

**COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC WORKS**  
**Minutes of April 12, 2007**

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Public Works was held on Thursday, April 12, 2007, at 10:00 a.m., in the Boardroom at 121 West Court Avenue.

**In attendance:**

Gene P. Hancock	Steve D. Reeves, Jr.	Vicki Gorham	Jeff Auman
Michael G. Monaghan	Denise Ogletree	Carlos Cometto	Stacia May
Henry O. Watts	Jeff Meredith	Curtis Burnett	Melinda Bishop
	Jeff Chapman	Richard Gentry	Ron Lemon
		Ken Whittle	

- I. Chairman Hancock called the meeting to order and gave the invocation.
- II. Chairman Hancock gave the statement of compliance with the notification provision of the Freedom of Information Act.
- III. New Business:
  - A. Chairman Hancock presented a recommendation from staff to forward \$83,838.19 to the reserve account in order to maintain the required balance of \$250,000. He referred to an expense report for the health insurance reserve account showing an estimated reserve of \$166,161.81 through March. He noted that CPW's portion would be \$61,201.88 and the remainder would come from Metro. A motion was made by Commissioner Monaghan, seconded by Commissioner Watts and unanimously approved.
  - B. Chairman Hancock noted that the bid tabulation for logos and slogan printing for vehicles had been placed on the agenda for discussion. Commissioner Monaghan requested that discussion of this item be postponed until *Executive Session* as a personnel matter since the recommended bid came from an employee.
  - C. Chairman Hancock presented a request for a purchase order for water meters. Manager Reeves explained that the purchase order was for an additional 336 water meters at a total cost of \$49,833. He reminded the Commissioners of discussion over a year ago at which there was a request to delete a meter reader position and to use the funding for that position to install more ERT module water meters. He added that the intent at that time was to do that over a three-year period in an effort to further reduce the burden on meter readers. He noted that this is the second year of the

program and recommended approval of the purchase order. A motion was made to approve the purchase order by Commissioner Monaghan, seconded by Commissioner Watts, and unanimously approved.

- D. Chairman Hancock presented information on a recommendation from staff to install fencing for security purposes at the rear entrance to the Central Operations Center (COC) located off of Florida Avenue. He referred to a map showing the location of the requested fencing. Chairman Hancock noted that it would not be a complete enclosure, but would place fences along the roadway at a total cost for the project of \$4,700. He added that some materials had been known to disappear from this area in the past. Commissioner Watts asked why the area would not be completely enclosed. Manager Reeves responded that the area has used materials; the items removed were old fire hydrants taken out of service and kept for repair parts. This fencing would provide some additional security to prevent someone from driving in, picking something up, and loading it onto a truck. He noted that trees were planted there as a natural barrier and the added fencing should be enough to keep people from going in and loading up a truck. Commissioner Monaghan inquired as to when the last time a physical inventory of the yards was done. Ms. Ogletree responded that it was done around the end of 2006. She added that included everything inside the fence; they did not actually count things such as hydrants used for parts. Mr. Meredith noted a temporary barrier there and that they were still putting utility poles on the outside so that customers can get them. He added that the departments were working together in an effort to create more room inside of the fence so that more things could be moved inside. He stated that once the fire hydrants were taken, some modifications were made to the assigned areas inside of the fence for gas, water, and electric. He stated that they were looking at a rack system for inside of the fence. Mr. Reeves stated that if everything will be moved inside of the fence, then there would be no need for fencing. Mr. Chapman stated that the materials taken would not be the same as the stuff that is not on the inventory any longer because it could still be used for spare parts. Once it is depleted, it could be sold off for scrap metal. He further explained that an individual had driven their personal truck all the way up to the pile and taken fire hydrants and was selling them off for scrap. He noted that the hydrants weigh a couple of hundred pounds and putting up the fencing would basically make it not feasible for them to take the hydrants. Commissioner Monaghan stated concern with control issues rather than the price of the fence and asked about keeping track of what is put there. Mr. Chapman stated that everything inside of the fence had now been inventoried and the only

thing outside of the fence is stuff taken out of the system, but that could still have a salvage value to us. Commissioner Monaghan noted that it would still be an asset to us as long as it still has value, and we are losing money if someone takes it. Mr. Meredith stated that the goal was to make room for inventoried items inside the fence that are used on a regular basis. From time to time some of those items had been outside of the fence. A motion was made by Commissioner Watts and seconded by Commissioner Monaghan to approve the installation of fencing as recommended; the motion was unanimously approved.

- E. Chairman Hancock noted that management needed guidance with regard to charging the City of Greenwood for Richard Gentry's contribution of time spent on the development of an annexation brochure. Chairman Hancock noted that Mr. Gentry had worked with Mr. Charlie Barrineau to develop an annexation brochure and that brochure had now been posted on the website. He noted that Mr. Gentry's contribution of time for this project came to \$570. Chairman Hancock recalled that the original intent with regard to Mr. Gentry's work for other agencies was that they be billed for this time; however, management was requesting direction with this particular invoice. The Commissioners determined that since it was mutually beneficial to both parties, the City should not be charged for Mr. Gentry's time on this particular project. A motion was made by Commissioner Watts and seconded by Commissioner Monaghan not to charge the City for Mr. Gentry's time on the annexation brochure; the motion was unanimously approved.
  
