Meeting Minutes
Medford Comprehensive High School Building Committee Meeting
June 1, 2026 at 7:00 p.m. on Zoom

I. Roll call

Voting Members: 13 Present, 2 Absent
Non-Voting Members: 8 Present 2 Absent

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes
   A. Meeting Minutes from May 20, 2026 Full Committee Meeting

Motion to Approve Meeting Minutes by Ken Lord second by Maria D'Orsi 13/0/2 - Approved

III. Project Updates and Follow-Ups

Mayor, Chair Graham, and the project team met with MSBA ahead of Memorial Day. Spoke about deed restriction and updates to designs that were affected by the deed restriction. MSBA said that they understood that deed restrictions issues can happen and that they are not unexpected in these types of projects.

Also asked MSBA about PDP comments that asked the project team to design a school that was just a 9-12 design. MSBA said the ask was only for comparison purposes to show difference in square footage and explore all options, including options that include just 9-12 spaces and community spaces that are being considered for the project.

IV. Medford Update on Capital Projects and Preliminary Estimate of Project Cost Impact

Luke Preisner: Thanked city for their work on the presentation, asked city if it was possible for those who are 65+ and older if they know where they are clustered around city.
Answer: Spread out throughout the community. Not analyzed by neighborhood, moreso a comprehensive list.
Nicole Morell: Is all the space in the Hegner building spoken for?
Answer: Yes, design plans have been in place for over a year except for a small loft space on the second floor.
Nicole Morell: How were electric costs calculated?
Answer from City: You get a much more efficient building, but current service is gas and not electric. Need to be careful when designing a building and picking HVAC systems.

Nicole Morell: Appreciated the senior impact, but no mention of impact on students during the presentation.

Michelle Barkson 23 Dianne Rd: Thanked committee for work. Teacher in Lexington and said functioning high school is imperative to a community. Clarified that Lexington did not lose 65 positions because of the new high school building, but rather low enrollment. There are two funding sources. Asked City what are we doing as a city to bring down the project cost.
Answer from Mayor: Presentation was to show the lack of capacity of the debt

Zachary Chertok 5 Almont St: Thanked city for the presentation and bringing the city team. Asked committee to honor mayor's request to rightsize the building.

Ellen Rushman 52 Stigbe Rd: Asked why we are comparing debt exclusion to city capital projects. Disappointed so much data around senior and no students. Asked why debt exclusion numbers were being compared to city capital.
Mayor Answer: Asked by committee to ask for a capital improvement plan. City being asked to put debt on the general fund as part of this project even though there will also be a debt exclusion.

Susan Wilson 97 Winchester St: No children represented in the presentation. Said if we focus exclusively on cemeteries or people on fixed income that does not factor in the voters who are family. Emphasized getting building up to code and encouraged the city to explore ways to increase revenue in ways that are outside the scope of the committee.

Ada Gunning 40 Magoun Ave: Thanked building committee for their work and mayor for creating the presentation. Asked city for what their vision is for the building. Also asked where certain spaces that are in the HS would go if they are not able to be placed in the High School.
Mayor Answer: Been a stressor since the numbers came out. Began encouraging the committee to reduce space considerations to make the building more affordable for the community. Oversee 26 department and 18 city buildings and school buildings. Also said to prioritize people who are on fixed incomes, and all residents. Emphasized balancing the importance of creating a space for students with luxuries of a new building and having whole comm

Miranda Briseno 2 Taylor St: Have no kids in the school but babysits a lot of students in the city. Thinks that the presentation did not support the committee's needs to move forward with one design option.

Mike Mastrobuoni 73 Fulton St Rd: Doesn't think it is fair to say it is going to be the greatest and grandest high school in the country. Appreciates presentation about finances but asked for context for what the numbers mean to help everyday residents understand the material.

Jessica Parks 38 Quarry St: Thanked city for the presentation. Asked the city if there is a list of projects coming online and the associated revenue that is coming with those projects.
Answer: Will be posting CIP plan that will outline the expenses each year.

