

Deliberation Day 2007 Report

Falls Church City: What Are We Becoming?

**Date of Event: March 17, 2007
Mary Ellen Henderson Middle School
Falls Church, Virginia**

A Report from

Deliberation Falls Church City

Sponsored by

**Citizens for a Better City
Falls Church League of Women Voters
Village Preservation and Improvement Society**

Date of Report: May 14, 2007

www.dfccva.org

A chance to be heard and a reason to listen

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Character and balance of the City environment	5
Application of the City's master plan	7
Fiscal responsibility	8
Consultation and involvement	9
Survey results: Common ground on engagement and information sharing	11
Next steps & financial support	13
Financial report	15
Deliberation Day participants & online survey respondents	16

About this report and the Deliberation Day process

The purpose of this report is to encourage continued deliberation about the future of Falls Church City. It does not provide answers or solutions to the challenges the City faces, but rather, it highlights the trade-offs and the common ground that emerged at Deliberation Day on March 17, 2007.

The challenges faced by the City today will return repeatedly for consideration as new opportunities and problems arise. The need for deliberation, in order to reconfirm or redefine what the trade-offs are and what the common ground is, will continue.

Establishing common ground is particularly important. It is a means to set achievable community goals, on which individuals, community organizations and government then must act. Cycles of deliberation and action can bind a community more closely together.

This report was prepared by Beth Offenbacher and Bill Corbett of the Center for Voter Deliberation at no charge. It was reviewed and issued by Jerry Barrett, Phil Duncan, Ellen Gross and Edie Smolinski of the Steering Committee for Deliberation Falls Church City.

Executive Summary

On the icy morning of Saturday March 17, 2007, 135 Falls Church City residents came together for the City's first Deliberation Day. Attendees moved through four segments of small and large group discussions. Six students from George Mason High School and five adults led the eleven small group discussions. Eight more GMHS students served as note-takers. A panel of four City officials responded to questions in the large group discussions.

The format gave people of varying interests and backgrounds an equal chance to have their questions answered and their opinions registered. At the morning's end, attendees developed lists of possible actions that could be taken by individuals, by community organizations and by the government. Those suggestions were reviewed by 130 respondents in a subsequent online survey, which is summarized in this report (p. 11).

This report is a guide to the trade-offs the deliberations identified, as well as areas of common ground. The trade-offs will be faced repeatedly as new opportunities for economic development arise and as the City's fiscal circumstances ebb and flow. The common ground provides a means to meet those challenges.

How to balance the City's environment between its village legacy and a more urban future (p. 5) was the trade-off most widely identified and discussed. Attendees wanted Falls Church to remain a unique place, but did not agree on how a village sensibility can co-exist with a more urban look and feel. Managing traffic better and creating pedestrian-friendly retail and public spaces were common goals.

Application of the City's master plan (p. 7) was cited by some as too susceptible to exceptions for developers. Others countered that there is a trade-off: The City Council's use of the special exception ordinance has restored long-lost momentum to redevelopment, by enabling the Council to bargain more effectively with developers.

Fiscal responsibility (p. 8) was a third trade-off. The tension here revolved around whether urban-style redevelopment along the commercial corridors is the best way to sustain the City financially. Arguing that it sacrifices the character that has made the City an attractive residential community, some called for less City spending. Antagonism towards specific redevelopment decisions was balanced, to some extent, by calls for greater or more constructive citizen involvement in City policy-making.

Consultation and involvement (p. 9) emerged as common ground. Attendees, including the panel of City officials, took the position that the more consultation and citizen involvement, the better. Respondents to the online poll emphasized that more citizens should vote, volunteer for City boards and commissions and organize civic groups, and; that the City should reach out in specific new ways to better inform the community.

Each of the official panelists indicated a desire -- and named specific recent and future steps -- to increase citizen involvement in the City's work, e.g., an open house event at City Hall, a new online documents system on the schools' website, and recruitment of new residents to join in City planning work. The school board will make sure to speak regularly in public about the school system's most important strategic issues.

A number of participants felt that volunteers on City boards and commissions would benefit from more opportunities to review City policy-making from an integrated, over-all point of view.

Next steps and financial support (p. 13): Deliberation Day provided a safe public space for those well-versed and those new to City affairs to engage one another and learn. In this it succeeded, especially among the new residents to the City who attended. However, a conflict with a school event kept some parents away. Young adults and ethnic minorities were notably absent as well.

