

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA**

Monday, February 1, 2016

9:00 A.M. Worksession

MINUTES

Place: Commissioners' Chambers, second floor, Durham County Government, Administrative Complex, 200 E. Main Street, Durham, NC

Present: Chairman Michael D. Page, Vice Chair Brenda Howerton and Commissioners Fred Foster, Jr., Wendy Jacobs and Ellen Reckhow

Presider: Chairman Michael D. Page

Citizen Comments

Manager Davis introduced Jodi Miller as the new Deputy County Manager and welcomed her to her first day on the job.

Loretta Woodall, representative of the Carolina Arbors by Del Webb neighborhood, requested that the new EMS station at Leesville and Doc Nichols Roads, as was called for in the EMS Capital Improvement Project, be built very early in Phase One. She described the methods the community planned to utilize in order to reiterate their requests and concerns.

Manager Davis stated that Skip Kirkwood, Director of Emergency Medical Services, planned to conduct a presentation regarding EMS resources, but was traveling at the moment. Furthermore, the County would be taking into consideration the results of the Facilities Master Study, capacity issues, as well as the needs of the community while creating and implementing the Capital Plan. Chairman Page was concerned about the community's wait-time for EMS arrival.

Commissioner Jacobs recalled that the Board had requested a report on how the budget allocations made towards EMS were used. Drew Cummings, Assistant County Manager, informed her that the Board would receive the written report before the March 7th Worksession.

Commissioner Reckhow mentioned a previous discussion about out-posting another ambulance at Bethesda due to the understanding that most outlier ambulance locations are for rural areas, but the one in question served a more urban area with higher population density. Mr. Cummings stated that EMS ambulance protocol was to have one at Bethesda and move it to a different location if the number of available ambulances per call dropped below a certain number. Manager Davis stated that the challenges were staffing issues and reiterated Chief Kirkwood's point about playing catch-up with resources.

Vice Chair Howerton inquired as to how soon the Carolina Arbors community would receive a follow-up to their request. Manager Davis discussed the process that needed to take place and assured the Board and citizens that EMS was working on the issues.

Chris Tiffany spoke on the mistreatment and neglect of jail inmates by police and correctional detention officers as well as the suppression of inmate complaints against officers to other organizations, referencing the lack of participants in the interviews conducted by the National Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCHC).

Ruthy Jones, member of Shared Journey, a political group for women, asked that the Board support nonpartisan redistricting reform and requested a resolution be created in support of House Bill 92.

Commissioner Jacobs inquired whether the referendum would be discussed at the following Worksession. Chairman Page stated that they could add it to the consent agenda for the February 8th Regular Session.

Cara M. Williams, Director of Finance for Reinvestment Partners, discussed Reinvestment Partners' partnership with the Department of Social Services and how, through the Work First Development Program, they were able to create Volunteer Income Tax Assistance sites that served low to moderate income residents for free. She thanked the Board and hoped for the partnership to continue.

Tina Jones described how the Department of Social Services' Work First Development Program helped improve her family's livelihood. She pointed out other recipients in an effort to personify the program and requested that the Board continue to support it.

Commissioner Reckhow thanked Reinvestment Partners for the press conference they sponsored for the opening of a new VITA site. She encouraged everyone to spread information regarding the free tax assistance to citizens and emphasized that the program was one of the most effective anti-poverty initiatives in the country, it pulled millions of families out of poverty every year, and could increase a person's earnings by 10%.

Commissioner Foster stated that although Commissioners participated in the Mayor's Poverty Initiative, he wanted to highlight this program as a County effort to reduce poverty. He requested that Executive Director Peter Skillern and his staff participate in the February 8th Regular Session TV programming in order to inform citizens about the free resource. Chairman Page suggested featuring Reinvestment Partners on the County's TV show—they would need to record in February in order to be aired in March.

