckett stated there should be at least 50 districts, maybe 25 segmented. There are a lot of segmented districts there that are not fully served. Eric Bode responded that is correct. Along with some of the urbans, which are segmented, some projects we have run ENP, but have not done the full CFAP.

Eric Bode stated that even though we have served only half the districts, they represent the bulk of the state share commitment. Most of the districts that remain to be served are the 70 to 90 % local share projects, which have a small state share. Dr. Puckett responded that was a good point.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-80.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

b. CFAP Lapsed

This is for a Classroom Facilities Assistance Program Lapsed district: Columbus Grove Local School District. It is one that was originally approved in 2006. In their first year they tried a bond issue three times and failed within their one-year period. They tried again in 2008 and failed. They tried again in February 2009 and passed on the fifth attempt. It is a 79% state share district. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-81.

<u>School District</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Columbus Grove LSD	Putnam	\$21,277,816	\$5,656,128	\$26,933,944

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-81.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

c. ENP

The Exceptional Needs Program (ENP) is set in law. It is through an application process where certain districts are eligible and they can apply to say that their building is bad enough that they need to be served immediately instead of waiting for their turn under the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program. We had 5 eligible buildings that were part of the application process this past year. They were all accessed and scored by our ENP review committee, which consisted of 5 experts outside of OSFC staff. All 5 buildings that were in that process and were recommended are being replaced. Four of the five applicant buildings were in Madison Plains and four of those buildings are being replaced by a single K-12 facility. Eric Bode also noted that Springfield, which had a building in very poor condition, is a district that is in the 75th percentile. This is evidence that we have bad buildings in the state even among the higher wealth districts. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-82.

<u>School District</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Madison Plains LSD	Madison	\$14,209,577	\$25,261,471	\$39,471,048
Springfield LSD	Summit	\$8,386,869	\$25,160,607	\$33,547,476

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-82.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

d. VFAP

There are 3 projects for the Vocational Facilities Assistance Program (VFAP). These can all be funded within the 2% set-aside that we have for the VFAP program that is part of law. Actually it was temporarily expanded to 3% and is back to 2% now. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-83.

<u>School District</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Ashtabula County JVSD	Ashtabula	\$19,795,700	\$13,654,283	\$33,449,983
Lawrence County JVSD	Lawrence	\$15,395,339	\$5,131,780	\$20,527,119
Upper Valley JVSD	Miami	\$17,427,261	\$5,809,087	\$23,236,348

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-83.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

e. VFAP Lapsed

Mid East Career and Tech Center in Muskingum County is a lapsed VFAP district. It is a district that was approved in November 2007 by the Commission and Controlling Board. They went to the ballot and they failed. Their one-year funding period elapsed, but they were able to go back to the ballot in May of this year and were successful. They have applied and been approved for the federal bond program (QSCB Program) and this will reduce their cost of borrowing and actually allow them to do more locally funded initiatives than they had originally thought. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-84.

<u>School District</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Mid East Career and	Muskingum	\$22,712,695	\$10,019,248	\$32,731,943

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-84.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

f. Next Ten List

The next ten list is required by law. It is consistent with the priority order of approval resolution, which was presented and approved at the Commission this spring and part of that recognizes the next ten list. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-85.

"Next 10"	School District	County	Priority Rank
1	Eastern Local SD	Meigs	P-001
2	Fort Recovery Local SD	Mercer	P-003
3	College Corner Local SD	Preble	P-004
4	Mansfield City SD	Richland	P-005
5	Rolling Hills Local SD	Guernsey	P-006
6	La Brae Local SD	Trumbull	P-007
7	Crestview Local SD	Columbiana	P-009
8	Bristol Local SD	Trumbull	P-010
9	East Clinton Local SD	Clinton	P-011
10	Preble-Shawnee Local SD	Preble	P-012

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-85.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

g. ELPP Eligibility

Law requires an eligibility cutoff so if a district is within two years of funding from the CFAP program, we would not be able to start a project with them in the ELPP program. The thought is if they are that close they should just wait for the CFAP program. Because of that we ask the Commission to adopt a resolution every year saying what that cutoff is. The cutoff for this year is 420 on the equity list. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-86.

