

**Loudoun County
Countywide Transportation Plan Update
Complete Public Comment Record
December 2006 - April 2007**

Below is a complete log of all CTP related comments--21 in total--received via web, letter, email, or comment form. Names, emails, and addresses, salutations, personal comments or invitations to meet with County Staff have been removed for privacy and brevity. A summary of these comments, as well as a summary map are available on the project website: www.loudounctp.com. Comments have been grouped as follows:

General Comments: Analysis, Process, Participation, Growth	1
Dulles South	3
Leesburg	3
Route 7 Corridor	3
Route 9 Corridor	9
Route 28 Corridor	11
Transit	13

General Comments: Analysis, Process, Participation, Growth

Subject: Website, 12/18/2006

The project website doesn't provide any information about what the current transportation plans are for Loudoun County. For example, where would I find answers to basic questions like 'what road improvements are being planned for which area?,' irrespective of project 'ownership' I just want to find out about the roads and what is planned in Loudoun County. Can you please tell me what web site might be able to help me answer these questions? *Response: The current Countywide Transportation Plan appendix for Loudoun County on line at www.loudoun.gov/transportation/ctp.htm It lists all of the planned road improvements in the current plan which was adopted in July, 2001. The Transportation web site also lists other transportation related info including road improvements and funding. Virginia Department of Transportation also has information on their website: www.virginiadot.org*

Subject: Thanks for the website, 1/10/2007

This kind of local government transparency is long overdue for Loudoun County, for both businesses and residents. Hopefully a full-scale and unmoderated dialogue can begin to happen online, as well as offline - the public "town halls" and BOS hearings are useful, but don't nearly go far enough in allowing person's views to be adequately expressed, catalogued and addressed. <http://www.dullessouthonline.com>

Subject: Basis of deficiency analysis, 1/11/2007

As a resident of Hillsboro, I am very concerned about the ongoing zoning and CPAM debates. Now that there is a more rational consensus arising linking land use and transportation, I would like an opportunity to work with the planners. I have experience with transportation planning with MWCOG and other regional authorities as a consultant with Booz Allen in public transportation. I am no longer working in that area of our business. I have two questions:

Are there citizen boards or advisory positions available? *Response: Loudoun County Office of Transportation Services is not aware of any specific citizen boards or advisory positions in Loudoun at this time. Citizens are encouraged to check with the Board of Supervisors office (703-777-0204). The Board does have a Transportation/Land use Subcommittee which meets on the fourth Monday of every month in the Lovettsville Room of the County Government Center in Leesburg. The public may come and listen and comment on the various topics on the agenda. As part of the Countywide Transportation Plan update there will be some stakeholder meetings to obtain input. One general stakeholder meeting was held December 7, 2007. Notices of future meetings as well as summaries of past meetings are available on the project website: www.loudounctp.com*

How have the recent zoning changes and pending CP amendments been considered in the deficiency analysis? I think there needs to be more than one scenario given the very fluid nature of the political atmosphere, i.e., no growth, planned growth and unconstrained growth. Does the funding of the study support several scenarios? *Response: The CTP Model is using Round 7.0 land use data from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) including what was approved by the Board for Loudoun in the Coop forecasts. The model will also account for the Arcola Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM). The corridor analysis we are having done will incorporate a constraints and opportunities analysis, a build out analysis (2030) and traffic abatement and system management. This would include identifying a range of measures including capacity increases, transit land use and travel demand solutions.*

Subject: CTP, 3/30/2007

The March 29 presentation of the CTP brought home to me a major problem facing Loudoun Co.: the county is a corridor for commuters from other states. If Loudoun upgrades its roads, that will attract more commuters. If it doesn't, traffic will still increase on through roads, rush hours will lengthen and we will end up with more air pollution and force local drivers to fight commuter traffic. Given the tremendous growth of population and businesses in the county, we could end up with city-like traffic and pollution problems by 2030. I don't see any good answers to this. I favor limiting growth in the county to avoid turning it into a city and I don't believe that growth in business will turn out-of-state commuters into workers in the county. I suspect that most new workers will either be county residents or come from adjacent Virginia counties. My feeling is that upgrading roads to get commuters out of the county quickly, plus keeping the suburban character of Loudoun would be the best solution for our county.

Dulles South

Subject: Please Don't forget Dulles South, 11/30/2006

The roads in Dulles South are severely congested. If you don't believe me, please drive any of these routes:

In the morning, start at 8:00am and drive from Gilberts corner to Fairfax County line, or Rt. 50/Loudoun County Parkway to Rt. 28.

