



2025 School Building Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, June 23, 2026 – 6:00 PM

Location: East Hearing Room, 3rd Floor, Town Hall, 210 Central St, Hingham, MA 02043

Hybrid – Remote via Zoom

Committee Attendees:	Angela Thedinga, Chair	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Tom Donnelly	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Brian Mulkerrin	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Shane Nolan	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Charley Hayes	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
Central Office/Town:	Aisha Oppong	Executive Director, Hingham Public Schools
	Matthew Meehan	Facilities Director, Hingham Public Schools
	Patricia Burke	Sustainability Coordinator / Town of Hingham
	Kathryn Roberts	Superintendent of Schools
	Ben Burnham	Advisory Committee
	Steven Pohl	Advisory Committee
High School Design/OPM Team:	Tom Ellis	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas (JLL) / OPM
	Brendan Bovard	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas (JLL) / OPM
	Kevin Riordan	Dietz & Company – Architects / Designer
	Dani Garber-Letitia	Dietz & Company – Architects / Designer
	Mike Trzcinski	Hesnor Engineering / MEPFP Engineering
	Josh Doolittle	B2Q Energy Consultant
Plymouth River and South Elementary:	Robert Todisco	P3 Project Planning Professionals / OPM
	John Kurpeski	Gale Associates - Architects / Designer

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 6:03 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.”

Roll Call Attendance:

- Tom Donnelly – Present
- Charlie Hayes – Present
- Shane Nolan – Present

- Brian Mulkerrin – Present
- Angela Thedinga – Present

2. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Discussion: Minutes were presented for approval from the June 9, 2026 meeting. Angela noted that corrections to the posted minutes had been identified and edits are required.

Decision: Committee deferred approval of the June 9, 2026 minutes to the next meeting to allow time for all corrections to be incorporated.

3. To Approve Invoice(s)

Invoice #1: Dietz Services Through May 31, 2026

Amount: \$92,545.94

Discussion:

- Angela questioned charges against schematic design for ground source heat pump (3% complete) when the heat pump system had not yet been selected.
- Kevin clarified the charges were for roof design and MAAB (accessibility) improvements, which are part of schematic design regardless of heat pump selection.
- Angela asked about deliverables for the investigation phase. Kevin responded that an existing conditions report is being compiled and will include the MAAB assessment from Salas O'Brien and geothermal ground conditions assessment. Expected delivery: late June 2026.

Decision: Committee APPROVED invoice by roll call vote:

Motion: Tom Donnelly moved to approve Dietz invoice for services through May 31, 2026 in the amount of \$92,545.94.

Second: Brian Mulkerrin

Roll Call Vote: Tom Donnelly – Yes, Charlie Hayes – Yes, Shane Nolan – Yes, Brian Mulkerrin – Yes, Angela Thedinga – Yes

Invoice #2: Dietz Test Well Boring – Services Through May 31, 2026

Amount: \$82,128.83

Discussion:

- Brian Mulkerrin asked if the test well boring report had been received. Kevin stated it was submitted (conductivity test report) but acknowledged it might not have been widely distributed.
- Kevin noted the well did not test as conductive as originally estimated by the geothermal consultant.
- Angela asked why the invoice showed 98% complete. Kevin explained they may be awaiting final invoices from sub-consultants (Skillings and test driller).
- Brendan confirmed he would forward the test well report to Aisha immediately.
- The committee discussed whether to approve the invoice without having reviewed the report. Brian stated the committee doesn't need to review every technical report but should confirm the product exists. Shane agreed.

Decision: Committee APPROVED invoice by roll call vote:

Motion: Tom Donnelly moved to approve Dietz invoice for test well boring services through May 31, 2026, in the amount of \$82,128.83.

