

# Entry Gate Monitoring

*Victoria Kahle*

When University Place was being built, the developer, Pat Neal, installed the fences and entrance gates but left them open during construction. At the point where the development was nearing completion, Mr. Neal hired a company to provide personnel to open and close the front entry gates. Although most residents considered and called these employees “guards”, they were always considered “greeters” by Mr. Neal and by the company that employed them.

Almost immediately numerous complaints were filed by the residents. Because the greeters were not guards there were no security checks, only waves as the residents were waiting for the gates to open. Many times the greeters were so busy watching TV or sleeping that residents needed to honk to get the gates opened.

Over time, so many complaints were brought forward that the newly vested CDD Board felt they had no choice but to look into finding a better solution. While the Board continued to look into the financial end of the problem, one supervisor, Drew Clayton, visited a number of communities and surveyed their different solutions.

In February of 2009 the Board heard a presentation from Envera Systems, which was the company used and recommended by most of our surrounding communities. Over the next several months the Board discussed and presented to our residents the many aspects of the situation. After much deliberation the Board decided to phase in the use of Envera Systems on a trial basis. We began with Envera taking over the shift from midnight to 7am. This plan also allowed us to gradually phase out the greeters and help those who still wanted to work to find jobs elsewhere.

Once Envera took over entirely, the Board was able to provide the most security possible within our limitations of public access. The change also provided a savings to our residents of approximately \$50,000.00 to \$70,000.00 per year.

Although no system is perfect, we are continually assessing the situation and working with Envera to provide the best service possible, a balance of efficiency and effectiveness, for our community.

.....

## **Cost Analysis** Envera vs. Manned system

(Bob Nanni, UP District Manager, Severn Trent)

Due to recent events, social media comments and emails circulated within the University Place community, which together deliberately or otherwise create the impression that the selection of Envera Corp. as a gate monitoring agent was not a calculated and beneficial financial decision, I have written this memo to be used as a reference by the CDD Board Supervisors.

Contrary to the common knowledge of some residents, the District Supervisors utilized a manned security system for many years, beginning in 2005. Additionally, and also unknowing to some, a thorough analysis was completed to measure the potential cost savings of using an Envera unmanned system prior to 2009, which looked at the total payroll and supplies costs for the manned system that was in place for over four years.

Records for payroll and related manned security system costs show that the annual cost of this system averaged \$90,533, for a full four year average and there was one partial year for \$71,124 that was not included in the calculation of the average (it was a partial year). In summary, the *average the daily cost* was approximately *\$240 per day*.

Also, Envera paid approximately \$45,000 for “startup” costs such as cameras, network hardware and construction, a power supply source, back-up battery, electrical hardware, etc. All or a portion of this cost would have to be borne by the District in the event that the District chooses to utilize a manned system or a system that would not be compatible with the current one.

As recently as June of 2015 costs were brought forward that included twenty-four hour, twelve hour and patrol period manned costs. The costs are as follows, based on 24 hour security front & back gates:

Build Guard Facility (Back Gate), 12ft. x 15ft. = 180 sq. ft. x \$200 = \$36,000.

Two Guards (Front, Back Gates), 24 hours = \$4,418 per wk. x 52 = \$229,736.

Total cost estimate is **\$265,736** start-up, then **\$229,736** per year thereafter.

In every instance the manned system costs were more expensive; the Board recognized the financial advantage and chose to stay with the monitoring agency Envera. This decision was made because the Envera cost of \$5,887 per month or \$70,644 per year was less costly and more efficient. This cost includes all services and lease of the cameras etc. Since the beginning of the service agreement with Envera in 2009, the annual cost has remained consistent at \$70,644.

Costs such as gate arm repairs are not included because they are mainly due to damage, the front gatehouse repair due to mold cost \$7,260 and not included. Two cameras were replaced since 2009, one at \$1,000 (an infrared night camera) and a regular \$300 camera both paid separately, but could be considered an expense to the Envera system to be fair. The average daily cost of the Envera system is \$194, versus the \$240 per day of a manned system from six years ago and \$315 per day at today's cost.

If the level of service for a manned security was reduced to a twelve hour system the cost would still be \$114,868 annually and would still need an automated system for after-hours support.

In the final analysis, using today's costs, the *annual savings* with Envera is *\$44,224* versus a 12 hour manned system and a savings of *\$159,092* versus a 24 hour manned system. In addition, keep in mind that a guard house would have to be built at the back entrance for approximately \$36,000 and there is an estimated \$45,000 of electronic hardware and construction... these startup costs would also be incurred during the first year of converting back to a manned system.