

**Loudoun County
 Countywide Transportation Plan Update
 Public Comment Record from Website Form
 May 1, 2007 to September 30, 2007**

Below is a log of all CTP related comments –81 in total -- received via web comment form (www.loudounctp.com) or email, from May 1, 2007 to September 30, 2007. Names, emails, addresses, salutations, personal comments and invitations to meet with County Staff have been removed for privacy and brevity. Questions raised in these comments have been addressed by staff via e-mail to the individual author. Comments have been grouped as follows:

| | |
|---|----|
| General Comments: Process, Participation | 6 |
| Traffic Circles | 1 |
| Carpool Lanes | 1 |
| Transit | 2 |
| Route 659 | 1 |
| New Road | 1 |
| Route 7 (West) | 1 |
| Riverside Parkway | 1 |
| Route 50 | 1 |
| Shellhorn Road | 1 |
| Shaw Road/Cedar Green/Davis Dr. | 3 |
| Route 860/Watson Road | 6 |
| Route 15 North/Lucketts Bypass | 5 |
| Hillsboro Bypass/Hillsboro/Rt. 9 Connector | 51 |

General Comments: Process, Participation

Subject: Proposed Rt. 9 Connector Road, 5/9/2007

When is the next meeting planned that the public can attend? Why hasn't the public been better informed? I just read about this proposed road in the May 4th Leesburg Today. The alternate #3 road proposed would go right behind my property. Please advise. Thank you.

Subject: Link not working, 5/9/2007

I was trying to find out more information about your March 29th Meeting on the home web page, but the link does not work. When will the "late May" meeting be held? Thank you.

Subject: Copies of documents, 5/15/2007

Can you mail me printed copies of all of the 2007 documents listed on your documents page? If yes, here is my address:

Subject: Last Night's meeting, 6/19/2007

When and how do we hear the outcome of the meeting last night? Thanks.

Subject: Comments on Public Information meeting at Mountainview Elementary School, 9/9/2007

First I must identify that I am a resident of Purcellville, a business owner in the town of Purcellville, and I sit on the Purcellville Planning Commission. At this time, I speak as citizen of the county and town. I was extremely disappointed at the meeting held this week at Mountainview Elementary School from both the content and the facilitation. I will discuss content first.

1. This was supposed to be about the impact of CTP on Western Loudoun, which includes more than the Town of Hillsboro. There was no discussion of the Southern Connector; little mention of the 690 interchange, no discussion of the need for widening 7 By-pass – All improvements that need to be made quickly. There was no discussion of the improvements that need to be made to Alder School Road – to make it safe for students coming to HS-3 from the north.
2. Discussion of the Hillsboro by-pass did not even include the impact on the Towns around Hillsboro, only the impact on the 100 or so residents of the Town of Hillsboro.
3. We know that if the Town's and County work together, we get better results, but it seems that the County's consultants did not even consider the impacts on the 6000+ people that live in the Town of Purcellville. They did not consult the town about the Town's Transportation plan; they did not consult the PUGAMP Committee (which includes both representatives from the town and County) about the transportation issues within the JLMA.
4. Understanding that the Town of Hillsboro does need relief from traffic going through it, a by-pass would be a positive step. This by-pass, though needs to be built to handle the traffic, but it needs to be built so that it doesn't end at Business 7 (as it is now shown). It needs to help ease the congestion in the Town of Purcellville not make it worse. The only way to do this is to widen Rt. 7 to 3 lanes in each direction to the point that the by – pass cuts in.
5. There was discussion at one point to make this a toll road. I see that as defeating the purpose. The goal is to take the traffic coming from WV and move it outside the town of Hillsboro. A toll road will get less usage, and the traffic will continue to increase within the town.

In terms of the Facilitation of the meeting, the moderator made a statement up front that people would be given 1.5 minutes. He allowed some people to speak 8 or 9 minutes, and cut others off right at the 1.5 minutes. This was extremely unfair those that had found themselves at the end of the line and got little time. It was also frustrating for the audience that wanted to hear more opinions and from people other than those speaking on the Hillsboro issue.

As with any public information session, it is not easy to please all the people. I understand that the Hillsboro issue is the emotional issue, and the squeaky wheel gets the

oil, but it is important to remember that this county is made up a many more people that need to see transportation improved.

Subject: Countywide Transportation Plan Update, 9/24/2007

1. This is an attempt at a local solution for a regional problem. (Wrong approach.)
2. This is a new roads plan, not a transportation plan.
3. You should have started this with a significant study of present residents' needs and visions for their communities.
4. Stop talking about roads that will lead to some illusory new bridge over the Potomac. This has to START with Maryland, or the feds.
5. Where's the emphasis on getting cars OFF of the road--strategies to REDUCE the need for new roads?
6. Why so little emphasis on alternative modes of transit: bike path from the river to Leesburg?
7. Use a toll on the VA side of the bridge to discourage traffic and raise funds for road improvements.
8. Why doesn't this plan even mention the character or the economies (tourism, etc.) of the communities it plans to degrade or destroy? What kind of planning is this?
9. The model used to project traffic and behavior seems deeply flawed, many speakers mentioned.
10. Why no EMPHASIS (not just a little mention, as Phillips said by way of defense of the plan) on this region's poor air quality and the need for any plan to mold transportation solutions around a true plan for improving air quality?
11. Maryland has no plans for and sees no need for new capacity on its portion of Route 15 (This was said in the context of the vast amount of MD commuter traffic using the road morning and evening). When Marylanders tell their government they have a problem, let them come to us to ask us to help solve it. We shouldn't be forking out tax money to solve a problem Maryland says it doesn't have.

Traffic Circles

Subject: More traffic circles please, 9/30/2007

Please construct more traffic circles or round-abouts. The only ones I know of that are planned are for Gilberts corner, and a few on private property (i.e. shopping centers).

I used to hate round-abouts when I occasionally saw them in MA, MD, and other states. Then I traveled to Europe, where they have been in abundance, and saw how well they really work. I learned a whole new appreciation for them and now think the adoption of them in other states makes lot of sense: They reduce congestion and emissions, can be used for traffic calming, are cheaper to maintain than a signaled intersection, reduce the chance of a head-on or T-bone accident at intersections, and are more appropriate for historic areas than a traffic light.

Please consider round-abouts versus traffic lights or four-way stop signs in the future for the CTP, as well as encourage residential developers to use them as an alternative to stop signs and as a traffic calming feature. Thank you.

Car Pool Lanes

Subject: Car Pool Lanes for Loudoun County?, 5/4/2007

CAR POOL LANES!!! I moved here last year from California and have seen what a waste these are. They reduce the non carpool lanes by 25% yet only have a less than 10% utilization rate. Guess where the other percentage goes - into the remaining lanes! Stomp out this liberal left wing plot to force us into a desired mode of transportation. I, like a majority of Americans, love my car and love driving ALONE! We should not be penalized with an even worse commute!

Want less traffic thru LC? How about some toll booths at the WVA border to get the hundreds of WV cars and trucks I encounter every morning and evening on our LC roads to start paying a fair share for OUR roads!

Transit

Subject: LC Transit Route: Leesburg to Dulles North Transit Centre/ AOL, 5/8/2007

I am a county employee and I feel the following for the LC Transit:

1. The HUB should be Government Centre. It will help County employee to get to their workplace.
2. There should be more frequent bus service from Leesburg to Dulles Town Centre/ AOL Headquarter.

Subject: Fixed route bus: Dulles to Dulles, 9/27/2007

It would be very helpful if the Dulles to Dulles route was extended until 10pm because of people who miss the last commuter bus from West Falls Church Metro could catch a Washington Flyer bus to the airport then take the Dulles to Dulles to their car at The Dulles North lot.

Route 659

Subject: Route 659 Alignment in Vicinity of Bull Run Quarry, 5/17/2007

Please revise the Rt. 659 alignment in the vicinity of the Bull Run Quarry (Luck Stone) to reflect the alignment that was approved as part of the rezoning approval, namely ZMAP 2002-0018 and SPEX 2002-0016. The approved alignment shifts to the west of the existing quarry. We will have a graphic of the alignment submitted to you under separate cover.

New Road

Subject: Gilberts Corner - southern 4 lane alternate, 5/8/2007

I am dismayed to see the suggestion to turn New Rd into a 4 lane cut through to Rte 50. New Rd is currently an unpaved, rural residential road. There are at least 3 working farms on this road. Two are horse farms which offer riding lessons not far from the current road. It is not unusual to see tractors and horse trailers driving along New Rd. Both Lenah Rd and Braddock Rd which connect to New Rd are also residential roads. Is it a common practice to divert traffic from the main roads into residential neighborhoods? I would have thought it was the other way around.

Rt. 7 (West)

Subject: Turn off lane @ Rt. 7 and Williams Gap Road in Round Hill, VA., 8/6/2007

I would like to know the status of the Six Year Road Plan for the above captioned intersection. According to the Transportation Needs Presentation currently there are between 10,000-30,000 two way daily trips each day! We need a turn off lane now; it is a very dangerous intersection! Please advise me of your plans. Thank you.

Riverside Parkway

Subject: Riverside Parkway via Smith Circle, 8/27/2007

Though we would prefer that no major thoroughfare dissect Smith Circle at all, we reluctantly support the realignment of Riverside Parkway nearer Route 7 rather than around the perimeter of Smith Circle. The new alignment keeps most traffic in one corridor rather than bringing a 6 lane highway in close proximity to the Potomac River and entirely encircling Smith Circle with a multi-lane highway traffic. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Route 50

Subject: Interchange on Route 50 and West Spine Road, 8/28/2007

I am the owner of a gas station located on Route 50 (West) in Dulles South area. The retail center is known as "Croson's Store" and has been in business for over 60 years. This is one of the oldest businesses in operation on Route 50 corridor. I am concerned about the proposed interchange at Route 50 and West Spine Road. The planned interchange will directly impact my business and will shut down the gas station.

I am opposed to the construction of this interchange. I believe this interchange is planned to benefit Arcola Center. The nearby interchanges at North Star Boulevard and Loudoun County Parkway on Route 50 should be able to move the traffic in north-south direction. I urge you to remove Route 50/West Spine Road interchange from the Countywide Transportation Plan. Please consider and preserve "existing" businesses. Thank you for your attention.

Shellhorn Road

Subject: Countywide Transportation Plan – Shellhorn, 6/17/2007

I have not had much time to review this transportation plan. But one glaring flaw is the fact that Shellhorn Road does not make a direct connection to sterling Blvd.

The maze that is now planned around one of the densest future areas, the last planned metro station, is a joke for getting traffic in and out of that area. A direct connection from Shellhorn to Sterling Blvd. makes the most common sense instead of dumping everything into Old Ox Rd.

Personally the Rt. 789 connection as a major connection to Waxpool Rd. makes no sense compared to aligning Shellhorn to Sterling Blvd. The major dense development is around the metro station not the mostly developed Waxpool Rd. Again Shellhorn needs to be the major entrance and exit to the metro from Rt. 28 on the north side of the Greenway NOT the future Rt. 789 which goes to nowhere or basically to Waxpool where the development is coming to completion and is not a high density area. Just logic and common sense needs to be used here.

