

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

Monday, June 6, 2005

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

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Reckhow

Chairman Reckhow welcomed everyone to the June 6, 2005 Worksession of the Board of County Commissioners.

Chairman Reckhow reminded the Commissioners of the memorandum from C. Ronald Aycock, Jim Blackburn, and Patrice Roesler of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners. The communication urged County Commissioners to call at least five House members on June 7 and email at least 10 House or Senate members on June 14 to support Medicaid relief for counties. Durham County is expecting a \$1½ million increase this year.

Vice-Chairman Heron stated that at a Regional Forum meeting, she received an in-depth report stating that an additional \$.55 tax on each package of cigarettes would relieve counties of their Medicaid costs. The report also indicated that funds from school construction cuts are being used for corporate tax breaks.

Citizen Comments

Mr. Wesley Poole requested time on the agenda to discuss re-allowing the taking of deer with dogs in rural areas of northeastern Durham County. He gave a PowerPoint presentation which highlighted the following:

- Background regulations
- Current problems with the white-tailed deer population
- Proposal of a solution for the rural area of northeastern Durham County
- Answers to frequently asked questions and misconceptions

Mr. Poole petitioned the Commissioners to consider his proposal.

Questions/Discussion

1. Could the County Commissioners support such a proposal? With House and Senate support, a bill could be passed but not until 2007.
2. Are there any urbanized areas in the proposal? No, only farmland with 500 to 600 homes.
3. Is Treyburn in the proposed area? No.
4. How many signatures are on the petition? Approximately 130.

Chairman Reckhow thanked Mr. Poole for his thorough and thoughtful presentation. The County Commissioners would take his proposal under advisement.

Mr. Ralph McKinney Jr. spoke to the Commissioners about crime, sexual abuse, and racial issues.

Chairman Reckhow thanked Mr. McKinney.

2004 Annual Report of the Durham Open Space and Trails Commission

The DOST Commission advises the Board of Commissioners and the City Council on issues related to preservation of valuable open space, as well as the development of trails facilities for pedestrians and bicycles. The 2004 Annual Report summarized the activities of the Durham Open Space and Trails (DOST) Commission and was provided in conformance with the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement.

Keith Luck, Planning Supervisor, City-County Planning Department, stated that Tom Stark, Chairman, Durham Open Space and Trails Commission, was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Luck offered to answer any questions.

Directives

1. County Manager Ruffin will consider an increase from the previous year's \$950 budget allocation to the Commission. The requested amount for FY 2005-06—\$5,000.
2. The City has discontinued financial support to the Commission. Communicate to the City that the Commission needs financial support.
3. Mr. Luck will provide a report within the next week on the substantial charges to the Commission by the City print shop. Encourage the City to donate these services to the Commission.
4. The Commission should consider emailing newsletters, etc. to save on postage.
5. If the Commission will provide a proposal for additional funding, Vice-Chairman Heron would present it to the Convention and Visitors Bureau. (She serves on the Bureau as the County Commissioner representative.)
6. Mr. Luck will convey compliments from the Commissioners to the Commission for its hard work.

Report from the Women's Commission

Yvonne Dunlap, Secretary, Durham County Women's Commission (DCWC), presented the report from the Commission to the County Commissioners. She stated that for several months, the Durham County Women's Commission has made an intense effort to reorganize in order to fulfill the mission for which it was established. Thus far, the bylaws that govern the body have been amended. In addition, the Commission has engaged with the City of Durham and other community agencies to present a domestic violence forum (November) and vigil (December); it is currently updating the DCWC website and planning a fall women's forum. The Women's Commission has continued to monitor its roster and make what it believes to be appropriate decisions in order to maintain a viable body based on those bylaws.

The requests presented by Ms. Dunlap follow:

- Assistance with filling current vacancies with a more diverse group of women. (Presently, there are nine official members – 7 African-American, 1 Caucasian, and 1 Other representative. The Commission requests that all future members be chosen so the entire Durham community of women is represented.
- Assistance in filling vacancies on the Commission.
- Assistance with a permanent meeting place.
- Include announcements of Commission meetings in the local newspaper.
- Additional resources.

Women Commission Chairman Yolanda Mangum-Gordon reiterated the requests presented by Ms. Dunlap.

Questions/Discussion

1. Has the Commission been given past funding? Yes, in response to specific requests.
2. Commission recruitment efforts—word of mouth and invitations to meetings.

