

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
1	CTP Input/Comments						
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
3	Multiple - See Master	0	General	P Comment	In response to a question asking how the CTP update process could be change multiple stakeholders responded that the process should consider businesses as the public, take the advice of transportation professionals, implement improvements that serve the greater good, establish a vision and provide the will to see the vision through and work with COG to foster better interjurisdictional cooperation	Comment noted	No action required
8	Multiple - See Master	0	Interjurisdictional Matters	P Comment	Multiple jurisdictions provided overviews of their current transportation initiatives at the stakeholder meeting	Comment noted	No action required
12	Multiple - See Master	0	Overall CTP Document	Various	Provide a glossary, preface and correct title to read 2009 CTP in all instances	Staff concurs	Staff will make edits and investigate including a Route index; staff will include language requested by Commissioner Austin
19	PC-060209-37	1	Introduction	Written	Chapter 1. pp1 Remove first two sentences and substitute the following: "Loudoun County has been one of the fastest growing counties in the nation. In light of this past rapid growth, careful transportation planning must be undertaken." Delete last sentence.	Staff supports the text in its current form	PC concurs with staff recommendation
20	PC-060209-38	1	Introduction	Written	Pp4. delete sentences 1 and 2.	Staff supports the text in its current form	PC concurs with staff recommendation
21	PC-060209-39	1	Introduction	Written	Pp5. what does "the adaptability of each alternative to possible changes in land use." Mean? What are the alternatives you are referencing?	Staff notes that the language refers to events surrounding the previous CTP update and recommends removal of this reference	PC recommends changing the quoted language to read "and the current land use policies"
22	PC-060209-210	1	Introduction	Written	Chapter 1: Transportation Goals and Strategies: Introduction - Add brief historical overview of the CTP.	Staff recommends that this be included in the forthcoming preface	PC concurs with staff recommendation
24	PC-032609-3	1	Strategies and Goals	Verbal	CH 1 - Provide status report on each listed overall transportation strategy	Staff requests that this request be handled as a follow-on effort due to staffing level	Staff to provide information as follow-on effort and include in an appendix
25	PC-032609-6	1	Strategies and Goals	Verbal	CH 1 - More specific focus on outcomes between now and and next CTP update; set tangible, achievable goals; det out specific review date for next CTP update	Staff is available to meet with the PC to discuss this request	Staff will add a bullet under transportation strategies

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
26	PC-060209-213	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Transportation Strategies - Add "Work with adjoining jurisdictions to create seamless road connections wherever possible."	Staff recommends this be added as a policy in Chapter 2	PC concurs with staff recommendation
28	PC-060209-24	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Transportation Strategies - Add an item which reflects a direction in neighborhood roadway design to provide a grid of streets and the elimination of cul-de-sacs	Recommend adding a strategy under goal #1 that expresses the need to provide connectivity between developments to reduce overall burden on the CTP network. Provide specific guidance on execution of strategy in suburban policy #15 and design and construction standards policies #5,16,17 (incorporate VDOT standards as discussed during PC worksession)	PC concurs with staff recommendation and asks staff to add bullet under 1st goal stating that the County will work with VDOT to provide multi-modal standards
29	PC-060209-25	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Transportation Strategies - Add to the 4th bullet "Track overall system performance and recommend changes and improvements"	Staff believes the specifics of system performance are best described under policies, and notes that this is covered under level of service standards policies	BIN [see Chapter 8 recommendations]
32	PC-060209-40	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goals: Substitute following for goal so the County can state what is meant by multi-modal: "Provide a safe, affordable, convenient, efficient and environmentally sound transportation system to serve Loudoun citizens of all ages and abilities that encompasses pedestrians, bicyclists; drivers and passengers of transit vehicles, trucks, automobiles and motorcycles."	Staff would prefer to define multi-modal in the glossary	PC concurs with staff recommendation and asks staff to change "citizens" to "County" in 1st goal
33	PC-060209-41	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal #1 Ensure: What are the "other" County goals that are not stated in the RGP?	Staff recommends editing the goal to state "Ensure that the transportation system supports all County Goals including those contained in the Revised General Plan"	PC concurs with staff recommendation
34	PC-060209-42	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal #3 Ensure: Without money, OTS cannot ensure that planned land uses are supported. We may eventually catch up, but will never ensure that roads, bike paths, transit or ped paths and other County owned infrastructure will be in place to support. Therefore, remove this until there is a outside chance of achieving/accomplishing even part of the goal.	Staff recommends that the language be revised to state "Ensure that planned land uses are supported by appropriate transportation planning with respect to the types, levels and timing of transportation improvements"	PC concurs with staff recommendation

