



**MINUTES
WORK SESSION
FAIRFIELD COUNTY COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 18, 2013**

Present: David L. Ferguson, R. David Brown, Mary Lynn Kinley, Kamau Marcharia, Dwayne Perry, Carolyn B. Robinson, Council Members; J. Milton Pope, County Administrator; Davis Anderson, Deputy County Administrator; Jack James, County Attorney; Shryll M. Brown, Clerk to Council

Absent: Mikel R. Trapp

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80 (e), as amended, the following persons and/or organizations have been notified of the time, date, and location of this meeting: The Herald-Independent, The State, and Winnsboro Cablevision, and ninety-three other individuals.

1. CALL TO ORDER

At 6:04 P.M., Chairman Ferguson called the County Council meeting to order.

2. INVOCATION

Council Member Kinley led in the invocation.

3. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A. Chairman Ferguson pointed out that Christ Central Ministries was scheduled to give a proposal tonight on the Old Voter Registration Building; however, Christ Central Ministries called to pull their proposal off the agenda, since they heard there was another entity that was interested in that building.

The Fairfield Community Development Corporation, Inc., was asked to appear tonight to give their proposal. On behalf of the Corporation, Mrs. Terry Vickers gave the following presentation:

Fairfield County Community Development Corporation proposes to the Fairfield County Council the purchase of subject property for the sum of \$100 and considerations. The FCDC, in partnership with the Catawba Regional Fresh Food Coalition, Eat Smart Move More Fairfield, Fairfield Farmers Market, Clemson Extension-Fairfield, The Fairfield Arts Council, The Fairfield County Chamber of Commerce and The Dru Blair College of Art and Culinary School are dedicated to work together and to work with the residents of Fairfield County to revitalize Fairfield County. As part of the revitalization efforts, the group will work to provide a positive learning and work environment and educating and training adults and children to eat healthy, produce and prepare their own food, and express themselves through art. This training will also serve to provide residents with the training and assistance necessary to enable them to start their own business. The FCDC and its partners propose the following uses of the Subject property.

The 6200 sq. ft building to be known as The Fairfield County Farmer's Market- Artisan Center-Community Kitchen will develop interior into three spaces:

3000 sq. ft. open area to house Farmers /Artisans Market on a weekly basis

- This space will also be used for Fairfield Arts Council to hold workshops
- Will be used by students' with the Blair College of Art and Culinary School to develop student driven classes that work with adults and children to assist local residents in developing personal growth and marketable skill.

1500 sq. ft. will be developed into classroom space

- The space to be utilized for a 12 week course of work, presented on-site, by Farmer's/Entrepreneur University that specifically focus on nutrition, labeling, and expanded marketing for products, and create a demand for new jobs.

1700 sq. ft. will be a "shared-use/community" Commercial DHEC licensed Kitchen facility.

- This kitchen will provide a space for local farmers to produce food products for the marketplace.
- The kitchen will serve as an incubator for food entrepreneurs by providing business support.
- Kitchen will serve the community by providing training on proper food preparation including cooking and canning as well as other food related classes.

In an effort to increase the sale and consumption of locally grown food, the FCDC and its partners continue to support the development and growth of established, new and beginning farmers to participate in Fairfield Farmers Market, as well as continually work to develop programs and strategies to reach our under-served consumers (SNAP, WIC, Senior Vouchers). In March 2012, the total amount of money awarded to these programs in Fairfield County was \$862,000. None of the money received by these consumers could be spent with our locally grown food market. The approval to accept SNAP, WIC, Senior Vouchers at the Fairfield Farmer's Market will help expand the market and enable it to accept these funds that will provide a new revenue stream for local growers and producers that not only open the door for healthier eating, but help to increase the quality of life for our local resident.

The FCDC has received a pledge of \$125,000 to rehabilitate the subject building. The FCDC and its partners, all of which are 501-C-3 entities, will write a \$125,000 Rural Business Enterprise Grant (RBEG) for construction, conversion and repairs to the building. In early 2014, the group will also write third phase grant with Eat Smart Move More SC for equipment, technical assistance, professional services, start-up operating costs and working capital.

The FCDC stands ready to insure the building at time of purchase and will have building operational by fall 2014.

The FCDC and its partners will facilitate the continued growth and success of the Subject building while striving to elevate Fairfield County by providing healthy life-style learning and choices, by promoting entrepreneurial growth and by providing a positive and business friendly environment to champion the products, people and arts on all levels.