Vice Chair Howerton mentioned that the agenda included an item for the presentation by MDC, which also had to do with taxes, and encouraged Reinvestment Partners to stay and view it as it could present partnership opportunities.

Commissioner Jacobs thanked Reinvestment Partners for their work and requested that their information be added to the County's website. She also suggested that they connect with Kim Simpson, Tax Administrator, to ensure that Tax Office callers were made aware of the free VITA sites.

Commissioner Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, to suspend the rules.

The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Howerton moved, seconded by Commissioner Reckhow, to extend citizen comments.

The motion carried unanimously.

John Tarantino performed a presidential candidate parody song to the melody of Whitney Houston's "Saving All My Love for You."

Discussion Items:

16-858 Removal of Citizen Board Members Due to Poor Attendance

The Board was requested to remove Judy Ingram from the Nursing Home Community Advisory Committee in keeping with the Attendance Policy approved by the Board of County Commissioners in August, 2014. "If an appointee has absences (excused or unexcused) which constitute more than 50% of

the meetings in any calendar year or three (3) consecutive unexcused absences or five (5) consecutive excused absences in any calendar year, he or she is obligated to resign.” The Clerk’s Office was notified by the Nursing Home Community Advisory Committee of the absences and attempted to contact Ms. Ingram. There was no response.

Commissioner Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Foster, to suspend the rules for removal of a citizen board member due to poor attendance.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Foster, that the Board remove Judy Ingram from the Nursing Home Community Advisory Committee due to poor attendance.

The motion carried unanimously.

16-863 Presentation and Discussion of Resident Satisfaction Survey Results

The City of Durham conducted a Resident Satisfaction Survey of statistically valid samples of City residents, every other year, for some time. In the spring of 2015, City and County staff started discussions about conducting a joint survey. Since the City and County have similar strategic plan goals and share collective responsibility for addressing many complex community issues, staff agreed that a joint survey would be a valuable and efficient way to assess feelings about these issues in the overall Durham community. Working through ETC Institute of Olathe, Kansas, a joint survey instrument was developed through the summer and early fall and then sent out to a representative sample of County residents in October and November. Nearly 700 residents—over 400 of them inside the City limits and over 200 in the unincorporated area—completed the survey. The purpose of this meeting was for ETC staff to present their interpretation of the results. Many questions on the survey had been asked for years of City residents; therefore, the City was able to track response trends over a number of years. County residents’ responses to all survey questions, particularly those recently added, represented a new baseline of resident perception that the organization could build on in future years.

Staff believed that administering the survey annually, while regularly revisiting which and how survey questions were asked, would continue to give the County and the City useful, statistically valid information about residents’ views and priorities regarding the work of their local governments in serving the entire Durham community.

Manager Davis thanked staff for completing the task and emphasized the importance of the Survey in relation to the services the County offered as well as the Strategic Plan. Mr. Cummings recognized Michael Davis, Strategic Initiative Manager, and James Tabron, Deputy Register of Deeds III, for their work in the project. He described the purpose of the Survey and how it was intended to be used regularly in County management departments and processes for future projects and services. He introduced Jason Morado, Senior Project Manager for ETC Institute.

Mr. Morado presented the PowerPoint to the Board which highlighted the following points:

- ETC Institute credentials
- purpose and methodology used
- bottom line or overall feelings for Durham County
- major findings of Survey
- Survey response data summary

Commissioner Jacobs inquired as to the existing demographics of Durham County. Mr. Morado described the Survey response demographics and compared them with the overall Durham County demographics.

Commissioner Reckhow wondered if the 95% confidence level was applicable outside of the City limits where there were fewer responses. Mr. Cummings clarified that if one looked at only the unincorporated areas, the margin of error would be closer to plus or minus seven percent ($\pm 7\%$); the margin of error for the total responses was plus or minus 3.8 percent ($\pm 3.8\%$). Commissioner Reckhow suggested highlighting the higher margin of error in unincorporated areas in the final report and pointed out a wording error in the executive summary.

