DORE + WHITTIER

Project:	Essex Elementary School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	10/28/2025
Location:	Hybrid (Essex Elementary School Cafeteria & Zoom)	Time:	6:00 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	J. Greco

Present	Name (* Voting Member)	Affiliation
√	Michelle Cresta*	Director of Finance & Operations
√	Pam Beaudoin*	Superintendent
√	Kim Provost*	Principal
√	Theresa Whitman*	SBC Co-Chair
	John Binieris*	SBC Co-Chair
√	Andy Oldeman*	Manchester Finance Committee / Mechanical Engineer
√	Charlie Hay*	Architect School Building Experience
√	Gordon Brewster*	Engineer, Sr. Proj. Manager, Owner's PM, former Member of MERMHS & Memorial building
√	Tyler Virden*	Project Executive -Wise Construction / Paren
√	Annie Cameron*	Former SC Member and Memorial SBC Member
	Ariel Fernando Brian*	Architect - CBT
√	Jen Hocherman*	Architect - Partner SV Design
√	Michael Gerhardt*	Civil Engineer / Parent
√	Timonthy McDonald*	Architect - Onion Flats
√	Henry Ottenginer	Manchester Conservation Committee / Education Background
	David Pereen	Resident / Plumbing & Fire
√	Lisa O'Donnell	Design & Construction / Essex Planning Board
	Steve Hunt	Facilities Manager
√	Emily Dwyer*	EES Teacher
√	Kim Field	EES Teacher
√	Rachelle Rousseau	EES Teacher
	Mike Burton	Project Director / Partner - DWMP
√	Christina Dell Angelo	Project Executive - DWMP
√	John Albright	Project Manager - DWMP
	Rachel Rincon	Assistant Project Manager - DWMP
	Jacob Greco	Assistant Project Manager - DWMP
√	James LaPosta	Principal - JCJ Architecture
√	Fawn Pellegrini	Senior Project Manager - JCJ Architecture
√	Jeff Elliott	Project Architect - JCJ Architecture
√	Emily Czarnecki	Principal (Interiors) – JCJ Architecture

DORE + WHITTIER

√	Mike Pirollo	Principal – MLP Integrated Design
	Eric Haggstrom	Sustainability Director – JCJ Architecture
	Kelley Tapia	Soden Sustainability
√	Brendhan Zubricki	Essex Town Manager

Item No.	Action Item	Ball in Court
6.5	Send out the full space summaries	Project Team
6.5	Send out the educational program	P. Beaudoin

- **Please click here for the presentation**
  - **This will be referenced in the meeting minutes with slide numbers called out to refer to.**
- **Below is a summation of key points, please view the recording here for full transcript and chapter summaries.**

Item No.		Description
8.1	**Call to Order & Intro:** Called to order by T. Whitman at 6:05pm, please refer to the attendee list.	Record
8.2	**Approval of October 14 - 2025, Meeting Minutes (Vote Expected):** **Roll Call Vote:** A motion to approve October 14, 2025, Meeting Minutes made by A. Cameron and seconded by H. Oettinger • **Yes: 11 | No: 0 | Absent/Abstain: 5** Name | Yes/No/Abstain & Absent	Record

	Michelle Cresta	Yes	
	Pam Beaudoin	Yes	
	Kim Provost	Absent	
	John Binieris	Absent	
	Theresa Whitman	Yes	
	Andy Oldeman	Yes	
	Charlie Hay	Yes	
	Gordon Brewster	Yes	
	Tyler Virden	Absent	
	Annie Cameron	Yes	
	Ariel Fernando Brian	Absent	
	Jen Hocherman	Absent	
	Michael Gerhardt	Yes	
	Timonthy McDonald	Yes	
	Henry Oettinger	Yes	
	Steve Hunt	Advisor – No Vote	
	Emily Dwyer	Yes	
	Kim Field	Advisor – No Vote	
	Rachelle Rousseau	Advisor – No Vote	
	David Pereen	Advisor – No Vote	
	Lisa O'Donnell	Advisor – No Vote	

8.3	**Invoices & Commitments for Review and Approval (Vote Expected):** There were no invoices for approval at this meeting.	Record
8.4	**Removal of Apple Street from Site Selection (Vote Expected):**	Record

