

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

Monday, May 24, 1999

5:00 P.M. – 6:30 P.M.
Worksession

MINUTES

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

Present: Chairman MaryAnn E. Black, Vice-Chairman Ellen W. Reckhow, and Commissioners William V. Bell, Joe W. Bowser, and Becky M. Heron

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Black

Chairman Black opened the meeting.

Presentation and Discussion of Continuum of Care for At-Risk Children

County Manager David F. Thompson, Deputy County Manager Carolyn Titus, and Youth Coordinating Director Anita Daniels will make a short presentation to the Commissioners on the issue of increasing costs for the provision of care for children under consent orders. They will be addressing the Fiscal Year 1998-1999 Budget shortfalls that are the result of the increase in consent orders requiring out-of-county placements and outlining a course of action designed to address this issue strategically.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1998/99 Fiscal Year Budget Impact due to Court-Ordered/Consent Care (Local Funds Only) | David F. Thompson
County Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of the Current Problem | David F. Thompson
County Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Need for a Strategic Response | Carolyn Titus
Deputy Co. Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Procedures to Assess System, Determine Local Capacity and Develop New Resource Capacity to Meet Identified Needs | Anita Daniels
Youth Coordinating
Board Director |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board Discussion/Deliberation | BOCC |

Introduction: Deputy County Manager—Carolyn P. Titus

County Manager David F. Thompson introduced the newly appointed Deputy County Manager Carolyn P. Titus. The appointment was effective May 17, 1999.

1998 Fiscal Year Budget Impact due to Court-Ordered/Consent Care (Local Funds Only)

County Manager David F. Thompson said today's issue is children at-risk and our concerns for continuum of care for children. If we face this challenge and can bring together our different agencies in the community at large, we can be successful. I hope that after our presentation, the Commissioners will have a clear understanding of the current fiscal year impact due to the increasing demands for County mandated services in the local funds area. We are requesting input today and in the future from the Board of County Commissioners on the effects we are making to define the problems. We also are requesting information from the Board on how to bring about system improvements that are both effective and efficient as we develop solutions. This has to be an ongoing dialogue. In the current year's budget, the local consent care budgeted figure is \$500,000 for out of County care. Projections for this fiscal year are \$1,998,000. This is local funds. The combined cost of local, state, and federal funds for this year and next year will exceed \$3.5 million. For the first six months of FY 1998-1999, we have already spent \$800,000 in this one line item. The Durham Center Board, in this fiscal year, has agreed to allocate \$900,000 from its accrued general fund balances in this fiscal year to help absorb some of this cost. Court consent ordered care is a responsibility of each individual local government. In our current local budget, we have an impact of \$600,000 this year and another \$1.5 million next year for a total of \$2.1 million. At the youth home, the budgeted cost for FY 1999-1998 was only \$6,214. The current cost has increased to \$71,636 and in future years the cost is projected to cost \$123,000. The cost at the Youth Home to pay for other counties to care for these children is \$10,000 per month. These two cost centers we are talking about have an estimated amount of \$1,650,000 this fiscal year.

Scope of the Current Problem

Initially, the committee was comprised of County Department Heads who were trying to manage the financial shortfalls. This committee expanded rapidly as the scope broadened and quickly identified the following groups of children, as those believed to be impacting the current trends:

- ❖ Children in the Juvenile Court system who have been adjudicated abused, neglected, or delinquent, who need mental health treatment but are unable to pay; (*approximately 75 children currently in consent ordered care are funded by the County*)

- ❖ Children in the Juvenile Court system who are being held in secure custody in Detention Facilities outside of Durham because our facility is full; *(an average of 8 to 10 at any given time)*
- ❖ Children who are short and long term suspended from the public school system; *(approximately 450 short-term and 104 long-term in the 1997-98 school year)*
- ❖ Children in the Juvenile Court system who have been charged with or adjudicated for a criminal offense; *(approximately 303 as of April 30, 1999)*

Other data that was collected and analyzed by Anita Daniels, Youth Coordinating Board Director, heightened the committee's awareness that the lack of a continuum of care for at-risk children is a community-wide problem that is burdening all systems. Efforts to identify and quantify these groups of children are quite limited due to the lack of coordinated and automated data systems, lack of common definitions, varying state reporting requirements, incompatible automated data systems, and different data collection needs. Although committee members know the probability is high that many of these children are served and counted by more than one agency, it could not be verified through the data collection effort. *(It is important to note that the difficulty in collecting this type of data is a statewide problem as reported by the Governor's Commission on Juvenile Crime and Justice.)*

