

2025 Hingham School Building Committee

February 24, 2026

Call to Order

2025 School Building Committee Chair Angela Thedinga called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM and read the following statement regarding remote meetings:

This meeting is being held remotely as an alternate means of public access pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025 and all other applicable laws temporarily amending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. You are hereby advised that this meeting and all communications during this meeting may be recorded by the Town of Hingham in accordance with the Open Meeting Law. If any participant wishes to record this meeting, please notify the chair at the start of the meeting in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(f) so that the chair may inform all other participants of said recording.

2025 School Building Committee members participating remotely: Chair Angela Thedinga, Vice Chair James Cahill, Charles Hayes, Brian Mulkerrin and Shane Nolan.

2025 School Building Committee members participating in person: none

2025 School Building Committee members absent: Thomas Donnelly

School Committee members present: Jen Benham

Central Office Members present: Executive Director of Business and Support Services - Aisha Oppong

Remote Visitors present: Advisory Representative Ben Burnham and Sustainability Coordinator Patricia Burke, Tom Ellis- Jones Lang LaSalle Americas , Kevin Riordan and Dani Garber - from Dietz & Company , Robert Todisco - OPM - P-three

Confirmation that all members have been sworn in and were eligible to vote. Thomas Fleck participated in discussions but was unable to vote.

Approval of minutes

On a motion by Jim Cahill and seconded by Shane Nolan.

- It was voted to approve the minutes of the 2025 School Building Committee meeting held on November 6, 2025.

Alignment of the Scope

- Does the draft warrant article for extraordinary funds fall under the committee's charge?
Question raised by the Advisory Members to the 2025 School Building Committee.
- Is a like for like replacement of the boiler under the committee's charge?
- Will the MSBA fund a like for like replacement?
- Is the Interim handling of the boiler system a responsibility of the committee?

The committee discussed the scope of the heat pump evaluation, focusing on comparing operating costs between the current boiler system and proposed alternatives. Tom Ellis explained that the design team would conduct energy modeling and life cycle costing to assess long-term benefits, while Scott from Hessner Engineering clarified that a "replace in kind" scenario was not explicitly included in the RFP scope. The committee debated whether to include a baseline replacement cost, with Tom and Brian arguing for its necessity as a reference point, while Jen and Dani noted that the original MSBA application specified heat pump conversion rather than boiler replacement. The authority to define the project scope was confirmed to rest with both the school committee and select board, with the warrant article providing clear direction for the HVAC system update.

The committee discussed the scope of their HVAC assessment project, confirming that while MSBA funding is limited to heat pumps, the committee's broader scope includes all HVAC options. They agreed to follow up with the Town Council regarding the baseline HVAC versus heat pump assessment costs, as this was unclear.

Repairs to be performed on the Hingham High School Boiler and the engineering report received from C.A. Crowley Engineering, Inc

The committee also received an update on current boiler repairs at Hingham High School, with Aisha Oppong explaining that repairs rather than emergency replacements were possible, though significant maintenance costs had already been incurred.

The C.A. Crowley report provided 3 options for the High School Boiler:

- Option 1: New Multiple Gas Fired Boilers for \$1.5m to \$2m
- Option 2: Repair and Modify the Existing Boilers - approximately \$300,000
- Option 3: All Electric Air Source Heat Pump

MSBA Project Status Updates

Robert from P3 presented the timeline for elementary school roof projects, targeting June 2026 for MSBA submission and mid-October for town meeting approval.

The meeting discussed the project timeline and construction delivery methods for a school HVAC and heat pump upgrade. Tom Ellis, representing JLL as the owner's project manager, presented a preliminary schedule and explained the potential use of Chapter 149A construction management at risk delivery method, which could impact the schedule and overall project cost. The team discussed the need for various assessments, including existing conditions, geotechnical investigations, and electrical system capacity, before proceeding with the engineering and design phases. They also considered separating the roof-only projects from the high school project to potentially expedite the roof installations.

The group discussed the timeline for submitting project packages to the MSBA board and the associated town meetings. Tom explained that while the MSBA board meets every two months, towns can choose which board meeting to target, with a 90-120 day window for town approval after board approval. The team considered aligning multiple projects for a single special town meeting in the fall, though Robert clarified that towns can have multiple board meetings if needed. The discussion concluded with Tom noting that using a construction manager at risk would add time to the schedule, potentially pushing the timeline past the October board meeting.

The team discussed the timeline for the heat pump project, with Tom indicating that more information would be available in the next 2-3 weeks to refine the schedule. They explored the possibility of compressing the timeline to align with a town meeting in April, which would allow for a vote in May. Angela emphasized the need to consider both the pros and cons of using a CM at-risk approach, as well as the potential impact on the schedule. Robert noted that he could accommodate a combined town meeting for both the roofs and the high school project, though it might result in slightly higher bids for the roofs. The team agreed to further discuss the CM at-risk decision at the next meeting, with Tom promising to present a detailed analysis of the options and schedule impacts.

OPM and designer contracts for the High School, South Elementary School and Plymouth River Elementary School and act as appropriate.

The committee approved the OPM and designer contracts for the roof projects, with Aisha Oppong noting these would need school committee approval on Thursday. The committee approved contracts for high school and elementary school projects.

Total design for the Hingham High School was budgeted up to \$463,700 and the OPM was budgeted up to \$154,856.40 for the elementary school roofs; the design cost is up to \$256,900 and the OPM costs is up to \$20,000.

48 Hour Items

None

Next Meeting & Adjourn

March 10, 2026 at 6:00 PM - To discuss the construction manager at risk

March 24, 2026 at 6:00 PM - a detailed timeline discussion

On a motion by James Cahill and seconded by Shane Nolan It was voted at 8:16 PM to Adjourn.

Committee approved minutes by unanimous vote during the March 10, 2026 meeting

Documents Included:



Agenda



Item #2 - Meeting Minutes



Item #3 - Scope of the 2025 SBS



Item #4 Extraordinary Article & an Update on the Repairs on the HHS Boiler



Item #5 & 6 Update on the projects & OPM & Designer Contracts



National Grid Report