



2025 School Building Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 24, 2026 – 7:00 PM

Location: Remote via Zoom

Committee Attendees:	Angela Thedinga, Chair	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Tom Donnelly	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Charlie Hayes	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
	Jen Benham	2025 Hingham School Building Committee
Central Office/Town:	Aisha Oppong	Executive Director, Hingham Public Schools
	Matthew Meehan	Facilities Director, Hingham Public Schools
	Julie Strehle	Select Board Member / Liaison to Roof Projects
	Steven Pohl	Advisory Committee
	Patricia Burke	Sustainability Coordinator, Town of Hingham
High School Design/OPM Team:	Tom Ellis	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas (JLL) / OPM
	Brendan Bovard	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas (JLL) / OPM
	Kevin Riordon	Dietz & Company – Architects / Designer
	Dani Garber-Letitia	Dietz & Company – Architects / Designer

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 7:02 PM. 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.”

Chair confirmed committee attendees with roll call:

- Jen Benham – Present
- Jim Cahill – Absent
- Tom Donnelly – Present
- Charlie Hayes – Present
- Brian Mulkerrin – Absent
- Shane Nolan – Absent
- Angela Thedinga – Present

1. To discuss Hingham High School MSBA Roof and HVAC Project Updates and act as appropriate:

a. To review CMAR qualifications and potentially approve CMR Subcommittee recommendations

Tom Ellis presented the results of the CM at Risk pre-qualification evaluation conducted by the five-member subcommittee.

Process Overview:

- Seven firms submitted qualifications: Bond Brothers, Colantonio, Commodore Builders, Consigli Construction, GVW, TRAC Builders, and WT Rich
- Firms were evaluated against standard DCAM requirements and project-specific criteria including Massachusetts Chapter 149A experience, MSBA-funded projects, occupied school renovations, and geothermal/heat pump experience

Evaluation Results:

- GVW: Eliminated - failed to meet minimum bonding requirements and single project value threshold
- TRAC Builders: Eliminated - no Massachusetts CM experience or Chapter 149A projects; no occupied educational facility renovations; no geothermal experience
- Colantonio: Eliminated - limited CM and MSBA experience (projects as GC only); no geothermal heat pump experience; pending litigation with Town noted but not considered disqualifying factor per Shane Nolan's comment
- Top Four Firms: Bond Brothers, Commodore Builders, Consigli Construction, and WT Rich identified as having strongest relevant qualifications

Subcommittee Recommendation: The subcommittee discussed whether to pre-qualify three or four firms. Analysis showed a meaningful gap in relevant experience between Commodore Builders and the top three firms:

- Commodore's proposed team had only partial overlap of school and geothermal experience
- Did not propose an MEP manager (other firms did)
- Chapter 149A requires minimum of three pre-qualified firms

The subcommittee unanimously recommended pre-qualifying three firms: Bond Brothers, Consigli Construction, and WT Rich.

Committee Discussion:

- Tom Ellis confirmed all three recommended firms have experience with major school renovations while in session, geothermal projects, and Chapter 149A work
- Matthew Meehan confirmed evaluation prioritized Chapter 149A experience first, followed by school renovation and geothermal experience
- All selections contingent on satisfactory financial statement reviews

Vote: Motion by Jen Benham, seconded by Tom Donnelly, to approve Bond Brothers, Consigli Construction, and WT Rich as pre-qualified firms for the CM at Risk process.

Roll Call Vote:

- Jen Benham – Yes
- Tom Donnelly – Yes
- Charlie Hayes – Yes
- Angela Thedinga – Yes

b. To review and potentially approve the OIG CMR application

Chair Thedinga noted she had submitted comments after the pre-read, including clarifications regarding the 2025 School Building Committee and adding her professional background as a utilities construction engineer to demonstrate committee qualifications.

Brendan Bovard (JLL/OPM) confirmed no other comments were received on the application.

Tom Ellis noted the intent of the application is to demonstrate to the OIG that the committee has construction knowledge and understands CM at Risk and procurement processes. He stated this is likely the most qualified committee he has been involved with for an OIG application.

Vote: Motion by Charlie Hayes, seconded by Tom Donnelly, to approve the OIG CMR application.

Roll Call Vote:

- Jen Benham – Yes
- Tom Donnelly – Yes
- Charlie Hayes – Yes
- Angela Thedinga – Yes

c. To discuss geothermal system design criteria and potentially approve the ASR06 for supplemental test well

Kevin Riordon (Dietz & Company) presented the rationale for drilling an 800-foot test well.