Second: Shane Nolan

Roll Call Vote: Tom Donnelly – Yes, Charlie Hayes – Yes, Shane Nolan – Yes, Brian Mulkerrin – Yes, Angela Thedinga – Yes

Invoice #3: Dietz Reimbursable Consulting Expenses – EWIG

Amount: \$7,260.00

Discussion:

- Angela asked for context on this invoice. Kevin explained it was for reimbursable costs identified in the original fee proposal but not included in the executed contract, requiring submission as a separate invoice and contract amendment.
- The cost is for contractor services for roof cutting and patching during investigation phase.
- Brendan referenced approved budget showing a line item for “Roof Cut Reimbursable” of \$9,600, which was approved during the February 24, 2026 committee meeting.
- The invoice shows 100% complete for this work. Kevin agreed to confirm that no additional charges are expected.
- Angela confirmed this is within the approved reimbursable expense budget.

Decision: Committee APPROVED invoice by roll call vote:

Motion: Tom Donnelly moved to approve Dietz reimbursable consulting expenses for EWIG in the amount of \$7,260.00.

Second: Shane Nolan

Roll Call Vote: Tom Donnelly – Yes, Charlie Hayes – Yes, Shane Nolan – Yes, Brian Mulkerrin – Yes, Angela Thedinga – Yes

Invoice #4: Gale Associates Invoice (Invoice #53955) Date: June 10, 2026 Project: Elementary School Roofs

Discussion:

- Rob Todisco stated he had not formally reviewed the invoice but based on percent complete, it appeared fairly appropriate given they are targeting completion in 8 weeks.
- John Kurpeski (Gale) asked if future invoices should be sent to Rob for review before submission to the committee.
- Aisha and Angela confirmed that future invoices should be sent to Rob for review and stamp of approval before committee review.
- Rob agreed to send an email confirmation of his review immediately to close the loop for this invoice.

Decision: Committee APPROVED invoice by roll call vote:

Motion: Tom Donnelly moved to approve Gale Associates' invoice 53955.

Second: Shane Nolan

Roll Call Vote: Tom Donnelly – Yes, Charlie Hayes – Yes, Shane Nolan – Yes, Brian Mulkerrin – Yes, Angela Thedinga – Yes

Action Item: Rob to email confirmation of invoice review to Aisha and Angela. Future Gale invoices to be sent to Rob for review and approval stamp before committee approval

4. To Discuss Committee Communications Updates

Select Board and Advisory Committee Meetings (June 30, 2026)

Angela reported that the committee may have a slot on the Select Board meeting on June 30, 2026, at 6:00 PM to provide an update. She plans to use the same update deck previously shared with Advisory Committee and School Committee.

Ben Burnham confirmed the Advisory Committee (ADCOM) meeting is also on June 30, 2026, typically starting at 7:00 PM. He and Steve Paul (liaisons) provide standard committee updates during ADCOM meetings. Angela offered to attend to provide additional support if questions arise during the liaison update. Ben agreed this would be helpful.

The committee agreed to revisit at the end of the meeting whether any additional updates beyond the standard deck should be shared with the Select Board.

Legal Review – “Like-for-Like” Assessment Funding

Angela reported on the status of determining whether the like-for-like assessment (\$55,000, ASR-04) is an appropriate use of School Building Committee funds:

- The initial legal counsel is no longer available
- A new legal counsel is reviewing the matter
- A preliminary assessment has been provided
- Angela requested a meeting with the new counsel to ensure full context is provided before the assessment is considered final

Angela confirmed the committee has approved up to \$55,000 contingent upon legal review. If it is determined this is not an appropriate use of SBC funds, the approval serves as a recommendation to the School Committee to approve and fund the work.

Jen confirmed she would be happy to take the recommendation forward to the School Committee if needed

CM at Risk Selection Committee – Open Meeting Law Clarification

Angela provided two updates from the Town Clerk's Office:

- Subcommittee Status: The CM at Risk Selection Committee is officially considered a subcommittee and is subject to Open Meeting Law. This answered a question from the last meeting.
- Quorum Clarification: Even though only 6 committee seats are currently filled, the committee size is 7, so quorum is 4 members (not 3).
- At one prior meeting, attendance dropped to 3 people, which did not constitute a quorum.
- Any discussions or votes during that period will be brought back at the next meeting for re-vote with a full quorum if needed.

