

On 6/16/2011 10:33 AM, Chris Moran wrote:

Hi Mark,

I left you a telephone phone message yesterday and I would love to talk to you about either representing or appointing one of *A Better Site* representatives to the *Good Neighbor Plan Advisory Committee* (GNP) that the IFC is forming at the request of the Town Council to advise us about what elements should be included or emphasized in the Good Neighbor Plan, a document that will be eventually be reviewed by the Town Council. I would like for *A Better Site* and many of the nearby neighborhood associations, businesses, congregations and neighbors to be included and to advise the IC in this process.

Please contact me at either 929.6380.ext.26 or 417.5230 so I can share more information about the GNP with you.

Thank you,

Chris

---

**From:** Mark Peters [<mailto:tarheel@thepeters.org>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 20, 2011 7:37 PM  
**To:** Chris Moran  
**Subject:** Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

Please email the available dates and the documentation on how this is going to work, per the questions below.

We will expect that these meetings will be held as a public meeting and that the proceedings can be observed by the public and recorded.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding the dates and requested information.

Thanks,  
Mark

---

On 6/22/2011 3:35 PM, Chris Moran wrote:

Mark,

Before I send you any other information, I want to be very clear that the Good Neighbor Plan (GNP) process is something the Chapel Hill Town Council has asked the IFC to

organize and prepare as described in Resolution C approved on May 9. The IFC will follow the Town's instructions and spirit of that resolution.

The IFC believes that the Town's request is an opportunity to bring different groups and neighbors together near our new location, including A Better Site, to advise and help IFC representatives with its preparation of a stand-alone plan; and build, enhance and sustain effective neighborhood relations that will benefit all of the parties involved. The Good Neighbor Plan Advisory Committee can be a new beginning and positive step for all of us who are willing to participate, no matter what our thoughts or differences about Community House may be.

We are asking A Better Site to appoint one representative so this organization's views and thoughts are reflected during our meetings and discussions. A Better Site may send alternate representatives when its appointee can't attend scheduled meetings.

Those of us who participate will be gathered together to listen and respond to the variety of interests and points of view that have been mentioned during the town's public process, specify practical measures that respond to potential challenges and to develop the best tools possible for receiving suggestions and sharing Community House information with our neighbors, the community and the Town Council.

The advice and suggestions we seek from participating stakeholders and neighbors will be given full consideration when we write the GNP. The Chapel Hill Town Council will review our final GNP at a public meeting. IFC's process is chiefly intended to assure neighbors and the Town Council that our plan adequately responds to all of the major concerns and fears about Community House's presence in the neighborhood. A Better Site's involvement, along with other neighbors and neighborhood groups, is very important to the IFC, the GNP process and IFC's preparation of a final plan.

Please let me know if A Better Site plans to participate.

Thanks,

Chris

---

**From:** Mark Peters [<mailto:tarheel@thepeters.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 23, 2011 12:12 AM  
**To:** Chris Moran  
**Subject:** Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

Chris,

A Better Site is willing to participate in the meetings.

Summer is a time for family travel and commitments. We need to have multiple

representatives observe, particularly in the beginning, so that folks understand the ground rules and that there is continuity. If you want to give one rep during any given meeting the ability to speak for the group, then that is fine. You should consider having public comment at the end of each meeting, or after conversation and before decisions are made.

Again, given that this process is mandated by a town council resolution, I expect this meeting to be conducted in an open manner as if it were a planning subcommittee or other town council sponsored meeting. Proper notice should be given, public should be allowed to observe, and recording should be allowed.

Is the phrasing "[bring different groups and neighbors together near our new location](#)" meant to imply that the meetings will be held at UCC rather than on neutral ground?

Is the output of this going to be something that IFC and the town hides until 2 business days before the meeting as has been done throughout the SUP and shelter subcommittee process, or does IFC intend to publish in a timely fashion for the public to review and give input? Will there be iterative drafts with opportunity for input? Given your description, this is not a group process, but rather a process which IFC wholly controls and can do as it pleases.

Please send a list of potential dates and keep us posted on the invited and accepted participants.

Is Andy Sachs going to mediate these meetings?