Dr. Puckett asked what the change was. Eric Bode responded that it is 25 places higher on the equity list than it was last year. It went from 395 to 420.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-86.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

h. ENP Eligibility

Law provides for the ENP program a general prohibition that if a district were within three years of funding from the CFAP program, it would not be eligible for the ENP program. The cutoff for the three-year lookout is 430 on the equity list. There is another provision in law that says ENP districts cannot be ranked higher than the 75th percentile. So next year you have to be above 430 and below 458: it is a pretty narrow window that keeps narrowing. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-87.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-87.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

i. VFAP Eligibility

The VFAP ELPP program provides that any joint vocational school district may participate in the program as long as it is not expected to receive assistance under VFAP within two fiscal years of

the date the school district's Board of Educations resolves to apply for VFAP ELPP. The cutoff is recommended for districts ranked 24th or below on the VFAP three-year average equity list. This is 2 positions higher than it was last year. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-88.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-88.

Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 2-0.

4. FY10 District Project Agreements Approval – Presented by Eric Bode

Eric Bode presented the FY10 District Project Agreement Templates for approval. They are for the CFAP, CFAP Segmented, ENP and VFAP. This resolution authorizes the Executive Director to sign the project agreement and allow the districts to move into design and construction and start the flow of state funding once they have met their funding requirements. This year we moved the timing up a little bit. Typically we do not ask for approval of the project agreement templates for a couple months, but we have districts that, because of ELPP credit or other funding, are actually ready to move forward with their project and sign the agreement. There are five changes from last year to this year: delete reference to disposal of property due to a change in law this year; reorganize allowance and LEED paragraphs; add utility use reporting; clarify maintenance funding options and clarify the Construction Manager role in payment reconciliation. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-89.

Vice Chair Quill asked what the material difference on the construction manager's role on the reconciliation was. Eric Bode responded in the past the language referred to the treasurer reconciling payments when actually what they really do is work with the construction manger to reconcile payments between the treasurer's record what has been paid and the construction manager's record of what has been approved for payment. Before there was no mention of the construction manager, even though that is what we expected to happen. Lois Snyder, OSFC Deputy Chief Financial Officer, works with districts and expressed that some of the districts were confused by that provision-questioning whether the construction manager reconciles the payments or the district or does it need done together. The construction manager does most of the work in that process to see if there are any differences and what corrections need to take place. Vice Chair Quill asked if there were any problems besides confusion. Eric Bode responded there were and in going through the auditing program and closeout there have been times where the construction manager's records have not been in sync and some of that is because they have not had regular updates. We do expect the reconciliations to happen at least quarterly. In some cases you get to the end of the project and often a treasurer has changed and the lead person for the construction manager has changed and you are looking back over 5 years of records and it is difficult. We really think it is very important to do that reconciliation to make sure that records are in sync so that when you get to closeout it should be an easy process.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-89.

Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.

Approval: Vote 2-0.

5. Urban Project Agreement Approval – Presented by Eric Bode

Eric Bode presented an urban project agreement for the Columbus City School District for Segment 3 for approval. At the start of the Accelerated Urban Initiative in 2002, Columbus and the other five districts participating at that time all passed bond levies. Columbus did not pass one for their entire project, but rather passed one for Segments 1 and 2. They are actually the first district now of the urbans that has gone back for additional funding. Other districts have done additional segments, but they have all been within their original local funding. Columbus actually went back and passed on the first try. It speaks well of the project that it has been successful enough that they were able to go back to the voters and run on their record of achievement and were successful back in November for

enough funding for Segment 3. Between what they did before with Segments 1 and 2 and now Segment 3, these provide new or fully renovated schools for about half the students in Columbus. Clearly there is more to do even after this segment. This entails \$156 million to renovate one elementary school and one high school; build four new elementary schools, two new elementary schools/middle schools and one new middle school/high school and abate and demolish 10 schools. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-90.

Dr. Puckett asked how many schools are projected for Columbus. Eric Bode asked Eugene Chipiga, OSFC Senior Planning Manager, for his input. Eugene Chipiga responded that Columbus started out with 140 projects and is now down to 109. Eric Bode added that their population enrollment, as in all the urbans, has gone down. Although in Columbus, the loss has been much smaller than in other districts. They have been the most steady in terms of population.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-90.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