The FCDC and its partners hope that the Council recognizes and takes into consideration the positive benefits this building could provide to all citizens of Fairfield County. The FCDC and its partners stand ready to answer any questions or comments concerning this proposal.

Chairman Ferguson set forth that the Council would be placing this proposal on the next County Council agenda.

B. Recreation Proposals

Mr. Pope gave an overview of the process for discussing the recreation proposals and delineated the documents that were distributed to Council in the agenda package, i.e., pertinent minutes from previous recreation discussions, lease agreements that referenced properties or areas of potential recreation, bond information summary of what was approved in the bond related to recreation monies the legal opinion. Mrs. Lori Schaeffer gave a PowerPoint presentation as follows:

Recreation Study Overview

- Prepared by Central Midlands COG 2010

Existing County Programs

- As was discussed in Chapter 3, the programs offered by the county are not at capacity, but there are limitations to increasing participation. With minimal expenditure, the county could take the following steps to address some of the needs identified in the existing programs.
- The county should develop and unified branding campaign with a logo, DONE consistent signs, and brochures to help identify the recreation facilities and programs;
- Explore opportunities to play football games at other locations; DONE
- Explore the possibility of developing a multi-sport park at Adger Park, or a similar centrally located site in the county. One possible alternative is at one of the interchanges to I-77 ;
- Work to improve security at the mini parks with safety lighting and increased patrols. Additionally, the county should consider installing emergency call boxes.
- Add buses for after-school and summer programs. The growing number of single-parent families will place a greater need for these programs. DONE
- Add to the maintenance staff so that the maintenance work at the parks can be performed more frequently. A well maintained park is more inviting, resulting in more activity at the parks.

New Facilities And Programs

- The county has also expressed an interest in adding building space to its system. Currently the only indoor facility available is located in the M. H. Boykin Community Center. While no specific plans have been made, a multi-purpose building that can accommodate both athletic and community events and also serve as an emergency shelter should be considered.
- There is a demonstrated need for a community center on the eastern, western and central areas of the county. Care should be taken to place these facilities in the population centers of each area, consideration should be given to multiple uses of these facilities such as community functions, satellite recreation offices, storage of maintenance equipment for all county purposes including county maintenance and public works equipment. The council should deliberate and decide the most appropriate location to serve the needs of the citizens. To assist in the deliberation of suitable sites, CMCOG produced a series of maps showing the population density within each of the council districts. The intent was to show areas with the highest concentration of residents within each council district where a community center could be easily accessed by the most people. While community centers should be open to everyone in the county, below is a list of possible locations and the adjacent council district:
 - Eastern portion of the county near the Town of Ridgeway which can serve the residents of District 1, District 2, District 3 and District 7;
 - Center portion of the county replacing the current M.H. Boykin Community Center which would serve residents District 2, District 5, District 6 and District 7;
 - Western portion of the county near the Town of Jenkinsville which would serve District 3 and District 4;
 - Northeastern portion of the county near the Mitford Mini Park which would serve District 2 and District 3.
- New Programs
 - In the short-term, the county should look at adding programs that take advantage of the outdoor facilities the county currently has. Many of these programs should include activities targeted to adults as well as children. Such programs include:
 - Additional sites for football – in the process
 - Additional sites for soccer
 - Adult sports leagues –currently doing
 - Teen sports leagues - attempted
 - Boating/canoeing/fishing/camping
 - Walking programs – Palmetto Trail
 - Other activities such as horse shoes, skeet shooting, disc golf, etc.
 - As has already been noted, M. H. Boykin Community Center faces the challenges of limited space for the programs offered. There is little room for the programs to grow or for the county to offer new programs due to scheduling conflicts; however, the shape of the current site of the community center offers little options for expansion of the building. Additionally, the building is out of date. As

such, it is not ADA accessible, it has old wiring and it is not energy efficient. The county should look at alternatives for replacing the current community center that include both reusing the current site as a satellite facility and finding a new location for a new community center with administrative offices. The new site should maintain the centralized location in the county and have easy access along an arterial road.

New Parks

- Based on the analysis in Chapter 3, the county will need to add two additional mini/neighborhood parks by 2035 to maintain the current LOS. Based on population growth by census tract, at least one additional mini park should be located in Census Tract 9603, near the I-77 corridor, with another located near Lake Wateree.