School Building Committee Website

Aisha reported the School Building Committee website is now live. She requested committee members review and provide feedback, particularly on Q&A content, to ensure it is current and up to date.

Angela noted that Jen Benham made a helpful recommendation at the last meeting about ensuring Q&As are updated. Angela asked who typically creates Q&As for school building projects. Aisha responded that previously it was a combination of the superintendent, herself, and a communications

person. She requested committee members share any questions they think would be of interest to the public.

Upcoming Communications Planning Considerations

The committee agreed to revisit at the end of the meeting whether additional information beyond the prepared update deck should be shared with the Select Board and Advisory Committee on June 30, 2026.

5. To Discuss Hingham High School MSBA Roof and HVAC Project Updates and Act as Appropriate

a. General Project Update – Design Phase Work (CM at Risk Procurement Update)

Tom Ellis (JLL) presented:

- RFQ Published: The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was published in the Central Register on Wednesday, June 18, 2026.
- Response: To date, approximately 10 construction management firms have downloaded the RFQ from Project Dog (first week response considered good).
- Other Downloads: Trades people, companies, and bid services have also downloaded the package.
- Need to schedule a CM Selection Committee meeting within the next week to discuss evaluation criteria.
- Evaluation will focus on: Are firms qualified? Similar size, scope, and complexity of projects?
- Goal: Include as many qualified firms as possible. Most firms doing public work with DCAM certificates who do CM at Risk work should qualify.
- Will send out final RFQ to committee (if not already sent) and provide a draft score sheet for the qualification evaluation.
- RFP Phase: Tom noted the RFP (Request for Proposals) phase will be much more detailed with granular criteria.
- Schedule: Current schedule targets end of July/early August for RFP availability, assuming the heat pump decision is made, and adequate design information is ready. Currently anticipating 8 weeks for proposals but will try to accelerate if possible.
- Discussion: Matt Meehan has received an email inquiry, but all inquiries are directed through Project Dog for centralized responses.
- RFQ published June 18, 2026, with an RFQ response period of approximately 3 weeks from publication. Approximately 10 CM firms have downloaded the package, a good first-week response.

Next Steps:

- CM Selection Committee meeting within the next week to review evaluation criteria (similar size, scope, complexity projects) and establish qualification standards. Most firms with DCAM certificates doing public CM at Risk work should qualify.
- Qualified firms notification after RFQ evaluation.
- RFP Phase: late July to early August 2026 (currently scheduled), with 8 weeks for proposals (will attempt to accelerate), contingent on the heat pump system decision and adequate design information for contractors to respond.
- CM Selection and Award: Fall 2026.

Critical Dependencies: heat pump decision timing, schematic design completion, and availability of sufficient design information for meaningful proposals.

1. Site Survey

Kevin and Mike presented: A geothermal test well was drilled to 600 feet. Results informed the well field design for ground source and hybrid heat pump options. The conductivity test results showed the well did not test as conductive as originally estimated by the geothermal consultant.

2. Geothermal Well System Update

Mike Trzcinski presented updated well quantities:

Option 1 (Ground Source Heat Pump):

- Previous: 160 wells (600 feet deep)
- Updated: 200 wells (600 feet deep)
- Reason for increase: Cooling mode drives the quantity of wells; system is heating-dominant (extracting more heat all year than rejecting during cooling); increased quantities align with 600-ton peak cooling load; energy modeling over 20 years showed ground temperature would be greatly reduced (~20°F) without additional capacity.