When I have time I plan to make a video presentation on how to keep Loudoun beautiful even with high density. I also plan to start a blog on how to keep Loudoun beautiful and to help developers to maintain greenery and stop the denuding of the landscape. This will be done through taking what one would call a slop project and showing the developer how it can become a asset to county and the project itself by thinking thru the landscaping, positioning of buildings to save existing trees and what we see driving down the street. I have a project in mind for my first attempt at showing the developer how they might go from being a slop neighbor to a beautiful neighbor. All hope is not lost if some additional thought goes into major landscaping along Waxpool Rd. Otherwise this project is up for slop project of the month on my future blog. All development in this county should add beauty not take it away for ever, such as the ugly grey data centers on the greenway which should also be given an slop award.

More to come on my future blog and website. This website will hopefully show the public the difference between good neighborly design in development and slop projects which destroys the beauty of the county. We need win-win in this county, especially in transportation.

Shaw Road/Cedar Green/Davis

Subject: Old Gable Square, 9/25/07 (same comments submitted by 3 different residents of the area – included only once for brevity, counted as 3 sets of comments on this topic)

I would like to express my extreme displeasure with the current Loudoun County Transportation Plan of 2007. Why can't Shaw Road between Davis and Cedar Green either be removed as it goes nowhere (my preference) or be left in its current state of 2 lanes. Increasing this road to 4 lanes and building the new section through the monastery to connect the current Shaw Road and Cedar Green will be extremely detrimental to the quality of life of myself and my entire community and the surrounding communities not

to mention the monastery and let's not forget the significant decrease in our property values as well! Again, let's also not forget that the road will essentially go nowhere. This change will affect many parts of the community and will encroach significantly upon homes and significantly increase noise beyond the acceptable residential zoning limits (the road is ft and inches already from my house!). These roads will potentially impact our home values enough that we will have significantly more foreclosures in our neighborhood than in surrounding communities. This is the type of change that could affect us to the point that we will be unable to sell our property for anything close to its value. Safety is already a concern of our community. With the connection of Davis to Sterling Blvd. and primarily with the addition of the new piece of Shaw road behind our properties our community has seen a great increase in crime, especially car break ins due to the increased access nonresidents now have to our community. This is primarily due to the lack of lighting, and lack of space between our community and this section of Shaw Road (currently 3ft or less in places). Homeowners have started adding spotlights to their back yards and taken to leaving back lights on at all times to try and add lighting.

Not only do we ask that this road not be widened, we ask that the poor planning of the current road be addressed. I implore the planning committee & board of supervisors to at a minimum add a retaining wall to separate our property from the section of Shaw Road that is just ft & inches away. We would also request that a barrier of some sort also be placed between our community and Davis Rd. Once Atlantic is connected with Davis we expect that the traffic volume on Davis will increase significantly. We see both roads as safety and security issues; a barrier would provide not only noise reduction but would provide us with some protection from the road traffic, trash, and crime accessibility we are currently experiencing. Right now if someone loses control on Davis or Cedar Green they will end up in someone's house, not to mention the increase in trash, beer bottles, and cigarette butts that we now are having to clean up as a result. This situation is completely unacceptable, and adding the current CTP changes will be nothing less than a nightmare. I highly doubt ANYONE would want to live surrounded by 4 lanes roads.

We also request that the Corner of Shaw & Cedar Green be made a 3 way stop to decrease the potential of a serious accident happening at that dangerous intersection. It is very difficult to turn left or right off of Shaw onto Cedar Green at this time due to line of sight/placement of road.

Route 860/Watson Rd.

Subject: Route 860 Extension proposed, 6/18/2007

I live on Laceys Tavern Ct. which is a road soon to be turned over to the State. It is a private road at this stage. All the new multi-million dollar homes here were built in the last 3 years. I see on the new transportation plan that the Route 860 Extension as a 4 lane highway extending south of Rt. 50 to Rt. 15 appears to come right through our neighborhood as a 4 lane highway. Since the map used to draw the road does not seem to incorporate Laceys Tavern Ct. and Grand Ellison Place that both intersect with Braddock Road, is the proposed road supposed to be where our current private road is or perhaps is

that proposed road fall on the property line behind the homes newly built on these two streets? In other words would the County have to tear down these fairly expensive homes just to extend Watson Road? Seems pretty expensive idea considering each of these properties is each worth \$1.2 million to \$2 million each. Can you share if the specifics of this proposed extension include destroying these properties or is the plan to follow existing property boundaries and purchase vacant land behind our neighborhood? The neighbors are pretty upset over this and we desire some specifics.

Subject: Watson Road Extension, 6/20/2007

The current proposal shows this extension going through 2 streets which are not shown on the map. Laceys Tavern Ct. & Grand Ellsion Ct. With the extension of Lenah Rd. & New Rd. to Route 15 why is this Watson extension needed. I am opposed and would like some clarification.

Subject: Proposed Watson/Rt.860 extension and Gilbert's Corner, 6/20/2007

Can you please clarify why 2 roundabouts are needed at Gilbert's corner in addition to the Watson road extension? Also where the Watson extension will be - it appears to be right where my street - Laceys Tavern Ct is. Thank you.

Subject: Proposed relocation of Route 860, 9/7/2007

I recommend deleting the section of proposed relocation of Rt. 860 from the intersection with Rt. 50 to the intersection with Rt. 621.

The farmland in this area is zoned AR-1 with a density of 1 unit per 10 acres. Because the development pattern is low density and because the adjacent former transition zone is experiencing rezonings to the immediate east the area bracketing the existing Rt. 860 corridor actually forms the "hard edge" demarcation line between rural and suburban development.

It is apparent from looking at the proposed new Rt. 860 alignment that the purpose of the route is to relieve northbound traffic on Rt. 15, e.g. to bring the workers from Prince William County and south directly into the employment zones of eastern Loudoun.

The section proposed between Rt. 50 and Rt. 621 seems to me to be both unnecessary (the traffic for this direction could easily go a bit east on Rt. 50 then north) and detrimental since it would split the farmland it transverses while inducing increased development, potential rezonings, and thus defeating the "hard edge" of AR-1.

The strategy of getting developers to pay for new road construction will not work for this section as long as the "by-right" AR-1 zoning is in place. There is simply no incentive for developers to pay for such a road.

Local landowners do not need such a road or want such a road. The road will bisect many tracts of land making access to remaining parcels difficult and requiring additional service lanes to reach low-density home sites.

If the proposed route remains on the CTP as is, the possibility of its construction in the future casts a cloud of uncertainty as to how landowners can utilize their land. New homeowners will not want to live near a road of this magnitude therefore further devaluing the already reduced land values resulting from the shift from A-3 to AR-1.

If this route is so important to the growth of Loudoun's future then I suggest a development authority be funded with general revenue bonds and charged with immediately acquiring the undeveloped farms transected by this route so that the right-of-way is maintained and landowners aren't saddled with essentially privately funding the mandate of this road.

Subject: CTP - Route 860 Extension, 9/11/2007

I am asking the county to delete the Route 860 Extension from the CTP. I believe that there are other options, less disruptive to tax paying Loudoun County citizens, to address a projected traffic issue that is created by Prince William commuters. Re-engineering of the Gilbert's Corner intersection with turn lanes and signals on both Route 50 and Route 15 would be a more sensible solution - if a solution is even needed at this time.

Subject: Route 860 (Watson), 9/28/2007

I live on Watson Road, it is a 2 lane blacktop road that is narrow (18ft in front of my driveway) hilly and twisty with a 45mph speed limit. I am interested in your plan because I would like to see Watson Road changed to be more "safe". Currently, Watson is used heavily by commuters to cut through from RT. 621 to RT. 50. It is sometimes difficult in the morning to get on to Watson from my driveway due to vehicles traveling north at a high rate of speed. My mailbox is on the opposite side of the road as my driveway, during the afternoon rush hour, I frequently get "trapped" on the opposite side because of the fast moving traffic - bear in mind I only have 18 ft of road to cross. I will lend my support to either of the following;

1. Per your plan - relocate 860 to the west, which would alleviate the dangerous fast moving commuter traffic on Watson
2. Widen Watson to 24 ft, add a centerline, add a 6 ft bike lane on one side and reduce the speed limit to 30 mph.

The CTP also discusses the use of road beautification strategies, I think Watson Road would be a perfect candidate.

Lastly, there is a real safety concern about turning from Watson onto RT. 50 or vice-versa; just east of this area is a large elevation drop which creates a blind spot of the traffic moving westward. This intersection was the scene of a traffic fatality last year because blind spot. To help slow traffic the state installed "bump" strips on both the east and west side of this t-intersection. However, the condition still exists and unfortunately it's probably just a matter of time before there's another accident. Your CTP is very comprehensive and has a lot of good ideas, I look forward to helping you make Watson a prettier and safer road to drive on. Thanks for listening.

Route 15 North

Subject: Rt. 15 North of Leesburg, 9/13/2007

Regarding Route 15 improvements to address traffic safety and flow, I favor small, incremental improvements sensitive to the rural character and addressing local traffic issues. Although the modeling exercises are interesting and predict a possible future, it is unwise to believe that we know precisely what the future brings and exactly what strategies will address a probable scenario.

I strongly support making small changes, see how they work, and then move on to other small changes or more of the same change, depending on the outcome. This is a more prudent use of VA & Loudoun taxpayer resources and more sensitive to the local population. Selecting a traditional large scale remedy at this time based on possible projections is not planning-smart, fiscally prudent, or sensitive to the rural character of the area.

Specifically, I support the Planning Board giving serious consideration to the following smaller scale proposals: a toll booth on the southbound lane of Rt.15 at the Point-of-Rocks bridge to discourage commuter traffic and leverage out-of-state commuter resources to address the traffic issues; traffic calming solutions such as traffic circles - on Rt. 15 itself and on side roads, and rumble strips near Lucketts School; maintaining the bridge at Point-of-Rocks in its current character to act as a bottleneck; improving some of the side roads in the area for local use (but not so that they become attractive to commuters and absolutely not the four-lane "Lucketts bypass"); lowering the speed limits on side roads; adding more lights on Rt.15 to improve access for locals; improving Rt.15 shoulders. These types of solutions along with a strong emphasis on finding Regional and Countywide solutions, are more in keeping with the needs and resources of Loudoun residents, and share the burden of finding solutions for out-of-state commuter needs.

Regarding out-of-state commuter needs, I am interested in looking at a "several small bridges" option, rather than another mega-bridge. Several smaller bridges could be more sensitive to the rural character on both sides of the River and would spread the burden of addressing the out-of-state commuter issue across many communities and constituencies. Rt.15 should not be expected to be the answer to this issue.

Subject: Route 15 Corridor Analysis, 9/20/2007

I am commenting on the US 15/Rt 15 Corridor between Leesburg and Point of Rocks, MD. My wife and I recently purchased an existing home in the Lucketts area. We both work in the DC and NOVA area and of course must commute daily. We desire roads that are safe and free of congestion, especially in our local area. We do not agree with the loud, vocal group of residents that are opposed to any and all improvement to the Rt. 15 corridor. We are strongly in favor of improvements to the Rt. 15 corridor to improve safety and congestion.

Issues

I also believe that the Rt. 15 corridor analysis is flawed, because it tries to address two issues as one. I think that the analysis has two parts that should be analyzed separately. These issues are:

- 1) Immediately improve the safety and congestion level on the existing Rt. 15 right of way. Do this regardless of issue two below.
- 2) Study the possibility of an additional Potomac River crossing and connecting limited-access highway as a separate long-term project.

