

**WORKSESSION/SHAPING ORANGE COUNTY REPORT AND REQUEST TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING**

This worksession on the Shaping Orange County's Future Task Force Provisional Report and Recommendations had three purposes: review of the document and staff's comments on the relationship of the recommendations to current policy, regulations and initiatives, setting a hearing date for public comment, and specifying the Board's intentions regarding use of the final version of the Task Force's report.

Alderman Gist expressed concern that the steering committee has not met in quite some time.

Norm Gustavidson stated that this is a comprehensive plan for the county for the next 30 years.

Ellen Ironsides stated that the recommendation made by the task force had been reached by consensus. Ms. Ironsides stated that she understood the Carrboro Board's concern about community building in the original report. She stated that the report would be amended to reflect the Board's concern.

Carl Shy stated that the task force had used a base line scenario in making its recommendations.

Herby McKiver stated that all the issues and goals are connected. Mr. McKiver emphasized the comprehensiveness of the task force's report.

Peggy Pollitzer stated that she hopes that the Carrboro Board of Aldermen will look at the recommendations of the task force and think about how much better Carrboro can be using some of the recommendations.

The following resolution was introduced by Alderman Diana McDuffee and duly seconded by Alderman Mark Dorosin.

A RESOLUTION SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING ON  
SHAPING ORANGE COUNTY'S FUTURE TASK FORCE  
PROVISIONAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
Resolution No. 9/2000-01

WHEREAS, the Carrboro Board of Aldermen has endorsed and supported countywide efforts to develop a comprehensive quality growth strategy, and

WHEREAS, the citizen-appointed Shaping Orange County's Future Task Force has completed step 12 of a 15-step process to develop that strategy and has submitted this report to the elected bodies for consideration

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Carrboro Board of Aldermen that the Aldermen sets a public hearing for September 26, 2000 to receive comment on the Provisional Report and Recommendations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen that the following comments are made on the "Ten Critical Areas":

**Putting Community Building First**

*Alderman Zaffron substitute "Encourage" for "Have" elected officials support and commit to participate in ongoing community-building training.*

My comments throughout the document in large measure deal with an issue that Ellen raised which was in some cases the somewhat authoritative tone of some of the recommendations, centering around the government shall do this or that. Just to let you know that perhaps some language changes it would increase my comfort level. In general, it is a remarkable document. My comments under community building, under 3a and 3b had to do with the issues that we raised before. You mentioned that there was some new language that we're substituting for the recommendations under action 3a and 3b.

Gist – it says here “To have all elected boards adopt an ordinance to integrate community building into their procedures.”

Zaffron – I guess I still have an issue with having all boards do that. One might substitute “encourage” or “encourage all elected boards to explore”. This is going over the same ground we tread before which was that as not necessary as a matter of ordinance but as a matter of tradition but the way we do business, we do that anyway as can be observed by what's on the wall over there. The Board being made aware of this way of doing business, perhaps that's a little on the strong side. The language in 3b is to have elected officials do something- I would simply suggest substituting “encourage”.

Gist- I know we all a lot to say about all of these and I'm really anxious to hear everybody's comments, but if we could keep it as to the point as possible because if we take 3 or 4 minutes for each item--all of us haven't had that much coffee.

***Alderman Dorosin - that the existing report on making the Board of Commissioners more representative be revisited, rather than establishing a study committee to analyze options for making the Board of Commissioners more representative of the county's rural citizens.***

Dorosin- the only comment I have under #1 is this selections study committee. It seems to me this has already been done twice—once in 1993 and once in 1996. It has been submitted to the County Commissioners. In fact, I think one of those and maybe both of them have been included as an appendix to the larger report. I just wondered whether it is worth setting up another committee to do the thing again, as opposed to dusting off the one that has already been done. This exact process that you describe, that I think is a critical issue, has already been done twice. And as far as I know, the County Commissioners have chosen not to pursue it or follow up on it. So I was just wondering if it shouldn't to be considered to revisit the work that has already been done.

Gist – I had the same concern as Mark.