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
35	PC-060209-43	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal #5 Ensure: Add the following Ensure that all new projects, or major reconstruction projects shall accommodate travel by vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders as an integral element of the County's transportation system.	Staff believes that the intent of this goal/strategy is covered under other goals/strategies within the current text	PC asks staff to incorporate comment as strategy under goal #1 (as bullet #2)
36	PC-060209-44	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Strategies: First bullet: Substitute with the following: Complete the build-out of the major road network while ensuring accommodation and safety for vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. Add following bullet: Complete connections of all existing bike and pedestrian paths wherever it is deemed safe and reasonably cost effective.	Staff believes that the intent of this goal/strategy is covered under other goals/strategies within the current text; the follow-on bullet should be integrated as policy	PC asks staff to change "develop" to "complete" in bullet #2 of goal #1, but otherwise retain the bullet as is; the additional bullet recommended in the comment is to be added to policies as staff recommended
38	PC-052809-5	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal 1, Strategy 3: replace implement a traffic calming program with implement a highway safety improvement program, including traffic calming techniques	Staff notes that a highway safety program is somewhat beyond the role of OTS and is more a function of VDOT, although OTS works with VDOT on highway safety issues; staff would prefer to retain the current language	PC recommends working with VDOT on a multimodal safety improvement program
39	PC-052809-6	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal 1, add new strategy that states "identify priorities that will provide the greatest return on investment"	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
40	PC-060209-45	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Strategies: What kind of "improvements and facilities" will reduce trip lengths?	This strategy is referring in general to the concept of mixed land use, road and bike/ped connectivity and provision of transit	No action required
41	PC-060209-46	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Strategies: What are the "standards" in "Work with the Virginia Department of Transportation to update standards"	This strategy refers to the County's efforts to work with VDOT with respect to rural roads standards	No action required; it was noted by the PC that the strategy refers moreso to suburban roads standards
42	PC-052809-7	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal 3, Strategy 1: "to update design standards consistent with a multi-modal network"	Staff prefers the more general strategy as it allows for more flexibility in the types of changes that the County would work with VDOT on	PC recommends the following language: "to update standards within the context of a multimodal network"
43	PC-052809-8	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Goal 3, Strategy 4: change to "Respect and encourage shared use of rural roads by pedestrians, equestrians, farm vehicles, bicyclists and automobiles by making only those improvements necessary for the safety and utility of all users"	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
45	PC-060209-47	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Strategies: Substitute the following. (Again, has to do with timing. No money, no timing.) Ensure that planned land uses are supported by appropriate types, levels of transportation improvements which will include roads, transit, bicycle and pedestrian considerations.	Staff believes that the intent of this goal/strategy is covered under other goals/strategies within the current text	PC concurs with staff recommendation
46	PC-060209-48	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Strategies: Why is "Comply with all applicable environmental regulations" included under funding? I believe it belongs under quality of life.	Staff notes that compliance with environmental regulations is required in order to receive state and federal funding; staff notes that a strategy is listed under the quality of life goal that includes respect for environmental features	PC concurs with staff recommendation
47	PC-060409-1	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	...supports other County goals and the General Plan goals for supporting vibrant communities and employment centers and protecting natural and heritage assets,	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change and also notes that goals and strategies should be numbered
48	PC-060409-2	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	...are protected and maintained by completing vehicle and pedestrian systems, instituting transit systems, and addressing safety needs,	Staff believes these areas are covered under other goals/strategies	No action required
49	PC-060409-3	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Ensure that existing and planned land uses are supported....and timing of transportation improvements to serve 4 suburban communities and employment centers, the Transition Area, towns and the rural area.	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
50	PC-060409-4	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	...build-out of the major road network, ensuring integration with • The feeder system and service roads	Staff concurs, but suggests "while ensuring integration with the local road network"	PC recommends staff language
51	PC-060409-5	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Integrate a multi-modal system to include rail...	Staff notes that the PC elected to use the word "complete" instead of "develop"	No further action
52	PC-060409-6	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Implement a traffic calming program for neighborhoods and villages where appropriate	Staff concurs	No action required
53	PC-060409-7	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Track overall system performance using measures such as vehicle miles traveled between households and employment, public facilities and shopping; percent of mode split; level of service and safety	Staff notes that, as explained at the previous PC meeting, system performance is tracked using level of service analyses	PC recommends listing tools to track performance in Chapter 8 (staff to check with consultant; add to PC list of recommendations)

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
54	PC-060409-8	1	Goals and Strategies	Written	Integrate transportation policy with land use policy for employment centers and rural enterprises, and community access to facilities and services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Locate improvements and facilities to complete gaps in the suburban community transportation system</li> <li>o Work with Virginia Department of Transportation to update standards for ??? [comment]</li> <li>o Design roads through residential neighborhoods that are compatible with pedestrian and local residential use</li> <li>o Respect historic, rural and environmental features with context sensitive design</li> <li>o Prioritize projects that provide safe, multi-modal transportation for suburban neighborhoods and that support existing employment centers</li> </ul>	Staff requires further discussion on this comment	PC recommends: no action on first item; add first bullet to bullet #2; no action on 2nd bullet; add third bullet as sub-bullet to #3; 4th bullet change to read "Employ context-sensitive design in order to respect historic, rural and environmental features"; 5th bullet no action
56	Multiple - See Master	2	Planning Edits	Various	Relates to various edits requested by PC and Planning Department	Staff concurs with most edits - see master for details; those that staff would like further discussion on are addressed in the appropriate section	No action required
92	Multiple - See Master	2	Staff Edits	Various	OTS Staff have recommended a series of 29 edits to the CTP Map and text; most edits are clerical in nature	Approval is recommended; see Master for details; those edits that require PC discussion are addressed in the appropriate section	No action required
116	OTS-033009-24	2	Staff Edit	Staff Observation	CH 2 - ADD NEW Suburban policy to establish formal support of coordinated improvements to Route 606 and other segments of the "Dulles Loop"		PC concurs with staff recommendation
117	OTS-033009-25	2	Staff Edit	Staff Observation	CH 2 - ADD NEW Suburban policy for establishment and use of HOV lanes along Route 7 (Leesburg - Route 28), Route 28 (entire length in Loudoun, and "Dulles Loop". HOV lanes should be the final two lanes constructed on each roadway.		BIN; PC requested additional information on efficacy of HOV lanes and the ability to include truck lanes [information provided to PC]