In the afternoon, start at 5:00pm and drive from the Fairfax County line to Gilberts Corner, or Rt. 28 to Rt. 50/Loudoun County Parkway.

Subject: Public Comment Form Response March 29, 2007 TULC Meeting

The area on the "Excess Demand and Travel Reductions" map for Dulles South that is located between the 606 marker and Dulles Airport (the entire area shaded yellow) is now owned by the airport (MWAA), and is planned for intensive airport-oriented employment (office and industrial; some retail). Are these employment generations taken into account with respect to Dulles South road usage?

Leesburg

Subject: CTP - Leesburg, 4/4/2007

Please put Crosstrail Boulevard from Evergreen Mill Road to Route 15 back on the county plan. Leesburg and all traffic west of Leesburg desperately needs this. The bypass around Leesburg is a chokepoint right now, and extending Crosstrail Boulevard (as the Town has encouraged) would be a very positive step in the right direction. Thank you!

Route 7 Corridor

Subject: Route 7 East Corridor - Riverside Parkway Alignment, 3/5/07

The Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) understands that Loudoun County is in the process of considering updates to its Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). HHMI applauds that effort and writes to offer its comments on the portion of the CTP dealing with the Route 7 East corridor. As an employer with a significant investment in Loudoun County, HHMI has a keen interest in Loudoun County transportation issues and, in particular, transportation planning for the Route 7 East corridor. HHMI's recently-opened Janelia Farm Research Campus (Janelia Farm) is located there, and future transportation improvements in that corridor will be provided, in part, with land and financial contributions made by HHMI under the terms of the Janelia Farm transportation proffers.

The current CTP calls for Route 7 east of Leesburg to be converted ultimately to a limited access roadway, and significant progress has been made toward this goal since the CTP was last revised in 2001. A recent bond referendum and actions by the Board of Supervisors will accelerate construction of two more interchanges at Loudoun County Parkway and at the Ashburn Village Drive/Janelia Farm Boulevard intersections. HHMI

will participate in the construction of the second of these two interchanges pursuant to the Janelia Farm proffers. The CTP also calls for parallel roadways north (Riverside Parkway) and south (Russell Branch Parkway) of Route 7 to serve as feeders into the Route 7 arterial roadway. Completion of these parallel collectors will be necessary before the CTP's objective of having Route 7 function as a limited access arterial roadway can be realized.

HHMI's comments focus on the alignment of Riverside Parkway, which is designated in the current CTP as the northern part of this parallel system of collector roadways. In accordance with its proffer obligations, HHMI recently constructed and opened a portion of Riverside Parkway starting at the western border of Janelia Farm at the Landsdowne property and extending eastward to an intersection with Janelia Farm Boulevard. The current CTP calls for Riverside Parkway to continue across Janelia Farm, but the alignment called for in the CTP would require Riverside to turn sharply to the north (away from Route 7) from its current intersection at Janelia Farm Boulevard and to cross the north end of the Smith Circle residential subdivision before it ties into an existing section of Riverside Parkway in University Center.

We are writing to propose that the County modify the alignment of Riverside Parkway when it considers revisions to the CTP. We believe the County can accomplish its objective of developing a north parallel collector road much more efficiently if it eliminates the current sharp turn to the north and instead extends Riverside Parkway essentially due east from the Janelia Farm Boulevard intersection and parallel to Route 7. This preferred alignment would tie into a proposed road currently being pursued by the developers of the Potomac Farms Business Park just east of Janelia Farm. That roadway, referred to as Lexington Drive in Potomac Farms's development plans, could then be extended eastward across the southern end of the Smith Circle subdivision, with an ultimate connection to the existing University Center road system at Loudoun County Parkway.

We are submitting a hard copy of our comments that includes a drawing depicting both the current CTP alignment and the general location of the preferred alignment.

The preferred alignment is better than the alignment shown on the current CTP for several reasons, including:

1. The preferred alignment is more closely parallel with Route 7, which is the intended comprehensive plan function of Riverside Parkway. It would provide a direct connection between the planned Route 7 interchanges referred to above, maximizing their use and efficiency. The substantial diversion to the north with the current CTP alignment would take parallel traffic a significant distance away from the corridor and would discourage some traffic from using this segment of the parallel road network.
2. The current CTP alignment would require building a longer roadway across severe topography and large floodplain and wetlands areas, all of which would result in

increased construction costs and adverse environmental impacts. The alignment preferred by HHMI would be cheaper to build and more environmentally sensitive.

