

COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC WORKS

Minutes of August 14, 2008

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Public Works was held on Thursday, August 14, 2008, at 10:00 a.m., in the Boardroom at 121 West Court Avenue.

In attendance:

Gene P. Hancock	Steve Reeves	Vickie Gorham	Stacia May
Michael G. Monaghan	Carlos Cometto	Denise Ogletree	Bill Patrick
Henry O. Watts	Jeff Meredith	Vicki Knott	Charles Schulze
	Jeff Chapman	Chris Lindley	Brad Wyche
	Jeff Auman	Jerry Smith	John Tynan
	Richard Gentry		Chris Trainor

- I. Chairman Monaghan called the meeting to order. The invocation was given by Commissioner Hancock.
- II. Chairman Monaghan gave the statement of compliance with the notification provision of the Freedom of Information Act.
- III. New Business:
 - A. Mr. John Tynan, Mr. Brad Wyche, and Mr. Charles Schulze representatives of Upstate Forever for the Saluda-Reedy Watershed Consortium presented an action plan for restoring and protecting the water quality of Lake Greenwood. Mr. Tynan presented information on the importance of clean and abundant water for quality of life and economic prosperity in the Upstate; an explanation of how and why sediment impairs the health and threatens the future of Lake Greenwood; the root causes of where pollution is coming from and what it is doing to the lake; the long-term prognosis and importance of acting now to restore Lake Greenwood's health. Mr. Tynan concluded the presentation by outlining a list of action items and encouraged cooperation to engage strategically and collaboratively with upstream communities to work together to identify common problems and solutions to push for action at the regional level. He noted a regional initiative, Upstate Together, who is looking at the ten county region of the upstate and bringing key decision makers together to address growth, preservation of natural resources, and accommodation of economic development. Mr. Tynan and Mr. Schulze stressed the small window of time to start taking action noting that a delay would only increase the action needed to more like 75% from 25% to 50% needed now. He added that because Lake Greenwood is a narrow lake, it accelerates problems with sediment and phosphorous so there is

not a lot of time to take action. Taking the first key steps to save Lake Greenwood has to begin now to avoid more problems later. Mr. Schulze stated that Greenville is getting all of the benefit of the growth while pushing all of the cost down here; they have already pushed 11 million cubic yards of problems here. There is not enough money to get rid of 11 million cubic yards, but if growth continues that will pale in comparison to what would be in the lake. Commissioner Watts asked if plans were in place to enforce laws on sedimentation and dumping. Mr. Tynan responded that some counties upstream had delegated authority to handle sediment and erosion control; however, many counties do not and so it is handled by DHEC who does not have nearly enough staff to monitor and enforce. As the law is written, you only have to keep 80% of the sediment on the site so that even if you are going by the law you can still let 20% of the sediment get into the river making for a large percentage that ends up down here. He expressed the need to strengthen enforcement of actual standards and also look at making the 80/20 rule 90/10 or 95/5. Mr. Chapman asked about the methodology used for the slide showing point source solution. Mr. Commetto asked what those percentages represented. Mr. Tynan responded that it was the percentage of in-stream phosphorous attributable to the discharge to treatment plant monitoring station immediately below. He noted that some treatment plants identified do not have percentages because there are no monitoring stations below them. Mr. Commetto asked which of those would have to renew their NPDS permits within the next five years. Mr. Tynan noted a request for the list that he hoped to have by that afternoon and could circulate to the appropriate contact person(s). Mr. Commetto expressed the opinion that that would be the point to attack the problem in a cost effective way; they should communicate with them on the need to revise the model for the Reedy and Saluda because the water quality models probably say it is alright to discharge. Mr. Commetto suggested a PR campaign with DHEC to reflect the condition of the treatment source downstream, adding that they would likely tighten up their modeling procedures to require a phosphorous limit on those discharges and to upgrade those treatment plants. Mr. Commetto stated that DHEC should be informed as quickly as possible that Lake Greenwood is seriously threatened as a source of water for so many people. Chairman Monaghan referred to \$43 million in upgrades at the waste water treatment plant that Greenwood Metropolitan District (Metro) was spending in anticipation of stricter requirements. He added that they are about four years in to what amounts to a ten-year construction project there. Commissioner Hancock noted \$8 million already spent on a complete upgrade at the West Alexander Wastewater Plant. Mr. Commetto noted that with all of the \$50

million in upgrades to the waste water treatment plant made by Metro, their discharge goes to Lake Murray and the Savannah River, and so nothing we can do in this county besides addressing septic tanks would affect the water quality of Lake Greenwood. Commissioner Hancock noted they were already working on the septic tanks; however, there is no way to completely eliminate septic tanks, noting \$2.2 million spent by Metro on a trunk line with only two customers. They need some help with getting more people on line. Commissioner Hancock noted that sand had once been mined from the Saluda River to be used in construction; Mr. Tynan responded that they still do. Mr. Tynan addressed Mr. Chapman's question asked earlier about the slide on point source. Mr. Chapman asked if it was done during drought conditions; Mr. Tynan responded that there were both drought and wet years; there was some variety from 2002 to 2006. Mr. Chapman asked when the percentages were sampled and if streams were below 7Q10 since that would definitely determine the assimilative capacity of those streams; therefore, both percentages would need to be shown for a true comparison of how much was coming through point source or non-point source. Mr. Tynan responded that Mr. Chapman had a good point adding that he would look back at the report in more detail to see actual flows during that time period. He noted that all of the reports, including the one on phosphorous loading throughout the watershed were available on the Saluda-Reedy website. Chairman Monaghan expressed appreciation to the group for the presentation.