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
118	OTS-033009-26	2	Staff Edit	Staff Observation	CH 2 - ADD NEW Suburban policy AND SITE-SPECIFIC NOTE TO MAP (AND UPDATE CH 2 TEXT AND APPENDIX 1 (ROAD #28, #40)) regarding coordination with Fairfax County and Town of Herndon for study of new/realigned Rock Hill Road connection to facilitate access between the Route 28/CIT Metrorail Station (in Fairfax County) and the 606 corridor (in Loudoun County).		PC concurs with staff recommendation
122	PC-060209-69	2	Introduction	Written	Chapter 2. PP1. Delete sentences 1 and 2.	Staff supports the text in its current form	PC recommends deletion of sentences 2 and 3
123	PC-060209-133	2	Development of the Road Network	Written	Development of the Road Network: At the end of the first paragraph add: "In addition, the County consulted with the Commonwealth Transportation Board during the preparation of the plan map pursuant to VA Code § 15.2-2237.	Staff will need to research this issue	BIN [no action required]
124	PC-060209-134	2	Development of the Road Network	Written	Development of the Road Network: Need a single measure of LOS. It is measured differently in each of (i) this second paragraph here [operational conditions within a traffic stream], (ii) the second paragraph of Land Development Application Review [peak period], and (iii) LOS Policies #2 [peak hour and daily traffic volumes].	Staff notes that these measures of LOS are in fact actually the same; LOS is based on the peak hour volumes; the reference to daily volumes is based on the fact that projected levels of service must often be based on daily volume projections; staff can expand on this in the text if necessary	BIN [no further action required]
125	PC-060209-211	2	Development of the Road Network	Written	Development of Road Network - For the benefit of the reader, elaborate on resources and modeling used in ¶1.	Staff notes that the detailed discussion on modeling is found in Appendix 2 as stated at the end of paragraph 2 in this section	PC concurs with staff recommendation, but asks for deletion of the term "sophisticated" from the description of the computer model on the first page of Chapter 2; PC also asks staff to list sources and authors of reports and provide information on software and settings used in the modeling analysis as part of Appendix 2.
126	PC-060209-212	2	Development of the Road Network	Written	The Road Network: A. Countywide Transportation Plan Map - Explain why local roads are not included in road system analysis.	The CTP network includes those roads that have a significant impact on the function of the network, arterials and collectors; these roads require careful long-range planning to ensure that the network functions adequately	PC asks staff to incorporate language used in the staff comment (at left) to section A, The Road Network; section A should be reworked to clarify role of local roads

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
127	PC-060209-72	2	Road Planning Guidelines	Written	Countywide Transportation Plan Road Planning Guidelines: Third line of first sentence add after "design criteria," "transit lanes and possible bus facilities ..."	Staff notes that these provisions are not included in the roadway planning guidelines	BIN (staff to follow up with Transit Division to determine feasibility of the request) [PC recommends incorporating notes to identify segments that will be studied for bus use/HOV only]
128	L-012109-1	2-MAP	Airport Area Connector	Letter	Request change of Airport Area Connector (Hawling Farm Boulevard) designation from a minor collector road to a major collector road; request change in location of the Route 7/Riverside Parkway bridge crossing (University Center/Commonwealth Center area) to location of existing Richfield Way to develop a network consistent with other recent changes to the CTP.	OTS staff has made the requested classification change to the Airport Area Connector Road. OTS staff recommends maintaining planned alignment of Route 7 bridge crossing as it sees no justification for the proposed change (Riverside Parkway is aligned and stubbed out at planned location of bridge crossing).	PC recommends approval of the classification change of the Airport Area Connector Road, but not changing the alignment of the Route 7 bridge crossing
129	PC-060209-102	2-MAP	Belfort Park	Written	Sterling: Belfort: Is this the solution that the Belfort Task Force agreed to? Which option was this?	Staff has incorporated the Belfort Park Task Force recommendations into the draft, however, the BOS has subsequently stated its intent to adopt a revised alignment for the northernmost east-west segment of Shaw Road; staff will update the map accordingly	PC concurs with staff recommendation
130	PC-060209-263	2-MAP	Braddock Road	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Braddock Rd – Keep as proposed	Staff recommends that Braddock Road be maintained in its planned state to serve 2030 levels of traffic	PC recommended at its 6/4 worksession that Braddock Road be reduced from 4 lanes to 2 lanes west of Lenah Loop Road, and that the missing segment just east of Route 15 be added to the network as a 2 lane facility
133	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Broad Run Connections	Various	Multiple citizens asked for additional connections across Broad Run to alleviate traffic bottlenecks	Staff responded that the current plan includes Pacific Boulevard, Westwind Drive, Route 789 Extended, Gloucester Parkway, Russell Branch Parkway and the Loudoun County Parkway	No action required
145	PCWS-060209-3	2-MAP	Church Rd	Verbal	This facility should be 2 lanes east of Cascades	Staff concurs - this is a typo	PC recommends edit of map
147	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Climbing Lane	Various	Citizen expressed concern over safe access to Route 7 between West Market Street and Route 9; indicated that it very difficult to get in and out of side streets during peak hours; feels that a "Climbing Lane" would only make this issue worse with more lanes to cross and a shorter median; believes parallel roads and an interchange would fix the issue	Staff noted that this project is in the study phase and has no financial commitment beyond that stage at this time; staff has met with this particular citizen and heard his concerns; staff further notes that the long-term plan for this section of Route 7 is for parallel roads and an interchange as requested	PC recommends that the project move forward, but only if adequate safety measures are in place to protect local residents

