

Courthouse Building Committee

Meeting time: 2025-Apr-02, 10:00

Location: Teams

Participants:

Brooke DeYoung, Doug Shilo, Holly Elsholz, Jim Oakes, Julie Libby, Nick De Mayo, Robert Robicsek

Meeting Summary:

During the Courthouse Building Committee meeting held on April 2, 2025, LBA outlined the agenda, which included discussing the updated program and reviewing three design options for the courthouse. LBA presented the design options, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of each. The committee aimed to choose two design options to move forward with by the following week to maintain progress towards a mid-June completion goal. The committee plans to reconvene for further evaluation and feedback in the following week.

Meeting Notes:

1. Meeting Goals
 - a. Narrow down three design options to two for further refinement and conceptual design development.
2. Program Updates
 - a. Updated program summary was reviewed, reflecting adjustments for the Register of Deeds program.
 - b. Changes included six additional public parking spaces and six staff parking spaces, increasing the total parking count from 215 to 227.
 - c. Adjustments were made to align with comments from Jim Oakes regarding area calculations.
 - d. Building demolition and abatement costs were updated based on further discussions.
 - e. Program summary was sent to attendees earlier in the day for review.
3. Design Options
 - a. Option 1: Tunnel Scheme
 - i. Includes a tunnel connecting the Department of Corrections to the basement level. Secure prisoner transport elevator connects the tunnel to the courtrooms above. Court program is stacked for efficient secure corridors and vertical circulation.
 - ii. Public entry is emphasized with a prominent two-story façade. Staff entry and sally port are less prominent but functional.
 - iii. Simplest traffic circulation.
 - iv. Disadvantages include high cost and phasing complexity of tunnel construction, lack of direct mechanical room access to exterior.
 - v. It was noted the County Building Committee and Commissioners have already agreed to remove this option.
 - b. Option 2: Ramp Scheme
 - i. Goal was to be as similar to Option 1 as possible, but without the tunnel.

- ii. Features a ramp down to a basement-level sally port, with three different site plan sub-options explored. Drive-through site sub-option is preferred to avoid conflicts with staff parking access and expense of crossing roads.
 - iii. Secure prisoner transport elevator connects the basement Sallyport to the courtrooms above.
 - iv. Provides direct vehicular access to the mechanical room.
 - v. Overland drainage is difficult to provide outside the basement-level Sallyport, and a catch basin would need to be tied to existing stormwater systems. This results in the building being raised 5'-0" higher than other schemes. This requires more fill and retaining walls than the other options, which adds expense.
- c. Option 3: Upstairs Courts Scheme
 - i. Sally port is located at grade with a drive-through configuration. County is also entirely on the first floor, with the court program entirely on the second floor.
 - ii. Simplifies site grading and eliminates the need for a tunnel or ramp. Maintains natural site grades, minimizing drainage concerns.
 - iii. Likely the lowest-cost option.
 - iv. No direct vehicular access to the mechanical room, but there was discussion about alternative methods of access, such as larger elevators, modular equipment, and access wells.
 - v. An additional elevator is required to keep prisoner transport isolated from other programs.
- 4. Schedule
 - a. Due to continued program refinement, the addition of Register of Deeds to the program, and development of options that do not rely on a tunnel, the team is currently behind schedule.
 - b. Feedback on the 2 preferred options must be finalized by week of April 7, 2025 to maintain end date.
- 5. Next Steps
 - a. Detailed floor plans, elevations, and site plans to be developed once preferred options are established.
 - b. Next meeting to be scheduled for the week of April 7, 2025.

Action Items:

1. **Review design options and provide feedback to Design Team (Assignee: Courthouse Building Committee)**
2. **Share today's presentation and meeting minutes (Assignee: Doug Shilo)**
3. **Schedule follow-up meeting with courthouse building committee for next week to finalize design direction. (Assignee: Doug Shilo/ Jim Oakes)**