

## GRAFTON COUNTY COURTHOUSE BUILDING COMMITTEE

Via Teams

North Haverhill, NH 03774

April 1, 2026

PRESENT: Maintenance Supt. Oakes, Commissioner Hedberg, CA Libby, Assistant CA Elsholz, Doug Shilo – Lavalle Brensinger, Robert Robicsek – Lavalle Brensinger, S. Norcross

J. Oakes called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

The committee reviewed the following email from J. Oakes that had answers/comments from Lavalle Brensinger Architects (LBA) to questions that staff members from the county had after reviewing the updated floorplan.

### Sheriff Dept.

**Question:** Jill said, “Can the bathroom directly next to my admin be removed and turn that into a bigger admin area with a partition between the two admin. The rest looks as though it would be efficient for our department.”

**LBA Response:** Ok

**Question:** I noticed LBA did not reduce locker room showers to one per locker room per Sheriff Myer’s earlier request.

**LBA Response:** These showers can be removed.

**Comment:** Jill did not comment on proposed vehicle sallyport, so I assume the configuration is fine.

**LBA Response:** We will proceed with the site plan based the current sallyport location.

### County Attorney

**Comment:** Marcie Hornick, the County Attorney, is pleased with the latest design. No further comment.

### Probation & Parole (P&P)

**Comment:** Amanda Perry, the head of P&P said, “Remove the one spare office, shrink the evidence room to the size of the spare office you are eliminating and add one staff bathroom.”

**LBA Response:** We will replace the spare office with a staff toilet, as requested. The evidence room would remain the same or be slightly larger.

### Judicial Branch

**Comment:** Sarah Lineberry asked numerous questions, which I forwarded to LBA to answer. However, LBA failed to share its response. As the project owners, we need that feedback.

**LBA Response:** Understood. We were waiting for the feedback from other departments, which we only received today. There has been no separate response sent to the courts that we failed to copy Grafton on.

**Question:** First Floor- Is the entrance at the left rear of the building coming from the parking lot meant exclusively for court staff? It seems likely, since the two right rear entrances are for the staff elevator (*for second-floor tenants*) and the stairwell. Only staff with card access can enter the JB hallway.

**LBA Response:** The courts are now at grade, so no stair has been dedicated to the courts. The dedicated entrance is the door inside the elevator lobby leading to the court space. The elevator lobby itself would be shared. We will add an indication for card access at the door to the court.

**Question:** First Floor-Does Lavallee have furniture layouts for the Superior and Circuit Court main clerks' offices. Since the configuration of the offices changed slightly, it would be helpful to see the workstation layout and active file shelving in the main offices. If not, is there an updated Excel worksheet outlining the court space to verify room sizes and total square footage.

**LBA Response:** This pricing exercise excludes revised furniture plans and program comparisons.

**Question:** First Floor-It is hard to visualize the makeup and size of the Probate vs. CC file storage spaces but assume they are as before; the room behind courtroom #4 labeled storage used to read "Record Storage – CC" we assume that it is still a CC file room.

**LBA Response:** They are as before. The storage room in question is for the Circuit Court, yes. The storage room names can be revised to indicate which staff they serve.

**Question:** First Floor Lactation Room – Previously commented. The lactation room is in private JB staff space but is identified as a public space. It is hard to visualize how this will work for anybody but the court staff.

**LBA Response:** Agreed – this room is intended for court staff only, as it was on the previous plans. The color of this room can be revised to reflect this.

**Question:** If an updated Excel is not available, we would like verification that active file space is the same as the last version for both Superior and Circuit Court per the previous plan. We would also like verification that file space for archive files is the same and has not changed for both Circuit Court and Superior.

**LBA Response:** In the revised design, the active file spaces (Probate Files and Records Storage) are both shown at 100 SF less than the program amount. The archive files in the basement are the same SF as the previous design.

#### Courthouse Building Committee

**Comment:** The goal was to lower building cost, yet I see a 4<sup>th</sup> elevator added to the building. This does not lower capital cost nor help in keeping long-term cost down. 4 elevators for a building are excessive. We had hoped to shrink it to two in this latest redesign.

**LBA Response:** While there is an additional elevator *shaft*, please note that only a single elevator *stop* is added. We do not see how it is possible to maintain the secure corridors required in this configuration with less, but we are happy to discuss this further at our next meeting.

The committee discussed the additional elevator shaft with LBA. D. Shilo asked to confirm that the county is wondering if the defendant's elevator could be shared with the second-floor staff as well. Supt. Oakes stated that in the earlier plan this is what they were going to do, noting that there would be controls in place where the elevator would be locked if a defendant were being transported. D. Shilo noted that it would not only be court staff sharing this with defendants, but it would also be everyone. LBA further discussed the request and possible options that could be looked at. J. Oakes stated that it is better than what the courts have now. He stated that he thinks it is an acceptable compromise and for lowering long term costs of the building by removing an elevator. He feels that this option should be considered. K. Hedberg stated that she understands the long-term costs, but her concern is that they are going to keep chipping away from the building and it will not be what is needed down the road. She noted that while she feels they do not have to have a perfect option, she feels they need to something more than barely acceptable. K. Hedberg added that she is for saving costs where they can, in order to get this project approved but if it does not give them the safety, they need or the functionality, she does not see that savings as useful. J. Libby stated that she does not feel that it is unacceptable, but she is unsure how the courts will react. If it is workable, she thinks it is something the courts should consider but noted that if it is not a lot of additional capital costs, as D. Shilo explained, and it is the more functional option, maybe they should get the cost associated with this option as well. R. Robicek stated that he agrees with D. Shilo, that the courts would likely not be in favor of this change. He stated that they thought a lot about adding this 4<sup>th</sup> elevator and explained that moving the courts to the first floor changed the circulation dynamics of the whole building. The committee further discussed this option with LBA. J. Oakes asked about presenting this option to the Judicial Branch to see what their response is. K. Hedberg stated that it wouldn't hurt to present it but her hopes would not be high. J. Libby asked what they would end up saving by not putting in the 4<sup>th</sup> elevator. D. Shilo stated that they would save the cost of three (3) elevator stops but the square footage would be taken up by the storage they were short on. R. Robicek stated that they are working on an option for a flat roof versus peaked and they could ask their estimator what it would be without a 4<sup>th</sup> elevator. J. Libby stated that she liked this idea. J. Oakes and K. Hedberg agreed.

**Question:** Where will the water entrances come into the building?

**LBA Response:** We would anticipate the water entrance at the room marked "Sprinkler Room", though exact location and details are to be determined during full design.

**Question:** Where will the biomass entrance come into the building?

**LBA Response:** We would anticipate the biomass at the room marked "Sprinkler Room", though exact location and details are to be determined during full design.

**Comment:** In a recent meeting with the commissioners, two out of three commissioners indicated willingness to concede the two peaked roofs at the front of the building, but the cost savings had to be significant to get their buy in. The third commissioner was unwilling to

concede the peaked roofs. We will need cost estimates that compare the two options (peaked roofs vs. crown molding look).

**LBA Response:** Understood. We will proceed with pricing (with the roof as a break-out item) once layouts are approved.

D. Shilo stated that they will have three (3) breakout items to send to their estimators, the roof, elevator and the overflow parking that was talked about. They will plan to have these changes made and sent to their cost estimator by April 13<sup>th</sup>. D. Shilo stated that he thinks they will be able to get a budget back from the estimators by April 24<sup>th</sup> and deliver revised drawings/estimates to the county by May 1<sup>st</sup>.

11:53 am With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.