In response to those problems, and keeping in mind the stated desire for greater consultation and involvement, the Steering Committee is exploring other ideas, including the possibility of mini-deliberations this fall, in order to reach out to these and other City populations.

Cost is also a problem. Deliberation Day cost \$3,032, of which half came from a foundation grant. To survive in the long-term, Deliberation Day and mini-deliberations must cut costs and rely much less on printed advertising, which accounted for half of expenses. The Steering Committee hopes to work with other community groups to advertise one another's events to their respective e-mail lists. Deliberation Falls Church, in the future, will look to financial contributions from individuals, as well as community organizations. Information on how to contribute time and money is on p. 14.

Comments on this report are encouraged at www.DFCCVA.org. Comments are moderated and will appear after they are reviewed, usually within twelve hours. No comment will be excluded or edited on grounds other than incivility or assertions of bad faith.

May 11, 2007
City of Falls Church, Virginia

Introduction

In the sections that follow, this report presents City residents' views on (1) what the trade-offs are that most affect economic redevelopment decisions in the City, and (2) the questions they raised in that regard. The three sources of the residents' views and questions are:

- The records of Deliberation Day small group discussions, written on poster-sized paper by students and participants and collected afterwards by the organizers;
- A videotape of the two rounds of large group discussions; and,
- Residents' responses to the subsequent online survey, in which respondents rated forty-two suggestions made on Deliberation Day and also wrote in additional thoughts.

Transcripts of some of these primary source materials can be viewed online at www.DFCCVA.org.

The panel of City officials that responded to the deliberators' questions included: Mayor Robin Gardner, School Board Chair Craig Cheney, Economic Development Authority Chair Ed Saltzberg, and Planning Commission Chair Ruth Rodgers. The Steering Committee greatly appreciates their participation on Deliberation Day, and all that they do for the City.

All questions formulated by the deliberators, in small groups, are listed below. The questions synthesized from these and then posed by the panel moderator, City resident Peter Behr, are listed first and marked with an asterisk. The student discussion leaders and note-takers were recruited by Chris Pikrallidas of George Mason High School.

Character and balance of the City's environment

How to balance the City's environment between its village legacy and a more urban future was the trade-off most widely identified and discussed. Attendees wanted Falls Church to remain a unique place, but did not agree on how a village sensibility can co-exist with a more urban look and feel. Managing traffic better and creating pedestrian-friendly retail and public spaces were common goals.

Participants in the small groups shared an emphasis on the City's character. They disagreed amongst themselves about what emphasis should be placed on affordable housing, development, and particular visions for the City.

Points of Agreement

- How Falls Church has changed
- Big buildings destroy the old City
- Importance of reflecting Falls Church's traditional character and sustaining its neighborhoods
- Make the City as distinctive and unique as possible
- Maintain a theme for the City that is connected with new development
- If done properly, character can attract customers

Points of Disagreement

- Affordable housing – how much of a priority should it be? At what cost?
- Are City officials afraid of development?
- Uncertainty about what would make the City truly unique
- Tension over what balance – cost of independence and size, impact.
- Conflicts between competing visions for the City

There was not a lot of agreement about exactly what “unique” meant, apart from a dislike of monolithic buildings and a preference for reflecting the City’s traditional character and sustaining its neighborhoods. A key underlying question was what the trade-offs are, when it comes to maintaining the distinctiveness of Falls Church City? Further, how do we collectively identify and agree upon what to maintain and what is less important? As one attendee put it, there is a risk that Falls Church could become a “senseless place” instead of a sensible place.

Attendees were keenly concerned about the availability of shops and restaurants within City limits. This is an important aspect of Falls Church’s identity and, as a result, attendees asked how to make retail shops affordable for more small, non-chain businesses. Some were concerned from another perspective, noting that there is little diversity in retail spaces. Others expressed concern that some proposed projects, although financially attractive to the City, would nonetheless be aesthetically poor. For example, an 11-story hotel under discussion is “far too tall”. In general, tall buildings are seen as “smothering” within the context of the small town of Falls Church.