Thanks,  
Mark

---

On 6/23/2011 11:55 AM, Chris Moran wrote:

Mark,

I asked in my last communication for "A Better Site to appoint one representative so this organization's views and thoughts are reflected during our meetings and discussions. A Better Site may send alternate representatives when its appointee can't attend scheduled meetings. "

A Better Site's participation will be no different than any other member. Other members will also be encouraged to send or appoint an alternate if summer vacation, work or other commitments prevent one from attending.

Andy Sachs will facilitate the discussions. Follow up is important and meeting notes will be taken and shared with all GNPAC members, and IFC's Project Manager, Allan Rosen, will be available to meet with any member unable to attend meetings so no one is out of the loop or left behind. Allan is also available to meet with any alternate to answer questions and share GNP information.

This is not a Town or town-like meeting process. We will encourage free and open discussions among all of the members about Good Neighbor Plan principles, points of interests which we hope will be shaped on a foundation of trust, good will and respect.

GNPAC members will determine meeting locations and dates for future meetings that the IFC will encourage be held in the neighborhood at congregations, county buildings, businesses, participant homes and other locations.

Please provide the name and contact information of A Better Site's representative.

Yours truly,

Chris

---

On 6/27/2011 12:04 AM, Mark Peters wrote:

Chris,

The core ABetterSite team has nominated me for the rep provided you answer our basic questions satisfactorily, we can agree on basic operations, and you have sufficient HOA and other neighbor participation where HOA membership is not mandated by law.

Let's be clear that there is zero "foundation of trust" at this point. Major factors for this include the misrepresentation of why the neighbors stopped past DSC meetings in IFC testimony to the town, characterizations that you made about neighbors to the UNC Board of Trustees, the comments Whisnant made at your annual meeting, and the manner in which IFC has painted folks who oppose this location (or the at-risk social service concentration or some of the services proposed) as being opposed to serving the homeless.

I have asked some very clear questions in our chain of notes, but have received few clear answers. The answers are perhaps buried somewhere within the rhetoric.

Please give yes/no (or a straightforward specific answer or list as appropriate) to the following questions and THEN add the rhetoric if you so desire.

1. Will the first meeting be held in a neutral location? Will subsequent meetings?
2. Will the public be allowed to observe the meetings?

3. Will the meeting follow open meeting protocols such that they may be recorded for the public record as a subcommittee meeting would? Will agendas be published? Will minutes or notes be sent out?
4. Who are the invited participants? Who has accepted so far?
5. How many meetings do you envision? How many do you expect in July, in Aug, in Sep, etc.? How many hours total?
6. What will the process look like? When will you have a document that describes the goals, steps, and project management milestones?
7. Will the group work on document revisions or is this a "tightly controlled" input-gathering session like the sessions held by Leading and Governing?
8. Will drafts be available to the participants along the way?
9. Will the final document version be available at least one month before the public town council meeting?

Just to be clear about a few things:

1. From transparency and continuity points of view, the meetings need to be held as if they were town subcommittee meetings, most importantly that they are recorded by the facilitator and made available prior to the subsequent meetings. Participants must also be allowed to record the meetings. We will have to seek another delegate if you are unwilling to do this.
2. Each meeting needs to be held in as neutral a location as possible.
3. I refuse to participate in a process which produces a document which is hidden from us until the eve of the town meeting. Unfortunately, that is how many of the steps were handled by the planning dept and IFC throughout the SUP process (the notice and materials availability of the Jan 4th planning board meeting and the major materials before the March and May SUP meetings being withheld until 2 business days before being prime examples)
4. We are most interested in making sure that promises made to date are kept that transparency, that reporting is required for the life of the lease, and that other requests that we have made throughout many of the SUP and shelter subcommittee processes are permanently stipulated in the lease. I do not believe that your repeated framing of the relationship with neighbors through the use of the word "fear" is going to bring the results that you desire from this process. I am hoping that at least some of your emails going forward are able to move away from this strawman.

I look forward to your answers.

Thanks,  
Mark Peters

---

**From:** Mark Peters [<mailto:tarheel@thepeters.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2011 10:06 AM  
**To:** Chris Moran

**Cc:** Andrew Sachs

**Subject:** Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

Chris and Andy,

Please confirm that you received the email below. You may be working on a response that is not quite ready, and that is fine. I just want to insure that the email made it to you.

I would also like to make sure that I can clear my calendar for known dates of the meetings while we address the logistics. Please send those to me as soon as possible.

