

developer. Such sport-by-sport arrangements on an as-needed basis have worked against development of a unified long range community playing field plan.

This Committee hopes its reports on field needs will provide a basis for looking forward to more cooperative arrangements to meet those needs, while also providing a projection of what those needs will be between now and the end of the century.

2. Inventory of Fields Existing and Projections with Capacity Limitations

The Committee's initial effort was to bring together and supplement the existing inventories, maps and listing of sports field resources. This allowed the committee to get a clear perspective on existing and proposed field resources.

The Committee's examination of the community's athletic/play field resources and needs demonstrated Reston's reliance on multiple sources of support for adequate playing space. It also demonstrates the unquestioned necessity, as indicated earlier, for inter-agency cooperation in meeting those needs.

TABLE III B1
RESTON AREA FIELD INVENTORY

FIELD	USE	LAND OWNER
<u>North of Access Road</u>		
Baron Cameron	Adult Softball (lighted)	Fairfax County**
Baron Cameron (2)	Soccer	Fairfax County
Browns Chapel I	Baseball	RHOA
Browns Chapel II	Baseball	RHOA
Browns Chapel III	Baseball (Practice only)	RHOA
Browns Chapel IV	Baseball (1985 loss)	RHOA
Browns Chapel IV	Soccer (1985 loss)	RHOA
Lake Newport (2)	Soccer	RHOA
Lake Fairfax (2)	Adult Softball (1 overlay)	Fairfax County
Lake Fairfax (3)	Soccer	Fairfax County
Hook Road I	Baseball	RHOA
Hook Road II	Adult Softball 1 football Youth Baseball overlay	-
Lake Anne Elementary	Soccer (Practice only)	Fairfax County
Forest Edge Elementary	Baseball (2-Practice only)	Fairfax County
Forest Edge Elementary	Soccer (Overlay)	Fairfax County
Ring Road	Youth Softball	RHOA
Wainwright	Youth Softball	RHOA
Access Site*	Soccer (3)	Fairfax County
Access Site*	Softball (1) (Overlay)	Fairfax County

*available spring '84

**Fairfax County sites include those at Fairfax County Park Authority Parks and those on other County owned land including schools.

TABLE III B2

RESTON AREA FIELD INVENTORY

FIELD	USE	LAND OWNER
<u>South of Access Road</u>		
Bordeaux	Baseball (T-ball only)	RHOA
Bordeaux	Soccer	RHOA
Hunters Woods Elementary	Youth Softball	Fairfax County
Hunters Woods Elementary	Soccer (Practice only)	Fairfax County
Hunters Woods Elementary	Baseball (Overlay)	Fairfax County
Running Cedar	Baseball	RHOA
Twin Branches	Baseball	RHOA <i>x regulation size</i>
Quartermaster	Soccer	RHOA
Foxmill Elementary	Baseball (2-Practice only)	Fairfax County
South Lakes High School	Baseball (lighted)	Fairfax County
South Lakes High School	Soccer (1 game, 1 practice)	Fairfax County
South Lakes High School	Youth Softball	Fairfax County
South Lakes High School	Baseball (Practice only)	Fairfax County
Terraset Elementary	Baseball (Practice only)	Fairfax County
Terraset Elementary	Baseball (Practice only)	Fairfax County
Sunrise Valley Elementary	Soccer	Fairfax County
Sunrise Valley Elementary	Baseball (Practice only) (Overlay)	Fairfax County
Sunrise Valley/Barton Hill	Soccer (Practice only)	RHOA
Sunrise Valley/Headlands	Soccer (Practice only)	RHOA
Sunrise Valley/Glade (The Greens)	Soccer	RHOA
Dogwood Elementary	Soccer (Practice only)	Fairfax County
Foxmill District Park*	Baseball (2)	Fairfax County
Foxmill District Park*	Soccer (2)	Fairfax County
Transco	Soccer (2)	RHOA

*Available spring '84

3. A Field System

The next effort of the committee was to survey the resources and suggest a field system that would make optimum use of playing fields now in existence and provide a framework for identifying the optimum resolution of future needs.

To meet existing and projected needs for playing fields in Reston, the RHOA/RCA Land Use Committee recommends a three-tier system on as follows:

- A. Fields for informal play and practice
- B. Neighborhood fields with limited scheduled use
- C. Sports complexes for the majority of scheduled games and tournaments

A. Fields for informal play and practice

No priority of development is intended by the order in which these tiers is listed. (See also February 10 Meeting Notes.)

