JOINT CITY-COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETING
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA
Tuesday, May 12, 2020
Virtual Zoom Meeting
9:00 a.m.

Agenda

Presiding – Mayor Steve Schewel

1. Approval of draft Joint City-County Meeting Minutes of January 14, 2020 and March 10, 2020. Both sets attached. (5 minutes)

2. Update on Durham City-County Current COVID-19 Situation by Rod Jenkins (Durham County Health Director); no attachment. (30 minutes)


4. Update on Emergency Feeding of Durham Public School Students, Families and Seniors by Donna Rewalt (Durham County Cooperative Extension Director); no attachment. (15 minutes)

5. Update from Working Group for next 60-90 Days for City-County-DPS by Bertha Johnson (Director of City Budget and Management) and Jodi Miller (General Manager Durham County Government); no attachment. (15 minutes)

6. Report on COVID-19 Taskforce on Recovery and Renewal by Steve Schewel (Mayor of City of Durham); no attachment. (10 minutes)

7. Report on Eviction Diversion Program - projected needs once Eviction Moratorium ends by Janeen Gordon (Durham County Social Services Assistant Director of Aging and Adult Services), Reginald Johnson (Director of Community Development) and Karen Lado (Assistant Director of Community Development). Attachment: Durham County Eviction Diversion Program Summary FY2020 (1 page). (30 minutes)

8. Report from DPS on Bridging the Digital Divide by Dr. Nakia Hardy, Deputy Superintendent for Academics; Chanel Sidbury, Executive Director- Secondary Teaching and Learning; Benjamin Brown, Executive Director – Information Technology; and Tanya Giovanni- Chief of Staff. Attachment: Igniting Limitless Potential, DPS Planning Update (11 PowerPoint slides) (30 minutes)

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 – County Commissioners Chamber – 9 a.m.
JOINT CITY-COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETING  
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA  

Tuesday, January 14, 2020 @ 9:00 a.m.  

Durham City Hall - 101 City Hall Plaza - 2nd Floor Committee Room  

Draft Minutes  

Presiding – Mayor Steve Schewel  

Present: Mayor Steve Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Jillian Johnson and Council Member DeDreana Freeman. Absent: None. Also in attendance, Council Member Charlie Reece (Alternate).  

Present: Commissioner Chair Wendy Jacobs, Commissioners Ellen Reckhow, Brenda Howerton and Heidi Carter (Alternate). Absent: Co-Chair James Hill.  

County Staff: County Manager Wendell Davis; County Attorney Lowell Siler; and County Clerk to the County Commissioners Monica Toomer.  

City Staff: City Manager Tom Bonfield, City Attorney Kim Rehberg and City Clerk Diana Schreiber.  

Mayor Schewel called the meeting to order, welcomed all in attendance and announced a hard deadline of 11 a.m. due to a scheduled press conference.  

Initially, due to a lack of quorum, the vote on the draft minutes was delayed until the arrival of the remaining committee members.  

It was the prerogative of the chair to determine that Item 2, Property Tax Relief, would be addressed next.  

SUBJECT: PROPERTY TAX RELIEF UPDATE (ITEM 2)  

City Attorney Kim Rehberg and Senior Assistant County Attorney, Bryan Wardell presented in conjunction with Durham County Tax Administrator Timothy Dwane Brinson.  

Attorney Rehberg introduced the item that consisted of an overview of how County taxation works, current exemptions, programs in place for low-income homeowners and a summary of the city’s current program.
Attorney Wardell summarized what the County could do to address the re-evaluation concerns of residents; introduced the three NC State statutory exemption programs: Circuit Breaker Homestead Tax Deferment Program, Elderly Exclusion, Disabled Veteran Exclusion.

Tax Administrator Duane Brinson explained the three exemption programs, eligibility requirements and responded to Chair Jacobs’ questions from the August 2019 Joint Meeting.

Q1) What other exemptions currently exist and what was the impact on the tax base?

According to NCGS, there were overall 83 different exemptions and tax relief programs available through state law and stated that the exemptions’ combined impact of the tax base resulted in a loss of $4.4 billion.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson inquired what percent of the $4.4 billion exempted value was Duke.

Tax Administrator Brinson could not respond since portions of Duke were exempt and other portions, non-exempt.

Q2) What was the City and County due diligence around the eligibility for the exemptions?

The Durham County Tax Office was bound by state law, informed residents of various exemption programs and set up payment options.

Q3) How many persons were currently using the exemptions and how many were eligible for the programs?

The current year eligibility figure was not possible to determine at this time. For 2019, 557 tax relief applications received; 315 met requirements; 25 were already in program applied for; remaining 217 applicants were denied. Overall, 2375 parcels were in exemption programs. For the main three programs, this amounted to $175 million in exempted value.

Mayor Pro Tempore requested the data be sent to the members of the Committee.

Mr. Brinson responded that the information would be forwarded to the Committee members.

Q4) Were there plans on enrolling more participants?

