



Reston Citizens Association

August 13, 2013

Ms. Heidi Merkel
Senior Planner
Department of Planning & Zoning
Fairfax County

Dear Ms. Merkel,

The Reston Citizens Association has been an active and enthusiastic participant in the Reston master planning process since its inception nearly four years ago. We have been strong advocates of transit-oriented development around Reston's coming Metrorail stations consistent with Reston's original planning principle. We have constrained that advocacy only by calling for the development to be of the right type at the right density in the right place. With the help of more than five dozen volunteers in the Reston 2020 Committee, we have provided the Reston Task Force with more than one dozen well-researched and presented papers on virtually every facet of TOD planning for Reston and have been at this table at every meeting since the task force began. More recently, we have responded constructively to all four previous Planning staff drafts of language for a new Reston areawide comprehensive plan, and this letter follows in that strong commitment to building a better, more urban Reston.

We offer the following comments and suggestion on V.5 of the draft Comprehensive Plan. Our comments are generally in the order of an issues appearance in the draft text. We close with some general observations on the drafting process.

Specific Comments

P.5 and beyond (Walking distance): Not fully explained is why the Planning staff has changed the language in the second paragraph on this page and later in the draft text to extend to the TOD area walking distance to 15 minutes, a distance consistent with a ¾-mile walk. Later in the text, this is done

indirectly by stating, for example, FARs may be approved “for areas within a safe, comfortable and reasonably direct 5-10 minute walk or approximately ¼ mile of the station platform (p.27).” Similarly, staff refers to the ¼ - ½ mile loop as a 10-15 minute walk. Staff do this inconsistently—sometimes referring to the standard of a ¼-mile = up to a 5-minute walk and ¼ - ½ mile as a 5-10 minute walk—although it’s clear that the staff’s intent to expand the area allowed for higher density development as developers wish.

Not only is this inconsistent with the general principles for TOD development, it directly contradicts the Fairfax County Guidelines for TOD development, which state, “This TOD area may be generally defined as a ¼ mile radius from the station platform with density and intensity tapering to **within a ½ mile radius from the station platform, or a 5-10 minute walk**, subject to site-specific considerations.” We know of no site-specific considerations that should alter this walking distance guideline, including the fact the Metro stations are located in the median of the Dulles Corridor. Traversing the median to the station is 200 feet or less than .04 miles. At a 20-minute per mile walking pace (the standard used in the walking distance calculations), the 200 feet adds 45 seconds to people’s walk—not an extra five minutes as this draft would allow. Moreover, we would note that the density and mix allocations in Scenario G, which guides the density planning for this draft plan and which we generally accept, would be seriously undermined by, in effect, extending the walking distance another quarter-mile. This change should be retracted throughout the text. On a positive note, we concur with your decision to set measurement from the station platform, and wonder why the staff would stretch the other end of the yard stick.

P.19 and beyond (Mix of uses—hotels and “other uses”—p. 24): Again, for reasons that escape us, staff has changed hotels from a non-residential to a residential use. This defies nearly four years of task force discussion of what the various land uses are; until this draft, hotels have always been considered a non-residential use. Moreover, we know of no one who “resides” in a hotel and hotel visitors are just as likely (maybe more so) to rent a car as use public transit or walk (see p. 24)—especially since most hotel visitors are on a business expense account.

Similarly, the paragraph on p. 24 noting that “other uses” included in a building may be exempted from non-residential uses is based on a faulty and dangerous premise: that they “may...generate activity in off-peak hours.” So do office buildings, retail, and every other type of land use I’m aware of. In fact, if one believes what is happening to office building use, they will operate 24 hours a day, enabling a smaller office foot print to support a given level of staffing. Should they be exempted from “non-residential” use?

The only appropriate test of “residential use” is whether someone lives there, not their transportation means, time of day, or any other criterion. “Residential use” should mean only use as a residence.

Staff knows as well as we do that this is merely an attempt on behalf of developers to add more office space to the mix of uses. In fact, with an average 5.8 percent hotel usage throughout the station areas, the non-residential-residential mix in the “transit station mixed use” would move from 50%-50% to 55%-45% and in the “residential mixed use” areas from 25%-75% to 30%-70%. As a rough order of magnitude estimate, we would foresee this amounting to an added 3.6MM GSF of non-residential

space, meaning the addition of 12,000 employees and the loss of 3,000 DUs, dampening efforts to bring some level of J:HH balance in the TSA areas. Hotels must be considered as part of the non-residential share of the mix of uses and the paragraph on p. 24 re hotels “can contribute” to less congestion should be deleted to reflect reality rather than the physically possible.