Commissioner Jacobs, Commissioner Reckhow, Manager Davis, and Mr. Cummings noted that certain wording used in survey questions could prompt negative answers, e.g. a survey question regarding “taxes” generated more negative responses than one that used “fees” even when it was tied to creating better County services for citizens.

Commissioner Reckhow recalled that, years ago, the Board deliberated creating a 311 phone number as a central point of contact for information and services offered by Durham County, similar to the City’s new Durham One Call line, and wondered if the feasibility had improved since the previous discussion. Manager Davis believed that the advances in technology would help with future communications and that it would be something worth looking into.

Commissioner Jacobs thought it was interesting that most people were not getting County information via the public access channel or the County website. She also noted that texting pictures to their local governments was a popular method used by citizens to actively participate in their communities; it would be beneficial to consider using interactive technology in Durham County as well. Manager Davis concurred that the County could use this as a good opportunity to rethink citizen engagement strategies.

Mr. Davis discussed the lack of citizen involvement in the County.

Commissioner Jacobs suggested rewording a question which asked if the citizen would be willing to pay higher taxes so that it did not include “higher” or “new taxes,” an example would be to ask which programs the citizen would prefer to reallocate money to.

Commissioner Reckhow suggested replacing "court services" with "criminal justice services" in the Survey.

Commissioner Jacobs inquired whether there was any way to further delineate citizen responses dealing with levels of satisfaction according to which solid waste provider they used—County vs. the City.

Commissioner Reckhow was concerned that citizens without roll-up solid waste carts were being charged the same amount as citizens with roll-up solid waste carts; they were paying the same while getting different levels of service. Mr. Cummings assured them that they would look into it.

Commissioner Jacobs was concerned that the Survey response demographics with respect to socioeconomic status were not representative of the Durham County population and asked what they could do to capture a more accurate representation. Mr. Morado gave examples of what could be done to the data to see if there were any differences in responses according to socioeconomic standing—it would help in determining whether the given data was accurate enough. Mr. Cummings added that all concerns were duly noted and the following Survey would better attempt to incorporate more renters and other underrepresented populations.

Commissioner Jacobs acknowledged that the Survey seemed like a strong tool for the Planning Department as they were going to begin the update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Mr. Cummings assured her that the Survey results would be widely shared.

Chairman Page was disappointed in the low number of respondents that stated they wanted better services, such as more affordable housing. Vice Chair Howerton reminded him that people who likely needed the services were the same that could not afford to pay higher taxes for them.

Commissioner Reckhow was troubled by the fairly low level of walking and biking satisfaction in the data and hoped that they could work towards increasing the ease of walking and biking in the County.

16-880 Discussion of Proposed Sports Commission Interlocal Agreement

A task force comprised of representatives from the City of Durham, Durham County, the Greater Durham Chamber of Commerce, DCVB, Duke, NCCU and several other interested individuals met for more than a year to devise and refine recommendations for a Durham Sports Commission. Discussions in front of the Board of County Commissioners and at the Joint City-County Committee led to further refinements in the proposed plan. The Interlocal agreement reflected that evolved thinking and was brought forward for discussion by the Commissioners. The Durham Sports Commission was proposed to be made of up 9 members, 3 each appointed by the City and County and three private sector members appointed by the Chamber of Commerce. An advisory board of Durham area sports experts was anticipated in the agreement. The Commission and its staff would have independent 501(c)(3) status but would be housed at, and receive both financial and in-kind support from, the Durham Convention and Visitors Bureau. The proposed agreement would last through the end of FY17-18 (three years including the current year) and was proposed to be funded as follows. The City and County area each asked to devote approximately one-third of the expected growth in the occupancy tax (with FY14-15 as a baseline) to the Sports Commission. The DCVB would dedicate one half of its growth to it. Appropriately pro-rated amounts would be paid for the remainder of FY15-16. City and County funds would only be used for bid fees, sponsorships, and underwriting, items which the DCVB's founding legislation prohibited it from spending occupancy tax revenue on. These were expenses more of which would be paid out the more successful the Commission was in bringing new sports-related activity to Durham. Private sector businesses and foundations would also be asked to support events.

