

CUMBERLAND COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
MARCH 1, 2007 – 9:30 AM
REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Commissioner Diane Wheatley
Commissioner Jeannette Council
Commissioner Ed Melvin
James Martin, County Manager
Juanita Pilgrim, Deputy County Manager
Cliff Spiller, Assistant County Manager
Amy Cannon, Assistant County Manager
Grainger Barrett, County Attorney
Sara VanderClute, Public Information Officer
Bob Stanger, County Engineer
Tom Cooney, Public Utilities Director
James Lawson, Human Resources Manager
Laura Blackley, Human Resources Analyst II
Bob Bennett, Storm Water Advisory Board Chair
Dennis Gould, Storm Water Advisory Board
Andrew Barksdale, Reporter – The Fayetteville Observer
Marie Colgan, Deputy Clerk

Commissioner Wheatley called the meeting to order at 9:45 AM

1. Approval of Minutes: January 4, 2007

MOTION: Commissioner Melvin moved to approve.
SECOND: Commissioner Council
VOTE: UNANIMOUS

2. Update on Locke's Creek Drainage Study

Tom Cooney advised that Greg Caison, Storm Water Services Manager, could not be in attendance and introduced two members of the Storm Water Advisory Board. Mr. Cooney stated he had been directed to seek qualified engineering firms to perform a study of the drainage problems at Locke's Creek. A Request for Qualifications was developed and mailed to prospective firms and seven (7) responses were received. Interviews were held with three (3) of the seven firms and a selection committee unanimously selected Jewell Engineering Consultants. They in turn proposed four different scenarios for consideration and scenario #4 was selected by the committee. Scenario #4 looks at the whole basin but, instead of profiling the major stream channels as Scenario #3 would include, profiles the major streams at bridge (i.e., road) crossings. Mr. Cooney directed attendees to the handout and reviewed the maps provided of the area. During a conversation with James Martin after receiving the selection, it was decided that scenario #3 which looks at the whole basin is the most comprehensive of the options. The cost of scenario #3 is \$365,741, as compared to scenario #4, which is \$318,436. Mr. Cooney reminded members that this figure is just for the study. Mr. Stanger informed members that if this study is done that it would provide a good planning tool when looking at rezonings. Commissioner Wheatley questioned what would happen after the study with regard to monies needed for identified problems. There would not be major funding available for large projects. Funds would likely have to come from storm water fees, grants and perhaps assessments or a service district. Several potential avenues were discussed with regard to funding the project: (a) \$50,000 which has been identified by the Joint Stormwater Utility within its utility fund; (b) The City of Fayetteville could be approached for a limited amount of funding

based on the small area of drainage basin within the City limits; (c) the NC Department of Transportation could be approached for potential funding, (d) grant funding, but (e) the County General Fund become the most likely source to provide the majority of the funding. Commissioner Council questioned county-wide benefits/services with regard to the \$50,000 monies available per year from the Stormwater Utility. Mr. Cooney advised that the fees currently being paid are intended to meet the regulatory requirements of the County's NPDES Stormwater permit, which focuses more on quality not quantity. Mr. Martin advised members that he has been reminded that there is a million and a half dollars which has already been budgeted for some water and sewer issues in connection with the City of Fayetteville which could be considered as part of the funding along with the other funding possibilities. Mrs. Pilgrim suggested that this be placed on the FY08 Federal legislative agenda with The Ferguson Group.

MOTION: Commissioner Melvin moved that staff develop a recommendation for the full study, seek funding and take the recommendation to the Finance Committee.

SECOND: Commissioner Council

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

3. Consideration of Law Enforcement Promotion Policy

Mr. Martin reminded attendees of the salary study for law enforcement officers which took place last year. However, the approach that was taken has led to an unanticipated effect, which has resulted in this request being made for a change in the Law Enforcement Promotion Policy. A promotion policy is being recommended that would allow Law Enforcement Officers' relative position in the range of their current classification to be carried forward to the promoted classification. Mr. Martin explained that an officer receives a 5% increase in pay after being with the Sheriff's Office for three (3) years and then receives a 5% increase for a career development step every four years thereafter. However, for individuals receiving certain promotions, depending on the compensation spread between positions, it may result in the loss of the benefit of the career development step increase; thus creating inequity between some of the senior and junior officers. Mr. Lawson added that one of the impacts is that a high performer who advances up the ranks quickly would actually make less money than one who has taken the longer path of advancement. Variances between the salary grades in the new law enforcement salary plan range from 5% to 16%. This differs from other county positions where grades are generally separated by 5%. Ms. Blackley stated that about five (5) employees have already resigned due to the inequities and that Human Resources is holding several actions that will be effected by this inequity, until consideration has been given to the proposed change in the policy. Several examples were presented explaining how the inequities are created. When questioned where the monies will come from for this change, Mr. Martin advised that lapsed salaries in the Sheriff's Department budget would cover pending actions and other actions that would occur through the end of this budget year. Next year's budget will need to be adjusted accordingly using past history of promotions within the last few years.

MOTION: Commissioner Wheatley moved to accept the policy as presented and to send it forward to the full Board for consideration.

SECOND: Commissioner Melvin

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

4. Other Matters of Concern None stated.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:35 AM