Thanks,  
Mark

---

On 6/29/2011 11:58 AM, Chris Moran wrote:

Mark,

Your nomination by A Better Site is noted and I welcome your participation on the *Good Neighbor Plan Advisory Committee* (GNPAC). I recognize that you have been involved in this issue from the start and have been a relentless advocate for your organization. Meaningful participation by *A Better Site* offers an opportunity to build some trust between all of the participating members and to help advance the GNP process. I remain hopeful for improved communications and positive, neighborly relationships between us.

Below is my response to your questions sent in your recent communication. I hope my answers will encourage your participation.

Will the first meeting be held in a neutral location? The first meeting will be held at the United Church, a central location in the neighborhood. While United Church is a group that supports Community House, I believe it will work hard with all of us to enhance neighborhood communications and contribute ideas for a plan that we all can respect.

Will subsequent meetings? IFC hopes that all meetings will be in the neighborhood near the new Community House site. Congregations, the Board of Commissioners room, business conference rooms, UNC printing offices and Freedom House are some example locations the group can choose from. We will need a location large enough to accommodate all participants.

Will the public be allowed to observe the meetings? The meetings are designed to get advice and good ideas for a Good Neighbor Plan from an active advisory committee and we believe that discussions will be most productive if limited to participating

members. Observers, host members, IFC and town resource folks may need to be invited or be on-hand to answer questions about matters of interest to the committee.

Will the meeting follow open meeting protocols such that they may be recorded for the public record as a subcommittee meeting would? The IFC is not a public agency and the Open Meeting Laws have no application to these meetings. Towns and county governments are required to comply with the Open Meetings Laws and when the plan goes back to the Town of Chapel Hill for review those protocols will be in place.

Will agendas be published? The agenda planned for every meeting will be sent in advance to GNPAC members. Of course, members can suggest future discussion items for upcoming meetings.

Will minutes or notes be sent out? Yes they will. Committee members will be able to weigh in on notes and when finalized they will be sent to GNPAC members and interested parties.

Who are the invited participants? Groups mentioned in the Town's Resolution C and other nearby groups, associations and congregations have been invited to the table. The groups include but are not limited to: Episcopal Church of the Advocate, one formerly homeless person, one Community House resident, an IFC Board member, the Director of Community House, Freedom House, University of North Carolina, The United Church, Orange Methodist Church, The Christian Scientist Church, Harrington Bank, Orange County Government (Southern Human Services Center), Housing for New Hope, Northwood V Community residents (two groups), North Forest Hills residents(s), A Better Site, Vineyard Square HOA, Chapel Ridge/View Apartments, and the Rainbow Heights public housing neighborhood community . A roster of participating names and affiliations will be sent with the first meeting materials.

How many meetings do you envision? Not sure yet. We are hoping our plan will be approved by the Town Council before the end of the year. Participants may want to suggest the number of meetings or strategies for gathering information during our first meeting.

How many do you expect in July, in Aug, in Sep, etc.? Not sure yet. Two participants cannot be there in July due to conferences or vacations. I have suggested to them, as I have suggested to A Better Site, that they appoint alternates in their place or meet with Project Manager, Allan Rosen for up-to-date information.

How many hours total? Approximately three-hour meetings with the full group. Some of the work could be done on-line or in mini-sessions. This will be up to the GNPAC.

What will the process look like? I, with Andy Sachs help, will send out an email prior to our first meeting with an explanation of the process and a copy of the Town's Resolution C.

When will you have a document that describes the goals, steps, and project management milestones? [Goals and expectations are similar to the Town's Resolution C and will be fleshed out at our first meeting.](#)

Will the group work on document revisions or is this a "tightly controlled" input-gathering session like the sessions held by Leading and Governing? [This will be a different process, one that has been requested by the Town Council where the GNPAC, a much smaller group than those attending the SHSC with Leading and Governing Associates, will have greater input. I expect that options will be generated by the full group through discussions as well as by individuals or subgroups. IFC will generate iterative draft documents based on its SUP application and greater neighborhood input as the process unfolds. The final document will be given to the Town to review and eventually presented to the Town Council where public comments may be registered.](#)

Will drafts be available to the participants along the way? Yes they will.

