

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SPECIAL MEETING
LEGACY HALL
4301 NEW TOWN AVE, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23188
August 8, 2024
3:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

ADOPTED

B. ROLL CALL

SEP 24 2024

Barbara E. Null, Stonehouse District
Michael J. Hipple, Powhatan District
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District
James O. Icenhour, Vice Chair, Jamestown District
Ruth M. Larson, Chair, Berkeley District

Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA

Scott A. Stevens, County Administrator
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney

Ms. Larson extended appreciation to her fellow Board members, staff, and guests for their attendance at the Special Meeting.

C. BOARD DISCUSSIONS / GUIDANCE

1. Government Center Discussion

Mr. Brad Rinehimer, Assistant County Administrator, addressed the Board and guest attendees. He thanked everyone, adding he wanted to introduce the guest attendees before providing a brief timeline on the Government Center project. Mr. Rinehimer noted that during the process, an internal working group was formed to review proposals. He added the group had spent numerous hours working with the architects, the builder, and the engineering team. Mr. Rinehimer introduced working group members: Ms. Grace Boone, Director of General Services, Mr. Shawn Gordon, Chief Civil Engineer, Ms. Sharon McCarthy, Director of Financial Management and Services, Mr. Patrick Page, Director of Information Resources Management, and Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development. He noted an outside consultant, Mr. Jim Yatzek with McDonough Bolyard Peck, Inc. (MBP), was also a member of the working group but was unable to attend. Mr. Rinehimer introduced Mr. Al Davis from Henderson, Incorporated, who would introduce some members of the Henderson team.

Mr. Davis thanked Mr. Rinehimer for the opportunity to introduce his team and provide project information to the Board. Mr. Davis introduced Mr. Brad Sipes and Mr. Michael Creasy, lead architects and project managers from the design partner, GuernseyTingle, as well as Mr. Rodney Freeman and Ms. Leslie Schultz, President, of Henderson, Incorporated. He continued the introductions with Mr. Tom Tingle, GuernseyTingle, and Mr. Peter Henderson and Ms. Heather Harmon of Henderson, Incorporated.

Mr. Rinehimer noted the team was a great group to work with and he extended his appreciation

to the group. He referenced the timeline of approximately 10-11 years earlier when discussion regarding the building of a consolidated Government Center occurred. He stated discussion ensued over the years until 2020 when the County performed a space needs study. Mr. Rinehimer noted a Facilities Master Plan was reviewed and costs were considered for a new Government Center versus retaining the current location. He further noted an unsolicited proposal was received in December 2022 from the Henderson-Gilbane (Henderson, Incorporated and Gilbane Building Company) group. Mr. Rinehimer stated at that time, the proposal was presented to the Board, the working group was formed to evaluate the proposal, with a recommendation forwarded to the Board. He noted the Board accepted the Henderson-Gilbane proposal, publicly advertised the project for 120 days, after which one competing proposal was received. Mr. Rinehimer stated at that point Mr. Yatzeck joined the team to assist with proposal evaluations. He noted the next step was to present the information to the Board, which the Board approved the decision to move forward with the Henderson-Gilbane group. Mr. Rinehimer stated the next step was negotiation of an interim agreement which encompassed a 30% design. He added that step occurred in late March-early April with the team working on that project aspect to date. Mr. Rinehimer stated the intention of the interim agreement was to reach the 30% design point, adding the process was approximately halfway through that point with the programming phase completed. He provided details on the various components of that phase. Mr. Rinehimer noted the Board's direction was needed for schematics and other aspects, adding his goal was to gather that information and direction at this meeting. He presented the four main items for the Board's input: site layout, School Administration, site parking, and exterior concepts. Mr. Rinehimer noted the site had some topographic and size limitations which had been addressed. He stated School Administration had been discussed as an on-site option, which upon the decision to build, would include or not include School Administration. Mr. Rinehimer noted site parking was similar in point to School Administration, adding consideration of a parking deck was an option as well as underground podium-type parking. He added Mr. Sipes would address the latter parking style in more detail. Mr. Rinehimer stated the fourth item, exterior concepts, had been previously discussed.

