

## LANDMARK MEWS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION MINUTES

Board Meeting March 5, 2008

The March LMCA Board meeting was held on Wednesday, March 5, at the home of Brenda Johnson, 6366 Brampton Court. Members present: Bruce Wood (President), Loren Sciorba (Vice President), Bill Gaffney, Brenda Johnson, and Delia Riso. Absent: Don Washington. Also present were Marty McDonald (Treasurer), Roger Casalengo (Property Manager), Karen Kovach (Recording Secretary) and Wayne Brewer, Co-Chair of the Covenants Committee. Homeowners present: Lea Abrams, Simon Bennett, Chris Dale, and Bill Evans. Bruce convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

The minutes of the February 18, 2008 meeting were approved.

**Covenants Committee Report** – Wayne Brewer reported that a Covenants Committee meeting is being planned to coordinate the spring inspection.

**Financial Report** – Marty McDonald distributed a 4-page report: LMCA Financial Report; LMCA Actual Expenses vs. Budget Feb 29, 2008; LMCA Investments and Savings Feb 29, 2008; and LMCA Balance Sheet as of Feb 29, 2008. Marty summarized each page. He has added a new line to Contract Expenses for “Security Fees” and added a new item “Computer Website” under Mandatory Supplies and Services. He reported that bucket 1 (Contract Expenses) will go over budget because of security related expenses. Marty opened the E-Trade account (discussed in February) with \$4,000.00 in savings and \$1,000.00 in checking. No minimum balance is required in the checking account and it will earn 3.6% interest. Since the Wachovia checking account doesn’t earn interest, Marty suggested the board consider closing that account once the checks are used up.

Marty recommended purchasing a software program that will supplement the Reserve Analysis Study, conducted every 5 years. This program is used by community associations and is recommended by the Community Associations Institute. The program provides access to information important for managing and maintaining the community and stores details unique to LMCA. By tracking rising contract and infrastructure maintenance costs, it aids in analysis of reserves versus required expenditures. The vote on whether to purchase the program was deferred until the April meeting.

**Property Report** – Roger reported that he will canvas homeowners this month to determine who wants to pay to have their trees trimmed. Regarding Stevenson Avenue relandscaping, he recommended draught resistant plantings and will present the cost at the April meeting. He has discussed the redesign of the berm with three landscapers, and Marty also has a proposed design. Roger will contact homeowners surrounding the berm for their input. He also reported that Alfredo refitted 16 “uplighting” boxes and changed 10 bulbs. Roger has an appointment with Steve from Dominion Paving, who is coming to assess resurfacing of the berm path.

Roger reported that sump pump water draining onto Manchester Way had created cracks in the pavement, which Dominion Paving also will look at. In response to the board’s request for

technical details on the proposed laying of PVC pipe under the street and concerns over damage to the road bed, Roger explained that the pipe will be laid 4 feet below the road and both American Plumbing Supply and Dominion Paving have asserted that it will not affect the road. The contractor who will be doing the work agrees this is the best solution to the drainage problem. The highest bid received was \$3500.00; Alfredo's bid was \$2500.00. Regarding other sump pump drainage areas in Landmark Mews discussed at the February meeting, Roger has inspected the areas and reported that no action needs to be taken at this time. At one home, water is only discharged periodically and is not creating a hazard; at the other house, the water flows along the curb and into the gutter.

The Board voted to proceed with the repairs on Manchester Way:

*Brenda Johnson recommended approval, Bill Gaffney seconded. Approved: 5 Absent: 1.*

Berm Path: The discussion about repairing the path covered the methods of repair and means for laying asphalt. Roger learned from a contractor that the width required by the machinery used to lay asphalt would tear up the ground on either side of the path, which could damage sprinkler heads and vegetation. Further investigation is needed.

Roger added that he had a conversation with Fairfax County Police about the criminal activity in the Mews. The police officer said that the type who break into cars are not likely to be the same individuals who would break into homes. He pointed out that perpetrators of these crimes have different mindsets. Roger has observed the contract police patrol in the community and asked whether changed tactics from patrols to stakeout might be more useful in catching the perpetrators of the recent vehicle crime in the community. Only one officer patrols, a stakeout might require two officers. Further information is needed.

**Architectural Standards Review** — Loren advised that he is working on a final draft, on behalf of the task force, which will then be referred to the Covenants Committee for its review. Details are being incorporated that cover two major changes: permitting fiberglass front doors and retractable rear awnings. The draft will be posted to the website before a final decision is made. The standards will be discussed at the April meeting.