Commissioner Foster stated that he introduced the initial idea to Board years ago and now asked that the Board support and approve it in order to add it to the consent agenda for the Regular Session on Monday, February 8th.

Commissioner Jacobs expressed her excitement for adding the item to the consent agenda and briefly discussed the history and great community effort that enabled the creation of the Sports Commission. She thanked the panel, which included Casey Steinbacher, President Emeritus of the Greater Durham Chamber of Commerce; Shelly Green, President and CEO of the Durham Convention and Visitor's Bureau; and Willie Darby, Senior Assistant County Attorney.

Commissioner Reckhow applauded everyone who worked on the project and inquired as to where the money allocated from new occupancy taxes would go for the current year considering that no executive director had been hired. Ms. Green clarified that the City and County money would go towards bid fees, underwriting, and things that the DCVB could not use their own resources to finance—the funds would not be used for hiring, operations, or marketing. The current year's allocations would go in a fund of which a portion would be encumbered for future years. Commissioner Reckhow asked Mr. Darby if it was necessary to add that language to the agreement under Year One (1) to ensure that the plan was part of public record. Mr. Darby believed that the current language was ok.

Commissioner Reckhow suggested a wording change on one of the pages. Mr. Cummings confirmed that it would be edited.

16-875 MDC Presentation

MDC, a 50-year-old national nonprofit based in Durham, was best known locally for creating and incubating Made in Durham, but that was just one of a number of MDC initiatives created to help Southern communities address the needs of low-income residents and close the gaps that separated people from opportunity. A major area of MDC's work was in economic security, and a key part had been the creation and development of The Benefit Bank of North Carolina, an online service that provided step-by-step instructions to help low-income families complete their state and federal income taxes at no charge, and ensure they received the Earned Income Tax Credit—the nation's largest anti-poverty program—if they were eligible. MDC received support from The Duke Endowment and the William R. Kenan, Jr. Charitable Trust to find partners to make the service as widely available as possible. MDC's Economic Security work also included NC VetsCorps, a statewide AmericCorps program that worked through local organizations to connect active duty service members, veterans, and their families with resources to address housing needs, economic opportunity, and legal services, and a team of Health Care Navigators who worked through community-based organizations and community colleges to conduct health insurance outreach and enrollment activities under the Affordable Care Act.

David Dodson, MDC President, and Ralph Gildehaus, JD, MDC Senior Program Director, presented to the Board.

Commissioner Jacobs believed that what they were describing was also currently happening in Durham and listed the many programs operated by different Durham organizations.

Vice Chair Howerton thanked the panel, emphasized the importance of collaboration, and encouraged the Board to consider what the next step should be.

Commissioner Reckhow thanked Vice Chair Howerton for bringing the item to the Board and related the Network of Care list which was maintained by Alliance Behavioral Healthcare—she believed that the list needed updating and possibly a new name in order to effectively reboot it.

Commissioner Foster suggested that MDC collaborate with Manager Davis and Michael Becketts, Social Services Director, in order to ensure that everyone received the biggest bang for their buck.

16-830 Financial Advisor (DEC Associates) Fiscal Overview in Preparation for the FY 2017-2026 Capital Improvement Plan Update

The Board was requested to receive a presentation from the County's Financial Advisor, DEC Associates, Inc., on the County's financial position in preparation for the update on the 2017-2026 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) update. This conversation laid the foundation for the following months as staff refined the 2017-2026 CIP and clarified the approaches required to liquidate debt to support future capital project needs.

George Quick, Chief Financial Officer, introduced Claudia Hager, Director Of Budget Management; Doug Carter, President and Managing Director for DEC Associates, Inc.; and Andrew Carter, DEC Associates, Inc.