***Alderman Spalt - it is very important that Carrboro citizens be given an opportunity to comment on the task force report.***

Spalt- I'm going to mention a process question that may relate partly to what Mark commented on. I think that it relates to community building. That is, I'm really glad that we're about to have a hearing here in Carrboro on this document. I believe that that will be the first meeting in Carrboro—a public meeting, besides the official presentations to the Board of Aldermen. I think that we have had some few really active members on the task force, but I remember when meetings were set for going around the county to gather opinion, there were none held in Chapel Hill or Carrboro. The closest one was held at Mt. Carmel Church, which is a great place to have a meeting. But it was done partly because it was thought that some folks might not want to travel into Carrboro or Chapel Hill for a meeting. But half the population of Orange County lives in Carrboro and Chapel Hill. It is really important since it hasn't happened in a comprehensive way, that it happens now. Even with the last big meeting that was held up at Stanback, although it was widely publicized, and it was hoped that it would be a large meeting. I don't know whether just general folks from either town came. It is really important at this

stage since it hasn't happened as much as it might have, that there be a lot of opportunities for feedback among our citizens. There are folks in the urban areas that feel concerns about the representation, as do folks in the rural areas. But I don't think that there was as much bouncing off and input on this. It may be why this comes out the way it was before as opposed to perhaps with some new twist or new thinking. It is difficult work building communities. For a long time I received most of the materials for the task force meetings and for the first year I went to almost every meeting, but after I was elected, I couldn't physically go to both sets of meetings. It's not that the task force hasn't done the work, but there are a few gaps. I think that this is one. Partly this is to the task force and the staff and partly to the folks in Carrboro that are watching and know now that there's an opportunity on September 26<sup>th</sup> for a hearing on this and copies of this are available at Town Hall. Come and get one and read it and tell us, tell the staff, tell the task force members what you think.

Mike Brough asked what the result of this process will be. Is the intended result of this process for the Board to adopt this as a plan for the future or is it more akin to accepting the report that may inform our future planning decisions. I think the distinction is critical since I can easily see people debating any of these issues in some substantial extent if the Board is then going to take a vote and say these are the town's policies is one thing and that suggests a degree of consideration and reflection and perhaps debate. Whereas another degree of reflection and consideration and debate may be involved if what the Board is going to do is to say that we accept this as a report and it may be relevant to our future planning decisions.

Gist- my understanding that the final product will be used as guidelines, rather than ordinances.

Zaffron – there may be some intermediate language between accepting the report and language which says we endorse those as town policy. The extent to which we have a comfort level with the specific language of the contents I think will determine what the outcome of that language will be.

Dorosin – the language in the resolution that is included after the comment goes to that very issue.

***The Board agreed that the Shaping Orange County Report would be used only as a guide to the town.***

### **Interlocal and Regional Cooperation and Planning**

Dorosin – at the top of page 5 there is a list of suggestions and after the one about infill is emphasized “but only where appropriate”. I think that is inappropriate. It is the only thing that's singled out. I think that all these strategies it is implicit in the document that they are only going to be considered where they are appropriate. I would ask that that be deleted.

***Alderman McDuffee- expressed fear over the creation of a growth management board and how such a board would function.***

McDuffee- I also have a little fear of creating a growth management board across all jurisdictions. With the incredible pain we went through to get our small area plan adopted, I just have some concerns about how that could function.

***Alderman Gist – the creation of a growth management board would be somewhat of a “Trojan horse.”***

Gist – I feel the same as Diana, the growth management board would be kind of a Trojan horse. We're both kind of leery of that in terms of other governments.

***Alderman Gist – would never support a merger of the town's recreation department with other entities.***

In terms of the government efficiency project—there is no way now or ever that I will support merging our recreation and parks service with other entities. This is not a new statement on my part. Not only will I not support it, but I will fight it. I think that Carrboro's identity in many ways is tied in with our recreation and parks department. It's special, it's small town. Certainly people from other jurisdictions take part in our programs, we welcome them. But I have no desire to merge them.

***Alderman Spalt - the growth management board is consistent with what Carrboro has been doing and would cooperate in making that happen.***

Spalt – I think that whatever happens if there is a growth management board or there is not a growth management board, that the statement here that the joint land use plan focusing growth towards Chapel Hill, Carrboro, Hillsborough, Mebane transition areas—the already urbanized areas—is consistent with what we have been working towards as a board here and I would certainly cooperate with making that happen. We're working on infill, we're working on redevelopment, we're working on increasing commercial use in existing commercial areas for all sorts of reasons, including the environmental, transportation, land use, mixed use types of reasons. I think something like this is helpful because it will not succeed as a policy if the rest of the county just sprawls and we don't have authority over the rest of the county. We have to work together on that. I welcome a strong statement like that.