**Security** — Bruce opened discussion on the proposed statement of work from William H. Gordon Associates, Inc, recommending a security assessment survey that will identify and recommend security measures. The cost will be \$4,820.00. The board discussed the cost of the survey in light of expected results. Some felt that the proposed statement of work did not adequately state how detailed the resulting report would be as to what degree the recommended measures would be specific to Landmark Mews and reasonable to implement, considering cost and the physical layout of the community. Some felt that the examples of past experience were not relevant to a homeowner community and that examples of recommendations were superficial. Marty objected to the expenditure, pointing out that a security assessment had been made in the past, albeit it had been done gratis and provided only a general overview of security options. Similarly, Roger expressed his opposition. The board and homeowners present discussed whether the money should be spent on upgrading lighting. Concern was expressed that decisions on security measures were being discussed with no one having experience or

knowledge of the subject, and that acquiring expert advice made sense. Bruce stressed that any security measure taken should be part of a holistic approach and that the assessment would provide context. Loren asked if board members would have the opportunity to talk with the expert and added that since the Board lacks the knowledge to address the issue the options are to pay for the information, find another source for less cost, or do nothing. Bill suggested that since there are many questions about the deliverable, the Board invite the security expert to the April meeting to explain how detailed and inclusive the report will be.

Bruce asked homeowners present for comments. Lea Abrams expressed her disapproval that the Board is paying for the off-duty patrol officer program, and as with purchasing an assessment, suggested that the monies could be spent elsewhere on ways to provide greater security. Lea pointed out that if there are unoccupied homes in the community, they could attract criminals and be at risk of break-ins. She informed the Board that she has been followed into the community by people in cars who park for a time and then leave. Simon Bennett also expressed reservations about the project, believing the proposal's "deliverable" not sufficiently detailed.

Bruce will contact GA, Inc, and explore the possibility of a representative attending the April board meeting.

There was no other business, and an executive session was not held. A motion to adjourn was made by Brenda Johnson, and seconded by Loren Scieurba, and approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m..

The April meeting will be on Wednesday the 9th, also at Brenda Johnson's.

Submitted,

Karen Kovach  
Recording Secretary

---

**LANDMARK MEWS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION MINUTES**  
**Special Meeting of the Board**  
**Conference Call Meeting/Friday, March 14, 2008**

The LMCA Board convened for a conference call hosted by President Bruce Wood on Friday, March 14. This special meeting of the Board was duly noticed on the website. Present were Bruce Wood (President), Loren Scieurba (Vice President), Bill Gaffney, Brenda Johnson, Delia Riso and Karen Kovach (Secretary). Don Washington was absent.

**Background:** The special meeting was held to resolve outstanding questions about the nature of the report the security consultant would produce. Prior to the conference call, Bruce had discussed with representatives of the consultant, William H. Gordon Associates, Inc.(GAI), questions raised at the March Board meeting regarding their proposal (letter, subject: Security Consulting Services, dated February 29, 2008) for a security analysis of Landmark Mews. GAI provided a follow-up letter, dated March 11, 2008, which explained in greater detail what they

will provide. Copies of this letter were emailed to all Board members prior to the conference call. Mr. Mike Jones of GAI participated in the conference call to elaborate on the proposal, answer any questions, and address lingering concerns.

**Minutes:** The conference call meeting began as scheduled at 4:00 P.M. with Mr. Mike Jones, a security professional with Gordon Associates, Inc. Bruce introduced those present and explained the purpose for the meeting as resolving timely issues about the “deliverables” of the study raised by Board members and homeowners during the March Board meeting. He referred to the supplemental letter as providing more context than the proposal previously received. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jones began by reviewing his credentials in security, protection, and crime prevention (biography filed with minutes) and contrasted the Davis Study (prepared for LMCA in December 2006) with what can be expected from GAI. He observed that while the Davis Study was a good baseline study, the security analysis from GAI will go much further, providing prevention-based strategies appropriate for our particular community and needs. Mr. Jones described himself as an urban and suburban specialist in protection, but also a homeowner in a community governed by a Home Owners Association, so he is keenly aware of the unique requirements. He acknowledged the need for “prevention without making the community feeling like ‘Stalag 13’.” He also commented on his awareness of HOA finances and management concerns and commended the Board for exercising due diligence in examining the proposal, requesting clarification on the deliverable, and seeking assurance that their money will be well-spent. He promised a “thorough analysis of the risks you face.”

