

**COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC WORKS**  
**Minutes of December 8, 2011**

The regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Public Works was held on Thursday, December 8, 2011 at 10:00 a.m., in the Boardroom at 121 West Court Avenue.

**In attendance:**

Gene P. Hancock	Steve Reeves	Vickie Gorham	Bill Patrick
Michael G. Monaghan	Richard Gentry	Vicki Knott	Chris Trainor
Henry O. Watts	Mark Falls	George Petersen	Stacia May
	Eduardo Noriega	Jeff Auman	David Tuck
	Denise Giannetti	Jeff Chapman	
	Jerry Smith	Carlos Cometto	

- I. Chairman Monaghan called the meeting to order. The invocation was given by Commissioner Watts.
- II. Chairman Monaghan gave the statement of compliance with the notification provision of the Freedom of Information Act.
- III. Approval of Minutes:

After Commissioner Hancock noted that he did not attend the meeting on October 13, 2011, a motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Watts, seconded by Chairman Monaghan, and unanimously approved.

A motion to approve the minutes of the regular meetings on October 27, 2011 and November 10, 2011 was made by Commissioner Watts, seconded by Commissioner Hancock, and unanimously approved.

IV. Business:

- A. Manager Reeves presented a recommendation to approve the low bid meeting specifications for uninterruptible power supply upgrades at the water treatment plant and for the new computer room at the main office building, from Carroll's Electric, in the amount of \$29,536.

A motion was made by Commissioner Watts and seconded by Commissioner Hancock. Chairman Monaghan asked for an explanation; Mr. Auman explained that two pieces were combined to obtain some cost savings. He pointed out the first upgrade for the unit that is already at the water plant to cover lab equipment and new servers, with some savings by reusing the cabinets. The other piece will be downstairs at the main office to cover all

customer service and cashiers when there is a power blink causing all of the computers to go down. It then takes several minutes to come back up and to serve customers again; this would keep that from happening. Additionally, the computer room is being moved from upstairs to downstairs. Mr. Auman added that the current system upstairs would then cover the security system and main switches. With no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

- B. Chairman Monaghan noted that a decision on video surveillance equipment for the water treatment plant was postponed at the last meeting so that Mr. Chapman could be present to address concerns. Chairman Monaghan shared his first concern with whether there is any likelihood of a threat to the water treatment plant, and expressed the opinion that it is not very likely given how long it has been there with no attack. He commented that there had actually been break-ins at the COC and items were stolen, so a surveillance system there would make more sense than at the water plant. He continued with another concern that it does not seem to be a preventative measure. Chairman Monaghan asked how this would protect the plant since there would not be constant surveillance. Mr. Chapman responded that in 2003 when the Homeland Defense Bill came into being and Vulnerability Assessments went into play, the AWWA began tracking water treatment systems. A survey of 461 water treatment systems was done in 2009, and identified as being in need of video surveillance security measures. Of those 461, 90% have now installed video surveillance. Mr. Chapman then referred to a recent e-mail from Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ISAC), authorized by Congress in 2002 to protect the drinking water supply. Congress determined that an attack on water supply would be crippling. Mr. Chapman continued that with regard to constant monitoring, the system as proposed does not tie in to the SCADA system at this time, but can be tied in so that it would give an audible alarm throughout the plant to notify the operators. As it stands now, it is not part of the cost requested up front. He stated that one of the biggest deterrents this video system would provide is the visual presence of cameras. He pointed out that if someone were to come on site and see the cameras, they are less likely to be up to no good if they know they are being videoed. The same as with home security systems, if you are up to no good and one house has video surveillance and another does not, you will choose the house without surveillance. Mr. Chapman stated that for an additional \$2,000, an audible alarm could be wired to the DVD recorder so that if the operator is in the control room, they could see where the camera is picking up the alarm. It does not tie in to the existing SCADA system, but that could be added later. Chairman Monaghan asked how an operator would respond if they saw someone climbing the fence; Mr. Chapman responded that there are

