

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

Monday, June 1, 2009

9:00 A.M. Worksession

MINUTES

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

Present: Chairman Michael D. Page, Vice-Chairman Ellen W. Reckhow, and Commissioners Becky M. Heron, Brenda A. Howerton, and Joe Bowser.

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Page

Review of May BOCC Directives

Laura Jensen, Assistant to the County Manager, introduced this item stating that at each month's worksession, the Board of County Commissioners has the opportunity to review the previous month's directives for staff and make comments as necessary.

Chairman Page thanked Ms. Jensen for the update; no directives were given.

Presentation of Revisions to the Durham County Ten-Year Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan for 2009-2019

Michael Turner, Director of General Services, introduced this item. He stated that North Carolina General Statute (NCGS) 130A-309.09A (b), which became effective October 1, 1996, requires each unit of local government, either individually or in cooperation with other local governments, to develop a ten-year comprehensive SWMP and submit to the North Carolina Department of Environment & Natural Resources (NC-DENR) for approval. In addition, each local government is required to submit a three-year revision to the SWMP adopted through resolution by the BOCC. On June 23, 1997, the Board adopted Durham County's first 10-year comprehensive SWMP for 1997-2006. The plan was revised in 2000 and 2003; the last revision was made on June 9, 2006.

Mr. Turner informed the Board that the next revision is due to the NC-DENR by July 1, 2009, for the period 2009-2019. The three-year update discussed the current solid waste practices used within Durham County, possible changes that could be made to improve solid waste management and reduction initiatives for the next ten years. Future Plan updates will follow at least every three years to allow for improvements and continuous monitoring of the Plan's implementation. The intent is to continue to further develop and implement strategies for waste reduction and for future solid waste management alternatives.

In light of the current state of the economy, a great deal of emphasis will be placed on providing the maximum benefit and level of service while using the least amount of public

funding possible. The County has agreed that using solid waste disposal tax distributions to help maintain existing waste reduction/recycling programs and services would be the best course of action. Recommended enhancements to these existing programs, as outlined in this 2009 Plan Update, will be accomplished largely through the use of staff time and expertise, and will focus on public outreach, education, partnerships with local business, educational, and community institutions.

Participating departments in this year's update include the County Department of General Services, the Durham City Solid Waste Management Department, the North Carolina State Department of Pollution Prevention & Environmental Assistance, and the Durham County Office of Emergency Management.

Mr. Turner added that prior to the three-year update, a hearing to receive public comment had been scheduled by the BOCC for the last three revisions, which occurred on June 26, 2000, June 9, 2003; and June 12, 2006. At each of these public hearings, no one signed up to comment on the revision.

Mr. Turner informed the Board that for the 2009-2019 update, staff took a different approach and advertised two public community meetings to invite citizen input. The first meeting was conducted on Wednesday, April 16, 2009, from 6:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. at the North Regional Library. A second meeting was conducted on Thursday, April 29, 2009, from 6:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. at the East Regional Library. Both meetings were advertised in The Herald-Sun on April 8, 2009, at a cost of \$663.48 and on NBC-17 MyNC.com. In addition, the community meetings were posted on the Durham County Public Information "News Release" homepage; the Official Durham County, North Carolina Twitter website; and the Department of General Services Waste Reduction and Recycling website. Three County residents attended the April 16 meeting to provide comment, and one person, a reporter from The Herald-Sun, attended the April 29 meeting. Also, three citizens responded at two of the public meetings, with input via email to Brian Haynesworth, County Waste Reduction Specialist. All comments received were considered in the development of the 2009 update.

Mr. Turner concluded by stating that with no public comment on the last three updates (2000, 2003, and 2006), with the County Attorney's clarification that a public hearing is not required, and in consideration of the two public community meetings advertised and conducted by a representative of the Department of General Services, no public hearing is being recommended. Instead, and with input from the Board at this meeting on the plan, the Board would be asked at their next regular scheduled meeting on June 8, 2009 to adopt a resolution approving the 2009-2019 plan revisions for submittal to NC-DENR by June 30, 2009.