***Alderman McDuffee – does not feel anything else is needed to control growth when growth is connected with where water and sewer exists.***

McDuffee – It seems to me that the growth is very much channeled where there is sewer and water--which is in the urbanized areas. I'm not sure we need something else that channels that growth. The density in the areas that are outside the boundaries of Carrboro and Chapel Hill there might be some agreement reached that that density is not sufficiently low enough to prevent sprawl. As I understand the way most of the county is zoned, the density requirements outside of the water and sewer boundaries is not at a level to prevent sprawl.

Spalt – I think the goal of this is to try to move in the direction of trying to do that. It talks about transfer of development rights programs and various other things that would be designed to try to accomplish that. It is not going to be easy. But I think that these statements in here that are moving in that direction are welcome.

***Alderman Zaffron - feels the recent legislation dealing with MPO's is ahead of the recommendations in the report. Suggested changing the language "reviewing and revising MPO boundaries" and insert "cooperate and coordinate with surrounding MPO's and regional planning.***

Zaffron – I have some brief comments on regional transportation issues. This is a bit of a hornet's nest under reviewing and revising MPO boundaries for the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO. There is all sorts of stuff going on particularly as it relates to intergovernmental planning between the Raleigh area MPO and this one. There was a bill signed into law by the Governor which provides for the reorganization of MPO's. In talking about areas in western Orange County outside of MPO's, there is also another provision in that bill that creates what are called RPO's which are rural planning organizations. The legislation moved ahead of this statement. In this statement one might wish to be quite careful because the extent to which the Alamance-Burlington MPO has been contacted about this idea, if they get wind of it from a unilateral action, I think we may engender resistance to cooperation rather than having it perceived as an invitation. I would suggest that we drop the language about reviewing and revising the MPO boundaries and simply say cooperate and coordinate with surrounding MPO's in regional planning. I think that would better reflect what the general sentiment would be.

**Land Use Patterns that Meet People's Needs While Protecting Natural Resources**

*Alderman McDuffee - expressed concern about allowing villages to be zoned for an overall density of one to two units per acres with at least 50% open space. This is a little too prescriptive.*

McDuffee – On page 6, the last bullet there which is about the zoning that should be allowed for density in villages and the prescription of 50 percent open space, I'm not sure how that squares with what we ended up with in our small area plan. But that's an area that sounds too prescriptive. I wouldn't think we would want to change what we did.

*Alderman Spalt – one to two units per acre in a village is not enough--that's suburban sprawl.*

Spalt – I would go one step farther than that if I could. That is one to two units per acre in a village is no where near enough. That's suburban sprawl.

*Alderman Zaffron - suggested. "Encourage regional planning and local government cooperation."*

Zaffron- this falls under general principles of sustainability and regional planning and cooperation. Under sustainability and community building – goal #5 and then recommendation 3b—Lobby the General Assembly for a state-wide planning mechanism that would require regional planning and local government cooperation. I think a lot of people, particularly in rural areas, are very concerned about the idea that they would be compelled by the State essentially not to cooperate but to be put into a structure where they would essentially have their land use choices dictated to them by other planning agencies. The Smart Growth Commission is working on this issue and they are preparing recommendations for the Governor. That's kind of going back and forth. So I would be more comfortable with language that which say "encourage regional planning and local government cooperation." A lot of what's being contemplated in those recommendations has to do with incentives where folks get a bonus and get additional help and assistance from the State if they engage in Smart Growth cooperative practices.

*Alderman Dorosin - expressed concern that affordable housing and human services should be balanced with other areas in the report.*

Dorosin- I understand that one of the main driving principles behind the whole process is growth and land use planning and environmental issues. I have a general concern that items 3, 4, 5 and 6 focus on environment, water supply, natural areas, and land use planning. This is a comprehensive document and I have a generalized concern about the balancing of all those points with affordable housing—which gets a very cursory examination. The economy, the human services ones—any one of those you could have come with as much on as with these. I understand that any document like this is a product of consensus and doesn't necessarily reflect the interests of those who created it. I just want to consider the balancing of the scope of some of these very detailed recommendations on environmental and on land versus the very minimal things on housing and human services.

Gist- I appreciate that. I fully agree.

**Alderman Spalt - suggested that the task force report be summarized into an executive summary for those who will not read the entire report.**

Spalt – I've seen the longer version of the report as it was being developed. This report begs for an executive summary, it begs for several different versions—the full one that relatively few people will read, a shorter one

and a pamphlet. Because there are a lot of people that will not read more than a pamphlet or a front and back. If the housing can be summarized in those eight lines, then the other things can be too.