- C. Dell Angelo noted that the SBC reviewed this topic in depth for weeks and the project team had reviewed and provided the completed matrix.
    - J. Elliott noted JCJ updated the environmental impact of the site on the criteria matrix for Apple Street to yellow based on the previous SBC meeting discussion and recommendation.
- C. Dell Angelo noted that at the straw poll vote at the last meeting, the SBC agreed to remove Apple Street from the site and the ask now is to make an official vote.
- A. Cameron asked what the SBC and project team will need to provide to the MSBA to prove that they have done enough work to eliminate this option.
    - C. Dell Angelo noted that we believe what the project team have compiled so far, based on the criteria matrix, and the discussion is sufficient and as part of the PDP submission to the MSBA.
    - A. Cameron noted she understands at this high-level point in the project that costs cannot be understood with the magnitude of changes that would need to occur to make Apple Street viable. Given the information that has been presented, A. Cameron believes that the MSBA and the Town will support the removal of Apple Street.
    - P. Beaudoin noted that the MSBA wants to ensure the District studies the options to determine the most cost effective and fiscally responsible project, and based on the data provided, it seems Apple Street has the most cost implications related to site selection.

Name	Yes/No/Abstain & Absent
Michelle Cresta	Yes
Pam Beaudoin	Yes
Kim Provost	Absent
John Binieris	Absent
Theresa Whitman	Yes
Andy Oldeman	Yes
Charlie Hay	Yes
Gordon Brewster	Yes
Tyler Virden	Yes

DORE + WHITTIER

Annie Cameron	Yes
Ariel Fernando Brian	Absent
Jen Hocherman	Yes
Michael Gerhardt	Yes
Timonthy McDonald	Yes
Henry Oettinger	Yes
Steve Hunt	Advisor – No Vote
Emily Dwyer	Yes
Kim Field	Advisor – No Vote
Rachelle Rousseau	Advisor – No Vote
David Pereen	Advisor – No Vote
Lisa O'Donnell	Advisor – No Vote

Roll Call Vote: A motion to remove Site C, Apple Street, as a potential site for the Essex Elementary School Project was made by G. Brewster and seconded by H. Oettinger

- **Yes: 13 | No: 0 | Absent/Abstain: 3**

Discussion:

- A. Cameron noted that there will be a narrative created to share with both boards of selectmen to explain why this choice was made
    - A. Cameron noted she has a draft that will be reviewed by both P. Beaudoin and T. Whitman

8.5	**Space Summary & Education Program Progress** • C. Dell Angelo shared that the project team has previously outlined as part of the PDP deliverables, that the District needs to develop the Educational Program, which drives the development of the three space summaries, based on the three enrollment configurations. At our last meeting, we reviewed the introduction of the two deliverables. C. Dell Angelo added that the space summaries will be shared with the SBC by Thursday this week and they will be asked for its acceptance at the 11/6/2025 meeting. • J. Elliott reviewed the space summaries slides showing the original Manchester Memorial School version, as well as the draft version	Record

DORE + WHITTIER

of the proposed new Essex Elementary School with variations from the MSBA guidelines (Slide 8 - 10).

- R. Russo asked why the kindergarten classes are not listed.
    - J. Elliott noted that there are two classrooms for kindergarten, they were just not shown on the high variations from the MSBA guidelines slide. J. Elliott noted that they are included in the overall space summaries.
    - P. Beaudoin noted that this is just showing the line items with variations.
- C. Hay noted that it seems like the special education line is way over and was wondering since it is a District wide program could they be moved to Manchester?
    - P. Beaudoin noted that Manchester is running out of space currently for special education and the RISE program is the largest of the programs. She noted they used to be in Essex but now they are in Manchester due to ADA accessibility. She added that 23% of the district population is involved in special education
    - C. Dell Angelo noted that we have seen this is change in schools on other projects and that recently there has been an increase in the creation of and need for special education space.
- P. Beaudoin asked if the space summary included the PT/multipurpose room.
    - J. Elliott noted yes, it is around 1,200 square feet.
- A. Cameron noted that it seems the Essex project is a larger percentage than the MSBA guidelines compared to the Manchester version.
    - T. Whitman noted it would be helpful to see the justifications for this space
    - C. Dell Angelo said that the educational program that will be reviewed by the MSBA is the driver and justification for the space.
- A. Cameron noted that it should be considered that some of these spaces may be outsourced in the future.
    - P. Beaudoin noted that special education space needs have consistently gone up and they expect them to keep increasing in the future.
- A. Cameron asked how much space is really needed for the addition to the full K-5 at Manchester Memorial grade configuration?

DORE + WHITTIER

- P. Beaudoin noted that there would be a need for an increase in around 6 classrooms plus Pre-K along with any configurations required for the common space to fit everyone.