6. Consultant Contract and Amendment Approval – Presented by Eric Bode

Eric Bode presented an amendment to the Regional Program Consultant Services (RPC) agreement. There are currently 5 firms for the RPC services. Most of the work under RPC is typically is done in working with the planners to get the districts ready for projects under the ELPP program, although the Bovis contract is a smaller RPC contract that is actually primarily focused on work to provide construction management oversight services on special projects. In particular we have used Bovis on the Wellston project with corrective work on masonry repairs, which is currently underway. They are also overseeing the Leetonia project. We request approval to amend their contract for \$250,000 in addition to the original \$400,000 in their current contract. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-91.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-91.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

Eric Bode presented a Commissioning Services contract for the Ohio State School for the Blind/Ohio School for the Deaf (OSSB/OSD). Commissioning is standard on all of our projects. Previously, seven vendors were pre-qualified and created a standard contract and pricing. The project team for OSSB/OSD selected one of these vendors, Four Seasons. The standard contract and pricing is slightly modified to reflect direct payment by the state rather than payment by a school district. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-92.

Dr. Puckett asked if the Controlling Board would approve the Commissioning Services contract for the OSSB/OSD. Eric Bode responded that because it exceeds \$50,000 it would go to the Controlling Board. Eric Bode suggested that Resolution 09-92 #2 be amended to read including submission of the contract to the Controlling Board for approval.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve amended Resolution 09-92.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

7. School Energy Conservation Financing Program Approval – Presented by Mark Wantage

Mark Wantage presented nine School Districts requesting participation in the Energy Conservation Financing Program. In this program districts identify energy saving facility improvements. Projects must pay for themselves through the result and reduction of energy consumption within a fifteen-year period. School districts are required to prepare and submit project proposals for review and approval by the Commission. Commission approval allows the school district to obtain financing and proceed

with their program. These projects have been reviewed by the Ohio Department of Development/Office of Energy Efficiency and the staff of the OSFC. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-93.

Barnesville Exempted Village School District (Belmont):

Total Project Cost \$1,171,029
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 4.45%
Totalled Annual Savings \$101,249
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 25%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 11.6 years
Number of Buildings 3
Vendor H.E.A.T. Total Facility Solutions

Bath Local School District (Allen):

(QSCB Application)
Total Project Cost \$879,064
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 5%
Totalled Annual Savings \$60,287
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 30%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 14.6 years
Number of Buildings 2
Vendor Brewer-Garrett Company

Bellevue City School District (Huron):

Total Project Cost \$1,439,280
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 4%
Totalled Annual Savings \$101,513
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 7%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 14.2 years
Number of Buildings 1
Vendor Facilities WebService, LLC

Bloomfield-Mespo Local School District (Trumbull):

(QSCB Application)
Total Project Cost \$141,947
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 5%
Totalled Annual Savings \$9,488
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 20.9%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 14.9 years
Number of Buildings 2
Vendor Brewer-Garrett Company

Champion Local School District (Trumbull):

(QSCB Application)
Total Project Cost \$708,471
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 5%
Totalled Annual Savings \$80,383
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 11.3%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 8.8 years
Number of Buildings 4
Vendor Brewer-Garrett Company

Delphos City School District (Allen):

Total Project Cost \$240,529
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 5%
Total Annual Savings \$16,253
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 15.4%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 14.8 years
Number of Buildings 3
Vendor Brewer-Garrett Company

Hudson City School District (Summit):

(QSCB Application)
Total Project Cost \$2,274,257
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 0%
Total Annual Savings \$175,556
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 21.9%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 12.9 years
Number of Buildings 5
Vendor CCG Energy Solutions

Scioto Valley Local School District (Pike):

(QSCB Application)
Total Project Cost \$1,101,067
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 1%
Total Annual Savings \$224,446
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 28.6%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 4.9 years
Number of Buildings 3
Vendor Sabo/Limbach Energy Services

Waterloo Local School District (Portage):

Total Project Cost \$2,055,164
Interest Rate (Included in the Total Project Cost) 5.1%
Total Annual Savings \$139,967
O&M Savings is Percentage of Total Savings 18.2%
Payback Period (Maximum 15 Years) 14.7 years
Number of Buildings 1
Vendor Chevron Energy Solutions

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-93.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

8. Master Facilities Plan Amendment Approval – Presented by Steve Lutz

Steve Lutz presented one amended Master Facilities Plan for a district participating in the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program.

