



**SUMMARY OF MINUTES
RESTON COMMUNITY CENTER
BOARD OF GOVERNORS' MEETING
JUNE 1, 2009**

Present:

- Carol Ann Bradley, Chair
- Colin Mills, Secretary
- Bill Keefe
- Bill Bouie, Vice Chair
- Beverly Cosham
- Cathy Vivona, Treasurer
- John Gasson

Absent and Excused:

- Bill Penniman
- Claudine Varesi

Staff:

- Leila Gordon, Executive Director
- Renata Wojcicki, Finance Director
- Pam Elcesser, Customer Service Manager
- Thomas Ward, Deputy Director
- BeBe Nguyen, Director of Communications
- Brian Gannon, Facility Booking Manager

Visitors:

- Robin Smyers, Reston Association RA President and Lake Anne/Tall Oaks District Director
- Kathleen McKee, RA Vice President and South Lakes District Director
- Cheryl Beamer, RA Secretary and Hunters Wood/Dogwood District Director
- Richard Chew, RA At-Large Director
- Joe Leighton, RA At-Large Director
- Frank Lynch, RA North Point Director
- Tom Vis, RA At-Large Director
- Milton Matthews, RA Chief Executive Officer
- Larry Butler, RA Director of Parks and Recreation

Please see attached sign-in sheets for the names and addresses of the audience members.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:13 p.m., welcoming the viewing audience.

Approval of the Agenda:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair

MOTION #1:

Colin Mills moved that the Board approve the Agenda. Cathy Vivona seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.

Approval of the Revised May 4, 2009 Board Minutes and the May 11, 2009 Special Board Minutes:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

The Chair noted that under MOTION #2 of the May 4, 2009 Board Minutes, "May 4, 2009 Board Minutes" should be changed to "April 6, 2009 Board Minutes."

MOTION #2:

Cathy Vivona moved that the Board approve the Revised May 4, 2009 Board Minutes and the May 11, 2009 Special Board Minutes. Colin Mills seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the Revised May 4, 2009 Board Actions and the May 11, 2009 Special Board Actions:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair

The Chair noted that under MOTION #3 of the May 4, 2009 Board Minutes, "May 4, 2009 Board Actions" should be changed to "April 6, 2009 Board Actions."

MOTION #3:

Bill Bouie moved that the Board approve the Revised May 4, 2009 Board Actions and the May 11, 2009 Special Board Actions. Colin Mills seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.

Chair's Remarks:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair

The Chair announced that the *Feasibility and Market Analysis for Indoor Recreation Final Report* will be available on the RCC Web site at www.restoncommunitycenter.com and the Reston Association RA Web site at www.reston.org. Questions or comments can be e-mailed to RCC at rcccontact@fairfaxcounty.gov, or RA at Member_Services@reston.org. A document containing answers to frequently asked questions about the proposed indoor recreation facility will also be available at the RCC Web site at www.restoncommunitycenter.com.

The Chair noted that earlier this evening, representatives from the consultant firm, Brailsford & Dunlavey (B&D), had delivered a presentation on the report.

Citizens Input:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair.

The Chair recited the rules for public testimony. The Board will not respond to any questions at this time, as per the procedures established for public comment at RCC Board of Governors' meetings.

The Chair reminded the audience that the RA Board will be holding a community input meeting in each RA District to allow for dialogue between attendees and RA representatives. There will also be several RCC community dialogue meetings where participants can share ideas, provide input, and make suggestions.

Evan Bass, 1983 B Villaridge Drive, Reston, Virginia 20191, read his statement in support for the proposed indoor recreation center. Please see his attached statement.

Rick Beyer, Co-Chair of the Coalition to Save Brown's Chapel, 11571 Lake Newport Road, Reston Virginia 20194, noted that so far, over 1,000 people have signed a petition opposing the destruction of Reston's natural and financial resources. The proposed joint RA/RCC recreation facility at Brown's Chapel is flawed and there are better alternatives. The RA Board is becoming conflicted between representing its members on one side and siding with Fairfax County representatives on the other. The RA Board does not report to the RCC Board, Hunter Mill District Supervisor Cathy Hudgins, or Fairfax County developers. On the other hand, the RCC Board does represent Fairfax County because it is appointed by the Hunter Mill District Supervisor and serves at the pleasure of the Supervisor. Therefore, the RCC Board is considering the proposal from a Fairfax County perspective and this is where one of

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

the big conflicts resides. It appears that the RCC Board prefers a Wal-Mart sized facility on RA private property. It also appears that certain RA Board members are in favor of this approach and are more interested in serving the Hunter Mill District Supervisor than the members who have elected them. The consultants' final report has changed significantly from the draft report that was posted on the RCC Web site and later removed from the site a few weeks ago. According to the draft report, the total project cost was estimated to be \$65 million but the final report estimated it to be \$49 million. The total cost is still outrageous. The \$49 million does not include the 5.5% interest rate over 20 years that would add another \$33 million in interest financing. This figure, coupled with the projection of more than \$1 million of annual operating loss, would put the overall project cost at well over \$100 million. This project represents the wants of a very small percentage of the community. The figures presented in the report disprove the case for a new facility. Furthermore, it appears that the demand for a new facility has increased significantly over the last three weeks. According to the report, 92% of the total participants in tennis and 82% of the total participants in swimming will be non-Reston residents. Therefore, this facility will not be used by 90% of Restonians but by Fairfax County residents. The operating statement in the report omits the cost of rent for the facility, which would be approximately \$4.2 million, thus bringing the annual operating loss to \$5.2 million. The revenue will not even cover the rent of the facility and personnel and non-personnel costs. When the facility has been paid for after 20 years and \$82 million, the facility will only be able to cover 80% of its operating expenses. Mr. Beyer stated that the RA membership will take legal action against the RA Board if any attempts are made, directly or indirectly, to circumvent RA member rights regarding any conveyance of RA land without a super referendum, including but not limited to land swaps, long-term leases, or border changes.

Jack Trenta, 11583 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, read from a promotional marketing piece that was prepared by the RA to try to attract people to Reston: "Living in Reston is like living in a park. More than any community in the country, Reston was designed to have a significant amount of open space available for the recreation of its residents. You've probably noticed the abundance of trees, flowers, and trails. Natural spaces were considered essential for the enjoyment of residents when Reston was just a dream. Today, the Reston Association enhances, protects, manages, and maintains more than 1,300 acres of open space, including the 72-acre Walker Nature Center; four lakes; three ponds; common ground featuring woods, meadows, and wetlands [including Brown's Chapel]. These beautiful spaces give Reston its special, park-like feeling." Mr. Trenta said that the consultants' study does not touch the heart and soul of the Reston community in any way, shape, or form and it has no understanding of it at all. This proposal will not be approved.

Amy Justice, 1459 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, said she believes that the proposed indoor recreation facility is a done deal. She read an excerpt from the March 9, 2009 Community Relations/Program Policy Joint Committee Meeting report: under Update on Task Force activities and timeline issues, "Carol Ann reported that the RCC/RA Task Force received information from Urban Planning. She stated that there are several permits that need to be obtained. She described the conversation with RA Board Chair, Milton Matthews and Larry Butler, as being productive and involving a variety of options RCC representatives, herself, Bill Bouie and Leila Gordon, would like the site engineer to pursue to revise the way the building and parking are located on the Brown's Chapel RA property. The suggestions were made to eliminate all of the current Brown's Chapel property elements (ball fields, picnic pavilion, and outdoor basketball and volleyball courts) to accommodate the size building desired on that property without going onto the adjacent property." In the same report, the Committee recommended naming the prospective facility the Robert E. Simon Community Center, which was subsequently approved by the RCC Board on April 6, 2009. Ms. Justice commented that the community does not believe that this proposal is just an idea and that no decisions have been made when there is such concrete evidence to the contrary.

Gordon Gerson, President of the Reston Masters Swim Team (RMST) Board, 10913 Knights Bridge Court, Reston, Virginia 20190, read his statement in support for the swimming component of the new

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

facility. Please see his attached statement. Mr. Gerson pointed out that the RMST is not against building a facility but is against not taking any action at all.

Dr. Chun Hong, 1320 Wedgewood Manor Way, Reston, Virginia 20194, spoke in favor of the recreation center because it will support exercise activities that help longevity and both physical and mental health, provide a much-needed indoor swimming pool and other recreational opportunities, and advance Reston's signature in the country and around the world.

Deb Pestronk, 11486 Links Drive, Reston, Virginia 20190, read her statement in opposition to the proposal. Please see her attached statement.

Debra Casey, 1423 Belcastle Court, Reston, Virginia 20194, said she is opposed to any development on Brown's Chapel Park, but she is not against a new tennis or swimming facility. If the park is destroyed it can never be replaced. The park belongs to the people of Reston and it is their decision as to what happens to it.

Jeff Thomas, President of Reston Little League Board of Directors, and Vice President of Reston Youth Baseball, 11310 Myrtle Lane, Reston, Virginia 20191, said he appreciates the need for tennis and swimming facilities, but he strongly objects to destroying Brown's Chapel Park because it is special. He recommended that the RA and RCC Boards work together with Reston residents to discuss ideas and find solutions to meet the needs of the broad community and to also protect the heritage of baseball in Reston.

John Nusbaum, 1579 Autumn Ridge Circle, Reston, Virginia 20194, noted that Reston Runners is composed of 1,400 members who do not need an indoor facility because they are outside at all times of the year and in all weather conditions. He suggested that Brown's Chapel Park return to an environment similar to that of Meadowlark Park where people can walk around, have a picnic, and enjoy the open space. Once the park is destroyed, it can never be restored to its original condition.

Kevin Appleton, 2409 Glade Bank Way, Reston, Virginia 20191, said he is not in favor of ruining Brown's Chapel Park. Restonians can come up with a solution that satisfies the majority although it may take longer than three to four years.

Bob Skinner, 1268 New Bedford Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, read his statement in opposition to the proposal. Please see his attached statement.

Peter Greenberg, 1451 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, noted that the proposed parking garage, consisting of 596 spaces, would be located 86 feet from his bedroom window, and early in the morning when swimmers arrived at the facility he would smell the gas fumes from their vehicles and hear their doors open and close. Mr. Greenberg pointed out that he would support an appropriately sized and financially viable indoor swimming facility. At the last RA Board meeting, Joe Leighton, RA At-Large Director, suggested that a tennis facility immediately be constructed at Lake Newport and be open for the next tennis season, to which RA President Robin Smyers replied, "That will never happen." Mr. Greenberg said he strongly favors Mr. Leighton's idea and hopes that the tennis facility will open by September.

Jill Tunick, 2252 Coppersmith Square, Reston, Virginia 20191, strongly recommended that the RA Board poll every household in the RA membership about whether or not the proposed indoor recreation center should be built. This will ensure that the final decision is fair and egalitarian. As a member of Reston Runners, Ms. Tunick said this group was never approached by the consultants. When information is being gathered about the decision, input from all RA households should be obtained and not just that of a select few.

