

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

Monday, November 3, 2003

9:10 A.M. Worksession

**Minutes**

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

Present: Chairman Ellen W. Reckhow, Vice-Chairman Joe W. Bowser, and Commissioners Philip R. Cousin Jr., Becky M. Heron, and Mary D. Jacobs

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Reckhow

**Agenda**

Chairman Reckhow announced that anyone who would like to speak on an item has to sign up in advance, or if an item is moved to the next regular session, it can be spoken on then.

**Funding Shortfall for After-School Care Assistance**

In response to the Board's request made during its October 27, 2003 Regular Session, the County Manager asked the Department of Social Services (DSS) to develop a short-term strategy for after-school care for the balance of the calendar year while other alternatives for the remainder of the fiscal year (and subsequent fiscal years) are being explored. In addition to potential savings in Medicaid, the Manager and DSS were notified by UDI that it has unspent federal Welfare to Work grant funds that may be available to support after-school care for some children. Because the eligibility guidelines for the use of Welfare to Work funds are very stringent, DSS continues to conduct research on how (and whether) the County could use these funds and the potential number of children who could be served with this fund. DSS will have a full report to share with the Board of Commissioners at this meeting on the available Medicaid and UDI Welfare to Work funding, as well as other sources that may be available.

A meeting with the Director of the State Division of Child Development was held Friday, October 31, 2003 with Commission Chairman Ellen Reckhow and Commissioner Becky Heron to discuss Durham's situation and potential State assistance.

Resource Person(s): Ellen W. Reckhow, Chairman; Mike Ruffin, County Manager; and DSS staff—Dan Hudgins, Director; Arnold Dennis; Director for Family Self-Sufficiency;

Sharon Hirsch, Director for Customer Access and Program Support; Karenne Berry, Executive Director for Durham's Alliance for Child Care Access

County Manager's Recommendation: The Manager recommends that the Board approve the short-term strategy (as communicated through email over the weekend) and authorize staff to proceed accordingly. Staff will return with a long-term strategy on December 8 after a thorough examination of all long-term alternatives has been explored.

Chairman Reckhow recognized County Manager Michael M. Ruffin to make his presentation.

The Manager said that enough money was found (\$250,000) in the Social Services' budget to continue the program for the next 60 days (end of the calendar year) to buy time to determine the reallocation from the State. One major source of local funds in the Social Services' budget is Medicaid, which is almost \$12 million. The department will have 60 days to lobby the State and the Legislature. A report of continuation funding will be presented to the Commissioners in December.

County Manager Ruffin recognized Social Services Director Daniel Hudgins for his comments and information.

Mr. Hudgins said various organizations in the community are looking for additional funding from the City (UDI) and the State to provide funding for the shortfall for after-school care assistance.

Commissioner Heron said that the problems are caused by the Federal and State Governments, and that help is needed to communicate the problems to the Legislators on all levels of government.

Chairman Reckhow requested that a second letter be written to the Governor and to all those who received copies of the previous letter. A list of all actions taken on the local level to fill the gap will be included in the letter to reveal the commitment of Durham County and DurhamCAN.

Chairman Reckhow suggested that a meeting be set up with the Durham Delegation in November to give them the full story.

Mr. Hudgins said that several strategies are being considered to get additional funding.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Cousin, to suspend the rules to vote on the matter.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Cousin, to add \$256,056 to the Child Care Subsidy Program as needed.

The motion carried unanimously.

### **Triangle Transit Authority—Update**

John Claflin, General Manager, Triangle Transit Authority (TTA), provided a brief update to the Board on the Authority's efforts with regards to rail corridor planning and transportation demand management. TTA is a public transportation provider, offering a wide variety of services to the Triangle area and outlying counties.

Resource Person(s): John Claflin, General Manager, Triangle Transit Authority

County Manager's Recommendation: The Manager recommends that the Board receive the report and advise staff if any additional information or action is necessary.

Chairman Reckhow announced that as of December 1, 2003, Vice-Chairman Bowser will be Durham County's representative on the TTA.

Chairman Reckhow recognized Mr. Claflin to make a presentation concerning the regional rail system.

Commissioner Heron said that a great concern in Durham County is the lack of plans for a rail transportation system in northern Durham County. She urged Mr. Claflin to remember northern Durham County when rail transit plans are being considered.

Vice-Chairman Bowser urged Mr. Claflin to give consideration to a conducting a survey in northern Durham County relative to rail transportation.

No official action was taken on this item.