The Old Fort Local School District of Seneca County had a first amendment for their 2008 participation in the Classroom Facilities Assistance Program. Old Fort is a small district, projected to serve 504 students in Grades K thru 12. The plan approved last November provided for closing their elementary school and placing the K-12 population in the existing high school with renovations of that facility. Districts are encouraged to work with an architect during the project-planning phase to confirm the assessed scope of renovation work and to help the district confirm that the renovation and planned reuse of a facility meets the needs of the district. The district desired to accept the offer of funding at the earliest date but reserved the right to revisit the project scope and budget once they

retained an architect to assist them in this review. As their review effort progressed it became apparent to the district that the project, as planned, was not sufficient to provide for the educational program for the K-12 population. The architect identified missed scope of renovations, error in the reported size of the building, and concerns regarding the planned reuse of some of the existing spaces. This amendment adjusts the MFP scope to: change from renovation to renovation with an addition, delete the conversion of the existing Bus Service bay and shop area for K-12 use and the conversion of selected oversized spaces for classroom instructional use. The amendment also adds the replacement of the electrical system, plumbing waste lines and demountable partitions to the renovation scope. The Budget is adjusted to add \$6.4 million dollars to the co-funded project budget, which is a 68% increase. While this is a substantial increase to the project budget, the planned budget is 7% less than the cost of all new construction. Commission staff worked with the Old Fort Local School District and their architect to assure that the renovation and addition project will adequately serve the K-12 educational program needs of the district. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-94.

Dr. Puckett asked the reason the original assessment was so off. Director Shoemaker responded that he, Steve Lutz and Eugene Chipiga visited the district and there were several critical items that were missed on the assessment. The other thing that we looked at was the building they have they have taken very good care of it. Just from a public relations standpoint, it might be a tough sell in that community to say we are going to tear this down and build all new. We felt we should be leaning toward renovation with the add on. Some of those things on the assessment were missed, we needed to have a little closer look up front and I think the idea that some of those spaces, those adjustments that Eugene made, the spaces were there, but they were not very practical to try and convert to some of the things that originally we thought they could be converted to. The district is happy now with the proposal and pretty optimistic about passing their levy.

Dr. Puckett asked who did the original assessment. Steve Lutz responded that A.D.A. did the original assessment. They are a long-term provider of assessment services with OSFC. The process involved here is that we typically anticipate the involvement of the district's architect before we finalize the assessment report and before we enter into the facilities plan because it is so tricky to fully anticipate the districts needs particularly in a K-12 solution being fitted into a renovated facility.

Vice Chair Quill asked if there was a problem with the assessment vendor. There also appears to be a process issue relative to the involvement of the district's architect or quality control on our end. Steve Lutz responded that we use the involvement of the district and their architect as a quality check to make sure the accuracy of the report and also to give the district the opportunity to provide input for things that an outsider might not be able to identify.

Vice Chair Quill asked if it was a box we did not check or we were fully aware that the architect had not had involvement at the appropriate stage before we approved the master facilities plan. Steve Lutz responded that it was not an oversight in terms of not checking a box. We were aware that it had not yet occurred. The district was aware and even wrote us a letter stating that they wanted to go ahead with the acceptance of the offer of funding, but revisit this after the architect is on board. Vice Chair Quill asked what was the vendor's response when we talked to them about some of the obvious problems. Steve Lutz responded as the issues were brought up by the design architect, OSFC had those reviewed by A.D.A. and asked for their opinion whether or not they would concur with the recommended changes and they indicated that they did not oppose the change in the square footage of the facility.

Vice Chair Quill asked if there were any other quality issues with this vendor on other facilities. Steve Lutz responded that virtually all of the assessors have corrections to be made to their assessments from time-to-time and the largest cost driver in the assessment was changes in whether or not spaces should be converted for use for K-12 instructional space. Vice Chair Quill asked if any were 68%. Steve Lutz responded that he did not have statistics with him. Director Shoemaker added

that it was probably a combination of two things: the practicality of the original assessment fitting in the plan and the fact that there were some major errors in the mechanical system when we evaluated and the school architect picked up on it.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-94.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

9. Architectural Agreements and Amendments Approval – Presented by Steve Berezansky

Steve Berezansky presented design profession agreements and amendments for Commission consideration. The Commission staff reviewed and recommended approval of Resolution 09-95.