3. The current CTP alignment would likely require condemnation of right-of-way across a number of residential lots in the northern portion of the Smith Circle subdivision, many of which include homes that were constructed quite recently. On the other hand, right-of-way over the remaining affected property associated with the preferred alignment appears to traverse fewer residential lots than the current CTP alignment, which may also contribute to making it a simpler and less costly alternative for the County. Moreover, with commitments from HHMI and the adjacent Potomac Farms Business Park, a substantial portion of the right-of-way for the preferred alignment can be obtained by the County in the short term.

4. The preferred alignment also would avoid bringing the Route 7 “parallel” traffic back away from Route 7 toward the Potomac River and into the Smith Circle residential subdivision. With the preferred alignment, residents of Smith Circle desiring to gain access to Route 7 would travel south to the collector road and then east or west to one of the two Route 7 interchanges to be built. Under the CTP alignment, a resident would actually have to travel north, away from Route 7, in order to gain access to that arterial road.

5. The preferred alignment would accomplish the County’s objective of developing a north parallel collector with Route 7 without bisecting HHMI’s Janelia Farm Research Campus in a manner disruptive to HHMI’s campus design and day-to-day operations.

HHMI is interested in the construction of a road network that improves traffic circulation at the front door of Janelia Farm and throughout the Route 7 corridor. The current CTP alignment of Riverside Parkway would be expensive to build and would not accomplish the primary transportation objectives. HHMI, therefore, respectfully requests that the alignment currently shown in the CTP be eliminated and replaced with the more direct alignment we have described.

As you begin specific consideration of the Route 7 corridor, we would greatly appreciate the opportunity to meet with appropriate County officials to discuss our comments. Also, please add us to any list of contacts you may be developing for your consideration of the Route 7 corridor and the CTP generally.

Subject: Response to Howard Hughes Comments on CTP Update, 4/1/2007

As a long time resident of Potomac Farms (Smith Circle), I am opposed to the proposed input by Howard Hughes Institute, regarding the alignment of the Route 7 North Collector Road (Riverside Parkway). This company has arrogantly proposed to "realign" Riverside Parkway to come across the southern end of Potomac Farms Subdivision. Riverside Parkway is currently planned to come across the northern most side of Potomac Farms and continue across Janelia Farm. Changing this alignment now to satisfy the wishes of one company, at the expense of an existing residential subdivision is not fair to the residents who have lived in Potomac Farms for many years. It would be highly

disruptive to an older established community. The Potomac Farms community in the Broad Run District needs to have its boundaries preserved for the sake of the quality of life of its residents. To that end, I am writing to encourage all the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to maintain the current plan for the alignment of the Route 7 North Collector Road to remain as it is in the plan today. The Route 7 South Collector Road (Russell Branch Parkway) is a sufficient road network to empty traffic off and on to Route 7, and I see no reason why the Potomac Farms residential community should be sacrificed.

Therefore, I write to strongly oppose any plan to realign Riverside Parkway from its alignment in the current County Transportation Plan. It is my sincere hope that the current Board of Supervisors protects the citizens of Potomac Farms from being encroached upon, thereby threatening the quality of life, the de-valuing or condemnation of land of long time residents. I will be closely following this matter, along with many of my neighbors who share a deep concern.

Subject: Comments Regarding Howard Hughes Recommendations, 4/2/2007

Please allow this letter to serve as my comments to the letter prepared by John C. McGranahan, Jr. of Hunton & Williams on behalf of Howard Hughes Medical Institute in regards to the Countywide Transportation Plan Update.

First and foremost I am appalled at the comments submitted on behalf of Howard Hughes Medical Institute, not to mention the total disregard of a small residential community (Potomac Farms) that will be significantly affected should a road of such magnitude bisect our community. I would also like to note and point out that our so called neighbor (Howard Hughes Medical Institute) that states they have a keen interest has yet to reach out to the residents of Potomac Farms at which their property is adjacent to. As a long-time resident and property owner in Potomac Farms with a significant investment in my home and community, I too have a keen interest in Loudoun County transportation issues, and in particular, transportation planning for the Route 7 East corridor.