### **Report From Rev. James E. Vaughn, Chairman, Durham City/County Cable Advisory Board**

Rev. James E. Vaughn, Chairman, Durham City/County Cable Advisory Board, made a report to the Board of County Commissioners concerning cable-related issues, including:

- Current composition of the Cable Advisory Board;
- Cable Advisory Board bylaws;
- Cable Advisory Board work agenda;
- The need for closer collaboration between the City and County on cable issues; and
- The current atmosphere of cable deregulation.

Rev. Vaughn is a 30-year veteran of the broadcast industry.

Resource Person: Rev. James E. Vaughn, Chairman, Durham City/County Cable Advisory Board

Mr. Greg Thomas, a County appointee to the Durham City/County Cable Advisory Board, was present at the meeting.

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board receive the information.

Chairman Reckhow said that Rev. Vaughan contacted her about a month ago wanting to get more actively involved with the County relative to this joint board.

Rev. Vaughan made a presentation to the Board of County Commissioners. He said that the purpose of his attending the meeting was to introduce the Board and take time to make sure the board's functions are fully understood. He made a presentation on cablevision and congratulated the County for having the foresight and courage to say no to Time Warner Cable regarding rate increases.

Rev. Vaughan urged closer collaboration between the City and County of Durham and other municipalities that have franchises with Time Warner. He discussed the bylaws of the City/County Cable Advisory Board. The cable board's responsibility is to make recommendations to the City Council, City Administration, Board of County Commissioners, and County Administration. This board not only represents a joint effort between the City and County, but also the public through the Public Access Association. Rev. Vaughan discussed the composition of the board's membership.

Rev. Vaughan talked about the importance of the Cable Competition Act of 1996. He stated that the County should be a larger partner in the cable effort.

Commissioner Heron said that the Durham Cable Advisory Board may want to contact Triangle J Council of Governments to work together with the seven municipalities to finalize a franchise agreement. The City of Durham may want to become a part of the franchising agreement to recommend beneficial changes.

Rev. Vaughan said that the Durham Cable Advisory Board would like to see the details on the removal of the certificate to regulate basic rates. He wants to know where that stands at the present time so that the City or anyone else can assist the County.

Chairman Reckhow directed County Attorney Kitchen to attend the next Durham Cable Advisory Board meeting to tell Rev. Vaughan the status of the removal of the certificate to regulate basic rates with Time Warner.

Chairman Reckhow suggested that a Commissioner serve as a liaison to the Durham Cable Advisory Board that meets on the third Monday of the month at 3:30 p.m. in the City Clerk's office. She asked Vice-Chairman Bowser to serve as the liaison.

Commissioner Heron said that she would be able to attend some of the meetings.

**Farmland Preservation: Adoption Map Which Identifies Voluntary Agricultural Districts (VAD) and Agricultural Priority Areas (APA)**

The revised Farmland Protection Ordinance adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in August of this year specifies that Voluntary Agricultural Districts (VAD) be established by the BOCC. The Ordinance also specifies that Farmland Board members be appointed according to the districts. Farmers participating in the program are then members of the district within which they reside. The purposes of the VAD are to encourage the economic and financial health of farming areas, to protect farm activities, and to increase the identity and pride in the agricultural community.

The designation of Agricultural Priority Areas (APA) in Durham County is intended to identify existing lands where Durham County desires to encourage permanent agricultural use. Designation of APA boundaries is the first step in directing the expenditure of funds for farmland protection and conservation easement acquisition. The proposed APA boundary lines take into consideration the Urban Growth Boundary and the draft update of the Durham County Comprehensive Plan.

The Board of County Commissioners is requested to adopt the Voluntary Agricultural Districts and approve the Agricultural Priority Areas. Planning Department and County Engineering, Open Space Division staff, as well as Farmland Protection Board members, reviewed the proposed map.

Resource Persons: Eddie Culberson, Director, Soil & Water Conservation District; Wayne Cash, Chairman, Farmland Protection Board; and Lowell L. Siler, Deputy County Attorney

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board receive and discuss the Voluntary Agricultural Districts (VAD) and Agricultural Priority Areas (APA) matters.

Chairman Reckhow recognized Mr. Culberson to present the agenda item to the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Culberson said that the revised ordinance requires the establishment of priority areas as well as the Voluntary Agricultural District (VAD). Three priority areas (Little River, Flat River, and the Falls Priority Areas) were developed where Durham County wants agricultural activities to continue. Within those areas are the Agricultural Priority Areas (watershed areas).