- B. Manager Reeves stated that based on the audit report given at the last meeting, it would now be appropriate for the Board to adopt the Resolution required for the annual exchange of checks with the City of Greenwood. Manager Reeves read the Resolution as follows: "Be it resolved by the Commissioners of Public Works (CPW) for the City of Greenwood that, simultaneously with the payment by the City of Greenwood to the CPW of the City's outstanding bills in the amount of \$656,675.67, which represents the CPW's charges for street lighting, fire hydrant rental and other utility services provided to the City during the year 2007, the CPW does hereby determine that the CPW shall pay into the General Fund of the City the amount of \$656,675.67, plus \$593,961.13, which includes \$50,636.80 representing utility bills for the Federal Building, for a total of \$1,250,636.80, such amount having been determined by the Commissioners to be surplus monies based on information supplied to them by the CPW's auditors."

A motion to adopt the Resolution as recommended was made by Commissioner Hancock, seconded by Commissioners Watts, and unanimously approved.

- C. Manager Reeves had nothing new to report on annexation. Mr. Gentry reported on a presentation made at Promised Land to about eighteen people.

IV. Other Business:

1. Manager Reeves asked the Commissioners for dates for the annual Safety BBQ. The Commissioners agreed on September 25 following the regular meeting, as long as that date was still open with the caterer.
2. Manager Reeves presented a request from Mr. Chapman to include additional water projects not originally included in the bond, noting that water projects that were included in the bond were under-budget by \$395,679.70. He stated that they are requesting \$200,000 for SCADA upgrades at the water treatment plant, and \$20,000 for a 12-in. ball valve. Chairman Monaghan asked about grant money. Mr. Chapman clarified that these are water treatment plant projects that are under-budget. The grant would be funded out of the water distribution side where \$1.2 million was identified in the grant; \$280,000 of which would be used for matching funds pledged for the grant. Manager Reeves clarified that there are two portions. A portion of monies were designated for the water treatment plant alone, and that portion is under budget by \$395,679.70 because actual prices came in under the estimates. The bond issue was based on the estimates so we are under budget on the water treatment plant projects. Manager Reeves continued that Chairman Monaghan was referring to approximately \$1.2 million that was received for water line replacement projects. He noted that they also wanted to change the designation for water line replacements to water line improvements and extensions. Mr. Chapman stated that there would be roughly \$800,000 left after taking out the matching monies, and they are now proposing using about half of the amount designated now for water line replacements because technically, any place we have a water line we can go back and upgrade, make it newer or larger. Mr. Chapman requested that half be changed and designated for extensions and loopings which are system improvements in the bond. Chairman Monaghan stated concern with having bond money available, and stressed that he did not want any capital construction coming out of the reserves this year. Manager Reeves stated that he believed that was the intent of Mr. Chapman's request, and

Mr. Chapman agreed. Manager Reeves added that these were some of the budgeted projects from the capital expense side that they would now like to include in the bond funds. Mr. Patrick clarified that they had shifted already approved projects from operating funds to bond funds, and now needed authorization from the Board to include them as bond projects to be paid out of those funds since the Board had already approved these projects to come out of operating funds. Mr. Chapman and Manager Reeves agreed.

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

3. Manager Reeves distributed handouts with the most recent version of collection agency procedures noting that both staff and Mr. Patrick had made some changes since their last discussion. The Commissioners received them as information for discussion and consideration at the next meeting.
4. Manager Reeves provided handouts of the latest SCAMPS electric rate survey noting that CPW was now the third lowest in the survey, as a result of fuel cost increases.

V. Executive Session

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

The meeting returned to open session. Mr. Patrick stated that the Commissioners discussed a proposed Grievance Policy and Procedure during *Executive Session*. He noted that for years the Commissioners had been following a Grievance Policy in the Employee Handbook and also followed a non-written policy and procedure for grievance hearings. The Commissioners asked the attorney to draft a more comprehensive Grievance Policy and Procedure which would include procedures for hearings that is consistent with what had been followed for years. Mr. Patrick stated that had been drafted; the Commissioners had an opportunity to review it; and the General Manager had one suggestion for a change to clarify that on asking questions of witnesses, that a party could ask questions of his or her own witnesses but not cross examine witnesses presented by the other party. Mr. Patrick stated that he believed the sentiment of the Commissioners was to approve the policy as submitted, subject to clarification that witnesses presented by the

employee or the General Manager could be questioned by the party presenting them but could not be questioned directly by the opposing party. Mr. Patrick stated that a motion to that effect would be in order.

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

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

Approved: _____, 2008

Secretary