Although the field sports' problems of quantity and quality of fields has been amply demonstrated, far less attention has been given to the needs of younger children, in particular for small open areas for spontaneous play. Numerous totlots are available for the youngest children, and the other children who play organized sports do have fields to play on, however limited their availability and quality. Committee members pointed to a need for additional play sites within the neighborhoods where children live and play that could as easily be used for kite flying as for pickup baseball games. To some extent, nearby school sites meet this need. The committee believes, however, that more attention should be given to the development of spontaneous play areas. Such play areas could be used for informal practice sessions by field sport teams thus freeing up regulation neighborhood fields for play. There are a number of areas where informal play fields could be developed or existing open areas enlarged to provide these needs--and which would not infringe upon the neighboring uses to the extent a regulation playing field would.

B. Neighborhood fields

The neighborhood field would be scheduled for team use during play periods but available for other uses during other times. The concept of neighborhood fields with limited scheduled use has been addressed by RHOA. The committee notes with favor that RHOA daily reserves at least one neighborhood field for use by Reston residents/unscheduled users in case all other fields are in use. That is a particular scheduling nicety that may not be widely

understood. There are, however, too few of these neighborhood fields to accommodate the demands of organized field sports, particularly for practices. As noted in the recommendations, a number of fields--especially those at elementary school sites--could be upgraded for neighborhood use, taking some of the pressure off of the sports complexes for playing fields.

C. The playing field/sports complex

The most efficient way to provide sports fields--construction, maintenance, scheduling and use--is in multiple field complexes. Baron Cameron Park--one of the 3 sites the committee was asked to review in particular--has evolved into such a complex. (See separate recommendations regarding this site). Development of athletic field complexes in Reston has been inching forward but has stopped short of optimum sports complexes.

One of the difficulties of this trend to date has been the use of overlay fields, which can be adapted to use by several sports. None of the organized field sports have been satisfied with overlays. Only one sport can use an overlay at a time, and overlay fields tend to wear in ways that are detrimental to use by multiple sports. Overlay fields were first designed on the assumption of spring baseball and fall football. Soccer is more popular than football and is played spring and fall. Overlay fields are a stopgap measure and should be viewed as such. Sports complexes in the future should also include ample parking and space for amenities such as facilities for picnics and concessions.

4. Implementation

One technique for realizing the three-tier field system would be to have RHOA assume responsibility for the informal play and practice fields and the neighborhood fields (that are not located at schools) and the County Park Authority assume responsibility for the sports complexes, which would serve as county-wide facilities. (See, for example, March 1 Meeting Notes.)

The committee did not discuss possible sites or financing for any of these tiers. However, it was suggested by the committee Chairperson that future field development and maintenance should equitably involve all relevant parties. Given the developer's responsibility to provide the land, and RHOA's responsibility to maintain it, an equitable arrangement might have the county accepting responsibility for all major sports complexes as it does, for example, for the Lake Fairfax Park complex, with the field users--the organized sports groups--making a fair contribution to field acquisition, development and maintenance. No specific

formula is recommended but one should be worked out in the near future.

Population Projections and Field Need Status

After completing the inventory of existing and planned resources and after developing a "system" of play field types, the next step for the committee was to project need. First it was assumed that sports participation--very high in Reston - a family oriented and athletic suburban community with active, successful sports programs--would remain constant as a percentage of the total age group.

Based upon techniques used by Fairfax County to project population components and the projections of Reston Land Corporation with respect to new home sales, a projection by age group was developed.

TABLE III B-3
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS
RESTON TOTAL POPULATION BY AGE GROUPS 0 - 19

Year	1980		1990		1997 - 2000		
Total Population	37,000		46,000		55-58,000		
<u>Age Group</u>		% of Total		% of Total		% of Total	2 Decade % Growth +57%
0 - 4	3034	8.2	3636	7.9	4395	7.6	+45
5 - 9	3629	9.7	4240	9.2	5029	8.7	+39
10 - 14	3819	10.3	4406	9.6	5266	9.1	+38
15 - 19	2888	7.8	3485	7.6	4322	7.5	+50

It should be noted that while the overall population grows by 57% ± over the next two decades (from 37,000 in 1980 to 58,000± in the year 2000) the age groups grow by more modest 39% and 38% rates in the most intensive sports field use age groups. The size of these age groups will decline after 2000 due to aging of the community. Thus, a peak field use period can be projected during the 1990s. Based on these population projections, the field need projections (see pages 22 - 24) were generated. These show that demand for the Reston area athletic facilities will increase beyond the facilities now planned. The shortfall is due to the fact that (1) existing fields can not be used in their present condition, (2) overlay fields need to be eliminated and (3) few new athletic facilities are planned past 1985. The playing fields system needs to be structured and maintained from top to bottom as per the committee recommendations.

