Berryville-Clarke County Government Center
Joint Building Committee
101 Chalmers Court, 2nd Floor,
Berryville, Virginia
Meeting Room C
9:30 AM, Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Agenda

Item	Description
1.	Call To Order
2.	Adoption of Agenda
3.	Approval of Minutes:
	− May 1, 2024 Regular Meeting
4.	Quarterly Billing Review
5.	Facility Review / Follow-up Items:
	− Elevator
6.	Next Meeting:
	− January 15, 2025, Organizational Meeting
7.	Adjournment

Berryville-Clarke County Government Center
Joint Building Committee

May 1, 2024   Regular Meeting   9:30 am

At a regular meeting of the Berryville-Clarke County Government Center Joint Building Committee held on Wednesday, May 1, 2024, at 9:30 am in the Meeting Room C, Berryville Clarke County Government Center, 101 Chalmers Court, 2nd Floor, and Berryville, Virginia.

Members Present: Bev McKay, Chris Boies, Jay Arnold, Keith Dalton

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Catherine Marsten, Emily Johnson, Brenda Bennett, Joey Braithwaite, Gordon Russell

Others Present: Sheriff Travis Sumption, Berryville Police Chief Neal White, Brian Page

1. Call to Order

   At 9:30 am, Keith Dalton called the meeting to order.

2. Adoption of Agenda

   Bev McKay made a motion, seconded by Jay Arnold, to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Jay Arnold	-	Aye
Chris Boies	-	Aye
Keith Dalton	-	Aye
Bev McKay	-	Aye

3. Approval of Minutes

   Jay Arnold made a motion, seconded by Bev McKay, to approve the minutes of January 10, 2024, as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Jay Arnold	-	Aye
Chris Boies	-	Aye
Keith Dalton	-	Aye
Bev McKay	-	Aye

4. Quarterly Billing Review

   Emily Johnson of Joint Administrative Services (JAS) presented the following:
   – Billing data for the first quarter 2024 is shown in the spreadsheet included in the packet.
   – Custodial services are now in-house, so the Town and County split the cost of services and supplies according to square footage.

   Keith Dalton
   – Asked if the Town was doing a better job providing information.
     ▪ Emily Johnson replied yes, but staff is still only receiving blanket charge information; there is no hourly breakdown for mowing and snow removal charges. The mowing charges seem to be billed at a flat rate of $850 per month.

   Bev McKay
   – Observed that there was very little rain last summer so mowing was not really necessary.
   – Asked how the amounts paid to the Town for mowing and snow removal (services provided by in-house Town staff) were determined. The amounts paid seem a bit high, considering the drought conditions and limited snowfall.
     ▪ Keith Dalton answered that he is not sure. For snow removal, he believes the Town tracks hours and equipment used and bills at VDOT's contractor rates, but will look into it more closely and bring information to the next meeting.
   – Further suggested that it may be worthwhile to put a bid out for snow removal at the government center, especially if it would be cheaper and free up Town staff.
     ▪ Mr. Dalton replied that it is an option for the rear parking lot but he would prefer to not change how the front is handled, because the front parking lot is kept at least passable for police and essential personnel during storms.

   Keith Dalton
   – Asked if JAS staff was communicating with Town staff about billing.
     ▪ Emily Johnson replied yes and added a request that the Town please continue sending actual invoices to JAS instead of paying invoices up front and submitting blanket reimbursements at the end of the year. It would be much easier for tracking, payment splits, and reconciliation if invoices go through JAS as they are received.

   Chris Boies
   – Shared that the intent was for the Committee to review and approve the billing report quarterly to make reconciliation at the end of the year easier overall.

   By consensus, the Committee agreed to consider approval of the first quarter billing report at the July 3 meeting, pending receipt of more detailed invoice information.

5. Security Cameras/Access Control Discussion

   Berryville Police Chief Neal White presented the following:
   – The Town secured Enterprise Security Solutions last year to provide surveillance and access control systems at three different sites, including the wastewater treatment plant.
   – The systems are intuitive, effective, and have worked out quite well for the Town.

- For the Joint Government Center, this Committee has previously discussed perimeter security cameras to cover the parking lots, minor interior cameras for the downstairs lobby area, and a camera for the hallway next to the Building Inspections Department.
- The intent would be to monitor ingress and egress from the building, not employee habits.
- There was a recent security concern at the government center and it would have been nice to be able to review footage from the incident and potentially enter it as evidence.
- Access control is also an important feature, so employees and officials can be issued a card or a code that would allow them access to specific areas. A card or code system is preferable to physical keys, especially for public spaces such as the meeting room.
- This security project can be scaled; the system can provide both surveillance and access control and can potentially tie into systems at other locations.

Keith Dalton
- Recalled that the Committee, at the last meeting, approved the installation of three cameras and one access control unit for the Voter Registrar's office and asked if that was a standalone system or able to be integrated in the future.
  - IT Director Gordon Russell answered that it was envisioned as a standalone system, partly because it was done using federal grant funds and partly because the state requires different security standards for the registrar/elections office.
- Further asked if the outdoor security cameras could be integrated and if the Town would be able to get the footage from those cameras.
  - Chris Boies advised that it is preferable to keep them isolated. Election security is critical, so the registrar's office has a lot of additional regulations that do not apply to other departments and offices. If the Town should need footage from those cameras, the registrar's office is cooperative.