Dorosin – The report gives the impression that these other things are more important and this item, while included, has been given that short description.

### **Conserve Natural Areas, Farmland and Other Important Open Space**

*Alderman Spalt - when land is being preserved, different distinctions should be made for the different areas.*

Spalt – I think that it is important that when land is being preserved, identified and specified that the kind of distinctions that are made here are made so that (there's often times when land can serve multiple functions—there provide open space, they provide views, small farms) but if something is being preserved for water quality, then it's not exactly the same thing as if it were being preserved for farm land. They are compatible, but there are differences. I think that it's important that these kinds of different areas are identified here.

*Alderman Zaffron – there should be master plan for creating hamlets, mixed use developments or villages.*

Zaffron – I had a concern about recommendation 3, action 3a which is adopt a process to develop in small increments large scale areas such as hamlets, villages or compact, mixed-use developments. A lot of people have real issues with whether or not such developments are even possible if one imposes a very lengthy time line on the development of such compact mixed use villages or hamlets, etc. The simple reason being the economic factors of maintaining a heavy debt load over a very long time when in order to do these things efficiently, they need to be done very quickly and comprehensive as part of the master planning process. If you have a careful master planning process such as that outlined in our small area plan, then you have a whole master plan that is ready to go and meets all your criteria but “bam” they get in there and do it and that helps meet your affordability goals and provides a window of economic viability for the product. Having to pay debt service essentially on an entire project's financing over say a 20-year period is simply not viable. That's an economic reality that we need to explore if we are actually interested in making sure these development patterns do in fact occur.

### **Environmentally Sustainable Transportation Systems that Meet People's Needs**

*Alderman Spalt - trains to Carrboro.*

Spalt – trains to Carrboro. We are prepared to cooperate in any way that we can.

*Alderman Zaffron - governments will be required to use lower emission motor vehicles because of federal legislation.*

Zaffron – Under recommendation 4b, Adopt a policy to systematically replace older government vehicles with new, no or low emission vehicles..... We are going to be required to do that anyway because of a federal mandate. The legislation has already been adopted. In fact it is already affecting the purchasing decisions that are being made by transit and public fleet organizations.

*Alderman Dorosin – mixed use zoning is a way of reducing use of vehicles.*

Dorosin – I would add to the list of bullets the idea of mixed use zoning as a way of reducing use of cars.

***Alderman McDuffee- before we can have public transit that meets citizens' needs, we have to have a dependable public transit system and suggested strong language for what an adequate public transit system can do for the community.***

McDuffee – the title of this one is good. Maybe something in the condensation is lost. In the first bullet where it says “expand the availability and use of public transportation”, I think that should be separated from the needs for seniors and disabled. I think there are some other groups that are missing there too. Basically I think before we can have transportation that meets people's need, we have to have a public transportation system that actually gets people to work efficiently, so that someone can live in this town and not be dependent on a car. Even though it has been touted a lot that we have the best bus system in the state, people who try to live here without dependence on a car don't find that very comforting. It's not very effective for getting people to work at the University, for living in this community with a car. I would suggest stronger language about what an adequate public transportation system could do for us in terms of meeting people's needs and having environmentally positive impact.

### **Water Supply Protection, Pollution Prevention, and Waste Reduction**

***Alderman Zaffron – has serious concerns about any structure charging fees for stormwater management or reference to a stormwater utility.***

Zaffron – I still have serious concerns about any structure charging fees for stormwater management or references to a stormwater management utility. I know it has become very hot since in the wake of extraordinary rainfalls-- Eastgate is flooded yet again. The fact of the matter is that it is the lowest place in the county—it's in a basin—and you couldn't build in it anyway. A lot of the discussion about the extent to which development that has taken place in other areas has actually contributed to that given the extraordinary weather events that occurred is not yet supported by documents. So I think it would premature to act in that regard.

***Alderman McDuffee - the jurisdictions need to work together on stormwater management. Is not convinced that “pay as you throw” would reduce solid waste.***

McDuffee- I think that we obviously need to work cooperatively on stormwater management. While we might not have jumped on the idea that was presented to us some time ago about how that was done, I think that the idea of how we should work on stormwater management should be a focus here. Under the reduced solid and hazardous waste are some prescriptive suggestions there. This Board has had some trouble with a pay-as-you-throw system and it's fairly regressive implications for citizens. I am not totally against pay-as-you-throw, but I don't think that it has been proven in this community with the collection local and the landfill at the county how instituting pay-as-you-throw or raising would have any impact on reducing solid wastes or hazardous wastes. We may be able to prove it, but I can't figure out how if the county implements a fee and we're doing the collection here in Carrboro, how that's going to reduce solid wastes. I think that's something thrown out there as a given that this would reduce it and there are certainly communities out there where it has and there are ways that it can be implemented, but it hasn't been shown to us here yet how that would do it. I am comfortable with that being given as a solution for reducing solid wastes.