The small groups’ questions to the panel of officials were:

1. Are there ways to balance village character, the need to be more welcoming, and the need for commercial development?*
2. Are there important questions involving the City that require another comprehensive study? For example, a transportation study of North Washington Street on the east side? Pedestrian studies? What are the City-wide issues that call for further study? Is there a problem of not adopting studies?*
3. How do you combine ambiance and functionalism on Broad Street – e.g., like Shirlington – to make it a great place?
4. How do we get the kind of community we want: racially and economically diverse, walkable and meets the urban standard?
5. Will the City promote home businesses with multiple employees?
6. How will transportation be provided for residents in new developments?
7. Will we have a fully integrated traffic and parking plan?
8. How do we keep the sense of a village, while growing into a more urban place?
9. How do we ensure families can afford to live in Falls Church?
10. What is affordable housing in Falls Church?
11. How can the City maintain and strengthen its identity? How do you plan to facilitate the evolution of the identity?
12. Can we have a system study of traffic and pedestrians (North Washington, around East Falls Church, Route 7 width)

Mayor Robin Gardner affirmed that the City must be sensitive to buildings that are potentially out of scale, by giving careful attention to setbacks and height on all sides of proposed structures. Whether a development proposal is for office space, mixed-use, or residential, in her view each member of the City Council has paid attention to what the proposal would do to make the City unique. Planning Commission Chair Ruth Rodgers noted that studies of traffic and parking must not only be undertaken, they must to be followed as well. One example in that regard, cited by Mayor Gardner, is permit parking. Decisions on traffic and parking will not satisfy everyone, but need to be made, Mayor Gardner said, or the City will be a victim of analysis-paralysis.

School Board Chair Craig Cheney pointed out that starting in April, within a time frame similar to the City’s development planning efforts, the school board would begin long term studies on school building needs. A major focus will be how to incorporate and facilitate community use of school structures.

Respondents to the online survey revealed a strong desire but little common ground on how to balance redevelopment with the City’s existing character. The top-rated City policy-making

suggestion, which ranked tenth, overall, of forty-two suggestions, was “Look far ahead in order to maintain a distinct character and charm for the City.”

Application of the City’s master plan

Application of the City’s master plan was cited by some as too susceptible to exceptions for developers. Others countered that there is a trade-off: The City Council’s use of the special exception ordinance has restored long-lost momentum to redevelopment, by enabling the Council to bargain more effectively with developers.

Participants in the small groups were worried about the changes coming to the City. They disagreed amongst themselves about whether the priority concern should be deviations from the master plan, the effectiveness of City leadership, or how to most effectively keep people informed, in a timely way, about important steps in the development planning and decision-making process.

Points of Agreement

- Changing nature of neighborhood development in residential areas not well planned/controlled
- Following the code but not being thoughtful
- Little trust in developers or in the ability of the City to carry out its stated Master Plan through developers

Points of Disagreement

- Inconsistency with following the Master Plan
- Leadership follow-through and accountability
- How to most effectively keep people informed about decisions and priorities

A strong theme of small group discussions was that the City government’s process of balancing interests, between the perceived need to increase the commercial tax base, on one hand, and the concerns of residents affected by commercial redevelopment, on the other, was insufficiently understood or outright faulty. Other attendees were concerned about how to protect the environment, and expand green space and park land in the City, while also allowing for redevelopment and new development.

The small groups’ questions to the panel of officials were:

1. When developers’ first proposals do not conform to City plans that have received considerable citizen input, is it a communications problem? If not, what is the problem?*
2. Do we have the leverage as a community to say no to developers in a metropolitan area where there are a lot of [other] opportunities to go [somewhere else] and do what they want to do?*
3. Is the use of special exceptions counter-productive to the master plan?
4. How do you resolve the tension between competing priorities?
5. How can the City and its leadership better communicate with the citizens so that they are aware of when it is important to participate in the process for monitoring development projects?
6. How can citizens make sure the City leadership is accountable to their wishes/concerns about the City?
7. Are we too eager to go along with developers? How do we adjust our plans so that we aren’t too quick to make exceptions?
8. How well is the current development following the City’s comprehensive plan?
9. What difference is this meeting going to make in the way the City does things?

10. What role can City government play as developer or landlord to provide affordable commercial space for existing and smaller businesses?