Option 2 (Hybrid System – Ground Source + Air Source):

- Previous: 120 wells
- Updated: 152 wells
- Same reasoning as Option 1

Air-Cooled Chiller Addition (Both Options):

Salas O'Brien recommends adding a 30-ton air-cooled chiller connected side-stream to the piping from the ground source field:

- Purpose: Shave off loads during peak heating and peak cooling.
- Benefit: Eliminates approximately 10 wells (10 wells × 3 tons/well = 30-ton chiller); cost savings ~\$300,000 in well costs (10 wells × \$30,000/well); chiller cost ~\$150,000; net savings ~\$150,000; balances heat extraction/rejection to maintain stable ground temperature over 20 years.
- With Chiller: Option 1 – 190 wells (instead of 200); Option 2 – 142 wells (instead of 152).

Well Field Layout Considerations:

- 600-foot wells – Option 1 (190-200 wells) would not fit within the track infield; would extend beyond and potentially disrupt track event stations. Option 2 (142-152 wells) fits better but still tight.
- 800-foot wells (alternative) – Option 1 would fit within the track infield at Foster Elementary depth. No test well was drilled to 800 feet. Recommendation: may conduct an 800-foot test well during the next project phase to confirm feasibility.

3. Roof Design Update

Kevin Riordon presented on proposed roof improvements:

Existing Conditions:

- Current slopes: 1/8 inch per foot or less, causing ponding water (photos presented).

- Existing insulation: 3 to 3.5 inches thick.
- Too few drains; drains too far from roof edges (current code: within 50 feet).
- Concrete roof decks naturally “creep” (deform downward) over time, exacerbating drainage issues.

Proposed Improvements:

- Increase slopes to 3/16 inches or 1/4 inch per foot (wherever possible).
- Target 1/4-inch slope especially in areas planned for solar panels (solar blocks water drainage).
- Higher slopes will overcome inconsistent flatness of concrete roof decks.
- Add approximately 6 inches of height to accommodate thicker insulation and improved slopes. Maximum roof edge height increase: 12 inches (goal: maintain consistent roof edge around building).

Additional Drains:

Adding drains in problem areas: center classroom wing, cafeteria, and areas where distance from roof edge to drains exceeds code requirements. Yellow highlighted areas on presentation indicate problem zones requiring attention.

Roof Edge Flashing – Existing Conditions:

- Current system: two thin pieces of metal (roof edge coping + lower flashing).
- Corrugated metal panels below showing “oil canning” (waviness), deterioration, gaps between panels, movement due to wind and freeze-thaw cycles, and loose fasteners suspected.

Proposed Solution:

Replace with composite metal panel system: polypropylene backing + metal face; eliminates oil canning (warping of thin sheet metal); available in various appearances (e.g., reveals every 4-5 feet); concealed fastener system on back; more durable, cleaner appearance; single piece replaces current multi-layer system.

With 18-24 inches dropping from roof edge, thin sheet metal would exhibit oil canning; composite panels solve this aesthetic issue.

Matthew strongly prefers replacing all older metal flashing and panels for consistency and uniformity, durability, aesthetics (especially visible from front, south face, and north side), and to address current weathering, gaps, and movement issues.

Committee Discussion: Angela asked about cost alternatives. Kevin noted leaving existing lower flashing would result in 3 layers of material with inconsistent aged appearance. The composite panel system allows for a single, cleaner piece and uniform color/appearance. Cost estimates for alternative options remains outstanding.

Solar Readiness and Structural Improvements:

Kevin presented roof areas analyzed for solar panel installation. Color-coded structural analysis: blue areas require no structural reinforcement for solar; red areas require basic reinforcement; orange areas require reinforcement but are feasible (cafeteria, gymnasium, auditorium).

Target areas for solar (orange) are the cafeteria, gymnasium, and auditorium. These three areas are easiest to reinforce due to long-span steel joists and open/accessible structure below, unlike classroom wings which have complex ceilings, lighting, and utility systems. Reinforcement

involves welding smaller steel pieces to existing trusses (not adding full beams), making it more cost-effective and less disruptive than classroom wing reinforcement.