Brian Haynesworth, Waste Reduction Specialist, presented the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) with an update on revisions to the Durham County 10-Year Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for 2009-2019. He highlighted the executive summary.

Mr. Haynesworth stated that Durham County would educate residents as to what can be disposed within the County and to provide the means for alternatives for the disposal.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow voiced her opinion regarding the goal percentage.

Mr. Haynesworth concurred with the Vice-Chairman Reckhow's comments. He added that the waste reduction management team would be establishing an advisory body comprised of the City, County, Duke, and NCCU to have a quarterly meeting to discuss solid waste issues.

Commissioner Heron commended Larry Dixon, Waste Reduction Supervisor, on what is currently being done as it relates to solid waste.

Commissioner Bowser suggested that in order to reduce waste, homes that are producing the waste should be visited. He expressed concerns about waste being brought from Orange County to the facility transfer station. He voiced his opinion about dumpsters at the waste stations that do not have a drive-up ramp.

Commissioner Bowser asked the following:

- Is the department tracking what is being picked up; how is it being tracked?
- Is BFI landfill located within the County?
- Would waste in a facility such as BFI landfill show in Durham County's numbers as far as the state is concerned?

Mr. Haynesworth stated that at the close of a fiscal year, Cities that have a major stake in the solid waste management are required to report on what is being disposed at their particular facilities. The companies have to provide the information to the State. When the information is received, the information tracked and determined how much of the waste is being generated and from the companies. As far as BFI landfill, the State only works with facilities that are properly permitted.

Mr. Turner responded to Vice-Chairman Reckhow's suggestion regarding the 18% goals. He stated that staff would happily revisit the percentage. He answered Commissioner Heron's question regarding the effect annexation has had on solid waste and recycle locations.

Chairman Page expressed appreciation regarding the public education program to enlighten citizens regarding the importance of solid waste disposal.

Directive

1. Place on the June 8 consent agenda.
2. Consider ways to get the private haulers involved in the efforts to reinforce what is going on.

Durham Cooperative Extension—Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service (NCCES), North Carolina State University (NCSU), North Carolina Cooperative Extension Program (NCCEP), and North Carolina A&T University (NCA&T)

Delphine A. Sellars, County Extension Director, introduced this item stating that on April 13, 2009, the BOCC approved a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) which details the individual relationships and mutually agreed-upon responsibilities of North Carolina

State University, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, and Durham County. Specifically, the agreement outlines and clarifies the employment relationship between cost-shared employees of North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, North Carolina Cooperative Extension Program, and Durham County. This MOU was approved, through Consent Agenda on April 13, 2009, with the understanding that by agreeing to be a send-in County, the salaries of shared county and state employees would be equally divided between the County and University System. Subsequent clarification now indicates that this is not the case. Extension is requesting that the BOCC elect to make Durham Extension a Send-in/Lock-in County Agency instead of the previous selection of Send-in only.

Ms. Sellars provided clarification to the Board regarding the Send-in/Lock-in option of the MOU. She stated that the employees would be State employees based on benefits, salary, and workers comp.

Commissioner Bowser asked why the State would be willing to take on additional monetary responsibilities. He discussed the services that Cooperative Extension provides for Durham County.

County Manager Ruffin elaborated on the State's decision to consider a better way to administer Cooperative Extension with each county that is more standardized. He felt as though the County would benefit from sharing cost.

Directive

Place on the June 8 Consent Agenda.

Proposed Wellness Center Contract for Fiscal Year 2010

Marqueta Welton, Director of Human Resources, introduced this item. She asked the Board of County Commissioners to receive information on the performance of the Durham County Employees' Wellness Clinic and make recommendations on continuing the Wellness Clinic operations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2009.

Sabine Cioto, Assistant Vice President of Client Services, HealthStat, presented the following:

Who is HealthStat?

- HealthStat is a leading provider of On-site Primary Care, High Health Risk, and Disease Management services for employers throughout the United States.
- Headquartered in Charlotte, N.C. and founded in 2001.
- 87 clients, 22 states, over 61,000 employees, plus dependents.
- 9 Municipalities/Government entities.

What are the Primary Goals?