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

David Overbagh, 2103 Thomas View Road, Reston, Virginia 20191, pointed out that once open space is gone, it is always gone. Hug-A-Tree camp at Brown's Chapel Park is one of the gems of Reston. The proposed facility does not belong on the Brown's Chapel property. Mr. Overbagh noted that he will review the feasibility study so he can form an opinion on it and he encouraged others to do the same.

Merilyn Green, 11107 Timberhead Lane, Reston, Virginia 20191, commented that Reston is a wonderful, special place. If the new facility was built and it is old after about 15 years, she will not regard the facility as one of the things that has kept Reston unique and is continuing to make Reston unique. Reston was formed with unique ideas; the community has remained unique since it was created. To address the given issues, unique ideas are needed to help Reston continue in the same direction. There have been suggestions from the community, such as building a facility at a location that is currently not being used. Ms. Green proposed a facility that contained woodworking, framing, or painting studios where local professionals can teach and organize activities. The many ideas provided by the community should be considered.

Michael Kogan, President of the Newport Cluster Association, 1583 Regatta Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, said the RA Board should drop this partnership with RCC because this is a very expensive project and there are other ways to solve the problem. He suggested that the RCC release some of the RA membership's money in order to finance covering Lake Newport pool, which is a 50-meter Olympic pool. He further suggested that RCC contribute some of the RA funds toward building two or three indoor tennis courts at available Fairfax County-owned land in the Reston Town Center. Mr. Kogan pointed out that he has been going to the Reston gym at Isaac Newton Square for years and he did not need any other facilities.

Deborah Maher, 11597 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, noted that she is in total opposition of a recreation center on any park in Reston. She also objected to the management decisions of the RA Board and asked why the community was not asked first about this project. Ms. Maher also asked why Lake Newport pool is closed on Fridays. In cooler weather, tennis players should wear warmer clothes when they play outside. It is a lot less expensive to add outdoor lights at existing facilities than to provide a ceiling, heating, and air conditioning at an indoor facility. The RA Board has made ludicrous decisions with the RA membership's money. Ms. Maher demanded to know who had the authority to spend \$91,000 on this project so far. She expressed concern about how much more money will be needed for the next steps in the process. She commented that she did not understand why this current RA Board cannot be satisfied with the beauty of Reston and keep it the way it is and to improve the existing facilities in need of improvement while staying within the Board's financial responsibilities. The RA Board's legacy should be to the next generation and to not put them in debt for more bonds.

Marie Huhtala, Secretary of the Reston Citizens Association (RCA) Board of Directors, 12228 Quorn Lane, Reston, Virginia 20191, said the RCA has serious concerns about the Brown's Chapel site and the size and scope of the facility. She read a list of questions from the RCA regarding the proposed recreation center. Please see the attached list. She noted that the RCA has not taken a position yet but is very concerned and is following the project closely.

Michael Rierson, President of the Newport Shores Cluster Association, 1464 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, noted that the Newport Shores Cluster membership and Board of Directors are adamantly opposed to the plan of record for Brown's Chapel for all the reasons cited by previous speakers. He requested that the RA Board immediately implement a moratorium on any additional consideration for any further use of the Brown's Chapel property until an appropriate resource-based master plan is implemented and that plan must include the involvement of the communities in North Point. Mr. Rierson pointed out that the consultants' draft report was removed from the RCC Web site five days after it was initially posted and that the draft report contained different information than what was provided by the consultants earlier this evening. He also questioned how the consultants obtained the usage numbers and made assumptions to support those numbers. The estimated \$1.1 million per year

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

deficit that will be burdened by Small District 5 (SD5) is alarming. The community has provided some great suggestions about redevelopment and conversion. In this economic climate, it is highly inappropriate that the RCC Board is proposing a \$65 million recreation center that would be supported by SD5. A group of Reston residents plan to propose to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors that SD5 be reexamined with the idea to reduce the tax rate so that RCC would have the necessary funds to operate and have capital maintenance for its facilities but to negate this bankrolling of \$8 million in the RCC accounts for the future development of a new facility. RCC should have to go to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and ask for a referendum and justify it just like the Fairfax County Park Authority, Fairfax County Public Schools, and other County agencies have to do. The community does not oppose an appropriately planned, sized, and funded facility. Swimming advocates should note that according to the report, the facility will not be built for five years. A swimming facility should be built much sooner but it should be appropriate, sustainable, and fundable with existing resources. Mr. Rierson said he found it incredible that the RA and RCC Boards can propose a 171,000- square foot facility, 550 parking spaces, and destruction of open space before consulting with the membership who appoints, elects, and funds them. That is the flaw of this process. The community supports the local athletic organizations and also desires facilities to address their needs, but any project should be evaluated with a sensible eye to the bottom line and the protection of the natural resources in Reston.

Robert Szaro, 11585 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, expressed opposition to the study because it framed the assumptions incorrectly and failed to ask the following questions: Who in Reston wants a facility? How many people in Reston want the facility? Who is willing to pay for such a facility? The list of committees, organizations, and groups who were consulted in the study was a very biased list. Taking away the opportunity for children to explore the woods and get to know nature is absolutely ludicrous.

Tyrone Gillum, 11107 Waterman's Drive, Reston, Virginia 20191, discussed the benefits of living in Reston and commented that it is a great place to live. There are valid points on both sides of this issue. Mr. Gillum said he does not want to build a recreation center that is inappropriate but he recognizes the definite need for this facility. He pointed out that a Wal-Mart sized facility is not under consideration but three program options are and none of them have been decided on. Input from people who live around the Brown's Chapel site is expected in the future. Mr. Gillum requested that members of the community disagree without being disagreeable and also be respectful of one another as this project continues. He said he hopes that a solution can be achieved that satisfies the majority.

Mary Joyce Kemper, 2160 Golf Course Drive, Reston, Virginia 20191, commented that Reston needs a facility that will support the health needs of the entire community. Parking may not be required if the facility is located near the Metro or bike paths. The community should be able to produce a creative answer that addresses all needs, keeps the community out of debt, and meets the consensus of the community.

Davood Sedaghatfar, 1577 Inlet Court, Reston, Virginia 20190, expressed his profound disappointment with the proceedings of this meeting. At the May 18, 2009 RCC Finance Committee meeting at RCC Lake Anne, the audience was promised that they would get their questions answered at the June 1st meeting; however, none of the questions have been answered. He objected to the fact that the audience was not allowed to ask any questions. Mr. Sedaghatfar commented that the consultants' presentation was extremely vague and entirely technical and it was rushed and not prepared for the general public to understand. Almost 90% of what was said this evening was repeated from the May 18th meeting. The process is flawed.

Richard Chipman, 1571 Harpers Cove Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, said he is not opposed to sports facilities but he is opposed to the proposal because it is fiscally irresponsible and damaging to precious, unreplenishable open space. The upper total cost of the entire capital expense plus the interest carrying cost over 20 years is \$100 million. If the facility was to only serve the RMST, the cost would be \$1

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

million per person, which is not a reasonable expenditure. If the facility was to serve the 500 families that the report estimates would have annual paid passes to the facility, the cost would be \$200,000 per family. Is that a reasonable expenditure? If the facility was to serve the 2,000 individuals who might participate in the facility, the cost would be \$50,000 per person. If the facility was to serve all 25,000 households in Reston, the cost would be \$4,000 per household. Households will still have to pay an additional \$800 family membership per year plus court rentals of about \$30 per hour and swim lane rentals of about \$35 per hour. Mr. Chipman said the community is willing to develop a proposal that is fiscally responsible.

Michael Ahmadi, 2460 Arctic Fox Way, Reston, Virginia 20191, pointed out that Mitchell Frank and Denis Kudla, who are from the Northern Virginia area and practice tennis in Reston, recently competed in the French Open Juniors tournament. A new recreation facility will serve future generations of Reston residents.

Craig Branson, 1608 Apricot Court, Reston, Virginia 20190, voiced objection to the plan because it will remove the baseball diamonds at Brown's Chapel. He questioned why the proposal would eliminate baseball fields but build more tennis courts when the consultants' draft report indicated that the number of baseball fields was at par for the community but there was an overabundance of tennis courts. Mr. Branson pointed out that he lives near the Hook Road tennis courts and most of the time the courts are not completely occupied. He said he is not opposed to a swimming facility but he believes this plan is unsuitable and should be reconsidered.

Sonja Ingram, a field representative for Preservation Virginia, 767 Main Street, Danville, Virginia 24541, noted that Preservation Virginia is not opposed to the construction of recreation facilities but is opposed to the placement of a recreation center in a communal park that has been used recreationally by Reston residents for many years. Brown's Chapel Park is not an abandoned, unused field; it already is a natural recreational center. Reston is used as an example of a historic planned community in many historic preservation university programs. As a historic preservationist representing Preservation Virginia, Ms. Ingram said she always stresses the importance of communities maintaining the integrity of their historic sites and this includes Reston, a planned historic community that was specifically designed to incorporate open space and parks within its fabric. Thus, it is important to maintain that.

Diana Carter, 12119 Stirrup Road, Reston, Virginia 20191, spoke in opposition to the following issues:

- The RA Board expanding its mandate and losing the trust of the RA membership as a result of this project and a continuing set of expansions of mandate.
- The RA and RCC Boards spending money that the community cannot afford to run a study before soliciting community input.
- The loss of open space and the degeneration and destruction of what Reston has always been and stood for.
- The RA does not have the funds necessary to finance this project without acquiring a loan.
- The increase of impervious surfaces and the damage to streams, which will consequently require more heavy equipment to get on the site and destroy more open space to restore the streams.

Ms. Carter explained that the basic premise of this project is composed of three parts: 1) recreational facilities are a basic need of life for obese people, swimmers, and medical professionals; 2) some members of this community cannot afford to pay for this basic right and they cannot satisfy it without a \$100 million facility; and 3) the rest of the community needs to be enslaved by an increase in taxes to pay for this facility. She commented that the RA and RCC did not have the right to place this burden on the community and that this project is not moral, ethical, or legally justified.

Mary Buff, 1664 Waters Edge Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, said she strongly objects to the destruction of open space and parkland in Reston because it can never be replaced. She claimed that the RA and RCC Boards do not care about the preservation of the natural beauty and trees of Reston. Ms. Buff suggested to Mr. Bass that in lieu of building a new facility, overweight children can walk or ride their bike

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

along one of Reston's numerous pathways. Reston's existing facilities need to be examined. For example, the Reston YMCA has an underutilized teen center, which would be a less expensive alternative to using and paying taxes on a new facility. It appears that not many people in Reston are interested in exercising, since Worldgate Sport & Health Club and YMCA are always seeking new membership. Ms. Buff pointed out that she exercises in the YMCA pool every day and it is never crowded. RCC Hunters Woods, except for the pool, is never crowded. The consultants' study gave an excellent case on the need for a Fairfax County or a regional facility but hardly any case at all for a Reston-paid facility. Ms. Buff questioned how the consultants assumed that 90% of users would be from Reston when the data demonstrate that the majority of the participants would be from outside of Reston. If non-Reston residents want to use the new facility, they can help pay for it.