Immediate Improvements to Route 15

The safety and congestion level of the existing Rt.15 is simply unacceptable. I recommend that the county immediately begin basic improvements to the existing road to improve these levels. I suggest these basic improvements:

- Clearing the brush on each side of the road to improve visibility down the road and around corners.
- Building standard shoulders on both sides of the road.
- Widening any existing bridges and culverts to allow for safe shoulders.
- Installing more guardrails.
- Building more turning lanes where needed.
- Installing traffic signals to manage local traffic access to Rt. 15. Some suggested intersections are at Montresor Road, Spinks Ferry/New Valley Church Roads, St Clair Lane, and Lovettsville Road. I also suggest a second traffic light in Lucketts, located south of the grade school, to provide safe access to the school and calm traffic there.
- Grading and leveling of blind hills, especially hills that result in a turn immediately over the rise.
- Straightening of blind curves.

Existing engineering standards for two-lane highways should be used for all the above improvements.

I do not agree with the suggestions to build toll-booths, traffic circles, and other ridiculous proposals to discourage Maryland drivers from using this road. Frankly, I don't care what Maryland residents do or don't do. The primary focus should and must be on the safe use and access for Loudoun county residents. Rt.15 traffic must be safe and accessible for local residents.

New Potomac River Crossing and Connecting Limited-access Highway

A separate study should begin for a new Potomac River crossing and connecting limited-access highway, located somewhere west of Reston but before the Berlin Turnpike.

Many have suggested extending Route 28 north to facilitate this project, and that seems like a logical place to put this. However, other more feasible locations may exist and would be discovered by this new study. It would also give an opportunity, once more, for the states of Virginia and Maryland to participate. If the Federal highway department must mediate, so be it.

In general, Loudoun County should be a leader and participant in any such project, but should not be the sole participant. This project must involve both states, the NOVA road tax authority, and preferably the Federal government.

Again, my wife and I do not agree with those Loudoun residents that oppose such a project in all forms. A new river crossing and highway would specifically benefit local residents that use Rt. 15 by providing an alternative highway, and of course it would improve traffic in general throughout Loudoun County and Leesburg area. I suspect that many of those who oppose this idea are simply afraid that their property will be taken or devalued. If Federal, state, and local governments would compensate property owners generously instead of being stingy, it would reduce much of this type of opposition.

Thanks. We attended the recent meeting at Smart's Middle School regarding the Rt.15 corridor analysis. Thank you to the commissioners and staff that attended this meeting. Their presentation and conduct was very professional and proper, especially when dealing with some irate speakers. Special thanks go to George Phillips, who speaks very openly and personably with attendees. Finally, thank you for allowing us to comment.

Subject: CTP Update/Lucketts bypass, 9/24/2007

Keep the Lucketts Bypass off the plan. This is not the solution to a regional problem. Should we build a four lane road to nowhere? Maryland has no plan to accommodate their commuter traffic North of VA, why should we? A bridge crossing at Rt. 28, encouraging (no, mandating employers to have a policy for) telecommuting, mass transit, effective land use policies can all be big players in achieving a solution. I am sick to death of seeing the things that are important to ME be destroyed for the greater good. Lucketts is MY community and my husband and I work out of our home North of Lucketts to keep from being part of this problem. Keep the Bypass off the plan.

Subject: CTP, Route 15, 9/24/2007

I attended both input meetings for the Route 15 portion of the CTP update. I am a rural resident and business owner living near Lucketts, and have been working on improving access, safety, and flow on Route 15 north of Leesburg since 2001. I agree with many of the points made by the speakers. A few of the points made at the first input session, especially as concerns the 8-mile long "bypass" (new highway, with bottlenecks at each end), were:

1. This is an attempt at a local solution for a regional problem. (Wrong approach.)
2. This is a new roads plan, not a transportation plan.
3. You should have started this with a significant study of present residents' needs and visions for their communities.
4. Stop talking about roads that will lead to some illusory new bridge over the Potomac. This has to START with Maryland, or the feds.
5. Where's the emphasis on getting cars OFF of the road--strategies to REDUCE the need for new roads?
6. Why so little emphasis on alternative modes of transit: bike path from the river to

Leesburg?

7. Consider congestion pricing: a toll on the VA side of the bridge to discourage traffic and raise funds for road improvements.
8. Why doesn't this plan even mention the character or the economies (tourism, etc.) of the communities it plans to degrade or destroy? What kind of planning is this?
9. The model used to project traffic and behavior seems deeply flawed, many speakers mentioned.
10. Why no EMPHASIS (not just a little mention, as Phillips said by way of defense of the plan) on this region's poor air quality and the need for any plan to mold transportation solutions around a true plan for improving air quality?
11. Maryland has no plans for and sees no need for new capacity on its portion of Route 15. (This was said in the context of the vast amount of MD commuter traffic using the road morning and evening.) When Marylanders tell their government they have a problem, let them come to us to ask us to help solve it. We shouldn't be forking out tax money to solve a problem Maryland says it doesn't have.

At the second input session, yet another new bridge crossing, again with no consultation with Maryland, and absolutely no chance of occurring, given that it would necessitate a large new road through Montgomery County's rural preserve.

It is very disappointing to see that further time and resources were wasted on traffic studies of yet another bridge crossing that will never, ever happen.

It was also disappointing to see the consultant characterize "traffic calming" as "inappropriate" for Route 15. Traffic calming is defined as getting traffic to obey the traffic laws. Speeding is endemic on Route 15, and it endangers residents and commuters alike. What is inappropriate is for the county to be tacitly supporting illegal behavior on the part of drivers.

I would like the county to consider modern road designs for Route 15 that maximize safety, access, and flow for this vital road. Additional traffic signals will increase access but will reduce flow. Reducing access points by combining Limestone School Road with Montessor Road (by moving the former north to align with the latter) with a modern roundabout will increase safe access for residents, moderate speeding and reckless driving, and help maximize flow on this road. Moving New Valley Church road 600 feet north to align with Spinks Ferry Road, likewise with a modern roundabout, will reduce these four intersections to two. It also will substantially increase safety on the road, and provide residents with driveways on Route 15 an easy alternative to turning left across traffic (they can turn right instead and make the equivalent of a U-turn at the next roundabout). Please consult ample national studies that substantiate the improvements that result from this economical intersection design.

- Keep bypasses out of the CTP.
- Put residents' and local business needs first. Public involvement from a broad range of well-informed citizens on road issues must be well known to the county. To get citizen buy-in, make use of them.
- Stop accepting plans for new roads from developers and their consultants.

- Work regionally to solve interstate and intercounty commuter problems.

Thank you.

Subject: CTP /RT. 15 Proposals, 9/24/07

While modeling exercises are interesting, they are only as good as the assumptions they are based on. I'm willing to wager the recent announcement regarding the relocation of AOL's headquarters was not one of the assumptions, yet changes by major employers in the county can have significant impacts on transportation needs. Also technology already exists to allow many workers to work from home. Only business practices need to catch up, so that telecommuting is available to a wider section of the workforce, eliminating the need to commute daily. Spiraling fuel costs coupled with ever widening sprawl and the resulting painful commutes, may finally drive employers to allow widespread telecommuting.

I believe whatever changes are made to Rt. 15 should be made with an eye towards improving access to county residents with the needs of out of state commuters considered as a distant second priority. Loudoun residents are not responsible for easing the commute of those that choose to move out of state in order to purchase a larger home than they might have been able to afford in the county. A long commute is part and parcel of such a decision, and county residents should not be expected to fund simplifying life for out of state residents.

I support the Planning Board giving serious consideration to the following smaller scale proposals: a toll booth on the southbound lane of Rt.15 at the Point-of-Rocks bridge to discourage commuter traffic and leverage out-of-state commuter resources to address the traffic issues; traffic calming solutions such as traffic circles - on Rt. 15 itself and on side roads, and rumble strips near Lucketts School; maintaining the bridge at Point-of-Rocks in its current character to act as a bottleneck; improving some of the side roads in the area for local use (but not so that they become attractive to commuters and absolutely not the four-lane "Lucketts bypass"); lowering the speed limits on side roads; adding lights at each intersection on Rt.15 North of Whites Ferry Road to improve access for locals; improving Rt.15 shoulders. These types of solutions along with a strong emphasis on finding Regional and Countywide solutions, are more in keeping with the needs and resources of Loudoun residents, and share the burden of finding solutions for out-of-state commuter needs.

Regarding the ill conceived RT15 "By-Pass", I strongly oppose any such proposal. The 4 lane by-pass would cross several unimproved roads with apparently no plan as to how one would enter/exit the high speed 4 lane onto these unimproved dirt roads where county residents actually live. Also, I feel the "By-Pass" would do more damage to the "rural character" of the corridor than would simply widening the existing road. Ruining farms, homes and parks to "by-pass" a gas station, trailer park and some run down antique stores is, in my opinion, "cutting off your nose to spite your face".

Hillsboro Bypass/Hillsboro/Route 9

Subject: Proposed Rt. 9 / 690 four lane road, 5/8/2007

I am strongly opposed to the "new" proposal to build a four lane, possible toll road connecting Rt. 9 and 690 in Western Loudoun County. Both alternative 1 and alternative 3 on the most current presentation show the LOS as a D with this road. Why would a road be built, destroying the rural landscape, the farm community, the property and lives of hundreds of landowners that will be affected by this road, when it does not provide an acceptable solution to the traffic problem? Why is Rt. 340 on the W. VA side, connecting to Rt. 7 in VA, not being explored as a viable alternative to the traffic problems on Rt. 9? As a homeowner in the area, I chose to live in Hillsboro for the rural nature of the community. My property is under an open space easement, which prohibits me from building any structure in that area, in order to preserve the landscape and farm. How ironic, that I can't build a barn, yet the county can propose to build a four lane road on my land that is designated "open space". The implications of the road are far reaching. The road is NOT a solution to the traffic problem.

Subject: CTP Alternatives 1 and 3, Rt. 9 to Rt. 7 Connector, 5/9/2007

To whom it may concern:

My husband and I are constituents living in the Blue Ridge district. We recently learned of the new recommendation for the proposed 4 lane toll road in Options 1 and 3 of CTP. We vehemently oppose this major highway for the following reasons:

1. It is clearly a "road to nowhere." It would cut through pristine farmland to connect to Woodgrove, which would not be four-lane, resulting in no improvement in traffic concerns whatsoever.
2. The farms it would destroy are some of the last vestiges of historic beauty in Western Loudoun. One of the farms has been intact for over 100 years. Moreover, the road would either literally or effectively destroy the ruins of an antebellum stone mill that is a treasure of the county. This, apparently, was difficult for the "outside consultants" to realize just by looking at a map.
3. It is inconsistent policy to plow over acres of untouched country side while stating that you are "preserving the rural nature" of Route 9, which has been known and accepted by all to be a major thoroughfare.
4. We, as constituents and commuters as well, believe that our last remaining countryside should be preserved at all costs, as once it is lost it can never be regained. We are willing to pay the price of traffic congestion to preserve this land. After all, we chose to live here rather than Fairfax County, or Los Angeles for that matter, for these reasons.

Of course, it would be easy to solve all traffic concerns by paving the entirety of Loudoun County. Much would be lost with this approach, however, that could never be recovered. Certainly there are other more non-invasive and cost-effective methods to deal

with our traffic woes; i.e., more telecommuting options, and/or the expansion of public transportation, such as the awesome Loudoun County Connector.

We respectfully request that you oppose this transportation recommendation, and investigate transportation options less devastating to the most precious resource held by Loudoun – our countryside. Please keep us informed of all developments regarding this issue, so that we may continue to provide our comments and opposition.