Chairman Reckhow said to move this item forward to the Regular Session scheduled for November 10, 2003. She directed Mr. Culberson to ask Frank Duke in the City-County Planning Department if he is comfortable with the map as it is drawn, given the current recommendation out of the Comprehensive Planning Process for Urban Services in the southern area near the airport.

Mr. Culberson said that the revised ordinance requests that a new committee be formed from the VAD. Applications from interested citizens wanting to serve on the committee will be submitted.

### **Mental Health Reform Quarterly Report—The Durham Center**

This was the first quarterly report the Board of County Commissioners received regarding the status and changes in the Mental Health Local Business Plan, as well as other reform issues including:

- Request for Proposals (RFP) and Service Divestiture—status report;
- Durham Center Employees—RIF status; transition to private providers; number of staff maintained in County jobs; turnover; moral; severance policy; selection process for Local Management Entity (LME) jobs;
- State Hospital Bed Allocation Days—what this means to the Durham community;
- State Hospital Downsizing—establishment of community services;
- Access System;
- Children’s Programs—system of care; provider network;
- Substance Abuse Services;
- Integrated Payment and Reimbursement System (IPRS);
- Business Practices for the LME—includes new MIS system for managed care; and
- CFAC (Consumer and Family Advisory Committee).

Resource Person(s): Ellen Holliman, Interim Area Director, The Durham Center

County Manager’s Recommendation: The Manager recommended that the Board receive the report, make inquiries, and provide direction as needed.

Chairman Reckhow stated that Doug Wright, Chairman, Mental Health Board, was present along with several other members of the Mental Health Board.

Chairman Reckhow said that she is a Mental Health Board member and much work is going on concerning the reform issues. She said that she was pleased that Ellen Holliman, Interim Area Director, The Durham Center, is going to give the County Commissioners quarterly reports regarding the status and changes in the Mental Health Local Business Plan.

Chairman Reckhow recognized Ellen Holliman to present the first quarterly report.

Ms. Holliman said that County Manager Ruffin recommended that she read the entire written report in her presentation.

The following comments read by Ellen Holliman follow:

“I am here today to give an update on where we are with our local business plan and progress towards being certified as an LME (local management entity). While I could take this time to cover the report in front of you, instead I will use my time to discuss the current and real issues facing our agency – all in some way related to the change in the mental health system.

First, I will tell you these are the most difficult times I have ever seen since joining MH in the early 70's. Just to remind you – we are changing the way we will provide MH services as a response to legislation passed in 2001 – referred to as the MH Reform Act – and the subsequent state plan. While there are many elements to the State Plan and legislation, the very basic requirement is to have LMEs to manage the public MH-DD-SA dollars and have services provided by private agencies. Simply put, this means the LME will become the HMO of the public mental health dollars and all programs and services we have been providing will be transferred to other agencies.

I have given a lot of thought to an analogy to describe what is happening to our public MH system. It's like you are so tired of that disorganized closet – it does not serve you well, you can't find anything – then you decide to reorganize – but to do so, you make an even bigger mess. But as you put things back in order, it again functions to meet your needs. And that's in a simplest way were we are, the system was seen as broken, unresponsive to meeting the needs of citizens. We're in the process of pulling it all out and at the same time putting it together to make it function better to serve more people, more efficiently and using best practice.

This in itself is a huge undertaking. We are trying to transfer the responsibility to providers along with our staff and clients in as seamless process as we can. I can honestly tell you this is a very challenging process. We put out the first divestiture schedule last February, we have shared all requests for proposals with staff, county HR has held meetings to discuss RIF status. No matter what we have done to prepare staff, it is not real until the employee is holding a RFI letter with his/her name on it.

Each of the bullets outlined in your agenda action form represents a major project/or mandate we are dealing with this year. I will begin with request

for proposals and staff. I will discuss both points because they are so inter-rated.