Will the final document version be available at least one month before the public town council meeting? [Once provided to the Town staff, they will use their normal time periods for review, postings and notifications far in advance of Town Council meetings.](#)

---

**From:** Mark Peters [<mailto:tarheel@thepeters.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 07, 2011 5:28 PM  
**To:** Chris Moran  
**Cc:** Andrew Sachs  
**Subject:** Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

Chris,

Two primary sticking points remain:

A) That the meetings be recorded or that we be allowed to record meetings we attend.

B) That A Better Site be provided a final draft as a cc: to the email sent to town staff. To be clear, that we receive a copy of the report at the same time that the town is given the report, at least two weeks prior to the town meeting where it is scheduled to be discussed. There are no "notifications far in advance" of a town council meeting. Town Council agenda materials are posted a mere 2 business days before the meeting. IFC, as an applicant, received materials far in advance of the SUP, but citizens did not.



As far as invitees, I notice that there are no tenants from Homestead Station on your list and I do not see Parkside on the list.

Who are the "observers" going to be?

How are the non-HOA neighbors going to be selected?

I have not yet received any dates or tentative dates for the meeting(s).

-Mark

---

On 7/8/2011 10:36 AM, Chris Moran wrote:

Mark,

Our response to yesterday's email and your two primary sticking points before you agree to participate as a representative of A Better Site on the Good Neighbor Plan Advisory Committee (GNP) is as follows.

Mark, although the IFC invited you and would welcome any positive representation from A Better Site on the GNP Advisory Committee, I believe that you are continuing to condition your acceptance of our invitation upon my agency's agreement to terms that involve discussions and decisions the GNP Advisory Committee should be considering when it meets.

Your first demand is that the meetings be recorded or that A Better Site be allowed to record meetings at which it has a representative. The GNP advisory committee will discuss and develop its own operational protocols when it meets. If A Better Site is conditioning its participation on establishing this protocol without the group's input prior to the first meeting, I do not see how to accommodate your demand without impairing the group process.

Your second demand is that A Better Site be provided a final GNP draft at the same time that the Town is given IFC's final draft and that this is done at least two weeks prior to the scheduled Town meeting. Because it is my expectation that all committee members will receive each and every draft of the Good Neighbor Plan as it develops, this demand confuses me.

Members of the GNP Advisory Committee by the nature of everyone's service and commitment for developing positive neighborhood relations and a GNP will see, discuss and weigh in on drafts throughout the process. This means every GNP advisory committee member will receive a final GNP draft before it is delivered to the town staff for its review.

There is no guarantee that there will be a two-week lag between the final draft of the Good Neighbor Plan and when it must be provided to the Town. The timing of completion is for the Committee to determine. The timing of the town staff's review of the GNP and its circulation to the Town Council is for the Town to determine. It would be unwise to put artificial constraints on the work of a group larger than the groups either of us represents. If you and A Better Site do decide that you do not wish to have a member on the Committee, IFC will include A Better Site on the list of folks to get regular meeting notes and communications about the Good Neighbor Plan process.

As to other committee members and their affiliations, observers, meeting notices and the like, again, I anticipate that the group will establish its protocols at the first meeting and begin to address such questions. For clarification, I have used the term "observers" to mean persons who attend meetings and follow the group's protocols but are not members. As with other protocols, the protocol around observers is for the group to establish.

IFC regrets that you have not committed to be a member of the Committee yet. You have not yet received any dates or tentative dates for the meeting(s) because you have not made a commitment to participate. Notices have been limited to persons who have made a commitment to be a part of this process.

We do hope that you or someone else from A Better Site will choose to be on the Committee. I cannot over-emphasize the importance we are placing on trust-building and open communications amongst Advisory Committee members with the hopes that these traits will carry on in the Committee and in the community-at-large. We hope you will join the Committee soon and help us achieve this goal.

If you and A Better Site are not ready to commit to joining the Advisory Committee at this juncture, perhaps you would consider being an observer during our process. I will be glad to bring this up at our first meeting for consideration by the GNP group.

Please let me know if you are interested in either of these choices. If you have any further questions before you are able to make your decision, I want to remind you that Rick Allen and I have an outstanding invitation to you to meet if you desire.