Brian Page of Enterprise Security Solutions presented the following:
- In addition to the systems at the three Town sites, Enterprise Security Solutions also provided a quote for the system for the Voter Registrar's office.
- That system meets very specific Department of Elections compliance requirements, both in terms of accountability and the ability to satisfy any audits. The Voter Registrar's cameras will feed into a dedicated server that records everything, but they do have dual-stream capabilities. If desired, that video could route into a larger, building-wide system in parallel.
- All of the systems that are currently deployed are standalone systems but can be connected and integrated in the future if desired.
- They have taken a very strategic approach in proposing a surveillance and access control system for this building that is consistent with the others and the project can be scaled as needs arise and budget allows.
- Should there be an incident, this system allows law enforcement to view live footage in their cruiser or on their smartphone.

Bev McKay
- Asked who owns the data from the Voter Registrar's camera system; if the Sheriff's Office or Police Department are able to obtain that footage.
  - Chris Boies answered that the Clarke County Board of Elections owns the data. Though they are a separate entity, they are cooperative and would be able to share footage if requested.

Keith Dalton
- Advised that access control, in the form of proximity cards, is the priority for the beginning of this project. There would be nine access points: the employee entrance, central stair, and library, the two Town wing entrances off the atrium, the two County wing entrances off the atrium, the Town side door, and the County side door.
- Staff has to carry a lot of keys within the building. If keys get lost, then the door needs to be re-keyed, which is costly. A significant advantage of access cards is the ability to disable it without affecting the others.

Bev McKay
- Questioned how the public would be able to access services if there were access control on the central stairs door.
    - Sheriff Sumption answered that the access control equipment can be programmed so that it is open to all during business hours and automatically locks when the building is closed.

Keith Dalton
- Observed that a large portion of the initial system expense is for a server of sufficient size to handle both access control and security cameras.
    - Brian Page confirmed that the server is usually the most expensive part of the system. The current quote for access controls is around $67,000, which includes all door panels, cabling, equipment, installation labor, training, and a server of sufficient size to handle cameras in the future.
    - Gordon Russell added that it is not actually one single server, because the data storage necessary for video is different from the panel and connection needed to manage the access controls.
        - Mr. Page replied that this is one of many things that can be discussed as the project moves forward. The vendor is comfortable working in parallel with the county's IT team.
- Asked what the cost to re-key the building would be, should one of the master keys be lost.
    - Joey Braithwaite answered that the current cost is between $145 and $250 per door.
- Further shared that the government center's portion of the previous quote for a camera system was around $64,500, for four interior and six exterior cameras, but that could be reduced because the three Voter Registrar cameras are already being installed.

Sheriff Sumption
- Asked, if the Town already has these systems in place at other facilities, why another server would be necessary for the government center.
    - Chief White replied that the existing systems are standalone and isolated, because there is not internet connection at all of the sites.
    - Brian Page added that, once the broadband project is complete, all the systems would be connected to one another; the equipment being deployed is intended to be easily connected and integrated in the future.
- Opined that, currently, access controls are more important than cameras. Without someone constantly monitoring the video, cameras are very reactive. Access control cards could also be used for ID badges, which are extremely helpful.
    - Brian Page stated that the access controls quote included only the proximity cards, as a cheaper option, but they absolutely have the ability to upgrade to integrated ID badges as well.

Keith Dalton
- Summarized that staff has discussed access controls and security cameras a good bit, the next step would be bringing the discussion to the governing bodies to determine what they are interested in funding. Town Council has been reserving funds for these projects.

Chris Boies
- Advised that the Board of Supervisors Finance Committee discussed the matter during the budget cycle; this budget year was difficult and there was no support for this project. Without a special supplemental appropriation, the next opportunity for the county would be during the fund balance designation discussion in the fall. The Finance Committee would have to support using fund balance designation for the county's portion (two-thirds) of the project.
  - Brian Page added that Avigilon (the system manufacturer) has a grant team that could investigate potential funding resources. The proposals could also be refined to try to reduce costs as well.

6. Facility Review/Follow Up

Bev McKay
- Shared that the Board of Supervisors has received complaints about the landscape appearance on the front of the building.
  - Keith Dalton replied that the previous, larger plants died off and were replaced by smaller plants but they are growing. There have been some new plantings around the building, as well.

Chris Boies
- Advised that there have also been complaints about the condition of the meeting room chairs; the county will research some options and bring pricing information back to the Committee.
  - Keith Dalton added that the chairs are original to the building and replacing them would ultimately be cheaper and more successful than reupholstering.

7. Next Meeting

   July 3, 2024, Regular Meeting

8. Adjournment

   At 10:32 am, Keith Dalton adjourned the meeting.