Agreements:

School District	Project	Architect	Amount
Edgewood CSD	Build one new high school	SHP Leading Design	\$2,359,678.91
Pickerington LSD	Renovations to Fairfield Elementary School and Ridgeview Junior High School; renovations/addition to Pickerington and Violet elementary schools and Pickerington Central High School	SHP Leading Design	\$2,947,691.66

Locally Funded Initiatives:

School District	Project	Architect	Amount
Columbus CSD	Avondale Elementary School increased construction cost above and beyond Master Plan budget	James Bean Architects	\$112,405.00
Columbus CSD	Burroughs Elementary School increased construction cost above and beyond Master Plan budget	Braun & Steidl Architects, Inc.	\$94,367.00
Pickerington LSD	Excess oversize space for kitchen, media center, and gymnasium areas, and renovation of the auditorium fixed seating space	SHP Leading Design	\$42,904.00

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-95.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

10. Construction Manager Agreements Approval – Presented by Steve Berezansky

Steve Berezansky presented the following Construction Manager agreements for Commission approval. The Commission Staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-96.

School District	Construction Management Company	County	Amount
Brookville LSD	Shook Touchstone LLC	Montgomery	\$657,154
Edgewood CSD	The Quandel Group, Inc.	Butler	\$2,179,934
Huber Heights CSD	The Skillman Corporation	Montgomery	\$8,409,340
Indian Creek LSD	Richard L. Bowen + Associates Inc.	Jefferson	\$824,400
Leipsic LSD	Richard L. Bowen + Associates Inc.	Putnam	\$920,553
Niles CSD	Hammond Construction, Inc.	Trumbull	\$2,896,935

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-96.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

Steve Berezansky presented the following Construction Manager amendments for approval. The Commission Staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-97.

School District	Construction Management Company	Amount
Scioto County JVSD	BBL Construction Services, LLC	\$52,805

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-97.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

Steve Berezansky presented the following Construction Manager amendment for a “locally funded initiative” for Commission approval. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-98.

<u>School District</u>	<u>Construction Manager</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Scioto County JVSD	BBL Construction Services, LLC	\$4,836
Arcanum Butler LSD	Bovis Lend Lease, Inc.	\$190,377

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-98.
 Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
 Approval: Vote 2-0.

11. Trade Construction Contracts Approval – Presented by Steve Berezansky

Steve Berezansky presented trade contracts for Commission approval. All contracts represented the lowest responsible bidder. There were no awards to the second low bidder. The Commission staff reviewed and recommended approval of Resolution 09-99.

	<u>School District</u>	<u>Contracting Entity</u>	<u>Scope Of Work</u>	<u>\$ Amount</u>
1	Akron CSD	LVI Environmental Services, Inc.	Asbestos Abatement	\$553,490.00
2	Akron CSD	Gateway Environmental Service, Inc.	Demolition	\$219,000.00
3	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Slagle Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	Plumbing	\$1,100,000.00
4	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Reddy Electric Company	Electrical	\$1,658,250.00
5	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Apex Mechanical Systems, Inc.	HVAC	\$2,542,770.00
6	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Kenny Huston Company	Masonry	\$3,466,500.00
7	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Messer Construction Co.	General Trades	\$9,076,000.00
8	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Stafford-Smith, Inc.	Kitchen Equipment	\$368,960.00
9	Arcanum-Butler LSD	A-1 Sprinkler Company, Inc.	Fire Protection	\$337,520.00
10	Arcanum-Butler LSD	Otis Elevator	Elevator	\$102,916.00
11	Ashtabula Area CSD	Logos Communications, Inc.	Data Communication Network Equipment and IP Only PABX System	\$181,962.00
12	Ashtabula Area CSD	ProQuality Land Development	Demolition	\$119,200.00
13	Barberton CSD	Cavanaugh Building Corporation	Site Circulation - General Trades	\$366,760.00
14	Barberton CSD	Cardinal Maintenance & Service Co., Inc.	Roofing	\$154,975.00
15	Barberton CSD	Dial Electric, LTD	Site Circulation - Electrical	\$83,944.00
16	Buckeye Central	OM Workspace	Classroom Furniture and Equipment	\$439,631.70