Chris

---

**From:** Mark Peters [<mailto:tarheel@thepeters.org>]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 08, 2011 12:00 PM  
**To:** Chris Moran  
**Cc:** Andrew Sachs; Rick Allen  
**Subject:** Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

Chris,

You stated that you will invite us to participate and we have stated that we would like to

participate provided that the process meets basic, acceptable meeting guidelines. Based on lessons learned during the SUP and shelter guidelines processes, we are very sensitive to our participation and our intentions being co-opted and misrepresented.

Thus, we made two simple and straightforward requests for transparency. Transparency in no way impairs a group process.

The first request was that minimum public meeting rules apply. We would prefer that the meetings be open such that all neighbors have the opportunity to observe the meetings. We realize that this would impose logistical problems, so we did not push for this requirement. However, the meetings need to be recorded so that there is no dispute about information presented or discussed. During the earlier neighbor dispute resolution, there were holes in the minutes/notes and participants were allowed to change minutes/notes after the fact however they desired. Unless you have something to hide, then we are surprised that you object to this since this is group development of a plan and not mediation.

The second request is that materials not be withheld from participants. As long as each version is given to us before it is provided to the town, per your statement "This means every GNP advisory committee member will receive a final GNP draft before it is delivered to the town staff for its review.", then that meets the intent of our request.

IFC is setting the ground rules for the initial organizational meeting and these initial organizational ground rules can include recording this initial (first) meeting if IFC allows. I hear you saying that after the initial meeting, the rules established by the participants will apply. We will continue to participate as long as the rules and process are acceptable to us.

Regarding your offer that we merely observe, it makes absolutely no sense to hold a meeting where our representative is invited and yet not be not allowed to actually participate. Such precedent would not bode well for the future of this plan.

Regarding the invitation to meet with you and Rick, I have had too many commitments this week to consider this and there is no point in meeting until we come to terms with these basic requirements. Once we can come to an agreement, then I may entertain the invitation.

I look forward to receiving the dates for the meetings.

Sincerely,  
Mark

---

On 7/8/2011 12:21 PM, Chris Moran wrote:

Thank you for your reply Mark. I thought having a face-to-face conversation about the GNP process would have been useful. I am not sure from your email whether or not you have committed to participate on the committee or be at the table with us as I described it in my previous response. Please advise. Chris

---

**From:** [Chris Moran](#)  
**To:** [Chris C. Moran](#)  
**Sent:** Friday, July 08, 2011 2:29 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

We are willing to participate and look forward to receiving the dates. We expect to record the first meeting and to participate in the discussion of how the group will proceed.

Thanks,  
Mark

---

On 7/8/2011 3:13 PM, Chris Moran wrote:  
[Mark](#),

Glad you will participate. I will consider you as A Better Site's primary representative and member of the Good Neighbor Plan Advisory Committee, and will add your name and contact information to the attached roster on Monday for everyone. I am in contact with a couple of other persons who have yet to agree to serve. so the roster keeps changing.

Based on my previous emails and requests, I respectfully ask that you not bring any video or audio recording equipment into the building until the GNP Advisory Committee discusses the protocols for this process.

The first meeting is scheduled at the United Church this coming Monday from 4pm -- 7pm including dinner for committee members. Please see the attached materials that have been distributed for this discussion.

Thanks,

Chris

---

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Mark Peters](#)

**To:** [Chris Moran](#)  
**Cc:** [Andy Sachs](#) ; [Rick Allen](#) ; [chris Moran](#)  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 09, 2011 10:19 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Neighbor Plan Participation

The ABetterSite steering committee has reviewed the materials and is declining to participate at this time.

---

Subject: Re: Neighbor Plan Participation  
Date: Sat, 9 Jul 2011 11:56:14 -0400  
From: Chris Moran [cmoran@nc.rr.com](mailto:cmoran@nc.rr.com)  
To: Mark Peters [tarheel@thepeters.org](mailto:tarheel@thepeters.org)  
CC: Andy Sachs <[asachs@igc.org](mailto:asachs@igc.org)>, Rick Allen <[rick@synergybuilding.com](mailto:rick@synergybuilding.com)>, chris Moran <[executive@ifcmailbox.org](mailto:executive@ifcmailbox.org)>

Sorry to hear that Mark. Thanks for clarifying this for us. Chris

---

(As of September 24, 2001, No further communications have been received from the developer or from the dispute settlement center)