#### REQUEST for PROPOSALS

We actually began January 1, 2003 with the transfer of 25 staff to the Orange, Person, Chatham MH program to provide case management services to children and families of Durham. All staff maintained their positions, pay and benefits under the transfer to OPC. Welcome Baby divested July 1 – all four employees were transferred to the Durham County Cooperative Extension Service. Also in July, the PACT was taken over by the State – one employee took a job with the State and the other with a contractor. In September, we divested of the services provided by Sara Barker Center. Of those 7 positions, 3 were placed in other county positions, one retired, one took a job with the State and 2 received severance pay – they continue to be on priority status for jobs they qualify with the county. In preparing this RFP, we changed this service – why and where are the children? First, this started last February when the area board took a hard look at all programs and services of The Durham Center. It was found that we had a center based program that served anywhere from 16 – 0 children with disabilities and 4 or more children who are considered typically developing at an approximate cost of \$650,000 – additionally, we had a waiting list of approximately 35 children with developmental disabilities who were waiting for services at Sara Barker. After quite a process (that included staff, child care experts in the community and a parent) it was decided that instead of divesting the program as it was currently structured, we would revise the program to be more in line with best practice, serve all the children and be more cost effective. A non-profit agency, Community Partnerships begin this summer working with the children and families. Essentially, the children are placed in normal day care centers and with supports (extra staff) to assist the child with developmental disabilities. I might add this way of providing services to young children will follow the child as he becomes school-aged – with the No child left behind effort in our public schools.

So what is happening with Sara Barker? The Arc of Durham, who owns the building, is partnering with Lifespan and another provider to reopen Sara Barker as a facility to serve at least 50% children with developmental disabilities and 50% children who are typically developing. The Arc has requested we transfer the county owned equipment in the building to them to continue to provide day care services to children. The request is awaiting your action at a future BOCC meeting.

In addition to the three programs just mentioned, we have 6 programs we are currently working with to finalize RFPs – we are at different stages

with each one – from negotiating the contract, working with the agency to hire staff, transferring clients – with all trying to make it as seamless a process for clients and for staff – trying to be fair.

This is a good point to talk about specific staff issues. Overall I would say we are at our lowest point with staff moral. At the same time, you will find very brave staff trying to provide services and cope with the changing environment. Their feelings go from sad, frustrated, scared, to stressed and angry about what is happening to them and the system they have known for many years. I am personally keenly aware of where they are – it's not easy losing the system you have known – to be faced with the stress of a new employer and way of providing services. The paradigm shift is huge for the majority of our staff.

Other points regarding staff:

1. Turnover. As you might surmise, the Mental Health Reform process has caused the Durham Center to experience increased employee turnover. The turnover rate for the six-month period from May to October 2002 was 13% (25 employees out of 198). In the comparable period in 2003, the rate was 16% (22 out of 136 employees). If the 13 RJF-ed employees are included in this latter figure, the rate jumps to 26 %. As we have lost staff, we have filled in with contract staff — however, this continues to present us challenges as we need to transport clients — and only county employees can do that because of insurance issues. The problem I have with continuing fill vacant positions with county staff is that makes the competition for county jobs even stiffer for our longer term employees. Highest among our daily challenges is to provide services while developing our new LME system. Also, we have not filled positions where we can.

2. RFP Process. As we divest our programs, we place the highest value on how potential providers plans on utilizing our staff. The evaluation criteria for the proposals are heavily weighted on the employee issue. Shortly after the contractor is selected, we arrange for them to meet with the affected employees to discuss employment opportunities and the application process. The contractors, thus far, have been very keen on hiring as many of our staff as possible and are offering generally comparable pay and benefit packages. However, like the situation with Sara Barker, it may be that some programs will be redesigned to be more cost efficient and therefore, there may not be the need for as many staff as we currently have in a particular program.

3. RIF Process. The RFP process is guided by a schedule, that has been shared with all employees — in fact it is posted on our web-site. As soon as it becomes clear that a program will be transferred to a contractor, and a

necessary RIF will result, we issue official RIF notices to affected employees. The County policy requires at least a 30-day notice, but we try to give more than that if at all possible. This gives HR more time to try to place the employees elsewhere in the County.

With the 6 programs we are transferring to other providers effective December 1 —28 staff received RJF letters — while the process is far from over, this is the current status of these employees —In the programs of MR-MI (case management for persons with both mental retardation and mental illness), CAP (Medicaid waiver program to keep people who would have gone to the state institution in the community) and Majors (Substance Abuse programs for children involved in the court system) — Of the 14 staff effected — 4 people were selected for LME positions; 2 are transferring to other county departments; the other 8 are applying with the provider. With the other programs — TASC, Prevention and the Crisis Stabilization Facility —we have not finalized our contracts with the providers, so meetings have not taken place staff. It is our hope this will happen in the next week to 10 days.