Mr. Carter presented the PowerPoint which included the following main points:

- Current capital program compared to actual financing needs – timing differences when comparing plans to execution
- Evolving nature of the County capital program and investment in County capital assets
- Credit rating methodology and how the County compared

- Comparative analysis to other Governments
- Selected comparative analysis
 - Comparison of the County’s investment in fixed assets
 - Comparison of the County to other N.C. highly rated urban Counties on a number of criteria
- Moody’s New Credit Methodology
- County credit positives and challenges
- Summary and preliminary debt capacity

Commissioner Reckhow asked if DPS had spent all of the 2007 money. Mr. Carter informed her that around \$15 million remained of the original \$40 million that was referenced in the presentation.

Commissioner Reckhow pointed out that once the reevaluation cycle was shortened from the current cycle of eight (8) years to four (4) years, Durham County’s full values would compare more favorably to other counties; they were lower due to the County being so late in the cycle that the full values were outmoded. Mr. Carter concurred.

Commissioner Reckhow stated that she believed that Durham already had a dedicated capital/debt service fund. Manager Davis clarified that it was more of a hybrid or best management practice. Mr. Quick further explained how the County currently operated and how the dedicated capital/debt service fund would alter management and debt operations. He described how projects in past years would prompt an increase in taxes in order to be funded, but creating a dedicated capital/debt service fund would help stabilize taxes because they would no longer rely on tax increases to fund future projects. Manager Davis added that pay-go funding for capital projects used to be an acceptable way to do business, but changes in rating methodology are pushing for a “cash is king” approach which in turn leads to changes in debt issuance models.

Commissioner Jacobs inquired about the recommendations for what the fund balance should be and if they would impact what the current unrestricted funds were. Manager Davis stated that they were currently in conversation about this matter and would be prepared to have the discussion at a later time.

16-847 Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment, Omnibus Changes 9 (TC1500001) Information Item

The Board was requested to receive an informational item regarding Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment, Omnibus Changes 9 (TC1500001). Summary. Text amendment TC1500001 proposed necessary technical revisions and minor policy changes to various provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The amendments were grouped into five categories:

- Amendments necessary to reflect a change to the name of the State Division of Water Quality;
- Amendments to Section 2.5, Historic Preservation Commission, to remove duplicative standards with the rules of procedure or Interlocal agreement as similarly done with the Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission, and Sec. 3.16, Historic District or Landmark Designation, to revise the district initiation process and remove unnecessary plan requirements;
- Amendments identified as necessary corrections, clarifications, re-organization, or other minor changes to more accurately comply with the intent of the regulations or codify interpretations of regulations;
- Amendments that reflect minor policy changes and are not solely technical in nature; and
- Additional changes to the standards for wireless communication facilities (WCFs) (paragraph 5.3.3N)

Michael Stock, AICP, Senior Planner, and Scott Whiteman, AICP, Planning Supervisor, presented to the Board.

Commissioner Jacobs asked if this had gone before the City Council. Mr. Stock informed her that it had not yet. Commissioner Jacobs was concerned about some comments made by the Planning Commission and inquired as to how the agreed upon language regarding 15% affordable housing within a half-mile of transit stops would be incorporated in the UDO. Mr. Whiteman recommended that the language be added to the Comprehensive Plan instead of the UDO because it was more policy guidance for staff rather than regulatory. Commissioner Jacobs stated that it needed to be addressed somehow in the UDO. Mr. Stock stated that staff was looking into it and had already made adjustments, but since the language was mostly guidelines, it could impact how regulatory a UDO document could be.

Commissioner Jacobs and Mr. Stock further discussed how the bike parking issues were addressed in the UDO.

Vice Chair Howerton inquired whether any other changes would be implemented outside of what was being presented. Mr. Stock informed her that the only current potential changes would be the ones requested by City Council to the Historic District initiation process.