Mr. Sipes addressed the Board noting Clark Nexsen was another group working on the project, but representatives were unable to attend the meeting. He noted the architectural collaboration between GuernseyTingle and Clark Nexsen on the project. Mr. Sipes addressed the size configuration with the buildings approximately 60 feet to 80 or 90 feet wide. He addressed that point in more detail and highlighted the dimensions in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Sipes noted the building was approximately 164,000 square feet, adding an 80-foot-wide building would be very long. He further noted that point led to consideration of a multi-level building concept. Mr. Sipes continued the presentation to demonstrate departmental groupings with three options which he addressed in detail. He noted as analysis continued the second option was eliminated as it encompassed separate buildings. Mr. Sipes addressed separation of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in design consideration, adding a standalone EOC was not warranted as a separate dedicated space. He added the majority of the year that EOC space could be used for other functions with EOC use determined during emergency situations. Mr. Sipes noted the EOC space would serve as double space, but he added that space required the special criteria to withstand the emergency event. He addressed other considerations for the EOC in more detail. Mr. Sipes continued the presentation highlighting the various components of a three-floor diagram which included modifications to the first option for incorporation of the EOC and School Administration. He displayed the first option design on the property map to visualize parking and other property aspects. Mr. Sipes noted consideration for the main entrance based on feedback from the working group. He further noted other criteria involved in the design concept. Mr. Sipes continued the presentation identifying advantages and considerations regarding School Administration. He noted an attached building provided greater mechanical, electrical, and plumbing efficiencies. Mr. Sipes addressed additional efficiencies, enhanced security, and future flexibility in more detail, citing maintenance as a major point. He noted a consideration of a fourth floor was less favorable due to the Building Code. Mr. Sipes further noted that with a fourth floor additional requirements were placed on the entire building. He cited elevator systems were one feature with additional criteria. Mr. Sipes indicated

additional building height impacted difficulty in fighting structural fires. He added that point was favorable in the three-story building recommendation. Mr. Sipes explained that the soils on the property were soft and could potentially impact the load bearing aspect of a three-story versus four-story building. He continued with a revised diagram showing the parking deck underneath the building, adding that deck was referenced as podium parking. Mr. Sipes compared the podium parking to a walkout basement. He noted additional considerations included a better use of the topographical slope, enhanced security, immediate building access, and other factors. Mr. Sipes highlighted this design offered more pleasing aesthetics to the Government Center with increased public parking as noted on the diagram. He noted future expansion was also available with this layout.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the podium parking was one level.

Mr. Sipes confirmed one level.

Mr. Icenhour questioned if the back parking lot was for employees and if a separate employee access would be available.

Mr. Sipes noted potential access based on preliminary discussion. He added that security concerns were major considerations. He provided additional details on a dedicated staff entrance into the building.

Mr. Icenhour noted his concern had been if staff had to walk around the entire building for entrance.

Mr. Sipes confirmed that point adding security could still be maintained. He noted multiple secure access points could be included with the modified first option floor plan.

Mr. Hipple noted the slope of the land would be used for the podium parking.

Mr. Sipes confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple referenced the advantages of the podium parking and the security features.

Mr. Sipes confirmed yes. He referenced after-hours calls to Social Services staff in which personal vehicles were required to be exchanged for County vehicles. Mr. Sipes addressed the safety features of secure podium parking in such instances.

Mr. Hipple noted this was another safety consideration by the Board to maintain employees. He further noted the importance of employee benefits.

Mr. Sipes concurred. He added there was a cost associated with podium parking.

Mr. Hipple stressed the importance of doing the project right in relation to cost and future revisions to projects. He added that cost would not go down.

Mr. Sipes concurred.

Mr. Hipple elaborated on additional points regarding spending.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the podium parking accommodated 200 vehicles.

Mr. Sipes confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked if that number was the same with a parking deck.

Mr. Sipes noted the parking deck was originally slated for two levels with accommodations for 120 vehicles. He elaborated on the parking accommodations in more detail. Mr. Sipes noted a possible terrace with an outdoor eating area near the parking as opposed to a third-floor rooftop location. He commented on the nearby walking trail and the natural space.

Mr. Hipple noted his agreement with the terrace concept. He acknowledged a relaxing place for staff to take a break or have lunch.

Mr. Sipes addressed the site exterior noting exploration on the design was forthcoming. He noted this meeting offered an opportunity to gather the Board's input on potential exterior design. Mr. Sipes stated the starting concept needed to be based on classical proportions, adding the building should not be a historic building. He addressed finding a balance of the two elements. Mr. Sipes noted the building should be modern with a 50-year long-term goal, but still be rooted in local history. He highlighted the design of the Law Enforcement Center (LEC) in the presentation, adding its design was separated into manageable sections. Mr. Sipes stated that style of building was recommended as he provided examples of the combined features which utilized classical proportions. He also presented several designs with varying overhangs for the Board's input. Mr. Sipes continued the presentation highlighting some original design submissions.

Ms. Larson noted it would be interesting to see how the five Board members would reach consensus. She stated her preference was the openness afforded by the glass front that overlooked the trail and other elements.