Durham County Tax Office was formulating a software program called the Property Tax Assistance Evaluator, an online resource consisting of a survey that would provide immediate feedback on the eligibility of property owners within the exemption framework. The resource would be housed on the Tax Office website.

Council Member Freeman inquired about the transfer of homeownership occurring upon death of a homeowner and how many families had to pay the deferred taxes of the deceased.

Tax Administrator Brinson responded that the information could be provided by showing all properties transferred and defined with their current owners then compare to assess which properties were reverted to heir properties; the information could be obtained with this method. He said the Homestead Exemption was not a deferment but the Circuit Breaker was a deferment.
Commissioner Howerton inquired about the rationale of persons not applying for the Circuit Breaker.

It was explained that the Circuit Breaker exemptions would need to be paid back upon death of the property owner and there were 27 Circuit Breaker participants in Durham. Three years of back tax liability plus interest would need to be paid back upon a disqualifying event. The Homestead Exemption was more beneficial in that it eliminated half of the tax bill with no required payback.

Mayor Schewel requested the breakdown of the participants in each of the programs.

Mr. Brinson responded that the information would be sent to the Committee members.

Commissioner Reckhow referenced the memo from Attorney Wardell, and asked about working with the Local Delegation about the possibility of a state-wide amendment to the Circuit Breaker that would lower the age requirement and broaden the income parameters.

Tax Administrator Brinson responded it was worth exploring, especially as a new option for persons under 65 years of age.

There was additional discussion of the impact of marital status on exemption eligibility. The maximum income allowed for eligibility was $31,000, whether single or married.

Commissioner Reckhow asked if there was discussion at state-wide conferences to revise the parameters for eligibility. Mr. Brinson responded that to his knowledge, there have been no discussions.

Council Member Freeman inquired about taxing non-profits. To respond, Mr. Brinson explained that his office followed North Carolina State Statutes which exempted non-profits.

Chair Jacobs inquired about Charlotte, NC looking to change qualifications for state programs by lowering the age eligibility. Mr. Brinson responded that state legislation was proposed but nothing had been adopted.

Attorney Wardell spoke to actions at the local level implemented to address the issue of tax abatement; spoke to an assistance program for low-income individuals that could consist of a non-profit, the non-profit would be funded by the County via grants. He stated that to provide moderate-income persons’ relief could be seen as tax rebates and tax rebates were prohibited according to NCG Statutes. An alternative would be for the County to set up a department similarly to the non-profit.

Attorney Rehberg addressed income standards of the Durham and Charlotte programs. She stated federal community development statutory law defined low-income as 50% AMI and state statutes define it at 60% AMI. The City’s current long-term homeowner grant defined eligibility at 80% AMI, a moderate income level. UNC School of Government Professor Dr. McLaughlin analyzed income levels and flagged the city’s income level by indicating the income level would have to be reduced. If the city wanted to conduct a property tax program consisting of giving funds to individual families, there must be a constitutional or public purpose. As per NCGS 160A-456, the City was allowed by statute to establish welfare programs. If the County were to join the City in expanding an existing program, the partnership would have to go before the Durham County voters as a referendum. There were two options to approach the program, one as an affordable housing
issue and the other, as a low-income, welfare issue. Establishing a non-profit for affordable housing was a possibility.

Commissioner Reckhow inquired if research had been conducted of best practices in other states; and mentioned a program in Cambridge, Massachusetts that allowed different property tax rates between residential and non-residential properties and noted this practice helped homes be affordable. She expressed concerns about the labor costs of administering an affordable housing program.

Mayor Schewel concurred with Mayor Pro Tempore to obtain the statistics from Tax Administrator Brinson. He continued by asking City and County Managers to look at alternatives for an affordable housing program and to research the issue of a referendum and the non-profit option. He stated that it would be important to define the term ‘low income’ and supported the Tax Office’s App to determine eligibility for existing programs. He summarized that staff should come back to both the City and County by budget time with some ideas and alternatives, then members of the Joint Committee could decide to move forward or not.

Council Member Freeman urged the defining of low-income and how familial circumstances impacted income standards.

Chair Jacobs encouraged support from UNC School of Government of what would be permissible, what would the criteria be, what were the best practices from other states for similar types of programs, and what would that look like along with estimates of funding levels and the number of persons eligible and have this information available for the next Joint City-County meeting in March 2020.

Commissioner Howerton asked about the meaning of the term welfare program.

Attorney Rehberg responded that the meaning of a welfare program was a program tailored to meet the needs of low-income individuals.

It was the consensus of the Joint City-County Committee to come back by the next Joint City-County Meeting (March 2020) budget time with alternatives of how elected officials could handle the program for long-term, low-income homeowners and if so, in what form. By show of hands, the following persons were in favor: Mayor Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson, Council Member Freeman, County Commissioner Chair Wendy Jacobs and Commissioners Carter, Howerton and Reckhow. No hands were raised in opposition to the plan.

Commissioner Reckhow added that she would like financial counseling for families included in the program.