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
150	PC-060209-118	2-MAP	Cochran Mill Road	Written	Transition Area roads: Cochran Mill: What is the effect of the Sycolin Road FAA alignment on this project? Since the road is only used by trucks that exit to 7, do we need to spend any money pushing this road farther southward and missing Shreve Mill as a crossroad intersection?	Staff notes that the planned facility has no effect on Sycolin Road; the western end of the road is planned for a more southerly alignment to avoid Sycolin Creek; staff notes that the PC recommended that this facility be maintained on the CTP network, but with higher priority given to Crosstrail Boulevard	PC elected to recommend retaining Cochran Mill Road as called for in the draft; however priority should be given to completing Crosstrail Blvd
151	PC-060209-88	2-MAP	Croson Lane	Written	Metrorail Related - 3. Croson Lane. This is misleading. This is not a "thru" street if it is going directly through Moorefield station (whose map I have packed away somewhere) on those grid streets. Please check on this and confirm that Moorefield Station is going to allow this 4 lane road to go through its building in the southwest corner of its property.	As staff noted on 6/2, the CTP map will be updated to reflect the approved network in the area of Moorefield Station; this update includes a revision to the alignment of Croson Lane on its eastern end such that it ties into the Transit Connector Road	Staff will update the CTP map as noted; no PC action required
152	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Crosstrail Boulevard Extension	Various	Request for extension of Crosstrail Boulevard from Route 621 to Route 15	Staff notes that the BOS removed this connection in 2001	PC recommends Crosstrail Blvd be maintained in its current state
156	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Dulles Loop	Various	Issue relates to need for improvements to Dulles Loop routes including Routes 50 and 606	Comment noted, see CTP	PC recommends that long-term concept be expanded to include multi-modal options and parallel roads; add a policy for a corridor study
171	PC-060209-271	2-MAP	Dulles South Boulevard	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Dulles South Blvd – Remove stretch between North Star Blvd and Gum Spring Road. Does not comply with comp plan.	Staff recommends that this road segment be retained in the CTP to accommodate 2030 projected levels of traffic	PC concurs with staff recommendation
172	PC-060209-274	2-MAP	Dulles South Parkway	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Dulles South Parkway – Terminate the road to the west at North Star Blvd.	Staff recommends that this road segment be retained in the CTP to accommodate 2030 projected levels of traffic	PC concurs with staff recommendation
173	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	East Gate View Drive	Various	Citizen owns property on Route 50; desires construction of East Gate View Drive; his understanding is that developer will not build the road	Staff notes that East Gate View Drive is proffered as part of a development; however, the timing of the improvement is dependent on the developer and market conditions	No action taken
176	PD-032409-21	2-MAP	Edwards Ferry Road	Referral	Planning staff recommends adding text to Chapter 2 that describes required coordination with respect to Edwards Ferry Road and planned improvements (refer to referral for details)	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC asks Planning staff to develop appropriate language for their recommended text
177	PD-032409-88	2-MAP	Edwards Ferry Road	Referral	Planning staff recommends that the ultimate section of Edwards Ferry Road be revised from a U4 to an R2	The CTP calls for this section of Edwards Ferry Road to be studied to evaluate alternate typical sections	PC recommends maintaining Edwards Ferry Road as a 2-lane facility (R2)
178	PD-032409-89	2-MAP	Edwards Ferry Road	Referral	Planning staff recommends traffic calming for River Creek Parkway at its northern terminus	Staff believes this should request should be evaluated as a follow-on effort	PC asks Planning staff to develop appropriate language for their recommended text

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
180	PC-041409-1	2-MAP	Greenway	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Is expansion to 8 lanes justified? Noted high cost of tolls already. Are resources better devoted to other roadways?	From a modeling perspective, the traffic demand will require 8 lanes; staff notes that the Greenway is a private facility with no County resources involved	PC concurs with staff recommendation; staff notes that Greenway operator will have to seek SPEX approval for 8 lanes
184	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Greenway	P Comment	Multiple stakeholders stated that a graduated toll system needs to be installed on the Greenway	Comment noted	Refer to Chapter 8 item
187	PC-060209-89	2-MAP	Greenway Loop	Written	Metrorail Related - 4. Greenway loop. Please explain what you are accomplishing with this road. If you can get toll to toll rates (see item 1) this would make this superfluous. Money would be better spent connecting Croson to where you plan to put the start of the Greenway loop in the Dulles parkway Centerline road over LCP and down to Route 606. That would make the 606/607 connector without having a 4 lane highway through all the residences on Westwind.	The Greenway Loop Road is consistent with the approved Moorefield Station and Dulles Parkway Center applications; the facility is designed to support the movement of local traffic and the larger grid network; staff notes that Croson is proffered to connect to the Transit Connector Road - the map needs to be updated to reflect this as included in the approved Moorefield Station development	Planning and OTS staff will meet with interested members of the PC to discuss the road network in the vicinity of transit stations; with respect to this item, no action is required; PC recommended that staff update names on the CTP map to reflect existing road segment names where appropriate
188	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Gum Spring Road	Various	Issue relates to the desire for completion of Gum Spring Road, problems with cut-through traffic and the incorporation of turn lanes on Route 50	Staff notes that the two lanes of the West Spine Road due to open in July 2009 will be northbound only and will act as a defacto right-turn lane with access to eastbound Route 50 only; Staff further notes that Gum Spring Road is due for completion approximately the end of July. The new 4-lane facility will include turn lanes	No action required
193	PC-060209-272	2-MAP	Gum Spring Road	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Gum Spring Road – Between Braddock Road and Route 50 – Retain the current road name in the CTP instead of Route 606 Extended. Keep ultimate condition for this stretch to 4 lanes median separated with turn lanes. This is important to keep this road in the suburban neighborhood area functioning as intended as a residential collector road not as an arterial. This is also essential to maintain the residential character of this area and to encourage safe bicycle and pedestrian usage in this residential corridor.	Staff notes that names of planned roadways are for planning purposes only; staff supports the ultimate condition of this roadway as a 6-lane facility to support projected 2030 levels of traffic	PC recommends that this facility be 4 lanes in a six lane ROW; PC also recommends the facility be named Gum Spring Road
196	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Jennings Farm Road	Various	Multiple citizens requested removal of the Jennings Farm Road from the CTP	Modeling analysis indicates that this segment would relieve Route 7 by taking local traffic off of the facility; however, no funds are available to complete the project and therefore there are no immediate plans to do so	PC concurs with staff recommendation