Estimated solar capacity is approximately 900 kW output, which would cover a significant portion of the high school's 2025 electrical usage. Solar installation is not included in current project scope; the design will ensure roofs are “solar-ready” so that future solar installation would not require roof penetration.

Committee Discussion: Angela asked if the structural analysis needs updating once HVAC equipment is selected. Kevin responded that equipment would go in similar locations as existing, so he doesn't expect significant changes to the blue (no reinforcement) areas but will update once more is known. Tom suggested including solar in lifecycle cost analysis to understand impact. Patricia noted this would require adding solar installation costs as well as operational savings, and reminded the committee of a \$6,000 incentive from HMLP for solar.

Recommendation: Kevin stated this is their current recommendation. It could be scaled back during value engineering if reinforced areas prove too costly, but that would eliminate the ability to add solar later.

4. MAAB Improvements Update

Kevin presented: Salas O'Brien is conducting exterior accessibility improvements work for sidewalks, stairs, and ramps. A report with recommendations is expected by end of June 2026. Goal is durable, long-term improvements rather than temporary patches. Future presentations will provide more detail and may involve committee input on specific recommendations.

b. Heat Pump System Update

Mike Trzcinski and Kevin presented updated modeling assumptions.

Summer Occupancy Schedule:

- Defined summer period: June 21 to August 21 (approximately 2 months). First day of school: August 21. Last day of school: June 21. Captures late spring period when classes are in session and teachers return to prepare classrooms.
- Occupied areas during summer: center classroom wing (revised from north classroom wing per Matthew Meehan's input). These are the only areas actively cooled during summer, though the entire building will be air conditioned year-round.
- Weekday operating hours – School Year: 7 AM to 10 PM. Summer: hours adjusted based on actual usage (to be refined).
- Weekend operating hours – currently modeled 9 AM to 6 PM for auditorium, gymnasium, locker rooms, and offices. Mike requested more accurate weekend usage data from Matthew Meehan, noting the current assumption (fully occupied Saturday and Sunday, 9 AM to 6 PM with hundreds of people) has real impact on energy usage and ground source field sizing.

Matthew Meehan's Response:

Can provide accurate historical data based on past 3 years. School year: building definitely occupied 7 AM to 10 PM almost every day. Summer use goes down considerably (especially gymnasium, rarely used in afternoons due to heat). If the building is air conditioned, summer use patterns may change. Will provide detailed loading schedule for both summer and school year weekends.

Temperature Setback (Unoccupied Summer Spaces): 80°F setpoint for areas not actively occupied during summer.

Dehumidification:

Current design (all three options) provides air conditioning with incidental dehumidification when operating above setpoint; there is no active humidity control in the base design.

- Fan Coil Units (proposed for classrooms): temperature-driven, not humidity-driven; cannot control humidity; remove moisture only when operating above temperature setpoint.
- Dedicated Outdoor Air Units (DOAS) (serving classrooms): bring in 100% outside air, provide code-mandated ventilation and improve indoor air quality, ducted to every classroom; could be enhanced with dehumidification capability (subcooling and reheating coils) as an add-on option allowing humidity setpoint control.
- Rooftop Units (~7 areas with existing rooftop units): will be fully ducted heat pump systems with capability to dehumidify.

Cost and Energy Impact: adding reheat coils would not significantly increase equipment costs. Adding dehumidification would have a big impact on energy usage and load on the geothermal well field.

Committee Discussion:

Q1: What humidity levels would we experience during unoccupied summer periods (e.g., maintained at 78-80°F for a week without active cooling)?

A1: Mike responded that this would need to be modeled for a specific scenario. If not ventilating, the system is not bringing in hot humid air (recirculating and cooling air), and will continually remove moisture when fan coil units are enabled above 80°F. Difficult to make general assumptions since it depends on outdoor humidity, but a typical classroom scenario can be modeled to provide estimates.