A commentary by syndicated columnist William Raspberry that appeared in The Duke Chronicle Newspaper in March summed up the initial review by our group. Kenneth Dodge, Director of Duke University's new Child Policy Center, uses the allegory of a man who has placed himself at the bottom of a waterfall, working feverishly to rescue children as they plummet over the cascade. He hauls them out, nurses their wounds, takes them to the hospital—and begs for more money to continue and expand his rescue work. He is a smart hero, and it occurs to him that if he could get up to the top of the fall, he might be able to keep many of the children out of the dangerous waters. The problem: More youngsters will fall while he's climbing the cliff. And so he stays where he is.

Given the picture that has emerged, an intensive community response is needed. A carefully devised strategy is required to address the issue of our children who are already plummeting over the waterfall. We must resist the temptation for a quick fix. Too often our services are defined by available funding rather than a strategic community process to ascertain what our children truly need.

Need for a Strategic Response

Deputy County Manager Carolyn Titus spoke about the need for strategic response on our part.

Clearly one of our first goals is to bring our children back to the Durham community. This will allow their families to participate in the treatment process, thereby decreasing long residential stays and increasing the effectiveness of treatment interventions. Not

only will our children and their families be better served, our approaches will be more effective and produce better treatment results.

The committee recommends the following steps:

- ◆ Determine the appropriate group structure to address the current problems of our children.
- ◆ Establish an immediate process to collect and share data about children who are served between State and Local agencies to formulate short and long term strategies for services.
- ◆ Address barriers regarding confidentiality, varying data collection formats, inadequate automated data system, and other issues that keep agencies from sharing information about children who are served.
- ◆ Develop a flowchart for each agency identifying the process for children who come through the Juvenile Justice, child protection, mental health, and public school systems.
- ◆ Determine the impact of the new Family Court and the Juvenile Justice Reform Act on treatment needs for children.
- ◆ Identify capacity of local services and financial resources being used in our county and review new resources in the developmental stages such as Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST), MAJORS grant, (\$170,000) Communities that Care grant (\$80,000), Safe Schools & Healthy Students Initiative grant (\$3 million), and day treatment.
- ◆ Identify any local resources currently underutilized such as the “Just Us” program.
- ◆ Determine what new resources must be developed to keep children in our County. Review existing proposals for new services such as a day reporting center for juveniles, a continuum for suspended students, and a multi-purpose group home.
- ◆ Determine funding sources that are currently available and funding sources that could be developed and/or redirected to provide enough services in our own community.

The second major conclusion of this Committee is also captured by William Raspberry’s closing of his article describing attempts to stop the flow created at the top of the waterfall—by stopping kids before they fall from the top. “...when we’re so consumed with what presently violent youngsters are doing, we find it hard to think of prevention. It’s like trying to sell a smoke alarm to a man whose house is on fire.” There needs to be a strategic plan of action to begin looking at “...best practices for prevention strategies.”

Deputy County Manager Titus said we will come back to the Commissioners with a recommendation on a charge for the Youth Coordinating Board and the Juvenile Crime Prevention Council and how they can be involved in the planning process.

County Manager Thompson said a charge from the County Commissioners is very powerful.

Proposed Process to Assess System, Determine Local Capacity and Develop New Resource Capacity to Meet Identified Needs

Anita Daniels, Director, Youth Coordinating Board, talked about additional steps recommended by the committee to initiate the prevention process.

The steps are as follows:

Additional steps recommended by the committee to initiate the prevention process are:

- ◆ Develop a unified data collection method for each agency using the Governor's Crime Commission's Communities that Care process, which collects data in a manner that can be used across the State.
- ◆ Consolidate all funding for youth-related nonprofit agencies to the Youth Coordinating Board for annual review, funding recommendations, program assessment, monitoring, and evaluation.
- ◆ Complete recruitment for Youth Coordinating Board Management Committees (*ages 6-12 and 13-18*) which will determine service priorities for current and future funding and recommend promising approaches to address negative youth behaviors. Ensure that services are research-based and have proven track records in addressing adolescent behavior problems.
- ◆ Conduct program assessments for all agencies funded by the Juvenile Crime Prevention Council to determine effectiveness and determine that the recommendations of the Management Committees and the Juvenile Crime Prevention Council are coordinated.
- ◆ Develop coordinated efforts to pursue grants to expand and create services when the funders' request *clearly* correlates with needed services for the Continuum of Care.

The Commissioners asked questions and made comments about the continuum of care for at-risk children to which the panel responded. Dr. Steven Ashby, Mental Health Director, also participated in the question and answer session.

Chairman Black stated the administration will bring a charge at the June Worksession for the Commissioners to sign.

County Manager Thompson said there will be two charges. One will be to the Manager's Office for the Commissioners to sign off on stating what the Commissioners are holding him responsible for and one to the community base committee.

Y2K Plan

Michael J. Palmer, Deputy County Manager, will present an overview of the County's Y2K Preparedness Plan. Selected areas of the Plan will be addressed by:

Perry Dixon, IT Director	Plan Coordination and Information Systems
Mike Turner, General Services Director	Facilities
City Representative	City Administered Joint Departments
Scott Gardner, District Manager, Duke Power	Duke Power Y2K Plan Update
Deborah Craig-Ray, Public Information Officer	Public Information Planning

County Manager's Recommendation: Discuss and receive the report.

Y2K Preparedness Plan

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Overview of Y2K Plan | 5:45-6:30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plan Coordination and Information Systems | Perry Dixon
IT Director |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City Administered Joint Departments | John Pederson
City of Durham
Assistant Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Duke Power Update | Scott Gardner
Duke Power
District Manager |
| <input type="checkbox"/> GTE Update | Steve Toler
GTE Regional Public
Relations Director |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Information Planning | Deborah Craig-Ray
Public Information
Director |

Deputy County Manager Michael Palmer presented the Commissioners an introduction to the Y2K Preparedness Plan.

Phase I of the Y2K Plan was started in March 1996, focusing on the information system, our highest risk area. We are very close to completing our information fixes at this time.

In September 1998, Phase II of the Y2K plan, which focuses on our departments readiness, was initiated. The IT Department has coordinated and guided the County Department plans. The department plans are now and will be continuously evaluated and fine tuned.

The third phase of our plan, which is in the early design phase at this time, will focus on informing our citizens about our Y2K readiness and our mission--that Durham County staff will communicate with confidence that on January 1, 2000, we will be ready to continue the same level of services our citizens expect, with minimal disruption.

The agenda for the Y2K Preparedness Plan was followed in order to give the Commissioners a total picture of our plan and the progress that has been made to

implement the plan. The action plans to occur between June 1, 1999 and January 1, 2000 were also discussed relative to public information planning.

Perry Dixon, IT Director, explained to the Commissioners how the Y2K problem originated. He also gave the Board an overview of Y2K relative to the plan coordination and information system. The County is not complete with its Y2K efforts, but we are in good shape. We are ahead of schedules in the Information Technology Department. Our plans and projects are in process and will be completed on time. Regardless of our best efforts, there is risk.

Michael Turner, General Services Director, told the Commissioners about the General Services Y2K Plan, and the progress that is being made to implement the plan. Between now and October 31, 1999 the department will be in the process of verification by testing certain risk classification categories. On the evening of Friday, December 31, 1999, we will have building maintenance staff checking all the buildings to be sure they are ready for business on Monday, January 3, 2000.

John Pederson, Assistant Manager, City of Durham, told the Commissioners about the City's Y2K Plan and the progress that is being made to implement in order to check all systems. He also spoke about the public information efforts and the public forum that will be held to answer citizens' questions relative to services across the community.

Scott Gardner, Duke Power District Manager, explained to the Commissioners the Y2K plans that Duke Power Company has instituted and the implementation progress that is occurring.

Steve Toler, GTE Regional Public Relations Director, reviewed with the Commissioners the Y2K Plan GTE has developed and the progress that is being made to implement the plan to be sure that all systems are Y2K compliant.

The Commissioners asked questions, made comments, and suggestions to staff relative to Y2K concerns.

Commissioner Bell suggested that the Y2K information at the Board level be simplified by stating the various levels of risks. The levels of risks should be broken down into tiers 1, 2, and 3. Each Department should be put into a tier and indicated where we are.

County Manager David F. Thompson said Commissioner Bell's suggestion is good and the information will be formatted for the Commissioners in 30 days.

Closed Session

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Bowser, to adjourn into Closed Session to discuss the

handling of a claim and in order to preserve the attorney-client privilege pursuant to G.S. 143-318(a)(3).

The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Garry E. Umstead, CMC
Clerk to the Board