Commissioner Reckhow was concerned about sidewalk regulations with respect to not requiring a grass strip between the sidewalk and the road—she used Ninth Street North as an example. Mr. Whiteman clarified that the Ninth Street North development was zoned and approved under older regulations. Commissioner Reckhow felt that the sidewalk strips helped in many aspects and should be incorporated in more areas.

Commissioner Reckhow and Mr. Stock discussed other comments made during the Planning Commission meeting and a BPAC provision regarding bicycle storage. Commissioner Reckhow asked how Commissioner Jacobs's request regarding the affordable housing language being added to the UDO would be dealt with. Mr. Stock described how they had already addressed that and that it would actually be a policy within the Comprehensive Plan. Steven L. Medlin, AICP, Planning Director, added that they would be looking at the preamble portion of the UDO, specifically at those provisions.

Commissioner Foster inquired whether the City would be voting on this before it became an amendment. Mr. Stock answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Foster was concerned that the Board would be held accountable for not making the wireless portion retroactive and requested that an addendum be added to inform citizens as to why their requests could not be reflected in the UDO. Mr. Stock confirmed that they would add the addendum.

Commissioner Reckhow requested clarification on the structural integrity certification piece of the UDO. Mr. Stock and Mr. Medlin explained that in order to make all existing towers be in compliance with the regulations that new towers would abide by, an amortization program and a timeline of older tower inspections to get them in compliance would have to be created, but the cost-benefit analysis and legal constraints deter the proviso's inclusion in the ordinance.

Commissioner Reckhow inquired whether there were any towers that were no longer in use, essentially abandoned, but still up. Mr. Medlin stated that the ones that appeared to be were investigated, but all turned up to still be in use.

Commissioner Reckhow questioned if the County required decommissioning when old towers stopped being used. Mr. Medlin informed her that he was not aware of anything that would require the towers to be removed. Commissioner Reckhow requested that a provision be created for this purpose. Mr. Medlin said they could look at expanding the abandonment clause.

16-871 Update from Alliance Behavioral Healthcare

Robert Robinson introduced Dr. Beth Melcher, Chief of Program Development and Evaluation, and Ann Oshel, Chief Community Relations Officer. He and Dr. Melcher went over the presentation which included information on the following:

- Alliance history and local presence
- Board composition and FY16 funding
- Information on people served and methods used to serve them
- Network Development
- Changes in Medicaid
- Achievements

Chairman Page asked who was currently running Durham Center Access. Dr. Melcher informed him that it was operated by a company called Recovery Innovations. Commissioner Reckhow added that the company that ran it before was Freedom House.

Commissioner Reckhow visited the Durham Recovery Response Center (formerly Durham Center Access) and recounted how worn out the facility was as well as the substantially lower utilization of the center as compared to the previous year. She suggested to Manager Davis that inspecting properties upon the end of leases might prevent facilities from becoming too worn in the future, as it would alert the County of any overlooked maintenance issues. Commissioner Reckhow also suggested having an open house at the Durham Recovery Response Center once renovations were complete to increase publicity.

Chairman Page inquired about the patient release policies of the DRRC—a homeless citizen had contacted Chairman Page after being released from the facility at around 11 p.m. Dr. Melcher and Mr. Robinson explained that the screening, triage, and discharge plans were all voluntary, but patients were supposed to have effective discharge plans before they left the facility; follow-up would be conducted to find out the circumstances of the citizen caller's discharge.

Commissioner Foster was concerned about how many people with alcohol problems were served by Freedom House while they managed Durham Center Access; the reports from the Sheriff's office showed only nine (9) were served in one (1) year. He concurred with Commissioner Reckhow regarding full utilization of the facility in order to help as many citizens as possible. Mr. Robinson stated that they would send the Board monthly utilization reports.

