



Hingham High School Accelerated Repair Project

2025 Hingham School Building Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 30, 2026 – 6:00 PM

Location: ZOOM remote meeting only

Meeting Attendees:	Angela Thedinga, Chair Jim Cahill Tom Donnelly Charles Hayes Brian Mulkerin	2025 Hingham School Building Committee 2025 Hingham School Building Committee 2025 Hingham School Building Committee 2025 Hingham School Building Committee 2025 Hingham School Building Committee
Central Office/Town:	Aisha Oppong Matthew Meehan Patricia Burke	Executive Director, Hingham Public Schools Facilities Director, Hingham Public Schools Sustainability Coordinator / Town of Hingham
HS Design/OPM Team:	Kevin Riordon Dani Garber-Letitia Tom Ellis Brendan Bovard Mike Trzcinski	Dietz & Company – Architects / Designer Dietz & Company – Architects / Designer Jones Lang LaSalle Americas (JLL) / OPM Jones Lang LaSalle Americas (JLL) / OPM Hesmer Engineering (MEP)
ES Design/OPM Team:	Robert Todisco John	P3 / OPM GAIL Associates
National Grid:	Kevin Silveira Michael Skinner	Development Engineer Municipal Energy Efficiency Representative

1. Call to Order

- ‘ The meeting was called to order by the chair at 6:03 PM as a quorum was present.

The meeting chair made the following statement:

“This meeting is being held remotely as an alternative 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.”

2. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Discussion: Minutes presented for approval from March 10, 2026, March 24, 2026, and April 7, 2026, meetings.

Decision: Committee APPROVED all three sets of meeting minutes via roll call vote:

Motion: Jim Cahill

Second: Charles Hayes

Roll Call Vote: Unanimously approved

3. Plymouth River Elementary School and South Elementary School MSBA Roof Project Updates

a. Current Conditions Update

Discussion: Rob Todisco provided update that investigation at PRS occurred during April vacation with structural analysis and survey of existing conditions on-going. John from GAIL Associates provided elementary school roof investigation update:

- Successful completion of field work during school vacation
- Test cuts and hazmat sampling completed at both PRS and South Elementary
- Awaiting asbestos test results
- Infrared drone scan scheduled for both buildings
- Report targeting end of May completion
- Cost estimates to follow in June

Questions:

- **Q1:** Angela inquired about timeline for receiving full findings.
- **A1:** Rob explained that structural conditions study will continue and formal report will take “a few weeks” to complete.

Action Item: Rob to provide detailed findings for committee review.

b. Timeline Review

Discussion: Rob shared updated schedule reflecting

- MSBA submission by end of August (August 28th deadline)
- MSBA Board vote is scheduled for October 28th
- Special town meeting to be determined for fall date TBD, likely early December depending on Select Board decision.
- Design team could continue working immediately after MSBA submission in August.
- Bidding timeline targets end of January with bids in hand by March 2027.
- Construction start is planned for day after school ends in June 2027.

Questions:

- **Q1:** Angela asked about timing of MSBA board feedback and decision process
- **A1:** Rob explained that preliminary feedback comes 3-4 weeks before board vote (early October), and once projects reach the agenda, ARP projects are typically approved as a group.

- **Q2:** Angela inquired about ballot vote requirements following town meeting.
- **A2:** Aisha explained this depends on financing method - borrowing typically triggers ballot questions, usually held one week after special town meeting.

- **Q3:** Angela asked about impacts to start of construction date if design phase encounters delays.
- **A3:** Rob confirmed construction start date won't change regardless of when design resumes, but later bidding (closer to summer) results in higher prices due to contractor capacity constraints.

4. Update from National Grid on Report

Discussion: Kevin Silveira and Michael Skinner presented breakdown and background of \$2.12 million estimate from their comprehensive building assessment, which was required for eligibility of National Grid incentives.

- Estimate based on 850 tons capacity at approximately \$200,000 per ton (upper limit of market range)
- Actual completed retrofit projects in National Grid territory ranged from \$80,000-\$126,000 per ton
- Conservative estimate accounts for shale conditions, prevailing wage, and market volatility
- Cost Breakdown Discussed:
 - Wells: \$20,000-\$32,000 per well
 - Heat pump equipment: \$5,000-\$10,000 per ton
 - Installation costs: \$10,000-\$20,000 per ton
 - Distribution system upgrades: \$30,000 per classroom
 - Air handler: \$25,000-\$30,000 per unit
 - Electrical demo, controls, insulation, ADA compliance considerations

Questions:

- **Q1:** Danny asked how totals reach \$168 million from the component costs shown.
- **A1:** Kevin explained costs are per ton/per unit, with 850 tons estimated and multiple classrooms/air handlers factoring into total.

- **Q2:** Committee member questioned reasonableness of 850-ton estimate.
- **A2:** Mike from design team noted current building has 220 tons of cooling for 20% of building, estimated final calculations will likely be 300-400 square feet per ton.