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
204	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Lenah Loop	Various	Several comments were received requesting removal of the Lenah Loop Road	Staff supports the inclusion of the Lenah Loop Road to facilitate the movement of projected 2030 traffic in Dulles South; staff notes that this roadway was retained by the PC at the 6/4 worksession	PC recommends maintaining the planned Lenah Loop
209	S2-051909-18B	2-MAP	Loudoun County Parkway	P Comment	Questioned the ability to widen Loudoun County Parkway to 8 lanes	Staff notes that the analysis took into account environmental and physical constraints to widening; a detailed design, however, has not been prepared for an 8-lane facility	PC recommends a 6-lane facility in an 8-lane ROW
211	PC-060209-265	2-MAP	Loudoun County Parkway	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Loudoun County Parkway – Limit Ultimate Condition to 6 lanes incorporating complete street multi-modal design features to encourage pedestrian and bus service and access to Moorefield station from adjacent neighborhoods such as Loudoun Valley Estates and Brambleton	Staff notes that the modeling analysis indicates the need for this facility in order to accommodate projected levels of traffic and avoid excessive congestion	PC recommends adding a "Complete Streets" policy in design and construction standards section - Commissioners Austin and Chaloux to draft the policy language; number of lanes discussed above
217	S2-051909-26C	2-MAP	Mooreview Parkway	P Comment	Expressed concern over Winridge and Mooreview road facilities cutting through the development	Comment noted; these facilities have not been changed from 2001 plan and modeling analysis indicates that they continue to be needed; staff notes that these facilities will be built initially as four lane facilities	PC concurs with staff recommendation
218	PC-060209-101	2-MAP	Moran Road	Written	Sterling: Moran: Is this the solution that the Belfort Task Force agreed to?	Staff notes that all of the improvements recommended by the Task Force have been included in the CTP; however, the BOS has acted subsequently to re-align the northernmost east-west section of Shaw Road to a new alignment	No action required
219	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	New Road	Various	Multiple citizens requested removal of New Road from CTP	Comment noted; staff notes that the modeling analysis indicated that inclusion of New Road as a 4-lane facility in the CTP network alleviated significant congestion on Routes 15 and 50	PC recommends removal of New Road from the CTP network
237	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Northstar Boulevard	Written	Two Commissioners recommended the removal of Northstar Boulevard south of Braddock Road if not received by Prince William County	Staff notes that the PC elected to retain Northstar Boulevard as a 4-lane section south of Braddock Road	PC recommends a 4-lane facility in a 6-lane ROW
240	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Pleasant Valley Church/Route 50	Various	Multiple citizens requested improved access to Route 50 for Pleasant Valley Church including approval of Steeple Run Drive in association with rezoning application and/or maintaining crossover due to be closed with Route 50 widening	Staff is providing comments on this application as part of the referral process; staff notes that the Route 50 widening is a VDOT project	No action required
254	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Potomac River Crossing	Various	Multiple comments were submitted requesting/seeking information on a new bridge crossing to Maryland	Staff notes that this is not under consideration in the draft plan	PC has added a policy for mass transit underground across the Potomac and also a general policy for exploration of options for additional crossings
261	PCWS-060209-2	2-MAP	Potomac View Road	Verbal	Should explore options for an overpass at Potomac View Rd and Route 7	Staff will research the issue	BIN [no action]