Peak
field use
in 1990s

Short fall

The field demand is projected by expected demographic characteristics of the community. Based on those projections, the committee recommendations are expected to meet the community's field needs if fully implemented by the appropriate public and private interests. Projections are based on the best data available and on current participation by age group for each field sport. The reader should note, however, that while the Committee is confident of these projections, they are, ultimately, best guesses. Trends can be altered by economic or other factors. From year to year sports programs may experience participation levels above or below those projected. As the quality of fields and therefore play improves the programs may grow in popularity. Therefore, the field requirements found in part V could be underestimated. However, as noted at note 4 in Appendix C.1, participants per field is based on an assumption that every participant will play a game on the same day. Some communities - such as the Maryland suburbs and the new community of Columbia - make more extensive use of facilities by scheduling to avoid one day a week peak use. It appears, however, that implementation of the Committee recommendation will not necessitate any compromise in the current playing field peak factors. If the other recommendations are adopted every team can be accommodated to play a game on the same day of the week.

avoid
one day
a week
field use

}

6. Field Quality

Although this report primarily addresses questions of quantity--how many fields will be needed by the field sports groups--several quality issues must be mentioned.

(1) Playing fields in Reston are often of insufficient size for the sport using them. (2) Playing surfaces are sometimes dangerously deficient.

dangerously
deficient
x

Regarding the surface problem, some fields lack grass, have poor drainage, are affected by erosion. Some have surfaces that at the least are detrimental to the game if not safety

hazards, i.e. uneven contour, rough, rocky playing areas that affect the bounce of the ball and the play of the game.

The surface problem in part relates to intense use, particularly by soccer, which uses some fields nearly year round, in good weather and bad, for team tryouts, practices and games. New fields are pressed into service immediately upon their being graded and seeded.

The user sports have been concerned appropriately with quantity. There just have been too few fields for the number of participants. However, the sports organizations must begin giving equal attention to the quality of Reston's playing fields.

As noted in the conclusion, upgrading a field to regulation dimensions and providing a superior playing surface is far less expensive (when possible) than building a new field. By starting with more and better informal play/practice areas and then upgrading neighborhood fields, when possible, the optimum use of field space and resources will be accomplished.

*What solution
to practice?*

re new

TABLE III B4
COMPARISON OF EXISTING, PLANNED AND NEEDED FIELDS

FIELD INVENTORY
 GAME FIELDS

	<u>RHOA</u>	<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Baseball/softball	11	9 (5 overlay)	20
Soccer	7	12 (5 overlay)	19
Football	1	-	1
<u>PROPOSED</u>			
Baseball/softball	-	3 (1 overlay)	3
Soccer	-	4 (1 overlay)	4
Football 1	-	-	
<u>TOTAL REQUIRED</u>			
	1990	2000	
Baseball/softball	17 (youth) 6 (adult) <u>23</u>	18 (youth) 7 (adult) <u>25</u>	
Soccer	18 (youth) 2 (adult) <u>20</u>	19 (youth) 2 (adult) <u>21</u>	
Football	2 (youth)	2 (youth)	
<u>TOTAL AVAILABLE</u>			
Baseball/softball	23 (includes 6 overlay)		
Soccer	23 (includes 6 overlay)		
Football	1		

TABLE III B4

Youth Baseball/Softball

<u>1980</u>	<u>Total Youths</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	
5-9	3629	363	10%	90	
10-14	3819	533	14%	65	
15-19	<u>2888</u>	<u>100</u>	3%	60	
total 5-19	10,336	996 (9.6%)			
<u>1990</u>	<u>Total Youths</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	<u>Fields Needed</u>
5-9	4240	425	10%	90	5
10-14	4406	625	14%	65	10
15-19	<u>3485</u>	<u>100</u>	3%	60	<u>2</u>
total 5-19	12,131 (+17.4 Δ '80)	1150 (9.5%) (+15.5% Δ '80)		total	17
<u>2000</u>	<u>Total Youths</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	<u>Fields Needed</u>
5-9	4395	450	10%	90	5
10-14	5029	700	14%	65	11
15-19	<u>4322</u>	<u>125</u>	3%	60	<u>2</u>
total 5-19	13,746 (+13.3% Δ '90)	1275 (9.3%) (+10.9% Δ '90)		total	18