- **Q3:** Angela asked about National Grid project experience base

- **A3:** Kevin confirmed only 3 completed retrofit projects in National Grid territory within last year (Beverly, Wenham, Danvers)

5. **Hingham High School MSBA Roof and HVAC Project Updates**

a. **Current Conditions Update**

Discussion: Kevin Riordon provided update on ongoing site investigations

- Test well is nearly complete, awaiting thermal conductivity results
- Roof investigation is complete and structural engineer is assessing potential for solar capacity across three different roof ages.
- Hazardous materials testing completed on roof - only 1 of 90 samples contained asbestos
- Interior hazmat testing to be targeted based on final design and demolition scope

b. **Timeline Discussion**

Discussion: Tom Ellis presented updated schedule.

- Focusing on Chapter 149A CM at Risk procurement
- Critical path items: Owner Project Requirements (OPR) development, schematic design completion by July, CM selection by mid-October
- Full project budget development in November, December MSBA submission targeting February board meeting before April town meeting

Questions:

- **Q1:** Angela asked about best practices for developing Owner Project Requirements
- **A1:** Tom explained this is collaborative and opportunity to incorporate town and facility requirements (net zero goals, electrification preferences building management system coordination). Project team will work primarily through Matt and Patricia to develop this document.
- **Q2:** Angela inquired when heat pump option cost estimates would be available for decision-making
- **A2:** Kevin explained energy model completion feeding into life cycle cost analysis, with goal to have preliminary cost estimates by end of May for decision-making, though timeline may be challenging

Action Items:

- Small working group (Matt, Patricia, Tom) to develop Owner Project Requirements for committee review
- Design team to provide preliminary heat pump option costs by end of May

c. **Heat Pump Preliminary Options Analysis**

Discussion: Danny Garber-Letitia presented three HVAC system options with detailed equipment descriptions and comparative analysis

- Option 1 - Ground Source System:
 - Fully geothermal with water-based distribution
 - Rooftop units for large spaces, geothermal heat pump chiller in boiler room, fan coil units in classrooms
 - Most expensive upfront cost, least expensive operational cost
 - Most efficient and future-proof (refrigerant only in rooftop units)
 - Equipment lifespans: heat pumps 15 years, chillers 20 years, pumps 20 years
- Option 2 - Combo Ground/Air System:
 - Partial geothermal with variable refrigerant flow (VRF) condensing units
 - Refrigerant distribution throughout building
 - Less future-proof due to refrigerant regulations and leak potential
 - Emergency exhaust systems required for new flammable refrigerants
- Option 3 - Complete Air Source System:
 - Air source heat pump chillers and rooftop units
 - Least expensive upfront, most expensive operational cost
 - Least efficient requires oversizing for winter performance
 - More rooftop equipment requiring additional structural reinforcement
- Additional Considerations:
 - All options require boilers for emergency backup heating (Electric or Gas)
 - All options need above-ceiling piping work impacting ceiling heights and lighting
 - Geothermal options require trenching through parking areas and 1954 building crawlspace (moisture/mildew issues identified)
 - Unit ventilator removal requires exterior wall patching for all options

Questions:

- **Q1:** Angela asked about geothermal well maintenance requirements and lifespan
- **A1:** Danny to follow up with geothermal engineer, but ground loop should last at least 50 years
- **Q2:** Angela inquired about impact of unit ventilator removal on classroom perimeters
- **A2:** Kevin explained units are independent of shelving, requiring some floor/wall finish patching
- **Q3:** Aisha asked about like-for-like boiler replacement comparison
- **A3:** Mike explained new unit ventilators would require energy recovery, becoming couple feet wider, and would need additional exhaust vents

d. Review Site Survey Proposal (ASR-01)

- e. **Review Test Well Proposal (ASR-02)**
- f. **Review ADA Compliance Proposal (ASR_03)**

Discussion: Three Additional Service Requests (ASRs) presented for approval

- ASR-01: Site Survey (\$33,000) - needed for ADA compliance review regardless of HVAC option chosen
- ASR-02: Test Well Boring - within previously approved \$70,000 not-to-exceed amount, no further vote required on this item.
- ASR-03: ADA Accessibility Compliance Study (\$91,650)

Questions:

- **Q1:** Angela asked if site survey was critical for end of May heat pump cost estimates.
- **A1:** Kevin explained survey not critical for cost comparisons but needed for ADA compliance and must be started soon due to 3-week mobilization and 4-week completion timeline.

Decision: Committee APPROVED ASR-01 (\$33,000) and ASR-03 (\$91,650) via roll call vote:

Motion: Jim Cahill

Second: Charles Hayes

Roll Call Vote: Unanimously approved

6. Invoice Approvals

Discussion: No invoices were presented for approval. Angela noted committee reviewing signature process (currently requiring four signatures vs. potential delegation to one or two members)

7. 48 Hour Items

- None reported

8. Next Meeting

Discussion: Proposed meeting dates: May 12, 2026, and May 26, 2026, 6:00-8:00 PM

- May 12: Building master plan context and roof work updates
- May 26: Heat pump option cost estimates and like-for-like replacement conceptual costs

9. Adjournment

Decisions: After discussion of agenda items, committee concluded the meeting at approximately 8:23 PM.

Motion: Charles Hayes

Second: Tom Donnelly

Roll Call Vote: Unanimously approved

Recorded by Brendan Bovard

Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc. / Hingham High School ARP Owner's Project Manager