Chris Bennett 19 Martin St: Grateful to see the numbers from the city. Stated need to be realistic on what we're spending money on. Doesn't think the size of the building is realistic.

Harrison Greene 2 Ronaele rd: Asked city what priorities are there from the city to balance the needs of the project. Asked what the alternative sources of funding are for the project.
Answer: High School is top priority for the city, but there are other projects that need to be done.

Maria Daniels 67 West St: Thanked committee and mayor's office for their hard work. Appreciate the transparent sharing of data. Also appreciated data about people on fixed income. Urged committee and chair about positive attitude towards paying for school.

Zoe Moutsos 33 Johnson Ave: Thanked mayor and her team for the numbers. Wants to normalize sharing information on a regular basis with more context. Asked for presentation to be done again when there is a real number within the context of other city projects. Excited to see numbers continued to be placed in front of the public and with context.

Daina Sherman 54 Dover St:thanked city for presentation. Seen amount of pride new high schools has generated in nearby cities and towns. Would appreciate the positive outlook of what the investment would serve and how it would generate monetary and emotional capital for the city.

Kerri Babish 25 Hancock St: Appreciative of the work from committee and city and mom of three. Felt that Municipal buildings are in need of repair because future-proofing was not being considered. Do not want to undersell ourselves now in order to not run into issues down the road.

Sophie R :felt really upsetting that there was no mention of students in the presentation. Asked mayor's office for what are the alternative sources of funding. Asked about the impact of renovating Curtis Tufts and what would go in that building.
Mayors Answer: Hegner Center cost $5m to renovate, but assessing needs to be done.

Chair Jenny Graham: Is there an opportunity for Medford's Reimbursement rate to go up after feasibility.
Project Team: Reimbursement rate likely to go up through incentive points that are given based on how the project is built. Not yet known until Schematic Design.
Chair Jenny Graham: Assessor based on 2% growth number. Is that consistent with past years and does that include new housing projects

Assessors Office: 2% is a conservative estimate that is based on average historical growth. Impact won't be felt in a single year, but over time.

Luke Preisner: Asked project team to clarify how reimbursement rate affects reimbursement net
Project team: Base reimbursement rate is 53%. At the end of SD, will have more information what additional incentive points the project will qualify for. Only applies to MSBA eligible spaces for the building to be reimbursed and caps on other project costs for reimbursement.

V. Review PSR Cost Estimates for C2.2A and C3.4A

The project team presented revised cost estimates for the new alternative design options. These support the PSR cost estimates presented at the May 20 meeting.

Zachary Chertok 5 Almont St: Asked for transparency of impact on tax payers as cost estimates get finalized.

VI. Project Timeline June 2026 - June 2027

The project team presented an upcoming tentative meeting schedule along with meetings with the MSBA board of directors that align with the Medford HS project.

VII. Updated Evaluation Criteria Matrix

The project team updated the evaluation criteria matrix that was used to support the building committee's decision to narrow down design options. The matrix also includes a C2.2A HS only option that assumes the first cost and operational costs will still be incurred by the District and city when the programs currently at the HS are relocated to other spots in the city.

A. Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) Presentation

Ken Lord: Do the air source and ground source need boilers?
Project Team: No they do not.

Zachary Chertok 5 Almont St: Would love for collaboration with the city's projections with what was presented this evening. Do you anticipate the cost of geo-thermal options being finalized by the next meeting?
Project Team: Given the size of the site, Bore wells touch upon a variety of sites. It is rare for higher efficiency from those tests. Analysis is conservative and based on results of previous projects. Doesn't think bore tests will show efficiency.

Suni Dillard 39 Charnwood St: Will this be presented to MEP advisory team later on. Project team said yes.

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Upcoming Meetings

A. June 3, 2026 - Community Forum #5 at 6:30 p.m.
B. June 10, 2026 - MCHSBC Committee Meeting at 6:30 p.m. - select a single design option
C. June 18, 2026 - MCHSBC Committee Meeting at 6:30 p.m. - approve PSR for submission

Motion to adjourn by Ken Lord second by Brian Hilliard - 12/0/3 - Motion Approved

Meeting adjourned