17	Canton CSD	Feinman Mechanical, Inc.	HVAC/AHU Modification-Fan Coil Replacement	\$143,268.00
18	Cleveland CSD	Perk Company	Site Concrete Work	\$143,375.00
19	Cleveland CSD	Northeast Ohio Trenching Service, Inc.	Site Work	\$609,000.00
20	Cleveland CSD	Miles Mechanical, Inc.	HVAC	\$2,100,000.00
21	Cleveland CSD	Simplex Grinnell, LP	Fire Protection	\$158,930.00
22	Cleveland CSD	Great Lakes Crushing	Landscaping	\$20,000.00
23	Cleveland CSD	Simplex Grinnell, LP	Fire Protection	\$246,875.00
24	Cleveland CSD	S. A. Comunale Company, Inc	Fire Protection	\$161,000.00
25	Cleveland CSD	Northeast Ohio Trenching Service, Inc.	Site Work	\$632,000.00
26	Cleveland CSD	CRS Metalworx, Inc.	HVAC	\$1,921,590.00
27	Cleveland CSD	Blaze Building Corporation	General Trades	\$5,556,000.00
28	Cleveland CSD	Doan Pyramid, LLC	Electrical/Technology	\$2,214,770.00
29	Cleveland CSD	Accurate Concrete Systems, Inc.	Site Concrete Flatwork	\$182,300.00
30	Cleveland CSD	Commerce Plumbing Company	Plumbing	\$627,700.00
31	Cleveland CSD	East West Construction Co., Inc.	General Trades	\$4,999,999.00
32	Cleveland CSD	Castle Heating & Air, Inc.	HVAC	\$2,995,000.00
33	Cleveland CSD	Doan Pyramid, LLC	Electrical/Technology	\$1,778,000.00
34	Cleveland CSD	Soehnen Piping Company	Plumbing	\$575,220.00
35	Cleveland CSD	Great Lakes Crushing	Landscaping	\$12,500.00
36	Clinton Massie LSD	Anderson Recreational	Playground Equipment	\$118,640.00
37	Clyde Green Springs EVSD	Breckenridge Kitchen Equipment	Food Service Equipment	\$1,136,110.00
38	Clyde Green Springs EVSD	Wadsworth Slawson Northwest	Temperature Controls	\$768,000.00
39	Clyde Green Springs EVSD	S. A. Comunale Company	Fire Suppression	\$88,699.00
40	Columbus CSD	R W Setterlin Building Company	Wood Floor Finishing - Quarry Tile Refinishing	\$84,000.00
41	Columbus CSD	Continental Office Environments	Loose Furnishings - Administrative	\$33,505.70
42	Columbus CSD	Continental Office Environments	Furniture	\$64,942.02
43	Columbus CSD	Continental Office Environments	Classroom and Cafeteria Loose Furniture	\$232,901.92
44	Elyria CSD	GCS Industrial Services, Ltd.	Asbestos Abatement	\$156,560.00
45	Elyria CSD	Tiffin Scenic Studios, Inc.	Stage Rigging	\$363,498.00
46	Fairfield Union LSD	Southeast Security Corporation	Electronics	\$1,344,269.00
47	Fairfield Union LSD	Tom Sexton & Associates	Cafeteria Tables and Chairs- Misc. Furniture & Equipment	\$350,044.48
48	Fairfield Union LSD	Continental Office Furniture	Furniture	\$500,952.63
49	Fairlawn LSD	Tom Sexton & Associates	Loose Furnishings	\$213,676.00
50	Fairlawn LSD	Microman, Inc.	Telecommunications & IP CCTV Equipment	\$238,569.00
51	Fairlawn LSD	Valley Electrical Consolidated, Inc.	Audio Visual	\$286,900.00
52	Gallipolis CSD	Johnson-Lancaster and Associates, Inc.	Food Service	\$269,438.00
53	Gallipolis CSD	Central Masonry, Inc.	Masonry	\$1,101,056.00
54	Gallipolis CSD	The Tarrier Steel Co., Inc.	Structural Steel	\$440,000.00
55	Gallipolis CSD	The Tarrier Steel Co., Inc.	Structural Steel	\$460,000.00
56	Geneva Area CSD	Gorman-Lavelle Corporation	Plumbing	\$461,233.00
57	Geneva Area CSD	Dial Electric LTD	Electrical/Technology	\$1,184,660.00
58	Geneva Area CSD	Brown Sprinkler Service, Inc.	Fire Protection	\$86,160.00