Planning Commission Chair Rodgers noted that developers have business plans and profit margins in mind that can conflict with the City's master plan. Now that the City has restored momentum to its commercial redevelopment, the City can be tougher about sticking to its master plan. The City needs to listen more carefully to those who live near proposed redevelopments, and to the entire community. Rodgers stated that exceptions to the master plan should be just that, exceptions.

Mayor Gardner responded with specifics on the toughness of recent negotiations with developers. EDA Chair Saltzberg noted that if special exceptions offered developers are unattractive, developers often may, by right, build fast food or convenience stores on a commercially zoned parcel. That is not only potentially unattractive; it generates less tax revenue than some alternatives. For example, a multi-story, mixed-use building generates six times more revenue than a typical parcel of under-utilized commercial land.

One hundred-two of the 130 respondents to the online survey wrote an answer to the open-ended question, *What is the most important thing that ought to be done in Falls Church?* The majority offered specific (33) or general (25) views on economic development, and reflected many of the trade-offs identified on Deliberation Day. These comments can be viewed at www.DFCCVA.org.

Fiscal responsibility

Fiscal responsibility was a third trade-off. The tension here revolved around whether urban-style redevelopment along the commercial corridors is the best way to sustain the City financially. Arguing that it sacrifices the character that has made the City an attractive residential community, some argued for less City spending. Antagonism towards specific redevelopment decisions was balanced, to some extent, by calls for greater or more constructive citizen involvement in City policy-making.

Participants in the small groups understood that redevelopment, principally along the City's two commercial corridors, has been justified as a means to reduce the City's reliance on residential property taxes, and that property values are affected by the City's overall image and reputation. They disagreed amongst themselves on whether such an emphasis is necessary, feasible, self-defeating or desirable.

Points of Agreement

- Cost impacts from development decisions
- Financial challenges of remaining an independent City
- Property values are important
- Small town character "pays the bills" – we need to see more business and maintain the character of the community

Points of Disagreement

- Why costs/budget is so high
- Urgency to build while Tysons also expands – can we keep up?
- Courage to pursue an alternative economic model
- Is "small town feel" financially viable?
- Is commercial space too expensive per square foot – or do we have too much?
- Internal vs. external pressures regarding development

Small group discussions focused on how to provide the resources needed to sustain a high quality of life for City residents, but still maintain affordable housing for City and school employees, older residents and young families. Discussions also touched on how to balance the need for fiscal responsibility with a desire for diversity of race, income and professions among residents. Finally, attendees were concerned with how to maintain high quality schools without creating an over-crowding dilemma.

The small groups' questions to the panel of officials were:

1. Are we at a critical stage in terms of being able to afford all the things we want as a community? School costs? Teacher pay? Housing? How urgent is the issue?*
2. What have you learned over the last four years about growth and development? What would you have done differently now that you've seen the results?*
3. What are the roadblocks to keeping the patience and courage to pursue an alternative economic development model for our City? (as compared to Clarendon, Ballston, Tysons Corner)
4. How does the City's leadership intend to maintain the City's financial viability? Is the City government overstaffed?
5. How can we promote the City?
6. Is the City willing to accept that we can't have much more growth in the school system? How can small town feel be maintained/be financially viable and consistent with the City vision statement?

Mayor Gardner responded that the City's fiscal situation was critical three or four years ago, but is not so now. However, once the City Council approves a redevelopment project, the expected tax revenue is not realized until after project completion, usually two years later. It is important to be forward-thinking and to prevent stagnation in redevelopment, in order to avoid a fiscal crunch in future.

Chair Cheney indicated the School Board, like the City Council, aimed to align budget priorities with a strategic plan. He cited decisions on more narrowly targeted benefit increases for staff this year as being made on such a basis. As with redevelopment decisions, tough decisions by the school board will receive public support only if budget priorities are aligned with a well-understood strategic plan.

The fiscal challenge was not addressed specifically by any of the participants' suggestions, despite some mention in small groups that there are alternative economic models for the City. Some of the open-ended comments in the online survey did address specific fiscal matters, such as whether the financial benefits of mixed-use redevelopment exceed the costs of increased services to new residents. The number and vehemence of critical comments regarding redevelopment was balanced by equally numerous and firmly argued comments calling for greater or more constructive citizen involvement in City policy-making. These comments can be viewed at www.DFCCVA.org.