- F. Manager Reeves presented information on the Delegated Review Program recently approved by DHEC for construction permit applications for utility systems, particularly water and wastewater. He explained that normally DHEC would charge developers or engineering firms a \$400 fee for that service. Prior to our approval of the Program, they would have to apply to DHEC for design approval. Now they can now submit them directly to us. He stated that Mr. Carlos Cometto and his department would be reviewing the plans. Mr. Reeves asked for guidance with whether to charge a fee similar to DHEC, and recommended charging \$250 for that process. He noted the savings to developers and engineering firms while allowing CPW to recoup a small amount to cover ours costs. Mr. Reeves stated that Mr. Cometto feels we would average between 15 to 20 reviews per year for approximately \$3,000 to \$5,000 annually. He stated that although that is not a substantial amount, Mr. Cometto had pointed out that it could help pay for a plotter or some other piece of equipment in their department. Chairman Hancock asked for clarification on what they

would be reviewing. Mr. Cometto responded they would be reviewing the submittal on water lines that come to them on a normal basis. He stated that a technical review would be done but before giving them a letter of approval, the engineer had to submit a check to DHEC for \$400 for a small project or \$1,000 for a project the magnitude of East Cambridge, where it would likely spend two months with DHEC before getting approval. By sending them to us, CPW would do the review, put together the approved package with the consultant, they would only write a \$75 check, and CPW would certify that all of the technical requirements are met, send it to DHEC who then issues a construction permit. Commissioner Monaghan asked for clarification on what they would be permitting and the type of construction. Mr. Cometto provided an example of water lines in a subdivision. Mr. Reeves added that it could also be for any extension. Mr. Reeves provided the example of a request from Piedmont Tech for a short line extension out to a site they were looking to purchase that may only be a 500 feet extension but would still require a construction permit from DHEC. He added that DHEC would still do them, but they had decided to allow companies with professional licensed engineers on staff that meets certain guidelines to be accepted into the Delegated Review Program. He reminded the Commissioners that CPW was recently approved for that program after the approval of the Cross Connection Program and other requirements; also because Mr. Cometto is a registered engineer. He added that the hope is to cut down the two-month process of going through DHEC considerably. Commissioner Monaghan asked about the cost to CPW. Mr. Cometto stated that the only additional cost would be in verifying that the submittal package put together by the engineer is complete before mailing it to DHEC. He added that the package would be sent via registered mail to DHEC, and that it would probably require a couple of hours above what was normally done. He added that it provides an additional service to the consultant, the engineer, and the client so that they do not have to deal with DHEC. Mr. Reeves asked Mr. Cometto about a fee schedule. Mr. Cometto responded that DHEC charges \$200 for less than 400 feet; he was not sure for those between 400 feet and 1,000 feet; and \$1,000 for over 10,000 feet. Mr. Reeves suggested that Mr. Cometto put together a Schedule of Fees for approval at the next meeting and the Commissioners agreed.

- G. Manager Reeves reported that there was nothing new with annexation at this time other than that the Jim Timms property is still pending. Mr. Timms had been asking Steve Brown about the incentive program from the City. He reported that Howard Corley had talked to the attorneys about proceeding with the rest of the property apart from Advance Auto.

He noted that the attorney had been in touch with Advance Auto and they should get things done pretty quickly so that it can be kept one site. Chairman Hancock inquired about information on the number of cities annexed with a water system. Mr. Reeves responded that the Municipal Association does not have a record. He added that nobody has an official register of who has done it or not done it. Mr. Reeves noted that he had been told that about 50% of the cities have adopted a program requiring annexation. Chairman Hancock stated that we should know how many water systems are in the different cities. Mr. Reeves referred to an article the past week that appeared to be mostly political where Orangeburg recently did, and their County Council was giving City Council a hard time for doing it. Mr. Reeves added that there were approximately 246 water systems in South Carolina. Chairman Hancock stated that if we had a list of those, you could probably find out what is left out of that that are the cities. Mr. Reeves responded that they would try. He referred to a rate survey a couple of years ago of all water systems in the state. Mr. Chapman responded that he could get the survey. Commissioner Watts noted grading being done at the Jim Timms property. Mr. Reeves added that Mr. Cometto and staff are still working on sewer and would be ready to bid that project soon. He added that they were not pushing too hard for him to run out and make a connection and then not annex. Commissioner Monaghan stated that if we build it, he could not connect unless he annexed. Mr. Reeves responded that was correct, but he did not want that to become a legal issue for him to challenge. Mr. Lemon inquired about Teak Wood, the old Moore Business Products facility. Commissioner Monaghan responded that it appears to be almost dead and it was unlikely that anything would happen there. Mr. Gentry reported on inserts on the gas incentive program that would go out in the next billing cycle. He stated that he had just completed the design for the annual water report that would be put out for bid soon. He referred to an ad in the past Sunday's newspaper of which the Commissioners were complimentary. Mr. Gentry reported that they were working on redoing the "pipes" on the website that Commissioner Monaghan did not like. Commissioner Monaghan noted problems with scrolling down through the minutes on the website. Mr. Auman responded that they are working on the problem to make it easier to use. He noted the addition of a big VISA logo to the main page of the website. Ms. Giannetti added that credit card inserts would be going out shortly. Chairman Hancock asked about something for tankless water heaters and another water heater with a tank that is a different size. Mr. Lemon responded that there is something put out very similar to a tankless water heater that is on demand. He referred to a presentation at the last seminar that he and Mr. Gentry attended and