Commissioner Jacobs questioned how many beds and chairs were available for people in crisis and how long patients were able to stay. Dr. Melcher informed her that there were 16 beds—patients stayed 3-5 days on average in a bed—and 12 reclining chairs—patients were allowed 24 hours max in a chair; the goal was to quickly connect people to resources in order to serve as many as possible.

Commissioner Jacobs was concerned about outreach and ensuring that citizens knew about the Center and services if offered. She felt that there should be a mechanism in place which aided law enforcement and other agencies in referring citizens to the Center for mental health services. Dr. Melcher informed her that there were many crisis collaborations between Durham organizations that had been meeting regularly for some time and would continue to do so. Mr. Robinson added that they would be putting out more advertising and education for the community in the following months.

Ms. Oshel discussed partnerships, collaborations, access to care, education, prevention, and early intervention.

Commissioner Reckhow suggested utilizing billboards on North Carolina Highway 147 to advertise the Network of Care services as well as making sure that it was as comprehensive a list as possible.

Commissioner Jacobs suggested integrating the Social Services directory in the Network of Care directory. Both Commissioners suggested changing the name from Network of Care to something else and added that incorporating a keyword that people in crisis would use while looking for help would be beneficial.

Mr. Robinson reminded the Board of the Lunch and Learn, coordinated to talk about Medicaid transformation, on March 18th.

Commissioner Foster inquired as to who the Durham jail mental health provider was. Ms. Oshel informed him that it was the Criminal Justice Resource Center. Commissioner Foster inquired as to the role of Alliance's provider in the two (2) deaths that had recently occurred in the jail or if the provider had provided any services for the two individuals while they were detainees. Ms. Oshel clarified that the Health Department took the lead in the investigations because they monitored the jail medical provider. Manager Davis stated that the service provider was the Correct Care Solutions and was managed through the Health Department.

Commissioner Foster was concerned about Alliance's effectiveness in prevention and diversion methods considering that around 40% of the jail population had mental illnesses and the utilization rates of the DRRC were low. There was a disconnect happening somewhere in the process and not enough outreach being done to inform people, especially those in the jail, of the services offered for mental health. Ms. Oshel concurred and mentioned that jails had become default psychiatric facilities across the nation. She further detailed the methods that they were employing to close the access gap that occurred in the mental health and criminal justice intersection.

Commissioner Reckhow asked Ms. Oshel to attend the Step-Up meetings to ensure that all the work she stated was being performed was reflected on Criminal Justice Resource Center Director Gudrun Parmer's Intersections Model. Ms. Oshel stated that she planned to begin attending. Mr. Robinson brought up the repeated budget cuts to Alliance's budget and informed the Board that he would be advocating for \$152 million in County funding in the future to reinvest in services.

16-870 Report on Age-Friendly Durham Initiative

Melissa C. Black, MPH, Durham Partnership for Seniors Coordinator, and Cathy Stallcup, Durham Partnership for Seniors Executive Director, presented to the Board an update and recommendations from the Durham Partnership for Seniors on the Age-Friendly Durham Initiative.

Commissioner Jacobs thanked the presenters and acknowledged people in the audience that were strong advocates for senior citizens. She emphasized the importance of creating an age-friendly community and asked if the item could be added to a Joint City-County Committee meeting. Manager Davis advised to give it some thought.

Vice Chair Howerton thanked the panel for their presentation, noting how much time and effort was involved in creating the initiative.

Commissioner Reckhow thought that some of the initiative goals could be included in the County planning process, such as in the Strategic Plan and the CIP, to ensure that they were integrated in the plans that guided future development of County-wide programs.

Commissioner Jacobs further explained what being an age-friendly community included as well as the benefits reaped by citizens of all ages. She inquired as what the next steps would be. Manager Davis described the different ways that the initiative could be packaged into the community model in order to maximize utility.

16-862 Sustainability Office Update on the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan and Energy Savings Performance Contracting

Tobin Freid, Sustainability Manager, introduced Megan Carol, Sustainability Specialist, and presented an update on the Durham Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction plan and Energy Savings Performance Contract.