Consultation and involvement

Consultation and involvement emerged as an area of common ground. Attendees, including the panel of City officials, took the position that the more consultation and citizen involvement, the better. Respondents to the online poll emphasized that more citizens should vote, volunteer for City boards and commissions and organize civic groups, and; that the City should reach out in specific new ways to better inform the community.

Participants in the small groups agreed that economic redevelopment along the City's commercial corridors is occurring rapidly, and that residents are challenged to keep up with the pace and details of City decision-making. They disagreed on whether and how the decision-making process should be shifted to remedy its perceived inadequacies.

Points of Agreement

- Neighbors to proposed redevelopment projects not sufficiently consulted
- Time effects – going full speed ahead with development
- Engage people – involve them in City activities and in City decision-making

Points of Disagreement

- Top-down vs. bottom-up decision-making
- How to effectively involve people who are long-term and people who are new to Falls Church
- Any forum for business?
- Have to be “plugged in” to understand FC

In the small groups, participants discussed how to keep the public effectively up-to-date on decisions that are made and actions that are taken by the City’s public officials (elected, appointed and staff), particularly when the effects can’t quickly be seen, such as development decisions. When the building can literally be seen, it’s too late to get involved.

A number of participants felt that volunteers on City boards and commissions would benefit from more opportunities to review City policy-making from an integrated, overall point of view.

The small groups’ questions to the panel of officials were:

1. Do you think the residents are satisfied with the work session process, in terms of the ability of residents to speak and communicate? There are some work sessions where the developer speaks and the residents cannot. Do we need to change that process?*
2. What can we do differently as a community, with [what you heard at] this meeting in mind?*
3. How do we get greater involvement and participation, by more of the community, in these difficult decisions that the City is facing?*
4. How can we (City Hall and residents) make sure that we are pro-active with developers?
5. Is development being led by the momentum of the development process or by deliberations between affected citizens and communities?
6. Would the City government be willing to take the initiative to actively encourage affected individuals and communities to participate in the development planning from the beginning?
7. Do we have a smaller political division for involvement based on wards or neighborhoods?
8. How do we insure all different populations of our students (economic, academic, ethnic, vocational) are represented and supported?
9. What are our strategies for involvement at the community level?
10. How does the current process provide sufficient opportunity for community and residential involvement?
11. How can we improve communications between the government and the citizens?
12. How will new residents be welcomed into the City?
13. How do we encourage a greater sense of community, familiarity between citizens?

Each of the panelists indicated a desire -- and named specific recent and future steps -- to increase citizen involvement in the City’s work, e.g., an open house event at City Hall, a new online documents system on the schools’ website, and recruitment of new residents to join in City planning work. EDA Chair Saltzberg indicated that at least one developer that has worked in the City before, Akridge, is returning with a new proposal and a demonstrated willingness to make changes that reflect community input. School Board Chair Cheney said that the school board will make sure to speak regularly in public about the school system’s most important strategic issues.

Mayor Gardner pointed out that public hearings, not work sessions, are the proper forums for citizens to express their views, and that more public hearings, not an open mike at work sessions, is what is needed if people need further opportunities to present their views.

Survey results: Common ground on engagement and information sharing

Deliberation Day participants, organized in eleven groups of eight to twelve people per group, made eighty-eight written suggestions for what individuals, community organizations and City government should do to respond to what Falls Church City is becoming. The subsequent online survey consolidated similar suggestions into 42, divided in three categories:

- Information sharing, with 11 suggestions
- Citizen and community involvement, with 18 suggestions
- City policy-making, with 13 suggestions.

Respondents scored each of the 42 suggestions as one (only) of the following:

- Most Important (3 points)
- Less Important (2 points)
- Need More Information (1 point)
- Unimportant (-2 points)
- Bad Idea (-3 points)
- No Opinion (0 points)

The survey found the greatest common ground in four suggestions for citizen and community involvement, and in the top five suggestions for information sharing.