Updates/Improvements

- Gym flooring
- Tennis courts (8)- Recreation 4, Lake Monticello 2, Centerville 1, Admin 1
- Gym Flooring
- Playground equipment- Horeb Glenn, Middle Six, Mitford, Airport/Adger, Willie Lee, Drawdy Park, Lake Monticello
- Tree removal at Drawdy Park
- Drainage/plumbing at the Recreation
- Football field at Drawdy
- Fitness equipment

Programs

- Zumba 30+
- Group fit (spin,bootcamp,HIIT) 30+
- Soul line dancing 20
- After School 35 (capacity)
- Gymnastics 35+ (open new class)
- Dance 15
- Tae Kwon Do 10
- Football 150
- Soccer 100
- Baseball 250
- Basketball 175
- Senior program 45+

Mrs. Laura Johnson gave a PowerPoint presentation of the accounting of recreation capital funds as follows:

Recreation Capital Account

- In fiscal year 2006, a Recreation Capital Account was established for use by the Recreation Commission.
- In June 2006, \$500,000 was transferred from the general fund (fund 100) to the Recreation Capital Account (fund 804).
- In a letter dated June 20, 2006, Mr. Carnell Murphy, Recreation Commission Executive Director (and County Council Member) requested a check in the amount of \$25,000 for the initial payment of MAR Construction Company. The Recreation Commission had entered into a construction contract with MAR construction for a new gymnasium.

Recreation Fund Balance FY 2006 and 2007

- FY2006 Balance
500,000.00 Transfer In
(25,000.00) MAR payment
475,000.00 Ending balance
- FY 2007 Balance
No activity in FY 2007
475,000.00 Beg. Balance
475,000.00 Ending balance

Dissolution Of The Recreation Commission

- A resolution was passed in February 2007 stating the following: "Requesting The South Carolina General Assembly to Abolish the Fairfield County Recreation Commission and thereby grant the County all authority permitted to Subdivisions of this State to provide its Citizens with those services previously provided by the Commission; and other related matters."

Recreation Fund Balance FY 2008

- 475,000.00 Balance Forward from FY2007
- - Revenues/Transfers
- (39,750.00) MAR Construction payment in February 2008
- (39,750.00) MAR Construction payment in March 2008
- (4,473.00) Central Midlands Memorandum of Agreement (Parks /Recreation Planning)
- (4,472.71) Legal Fees Related to MAR Construction
- (5.00) SCE&G Lease (2 acres at Lake Monticello) paid in October 2007
- (88,450.71) TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 386,549.29 FY 2008 Ending Balance

Recreation Fund Balance FY2009

- 386,549.29 Balance forward from FY2008
- - Revenues/ Transfers
- (10,034.00) Central Midlands Memorandum of Agreement (Parks /Recreation Planning)
- (5,596.00) Central Midlands Memorandum of Agreement (Parks /Recreation Planning)
- (15,630.00) TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 370,919.29 FY 2009 Ending Balance

Recreation Fund Balance FY2010

- 370,919.29 Balance Forward from FY2009
- 828,670.00 Revenues/Transfers (Approved in Budget Ordinance)
- (1,977.00) Central Midlands Memorandum of Agreement (Parks /Recreation Planning)
- (18,000.00) Land Purchase for Middlesix minipark
- (553,645.14) Various improvements to recreation facilities
- 573,622.14 TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 625,967.15 FY2010 Ending Fund Balance

Recreation Fund Balance FY2011

- 625,967.15 Balance Forward from FY2010
- - Revenues/Transfers
- (7,889.00) Central Midlands Memorandum of Agreement (Parks /Recreation Planning)
- (89,600.39) Playground equipment at various recreation facilities
- 97,489.39 TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 528,477.76 FY2011 Ending Fund Balance

Recreation Fund Balance FY 2012

- 528,477.76 Balance Forward from FY2011
- - Revenues/Transfers
- (4,787.99) Various Fitness Equipment
- (4,787.99) TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 523,689.77 FY2012 Ending Fund Balance

Recreation Fund Balance FY2013

- 523,689.77 Balance Forward from FY2012
- 125,000.00 Revenues/Transfers (Approved in Budget Ordinance)
- (167,475.00) Drawdy Park
- (113,895.09) Fitness Equipment, Playground
- (281,370.09) TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 367,319.68 FY2013 Ending Fund Balance (Unaudited)

Recap

- Since the Recreation Capital Account was established in 2006
- 1,453,670.00 Total Transfers from the General Fund
- (1,086,350.32) Total Expenditures
- 367,319.68 Balance

Fund Balances by Fiscal Year

- 2006 - 475,000.00
- 2007 - 475,000.00
- 2008 - 386,549.29
- 2009 - 370,919.29
- 2010 - 625,967.15
- 2011 - 528,477.76
- 2012 - 523,689.77
- 2013 - 367,319.68 (Unaudited)

Central Midlands has been paid \$29,969 under the Memorandum of Agreement.

