



City of Madison

Meeting Minutes - Final

BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Tuesday, July 24, 2007

4:00 PM

119 E. Olin Avenue

SPECIAL MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present: Priscilla B. Mather, Jonathan H. Standridge and Gregory W. Harrington

Excused: Lauren Chare, George E. Meyer and Thomas Schlenker

PUBLIC COMMENT

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

87. [06994](#) Authorizing the Water Utility staff to negotiate and the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute a contract for the procurement and installation of video surveillance and recording equipment at the Water Utility's remote facilities.
Attachments: video surveillance resolution - Version 1.pdf, 06994 Registration Stmt.pdf

AI said that a separate Resolution to the Common Council was approved previously to accept the federal grant for this. It is an 80%-20% matching security grant for \$388,000 we proposed to use for video cameras at unit wells. Information, demonstrations, and proposals for video cameras were verbally requested of 4 security equipment vendors. Only 3 responded to our request to pre-qualify by demonstrating their equipment and conduct an on-site "Proof of Concept" test of their equipment. Only 1 vendor was successful in getting the video system to work with our radio system. That successful vendor was Longwatch. The problem was a lack of available bandwidth within our radio system and working with our SCADA system. Due to this technological challenge, we have requested and received a performance guarantee from Longwatch. We want this system to work.

The total original proposal from Longwatch was for \$640,000. That far exceeded our budget and we negotiated a reduction in the proposed fee by revising the scope of the project to reduce it to \$450,000. Jon asked if installation would be in addition to that. AI said that the price includes installation. Jon asked if there was a reduction in services as a result of reducing the cost. AI said that they reduced the equipment, but maintained the proposed backbone of the system so we can add more equipment later if we wish.

Jon asked why there was not a RFP issued and how we know we have the best firm for the work. AI said that after talking to the local experts in the video equipment and SCADA field, he contacted four vendors by phone and asked them to come in and propose and demonstrate a solution that would provide video surveillance of our remote facilities. Three vendors responded. Only Longwatch

could demonstrate that they could make it work on our system. The difficulty is not in providing cameras, but in transmitting images over our radio system.

Jon asked if there was only one copy of the proposal. Al said he only brought one copy with him to the meeting; it is a 75-page document. Dan offered Jon his copy of the document. Jon asked Greg if he had seen the proposal before the meeting. Greg said he had not and did not think it was necessary for him to have seen it. Jon expressed discomfort with approving the resolution when there was no proposal to look at before the meeting, no RFP, no bids and no reasons provided other than Al's recommendation. Percy said she has trust in Al's opinion on this.

Jon asked Robin if there was a limit above which we needed to go out for a RFP. Robin said he just received a copy of the City requirements for this, but had not had a chance to review them. Jon said that he could not support the resolution because he thinks the process was flawed. Al said that if we were to change the process, we would likely lose the grant. Jon asked why we would lose the grant. Al said because it would delay us 2 or 3 months. Dave said it is his understanding is that in order to comply with the terms of the grant, the funds need to be spent by October 31, which is the end of the federal fiscal year.

Jon asked how other Utility staff feel about this. Dan said he had read it, but had no opinion.

Dave said he supports it. He said there is federal money for this, which we could lose if we don't move forward. There was a competitive process; we had 4 firms contacted and 3 firms that competed for the work. Only one demonstrated they could do the work. Dave said the City Attorney's office had been involved in this, and Attorney Lara Mainella had written the resolution.

Al said comments were solicited on the proposal via email from Utility staff, but no comments were received.

4:15 Greg moves approval, Percy seconds. Jon questions validity of second based on Percy's position as president of the Board. Dave is asked to call the City Attorney to see if the Board president can second a motion in this situation. Dave reports that the City Attorney says it is not clear absent Board rules that address it. He said there could be a legal question that the second was valid. He also said that the inability of the Board to take action on the item due to the lack of a second would not prevent it from going to the Common Council for consideration.

Al asked Jon what he would like to see in the way of documentation of the process. Jon said he would like to see the technical details that would clearly indicate to him that this is the best proposal we can get and this is a reasonable price. Al said what he has found is that there are very few people with the technical expertise to accomplish this project due to the radio system with the exception of Longwatch. He said he would be happy to have them come in and talk to him. He said the problem is not the cameras, lots of firms can do cameras with wires, it's when you add the radios in that it gets difficult and complicated, especially with 32 remote sites to deal with. Al asked Jon what he would like to see in the way of an RFP process. Jon said that he would like to see three detailed bids on this work so he can look at them and evaluate them. Al said he talked at length with three vendors over several months. We had demonstrations in two wells and in the SCADA room for several weeks. Two of them could not get their equipment to work with our radio system and declined to bid on the project. Only Longwatch submitted a bid.

Jon said he had not heard anything that would change his mind.

4:30 Jon moves adjournment, there is not second. Discussion continues. Jon asked Greg if he feels comfortable approving this based on what he has before

him. Greg says the information looks okay to him and he trusts AI's professional opinion on it. Percy says it is unfortunate that board members second guess the technical staff, and that sometimes we need to go with their experience and she is saddened that Board members don't trust the technical staff. Jon said he is by nature a trusting person, but the last two years has taken that trust away. At 4:40 Greg Harrington seconded move to adjourn. Unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4:40 p.m. Greg Harrington seconded the motion for adjournment.
Unanimously approved.