- Early detection of potential health risks to improve quality of life;
- Lower the cost of primary care with an on-site Practitioner available to all eligible employees;

- Engage employees in health promotion, prevention, and health risk management activities, resulting in a healthier population;
- Assist in the reduction of healthcare costs for both the employer and employee.

Durham County

- Opened on-site clinic in June 2007;
- Clinic staffed by a Nurse Practitioner and Medical Office Assistant;
- Clinic available Monday through Friday, 36 hours per week;
- 6,031 visits to on-site clinic between April 2008 and April 2009
- As of April 20, 2009:
 - 1,849 clinic eligible participants
 - 1,289 have completed a Health Risk Assessment (70%)
 - 43% (553) have two or more risk factors or any one panic value
 - 53% of those above are compliant with HealthStat’s standard program
 - 83% of visits are for disease management

Additional Programs:

Slim Down Contest #1

- August 2008 – October 2008
- 159 Participants
- 469 total pounds lost

Slim Down Contest #2

- January 2009 – March 2009
- Began with 142 Participants
- Weight loss goal: 1,000 pounds
- 67 participants at end of contest
- 916 total pounds lost
- 26 participants lost greater than 5% of their body weight

Positive effects of the on-site clinic

- Data is based on employees having completed at least two risk assessments. A risk assessment consists of a healthy survey; biometrics (height, weight, and blood pressure); and a fasting blood draw (lipid panel, glucose, and PSA). All information is based on assessments through December 2008.

Positive effects of the on-site clinic (Graphs)

Office Visit Cost compared to HealthStat cost

	<i>Employees’ and Claims</i>	
	<i>Office Visits – Current Period</i>	
	<i>Office Visits</i>	<i>HealthStat Encounters</i>
<i>Number of Visits/Encounters</i>	7867	6854
<i>Paid Amount</i>	\$991,003	\$358,942
<i>Average Cost Per Visit/Encounter</i>	\$126	\$52

Ms. Welton responded to Vice-Chairman Reckhow's question regarding how the numbers compare to the targeted number. She stated that the targeted number 90% is based on the number of participants; however, only 70% has participated in the risk assessment.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow asked how Durham County could navigate closer to the targeted number.

Ms. Cioto responded that offering incentives or disincentives would increase the employee participation.

Ms. Welton explained the employee incentive to the Board. She addressed the 90% goal.

County Attorney Kitchen stated that federal regulations do not allow the County to use the stick approach as it relates to employees.

John Gasiorowski, Independent Benefits Advisors, responded to the federal regulations. He commented about 70% of the employees that participate in the HRA. He recommended that staff review the budget and find ways to encourage employees to complete the assessment or reassessment. He discussed statistics regarding preventing catastrophic claims.

Stephanie Turner, Durham County Nurse Practitioner, addressed Commissioner Heron's question regarding the follow-up visits. She stated that it is not mandatory that employees follow up with the clinic; however, employees may use their primary care physician. She stated that technically she could be the employees' primary provider; however, when the office is closed the employee has no access to her or the clinic.

Chairman Page made comments regarding the hemoglobin A1C levels.

Directives

1. Consider ways to get employees to be proactive about their health care.
2. Consider a less costly approach.
3. Educate employees about the incentives given as it relates to HealthStat.
4. Include diversion in the education campaign for the employees.

Request from Durham's Partnership for Children—Donated Space for Early Head Start Grant

Marsha Basloe, Executive Director, requested that the Board consider providing a match to a grant application being submitted by Durham's Partnership for Children for an Early Head Start Program. The proposed match would be in the amount of \$23,050 over a two-year period in the form of a sublease for office space in the amount of \$1 year. The office space is located in the Durham's Alliance for Child Care Access (DACCA) facility located at 1201 Briggs Avenue. The space is currently not being used due to the relocation of the DACCA business office to DSS. It is comprised of a large 922 square foot space with four modular workstations, two tables, side chairs, a conference room table, and chairs. The County has a 10-year lease at \$12.50 per square foot with Child Care Services Association.