MAR Construction has been paid 104,500.

Current Fiscal Year 2014

- There was no budget established for Recreation Capital in fiscal year 2014.
- Per the prior County Administrator, any capital expenditures the Recreation department will need will be paid from the 2013 bond funds designated for recreation facilities.

Fairfield Facilities Corporation 2013 Bonds

- One of the projects listed in the bond is for Regional Parks for each county district (7 total) in the amount of \$3,500,000 for designing, constructing, acquiring, equipping, enlarging, extending, or increasing the existing various recreational facilities.

After receiving the financial overview of the accounting of the recreational funds, Mr. Pope set forth that the Council is at the point of deciding legislatively how the capital bonds funds should be spent.

Questions?

- Did the bond actually say that we were having \$3.5 million dollars, or did it say \$500,000 per district?
- What is the life of this bond?
- When we first appropriated that money to the Recreation Commission, it was earmarked \$500,000 for a specific purpose. It was repeatedly said the \$500,000 would constitute doing a county-wide study, and the first building, and that money is to go to western Fairfield. The Council voted to do that, and then the Recreation Commission was dissolved. Clearly, that money should have still been earmarked for recreation. Can you take earmarked money and move it around and have to come back to the Council for a vote to approve that to move that money. That was the legal question I asked. You are saying legally, you can do it?
- Attorney Jack James rendered an opinion on the following subject: Were the certain funds received by Fairfield County upon the transfer of funds (assets)/{change in authority} of the Fairfield County Recreation Commission in 2007, which are said to have been originally intended by the Recreation Commission to be used for construction of a gymnasium in western Fairfield County, properly placed in the County's general fund, or should they have been set aside for the building project as originally intended by the now defunct Recreation Commission?
- If it's the responsibility of the County and it was dissolved, what's in writing, specifically, that the County says we should do with those funds?
- Did you take any of that money prior to them being dissolved and not do what that money was prescribed to do?
- Where, in writing, in the minutes, where we dissolved the fire department—brought it up under the Council; that all budgets and all monies prior to that--that was pending for fire trucks or work or whatever-- that that money was dissolved and put back into the budget.
- So you are saying special purpose districts can be taken away from County Council and it does not have to go through legislators? We dissolved the fire department without going through a legislative act and with the authority of the Council, is that what you are saying? Is that legal? I need a legal opinion on that.

Council Member Marcharia read, in its entirety, the minutes which delineated a motion that was made on February 28, 2005 as it relates to the recreation study and facility in western Fairfield.

- Did the Council vote to accept the study done by the COG?

At this point, the recreation proposals were outlined by each member of Council as follows:

District 1 – Vice Chairman Perry:

- Community center located within 2-3 miles of Town of Ridgeway
- Convenient to Geiger Elementary School
- Indoor Gymnasium
- Exercise Equipment (Treadmills, bicycles and weight lifting equipment)
- Baseball/softball field
- Computers with internet access
- Multi-purpose meeting room
- Walking trail
- Game room(pool table, table tennis)
- Multi-purpose field (soccer/football)
- Playground equipment

Vice Chairman Perry asked Mrs. Schaeffer to take his request and attach a figure to it based on the \$500,000 allocation. He, in turn, will take this back to his community and prioritize it based on what has been requested and what can be appropriated for District 1.

District 2 – Council Member Robinson:

- No report, because the night that Mr. Shuler was here and presented the program and plan for 2009, there was the center suggested in Ridgeway. Council Member Robinson voiced that it is simpler for every district, except District 2, to come up with a Plan, because it is everywhere. The only thing is that there is one community over at Peay Ridge. Feel there is a need for some playground equipment for those children, as they are so far removed from anything else in the County.

District 3 (written report submitted by Council Member Trapp):

- Buckhead Community- two land owners are interested in selling the county 2 acres of land.
- Blackstock/Woodward Community- we have a land owner that is interested in selling the county 2 acres of land. There is a park about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from Blackstock in Chester County that is fenced and locked; not user friendly for the citizens in those communities
- White Oak Community
- Small town Community
- Greenbrier Community
- Blair Community

District 4 – Council Member Marcharia:

- Request that the monies that were appropriated (\$500,000) go for the site development and construction of a building on the 8.12 acres of land.