- C. Hay asked if there has been any analysis on the core/common spaces in the Manchester building?
    - J. Elliott noted there would be an increase needed of around 13,000 square feet.
- T. Whitman asked where the physical impact is shown for the EES K-3 grade configuration for the students that go to Manchester Memorial.
    - P. Beaudoin said they can physically take grades 4 & 5 at Manchester Memorial but there will be educational impacts
- G. Brewster asked that for the K-5 option at Manchester would they need to add 40,000 square feet?
    - J. Elliott noted that it is correct and the existing building would have very little renovation.
- M. Gerhardt noted some observations such as there is a 63% increase over the MSBA guidelines for the proposed EES K-5 option, and the Manchester project was only 31%. He added that based on the space summaries shown the Manchester Memorial had 230 square feet/student and the proposed Essex Elementary School is currently at 290 square feet/student
    - J. Elliott noted that some of the larger spaces are the same size but serve a lower number of students, which skews the student/SF numbers.
- M. Gerhardt noted when he does the math, he is missing some 6,000 square feet for the Essex Elementary School K-5.
    - J. Elliott noted that the MSBA template does not always use the full 1.5x grossing factor for every square foot.
- M. Gerhardt asks if the square footage above the guidelines is completely non-reimbursable.
    - J. Elliott noted that the MSBA will track all the deviations, compare it to the educational program, and ask the District questions to decide whether they will reimburse some of the spaces or not. He added they will reimburse more than just the 45,000 square foot guideline shown but that the template does not show what those

DORE + WHITTIER

values are. The final reimbursement number will be incorporated into the final project cost.

-
- C. Dell Angelo noted they will work closely with the MSBA and DESE and when the educational program shows a strong need for space the MSBA can and will likely reimburse the spaces.

  - M. Gerhardt asks if it is realistic that grades 4 and 5 could fit into the Manchester building?
    - P. Beaudoin noted that if that is the case they will need 16 to 18 general classrooms so some programs will have to be displaced, and space will have to be used differently than it was designed for if large group spaces must be taken.
    - T. Whitman noted it is important to show that there will be impact on the Manchester program if grades 4 and 5 are moved over.
  - P. Beaudoin asked based on the projected square footage for EES, would the school be designed as a single-story building, or stacked like Manchester and how does this affect the square footage totals?
    - J. Elliott noted it does not affect it greatly and the 1.5x grossing factor considers circulation for both horizontal and vertical spaces. He noted that EES could very well be two stories creating upper and lower schools, he added this is very common.
  - A. Oldeman noted that he has seen any special education that has to be outsourced often ends up being a higher operating cost for the District rather than keeping in house.
- T. Whitman asked to confirm that the SBC will be voting on this at the next meeting.
  - C. Dell Angelo noted yes, and they will be sending all space summary documents Thursday, and the educational program on Monday. The SBC will be voting on whether to accept these at the next meeting, and the School Committee will vote on whether to accept the space summaries and whether to approve the educational program. C. Dell Angelo added to send any questions directly to the project team.
- C. Hay asked if there will be any more review of the space summaries by the project team to lower the number?
  - P. Beaudoin noted there may be some confusion around this as they are not coming up with the numbers, they are

DORE + WHITTIER

	created by the educational program that drives what spaces are needed and the space summary templates creates the square footage. ○ C. Dell Angelo added that the MSBA provides the educational program template, and the District develops the information that is required for the District. ● J. Hocherman asked if there are standards across MSBA projects about what percentage of the square footage over the guidelines is normally accepted for reimbursement. ○ C. Dell Angelo notes yes, they can provide information. ● McDonald asked if there is a way to articulate the overage from what MSBA will not participate in and what that the District can afford? ○ T. Whitman thinks that is something that will not be known till they go to the voters as everyone will have a different number, but the job of the SBC is to create the most cost-effective school for the District. ● P. Beaudoin noted that as an educator the most important aspect should be the classrooms even if that means reducing the size of items such as the gym even though that is also needed. ● A. Cameron asked when the decisions to pull back scope due to cost will occur. ○ C. Dell Angelo noted we have not even started designing alternatives yet, so we are not ready to discuss costs at this high level. C. Dell Angelo added that JCJ needs these space summary sheets to start developing design alternatives, and as the alternatives are reviewed with the SBC, there might be instances where one or more alternatives might be removed from the options within the PDP phase to winnow down the number of options. C. Dell Angelo noted that at PSR they will really be focusing on a smaller number of options and at the end of PSR they will be choosing the preferred option and that is when costs really start to be reviewed. ● J. LaPosta noted that this is a long process, and the space summary templates are not static, they will change throughout the process even after they are accepted at PDP. He noted that their job is to design the most efficient plan and the refining from the SBC will start as soon as designing starts. He added that the MSBA will not accept the project if it does not meet the educational program so they cannot refine too much too soon. J. LaPosta also said that a lot of efficiencies can be found for the buildings once they start being designed. ● T. Whitman asked to confirm what the SBC is accepting again.	