Mr. Sipes noted each Board member gave the design team some direction. He stated the options allowed for inclusion of the different perspectives.

Mr. Icenhour stated he favored the design with two side components and a middle section. He noted the large expanse of glass similar to the LEC and potential hurricane damage. Mr. Icenhour stated the need for strong glass and elaborated on the use of glass on the building. He reiterated the proper use of the glass for an open concept as Ms. Larson had noted.

Mr. Sipes referenced the hardening of the glass for the larger areas.

Mr. Icenhour noted the cost in the areas of glass hardening versus other areas. He stated he liked the modern touch on traditional structures. Mr. Icenhour noted a three-story building would also be more manageable.

Mr. Sipes concurred.

Mr. McGlennon stated he preferred the large expanses of windows, adding the windows created a greater sense of light. He noted his preference was a warm and welcoming building rather than an intimidating look. Mr. McGlennon elaborated on the importance of a sense of belonging for anyone coming into the building for services. He noted he favored softer corners and expansions.

Mr. Hipple stated he liked the LEC design. He addressed design costs with each turn representing a dollar amount for footings and other design elements. Mr. Hipple noted the LEC design was more cost-efficient. He further noted other design elements such as a covered terrace and other considerations.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Null stated she was an architectural advocate and a strong proponent of flowing lines and a curved entry. She noted an open entry with high ceilings to indicate a welcoming feel to the building. Ms. Null stated she would like the use of copper incorporated into the design, adding

the addition of metal was a desired feature. She elaborated on additional design features for inclusion. Ms. Null stated she wanted a natural and clean look at the front as she was not in favor of parking lots.

Mr. Sipes noted the Board had provided good feedback for the design direction. He stated options could then be presented to the internal working group for review prior to the Board's review.

Ms. Larson noted the four questions presented to the Board at the beginning of the presentation. She further noted the exterior question had been addressed. Ms. Larson asked if a consensus on the parking was required.

Mr. Rinehimer responded yes. He asked the Board if it agreed on the site layout.

Mr. Icenhour replied yes that the building was pulled back and centered on the lot with no large parking lot at the rear.

Fellow Board members concurred.

Mr. Rinehimer noted the site layout included one building with School Administration in the wing. He stated that component could be added if needed later in the process.

Ms. Larson stated regardless of the decision on the school system operating jointly or separately, a future location for School Administration was still needed.

Mr. Rinehimer noted the site was being developed to accommodate either School Administration or another group as needed. He added that aspect had been incorporated into the design from the start of the process.

Mr. Hipple suggested building the wing presently and not as an add-on later. He cited costs and other factors toward a delay on that construction.

Mr. Rinehimer questioned if pedestal-style parking was the Board's choice.

While the consensus favored that style, Ms. Larson expressed concern regarding costs and items being cut. She noted she favored that parking style but cautioned that if cuts needed to be made for the building to allow for the parking, that was a concern for her.

Mr. Rinehimer reiterated no decisions were being made at the meeting, but the Board's input allowed for direction. He noted changes could be made at a later date. Mr. Rinehimer asked the Board if the consensus was in favor of the pedestal-style parking.

The Board concurred.

Ms. Null asked about the layout showing the parking deck and relocating it to the back of the property. She noted the streetside view if the parking deck was on the front.

Mr. Rinehimer noted those were questions that had arisen.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple noted the Government Center would not be cheap to construct, but he referenced the older buildings in the County and repairs to those structures. He stressed the importance of investing funding into a long-term product for the citizens.

Mr. Rinehimer thanked the Board and special guests for their attendance. He expressed his

appreciation to the Board members for their responses.

Ms. Larson thanked the internal working group for attending the meeting. She extended her appreciation to her fellow Board members for the great discussion.

At approximately 4:01 p.m., the Board recessed for a short break.

At approximately 4:10 p.m., the Board reconvened.

D. CLOSED SESSION

A motion to Enter a Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null

At approximately 4:11 p.m., the Board of Supervisors entered a Closed Session.

At approximately 5:25 p.m., the Board re-entered Open Session.

A motion to Certify the Board only spoke about those matters indicated that it would speak about in Closed Session was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null

1. Discussion concerning a prospective business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating or expanding its facilities in the community, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(5) of the Code of Virginia
2. Discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(29) of the Code of Virginia and pertaining to the contract for the joint operation of schools between the County and the City of Williamsburg.
3. Certification of Closed Session

E. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 5 pm on September 10, 2024 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by Barbara Null, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Null

At approximately 5:26 p.m., Ms. Larson adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

Teresa J. Saeed

Deputy Clerk