Ms. Basloe provided background information stating that in 2008, the Partnership convened a community work group to undertake a strategic planning process specifically around the needs of infants and toddlers in Durham County. The group developed a strategic plan which identified community resources and needs/gaps within the community. Strategies were developed that would build on community strengths and meet the specific needs and existing gaps. One specific strategy identified was the development of an Early Head Start program when federal funding became available. With the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, \$17 million will be available in North Carolina for the expansion of Early Head Start programming. With the Durham County's Strategic Plan for Infants and Toddlers already completed, Durham County is well positioned to apply for this federal grant.

Durham's Partnership for Children, in collaboration with community partners, is developing a grant application that could bring in more than \$1 million in federal funding to serve more than 100 at-risk infants and toddlers. As part of the federal grant, there is a requirement of a 20 percent non-federal share that may be met by cash or in-kind contributions. Durham's Partnership for Children is requesting County support for office space for the Durham Early Head Start program. If approved, Durham County's contribution would be \$23,050 over two years in the form of office space.

Ms. Basloe concluded by stating that currently, the County pays the rent for this space from child care subsidy administration funds. These funds are restricted and cannot pay for an Early Head Start program lease; therefore, the \$1/year lease to the Partnership would require that \$23,050 in new monies be identified and appropriated through the DSS budget as follows:

- FY 09-10—\$8,643.78 for a 9-month lease
- FY 10-11—\$11,525 for a 12-month lease;
- FY 11-12—\$2,881.26 for a 3-month lease.

Kate Irish, Program and Evaluation Manager with Durham's Partnership for Children, discussed the following:

Overview

- Background
- Strategic Planning Process
- Early Head Start
- Durham's Early Head Start Application

Durham's Early Childhood System Framework

- Needs
- Goals
- Strategies
- Impact Areas

Birth-Three Years Critical for Brain Architecture

- Research tells us that starting even with Pre-K can be too late.

- The birth-three years are critical for the developing brain architecture.
- Emphasis on Pre-K and four year olds means that babies and toddlers have been left behind.

Preventive Intervention is More Efficient and Produces More Favorable Outcomes than Late Remediation (Chart)

Durham's Strategic Planning Process

- Invited diverse group of experts, parents, stakeholders, etc. to participate.
 - Child Care, health, family support, researchers, parents, faith community.
- Assessed community needs
- Identified Strengths/Resources
- Identified Gaps in Services/Supports
- Developed Strategies

Vision: We envision a community where all infants and toddlers are nurtured in healthy, safe, and age appropriate environments for optimal growth and development.

Needs of families with infants and toddlers

- Access and quality of child care
 - 580 children ages birth-three on waiting list for child care subsidy (May 2009).
 - Approximately 200 slots in five-star child care facilities for infants and toddlers (January 2009).
- Intensive, evidence based family support services for families not accessing licensed child care.

Strategic Goals

- Increase quality of existing child care and build the supply of high quality infant and toddler child care.
- Increase the availability of beneficial and accessible supports and services for effective parenting.
- Improve the physical and social emotional well-being of infants and toddlers.
- Mobilize the community to recognize the importance of promoting healthy infant growth and development and allocate resources to meet the needs of these children and families.

Key Strategy: Early Head Start

- Serves low-income infants, toddlers, pregnant women and families.
- Enhances children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development; assists pregnant women to access comprehensive prenatal and postpartum care; supports parents' efforts to fulfill their parental roles; and helps parents move toward self-sufficiency.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

- An estimated \$619 million in ARRA funds for expansion of Early Head Start.

- North Carolina will receive approximately \$17 million.
- Existing Early Head Start programs may expand and new applicants may apply.

Durham's Early Head Start Application

- Serve approximately 100-300 low-income infants and toddlers.
- Center-based and Home-based program options to meet the needs of families.
- Collaboration with community child care sites to offer Early Head Start.
- Could bring more than \$1 million into Durham County.

Early Head Start Collaborators

- Operation Breakthrough
- Child Care Services Association
- Healthy Families Durham
- Chapel Hill Training Outreach Project
- Durham's Partnership for Children

Request from County for Support

- Early Head Start requires a 20% non-federal share that may be met by cash or in-kind contributions.
- Request of County support for office space for the Durham Early Head Start program staff.

