

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

Monday, March 3, 2008

9:00 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 Michael D. Page, and Commissioners Lewis A. Cheek, Philip R. Cousin Jr. and Becky M. Heron

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Reckhow

Citizen Comments

Fred Foster Jr., 5718 Whippoorwill Street, Durham, NC 27704, requested time on the agenda to speak to the Commissioners about the energy plan that Duke Power is proposing for the citizens of Durham. He made the following comments:

“We are living in a time where more and more families are looking for ways to save money. Energy efficiency and energy conservation are the first lines of defense in keeping our utility cost down.

Duke Energy has a proposal (E-7sub 831) before the North Carolina Utility Commission that asks for money to teach energy conservation and gives the savings back to the utility company. Let me clarify, the North Carolina Utility Commission want us to save money and give it to them. We need more energy conservation programs that make our homes more energy efficient, which improves the housing stock in our communities.

When government has to pay more in utility cost, that money is lost to the people the government serves. The problem with this proposal is that it shifts the burden on to the renting poor people on fixed incomes.

Does Duke Energy believe slumlords will fix up their properties when they don't pay the utility bill? This will become a tax on the poor. Are you aware of how much Social Services paid in Energy Relief to the poor?

Please send a letter to the North Carolina Utility Commission asking them to vote for denial (E-7sub 831). This proposal is a penny wise and a pound foolish”.

Commissioner Cheek requested that staff review the Residential Energy Use in Low-Income Households in North Carolina Report and bring recommendations back to the Board.

Iris Wadsworth requested time on the agenda to speak to the tax foreclosure on 110 Plantation Drive; however, she was not in attendance.

Rhonda Dotsey, President, Friends of Hill Forest, requested to speak to the Commissioners about a situation of concern to residents of Hill Forest. She stated that the Friends of Forest Hill is a nonprofit citizen’s organization chartered to support continued recreational use of Hill Demonstration Forest as well as its primary focus on education, research, and environmental stewardship. She requested that Commissioners endorse the resolution.

Ms. Dotsey stated that the following goals are to provide an organization that will:

- Represent and advocate for the entire community of users of Hill Demonstration Forest.
- Develop options for trail creation and maintenance.
- Create a recreation protocol that assures all stakeholders access.
- Speak with one voice to whoever can help us keep community access open.

Chairman Reckhow suggested that the resolution be forwarded to the Open Space and Trails Commission for discussion.

Durham Workforce Development Board Annual Report

Alan Delisle, Assistant City Manager for Economic and Workforce Development, introduced this item. He stated that the Durham Workforce Development Board staff requested to present its Program Year 2006 Annual Report to the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Delisle highlighted the following:

The Durham Workforce Development Board and Durham JobLink
2006-2007 Highlights

1. 2007 Youth Summit - youth from diverse backgrounds
2. Honey Baked Ham Job Fair - 28 job seekers found jobs
3. Hurricane Katrina Program - 70 placed, 12 in training
4. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Recognition Ceremony - 52 honorees (Adults and Youth)
5. Workforce Development Forums - 54 businesses from healthcare, bioscience, higher education and IT

Kevin Dick, Workforce Development Administrator, continued the report discussing the following:

The Durham JobLink System

Through the Durham JobLink Career System We Provide:

1. Services to All Job Seekers Including:
 - Low Income Adults and Youth
 - Laid off Individuals
 - Ex-Offenders
 - Other Special Populations
2. Services to All Businesses including Those in our Four High Demand Target Industries:
 - Healthcare
 - Higher Education
 - Information Technology
 - Bioscience
3. Other High Growth Industries Programs for All Job Seekers
 - Over 4,300 employed
 - 11,496 registered job seekers
 - Over 60,000 in customer traffic (repeat visits by job seekers)
 - Over 3,000 new job listings from businesses with over 5,300 new openings

Job Seeker Characteristics

Adult, Laid Off Workers and Low Income Youth

Programs for Unemployed, Underemployed and Laid Off Workers

- 225 Individuals found employment
- 85% stayed on the job at least six months
- 51 people that were employed also received an educational credential
- Placement wage goals for participants exceeded

Programs Serving Ex-Offenders

- Between July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007, ex-offenders were released from state prisons and returned to Durham.
- 145 individuals served (others were served by other community groups) in the JobLink Ex-offender Program.
- 76 placed into employment and 28 were placed into training.
- Average wage - \$8.87 per hour (up from \$8.25 last year).
- 63% of program clients were still employed after 6 months.

Programs Serving Hurricane Katrina Re-locators

- Over 200 families relocated to Durham from the Gulf Coast.
- 82 participants career counseling, job placement, and job retention assistance.
- 70 became employed.
- Average wage: over \$11 per hour.
- 12 enrolled in training.

A Hurricane Katrina Success Story

- Shamika, Anthony, and their two children relocated to Durham after the storm hit.
- Anthony was able to find a employment through a six-month Work Experience contract under the National Emergency Grant (NEG) program, that provided him with the skill-set and means to secure a full-time position with Home Depot.
- Shamika received assistance in recertification of her Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) license and accepted a position that allowed her to work around their children's school schedule.

The Durham JobLink Youth Employed and Succeeding (YES) Program

- 100% of the youth aged 19 - 21 that were looking for a job when they entered the program found a job.
- 59% of the youth aged 14 - 18 entered the program stayed in the program for at least six months.
- 68 youth aged 14 - 20 employed through the Mayor's Summer Youth and YES Summer Employment - Wage Range \$6.50 - \$8.00 per hour.
- Thirty high school students are part of the Working Hard on Achieving (WHOA) program. Program includes group mentoring, career exploration and summer employment.
- 100% of the youth aged 19 - 21 stayed in the program for at least six months.
- 31 youth aged 14 - 18 either achieved skill goals, a GED or a diploma.