Q2: So we're getting whatever dehumidification happens when AC is on, but not actively controlling humidity?

A2: Mike confirmed this was correct.

Tom's Clarification: Tom initially questioned the need for separate dehumidification when the building is fully air conditioned, noting full air conditioning eliminates the need for standalone dehumidification systems, some schools historically had dehumidification instead of air conditioning, and the same system operates in June as in July, just with different setpoints in summer.

Angela's Clarification: Angela explained her question was about understanding what's in the energy model and design, not solving a problem. She wanted to confirm that the current design provides whatever moisture removal happens when AC operates, there is no active humidity control, and this may be totally fine but is important to understand for decision-making.

HMLP Electricity Rates:

Patricia requested that actual Hingham Municipal Light Plant (HMLP) rates be used in energy modeling, noting HMLP rates are better than investor-owned utility (National Grid) rates and this is important for accurate operational cost projections. Mike responded that current modeling uses rates from the National Grid study; for natural gas the same rate applies since National Grid is the supplier; for electricity, rates will be updated once Matthew Meehan/Patricia provide HMLP billing data.

Action Item: Matthew Meehan to provide historical electrical billing data with HMLP rates.

Heat Pump Options Summary:

- Option 1 – Ground Source Heat Pump: 200 wells (600 feet deep), or 190 wells with 30-ton air-cooled chiller. All heating and cooling via geothermal. Well field may not fit within track infield at 600 feet depth; may require 800-foot wells (Foster depth) or placement outside infield.
- Option 2 – Hybrid System (Ground Source + Air Source): 152 wells (600 feet deep), or 142 wells with 30-ton chiller. Combines geothermal with air-source heat pumps; lower well count than Option 1 with better fit within track area.
- Option 3 – Air Source Heat Pump: No geothermal wells; all heating and cooling via air-source heat pumps (rooftop units). No updates at this meeting.

Cooling Tower Option Discussion:

Background: Jim Cahill had previously raised questions about alternative HVAC approaches. Mike presented a traditional cooling tower system option: cooling via a chiller within the building piped to a cooling tower (rejects heat to atmosphere); heating via a boiler system similar to existing; distribution of chilled water to new equipment (fan coils or other terminal units).

Compared to the current system (roof-mounted air-cooled chiller sending chilled water into the building), the cooling tower option takes the chiller, places it inside the building, and adds a cooling tower. Key point: no heat pump is involved, so this option would not meet MSBA's heat pump system intent.

Committee Action: Information documented for Jim Cahill's review if he has further questions. Committee moved on from this option.

c. Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) Update

Kevin and Mike presented updated LCCA. Key updates since last meeting:

- Increased well quantities: Option 1 – 200 wells (from 160); Option 2 – 152 wells (from 120), reflected in construction cost estimates.
- Utility incentives added: National Grid preliminary estimates (provided by Kevin Silvera, National Grid representative), incorporated into the lifecycle matrix.
- Federal IRA Direct Pay Tax Credit added: preliminary estimate of \$9.9 million for Option 1 (Ground Source), incorporated into the lifecycle matrix.
- Design criteria updates reflecting updated summer occupancy schedules and temperature setbacks; main energy changes from refined space usage and operating hours.
- To be updated: HMLP electricity rates (pending data from Matthew Meehan) and refined summer/school-year weekend usage (pending data from Matthew Meehan).

Construction Cost Estimates (Preliminary):

- Option 1 (Ground Source): ~\$39.2 million (average estimate)
- Option 2 (Hybrid): ~\$33-35 million (estimated)
- Option 3 (Air Source): ~\$26 million (estimated)

Net Cost After Incentives (Preliminary):

- Option 1: ~\$30 million (after \$9.9M federal tax credit and ~\$1.9M utility incentives)
- Option 2: To be determined (pending research on federal tax credit eligibility; utility incentives ~\$1.9-2M estimated)
- Option 3: Minimal incentives (no federal tax credit; limited utility incentives)

Operational costs over 40 years include energy costs, maintenance, and equipment replacement, using a present value discount rate of 3%. Energy cost escalation is included in calculations but details were not fully displayed in the current table (noted by Josh Doolittle, confirmed by Mike).