Baba Freeman, 11404 Orchard Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, noted that she was elected to the first RCC Board of Governors in 1976. She helped design RCC Hunters Woods and engaged in three years of work on the project prior to the first referendum that created SD5 and the second vote that approved the bond issue. During those three years, Ms. Freeman visited every organization in Reston to ask what they would like in a recreation center. She suggested that the current RCC Board follow this same approach.

Michael Belyavsky, 1571 Old Eaton Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, pointed out that the two sides of this issue should not be one side against recreation and the other side for recreation because he believes that all Reston residents support recreation. Brown's Chapel Park is a fully functional recreation facility that requires no additional taxpayers' dollars. As Reston develops further and becomes denser, its green space will become even more valuable. If an indoor recreation center is truly needed, Mr. Belyavsky requested that the RA and RCC Boards consider other options and their associated costs. As all Restonians work through what is a need and what is a want, they should be respectful of one another and recognize that money is limited.

Mike Freeman, 11404 Orchard Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, pointed out to the RA Board that its first responsibility is to protect the open space. He asked if the RA Board has considered locating this facility on vacant land in Reston Town Center. Mr. Freeman strongly urged the RA Board to keep Brown's Chapel Park the way it is.

The Chair thanked all the speakers for their comments.

Committee Reports

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair

Program Policy Committee - May 11, 2009

Colin Mills, Vice Chair. The report was summarized and submitted for the record. Please see attached report.

The following change was made to the report: Cathy Vivona, a member of the Program Policy Committee, was absent and excused from the meeting.

Finance Committee - May 18, 2009

Cathy Vivona, Chair. The report was summarized and submitted for the record. Please see attached report.

Approval of Committee Reports:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair

June 1, 2009 BOG Meeting cont'd

MOTION #4:

Colin Mills moved that the Board approve the Committee Reports, with the amendment to the Program Policy Committee report to add Cathy Vivona (committee member) as absent and excused from the meeting. Bill Bouie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Old Business:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair.

There was no old business.

New Business:

Carol Ann Bradley, Chair.

There was no new business.

MOTION #5:

Colin Mills moved that the meeting be adjourned. Bill Bouie seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Colin Mills, Board Secretary

Date

**RESTON COMMUNITY CENTER
BOARD ACTIONS
TAKEN AT BOARD OF GOVERNORS' MEETING ON JUNE 1, 2009**

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---|
| 09-6-01 -1 | Bd | That the Board approve the Agenda. |
| 09-6-01-2 | Bd | That the Board approve the Revised May 4, 2009 Board Minutes and the May 11, 2009 Special Board Minutes. |
| 09-6-01-3 | Bd | That the Board approve the Revised May 4, 2009 Board Actions and the May 11, 2009 Special Board Actions. |
| 09-6-01 -4 | Bd | That the Board approve the Committee Reports, with the amendment to the Program Policy Committee report to add Cathy Vivona (committee member) as absent and excused from the meeting. |
| 09-6-01 -5 | Bd | That the meeting be adjourned. |

Colin Mills, Board Secretary

Date



MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 11, 2009
TO: RCC Board of Governors
FROM: Colin Mills
Vice Chair, Program Policy Committee
SUBJECT: May 11, 2009 Program Policy Committee Meeting

The Program Policy Committee met on Monday, May 11, 2009. Present were:

- Colin Mills, Vice Chair, Program Policy Committee
- Carol Ann Bradley, Board Chair
- Beverly Cosham (committee member)
- Claudine Varesi (committee member)
- Bill Bouie
- John Gasson
- Bill Penniman

Bill Keefe, Program Policy Chair, and Cathy Vivona, (committee member) were absent and excused.

Attending from the RCC staff:

- Leila Gordon, RCC Executive Director

The Program Policy Committee Vice Chair officially called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

Proposed Revisions to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between RCC and Fairfax County: Colin, Vice Chair of the Program Policy Committee, yielded the floor to Robert Goudie, who asked to speak on three items that he felt were missing from the current rewrite of the MOU. The first item was defining in the MOU the requirement that two-thirds of the Board must approve any capital expansion. Robert expressed that he felt comfort in knowing that it takes two-thirds of the Board to change the By-Laws. He also stated that how the Board conducts business is a governance issue and understands that the County Attorney felt that it should be included in the By-Laws rather than the MOU. Robert said that he would reserve comment until he is able to hear more about it.

Robert's second issue of concern was making sure that all proposed facilities located within SD5 are principally for the benefit and use of residents and workers within SD5. He said that his proposed language is consistent with what most people think and that it is already in the operating principles for the RCC. He said that he has not seen that language in the MOU. He acknowledged that the County Attorney thinks that the language might already be in there, but Robert wanted to see where it is located within the MOU.

May 11, 2009 Program Policy Committee Meeting

Page 2

Robert's final issue of concern was governance reform, an issue that came out of the Governance Review Panel (GRP) discussions five years ago. One reform proposed by the GRP was the use of on-line e-mail ballots. He stated that he is aware that the RCC is moving positively in that direction, and that he thought that it was a great move. He said that he would not dispute the one person, one vote issue and that he understood the rationale behind it – that it is based on the County's advice. He did, however, mention that another material change, regarding district seats, was unanimously adopted by the GRP, and that there are people who have opposed that recommendation since it was adopted. He stated that people view it as a baseline democratic reform to help ensure broad-based representation on the Board. He further stated that he recognizes that district seats are not a panacea or a perfect way to ensure that broad-based representation is given on any board, because there is no perfect way to do that unless the RCC moves to a totally different appointment model – a change he states that he opposed out of a desire to speed revisions to permit a new voting process. Robert stated his view that district seats are the best model to ensure broad-based representation, and that the goal in appointing the Board should be to ensure that the board selected is representative of wide cross-sections of the community, so that the advice given to the Board of Supervisors comes from a broad-based perspective. He stated that it would help to ensure community buy-in for Board decisions that impact areas close to the Board members.

In response to a question from Bill P. regarding RCC programming involving trips for seniors outside the district and how Robert's proposed wording might eliminate those programs, Robert responded that his plan would not eliminate those types of programming. He said that he thinks that taking trips to established facilities is a great thing, but that his issue revolves around partnering with organizations outside the district to help to build facilities outside of the district or to construct programs that are operating outside of the district. Bill P. stated that he objects to excluding people from other parts of the County from participating even though there is a distinction in the fees charged. Beyond that distinction, the focus is on SD5 residents. Bill P. expressed that in Robert's written comments, the language seemed to exclude such activities.

Leila commented that County Attorney, Mike Long, suggested that in Section 3(G), Disbursement of Funds, the phrase "primarily for Small District 5" can be added immediately after "...undertaken jointly with other community organizations..." which would reinforce the intent of the language Robert recommended. Leila stated that the County Attorney cautioned against becoming too restrictive about expenditures or the potential for the kinds of activities that might occur outside SD5 and for non-residents of SD5. John commented that the benefits of the programs are really for the residents of SD5; however, Leila stated that programming is not geared just for residents of SD5, but also for employees of SD5 businesses. She said that is why the language should state "for Small District 5 or Small District 5 constituents," as opposed to exclusively "for Small District 5 residents."

In response to a question from Bill P. in reference to where that language would be inserted, Leila stated that it would be inserted into Section 3(G) at the top of page 5 of the draft MOU revisions. (See attached MOU draft as amended.) Leila stated that it was the County Attorney's suggestion that if the emphasis for both the capital and the programming expenditures be primarily for Small District 5, you could say "primarily for Small District 5" or "primarily for Small District 5 constituents" right after the end of the parenthesis on the outside. The County Attorney suggested that a second sentence could be made if it was felt that the sentence is too long. Robert suggested that they needed to ensure that it was not just being implied with respect to potential joint activities but for all activities. He also said that the language should state "primarily for the benefit and use..."

Leila stated that "the Reston Community Center" should be deleted from the following sentence in Section 3(G): "...maintenance or operation of the Reston Community Center(s) all the RCC..." So the sentence should read: "...maintenance or operation of RCC facilities within Small District 5." Leila stated that the County Attorney said that legally, there is no potential for building or creating capital

May 11, 2009 Program Policy Committee Meeting

Page 3

improvements outside Small District 5. Leila stated that there are some 65 e-mails that have the same two items of concern. Leila created a distribution list with all of the e-mail addresses, which will be used to send out the results of what the deliberations are from the evening's meeting. She said that if anyone responds in aggregate, she will respond in aggregate. Robert stated that he, too, will send the results out to his contacts.

Bill P. suggested that in reference to managing the length of sentences, in Section 3(G), top of page 5, prior to the sentence beginning with "Petty cash," insert "the RCC shall expend funds primarily" or "RCC funds shall be expended primarily for the benefit and use of constituents of SD5." Leila suggested using "Small District 5 funds" to be consistent. Leila also suggested using "for the benefit of" as opposed to saying "benefit and use..." Robert interjected that the reason is that funds are being spent for either programs or facilities. He said they would not use the funds but they would use what is offered by the funds. The sentence was further revised to "Small District 5 funds shall be expended primarily for the benefit and/or use of constituents of Small District 5."

Colin asked Leila to address the two-thirds requirement for capital expansions. Leila stated that the County Attorney stated that it should remain in the By-Laws. All of the similar voting protocols reside in the Board's By-Laws, and for the sake of consistency, the voting requirements other than simple majority vote should live in the same document. Robert disagreed but accepted the point.

Colin asked that the district seats be addressed. He referred to a memo received from the County Attorney in response to the possibility of adding district seats. The memo was read into the record (see attached.) Colin pointed out several points in the memo, the first being that if divisions are made by affinity groups or recreational affiliation, where would it stop? Colin stated that there was a motion to establish districts in 2005 before the Board and the motion failed on a vote of 5 to 4. Beverly explained that the opposition to having districts was that if there is no issue on the table, there is a lot of difficulty in persuading people to run for a board seat. She added that the Board represents all of Reston, not just specific sections. She said that the program offerings are for the entire community. She made the point that at the last preference poll, people ran at the very last minute because there was a lack of interest in serving. She pointed out that there are many people who are not aware of what takes place at the RCC and many who do not know that they are paying the SD5 tax. Beverly expressed that she did not see how a person representing a specific district would have a different goal from someone who is at-large.

In response to Beverly's comment, Robert stated that he felt that Beverly was on point when she stated that it is difficult to find people to serve on boards, and that the statement is true whether there are district seats or not. He said that whether a person is an at-large person or a district seat person will not matter when it comes to day-to-day management. He said that where it becomes relevant is when the Board considers expanding or contracting the capital footprint. He stated that it would cause neighborhood issues to arise. Whether a district or at-large, serving as a board member still requires that the person take an oath to serve the betterment of the RCC; therefore, the fact that a person puts on a hat representing district or at-large seating does not mean that a person cannot, does not, or should not have a broader fiduciary duty to the entire community. He said that when there is talk about expanding the capital footprint, district seats maximize the likelihood that things that impact those particular neighborhood interests will be placed on the table in advance.

Robert also pointed out that district seats neutralizes the arguments that any could claim that they were blindsided by any issues that may arise that would impact that district representative's area. Robert's third point in reference to district seats is that when programming decisions are made, they will be made with demographic differences between districts in mind. He said that having district seats gives the best democratic way of helping to ensure that the Board is representative of the broad diversity within the

May 11, 2009 Program Policy Committee Meeting

Page 4

community so that when programming decisions are made, all of that is taken into account. District seats increase the chance of getting all cross-sections of the community.