Conductivity Comparison - Foster Elementary vs. Hingham High School:

- Foster Elementary School wells: 600 feet deep with conductivity results ranging slightly above and below Hingham High School's results
- Hingham High School initial test: 600 feet deep, 1.56 BTUs/hr/ft/°F conductivity
- Important Correction: Foster Elementary wells are confirmed at 600 feet (not 800 feet as previously stated)
- Expected variability at Hingham High School would be similar to Foster if wells remain at 600 feet

Benefits of 800-Foot Wells:

- Reduced setup costs (approximately 50 fewer wells)
- Smaller field footprint - remains within track infield
- Reduced circuit sizing and smaller manifold vault
- Fewer well casings required
- Less disruption to athletic spaces

Cost Considerations:

- First 600-foot test well: ~\$70,000-\$74,000
- Proposed 800-foot test well: ~\$90,000+
- Higher cost due to extra 200 feet of depth, longer drilling time, potential for more water, two 20,000-gallon tanks vs. one
- Per-well cost increases with depth, but offset by fewer total wells needed
- Water disposal costs are significant for test wells; actual well field installation can use DEP-approved on-site discharge methods (lower cost)
- Tom Ellis noted CM with geothermal experience will help ensure project only pays for actual costs incurred

Water Management:

- Test well requires tank-and-haul disposal method (higher cost)
- Actual well field can obtain DEP approval for on-site discharge of clean water (lower cost)
- Water extraction only occurs during drilling; completed geothermal system has zero impact on groundwater

Town Water System Coordination:

Julie Strehle (Select Board/Water Commissioner) raised important concern about proximity to town water wells:

- Town has at least 3 active production wells on Free Street (serving entire water system)

- One emergency well on Downing Street (currently used for field irrigation)
- Unlike Foster Elementary, high school is located in watershed area near active town water infrastructure

Dani Garber-Letitia (Dietz & Company) confirmed:

- Geothermal engineer reviews surrounding site conditions
- Will obtain exact locations, depths, and capacity of all town wells
- Goal is zero impact on town water supply
- Kevin Riordon clarified: geothermal system only extracts water during drilling/installation; after completion, zero ongoing impact

Patricia Burke (Town Sustainability Coordinator) and Matthew Meehan offered to facilitate coordination with Water Department Superintendent Russell Tierney.

Test Well Location:

Discussion of optimal placement considering multiple factors:

- Driller recommends maximum distance from first test well for best geological variation
- Tom Ellis suggested placing within anticipated 143-well grid pattern so test well can be utilized in actual field
- Chair Thedinga noted value in proximity to 600-foot well for direct depth comparison data
- Aisha Oppong requested location drawing before drilling to assess impact on school and youth sports
- Team will coordinate with school district to minimize disruption to fall athletics

Timeline:

- Estimated 2 weeks total (mobilization through demobilization)
- Approximately 2-3 days drilling, plus installation, grouting, curing, and testing
- Drillers better prepared for water management based on first test well experience

Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) Assumptions:

Chair Thedinga asked what assumptions were used in the previously presented LCCA:

- **LCCA assumed:** 200 wells at 600 feet
- **With air-cooled chiller:** 190 wells at 600 feet
- Chiller size and location remain same regardless of well count (roof or site-mounted)
- Well count and chiller cost offset each other, so estimate did not change significantly between scenarios
- **Implication:** If 800-foot wells prove feasible with comparable/better conductivity, total project cost could decrease from LCCA estimate

Rationale for Drilling Now:

Kevin Riordon and Dani Garber-Letitia explained timing importance:

Information Gained:

- Actual conductivity at 800-foot depth (could be higher or lower than 600 feet)
- Water conditions at greater depth
- More accurate cost estimating for well field installation
- Potential to reduce well count if conductivity is favorable

Benefits of Early Testing:

- Information incorporated into MSBA schematic design submittal
- Allows design to be finalized with certainty rather than assumptions
- Enables more accurate bidding with less contingency

- Avoids costly change orders during construction
- Change orders never recover full value and have MSBA reimbursement complexities
- Well field is one of first major construction activities; changes at that stage are most disruptive and expensive

Matthew Meehan emphasized:

- Getting ahead of design decisions benefits entire project
- Information impacts building loading and well field capacity
- Very important to provide this data to designers early in process

Project team advised that if delayed, information would not be available for schematic design package, resulting in conservative assumptions and potential construction-phase changes.

Budget and Affordability: Tom Ellis and Brendan Bovard presented the budget spreadsheet.

- Original appropriation can accommodate the test well cost
- Would require partial use of contingency funds
- Current funds are sufficient to complete Schematic Design
- Additional funds will be required to complete Detailed Design (DD)

Committee requested Dietz to provide estimate for DD by next Committee meeting. Committee considered deferring one week until the fuller DD cost estimate became available. Tom Donnelly commented on risk associated with a delayed decision. (i.e. Drilling subcontractor schedule and availability)

Vote: Motion by Tom Donnelly, seconded by Jen Benham, to approve ASR-06 for supplemental 800-foot test well.

Roll Call Vote:

- Jen Benham – Yes
- Tom Donnelly – Yes
- Charlie Hayes – Yes
- Angela Thedinga – Abstain

2. 48 Hour Items:

CMAR Subcommittee meeting minutes were submitted as a 48 hour item. Chair Thedinga questioned if subcommittee minutes were typically approved by the subcommittee themselves, or the parent committee. Jen Benham advised that the subcommittee approves their own minutes. Tom Ellis responded that referenced minutes would be presented to the Subcommittee for consideration.

3. Next Meeting Date:

September 01, 2026

4. Adjourn:

After discussion of agenda items, the committee concluded the meeting at approximately 08:35 PM via motion to adjourn by Jen Benham with second by Tom Donnelly.

Roll Call Vote:

- Jen Benham – Yes
- Tom Donnelly – Yes
- Charlie Hayes – Yes
- Angela Thedinga – Yes

*Recorded by Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc. / Hingham High School ARP OPM
Committee approved minutes during the September 15, 2026 meeting*