Ms. Blasoe explained that the \$250,000 would be a match if \$1 million could be brought into Durham County. She stated that 20% is needed of the total grant and the match. She asked that the County contribute \$23,050. She informed the Board that Durham's Partnership for Children is in conversation with other smart start subsidies regarding the funds.

Commissioner Heron suggested that the organization place resources from programs that are not successful into programs that are successful.

Ms. Blasoe responded to Commissioner Heron's concern about how the Partnership for Children was working with Cooperative Extension. She stated that the organizations work very closely together. She stated that the entities are currently working hard on the East Durham Children's initiative.

Delphine Sellars, Cooperative Extension Director, stated that all extension services are utilized in reaching out to the community and providing services to families.

Commissioner Heron asked the following:

- Is there an evaluation being done on these programs?
- Have Partnership for Children asked other organizations for \$23,050?
- What would happen to the programs, when there are no stimulus funds?

Vice-Chairman Reckhow expressed gratification to see the proposal for Early Head Start. She stated that it is a much needed program in Durham. As it relates to the support, she addressed the issue that the out-of-pocket cost would be 50% of the \$23,050. The County

has a long term lease for the space. She pointed out that if the County does not match the grant then the County would still be liable for the payment because of the 10-year lease.

Carolyn Titus, Deputy County Manager addressed Vice-Chairman Reckhow's concerns, stating that the County has the long-term lease for the space. She stated that the lease is being paid for out of the child care subsidy. She has been informed by the Department of Social Services finance office that the amount needed in new dollars is \$23,050.

The Board and staff held discussions about the County's contribution of \$23,050.

Commissioner Bowser asked the following:

- What percentage would go into direct cost?
- If the County gives in-kind funds would the amount count towards the 15%?
- Are you in dialogue with other organizations that provided these services?

Ms. Blasoe responded stating that the early head start program provide guidelines that require no more than 15% of salaries and benefits be used for administrative purposes; therefore, 85% would go into direct services.

Directive

1. Focus on other directions to ensure that the programs succeed.
2. Consider at ways to engage the parents.
3. Consider the long-term ramifications regarding future agreements.
4. Find ways to get citizens economically involved in the community.

Agenda Adjustments

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to add the Health and Human Services item to the agenda

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Bowser Heron, Howerton, Page, and Reckhow
Noes: None

Health and Human Services Financing

George Quick, Finance Director, briefed the Board on the financing portion of the Health and Human Services Complex. He stated that back in April, the County closed on \$118,000,000 finance proposal that included approximately \$61,000,000 that was placed in a fixed-rate portion; however, \$56,000,000 was of a variable rate nature. The variable rate portion was to be priced on a seven day variable rate facility that was managed through SunTrust.

Mr. Quick stated that when the County started and closed on the deal, the first two weeks of the deal went smoothly; however, the beginning of the third week, SunTrust was downgraded to a level that did not allow them to access the market at market rates. Within week three,

the County ended up paying 1.55% for the money while the market rate was at .55cents. Things got to the point where it was unable to remarket about 23 million of the 55 million with a rate starting at 2.2%. Currently, the County is paying .28% for the funds when the market is around .40 cents.

Mr. Quick informed the Board that he worked with SunTrust on an offer that would move the financing from their facility to another financial institution. A deal was reached with SunTrust that would bring the federal home loan bank into play to overlay the credit in which the results would be that the County would end up being below market about .39 cent. The County would have to take the deal back to have the overlay approved and make minor changes to the documents that support the particular bond.

Mr. Quick recommended that this item be brought back to the Board June 22 for approval and hope to take it to the following week for implementation.

Commissioner Heron asked if the County could stay with SunTrust or move to another financial institution?

Mr. Quick responded that by moving to another institution, the pricing would be substantially greater than what the rework would cost. He spoke about the \$61,000 legal fees that would be incurred by doing that

The Board thanked Mr. Quick for his report.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairman Page adjourned the meeting at 12:24 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Angela M. Pinnix
Clerk to the Board's office