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
262	L-092408-1	2-MAP	Purcellville	Letter	Show in the CTP the Southern, Northern and Western Collectors; widening of Route 7 and Route 287 and the Interchange with Route 7 and the Western Collector; realign the northern and western collectors so that they connect; extend the Northern Collector to a logical connection point to the east; show an upgrade to the Route 7 Bypass/Route 287 interchange (ramps/capacity improvements); include roundabouts on "A" Street (South Collector Road) with 32nd, 20th and Maple, and at Route 287/Main street; include Main street as a scenic byway; include a detailed transportation study for the Hillsboro Bypass; coordinate transportation improvements in the PUGAMP area; include provisions for funding Town projects like Maple and Main	Western Collector requires discussion/recommendation by Planning Commission. Routes 7/287 interchange does not require approval in the CTP. Extension of North Collector requires further discussion. Widening of Routes 7 and 287 already in the CTP. "A" Street/32nd Street and Main/287 roundabouts require Town/County coordination; Town should request By-Way status through VDOT; CTP is not a funding document, and it is noted that 2% of County's share of regional transportation funds are given to Town on an annual basis.	PC recommends extending Northern Collector to JLMA boundary in accordance with PUGAMP; add note for the Western Collector on the CTP map and in the text
263	E-011309-1	2-MAP	Purcellville	E-mail	Follow-up to 9/24/08 letter. Various recommended corrections on page 2-13, 2-5, better commuter park & ride lot sites outside of Purcellville, North Collector Road has always been on the plan/ not a change from 2005, Loudoun County household density for 2000 and 2030 needs to be corrected (dots inaccurate)	Reference to Southern Collector from 4 to 2 lanes has been made; Route 7/690 interchange is not contingent on widening of Route 7, however it would not preclude the widening; Route 7/690 interchange is included in the CTP as is a note stating that location is to be determined in consultation with Town and VDOT; Hillsboro Bypass has been removed from CTP consideration by BOS; P & R Lots - temporary location is at Patrick Henry College, ultimate location at Scott Jenkins Park (east of Hamilton), with a 2nd lot in the Purcellville vicinity (located to be determined). It is noted that North Collector road alignment and 4-lane designation have not been changed from adopted 2001 CTP. Referenced maps are not in the CTP.	No action required
264	PC-060209-104	2-MAP	Relocation Drive	Written	Sterling: Relocation Drive: Fix this name, it is awful.	Staff notes that the re-naming of existing roads is handled by the Department of Mapping	No action required
265	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Riverside Parkway	Various	Multiple citizens/commissioners asked for the County to reconsider extending Riverside Parkway through Potomac Farms and/or directing traffic to the Lexington Overpass	Modeling analysis showed the need for this connection; staff notes that Riverside Parkway is on the map as a conceptual corridor and will require detailed study before an alignment is selected	PC has recommended that an alignment study be conducted to determine appropriate course of action; among the alternatives to be considered is the Riverside connection to the Lexington flyover
287	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Route 7 Operational Improvements	Various	Multiple citizens expressed desire for improvements to Route 7 east of Route 28	The County is working on operational improvements to Route 7; there are no plans to widen Route 7 east of Route 28 due to potential for impacts to existing development	BIN - PC requests staff to bring in summary of improvements and timing [information provided to PC]

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
292	PC-060209-82	2-MAP	Route 7	Written	VA Route 7: There should be mention about when the Town is ready to do their section of Rte 7 to eight lanes and if they agree to HOV lanes since the Town line is out to Wegmans/Rivercreek Pkwy/Crosstrail Blvd. Further there is the JLMA until the Goose.	Comment noted; there are no current plans to widen to 8 lanes; also, HOV is only to be considered/evaluated, and would require Town/County cooperation	No action required
293	PC-060209-5	2-MAP	Route 7 Ped Xing	Written	Add bullet item to Suburban Policy Area Roads: VA Route 7 Countryside pedestrian, and bicycle crossing will provide safe means for non-motorvehicular movement across Route 7 without impeding traffic flow. Currently pedestrians & bicycles cross Rt 7 at Countryside at the traffic light in competition with motor vehicles. The addition of pedestrian crosswalks with signalization will impede traffic flow, and will require that pedestrians traverse only halfway across Rt 7 at a time, as the travel distance is too great to permit a complete crossing in a reasonable time frame. The intersection is dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to visit Dulles Town Center. The proposed solution is a pedestrian/bicycle bridge either at or east of Countryside Blvd. This is just one example of a situation where road safety and Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobiltiy are intertwined. Another similar situation occurs at Rt 15 Bypass and Fort Evans Road, Leesburg--where pedestrians do not have access to the Outlet Mall. Likewise at Edwards	Staff recommends further discussion as to the most appropriate place for this item	BIN and discuss with Chapter 4; staff to add policy in Chapter 4 to address pedestrian overpasses [PC addressed in priority list]
294	S2-051909-21A	2-MAP	Route 7 East	P Comment	Stated that Route 7 should have express lanes in the median	Comment noted	No further action
300	PC-041409-12	2-MAP	Route 7 West	Verbal	CH 8 - Routes 7 & 9 - Effect of widening east end of Route 9 to 4 lanes and Route 7 to 8 lanes from Route 9 to Leesburg	The effect is to improve level of service on these respective routes	No action required
304	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Route 15 South	Written	Multiple commissioners requested that Route 15 be reduced to 2 lanes coming into the County from Prince William County	Staff notes that the PC elected to reduce Route 15 to 2 lanes on this segment	PC elected to reduce Route 15 to 2 lanes on this segment
308	S1-051209-6B	2-MAP	Route 28 Access	P Comment	Permanent right-in access from Route 28 to Steeplechase Drive is requested	Comment noted; staff notes that the plan calls for Route 28 to be a limited access facility with at-grade access terminated	BIN (verify that right-in will remain until completion of Atlantic Blvd) [staff verified that right-in will remain open]