In 2007, the Board of Commissioners and City Council adopted the “Greenhouse Gas and Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Inventory and Local Action Plan for Emissions Reductions (“Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan”). The plan included an estimate of the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by various sectors in Durham and outlined some strategies for reducing emissions. It also set emissions reduction goals: government reductions of 50% from 2005 levels by 2030 and community reductions of 30%. The City-County Sustainability Office was tasked with implementing the plan, in partnership with other city, county, and community partners.

As part of the strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the county entered into a \$4,549,000 Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC) with Trane in the fall of 2012. This project included energy and water upgrades in seven buildings, and paid for the upgrades over 15 years through utility savings. Construction was completed by February 2014 and savings exceeded expectations.

Commissioner Reckhow felt that there was still room for improvement for the Administration Building. Ms. Freid and Manager Davis explained that it was a difficult building to work with due to its age and the fact that it was running on a single utilities unit with the neighboring building.

Commissioner Jacobs was concerned about the lack of progress in efficiency of government buildings and inquired if there were additional things that could be done to increase energy efficiency. Ms. Freid described some efforts being made and suggested creating a County Energy Plan. She was also working on automating energy data—they currently received energy bills for each building once a month and it was difficult to analyze so many bills in a manner that would allow timely adjustments as needed.

Commissioner Jacobs described the Charlotte Smart City Initiative which used IT equipment to monitor private sector businesses’ energy consumption and hoped that the County could really start evaluating sustainability. Manager Davis reminded the Board that creating similar initiatives would require substantial investment in staff, equipment, and so on. Before such steps could be taken, they would first need to determine which priorities were to be top investments, and then fund them.

Commissioner Reckhow was disappointed in the lack of progress in building energy efficiency and wanted to keep this in mind for future building designs. She was concerned with idling trucks at construction sites and suggested providing public education to construction workers and their supervisors to cut back on CO2 emissions.

Commissioner Reckhow and Ms. Freid discussed electric vehicle parking spaces. Commissioner Reckhow suggested having regular programming to remind people to be mindful of their energy consumption.

16-867 Rougemont Community Water System Update and Preview of Related Legal Documents up for Approval

The Rougemont Community Water System project was under construction and progressing well. In addition to receiving a brief update on the project, Commissioners were also asked to preview utility ordinance revisions, the proposed water utility rate structure, the 2016 fiscal year budget ordinance amendment for the water utility, and the water service agreement. The water ordinance revisions were very similar to the water ordinances of the City of Durham.

Commissioner Foster inquired about the water rates for the area. Mr. Cummings stated that the rate structure was to be approved the following week and gave the estimate of regular house use bringing up a bill of about \$40-\$50 per month. Commissioner Foster was concerned about citizens protesting at upcoming meetings because of the rates they would be paying.

Commissioner Reckhow, Mr. Cummings, and Jay Gibson, Director of Engineering and Environmental Services, discussed what a typical household was.

Commissioner Jacobs inquired as to who would be running the water system. Mr. Gibson informed her that the County would, but evaluation of whether it was to the County's advantage to maintain ownership and contract out operations, or to operate and own, would continue. Commissioner Jacobs asked if more staff would be needed to operate the water system. Mr. Gibson stated that for the time being, no additional staff would be needed.

Commissioner Jacobs asked if written notices about the future implications for refusing the free water hook-up would be sent to homeowners. Mr. Cummings stated that they had multiple conversations with the people who declined and tried to fully inform residents. Commissioner Jacobs was concerned about the low market values and low developmental values for homes and homeowners that would result from declining the water system hook-up.

Commissioner Jacobs questioned what the periodic availability charge was. Mr. Gibson clarified that it was for people who could not afford to pay their bill—they would agree to pay a charge per month, which would be less than the full amount due, to maintain water service.

Adjournment

Commissioner Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, that the meeting be adjourned.

The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Tania De Los Santos
Administrative Support Assistant