P. 20-21 (Planned Development Potential): The change in language here, eliminating any reference to the total amount of planned office space in the TSAs (much less other uses), all but eliminates the usefulness of the Plan as a guide to development. The plan is not a benchmark, it is a set of goals (at the minimum) that should not be altered with each re-zoning; otherwise, what’s the point? We appreciate that some—LIMITED—flexibility is warranted in planning two decades ahead, but this language undermines all that follows. In contrast, the original text points to a reasonable office development goal. Staff may want to articulate similar goals for other land use types and point to the ensuing TSA sections, but not the waffling language this draft now includes. Otherwise, stick with the language originally in the draft text.

P. 28 (Bonus opportunities): We agree with your concern that bonus densities should not be extended beyond the ¼-mile ring.

P. 31 (Improve Connectivity): We believe an additional principle needs to be included: “Assure north-south mobility across the Dulles Corridor and through the transit station areas for Restonians and others through additions and improvements in the road network.” The key transportation issue for many, if not most, Restonians is driving from one side of Reston to the other. The corridor is already a sometimes insufferable barrier for people needing to drive to the other side of town. Neither we nor the County (so far as we can tell) has any plans for transit that would address this specific point-to-point transportation need—doctor’s offices, soccer and other sports fields, even a preferred supermarket (Trader Joe’s, for example) or pharmacy. As FCDOT’s existing conditions report showed, peak period conditions along these routes are already failing, and it won’t get better without road improvements.

P. 35 (Pedestrian Crossings): We believe this paragraph must explicitly allow for a limited number of grade-separated crossings at key intersections near Metro stations. Proposed language: “At intersections across major roadways near Metrorail stations, including the intersections of Wiehle and Reston Parkway with Sunset Hills and Sunrise Valley Drive, grade-separated crossings offer the safest and most congestion reducing way to handle the large number of pedestrians crossing to work or Metrorail.”

P.38+ (Tree Canopy): An added goal should be “the protection of existing mature trees where possible in the transit station areas, particularly along the Dulles Toll Road.”

P. 49 and elsewhere (Parking Design, Surface Parking): We believe no new surface parking lots or free standing parking garages should be allowed in the transit station area. Future parking should be incorporated into the building they support, not in a separate garage or surface lot. *All surface areas not covered by a building and its requisite parking should be reserved for public open space.* We share the concerns expressed in this draft about surface parking (p. 51). We concur with the on-street parking language (p. 52).

P.53 (Calculation of Public Open Space): The draft proposes that 20 percent of the net lot area should be open space. After having done some calculations on hypothetical parcels and blocks, we believe this percentage is insufficient because the actual resulting public open space may be on the order of 10-15% of the gross lot area. (For example, a 400'x200' block parcel surrounded by local (narrow) streets comprising some 80,000 GSF would lead to a net lot area of 60,800 SF. At 20%, the resulting open space square footage would only be 15.2% of gross lot area. Parcels with a street on only one side would achieve a better result. Parcels facing broader streets would achieve lower results.) We believe the percentage of net lot area devoted to open space should not be less than 25% to achieve an attractive public space.

P. 53 and beyond (Publically Accessible Open Space):

- First paragraph: The last sentence should end “the transit station areas,” not “the Reston community.” As indicated at the top of the page, this section is about the TSAs, not the community. We have sufficient open space in the non-TSA community consistent with the value Reston puts on open space, nature, and the environment; much needs to be preserved or created in the TSA areas.
- Bottom of p. 53: “...immediate proximity of the transit station areas” is not good enough. The open space requirement of the TSAs must be met in the TSAs where the people will be. Adding 60K jobs and 50K people in the TSAs requires that they have their own abundant open space. It is not incumbent upon the community, which continues to pay for its open space through taxes and RA fees, to accommodate these people.
- We have more to say on this issue in the context of Parks and Recreation.

P. 55 (Monitoring System): We do not understand why County staff changed the monitoring effort to only new development, not the entirety of development. It is the entirety of development that affects transportation, including changing transportation behavior, not just the incremental share. This needs to return to the original language.