4. Severance Pay. First of all, the county severance package is intended to assist the RIF status employee who may face a period of unemployment due to the loss of county job. We do not see it intended as an earned entitlement due to anyone departing from the county employment. #1. The staff person's status regarding R I F eligibility is not impacted by a decision not to accept a offer of employment from a contractor. Staff have the option to apply for consideration with a contractor for employment. The decision to apply is determined by individual choice. The RIF status is not in any way impacted by staff who do not choose to apply for contract opportunities.

You may recall reading in a recent email I sent to staff regarding the 72 hour condition...meaning the employee has 72 hours following an offer of a position by the provider to give an answer. The 'priority placement consideration status' we have negotiated for employees being impacted by divestiture, is out of necessity a time limited status. These contractors must bring staff onboard immediately in order to build the staff capacity to assume the case coordination/support functions required by the divestiture contract. Once the employee receives an offer of employment from a contractor under the 'priority placement consideration status', the offer has 72 hours time limit for the employee to make a decision and be guaranteed placement availability. Employees upon accepting these employment opportunities will be required to begin orientation and training as employees of the contractor in advance of the December 1st date. Therefore employees accepting positions are required to submit their

resignation to County HR effective the hire date established with the contractor.

It is true those employees who resign County employment in advance of the Dec 1st RJF separation date will not be considered eligible for the severance package.

ALL EMPLOYEES IN RIF STATUS ARE PROVIDED PRIORITY PLACEMENT ATTENTION BY COUNTY HR. THE GOAL OF HR IS TO PLACE AS MANY EMPLOYEES IN OTHER COUNTY POSITIONS IN ORDER TO AVOID FORCED RIF SEPARATIONS WITH AS MANY EMPLOYEES AS POSSIBLE. HR may determine an employee not eligible for the severance package if they a) refused an offer of suitable employment from a County agency or b) refused to interview for County positions deemed suitable for placement by HR.

5. LME Hiring Process. At the same time we are divesting direct services, we are establishing the LME. A committee has been meeting for several months developing job descriptions and an organizational chart for the new organization. We have already begun to hire persons for some LME positions.

We advertise positions solely to (County) Durham Center employees. Interested persons apply and are interviewed. Selections are made from the most qualified. To date, all LME positions have been filled with Durham Center staff.

To date we have hired:

--Four Contract Management Positions

--Three Care Management Positions

--One Hospital Liaison position (another is being advertised outside the department, since there were no internal applicants to apply)

While the LME positions have not been finalized by County HR — we have used the following process — advertised to internal staff only — once the person is selected, the person is transferred to the new department — along with his current salary and position. Once all the LME positions are finalized the staff transferred will be reclassified.

6. 18 Employees have over 15 years of County Service

10 employees have over 20 years of service — of those 2 can retire now with 30 years of employment; 3 can retire with over 25 years of service;

2 have been in RIF status — but selected in one of the LME positions

The remaining 3 have RIF letters, but the programs they are in have not finalized contracts — these are the folks who need to look for government employment to maximize their years of service.”

Chairman Reckhow announced a mental health reform training session to be held next Monday beginning at 4:00 p.m. in the County Commissioners’ Chambers.

Chair Reckhow said that she appreciated the quarterly report and would like an update in three months.

### **Performance Appraisal Instrument for BOCC-Appointed Officials**

The Board of Commissioners requested a formal performance appraisal instrument to assist with performance appraisals for the County Manager, County Attorney, Clerk to the Board, and Tax Administrator. Commission Chairman Ellen Reckhow and Commissioner Mary Jacobs worked with the Human Resources Department to develop an instrument for the Board of County Commissioners to consider.

Resource Person(s): Ellen W. Reckhow, Chairman; Mary D. Jacobs, Commissioner; Jackye Knight, Human Resources Director, and Marie Shaw-Simmons, Senior Human Resources Analyst

County Manager’s Recommendation: The Manager recommended that the Board review the instrument and make any revisions as it deems appropriate.

Chairman Reckhow recognized Commissioner Jacobs to introduce this agenda item and to make any remarks.

Commissioner Jacobs commented that during her first participation in an evaluation, she was concerned that the Commissioners did not have a written evaluation instrument.

Elaine Hyman, Employee Relations Manager, Human Resources Department, said that one of her responsibilities is the Performance Appraisal System that is based on a workplan.

Ms. Shaw-Simmons said that the workplan has been placed on our form that is used by all employees and includes the rating system which allows transfer of the work objectives to the plan. Then it allows for prioritization and evaluation of the objectives.

Chairman Reckhow said that the step that needs to be added is to help the individual set priorities as high, medium, and low.