The North Collector road alignment was designed back in 1993. Prior to that time George Washington University Center just began construction. Unlike Howard Hughes Medical Institute, representatives from the University Center contacted and met on several occasions with Potomac Farms residents to discuss their planned project and the road alignment. The result was such that the North Collector road alignment would be the best alternative in an effort to keep our community as intact as possible while achieving the County's overall objective of a collector road. Currently the road proposal of Howard Hughes Medical Institute would require a four-lane road to be constructed less than a few hundred yards parallel to Route 7. This proposed road will bisect our community and considerably compromise a community water well which provides water to over 43 residential units and let us not forget the many homes and property owners that will be subjected to the loss and devaluation of their property.

Howard Hughes Medical Institute's comments namely number 5 states "The preferred alignment would accomplish the County's objective of developing a north parallel

collector with Route 7 without bisecting HHMI's Janelia Farm Research Campus in a manner disruptive to HHMI's campus design and day-to-day operations." How dare they be so selfish? They don't want their property to be bisected, disruptive or detrimentally redesigned but it's o.k. to disrupt our residential community for their own personal interests at the expense of the residents of Potomac Farms.

The residents of Potomac Farms would be drastically affected should a road bisect our community as suggested by Howard Hughes Medical Institute. I respectfully request the officials of the Loudoun County Government to help protect the Potomac Farms residents from the torment that is being suggested by Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the developers who clearly are making proposals for their own personal gain and interests.

Subject: CTP Update, North Collector Road, 4/2/2007

I am very concerned about the design proposed layout for the new road, mostly because it does not show a major advantage to the local residents or would be users of the road. By design it does not address the real traffic congestion problem in that area on Route 7. It appears to be of little benefit if any to Potomac Farm residents. On the contrary, it guarantees a decrease in property values for Potomac Farm residents, and places traffic very close to my adjoining property, on the side and the back of my lot.

I request that the Supervisors in this County help maintain balance between Population, transportation, residential and commercial growth, that affects the quality of life for all the local residents and for you to be mostly supportive to our justified concerns and voice our opinions that we object to the proposed plan.

Subject: Comments on Behalf of Capital Associates, 4/6/2007

Capital Associates is the owner of the Potomac Farms Business Park, a PD-OP zoned office park located east of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute ("HHMI") and west of Potomac Farms residential neighborhood. Potomac Farms Business Park, HHMI and the Potomac Farms residential neighborhood all abut Route 7 on the north side and are planned to be served by the northern collector road known as Riverside Parkway. Riverside Parkway has been constructed from Fort Evans Road in the Town of Leesburg through Lansdowne and a portion of HHMI to the intersection of Ashburn Village Boulevard. Potomac Farms Business Park and HHMI have planned to extend the northern collector from the Ashburn Village Boulevard/Riverside Parkway intersection east to Smith Circle as part of development of PD-OP uses on the Potomac Farms Business Park property. Extension of the northern collector road to Smith Circle would be assisted by an amendment of the Countywide Transportation Plan ("CTP") in a location that more nearly parallels the alignment of Route 7 as is shown on the attachment to the comments made by HHMI.

The current CTP alignment of the northern Route 7 Collector Road originated with the 1990 Route 7 Corridor Study by the Virginia Department of Transportation ("VDOT"). The concept of the Route 7 Corridor Study was to illustrate the approximate location of grade-separated interchanges along Route 7 at planned intersections of major north/south collector roads, including Loudoun County Parkway, Ashburn Village Boulevard,

Lansdowne Boulevard and Route 659/Belmont Ridge Road. Three of the four interchanges along Route 7 have been constructed or are planned for construction. The Route 7 Corridor Study contemplated limiting direct access to Route 7 and providing access to adjacent properties from parallel collector roads north and south of Route 7. On the south side of Route 7 Russell Branch Parkway has been partially constructed between Claiborne Parkway and Loudoun County Parkway. The northern collector road, Riverside Parkway and Fort Evans Road, have been constructed from Ashburn Village Boulevard to the Route 7/15 Bypass. Extension of the northern collector road in the form of construction of Lexington Drive across HHMI and Potomac Farms Business Park is currently being designed and will be cooperatively constructed by Potomac Farms Business Park and HHMI.

The comments made by HHMI concerning the realignment of the northern collector road, which are listed below are endorsed by Capital Associates (same as 1-5 for HHMI above):

1. The preferred alignment is more closely parallel with Route 7, which is the intended comprehensive plan function of Riverside Parkway. It would provide a direct connection between the planned Route 7 interchanges referred to above, maximizing their use and efficiency. The substantial diversion to the north with the current CTP alignment would take parallel traffic a significant distance away from the corridor and would discourage some traffic from using this segment of the parallel road network.

2. The current CTP alignment would require building a longer roadway across severe topography and large floodplain and wetland areas, all of which would result in increased construction costs and adverse environmental impacts. The alignment preferred by HHMI would be cheaper to build and more environmentally sensitive.

3. The current CTP alignment would likely require condemnation of right-of-way across a number of residential lots in the northern portion of the Smith Circle subdivision, many of which include homes that were constructed quite recently. On the other hand, right-of-way over the remaining affected property associated with the preferred alignment appears to traverse fewer residential lots than the current CTP alignment, which may also contribute to making it a simpler and less costly alternative for the County. Moreover, with commitments from HHMI and the adjacent Potomac Farms Business Park, a substantial portion of the right-of-way for the preferred alignment can be obtained by the County in the short term.

4. The preferred alignment also would avoid bringing the Route 7 "parallel" traffic back away from Route 7 toward the Potomac River and into the Smith Circle residential subdivision. With the preferred alignment, residents of Smith Circle desiring to gain access to Route 7 would travel south to the collector road and then east or west to one of the two Route 7 interchanges to be built. Under the CTP alignment, a resident would actually have to travel north, away from Route 7, in order to gain access to that arterial road.

5. The preferred alignment would accomplish the County's objective of developing a north parallel collector with Route 7 without bisecting HHMI's Janelia Farm Research Campus in a manner disruptive to HHMI's campus design and day-to-day operations.

The current CTP plans for alignment of Riverside Parkway from the Ashburn Village Boulevard intersection illustrate a sharp northern shift of the northern collector road away from Route 7, across HHMI's property and residentially zoned portions of Potomac Farms, to University Center that is unlike any other portion of the VDOT Route 7 Corridor Study. The current CTP alignment discourages motorists from using the Northern Collector Road and unnecessarily impacts homeowners living in less densely populated areas of the Potomac Farms residential neighborhood.

Capital Associates encourages Loudoun County to revise the general location of the proposed alignment of the Route 7 North Collector Road attached to these comments. Capital Associates would appreciate the opportunity to meet with Loudoun County Office of Transportation Staff to discuss the proposed alignment of the Northern Collector Road. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Subject: Public Comment Form Response March 29, 2007 TULC Meeting

As a longtime resident of Potomac Farms subdivision I am writing to object to the "preferred" alignment that is being proposed by the firm of Hunton & Williams that is representing the Howard Hughes Medical Institute as indicated in their letter to you dated March 5th, 2007 dealing with the Route 7 East Corridor.

I am objecting to a roadway that would cut across Potomac Farms on the south side, dividing it, running right along my property line and very close to my home. Not only would the noise of constant traffic be very distracting, I feel it would devalue my property that I have been diligently maintaining all these years in hopes of getting a good price for it if I should decide to sell some day. This is to request that the alignment of Riverside Parkway stay on the north side of Potomac Farms subdivision.

I know that the Howard Hughes Medical Institute has a significant investment in Loudoun County, but, so do all the Potomac Farms residents that have been living on the south side and paying real estate taxes for many, many years.

Route 9 Corridor

Subject: Route 9 widening, 4/1/2007

The money to widen Rt. 9 could be better spent creating a bypass that directed commuters to an improved Rt. 7. Let's look for a solution that benefits Loudoun County and Virginia residents rather than one that benefits West Virginia commuters.

Rt. 9 moves well in the morning and evening. There is a lot of traffic, but it's not at a standstill.

The cost to pay off all of the homeowners along Rt. 9 to widen it would be better spent bypassing Rt. 9 above Hillsboro and making Rt. 7 6 lanes.

Subject: Route 9 bypass, 4/1/2007

The last remaining option for the Route 9 bypass around Hillsboro, Waterford and Lovettsville must be preserved and the landowners compensated in some fashion. I have worked very hard to get this done over the last four years. Someone at the County level should take the bull by the horns and "just do it".

Subject: Route 9, 4/4/2007

My comments concern the CTP presentation proposal for transforming Route 9 into a four-lane highway. At the town stakeholders meeting last fall I expressed to the consultant group the position of the Town of Hillsboro, which rejects specifically the

widening of the route. The presentation noted the chief environmental constraint being the historic village itself. Four lanes through the town is obviously not an option so I am somewhat perplexed as to why it would be recommended as part of the plan. Likewise, our federally funded traffic calming plans appear to have been disregarded in this study.

I was pleased to see the study on a proposed alternative course for Route 9, or bypass from west of Hillsboro to Purcellville, confirms what has long been my contention that increasing the capacity of the route will act to induce much more traffic from the outlying region in West Virginia and Maryland, encouraging commuters to abandon existing routes and inevitably create greater congestion on Route 9 and on other roads in the vicinity. This is a policy decision that will in turn largely shape long-range land use choices.

As to the notion of such a bypass/highway requiring a toll, in my view that would simply ensure that the old route would continue to be used extensively, much more so because of the induced volume of traffic, and likely turn it into a primary truck and commercial route to avoid tolls. The first threshold for even considering any proposed alternate route must be that it is free for motorists; must be strictly limited access with no adjacent development and that commercial truck traffic is restricted on old Route 9.

Rather than choose to make Route 9 in Virginia a major, regional commuter artery, the CTP should hold fast to the proposition that this road remain a rural, two-lane highway sufficient to accommodate the transportation needs of the immediate vicinity. This historic, scenic, and increasingly tourist area should be acknowledged to be an economic and aesthetic asset and all roadway improvements should correspond to this fact. Protecting the historic town of Hillsboro and the surrounding view sheds and rural character of the area should be considered an element of county economic development as this will enhance tourism to Loudoun. The Town of Hillsboro has a plan for extensive traffic calming and enhancement of pedestrian safety and we expect the CTP not only to recognize those efforts but to champion them as well.

On the looming West Virginia Route 9 improvements, it is incumbent upon Loudoun County and Virginia to engage all involved agencies to ensure all parties' awareness of the intent not to have corresponding improvements in Virginia and to propose the alternative of re-routing West Virginia's Route 9 improvement funds (from Charles Town to the Virginia boundary) to the existing Rt. 340 to Virginia Route 7. This remains the most rational and logical solution to the commuter traffic problems arising from growth in the Charles Town/Martinsburg area.

Subject: Proposed Route 9 to Route 7 Connector west of Hillsboro and west of Purcellville, 4/6/2007

As property owners we were gratified to hear comments from the consultant for the Loudoun County Office of Transportation Services ("OTS") concerning provision of a transportation corridor from Route 9 west of Hillsboro to the Route 690/Route 7 Intersection at the western end of Purcellville. The alignment illustrated by the OTS consultant is similar to one of the three routes studied by the Virginia Department of

Transportation ("VDOT") when VDOT was analyzing methods to move Route 9 traffic through or around Hillsboro. The alignment depicted by the OTS consultant would allow traffic from West Virginia that uses Route 9 to access Route 7 without impacting historic Hillsboro and without burdening Route 9 from Hillsboro to Clarks Gap.

Provision of the alternate Route 9 access described by the OTS consultant would also help provide an interchange at Route 7 and Route 690 that the Town of Purcellville needs and the Board of Supervisors has agreed to study. The proposed connector between Route 9 and Route 7 would also provide improved access to the Fields Farm for any public uses that may be developed on that property.

Route 28 Corridor

Subject: Ashburn Commuting Congestion, 3/13/2007

During rush hours the Route 28 exit from the toll road continues to be very congested. Additionally Waxpool Road traffic is very heavy and frequently backed up. I believe much of this congestion could be remedied, with a few improvements.

1) Close the intersection at Innovation Dr. on Route 28 and route the traffic to the Old Ox Rd. interchange via a service road. This would eliminate the only light that holds up traffic on the northern stretch of Rt. 28. The effect would be opening up Rt. 28 during rush hours.

2) Create a new road from Old Ox road that would have direct access to the Loudoun County Parkway near the Toll Road. This would eliminate much of the traffic in Ashburn and allow many commuters to get to Brambleton, Loudoun Valley Estates and Broadlands without having to go the round about way of Waxpool and congesting many of the Ashburn roads. Currently the only way to get into Ashburn from the East is Waxpool. Another access needs to be added.

Subject: The Blind Spot; or: Buses to carry people, 4/2/2007

My only major criticism relates to the upper Route 28 corridor area. According to the analysis, this is the largest single employment center in the County, but there is a major blind spot. Consider the following three objectives related to the upper Route 28 corridor area:

- Consider a rear access to Dulles from Route 606
- Provide a parallel facility to relieve extremely high traffic levels on Waxpool Road
- Develop feeder bus routes for planned Metro stations and add park and ride facilities that will feed long-haul buses until Metro stations open.

The blind spot is this: this major employment center gets no significant bus service on its own account. Dulles Rail will not solve the County's transportation problems. The EIS only promises 5000 new transit trips per day, less than one highway lane in each direction at the County line. In fact no Metro project is planned to go anywhere near most of the County's employment or existing housing centers. If we're actually serious about

alternative modes of transportation than a center such as the upper Route 28 corridor needs its own transit support – buses. This means a commitment to running quality service into other parts of the County and providing dedicated bus facilities into the employment and retail centers to provide a benefit to ride the system (a.k.a. bus ways).

Subject: Letter to the Special Meeting of TLUC Meeting - Atlantic Blvd, March 28, 2007

I write on behalf of Orbital Sciences Corporation with regard to the Special Meeting of the Transportation/Land Use Committee to be held on March 29th, 2007. The Purpose of this letter is to comment on the updates to the Countywide Transportation Plan, in particular to plans to complete Atlantic Boulevard.

In 1993, Orbital relocated its company's headquarters and satellite division from Fairfax County to Dulles on Atlantic Boulevard at the corner of Steeplechase Drive. Since that time, Orbital's annual revenues have grown from \$190 million to over \$802 million and our Dulles-based employee population has grown to over 1,200. We expect to continue hiring more employees in Dulles, and we recently completed a 10,000 square foot addition to the satellite manufacturing facility here.

For our employees who live to the west, east or south of our offices, there are really just two routes to our campus. First, they can travel north on Route 28, turn at Steeplechase Drive, and then turn into our property. Alternatively, they can take Route 625 to Magnolia Road, head northwest on Magnolia to Atlantic Boulevard, head north on Atlantic Boulevard, and then turn into our property.

The intersection of Steeplechase Drive and Route 28 is slated for removal in order to make Route 28 a limited access highway, as it has long been planned. This would force all our employees from the south, west and east to cut through Magnolia Road in order to reach our office. This situation presents a problem, but we believe that the current effort to revise the CTP affords the County with an excellent opportunity to meet the transportation needs of this important economic corridor and its neighbors.

As the Countywide Transportation Plan has long made clear, Atlantic Boulevard needs to be extended to reach Route 625. Indeed, this extension is included among the "High Priority" projects in the most recent CTP and was slated for completion between 2002 and 2007. Specifically, the Plan states that completion of Atlantic Boulevard between Route 7 and Route 625 "needs to be accomplished in coordination with the construction of the Route 28 interchanges to adequately serve the rapidly developing commercial corridor" (CTP A2-4). While Atlantic Boulevard has been completed from Route 7 south to Magnolia Road, the last portion (from Magnolia Road south to Route 625) remains unfinished. This segment, once completed, will obviously improve the functionality of Route 28, which in turn plays an important role in the regional transportation network. But it will also have more local effects, benefiting our property as well as all our neighbors. This important connection, once made, will ensure the continued economic viability of the eastern side of Route 28 between Route 7 and Route 625. It will also

remove traffic generated by such commercial uses from surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Orbital Sciences owns four parcels on the north side of Steeplechase Drive, just north of our existing campus. It has long been our intention to expand operations onto that property, and after many successful years in our current facilities, we are now in a position to do so. Unfortunately, with the closure of Steeplechase Drive on the horizon, and absent any plan to make the Atlantic Boulevard connection, I am concerned that this location may soon no longer be viable for us. Needless to say, we would greatly prefer to stay and grow where we have already been so successful. To that end, we would very much like to work with the County and the State in order to accelerate the completion of Atlantic Boulevard.

With that connection in place, I am confident that Orbital Sciences can continue to thrive in its current location, and we look forward to our continued participation in the success of the Loudoun County economy. If you have any questions on any of the comments raised here, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Transit

Subject: Transportation directly to and from Metro stops, 3/14/2007

I know that I and many other Loudoun residents would use Metro more often to get to the District of Col. if there were regularly buses directly from Ashburn, Sterling, and/or Leesburg to the Vienna and/or Falls Church Metro stops. I'm not referring just to commuter use, but especially to the weekend or weeknight users who now find it too inconvenient to drive to the commuter bus stop in Herndon to get a bus to the Metro stop in Falls Church and on to their stop in DC.