TABLE III B4

Soccer

<u>1980</u>	<u>Total Youths</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	
5-9	3629	943	26%	150	
10-14	3819	1025	27%	150	
15-19	<u>2888</u>	<u>154</u>	5%	150	
total	10,336	2122 (20.5%)			
<u>1990</u>	<u>Total Youths</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	<u>Fields Needed</u>
5-9	4240	1100	26%	150	8
10-14	4406	1200	27%	150	8
15-19	<u>3485</u>	<u>175</u>	5%	150	<u>2</u>
total	12,131	2475 (20.4%)			18
<u>2000</u>	<u>Total Youths</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	<u>Fields Needed</u>
5-9	4395	1150	26%	150	8
10-14	5029	1350	27%	150	9
15-19	<u>4322</u>	<u>225</u>	5%	150	<u>2</u>
total	13,746	2725 (19.8%)			19

TABLE III B4

Football

<u>1980</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>
5-9	150	4%	320
10-14	226	6%	320
15-19	<u>14</u>	.5%	320
total	390 (4%)		

<u>1990</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	<u>Fields Needed</u>
5-9	175	4%	320	1
10-14	275	6%	320	1
15-19	<u>25</u>	.5%	320	-
total	475 (3.9%)			<u>2</u>

<u>2000</u>	<u>Players</u>	<u>%Participants</u>	<u>Players per Field</u>	<u>Fields Needed</u>
5-9	175	4%	320	1
10-14	300	6%	320	1
15-19	<u>25</u>	.5%	320	-
total	500 (3.6%)			<u>2</u>

7. Implementation

As the committee discussed problems and formulated solutions, it became very apparent that a major element was missing within the existing community bureaucracies to deal with the field sports issue: There is no coordinating body in Reston with representation from all field sports to help RHOA and RCA formulate a coherent fields policy/program. In order for the community to have a high quality system of playing fields which adequately, but not excessively, meets citizens' needs, somebody or some group must monitor fields plan development and needs projections on a continuing basis. The committee feels that the RHOA Field Sports Council, which currently coordinates scheduling of RHOA fields between all Reston sports groups, should be up-graded to standing committee status with the following responsibilities:

1. Continue to coordinate field scheduling among the various sports;
2. Monitor trends in participation levels, field usage, and field requirements for all field sports active in Reston;
3. Project changes in fields needs for the various sports;
4. Monitor the quality of the various available fields and formulate strategies for insuring that all fields in Reston remain playable;
5. Recommend changes and/or additions to the fields system;
6. Serve as liaison between the County Park Authority, the County School Board, and RHOA in the development of a fields system and/or other strategies for providing adequate fields in Reston;
7. Report at least annually to RHOA/RCA of its work and recommend policy on the entire fields issue.

The RHOA Field Sports Council is the logical choice for this role, because it already exists and because it includes representatives from all Reston's field sports, as well as the RHOA Council. Land Use Committee members feel strongly that the only way a sensible, long-term fields policy can be achieved is through a coordinating committee which is able to mesh the plans, programs and needs of all the competing interests involved with this issue.

8. Recommendations

1. Upgrade open areas and existing informal play fields to expand use for informal play and informal practices.
2. Create new open play fields for informal play and practice use.

3. Improve substandard neighborhood fields and large play areas for limited scheduled competition as neighborhood fields.

4. Upgrade playing at county schools where feasible (including Dogwood and Hunters Woods schools and elsewhere) to provide adequate playing conditions.

5. Continued development and opening to the public of new sports field complex facilities at Fox Mill District Park and Northern County Government Center.

6. Following the acquisition by the Park Authority of future school site at North Reston Stevenage Road that has been determined by the Fairfax County School Board as surplus, recommend approval of the plan submitted by Reston Land Corporation by appropriate county agencies and bodies.

* 7. Eliminate overlay fields from all playing field complexes.

8. Establish the RHOA Field Sports Council as RHOA's field sports policy and coordinating body with appropriate responsibilities.