A Durham JobLink Youth Success Story: The 2007 Youth Summit

- Parents and 62 youth and parents from different backgrounds attended and gave input.
- Many of the participants stated that there needs to be more recreational activities that cater to youth in Durham. They recommended more sporting leagues, fellowship opportunities, and mentoring programs in the community.

The Durham JobLink System

- A Business Services Committee was formed.
- Four workforce development forums were held in the high growth sectors identified by the Durham Workforce Development Board.
- The Durham Workforce Development Board, in collaboration with the N.C. Department of Commerce, awarded four area employers with incumbent Worker Grants totaling of \$58,707 to train 132 existing workers. Those four companies were:
 - Eisai, Inc: 32 people
 - Durham Exchange Club Industries, Inc. (DECI): 42 people
 - Cameron & Cameron, Inc.: 10 people
 - Nitronex Corporation: 48 people

The Durham JobLink System - Other Highlights

- Antioch Baptist Church became a designated JobLink Career Center Satellite Site.
- The Durham JobLink Career Center began a 24 hour free voice mail service to individuals in job search.
- The Durham Workforce Development Board in partnership with the Capital Area Workforce Development Board implemented a Disability navigator Program in the JobLink Career Center.
- The Durham Workforce Development Board has received a \$55,000 grant to collaborate with the Capital Area Workforce Development Board and the Kerr Tar Workforce Development on a Regional Project respond more quickly to the needs of Research Triangle businesses.

The Durham JobLink System - Upcoming Projects

- Installment of a First Source Hiring Agreement
- Improved Website for the Durham Workforce Development Board
- The Launch of the Career Readiness Certification Project (Partnership with Durham Tech)
- Holton School Planning in Conjunction DPS, Durham Tech, Durham Parks and Recreation and Durham City

Challenges on the Horizon

- Loss of Federal Funding
- Lack of Capacity in Local Programs to Operate WIA Programs
- Drop-out rate of approximately 500 youth per year from the Durham Public School System

Wish-List Initiatives

- Increased funds for paid-work experience and an expansion of post-secondary training opportunities to serve more youth.
- Increased funding for training opportunities for ex-offenders to increase their chances of finding jobs at livable wages.
- Improved local MIS Systems to help public programs “talk to each other better” and provide upgraded services to businesses and job seekers.

In 2006 - 2007, the Durham JobLink Received Support from Many Partners:

- The City of Durham
- Durham County
- The Durham Workforce Development Board
- The North Carolina Employment Security Commission
- Durham Technical Community College
- Community Partnerships, Inc.
- The Achievement Academy of Durham
- Training for Success

- Durham Literacy Center
- The North Carolina Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- The North Carolina of Services for the Blind
- The Veterans Employment and Training Administration
- General Management Solutions, Inc.
- Many Private Sector Partners and Community Groups

Mr. Delisle responded to questions posed by the board.

Vice-Chairman Page added that a number of preparation workshops are offered for those trying to gain employment. He expressed appreciation to Workforce Development regarding job fairs that are brought to the communities to help citizens find employment.

Chairman Reckhow thanked Mr. Delisle and staff for the presentation.

Directive

1. Include the total participation in the report relating to the Summer Youth Programs.
2. Consider expanding the Summer Youth Programs as well as internships for youth.
3. Consider utilizing probation and parole to provide a targeted outreach for ex-offenders.
4. Consider discussing different ways of outreach at an upcoming Juvenile Crime Prevention Council meeting.
5. County Manager to survey county departments about providing jobs for the Summer Youth Program.

Downtown Master Plan: Seven Year Review and Updated Work Plan

Bill Kalkhof, President of Downtown Durham Inc. DDI, introduced this item stating that the Downtown Durham Master Plan has guided the growth of DDI since its adoption by the City Council and County Commission in 2000.

Once a community has developed a master plan, it is good public policy for the community to review that plan every five to seven years. Revisiting the Master Plan is essential to ensure that downtown represents the citizens who live and work in Durham, that it encompasses the unique history and culture of the city, and that it develops Durham's economic potential. The process was designed to include broad public participation.

Mr. Kalkhof informed the Board that the 2007 Downtown Durham Master Plan - Seven Year Review and Updated Work Plan, is the result of a year-long planning process. This new work plan assesses the growth that DDI has experienced over the past seven years and, along with guidance from new market analysis and public participation, seeks to provide an updated series of strategies to continue to foster and direct development growth in Downtown over the next 2 - 7 years.

Mr. Kalkhof provided the following update regarding the Downtown Master Plan:

Planning Process:

2007 Downtown Durham Seven Year Review and Updated Work Plan

- I. Public Participation
 - a. Community Survey
 - b. Stakeholder Interviews
 - c. Community Charrettes
 - d. Open House
- II. Progress Assessment
 - e. Accomplishments
 - f. Progress Report
 - g. Updated Market Dynamics
- III. Updated Strategic Plan
 - h. Updated Strategies
 - i. Opportunity Sites
- IV. Updated Work Plan
 - j. Development Directions
 - k. Updated Development Focus Areas/Catalyst Projects
 - l. Implementation Plan

- Public Participation (over 1,110 people)
- Online Survey (1,092 responses)
- Downtown Stakeholder Interviews (close to 30)
- 2 Community Charrettes (83 participants)
- Public Open House

This is an update to the Downtown Master Plan that was adopted in 2000.
Good public policy to review progress and plan for the future every 5-7 years.
There are many new players in downtown since the 2000 Master Plan was adopted.