District 5 – Chairman Ferguson:

- Extend on Chappelltown Mini Park (Use it as a model). Like to see additional seating around the outside to keep 4-wheelers out of the building
- Mini park- Rion Road (end of Kelly Miller Road)
- Mini park -Peach Road (between 321 and Greenbrier Mossydale Road)
- Mini park- Peach Road and Syrup Mill Road (toward the Church)
- Look into purchasing Guardian field/walking trail area

Districts 6 and 7 – Council Member Kinley and Council Member Brown:

- Requested that staff put numbers to the requested projects
- Highlight and expand football field at Drawdy Park
- Walking trail at Drawdy Park
- Fitness building (renovation of old Maintenance building for a room for spin bikes; Zumba)
- Addition of Genealogy building behind Museum
- Add shelter, picnic tables and grill at Friendship Park
- Need some activity at Zion Hill. Looked at swimming pool area at end of College Street for possible soccer field; consider putting in water fountain
- Consider new building in Zion Hill area; Looked at Wilkes Building, or another piece of land to put butler building for meeting place, etc.
- St. Paul Baptist Church offered use of social hall building for computer use and meetings
- Looking at 15 acres of land near corner of Course Road and Middlesix for creating 4 or 5 baseball diamonds with open gym

Questions?

- How much is it going to cost to operate them?

Next Steps:

- Get the places designated to see where they would be; what kind of obstacles would arise in putting parks or buildings in; let staff come up with numbers.
- Would want to meet back with Council to ensure everything is identified. Suggest creating a master list in one complete document, by district, as to what the proposal is. Cannot get precise numbers until bid out; however, could possibly get estimates, etc.
- At some point, would need a vote from Council to say move forward with designated projects; secure architectural designs, costs, etc.
- Would like to see an example set up like the Chappelton park for mini parks and design all the parks the same way so that the same equipment could be ordered.

Chairman Ferguson set forth that Council does not have a standard of the way to select what goes in each district. He asked that, at the next Council meeting, Council be thinking of one of two proposals: (1) that each respective Council Member make the recommendations as to what goes in that district and the entire Council vote on it; (2) district representative, once they have met with the community, have the "say-so", and they would be the strict one to make that decision about their district. Chairman Ferguson maintained that it has to be one or the other, and Council must vote on it being one or the other.

Council Member Brown agreed that a policy needs to be established; however, he opined that staff needs to be given enough time to come up with numbers. He opined that Council should not move quite as fast on this decision until it is known what kind of numbers Mrs. Schaeffer and Mr. Pope will be putting on as far as operations and expense.

Chairman Ferguson clarified that he was not asking Council to vote on what they want to do on Monday night, but on the concept on how to make that decision. Chairman Ferguson also asked Mr. Pope if he has had any property on Road 99 to come forward since two weeks ago. Having heard that Mr. Pope has not had any movement on it, the Council would go forward with the third reading on the piece of property on Road 99 that was proposed by Council Member Trapp.

Council's comments on voting on the process on Monday night:

Perry: Prefer to wait.

Kinley: Prefer to wait.

Marcharia: Think each individual Council Member, if they are already prepared to move ahead and have their figures and facts together, should be allowed to go ahead. Inquired about the two conceptual plans received previously. Brought forth that he has some concerns about not receiving responses from everyone as it related to his questions of: itemized account, by district, that has received recycling centers; who did the work; how much was paid to workers, etc.; alleged \$5.2 million dollars related to the Local Option Sales Tax; status of fund balance; exact amount of construction of Peach Road Industrial Park, who were the contractors/sub-contractors and diversity of the people who worked on the project.

Brown: Prefer to wait until better numbers are available.

Robinson: Need to wait because there are more factors than mentioned; there are ongoing costs; need to have a schematic; does it fit in overall recreation plan that Mrs. Schaeffer has; need to talk about \$500,000; where will the extra come from; a lot more than just voting how to do this process.

Ferguson: Sounds like an overwhelming voice to wait to vote on the procedure to determine what Council will do.

Next meetings:

9/23/2013 – Regular Meeting - Fairfield Central High School – 6:00 PM

9/30/2013 – Special Meeting (Local Option Sales Tax) – Fairfield Central High School – 7:00 PM

4. ADJOURN

At 8:25 P.M., it was moved by council Member Kinley; seconded by Council Member Robinson to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

SHRYLL M. BROWN
CLERK TO COUNCIL

DAVID L. FERGUSON, SR.
CHAIRMAN