59	Geneva Area CSD	Western Reserve Mechanical, Inc.	HVAC	\$1,360,000.00
60	Geneva Area CSD	C T Taylor Company, Inc.	General Trades	\$5,839,700.00
61	Graham LSD	Saturn Electric, Inc.	Electric	\$1,465,605.00
62	Hamilton CSD	Nor-Com, Inc.	Technology	\$3,345,686.00
63	Hamilton CSD	Nor-Com, Inc.	Electrical	\$319,995.00
64	Hardin Northern LSD	Charles Construction Services, Inc.	General Trades	\$5,113,500.00
65	Hardin Northern LSD	Vulcan Fire Protection	Fire Protection	\$269,970.00
66	Hardin Northern LSD	Vaughn Industries, LLC	Electrical	\$1,737,700.00
67	Hardin Northern LSD	Lepi Enterprises, Inc.	Asbestos Abatement	\$36,993.00
68	Hardin Northern LSD	Econco, Inc.	HVAC	\$1,640,000.00
69	Hicksville EVSD	O.B.O. Demolition & Construction, Inc.	Demolition	\$319,000.00
70	Kalida LSD	Logos Communications, Inc.	Technology Equipment	\$239,929.00
71	Kalida LSD	Valley Electrical Consolidated, Inc	Educational Video Equipment	\$155,590.00
72	Lakota LSD	Accel Fire Systems, Inc.	Fire Suppression	\$265,400.00
73	Lakota LSD	Lake Erie Electric of Toledo	Electrical	\$3,261,472.00
74	Lakota LSD	Vaughn Industries, LLC	Mechanical/HVAC	\$3,891,000.00
75	Lakota LSD	Mel Lanzer Co.	General Trades	\$17,089,795.00
76	Lorain CSD	Dem/Ex Group	Asbestos Abatement and Demolition	\$803,000.00
77	Louisville CSD	Cardinal Environmental Services, Inc.	Hazardous Materials Abatement	\$143,416.00
78	Madison LSD	Hagerman Construction Corporation	Masonry	\$2,487,000.00
79	Mt. Healthy CSD	J. K. Meurer Corporation	Struble Road Improvement	\$101,400.00
80	New Miami LSD	M & W Drilling, LLC	Geothermal Wells	\$518,000.00
81	New Miami LSD	Cox Paving, Inc.	Early Sitework, Utilities and Footers	\$1,911,647.00
82	North Union LSD	Raze International, Inc.	Asbestos Hazard Abatement	\$140,000.00
83	Olmsted Falls CSD	Continental Office Furniture	Furniture	\$183,567.18
84	Paint Valley LSD	General Temperature Control	General Trades & Electrical	\$843,000.00
85	Pioneer Career & Technology Action Contractors, Inc.		Underground Storage Tank Systems Removal	\$26,425.00
86	Reynoldsburg CSD	Paul Construction Company, Inc.	General Trades	\$331,307.00
87	Reynoldsburg CSD	Crawford Mechanical Services, Inc.	Plumbing	\$20,460.00
88	Reynoldsburg CSD	Claypool Electric, Inc.	Electrical	\$449,900.00
89	Reynoldsburg CSD	Farber Mechanical Contractors	HVAC	\$9,940.00
90	South Point LSD	Dataserve Integrations	Telecom Equipment	\$169,863.71
91	South Point SD	Zimmerman School Equipment	Furniture	\$171,541.85
92	South Range LSD	Alex Roofing	Roofing	\$1,549,000.00
93	South Range LSD	Antenucci, Inc.	HVAC	\$3,440,000.00
94	Union LSD	Shelly & Sands, Inc.	Site-Work	\$832,400.00
95	Union LSD	Accurate Electric Construction, Inc.	Electric/Fire Alarm	\$240,000.00
96	Union LSD	Hein Construction, Inc.	General Trades	\$895,933.00
97	Warren CSD	Environmental Assurance Company, Inc.	Hazardous Abatement	\$284,990.00
TOTAL				\$117,737,346.19

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-99.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

12. Settlement Agreements Approval – Presented by Jerry Kasai

Jerry Kasai presented for Commission approval a settlement with Corna-Kokosing Construction Company on the Amanda Clearcreek Local School District. Since opening in 2003, the new 3-12 School roof has issues with the asphalt shingles being blown off during high wind events. This appears to be exacerbated by the topography of the area surrounding the building, which seemingly strengthens and funnels the wind in a path directly towards the roof elevation, which faces the southwest. Parts of the roof have already been replaced through the property insurer for the School District. After numerous evaluations by a number of expert consultants, the co-owners took the position that the cause of most of the shingle blow-off problems was that the original roof installation did not follow the proper nailing pattern to obtain an installation, which would withstand winds within the building code requirements. After demand and negotiation, the contractor agreed to pay the co-owners \$200,000, which was estimated to be the cost of replacing the areas of the roof which had already not been replaced. The Commission staff recommended approval of Resolution 09-100.