IIIC. PATHWAYS: THE NON-MOTORIZED ACCESS SYSTEM FOR PEDESTRIANS, BICYCLES AND HORSES

1. Overview

The "pathway" system is the movement framework of the Reston Open Space system. All the recreation facilities - swimming/tennis/fields/tot lots/multipurpose courts/nature study areas - provided by RLC, RHOA, Fairfax County and other in the Reston area - should have access provided by a comprehensive pathway system. The existing pathways have been costly to develop, and no open space improvement is more broadly used; however, the current paved pathway "system" used by strollers, walkers, joggers, bikers, cycle commuters (serious bicyclists), and the more limited soft/natural surface hiking and horse trail "system" does not yet fulfill its potential.

There are several reasons for this condition. One is that in spite of good intentions and considerable expense, there is no overall concept for all the pathway elements - this is no truly Comprehensive Plan. There are many agencies and individuals involved in the process, and no one has exerted effective dominion or coordination. The Regional Park Authority's major east-west trail system - the W&OD Regional Trail Park (one of the premier bike trail systems in the United States) - runs thru Reston. A County Trails Plan, (coordinated to some extent by the County's Office of Comprehensive Planning) deals with some, but not all, of the county trails users and systems. There are county facilities, in particular County Park Authority facilities, with trails for pedestrians and horses. There are "pathways" maintained by RHOA as well as some by clusters. The County Public Facilities Manual requires developers to provide some elements of a comprehensive pedestrian movement system, and discourages others; the County Trails Plan requires pathways that will never be used, and allows obvious needs to go unanswered. Some links are put in at the request of community groups and adjacent residents; other are deleted for the same reason.

In part the lack of a comprehensive approach to the pathway system is due to a change in pedestrian circulation philosophies since Reston was initially planned and construction started. The initial concept was a pedestrian movement system that was completely separate from roadways. It would be made up of 8 ft. lighted pathways, crossing roadways with underpasses and bridges.

In Reston, as in Columbia and other planned communities, underpasses were prescribed early in the development cycle. Later it has been found that they were used very little. While the underpass under North Shore Drive at Hickory cluster is a tour de force of urban design and a significant

achievement, topography and road widths in many areas make most others little more than clammy culverts.

Second, the pathways were initially designed to wander thru the residential clusters. While pathways are very popular, they are not popular "in my back (or front) yard, thank you".

As the cost of construction, asphalt and electricity escalated, so did an 8 ft. lighted pathway system. Issues of safety and security, discussed by the Fairfax County Police with the Task Force early in our studies, also tend to make the earlier concept of pathways through the middle of wooded valleys less desirable.

The optimum system is now felt to be the one being implemented in North Reston; however, that leaves South and Central Reston with part of the old system and no clear direction as to how to utilize these parts and pieces to fashion a complete new system.

Linkage
One systematic problem that exists, especially in Central and South Reston, is lack of linkages between cul-de-sacs. This is especially a problem in lake front clusters where linkages between cul-de-sacs would be a viable option to a lake front pathway.

An unfortunate situation with respect to the continuity of certain sections of the pedestrian pathway system has to do with construction timing. For example, occasionally it may appear that only a portion of a pathway has been built, resulting in an incomplete or disconnected system. The reason for this is that it may not always be feasible to build a given length of pathway across a number of different parcels at one time since adjoining parcels may be sold or developed at different times. Moreover, even a single builder may develop a parcel over several separate phases.

Although it would seem desirable to build a longer section of pathway at one time in order to provide for a more "complete" system, this pathway invariably would be disrupted to accommodate required entrance cuts, grading, utilities, roads and other site construction activity.

Signage - or some alternative way of finding ones way around on the pathways - is a significant problem. This is an issue that has been addressed by the Pathways Task Force. A comprehensive approach to the trail system would provide a basis, a point of departure for an effective signage and guidance system.

What is lacking is a general Master Plan - a guiding philosophy for the provision of a comprehensive pathway system.

2. Components

Reston's pathway system is made up of the following components:

- a. 8' asphalt "major" pathways
- b. 4' and 6' asphalt "minor" pathways/cluster connectors
- c. 4' concrete sidewalks
- d. wood chip trails from 3' to 5' in width
- e. natural surface (dirt) trails from 2' to 8' in width

These components, if tied together into a comprehensible system, would provide an important and useful system.