Citizen and community involvement

- Vote (Rank=1, Average score= 2.91 which rounds to 3, for a rating of Most Important)
- Volunteer for boards and commissions (Rank=2, Average score=2.57, Rating=Most Important)
- Take responsibility to organize, be pro-active, get neighbors and young people involved; join community groups; attend and make voices heard at City Council and boards & commissions; write letters and make phone calls. (Rank=3, Average score=2.53, Rating=Most Important)
- Recruit for City boards and commissions (Rank=7, Average score=2.36, Rating=Less Important)

Information sharing

- [Have more] transparency [in] advertising, to ensure the community is well-informed and has a chance [to] provide input to decisions; build trust. (Rank=4, Average score=2.52, Rating=Most Important)
- Reach out to newcomers and neighbors to publicize City Council meetings, work sessions, etc. (Rank=5, Average score=2.37, Rating=Less Important)
- Better use of City website; use a “board documents” system for policy and background material; add discussion boards. (Rank=5, Average score=2.37, Rating=Less Important)

- Develop welcome package and activities – use current residents in outreach to new residents, including renters. (Rank=7, Average score=2.36, Rating=Less Important)
- Hold education forums on City issues; City Hall Open House or road shows (Rank=9, Average score=2.35, Rating=Less Important)

By contrast, there was less common ground on what the direction of City policy-making should be. No suggestion on City policy-making received a rounded average rating of Most Important. The top-rated City policy-making suggestion, which ranked tenth, overall, was “Look far ahead in order to maintain a distinct character and charm for the City”. The second-ranked (twelfth overall) was “Make sure most groups are represented”.

The results should be regarded with caution, due to the lack of a representative sample of City residents and a corresponding bias. Substantial numbers of the survey respondents have served on City Council (6%), the School Board (8%), a board or commission (42%) or a combination of those (45%). A plurality of the survey respondents have lived in the City more than twenty years (36%). The respondents overwhelmingly own their homes (96%). By contrast, a City-commissioned survey in 2006 found that only 27% of City residents moved to their present residences in 1989 or earlier, and that a sizeable 31% of City residents rent, rather than own.

Accordingly, the online survey found that what is of most concern to its respondents -- the people most actively engaged in the City’s civic life -- is that more people in the City need to be actively engaged in its civic life.

A final indicator of the high level of citizen involvement among respondents is the narrow band into which City policy-making suggestions were ranked. The thirteen City policy-making suggestions ranked between ten and thirty, with one low-rated (40th) exception. The highly-engaged and knowledgeable respondents to the survey found plenty of common ground on what to do about improving citizenship and information sharing in the City, but much less common ground on what policies the City should adopt.

The full results of the survey are online at www.DFCCVA.org.

Next steps and financial support

Deliberation Day provided a safe public space for those well-versed and those new to City affairs to engage one another and learn. In this it succeeded, especially among the new residents to the City who attended. However, a conflict with a school event kept some parents away. Young adults and ethnic minorities were notably absent as well.

In response to those problems, and keeping in mind the stated desire for greater consultation and involvement, the Steering Committee hopes to kick off a series of mini-deliberations this fall, in order to reach out to these and other City populations.

Cost is also a problem. Deliberation Day cost \$3,032, of which half came from a foundation grant. Deliberation Days and mini-deliberations are financially viable in future only if a combination of the following steps are taken.

- Printed advertising expenses are sharply reduced or eliminated. To achieve this, the Steering Committee hopes to work with other community groups to advertise one another's events to their respective e-mail lists
- Other costs are kept in line.
- The level of contributions from community organizations can cover event and website expenses.
- Individual contributions supplement organizational contributions.

Replacing printed advertising with e-mail from community groups

Eighty-three attendees answered the question, "How did you find out about Deliberation Day?" as follows:

Membership organization – 28	E-mail – 7
Newspaper ad – 19	Flyer - 6
Friend or family – 18	Neighborhood association – 3
School teacher – 10	Religious organization – 2
City government – 9	Invitation letter – 3
Newspaper story – 7	

Based on these responses, printed advertising can be sharply reduced or eliminated if community organization messaging and a wide range of word-of-mouth activities take its place. In general, an advertised message will gain the attention of an individual only after the message is heard or viewed multiple times. Thus, the wider the range and the greater the number of community organizations advertising the event to their members, the greater the chance that people will attend.

Deliberation Falls Church now has an e-mail list of approximately 225. This list will not be published or shared.

However, the list will be used occasionally by Deliberation Falls Church to publicize the activities of other community organizations who publicize Deliberation Day with their members. This follows the gracious example of the following individuals and organizations that helped us to economically publicize the first Deliberation Day.

Association of American University Women City of Falls Church E-Focus Edna Frady Falls Church News Press Community News & Notes	Falls Church Women's Club FCCPS – Backpack Flyers distribution FCCPS Business in Education program George Mason High School PTA
---	--

Also with respect to the exchange of services among community organizations, the following organizations accepted invitations to set up information tables on Deliberation Day, at no cost or obligation. In addition, a one-page flyer on each organization was included in the free discussion guide that was distributed to all participants.

Christ Crossman United Methodist Church Citizens for a Better City City of Falls Church Boards & Commissions City of Falls Church Planning Commission Deliberation Falls Church City The Falls Church	Falls Church Arts Falls Church Housing Corporation Historic Falls Church Inc. League of Women Voters of Falls Church Village Preservation and Improvement Society Winter Hill Community Association
--	---

It is our hope that these and other community organizations will attend future Deliberation Days to publicize their own roles in the community, and that they will lend their support by publicizing Deliberation Day to their members.

Financial Support

In order to produce additional Deliberation Days and mini-deliberations, financial support is needed.

For those interested in making a contribution, a check may be made out to Deliberation Falls Church, and mailed to Philip D. Duncan, 1069 W. Broad Street, #776, Falls Church, VA, 22046. Organizational and individual support is welcome.

Your contribution to Deliberation Falls Church is fully tax-deductible.

Deliberation Falls Church and The Center for Voter Deliberation are registered trade names of Citizen Sovereignty Incorporated, which is a nonpartisan and nonprofit Virginia corporation and public charity that is exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions are deductible under section 170 of the Code. A financial statement is available upon request, or from the Office of Consumer Affairs of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Join Us in Continuing the Discussion

The dialogue that occurred on Deliberation Day was just the first of many possible opportunities to discuss and influence the future of Falls Church City.

If you would like to volunteer to assist in future deliberations or, if your organization is interested in hosting a small group discussion focused on “Falls Church City: What Are We Becoming?” contact Jerry Barrett (703-241-3854) or Phil Duncan (703-237-1500). Session length is two hours for our mini-deliberation format. A free, 1 ½ hour training session for potential discussion leaders is included.

Financial report

Deliberation Day costs totaled \$3,031.87, half of which was paid by the Center for Voter Deliberation. Other generous contributions came from the Citizens for a Better City, the League of Women Voters of Falls Church, and the Village Preservation and Improvement Society. In addition to contributing time and expertise, members of the Steering Committee covered a number of expenses out of pocket, such as the cost of conference calls and flyers. Ida & Jeff Peterson, Edie & Tom Smolinski and Judy & Bill Corbett graciously contributed the coffee and other refreshments on Deliberation Day.

The Center for Voter Deliberation is the recipient of a small grant, renewable annually over three years. This grant funding may or may not be available in support of Deliberation Day in Falls Church City in 2008 and 2009, but not thereafter.

Printed advertising, at a cost of \$1,456.36, accounted for almost half of Deliberation Day expenses.

Event and website expenses totaled \$1,575.51, which is slightly more than the \$1,500 in contributions made by the three local community organizations in support of Deliberation Day.

EXPENSES		REVENUES	
PRINTED ADVERTISING		CONTRIBUTIONS	
-- FC News-Press	\$1,283.69	-- CBC	\$300.00
-- Invitation letters	\$50.87	-- CVD	\$1,531.67
-- Flyers	\$121.60	-- LWVFC	\$700.00
		-- VPIS	\$500.00
SUBTOTAL	\$1,456.16		
WEBSITES	\$133.99		
EVENT COSTS			
-- School rental	\$452.50		
-- Discussion guide copying	\$324.23		
-- Poster-sized writing pads	\$299.97		
-- Miscellaneous	\$182.30		
-- Videotaping	\$125.00		
-- Other copying	\$57.52		
SUBTOTAL	\$1,575.51		
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,031.67	GRAND TOTAL	\$3,031.67

CBC = Citizens for a Better City
 CVD = Center for Voter Deliberation
 LWVFC = League of Women Voters of Falls Church
 VPIS = Village Preservation and Improvement Society