Operational Cost Estimates (40 years):

- Option 1: ~\$14 million
- Option 2: ~\$16 million
- Option 3: ~\$17 million

Quick Analysis (Angela's Calculation): Option 1 total (construction + 40-year operations) = \$30M + \$14M = \$44M. Option 3 total (construction + 40-year operations) = \$26M + \$17M = \$43M. This suggests the options may be at a crossover point where lifecycle costs are very similar.

Tom's Response: Need to see total project cost, not just the HVAC system. Items listed at the bottom of the LCCA as "does not include" (roof costs, soft costs, phasing/logistics costs, etc.) are largely the same across all options. Estimated total project could be \$60-80M+ depending on these other factors.

Committee Discussion – Information Still Needed:

- Federal IRA Direct Pay Tax Credit: verify preliminary \$9.9M estimate for Option 1 with tax consultant; research eligibility for Option 2 and estimate credit amount if eligible; Mike (Salis O'Brien) and Patricia to meet and itemize eligible costs.
- HMLP Electricity Rates: Matthew Meehan to provide historical billing data; update LCCA with accurate HMLP rates.
- Summer and School-Year Weekend Usage: Matthew Meehan to provide accurate schedules for auditorium and gymnasium, considering both historical data and anticipated use if building is air conditioned.
- Dehumidification Analysis: Mike to model relative humidity levels in typical classrooms during unoccupied summer periods.
- Additional Clarity Requested: energy cost escalation assumptions, NPV calculation details, and total project cost including items currently excluded from LCCA.
- Schedule and Disruption Comparison: any material differences in construction schedule or disruption to building/students between options.
- Maintenance Requirements: more detail on "difficulty of maintenance" ratings (Option 2 rated as "3", more difficult); what operational maintenance would look like for each option; consider existing staff experience with the Foster geothermal system.

d. Review and Approve Dietz Additional Services

1. ASR-04: Additional HVAC Options and LCCAs

Amount: \$70,700

Scope: Energy modeling and lifecycle cost analysis for boiler-based heating options:

- Option 4: Traditional boiler system with pre-heated/pre-cooled ventilation air (DOAS system) to meet current energy codes.
- Option 5: "Apples-to-apples" comparison with air conditioning added to traditional boiler system.

Discussion: The committee discussed whether this was an appropriate use of School Building Committee funds versus School Committee funds, pending legal review to confirm the appropriate funding source. If deemed inappropriate for SBC funds, the approval would serve as a recommendation to the School Committee for funding.

Motion: Approve ASR-04 for \$70,700, conditional upon legal review confirming appropriate use of funds.

Roll Call Vote: Tom Donnelly – Yes, Charlie Hayes – Yes, Shane Nolan – Yes, Angela Thedinga – Yes

Result: Conditionally approved pending legal review of funding source.

Timeline: Mike stated energy modeling and lifecycle cost analysis for boiler options expected within three weeks.

2. ASR-05: Scanning of Existing Drawings

Amount: \$1,287.50

Breakdown: Andrew T. Johnson (scanning services) – \$1,178.50; Dietz overhead – 10%.

Discussion: Corrections needed to line-item descriptions. Invoice from Andrew T. Johnson to be attached as supporting documentation. Kevin confirmed this should be 100% complete.

Motion: Approve ASR-05 for \$1,287.50, pending corrections and attachment of supporting invoice.