Executive Director Shoemaker acknowledged Tom Brannon, OSFC Senior Post Construction Administrator, for all his work resolving the roof issue at Amanda Clearcreek.

Dr. Puckett moved to approve Resolution 09-100.
Vice Chair Quill seconded the motion.
Approval: Vote 2-0.

13. Public Testimony

No public testimony was provided.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 PM.



J. Pari Sabety, Chair

These meeting minutes were prepared by:
Carolyn McClure
Executive Assistant
Ohio School Facilities Commission

Cory-Rawson Local Schools

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Jay G. Arbaugh

TREASURER

Sheila R. Hausknecht

"Educating for Excellence"



3930 County Road 26
Rawson, Ohio 45881
419-963-3415, 419-477-5101
FAX 419-963-4400

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dr. Brad W. James
Joseph A. Mattoon
William L. Sprosty
Cynthia J. Wagner
Jerry K. Wieman

July 21, 2009

Madame Chair, Members of the Commission and Executive Director Mr. Shoemaker;

My name is Jay Arbaugh. I am the Superintendent of Cory-Rawson Schools.

Cory-Rawson has been involved with the OSFC since 2001 and attempted to pass a bond issue for 7.8 mills in May, 2007 that was UNSUCCESSFUL due to the amount of the issue. We are not a wealthy district and we are not a poor district, as I believe our 52%-48% split suggests. Beginning this year, in preparation for our upcoming spot in the OSFC rotation, we discussed multiple possibilities. To put it mildly, I was overjoyed with the prospect of segmenting our project.

When I brought this possibility to the district's Building Committee, the members agreed that the OSFC opened a new door to our building project. Due to the high millage required to fund the local share of the entire master facilities plan, which requires approximately 9.5 mills, and the current state of the economy, the community's reception to a nearly 10 mill bond issue was cold, at best. The committee elected proposed segment one because it is much more affordable to our constituents at 4.5 mills. It is an issue that we can take to the public in good faith, and hopefully pass.

The proposed segment will allow the district to relocate students from two buildings, which are operationally inefficient, to one campus. With the possibility of a segmented project we will be able to present an option that is more affordable to the tax paying public and will hopefully allow us to replace our 96 year old K-4 school, which has the most pressing facility needs in the district. Without this option it is difficult to imagine a scenario that would allow my district to participate in any OSFC project.

Madame Chair, thank you for this opportunity. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay G. Arbaugh". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Jay G. Arbaugh
Superintendent



**WAYNE TRACE
RAIDERS**

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Patrick Baumle
Les Hockenberry
Lisa L. McClure
Perry R. Sinn
Dale Stoller
Rob Wannemacher, Treasurer

Wayne Trace Local School District

Brian R. Gerber, Superintendent
Ann Olwin, Administrative Secretary
4915 US Route 127
Haviland, OH 45851
Phone: 419-263-2415, 399-4113 or 622-6300
Fax: 419-263-2377

Wayne Trace Jr.-Sr. High School
Haviland, Ohio 45851
Kevin Wilson, Principal
Bill Speller, Dean of Students
Ph: (419) 399-4100
Ph: (419) 622-5171

Wayne Trace Payne Elementary
Payne, Ohio 45880
Sarah Deatrick, Principal
Ph: (419) 263-2512

Wayne Trace Grover Hill Elementary
Grover Hill, Ohio 45849
Alan Lautzenheiser, Principal
Ph: (419) 587-3414

July 7, 2009

Mr. Thomas H. Brannon
Senior Post Construction Administrator
Ohio School Facilities Commission
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1400
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Tom:

It is my honor and privilege to inform you that at the July 6th Board meeting, the Wayne Trace Board passed the following resolution:

“to commend Thomas H. Brannon, Senior Post Construction Administrator from the Ohio Schools Facility Commission for his work and cooperation in resolving building issues at WTHS that led to the repair and fixing of the roof leaks. Tom demonstrated team work and cooperation in resolving these problems.”

We appreciate you going the extra mile for Wayne Trace. It is a great feeling to know all issues relative to the building project are finally in the process of being resolved.

Educationally yours,

Brian R. Gerber
Superintendent