

CUMBERLAND COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MAY 7, 2009, 8:30AM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Marshall Faircloth  
Commissioner Kenneth Edge  
OTHERS PRESENT: James Martin, County Manager  
Amy Cannon, Asst. County Manager  
Grainger Barrett, County Attorney  
Harvey Raynor, Deputy County Attorney  
Tom Cooney, Utilities Director  
Phyllis Owens, Economic Development  
Marsha Fogle, Clerk  
Sara VanderClute, PIO  
MEMBER ABSENT: Commissioner Billy R. King

Commissioner Faircloth called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of Minutes: March 5, 2009

MOTION: Commissioner Edge moved to approve.

SECOND: Commissioner Faircloth

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

2. Consideration of using Eminent Domain to obtain a Utility Easement for the Cedar Creek Road Project

Mr. Cooney, Public Utilities Director, noted that efforts to extend public water to Cedar Creek Road residents, just east of the railroad tracks adjacent to the former Monsanto facility, have been in the works for several years. However, the owner with the largest tract of land does not want to grant an easement for the water line. A second option to extend water along Cedar Creek Road, which would require an easement and a bore under the railroad tracks would add about \$75,000 to the cost of the project. The County's share would be no more than \$50,000, and probably less, with the staff having approached PWC about sharing the balance. Since this second option is really the preferred option, although a little more expensive, staff anticipates this will be the preferred way to go. In addition, staff hopes that PWC will pay for upgrading the line from an 8 inch to a 12 inch line. At this point PWC does not want to commit to anything until the county-wide feasibility study comes in, which should be sometime next week. The County will await PWC's decision about its participation in this water project.

Mr. Cooney told the committee that while we don't need to use Eminent Domain for this project, there could very well be projects in the future that will be delayed or frustrated unless the County used this tool to obtain water easements. He just wanted to make the Committee and Board aware of this possibility. The Commissioners present expressed strong reluctance to employ Eminent Domain.

## NO ACTION NEEDED

3. Consideration of a revision to the Economic Development Investment Policy for “gateway” projects

The County Attorney told the Committee that the County’s current Economic Development Investment Policy limits incentives to a specific list of industry projects. These proposed revisions address projects along a major gateway/entrance into a municipality in the county that targets an area of at least 20 acres that is blighted, deteriorated, deteriorating, or inappropriately developed from the standpoint of sound community, planning, development and growth. The project shall have high potential to transform and greatly impact the population, business prospects and tax base in the area. The revisions require the Chamber of Commerce to estimate to the Board of Commissioners that the project has reasonable potential to stimulate from the project, and neighboring property or development impacted by the project, a return to the County of property tax revenues for a ten year period of at least 250% of the County’s incentive payments to the project. The Chamber would also conduct a review of the economic feasibility of the project and recommend it. Financial support could be given in the form of a loan or probably a grant, which could be used for site clearance, site grading, and infrastructure of roads, sidewalks, utilities, fiber-optic or wireless communications facilities, etc. The county would only participate if the municipality affected participates in providing incentives.

**ACTION:** Consider whether to recommend these revisions to the Board of Commissioners.

In response to a question from Commissioner Edge, the County Manager, indicated incentives would usually be given in the form of a grant.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Edge moved that the Committee recommend approval of the revisions to the Board of Commissioners.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Faircloth

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

4. Other matters – There were no other matters to be considered.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:10AM.**