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
309	PCWS-060209-1	2-MAP	Route 28 Ultimate	Verbal	Explore multi-modal options for Route 28 expansion to 10 lanes	Staff notes that the CTP calls for study of HOV lanes; recommends that other multi-modal options (including truck lanes) be studied as part of the same study	BIN [no further action required]
310	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Route 50 Access	P Comment	Several stakeholders expressed concern that businesses access not be cut off and that alternative access is in place before Route 50 becomes limited access	Staff notes that before Route 50 can become limited access, alternative access points must be provided to existing parcels	Addressed in Suburban Area Road Policies - no action required
323	PC-060209-114	2-MAP	Route 50 Corridor	Written	Transition Area roads: Route 50 parallel roads can stop at Northstar.	Staff supports the inclusion of the parallel roads as planned	PC concurs with staff recommendation
324	PC-060209-261	2-MAP	Route 50 Corridor	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Route 50 – Grade separated interchange warranted at Route 606 and Route 50. Remove all other proposed grade separated interchanges on Route 50 at North Star Boulevard, West Spine Road, South Riding Boulevard. Need more information on VDOT Route 50 expansion plan to evaluate proposed grade separated interchange at Tall Cedars Pkwy and Route 50. (Note: Fairfax County has no current plans to improve Route 50 intersections east of Loudoun and west of Route 28). Recommend that the County seek other alternatives for limiting access and moving traffic on Route 50. Need to reduce the number of traffic lights on Route 50 and synchronize the remaining traffic lights in Loudoun and Fairfax County.	Comment noted; staff notes that the interchange for 50/606 is currently in conceptual design; staff strongly recommends that other planned grade separated interchanges be maintained along Route 50; as noted by VDOT at the 6/4 worksession, Route 50 is already strained and in need of interchanges to accommodate existing traffic; the forecasts used for the CTP consider 2030 levels of traffic which are considerably higher than those witnessed today; Route 50 will not be able to accommodate projected levels of traffic without interchanges	PC concurs with staff recommendation - staff to add language to the interchange definition that lasts the different types of interchanges
325	PC-060209-90	2-MAP	Route 50/606 Interchange	Written	Route 50: Has the design of Rte50/LCP been completed from the 2006 Bond Referendum? If it has, indicate so. If not, put in date it will be completed.	The interchange for this location is currently in conceptual design; staff has refrained from providing completion dates as they are subject to change and also help to make the document seem less current once completed	No action required

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
327	PC-060209-95	2-MAP	Route 606 Extended	Written	Loudoun County Parkway: We need to let 606 stay as an overlay to 607 (LCP). I do not think that we need it to extend to Gum Springs. The current light on Evergreen allows it to become Gum Springs and that road can stay at 4 lanes rather than 6. Then it can interface with West Spine when it crosses 50 and join up with Gum Springs again. This allows all the developments around Gum Springs to get to 50 and 606 to get to the metro stations and rte 28.	Staff notes that the modeling analysis indicates the need for this facility in order to accommodate projected levels of traffic and avoid excessive congestion	PC concurs with staff recommendation - staff to change the name of Route 606 extended to reflect approved/built segment names
328	PC-060209-96	2-MAP	Route 621 Relocated	Written	Rte 621 Relocated: Rename the road. This is awful.	Staff notes that names of planned roadways are for planning purposes only	PC recommends staff change name of Route 621 relocated to reflect approved/built segment names
329	PC-060209-269	2-MAP	Route 648 Relocated	Written	2030 CTP Map Suggestions –Dulles District Area: Route 648 Relocated – Remove proposed road improvement from CTP entirely. Does not comply with comprehensive plan.	Staff notes that the PC elected to remove this road from the network	PC elected to remove this road from the network
330	PC-060209-87	2-MAP	Route 789 Extended	Written	Metrorail Related - 2. Route 789 (Lockridge) to be extended through the AOL complex, across the Broad Run, over the Loudoun County Parkway CANNOT meet up with Waxpool unless it crosses LCP again. Do you mean Farmwell??? Please check map and fix one or both.	Staff believes the description is correct; will discuss with PC as necessary	PC recommends staff clarify text as needed
331	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Route 860	Various	Multiple citizens asked for Route 860 to be removed from the CTP	Modeling analysis showed the need for this connection as it relieves unacceptable levels of congestion on portions of Routes 15 and 50	PC elected to remove this road from the network; however staff may include policy that would allow for coordination with Prince William County to identify an alternative connection (to replace 860 extension/New Road)
342	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Route 9	Various	Multiple citizens expressed concern over traffic operations in the Route 9 Corridor	Staff shares concerns with respect to capacity issues on Route 9; staff further notes that the BOS has removed the Hillsboro Bypass from consideration in the draft CTP	No further action
346	EG-062108-1	2-MAP	Russell Branch	E-mail	Requested information on the proposed deletion of Russell Branch Parkway west of Route 659 (Play-to-Win site), as well as the relocation of Sycolin Road (Leesburg Airport runway extension).	OTS staff recommends maintaing Russell Branch Parkway (west of Route 659) on the CTP. Sycolin Road realignment to accommodate airport runway extension is reflected on draft CTP.	PC recommends continuing Russell Branch Parkway to Cochran Mill Road and also providing a bike/ped connection from Russell Branch Parkway across Route 28