Mr. Jones observed that Landmark Mews is an affluent neighborhood; it “looks great” and is attractive, unfortunately, also to a criminal element. What GAI will do for the study is, initially, a lot of groundwork on the history of not only our neighborhood but surrounding neighborhoods. Their experts will come in and look at the “operational environment,” i.e., trash and recycle pick-up, landscaping, service deliveries, etc. They will look at the type of trash being set out, because criminals engage in “trash hunting” to gather intelligence. The operational environment also includes vehicle patterns, i.e., who, what and when of vehicles coming into Landmark Mews. They will talk to police and local stores. Most neighborhood stores are willing to share information gathered from their security cameras and criminal activity they deal with. The point is that crime is not isolated, and individuals who could potentially carry their activity into the Mews may very well be plaguing surrounding retail businesses.

Mr. Jones generally briefed on the elements of crime prevention, such as the community being aware of who belongs there, and presented an overview of the types of recommendations the analysis might offer. Of those, only options relevant and feasible for our community would be recommended. A series of recommendations from current (what can be enacted now) to planning guidance for various types of measures for the future will be included in the appraisal, which he assured will be unbiased. Neither he nor GAI sell any security devices, so they do not have a vested interest in steering the Board toward any product, service, or program.

In discussing low-cost options, Mr. Jones made three points:

1. He can get a feel for the situation by talking with people and observing the community
2. The vehicle break-ins could have been worse if a homeowner happened upon the thieves in the act. When thieves are surprised, they can become violent
3. The community needs to be made not only unattractive to a criminal element, but to others who should not be in the community, such as pan handlers.

When the police are interviewed, and thus made aware of the fact that LMCA has contracted outside, professional help, Mr. Jones knows from his past experience in law-enforcement, that our community will get more attention from the police. He will seek information on trends. For example, what types of vehicles are predominately targeted, and for what purpose. Are they being stolen for resale or for parts? Trend analysis is a big part of the research.

Whatever options they recommend, they will follow up after the measures have been implemented to see what impact they have had. This is an ongoing process, so their involvement will not end with the presentation of the report. GAI and Mr. Jones are interested in learning what crime prevention measures resolve. An advantage that GAI brings to Landmark Mews is that multiple experts are bringing their experience to bear on the problem. In addition to security professionals, the team includes specialists in other fields, such as engineers and designers, to provide expert analysis from a wide perspective.

The challenge to community design is to make it difficult for people who don't live there to come through and get out quickly, while at the same time not unduly inconveniencing residents. Mr. Jones said he is not promising a 100% solution, but he promises "I won't leave you hanging."

Bill Gaffney commented that he had studied the March 11 letter and it answered most of the questions he had raised at the Board meeting, and he expressed his appreciation for the presentation.

Delia Riso added that although she had been opposed to spending the money on a security appraisal, she was impressed with the breadth of the investigation and analysis that will be provided.

Mr. Jones responded that some HOA boards would not care enough to take the time to address this issue and complimented the spirited discussion as reflecting well on the Board.

Bruce observed that GAI doesn't normally take HOAs as clients, that their market normally is more complex undertakings. Mr. Jones said that while facilities are a big part of their security work, making people safe in their homes and communities goes to the heart of why GAI professionals entered the security field in the first place. They design facilities and businesses to make people safe, but taking care of people where they live is as, if not more, important. He acknowledged a marketing aspect here, that if people think of him and GAI as successful in providing personal and community protection, they will think of them when it comes to protecting their businesses.

Bruce asked Mr. Jones to drop off the line at 4:25 for the Board to discuss and vote.

Loren expressed his opinion that all the information that has been received since the first proposal has been absolutely on target with the Board's objectives and the end product, as described, is very much what they are looking for.

General consensus was that Mr. Jones' comments, written and oral, were helpful in clarifying what GAI will deliver.

*Bruce moved to adopt the proposal as stated in the letter of February 29, 2008. Loren seconded the motion. Approved: 5 (Wood, Sciarba, Johnson, Gaffney, Riso), ). Opposed: 0. Absent: 1 (Washington).*

Delia moved to adjourn the meeting. Bill seconded the motion.

Conference call ended at 4:35 P.M.

Submitted,

Karen Kovach  
Recording Secretary