Chairman Reckhow recognized Commissioner Jacobs to discuss an instrument about the management performance factors. The staff would use this form to comment on the interaction or reaction of the County Manager with the staff. This form would be used

next year (November 2004) to evaluate the County Manager. He will have a year to work with the form before the form will be used for his evaluation.

Commissioner Heron had a concern about the department heads evaluating the County Manager. She will have to think about it before she can support the suggestion.

Vice-Chairman Bowser said that he could support the concept of the department heads evaluating the County Manager.

Commissioner Jacobs said that the form needs additional work.

Chairman Reckhow and Commissioner Jacobs would meet with Ms. Shaw-Simmons to discuss a form to use with the elected officials whose salaries are set by the County. The Commissioners could ask the Sheriff and Register of Deeds to present a workplan for the upcoming year when they are evaluated in June.

Chairman Reckhow asked the Commissioners to present any proposed changes to the form to Commissioner Jacobs or Mr. Umstead by November 10, 2003 to allow enough time for the County Manager's evaluation by the end of the month.

### **Update on the Results Based Accountability Process**

At the September 29, 2003 Fall Retreat, Commissioners were informed of the progress made on implementing Community Wide Outcomes (Track 1) and County departmental Performance Measures (Track 2). The morning session focused on performance measures of County departmental programs. The consensus among Commissioners was to continue the work on developing and implementing performance measures in County Government departments. The afternoon session concerned Community-Wide Outcomes; the work of five of the ten outcome workgroups was highlighted. The retreat culminated with discussion regarding whether the Commissioners wish to support further the community-wide work around the ten outcome areas, and whether to invite other organizations and community leaders to partner in sponsoring the next steps. The result of this discussion was to take some time to understand and consider how best to move forward with the community-wide efforts. Staff was directed to allow the Commissioners time to process the information and to bring this back to the November 4, 2003 Worksession to discuss how to proceed.

A number of next steps have been proposed for consideration by the Board:

- Community-Wide Outcomes (Track 1)  
Partner with Durham City Government to help facilitate expanding the community workgroups to allow for greater participation and shared responsibility for effecting community change, a challenge encountered by many of the workgroups. City Administration is favorable to partnering with the County in this process and has offered to introduce this opportunity to City Council at its December retreat. Durham

County could then extend formal invitations to members of the community and appoint members to serve on its outcome workgroups.

Another recommendation is to narrow the focus of our outcome areas. Currently, ten outcome workgroups exist; staff suggests combining a few groups whose issues overlap, leaving the following broad outcome areas on which to concentrate:

1. All of Durham's citizens and communities are healthy;
  2. All of Durham's citizens and communities are safe;
  3. Children are ready for and succeeding in school;
  4. Durham's communities are vibrant, embrace and celebrate cultural diversity, and are supported by active citizens. (Staff recommends including the "Elders Live With Dignity" workgroup into this one.)
  5. Durham enjoys a prosperous economy. (Combine the high performance workforce into this group.); and
  6. Durham enjoys a sustainable environment.
- County Department Performance Measures (Track 2)  
County departments have continued developing performance measures for two or three of their programs. A training session was held on October 16, 2003 for nearly 350 supervisors to increase the knowledge of performance measurements throughout the organization. The City of Durham participated in this training opportunity by sending fifty of its employees. County departments are continuing to gather data to track and report progress. The FY 2004 Budget would offer an opportunity for every County department to report on at least one performance measurement.

The support of the Board of County Commissioners was critical to continue the progress being made both within County departments, as well as in the Durham County community.

Resource Person(s): Michael M. Ruffin, County Manager, and Heidi N. Duer, Assistant to the County Manager

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board receive the presentation, make changes as it deems appropriate to the strategies of the Results Based Accountability process, and authorize staff to move forward with the implementation thereof.

Chairman Reckhow suggested that the Results Based Accountability process should be put on the joint meeting agenda with the Board of Education and the Board of County Commissioners scheduled for November 24, 2003.

Commissioner Jacobs wanted a financial report on the accountability process.

Chairman Reckhow directed staff to put this item on the consent agenda for Monday, November 10, 2003.

**Closed Session**

County Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, to adjourn to closed session pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with an attorney and to preserve the attorney-client privilege.

The motion carried unanimously.

**Open Session**

Chairman Reckhow said that the Board gave direction to staff in the Closed Session.

**Adjournment**

Chairman Reckhow adjourned the worksession at 1:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Garry E. Umstead, CMC  
Clerk to the Board