DORE + WHITTIER

	◦ C. Dell Angelo noted they are accepting the spaces that support the educational program, and this will not be finalized until the end of Schematic Design with the MSBA. C. Dell Angelo added that the educational program is really the document that is being approved by School Committee as if it were to change the School Committee will need to revote to approve it. ▪ P. Beaudoin noted there are no classroom numbers or square footage included in the education program. • E. Dwyer provided an example from her experience on the Pentucket SBC about how the indoor track space was supported by their education program the SBC decided that it should not be included.	

8.6	**Schedule Update**
	
	• C. Dell Angelo provided an update to the schedule for the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) and the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) (Slide 12).
	  ◦ T. Whitman asked if the open-door food truck could be scheduled on the day that the tour and community meeting.
	    ▪ R. Russo noted that the food truck comes right a dismal before the school tours and the community meeting.
		Record

8.7	**Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to the Meeting (Occurred after approval of meeting minutes)**
	
	• Please note that this agenda topic was taken out of order and reviewed at the beginning of the meeting after previous meeting minutes were approved.
	• B. Zubricki, the Town Administrator for Essex, joined the meeting to discuss the town shelter aspect of the proposed Essex Elementary School.
	  ◦ P. Beaudoin noted this is a general inquiry into the Town of Essex asking whether they have any changes to the current shelter plans for Essex Elementary School.
	  ◦ B. Zubricki noted that the Town's emergency plan is for the Essex Elementary School to be the local shelter, and
		Recor
		d

DORE + WHITTIER

	they would bring in Red Cross. However, Cape Ann general area is working to make Gordon College a widespread shelter. B. Zubricki noted that they would need a generator, ability to cook, and a large space for gathering with heating and cooling capabilities. ◦ J. Hocherman asked if this would impact on the structural aspect and cost of the project. ◦ F. Pellegrini noted yes it would increase the category required for the structure. She added that they can make the school prepared for these things without designating the building as a certain level shelter. ◦ B. Zubricki agreed with this path. ◦ C. Dell Angelo noted she sent an email to the SBC with all the requirements that would be met. ◦ The committee agreed to move forward with the existing shelter in place capabilities.	
8.8	**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.	Record
8.9	**Reflections & Action Items** • P. Beaudoin noted that there has been conversation regarding the Town Meeting schedules as outlined within the MSBA project schedule for Fall 2026. P. Beaudoin stated it would be helpful to schedule a time to review this timeline with the Leadership team as well as certain chair members from boards within each Town. ◦ T. Whitman agreed that SBC should be involved and suggested that we empower P. Beaudoin to meet with the two Town Administrators for an initial conversation. The group supported this path. ◦ C.Dell Angelo noted they could create a working group if that would be helpful ◦ P. Beaudoin noted she will start first with an offline group and bring it forward if needed.	
8.10	**Adjourn:** **Roll Call Vote:** A motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 7:51pm by G. Brewster and seconded by A. Cameron	Record

- **Yes: 14 | No: 0 | Absent/Abstain: 2**

Name	Yes/No/Abstain & Absent
Michelle Cresta	Yes
Pam Beaudoin	Yes
Kim Provost	Yes
John Binieris	Yes
Theresa Whitman	Yes
Andy Oldeman	Yes
Charlie Hay	Yes
Gordon Brewster	Yes
Tyler Virden	Yes
Annie Cameron	Yes
Ariel Fernando Brian	Yes
Jen Hocherman	Absent
Michael Gerhardt	Yes
Timonthy McDonald	Absent
Henry Oettinger	Yes
Steve Hunt	Advisor – No Vote
Emily Dwyer	Yes
Kim Field	Advisor – No Vote
Rachelle Rousseau	Advisor – No Vote
David Pereen	Advisor – No Vote
Lisa O'Donnell	Advisor – No Vote

Sincerely,
DORE + WHITTIER

Jacob Greco
Assistant Project Manager
Cc: Attendees, File
The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.