Roll Call Vote: Tom Donnelly – Yes, Charlie Hayes – Yes, Shane Nolan – Yes, Angela Thedinga – Yes

Contract Amendment Note: The committee noted that a formal amendment to the Dietz contract incorporating ASR-04 and ASR-05 needs to be executed but does not require a separate vote. The amendment will be finalized after confirmation of funding sources for ASR-04.

e. Update Current Project Schedule

Tom Ellis presented: Current schedule targets completion of schematic design in August 2026. Kevin noted approximately 6-8 weeks needed to complete schematic design drawings after heat pump system selection, plus an additional 2 weeks for cost estimating after SD drawings are complete.

Critical Path: Heat pump decision needed very soon to maintain the August schematic design completion, provide adequate design information for the CM at Risk RFP, and allow sufficient time for CM proposals.

CM at Risk RFP Schedule: currently scheduled for late July to early August 2026, contingent on having adequate design information for contractors to respond. Currently allows 8 weeks for proposals, but the team will work to accelerate if possible.

1. Review Heat Pump Options Decision Timeline

Angela led discussion on the decision-making timeline. The committee reviewed what information is still outstanding before a heat pump system selection can be made:

- Federal IRA Direct Pay Tax Credit (priority item): verify \$9.9M estimate for Option 1 with tax consultant; research Option 2 eligibility and estimate if eligible; Mike (Salis O'Brien) and Patricia to meet and itemize eligible costs; create a project narrative documenting assumptions and calculations for Town Meeting socialization and IRS submission/documentation.
- HMLP Electricity Rates: Matthew Meehan to provide historical billing data; update LCCA with accurate rates.
- Weekend Usage Data: Matthew Meehan to provide accurate schedules for auditorium and gymnasium for both summer and school year weekends, considering potential increased use if spaces are air conditioned.
- Dehumidification Analysis: Mike to model typical classroom humidity during unoccupied summer periods.
- Energy Modeling Clarifications: export energy cost escalation assumptions from the detailed model; clarify NPV calculation details.
- Additional Context for Decision: total project cost (including currently excluded items); construction schedule comparison between options; disruption/invasiveness comparison;

operational maintenance requirements and complexity; Buy America requirements (triggered if system exceeds 1 megawatt).

Committee Discussion on Federal Tax Credit (Patricia's Points):

- Emphasized the importance of conservative estimates for the federal tax credit.
- Segregating eligible costs during design and construction for easier IRS documentation.
- Creating a project narrative with all assumptions and calculations documented.
- Tax consultant review before finalizing estimates.

Tom's Observation: Even with preliminary numbers, Option 1 (ground source) appears to offer significant lifecycle cost advantages — approximately \$30M net construction cost (after incentives) versus approximately \$26M for Option 3. When 40-year operational costs are included, Option 1 may be less expensive overall, though the committee needs full information to make an informed decision.

Patricia's Points on Funding Mechanisms: MassCEC Bridge Funding could provide an upfront advance of the estimated federal tax credit (repaid when IRS issues the credit), which does not change the total funding amount but reduces short-term borrowing needs; Aisha and Patricia to explore. MSBA reimbursement applies equally to all options and should not factor into the differential analysis between options.

Angela's Request for Context: Committee members expressed interest in understanding how systems would physically fit within the building, impact on construction schedule, invasiveness during construction, comparative operational complexity, what maintenance would look like for each option, and staff experience with the Foster Elementary geothermal system.

Decision Timeline: No specific decision date was set, but the committee acknowledged urgency — a decision is needed soon to maintain schedule, with outstanding items to be completed within the next 1-2 weeks, and a decision needed by mid-July 2026 at the latest to maintain the schematic design schedule and CM at Risk procurement timeline.

Next Steps: Mike, Patricia, and Matthew to coordinate on outstanding data; tax consultant review of federal credit estimates; updated LCCA with refined data; additional context on construction and operations to be provided.

6. 48 Hour Items

None.

7. Next Meeting Date(s)

Scheduled Meetings:

- July 14, 2026
- August 18, 2026

8. Adjourn

Meeting Adjourned.

Committee approved minutes during the July 20, 2026 meeting.

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