Robert commented that the County Attorney's advice is not legal advice, but political advice, and that the decision is a political and not a legal decision. He said that the only legal argument made in the memo is that if RA districts are used, some SD5 residents may be overlooked who are not on property subject to the RA covenants. Robert pointed out that the proposal is that using the RA districts as a baseline, Town Center plus the four RA districts would create five districts. He said there are two or three neighborhoods in SD5 that are not in RA. Leila stated that the boundaries do not overlap. She said that they are close but not precise. She stated that to adopt a change to districts at this point would put a snag in the timeline in gearing up for the 2009 preference poll and would prevent the Board from being able to institute a broader enfranchisement by ease of access for participants. Leila said that she had received several e-mails from people who voiced their dislike of the idea of districts.

Leila pointed out that the other issue from the perspective of equity in terms of representation is that there are some geographic areas within Reston with a predominantly greater proportion of commercial property in terms of a ratio to residential property. She said that if the goal is to try to create a geographic representation of people's interests when it comes to capital projects and facility issues, there are more safeguards in those processes that would assure that the directly affected community is heard, and that those not directly affected are also heard. She said that the idea that the districts are required to assure that is moot by virtue of all the legal impediments to expansion or capital projects being undertaken without public hearings, public comment, and community participation. Robert stated that to the extent that debt is not involved, there is not that kind of check. Leila responded that for capital projects that extend the footprint of RCC, the By-Laws require notice to the public and the public's participation. Robert stated that district seats will give a very solid defense to that kind of argument because someone from that neighborhood would have a voice at the table at the start of the process.

Robert commented that in terms of demographics, the Town Center is disproportionately commercial, not residential. He said that the Town Center's population did not compare to the four RA districts (plus outlying areas in those districts) back when the idea was first considered. He further stated that it has been squared up with the addition of Mid Town residences. Reston Town Center now has approximately 5,000 residential units, which is close to the number in an RA district, because RA's four districts represent approximately 20,000 units. So, Robert feels that a Town Center district seating is already close from a residential units standpoint. Robert further stated that the GRP did not just compare resident numbers. He said that when the GRP looked at district seats, it was a compromise to the idea of having business seats on the RCC Board. He said that there was significant opposition to business seats from the GRP. The GRP gravitated to the idea because Town Center – which would become its own district – would give a voice to the business community. He stated that it is empowering for the Board to lean towards district seats.

In response to Robert's comments, Beverly made a point that voter participation in the preference poll in regards to the business community is extremely low. She stated that the RCC always conducts public hearings and adheres to the Freedom of Information Act. Everything that is done at the RCC is public record and is available to everyone. The community is invited to sit on any committee of the Board as a non-voting member and in that capacity can find out everything that is taking place within the RCC. Beverly pointed out that no one shows up at the meetings outside of Board members and staff, but she mentioned that people are now showing up to speak on the issues being presented because there is disagreement about them.

In response to Beverly's question regarding whether or not another district would be created if rail is approved, Robert stated that her points were legitimate, but that none of her arguments defeat the argument of district seats.

Robert addressed comments regarding attracting people to run for the preference poll. He stated that if

May 11, 2009 Program Policy Committee Meeting

Page 5

there were district seats, it would more than likely motivate more people to get involved. He said that it could be more intimidating to run at-large in a community of 65,000 people as opposed to their districts because they know people in their own neighborhoods. Beverly stated that if a person ran and was able to get all 5,000 people in their district to vote for them, there would be more votes for that person than for the at-large candidates. Robert stated that with on-line voting, the RCC would have greater visibility, which is consistent with what the GRB discussed. He said that the idea of running for seats on a board is an intimidating process for a lot of people and that that the more local it is made, the better the chance that people will run.

Leila pointed out to Robert that he was well over the three minutes allotted to speakers. Colin stated for the record that Robert was granted dispensation to extend his remarks.

Finally, Robert commented that district seats have a mollifying effect on preventing a single-issue group from taking control of any board, and that it was not a good thing for the Reston Community Center to have a process that could be overtaken by any group. He said to dilute that influence, the franchise could be expanded. He feels that on-line balloting will take care of that. He said that district seats broken down geographically minimize the chances of a minority viewpoint taking over the board. District seats help to provide a buffer against such a takeover.

Colin opened the floor to the rest of the committee for comment. Bill B. stated that the best example of district seats not being the answer to increase the number and interest of potential candidates is what happened during the most recent RA election, where there was no opposition. Colin pointed out that there was one at-large seat, which also had no opposition. John commented that whether there are district seats or not, it is about representing the community and about the process and how the people are made aware of it. He said district seats are just one option out of many on how to make the process better. Bill P. stated that he is not persuaded to lean towards district seats. He pointed out that both he and Robert disagreed on the issue before. He said at the time, the disparity regarding the size of perspective districts was a significant issue. The change in the demographics of Town Center might have reduced that problem, but there were differences among the other districts as well. Bill P. stated that an investigation of Town Center residential numbers would need to take place and the decision should be made based on a factual basis rather than just assuming the numbers have increased to an equivalent level. He said that he was not persuaded that sectors of the RCC have different interests or should have representatives to speak for different interests, because the Board is there to represent the community as a whole. The idea that having district representatives will solve the problem of people being surprised is not supported by the fact that those people objecting to the recreation facility had RA representatives at a district level and yet complained that they were surprised.

Bill P. expressed that the other issue he had before, but might be solved by moving to a new voting system, is that there would be a situation where a dozen people vote in one district and they elect someone because of a lack of participation. The issue would be that an already small group of voters would be further divided into an even smaller group and you would then end up with potentially very unrepresentative people. The buffer against that now is that you can elect only three people each year. Bill P. went on to say that there is not enough time to implement that dramatic a change and still get the MOU modified for the new voting system. He said that he would not support making the change to districts because of those reasons.

Carol Ann stated that the members of the Board hopefully have an overall vision or are working on an overall vision for the RCC role but also have an awareness of the total Reston community and the needs of that community. If the Board is open to listening and working with the total community on specific issues like the new recreational facility, districting could confine thinking to what is taking place in that particular area. Carol Ann stated that hopefully, the mindset is that "we" are all in this together. She said that the Board might be willing to revisit the issue, but should not proceed with districts at this time.

May 11, 2009 Program Policy Committee Meeting

Page 6

Colin commented that he agreed with Robert in that district seats would not preclude Board members from thinking about all of Reston. People on the RA Board have to have a view of the larger community. He said anybody that is inspired to serve their community is very likely to be animated by concern for the larger community, and the fact that RA has district seats did not stop people from feeling blindsided about the proposed recreational center even though RA is also participating in the process. People tend to become engaged with these processes when they perceive that there is going to be a change that impacts them. Colin stated that while it is the responsibility of all community organizations to make a better effort to engage the community earlier in the process, it is also the responsibility of the community to pay attention to the things that are happening around them.

Colin stated that he agrees that the Board is not in a position to implement district seats in this MOU revision, nor will there be enough time to implement those changes in time for the preference poll in the fall. He did say that he felt that it was an issue that should be further studied, with a possible vote in time for the 2010 preference poll.

The meeting switched gears to address/clarify other revisions to the MOU. John wanted clarification concerning old language versus new language on page 4, Section 3(F), Income Management. He questioned why, if there is no material difference, the language is being changed. Leila explained that the old language suggested that the only time the BOS would change the amount of the levy would be at the recommendation of the BOG, and the legal situation is that the BOS may change the tax rate independently of the BOG. The suggested language from the County Attorney's office provides both for the BOG suggesting or recommending a change to the tax rate, which requires a two-thirds vote per the By-Laws, and acknowledges that the BOS ultimately establishes the rate of the tax on SD5.

In response to a question from John, Leila stated that the old language created the impression that the change would be "...recommended by the governing board and shall be subject to approval by the BOS..." implying that the rate would change only at the behest of the Board of Governors. It does not make clear that the BOS establishes the tax. The County Attorney felt that the language could mislead someone who may want the BOS to act on the tax irrespective of the BOG. In the past, the BOS has lowered the tax rate without a motion or request or a BOG recommendation to do so.

In response to another question from John, Leila confirmed that it can be initiated by the BOG but that the power to adjust and/or do otherwise with the tax itself, is vested in the BOS. She further stated that the BOG has the ability to recommend the tax rate and adjustment to it either up or down subject to the By-Laws. If the BOG determines that the taxes should be raised/lowered and two-thirds of the Board agree to it, it can then be recommended to the BOS; however, the legal authority to levy the tax on SD5, still rests with the BOS and they may make whatever adjustment at any time with or without BOG recommendation.

Marcia McDevitt stated that in 1975, she sat on the committee that designed the RCC. She said that there is nothing in the law states the levy has to be used for the RCC, unlike the McLean Community Center. Leila pointed out that the MOU establishes the purposes of the funds. There was a brief discussion on whether or not the County could access the funds. Bill P. stated that the BOS has the sole legal authority to change the tax with or without a recommendation from the BOG and that they will not relinquish that right.

In response to a question from John, Leila stated that the last discussion of revisions to the MOU by the Board that took place regarding per-household versus per-person over 18 years of age residing in the district, was that per-household was the approach that should be taken.

MOTION: Beverly Cosham moved that the Program Policy Committee forward the final revisions to the MOU, as amended, to the full Board for approval. Bill Bouie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Colin reminded everyone that the full Board has to approve the changes to the MOU.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 22, 2009
TO: RCC Board of Governors
FROM: Cathy Vivona, Chair
Finance Committee

SUBJECT: May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

The Finance Committee met on Monday, May 18, 2009. Present were:

- Cathy Vivona, Chair
- Carol Ann Bradley, Board Chair
- Bill Bouie
- Bill Penniman, Vice Chair
- Colin Mills (attending, not a committee member)

John Gasson was absent and excused.

Attending from the RCC staff was:

- Leila Gordon, RCC Executive Director
- BeBe Nguyen, Director of Communications
- Renata Wojcicki, Finance Director

Robin Smyers, Reston Association President, was also present.

The Finance Committee Chair officially called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

Cathy welcomed the Small District 5 (SD5) residents in attendance and introduced herself and the other present RCC Board members and staff. Cathy gave a brief explanation of the three budgets that the Board tracks. She said that tonight we will address the monthly report as well as guidelines for the 2011 budget process. She reminded residents that the current Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 budget will end on June 30, the FY 2010 budget will begin on July 1, and RCC is preparing a presentation to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors for the FY 2011 budget.

Fund Statement Report:

Renata noted that she distributed the RCC Fund Statement, which reflects the most current Third Quarter changes and corresponding adjustment to Fund 111. A funding decrease of \$7,590 reflects the January 2 furlough day reduction of the budget. An increase of \$557,057 to FY 2008 expenditures reflects capital project costs for RCC renovations. This amount is now included in the ending balance for FY 2008 instead of in FY 2009 Capital Projects. Overall, there is no change to the fund balance, with the exception of the decrease in Personnel Services, which in effect, resulted in an increase to the fund

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 2

balance by \$7,590.