Deliberation Day Participants & Online Survey Respondents

Jody Acosta
 Cheryl Adams*
 Rosaura Aguerrebere
 Jim Alverson*
 Carl W. Anderson
 Renee Andrews
 Ronald Anzalone*
*Allie Atkeson**
 Paul Barkley
 Nader Baroukh
Jerry Barrett
 G. Bastarache**
 D.A. Batten**
Janine Baumgardner
 Marty Behr
Pete Behr
 Nick Benton*
 Lois F. Berlin*
Nancy Brandon
*Jack Brorsen**
 Ron Brousseau**
 Maureen Budetti*
 Barry Buschow
 Pam Callison*
*Craig Cheney**
 Anthony Cipriano
 Tom Clinton*
 Sally Cole**
 Martha Cooper
*Bill Corbett**
Michael Costelloe
 Barbara Cram*
 L. Crowther**
*Pete Davis**
 Shelton Davis*
 Carol DeLong
 Kathleen Donovan**
 Doris Doran*
 Pam Doran
 Steve Doudaklian
 Jason Douglas*
 Vesta Downer
Phil Duncan
 Dee Ellison*
 Elizabeth Emge*
 Katie Emmons*
 Donna Englander*
 Bernadette Fancuberta
 Sara Fitzgerald
 Ellie Flaherty
 Richard Flaherty*
 Regina M. Flahie**
*Dexter Fox**
 Edna N. Frady
 Judy Fraser
Adam Gann
 Dan Gardner*
 Michael Gardner
Robin Gardner
 Rick Goff
 Jack Gosnell*
 Nikki Graves
Ellen Gross

Mary Clare Gubbins**
*Gisou Haghighat**
 Dan Hagigh*
*Meredith Hamme**
 Kitty Hayes
 Edwin B. Henderson
 Lindy Hockenberry*
 Christian Holmes*
 Mary F. Hood
 Carolyn Hoover*
 Ellen Hottea
 Carol Huttar
 Joel Huttar**
 Carol Jackson**
 Rosemary Hayes Jones*
 David Karro*
 Eleanor Karro
 Cathy Kaye
 Tom Kaye*
*Kimberly Kenny**
*Zhoreh Khayam**
*Elyse Krachman**
 Julie Krachman**
 Charles Langalis*
 Gail Lanouette
 Gary LaPorta*
 Hal Lippman
 Amos Long**
 Virginia Long
 Dan Maller
 Peter Markham*
 Susan Matchett*
 Lou Mauro**
Richard Maynard
 Susan Dovell Maynard*
 Dick McCall**
 Patrice McKenney*
 R Meeks**
 Marty Meserve
 Peggy Monahan
 Vicky Moore
 Mochel Morris
 Aidan Morse*
*Beth Offenbacher**
 Lou Olom
 Gail R. Opitz**
 Sandra Orr*
 Ron Peppe
*Ida Peterson**
Jeff Peterson
*Sally Phillips**
 Gerald Pressman**
 Garret D. Rambler*
Beverly Rausch
 Don Rea*
 Terri Rea*
 Lisa Reeves**
 Harry W. Reitze
 Michelle Repper*
 J. Resta**
Ruth Rodgers
 Steve Rogers**
 Anne Rohall**

Ed Saltzberg
 Kevin Lee Sarring
 Jim Saulsbury
 Bill Schellstede*
 Jim Scott*
 Ann Scully*
 Jane Scully
 Mary Beth Sefton*
 Kieran Sharpe*
 Wyatt Shields
 Lynda Singletary
 Tim Sivia**
 Carol Sly**
Edie Smolinski
*Tom Smolinski**
 Bob Snee
 David Snyder*
 Annette Spector*
 Steve Spector*
 Ken Sprankle
 Valerie Sprankle**
 Dennis Sutch**
 Zina Sutch**
 Dennis Szymanski**
 Nar Taing*
 Melissa Teates
 Maurice Terman*
 Greg Theisz**
 L. Thomas**
 Keith Thurston
 Greg Toney**
Sarah Van Buren
 Patrick Vennebusch**
 Mike Volpe**
 Gail Wadsworth
 Midge Wang
 Claire Waters
 Jim Waters*
 Hillel Weinberg
 Rebecca Weissman*
 Catherine Wiant
 Bob Wilden*
 Eileen Williams
Jeffrey Williams
 Marlene Winfrey
 Gregory Woodyard*
 Walt Wurfel
 Suzanne Young

* Attended Deliberation Day only

** Responded to online survey only

Organizers, discussion leaders & other volunteers are in italics

n.b. 25 online survey respondents were anonymous