

Subject: Re: Pard funds in Laurens County
From: Kat Fay (kat_fay@ymail.com)
To: bjwilloughby@scprt.com;
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2012 2:38 PM

Thank you kindly for responding. I apologize that I don't know to address you as Ms. or Mr., I missed seeing your first name on the staff directory.

Perhaps you missed my questions relating to the Department's own processes. Your agency has authority to investigate if the terms of agreement your Department established or controls, under which monies are disbursed to the party of your Department's agreement (the sponsor), are met. Unless, of course, the Department is advertising agreement qualification terms as 'mandatory' with full knowledge they are not. Lacking response to my questions on the Department's own processes, I have no choice to consider continued evasion purposeful, and, as concurrence that the Department disburses PARD monies to sponsors without regard to compliance of the PARD terms published in the PARD applications. Perhaps I am mistaken in my belief that you understood my direct questions on the Department's management of it's own processes. So I am making a good faith attempt to ascertain if you misunderstood my questions on the Department's management of PARD terms in hopes of resolving this administratively. As I indicated to Ms. Cushman, continued evasion is obstructive to transparency and damaging to public trust.

Could you please address why the Department allowed Laurens County to violate PARD terms, page 7, that specify "The project sponsor must either own the site in fee simple title or have a lease/joint use agreement for a term commensurate with the duration of the agreement period indicating the sponsor has primary control and the purpose of the site is for public recreation.", and page 8 terms, which state, in summary, the sponsor must operate the facility during the time of agreement. Please explain how Laurens County's admission, which is included in the public records posted at my sight, that it never operated the park, along with the evidence of exclusive access to the Park to operate for revenue generation by Mr. Martin, meets PARD terms. The documented evidence, such as FOIA requests, news reports, and others, and my affidavit to source of these documents, is available at my website. It seems like the PARD application misrepresents the Department's oversight of it's own qualification process for grant funding. If your Department isn't capable of monitoring the qualification and decision process it uses to disburse PARD monies, it is likely the rest of the Department is suffering from the same inadequacy. Mistakes or oversights in process are good faith errors that can be fixed. Defensive stonewalling destroys, rather than fixes, agency credibility. Thank you for your review of my concerns.

Katrina