Renata reported that on April 6, 2009, the RCC Board established an Economic and Program Contingency Reserve Fund. This new reserve fund is included in the Fund Statement as an additional line item. The new reserve amount for Capital Projects is \$3 million.

April Month-to-Date 2009 Revenue Review:

Renata briefly reviewed RCC financial activities that occurred through the end of April. In terms of tax revenue, RCC is at 99.84% of total collections and is expected to meet the projections by the end of the fiscal year.

Bill P. commented that the footnotes in the monthly financial report are very helpful.

Renata continued her review with personnel expenses which she said are well below the budget at 67.47%. She reiterated to the committee that personnel expenses are always one payroll behind, which equates to approximately \$200,000. At this time, personnel expenses should be at 83% of the budget. RCC expects to fill remaining staff vacancies in the coming months.

Renata next reviewed operational expenses, noting that there is a significant remaining balance and she anticipates some savings at the end of the fiscal year. RCC staff has been reevaluating procurement commitments. Some reservations have been closed already and some requirement amounts have been increased. The remaining encumbrance funds will be expended by the end of the fiscal year. At this point, the total operational expenses are at approximately 8% below the budget allocation.

In reference to capital projects, Renata explained that the total budget was reduced by the amount of expense accrual related to two FY 2008 invoices totaling \$557,057, as previously mentioned when she reviewed the adjustment that was made to the Fund Statement for FY 2008. Although this amount does not affect the overall fund balance, it does affect the FY 2009 budget. All the capital projects that commenced last year are now completed. There are some final invoices that should be coming in shortly and those should be paid by the year end.

In response to a question from Cathy, Leila said there are still a few work orders related to the build-out of the offices for Aquatics and General Programs but those should be completed before the end of the fiscal year. Renata noted that there are several projects planned for FY 2010 and FY 2011 but they have not yet been started. Per the Committee's request, included in the monthly financial report is a list of the RCC Hunters Woods and Lake Anne Priority 1 projects and their associated amount advertised at the public hearing for programs and budget two years ago and the subsequently revised amounts. The total original budgeted amount for these projects was \$282,000. The budgeted amounts for several projects will be addressed by the RCC Building Committee and Board.

Replying to questions from Bill B., Renata said the HVAC upgrade project should be closed before the end of the fiscal year. Leila noted that this close-out should include the contingency. There is a small punch list of items related to the HVAC upgrade and natatorium that is anticipated to be finished before the end of fiscal year.

Fiscal Year 2011 Budget:

Cathy presented recommendations to the RCC staff as follows:

- Prepare the FY 2011 budget with sufficient funding in personnel to support planned programs, services and facility requirements;

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report
Page 3

- Provide continuity of all current RCC programs as well as the FY 2010 pilot programs, and sustain them through FY 2011; and
- Prepare the operating expenditures to support the RCC programs, facilities, and services while retaining a reduction in each unit of 5% of the current FY 2009 and FY 2010 budgets. This reflects the Fairfax County's information regarding the 8% reduction in tax assessments anticipated for FY 2010.

It was the consensus of the committee that these recommendations be accepted and provided to staff.

Public Comment Regarding the Proposed Indoor Recreation Facility at Brown's Chapel Park:

Cathy recited the rules for public testimony.

Leila explained that the Reston Association (RA)/RCC Joint Task Force will receive the final report from the consultant firm, Brailsford & Dunlavey (B&D), on June 1, at 6:30 p.m. at RCC Hunters Woods. The report will assess community needs and gauge whether Reston could support additional indoor recreational space. On June 2, the B&D report will be posted on the Web sites of the RA (www.reston.org) and RCC (www.restoncommunitycenter.com). In the interest of accommodating as many people who wanted to speak about the new facility as possible, the RCC Board decided to hold its Finance Committee meeting at RCC Lake Anne this evening to hear comments from attendees. This is one of several meetings that will occur between now and the September decision deadline for the RCC Board's budget process and the November decision deadline for the RA Board of Directors' budget process. There will be many other opportunities for people to speak and provide input. This will not be the only opportunity for people to register their concerns and opinions.

In response to a question from the audience, Leila stated that the Task Force members were drawn from the RA and RCC Boards.

Cathy called the first listed speaker.

Michael Rierson, President of the Newport Shores Cluster Association, 1464 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, read his statement in opposition to the RCC/RA Brown's Chapel Park Recreation Area redevelopment proposal. His statement is attached.

Seldon Kruger, 11571 Hemingway Drive, Reston, Virginia 20194, spoke in opposition to the proposal. His main concerns were the considerable financial burden that will be placed on Small District 5 (SD5) businesses and residences for a recreation facility that will be primarily used by people outside of Reston and the facility will cause a detrimental impact on the quality of life in Reston due to the destruction of open space. The entire project is fiscally and environmentally unsound. Mr. Kruger was dismayed that the RCC and RA invested money to plan a project that was intended initially to address the construction of eight tennis courts.

Elizabeth Lannon, 2002 Chadds Ford Drive, Reston, Virginia 20191, expressed opposition to the facility because it is unnecessary and costly. People who live in SD5 pay an additional tax based on their property tax assessment. For example, the owner of a SD5 property valued at \$500,000 pays approximately \$250 a year in additional property taxes. A covered swimming pool in the Ridge Heights neighborhood of South Reston was removed because it was underutilized by Reston residents although it was used by many non-Reston swim teams which in effect, caused problems in the neighborhood. Indoor tennis and racquetball facilities near Sunset Hills Road were closed due to underutilization. Ms. Lannon recommended that as a more cost-effective alternative to the proposal, an indoor pool be built at South Lakes High School and the school's five tennis courts be covered with a bubble or a more

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 4

permanent structure. She also recommended that these public meetings be communicated more effectively since local newspapers are no longer delivered to homes in Reston and that the RA Web site be improved to make it more easily navigatable.

Michael Kogan, 1581 Regatta Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, aligned himself with the statement of Mr. Rierson.

Maureen Nugent, 1584 Regatta Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, said she also supported the statement of Mr. Rierson.

Amy Justice, Co-Chair of the Coalition to Save Brown's Chapel, 1459 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, read her statement in opposition to the proposed recreation center. Her statement is attached.

Leslie Trenta, 11583 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, read her statement in opposition to the proposal. Her statement is attached.

Kim Kercher, 1569 Old Eaton Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, indicated her opposition to the plan because it will destroy a park that is enjoyed by her children.

Peter Greenberg, 1451 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, read a list of five financial-related questions and requested that the committee respond to them in a timely manner. The list is attached.

Marie Huhtala, 12228 Quorn Lane, Reston, Virginia 20191, spoke in opposition to the proposal due to concerns about the loss of parkland and open space and adverse impacts on the character of the community. Brown's Chapel Park is located on common land and does not belong to the RCC or RA but to the people of Reston and the RCC and RA do not have the right to deed the land to Fairfax County. SD5 residents already pay taxes to support the County recreation and community centers and the RCC and they are now being asked to pay more taxes to support a facility that will be available to everyone.

Bruce "Chip" George, 1431 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, expressed opposition to the proposal because it is inefficient and requires that all Reston residents pay 100% of the cost to build the facility when 72% of the users will be non-residents. The facility is also projected to operate at a loss of \$1 million per year and therefore, should not be considered. The process the RCC and RA have gone through to gather information has been ineffective. Mr. George said he was astounded to learn that the facility already has a projected name. He implored the RCC and RA to re-examine the proposal and needs assessment closely and develop a better solution.

Charlene Schneider, 11955 Grey Squirrel Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, strongly objected to the project because it is preposterous, unjustifiable, and fiscally irresponsible and it will have an adverse impact on the environment and remove precious green space that cannot be replaced. The plan is also incompatible with the emphasis on green space, parks, walking trails, recreational fields, and outdoor pools in Reston. The Autumnwood swimming pool closes mid-August every year due to a lack of users and staff. The covered pool in Ridge Heights closed also due to a lack of users.

Erika Williams, 1394 Old Quincy Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, expressed concerns that the increased traffic resulting from the new facility will not be adequately addressed and much-needed pathways will be removed. The facility is also unnecessary since there are plenty of indoor pools in the County, such as Spring Hill RECenter, Oak Marr RECenter, Herndon Community Center, Reston YMCA, and RCC Hunters Woods.

Michelle Moyer, Secretary of the Reston Masters Swim Team (RMST) Board, 2077 Bingham Court, Reston, Virginia 20191, spoke in support of the proposed facility because it will be able to efficiently accommodate multiple swim groups at a time, maintain a sense of community, and provide much-

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 5

needed amenities to the residents. The Ridge Heights pool was fully used by RMST and U.S. Masters Swimming (USMS) teams, helped keep children involved in an active sport to build their health, and supported the well-being of the community.

Caroline Dibbs, 1648 Waters Edge Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, aligned herself with the comments of the previous speakers in opposition to the proposal. She recognized the need for a year-round indoor swim facility by use of the USMS teams, but she questioned how this plan escalated into such an enormous and expensive facility when only a single indoor tennis facility was initially considered. Ms. Dibbs said she was satisfied with swimming laps in the Reston YMCA pool. She demanded to know who was responsible for initiating the feasibility study. There has also been a lack of community involvement in this process.

Rich Gunther, 11543 Olde Tiverton Circle, #20, Reston, Virginia 20194, indicated his opposition to the facility because the residents did not want it and therefore, it should not be considered any further. He said that if this facility is approved, some residents will take legal action to get it shut down.

Kim Giebel, representing the Great Falls Crossing Community Association, 1339 Dasher Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, noted that many of the meeting attendees resided in neighborhoods surrounding the park. E-mail campaigns were started in her community to keep the residents informed about the proposal. She expressed concern that additional traffic resulting from the facility will not be accommodated sufficiently. Ms. Giebel suggested that the underutilized Reston Community Association facility in the south portion of Reston be considered for upgrade into this high-tech facility. She also supported Ms. Lannon's recommendation to construct an indoor pool at South Lakes High School and cover the school's five tennis courts. She further suggested consideration of other vacant buildings in Reston, adequate assessment of the projected traffic, and improvement of the communication method to all the neighborhoods that will be affected by this project.

Candice Black, 1617 Autumnwood Drive, Reston, Virginia 20194, said the RCC and RA failed to maintain communication with the community and provide substantial research to support the proposal. The residents will continue to attend the meetings and present more questions. Ms. Black also expressed opposition to the project because it will remove the park's attractive landscape and destroy its wildlife habitat.

Angela Loving, 1243 Lamplighter Way, Reston, Virginia 20194, encouraged members of the audience who do not get an opportunity to speak to attend the future meetings and continue to provide input to the RA and RCC. She spoke in opposition to the proposal due to concerns about the loss of open space, trees, walkways, and paths. Reston does need a newer tennis and swim facility and if this project is approved it should support principles of smart growth and fiscal responsibility. Ms. Loving suggested that this facility be located on an RV storage lot or other type of property that is already paved and is not in a quiet residential neighborhood.

Mike Maher, 11597 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, said he also opposed the proposal because the park should be preserved in its natural state.

Dean Lopez, 1390 Old Quincy Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, said that since he had only learned about this project last week, he has not had a chance to review the relevant information on the RA and RCC Web sites. Although he shared many of the comments of the previous speakers, he desired to learn more about the project and evaluate it objectively. The RA and RCC have failed to effectively

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 6

communicate to, and involve, the community at-large in discussions of this project. Mr. Lopez strongly recommended that going forward, a more methodical and thoughtful public outreach process be deployed to keep the community well informed of the plans and rationale behind this project. Traffic is a major issue, especially since the planned Metro station in Reston will significantly increase traffic in the area and 72% of the facility users will be traveling from outside the community.

Philip Rainwater, 11184 Longwood Grove Drive, Reston, Virginia 20194, noted that this is his first time attending a meeting to provide input on the proposal since he first learned about it only a few days ago. He presented the following questions for consideration by the RA and RCC Boards:

- 1) What is the origin of this concept? By whom and to what procedure did this concept originate, and how did it reach this point in the process?
- 2) Have other sites in Burke, Westfields, Chantilly, and Annandale been considered for this project, where perhaps there are more appropriate demographics, user profiles, and age categories?
- 3) Why is this project not being considered at a school location where there are paved grounds and traffic solutions already in place?

Mr. Rainwater expressed opposition to the proposal because it will destroy the open space, playing fields, and other facilities at Brown's Chapel Park. A critical assessment of other locations is required before this project is to go forward.

Mike Louko, 2066 Beacon Heights Drive, Reston, Virginia 20191, spoke in opposition to the proposal. His main concerns were the needs to preserve green space, parkland, and ball fields in Reston for members of the community to enjoy; provide information to everyone; and sustain the quality of life for the children of Reston. Mr. Louko is not against swimming or tennis, but he is against taking existing facilities that children enjoy and converting them into a different use. There are plenty of other properties that can be considered for this proposal. The RCC and RA must listen to the people of Reston and thoroughly understand their backgrounds and needs. Mr. Louko expressed appreciation to the RA and RCC for their work, but said they need to perform a better job of providing more information and listening to the voices of the people.

Jane Wong, 11411 Hollow Timber Way, Reston, Virginia 20194, said she agreed with the remarks of Ms. Huhtala regarding the funding of this facility. Reston residents paid for a bond to fund the RCC even though the entire County, and not they, owns the building. Not only do Reston residents pay annually for the continued maintenance of the RCC, they also pay for the continued maintenance of the other County facilities although County residents do not support the RCC in return.

Lillian Justice, 11702 Indian Ridge Road, Reston, Virginia 20191, noted that she pays over \$400 annually in SD5 taxes and she supports the RCC. She did not believe that this project met the high standard of evaluation that other Reston projects have undertaken.

Logan Kruse, 11405 Northwind Court, Reston, Virginia 20194, strongly objected to the proposed recreation facility because it will destroy the park, woods, and wildlife habitat; cause excessive noise; increase traffic; and harm the character of the community. As a member of a swim team, she and her teammates are allowed to share the use of the Lake Newport Olympic Pool. If this facility is approved, she will refuse to visit it.

Mikhail Belyavsky, 1571 Old Eaton Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, said anyone in the County is welcomed to enjoy Brown's Chapel Park. In addition to a need for a year-round swimming facility, there is also a need for year-round open space, variety of recreational opportunities, and beautiful parks. He suggested that a commercially-zoned property be considered for the new facility. Although he supports swim teams, this may not be the best location or time to address their needs.

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 7

Kristina Alcorn, 11716 Great Owl Circle, Reston, Virginia 20194, noted that she was speaking on behalf of the Reston Little League since her son plays baseball at Brown's Chapel Park. She strongly opposed the project due to the loss of three ball fields.

Emily McKittrick, 1117 Northwind Drive, Reston, Virginia 20194, read her statement in opposition to the proposal. Her statement is attached.

William Smith, 11817 Briar Mill Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, asked if over \$100,000 has been spent so far on this project. Leila replied that this figure is inaccurate and the actual cost will be presented to the public at the June 1st meeting.

Morgan Giebel, 1339 Dasher Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, expressed opposition to the proposal because it will destroy the park and the animals' habitat.

Kathy Kaplan, 11223 Leatherwood Drive, Reston, Virginia 20191, voiced objection to the construction of the below-ground parking garage because it will remove the Freedom Grove 9/11 memorial at the park.

Gene Mechling, 11423 Summer House Court, Reston, Virginia 20194, expressed concerns that the facility will have adverse impacts on the adjacent property values, traffic, and paths. Residents were not consulted on this proposal.

Ryan Greenberg, 1451 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, asked if the park, instead of the proposed recreation center, could be named after Robert E. Simon, founder of Reston.

Jane Anthony, 2055 Wethersfield Court, Reston, Virginia 20191, read her statement in support for the new facility. Her statement is attached.

Charlene Celano, 11955 Grey Squirrel Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Her main concerns were the lack of community need for a facility of this scale and premature naming of the building. Ms. Celano recognized that swim teams needed more places to practice. Therefore, she asked if it would be possible to convert an underutilized pool in Reston into an indoor facility, such as the pool in the Tall Oaks or Shadowood communities.

Richard Chipman, 1571 Harpers Cove Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, said the many people who are opposed to destroying the park may support locating the facility on land that is already paved or utilized for other purposes. He suggested that the RCC and RA create a new approach to accommodate both sides of this issue before proceeding in the process.

Robert Szaro, 11585 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, concurred with the previous speakers who opposed the project. The project will cause a detrimental impact on the environment because it will create impervious surface, destroy open space, and contribute to the global climate change problem.

Mike Hathaway, 1453 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, indicated his opposition to the proposed recreation center because it will be too close to his property, adversely impact the character of the community, and destroy the ball fields and open space. An indoor swimming pool is not a logical tradeoff for the demolition of the park. Mr. Hathaway questioned how the RA's Design Review Board decided that installing lights on ball fields is in violation of the Design Guidelines but constructing a 170,000-square foot permanent building at the park is acceptable.

Heidi Keusenkothen, 10909 Hunt Club Road, Reston, Virginia 20190, voiced objection to the proposal because it will remove the trees and open space at the park. She recommended that the recreation

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 8

center be located in an underutilized space at the Tall Oaks Shopping Center and enhanced to make it aesthetically pleasing.

Lisa Schneider, 11955 Grey Squirrel Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, strongly objected to the facility because it will ruin the park, destroy the open and green space, and adversely impact the quality of air.

Ron Walker, 1402 Hemingway Court, Reston, Virginia 20194, asked how many members of the RCC Board lived in SD5. Leila responded that all the RCC Board members lived in SD5.

Don Taylor, 1569 Brass Lantern Way, Reston, Virginia 20194, asked how much has been spent on this project to date. Leila replied that approximately \$92,000 has been paid on this project thus far.

Responding to more questions from Mr. Taylor, Leila explained that during and following the June 1st meeting, a complete history of the project, an outline of the next steps, a description of the community's role in the process, and the community engagement plan to receive input from the RA membership and SD5 constituents will be presented to the public. A bond referendum will be required if capital funds are expended to support this project.

In response to additional questions from Mr. Taylor, Robin Smyers, President of the RA Board of Directors, said the location of this facility has yet to be determined. The need for a referendum of the RA membership is contingent on the location. If RA sought to transfer its land to Fairfax County for the construction of a recreation center, it is unknown at this time whether a referendum will be required. Ms. Smyers encouraged Mr. Taylor to attend the June 1st meeting so he can learn helpful information about the project and get his questions answered. Mr. Taylor said he was uncertain whether this will be the case since the RA has failed to keep the public informed effectively. Ms. Smyers assured him that the RA will work diligently to ensure that the public is kept well informed. Mr. Taylor expressed appreciation to Ms. Smyers for her time and effort.

Davood Sedaghatfar, 1577 Inlet Court, Reston, Virginia 20190, requested that the information that will be presented at the June 1st be written clearly and avoid jargon and legalese so that people can easily understand the content.

Jack Trenta, 11583 Lake Newport Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, asked where the June 1st meeting will be held. Leila said the meeting will be held at RCC Hunters Woods in a larger room, with an occupancy capacity of 70 people. (*Note: the meeting location was subsequently changed to the Community Room, with an occupancy capacity of 400 people*). The public hearing on the RCC programs and budget for FY 2011 will be held on June 15, at 7p.m., in the Community Room at RCC Hunters Woods. Members of the public are invited to provide comments regarding the proposed facility at this hearing. Both meetings will be broadcast on Comcast Channel 28.

Replying to another question from Mr. Trenta, Leila noted that at the RCC Board of Governors' meeting on June 1, at 8 p.m., in the RCC Hunters Woods Community Room (following the Joint RA/RCC Board meeting at 6:30 p.m., to receive the final report from B&D), members of the audience will be given the opportunity to provide comments.

Some members of the audience suggested that the RCC and RA schedule future public meetings in a gymnasium, cafeteria, or auditorium at a Reston school to accommodate the expected large number of attendees.

Another suggestion was to mail notices, send e-mail notifications, and use computerized telephones to

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 9

call every household in Reston to inform them of upcoming public meetings. Joan Smith, 11817 Briar Mill Lane, Reston, Virginia 20194, recommended that future public meetings be held in a bigger building, like the Sheraton Reston Hotel, that regularly holds training sessions and conventions and can accommodate all attendees. Reston residents should be allowed to decide whether to move forward in this effort and spend more of the tax revenues of SD5.

Mary Buff, 1664 Waters Edge Lane, Reston, Virginia 20190, voiced her concerns about the following: 6 p.m. is too early to begin a meeting due to people's commute time from work, the lack of air conditioning in the building, the RCC's decision to meet in a smaller room even though a bigger room was available, and the absence of a microphone for speakers. She also commented on the hypocrisy demonstrated by the RA and RCC in this process. Ms. Buff questioned how the RA can prohibit the removal of a tree more than six inches in diameter and can yet support a plan to remove an entire park.

Kevin Murphy, 1459 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, commented that the RCC and RA have not been willing to listen to the community although they are willing to listen to the consultant firm. He claimed that the draft feasibility study does not support the plan and asked if the SD5 taxpayers can be refunded the money spent on the B&D report because it has been a waste of their money and time.

In response to a question from an unidentified male member of the audience, Leila stated that the suggestions provided this evening on how to improve communications will be taken and further communication undertaken as efficiently and effectively as possible. The next part of this process is to hold community engagement meetings to determine whether to continue this effort. The unidentified man commented that this process appears to be one-sided since the consultant firm controls how the money is being spent. He said members of the community need to be able to provide input on the allocation of funds in this process, especially considering the amount of money they will be expected to pay to fund this facility.

Replying to a question from another unidentified male member of the audience, Leila indicated that there will be a series of meetings and opportunities for members of the community to provide input to the RA and RCC throughout June and via a variety of settings and formats. She encouraged people to send their thoughts, opinions, and feedback to RCC [via rcccontact@fairfaxcounty.gov](mailto:rcccontact@fairfaxcounty.gov), or to RA via Member_Services@reston.org. Following the June 1st meeting, there will be another RA/RCC Joint Task Force meeting in July at the RCC Hunters Woods Community Room, to provide an update on the process thus far.

Another unidentified male member of the audience said he was angered that there is no systematic process to gather input from the community on whether to terminate the process.

Cathy suggested that attendees forward their questions to the RCC contact e-mail at rcccontact@fairfaxcounty.gov.

An unidentified female attendee pointed out that approximately 250 people were in attendance, and she strongly objected to being told that they must return in June and July to express their views. She demanded that the community input provided this evening be a matter of record. Leila assured her that the input has been heard and is a matter of record.

Another unidentified female member of the audience claimed that many of the attendees could not even gain access inside the room in order to hear the speakers although the meeting could be moved to the larger room available next door. She requested each RCC and RA representative who was present to provide their name and title.

Bill P. noted that members of the RCC Board and RA President Robin Smyers were present. Bill P. introduced himself and said he has been a RCC Board member since 2006 and is the current Vice

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 10

Chair of the RCC Finance Committee. The proposal for an indoor recreation center is not final. The concept was to develop a proposal to provide a kind of recreation center that will be very valuable to Reston.

This process is open to public input, and the RCC and RA will continue to listen to the public. No facility will be built without a bond referendum voted on and approved by the SD5 constituents. Money had to be spent to develop the concept. RCC and RA have already received numerous comments from the public.

Leila pointed out to the members of the audience that the proceedings are being recorded and the RCC and RA representatives are listening to all comments and concerns being expressed this evening.

An unidentified female member of the audience claimed that many of the attendees did not know about this meeting until earlier today due to the lack of communication.

An unidentified male attendee strongly recommended that the June 1st meeting be held in a larger facility. Leila replied that she will explore other available meeting facility options to better accommodate a larger audience capacity.

An unidentified female member of the audience pointed out that she and other attendees can volunteer to help with the public relations effort and reserve a bigger meeting location. Leila said she will try to find another location.

Bonnie Haukness, 1476 Waterfront Road, Reston, Virginia 20194, pointed out that she did not receive any notice in the mail about the RA's recent referendum for a new headquarters; however, she received three notices for the 2009 RA Board elections. At least one notice should be sent to all SD5 households informing them about the recreation facility proposal and the public meeting schedule. Ms. Haukness claimed that as of 4 p.m. today, the RA Web site indicated that this meeting started at 7:30 p.m.

An unidentified woman commented that this process will be unfair if the RCC and RA failed to obtain a large enough venue to hold future public meetings and allow all attendees the opportunity to voice their opinion. She suggested that gymnasiums at elementary or high schools be considered. Leila reiterated that she will find a bigger meeting space.

Carol Ann introduced herself and said she is the current RCC Board Chair. She thanked everyone for attending this meeting and assured them that she and the other members of the RCC Board have been listening to all their concerns and suggestions. Last spring, RCC collaborated with the Alliance of Reston Clusters and Homeowners (ARCH) and small focus groups to discuss the concept for a new recreation center. In addition, citizen surveys administered by the RCC in 2007 indicated a need for additional indoor recreation space. Many people are waitlisted for RCC classes, and the RCC has implemented a lottery system as the fairest way to handle registrations. The people of Reston should take this opportunity to provide their points of view and issues. The RCC Board is willing to listen to what the public has to say. This is not a done deal. Additional information will be presented at the June 1st meeting. Leila will continue to respond to e-mails. Updated information will continue to be posted on the RCC Web site. The suggestion for a postcard to be sent to all SD5 addresses may be a more effective communication method since local newspapers are no longer being delivered to SD5 residences. *(A postcard mailing to all SD 5 households has subsequently occurred announcing the two June meetings.)* Public comments received so far have facilitated this process. Carol Ann recognized that all the residents of Reston are committed to their community and the environment. Some people in Reston cannot afford to be a member at the YMCA or Gold's Gym and will, therefore use the new facility so they can have access to recreation. Carol Ann expressed appreciation for everyone's time and effort. As the RCC Board Chair, she will work with members of the public, Leila, and anyone else in order to provide the needed information. Carol Ann noted that she has been writing down all the ideas she has heard this

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 11

evening and reminded the attendees that the proceedings are being recorded.

An unidentified male member of the audience suggested that a link for the Coalition to Save Brown's Chapel Web site (www.savebrownschapel.com) be added to the RCC Web site to encourage visitors to learn about both sides of this issue. Cathy replied that the entire RCC Board will review this suggestion. Ms. Smyers thanked the RCC Board for allowing her to sit at the table this evening as a guest. She introduced herself and said she is the current RA President and the Lake Anne/Tall Oaks District Director. The RA and RCC Boards, through a Joint Task Force, have been working together since early last fall to explore the potential for a jointly supported indoor recreation facility. Ms. Smyers echoed Carol Ann's sentiment that no decisions have been made yet. The RA will hold meetings for its members separately from the RCC meetings to ensure that RA members have every opportunity to learn about this project and provide input. At these meetings, the RA will share the history of this project and the various facilities evaluated over the past 20 years and explain why the tennis courts on Sunset Hills Road were closed, the pool bubble at Ridge Heights was shut down, and why there are no lighted ball fields and similar facilities in Reston. The input people provide will ultimately determine if there will be a new facility and if so, where it will be located, what it will entail, how big it will be, and what types of programs it will offer. If there could have been an indoor pool at South Lakes High School when it was built in 1978-1979, one would have been built there. Ms. Smyers said she is committed to making sure that the children of Reston do not have to travel far early in the morning to use an indoor swim facility, with the community's input and inclusion in this process. As a member and leader of this community, if she is made aware of a need for indoor tennis, swimming, or other recreational facilities, it is important to listen to the input received, evaluate it, and forward it to the RA members for their consideration. Ms. Smyers was a camp counselor at Brown's Chapel Park in the 1980s and there are homes now where she used to take the children out for their camp cookouts. However, she is not against development of houses and other uses in Reston. There should be a balance in the community for uses by residents of all ages, demographics, wants, and needs. This is what Reston was built on. Ms. Smyers encouraged members of the community to stay involved and participate in the process. She is pleased to see so many people attending this meeting. It is acceptable for the members of the community to disagree with the proposal, as long as they are respectful about it, and they share with the RA and RCC their suggestions and ideas and provide the boards with orders on how to proceed in this effort. The opportunity for the community to provide input will be in an open forum, with transparency of information. Ms. Smyers guaranteed that members of the community will have multiple times to be involved in the process. She then polled the audience to find out how many members have signed up on the RA Web site to receive eNotices (a free service offered by the RA to enable subscribers to receive current news and events based on their selected topics of interest). RA will not send people e-mails unless they give their permission to do so. Ms. Smyers strongly encouraged people to visit the eNotices page (click on the [eNotices](#) link located at the top right corner of the RA homepage at <http://www.reston.org>); check the boxes of the categories they are interested in; enter their first and last names and e-mail address; and then click on the "Subscribe Me" link at the bottom of the page. RA is sending e-mail updates on a weekly basis to help keep the recipients informed about their interests.

Mr. Greenberg recommended that the RA establish a separate category of eNotices dedicated entirely to the indoor recreation facility process. He noted that although it is helpful for people to stay informed about general news on the RA, some people may want to initially receive updates focused only on this process and they may later decide to receive eNotices on additional topics as well. Based on his experience attending RCC Board meetings, he commended the members for their work and commitment to the community. However, Mr. Greenberg disagreed wholeheartedly on every level of this project and expressed concern that the RCC and RA will be accused of attempting to hide certain information from the public if they fail to ensure that the people interested in this issue receive all the information they desire.

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 12

Ms. Smyers said she will request RA staff to add a new eNotices category for people to sign up to receive e-mails only on the indoor recreation facility process. (*This has subsequently been accomplished.*) She pointed out to Mr. Greenberg that the eNotices is an excellent tool to update subscribers on important RA information, including the Board of Directors' meetings, various RA activities, and the RA/RCC partnership. Mr. Greenberg replied that his household signed up for all of the categories of eNotices. People, who initially sign up for only the new category, may decide to sign up for others if they are pleased with the service. Mr. Greenberg said he will start attending the RA and RCC meetings and will probably volunteer to serve on a board as a result of this effort.

Ms. Smyers thanked the meeting attendees for their time and indulgence.

An unidentified male member of the audience expressed the need for the RCC and RA to send a postcard to all Reston addresses because he believed that 80% of the residents did not know about this plan.

Mr. Greenberg stressed the importance of the RCC and RA to go over and beyond with the communication from this point forward to avoid accusations of negative actions.

Leila introduced herself and said she is the current Executive Director for the RCC.

Cathy introduced herself and said she is a member of the RCC Board and Chair of the RCC Finance Committee. She noted that there is a lot of information available on the RCC Web site.

Mr. Greenberg pointed out that per a conversation he had with Hunter Mill District Supervisor Catherine Hudgins, she claimed that she was not involved but swore to him transparency in this process. However, the draft B&D report was subsequently removed from the RCC site. Bill P. said Mr. Greenberg should not blame Supervisor Hudgins for the removal of the draft report. Leila concurred and noted that the final study will be posted on the RCC Web site on June 2.

In response to questions from Mr. Greenberg, Leila explained that the final B&D report has not yet been completed and has not been paid for since it has not been delivered.

Bill B. introduced himself and said he is the current Vice Chair of the RCC Board and has been the Chair of Reston Youth Baseball for 13 years. He commented that he is pleased that members of the community were attending this meeting. As current Chair of the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) Board, Bill B. has identified the community needs and the park projects that will be funded by capital bonds. Information on this proposed indoor recreation facility has been coming from a variety of sources, including B&D. Park projects totaling \$25 million are currently being implemented. The FCPA Board held a public input meeting on April 28, at the Hunter Woods Elementary School cafeteria, to collect public comment on the proposed draft Stratton Woods Park Master Plan Amendment. This amendment proposes to add lights to the 90-foot diamond field and tennis courts and to convert the sand volleyball court to a lighted outdoor handball/racquetball court at Stratton Woods Park, located at 2431 Fox Mill Road in Reston. Bill B. noted that 100 people had attended this meeting but he did not see any of the attendees present this evening. The 2008 Park Development Bond Referendum has set aside \$1 million in the next two years for the creation of a new community skate park at Lake Fairfax Park, located at 1400 Lake Fairfax Drive in Reston. Bill B. said the RCC conducts business openly and transparently. RCC recognizes that this is a controversial issue, and a decision has not been made. Some members of the community have indicated that they support new sports opportunities but they also support the preservation of Brown's Chapel Park. Reston is not gaining more land. Staff from the Fairfax County

May 18, 2009 Finance Committee Report

Page 13

Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) will hold a Reston Land Use College, comprised of a series of classes designed to acquaint Reston citizens with the key elements of the planning and development process within the County. These classes will form the foundation for public participation in the upcoming study to update and revise the Reston Master Plan. If interested in participating in the Reston Land Use College, please e-mail Loren Bruce, with the Planning Division of DPZ, at Loren.Bruce@fairfaxcounty.gov. For more information, please visit the County's Web page on the Reston Master Plan Special Study at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/reston.htm>.