Directives

1. The Clerk will include meetings announcement in The Herald-Sun Weekly Calendar.
2. The Commission will work with the Clerk to the Board to establish a permanent meeting location (possibilities—the Durham County Government Administrative Complex or the Library).
3. The County Manager will examine the possibility of Cooperative Extension providing staff support and subsequently, he will contact Ms. Mangum-Gordon.
4. Chairman Reckhow and Vice-Chairman Heron will be involved in the fall women's forum.

Tax Office Website—Use of Digital Home Images

Tax Administrator Ken Joyner explained that the Tax Office has been working with the current software vendor to develop a website to meet more thoroughly the needs of Durham's citizens, businesses, and others. The Tax Office has almost 80,000 digital images (pictures)

of improved properties in Durham County; however, they are not currently a part of the Tax Office's website. The Tax Administrator requested input regarding making these pictures available to the public on the website.

Questions/Discussion

1. How much time will be involved in the project? Not a significant amount of time as the information is already on the server; a link must be added.
2. Any need for additional personnel? No.
3. Other counties online—Mecklenburg, Franklin, and Wake.
4. Surrounding counties not online—Chatham, Johnston, Person, and Forsyth.
5. Does the department have photographs of foreclosed property? Yes.
6. The amount that can be charged by the department for making copies for citizens.
 - The cost of supplies for copying may be charged but not the cost of the staff person. The public records law does not allow a county to recover its costs. The Commissioners could ask for a change in the law.
7. With the new website, a more accurate square footage will be reflected online. Citizens can print copies of property record cards at their homes.

Directives

1. Mr. Joyner will proceed with the project.
2. Mr. Joyner will consider the fee schedule to make sure the department is charging the permitted 10 cents per copy.
3. Mr. Joyner will send a memo about the new website to the City Council.

Document Management/Imaging Vendor Contract

Sharon Hirsch, Assistant Director, Customer Access and Program Support Services, DSS, recommended that OneSource be awarded the contract for the Document Management/Imaging project. The Department, in partnership with the IT and Purchasing Departments, has undergone an extensive process to determine countywide requirements for this pilot and has conducted an extensive review of responses to the RFP. Responses were received from 15 vendors. The review process included onsite demonstrations and site visits to NC agencies using the proposed applications in New Hanover, Randolph, and Johnston Counties, as well as extensive telephone reference checks.

Ms. Hirsch conveyed that this project would improve the way DSS manages and stores client records, will result in major space efficiencies planned in the new Human Services Complex, and improve customer service. The project includes offsite storage and technology so records can be viewed on computer screens. Because the project is designed to improve the document management process, in addition to scanning documents, it includes: electronic signatures on forms, on-line and interactive forms, automatic routing of forms to a supervisor or other designated persons for review and/or approval, scanning documents from clients and providers, importing electronic documents from clients and providers, and storing commonly used documents in a common area such as driver's license/picture identification and birth certificate. Families will be able to share information one time with the agency; the agency

will save significantly on the purchase of paper, file folders, and file cabinets, and the County will realize \$3.5 million savings in the required square footage in the new Human Services Complex, with 20,000 square feet less than DSS currently occupies.

The total cost is for an amount not to exceed \$647,741.17. The OneSource software acquisition and implementation totals an amount not to exceed \$506,153. Hardware acquisition and implementation totals \$141,608.71, of which \$84,365.71 will be purchased from existing state contracts. Funding for this project totaling \$500,000 was approved in the FY05 DSS Budget. An additional \$125,000 is budgeted in FY06 and remaining funding will come from expected savings in the DSS administrative budget from reduced need to purchase file cabinets, paper, printer toner, and file folders. DSS will receive approximately 50% in reimbursement from this project through indirect cost allocation; therefore, the cost to the County will not exceed \$323,871. No additional County funding is required.

Questions/Discussion

1. Is this a model for other departments to use as well? Yes, other County departments' requirements were reviewed in the process.
2. Will the project result in staff reduction? Not initially, possibly long term.
3. Can information be shared between departments? Yes.
4. People will not have access to inappropriate information because of strict security levels.
5. Cost to the County? ½ of the total cost = not-to-exceed cost of \$323,871
6. Are licensing fees involved? Yes, plus additional hardware. The project is a downpayment for future expansion, which will produce additional costs (new servers for departments); however, the same license can be used.
7. DSS has an employee training effort underway for this and other technology.
8. Can files be accessed simultaneously? Yes.

Directives

1. Challenge to DSS to achieve staff efficiencies. Use the investment in document management/imaging to reap dividends.
2. Place the contract award to OneSource on the June 13 agenda to authorize the County Manager to execute the required contract documents.

South Regional Library Update

Glen Whisler, County Engineer, presented the following report on the status of the South Regional Library planned for the former Lowes Grove School property:

Background

The former Lowes Grove Elementary School property was purchased from Durham Public Schools for \$1,000,000 on May 14, 2004 for development of the South Regional Library. The property is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of NC-54 and South Alston Avenue and includes 16.062 acres. The site includes five former school buildings which were planned for demolition at the time of purchase. Funding for the site acquisition was

included in the 2001 Bond Referendum. Funding for design and construction of the library was included in the 2003 Bond Referendum. The project budget is included in the FY 04-13 Capital Improvement Plan.

Proposed Development

A Site Investigation and Development Opportunities for the Lowes Grove Elementary School Site was completed by Coulter, Jewell and Thames in July 2003. The purpose of this report was to evaluate the suitability of the site for use as a library and future EMS station and to identify any potential development constraints. Several conceptual site plans were developed as part of the report. The preferred alternative (Scheme 2) located the library on approximately 5.6 acres at the southern end of the site with a 1.35-acre site for a future EMS station adjacent to and north of the library site with access to Alston Avenue. The remainder of the site, approximately 9 acres, was available for additional development. At the time of the site investigation, consideration was given to development of athletic fields and park facilities by the City of Durham. However, the City later declined to pursue joint purchase and development of the site with the County.

The library facility proposed for this site is the 25,000 SF regional prototype design that is currently under construction at the East and North sites. The future EMS facility is envisioned to be a two-bay facility and is not included in the recently adopted FY06-15 Capital Improvement Plan.

Existing Buildings

The school campus includes five individual buildings built between 1910 and 1960. The original Lowes Grove School was constructed in 1896 and rebuilt in 1902 and has been relocated to the Lowes Grove Middle School site. The school ceased operation in 1989. Since that time, the buildings have been vacant and their condition has declined due to aging and vandalism.

The library as proposed in the site investigation report would require demolition of the two southernmost buildings (Buildings 1 and 2) and the EMS station would require removal of the middle of the five buildings (Building 3).

In January 2004, Belk Architecture completed an evaluation of the five buildings on the campus to determine the potential for renovation. The report concluded that only the northernmost building was feasible for renovation. This building would not be impacted by the proposed library or EMS station.

Redevelopment Proposals

In an effort to determine if any feasible alternative development plans for the site could retain the existing school buildings and provide for the library and EMS station, the Board of County Commissioners directed staff to request development proposals. A request for Letters of Interest and Statements of Qualifications was advertised on October 3, 2004. Following a pre-submission conference on October 14, 2004, two addendums were issued

and two submissions were received on December 1, 2004. Proposals were received from Zapolski + Rudd/Michael Hining Architects and TND Partners, LLC.

A review committee comprised of County staff was established. Due to conflicts with the ERP project for several committee members, review of proposals was scheduled for April 14, 2005.

The review committee noted that neither firm provided all of the information requested. In addition, financial information was limited in both proposals and neither included an adequate schedule for the project.

A fundamental difference in the site plans submitted was that TND retained all of the existing buildings while the Zapolski + Rudd proposal retained the northern most building. The TND plan located the library interior to the site. The Zapolski + Rudd proposal located the library on the perimeter of the site; on two schemes it was sited at the southwest corner of the property. Neither firm provided for a future transit corridor along the eastern boundary of the property.

Recommendations

The review committee recommends that the County proceed with design and construction of the South Regional Library in general conformance with Scheme 2 in the Site Investigation Report. This would allow the library project to move forward and the northern building, which has the most potential for restoration and reuse, could be retained. Some work to secure the building and limit additional deterioration is suggested. The northern 9 acres of the site could be retained for future development by the County or sold for a private development. It is recommended that the other buildings on the site be removed because of their deteriorated condition and conflict with the library plans. It is also recommended that the history of the Lowes Grove School be acknowledged in the South Regional Library. This could include a collection of materials related to Lowes Grove School that could be appropriately preserved and made available for future reference. Other avenues for acknowledgement of the Lowes Grove School and its history could be explored during project development.

Questions/Discussion

1. Road improvements, entrances, and exits to the proposed library.
2. Location of the future EMS station.
3. Community response.
4. South Regional Library's affect in terms of Main Library usage.
5. Ways to orient the facility to maximize access for the patrons, visibility from major transportation corridors, and private development.
6. Lowe's Grove flair to be reflected in the design of the building.
7. Feasibility of preserving buildings that are of no value.
8. Schemes proposed by Zapolski + Rudd.

Directives

1. Preserve the most valuable northwestern building to satisfy community desires.
2. County Manager will continue discussion and dialogue with Zapolski + Rudd LLC.
3. Work to maximize the potential use of the property—library, future EMS station, and other private development to enhance tax value. Use the site judiciously and wisely.
4. Proceed with the plan to construct the South Regional Library on the southern portion of the site.

Mr. Whisler provided the construction timeline:

- Meet with the architect to obtain the proposal for building design and site plan (will be brought to the Board either June 27 or July 25).
- Nine-month period for plans to be drawn. The most time-consuming part of this process is getting the site plan developed and approved.
- 12 – 14 months for actual construction.
- Some processes can occur concurrently (i.e., preliminary site preparation, removal of four buildings, securing the northern building).

Presentation on Restructuring the County's Audit Function

Wendell M. Davis, Deputy County Manager, stated that on the heels of the 2004 Human Resources Audit, an Audit Assessment Task Team was assembled from across the State for the purpose of evaluating the audit process and to make recommendations on completing the benefits audit. In addition, recommendations were made by the Audit Assessment Task Team for restructuring the County's audit function. The two principal recommendations that came from the Audit Assessment Task Team were as follows:

A benchmarking survey should be performed to assess the appropriate size and structure of the Internal Audit Department.

Internal Audit should report to the highest level within the County organization (i.e. the County Manager **and** the Board of County Commissioners) with consideration given to establishing an Audit Review Committee that can serve as a third party in receiving/reviewing audit reports and addressing unresolved issues related to the audit process. It was also recommended that if the County establishes an Audit Review Committee, that the structures and recommended practices be utilized from the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) and the Government Financial Officers Association (GFOA).

Staff work has been completed for each of the recommendations.

The Commissioners, Mr. Davis, County Manager Ruffin, George Quick, and County Attorney Kitchen discussed and reviewed the following documents as presented by Mr. Davis:

- Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of the Audit Oversight Committee for Durham County Government
- Audit Department—Section 1: Organization and Policy; Section 2: Method of Operation; and, Section 3: Audit Services

- Durham County Audit Department Charter
- The Institute of Internal Auditors—Code of Ethics
- Audit Oversight Committee By-Laws

Questions/Discussion

1. What is the difference in the Audit Services Manager and the Audit Services Director? Audit Services Manager (Senior Auditor, one step below the Director) and the Audit Services Director (Chief Audit Executive).
2. Mr. Davis recommended the following staff additions (the County currently funds an Audit Director):
 - Three positions—one Senior Auditor/Audit Manager and two Auditors.
 - **Total Cost for the three new positions**—\$144,284 in addition to \$2,000 for a library for the audit function (The County Manager recommended one new position [Senior Auditor] in the upcoming budget. The other two positions will be phased-in the following year.)
3. Other communities with Audit Oversight Committees—Mecklenburg County, City of Winston-Salem, and City of Durham.
4. Explanation for Audit Department, Section 1: Organization and Policy, 1.2—“By authority of the County’s Audit Department Charter, the Director of Audit (Director) is hired by the County Manager and is organizationally independent of the operating activities of the County”. The program will be supervised by the County Manager but coordinated, managed, and approved by the Audit Oversight Committee.
5. Responsibilities of the four audit employees—financial audits, programmatic audits, and basic investigations (waste, fraud, and abuse).
6. Number of new positions recommended versus prior number of Audit staff.
7. “County Officials” includes Audit Oversight Committee members.
8. Experience in other counties regarding confidentiality and Audit Oversight Committees—three provisions (two in the Code of Ethics and one under AUDIT DEPARTMENT, Section 2: Method of Operation, 2.2) govern behavior.
9. The County Manager will be an ex-officio non-voting member of the Audit Oversight Committee.
10. Responsibilities of the County’s external auditor.
11. “Callers may remain anonymous if they wish”—AUDIT DEPARTMENT, Section 3: Audit Services 3.1.F is consistent with the “whistle blower” laws.
12. AUDIT DEPARTMENT, Section 3: Audit Services 3.6. Records Disposition is subject to the Records Retention Policy adopted by the Department of Archives and History.
13. Composition of the Audit Oversight Committee.
14. Audit Oversight Committee is a public body subject to the same rules as the County Commissioners.
15. Education required for the Audit Services Manager.

Directives

1. County Manager to provide the amount of funding for the one new position (Senior Auditor) which he recommended for FY 2005-06.

2. AUDIT DEPARTMENT, Section 1: Organization and Policy:
 - 1.4.B: insert “or the Board of County Commissioners” to the end of the sentence.
 - 1.5: County Attorney to work with Mr. Davis regarding amending language to include “subject to applicable state law”. A separate section with the caveat could be added.
3. AUDIT DEPARTMENT, Section 2: Method of Operation, 2.3: add “or as requested by the Board of County Commissioners” to first paragraph, end of the sentence.
4. AUDIT DEPARTMENT, Section 3: Audit Services 3.3, first paragraph: amend wording “an original draft”; possibly change to “a working draft”.
 - 3.4—add Board of County Commissioners to the end of the first sentence.
5. AUDIT CHARTER, II. Authority and Scope of Audit Activities. Authority: first paragraph, third sentence—insert “Manager and/or Board of County Commissioners” after “Audit Department”.
6. AUDIT CHARTER, V. Reports and Procedures. Communication of Findings: add “Board of County Commissioners”.
7. AUDIT CHARTER, VII. Quality Assurance, second paragraph, end of third sentence: insert “Board of County Commissioners”.
8. AUDIT CHARTER, VIII. Charter Amendments: insert “recommended by and approved by the Board of County Commissioners”.
9. AUDIT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, Article II. Purpose. Section 1: insert “among other things” after “functions”.
10. AUDIT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, Article III. Membership. Section 1: amend language to reflect that two County Commissioners will serve on the Audit Oversight Committee.
11. AUDIT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, Article IX. Meetings. Section 1: insert “or at a minimum of three times per year” to the end of the first sentence.
12. AUDIT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, Article IX. Meetings. Section 3: insert “May or” after “during”.
13. AUDIT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, Article IX. Section 4: delete second sentence.
14. Mr. Davis will highlight the proposed revisions to the documents.
15. The item will tentatively be revisited at the August 1 Worksession agenda.

Medicaid Issues

Deputy County Manager Carolyn P. Titus introduced Rebecca Troutman, North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, Director of Research and Public Technology, to clarify the Medicaid process, particularly as it relates to the County’s 5-cent local match.

Ms. Troutman explained the Medicaid payment process, how counties are billed their 5-percent portion, and how the state estimates annual Medicaid spending by each county. Her report follows:

Medicaid Payment Process

Client determined eligible for Medicaid

- Must be in target group and be income/asset eligible

- Eligibility by county employees, paid county and federal, no state
- 1.5 million North Carolinians covered—17.7%
- Durham = 15.6% - 2004
- Covers 45% of babies born

Client mailed Medicaid card monthly

- 1.2 million cards mailed monthly, planning replacement with plastic swipe
- Families eligible for 6 months
- Medically needy reports monthly
- Some institutional annually

Client visits provider for services

- If eligible, federally entitled to service
- 52,000 providers enrolled

Provider delivers medical service (DRG)

- Medicaid client considered health consumer

Provider submits normal service charge to Division of Medical Assistance (DMA) via Medical Management Information System (MMIS)

- All services via DRG code and provider bills normal charge

MMIS claims processing matches service with Medicaid rate

- Medicaid rate largely set by state, often percent of Medicare
- Provider cannot bill for difference

MMIS generates “check write” 3-4 times monthly and processes payment to provider

MMIS calculates county share based on service and residency

- NC requires 15% non-federal = >5% total
- \$470 million 2004-05

Department of Health & Human Services (DHHS) controller calculates additional buy-ins (Medicare Premiums) and debits county share monthly

State law requires DHHS county cost estimates by February 15

- 108A-88

DMA calculates total Medicaid budget based on category of service

- \$9.2 billion 2005-06
- Inpatient, dental, drugs, etc.
- Projects increases in costs, clients, services consumed

DMA estimates cost by county area share via program exp. Report (PER)

- Based on December year-to-date data
- Calculates percent spent by county client of statewide amount of category of service
- Excludes debits and credits
- e.g. Durham clients consumed 1% of total inpatient statewide

Percent spent per service applied to total Medicaid budget estimate

- e.g. 1% applied to total inpatient projection and assigned to Durham County Government

Federal, state, county shares calculated per service

- Federal participation changes annually
- 3 year average of state per capita v. national per capita

- 63.58% 2005-06
- Family planning at 90%
- Provider taxes offset some cost increases

Resulting cost = Durham County estimate

- \$12.1 million 2005-06, 2.5% of county total
- 10.9 million 2004-05 November estimates
- 11.0% increase, nearly double statewide county increase
- Projections updated after General Assembly adjourns for program changes

Questions/Discussion

1. Is Durham County's increase 11 percent for next year? Yes, based on cost estimates.

County Manager Titus stated that although the County's cost has increased, the citizens are benefiting by receiving greater healthcare.

Ms. Troutman echoed Chairman Reckhow's urging that the Commissioners call House members on June 7 and email House or Senate members on June 14 to support Medicaid relief for counties.

Public Health Budget

Brain Letourneau, Public Health Director, presented issues facing the Durham County Health Department as it approaches the beginning of the 2005-2006 Fiscal Year. He briefly explained some of the programmatic challenges. County Manager Mike Ruffin's Fiscal Year 2005-2006 recommended budget for the Durham County Health Department is \$16,678,566. This funding level is 2% above the estimated spending level for FY 04-05 (\$16,352,449) after various budget amendments that occurred during the operating year. The recommended budget amount is 5.6% above the FY 04-05 approved budget of \$15,745,806. The recommended increase in the Durham County appropriation is 4.1% from \$11,105,769 to \$11,562,001 based on estimated revenue.

Budget increases:

- Request for two new Tuberculosis Control Program staff nurse positions (single largest recommended increase).
- Fully funding the contract for the Medical Director through the UNC School of Medicine (Division of Infectious Diseases).
- Projected salary increases related to the existing pay plan.
- Inflationary increases.

Mr. Letourneau spoke about the myriad of complex community health issues the Public Health Department has faced and will continue to face:

- Addiction disease and the need for a community response to understanding and effectively managing what has become everyone's problem.
- Obesity and the need for physical fitness.

- Flu vaccine crisis of last fall and early winter. The federal government has not issued any bulletins to alleviate concerns about a continuation of what has become an annual influenza vaccine crisis.

Progress made by the department:

- Improving the health status of the community.
- An historical low in the infant mortality rate (fallen to 4.7 deaths per 1,000 live births in 2003 [the latest data available] from nearly 12 in 1998, a 60% decline. The non-white rate has fallen to 7.6 deaths per 1,000 live births, far below the state's non-white rate and below the overall average for all babies. However, this rate is nearly 3 times the rate for white infants.)
- Lowering the early syphilis rate.

Mr. Letourneau spoke about issues facing each division of the Public Health Department.

Gayle Harris, Assistant Local Health Director, presented information about the department's performance measures from three divisions to reflect its participation in the Results Based Accountability efforts:

Performance Measure 1: Maternity Clinic: Percentage babies born with low birth weights (5 lbs. 8ozs. or less), a primary factor for infant mortality

- Important because of the increased risk of death and a wide range of disorders that affect infants throughout childhood and beyond (learning disorders, behavior problems, lower respiratory tract problems, and personal and financial costs)
- Downward trend since 1999 (15% to 7.2%)

Performance Measure 2: Environmental Health: Percentage compliance with mandated inspections (quarterly)

- 875 establishments (schools, institutions, restaurants, food stands) to which the mandated quarterly inspections apply
- From July '04 to Jan '05– 3% growth in the number of establishments with most of those being upscale fast-food restaurants (Ruby Tuesday type)
- Moving towards a risk-based assessment (state mandated) technique that will take more time until staff learns the process
- Currently, 81% compliant with quarterly inspections
- Received two positions last year, one position filled in January—six months training required. If the second position is not filled before August, hiring and training will be delayed by six months (certification classes held twice per year; the next class starts in August).

Performance Measure 3: Nutrition—DINE for LIFE (Durham's Innovative Nutrition Education for Lasting Improvements in Fitness and Eating): Percentage of elementary students recognizing that skim milk is best for the body, using post test data collected at the end of the school year

- Used a variety of teaching modalities to target overweight/obesity prevention through

education on nutrition and physical activity with students in targeted Durham Public Schools

- Responses regarding milk increased from 51% to nearly 70%
- Skim milk is now in the cafeterias, moving toward eliminating whole milk as a lunchroom option

Questions/Discussion

1. Medicaid reimbursement levels.
2. The time spent on education and outreach in the Health Department as opposed to direct patient care.
3. What percentage of clients in the Health Department are Medicaid patients? 15%
4. Has available funding been lost as a result of staffing issues? Yes.
5. The number of Neighborhood Nurses? Two nurses and one outreach worker based in public housing units.
6. Increase in obesity and juvenile diabetes.

Directives

1. Mr. Letourneau will provide information on specific grants and funding lost because of staffing issues.
2. Ms. Harris will inform the Neighborhood Nurses of the Grandmother Support Program through the Care Giver Program, Coordinating Council of Senior Citizens.

Department of Social Services Budget

Iris Carlton-LaNey, Chair, Social Services Board, spoke about the new positions requested by the Social Services Department:

- One Child Protective Services Social Worker III
- Medicaid position
- Two administrative support positions

Ms. Carlton-LaNey explained the requests.

Chuck Harris, Interim Director, Department of Social Services, gave a presentation entitled "Preparing for the Future and Working Smarter". Mr. Harris highlighted the following in his presentation:

- mission and values
- immediate challenges
- results based accountability
- expansion requests
- child welfare
- foster care and adoption
- adult services, particularly In-Home Aide (IHA) Service

Sharon Hirsch, Assistant Director, Customer Access and Program Support Services, reported on:

- increasing efficiency and effectiveness with best practices
- growing Latino population
- new Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) process
- Federal Block Grant squeeze
- federal and state mandates versus discretionary programs
- revenues and expenditures—FY05
- Medicaid trend
- County share of DSS budget

Arnold Dennis, Assistant Director, DSS, elaborated on the following:

- increased Medicaid caseloads
- child support
- childcare

Tom Niemann, DSS Board member, reiterated staff comments. He asked the Commissioners to consider funding the full DSS budget request and set the stage for the new director.

Questions/Discussion

1. Interstate process regarding receipt of Child Support payments
2. EBT process—increased mandatory cost (50% county share)
3. Can the County cap its cost? It is allowed in some programs but citizens pay the consequences.
4. Employee salaries.
5. DSS has positions that are funded throughout Durham County.
6. Child support collection rate and low productivity and efficiency rate per worker.

Directives

1. Provide more information regarding Medicaid figures.
2. Collect additional data and provide to the Manager regarding why Durham County DSS is above average in spending compared to counties similar in Medicaid eligibility and poverty rate (Guildford and Forsythe, not Wake or Mecklenburg).
3. Provide elaboration as to how the two new requested clerical positions will make a difference in the department.
4. Address low productivity and efficiency rate.
5. Benchmarking in Child Support with comparable counties.
6. County Manager will schedule a meeting within the next two weeks to request service from the Courts for child support enforcement.

Mental Health Budget

Ellen Holliman, Director, The Durham Center, stated that The Center is requesting no increase in its budget for FY 2005-06. Ms. Holliman and Beth Bordeaux, Quality

Management Administrator, presented the budget, referencing resource and background information as follows:

- Budget Presentation for FY 2005-06
- Brochure on Substance Abuse
- Strategic Planning for FY 2005-06
- Charts reflecting hospital admissions
- Medicaid Basics—key facts about the program

Ms. Holliman and Ms. Bordeaux's presentation included the following:

Major Accomplishments FY 2004-05

- Completed Divestiture of Services
- Developed the Local Management Entity
- Opened Durham Center Access (Crisis Program)
- Reduced admissions to state hospital
- Developed Substance Abuse Plan
- Eliminated CAP waiting list
- Continued success with System of Care

Substance Abuse Progress

- Leadership – nationally recognized ASAM physician
- Three outpatient SA providers
- Reduced admissions to ADACT by 67%
- New halfway houses for men and women
- Supportive living program – Healing with Care
- RFI – Clubhouse for groups – AA and NA
- Voucher system for transportation
- Provider selected – IDDT (people with MI and SA)

Adult Consumers Served – Medicaid Coverage

Child Consumers Served – Medicaid Coverage

Durham Center Admissions & Discharges

Adult Psychiatric Hospital Admissions

Child Psychiatric Hospital Admissions

ADATC Admissions

Adult Psychiatric Hospital Usage

Child/Adolescent Hospital Usage

ADATC Usage

Challenges for 2005-06

- Changing the community culture to use DCA
- Address the facility needs and funding for DCA
- Transitioning to new service definitions
- Moving towards higher quality, best practice service delivery
- Implementation of eCura, MIS system
- Managing the limited state and local dollars to serve as many people as possible with the services needed.

Strategic Planning Goals

- I. Develop and sustain a comprehensive array of high-quality services
 - Increase service quality
 - Develop missing and inadequate services
 - Identify new funding sources for non-covered services
 - Identify strategies to address specific consumer needs across disabilities
 - Transportation
 - Peer support
 - Family/parenting support and education
 - Promotion of natural, informal, and community supports
 - Access and responsiveness (provider and LME)
 - Customer Service (Provider and LME)
 - Transition support and efficiency
- II. Optimize the Utilization Management function of the LME
 - Assure appropriateness of all services
 - Assure efficient management of IPRS-funded service utilization to reach as many consumers as possible and extend funding throughout the year
 - Obtain approval to authorize all Medicaid and IPRS service in FY 2006
- III. Improve Quality of Services
 - Develop and implement a set of core values based on best practice approaches, evidence based practices, and System of Care philosophies
 - Develop a comprehensive Quality Improvement Plan
 - Address specific quality issues
 - Define quality expectations for each service and implement methods for checking, tracking, and reporting
 - Improve the quality of Case Management services
 - o Training and technical assistance
 - o Strengthen workforce and reduce turnover
 - o Monitor indicators listed on quality reviews
 - Strengthen Person/Family-centered planning
 - Increase and improve consumer satisfaction measures
 - Improve Customer Service
 - Identify a broader array of measurable consumer outcome indicators and the means to collect and report data
- IV. Strengthen Communication and Public Relations
 - Within the community
 - With consumers and families

Strategic Planning—Consumer Indicators

- Decrease re-admissions to DCA 24-hour beds
- Increase number served and penetration rates per disability category
- Increase engagement into substance abuse services
- Increase % of consumers with Medicaid coverage
- Increase penetration rate in serving individuals who are homeless
- Identify mental health needs of the homeless population in Durham

- Gather baseline data on engagement of informal support systems for child mental health consumers
- Reduce state hospital admissions
- Reduce state hospital bed day usage
- Maintain no more than 15% of all children served in out-of-home placements
- Increase the number of individuals who receive CAP services and maintain appropriate CAP budgets
- Increase # of consumers with developmental disabilities who move from institutional care to community-based services
- Increase access to services within state designated time frames for routine, urgent, and emergent – minimum standard 85%

Goals for 2005-06

- Decrease re-admissions to DCA
- Increase the number of people served in each disability category
- Increase the % of consumers with Medicaid coverage
- Reduce state hospital admissions and bed days utilization
- Move 4% of people from Murdock to the community
- Maintain 15% or less for out-of-home placements for children

The Commissioners had no questions about the presentation.

Chairman Reckhow commented that the Commissioners and Mental Health had regular interactions throughout the year; therefore, no questions were necessary. Regular discussions should continue.

New Attorney Position Request

County Attorney Chuck Kitchen gave the following PowerPoint presentation to justify his request for a new County Attorney:

Why another Attorney?

Changes in the law, together with heavier caseloads, have resulted in the inability to meet expected levels of performance in the DSS division of the County Attorney's Office.

What is the Case Load for Child Support?

- ❖ 80% of the IV-D attorney's time is devoted to child support.
- ❖ 8415 cases are under court order.
- ❖ The case-to-attorney ratio is approximately 10,000 cases to one attorney.

What is the Case Load for DSS?

July 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003

- ❖ 45 cases adjudicated
- ❖ 21 cases adjudicated in 60 days or less
- ❖ 73-day average from filing to adjudication

January 1, 2004 through June 30, 2004

- ❖ 48 cases adjudicated

- ❖ 27 cases adjudicated in 60 days or less
 - ❖ 64-day average from filing to adjudication
- July 1, 2004 through December 31, 2004
- ❖ 71 cases adjudicated
 - ❖ 24 cases adjudicated in 60 days or less
 - ❖ 90-day average from filing to adjudication

Current Open Cases – 336

- ❖ Case is reviewed within 90 days of filing and then every six months thereafter
- ❖ A permanency planning hearing must now be held for each case
- ❖ Pending legislation would allow an appeal from the planning hearing in addition to the appeal from a termination of parental rights

What Do We Want to Do?

What will an additional attorney do for the citizens of the County?

- ❖ Devote one full-time attorney to child support to manage caseload.
- ❖ With a full-time child support attorney, 66% of cost will be picked up by State and Federal sources.
- ❖ Three full-time attorneys will be devoted to DSS, which will bring the County into compliance with standards in the Federal Adoptions and Safe Families Act as codified in G. S. § 7B-801(c).

Questions/Discussion

1. Would the new position guarantee additional court time? DSS has sufficient court time to accommodate the new position.
2. County Attorney Kitchen named the current DSS Attorneys and explained their duties.

Motion to Excuse Chairman Reckhow from the June 13 Budget Worksession

Commissioner Cheek moved, seconded by Commissioner Cousin, to excuse Chairman Reckhow from the 4:00 P.M. Budget Worksession on June 13, as she would be receiving an award in Raleigh during that time.

The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vonda C. Sessoms
Clerk to the Board