***Alderman Spalt - the focus should be on a study and implementation of cooperative arrangements for stormwater management.***

Splat – I would suggest on the stormwater thing that we are no doubt going to be discussing a lot more than we have, I think this Board would be more comfortable with instead of create a fee structure for stormwater management, that it be something that is more like study and implement, but move toward cooperative

stormwater management rather than specifying a specific solution. There has got to be a lot more cooperation on this. Where it's going to go is still up in the air.

Gist- I think a lot of us agree on that.

Zaffron- I wanted to echo Diana's comments.

### **Supporting a Diverse Economy that Meets Local Needs**

***Alderman Dorosin - concerned about how narrow the recommendation is for economic recruitment. Where can these businesses be put? What areas can be made available?***

Dorosin – My problem with this section—all these criteria are excellent—any business that would meet these would obviously be one that we would like to have. Right now, speaking for Carrboro but I think it is true generally, that we are at a point where the situation is more critical as far as economic recruitment and economic development. All these goals are ideal, but I don't think right now we are in a position to say that this is all we are looking for. I am concerned that this is a little narrower than I feel is the basis for our economic recruitment. The other point that I think is missing from the recruitment is considering the land use question. Where can we put these businesses and are there areas of land that can be rezoned? I'm not sure that there is any place that suitable for light industrial and I think that it's one thing to say we want these things, it's another to be able to actually go out and recruit these businesses and say this is what we have.

Gist- I agree. We often in this community talk about providing opportunity for poor people and expanding business and expanding the tax base, but yet we ran into some trouble getting any significant acreage in the small area plan in which to put anything other than gift shops to expand our tax base. We really need to put our land where are mouth is in this case.

***Alderman Zaffron – there should be bullets added which talk about the county taking on a proactive approach to economic development and recruitment.***

Zaffron – what I saw was sort of a balance in the tone within the context of this document. The tone should emphasize and there should be some bullets, which talk about the county taking on a proactive approach to economic development and recruitment. Basically what we are telling them what we don't want. The converse is to say what we do and to say what we do within the context of a realistic expectation that current economic circumstance will allow it to occur.

***Alderman Spalt - supports building off the presence of UNC-CH and UNC Hospitals.***

Spalt – I just want to emphasize a point on page 8, item 7 which talks about building on the strengths of presence of UNC and the UNC Hospitals by supporting spin off businesses. I have been impressed at how many local businesses are related to UNC. We talk about non-residential construction or non-residential activity—we have an enormous amount of this activity going on. It just doesn't happen to be taxable, but it has an enormous amount of economic spin off. People are working in businesses that you might not think were primarily being supported by the activities that go on on the campus or that spin off from the campus or Research Triangle Park where they are supplying specialty items—anything from catering to glassware to whatever. I don't know what role as a government we have in helping to identify those niches, but I think that as they as they are identified and as people get started in them, that helping them to grow into larger and more long-term businesses, making sure that they have a place that they can stay in the community and they don't

have to move out into an area where we hope we are going to have country and not commercial development that that is such a big potential that we have.

***Alderman Zaffron - supports offering educational programs for start-up businesses.***

Zaffron – This came under: expand skills development services and opportunities. It has to do with very minimal sorts of skills development. Basically people who just have no skills whatsoever. It doesn't really talk about how people can leverage wealth. I think it would really be worthwhile to explore as part of creating economic opportunities for low-wealth people as well as to talk about skills and savings and investment and investment clubs and other mechanisms that are often used by educational institutions and self-help organizations to help low-wealth people accumulate and leverage wealth. If you check somebody skills but you teach them how to manage or leverage their money, they will be broke in five years.

Gist – like to micro-loan program that we are starting for which the training will begin on September 16<sup>th</sup>.

Zaffron – the other is how we are teaching them to participate in the larger economic. Some people who are rather paternalistic bent say that people with this educational level are not really capable of assuming these risks. But anyone, given some proper educational tools, can make responsible and sometimes very lucrative decisions and they should be empowered to do so.

