

GRAFTON COUNTY COURTHOUSE BUILDING COMMITTEE

Administration Building

North Haverhill, NH 03774

April 25th, 2024

PRESENT: Commissioners Piper, County Administrator (CA) Libby, Assistant County Administrator Burbank, Maintenance Supt. Oakes, Assistant Maintenance Supt. Colbeth and Administrative Assistant Norcross.

J. Libby called the meeting to order at 1:01PM

J. Libby stated that the first order of business was to elect a Chairperson.

MOTION: J. Libby nominated J. Oakes as chairman. W. Piper seconded the nomination, and all were in favor.

Review 10/25/23 Email from Roy Ward from EH-Danson – J. Oakes reviewed the email outlining the steps the County needs to take to start the process of the new Courthouse. The first step was to create a committee. The responsibilities of this committee will be meeting with the design team, reviewing the process, making decisions and interfacing with the Commissioners. The next item is architect and engineering team selection. He noted that many of these things are the benchmarks. He stated that he is unsure of the programming piece, the way R. Ward was suggesting the architect and engineer conduct interviews with those in the building. He stated that the people in the Courthouse are people they know and work with and he does not know if they want to pay EH Danson to do these interviews again. This is something that the County can do themselves.

J. Oakes stated that the next step would be interviewing each department/agency that occupies the building and using the EH Danson report as a baseline. He stated that he has thought about sending all of the entities this report that was done two (2) years ago and having them review it again ahead of time before the interview and refresh their memories. J. Libby stated that she felt that makes sense to have the groundwork laid for the needs in the building. She noted that the Registry of Deeds was not included in this original design, so they would need to start from scratch with their needs. She agrees with J. Oakes to send this report out and get everyone's true needs, not wishes, as they need to be able to afford and justify this project. J. Oakes asked J. Libby if she has a list of point of contact for all of the departments and agencies. J. Libby stated that she would get that list to J. Oakes.

J. Libby stated that she thinks an introductory email to everyone involved, letting them know who is on the committee, give them copies of the reports and let them know the committee will be meeting with each department individually will be very helpful in starting the process.

Interviews – J. Oakes stated that he would like to do a few interviews each day with departments. He asked if the whole committee would interview each department and questioned W. Piper's ability to be here for each one. W. Piper said that she does not feel the need to be present for all of the interviews. She stated that J. Oakes, J. Libby, H. Burbank, and R. Colbeth could conduct

the interviews. J. Libby noted that they will need to talk to these departments more than once. The group can bring back the information to W. Piper as well.

J. Libby stated that if they are in a position by August to figure out the architect piece, that would be ideal because if they are going to use ARPA funds, they need to have a contract signed and in place by December.

J. Oakes explained that once they hire an architect and engineering team, phase one is the schematic design, what would this building look like and then build a model. The goal of this phase is to come to an agreement on an initial design and ensure it satisfies all needs. At that point they will have something more finite to deal with. J. Oakes asked if their goal is to take this design and development with ARPA funding or just get to the schematic design. J. Libby said that her thought was that they would take the phase 1 fees out of ARPA. Once they are at that phase, they would then bond out the rest of the project costs. Based on the EH Danson report, it is going to be in the \$500,000-\$600,000 range for phase 1. If they took \$1 million from ARPA, they could use the remaining funds until they run out. J. Libby noted that these are old figures as well and may not be accurate. She suggests they allocate a set amount of ARPA funds towards this project. W. Piper asked why they wouldn't use more ARPA funding for phase 2. J. Libby said that they can, and it is up to the Board of Commissioners. She stated that she would have to look at the ARPA obligation requirements and noted that she does not know the desire of the board, on other thoughts for ARPA funding. She is open to what the majority of them want. W. Piper stated that given how large this project, funding as much as they can out of ARPA would be desirable. J. Libby stated that she would propose, for the Commissioners' next meeting, having a better calculation and coming up with a rough estimate. They can then look at where they are with ARPA funds and have a discussion prior to the May Executive Committee meeting.

J. Oakes advocated before they met again that they all refresh their memories with the EH Danson report. He suggested a follow up meeting with the Commissioners on the overall goals and vision of the courthouse.

J. Oakes stated that he was going to go to R. Ward and clarify some items in the email regarding the programming. J. Libby stated that she thinks this piece regarding the programming, the architect would be on board and working with the County on these other items to figure out how this building would be best laid out. W. Piper stated that she does not know whether there should be only one (1) Commissioners meeting verifying the wants and needs. She asked if there should be another meeting with the board. J. Libby stated that there will be multiple meetings with the Commissioners. J. Oakes added that it is the Commissioners project, and this committee is a tool to bring recommendations to them. J. Libby stated that they want as much involvement as possible from the Commissioners. She stated that in September, they can give the Executive Committee an update as well since they are the ones with the ultimate approval. Being transparent and keeping people informed helps them when the time comes to vote.

J. Oakes stated that the summary package from this report was given out to everyone who was at the meeting on March 5th. He asked where the Delegation is regarding this project. J. Libby stated that the Delegation does not know much but the Executive Committee has been briefed at each of their meetings.

J. Libby stated that when they built the jail, they were required to have a public hearing before the bond vote. She stated that they had public hearings in each area of the County, so they had full Delegation and public input. She noted that when they are at that stage with the Courthouse, it may be worth doing and something to keep in mind. All the education and transparency they can provide will only help them in the end.

J. Libby will get J. Oakes contact information to get the initial email sent out to everyone involved. The Committee agreed to meet again on May 28th at 1:00.

1:44 PM – With no further business the meeting adjourned.