Minutes Recorded and Transcribed by Catherine Marsten

FY2025 Joint Government Center Shared Costs	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6	Period 7	Period 8	Period 9	Period 10	Period 11	Period 12	Period 13		
10/25/24	Jul-24	Aug-24	Sep-24	Oct-24	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Post Yr	TOTALS	
Utilities to be split 37.3% Town/62.7% County															
Washington Gas	960.77	1,537.90	1,348.35	1,161.62										5,008.64	
Rappahannock Electric Coop		6,958.54	6,638.49	6,372.67										19,969.70	
Water/Sewer - Town of Berryville	86.95	81.53	86.95											255.43	
Liability Insurance to be split 37.3% Town/62.7% County															
VACORP	5,895.78													5,895.78	booked to County 100-43200-5300
Trash Service to be split 37.3% Town/62.7% County															
Republic Services	128.32	128.32	160.40											417.04	
Building Repair & Maintenance to be split 37.3% Town/62.7% County															
Amazon														0.00	
Applied Building														0.00	
Innovative Access Technologies (formerly Anderson)		126												126.00	
Berryville Auto Parts														0.00	
Berryville True Value Hardware		19.99	17.82											37.81	
Broy & Son Pump														0.00	
Doli/Boiler				20.00										20.00	
Capital Tristate														0.00	
CQI Water Treatment		242.50												242.50	
Elite Power														0.00	
Fast Signs														0.00	
Fire Protection		59.50												59.50	
Fisher Auto														0.00	
Glass Doctor														0.00	
Grainger Inc														0.00	
Home Paramount Pest	218.50													218.50	
James River Equipment														0.00	
Juniper Enterprises														0.00	
Kee Construction Services														0.00	
NEIS - Nat'l Elevator Inspection														0.00	
Norvac Lock Tech														0.00	
Otis Elevator Company														0.00	
PowerSecure Service														0.00	
Riddleberger Bros	4,818.00		8328.00											13,146.00	
Southern Refrigeration														0.00	
TeamCraft Roofing														0.00	
Truist Bank				136.29										136.29	
Valley Doors Unlimited LLC														0.00	
Repair/Maintence Labor (provided by R. Miller)	914.63	925.43	799.05											2,639.11	Repair & Maintenance labor not in Munis
Berryville True Value														0.00	Prepaid by Town Inside expenses split 37.3/62.7
Clarke County Central Store														0.00	Paid by Clarke County outside expense split 50/50
Mowing/Weed-eat/Chipper (Town in-house)														0.00	
Andersons - Mulch														0.00	
Snow Removal (Town in-house)														0.00	
Labor for clearing privacy fence														0.00	Prepaid by Town outside expense split 50/50
Waterloo Electric (Repair/Replace lights)														0.00	
A-Sign Place														0.00	
Berryville True Value														0.00	
In house labor for sign removal														0.00	
sub-total	13,022.95	10,079.71	17,379.06	7,690.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**48,172.30**	*Take out 50/50 split invoices in blue*
														16,625.71	
TOTAL	13,022.95	10,079.71	17,379.06	7,690.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**48,172.30**	*Includes the blue invoices*

Shared	Sub-Total Town Portion 50% (Paid by County)	0.00
Costs	Sub-Total County Portion 50% (Paid by County)	0.00
Shared	Sub-Total Town Portion 37.3% (Inside paid by Town)	0.00
Costs	Sub-Total County Portion 62.7% (Inside paid by Town)	0.00
Shared	Sub-Total Town Portion 50% (Outside paid by Town)	0.00
Costs	Sub-Total County Portion 50% (Outside paid by Town)	0.00
Shared	Sub-Total Town Portion 37.3% (Paid by County)	17,968.27
Costs	Sub-Total County Portion 62.7% (Paid by County)	30,204.03
		48,172.30

Other expenses Not split just between Town and County (split differently) Direct bill to 740

TechClarity	0.00 6% Town

Shentel	123.17	122.12	122.67	123.31		491.27	Town's portion
Va Dept of Information-Long Distance - 100% TOB		65.32	65.19	65.40		195.91	Town's portion
TOB Custodian Services (from payroll)	1,385.66	1,290.22	1,290.22			3,966.10	Town's portion
Cleaning supplies (split by Sqft)	36.11	51.32	29.78	58.77		175.98	Town's portion
					Total Other expenses	**4,829.26**	
					TOTAL COSTS	**53,001.56**	
					TOTAL EXPENSES FOR JGC		
					Total Town Portion	**22,797.53**	
					Total County Portion	**30,204.03**	
						53,001.56	

402-43200 JGC	Per Munis - 740 detail	15,471.93	From YTD	
402-43200 JGC	Per Munis - 100 detail	24,852.66	From YTD	
402-43200 CUSTD	Per Munis - 740 detail	4,142.09		
301-402	Per Munis - 301 detail	0.00	44,466.68	
Less Fiscal Agent amt booked to Joint Operations (740-7000)		0.00		
Plus maintenance labor not in MUNIS		2,639.11		
Plus insurance premium not booked to JGC in MUNIS		5,895.78		
Plus TechClarity booked 100% to 12510		0.00		
	100% by town	0.00		
	Total	53,001.57		
	Per Spreadsheet above	53,001.56		
	difference	-0.01		