**Affordable Housing**

***Alderman Spalt – the Board has established affordable housing as a high priority.***

Spalt – We have established this as one of our highest priorities in the town and have acknowledged that in the growth of the land trust. This is the kind of thing that shouldn't get lost by being a small section.

Zaffron – I agree on Allen's comments.

***Alderman Dorosin – the governments should explore land they currently own or that could be acquired for affordable housing.***

Dorosin – In the action strategies—this goes back to the environmental compared to housing—under action strategy 45 and 46—all of them include direct expenditure of monies for conservation, directly purchasing land for conservation, conversation easements, securing funding for acquisition of land development rights. There is nothing comparable to that in the one for housing. There is a dedicated funding that would go to nonprofits and advocacy groups but I don't think any of the governments have fully explored the opportunity with land that they already own or land that they could easily acquire that is currently vacant that could be turned over to someone to build houses.

**Human Services Priorities**

***Alderman Gist - mental health should be emphasized.***

Gist – I agree that this area should be expanded. It looks like mental health has been relegated to just a couple of lines. Many of the problems that we have in this community are connected with the lack of mental health services. Our mental health system is under attack; our local mental health providers are under attack. It deserves more than one line.

***Alderman Dorosin - the health and human service priorities for the Latino community should be added as a separate bullet.***

Dorosin – one bullet that should be added to the second one is a specific item addressing the needs of the Latino community. I think the rubella crisis indicated that. The community's response to that I think was poor, and the Latino community ended up taking care of that themselves to a large extent. Just like we have a separate category for seniors, I think there are some issues where health and human service priorities for the Latino are significant enough to address as a separate item.

### **K-12 Education**

***Alderman Zaffron - additional language should be added employing more efficient and cost effective school construction and property acquisition.***

Zaffron – I hate to tread in areas which are really issues between the county commissioners and the school board. I think there should be some additional language added employing more efficient and cost effective methods of school construction and property acquisition.

***Alderman Dorosin – applauds the inclusion of the local third rail of merger.***

Dorosin – I applaud the inclusion of the local third rail of merger. I am happy to see that in there as a consideration.

***Alderman McDuffee - something should be included to ensure that joint efforts for use of school facilities allow public access.***

McDuffee – One comment that I would have under the second arrow, which goes to the joint merger of schools. I would ask that something be put in there ensuring that these joint efforts allow adequate public access to the facilities.

Gist – I would second that. There are a whole lot more people funding the school system than using the school system and the school system has got to get smart to that and start really sharing and truly sharing what we are all paying for. I think that needs to be in here.

***Alderman Spalt – there is too much focus on merger. There is a Schools and Land Use Council in existence that is looking at joint use of facilities and joint purchase of land. The reduction of class sizes is a matter of money.***

Spalt – I think that in the summary that whether it's the third rail or not, that they have almost all of the substantive comments on education in the county focused on merger is unfortunate because I think that it is disproportionate. Greater cooperation is one thing, but there is so much that needs to be done, despite the quality of the schools that we, that needs to be done with both systems. There are so many things that people could do to be more involved, that it seems to me to be out of proportion for this summary of what the recommendations are. On the second item, I think that it is worth mentioning that there is a Schools and Land Use Council that was set up by the county commissioners. There are two of them that function together. One of them works with the jurisdictions associated with each school system. Diana and I are members from Carrboro for the Chapel Hill-Carrboro area. It is looking precisely at this kind of thing—joint use of facilities and joint purchase of land—so the report might reference that this is taking place and might look at it and say it should be enhanced or it's going in the wrong direction--some of that's already happening. The last one—reduce class

size and smaller schools—is largely a matter of money. I think that both school systems would jump at the opportunity to have smaller class sizes. It is amazing how much they cost. Just reducing a couple of students per class, the number of extra classrooms and the number of extra teachers you need is enormously expensive. It's a matter of what people can or are willing to pay for it. I can't remember how large the section is on education in the report, but it ought to be substantial.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen that the Aldermen plan to accept the final version of the document as a benchmark that may inform future planning efforts and against which future changes to policy and procedure may be measured.

The foregoing resolution having been submitted to a vote, received the following vote and was duly adopted this 22nd day of August, 2000:

Ayes: Mark Dorosin, Diana McDuffee, Jacquelyn Gist, Michael Nelson, Allen Spalt, Alex Zaffron

Noes: None

Absent or Excused: Joal Hall Broun

\*\*\*\*\*