Leila indicated the tape had expired; and asked if there were comments other than those already made.

There being no further questions, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

FUND STATEMENT

Fund Type G10, Special Revenue Funds

Fund 111, Reston Community Center

	FY2008 Actual	FY2009 Adopted Budget Plan	FY2009 Revised Budget Plan	FY2009 Third Quarter Estimate	Increase (Decrease) (Col. 5 -4)
Beginning Balance	\$7,244,262	\$4,940,060	\$8,709,757	\$8,709,757	\$0
Revenue:					
Taxes	\$7,057,365	\$7,035,203	\$7,035,203	\$7,035,203	\$0
Interest ¹	457,402	240,000	240,000	240,000	0
Aquatics	228,935	288,000	288,000	288,000	0
General Programs	339,776	334,888	334,888	334,888	0
Rental	105,136	75,000	75,000	75,000	0
Vending (delete)	0	0	0	0	0
Theatre BoxOffice	0	70,400	0	0	0
Arts and Events	212,805	0	172,290	172,290	0
LakeAnne	0	101,890	0	0	0
Total Revenue	\$8,401,419	\$8,145,381	\$8,145,381	\$8,145,381	\$0
Total Available	\$15,645,681	\$13,085,441	\$16,855,138	\$16,855,138	\$0
Expenditures:					
Personnel Services ¹	\$3,388,317	\$4,103,946	\$4,103,946	\$4,096,356	(\$7,590)
Operating Expenses	2,179,423	2,902,157	2,930,555	2,930,555	0
Capital Equipment		0			0
Capital Projects ²	1,368,183	1,895,490	4,081,440	4,081,440	0
Total Expenditures	\$6,935,923	\$8,901,593	\$11,115,941	\$11,108,351	(\$7,590)
Total Disbursements	\$6,935,923	\$8,901,593	\$11,115,941	\$11,108,351	(\$7,590)
Ending Balance³	\$8,709,757	\$4,183,848	\$5,739,197	\$5,746,787	\$7,590
Maintenance Reserve	\$930,386	\$977,446	\$977,446	\$977,446	\$0
Feasibility Study Reserve	155,064	162,908	162,908	162,908	0
Economic and Program Contingency			1,598,844	1,606,434	7,590
Capital Project Reserve	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	0
Unreserved Balance	\$6,624,307	\$2,043,494	\$0	\$0	\$0
Value	\$0.047	\$0.047	\$0.047	\$0.047	\$0.000

1. A funding decrease of \$7,590 reflects the January 2 furlough day reduction of the budget.

2. In order to account for revenues and expenditures in the proper fiscal year, an audit adjustment has been reflected as a increase of \$557,057 to FY 2008 expenditures to reflect capital project costs for Reston Community Center renovations. The audit adjustment has been included in the FY 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

Explanation: This amount is now included in the ending balance for FY2008 instead of in FY2009 Capital Projects.

3. The fund balance in Fund 111, Reston Community Center, is maintained at adequate levels relative to projected personnel and operating requirements. The available fund balance is divided into four reserve accounts designated to provide funds for unforeseen catastrophic facility repairs, feasibility studies for future programming and funds for future capital projects.

By RCC Board of Governors Action 04/06/09, a new Economic and Program Contingency Reserve Fund was established to sustain RCC programs, facilities, and services and the Capital Project Reserve amount was increased to three million.

	Personnel Expenses	Budget FY09	Mar	Apr	ENCUMBR.	YTD	REMAINING BALANCE	% Budget Used Ytd		
1	Administration	399,923	\$ 24,769	\$ 24,769		251,514	148,409	62.89%		
2	Board OG	5,764				135	5,629	2.34%		
3	Booking	121,702	\$ 9,135	\$ 9,012		89,346	32,356	73.41%		
4	Comptroller	301,503	\$ 20,076	\$ 19,772		199,972	101,531	66.32%		
5	Customer Service	358,771	\$ 22,628	\$ 22,946		204,340	154,431	56.96%		
6	Engineering	90,854	\$ 7,759	\$ 7,539		70,054	20,800	77.11%		
7	Maintenance	298,908	\$ 25,546	\$ 24,736		237,472	61,436	79.45%		
8	IT	107,703	\$ 7,331	\$ 7,331		76,002	31,701	70.57%		
9	Media	179,103	\$ 15,728	\$ 14,552		138,840	40,263	77.52%		
10	Performing Arts	417,812	38,672	38,540		279,671	138,141	66.94%		
11	Aquatics	637,153	48,566	47,829		415,331	221,822	65.19%		
12	General Programs Admin	83,814	6,310	6,481		62,527	21,287	74.60%		
13	Teens	130,198	6,139	7,301		79,508	50,690	61.07%		
14	Senior	130,394	7,116	12,168		77,101	53,293	59.13%		
15	Youth	145,553	8,178	12,190		98,364	47,189	67.58%		
16	Adult	187,220	19,054	17,837		131,072	56,148	70.01%		
17	Community Events	157,142	6,641	6,641		92,577	64,565	58.91%		
18	Camp Goodtimes	82,041	(161)	905		66,319	15,722	80.84%		
19	Arts Education	260,798	16,676	18,638		193,616	67,182	74.24%		
	Total Personnel Expenses	\$ 4,096,356	\$ 290,161	\$ 299,185	\$ -	\$ 2,763,760	\$ 1,332,596	67.47%		
	Personnel expenses are one payroll behind									
1	Administration - Admin's allocated budget includes unassigned funds in exempt pay that are then used to cover unanticipated needs									
2	BOG	Discontinued use of exempt position for meeting transcriptions								
4	Comptroller	Vacant merit position; partially offset with part time and overtime costs- filled in April								
9	Media									
10	Performing Arts	Vacant merit position; partially offset with acting capacity and overtime costs-filled in November								
12	General Programs Admin									
13	Teens	One part time assistant position vacant; SOS cancelled mid-year								
16	Adult									

	Operational Expenses	Budget FY09	Mar	Apr	ENCUMBR.	YTD	REMAINING BALANCE	% Budget Used Ytd	
1	Administration	389,844	395	8,405	#####	228,447	161,397	58.60%	
2	Board	38,150	5,050	342	0	18,722	19,428	49.07%	
3	Booking	50,347	95	10,357	9,682	36,534	13,814	72.56%	
4	Comptroller	456,501	20,264	26,346	66,968	419,273	37,228	91.84%	
5	Customer Service	825	0	754		754	71	91.45%	
6	Facility Engineer	167,203	50	15,000	36,010	98,645	68,558	59.00%	
7	Maintenance	302,966	25,851	20,125	82,808	277,014	25,952	91.43%	
8	IT	165,413	3,207	(1,806)	4,682	60,145	105,268	36.36%	
9	Media	276,683	10,194	41,828	15,940	220,043	56,640	79.53%	
10	Performing Arts	351,410	78,133	9,098	9,608	307,469	43,941	87.50%	
11	Aquatics	73,150	5,478	4,063	9,493	72,491	659	99.10%	
12	General Programs Admin	5,100		109		946	4,154	18.55%	
13	Teens	150,237	6,297	9,119	9,929	131,786	18,451	87.72%	
14	Senior	99,002	4,906	7,296	6,862	66,923	32,079	67.60%	
15	Youth	42,814	4,918	3,183	10,395	43,007	(193)	100.45%	
16	Adult	108,576	4,359	2,216	32,437	113,319	(4,742)	104.37%	
17	Community Events	119,672	704	8,160	5,475	104,482	15,189	87.31%	
18	Camp Goodtimes	31,960			1,659	27,717	4,243	86.72%	
19	Arts Education	100,703	1,590	2,796	10,168	56,356	44,347	55.96%	
	Total Operational Expenses	\$ 2,930,555	\$ 171,491	\$ 167,392	#####	\$ 2,284,072	\$ 646,483	77.94%	
1	Administration	Encumbrances reduced in April by 250 K							
11	Aquatics	\$4,320 (72 * \$60) RA Pool Passes payment affected budget remaining balance							
13	Teens	Latchkey program initiative costs paid in FY2009 \$20K							
14	Senior	Woodshop equipment costs should be shared with Senior department. \$9,650.12 therefore added in May.							
15	Youth	Heritage Language Literacy Pilot Program costs paid in FY2009 \$5K							
16	Adult	Woodshop equipment costs should be shared with Senior department. \$9,650.12 therefore subtracted in May.							
1-19	All Departments are reviewing encumbrances and reservations.								

	Capital Proj. Expenses	Budget FY09	Mar	Apr	ENCUMBR.	YTD	REMAINING BALANCE	% Budget Used Ytd	
1	HVAC Upgrade 003717.1	\$ 2,256,540	\$ 80,121		#####	1,537,374	\$ 719,166	68.13%	
2	Natorium 003717.2	\$1,058,280	\$ 51,263	\$ 10,847	#####	1,035,627	\$ 22,654	97.86%	
3	Theatre Rigging 003717.3	\$ 181,090			\$ 457	164,574	\$ 16,516	90.88%	
4	Fire Alarm Repl. 003717.8	\$ 203,990			#####	186,993	\$ 16,997	91.67%	
5	Lockers Repl. 003717.4	\$ -				0	\$ -	0.00%	
6	HW LA Priority 1 003717.5	282,000			33,396	33,396	248,604	11.84%	
7	Moving Lights 003717.6	39,540				0	39,540		
8	Theatre Dressing Room Ren	60,000				0	60,000		
	Total Capital Expenses	\$ 4,081,440	\$ 131,384	\$ 10,847	#####	\$ 2,957,963	\$ 1,123,477	72.47%	
	Total RCC Expenditures	\$11,108,351	\$ 593,036	\$ 477,425	#####	\$ 8,005,796	\$ 3,102,555	72.07%	
1-2	HVAC/Natorium budgets reduced by DMB by the amount of expense accrual related to two FY2008 invoices totalling \$557,057								
1-4	FY2008-2009 Capital Project sline 1-3 overall savings 291K								
5	Lockers Repl. 003717.4	cancelled by RCC Board							
6	HW LA Priority 1 003717.5	FY2010 carryforward due to schedule requirements for the facility							
7	Moving Lights 003717.6	FY2010 carryforward due to schedule requirements for the facility							
8	Theatre Dressing Room Ren	vFY2010 carryforward due to schedule requirements for the facility							
	HWLA Priority 1 003717.5	Public Hearing	Revised						
	Replace Asbestos Floors	30,000							
	Replace Popcorn Ceiling	10,000	10,000						
	Replace Dryw all Kitchen Area	2,000	2,000						
	Enhance CRAcoustics/AE Study	42,000	60,000						
	Upgrade CR Sound System	68,000							
	Staging/Seating Equipment	24,000							
	Performance Lighting	45,000							
	Blackout Curtains	10,000							
	Replace Exterior Skylights	15,000							
	Replace Back Dock	15,000	15,000						
	LA Wood Storefront replacement	6,000	6,000						
	LA ADA compliant doors	5,000	5,000						
	LA Front Desk Re-Design	10,000	10,000						
	Total HW and LA Priority 1 and	282,000	108,000						