Chair Jacobs spoke to the Housing Repair Collaborative and asked staff to look at how to increase funding for other types of expenses that low-income homeowners may have in maintaining their homes. Mayor Schewel noted that there were funds in the Housing Bond for such programs.

**SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 2019 - ITEM 1**

It was the consensus of the Joint Committee to revise the draft minutes with a minor revision as requested by Council Member Freeman and Commissioner Reckhow.
MOTION by Commissioner Reckhow, seconded by Council Member Freeman, to approve the revised minutes of the December 10, 2019 Joint City-County meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

SUBJECT: MADE IN DURHAM – SIX MONTH INTERIM REPORT (ITEM 4)

Casey Steinbacher, Executive Director of Made in Durham, presented the item. The presentation included the following:

- Recap of original problem that established the organization
- How MiD was established
- Progress made and lessons learned to date
- Focus of future work

MiD was a collaborative of community organizations designed to enhance Durham’s talent pipeline with the following organizations:

- Office of Economic & Workforce Development
- Office on Youth
- Partnerships for Youth Opportunities
- Student U
- Durham Public Schools
- Durham Technical Community College
- United Way
- Durham Chamber of Commerce
- NC BioTech Center
- Youth representatives
- Durham’s Children’s Initiative
- Durham Literacy Center/Achievement Academy

Ms. Steinbacher stated the contracts between the City of Durham and Durham County did not have uniform performance criteria; defined the problem by speaking about disconnected youth and their educational progress within the talent pipeline and compared 2012 to 2018.

Three areas of focus were discussed concerning Opportunity Youth, Work-Based Learning and Youth Engagement and included the value of MiD in overcoming barriers. She addressed transportation programming that provided youth passes (18 years, 21 years); and spoke to various work-based learning activities.

Commissioner Reckhow inquired about the distribution channels for bus passes; asked about duplicity- how students were counted across the various programs; and compared the number of total disconnected youth of 4000 to the number of participants in MiD of 300, touching less than 10% of the total disconnected youth.

Dominique Oliver, Re-Engagement Strategist, explained how the passes were distributed in Durham Public Schools; noted that some students were counted more than once across the lists of programming and stated the re-engagement students were all unique (counted once).

After her response regarding the pilot program’s lessons learned, Ms. Steinbacher introduced a partner in the work, Lizzie Ellis-Furlong, Executive Director of the Durham Literacy Center.

Ms. Ellis-Furlong addressed her organization’s work with youth, specifically the high school equivalency programming with Durham Youth Opportunity Program and Durham Futures and Collaboration and explained how transportation issues and foster care impacted her students.
Dr. Julie Pack addressed the 3-2-1 Work-Based Initiative and its vast network of employers and explained the partnership with MiD.

Mayor Schewel expressed concerns about the timeframe of the meeting with the impending press conference approaching at 11 a.m.

Bethlam Prague, Youth Network graduate who currently worked on the Youth Engagement Program, explained how MiD had impacted her education trajectory in a favorable way.

Ms. Steinbacher summarized the 2019 Goal Status and future direction and addressed the contracts pertinent to the City and County. The 2020-2023 Future Focus: Working Toward (slide) summarized the following initiatives:

**Opportunity Youth (OY)** – Wide vision; Successful creation of Durham OY Collaborative, Successful addition of ‘at risk’ initiative to support OY efforts.

**Work-Based Learning (WBL)** – Full collaboration of programs that provide youth in Durham WBL. Shared technology that provides program access, data outcome tracking and insights into participation barriers for youth and employer partners; robust employer participation with match to best-fit activities and talent development.

**Youth Engagement** – Increased capacity to support growth of YN; successful youth informed WBL initiative in all Durham high schools; and execution of racial equity action projects in 50% of Durham high schools.

Chair Jacobs spoke to the collective impact model and emphasized the breaking down of silos and establishing resource connections. She expressed concerns about the limitations of bus routes to employment centers and the limited number of Durham residents getting jobs in Durham. Additional information was voiced about the County Commissioners’ support of the ‘education to jobs pipeline’ along with the utilization of a template focused on community benefits and emphasized the need to ensure implementation.

Commissioner Carter supported the technological collaborative platform and asked about lessons learned on current barriers/gaps that would ensure success.

Ms. Steinbacher responded that there needed to be a universal community vision between the City, County and partnering organizations; stated the biggest challenge of MiD was that they were competing for program funding with other similar organizations and admitted that long-term sustainable funding continued to be sought in order to support MiD’s backbone.

Commissioner Carter asked about the engagement of MiD with RTP.

It was explained that MiD has close associations in RTP as evidenced by monthly meetings of STEM in the Park and corporate engagement convening with a focus on work-based learning.

Commissioner Howerton expressed thanks for the support of youth in Durham.

Mayor Schewel requested the supporters of MiD to stand and be recognized.

Council Member Freeman encouraged MiD’s focus on disconnected youth; urged feedback in the form of statistics such as the number of disconnected, at-risk youth being served and stated ‘touches’ were unacceptable; admitted that reaching just 400 youth was a failure; and noted that
additional resources were needed to focus on the youth of McDougald Terrace in relation to their housing and preparations to move youth onward and out of the housing.

Ms. Steinbacher stated she would forward the vision for MiD Opportunity Youth and encouraged meetings with each Joint Committee member to help craft a game plan for youth support.

Mayor Schewel encouraged better participation results in the YouthWorks Internship program.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, March 10, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. in the Durham County Commissioners’ Chamber.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Diana Schreiber, CMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
JOINT CITY-COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETING
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

Tuesday, March 10, 2020

Commissioners’ Chambers
County Administrative Building, 2nd Floor
9:00 a.m.

Draft Minutes

Presiding – Chair Wendy Jacobs

Present: Board of County Commission Committee Members – Chair Wendy Jacobs, Vice Chair James Hill, Jr. and Commissioners Brenda Howerton, Ellen Reckhow and Heidi Carter (Alternate)

City Council Committee Members – Mayor Steve Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Jillian Johnson and Councilmember DeDreana Freeman

Others – County: County Manager Wendell Davis; General Managers Deborah Craig-Ray, Claudia Hagar, Jodi Miller; Joanne Pierce; and Peri Manns; Senior Assistant County Attorney Larissa Williamson; Clerk to the Board Monica Toomer; Chief of Staff Drew Cummings and Budget Director Keith Lane

Others – City: City Manager Thomas J. Bonfield; Wanda Page, Deputy City Manager; City Attorney Kimberly Rehberg; and City Clerk Diana Schreiber

Presider: Chair Wendy Jacobs

Call to Order/Welcome
Chair Jacobs called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone in attendance to the Tuesday, March 10, 2020 Joint City-County Committee meeting.

Report from Together for Resilient Youth (TRY) – Outreach and Grants
Dr. Wanda Boone, Executive Director of TRY shared a presentation which explained the Handle with Care (HwC) Initiative proposal, the financial need and the purpose. She requested $75,000 from the City/County to support the needs of this initiative.
Chair Jacobs asked Dr. Boone to provide details about the initiative. Dr. Boone stated when a child experienced trauma in a neighborhood, law enforcement would contact TRY who would step in and assist with monitoring that child. She added to monitor outburst in the school, TRY and Alliance Behavior Health would provide assist; instead of suspension being the only option.

Commissioner Reckhow shared her biggest concern was fear of safety. She stated this was a comprehensive approach of all needs and felt there was a need for more of a universal approach. Commissioner Reckhow added the Board recently approved the Eastern Childhood Initiative to complete an early childhood action plan that addressed the ten goal areas developed by the State – two (2) of which directly related to what Dr. Boone has shared.

Commissioner Howerton stressed that parenting and housing was essential to the traumatizing effects of children. She added when parents do not have the necessities to provide, that could affect the child’s behavior.

Councilmember Freeman stated if the presentation was shared in January 2020, she would have agreed to the money requested. She was hopeful there would be more consideration and staff would assist.

Dr. Boone stated this was her first time in 20 years presenting before the Joint City-County Committee requesting funds. She welcomed support and stated this would be done correctly and efficiently.

Commissioner Carter asked for clarification on the process to request funds. County Manager Davis shared the non-profit funding process and how the information was received and shared.

Chair Jacobs thanked Dr. Boone for her presentation, adding the HwC was a very important initiative. She suggested Dr. Boone share her information with the Durham School Board since this initiative would also benefit the school system and the Community Safety Task Force which was an opportunity for partnership with the City of Durham. Chair Jacobs also invited Dr. Boone to present to the Durham Directors.

**Property Tax Relief Discussion**
Claudia Hager, General Manager stated the charge to staff was to look at current tax exemptions offered by the state and based on legal guidance set perimeters for a grant or non-profit option to implement a relief program.

Dwane Brinson, Tax Administrator was asked to develop a value available online which would simplify the application process to help citizens pre-determine if they qualified for one of the programs available. He stated the tool was tested, approved and would be available to the public soon. Chair Jacobs asked that the information be shared with City Council and the Board when the opportunity became available. She also suggested community training and outreach to make the public aware.
Mayor Schewel thanked the staff for working on the tool and looked forward to the community having this service available.

Ms. Hager added with regards to the grant programs, conversations were held with the School of Government and community development partners with the City. She also stated staff met with Dr. Jim Savara for community highlights regarding tax relief as well.

Karen Lado, Assistant Director – Department of Community Development stated the options included – but not limited to the following variables:

- Income threshold
- Determining if all residents of the household income was reviewed or just the owner
- Tenure requirements
- How to calculate the benefit

Ms. Lado also shared the two (2) components of program costs: property tax revenue and program administration. She discussed the increase in applications likely to be received and the need for additional staff to run the program to its full potential. Ms. Lado continued to say that staff was working diligently on options with hopes of sharing those with the Committee at a future meeting.

Ms. Hager thanked the Committee for receiving the overview on what the process would look like; adding the cost element was something the committee would need to determine. She continued to say the total cost numbers would also be shared to help determine the next steps.

Chair Jacobs asked if different options would be considered in phases. Ms. Hager responded staff would bring back options to consider and allow the Council and Board to decide what would work best based on their fiscal challenges.

Vice Chair Hill noted one factor not mentioned was the value of the house and asked for an explanation. Ms. Lado responded currently with these programs, valuing the house was not a factor. She added a part of the challenge was a low-income homeowner owning a home located in an appreciated neighborhood – their home value increased, but their income did not.

Councilmember Freeman stated knowing the process was just getting started, were there any figures available. Ms. Hager responded depending upon the percentage of users for the program and utilization – at the 30 percent level it was closer to $3 million and at the 50 percent level it was closer to $7 million. She highlighted those figures were still being examined and once confirmed the updated numbers would be provided.

Wanda Page, Deputy City Manager stated Ms. Hager mentioned the loss tax revenue and noted those numbers did not include the administration cost of the program. She added that could vary depending on the complexity of the program, being able to qualify individuals and the number of residents who qualified for the program. Councilmember Freeman asked were any non-profits in mind. Ms. Hager responded no; adding at this time the intent was to determine options available and propose two (2) strategies to the Council and Board.
Commissioner Reckhow expressed her concern surrounding the complexities of the administration. She shared a friend’s experience with regards to obtaining tax relief from a federal program and mentioned how extreme the process was. Commissioner Reckhow hoped that the program discussed would offer a sense of relief. Regional Johnson, Director of Community Development responded the City offered a grant program that was not as complex as the federal program; however, the process was still time consuming.

Commissioner Howerton questioned the estimates provided by Dr. Svara; asking for the overall number and the sustainability of those figures. Ms. Lado explained the figures in the handout; adding they were assumptions based on revenue which does not include administrative cost. She explained the difference between household and owner income; explaining if you were reviewing the household income, there were approximately 4000 households in 2016 with incomes less than 30 percent and 8700 below 50 percent (that number includes the 4000 households). Ms. Lado stated she did not have the figures for 80 percent but would provide that to the Committee.

Chair Jacobs asked what could the City Council and Board expect as they move forward with their upcoming budget processes. Ms. Hager stated staff was aware they needed to work fast and hoped within the next couple of weeks, they would have additional information to share.

Mayor Schewel thanked the staff for getting this work done and appreciated the rubric of variables provided for review. He shared that some programs – such as the state program worked well; adding staff should be attached to the system already in place. Mayor Schewel stated creating a second system may cause bureaucratic challenges and questioned whether the County was willing to take on this challenge. He pointed out an additional critical piece was how the money would flow through the grant, adding the program needed to be stated in a way to reach the people with the most critical need (30 percent should be the focus during the first year). Mayor Schewel also suggested extending the tenure requirements to possibly 10 years. He noted the program should target homeowners who have lived in neighborhoods for years that were now being regentrified versus owners who recently purchased homes in those neighborhoods.

Chair Jacobs stated it was very critical for those in need such as seniors who could benefit from this program, adding the homeownership rate was approximately 75 percent for that population. She continued to say it was also important to factor in the neighborhoods affected by rising market values and regentrification. Chair Jacobs noted the County was not looking at a lot of increased revenues and mentioned a revised Interlocal Agreement with the City with relation to the Sales Tax. She also stated there were requests from the Durham Public Schools and other County departments being made.

Commissioner Reckhow explained the sales tax negotiations initiated by the City, could cause the County to lose $2.5 - $4.5 million in County dollars. She added this program held a lot of merit and the County would be attempting to address new initiatives with fewer resources depending on where the negotiations landed.
Vice Chair Hill asked that citizens who inherited homes but could not afford the taxes were also considered in this program option.

Councilmember Freeman agreed with the suggested system adding there was no need to create a new program. She emphasized the need to remember to not focus on who it should go to, but rather focus on putting relief out there to who needs it.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson asked was this the only option in terms of tax relief. She stated many people have different housing needs that would be better served with other programs and asked staff to keep that in mind. Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson asked the County’s thoughts on program administration. Commissioner Carter stated the County should share the cost of administration with the City. Mayor Schewel agreed.

Commissioner Howerton hoped there was more conversation from the Council and Board before the community was aware. She added the community expected a response and the Committee was not sure what could be done within the budget.

Mayor Schewel asked of the 4000 households, could an estimate of those that were seniors that have the potential to benefit from existing programs be provided. Ms. Lado responded staff would be able to look at those applying for an exemption and create an estimate for low-income seniors; however, the census does not calculate those values.

Chair Jacobs asked when those options would be available for discussion. Ms. Hager responded staff expected to have that information before the May 12, 2020 meeting.

**Family Justice Center/Durham Crisis Center – Operating Space and Report**

Peri Manns, Interim General Manager stated staff was tasked to evaluate the Family Justice center and properties available. He added the need was at least 8000 square feet and although there was no exact match, the team toured the DSS Main Building and the Durham Convention and Visitor Building (DCVB). Mr. Manns continued to say the DSS Main Building included a long list of concerns which included mechanical and HVAC issues – while the DCVB Building met more of the needs which included parking, private offices and conference room space.

Kent Wallace-Meggs, Executive Director of the Durham Crisis Response Center hoped that the City and Could would be able to prepare space and make it available at no cost. He added the DCVB offered the arrangement of the building which was suitable for the space needed to service their client population. Mr. Wallace-Meggs stated there was funding available to build-out but the information for funding needed to be submitted by March 20, 2020. Kathy Hodges, Deputy Director of the Durham Crisis Response Center shared additional details about the grant received.

Councilmember Freeman expressed her excitement that a building was found which suited the needs of the center. She agreed to provide any assistance needed.
Commissioner Howerton questioned the amount of the grant. Ms. Hodges stated she was unsure; adding they must provide the dollar amount needed for the features before the amount was granted.

Chair Jacobs inquired about next steps and what would be the cost to the City and County jointly. Mr. Manns responded County staff would complete a final walk-through and get a formal request of needs (carpet, paint, security) and once completed, they would work with the City and County Managers on an equitable split on the amount. He noted that furnishing would remain in place at this location as well.

Commissioner Reckhow stated she looked forward to hearing about the space and spoke briefly about the security fence/options. Mr. Wallace-Meggs clarified that the fence was not necessarily about security but more so about providing an additional confidential barrier of the clients being serviced.

**Sustainable Development Goals Discussion**
Sarah Young, Assistant Planning Director shared a presentation which highlighted the following Comprehension Plan Integration:

- Map Comprehensive Plan to the Global Goals
- Include visioning exercises that begin with 2030 and work backwards to today
- Plan to advocate Global Goals within regional, state, national policymaking and planning.

Tobin Freid, Sustainability Manager for the City of Durham and Durham County added this would allow the ability for local governments to sign on as signatories to the delegation.

Chair Jacobs stated this was important as the Comprehensive Plan was being updated.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson also mentioned mapping the strategic planning goals to the map goals and recommended an intern assist with this process.

**Joint City-County Transportation Department Discussion**
Mayor Schewel proposed that the City and County work together to create a Joint City-County Transportation Plan. He clarified that he was not looking for action at this time; just a discussion on how the departments could possibly work together. Mayor Schewel mentioned the city bus system – sharing that 85% of passengers did not have a vehicle and stressed the ease if there was a joint committee.

Chair Jacobs asked County Manager Davis where the County was with hiring a transportation employee. County Manager Davis responded the staff person would be on board within the next 30-60 days. Chair Jacobs hoped this person would be able to assist the County with the system changes being addressed and also explain how transportation would fit into this joint committee. She added this was a complex discussion and they were looking at a joint funding effort.

Commissioner Reckhow inquired about the cost spent on the city bus service. Mayor Schewel response $13 million. Commissioner Reckhow stated cities were designed to provide services needed for a larger population. She was unsure if a merger would be logical seeing that counties
were not in the road construction business. Commissioner Reckhow suggested the Managers discuss this and provide more information to the Committee.

Commissioner Howerton asked what it would mean to merge transportation with the city. Mayor Schewel responded the county held authority over the transit tax dollars per the referendum. He stated a unified strategy was needed along with help from staff.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson stated the planning department was a model for a joint city-county department that solidifies unified government. She added number of residents that used transportation in the County called for more of a collaboration with the City; adding now that the County is moving forward in the transportation realm, it would be a beneficial to move forward with the merger.

County Manager Davis stated it would be premature to get into the particulars of the discussion at this time. He continued to say that he would like to get the expected staff person on board and have a conversation around priorities. County Manager Davis added there were critical steps needed to continue this discussion.

Chair Jacobs acknowledged the support of the bus service through the transit plan; adding whatever plan emerged, it would be unified with regards to planning.

Commissioner Reckhow stated a merger was discussed a few times and believed that transportation would operate better with a merger. She hoped it would be considered and there would be dialog regarding any split in cost.

Chair Jacobs asked the Managers to begin conversation with regards to next steps.

Adjourn
Chair Jacobs announced that Healthy Durham 2020 asked to shared information and there may be an update regarding the tax program at the May meeting. Hearing no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting Date: May 12, 2020 – 9:00 am, City Hall Plaza – Committee Room

Respectfully Submitted,

Monica W. Toomer
Clerk to the Board
COVID-19 Homeless Response

May 12, 2020
Colin Davis, Manager, Homeless System
Emergency Shelters

• Urban Ministries moved their shelter operation to the hotel.
• Shelters (Families Moving Forward & Urban Ministries) reduced their capacity for social distancing prior to the move.
• Challenges had to be overcome prior to increasing capacity at the hotel.
• Referrals to shelter are picking up with Urban Ministries’ goal to operate at full capacity (150 beds).
• Since shelter operations began at the hotel, Urban Ministries has served 179 people (this includes 10 families).
• Some services are still being provided at Urban Ministries on Liberty St.
Isolation Hotel

• Hotel to be determined...

• Will provide a place for people who are homeless or have no other safe housing option to recover from COVID-19 or await their test results.
Roadblocks to Isolation Hotel

- Frontline hotel staff are worried about their safety.
- Owners are trying to retain their staff and ensure safety for everyone.
- Hotels that have not shut down still have enough regular business to stay open through contracts or long-term guests.
- Hotels' lawyers and insurance companies are advising owners not to mix healthy and sick guests in the same building due to potential liability.
- Owners fear losing long term contracts/guests when it is known the hotel has COVID-19 positive guests.
- These lead to the all or nothing options from hotel owners.
Attempted Solutions to Roadblocks

• City of Durham’s Homeless System team and Durham County’s Public Health Department have designed a protocol to ensure hotel staff are safe.
• Exploring non-conventional isolation options.
• Offering education from Public Health staff to hotel staff about COVID-19 safety.
• Third party provider would clean rooms and linens, onsite 24 hour security, guest’s symptoms and illness would be monitored, COVID-19 positive guests would be quarantined from other guests, and meals would be provided to COVID-19 positive guests at their rooms.
Questions
Emergency Feeding & Food Security Update
Durham County Covid-19 Food Security Task Force

JOINT CITY-COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETING
MAY 12, 2020, 9AM
DONNA REWALT, COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTOR & COUNTY FEEDING CO-COORDINATOR
Food Insecurity - By the Numbers

16.5% Food Insecurity in Durham County

64% DPS free and reduced lunch participation

20.9% Sometimes skipped or limited meals (Hispanic/Latinx)

Sources: Food Bank of Central and Eastern North Carolina, Feeding America; Durham Public Schools; 2019 DCo Community Health Assessment
Food Insecurity - By the Numbers

1 in 4
Durham residents with low access to grocery store

$700
"Low Cost" monthly food budget for family of four

40.7%
North Carolina food insecurity, Late March 2020

Sources: 2017 DCo Community Health Assessment; U.S. Department of Agriculture; University of Arkansas study
Food Security Feeding Update

- Convene weekly Task Force meeting with 40+ community partners to share resources and determine needs.

- Community initiative of Durham FEAST (DPS, DPS Foundation and others) serving via 24 community locations and home delivery, as of Friday, May 8:
  - 220,192 meals provided
  - 5,700 children served per week (on average)
  - 2,600 adults served per week (on average)

This initiative will likely evolve to a new stage in June with DPS taking on a larger role.

Source: www.durhamfeast.org
Food Security Feeding Update

- Partnered with Triangle Nonprofit & Volunteer Leadership Center for "Feeding Durham Together" food security volunteer portal
  - 128 volunteer placements through May 9 (85 unique people)
- Implementing a feeding plan to serve food insecure COVID+ families.
- Sharing information with organizations and food insecure populations around P-EBT benefits, Triple Bucks at Farmers Markets for SNAP/EBT, and other resources.

Source: ABC 11
Ensuring that Durham food site information is updated via new GIS map (to right), End Hunger Durham, and No Kid Hungry NC.

Strengthen local food access through implementation support of new Farmers Market COVID operating guidelines.

Connect Durham County farmers to food security efforts through adjustment of Farmer Foodshare agreement and farmer survey.

Source: City/County GIS
Food Security – Emerging Issues

- Understanding and supporting financial needs of smaller food pantries/sites for purchasing food and meals.
- Monitoring food supply issues (i.e. shortage of family-size canned food.)
- Ongoing need to access PPE, sanitizing, safety, and cleaning supplies for feeding sites.
- Need to address local food system coordination (such as providing support to increase Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) certification for farms).
- Finding new ways to track data on hunger as the crisis evolves to ensure food gets to the people most in need.
Food Security – Opportunities

- COVID emergency highlights need for year-round comprehensive countywide effort on Food Security

- Supporting senior (65+) feeding needs
  - End Hunger Durham
  - Meals on Wheels
  - Possible funding sources (County/City, FEMA, Duke, donations)

- Addressing undocumented / refugee populations

- Assisting Latinx community
  - El Centro Hispano & others
Issues for the Task Force & Leadership:

- Understanding the nature and location of increasing needs in Durham;
- Understanding what other resources - including federal, corporate, philanthropic, and public funding - may be available to help meet new needs;
- Working with Emer. Mgmt. and Finance to understand likely timing and level of FEMA / state reimbursement for proposed or real expenditures;
- Trying to determine levels of effort (including funding) for issues where both severity and the possible duration of the issue are difficult to assess;
- Using flexibility and innovation to develop quick responses to hunger where typical emergency mgmt. approaches are not applicable;
- Accelerating the speed at which staff and government systems align within and across government entities (and NGOs, including business community) to respond with decisions and resources.
Questions and Answers
Durham County Eviction Diversion Program
FY 2020

Beginning Balance: $180,000
Funds Expended (DATE): $130,000 (estimate)
Number Clients Served through 29 February 2020: 77
Adjusted Budget: To Be Determined Once SAP Returns

Eviction Diversion works in partnership with Legal Aid to prevent eviction once filed by providing both legal assistance and funds to help bring client current with rent. Establishes a plan for sustainability before providing financial assistance through assessment.

In FY19, the Board of County Commissioners allocated $90,000 to assist residents after the referral to Legal Aid or Duke Law Clinic, to assist in alleviating their housing crisis. Although only $90,000 was allocated, the 99 residents served resulted in $128,937.84 in rental assistance to prevent evictions; 143% of the FY19 allocation. Consequently, in FY20 the Board of County Commissioners allocated an additional $60,000 to the original $90,000, and DSS was able to find $30,000 within their own tight budget to bring the total Eviction Diversion financial assistance program to $180,000. Due to the malware attack on Durham County on the 6th of March, the Eviction Diversion financial assistance program had to be temporarily assistance. Nevertheless, the Eviction Diversion financial assistance program was able to assist 90 residents, with a total of $136,725.54 as of the last check that was able to be sent on 2/29/2020. This represents 76% of the FY allocation.

Special Covid-19 Funding: $50,000 for Eviction Diversion/ $50,000 for Emergency Assistance

Durham County DSS requested an additional $50,000 during a recent budget amendment to assist specifically with households impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic and prevent evictions through rental assistance (additional $50,000 secured). These funds will:

- Be designated for households with loss of income due to the pandemic
- Will have higher limits for rental subsidy to prevent evictions/bridge gaps
- May have caps (higher than average payment) with eviction diversion funds due to limited funding
- Flexibility within both fund sources to address needs with most maximum efficiency
- Funding to be spent by June 30, 2020
DPS 1:1 Planning Update

May 12, 2020
Dr. Pascal Mubenga, Superintendent
AGENDA

Rationale & Findings

Device Selection & Cost

Next Steps
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One of the most important aspects of technology in education is its ability to level the field of opportunity for students.

—John King, Former U.S. Secretary of Education
PRIORITY 1: INCREASE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

By 2023, 100 percent of all teachers, leaders, and staff will use technology as a tool for accelerating and personalizing student learning.

Strategy 1
Professional Development: Establish and implement professional learning opportunities designed to support the new NC Digital Learning Competencies licensure requirement for all certified staff.

Strategy 2
Professional Learning: Offer ongoing professional learning opportunities to increase the engagement of students with technology to support learning across all content areas.

Strategy 3
Leadership: Implement a process to standardize technology devices for every certified staff member.
   a. School-Based: administrators and teachers
   b. Central Office: directors and above

Strategy 4
Content and Instruction: Fully implement with fidelity the use of the district identified Learning Management System (LMS) for staff and students.

Strategy 5
Technology Infrastructure and Devices: Ensure that our technology and infrastructure are supported with sufficient networking capacity.

Strategy 6
Data and Assessment: Utilize the measures of the NC Digital Learning Plan progress rubric to ensure that every student engages with technology to support learning during the school day.
Goal 1D implicitly states DPS' plan to become a 1:1 computer to student learning environment in order to expand learning opportunities and create equitable educational conditions compatible with today’s technology-driven society.
## DEVICE SELECTION & DEPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Total Student Enrollment in DPS (Average Daily Membership-Month 6)</td>
<td>33,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Chromebooks Currently in Use for Students</td>
<td>18,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Devices Needed to Achieve 1:1 Status (Enrollment minus current devices in use)</td>
<td>19,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENTATIVE COST ESTIMATE

**K-12 Procurement Options**

- 19,115* Devices Needed
- $360.75/Device
- $144/Hotspot
- Staff are still gathering data on the number needed.
- Cost Estimate ($9.63 M)
  - Devices $6.89 M
  - 19,115 Hotspots $2.75M

**3-12 Procurement Options**

- 13,336* Devices Needed
- $360.75/Device
- $144/Hotspot
- Staff are still gathering data on the number needed.
- Cost Estimate ($6.73 M)
  - Devices $4.81 M
  - 13,336 Hotspots $1.92 M

*These numbers are preliminary.
**PROPOSED TIMELINE**

- **Initial Strategic Planning:** January-June 2020
- **Policy Development:** May-July 2020
- **Device Procurement:** June-July 2020
- **Professional Development:** July-August 2020
- **Deployment Resources:** August 2020
- **Device Preparation:** June-August 2020
- **Deployment to Students:** August-October 2020
NEXT STEPS

• Purchase Devices and wifi hotspots
• Provide Professional Learning for Staff
• Update and Develop Policies and Procedures for 1:1 Learning and Device Management
• Develop 1:1 Handbooks for Students, Staff and Families
• Select a Learning Management System