noted that the cost is similar to a tankless water heater at about \$1,200. He noted a couple of requirements on the A. O. Smith model, and reported that Home Depot sells a tankless Aqua Star model for about \$450. Both Commissioner Monaghan and Chairman Hancock agreed that people do not know anything about them and requested something in the newspaper explaining them. Mr. Lemon asked if that would be against CPW policy. Mr. Reeves stated that we could advertise a tankless water heater but could not advertise a brand name or vendor. Mr. Gentry stated that an ad ran some time ago for tankless heaters that simply referred them to the distributor. He stated that the tax incentive was mentioned in the ad. Mr. Whittle noted that savings for the tankless versus regular water heaters could be shown because it actually uses less gas.

- H. Manager Reeves noted an earlier request from Commissioner Monaghan to review the bond project listing again before final approval. He pointed out the need to proceed with the bond issue so that they can get the investment bankers moving and the bond attorney started and noted that much of the process had to take place before issuing bonds. Commissioner Monaghan stated that he was unclear as to the rationale that the bond was necessary. Mr. Reeves asked the Commissioners to let him know if they felt another session was in order. Commissioner Monaghan asked how much money was available through the regular capital improvement program. Mr. Reeves recalled that during the budget process a number of projects were listed in the capital improvement portion of the budget. He noted that the reason many projects were put into the bond project list was that more projects were due than funding was available in the budget. Commissioner Monaghan stated a desire to know the exact dollar amount. Ms. Ogletree responded that the more we increase it, the higher we would have to drive rates to cover it. Mr. Reeves responded that the question was how much was included in the budget that rates are covering. Ms. Giannetti responded that she would check and respond to Commissioner Monaghan via an e-mail. Commissioner Monaghan noted that depreciation write-off was supposed to be for capital improvement, and Ms. Giannetti agreed. Commissioner Monaghan stated that if there is depreciation of \$3 million and the bottom line is in the black, then we should have that amount to spend on capital improvements. Ms. Giannetti responded that amount would not necessarily be available in cash sitting there to spend because we are actually doing capital projects during the year, and it would have to be an offset of what we depreciated that year. She noted \$5,000,035.00 depreciated last year. She explained that the amount actually spent on capital projects would be subtracted from that amount to come up with the net available. Commissioner Monaghan

stated a desire to take a look at the numbers. Chairman Hancock stressed again the need to get started on the bond issue. Mr. Reeves suggested waiting if the Board was not comfortable with the projects. He added that they would need approval within the next few weeks because interest rates are low right now. Commissioner Monaghan stated the desire to have another session to discuss the particular projects in question in more detail. A session was scheduled for April 24 at 1:00 p.m. prior to leaving to attend the SCAMPS legislative event in Columbia.

IV. Other Business:

1. Manager Reeves reminded the Commissioners of the SCAMPS Legislative Reception on April 24.
2. Manager Reeves informed the Commissioners of the receipt of an e-mail regarding a contest from Land's End, who provides our uniforms. He stated that typically we would not enter something of this nature, but the winner is eligible for up to \$20,000 in uniform apparel. He noted that there is not a great chance of winning, but if we do not enter, we have no chance. Commissioner Monaghan asked what was involved. Mr. Reeves responded that there is a form to submit and there is no cost involved. Ms. May added that should we win, we would be asked to sign a release form allowing Land's End to use pictures of staff in their advertisements and catalogs. The Commissioners were in agreement with entering the contest.
3. Commissioner Monaghan inquired as to whether the December inventory revealed any discrepancies. Ms. Ogletree responded that it did not. Mr. Burnett added that they do inventory counts all along throughout the year at least once a month; they count things inside more often.
4. Manager Reeves reminded the Commissioners of the need to discuss the acceptance of an offer for Metro's portion of the Administration Building (main office). Chairman Hancock noted that a contract was being drawn up by Roy. A motion was made by Commissioner Monaghan and seconded by Commissioner Watts to purchase the portion of the Administration Building at 121 Court Avenue now occupied by Greenwood Metropolitan District at a cost of \$600,000; the motion was unanimously approved. Commissioner Watts inquired about a closing date and Manager Reeves responded that a contract with terms would be provided for approval at a later date. Commissioner Monaghan added that if they wanted to be paid early, they would have to pay rent.

V. Executive Session

A motion was made by Commissioner Monaghan, seconded by Commissioner Watts, and unanimously approved to go into *Executive Session* to discuss contractual, legal, and personnel matters.

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

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_, 2007

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary