



when installing new sign posts and removing existing posts in the Farming Creek Subdivision. The employees were: Jay Shumpert, Sign Shop Tech; Benji Belcher, Drainage Maintenance Supervisor; Todd Frick, HEO III; Bryan Oswald, HEO III; Mike Lindler, HEO II; Wade Spivey, HEO II; and Bob Smith, HEO I.

Also, Albert Tobias, Supervisor, Dist. II; Jason Ward, HEO III; and James Vaughan, HEO I, employees in the Public Works Department were recognized for their assistance to the Mack Edisto Fire Department following a serious wreck. The employees immediately went to work removing trees and cutting a path to the truck after it had been wedged in the woods between pine trees.

**Adoption of Lexington County’s Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Values and Goals -** Mr. Jeffcoat made a motion, seconded by Mr. Derrick to approve the adoption of Lexington County’s Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Values, and Goals.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion.

Ms. Doucett said as she worked with the Department Heads and their staff to share with them Council’s mission; vision; values; and goals, several employees have stopped her to express their appreciation to be part of the process. As a result of the employees’ participation, it was suggested that Council consider adding “Loyalty” to the values under “E.” Encourage Teamwork Through Cooperation and Loyalty. She said loyalty seemed to strike a cord with a number of employees who felt that Lexington County has a long heritage of very loyal employees.

Mr. Derrick made a motion to amend the motion, seconded by Mr. Kinard to add the word “Loyalty.”

Vote on Amendment

In Favor:

Mr. Cullum	Mr. Derrick
Mr. Kinard	Ms. Summers
Mr. Keisler	Mr. Jeffcoat

Not Present: Mr. Davis

Vote on Motion as Amended

In Favor:

Mr. Cullum	Mr. Jeffcoat
Mr. Derrick	Mr. Kinard
Mr. Davis	Ms. Summers
Mr. Keisler	

**Resolutions - Swansea High School Marching Band and Chapin High School Marching Band -** Mr. Kinard made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat that the resolutions be approved.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:      Mr. Cullum                      Mr. Kinard  
                    Mr. Jeffcoat                     Mr. Derrick  
                    Mr. Davis                        Ms. Summers  
                    Mr. Keisler

**Appointments** - None.

**Bids/Purchases/RFPs** - A motion was made by Mr. Keisler, seconded by Mr. Derrick that the following Bids/Purchases/RFPs (Tab S, T, U, V, W, and X) be approved.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Derrick asked the County Administrator if she would like to address Tab X, Soliciting Full Line Grocery Chains for Christmas Gift Cards.

Ms. Doucett said the employee Christmas gift cards have a long tradition with the County in that County Council has provided a \$25 gift card to purchase holiday groceries to all employees as a show of appreciation for their loyal service. She said during a recent conversation with the I.R.S., it was noted that the gift cards should be treated as a bonus and, therefore, would be taxable and wanted to be sure that Council was aware that the County would have to show the gift card as a taxable bonus in the employees' W-2 statements.

Mr. Derrick stated for the record that this was the most ridiculous thing that he has heard.

**Hot Water Heater Tank Replacement - Building Services/Sheriff's Department - Sole Source -**

A requisition was submitted by Building Services for the purchase of a hot water heater tank replacement for the Sheriff's Annex. Because the burner is still operational, only the existing boiler tank will have to be replaced, resulting in a savings of approximately \$5,000. Total cost including tax is \$12,647.92.

The purchase is deemed a sole source from Ken Clary and Company, LLC as the tank will be installed utilizing existing equipment.

**Microsoft Volume Licenses with Media - Library Services -**

A request was submitted for the purchase of seventeen (17) Microsoft Volume licenses with media to be paid with State Lottery funds for Library Services. The licenses will provide new software for the new Swansea and South Congaree libraries being constructed. The licenses and media will be purchased from Software House International through State Contract Number 01-S4072-A7243. Total cost including tax is \$5,400.24.

**Dell Poweredge Server with Linux Operating System - Sheriff's Department -**

The Sheriff's Department submitted a requisition for the purchase for one (1) Dell Poweredge Server with Linux Operating system to replace the current server that is approximately eight years old and is essential for the housing of records management and field reporting systems data. The server will be purchased directly from the manufacturer, Dell, through State Contract Number 05-S6656-A11104.

Total cost including tax is \$8,980.75.

**Motorola Portable VHF Radios and Monitor/Receivers - Public Safety/Fire Service -** Requisitions for the purchase of thirteen (13) Motorola portable VHF radios and forty-eight (48) monitor/receivers were submitted by Public Safety/Fire Service. The equipment will be purchased directly from the manufacturer, Motorola, through State Contract Number OIR2002.07.

With the increased volume of emergency calls and the continued need for effective fire ground communications, Fire Service uses the available VHF frequencies. The radios will be replacement only and will result in no additional service charges for 800 MHZ service. Cost including tax is \$14,368.52.

The monitor/receivers are utilized to alert personnel of an emergency call. Many of the existing units are approaching 20 years old and are in need of replacing. Additional monitors are required in order to meet an increase in personnel as well as replace monitors that are lost, stolen, damaged, or no longer serviceable. Cost including tax is \$20,998.39.

Total cost for the radios and monitor/receivers including tax is \$35,366.91.

**Rehabilitation Specialist and Contractors Minor Home Repair Program -** Staff requested approval to use the Request for Qualifications process to solicit resumes from qualified firms to provide services for rehabilitation inspections and qualified contractors to provide minor home repairs for single-family residential minor housing repair projects for a County wide housing program. Lexington County will administer the program using funds available from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. The top Rehabilitation Specialist will be required throughout the life of the project to ensure that County Standards are met and that property is maintained. In addition, a list of pre-qualified contractors will be approved to perform the necessary repairs.

Four (4) firms for the Rehabilitation Specialist and three (3) contractor firms to provide minor home repairs were received. The committee recommended awarding the Rehabilitation Specialist contract to S&F Engineering Company, Inc. as the highest rated offeror and recommended all three of the contractors; Associated Contractors, First Class Construction LLC, and Konstruction Services Inc.

**Soliciting Full Line Grocery Chains for Christmas Gift Cards -** Bids were advertised and solicited from qualified full line grocery chains for Christmas gift cards for an estimated 1,300 County employees at a face value of twenty-five dollars (\$25.00). The successful vendor was required to have a store located in Lexington/Columbia, South Carolina area. Three (3) bids were received.

Staff recommended that the award be made to Piggly Wiggle Carolina as the low bidder meeting specifications. Total cost including tax is \$29,250.

**Chairman's Report -** Mr. Cullum stated he attended several Homeowners' Association meetings

in his district and that he and Councilman Keisler attended a Reserve Deputies Luncheon on November 2, honoring the reserve deputies. He said the reserve deputies volunteer approximately 6,000 hours a year assisting the Sheriff's Department which is a significant savings to the County.

**Administrator's Report** - Ms. Doucett indicated that she had failed to mention earlier when talking about the County's mission and vision statements that Mr. Frank Chapman with RDA Associates had planned to be here but was unable to attend due to an unexpected funeral and wanted Council to know how excited he is to see some of the "fruits" of the labor.

**Community Development Report Newsletter** - Ms. Doucett said Volume 1, Issue 1 of the Community Development Report Newsletter has been published. She said this is a continuation of the Community Development Department reaching out to citizens, builders, and developers in the County.

**County Auction** - Ms. Doucett announced that the County auction will be Thursday, November 16 at 10:00 a.m. at Central Stores located on Ball Park Road.

Mr. Cullum thanked Mr. Ronald Scott, Director of Community Development, and his staff for the changes that the department has instituted to help the citizens, builders, and developers understand the process they need to go through whether it be for building codes, and/or inspections, zoning issues, etc.

**Approval of Minutes - Meeting of October 10, 2006** - A motion was made by Mr. Kinard, seconded by Ms. Summers to approve the minutes of October 10, 2006 as submitted.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Kinard
	Ms. Summers	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Davis	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

**Zoning Amendment - Zoning Map Amendment M06-08 - Lake Estates Dr. ( Intersection of Timberlake Dr. to Water Links Dr.) - 3<sup>rd</sup> and Final Reading** - Mr. Jeffcoat made a motion, seconded by Mr. Keisler that Zoning Map Amendment M06-08 receive third and final reading.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Kinard
	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Davis
	Ms. Summers	

**Ordinances - Ordinance 06-16 - Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of an Infrastructure and Real Estate Improvements Financing Agreement Between Lexington County and Allied**

**Air - 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading - (Tentative)** - Mr. Jeffcoat made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kinard that Ordinance 06-16 be given second reading with the amendment that only \$50,000 tax credit be given for the first two years, if Allied Air is the tenant for the entire period in which the tax credit is given.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:      Mr. Cullum                      Mr. Jeffcoat  
                    Mr. Kinard                        Mr. Derrick  
                    Mr. Davis                         Ms. Summers  
                    Mr. Keisler

**Ordinance 06-18 - Ordinance to Amend Ordinance 95-12 as Amended by Subsequent Ordinances Relating to Joint County Industrial Park of Lexington and Calhoun Counties so to Enlarge the Park (Accurate Mfg. Inc. and Saxe Gotha Property) - 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading** - A motion was made by Mr. Kinard, seconded by Ms. Summers that Ordinance O6-18 be given second reading.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:      Mr. Cullum                      Mr. Kinard  
                    Ms. Summers                    Mr. Derrick  
                    Mr. Davis                        Mr. Keisler  
                    Mr. Jeffcoat

**Committee Reports - Planning and Administration, J. Owens, Chairman - Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH)** - Mr. Jeffcoat, on behalf of Mr. Owens, reported the Planning and Administration Committee met during the afternoon to consider a request from Ms. Jennifer Moore of United Way to provide \$2,500 through the Community Development Block Grant program for the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH). The funds will be used to assist with a new state-wide count of homeless persons. The count will be conducted on January 27, 2007.

Mr. Jeffcoat made a motion, seconded by Mr. Davis to approve the request to allocate \$2,500 through the Community Development Block Grant program for the purpose of assisting a new count of the homeless.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:      Mr. Cullum                      Mr. Jeffcoat  
                    Mr. Davis                        Mr. Kinard  
                    Mr. Derrick                       Ms. Summers  
                    Mr. Keisler

**Justice, S. Davis, Chairman - Lexington County Sheriff Department (LCSD) Title IV-D Program - Sheriff's Department** - Mr. Davis reported his committee met during the afternoon to consider a request by Col. Paavel, Sheriff's Department, that the Title IV-D Program that the

Sheriff has administration over, be changed to be used to purchase capital items rather than fund the part-time clerk position (POSN000769) and the approval of an Administrative Budgetary Transfer (ABT) in the amount of \$47,909 of projected revenue be transferred to various accounts for the purchase of equipment and services for the newly created Fugitive Task Force Unit.

A motion was made by Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr. Keisler to approve staff's request.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Davis
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Kinard
	Mr. Derrick	Ms. Summers
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

**Cars for Reserve Deputies - Sheriff's Department - James R. Metts, Sheriff** - Mr. Davis reported his committee met during the afternoon to consider a request by Sheriff Metts that four vehicles being replaced in the Sheriff's Department be reassigned to the Reserve Deputies for their use.

Mr. Davis made a motion, seconded by Mr. Keisler to approve the reassignment of four of the best of the used vehicles being replaced in the Sheriff's Department to the Reserve Deputies. This will bring the number of vehicles used by the Reserve Deputies to ten.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Davis
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Kinard
	Mr. Derrick	Ms. Summers
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

**Health & Human Services, J. Carrigg, Jr., Chairman - EMS Staffing and Training Issue - (Goal #1) - Public Safety/EMS** - On behalf of Mr. Carrigg, Ms. Summers reported the Health & Human Services Committee met to discuss a request by Brian Hood, EMS Coordinator, that the fifteenth senior paramedic position be changed from a 12-hour rotating shift to a 40-hour position at no additional cost and to approve a \$20,000 budget request for FY2007-2008 to convert up to five basic level EMT positions to Paramedics if the need should arise as result of Paramedic training.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion.

Ms. Doucett reiterated to be sure everyone understood that the approval of this request will have an impact on the upcoming FY2007-2008 budget by allowing the EMS Coordinator to send additional EMTs to training so they can go ahead and become Paramedics. She said this was necessary as registration will occur prior to the FY2007-2008 budget approval process.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Ms. Summers
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Kinard

Mr. Derrick                      Mr. Davis  
Mr. Jeffcoat

**Public Works, B. Derrick, Chairman - Paving a Portion of Vera Road - Public Works - Mr. Derrick** reported the Public Works Committee met on Tuesday, October 24, 2006, to consider a staff recommendation regarding paving of a portion of Vera Road.

Mr. John Fechtel, Director of Public Works, stated Vera Road was approved by Council for paving in 1994 as one of thirteen (13) projects the Delegation had requested; however, subsequent funding was delayed as a result of right-of-way problems: approximately 400 feet of the road is located within railroad right-of-way. Mr. Greg Force, one of the property owners on Vera Road, requested that County Council reconsider paving the 1,050 feet of the 1,450 feet that is unpaved. Mr. Force also included a “fact sheet” describing the commercial growth and use of this road and indicated the property owners on the west side of Vera Road have agreed to give the additional right-of-way necessary (a total of 50 feet).

Based on staff’s review, Public Works recommends that Council approve the request. Mr. Fechtel said with a relatively short distance (1,050 feet), the County can provide the labor and equipment. Material cost of approximately \$25,000 is available in the “C” Fund Economic Development Budget (account #2700-12301-539900).

The Public Works Committee voted to recommend to full Council that the 1,050 feet on Vera Road be paved and funds for the project be allocated from the Economic Development “C” Funds.

Mr. Derrick made a motion, seconded by Mr. Keisler to approve staff’s recommendation that the the 1,050 feet on Vera Road be paved and funds for the project be allocated from the Economic Development “C” Funds.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Derrick stated this project continues to be some of the roads that the Lexington County Delegation passed to the County (Lexington County Transportation Committee) in 1994 and Council is working to fulfil those unfilled obligations.

In Favor:      Mr. Cullum                      Mr. Derrick  
                    Mr. Keisler                      Mr. Kinard  
                    Mr. Davis                        Ms. Summers  
                    Mr. Jeffcoat

**Access Options for the Proposed Estates of Persimmon Hill Subdivision - Public Works - Mr. Derrick** reported this item was tabled during the afternoon committee meeting.

**Solid Waste Landfill, J. Kinard, Chairman - Staffing at Waste Collection Stations - Solid Waste Management - Mr. Kinard** reported during the afternoon, the Solid Waste Landfill Committee met to consider a new contract with Industrial Services, Division of Babcock Centers to

continue providing staffing at nine of the County's collection stations. The current contract expires November 30, 2006. Mr. Kinard said the new contract agreement is for \$445,500 fixed for five years and seven months. This will allow the contract to be concurrent with the County's fiscal year. A yearly CPI adjustment will be made for years six through ten.

Mr. Kinard made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat to approve the new contract with Industrial Services, Division of Babcock Centers.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Kinard
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Davis	Ms. Summers
	Mr. Keisler	

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - Mr. Derrick made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kinard to enter into Executive Session to discuss contractual and legal matters.

Mr. Cullum stated Executive Session will consist of seven contractual matters and six legal matters.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Kinard	Mr. Davis
	Ms. Summers	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

Mr. Cullum reconvened the meeting in open session.

**Matters Requiring a Vote as a Result of Executive Session** - Mr. Cullum stated Council was only able to receive the contractual matters during the Executive Session and reported there were no motions to be considered.

**6:00 P.M. - Public Hearings - Zoning Map Amendment M06-12 - West Side of Charter Oak Road Between US 1 and US 378** - Mr. Cullum stated the purpose of the hearing is to receive feedback in support or in opposition to the application for zoning change. He asked that each speaker provide their name and mailing address and that comments be limited to three (3) minutes. He asked that if there was anyone present who had signed up to speak but chose not to speak, but wanted to concur with what had been said, it was acceptable to indicate concurrence. Mr. Cullum added that no one would be denied the opportunity to speak. Mr. Cullum also asked that there be no disruptions including cheering, clapping, etc.

Mr. Cullum opened the public hearing and recognized Mr. Bruce Hiller, Development Administrator, Community Development.

Mr. Hiller stated that the applicant Mr. Reggie Enlow has requested a change in zoning classification for property located on the west side of Charter Oak Road between U.S. Hwy. 1 and

U.S. Hwy. 378 from Restrictive Development (RD) to Intensive Development (ID). He stated that Mr. Enlow indicated on the application that the reason for the request is to reduce the buffer restrictions for a proposed office complex and craft storage area. Mr. Hiller reviewed the maps and area by using a Power Point presentation.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for comments from those in opposition to Zoning Map Amendment M06-12.

Mr. Cullum stated that no one had signed to speak in opposition of Zoning Map Amendment M06-12 and asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in opposition.

No response. Mr. Cullum closed that portion of the hearing.

Mr. Cullum opened the hearing for those in favor of Zoning Map Amendment M06-12.

**Mr. Mike Brown, Charter Oaks, Lexington, SC 29072** - I am in favor with no comment.

Mr. Cullum stated no one else had signed to speak in favor and asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak.

No response. Mr. Cullum closed that portion of the hearing.

Mr. Cullum closed the public hearing.

**Zoning Map Amendment M06-13 - Brittany II Subdivision** - Mr. Cullum opened the public hearing and recognized Mr. Bruce Hiller, Development Administrator, Community Development.

Mr. Hiller stated that the applicant Mr. Fred Driscoll, Homeowners' Association President, has requested a change in zoning classification of Brittany II Subdivision from High-Density Residential (R3) to Low-Density Residential (R1). He stated that Mr. Driscoll indicated on the application that the reasons are: (1) Foremost it was the desire to keep Brittany II the way it has been for the past 15 years and not allow the rampant growth taking place around Brittany II to affect the current environment of the subdivision, (2) It would bring the zoning inline with the adjacent subdivision of Brittany Place, (3) The current homes per acre are typical of R1 versus R3 and no changes in the current subdivisions plots would have to be made, and (4) This change would not affect the Selwood property currently being developed C2 and R1.

Mr. Hiller said one of the major differences is that under Residential Detached you are allowed in R1, R2, and R3. Residential Attached (2) is not allowed in R1 and Residential Attached (3) or more is not allowed in an R1. He said when you look at the existing situation then we go with the more restrictive when you have zoning district versus a street classification. In this case, R3 would allow 20 dwelling units per gross acre, however, the streets in there are zoned local which brings it back down to a maximum allowed eight dwelling units per acre. He said to take it from an R3 to R1, again it reverses this situation, because local streets would be eight dwelling units per acre, but if it goes to R1, then the more restrictive would be four dwelling units per acre. Mr. Hiller reviewed the

maps and area by using a Power Point presentation.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for comments from those in opposition to Zoning Map Amendment M06-13.

Mr. Cullum stated that no one had signed to speak in opposition of Zoning Map Amendment M06-13 and asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in opposition.

No response. Mr. Cullum closed that portion of the hearing.

Mr. Cullum opened the hearing for those in favor of Zoning Map Amendment M06-13.

Mr. Cullum stated no one else had signed to speak in favor of Zoning Map Amendment M06-13 and asked is there was anyone to speak.

No response. Mr. Cullum closed that portion of the hearing.

Mr. Cullum closed the public hearing.

**Ordinance 06-17 - An Ordinance Approving the Option and Contract for the Sale of Certain Real Property from the County of Lexington to Agri-Ethanol Products, LLC** - Prior to opening the Public Hearing, Mr. Cullum stated that a few council members would like to address the audience. Mr. Cullum opened the floor to Mr. Jeffcoat.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated, I would like to first of all thank everybody for being here. I am the chairman of the Economic Development Committee and work very closely with companies that try to locate in the County. We don't let everybody come in the County that want to come. We have some people that we would like to come, that don't come, so it's kind of a mix a lot of times in dealing with the industry that would like to come or that we would like for them to be here.

I want to tell you that I appreciate all the correspondence that I have gotten from many of you. I was kind of surprised to see how many people have, just in recent years, moved into your area. It was quite interesting to see the number of people that have moved in from the different areas of the country to go into the Batesburg/Leesville area. Many of you, most of you mentioned the quality of life that you enjoy there and just want to let you know that, I'm sure you already know this, but the reason you enjoy that quality of life is because people like your council representative, Mr. Derrick. His family has been there for generations and they have certainly looked after the property and have obviously, the entire time they've been there for generations, had quality of life in mind when they made any move at all in the County as far as changes and we're very careful. I can tell you that you are represented very well, which obviously you know that because you just recently reelected Mr. Derrick by a right sizeable margin, I might add, and we are proud to have him here on the County Council with us. I've worked with Mr. Derrick now for about eight years fairly close. We don't always agree, but we seem to always get along, which is very important.

Tonight we are simply gathering information. We would like to hear from you. This is a little bit

unusual the way that this proposal has come about. We haven't offered this company anything as far as incentives go. Normally, if you are talking about an investment the size that these people are talking about, \$200 million, you would expect that we would have offered them quite an incentive package to locate in the County. To date, we haven't really done that. They would like to look at us and we would like to look at them. We don't have a lot of information about them at this point. We intend to have a lot of information before we make a final decision. And even if we decide to, final word is that we are going to let them take an option on that property and let them check the property out, that does not mean a thing except that we are still interested and that they are interested. We are not going to do anything that is going to cause any harm to the environment. I don't think there is a single person on this Council that would tell you that their intent is to do anything to get a dollar invested in Lexington County. We have already had those experiences. Not this particular Council, but we have had to deal with some of the moves that prior Councils have made; not always pleasant. We feel like we have learned quite a bit by our mistakes and we are ever mindful of those lessons that we've learned. We are always willing to bring in a good healthy company that can increase the quality of life, bring in good jobs, stimulate the economy. Those are things we're looking for. Things we are not looking for are companies that come in and destroy our quality of life, put our lives in danger, put our lakes and streams in danger, and in anyway cause harm to our groundwater. Just want you to know that we're all aware of that. And many of your different letters and faxes that I received, it seems that you want to make sure that we are aware and everyone of us up here, I can tell you, that's priority. We want to make sure that whatever we do that it's going to be best for you and your family and to protect the value of your property. We don't want to do anything that will cause you to lose value of your property and we want you to continue to enjoy a good quality of life and if anything that we do, we hope that it will enhance that quality of life. I appreciate you listening and Mr. Chairman, thank you for the time.

Mr. Cullum stated that he would like to reiterate a few things that Mr. Jeffcoat said. We are assembling our facts and that is simply put. This is a fact gathering exercise here, which we are going to use. It is a very important part of what we do in Economic Development because we do want to have the ability for a company, regardless of what type of industry they are or who they are, we want them to understand that they are going to fit in with our community. There are people in this room that I'm sure that represent four, five, six generations of folks that have lived right here in Lexington County and we are fully cognizance of that and we just want to be sure that we get a proper fit.

Mr. Cullum opened the Public Hearing for those in opposition of Ordinance 06-17.

#### **IN OPPOSITION:**

**Mayor James E. Wiszowaty, 257 Summerland Ave., Batesburg, SC 29006** - I am the mayor, businessman, resident of Batesburg/Leesville. But I agree with what Johnny said, you are a true gentleman. We just reelected you and a true friend and we have agreed but disagreed before, just recently. But, what I want to say, personally I'm not opposed to an ethanol plant. I think we rely on fossil fuel way too much. I'm not opposed to an ethanol plant. I am opposed to an ethanol plant at this site. And it's not because, you go to the website and you see them blowing up and you go to the website and you see this and you see that. And there are a couple of issues that ground water is a big issue. And what I did my due diligence on Saturday and Sunday and Monday morning, I went around after church on Sunday and I sat down with people around the park. Most of the people don't

even vote for me. They are out of the city limits because the park is barely in the city limits so I went down Diamond Lane, talked to people in Little Creek and their concern, of course, is ground water. Mainly ground water because they have lack of it now. Some of the wells are 36 feet deep. But, their main concern, and I'm going to keep it real short because I can go on all night, is the human factor. What I call the human factor. You go to their house and you sit down on their couch and you walk out on their porch and the first thing a few of them said to me is, Wiz, would you like that across from your house? No, I wouldn't. I wouldn't want to walk out on my front porch where there is a field there now, used to be a peach field for 35 years, some of those people lived there and now they are going to put an ethanol plant on it. And that's all I'm going to say is the human factor. I'm not worried about the safety; I've talked to our fire department, which is one of the best in the County, if not in the state, and they don't have any safety issues with it because of fire regulations.

The other fact is that I'm not opposed to an ethanol plant that I do have an alternate site, which is 2 ½ miles on the other side of Batesburg, which it conforms with the area out there toward Amick's Feed Mill and Columbia Farms. It has 3,092 feet of rail for a rail spur. It already has a 10 inch well with good water and a pond and it is conducive to what would work perfect. Although, Lexington County wouldn't get the tax dollars, we would still get the jobs. One hundred jobs close to Batesburg/Leesville. We would still get water revenues because we supply Monetta with water. So we can cover all the angles there. And I just think it is more conducive to what we would like to see there. And my other proposal is that I, too, can bring you an option for that property and a check for \$500,000 to turn it into a residential development of somewhere between 150 - 200 homes, which is guaranteed tax dollars for the town, water and sewer revenues, and impact fees for our community and clean living. And that's all that I really have to say and I know you guys will make the right decision for us because we've got a great councilman and we've got a great Lexington County Council, and I appreciate that.

**Ms. Rita Crapps, 324 West Columbia Ave., Batesburg, SC 29006** - Mr. Chairman and members of Council. I am Rita Crapps and I have lived my entire life in Batesburg/Leesville. I was chatting with Smokey earlier today; I have known Smokey and Billy since way before County Council days. My purpose here tonight is a moral dilemma. As an elected official of Batesburg/Leesville, I never want to turn down the opportunity for economic development. But, there is always a but. With the sale of the Rose property to Agri-Ethanol, I must put the political part of me aside and look at the family aspect. This property, the Rose property, is absolutely adjacent to my brother and sister-in-law. I can throw a rock across the highway to where my mother-in-law lives. There is absolutely nothing in this world that I want to happen to these people that I care so much for. When you look at this room full of people, these are all family friends, we are elected by family and friends and I feel compelled to stand here as a representative of the family and friends that put us in office. I'm not necessarily in the vein as Mayor Wiszowaty in saying that I don't have a problem with an ethanol plant. I am not completely sold on the prospect, whether it is in Batesburg/Leesville, whether it's in Saluda County, or whether it moves out to Kansas City. There are a lot of environmental issues to be taken into consideration. There are a lot of health issues. They don't have a neighborly rapport with communities, with houses in the adjacent areas. There are millions of studies, everybody can go online and read any kind of information you want; good, bad, indifferent and we never know what is legitimate and what is not. Personally, I will not support an ethanol plant, period, until I can visit one exactly like the one that is to be constructed and I keep telling people I want to be able to see it,

I want to feel it, I want to touch it, and I want to taste it before I have a warm and fuzzy feeling about it. I hope that you will very seriously consider or reconsider the sale of the property. Again to reiterate, ethanol is not neighbor friendly. There are a lot of people that live within a half mile radius of where this proposed site is to be. There are a lot better things in Batesburg/Leesville that we can do with 175 acres that would be a greater tax benefit to the community and to the County than a single ethanol plant. When we lost Burlington Industries many years ago, it all but broke Batesburg/Leesville. Now granted that Agri-Ethanol will not employ the same number of people as Burlington did, but businesses come and businesses go. If they spend \$200 million on this facility and decide five or ten years down the line, it's not working out, we're going to close the facility down, look what we are left with. If Batesburg/Leesville and Lexington County had an ugly ordinance, well that would solve the problem right off the bat because Agri-Ethanol would not be allowed to build. But, if they left, we would be left with this shell of a facility that is not pretty by anybody's stretch of any imagination. In my humble opinion, 175 acres is a whale of a tract for a lot of homes. I think we would get greater tax revenue, we would get greater service from citizens shopping in our local businesses than we would from one single plant that will employ maybe 70 people. I thank you for your time. Billy, I thank you for all you do for Batesburg/Leesville. You are a wonderful asset and I deeply appreciate you. Thank you very much.

**Ms. Darlene Grice, 1618 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose without comment.

**Mr. Ronald Grice, 1618 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose without comment.

**Ms. Julianne Rawls, P.O. Box 3616, Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose, but I concur with everything Rita Crapps just said.

**Mr. Jimmy Rawls, 644 E. Columbia Ave., Leesville, SC 29070** - Same here. I agree to support Rita's statement.

**Mr. Robert Cook, 123 Hollow Lane, Leesville, SC 29070** - Mr. Chairman and members of County Council, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you about this. I am opposed to this proposed ordinance. I live at 123 Hollow Lane which is in the Little Creek Subdivision, which actually if you, the County has a terrific economic development website which includes some aerial photographs of the proposed area and to orient you a little bit, that's my house right there (pointing to a map), within a half mile, as a crow flies, from where this proposed plant would be. I think or I expect that you will have more people talk to you about some of the environmental concerns that they have in the health concerns and the family concerns and I share all those and that's part of the reason why I'm opposed to this. But, I would like an opportunity to take a bit of a different take in that I've looked at the option contract that the ordinance would approve, and I've looked at the purchase contract that the ordinance would approve, and I'm concerned that the County Council, this is the time you have maximum leverage with Agri-Ethanol. They want this property, but unfortunately other than a very strangely low price, no conditions have been placed by the County Council with regard to the purchase of this property. There is talk about a certain number of jobs that will be created. There is talk about a certain amount of money that will be invested but there are no contingencies in the option that any of those things come to fruition or actually be provided by Agri-Ethanol. I think more tellingly, there is absolutely no contingency in the option or the contract that

this be used for an ethanol plant. They are buying this property in fee simple to use however they want to and there is absolutely no legal binding commitment that is being undertaken by Agri-Ethanol to do anything in particular with this property. Obviously, however, I think it's clear that they do want to buy this for the purpose of an ethanol plant. What concerns me, also, about the proposed contract is, County Council in paragraph 12 of that proposed contract, has seen fit to specifically address the proposed in environmental harm by this. The County, if this goes through, has included within this contract, specific protections that Agri-Ethanol will indemnify it for personal injury, for property damage, and all sorts of losses that would occur, and these are the words in the contract when the buyer, Agri-Ethanol, brings onto the property hazardous substances and toxic substances and the point is, I congratulate whoever drafted that for County Council because that was certainly a prudent thing to include within the contract. But if it is good enough to include within the contract for the County Council, I don't understand why not more has been done by County Council to ensure that those things don't happen to the people that aren't a part of this deal but are going to suffer the results of this deal. I think the only prudent thing to do is to step back from this, as Councilman Jeffcoat said, there really isn't a lot known about this at this point. However, once you allow them to execute that option and ya'll approve it, you don't have a legal option at that point. You've got to sell it to them if they come up with the purchase price. And I think it would only be prudent to step back from this and reconsider what you have done because there is a lot of community opposition to this and I think you will find that it is soundly based. And it's not anti-business and it's not anti-growth; it's anti- this specific business in this specific location. Thank you.

**Ms. Nancy S. Shealy, 1959 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose without comment.

**Mr. Charles E. Shealy, 1959 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose without comment.

**Ms. Gloria S. Adams, 732 Devils Backbone Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose without comment.

**Ms. Minnie G. Hughes, 222 Little Creek Dr., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose without comment.

**Mr. Walter Hughes, 222 Little Creek Dr., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose.

**Ms. Sarah Brunson, 4355 Pond Branch Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - Oppose without comment.

**Master James Eidson, 343 Little Creek Dr., Leesville, SC 29070** - This is James and I am Martin on the next line and we oppose.

**Mr. Martin Eidson , 343 Little Creek Dr., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose.

**Ms. Barbara Sandes, 115 Fair Ave., Batesburg, SC 29006** - I oppose.

**Ms. Patricia Hinderbrandt, 306 Delmar Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - I agree with what Rita Crapps said.

**Mr. Jeff Rikard, 3079 Windmill Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose with no comment.

**Mr. Marde Rikard, 228 Breezy Hill Rd., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose.**

**Ms. Ginger Scurry, 6647 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose without comment.**

**Mr. W.H. Scurry, 6647 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070 - Oppose.**

**Ms. Barbie Rodgers, 205 S. East Ave., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose without comment.**

**Ms. LeeAnn Shealy, 241 Crosson St., Leesville, SC 29070 - Not available when called upon to speak.**

**Mr. Wilbert Adams, 1227 Truex Rd., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose.**

**Ms. Cindy Grandy, 120 Hollow Lane, Leesville, SC 29070 - Oppose with no comment.**

**Ms. Sandra P. Shayes, 2245 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose with no comment.**

**Ms. Kristi Eidson, 343 Little Creek Dr., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose. I concur with all that has been said before me.**

**Mr. Rembert Waters, 2439 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070 - Oppose with no comment.**

**Ms. Joan H. Waters, 2439 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070 - Oppose with no comment.**

**Mr. D. C. Rikard, Jr., 224 Breezy Hill Rd., Leesville, SC 29070 - Oppose with no comment.**

**Mr. Gregory S. Rikard, 3111 Windmill Rd., Leesville, SC 29070 - Not available when called to speak.**

**Ms. Brenda Howard, 247 Little Creek Rd., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose and I agree with Rita Crapps.**

**Mr. Arthur Howard, 247 Little Creek Rd., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose.**

**Ms. Mary Ann Zagorsler, 336 N. Lee St., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose.**

**Mr. Dean Rodgers, 205 S. East Ave., Batesburg, SC 29006 - Oppose, no comment.**

**Ms. Ola M. Price, 2305 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose with no comment.**

**Ms. Debbie Colleen, 126 Little Creek Court, Leesville, SC 29070 - I oppose.**

**Mr. Wade H. Spradley, 6557 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070 - Oppose, but if anyone wants to visit one, it will go into operation in Richland (?) North Dakota within the next sixty days.**

**Ms. Margaret Spradley, 6557 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070** - Oppose with no comment.

**Ms. Ojetta Williams, 317 Brodie Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - I have been a citizen here for about 47 years. In March of last year, I was diagnosed with breast cancer and my concern here is about the chemicals that would be coming in with that plant and I know that studies have been done and I read some things about the chemicals that come along with that plant and it could be a contributing factor to cancer and in our area we have a lot of people, I don't have the number, but I know there are a lot of people, that have gone through this. And I am in opposition of that plant coming there because I think about the quality of life for me, the citizens there, my children, and my grandchildren and I would just ask that Council would reconsider the sell of that property.

**Mr. Herman Smith, 117 Carmel Ct., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose with no comment.

**Mr. Jerry Brunson, 4355 Pond Branch Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - Oppose with no comment.

**Ms. Lisa Corder Koon, 343 Mabus Rd., Batesburg, SC 29006** - One of the reasons I'm here is my father lives at 106 Carmel Court and if you have any of the plats you will see that he can stand on his front porch and throw a rock and touch the property that this plant would be built on. There are a lot of concerns and I've heard a lot of them brought up tonight, one about the water supply. Like I said, I don't want to tell my age but 40 plus years I have lived in this community. My father has lived on the property or in that vicinity for 30 plus years. Water has always been a problem in that area. That's one of his concerns. Property value, my father built this home in this location because it's peaceful, it's quiet; we've never had problems, but he raised two kids by himself and his thing was to build the property that when he passed away he had something to leave to his kids. His concern is after all these years of investment that property going down in value. I'm sure each one of you can picture if you can walk out your front door and you look, would you want to see that every morning when you get up and the potential down the road if there are fumes or if there are spills who will buy that property. That's a big concern in our neighborhood and I'm sure I'm speaking for anyone that lives on that stretch of highway. Traffic issues, trucks in and out, what type of traffic. I was at the last meeting. My biggest concern is, and I believe Councilman Jeffcoat mentioned that, that you don't have a lot of information. My question is, when do we get the information? How do we get it as citizens? Who's going to give us the facts, true facts? I understand internet is a tool that we can use, but my concern there is I can put any blog on there, I can put any website, and put anything I want. I need facts; EPA, DHEC, someone. I know there was a mention of someone said that they would possibly fly people to a plant. I will volunteer, pay my own fees, if I have need to. I would like to go on that committee as someone to represent that community to bring back the facts. That's our main concern.

One last thing of my question is, there's going to be chemicals there. Is our town prepared or do we have the hazmat potential that if an explosion, a chemical spill, do we have the proper things in place in our town to respond in a timely manner that would not affect people that live a rock's throw away that could cause them harm, death, or long-term illnesses. And I concur with the Mayor and ones that went before me and I oppose this measure.

**Mr. Billy Corder, 106 Carmel Ct., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose with no comment.

**IN FAVOR:** As Mr. Gummerson had to leave early to attend a school board meeting, Mr. Cullum allowed Mr. Gummerson to speak before leaving.

**Mr. William Gummerson, 610 Skyline Dr., Leesville, SC 29070** - First I want to thank the Council for the opening remarks, the fact that you are going to do due diligence in what you are doing. I, too, have concerns but I also have a concern that if you don't move forward and do due diligence at the same time, that a larger issue will be that businesses that were thinking about locating or coming to Batesburg/Leesville may think twice in terms whether or not you are open-minded and at least examining it. I have environmental concerns; I have esthetic concerns. My home is less than two miles away. But, I have yet to really get all the facts to see, when I weigh things, which is the best way to go. So I hope that you will move forward but do what the councilman said at the beginning with due diligence and be public about what those things are and hopefully we will have a good outcome. Thank you.

### **Opposition**

**Mr. B. Ray Hayes, 2245 Broad St., Leesville, SC 29070** - Oppose with no comment.

**Ms. Patricia W. Shealy, 4704 Pond Branch Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose.

**Mr. Clyde Waters, 231 Diamond Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose with no comment.

**Mr. Frankie Lawson, 6547 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose and agree with the statements that have already been made.

**Mr. Ted Lawson, 6547 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose.

**Ms. Harriet M. Crapps, 6436 Augusta Hwy., Leesville, SC 29070** - I oppose. I appreciate the opportunity to come here tonight and I deeply appreciate being afforded this opportunity to speak on the sell of property to Agri-Ethanol. My name is Harriet Crapps, I live at 6436 Augusta Hwy. where my husband and I built our home and reared our children over fifty plus years ago. My husband, Ed Crapps, and I owned and operated several successful businesses during our adult life. We are life-long residents of the Batesburg/Leesville area. Let it first be known that I am greatly for growth and development in Lexington County and especially in Batesburg/Leesville. With great joy I have seen our little towns grow, consolidate and become an area loved by many. I understand that Batesburg/Leesville is ready for great things and new developments. Continued growth will come. I am aware of the federal mandate for alternate fuel sources to move our nation's dependence from fossil fuels. That is why we have this current dilemma. You are posed to have a third and final reading on the sell of 100 plus acres of property to Agri-Ethanol for an ethanol production facility. This facility would be located directly adjacent to property that my husband and I gave to our daughter, Cathy Crapps and her husband, Victor. Ed and I built this home for them and they and their children live there. We felt it at the time of construction that we were building a home for them in a safe and family-friendly location close to us. I own 20 acres adjacent to the property on which the Burkett home was built. I also own 20 acres across the highway from where my home is located. I am grievously concerned about the impact an ethanol production facility will have on our quality of life. We have lived a quiet life in the county. It is my understanding that ethanol facilities do not

make friendly neighbors. The end product of an ethanol production requires for alcohol to be mixed with gasoline. This will mean that mass quantities of gasoline must be stored on site. The explosive and destructive power of gasoline alone is enormous. One gallon of gasoline has explosive power of 30 sticks of dynamite. I won't even begin to contemplate that ethanol potential of thousands of gallons of raw alcohol. Ground contamination from this sort of endeavor is also alarming. We have ponds on our properties that would be downstream from this site. We have livestock that use these ponds for drinking water. The consequences of ground contamination are far reaching and devastating. I won't even get into the numerous issues surrounding air quality. Bio-scrubbers work and bio-scrubbers fail. Yet, even in their failure, we must be able to breathe. Oops is never the answer when systems fail. Agri-Ethanol claims this new facility is to be state of the art. What does that mean? Have any of you personally seen an ethanol plant in production? Has anyone talked to people that live around them? To me, new and improved is a marketing strategy that means change the package and rename the product. Open the package and you still have the same old product, just a fancy new box. Look at Columbia Farms in Leesville, it is supposed to be state of the art facility, but it still smells on any given day. It is my desire to leave my properties to my daughter and grandchildren and not anytime soon, I might add. I want a wonderful legacy to leave these young people. If County Council stays this course, my grandchildren will inherit real estate that has become devalued as a result of an ethanol plant. No one can sit here in good conscience and tell me that this sort of facility will have any sort of positive impact on property value. Of course, the County will continue wanting my fair share of property tax money from me, but if in the near future, if I decided to develop some of this acreage, marketing it would be a nightmare. Who would want to buy and build within several hundred yards of an ethanol plant? Would you truly be willing to live next door to one? I am not. I beg Council to abandon the idea of selling the Rose property to Agri-Ethanol. I know that Lexington County might not make the \$500,000 profit from the sell, but what is more important to you as family men and lady? Is it the love of money, or the love of family, or the quality of living? Let's find some other form of like industry that is more neighbor friendly for this area. Thank you for listening and for your thoughtful consideration.

**Mr. V. R. Burkett, 194 Carmel Ct., Leesville, SC 29070** - How do I follow-up on what my mother-in-law said? I am the brother-in-law that Ms. Crapps, Rita, spoke about a little while ago. My property borders this same property and I can't say any more than what Rita said and what my mother-in-law has already said. Other than, I oppose.

**Ms. Cathy C. Burkett, 194 Carmel Ct., Leesville, SC 29070** - Oppose and my mom said enough for me.

**Mr. Barry Duvall, 349 Maiden Ave., Leesville, SC 29070** - I concur with the previous speaker.

**Ms. Kim Duvall, 349 Maiden Ave., Leesville, SC 29070** - I would just like to say that I concur with what everyone else has said before me. And I would like to reiterate what Mr. Cook said in that if you approve the sell of this land to Agri-Ethanol, at that point there is no real estate clause that they can go ahead and put this plant there and clearly there are a lot of concerns about environmental impact, things like that nature. But, like so many others before me have said, our primary concern is for the town itself and having an ethanol plant located right at the entrance of town, even if there were absolutely no emissions, no chemicals, no \_\_\_\_\_, just the mere site of a huge chemical plant

located right as you enter town, it's going to put a stigma on our town and it is going to inhibit future growth and that area is so much more conducive to a residential development rather than a big industrial plant that, I think the Mayor's proposition that this land be taken out of consideration for the ethanol plant and that we seek a developer who would use this for a residential development or even some other light industrial or other commercial type property than an ethanol plant would be much better suited further away from such a large residential area and I would ask that you take serious consideration of all these matters before you and that you would vote not to sell this land to Agri-Ethanol.

**Mr. Pete Hilderbrandt, 306 Delmar Rd., Leesville, SC 29070** - Yes, I pretty much agree with everything that has been said here tonight. I'm a freelance writer and I write for a lot of different magazines and one of the biggest magazines I write for is called *Distributed Energy* out of Santa Barbara, California. And I have written a lot of stories for them over the past few years and in the course of my writing for them, I have learned a lot about, all kinds of different systems, and there's a lot of exciting stuff out there with energy. A lot of stuff that's clean and also that is maybe costly up front, but, in the long run it really pays off. My editor, John Trotty (?), will not take an article from me about anything with ethanol. He just blows me off with that. There's nothing out there in that area that he is interested and the magazine, *Distributed Energy*, is about energy, alternative energy that is off the grid and that is working for a lot of people all around the country. I just did an article about the largest solar development in North America in a place in Sacramento, California. And what's being done out there is really incredible and there is a lot of other stuff that can be done in this area and I would be glad to offer my services in contacting other people around the country that could maybe bring something in that's maybe a little more environmentally friendly and maybe more of the people in the surrounding area would be happier with. I don't get too many good vibes right now from the people here, but maybe some other people are going to speak, but thanks for your time.

**Mr. Neal Pruter, 231 Main St., Leesville, SC 29070** - Oppose. My house was built in 1897. I have a little bit different slant than most of these folks here have. I'm not six generations back. I am new money. My wife is rich, I am poor, but I'm lucky. That's why we can pump all that money in my house. Ya'll may have noticed that I've got a new front porch, that's because I fell through the old one and almost lost my leg, that's no joke. We are there because we want to be there. We can live anywhere we want to live and guess what my wife wants to do, she wants to come live where ya'll live. She wants to come to the gridlock. She wants to come to Lexington now. She doesn't want to live where there's going to be a gasoline factory. We're not going to live where there's a gasoline factory. We are not. And, that doesn't mean anything because I promise you, you will see me again, because if we don't live there, we will be living around ya'll somewhere because she wants to come live in a new house. But, I want to live where I live. Twenty years ago, because I'm new money, I've only been there 20 years ago. Twenty years ago, I got to that town by luck and now I live in an old house, and I love that old house, and I love where I live, and I love my neighbors. A lot of them don't know me, but I love them. And I've done a little something else, too. I've done a little research about, not ethanol, about this company. I figured it must be a scientist that is going to run it or something like that. No, it's a real estate man from Raleigh with some bad financial history. I'm not here to defame him or them; I'm just saying this to you. When Archer Daniels Midland wants to come and build an ethanol plant and they built 60 before and they want to build a state of

the art, let's listen; I still don't want it in my town. I'm still not going to live there. But, we don't know a lot about this company but what I read and what I know in the time that I have spent looking in the last few days, this ain't some big established ethanol factory, ethanol company. These are, how many people? How many people do you think they have in their company? Three or four hundred? Four. Four, led by a real estate developer. So, let's just make the right decision and I'm going to live here no matter what, be fearful, 'cause I may be living close to ya'll and you will think I don't need this, let him stay out there in the country, but I love where I live and I love the people that I live around and I'm going to stay there as long as I can, but I am not living in a little town with a gasoline factory. Thank you.

**Senator Jake Knotts, Senate District 23, 500 West Dunbar Rd., West Columbia, SC 29169 -**

Thank you Council for allowing me to come tonight and speak. I spoke with a lot of these people here over the last couple of days. Basically, had to do a lot of cramming to find out a little bit about what was going on up in that area along with this. And I appreciate the job you do, Johnny, with trying to bring in industry and appreciate the job each and every one of you face trying to bring in industry to South Carolina.

But, the reason I'm here tonight, is with what little bit I've been able to get, with the help of Earl Hunter at DHEC, with the help of the internet, with the help of my secretary for two days now, that's been cramming as much information about this company and this industry that she could possible get, I've come to the conclusion at this point and time, I think it would be a very bad idea for us to just up and openly give an option on a company, like the gentleman before said, we've got four employees. It is a L.L.C. A limited liability company. That means, basically, that the assets, if anything happens, the only thing you can get is the assets of that L.L.C. That's why people form L.L.C.s. You know, several years ago, we had Tin Products in Lexington County. And we tried our best at the time to convince County Council not to bring Tin Products in here. But for some reason, and I know most of you were not here when it happened, but we ended up with Tin Products. They left us with a mess. I spearheaded it to try to close them down to get the liability replaced by that company, in fact, some of them went to jail; went to jail. But, we still had to clean it at taxpayers' expense and we still had a long road to hoe to clean up our lakes, clean up our streams. In doing some due diligence, and I understand that these types of facilities use an extremely, a lot of water and they use ground water or lake water because it is very costly for them to put in a system to take the chlorine out of city water and besides that they can't afford to buy this amount of water that they need from city water. It's not like the water that the farmers use to spray their crops; it goes back into the ground and it's filtered back down into the water system. This water goes up into the air, evaporates. This is basically something that everybody here can relate to. It's an old liquor still. It's just a big liquor still and people been making liquor for years so it's not any new technology, it's just advanced technology. And to give an option to the land, to a real estate developer for the purchase of what they've stated, I'm sure that they've got good intentions. But, I think it needs to be tied down a lot more than that because with a L.L.C. they come here and destroy our community or leave us with something that we can't live with. We've got a plant that guess what we can't do with, we can only sell it to another ethanol plant or we can tear it down. I've talked to these people here and all of them I represent. They are really concerned and we are fortunate in Lexington County to have citizens like this that will show out, show up tonight in this magnitude with concern for their community. They have concern for their community. That's their livelihood. It's the most important

investment that they've got. In fact, there's a person sitting in the audience tonight that will write you a check next week for that land, because they want to make sure that it is in the best interest of the community and they feel so strongly about it, that they have made that commitment and I think that for someone to put his money on the plate like that, he is sincere about the community. And like they say, the due diligence that I've had it's going to take an awful lot of water out of the ground. Those people don't have that much water up there anyway. There is no public water system up there to amount to anything for them to immediately jump on, especially if there is a problem. You know, it's one of these things that if they have a spill, I was told that the problem with a lot of these locations, these places are at, and one is in Mississippi, from what I can understand, the closest one. And this company, by the way, has none in operation; they are just trying to get permitted now in North Carolina and then they want to come here and build one and then they want to go back to North Carolina and build one and then they want to come back to South Carolina and build one. But, the biggest danger that you've got to this type of facility is in the event of a spill into a stream, it immediately cuts the oxygen off and kills, hey you will have a fish kill and a stream that just can't handle anything. Livestock to get out of that stream, they can't drink it. And I got that information from DHEC and from the due diligence, what little bit I was able to get. But, I think you need to be very careful that we tie it down so that we don't come back with another Tin Products down the road when they are gone, some to jail, and some down in Florida in a resort. It still owes us \$10 million that DHEC has tried to collect on the fines that they have put on them. And LLC, all of you know what a LLC is, it is a limited liability corporation. Limited means the assets that that LLC's got and those LLCs can be set up individually by just, I'm sure they're not going to group all twenty of them that they plan to put together so you can go in and take the assets of all 20. They are smart businessmen. They are going to LLC one at a time and if they go down, only thing you've got is what's there. And that's not good for Lexington; that's not good for Saluda; that's not good for South Carolina. That's not good for anywhere unless you can tie it down where you are assured that if they have a problem, that our citizens are protected and they are protected wholly, not just a plant there, and the employees but the people around the community and us as a county and that we don't have to end up expending taxpayers' money. We have had our share, people, of environmental problems in this county that we have went after and tried to bring in good industry. We had one down on 321. We just got out from under the curtain on that. We have a landfill that we are cleaning up on 321. The AT&T metals down there. The Tin Products. We need to be very careful, very careful on this one to make sure that we don't have any problems that we can't foresee in the future and that we protect these people out here that came up here tonight because of their concern to let them be heard that they love their community and you heard the gentleman before me say, he loves the community. He is there because he loves it, but he's not going to live by an ethanol plant and if something goes wrong up there, you're going to have a ghost town. Because not only you're going to have an ethanol plant down, you're going to have problems. Thank you.

**Mr. David Davis, 151 Driftwood Dr., Lexington, SC 29072** - Whenever I'm here in the United States. I'm a missionary, normally, in Brazil and Brazil is one of the world's leaders in ethanol production. Twenty percent of the, whenever you buy gas, 20 percent is ethanol in Brazil. And most of the cars are flexed. Brazil is one of the world's leaders in ethanol production and technology. About forty minutes drive from our project for boys in Ouro Fino there is an ethanol plant, a humongous plant, and sugarcane just across the road from us goes to that plant to be processed. Most of ya'll have not had the opportunity, from what I've gathered, to ever go near an ethanol plant.

The closest similarity that I can explain to ya'll would be something that smells like a paper mill. And the smell carries like a paper mill. The ethanol plant near us, there in Brazil, was located in a good area, a couple of miles out from a city, which has a workforce for the plant, but it was located in the middle of nowhere, radius of one mile around the plant or more in most directions, two miles, of nothing but their sugarcane fields. Because it is not the kind of plant you want to live by. They bus the workers in everyday, three shifts a day. But, it is not something to live next to. It would be cheaper for the workers of that plant to live on site, but that's not the thing that even the workers want to do. So they are bused in everyday. So as an engineer, I'm for alternative fuels and getting more efficient, lowering pollution and everything and ethanol is a very clean burning fuel, but, everything needs to be sited in the best possible area and this type of plant, you build in the middle of nowhere. It needs to be near highways, near rail lines, etc. But, you don't build it near a population center. I have another engagement and if anyone wants to talk later.

Mr. Cullum stated there was no one else listed to speak in opposition of Ordinance 06-17 and, therefore, closed the meeting for those in opposition to speak.

Mr. Cullum opened the meeting for comments from those in favor of Ordinance 06-17.

**IN FAVOR:**

**Mr. Jerry McSwain, 410 Willis St., Batesburg, SC 29006** - Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jeffcoat, and rest of the Council, specifically Billy Derrick. I'm here tonight basically for the community master plan which we put together in 2002. Folks, I know a lot of you know me as Jerry McSwain, Chairman, Chambers of Commerce. I want to tell the Council that I may be crazy, but I'm not stupid and I'm not going to get up here against all these people and tell them how much I want this plant. I think we need jobs in Batesburg/Leesville regardless of, I think we need to look at this real hard. Billy, I'm sorry. I've heard things tonight that I did not know about and I truly would like to see everybody just step back, take a deep breath, and let's make sure we do what Senator Knotts and our Mayor and the other people .... We have got, folks, to do something with that. I do know that I've been in this capacity, the Chamber, since 2002. I know that there have been a lot of companies that have come through looking at that site. And folks, we haven't been able to give it away. Because there is no four-lane highway. But, we do have a spur, a railroad line going through there, which is a great asset for a company like Agri-Ethanol. But, you folks have got your jobs cut out for you. You got elected and ya'll are going to have to make some tough decisions and along with the people who live in Batesburg/Leesville. So, I just want to say thank you for what you do for our community.

**Ms. Cheryl Bates, 915 Grayfield Rd., Batesburg, SC 29006** - I stand here tonight in front of you and in front of many of my friends, my son's friends, their parents. My son plays soccer with these folks. He goes to school with a lot of the children here. My background that brings me before you, I was real excited when I heard about the possibility of an ethanol plant. I work for the Atlantic Regional Commission in Atlanta in the air quality division doing transportation planning dealing with the air quality emission violations there. I have worked for the Department of Energy as a consultant in the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Division promoting Rebuild America, which promotes a lot of clean technology in helping buildings come in compliance. I have a background working with different labs around the country, the Energy Efficiency Renewal Lab in West Virginia, Enrell (?) in Colorado. I have been around the block where these industries are

concerned and so my first thought was oh, this is really cool, what does it mean. And as I was starting to look at information a lot of people in this room were coming at me going "it's terrible, it's awful, it's an awful thing" and I said, huh, there's a lot of propaganda that says one in a lot that says the other. I went to the labs. I've talked to many of my former cohorts and workers there; I've gotten them to send many reports. I have been forwarding those reports to my city council members that I am in contact with and to Billy. The biggest stack that I got today, which we requested over a week ago, it dealt with the emissions. The difference between a cold-fired, a gas-fired, and an electric-fired plant, we just got some of that data in today. I have forwarded that on. I think ya'll were already in session around 2:30 when that came in. I do ask you to step back and look at the impact that it's going to have on the community, but I support Gummerson. We need to look at what our options are. The plants are much cleaner today. The emissions are nearly 25 percent lower on the plants that are being built now as what was being built 15 years ago. And I think a lot of the data that's being thrown out there right now is from older plants. I talked to a gentleman who lives in Iowa who lives in a town with a plant, he says ethanol "no problem." When they built the soybean plant, we had a problem, "it stinks." The new ethanol plants are much cleaner, they are much nicer, I do encourage you to visit them. But, I just want to be someone who says there are some good options here and I think we need to look at all of the data and not just the bad data and I do hope that Billy will forward those e-mails onto you all that I have been pulling out from the people at the Department of Energy and EPA to look at those.

**Mr. Dwight Davis, 137 Bethlehem Rd., Batesburg, SC 29006** - Like you Johnny, I've been extremely surprised by the reaction that we have gotten from this thing. The people that's in favor of it, even opposed, it looks like to me. I thought that this thing was going to be a slam dunk when I heard this thing. I said, "well this is a gift from God." My name is Dwight Davis, I live at 137 Bethlehem Rd., 53 years. I was born on Dr. McLean's, in the hospital, on #1 Highway. I've been here three generations. Been paying on the same land for three generations. Last 15 years of my life, I have devoted to improving the quality of life for the citizens of Lexington County by being either an associate commissioner or commissioner for the Lexington Conservation District, Soil and Water Conservation District. And, I'm proud to say, right now I'm the chairman. I don't know why in the world they made me the chairman, but I'm the chairman right now. And I am so proud of that group of people. It is one of the top, if not the top, conservation district in the state. And you can ask anybody in the state about Lexington Conservation District. We've got some magic going on over there. It's amazing to me the information that people can disseminate from this thing and it's like other people have said, apparently you can find anything you want to on the internet. The conservation districts nationwide, they have been at this thing for a good many years, renewable fuels. And my source of information is the USDA. I don't know whether ya'll believe that or not, but USDA is where I get my source and the Federal Agri-Research Service. And the bottom line how we get all these toxic ground water contaminants and all this stuff, let me tell ya'll what is at an ethanol plant. There's water and that water can be affluent from a wastewater treatment plant, thereby, taking away the, improving the environment that way. You can use the affluent from a wastewater treatment plan, corn or grain stock of some kind, yeast and heat. That's all that's at an ethanol plant. Maybe they've got some comet or something for the bathroom or something, I don't know. But, as far as Tin Products, and I don't know where all these hazardous chemicals come from, you do have to denature ethanol. Like I say, they do have to denature the stuff to keep folks from taking a sip from the tanker cars, I guess. And to denature it, they use gasoline. And my

understanding is they keep about as much gasoline as you do at an average service station or, at the most, what would be at one of the bulk plants that are in the town limits of Batesburg now. So there is your hazardous. That's the only hazardous thing at an ethanol plant, according to the USDA. Not a blog site, the USDA. And what you get out of that, what comes out of an ethanol plant is ethanol, distillers grain, which is this high quality feed that you can make animal feed, poultry feed, fish feed, it's a very high quality, high dollar item. That's what has made ethanol to become feasible economically here is that they have improved the quality of the distillers grain and can sell it at such a profit. And, CO<sub>2</sub>, and it's about an even split. You get a third ethanol, a third distillers grain, and a third of carbon dioxide. And the carbon dioxide is used to make dry ice. And they can sell it, too. Besides the benefits of burning ethanol in our automobiles and reducing the greenhouse gases, which it does a great job at, you've got a built-in thing in an ethanol plant that comes into the area. I'm real up on this at the conservation district. We are constantly fighting for green space in Lexington County. Trying to keep it attractive. And green space, if ya'll don't know what that is, that's fields and open land. Anytime you put an ethanol plant in, you may be saving a farmer, or you may be encouraging a farmer to plant more and have more green space. And I assume all you know that planted crops filter water; moderate temperatures; produce oxygen; store carbon, to keep the ozone layer from going way, all that stuff. Well, nobody puts a dollar figure on that or a meter on that yet, we're going to though one of these days. And like I say, even mentioning Tin Products into this thing is just ludicrous. Tin Products was a blatant conglomeration of some kind and they used some heavy metals and it was a criminal intentional dumping of some of these heavy metals into the sanitary sewers, what they did. And, ethanol, from what I understand, is one of the most heavily regulated from a DHEC standpoint and from the federal standpoint. They have to have and provide space for somebody from Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms 24 hours a day, in there, monitoring that stuff. New ethanol plants are, there are all sorts of safeguards built into them. Also, I know that everybody here, will all consume. What does your Honda get about three miles to the gallon? 5. Thumbs up on that. And believe it or not, folks, we live in a country called the United States of America and everybody in this room has got a moral responsibility when it comes to food and fuel. You may not want to take responsibility, but my momma didn't raise me that because something wasn't pleasing to my eye or pleasant to me, if I was going to consume it, I shared responsibility in that and that's the way I taught my children. You don't push the bad parts off on your neighbor and just saying not in my backyard, don't cut it with me. That's not what America is about to me. We've all got to have a change in attitude on that. And believe, you me, I am a chicken grower, I know. What it boils down to, according to everybody I have talked to, ethanol is a good idea whose time has come. It is just like my Volkswagen bus, my '78 Volkswagen bus, that's a good idea. And I don't know why they quit making them. But, ethanol is what we are facing, folks, whether we like it or not for the next 20 years at least, probably 30 until somebody is smart enough to figure out how to build a hydrogen generator or hydrogen fuel cell and then we will go to a hydrogen economy. That's what all the brains tell us. And another thing about ethanol, I personally don't want to see another son or daughter from Lexington County lose his life in the Middle East and you can pitch it however you want to, it's about oil over there and there's not one life worth a trillion gallons of oil. One American life worth a trillion gallons of oil to me. Every gallon of ethanol or viable alternative that we can produce and keep from buying petroleum based products, we all share responsibility in that, too. Talking on the world scale, I like to think globally and act locally. That's always been my motto. I heard that in a rock-n-roll song years ago. But, I personally don't want to see another building fall down in the main street section of Batesburg/Leesville. I was blessed to see

Batesburg/Leesville, unlike a lot of people here that are showing these concerns, I saw it in its prime and it was a thing to behold. I grew up at a magical time. We had four car dealerships, two movie theaters, anything you needed in the world you could buy in downtown Batesburg/Leesville and it was because of what someone else mentioned, we had Burlington Textiles. We had strong agri-economy around, too, and we had a good mixed economy. And I'm telling you, ya'll won't believe it, but people from Lexington and Columbia came to work in Batesburg. It was an economic giant. And it has broken my heart the last 30 years or so to see the decline that we have and you know, I have had enough. It's our turn, I think. And, from what I've learned, and I agree with what everything everybody said about we've got to do due diligence and we've got to make sure that this company is reliable and we do need to go and first hand see an ethanol plant. But, not one in Brazil, because I'm sure they don't have the same DHEC requirements we do. We need to see one in Iowa or in this country. Governor Tom Vilsack, I have talked with him personally and it's the best thing that has ever happened in his state. We have 112 ethanol plants in the United States of America, Iowa has 82 of them. They have grabbed this thing by the tail and they see a good thing coming. Of course, all of you know, that the octane booster MTBE, which was put in every gallon of gas to boost octane so your vehicle wouldn't spark or knock, has been banned in 25 states. Because after your car burns, it goes up into the air smog and it precipitates out and it's getting into the ground water. Well, half of the states in the country have banned it already. I don't think South Carolina is one of them but it's coming. Ethanol is the only viable alternative for that. That's why such a boom and such a rush right now, they cannot get enough. Anyhow, I'm not going to change anybody's mind, I'm sure I'm not. I do wish ya'll would get reliable information and don't, it's almost like echo-terrorism that work here. Unreliable information is like poison. It is just like poison. Try your best to get reliable information and the conservation district is open to you. That's what we are there for is unbiased reliable information and I've got some cards in my pocket if ya'll need any. I know there will be some concerns that will have to be addressed. This plant is not going here if it either can't use the affluent economically or it can't get a viable source of groundwater. It won't happen. But, you've got DHEC and DNR is going to check all that out. It's not going to happen without their approval. I can tell you that. You don't have to worry about that. And as far as emissions, the folks that I've talked to in Iowa and Washington State, the new plants, whether fired by electricity or natural gas, is near zero emissions. I know that the calling card for the opposition is a tall smokestack with miles of smoke coming out of it. That ain't a thing but heat. It's just like when you walk out on a frosty morning and say whew, that's what that is. Heat is condensing the moisture in the air around it. There's nothing in. It's time though for us to start thinking about becoming part of the solution instead of part of the problem. And I appreciate all of your time.

Mr. Cullum closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cullum said he wanted everyone to know that this Council does take this very seriously. We take every Economic Development prospect that comes to us very seriously and Mr. Jeffcoat also stated to you correctly that not everybody comes to Lexington County. And it's not because they can, but because sometimes we don't open the door. We are truly concerned about our environment, our community, and more importantly than anything, the people who live in our county. I think the rest of the Council has heard some of the good, maybe some of the bad, and I don't know yet if any of it is going to be ugly, but we definitely will give this thing some serious concern. There will no

property transfers until we are absolutely comfortable with the decision we've made, either which way. So, right now this information will be taken and digested in written form and we will get it back to review it. We will continue as a Council to work toward doing our due diligence. I think there is a planned trip for those who are on Council that would like to actually have the opportunity, I think someone had the opportunity to say they wanted to, I think Ms. Crapps, she wanted to see it, she wanted to smell it, and wanted to taste it. I don't know about all three of those, but I definitely want to be close enough that I can understand what it is.

Mr. Cullum opened the floor to Mr. Derrick for comments.

Mr. Derrick said it's really tough sitting up here Mr. Chairman hearing all my friends and neighbors and acquaintances being on one side of a situation and thinking that I'm on the other side of that same situation. I've told you before when we had the public meeting, and I'm at the same place right now that I was then. I'm not on anybody's side. At this point and time I'm on a fact gathering mission and I'm not going to stand before this Council and recommend that we do this thing or not do this thing without knowing what it is that I'm talking about we are doing or not doing. We've got to find out. We have been inundated with all this kind of information, each one of the Council members has with special interest literature that puts one spin on this thing. We have an industry, I think maybe a really good industry, that has offered an option on this piece of property that could be a real windfall for the community and jobs in tax base and a lot of other things. But, let it be clear, I wouldn't dare vote in favor of something that I found out something about. You know Tin Products has been mentioned several times tonight, can't even believe we put Tin Products in the same conversation with an ethanol plant, a liquor still, as the Senator put it. We are talking about all natural ingredients, all natural product versus Tin Products. That's just an universe apart. But, I hope that we will continue to have the opportunity to at least investigate it to the point where we can determine what it is that we think that it is good, bad, or indifferent.

Ms. Crapps, I heard everything you had to say and I totally .....I will just conclude by saying that if it is not absolutely trouble free, if I don't find an environment that is absolutely trouble free, and if I don't find people in and around any of these existing manufacturing plants that say, it's not a big deal, it's no problem, we haven't had any problems, we haven't had any smells, we haven't had any groundwater contamination, we haven't had any safety issues. If we don't find those kind of conditions that exist, I will be back here screaming to the top of my lungs to these guys to ask them to get on a rail, that they are talking about bringing all that corn in on and keep on going because we don't want you in Batesburg/Leesville. But, I just found out today and I didn't find this out to make any other point other than to ask, what the current assessed value is in the Town of Batesburg/Leesville. And I found out that the current assessed value in Batesburg/Leesville is between \$11 - \$12 million. That's the assessed value; not the market value. The assessed value on a \$200 million dollar ethanol plant at 10 ½ percent, which nobody believes we could get 10 ½ percent assessed, if it were 10 ½ percent, that's \$21 million. That's over twice as much as the entire assessed value of the entire city limits of Batesburg/Leesville. So there are some services to be gained from that, but even at that, if it's bad, we don't want it, the mayor don't want them, the Council don't want them, I don't want them, and none of this Council up here wants them either. I ask the Chairman if he would put off third reading until the second Tuesday in December, which

is when we will take up third reading and let us absorb all this information we've gotten tonight and continue to gather information from the industry as well as through independent sites to find out what we can find out and get a trip put together so we and some of you can in fact go to one of these things to find out what's going on. So, I have even asked Jay, or I will ask Jay, if he will, if we have enough seats to take him out to wherever it is we go as an independent editor for the local news to spread the information. And I will continue to follow up with that information and the plan that's there for the company, itself, have said they will do public meetings and they will answer all these questions specifically, but right now we don't have the answers and I hope that you will hold on just a little bit and let's see if we can get the answers to some of these questions.

Mr. Cullum stated, I think what you heard is, I can attest with working with this gentleman for the last four years, he's going to do exactly what he just said. Because if anybody is ever going to look at one upside, inside out, it's going to be Billy Derrick and I can promise you that.

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - Mr. Kinard made a motion, seconded by Mr. Davis to enter into Executive Session to continue discussing the remaining six legal matters.

In Favor:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Kinard
	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Ms. Summers	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

Mr. Cullum reconvened the meeting in open session.

**Matters Requiring a Vote as a Result of Executive Session** - Mr. Cullum reported Council continued discussing legal matters during the Executive Session and indicated there were no motions to be considered.

**Budget Amendment Resolutions** - None.

**OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS - Taxpayer Money to North Carolina** - Mr. Jeffcoat stated today he received two phone calls from separate individuals telling him how disappointed they are that we, Lexington County, would collect tax money and send it to North Carolina.

Mr. Cullum stated instead of phone calls, he had three visits to his office. He said the issue was debated this past spring during the budget process, therefore, politely sent them to the Treasurer's Office to speak with Mr. Rowell.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk

M. Todd Cullum  
Chairman

**PLANNING and ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 14, 2006**

The Planning and Administration Committee met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Committee Room, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 12:50 p.m. Mr. Jeffcoat, Committee Vice Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

Johnny W. Jeffcoat, V Chairman	William C. Billy Derrick
Debra B. Summers	M. Todd Cullum

Absent: Joseph W. Owens, Chairman\*  
John W. Carrigg, Jr. \*\*

\*Mr. Owens was absent due to illness.

\*\*Mr. Carrigg was absent due to family illness.

Also attending: Katherine Doucett, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH) - Jennifer Moore, United Way** - Ms. Moore spoke on behalf of the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH). She said Julie Avin, MACH President, submitted an application requesting \$2,500 of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to assist with a new state-wide count of homeless persons. The count will be conducted on January 27, 2007.

A motion was made by Mr. Cullum, seconded by Ms. Summers to recommend to full Council for approval.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Approval of Minutes - Meeting of October 10, 2006** - A motion was made by Mr. Derrick, seconded by Mr. Cullum to approve the October 10, 2006 minutes as submitted.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Old Business/New Business** - None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee  
Assistant to Clerk

Johnny W. Jeffcoat  
V Chairman

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk

**JUSTICE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
November 14, 2006**

The Justice Committee met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Committee Room, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 1:10 p.m. Mr. Davis, Committee Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

George H. Smokey Davis, Chairman	William C. Billy Derrick, V Chairman
Bobby C. Keisler	James E. Kinard, Jr.
M. Todd Cullum	

Absent: Joseph W. Owens\*

\*Mr. Owens was absent due to illness.

Also attending: Katherine Doucett, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Cars for Reserve Deputies - Sheriff's Department - James R. Metts, Sheriff** - Sheriff Metts requested that four used cars that are being replaced in the Sheriff's Department be reassigned to the Reserve Deputies for their use. These vehicles will be kept under separate inventory.

A motion was made by Mr. Keisler, seconded by Mr. Cullum to recommend full Council to approve the reassignment of four cars that are being replaced in the Sheriff's Department for the Reserve Deputies.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**11<sup>th</sup> Circuit Law Enforcement Network Grant - Sheriff's Department - Col. Paavel** - Col. Paavel recommended to the Committee to consider a request to accept a \$20,000 mini-grant from the South Carolina Department of Public Safety, Office of Highway Safety, for the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit Law Enforcement Network. The Law Enforcement Traffic Support Team will be allocated 75% of the awarded funds to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the traffic enforcement units in all Lexington County municipalities. The remaining 25% is mandated to be used by the coordinating agency for the same purpose. The grant does not have a match amount.

A motion was made by Mr. Kinard, seconded by Mr. Cullum to recommend full Council approve to accept the \$20,000 grant.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Update on School Resource Officers and Crime Scene Investigation Grants - Sheriff's Department - Col. Paavel** - Col. Paavel updated the Committee about potential grants for School Resource Officers and Crime Scene Investigation Units by the State Public Safety Department. If the state releases these grants the Sheriff's Department will pursue these especially with all the events happening in the schools recently. Once notification comes in, they will be submitting budgets and requests for these.

Information only. No action taken.

**Lexington County Sheriff Department (LCSD) Title IV-D Program - Sheriff's Department - Col. Paavel** - Col. Paavel asked the committee to consider changes for the Title IV-D Program due to a recent contract amendment with the South Carolina Department of Social Services Child Support Enforcement Division. The contract amendment still allows for reimbursement for the successful service of Title IV-D papers but will also provide reimbursement for investigative hours, travel miles and meal expenses incurred. An Administrative Budgetary Transfer (ABT) has been submitted requesting \$47,909 of this revenue be transferred to various accounts for the purchase of equipment and services that would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the newly created Fugitive Task Force Unit. In addition, a request has been made to eliminate the part-time clerk position associated with the service of the Title IV-D papers, this task will be handled by the Fugitive Task Force Unit.

A motion was made by Mr. Keisler, seconded by Mr. Kinard to recommend to full Council that they approve changes to the Title IV-D Program.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Approval of Minutes - Meeting of September 26, 2006** - A motion was made by Mr. Cullum, seconded by Mr. Keisler to approve the September 26, 2006 minutes as submitted.

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - Mr. Cullum made a motion, seconded by Mr. Keisler to go into Executive Session to discuss a personnel matter.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The Committee reconvened in open session, no issues required a vote as a result of Executive Session.

**Old Business/New Business** - None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee  
Assistant to Clerk

George H. Smokey Davis  
Chairman

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk

**SOLID WASTE LANDFILL COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
November 14, 2006**

The Solid Waste Landfill Committee met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Committee Room, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 2:15 p.m. Mr. Kinard, Committee Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

James E. Kinard, Jr., Chairman	Johnny W. Jeffcoat, V Chairman
William C. Billy Derrick	George H. Smokey Davis
M. Todd Cullum	

Also attending: Katherine Doucett, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - Mr. Davis made a motion, seconded by Mr. Derrick to go into Executive Session to discuss a personnel/contractual issue.

The vote was in favor. Mr. Cullum was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. Kinard reconvened the meeting in open session.

**Staffing at Waste Collection Stations - Solid Waste Management - Joe Mergo, Director** - A motion was made by Mr. Derrick, seconded by Mr. Davis, to recommend to full Council to approve the Babcock Center contract for staffing at Waste Collection Stations. The contract agreement is for \$445,500 fixed for five years and 7 months. A yearly CPI adjustment will be made for years six through ten.

The vote was in favor. Mr. Cullum was not present when the vote was taken.

**Regulating Collection Stations Users - (Goal #2) - Solid Waste Management - Joe Mergo, Director** - Mr. Mergo has been in contact with two other counties who work abbreviated days every day at their collections stations. Mr. Mergo will be attending a meeting with state-wide solid waste management offices to discuss state-wide, curb-side garbage collections issues, programs and contracts, as well as the sticker issue. Committee requested that during this meeting, Mr. Mergo ask at what density level does it begin to make sense economically for curb-side garbage pick-up.

The survey for the Red Bank Collections Station is complete and ready for distribution after Mr. Kinard and Mr. Keisler review questions. Survey to be distributed Sunday, November 26 through December 9 with results at the December 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Approval of Minutes - Meeting of October 10, 2006** - A motion was made by Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat to approve the October 10, 2006 minutes as submitted.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Old Business/New Business - Funding** - None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee  
Assistant to Clerk

James E. Kinard, Jr.  
Chairman

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk

**AIRPORT COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 14, 2006**

The Airport Committee met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Committee Room, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 2:35 p.m. Mr. Cullum, Committee Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

M. Todd Cullum, Chairman  
Debra B. Summers  
Johnny W. Jeffcoat

William C. Billy Derrick, V Chairman  
James E. Kinard, Jr.

Absent: John W. Carrigg, Jr. \*

\*Mr. Carrigg was absent due to family illness.

Also attending: Katherine Doucett, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - A motion was made by Mr. Jeffcoat, seconded by Mr. Kinard to go into Executive Session to discuss contractual matters for Airport Engineering Services.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Cullum reconvened the meeting in open session.

**Airport Engineering Services** - Discussed in executive session; no action taken.

**Approval of Minutes - Meeting of October 10, 2006** - A motion was made by Ms. Summers, seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat to approve the October 10, 2006 minutes as submitted.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Old Business/New Business** - None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee  
Assistant to Clerk

M. Todd Cullum  
Chairman

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 14, 2006**

The Economic Development Committee met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Committee Room, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 2:40 p.m. Mr. Jeffcoat, Committee Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

Johnny W. Jeffcoat, Chairman	George H. Smokey Davis, V Chairman
William C. Billy Derrick	James E. Kinard, Jr.
M. Todd Cullum	

Absent: John W. Carrigg, Jr.\*

\*Mr. Carrigg was absent due to family illness.

Also attending: Katherine Doucett, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Project Gira - Economic Development - Al Burns, Director** - Mr. Burns introduced Ms. Gira Patel, Chief Executive Officer of Gira Steel. Gira Steel is currently relocating its facility from Columbia to West Columbia which will enable them to double their production. Information only. No action.

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - Mr. Davis made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kinard to go into Executive Session to discuss contractual matters.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Jeffcoat reconvened the meeting in open session; no actions taken.

**Project Z - Economic Development - Al Burns, Director** - No action taken.

**Project Otis - Economic Development - Al Burns, Director** - No action taken.

**Economic Development Projects - Economic Development - Al Burns, Director** - No action taken.

**Approval of Minutes - Meetings of September 26 and October 10, 2006** - A motion was made by Mr. Cullum, seconded by Mr. Kinard to approve the September 26 and October 10, 2006 minutes as submitted.

The vote was in favor. Mr. Davis was not present when the vote was taken.

**Old Business/New Business** - None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee  
Assistant to Clerk

Johnny W. Jeffcoat  
Chairman

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk

**COMMITTEE of the WHOLE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 14, 2006**

The Committee of the Whole Committee met on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Committee Room, located on the second floor of the Administration Building beginning at 3:55 p.m. Mr. Cullum, Committee Chairman presided.

Members Attending:

M. Todd Cullum, Chairman	James E. Kinard, Jr.
William C. Billy Derrick	George H. Smokey Davis
Debra B. Summers	Bobby C. Keisler
Johnny W. Jeffcoat	

Absent: Joseph W. Owens, V Chairman\*  
John W. Carrigg, Jr.\*\*

\*Mr. Owens was absent due to illness.

\*\*Mr. Carrigg was absent due to family illness

Also attending: Katherine Doucett, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Ordinance 06-09 - An Ordinance to Impose the Provisions as Allowed by South Carolina Code Section 12-37-670 so as to Allow Improvements that are Completed on or Before June 30<sup>th</sup> to be Taxable for the Period for July 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> of that Property Tax Year - (Goal #3)** - Mr. Jeff Anderson, County Attorney, informed the Committee that the Attorney General's office says that the statute is unconstitutional as it would be applied to separate counties doing separate things and said it has to be state-wide not county-to-county. The Attorney General says the statute needs to be redone. Information Only. No Action.

**Strategic Plan Objectives - (Goals #1, #2, #3) - Katherine Doucett, Administrator** - Ms. Doucett presented the Committee with objectives from County departments as they pertain to Council's goals. Ms. Doucett requested permission and guidance from the Committee to work with the departments to isolate particular objectives and present them as objectives with initiatives to begin as early as January 2007. These challenges have given the departments real direction in planning their future goals. Information only. No action.

**Approval of Minutes - Meeting of October 10, 2006** - A motion was made by Mr. Kinard, seconded by Mr. Derrick to approve the October 10, 2006 minutes as submitted.

The vote was in favor. Mr. Davis was not present when the vote was taken.

**Old Business/New Business** - None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Busbee  
Assistant to Clerk

M. Todd Cullum  
Chairman

Diana W. Burnett  
Clerk