Progress Report: 2000 Master Plan Goals

- Goal 1: To promote a vibrant, compatible, well connected mix of uses to increase the density and activity of the area, as well as to increase jobs, residences and the tax base.
- Goal 2: To make Downtown more pedestrian, bicycle and overall transportation friendly.
- Goal 3: To provide for marketing Downtown for future development including guidance for development incentives.
- Goal 4: To implement the 2020 Plan goal of establishing Downtown as the pivotal activity center in Durham and the region.
- Goal 5: To create building and streetscape design standards for development in the area that highlight and accent Durham's existing wealth of historic architecture, spaces, places, and views are compatible with traditional planning and defensible space concepts.
- Goal 6: To allow flexibility in the plan in order to take advantage of future development opportunities as they arise.
- Goal 7: To examine, identify and program costs for infrastructure changes that promote the above goals.

Conclusions from Progress Report

- The primary lesson that can be taken from the Master Plan Progress Report is that while there have been significant achievements in Downtown well in advance of previously set goals, the work on Downtown is not yet complete. Downtown leaders should not be complacent with quickly achieved success, as there are many essential components to the success of Downtown Durham that have yet to be realized.

This section is a discussion of key points regarding what needs to occur next in the context of the 2000 Master Plan 20 year Horizon. The points are organized into six primary categories that represent those most important areas for the updated work plan to focus upon:

- Public Policy
- Public Infrastructure & Services
- Connectivity
- Open Space
- Programming Downtown
- Downtown Management

Main Themes

In order to sustain this growth in Downtown, as well as to maintain growth, the Updated Work Plan outlines a number of strategies that primarily revolve around five overarching Themes:

- The City Center as a Focal Point
- Connectivity
- Residential In-Fill Development
- Continue Public Sector Investment
- Enhance the Capacity of Downtown Organizations

Conclusions from Progress Report

Public Policy

- A Continuation of Public - Private Partnerships is Needed.
- An Increased Residential Population is Important to Downtown.
- The Regulatory Process for Development Must be Efficient and Clear to Developers and Property Owners.
- Signature Building Development Improves Downtown Durham's Presence.
- The Geographic Boundaries of Downtown may have to be Re-Considered.

Public Infrastructure & Services

- Adequate Infrastructure Needs to be put into place to accommodate growth.

Connectivity

- Downtown Districts need to be Better Connected.
- Good Connectivity to Surrounding Neighborhoods still needs to be addressed.

Open Space

- Expanded Recreational Opportunities are Essential for the Growth Downtown Residential Population.

Programming Downtown

- The City Center District is a Vital Focal Point for Downtown Growth.
- Arts, Cultural and Entertainment Designations have the potential of being an important niche market for Downtown.

Downtown Management

Downtown needs an expanded, more financially viable organization to guide its growth.

Development Focus Areas "Catalyst Projects"

In addition to these themes, the Updated Work Plan represents a number of development focus areas that complement the overall strategies of the plan. Amongst these are "Catalyst Projects" opportunities that could bring the highest level of positive impact to Downtown.

The projects include:

Project	Project Type	Owner
South Bank Site	Redevelopment	Private
Church/Parrish St. Site	In-Fill	Public (City)
The Loop and Related Land	Right of Way/In-Fill	Public (City)
Intentional Open Space	Development Strategy	Various
212 Corcoran	Redevelopment	Private
Elkins Site	In-Fill	Private

South Bank Site

- Build to the Sidewalk
- Significant Amounts of New Space - Office or Residential
- Parking

Conceptual Development Scenarios

- Scenario (A) - Add on and Re-Use Existing Structure
- Scenario (B) - Mid-Rise, Mixed Use
- Scenario (C) - High-Rise, Mixed Use

Church/Parrish Street Site

Goals for this site include:

- Expanded Retail Opportunities
- Anchor Parrish Street
- Create Vistas

Conceptual Development Scenarios

- Strategy (A) - Existing Parking Lot
- Strategy (B) - Parking Lot + Existing Office Building

- Mid-Rise Mixed-Use building can be prominent buildings in smaller downtowns. With the right uses on the first floor, they can be designed so as not to be out of context with surrounding buildings of more modest height, especially with an upper story setback.

The 'Loop'

- Reconfigure or Remove
- The Loop as an Amenity
- On-Street Parking
- Multi-Modal Options
- Right-of-way Enhancement

Conceptual Development Scenarios

- Sites 1 & 2 - North Loop Condos/Apartments
- Site 3 - Corcoran Street Connector
- Sites 4 - South Loop Infill

Former Elkins Site

- Development/Design considerations for this site include:
- Gateway Opportunities
- Introduce Large Numbers of Office/Residential

Intentional Open Space

- Elements of "Intentional Open Space" Strategy:
- Seek to replace active or passive green space that is removed for development with new green space, possibly incorporated into new development. As there are sites of open land better used for development, so there may be ones that are better suited for open space (i.e. parking lots).
- "Intentional" open space that meets local needs. Opportunities to eat lunch, walk dogs, picnic, or see live performances all work together to fulfill the needs of the 24 hour downtown population.
- Maintain and enhance existing open space improvements.
- Utilize existing pedestrian oriented opportunities throughout Downtown to create unique pedestrian oriented corridors - alleys and tertiary right-of-ways - that link open spaces, parking, businesses and important destinations.

212 Corcoran

Development/Design considerations for this site include:

- Ground Floor Retail
- Maintain Parking Supply

Development Scenario Overview

- Scenario (A) - Re-Use (Office & Parking Garage)
- Scenario (B) - Mixed-Use Redevelopment

- A tall structure, more in context with neighboring Marriott and SunTrust buildings, would bring an opportunity to introduce larger numbers of office and/or residential, as well as a hotel to expand a potential hotel cluster on CCB plaza. Maximizing the amount of leasable space will also assist the development economics of the site, as this location is likely to be expensive to purchase.

Implementation plan

- The Implementation program is a critical piece of any truly effective Downtown improvement strategy.
- The plan is just the beginning of the process. It is through implementation that the community must come together to move the recommendations and strategies forward from concepts to reality.
- The implementation program is a series of action steps that outlines what is necessary to accomplish the goals, objectives, and strategies outlined in both the Downtown Durham Master Plan and the Updated Work Plan.
- The successful implementation of the following strategies will rely on the determined coordination and collaboration of the various public and private sector entities outlined below each strategy and subsequent actions steps.

Work Plan Strategies

A. Public Policy

- Strategy A1. Strong Public-Strategy Partnerships
- Strategy A2. Increased Residential Development
- Strategy A3. Sustainable/Green Development
- Strategy A4. Regulatory Issues
- Strategy A5. Geographic Boundaries of Downtown
- Strategy A6. Future Development of Signature Buildings that Provide Greater Density and Critical Mass
- Strategy A7. Downtown's Relation to the Broader Context of Durham and Triangle Communities.

B. Public Infrastructure & Services

- Strategy B1. Adequate Infrastructure
- Strategy B2. Day-to-Day Services

C. Connectivity

- Strategy C1. Connectivity Amongst Downtown Districts & Adjacent Neighborhoods
- Strategy C2. Activate Street-Level Store Fronts Into a Mix of Restaurants, Entertainment and Retail.
- Strategy C3. Gateway Entrances Into Downtown
- Strategy C4. Fix the Loop
- Strategy C5. Examine Potential for Traffic Calming and General Improvement of Circulation Through Downtown Arterials.

D. Open Space

- Strategy D1. Expanded Recreational Opportunities
- Strategy D2. Intentional Open Space

E. Programming Downtown

- Strategy E1. City Center as a Focal Area
- Strategy E2. Niche Market of Arts, Culture, and Entertainment Destinations and Events
- Strategy E3. Increase Special Events, Festivals, Gatherings and Public Art.

F. Downtown Management

- Strategy F1. Downtown Self Management

Summary of Updated Development Focus Areas

Public Sector

- DAP Renovation & Minor League Baseball Agreements
- Finish Durham Central Park
- Railroad Spur to Become Pedestrian & Bike Amenity and Open Space.
- Chapel Hill Street Railroad Underpass as an Entranceway
- Connectivity Across Railroad Tracks at Mangum and Blackwell Streets
- Future Expansion/Development of the Civic Center
- Streetscape and Infrastructure Expansion Throughout the Downtown
- Recruit a Grocery Store to Downtown

Private Sector

- Development of Properties in the City Center District
- Development of Property/Buildings in the DAP and Durham Central Park area
- Development of County building and parking lot in Warehouse District
- Development of West Village parking lots
- Development of Car Dealership Properties
- Development on Pads around Durham Station
- Development of Adjacent Neighborhood Projects including.

Mr. Kalkohf addressed questions asked by the Board.

Chairman Reckhow thanked Mr. Kalkohf for the presentation.

Directive

Place on March 10 Regular Session consent agenda for approval.

Presentation: Results from the 2007 Durham County Youth Risk Behavior Survey

Gayle B. Harris, Assistant Health Director, stated that a presentation from the Partnership for a Healthy Durham and Durham Public Schools was received and reviewed by the Board of County

Commissioners about results from the Durham County Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), a national school-based survey developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The survey is used to monitor health risk behaviors that contribute to deaths, disability, and social problems among youth in the United States.

In the spring of 2007, the Obesity and Chronic Illness Committee of the Partnership for a Healthy Durham in collaboration with Durham Public Schools received funding through the Durham Results-Based Accountability mini-grant process to support the analysis of local YRBS data. The responses of 484 middle school students and 392 high school students were sent to The Richard L. Hoffman Center for Assessment and Research Alliances (CARA) at Mars Hill College for aggregation and preliminary analysis. This was the first year Durham conducted the YRBS.

The data from the YRBS, as noted by the researchers, will enable educators, program planners, and others in the community to:

- 1 “Determine the prevalence of health risk behaviors;
- 2 Create awareness about and action toward priority health risk behaviors and related health problems;
- 3 Set program goals and objectives and monitor progress toward those goals; and
- 4 Provide comparable national, state, and local data.”

The results of the 2007 survey provide baseline data for this community. Plans are to 1) use this data to begin a community dialogue about the disparities that are illuminated; 2) identify evidenced-based practices that have been used in other communities to address those issues; 3) recommend models to pilot/replicate in our community; and 4) continue to conduct the YRBS every two years expanding to include the charter and private schools.

Ms. Harris reported the following:

Last year through the RBA mini-grant process, the Obesity and Chronic Illness Committee of the Partnership for a Healthy Durham in collaboration with DPS received funding to collect and analyze local data using the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). The YRBS is a national school-based survey developed by CDC in 1990. It is administered at a national level every two years to monitor health risk behaviors that contribute to deaths, disability, and social problems. This is the first time that local data has been collected in Durham. Historically, at the request of the NC DPI, up to 50 DPS students were randomly selected to complete the survey. Our children’s responses were included in the data for the region and the state. Consequently, we did not have local level specific data; so, the Central region data was used to shape programming for our community. The data collected will serve as baseline data enabling us to monitor trends over time.

The Durham County results were tabulated by The Richard L. Hoffman Center for Assessment and Research Alliances at Mars Hill College and sent to us in draft form in mid November. The final report was received last month.

I'd like to share a little bit about the YRBS before we talk about the methodology used and some of the highlights from the report.

The data is self-reported which presents some inherent limitations. However, the researchers believe that "similarities in the percentages of responses year after year and across locations suggest satisfactory reliability." The six general health risk areas are:

1. Behaviors that contribute to unintentional injuries or violence
2. Tobacco use;
3. Alcohol and other drug use;
4. Sexual behaviors that contribute to unintended pregnancy and/or STDs
5. Unhealthy dietary behaviors
6. Inadequate physical activity

While this data will give us some answers to who, what, when and where, the how and why are missing. So it is our role to take the steps necessary to answer those questions and to implement evidence-based programming in the community and schools that will positively impact those areas of concern. It is our intention to assure that the YRBS is conducted every two years on the national cycle so that we have comparative data to measure progress that is made.

876 students responded to the surveys - 484 middle school students and 393 high school students.

Demographics - middle school students—87% were 12, 13 or 14
53.4% female, @ 76% were in 7th and 8th grade; 17% Hispanic; 58.5% African American, 26.4% white; 79% reported grades of As, Bs, or Cs;

Crosstab summary:

Gender:

- Females generally reported higher school grades and lower proclivity to violent behavior or carrying weapons; slightly higher instance of drinking in the past 30 days and much higher levels of activity associated with weight loss. Girls were much more likely to have been taught about sexual abstinence. Boys reported much higher levels of physical violence or being victims of vandalism and slightly higher smoking rates.

African American/Black:

(22 questions where there were significant differences)

- Reported lower grade scores, lower seatbelt and helmet use, and higher cases of being in a physical fight
- Percentage reporting having used marijuana more than twice as high as other students
- Reported fewer incidences of eating dinner at home with families, higher rates of watching TV or playing video games 5 or more hours per day, being home alone over 6 hours per day, and fewer incidences of seeing a doctor or a dentist in the past 12 months

- Reported higher rate of asthma
- Reported fewer incidences of being harassed or bullied at school and lower rates of having used cocaine powder or crack cocaine, higher instances of having been taught about sexual abstinence and the dangers of HIV, AIDS, and other STDs

Latino/Hispanic:

(19 questions where there were significant differences)

- Reported lower grades, far higher levels of depression and feelings of insecurity - Over 14% reported that they did not go to school at least once in past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school or on the way to and from school
- 34.3% said that during the past 12 months, they felt so sad or hopeless almost every day for 2 weeks or more in a row that they stopped doing some usual activities
- Recorded higher levels of alcohol and cocaine use, and few cases of having been taught about AIDS, HIV, and other STDs
- Higher incidences of not eating breakfast in the week and lower rates of physical activity and participation in extracurricular activities. Only 36% reported having seen a doctor in the past 12 months.
- Reported fewer incidences of getting into fights

White/Caucasian:

(27 questions with significant differences - mostly positive)

- Reported higher percentage of having been harassed or bullied at school in the past 12 months
- Positives - higher grades in school, higher use of seat belts and helmets, fewer instances of being threatened with a weapon, and fewer instances of being in a physical fight; lower rates of smoking marijuana and cigarettes, and high instances of being taught about sexual abstinence
- Higher rates of physical activity every day of the week, and much higher rates of participation in extracurricular activities
- Reported far better access to healthcare

Demographics - high school students—92.5% 14 - 16 years old; 59.6% male; 85% in 9th grade; 12% Hispanic; 56.7% African American and 29% white; 84.1% reported receiving passing grades of As, Bs, or Cs.

Crosstab summary:

Gender

(13 questions had significant differences)

- Females reported higher levels of being harassed, bullied, or teased at school; more than twice as many girls as boys reported feelings of depression and thoughts of suicide
- Boys reported much higher levels of physical violence and carry weapons, higher levels of sexual activity, higher levels of marijuana use, and lower levels of having talked with a parent or adult family member about sex.

African American/Black:

(23 questions had significant differences)

- Reported lower grade scores, lower seatbelt and helmet use, and higher cases of being in a physical fight and fighting at school; recorded higher levels of feeling depressed (28% reported feeling alone in life compared to 17.9%)
- Reported higher levels of sexual activity and having sex with more partners; higher instances of having spoken with a parent or adult family member about sex; a higher percentage of those who were sexually active reported using condoms
- Reported higher rates of TV watching (five or more hours/day)
- Reported fewer cases of being offered drugs at school
- Reported lower frequencies in eating salads and carrots or drinking milk

Latino/Hispanic:

(15 questions had significant differences)

- Reported lower grade scores; reported higher levels of feelings of insecurity (over 25% did not go to school in last 30 days because they felt unsafe) 32% said that they had attempted suicide within the past 12 months;
- Recorded higher levels of alcohol use at school, 3 times the level of heroin use, and fewer cases of having spoken with an adult family member about sex
- Reported lower rates of physical activity and participation in extracurricular activities
- Reported fewer incidences of getting into fights

Whites/Caucasian

(31 questions had significant differences)

- Reported higher grades at school, higher use of seat belts and helmets, and fewer incidences of fighting; lower rates of drug and alcohol use; attempting suicide and sexual activity; much higher rates of physical activity everyday of the week and much higher rates of participation in extracurricular activities; having far better access to healthcare and better eating habits
- Negative indicators - among those who reported being sexually active, condom use was lower than among other students; a lower than average number said that a parent or adult family member had spoken to them about sex

There is a lot of work to be done. We should view these findings as a community issues; not issues that DPS should address alone.”

Mr. Harris responded to a question posed by Vice-Chairman Page regarding youth prevention. She stated that the youth prevention initiatives will be reviewed at an upcoming meeting.

Commissioner Cheek stated that he hopes Durham Public Schools are heavily represented, being that this relates to the youth.

Chairman Reckhow informed the Board that a joint meeting will be held with several RBA groups to discuss strategies about moving forward with the youth risk behavior survey.

Discussion of Interlocal Agreement to Share Contract Costs with City of Durham to Provide Public Access Programming

Deborah Craig-Ray, Assistant County Manager, introduced this item. She stated that due to recent changes in the cable franchising law, effective January 1, 2007, neither the City nor the County of Durham have agreements with Time Warner Cable to provide services beyond making channel space available for Public/Education/Government (PEG) use. Over the past several months, the two local governments have attempted to collaborate on broadcasting government programming on Channel 8; however, no provision has been made for public access programming. Following the January City-County Committee meeting, negotiations between Durham County, the City of Durham, access producers, and Time Warner Cable have been underway to develop a reasonable and cost-efficient arrangement for public access programming.

Most recently, to temporarily accommodate the access producers, the City received quotes to air public access programming. Based on quotes received, it was recommended that the City and the County contract with Time Warner through the end of the fiscal year June 30, 2008 at a 50/50 shared cost of \$12,065 monthly to ensure basic airing of completed shows.

The City of Durham was to have voted on the proposal at its February 18 meeting, and upon approval, the item was to come to the Board of County Commissioners on February 25.

Assistant County Manager Craig-Ray notified the Board that City Council did not approve the proposal and deferred the item to its February 21 Worksession. During the Worksession, a discussion was held regarding extending the contracting period through the calendar year and the City, County, and cable access producers continuing to share Channel 8 with an agreed-upon programming schedule.

City Council and the Board of County Commissioners are being asked to share costs through the end of the calendar year to facilitate public access programming. Durham County's share will be half of the \$12,065 or \$6,032.50. The City Council is set to vote on the agreement at its March 3 meeting. The duration is March 1 through December 31.

Assistant County Manager Craig-Ray requested that the Board approve Interlocal agreement between the City and County which clarifies the utilization of the City's broadcast facilities (Durham Government TV) and personnel to air the County's television shows and the replays of the Durham County Board of Commissioners' meetings. This arrangement will terminate when the County has established its own broadcast operation.

County Attorney Chuck Kitchen is seeking a dedicated channel from Time Warner Cable for Durham County's use, as is prescribed in the new cable franchising law. An update on that request will be provided at the meeting.

Commissioner Cheek moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Page, to suspend the rules.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Cheek, Heron, Page, and Reckhow
Noes: None
Absent: Cousin

Commissioner Cheek moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to allow the County Manager to enter into the contract with the City of Durham and Time Warner Cable to provide public access programming until December 31, 2008; to authorize the County Manager to approve the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for Durham Government TV.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Cheek, Heron, Page, and Reckhow
Noes: None
Absent: Cousin

Directives

1. Seek a preliminary injunction that would allow the Board to continue services.
2. Include the cost for additional providers in the Interlocal.

BOCC Chambers Technology Upgrades-Project Update

The Board received updates on the Design Development (DD) phase for the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) Chambers Technology Upgrades project. The purpose of this project is to upgrade the audiovisual capabilities and selected architectural enhancements in the Durham County Commissioners' Chambers located on the second floor of the Durham County Administrative Building at 200 East Main Street, Durham.

The Board of County Commissioners received a similar presentation on the planning/schematic design phase of the project on March 29, 2007. Since, efforts have progressed on the design development, incorporating revisions that respond to BOCC comments. The intent of today's update is to receive the Board's input on the design development phase, which will allow the project to advance to the construction document phase.

Glen Whisler, P.E., County Engineer, discussed the following:

Efforts to Date:

- Architect Kickoff/Brainstorming Meeting – August 2006

- Project Scope/Contract Discussions – August – November 06
- Planning Study Notice to Proceed – December 21, 2006
- Preliminary Planning Study Presentation to BOCC – March 29, 2007
- Design Refinement/Incorporate BOCC Feedback – April – May, 2007
- Planning Study Complete – May 31, 2007
- Capital Projects Review with County Manager – June 21, 2007
- BOCC Design Contract Award – November 12, 2007
- Design Contract Executed/NTP – December 18, 2007
- Kickoff Meeting – December 20, 2007
- DD Design Review Project Team – February 20, 2008
- DD Review with County Manager – February 26, 2008

Methodology

- Work around BOCC use of Chamber
 - Do not relocate BOCC meetings
 - Keep existing A/V equipment intact throughout construction period
- Stage main Chamber work around breaks in July and December
 - Construction window 1: June 24 – July 27, 2008
 - Balcony partitions, infrastructure modifications during July break
 - Build out/test control room August – December
 - Construction window 2: December 9, 2008 – January 2, 2009
 - Millwork and other Chamber modifications during December break
 - System verification during January, 2009

Project Objectives

- Update the Commissioners' Chambers Audio/Video Technology to current standards:
 - Improve reliability and usability
 - Facilitate hosting various events including joint meetings
 - Enable a platform for expanded services delivery
- Make selected architectural modifications:
 - Facilitate A/V technology integration
 - Improve facility effectiveness
- Improved Accommodation for Disabled

Scope of Work

Technology Improvements

- Monitors in Dais and Staff Desks
- Control room equipment upgrade
- Video Cameras
- Microphones, Audio system, Speakers
- Assisted Listening system
- Speaker Timer System
- Large-screen Projection System

- Television Camera to Truck Pre-wiring

Architectural Improvements

- Commissioner and Staff Desk Modifications
- New Handicap-Accessible Podium
- Joint Meeting Facilitation (Furniture)
- New Chairs
- Relocate Control Room
- Improve Sign-up Area
- Lighting Modifications
- Displays and Historical Display Casework in Second Floor Lobby

Beyond Current Scope, Under Discussion

- Displays and Historical Display Casework in first floor lobby
 - Digital Signage
- Production Equipment and Facilities
 - Cameras, lighting, for recording interviews, etc.
 - Studio facility
 - Equipment to automate/sequence the cable channel feed
- Video/Audio Recording Capability in BOCC Conference Room

Issues Raised During March 29, 2007 CIP Worksession

- Commissioners Preferred to View Presentation Content on Large Screen Projection System instead of Desk Monitors.
- Joint Meeting Seating Arrangement Required Removal of First Row of Seats in Chambers.
- Architectural Issues with Balcony Screen Wall for Control Room
- Architectural Issues with Video Displays in Lobby
- Request to Attenuate Noise Emanating from Chambers Foyer

John Thompson, DTW Architects & Planners, Ltd., briefed the Board on the following:

- Proposed Projection Scheme
- Project on Existing Chamber Screens
- Camera Locations
- Basic Floor plan
- New Podium
- Existing Balcony
- Balcony Screen – Glass and Curtains
- Chamber Group Seating
- Design Concepts
- Conference Room
- Support Space
- Foyer Existing Conditions
- Future Sign In & Information Area

- Lobby

Chairman Reckhow expressed concerns regarding the Chamber upgrades. She stated that citizens appreciate the nobility of the Chambers.

Commissioner Heron expressed concerns about the audio/video equipment being inaudible for citizens.

Mr. Whisler responded to questions asked by the Board. He stated that there would be a permanent projector for each screen that would be controlled from the control room. The podium will have capability that would allow an individual to operate their presentation from the podium.

Mr. Thompson stated that this design will also allow the Clerk's staff to operate the presentation as needed.

The Board held discussions regarding the BOCC Chamber upgrades.

Directive

1. Bring a cost estimate to the Board relating to the screen projection system; survey the Board about moving forward with the upgrades.
2. Provide a breakdown of the cost of the individual improvements.
3. Consult with the Clerk to the Board regarding the future sign in and information area.
4. Consider placing signs indicating that citizens move to the main foyer to communicate.

Closed Session

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Cheek to adjourn to closed session to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of business or industry pursuant to G. S. 143-318.11(a)(4).

The motion carried unanimously.

Reconvene to Open Session

Chairman Reckhow announced that the Board met in closed session; direction was given to staff; no action was taken.

Discussion of Issues for Legislative Agenda

Deborah Craig-Ray, Assistant County Manager, introduced this item. She stated that the 2007 North Carolina General Assembly will convene the Short Session at Noon on May 13 in Raleigh. An initial listing of legislative priorities has been prepared by staff for a general discussion by the Board. Following that conversation and with input from the Board, a more complete listing

will be developed for final approval prior to the start of the legislative session.

According to the adjournment resolution, Budget Bills must be submitted no later than 4:00 p.m. on Friday, May 16, to bill drafting. Local Bills must be submitted to bill drafting by 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 21, and filed in the House or Senate by May 28.

Ms. Craig-Ray discussed the following:

- Continuation of funding for CJPP
- Continuation of funding for JCPC
- Prepared food tax
- Raise compulsory school attendance age
- Payment of filing fees
- Telephone system in the courthouse
- County/Transportation legislation S1513
- Revaluation S1309
- Circuit Breaker: HB 1499 – Property Tax and PUV Changes and Studies
- H1889 Present Use Value System Modifications

Commissioner Heron expressed concerns regarding the payment of filing fees. She informed Ms. Craig-Ray that two additional items for the legislative agenda will be coming from the Animal Control Advisory Committee.

Directive

1. Revisit the prepared food tax to view the allocation of funds.
2. Review previous surveys as it relates to the prepared food tax.
3. Invite members of the legislation to attend a BOCC meeting to hear what the concerns and needs are for Durham County.
4. Consider further discussion about the circuit breaker.
5. Review the drought conditions; consider a proposal asking the State to help assist and analyze communities regarding the water budget.
6. Board and staff to email all ideas relating to the legislative agenda to Assistant County Manager Craig-Ray.

Citizen Comments (cont.)

Chairman Reckhow deviated from the Worksession agenda to allow the son of Ms. Iris Wadsworth to address the Board regarding tax foreclosure on 110 Plantation Drive. He expressed concerns regarding Durham County's foreclosure process. He asked that the Board give Ms. Wadsworth a 120- day extension to avoid bankruptcy.

Kim Simpson, Tax Administrator, addressed Mr. Wadsworth concerns.

Lowell Siler, Deputy County Attorney, provided legal advice stating that per state statute, once the foreclosure process has begun, the Board cannot resolve the issue.

Chairman Reckhow asked that Mr. Wadsworth consult with staff regarding the matter.

Sales Tax Interlocal Agreement

County Manager Mike Ruffin, introduced this item stating that the current Interlocal agreement with the City of Durham expires on June 30, 2008. The agreed-upon formula by which the two governments share taxes is two-fold:

- The County agreed in 2003 to maintain a per capita distribution. This means the state distributes the sales tax back to the local governments with 53.5% going to the County and 46.5% going to the City. However, the Interlocal agreement then requires that the City and County divide the proceeds with the County receiving 56.82% and the City receiving 43.18%. The agreed-upon formula means that the City must pay the County part of its per capita distribution.
- The City has agreed to pay to the County 50% of its Article 44 Sales Tax proceeds with the County if and when it receives in excess of \$3.8 million. This increases the percentage of total sales taxes that the County receives from 56.82% to 58.87%; the City’s total share of the sales taxes decreases from 43.18% to 41.13%.

The County Manager originally proposed a split of 59%/41%. However, discussions with the City have indicated an interest in a different split. It is believed that a 58%/42% split may be acceptable.

County Manager discussed the following:

Current Interlocal

- Expires June 30, 2008
- Per Capita Distribution from State (53.5% for County, 47.5% for City)
- 2-part Clawback Agreement with City
 - City pays County the amount to increase the County’s share to 56.86% and reduce its share to 43.14%.
 - County gets 50% of City’s Article 44 Sales Tax in excess of \$3.8 million.
- FY 2007-08 “Net” distribution: 58.94% for County, 41.06% for City.

Manager’s Original Proposal

New Interlocal at 59.00% and 41.00%	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
City	\$41,200,881	\$40,454,395	\$38,962,053	\$39,722,562	\$41,311,465	\$42,963,923
County	\$59,144,124	\$58,214,861	\$56,067,344	\$57,161,736	\$59,448,205	\$61,826,133
Chapel Hill	\$474,723	\$493,712	\$513,461	\$533,999	\$555,359	\$577,573
Raleigh	\$131,409	\$136,665	\$142,132	\$147,817	\$153,730	\$159,879
Total	\$100,951,136	\$99,299,634	\$95,684,989	\$97,566,114	\$101,468,758	\$105,527,509

City % Split	41.06%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%
County % Split	58.94%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%

Financial Impact of Manager's Original Proposal (59/41)

New Interlocal at 59.00% and 41.00%	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
County	\$59,144,124	\$58,214,861	\$56,067,344	\$57,161,736	\$59,448,205	\$61,826,133
Difference		-\$929,263	-\$2,147,517	\$1,094,032	\$2,286,469	\$2,377,928

Adjusted Proposal (58/42)

New Interlocal at 58.00% and 42.00%	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
City	\$41,200,881	\$41,441,088	\$39,912,347	\$40,691,405	\$42,319,061	\$44,011,824
County	\$59,144,124	\$57,228,169	\$55,117,050	\$56,192,893	\$58,440,608	\$60,778,233
Chapel Hill	\$474,723	\$493,712	\$513,461	\$533,999	\$555,359	\$577,573
Raleigh	\$131,409	\$136,665	\$142,132	\$147,817	\$153,730	\$159,879
Total	\$100,951,136	\$99,299,634	\$95,684,989	\$97,566,114	\$101,488,758	\$105,527,509
City % Split	41.06%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%
County % Split	58.94%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%

Financial Impact of Adjusted Proposal (58/42)

New Interlocal at 58.00% and 42.00%	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
County	\$59,144,124	\$57,228,269	\$55,117,050	\$56,192,893	\$58,440,608	\$60,778,233
Difference		-\$1,915,955	-\$2,111,119	-\$1,075,843	\$2,247,716	\$2,337,624

Per Capita Distribution

Straight Per Capita Split w/Medicaid Leg.	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
City	\$41,200,881	\$48,348,326	50,282,259	\$52,293,550	54,385,292	56,560,704
County	\$59,144,124	\$50,320,930	\$44,747,137	\$44,590,748	\$46,374,378	\$48,229,353
Chapel Hill	\$474,723	\$493,712	\$513,461	\$533,999	\$555,359	\$577,573
Raleigh	\$131,409	\$136,665	\$142,132	\$147,817	\$153,730	\$159,879
Total	\$100,951,136	\$99,299,634	\$95,684,989	\$97,566,114	\$101,488,758	\$105,527,509
City % Split	41.06%	49.00%	52.91%	53.98%	53.98%	53.98%
County % Split	58.94%	51.00%	47.09%	46.02%	46.02%	46.02%

Financial Impact of Per Capita Distribution

Straight Per Capita Split w/Medicaid Leg.	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
County	\$59,144,124	\$50,320,930	\$44,747,137	\$44,590,748	\$46,374,378	\$48,229,353
Difference		-\$8,823,194	-\$5,573,793	-\$156,389	\$1,783,630	\$1,854,975

Ad Valorem Distribution

Ad Valorem Split	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
City	\$41,200,881	\$37,577,727	\$37,781,211	\$38,959,053	\$40,517,416	\$42,138,112
County	\$59,144,124	\$59,520,180	\$55,690,129	\$56,324,400	\$58,577,376	\$60,920,471
Total	\$100,345,004	\$97,097,907	\$93,471,340	\$95,283,454	\$99,094,792	\$103,058,583
City % Split	41.06%	37.84%	39.48%	39.93%	39.93%	39.93%
County % Split	58.94%	59.94%	58.20%	57.73%	57.73%	57.73%
Other Tax Districts	\$606,132	\$2,201,727	\$2,213,649	\$2,282,660	\$2,373,967	\$2,468,925
Other % Split	N/A	2.22%	2.31%	2.34%	2.34%	2.34%
Grand Total	\$100,951,136	\$99,299,634	\$95,684,989	\$97,566,114	\$101,468,758	\$105,527,509

Financial Impact of Ad Valorem Distribution

Ad Valorem Split	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
County	\$59,144,124	\$59,520,180	\$55,690,129	\$56,324,400	\$58,577,376	\$60,920,471
Difference		\$376,056	-\$3,830,051	\$634,271	\$2,252,976	\$2,343,095

County Five Year Totals

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Five Year Total
Straight Per Capita Split w/Medicaid Leg.	\$50,320,930	\$44,747,137	\$44,590,748	\$46,374,378	\$48,229,353	\$234,262,546
Ad Valorem Split	\$59,520,180	\$55,690,129	\$56,324,400	\$58,577,376	\$60,920,471	\$291,032,556
New Interlocal at 59.00%	\$58,214,861	\$56,067,344	\$57,161,736	\$59,448,205	\$61,826,133	\$292,718,280
New Interlocal at 58.00% and 42.00%	\$57,228,169	\$55,117,050	\$56,192,893	\$58,440,608	\$60,778,233	\$287,756,953

Requested Action

- Suspend rules and authorize a letter to the City maintaining the per capita distribution at the State level and authorize an Interlocal agreement adjusting the distribution to 58% for the County and 42% for the City.

- Require a formal decision by the City on or before March 17, 2008

Commissioner Cheek moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to suspend the rules.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Cheek, Cousin, Heron, Page, and Reckhow

Noes: None

Absent: None

Commissioner Cheek moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to authorize a letter to the City maintaining the per capita distribution at the State level; authorize an Interlocal agreement adjusting the distribution to 58% for the County and 42% for the City; and require a formal decision from the City on or before March 17, 2008.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Cheek, Cousin, Heron, Page, and Reckhow

Noes: None

Absent: None

Adjournment

There being no further business, Commissioner Reckhow adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela McIver
Staff Specialist
Clerk to the Board's office