P. 56 (Public Transportation):

- *Pedestrians and bicyclists:*
 - We note that p. 18 has useful observations about pedestrian and bike connectivity in the station areas and says, “see additional guidance in the Transportation section.” The Transportation section is missing any discussion of pedestrian and bicycle travel in and to the TOD areas. Although this is discussed some in the Urban Design section, it deserves reinforcement here.
 - There must be pedestrian access **to** the TOD area through a system of sidewalks, trails and bike lanes. The RA trail system should be connected to the TOD areas, with proffer money as needed. Additional sidewalk links along arterials and collectors need to be provided. Efforts should be made to review the adequacy of these links within 1-½ miles from the station entrances.

- There must be safe pedestrian and bicycling routes, particularly in the Wiehle/Reston East station area. Routes over or under Wiehle, and Sunset Hills are particularly needed but access must also be provided between the Reston Metro Station and Town Center.
- There need to be pedestrian safety islands on the arterials and collectors.
- *Local Bus Service:*
 - This section requires expansion. With the restricted parking proposed, access to and from the TOD areas from north and south Reston and areas outside the TSAs will be by bus. With the opening of the Reston Town Center and Herndon/Monroe station in five years—and at the end of the 10-year horizon for the current 2009 Bus Transit Plan--the Fairfax Connector route structure should be re-examined and re-organized.
 - There is a need for:
 - Bus express lanes, particularly during rush hour.
 - Bus stops that avoid restricting other traffic (see Wiehle for an example of what should not be!). The bus stops should be covered.
 - Frequent shuttle bus service to move riders from the stations to businesses and offices outside the TSAs. Shuttle connections among the TOD areas—particularly to Reston Town Center—will be needed.
 - Express bus service from outlying areas to the TOD center. Creation of expanded park and rides in outlying areas.
 - Frequent shuttle service between North Town Center and Town Center and Reston station.
 - In the interim, a direct bus link from the Wiehle/Reston East station to the Reston Transit Center is required, not the round about routing through Town Center Drive or Reston Parkway now planned.

P. 57 (Network Level of Service): County staff has not addressed our request for a clear, measurable definition of this term. We can find no reference to it in ITE or other professional and official documents. Specifically we need to know:

- Does the “overall” NLOS refer to ALL intersections in the P1 study area or selected (particularly “gateway”) intersections?
- What TIMEFRAME does the NLOS cover—all –day, every day, including weekends and holidays; some “peak” interval—period, hour, etc.?
- Is it an AVERAGE of the measured LOS grades? If so, is the average weighted by the traffic volume at a given intersection?

Moreover, what does County staff mean by that the goal of LOS “E” is “expected.” What does that mean? Is that a forecast like “Rain is expected tomorrow?” Given a satisfactory definition of NLOS, we believe a better statement here is: “The goal for the street network in the Reston Transit Station Areas is an overall Level of Service (LOS) “E”.” Depending on the definition, that may not work, but it is a place to start.

Whatever the goal becomes, it is largely irrelevant unless we know where we are now. What is the NLOS for the existing streets in the TSAs?

P. 58 (Table T2): *We asked before and we will ask again:* What is the “reduction” goal from? Is this from current vehicle trip levels? We need more than a reference to the ITE handbook in a footnote. Vehicle trip levels absent TDM at future densities/mixes? As it stands now, the table tells the reader nothing—although we would all agree that reducing vehicle trips is a good thing. It is a metric without an identifiable beginning or an end.

P. 59 (Road Transportation Improvements): We once again ask that these be laid out in a general priority order. As it stands now, the Dulles Corridor crossings appear to be low priority, and actually listed in the reverse order of their priority (Soapstone should be first). Certainly the grid of streets is not last on such a list. On the other hand, we are less concerned with the expansion of Fairfax County Pkwy—which will only facilitate workers driving to/from Reston (not to mention ongoing BOS efforts to convert it to a toll road, diverting traffic to Reston Parkway).

For Soapstone and South Lakes overpasses mentioned here, the word “approximately” needs to be dropped. This is essential to the smooth, uncongested flow of traffic. Adding corners and almost certainly traffic lights with offset intersections will make traffic worse, not better in these TSAs.

P.64 (Table T3): We asked before and will again that a maximum parking rate (spaces per 1,000GSF for non-residential uses, spaces per DU for residential space) be added to this table, especially for commercial spaces. While we appreciate the reduction in the minimums over existing County standards, we anticipate developers will strive to attract tenants (or build to suit tenants) with parking rate targets much higher than these minimums. In general, we believe the maximums should be similar to those in Tysons. If we want people to get out of their cars, we need to make sure to get the cars out of the places they are likely to drive in the TSAs.

P. 65 (Funding of Transportation Improvements and Services): This single paragraph on the transportation implementation issue is worse than inadequate. We know that the Tysons transportation fixes will cost more than \$5 billion in future dollars, not counting financing charges. We know that Tysons residents and businesses have had a \$.04/\$100 and soon will have a \$.08/\$100 valuation surcharge added to their annual property tax bills as a result. This is a roughly eight percent surcharge on their taxes, which is especially unfair to residents. They will not make any added money for living there while their business counterparts stand to reap millions in additional profit each year. Like other implementation issues, this needs to be worked out before we agree to this elaborate vision of Reston TSAs. How we do this (even whether we can do this) is as important as what we do.

P. 72+ (Parks, Recreation, & Culture): This extended discussion of the concepts of urban parks, etc., does not provide a useful guide for any kind of planning purpose. It should basically end at the first sentence: See the County’s less than adequate Urban Parks Framework in Appendix 2. The section says nothing useful about what needs should be filled, where new facilities should be placed, how they will be financed, etc. At most, it is an extended narrative about possibilities, not plans.

Worse, the second paragraph points the finger squarely at current Reston residents (most of them in RA) to assume the burden of providing the necessary facilities for the growing employment and residential population in the TSAs. (See: "...elements of the larger Reston area's robust park and recreation system (**outside the TSAs**) may be able to be improved to help meet the needs of future (*Comment: inside the TSA*) residents and employees." Also, "Some of the needs identified above may be more appropriate to a location outside of the TSAs and may in fact provide greater benefit in such a location by encouraging broader use (e.g., Memorial Garden of Reflection) (p. 80).") The notion is reinforced throughout this section by phrases such as "working together" and "close collaboration." What these paragraphs really mean is what we developers have is ours and what Staff residents have is negotiable.

As dues-paying RA members, we resent the implication that we should be encouraged or even forced to give up *our* property that we continue to pay for so others in the TSAs, who have no obligation to also become dues-paying RA members under this plan, may be accommodated. This notion may well be considered an illegal taking of property under Virginia's stringent eminent domain laws. Would the County presume to tell developers to give up their property rights so others could use their property? Why should the community do so?

Unless and until (1) all new residents in the Phase 1 area become RA members and (2) developers provide the space (about 100 acres) and facilities required as stated by FCPA in its addendum to its memorandum to DPZ early this year within the TSAs, this notion is a non-starter for the community. The failure to even mention the list of park and recreational requirements generated by a County-RA panel (no one from RCA was involved), much less including a table in the plan comparable to the table in the Tysons plan laying out its facilities requirements, reflects the view that meeting the park, recreation, and cultural needs of TSA development will fall almost exclusively on the rest of the Reston community.

Finally, not once in this section (and rarely in the district/sub-district sections) does this plan recommend ("should") that a specific park or recreation facility "should" be built or its location. This may be forthcoming when a real map of proposed TSA area P&R facilities is provided, although it is now years overdue. Forget about requiring such facilities despite the huge increase in population and employment and the specific needs laid out by FCPA. To the extent any such facilities are explicitly mentioned (e.g.—community greens), their construction is conditioned by "could" and "might" and other totally non-committal verbiage to meeting the needs of the huge new community in our midst. Here are some examples:

- "Isaac Newton Square represents **an opportunity** to create a new residential neighborhood, including a community serving park. (p.88)" Is that a requirement, an ignorable recommendation ("should"), or just one of many possible "opportunities"?
- "Examples of **possible** amenities might include a signature community green or a flexible use, community gathering plaza and/or a destination playground. A redesign of the private and public uses in Reston Town Center North is anticipated offering opportunities to better integrate urban park features, recreation and cultural amenities. (p.79)." Many things are possible, but none are proposed or recommended. This is throwaway text from a developer's perspective.

- “A new community-serving park **should** be located in this subdistrict as well as a series of smaller urban plazas and parks to provide green spaces and recreational activities of various types within an easy walk of the residential buildings and office buildings in the subdistrict. (p. 99). At last, four pages from the end of the draft, a non-binding recommendation for a park in Town Center North.

Establishing unambiguous benchmarks for what parks and recreation facilities need to be built and where is important because, as this draft points out, phasing of development hinges on the development of these spaces and facilities. (“Priorities that should be addressed in the earliest phases of site development plans include critical links within the street grid, **parks and open space**, . . .” (p. 29)”) If the Comprehensive Plan does not establish what and where these parks and open space are supposed to be, how can it be addressed as a priority criterion for phasing site development?

At the minimum, we need specific language in that calls for:

- The construction of a recreation center in Town Center North or Wiehle North District.
- A large signature community-serving park in Town Center North of not less than 20 acres.
- A large community-serving park of not less than seven acres in Town Center South.
- Creation of a linear park along the W&OD trail from Wiehle west to the power substation, including a variety of playground and small sports courts.
- Preservation of the stream valley south and west of the Comstock building as a nature area.
- Creation of a substantial neighborhood park in Isaac Newton Square.
- Fortunately, the draft plan does call for preservation of the Sunrise Valley wetlands nature area.

P.81 (Schools): Although the second paragraph identifies specific locations for a new high and elementary school, it does note where “capacity enhancements” would be beneficial. We assume Langston Hughes Middle School (already overcrowded) would be expanded. It may be worthwhile noting the plans to “enhance” Terraset ES, Sunrise Valley ES, and South Lakes HS as well.

P.82 (Fire & Rescue): You have overlooked the North Point fire station (Reston Avenue & Rt. 7) which serves north Reston and Reston Town Center.

P. 83 (Library): In light of new information about Reston Regional Library plans, we believe the following sentence needs to be added to this paragraph: “A new or renovated Reston Regional Library should provide the full range of professional library services, including a large book collection for browsing and borrowing, extensive reference documents for study and review, and improved digital access to online information of all types, including subscription services. The library should be part of the expanded County government complex in Town Center North.”

P.83 (Implementation & Phasing Development-p. 28): These brief sections provide no useful guidance on how or when to achieve the goals laid out in this plan. At best, they lay out the numerous options that may be available. Reston residents are well aware of the extreme difficulty in establishing a financing arrangement in Tysons for needed transportation initiatives and the huge costs those will entail—and the likelihood that the similar tax surcharges will be applied here-- as we discussed above on

transportation financing. We are also keenly aware that the County wants to stick Reston with paying for a new recreation center through the local tax district. At the same time, as we've highlighted above, the language in this draft points to Reston residents sacrificing some of their property without compensation from either developers or new residents and businesses so that developers can make greater profits and the County can generate greater tax revenues through more development. We believe the failure to address these issues in a constructive and comprehensive manner during this planning process renders this draft plan as little more than a fantasy with so much flexibility that the broadly stated goals will never be achieved.

P.86+ (Individual development flexibility): In this overview of the "tier" system, the draft states, "These percentages should serve as a guide for individual developments but may need to be adjusted **within the same area tier** on a case-by-case basis in order to further other planning objectives." We warily agree with this statement, yet in the descriptions of all the Tier 1 areas in the ensuing district/subdistrict descriptions, staff fails to include the caveat that the flexibility is limited to the same Tier 1 area. On the other hand, staff makes this constraint for Tier 2 areas. We believe that any mix flexibility must be limited to the tier area in all cases and should so state explicitly for the Tier 1 areas. Otherwise, the desired J:HH balance will become even more elusive.

P.90 (Wiehle South Subdistrict—Tier 3 area): This brief paragraph states that it covers areas zoned PRC that are approved for convention/conference center uses. We are unaware of any Wiehle area south of the corridor that extends to PRC-zoned space (which is south of Sunrise Valley Drive so far as we know). Please provide specific information on this area, including whether it is south of SRV Drive, under RA governance, and when/why a conference center is zoned there.

Maps: There are a number of references to maps in the draft text and the maps are not included in the draft plan. In particular, these include the map of proposed locations for Reston parks and recreation facilities and the tax maps associated with the district/subdistrict descriptions. These need to be included in the next draft plan text.

Reston Recreation Center: Nowhere in this draft is a new Reston recreation center suggested; indeed, the phrase "recreation center" does not appear in the text. As have noted in the past, we believe there should be one, it should be financed by the County (vice Reston), and it should be located in a TSA, preferably Town Center North with other government facilities, but the Wiehle area may provide a reasonable alternative. We believe a specific recommendation should be made by County staff on this matter in the draft text. We would note that this recommendation was part of the Town Center Subcommittee report.

General Comment

In general, we support the densities, mixes, and locations for the transit station area development as outlined in Scenario G months ago, although we would amend it further to meet the needs of Restonians based on the impact analyses we have reviewed. I believe it is fair to say that the extent of our dissatisfaction with that scenario mirrors much of the development community's dissatisfaction with somewhat constrained densities and greater emphasis on residential development. Under Scenario G,

no one would get all they want, but we would all garner many of the goals for a transit-oriented urban community we each want to achieve if it were implemented. In a task force setting, that is called compromise and probably means that the Scenario G densities, mixes, and sitings are the best we can do.

Unfortunately, as Scenario G has been written up by County in draft Comprehensive Plan language, the goals and constraints in that scenario have been undercut in the name of flexibility. Each draft has been less satisfactory than its predecessor as a planning document from Reston's perspective. At this point the draft language has virtually no spine or muscle to achieve the goals and limits it professes.

- The latest draft, even more than its predecessors, includes numerous weasel words and phrases that undermine achievement of the planning goals of Scenario G, such as extending the TOD walking distance by five minutes in direct contradiction of County policy.
- It also omits vital details—sometimes completely—for critical planning elements, such as phasing, implementation, financing, and incorporating of parks and recreation to serve future residents and employees in the transit station areas. As a result, we have only an increasingly hazy vision of a possible outcome two decades from now with no roadmap (called a “plan”) to get there
- It omits opportunities that would serve the longer term development of the station areas, including moving deliberately now to acquire air rights along the Dulles corridor and including a new recreation center in one of the station areas.
- It generally calls upon the current Reston community led by Reston Association to provide space and financing to provide amenities that serve station area residents and workers without any commitment that the residents would become members of RA.

There are two critical ramifications of this amorphous, incomplete, and ultimately dysfunctional draft Plan. The first is that it gives developers and their associates, abundantly represented on this task force, virtually unfettered opportunity to build what they want in the density they wish at places of their choosing. The stretching and softening of various boundaries and planned mixes—since when have hotels been considered a residential use?—means almost anything can be built anywhere. The easy opportunities for developers to increase densities through proffers and bonuses means that, the market allowing, we can expect development to far exceed even the traffic clogging levels identified in Scenario G.

On the other hand, the draft Plan language essentially calls upon current Restonians to absorb all the burdens created by adding up to 50,000 jobs and 40,000 residents in the station areas. Despite the fact that the County Parks Authority has identified a need for more than 100 acres of parks and recreation facilities because of the population growth, the draft plan does not identify any space in the draft Plan to accommodate that need. In fact, it calls upon the current residents of the Reston PRC to share their space—which they continue to pay for annually—so that developers can build more and make greater profits. At the same time, the draft plan does not recommend—much less require—that the new

station area residents become members of RA. This is a double whammy for Restonians. Moreover, despite the County's acknowledgement that traffic at Reston's "gateway" intersections along the corridor will be operating at absolute gridlock in the next 20 years, the draft plan offers little in the way of concrete proposals or commitments to improving connectivity between north and south Reston. Indeed, the so-called Soapstone Connector is still in the feasibility process nearly five years after it was proposed by RMAG.

The community's apprehension and dissatisfaction with the plan is aggravated further by the draft plan's failure to address meaningfully the key implementation, phasing, and financing issues. Instead, what we have is an ambiguous vision with no direction or resources to assure we address even the most basic community infrastructure needs. We are certainly aware that the current residents of Tysons are being forced to accept a planned eight percent surcharge on their property taxes to pay for transportation improvements that will likely do little to serve their needs. Based on the County's failure to enforce phasing guidelines in other locations, in part due to an adverse court decision, the community doubts little will be done to insure that the needed infrastructure—streets, transit, schools, recreation center, etc.—much less proposed amenities, such as a performing arts center, will be implemented.

We are extremely disillusioned that a reasonably acceptable development scenario has turned into this amorphous, directionless mass of words. We hope that you can return this draft plan to a useful guide for development in Reston's station areas consistent with Scenario G. If not, it will be extremely difficult for us to support it.

Thank you once again for listening and hopefully addressing the Reston Community's concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about our comments.

Sincerely,

Terry Maynard
Reston Task Force Representative
Reston Citizens Association

CC:
Patty Nicoson, Chairman, Reston Task Force
RCA Board of Directors