



EMP Board Meeting Minutes

Special Meeting

February 27, 2017

A special Board meeting was called to order at 7:09 p.m. at 7238 and all members were present (KH, RS, RM, DJ and AE).

Presentation of Mr. Doug Brewer:

The meeting was called so the Board could meet with Mr. Doug Brewer, a principal at the architectural firm of W.A. Brown & Associates and member of various architectural committees at other HOAs in the Fairfax County area. Mr. Brown agreed to meet with the Board at the EMP Board President's request to discuss broad, forward-looking architectural changes to the EMP community.

Mr. Brown was briefed on the history and character of EMP as well as the composition and culture of its neighbors, their expectations and priorities.

Over the course of the exchange that followed Mr. Brown explained the various natural exterior materials on the market as well as synthetic counterparts. He noted that synthetic materials and production processes have advanced greatly since their early introduction into housing construction and are worthy of consideration for both ease of maintenance and appearance, as well as the fact EMP is not engaged in historic preservation, making them an option.

Mr. Brown said on the macro level it is important to finding materials, styles, colors and overall appearances that link the community through commonalities among the homes. This includes expanding, but limiting, material and color options available to homeowners in customizing their property. For example, roofing materials can extend beyond cedar shake but should be limited to perhaps just a few alternatives. Trim color options could also expand but perhaps be dictated by the various brick hues.

In sum, Mr. Brown recommended "package options" for residents that would offer a variety of material and color options in a collection; those materials and colors would compliment one another as well as the neighborhood.

Mr. Brown agreed to draft and present a proposal for the Board. The Board will use this as a baseline expense in speaking to other architects in the future.

Treasurer's Comment:

As this was not a regular meeting the Board Treasurer did not provide a Treasurer's report, other than to comment that the EMP tax returns had been filed and the return preparer paid.

Liability Insurance:

From the January Board meeting the Treasurer contacted EMP's insurance agent to discuss an umbrella policy, largely in light of recent tree fallings. Debate centered on whether to transfer the risk (by assuming the additional insurance) or mitigate the risk (by removing vulnerable trees).

The cost of an additional \$5M in the form of an umbrella liability policy would be approximately \$800 per year, which would bring annual EMP insurance costs to about \$2,700. EMP could also reduce the current liability insurance and obtain a larger umbrella policy, or vice versa. After much debate it was agreed that the best course of action is to both increase insurance with the umbrella liability option and have the larger, at-risk trees assessed and, if deemed dangerous, removed. **Motion** made to assume the additional insurance, seconded, passed unanimously.

Safety Committee Discussion:

Final proposals were introduced for the rebounder wall (\$4,000) and jungle gym (\$4,000) with discussion on whether to move forward. Discussion centered around two factors:

- a) Funding: The Board considered funding from existing reserves or imposing a special assessment. The Board debated the merits of each but did not make a final decision.
- b) Options: It was noted that a basketball hoop option was absent from the proposal despite being mentioned by the Safety Committee at the annual meeting. The Board acknowledged some neighbors dislike the noise created by the use of a basketball. The Board further discussed the likelihood that some neighbors may dislike noise produced by use of a rebounder board. The Board discussed some neighbors may accept the use/noise of a rebounder board but not a basketball, vice versa, neither, or potentially both. The Board also discussed the possibility of finding an objective measure to quantify the noise levels of a bouncing basketball vs. rebounder board. Some Board members thought it was beneficial to conduct a noise test to serve as an objective data point and indicated they would conduct such a test and report back to the Board. Some Board members noted that despite objective data some neighbors may still find the noise objectionable and those opinions would be a factor in further considerations.

Miscellaneous Topics:

The question arose as to whether non-EMP residents were allowed to fish in the pond. In fact, the pond is under owned by Fairfax County and EMP must allow access, but can restrict that access to the two public points on the northeast (off Merrimac) and southwest (off running trail) sides of the pond. There is a four foot easement around the entire pond that non-EMP residents can legally access.

The issue of reducing quarterly fees was raised. The discussion that followed centered on EMP's necessity, both financially and legally, to maintain minimum reserves. Therefore, at this time there is no opportunity for a fee reduction.

The topic of congestion on Balls Hills Road was raised, both at Langley School in the mornings and afternoons, as well as at Balls Hill and Lewinsville Road ("blocking the box"). It was determined that if we want to pursue addressing either of these traffic issues the best course of action is to contact Rep. Foust's office to lodge our concerns. No final determination as to when/whether to proceed with that course of action.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Richard L. Myrland
EMP Board Secretary

#