Subject: Rt 9/690 Connector, 5/9/2007

I cannot support a toll road, or any road, that would just add more cars to the Rt. 7 corridor west of Purcellville. I travel the Rt. 7 route to Leesburg to work each day and it is already too congested to add more cars.

Subject: 690 Toll Road, 5/9/2007

I have several questions regarding the toll road proposed as part of a Rt 9 traffic solution.

1. Specifically who hired the consultant who developed the plan?
2. How much did it cost tax payers?
3. Why wasn't the opportunity to attend public hearing better publicized?
4. There was no mention in the proposal relative to the Fields Farm site for the new high school even though it appears that the proposed route would have an impact on traffic in that area
5. What is the ratio of Rt 9 traffic that comes from Rt 287 vs. West Virginia? Its not mentioned in the proposal. Without knowing that, it doesn't make sense to choose a toll road over widening Rt 287 to the R7 interchange.
6. If indeed the majority of congestion on Rt 9 does come from WVA why should VA tax payers foot the bill for developers in West Virginia?
7. Why was no mention of a Rt340 solution not mentioned?
8. What became of solutions proposed the last time VDOT looked at this problem? Included in that project were solutions that widened Rt 9 while by passing the town of Hillsboro to the west and also development of a road around Hillsboro further east.

Ruining a designated state scenic byway with VA tax dollars that won't solve a West Virginia problem is outrageous. I will be attending the hearing in June and will request an answer to my questions.

Subject: Proposed Route 9 - 690 Bypass, 5/10/2007

We live on Cider Mill Road in Purcellville and we were surprised and appalled at the totally new recommendation for the proposed NEW 4 lane toll road in Options 1 and 3 of CTP that we just learned about in the Leesburg Today and at the CTP website. This highway would run right by the back of our new farm. We just moved out here a year and a half ago and have achieved our dream of moving to a pristine farm with open space easements on the properties all around us, believing that this would preserve the beauty for us to enjoy our horses and land. As a retired Navy Reserve Commander and a full time government attorney, I have worked very hard to achieve this goal. John is an engineering consultant and he, too, has worked hard to get to this place in our lives where

we could afford a property in the country to keep our horses and animals, raise John's girls, and invite family. Imagine our dismay when we saw the new proposal to build a 4 lane highway by the back of our property, cutting a swath through this awesome view and countryside?

This suggestion is out of the blue. This is the first mention of this option in the update to the countywide transportation plan. Supposedly it came from the public comments process. If this is true, we would like to know who suggested it as these comments are supposed to be retained and documented.

The original plan on March 29 was to widen route 9, and now the recommendations are to add this totally new 4 lane highway, without any impact analysis, environmental assessments, public comment, etc. All the time and expense that went into the route 9 widening recommendations have just been disregarded.

The suggestion is completely inappropriate and is corrupt and misguided. It cuts across land that is pristine, in open space easement, and would completely destroy the property value of homes such as ours, which it would be adjacent to. Cutting a 4 lane swath across pristine countryside to ease traffic from West Virginia is just absurd. That state should pay for its' own traffic. Put in a toll at the West VA border, widen existing route 9, add a rotary on route 9, and make route 9 a toll road, force West Virginia to cut a connecting road south from 9 to 7 on the West VA side of the Blue Ridge, or come up with some other option. But cutting a swath across our property and that of our neighbors in this beautiful Loudon County Virginia countryside is simply corrupt and benefits only the consultants and companies hired to do the work. We are vehemently opposed to this option and will not rest until it is eliminated from the plan.

This late addition to the plan after years of study will only result in flawed analysis, ruin dreams of homeowners like us, and cost the county and state millions, and make a mockery of the Board's dedication to preserving the rural heritage of Loudon County.

We have also just learned from a neighbor that there is no firm location for this highway yet. If that is so, it is reckless and irresponsible to add it as a "line on a map" based upon pure speculation, since this directly impacts the property values, use and enjoyment of the properties, and stress levels of the property owners in the path of this random "line on a map." Please remove the line until there is an appropriate opportunity for public comment on the general idea of a new 4 lane toll road or highway is allowed. Only then can a specific location be considered based upon various impact studies and surveys.

Subject: Proposed Route 9 - 690 Bypass, 5/13/2007

I strongly oppose the proposed Rt. 9-690 Hillsboro bypass. A four lane bypass will destroy the character of Hillsboro. The proposed route will cut through Civil War encampments, Historic Mills and wonderful properties that bring tourists to Hillsboro. It will destroy the very essence of what Hillsboro has been and still is to this day. Why spend Virginia tax dollars on a major commuter artery for West Virginia commuters. The current traffic calming effects in Hillsboro will in part force commuters to take 340 to

Route 7. The real traffic issue is Route 7 West of Leesburg. This bypass will only worsen this issue. This proposal is being driven by West Virginia developers and should not be allowed to be added to the Traffic Plan.

Subject: Plans to widen Rt. 9 to four lanes, 5/17/2007

I do not support the proposal to widen route 9 to four lanes west of Hillsboro - keeping route 9 a 2-lane road is essential to preserving the rural character of Western Loudoun. As many others have noted, commuter traffic on route 9 west of Hillsboro consists largely of commuters from West Virginia and Maryland and they should be encouraged to use alternative routes such as 340 to route 7. Widening route 9 will encourage even more traffic and more development and will completely ruin this beautiful area. As I live directly facing route 9, I will fight this proposal any way I can. West Virginia should not be widening route 9 to four lanes on their side of the border but instead spend the money improving access to route 7 via route 340. It makes no sense at all for Virginia to spend Virginian's money to make life easier for the speeding, litter-tossing, law-flouting commuters from WV and MD while ruining Virginia's pristine countryside at the same time. Can this odious idea and go back to the drawing boards.

Subject: Route 9 involve building a Hillsboro bypass, 5/18/2007

Please do not do this. Please do not kill the environment, with this further murder of western Loudoun landscape, of what is left of it in this 21st century that is still open space, good and beautiful. Please do not kill this sacred space. For about twenty years I have fought the idea of the Hillsboro bypass, all alternatives are destructive of country, rural like life. Just as fast cars on Woodgrove Road daily massacre animals splitting in bloodied pieces wild deer, raccoons, rabbits, slathering the mangled squashed bodies of Canada geese, cardinals, squirrels, possums; man's inhumanity, man's lack of common dignity and considerate intent will not be redirected, man's inhumanity will not be stopped by better roads and more ease of passage. Truckers, fast commuter traffic must be forced to go somewhere else. Put their energy into making faster and bigger, better roadways of these existing roads, I70, I81, Rt. 340, Rt. 7, Rt. 287, Rt. 15. Please do not touch, do not destroy the little that is left of the few open, sacred places of scenic views, restful livelihood, and natural habitat.

Subject: New Roads In West, 5/18/2007

Are you kidding me? How many people who live IN Loudoun County west of Hillsboro use Rt 9? Why should we carve up the country side just so people in WV can have a nice drive through our county. Life sucks, live closer to where you work or find a different job. I am tired of Loudoun catering to people who do not live in this county and expect us fix their problems. Traffic sucks, but maybe if the developers didn't cram a thousand homes just on the other side of the border, there wouldn't be so much traffic going down Rt 9 and 7. People in WV can take RT 340 south from Charles Town to RT 7 in Berryville and it would only add a couple on minutes to the commute (a commute down RT 9 and 7 with no congestion). How about just closing Rt 9 at the state line? That would fix a lot of problems, but that is just as absurd as plowing a 4 line highway west of Hillsboro down through country farms and roads to Purcellville. It's time to come up with better ideas. And by that I mean, don't let some Developer come in and offer to build the

road in exchange for an approval of a 4,000 unit development. Let's put our hard earned tax dollars to better use!

Subject: 4-lane Route 9 to 690 Connector, 5/19/2007

We have read the CTP Improvements Plan and are devastated to see that Michael Baker recommends cutting a 4-lane highway through one of the most pristine and environmentally sensitive areas of Western Loudoun, "to increase the level of service to commuters from West Virginia, to protect the historic village of Hillsboro, and to keep Route 9 rural."

We feel as if we just got a diagnosis of terminal cancer. Loudoun County cannot keep taking open land and destroying natural resources. It's got to stop and it should stop here. Kill this proposal. Bury it deep. The county cannot solve a problem for some by creating a disaster for many others.

We will do everything within our power to prevent this proposal from becoming an actual plan. The proposed "Hillsboro Bypass" would destroy historic farms and some of the most gorgeous open land in the county -- much of it under conservation easement, not to mention the precious homes and farms of many residents. We did not spend our life savings to move out here to be assaulted by the Department of Transportation, or run into the ground by influential residents of Hillsboro and Route 9.

How can you let this happen? We will contact every possible agency to prevent this atrocity, from the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, the Piedmont Environmental Council, and the County Administrator, to the Governor, congressman, and Senators of Virginia.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass Route 9-690, 5/20/2007

I am strongly against the bypass. It will not solve traffic issues and it will destroy wonderful, historic, and scenic area. Please reconsider this plan. Thank you.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass Route 9-690, 5/20/2007

I am a frequent visitor to Burnt Mill Farm on Cider Mill Road. I am appalled that you would plan a toll road through pristine farmland. This valley is an historical wonderful place. Not many are left in Loudoun County. Please protect what is left!!!!

Subject: Strongly Against Hillsboro Bypass Route 9-690, 5/20/2007

I can't tell you how depressed I became when I heard about the Hillsboro bypass plan. This plan will only attract more traffic and then dump it West of Purcellville to increase an already congested area. Your own consultants stated this at the initial meeting but were shot down by Board members. The Town of Hillsboro is against this plan. Why is this plan gaining support? Please reconsider this ill advised plan.

Subject: Strongly Against Hillsboro Bypass Route 9-690, 5/20/2007

Have the people who planned this toll road seen this wonderful valley? This will not solve the traffic issue it will only make it worse. Please continue with traffic calming

efforts in Hillsboro. This will force West Virginia commuters to go down 340 to Route 7. Thanks.

Subject: Proposed "Hillsboro Bypass," 5/21/2007

A 4-lane connector road referred to as "The Hillsboro Bypass" is proposed to divert West Virginia traffic from Route 9 and the consultant from Michael Baker, recommends routing this atrocity through nearby farms such as ours, which are supposedly protected by Permanent Conservation easements.

It is obvious to us that the most cost-effective and humane method for dealing with the traffic on Route 9, would be to widen the major arteries: Route 9, Route 690 which connects to Route 9 just outside of Hillsboro, and Route 287. All of these big roads lead directly to Route 7. A simple loop around the village, taking a minimal bit of land, would be the least destructive. Another excellent proposal would be to widen US 340 between West Virginia and Maryland.

Some people knowingly move onto major roads and then decry the traffic. Other people are very careful about where they move, choosing a site for its privacy, beauty, and in our case, perpetual protection under a conservation easement. Just last year the Board of Supervisors limited development in Western Loudoun to protect the beauty of the valley. Now they propose to destroy one of the most gorgeous natural habitats left in the county? This "Connector Route" needs to be eliminated from Loudoun's Transportation plan.

Subject: Four Lane Commuter Road between Route 9 and Route 7, 5/25/2007

I am outraged at the proposal to build a four lane commuter road through unspoiled agricultural and residential land between Cider Mill Rd. and Route 7. If we keep building new roads then builders will keep building more homes and sprawl will continue indefinitely. We will never solve our traffic problems this way because this policy brings more people further from their work places and creates more traffic. We do not have to subsidize this process with taxpayer funds. Sprawl causes increasing gas use with all of its international and environmental problems. The answer is simply to stop subsidizing it. I have a road plan for Loudoun County; no new roads. Politicians who authorize these plans can look forward to the opposition of citizens like me. We will oppose them with our votes and our donations.

Subject: Proposed Hillsboro Bypass, 6/5/2007

I would like to take this opportunity to express my concerns over the proposed "Hillsboro Bypass" that will soon be presented before the Board of Supervisors. I recently attended a public meeting at the County Government building in Leesburg on 4 June 2007. A presentation was provided by the consulting firm Michael Baker Corporation, county consultant on the CTP.

It is my opinion that in attendance was a majority of opposition to this proposed bypass (myself included). It is also my opinion that "by direction" the Michael Baker Corp. focused solely on a single concept of alternatives that included a bypass through what are currently pristine Loudoun County countryside, residences, and farmland. Why other

alternatives such as widening route 340 to route 7 and widening route 7 from 340 to Leesburg is not part of the Michael Baker Corp. alternatives is mind boggling.

Also I came away with the impression that our county government is trying to rush this proposal through the process. What is the motive for rushing such a destructive change to our county landscape as well as a huge impact to county residences (otherwise known as county tax payers)?

Another aspect of this proposal that seems to be missing importance is the need for traffic calming measures for the town of Hillsboro. It is what the town is asking for!

I plan to stand with my fellow neighbors to ensure that this proposal does not have a chance to come to fruition. If you are also concern about this proposed bypass, I urge everyone to write to all members of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors to voice your opinion in the loudest of tones!

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 6/11/07

We have visited this most beautiful section of Loudoun County many times, and feel it would be an inappropriate use of this historic land to put in a four lane highway through this pristine, gorgeous area.

Subject: 287 widening, 2007 Proposed Transport. Plan, 6/14/2007

Catoctin Creeks is a community of 57 home sites on the south side of the Route 9 and Route 287 intersection near Purcellville. The Homeowners Association would like to make you aware of our position on the various options being considered to deal with Route 9 traffic through Hillsboro. In particular, we are very concerned about the possibility of widening Route 287 to four lanes of traffic. We are strongly opposed to widening route 287 not only because of the effect it will have on our community but also because it makes no sense to do so from a planning standpoint.

Catoctin Creeks is one of the few if not the only community in Loudoun County that voluntarily down-zoned most of its property at inception from A3 to A10 zoning. Our development was intended to preserve the rural and agricultural beauty of western Loudoun County. We still have many members who run active farms from cattle, to row crops and hay. We feel we made a commitment to preserve the agricultural and rural character of Western Loudoun when we down-zoned and felt we had a reciprocal commitment from the county to help us in this cause. This is demonstrated by the county's commitment to preserve our A10 zoning regardless of future zoning changes. We have recently taken further steps on our own by passing a new covenant that will prohibit subdividing in our community regardless of any future zoning changes.

Route 287 passes right thru the middle of Catoctin Creeks. We have many members who cross the road to walk, jog, ride bikes, visit friends, and horseback ride so they can enjoy the entire community and the riding paths we have created as community open space. Widening Route 287 would make this all but impossible and would divide our community in half. We all know if this road is four lanes wide the traffic speed will

routinely be 60 – 70 mph regardless of what the speed limit is. It would also serve to destroy the rural character that we have gone to great lengths and expense to preserve.

The County is also well aware of the importance of the view and environmental criticality of Catoctin Creek valleys adjacent to Rt. 287. This was officially established in 1995 when the county joined us in establishing an open space protective easement for 207 acres of the north-branch valley that borders on 287. The widening would significantly reduce this protected acreage.

Beyond our own reasons for opposing widening route 287 we feel it makes no sense from a planning standpoint. We live on this road and drive it every day. There is never a traffic load that would even come close to require widening this road. The bottleneck for traffic is the intersection at Routes 9 and 287 and the intersection at Routes 7 bypass and 287. If any money were to be spent on route 287 it should be to improve these two intersections. It makes no sense to route traffic from Lovettsville down Route 287 to Route 7 instead of the current path traffic takes down Route 9. It makes more sense to let this traffic continue to use the Route 9 / Route 7 interchange. The Route 287 / Route 7 bypass interchange is already over burdened. Why send more traffic to this interchange and stop using the one at Route 9 and Route 7? This is especially true due to the new high school that is being built. If anything, we think traffic from Lovettsville should be encouraged to use Route 9 instead of Route 287. Using the Route 287 path instead of Route 9 is also a longer drive. We see no reason to purposefully make thousands of cars travel a longer distance every day using more precious energy resources and generating more greenhouse gases when there is a perfectly acceptable alternative in using Route 9 that can avoid this. Granted the effect per day is not large but it is cumulative and this should be a consideration in every planning decision. Route 9 is also a straighter and safer road to travel. There are several winding areas on Route 287 where accidents commonly occur.

In addition to the above, widening 287 will have a serious negative impact on the environment and on two historic structures. Regarding environmental impact, the County government is more than aware of the criticality of Catoctin Creek's north branch to our local environment and Potomac. The County is actively involved in the addition of the portion of the creek adjacent to Rt. 287 and south of Rt. 9 to what will be essentially the only stream-bank-mitigation program assets in western Loudoun. Widening Rt. 287 will almost certainly eliminate over 1000 feet of the creek from this program. Further, the widening will probably destroy over an acre of wetlands adjacent to the creek.

Regarding historic structures, there are two that will be seriously impacted by a 287 widening: a circa 1790 cabin, 38145 Howland's Lane, and a circa 1900 building at 16695 Berlin Turnpike. Both of these important historic buildings are less than 75 feet from the present edge of the 287 roadway boundary. Widening to four lanes would seriously impact both and may lead to their demise. While neither of these buildings is presently protected as part of any historic building program, the owners have worked to preserve them and they are certainly qualified by protection through such programs.

We notice that consultants have recommended "Alternative 3" without widening Route 287. This alternative imposes traffic calming on all of Route 9. While we agree Route 287 should not be widened, we do not agree that traffic from Lovettsville should be directed down Route 287 south of Route 9 for the reasons outlined above. We hope you agree with us in this matter and will vote accordingly.

Subject: Remove Proposed "Hillsboro Bypass" from draft Countywide Transportation Plan, 6/16/07

As most of you know, Jim Burton has issued a Board Member Initiative entitled: Removal of the Proposed "Hillsboro Bypass" from the Draft Countywide Transportation Plan. As property owners in the subject area, we fully support this initiative.

Further, the Town of Purcellville has issued a statement regarding "Proposed Hillsboro Bypass & PUGAMP" reminding the Commission and County staff that any transportation improvements proposed to be included in the Countywide Transportation Plan that would cross through the Purcellville Joint Land Management Area, as this proposed bypass does, would require an amendment to the Purcellville Urban Growth Area Management Plan. Since "The Hillsboro Bypass is not currently shown on PUGAMP as a future transportation improvement, the bypass must not be included in the PUGAMP area without review and approval of a PUGAMP amendment by both the County and the Town of Purcellville." Any mention of this proposed bypass must be removed from the draft CTP.

Hopefully you have all been inundated with pleas to remove this ill-conceived proposal from the CTP. This alternative was not recommended by the transportation consultant Michael Baker, Inc., for many reasons. A new 4-lane highway would increase traffic, encourage development, and thereby destroy the valley. This new road would only benefit developers and commuters moving in and out of West Virginia.

In 1997 the County Supervisors deeded our property and 5 surrounding properties in perpetual open space land use in recognition of the agricultural, scenic, woodland and wetland attributes. Since the youngest building on our property is a 1930's bank barn and the oldest barn has hand-hewn timbers, our property is historic as well. Just last year the County Supervisors voted to protect this land by restricting residential development. Of paramount importance is that the construction of the proposed highway is dependent upon acquiring properties through eminent domain and attempting the annulment of at least 16 conservation easements that fall under the Open Space Land Act, Chapter 17 of the Virginia Code. Removing such an easement under this law is not easily done.

This proposed highway has tremendous opposition and very little support. Please remove it from the draft CTP. Do not send it to committee for study. The County should honor its commitment to protecting the open spaces in Western Loudoun County and remove the cloud this proposal puts over our property. Vote for the sensible alternative, traffic calming on Route 9. Say NO to any further study of "The Hillsboro Bypass."

Subject: I Oppose the Hillsboro Bypass, 6/17/07

The original request for Hillsboro was to calm the traffic. This can be done in a few simple, cost-effective ways, without the need for a bypass.

First, move the speed limit signs out, so that the 35 MPH zone is outside town ½ mile further in each direction, and move the 25 MPH signs to the position of the current 35 MPH signs. Second, double the fines for speeding through town. Third, hire 2 troopers whose full time responsibility is to enforce that speed limit. Having 2 troopers assigned will cover both the morning and the evening hours, from 4:30 a.m. through 8 p.m. The fines will more than pay for their salaries.

The only costs to these proposals are the labor to move the signs, and the salaries for the troopers. And again, the salaries should be covered by the fines collected. The time needed to implement these proposals is minimal, much sooner than building a bypass.

The case for building the bypass to calm traffic doesn't appear to exist. It is incredibly expensive.

It will take years to build, and during that time, the traffic through Hillsboro will only increase.

When it is complete, it will actually encourage traffic, because there will be a new high-speed access to Route 7. It violates the County General Plan. It will cross a great deal of private property, much of which is in Conservation Easements.

Please remove this plan from any documents containing either current or proposed changes to our County Development.

Subject: Against Hillsboro Bypass, 8/31/2007

I strongly oppose any mention of a bypass option for Hillsboro. This will increase traffic, destroy wonderful Loudoun County Vistas, and only play into the hands of the developers who came up with the plan.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass – against, 9/1/2007

I am sympathetic to the residents of Hillsboro, but as a "solution" the proposed bypass is absurd. It hurts more Loudoun residents than it helps, it destroys hundreds of acres of the county at a cost of tens of millions of dollars, and merely shifts the traffic problem elsewhere in the county.

Clearly, the solution must involve improving and widening existing 4-lane highways to accommodate increasing cross-county traffic. Rt... 340 to Rt. 7 bypass is an obvious choice. Improving that route while installing so-called "traffic calming" along Rt. 9 (or even a toll at the WV border?) would go a long way to relieving traffic flow through Hillsboro, with no impact on the rest of the county residents or the countryside. Furthermore, the dollar investment in Rt. 7 improvements would aide a much larger number of Western Loudoun residents. Please kill this ridiculous bypass for good.

Subject: Proposed Hillsboro Bypass in CTP, 9/2/2007

Proponents of the proposed Hillsboro Bypass say development is inevitable and this is simply not true. These "Citizens" say supervisors are not planning for the future if they

do not place this 4-lane bypass in the CTP. But supervisors certainly planned for the future when they placed open land in conservation easements as they have done with a good portion of the land which would be destroyed by the proposed alignment. How is this planning for the future? "...land placed under permanent easement lowers the value used by the state to determine local ability to pay which results in increased funding from the state for schools and other county services..." [Clarion] These conservation easements coupled with the stricter land-use laws recently enacted by the board are very forward-reaching. Open land not only benefits those of us fortunate enough to be living on it, but aids in climate and pollution control for future generations. Development always follows road construction. If this highway is built, our land, and the agrarian character of Western Loudoun County will be -- as Rick Bragg puts it: "murdered by generic subdivisions." Please follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and remove this bypass from the draft CTP.

Subject: Hillsboro and Route 9 traffic, 9/4/2007

There are two key issues here. First: solving the serious traffic problem in Hillsboro (where Rt. 9 passes through). Second, protecting one of the chief virtues of Western Loudoun -- its rural and scenic countryside, its open spaces, its active farmland, and its historic towns and farms. We should not cut off our nose to spite our face. Hillsboro's traffic problems must be solved, but not at the expense of what makes Western Loudoun special in the first place. Therefore, to achieve these two goals, I ask that you remove all current aspects of the draft CTP update that relate to Hillsboro and Route 9 (including the so-called "Hillsboro Bypass"), and instead undertake a comprehensive study -- with firm deadlines -- that looks at all options for solving the Hillsboro traffic problems while respecting the factors and characteristics noted above. The result of the study would be a set of concrete recommendations to the Loudoun County Government and the BOS as to the best approach for addressing the above issues.

Subject: NO on Hillsboro Bypass/Other Measures to Consider, 9/6/2007

We vehemently oppose the construction of a Hillsboro bypass/highway from Rt. 9 to Rt. 7 as proposed. A highway through Western Loudoun County will benefit West Virginian commuters and land developers at the expense of county residents. This solution "solves" one problem (preserving historic Hillsboro) while creating many more and destroying the property of other Loudoun homeowners. Our commuting problems should be addressed with solutions that do not encourage more traffic and development. Furthermore, taxpayers should be provided with a cost-benefit analysis for any proposed solution. We urge the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to remove all vestiges of this bypass or proposed bypass corridor from the Countywide Transportation Plan and consider other measures.

While sympathetic to the concerns of the town of Hillsboro and the increasing congestion on Route 9, an Rt.9/Rt. 7 bypass through the countryside of Loudoun County is NOT the answer, especially when several other potentially significant and relatively inexpensive measures have yet to be taken.

Specifically, (1) Eliminate all local, large truck traffic from Rt. 9 to Rt. 7 by requiring the use of Route 340. Many citizens have reported their experiences of driving the two routes (9 to 7 and 340 to 7) during rush hour reaching the same point at virtually the same time. (2) Current plans for traffic calming in Hillsboro must be implemented and additional measures of this type evaluated and implemented.

Subject: Proposed Rte. 9 Connector, 9/6/2007

I am definitely against the proposed Rte. 9 to Rte. 7 Connector Road that is on the CTP Draft. My property lies in its proposed pathway and I feel it would greatly harm the historic and aesthetic charm of Western Loudoun County. I was at the meeting where this road was taken off the draft, but I am aware that there are some who are trying to put it back on.

I have some recommendations to help the concerns of Rte. 9 commuters. If completed in this order, I believe commuters will adjust and calm the roads:

- 1) Complete the traffic calming plan of the town of Hillsboro (including traffic circles, sidewalks & lights)
- 2) Complete the widening of Rte. 340 to four lanes from Charles Town, WVA to Berryville, VA to connect to Rte. 7
- 3) Widen Rte. 7 to six lanes from Berryville to Leesburg
- 4) Establish park n ride lots in Berryville (along Rte. 7) & Charles Town (along Rte. 9) These lots would have commuter bus pick-ups with connections to Dulles & Metro. They could also serve as a meeting place for carpoolers.
- 5) Build a short bypass around the north side of Hillsboro from Rte. 9 to Rte. 9 at Rte. 690. Incorporate this bypass into the town of Hillsboro's master plan.

Subject: Comments on Rt. 9 traffic problems, 9/6/07

My husband and I are constituents living along the Cider Mill Road Corridor, less than one mile from the formerly proposed "Hillsboro Bypass," which we opposed. We also consider ourselves part of the Hillsboro community, and frequent the town often to visit friends, shop, and attend functions at our kids' school, Hillsboro elementary. I feel like Hillsboro is our community, and would like to see its traffic problems eased.

There is a group of Hillsboro citizens who want the Hillsboro Bypass connector put back in the county transportation plan. I oppose this action. A western bypass is NOT the way to solve our traffic problems, for the following reasons:

1. A bypass would likely be a "road to nowhere", only moving congestion on to Rt. 7 at an earlier point, failing to ease the commutes of those traveling the road. Those wishing to avoid this backup would simply continue to use Rt. 9 through Hillsboro as a "short cut." Land would be appropriated and destroyed in vain, and the citizens of Hillsboro would obtain no relief.
2. It makes no sense to plow over hundreds of acres of untouched country-side and impact the property of over 65 landowners in order to "preserve the rural nature" of Route 9, or ease the traffic in the small town of Hillsboro.

3. I believe that our last remaining countryside should be preserved at all costs; as once it is lost it can never be regained. Not only would a bypass literally destroy land and farms, it is likely to bring additional development to an area already in danger of losing its rural nature. The farms that such a road would destroy are some of the last vestiges of historic beauty in Western Loudoun. This is what makes the town of Hillsboro a treasure!

Of course, it would be easy to solve all traffic concerns by paving the entirety of Loudoun County. Certainly there are other more non-invasive and cost-effective methods to deal with our traffic woes; the following approaches are suggested:

1. Immediately institute traffic calming measures along Rt. 9 to increase safety for travelers, and also encourage (West Virginia) commuters to use Rt. 340 to connect to Rt. 7. These measures could include

- lowering the speed limit to 45 in all locations, with 35-25 mph limits around towns, schools, and busy intersections;
- enforce these speed limits and impose penalties for aggressive driving;
- remove all passing zones from the highway;
- ban all non-local trucks from the highway;
- install additional lights at intersections such as Rt. 9 and Cider Mill, and/or Rt. 9 and Stony Point (alternatively, use 4 or 3 way stops at those locations);
- fortify crosswalks in the town of Hillsboro, possibly adding lights for pedestrians to use the crosswalks.

2. Create more incentives for telecommuting options, including larger access to the rural community to high speed internet service;

3. Expand public transportation options for West Virginia commuters, such as Loudoun County Connector and park and ride locations.

These suggestions do not involve extensive costs, and should be implemented and tested for a significant time period before any other proposals should be considered. If any other more expansive options become an issue, they should go into a County plan only AFTER they are evaluated and approved by a task force which includes residents of BOTH the town and surrounding areas of Hillsboro.

Subject: Historic Preservation, 9/6/2007

I wanted to urge the County and residents of Hillsboro not to view the Rt 9 traffic problem as an issue of historic preservation because the some farms the bypass will raze (including ours) were built 150 years before the Old Stone School and 60-70 years before "Hillsborough" was incorporated. I live 1 mile from the town and think it's very beautiful.

I'll do whatever I can to help (I don't drive through town anymore) but I don't understand how impacting 100 people with a bypass to satisfy folks in town makes any sense at all. I vote for closing Rt. 9 at the border!

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass Road, 9/7/2007

I write to voice my opposition to a bypass road to take traffic off RT 9, move it through the rural countryside near the Short Hills / Jonella Farm area and onto RT 7. Such a road will reduce the quality of life and property values of residents in the effected area who paid a high price to get away from this type of development. Those who live along RT 9 have always known that they purchased property along a long established transportation corridor. It would seem more just, and possibly more cost efficient, to simply construct a short bypass around the town of Hillsboro. Adding capacity for West Virginia commuters will likely result in more West Virginia Commuters; thus, creating a bigger problem in the long run. It would seem that a grander solution is to work with the counties in West Virginia to match the growth of their residential housing to the growth in their local employment base. Without such fundamental change we just end up with more commuters making a long trek into employment centers in Virginia. Those willing to make the long journey enjoy cheaper housing, but do not have to shoulder the direct and indirect cost of their transportation needs, which fall unjustly on Loudoun County and its citizens.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 9/7/2007

Put a loop around the Town or roundabouts at each end of town. I will not support an alternate route from Rt. 9 to Rt. 7, via Rt. 690 and the backyards' of my neighbors. Force trucks to take Rt. 340 to Rt. 7. This bypass will not ease traffic in Hillsboro, it will encourage more traffic to use Rt. 9 west of Hillsboro, with the same amount going through town and the rest impacting Purcellville and Rt. 7 further west.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 9/7/07

I attended the meeting held last night at Mountain View Elementary School in Purcellville, VA.

My wife and I moved to Western Loudoun County a little over 3 years ago. We moved from Potomac Station just outside of Leesburg, VA due to the feeling of being too cramped living in a subdivision style atmosphere.

We purchased 10 acres of land just west of the Hillsboro Vineyards and built our dream home that over looks the scenic valleys and mountain sides that make Western Loudoun such a beautiful place to live in.

We are not opposed to any plan that alleviates traffic on route 9 and improves the quality and safety for all individuals that live and reside in Loudoun county, however, the CTP plan that is in place today seems to only address the issues of Hillsboro residents.

The real issue that we have here is that the traffic problem that Loudoun county is incurring on Route 9 is not from the growth of the resident population in Loudoun, but due to the number of out of State residents that commute through Loudoun in order make significantly higher wages than their states can provide (West Virginia and to some extent Maryland) and then drive back home to live where houses, taxes and everything is much cheaper while all the while not contributing a single penny to the residents that reside and do pay taxes in Loudoun.

It was stated last night that 47% of the county workforce now lives outside of Loudoun County. That number in itself should make one ask why? Why is it that people are leaving the county to live, but choose to work within?

One of the proposals that I would propose is to have West Virginia spend their monies to build an off-shoot just south of Charlestown WV off of RT 340 that would cut south through WV and then meet up with RT 7 in Virginia. This approach would have minimal impact to Loudoun County residents, while cutting the overall distance that would be incurred by going the current 340 to 7 by over 65%. This would divert the existing traffic from West Virginia, which by my calculations comprises 80% of the problem now and into 2030 and would alleviate the issues that Hillsboro is experiencing. Additionally, if a Toll Booth could be placed at the border of West Virginia and Virginia at Route 9 that also would cut the traffic flows. I would be more than willing to pay West Virginia for every trip that I make into their state which would be reciprocal.

I know we can't control West Virginia transportation, but I do feel that concerted effort between that state and ours is needed to appropriately address this issue or it will only be time before even more residents leave beautiful Loudoun County.

A man stated last night during commentaries that he was looking for Leadership, I second that comment and ask the board of commissioners to not let Loudoun be destroyed by outside interests and to protect those of us that live here, pay taxes here and are not just passers by each and every day.

Subject: Comments to CTP re: Hillsboro connector, 9/7/2007

I. General Statement.

We are residents of Cider Mill Road, Purcellville, and the proposed Hillsboro Bypass alignment that was removed from the CTP by the Planning Commissioners would have been right along the back of our 11 acre property, destroying its value and livability and splitting our neighborhood down the center. Our property and the additional properties in the McNair farm subdivision would all have the proposed new 4 lane highway Hillsboro Bypass right along the back of their properties. We want, first and foremost, any mention of a new bypass or connector road from routes 9 to 7 remain OUT of the CTP for good. If this is somehow not possible, we demand the current proposed alignment remain OUT of the CTP for good. We believe the best solution to the traffic and safety concerns in our area is discouraging and preventing commuters from traveling through the county. We do

not want to foot the bill or see our beautiful homes, countryside, and towns destroyed in large part to accommodate commuters living outside of the state.

II. Timeliness Issues.

This plan has been thrown together at the whim of Supervisors without allowing the planners enough time to fully study the options, and without allowing ample opportunity to educate and obtain input from the citizens, based upon accurate facts. Therefore, we also demand the consideration of the draft CTP by the BOS be delayed until alternatives for addressing our traffic and safety concerns, as well as those of our neighbors, are thoroughly studied and that we, the public, have time to review all the detailed information and are able to make informed decisions and recommendations on what should be in the plan.

III. Factors to Consider.

The studies should consider all consequences of all the alternatives individually and in combination, and should provide thorough, clear details to the public with enough information to review them and comment. The studies should fully consider factors such as the impact on rural, historic, environmental, scenic, economic, land and structures in the properties affected by the alternatives. The cost of all alternatives should be thoroughly explained in detail. The relative harm to home and property owners affected by the alternatives should be considered and detailed. The results of these studies should provide data on the consequences of discouraging, slowing and preventing commuter through our county, to see if this would solve our traffic concerns. We want serious, thorough and accurate data to be added to the draft plan that details and provides concrete conclusions on the efficacy from all angles of our suggested alternatives, listed below, whether they would be implemented in combination with each of the others, altogether, or alone.

IV. Specific Alignments.

If a bypass must be mentioned, or an alignment for a bypass or connector included, in the CTP, than we would like accurate reference to the proposed changed or new roads as new versus existing roads or highways, and as connector, bypass, or diverter, as appropriate. We want the costs of each road improvement or new road to be specified, itemized and fully accounted for. This should include detailing the consequential costs and locations of additional required toll installation(s), limited access on/off ramps, building of local access roads, takings of properties, environmental costs, landscape expenses, geographic issues, and destroyed land and properties, etc. We insist that ALL, not just one, bypass/connector alternatives be included in the CTP as well, and equally studied.

V. Bypass/Connector Alignment Alternatives

- Widen route 9 to a 4 lane road from West Virginia to route 7. This alternative is least costly and would have less impact on most of the residents in the area. The

homes in Hillsboro could be preserved by being moved back, at least on one side of the street, to widen the existing road enough to make it safe, and cross walks could be added. But it would affect the historic value of the town, which is not desired. Nevertheless, this option should be included in the plan.

- Make route 9 into 4 lanes, and put a 4 lane bypass from 9 to 9 north or south of the town, and inside the town limits to protect the town and resolve the safety concerns of the residents without harming residences outside of town, destroying the countryside, and inviting excessive development.
- Keep route 9 rural and 2 lanes, and put a bypass from 9 to 9 north or south of the town and inside the town limits to protect the town and resolve the safety concerns of the residents without harming residences outside of town, destroying the countryside, or inviting excessive development.
- Keep route 9 rural and 2 lane, and put a bypass in the form of a tunnel north of the town and inside the town limits to protect the town and resolve the safety concerns of the residents without harming residences outside of town, destroying the countryside, and inviting ANY development. This, in our opinion, would be the best alternative combined with extensive traffic discouraging and calming and, if necessary, widening routes 341, 690, and 287 to 7.
- Widen existing routes 341, 690, and 287 to 7 to avoid having to build a huge new 4 lane highway.
- Build a new connector further west from town, extending route 671 to 7.
- Build a new connector running close to the state border from 9 to 7.

VI. Other Alternatives.

Other alternatives that do not require a connector and may not require a bypass that should be studied include:

- Reduction of the safety issue of passing traffic between towns/villages by enforcement measures including, but not limited to: increased police enforcement, setting up cameras to detect speeders and mail tickets, reducing speed limits with an added \$200 fine for speeding, flashing light alerts of the traveling speed of the vehicles, etc.
- Traffic discouragement or elimination of traffic through the route 9 corridor from commuters outside of the county, using similar measures mentioned above and those mentioned below, and any other possible measures.
- Keeping route 9 as 2 lanes, and reducing its desirability to commuters by putting tolls at the West Virginia border and the Route 7 intersection (congestion pricing).
- Reducing speed limits and enforcing traffic laws with more police presence, cameras taking photos of speeders who are then fined, flashing light signs indicating current speeds, etc.

- Adding more cross walks, side walks, and intersection and cross walk lights on route 9.
- Adding traffic circles on route 9 intersections.
- Creating no through truck routes on all rural roads connecting to route 9, such as Cider Mill and Stony Point.
- Placing no through traffic signs on all 2 lane rural side roads connection to route.
- Making additional routes such as Cider Mill and all of route 9 Scenic Byways.
- Discouraging West Virginia from completing the 4 laning of route 9 in their state.
- Promoting the widening of an existing route convenient to commuters, such as route 340 to route 7, or 719 or 690 to 7, to discourage commuters from route 9 before entering VA.
- Generally, extensive consideration and modeling on the “slow down and live with it” theory via extensive traffic calming throughout the route 9 corridor and rural roads leading to route 9.

VI. Issues to Address in All Studies.

We want the following issues to be considered, the effect of a bypass or connector on them to be provided, and a rationale provided to justify why a need for a bypass or connector supersedes the need to protect these properties:

All of these properties are in Open Space easements, so this bypass would violate the terms of the easements. All of these properties would be devalued, their views destroyed, and the area would become ripe for rapid commercial and residential high density development with this bypass. The remaining lots of 80 plus in the path of the bypass would suffer the same consequences. Many of these are in Conservation Easements.

Our area is part of the John Singleton Mosby Heritage Area and should therefore be preserved as a historical and cultural heritage. We want these issues to be considered and a rationale provided to justify the need for a highway or connector as superseding the need to protect this heritage. For example, right near us, there are at least 3 groups of historically significant structures that would be either eliminated or be on the edge of the bypass:

1. the Thompson Farm, built in the 1700s, across whose property the bypass would cut,
2. the Old Burnt Mill and Stone House on our next door neighbor’s farm, which has a great deal of Civil War and other historic significance, and has been featured in many Loudoun publications and magazines. In fact, there was a photo of the mill in Loudoun

County Government Center on June 18, the date of the Planning Commission meeting which resulted in removing the bypass from the CTP.

3. the Silverbrook Farm on Woodgrove, with Civil War era (at least) buildings.

Our area is on a scenic byway (Stony Point and Woodgrove Road). Our area has numerous environmentally sensitive issues, for example: A branch of the Catoctin River runs along the back of our property, and through our neighbors the Thompson's farm, much of it along the path of the bypass, and the state is making efforts to protect this water system. There are protected wetlands on the bottom of our property that extend across the direct path of the bypass. Our property borders on (and may actually be inside) the Upper Blue Ridge Mountains Important Bird Area listed in the Audubon Society. Our area is one of the most serene and beautiful view sheds in the County. This bypass would cut a swath of pavement and noise through the center of this rural view, and open the door wide to rapid development. Our area is rural, quiet and has numerous farms that would be destroyed by this bypass.

VII. Issues Unresolved at the 9/5/07 Meeting in Hillsboro.

There were the following issues unaddressed or unresolved at the 9/5/07 meeting that we would like to see addressed:

Because the proposed bypass would attract additional traffic, to be somewhat successful, the plan would require ALL of the following to work in conjunction to address traffic concerns. We would like to see the data on the modeling of each of these options alone and in combination, and a clear explanation of the conclusions that resulted in the proposal of this plan:

- A Route 15 bypass.
- A bridge to Maryland, which Maryland will not agree to.
- Widening route 9 to 4 lanes from the West Virginia border to the new bypass.
- Even with these additional projects, the Hillsboro Bypass is projected to ultimately fail in reducing commuter traffic through the county. We would like this explained and the justification for still proposing this in the plan.
- Proposed as a toll road, the bypass would require limited access to route 9 and the new bypass, thus taking even more property to create local access roads. We would like to see the data and costs when this is taken into account.
- There have been claims that the bypass is necessary to address unavoidable traffic problems facing the entire county, but we would like the planners opinion on this, and an explanation why the bypass that would really only benefit the town of Hillsboro, WV commuters, and developers, should be created at the expense of

the rest of the county, our homes, 100's of landowners on the western side of route 9, and over 80 lots and 64 homeowners in the path of bypass, but at no expense at to those who would benefit.

- There have been claims by the Citizens for a Safe Route 9 group that they were told specifically that if the proposed bypass alignment is not in this plan, then nothing would be done at about traffic and safety issues affecting the route 9 corridor. We would like to know who, if anyone, in the government stated this, or something similar, to the group. We want to know if this is true and why. We want to know the date, attendees, and content of the meeting in which this was discussed. Please consider this a FOIA request for that information. And if it is not true, please state so in public as soon as possible so we have the correct information.

VII. Conclusion

The reason we, and most of our neighbors, and most of the residents of Hillsboro, moved here was specifically to get away from highways and reckless development, and to enjoy a rural environment and pursue a country life style. We have worked hard and waited a long time for this. We keep horses on our farm. Our neighbors keep horses, cattle, grow hay. If I moved somewhere, say into Hillsboro, that I believed to be unsafe for my children, I wouldn't expect extraordinary sacrifice on the part of my neighbors to solve my problems; I would simply move away in a heartbeat. We have moved here to enjoy the rural and historic character of this beautiful county. If we wanted to live in Fairfax County and tolerate the suburban lifestyle, we would be there now. We have been there in the past, and we chose to pay a premium on our property to move here instead. This is our dream and the culmination of all we have worked for. Don't destroy it by putting the specter of a connector road through our back yard on the horizon.

Subject: Restore Language in CTP for Hillsboro Bypass/Connector West of Hillsboro from Rt. 9 to Rt.7, 9/10/2007

I live on Route 9 in the Town of Hillsboro, and support the proposed bypass connecting Route 9 to Route 7 west of Hillsboro. I request that the language for this road be restored to the current CTP.

I have watched cars drive past my sons' stopped school bus. My sons' bus driver has said she would rather pick them up directly in front of our house so they wouldn't have to cross Route 9. My family and I have literally been inches away from being hit by speeding cars while crossing in the crosswalk on Route 9. I saw the aftermath of an accident that left a van almost inside a neighbor's garage. I've watched fire and rescue vehicles struggle to get through stopped traffic to help victims of yet another Route 9 accident. I remember helicopters landing at my sons' school, waiting to air lift victims to a hospital after a terrible Route 9 accident. I was home the day a tanker truck and a small car had a near head-on collision in front of a home two doors down from mine. The anxious fuel truck driver informed us that the tanker was nearly empty...fumes ignite

faster than fuel. I still shudder at what could have happened if it had ignited...the lives lost and historic homes destroyed.

So when we say that we want a bypass to get traffic off of Route 9, make no mistake that it IS about safety. And in 5 years, when traffic from West Virginia is projected to nearly double, these problems are only going to get worse. It doesn't matter where the traffic comes from, because once it is in our county, it affects us...it is our problem.

If we do nothing or rely only on traffic calming, which still leaves portions of Route 9 so congested that it fails; we can expect to see more of the behavior we experienced after the stop light was installed at Route 9 and 690. Angry and impatient drivers trying to get from Route 9 to Route 7 will try to make up for time lost in congested or slowed traffic by passing on double lines, tailgating, failing to stop for pedestrians, and speeding along other portions of the road. Already, 61% of drivers go above the 25 mile an hour speed limit through town. This aggressive driving will put residents and drivers along the entire Route 9 corridor at even greater risk of accidents, injuries, and fatalities.

We want Hillsboro to be the kind of town that residents and tourists can stroll through. It is not that kind of town now. Between the growth in western Loudoun and the traffic increases we know are coming, the need for the proposed bypass is greater today than it has ever been.

Therefore, we respectfully ask that you put the proposed bypass back in the current CTP to preserve and protect our families, our homes, our town, and most of all, our safety.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 9/10/2007

Put a toll booth on Rt. 9 at the VA WV border. Use proceeds to build bypass around historic Hillsboro. The bypass should go just south of Hillsboro (maybe a short tunnel) and tie into the existing Hillsboro road to Purcellville, and link back into Rt. 9 about two miles passed the Hillsboro grave yard. Do not widen Rt. 9, just bypass old Hillsboro. I believe widening Rt. 9 will only invite more out of state drivers (non-voters, not residents). The proceeds could also enhance Historic Hillsboro with the traffic circles and maybe a cobblestone main street to help slow down traffic and encourage the bypass to the South.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 9/11/2007

I understand that there is much debate going on regarding a bypass around Hillsboro. For the record, I live in the affected area and I am strongly against such a road. It destroys what is left of western Loudoun. Likewise, it adversely affects more Loudouners than it helps. The folks in Hillsboro bought property knowing there was a road in their front yard. Why destroy other county residents' property and way of life by shifting traffic. Lastly, no Loudoun resident should have to pay money for what is increasingly a WVA problem. Without WVA traffic there would not be a problem. Therefore, just reduce traffic flow so WVA commuters are forced to take an alternate, but existing, route such as 340. If you want to spend money on roads that will help more taxpayers, put money

towards the traffic problems between route 9 and the Dulles Greenway. That would positively affect many more tax payers in western Loudoun!

Subject: Route 9 Bypass, 9/12/2007

I am writing to express my support for a bypass connecting Routes 9 and 7 west of Hillsboro. I consider a bypass the most effective way of tackling the town's debilitating traffic problem and the resulting safety issues. I live in Hillsboro.

Please consider at a minimum putting such language back into the CTP in order to preserve the option of a bypass, which would be of great benefit to residents up and down the Route 9 corridor.

Subject: Hillsboro bypass – against, 9/13/2007

There are many questions that must be answered to fully define the cost of such an undertaking. Some include:

- How many acres of the county are destroyed forever? What is the total loss in property value?
- How many residents have property seized? What is the net loss based on the difference between market value and proffered compensation?
- What is the total property devaluation for residents near the new highway?

I believe all of those can and should be quantified, in addition to the actual contracted cost of the road. I expect they come to many millions of dollars in public and private losses.

Less tangible but more important are aesthetic considerations, such as:

- Lost habitat for fox, beaver, coyotes, woodpeckers, owls, and other wild animals that make Loudoun what it is.
- Lost wetlands, as large swaths of this area are crossed with numerous creeks and streams that support geese, ducks, and herons, as well as helping to protect the Potomac and Chesapeake water sheds.
- Lost scenic roads

None of those can be replaced at any cost. But a clear accounting of the damage is essential.

Subject: Against Proposed Route 9 Bypass, 9/14/2007

I am strongly against the Route 9 bypass connecting Route 9 to Route 7. This will not help the issue but only increase traffic. Let the traffic calming work and the traffic will decrease. Don't destroy the countryside for a project that is doomed to fail.

Subject: Against Hillsboro Bypass, 9/15/2007

I am strongly opposed to a Hillsboro Bypass, it will destroy nature, over 100 homes, and it will only postpone the increase in traffic through the town of Hillsboro. Please let

traffic calming work and allow for the citizens to work together to solve this problem. This is being driven by developers, specifically, Joe Bane, Jr. and Mick Staton. Please stop this from happening.

Subject: Support the Hillsboro western bypass, reject Hillsboro “go-arounds”, 9/17/2007

In the Public Input session held at Mountain View Elementary School on September 6, 2007, several speakers proposed that the genuine bypass around Hillsboro be considered, i.e., one that begins on Route 9 west of Hillsboro and rejoins Route 9 east of Hillsboro. Indeed, the petition that was offered by Hillsboro Mayor Roger Vance included language stating that “all alternatives” be explored, thus giving the green light to include either a northern or southern bypass around Hillsboro, among other potential routes, including, presumably, the original route recommended in Alternatives 1 and 3 during the June 30, 2007 presentation by the consultant before the Loudoun Board of Supervisors..

My specific concern is the irreparable, permanent damage to Hillsboro from such a go-around alternative, since either a northern or southern route would intrude on Hillsboro’s Historic District, part of the National Register of Historic Places and the Virginia Landmark Register. It is noteworthy that the boundaries of that district have been virtually unchanged for nearly 150 years. A northern bypass on Short Hill Mountain would endanger the Town’s only source of water, The Tom Hill Spring. Named after a freed slave who lived very near it, the spring is located directly above the center of Hillsboro and has been the Town’s source of drinking water for over 200 years.

A southern bypass would almost certainly require the condemnation of the historic properties along Highwater Road—at least three of which are in the Historic District—as well as the historic homes on the south side of Catoctin Creek just outside the Town boundaries, including the 12 Tribe of Israel Community, a group of over 50 people who live there in a religious commune. Moreover, a southern bypass would require rerouting Catoctin Creek, a prospect that would certainly draw legal challenges from environmental groups such as the Piedmont Environmental Council and historians and preservationists who want to conserve the remains of the 5 mills that once dotted the Creek in and around Hillsboro.

Most important of all is the impact that either a northern or southern go-around would have on Hillsboro. We would, I fear, become suffused in the din of nearby speeding cars, or in the case of the northern route, jake-breaking 18-wheelers descending Short Hill Mountain. A go-around bypass would steal the very soul of our 250 year old village, turning it instead into a traffic island, maybe even converting its 36 historic homes into a series of quaint antique and specialty shops. Hillsboro is listed on the National Register of Historic Places for a reason. It is a priceless piece of history and a national treasure. Loudoun County should exclude from consideration any bypass alternative that puts Hillsboro's historic patrimony at risk.

Subject: CTP: Worse than just the Hillsboro mess, 9/17/2007

The consultant's basic premise is to move as much traffic as fast as possible. This is WRONG, WRONG, WRONG. Traffic should be diverted before it ever gets to near Hillsboro or Lucketts. Think outside the box: Gridlock is GOOD-- it slows things down, roads are safe, we don't waste money on new roads, and through-traffic is discouraged.

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass proposal, 9/18/2007

As responsible citizens who use very little county resources yet contribute much in the way of taxes, voting, serving jury duty, participating in the county's multi-million dollar equine industry, and owning a conservation-easement property which benefits the county in many ways including financially, all we can do is write letters and speak at public hearings. Even though the planning commission voted to remove the Route 9/690 Connector from the CTP, the alignment continues to be posted on the county website, printed in handouts, propped up on easels, and published in newspapers.

This alignment which, by admission of the Michael Baker consultant would not solve the traffic problem in Hillsboro and would worsen traffic in other parts of the County will obliterate our 35 acres and the 1800's to 1930's buildings thereon. This alignment will require the use of eminent domain and annulment of the permanent open land use easement, and this alignment -- conceptual or not, devastates us personally.

It is no consolation whatsoever when officials tell us "Any new road alignments would require a corridor study to determine a specific location. Historic and environmental resources would need to be taken into consideration for any new alignment." Having our property appear in the path of a 4-lane road, conceptual or not, is prejudicial and ruinous to us.

Since newspapers have reported that the Planning Commission and the Board voted against the bypass, many of our neighbors are under the false impression that the bypass is no longer a threat. Don't you think Loudoun County officials have enough to worry about without inviting this protracted debate over a conceptual bypass?

Traffic consultants have stated, "Bypasses around towns are difficult due to lack of funding, available land, and landowner opposition. Operational improvements and traffic calming are a more feasible and necessary priority...Route 9 traffic calming such as roundabouts and lower speed limits should be implemented to encourage traffic to use Routes 7 and 287" yet we could not find a model in the draft CTP showing results of traffic calming. Another viable plan should include the widening of US 340 between West Virginia and Maryland.

Please remove the Route 9/690 Connector as conceptualized in the draft CTP from the final CTP. This wouldn't be an issue right now if the county attorney hadn't quashed Mr. Burton's initiative back in June. After the Planning Commission's vote the initiative was considered redundant. Apparently the attorney was wrong. The presentation and the handouts at the recent public meeting in Purcellville were plainly biased in favor of the bypass.

Subject: Against Hillsboro Bypass, 9/18/2007

I support the decision of the Planning Commission to take out language of the Hillsboro Bypass. This will only increase traffic through Hillsboro while destroying what is wonderful about the area. Shame on Staton for meeting with developers and going over the line on the map before asking Lorna Parkins to look into it again after she said it was a bad idea. Enough unethical behavior by our BOS. Enough!!!

Subject: Against Hillsboro Bypass, 9/18/2007

I am 11 years old. Don't destroy what is wonderful about Hillsboro by building a bypass. I want to show my children this area too. Let traffic calming work. Who is getting rich by destroying my home?

Subject: Hillsboro, 9/18/2007

I would like to affirm my support for the Board of Supervisors recent decision to remove the Rt. 9 to Rt. 7 connector from the CTP. While I sympathize with the residents of Hillsboro, the solution to their problem is not to destroy thousands of acres of farmland and historic properties. The result of a new four lane road cutting through land, much of which is in open space easements, would be devastating. It would ruin the rural nature of the entire valley. My own property is in such an open space easement. The notion that I might have a four lane toll road on the very part of my backyard that I cannot even build a shed upon is ludicrous.

There are many options for Rt. 9 that would not result in this type of destruction. Before we embark on a journey from which there is no return, we need to spend more time studying our options. Traffic calming, rerouting traffic west of the state line, even bypassing Hillsboro would do much less damage to the area. In closing, I would like to reiterate my support for the decision to keep the four lane connector road off the CTP. It was the right thing to do.

Subject: No Hillsboro Bypass, 9/18/2007

I live in Jonella Farms. If we need a bypass around Hillsboro, then keep it IN and AROUND HILLSBORO and on Hwy. 9! Go NORTH! Make it really a by-pass and not a connector road for Rt. 9 to Rt. 7. Don't come through our backyards or on Woodgrove! Don't destroy our chosen rural landscapes!

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 9/19/2007

I am not in favor of a bypass that will affect so many pieces of property to benefit drivers from out-of-state. I have been a resident of Loudoun for 34 years and a property owner in Loudoun County for the last 27 years. My children grew up here and two of them are also property owners in Western Loudoun. This area is unique to the Northern Virginia area and needs to remain as a piece of the culture that adds so much to the Loudoun economy, both as farm land but more importantly to the tourism that brings in a great deal of business for this county. A bypass to benefit out of state travelers is not necessary.

Subject: No Hillsboro Bypass, 9/19/2007

We're opposed to a Hillsboro Bypass and the negative effects it could have on our neighborhood (just moved in 12/06). Improving commuting conditions will only encourage more people to move to WV and get more home for their dollar and enjoy lower property taxes.

Subject: Hillsboro, 9/20/2007

We are gratified that the Transportation Department of Loudoun County and its consultant responded to the concerns of citizens of western Loudoun County by proposing a much more reasonable solution to the traffic problems in Hillsboro. The stated objective to improve existing roads vs. building new ones and re-routing Route 9 to Route 9 along with better traffic calming measures is the best way to deal with the traffic problems in the town. We sincerely hope that the Planning Commission and Supervisors will uphold the recommendation that the Route 9/690 connector road be removed from the CTP and we ask that the Board of Supervisors approve this motion. As Anthony Faccavento of Appalachian Sustainable Development says: "We need to make a commitment to conservation precisely at a time when climate change, water shortages and increasing urban pressure on the landscape make healthy soils and farms more critical than ever."

Subject: Hillsboro Bypass, 9/26/2007

I visit Hillsboro quite often and would be much less likely to come if the bypass were built.