3. A Comprehensive System for North Reston

Based on the experience in older sections of Reston and elsewhere, and based on input from concerned residents, a comprehensive system has been proposed. After reviewing Reston Land Corporation's plans for North Point Village, the Committee endorses and recommends the following for North Reston:

- o Utilization of the guiding concept of a pathway "system" relating to origins, destinations and recreational uses.
- o 8' wide asphalt pathways should be planned along one side of major roadways not having sidewalks. (In North Point Village, these would include Baron Cameron Avenue, Reston Avenue, North Village Road, Wiehle Avenue, Lake Newport Road, and Center Harbor Road.) Pathways along these roads should meander adjacent to the roadway and not be located directly against the curb. In specific locations where existing bridges, guardrails, utilities or other constraints require the pathway to be located within the right-of-way, a grass buffer strip should be provided between the pathway and the curb.
- o A major pathway should be planned within or adjacent to the Fairfax Parkway right-of-way.
- o 8' wide major pathways should be provided through major open space corridors except where topography makes it infeasible. All major activity nodes should be connected by a comprehensive system.
- o It is recommended that the developer continue the current practice of locating 4' wide sidewalks along one side of residential streets, as proposed by the new road standards adopted for North Reston.

- o Wood chip trails, although initially less costly, are less efficient in the long run than asphalt. These trails provide an acceptable means of alternative pedestrian transportation, and should be encouraged within certain locations where deemed necessary and desirable by RHOA staff.

The RHOA Pathways Task Force has endorsed this system, and the Land Use Committee is satisfied that the proposed system will be close to an optimum system.

4. Town Center

Reston Land Corporation (RLC) has developed a general concept for Town Center which was reviewed by the Committee. The details of the pathway/pedestrian circulation system have not been developed at this time. The Committee, however, supports RLC's intent to optimize pedestrian circulation and provide linkings between Town Center and the surrounding pathway system including the W&OD Trail.

5. The Remainder of Reston - Central and South

With the exception of a few parcels not yet developed in Central and North Reston, the substantial portion of the developer proposed pathways/walkways yet to be built will occur in Town Center and North Reston. That leaves Central Reston and South Reston in need of a system plan and commitment to implementation.

The major task ahead will be to develop a Comprehensive Plan for pathways and implement it in Central and South Reston. As noted above, in spite of good intentions and considerable expensive construction, there is not yet a pathway system. The Committee determined that pathways in Central and South Reston were akin to the King's new clothes. Many have been frustrated by getting lost, for instance in the stream valley below Hunters Woods Village Center. Even more have been frustrated by finding there is no path from here to there. Many have taken to goat trails thru the woods, trespassing thru private yards or walking down the edge of streets. But to date no one has said "with all due respect to the effort to date and the good intentions expressed by all concerned, we are still a long way from a pathway system."

At the outset of the Committee's efforts, one member, after having biked or walked every path segment shown on the RHOA pathways map, observed that: if the swimming pools in Reston had been designed and implemented with the same level of comprehensive thought as the non-motorized circulation system, there would be water in only one end of most pools and no gate in the fences. This is a statement with which not all committee members concur. It does illustrate a

problem which the Committee has determined to be the outstanding long term open space need in Reston.

6. Recommendations

Within the short time available and the Committee's limited charge, it has proven beyond the Committee's capacity to become effectively involved in the issue of pathway/non-vehicular movement systems. There are many jurisdictions, many turfs. Those at RHOA who have advisory/staff responsibility do not have the policy mandate nor a comprehensive plan to deal with the pathway system in an effective way. The Land Use Committee has chosen to recommend the steps which should be undertaken to deal with the pathway issue.

It is the Committee's position that RHOA must take the lead, but whoever takes on the task of making a pathway system out of the existing parts must be willing to negotiate with the Regional Park Authority, with Fairfax County (Environmental Management and Comprehensive Planning), with Fairfax County Park Authority and with the full spectrum of users - both public and private.

They must:

1. undertake a comprehensive survey of what exists - no current map is completely accurate;
2. identify origins and destinations for major non-vehicular movements inside, into, from and thru Reston;
3. identify the potential users and determine their numbers and their needs.
 - people on foot - those who stroll, walk, jog and run.
 - bikers - recreational bikers, kids on bikes, serious bikers, commuters on bikes.
 - those who use the system to study nature/ride horses, etc.
4. create a plan which makes use of all the resources and meets the majority needs, and
5. be responsible for coordination and implementation of the system.

One way to start the process of developing a plan would be to take the existing trails "plans" and from these plus new elements, fashion a series of north/south connections - perhaps parallel to Reston Avenue, the Fairfax Parkway, Wiehle-Soapstone and one thru Lake Fairfax Park/South Lakes