two operators at all times, twenty-four hours a day, and if they were to see someone coming over the fence, they would first call the sheriff's department. Then, probably one operator would stay in the control room to man the phone, and the other would go out to observe; not to confront an intruder, but to attempt to get eye-to-eye contact and maintain control. Chairman Monaghan asked about a siren similar to the fire station; Mr. Chapman stated that could be done. Chairman Monaghan commented that it does not appear that we are really serious if we spend \$60,000 for something that does not prevent anything. Mr. Chapman stated that ISAC tracks incidents at water systems; their claim is that it once was more innocent in nature when someone gained access, perhaps to look around or maybe steal copper. What they are seeing now is more investigative, looking at how to attack a water system. By doing the surveillance up front, something could be prevented. Chairman Monaghan stated that if there is real concern, they should hire a security guard. Mr. Chapman suggested that he could share the ways that a water system could be attacked during *Executive Session*, adding that it would not be good to advertise the best ways to cripple a water system in an open setting. He continued that once it happens at one plant, there could potentially be copycat attacks, as well as terrorist attacks. He recalled the Tylenol tampering incidents several years ago. Chairman Monaghan asked about lead time to install the surveillance system; Mr. Chapman stated that the assumption was a six-month contract; once we cut the contract, they would have that amount of time to come out and install. We would have to coordinate with the electric department to tie in. Chairman Monaghan asked how the system would work. Mr. Chapman responded that the cameras work on infrared motion. They have standard cameras monitoring specific points. Chairman Monaghan asked if Mr. Chapman was talking about what they have now, or what they are going to buy. Mr. Chapman responded that we have nothing now. The proposed system consists of both standard frozen cameras looking at one portion, and others at the intake and strategic locations that would pick up motion and actually move over to videotape with the motion. The alarm would be kicked off by any of the motion detectors; that would trigger an alarm event and also the DVR recorder. He noted that the only thing they would have to add would be an audible alarm portion since that was not included as part of this system. Manager Reeves clarified what he was hearing from Chairman Monaghan was that if we are going to spend \$52,000 for just video surveillance, maybe it is wiser to spend perhaps up to \$60,000 to include something so that an intruder knows that they have been seen. Hopefully, they would leave at that point in time. The alarm could be sirens, horns, or lighting; something to let them know that we are aware that they are there. Instead of just getting a video of the intruder, we are also then doing something to get them to leave. Mr. Chapman

suggested that they could reject these bids and go out and redo the bids to include that, or they could go to the low bidder and ask them about the cost to add these features. Chairman Monaghan agreed that if you are going to pay that much money, there should be something preventative; he added that there had not been any incidences in all of the years since the water plant was built. Commissioner Watts noted that he had lived in his house for thirty years without a burglary until last year, so there was a good record until last year. Mr. Falls stated that several vendors had come and looked at the lake plant to give ideas of how they would set up surveillance or protection. The cost has been extremely high, with one vendor giving a cost estimate of almost \$200,000, so they tried to keep it economically feasible by not adding any bells or whistles and stuck to the basics. He agreed that it is not really a preventative type thing. Chairman Monaghan suggested looking at the low bid to tweak it a little. Commissioner Hancock noted areas that are vulnerable to contamination that might need protection. Mr. Chapman added that there are several things that could be done to take out a plant at an intake that he preferred not to discuss now. Another benefit of cameras at the intakes is that it would be a strategic point for access to the plant; obviously the front gate is covered, but at the intakes, there is lake frontage where people such as fishermen come up. You may not necessarily want an alarm going off since fishermen do stop there and then go on their way, but it would be nice to log an alarm event at the operator's control so that they can watch to be sure that person moves on. The current proposal and low bid shows four cameras at the shoreline, two at the intake stations, and two at the electrical and carbon feed. Chairman Monaghan suggested that discussion continue during *Executive Session*, at which time Mr. Chapman could share concerns, and a decision would be made.

- C. Manager Reeves recommended approval of a software maintenance agreement for ESRI software, in the amount of \$21,079. He noted that the software runs the GIS equipment, and that there are no other providers of this service.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hancock, and seconded by Commissioner Watts; the motion was unanimously approved.

- D. Manager Reeves stated that the Board had asked staff to include consideration of a cost-of-living adjustment during the preparation of the proposed 2012 budget. He reported that based on the Consumer Price Index, there was a 3% rise from January 2011 when the last cost-of-living adjustment was given, to the current time. That 3% amount was included in the proposed 2012 budget. Commissioner Hancock stated that since employees had not

received an increase in two years, and we are about to enter into an inflationary period, if ever there is a time to give employees an increase, it is now. Chairman Monaghan noted that if you do not adjust, they are taking a cut. Commissioner Watts agreed, noting that Social Security had recently approved a 3.5% increase.

A motion to approve a 3% cost-of-living adjustment, effective January 1, 2012, was made by Commissioner Hancock, seconded by Commissioner Watts, and unanimously approved.

V. Other Business:

1. Manager Reeves reminded the Commissioners of a budget work session scheduled for Friday, December 9, at 8:30 a.m., at the COC.
2. Manager Reeves presented a plaque in appreciation of CPW for dedication and commitment to the Greenwood County Partnership for Tomorrow capital campaign.
3. Manager Reeves presented a recommendation to approve the low bid meeting specifications from Barnard, EMC, for the tapping contract, in the amount of \$1,275 per tap. He noted a bid was submitted at \$750 per tap using a different fitting, but fittings that work with Mueller had already been purchased.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hancock, seconded by Commissioner Watts, and unanimously approved.

VI. Executive Session:

A motion was made by Commissioner Hancock and seconded by Commissioner Watts to go into *Executive Session* for personnel and contractual matters; the motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting returned to open session. Mr. Patrick stated that during *Executive Session*, discussion took place with Mr. Chapman in the water department on the video surveillance and related matters with the water treatment plant. It is the sense of the Commissioners that they want to approve a motion that authorizes the acceptance of the low bid on the video surveillance for the water treatment plant, subject to management working out the installation of appropriate preventive measures with the low bidder at a reasonable cost in management's judgment, and within management's discretionary authority.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hancock, seconded by Commissioner Watts, and unanimously approved.

VII. With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary