

**Orange County/Chapel Hill Work Group**  
**October 11, 2019 11 am-1 pm**  
**Location: Solid Waste Administration Office, Chapel Hill**

**Session Goals**

---

1. Establish positive, productive agreements for working together.
2. Define what effective collaboration looks like for this group.
3. Identify success factors for the group's work and the metrics that will be used to gauge progress.
4. Prioritize topics for the group's work.
5. Clarify topics and confirm questions to be addressed.
6. Beginning to jointly generate possible solutions.

**Participants**

---

Jess Anderson, Loryn Clark, Bonnie Hammersley, Pam Hemminger, Judy Johnson, Maurice Jones, Travis Myren, Renee Price, Penny Rich

**Facilitator**

---

Maggie Chotas, DSC

**Session Notes**

---

**Welcome & Why we're here** – Penny Rich & Renée Price

Penny Rich welcomed participants to the meeting and provided history about the intergovernmental pilot project for the current year. Previously full boards of the county and local jurisdictions would meet together. The feedback from those meetings was that staff members weren't getting clear directions on next steps for municipal staff or county staff. Travis Myren proposed trying something new based on the Schools Collaborative. The hope is the Work Group format will provide more opportunities for clear next steps and follow up. Ms. Rich shared how Mr. Stevens and she met a year and a half ago to develop the agenda for the full boards meeting. When they pulled up the agenda from the prior year, nothing had changed. Via the Work Groups, the hope is items will move forward and the format will be a better way of communicating with the boards, which could receive the minutes electronically once they are finalized. Managers are suggesting after minutes are final they go into the agenda packet for the public where they will also be posted on websites.

Renée Price added there are many areas where the town and the county overlap and intersect. Keeping the dialogue open and collaborating is positive because Chapel Hill and Orange County affect each other. It's important to see where the town and the county come together on projects and help each other.

**Hopes for the Work Group**

*Participants identified hopes they have for the Work Group:*

- Loryn Clark expressed a hope to learn about partnership opportunities with the county.

- Judy Johnson said she hoped to have actionable items with clear direction.
- Maurice Jones said his biggest hope is to continue to look for partnership opportunities with Chapel Hill and Orange County and have open lines of communication on important issues affecting residents.
- Pam Hemminger noted her hope is to find those pathways forward where we can collaborate. She emphasized how helpful it is to know parameters of collaboration – including where the county is interested and wants to do, as well as what the county can't do.
- Jess Anderson hoped ideas and opportunities for collaboration come up and helpful next steps are identified. She said she would love to come away with a procedure to bring information back to respective boards and to the community.
- Renée Price said her hope is to be able to work together. Chapel Hill is such a major force in the county, it is critical to do as much as we can together and be able to leverage more opportunities for prosperity.
- Bonnie Hamersley said her hope is the same for all the work groups: to have open lines of communication and be able to bring information back to staff from the meetings to provide direction.
- Penny Rich said she hoped we find we can come to some sort of conclusions and have next steps.

### **Reviewing the goals of the meeting**

Ms. Chotas walked through the goals of the meeting and asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hemminger asked if by prioritizing the agenda items that meant we wouldn't get to all of the items. Ms. Chotas responded the decision about what to discuss would be made as a group. She recommended making sure the most important and the most urgent items are addressed first in the depth needed.

### **Articulating the vision for collaboration**

*Participants identified the following aspects of the kind of collaboration they would like to see in the Work Group:*

- Ms. Rich noted sharing information and goals.
- Ms. Hemminger added sharing where we are in relationship to our goals, recognizing timelines might be different.
- Mr. Jones added, when appropriate, understanding what barriers to collaboration have been in the past.
- Ms. Hammersley added identifying what we can collaborate on – not all topics require collaboration.
- Ms. Price noted if we can't actually collaborate, see how we can support one another and share the same narrative when possible.
- Ms. Hemminger observed we represent constituencies, not just ourselves. Ms. Rich added if you are representing your opinion, say that; if you are representing your board, say that.

Ms. Chotas asked work group members to consider how they want their conversations to look and feel. Participants responded:

- Ms. Rich said as we do in school collaboration, one person should talk at a time, follow up and ask what is meant. Don't be afraid to ask. It's an open communication.
- Ms. Hemminger added not interrupting.
- Ms. Price said respecting each other's opinions, even if we don't agree.
- Ms. Chotas noted her role as facilitator is to help the group fulfill what they want to do.

### **What success looks like**

*Participants identified success factors for the Work Group:*

- Ms. Hemminger said a list of next steps and follow through.
- Mr. Jones added movement on projects and initiatives.
- Ms. Rich said clear messages to staff so they understand what elected officials needs are.
- Ms. Hammersley noted continued support from the boards so they see this as a value and they are getting information to understand.
- Mr. Jones added an understanding from the public that we are working together. In order to get that to happen, we need to message it out to the community.

Ms. Rich said when it gets back to the Assembly of Governments meeting, we're all on the same page. She continued there will still be issues we need to work through because the towns haven't met together, but we are all know what we are moving towards. Ms. Anderson asked for clarification about the goals of the Assembly of Government meeting in January and wondered what would be able to be accomplished between the Work Group meeting and the Assembly of Government meeting, given the need to engage the public. Mr. Jones said it would be helpful to know what will happen at the Assembly of Government and asked is there going to be a presentation about the Work Group's decision to focus on certain issues.

Ms. Rich described the purpose of the Assembly of Governments meeting as having discussion about topics of shared interest -- for example about transportation. Individual towns and the county have already been talking about it -- some of these issues have been discussed in the Work Groups and will have already gone back to the boards, hopefully with clear directions to staff. At the Assembly of Governments meeting, hopefully we can offer some solutions, though nothing is set in stone or voted on at the meeting itself. Ms. Price emphasized the solutions coming forward will still need discussion and there still may be some issues to iron out because of differences of opinions.

Ms. Hammersley shared an example of how this process works. The Solid Waste Advisory Group had the idea of one fee across the county and that was brought up for discussion at the Assembly of Government meeting. Everybody on all the groups didn't agree, but the Solid Waste Advisory Group brought it forward and, coming out of the meeting, the issue went to boards and the boards engaged the public afterwards. Ms. Anderson summarized the purpose of the Assembly of Government is we are on the same page as to what we bring forward. Ms. Rich said she hoped there are some things that are already in motion, with decisions already made.

Ms. Hemminger reflected on effective Assembly of Governments meetings in the past as those when we had some shared topics we all wanted to discuss such as economic development, the need to change EMS response times and strategies and co-locating EMS and Fire together. She identified animal control as a topic of shared interest that hasn't been discussed previously in that format.

### **Prioritizing topics for discussion**

*Work Group members identified the following topics prior to the meeting:*

1. Economic Development
  - UNC start-ups
2. Transit & Transportation
  - Voting structure and Orange County Transit Plan
3. Climate Action Plan, Committee & Tax
  - Materials Recycling Program
4. Affordable Housing
  - Update on Town's efforts (2200 Homestead, Public Housing)
  - Partnership Opportunities?
  - Residential Development & Gentrification
5. Greene Tract
  - Next Steps, Resolutions and MOU
  - What does Partnership look like to the Town?
  - Governance Document
6. 2020 Census
7. Library Funding

Informational Updates: Mobil Parks, Wegmans, BRT

Ms. Chotas asked if there were other items to add to the list and Ms. Hemminger added the possibility of a 611/non-emergency number in addition to 911 so people can call in for non-emergencies to get more information.

Ms. Chotas asked the group to consider what's most important and what's urgent about the items on the list to prioritize discussion topics and make the best of the small group space and time. The Work Group decided to sort the agenda into items that would require shorter discussion time, those that would be more involved and quick discussions for next steps:

#### **Shorter discussion items:**

- Transit and transportation
- 2020 Census
- Library funding
- Economic development
- Affordable housing

#### **Longer discussion item:**

Greene Tract

#### **Quick discussions for next steps:**

- Climate Action Plan
- Consider 611

### **Transit and Voting Structure**

Ms. Hemminger provided context for the transit agenda item based on her discussion with the mayors of Hillsborough and Carrboro. She noted she doesn't talk with the mayor of Mebane about transit issues. Currently, the structure is staff driven and there are only three voting members who make recommendations that go to the Orange County Commissioners for decisions. The three voting members are Orange County Planning, the MPO and GoTriangle. She informed the Work Group the three mayors will be making a request for towns to have representation as votes for recommendations are made.

Ms. Hammersley noted this was brought up when she was first brought in as County Manager and at that time the county wasn't interested. She said she didn't know if they were interested now, but they are familiar with it. What she was told was towns were represented through the NPO. It will be up to the Orange County board if they want to give voting rights away to the towns. Ms. Rich added this is something we would have to bring to the board. Ms. Hammersley shared the mayors can make a formal request. Ms. Price added she thought Wake County has moved in that direction, with weighted votes reflecting the size of the towns. Ms. Hemminger concluded she would write the letter to the board and the other mayors have asked to be included.

### **2020 Census**

Ms. Hemminger opened the conversation by stating she is delighted to work on this project together and it is hugely important to count the numbers. The next steps are to figure out what the towns and counties are doing together to make it happen which will require resources.

Ms. Price, who is on the Census Committee, noted the critical thing is financial resources. The federal government and NC are not giving any assistance besides materials. Ms. Hemminger identified the need for a coordinated effort and messaging plan to be reaffirmed at the Assembly of Governments, which happens in January, and Census date is April 1. Ms. Rich asked if Chapel Hill has representation on this group. And Ms. Hemminger said they did.

Ms. Rich asked when will the report from the committee be delivered? Ms. Price responded there hasn't been a request for a formal report. Ms. Rich said a formal report will be important for communicating and coordinating the committee's plans and next steps and identifying financial support needed. Mark Dorosin was involved during the last census in 2010 and there was a lot of coordination in the community.

Ms. Hemminger requested a formal report before the Assembly of Governments meeting so it can be presented. Ms. Rich requested a timeline for the report to be delivered in December or Early January.

### **Library Funding**

Ms. Hemminger reflected the Chapel Hill Library hasn't had an increase in funding for many years and there is a desire in the town to make a specific ask for the county budget cycle. She asked what the request should look like, should the town decide to make it. Ms. Hammersley

responded the last time this funding request was considered was 2014/ 2015. She indicated it would be helpful to the county to receive data that showed a breakdown of Hillsborough and Carrboro users. Ms. Hemminger added we have the data right now about how many non-Chapel Hill users who are from Orange County and will work to break that down further.

Ms. Rich asked if charging non-Chapel Hill residents for a library card had been considered. Ms. Anderson responded that was not a part of the conversation, adding the orientation of the board is to make the library as accessible as possible and move towards an equity-model where individuals aren't charged.

Ms. Hammersley said she has heard from some commissioners they would like to wait and see the impact of the Southern Branch Library because the county will be funding that as well.

Mr. Jones asked when the Southern Branch Library was to open. Ms. Hammersley responded hopefully the groundbreaking will occur in the spring, once Carrboro resolves some parking issues.

Ms. Hemminger said a formal letter of request will be submitted once the library board collects the data needed.

### **Economic Development**

Ms. Hemminger described the desire to continue to partner with the county. There are a lot of projects going on at the moment and as much as possible strong communication will help. She recognized closed session discussions make open communication challenging.

Mr. Myren gave an update on real estate, noting appraisals have come in totaling about \$5.2 million on the three parcels: Visitor's Center, Skills Development Center and the parking lot. The expectation is the sales price will be the appraisal figure. What we are struggling with now is finding space for the Skills Development Center to move into before the Southern Branch library is built. Long term it will go there, but the process has been stalled because of Carrboro's parking questions. What we would want help with is some appropriate location for the Skills Development Center for 12,000-15,000 square feet with access to transportation and parking. The appraisal indicated the highest and best use is for demolition of existing buildings and mixed use.

In terms of a new place for the Skills Development Center and the Visitor's Bureau, Mr. Myren indicated University Place had been approached and the county had received some push back because University Place indicated they were only looking for retail. Mr. Myren said the county was preparing additional information to share about foot traffic.

Ms. Hemminger said the town would love to keep the Visitor's Bureau in downtown Chapel Hill.

Ms. Price added she wanted to make sure UNC start-ups are able to stay in Orange County. Ms. Hemminger added this is a top goal of the town as well: keeping start-ups and helping them

grow. Ms. Price described this as a culture of collaboration – working together to help companies find a good fit with the amenities they are looking for when they are thinking to relocate or expand.

Ms. Hemminger noted not everyone might know how we work together to move quickly on economic development opportunities. When an opportunity arises, manager, chair, economic development directors and the mayor meet to see if there is a consensus on a path forward and then we take it to our boards. She suggested making the joint statement the town and county are working together on economic development and we support start-ups coming to all Orange County. We are all working together to keep those and attract new ones. Ms. Price said when they do come here, she would like to make it public and celebrate the collaboration between town and county.

Ms. Hemminger asked if the thinking is the property will be sold by the end of the year. Mr. Myren shared that a letter of intent hasn't been negotiated yet. Ms. Hemminger requested notification as early as possible for public hearings, noting the importance of being prepared. She shared the information the town is trying to get the parking deck voted on in November.

Ms. Chotas asked for other items related to the topic area of economic development.

Mr. Jones and Ms. Clark shared handouts of the town's new affordable housing dashboard data, noting long-term, the more we can look at affordable housing as partners, the better. We're all facing this issue of new affordable housing – there needs to be more of a regional approach to it.

Ms. Hemminger asked if there were similar stats the county could provide. Ms. Hammersley said the information will be shared with the new Housing Director who will also share the county's data.

Ms. Hemminger reflected the affordable housing dashboard approach came out of the trip to Boulder where similar information was shared. We developed our own version and it was very helpful in setting the stage for the bond. The reality was we were always talking about affordable housing, but we had no clue where we were. We wanted to be able to quantify it, talk about it in the same terminology and make it so anyone could access the information. She expressed a hope for Carrboro, Hillsborough and the county to all have similar ways to share so we can see how we are all doing collectively.

Ms. Clark noted at the most recent meeting with the Coalition and the Collaborative, both Carrboro and Orange County provided information in a similar format and it's being identified as a priority with the Collaborative itself so joint measures will be available to track what the Collaborative is doing county-wide.

Ms. Hemminger asked if the topic of affordable housing with joint statistics could be on the agenda for the Assembly of Governments. Ms. Clark said the data could be packaged, if that's helpful.

### **Greene Tract, Resolutions, MOUs, Documents, What does Partnership look like for the town?**

Ms. Rich provided context for this discussion topic, noting the County Commissioners are concerned about what the town thinks the partnership looks like. She asked the town to identify what partnership on the Greene Tract looks like to them, noting we met for two and a half years and we thought we were on the same page, and turns out we weren't.

Ms. Hemminger responded from her perspective, elaborating we thought we were on a path together to do affordable housing on the Greene Tract, and we had certain steps in working through all the things that had happened in the Rogers Road community. Ms. Rich clarified that this wasn't about Rogers Road, but the question from the board is what does our partnership look like for the Greene Tract?

Ms. Hemminger responded it's not separate for the town because we had to spend a lot of staff time working with steps for the zoning compliance and not gentrification. We stopped to do a market analysis because the community was telling us one thing and we wanted to see if that was viable. We brought a consultant in and did community meetings to tell us what could go on the Greene Tract. We agreed to move the headwater lines around to preserve the sensitive areas. We were on that path as well and we voted to move those lines, but we didn't have the same agreement about what the blobs meant after that because we've had other things come up with the schools and the community saying we didn't notify them and that we haven't done an environmental impact study to see if the blobs are the size they're supposed to be. We've been on this path that we want to work on this together, but we ended up not being on the same timeline because we had more work to do that had to be done by our staff with the community.

Ms. Rich asked again for Chapel Hill to answer the question what does our partnership look like? What does the town of Chapel Hill partnership look like with Orange County and Carrboro? What does our partnership look like because it doesn't feel like we are partners right now – that's what the board wants to know. Ms. Price said to not include her with the board and asked Ms. Rich to indicate if she was representing herself or the board. Ms. Rich responded she was not representing herself, she was representing a majority of the board who wants to know what the partnership looks like.

Ms. Hemminger indicated it's two things and the town wears two hats. One hat is as joint owners of the land, which includes the fact that we want to offer affordable housing there together with our partners. We are also regulators of the land and we have to wear another hat at times where we want community input and certain standards met before we can move forward with partners on the site. Because of all of the things going on in our community, it is taking a longer time than what our developer partners want.

Ms. Rich said the question is how do we move forward together, being honest with each other and understanding we are partners? We met for two and a half years, we discussed something, we bring it forward and it was killed. We don't understand what partnership looks like.



Mr. Jones added an important component is making sure we are all operating with the same information. One of the concerns we've had recently is the question as to whether the Council voted to preserve the headwater reserve and also the joint preserve. They've done that twice now – in January and in July. That wasn't up for discussion, yet continues to come up. The one big question mark between where we are now and where we were before July is the Council has said we are in agreement with many issues, including: school site, public recreation, housing mixed use. The biggest difference seems to be where these will be.

Ms. Rich responded when we moved that resolution forward, nothing was binding as to where things were going to be. We weren't talking about affordable housing even though it was on the map and where it was suggested to be. The resolution was to move us to the next step to make sure we all could be involved in the environmental study and we all could be involved in community meetings. And we haven't – that has not happened.

Ms. Hemminger responded the Chapel Hill board felt having labels on a map predetermined what was going to happen there and they wanted a resolution – with help from the community – that said we have the same goals, but we are not willing to put labels on those goals in specific places on the map.

Mr. Jones reflected, by your account, we're even closer than I thought.

Ms. Rich agreed, but wondered what a partnership looks like and how to move forward together as partners. We were all involved in creating the environmental impact study and moving forward -- that was the whole part of meeting for two and a half years, but then it fell apart.

Mr. Jones noted the environmental study is supposed to be moving forward. At this point we have to figure out how to get our staffs to work together on it. We've reached out, but staff, understandably so, feel they haven't been directed to work on this yet because the new resolution hasn't been approved by the boards. Ms. Hammersley affirmed that is true. Mr. Myren added a staff level environmental study has been done. Mr. Jones said that the internal study doesn't seem to be what the boards are looking for. Mr. Myren added a whole staff team working through the exercise determined how the headwaters may be reconfigured.

Mr. Jones noted a good step is the deliverance of a draft MOU that is being reviewed. Ms. Hemminger said she thought the MOU sends a conflicting message and hasn't shared it with the whole board because she found it very negative. She said she thought we were going forward together and in the document the message is the county wants to divide it all up. We thought we were going toward affordable housing together. Ms. Rich interjected thank you for sharing that and explained it came out of the majority of County Commissioners not feeling like the conversations at the MMC were respected because there was an agreement that no community meetings would happen without all of the partners there.

Ms. Hemminger said we all did ourselves a disservice by not publishing the next steps out of the MMC meetings. Because the steps weren't published, the community didn't know about them and the community demanded this meeting in July. We were not prepared staff-wise for it and it disrupted our trajectory.

Ms. Rich added the town also had a community meeting and the partners weren't there. County staff and some stakeholders were present, but the town didn't have any elected officials [from the county].

Ms. Hemminger elaborated she didn't call the meeting, but got invited because she was bringing some stakeholders who had come in to talk. She said she was sorry that whole meeting happened – she indicated she didn't know what she didn't know about the rules of engagement on these things. At the MMC meetings, we need to document the steps we've agreed to and share with boards and the public so they know what the plan is. She noted she feels like what we are really disagreeing about is the timeline. I think we have the same goal list, but it might not happen in the time frame, but it will happen. We all want it to happen. Ms. Rich added she disagreed and didn't think it was just about the timeline.

Ms. Price reflected she would like the group to think more positively and assume we are all trying to do something good. She said positive thinking will help dispel suspicions and conspiracy theories.

Ms. Hammersley added in response to the draft of the governance document the county provided, it was her understanding the reason for it was because this isn't the first time there have been challenges. This has also happened back in the 2000s when we were moving forward and it stopped because we couldn't get in agreement. With the governance document, if we can't move forward, there's a way for us to turn our back on it and not just leave it. I don't know how you put that in a positive light when it's more or less a mediation document. It's also a draft and if it can be written in a more positive manner, make a proposal. We were asked to put it together by the group so that's what we did. As Travis said a number of times during that meeting, it's fine if you want to throw this draft away, but we do ultimately need a document. The first agreement doesn't give anybody information about what to do if we all don't agree. We're sorry if we offended anybody by it being negative. We hope it's going to work out, but if it doesn't, what do we do as partners?

Mr. Jones reflected that was why he thought it was a good first step, noting even if we disagree with some elements of it, this is an opportunity to respond back. Ms. Hammersley added it's up to the attorneys to work it out.

Ms. Rich elaborated it's important to remember when the collaborative started, the Greene Tract was not in the ETJ. The history of the Greene Tract was Ralph Karpinos would not let Chapel Hill spend any money on Rogers Road or the Greene Tract, unless it was in the ETJ. No one wanted it to happen, but it got put in because that was the only way Chapel Hill could spend money on sewer, the community house and on affordable housing on the Greene Tract.

Ms. Hammersley added it was very recent – 2015. Ms. Rich stated she understood the town had to wear different hats, but emphasized ultimately the town also has to work with what the partnership looks like because we were partners way before the Greene Tract was in the ETJ.

Ms. Hemminger said the town still wants to be partners and disagreed with Ms. Rich’s statement. From her perspective, the MOU stopped the town from moving forward on the environmental impact study because they said they wanted that first. If we were to stop doing everything we wanted to do to move the housing part forward, she said she felt that was a roadblock. Mr. Jones added technically the town stopped because we weren’t getting the cooperation needed.

Ms. Chotas shared her observation it seemed there was common ground being identified throughout the conversation and she saw some openings for building the partnership back up and strengthening the collaboration. She advised you can do both: plan for worst case scenarios while working toward your vision.

Ms. Rich added it’s important to have these conversations with the other partner and we could take the notes from this Work Group meeting to the MMC meeting in November.

Ms. Anderson said it seems like another next step is to have foundational information so everyone is operating from the same facts. In watching the county meeting last night, she observed folks were asking for the differences between the resolutions and other foundational information. There seemed to be a lot of misconceptions and misinformation. To move forward either way, people need to operate with the same information.

Ms. Hemminger emphasized the importance of having information at the MMC meetings and producing next steps to share back with boards and the public.

Ms. Rich added the topic needs to be on the Assembly of Governments agenda, no matter where things stand, so we can discuss it together.

Mr. Myren described how in the introduction to the governance document, he tried to lay out the differences in the resolutions. He asked if the Work Group would be comfortable sharing just that part of it to the boards, with the attached resolutions. If so, everybody would know what everybody else does. Mr. Myren requested Work Group members look at the introduction in that light and let the county know if they are comfortable sharing the information with the boards.

### **Climate Action**

Ms. Hemminger asked for more information about the parameters with the new tax to have an understanding of what it can be used for. Ms. Rich responded the group just had their first meeting and Chapel Hill has a representative on the committee. She further elaborated the county is relying on countywide groups for recommendations about what to spend the tax on and County Commissioners will have it as an agenda item.

## Identifying next steps

*Participants clarified the next steps coming out of the session.*

Topic	Action Step
1. Transit	Along with Hillsborough and Carrboro, Ms. Hemminger will send the county a formal request for representation on the voting structure for transit.
2. 2020 Census	The Census Committee will be asked to develop a report to be made available before the Assembly of Government meeting.
3. Library Funding	The town will make a formal request by February/March that includes data beyond Chapel Hill users of the library.
4. Economic Development	Continue working toward a culture of collaboration by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Communicating as soon as possible when public hearings are scheduled – before actual agenda comes out;</li><li>- Sharing affordable housing information gathered by the town with the new county housing director and other towns;</li><li>- Working toward parallel data regarding affordable housing in the county.</li></ul>
5. Greene Tract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Bring relevant parts of the Work Group minutes to the MMC meeting.</li><li>- Share foundational information – including background information from the MOU draft, if Work Group members are comfortable with that approach – let the county know.</li></ul>
6. Materials Recycling Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Refer to the Solid Waste Advisory Group and the Commission on the Environment.</li></ul>
7. 611	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Continue to gather information and revisit at a later time.</li></ul>
8. Assembly of Government agenda items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Affordable housing.</li><li>- Greene Tract.</li></ul>

## Informational Updates

Mobil Parks: Efforts are ongoing.

Wegmans: Limited SUP. Staff can have a conversation if there's an interest in reducing parking spaces.

BRT: Close to finishing up 30% design, still some traffic considerations Council will review. Had community engagement activities in September. Waiting to hear back from the federal government in January/February. Talked to David Price about this.

### Evaluating the session

*The facilitator asked participants to reflect on what worked well about this session and what they would like to see changed for the next one. A confidential electronic evaluation was also distributed.*

<b>What worked well?</b>	<b>What to consider changing?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Got through a lot of ideas.</li><li>- Listing next steps is helpful.</li><li>- Identifying what we want to bring to the Assembly of Governments meeting.</li><li>- Good that we could actually talk about our differences – that’s where trust and honesty comes out.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Have materials to talk about ahead of time.</li><li>- Consider including Carrboro for relevant discussions, such as transportation and the Greene Tract.</li></ul>