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
347	PC-060209-84	2-MAP	Russell Branch Parkway	Written	Russell Branch Parkway. If this is the south collector road, it needs to extend from the by-pass through to Pacific Boulevard. There needs to be mention about the section from Belmont Ridge Road west to either Crosstrail Blvd or (at least) Battlefield. This will involve a bridge over the Goose and some land from private citizens and Kettler's golf course. However, if you are using the CTP to reserve land, this should be mentioned and mapped.	Staff notes that the alignment was chosen to limit crossings of the Goose Creek	See EG-062108-1
348	PV4-043009-3	2-MAP	Shannondale	P Comment	Citizen expressed desire for the County to investigate a connection from Shannondale to Route 7	Comment noted. Staff notes that this would be an interjurisdictional effort and determine its feasibility	PC recommends no action
351	PC-041409-11	2-MAP	Sycolin Overpass	Verbal	CH 8 - Leesburg Bypass - Construct overpass and remove signal at Sycolin Road	Funding is in the six year plan for design only; obtaining construction funds is a high priority for the County	No further action
356	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Tall Cedars Parkway	P Comment	Multiple comments were received that expressed concern over the inclusion of Tall Cedars as a 6-lane facility in the plan	Staff notes that the proposed cross section for Tall Cedars Parkway is consistent with that proposed in the 2001 plan; modeling analysis indicates that a 6-lane facility is required to handle the projected levels of traffic; Staff notes that the PC decided to retain Tall Cedars Parkway along its entire planned length, but as 4 lanes in a 6-lane right of way	PC decided to retain Tall Cedars Parkway along its entire planned length, but as 4 lanes in a 6-lane right of way
368	PW6-050709-14	2-MAP	Traffic Calming - Richland Acres	P Comment Written	Q1 - Cut-through traffic in Richland Acres; people go through too fast to cut off signals on Route 7; we would like to return Richland Acres back to a quiet community	Comment noted	PC recommends no action
369	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Tri-County Parkway	P Comment	Several stakeholders expressed concern over the current alignment of the Tri-County Parkway as well as the construction of the facility at all; other stakeholders support the alignment to facilitate inter-county traffic	Staff notes that the modeling analysis indicates the need for this facility in order to accommodate projected levels of traffic and avoid excessive congestion	PC recommends renaming the Tri-County Parkway as the Loudoun County Parkway and also recommends adding a note to the map that a precise alignment will be determined in consultation with the land owners and with respect for the agricultural district while not compromising the utility of the alignment; ultimate cross-section to remain 6 lanes, but the facility will be removed from the priority list
377	PC-041409-13	2-MAP	Tri-County Parkway	Verbal	CH 8 - Tri-County Parkway - Rename/clarify easterly alignment (different from Route 659 Relocated (Northstar Boulevard) alignment).	Staff is open to discussion of alternate names; staff notes that the names shown are for planning purposes and the name is not set until the road is built	See above
380	S2-051909-26A	2-MAP	Waxpool	P Comment	Indicated that Waxpool Road was a concern; asked whether a roundabout was possible at Loudoun County Parkway	In order to assess the viability of a roundabout at this intersection, a follow-on study would need to be conducted	No action

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
381	PC-040209-36	2-MAP	West Spine Road	Verbal	CH 2 - Route 659/West Spine Road - should not be referred to as "Route 606 Extended" - ultimate condition of corridor should be 4 lanes, not 6.	Staff is open to discussion on the road name, the name is for planning purposes only; analysis indicates that a six-lane facility is required to accommodate the projected level of traffic (2030) at an acceptable level of service; staff notes that the 2009 draft is identical to the adopted plan for this facility	PC recommends that this facility be 4 lanes in a six lane ROW; PC also recommends the facility be named Gum Spring Road
384	Multiple - See Master	2-MAP	Westwind Drive	Written	Multiple comments were received questioning the viability of this facility	Staff recommends further discussion on this item	No action
387	PC-060209-215	2	Road Network Concepts and Policies	Written	Road Network Concepts and Policies - Add road numbers for all road names throughout the document.	Staff has added route numbers to the text in those cases where roads are commonly referred to by their numbers	PC asks staff to add route numbers to all roads throughout the document
388	PC-060209-216	2	Road Network Concepts and Policies	Written	Road Network Concepts and Policies - Add "Design and construct a Metrorail line from Dulles Airport underground along Route 28, then under the Potomac River to Rockville, with metro stations along Route 28 where feasible and express service in Maryland to Rockville, thereby preserving Montgomery County's conservation and agricultural areas."	Staff recommends adding a policy that states that the County will explore the concept of a rail line along Route 28 north to Rockville through a future study	PC asks that staff add a policy that states that "The County will study the feasibility of mass transit underground along Route 28, under the Potomac River, and under Montgomery County to Rockville, MD, with stations along Route 28 where feasible and express service in Maryland to Rockville, thereby preserving Montgomery County's conservation and agricultural areas."; PC also asks staff add a broader discussion of connections to MD somewhere in the document; a separate discussion also asked staff to add to the preface that the County contracted with Baker Corp to complete the CTP
389	PC-060209-73	2	Functional Classification/ Access Mgmt	Written	Functional Classification: Will the new VDOT regulations concerning secondary street standards and access management that will take effect October 1 affect any part of this plan?	Staff notes that the SSAR will take effect July 1; staff is incorporating language into the CTP in the Design and Construction Standards policies to reflect the changes	No action required

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
390	PC-060209-135	2	Functional Classification/ Access Mgmt	Written	Access Management: Replace this paragraph in its entirety with the following: Access Management is the systematic control of the location, spacing, design, and the operation of entrances, median openings, traffic signals, roundabouts, and interchanges for the purpose of providing vehicular access to land development, in a way that most efficiently balances the safety and efficiency of the transportation system for all users. The County supports access management techniques that focus on context-sensitive and economic designs that emphasize local access while balancing safety and capacity will best promote the needs of Loudoun County. The County will work closely with residents, businesses, the development community, and VDOT to address concerns and seek solutions for parcel access issues. The County will continue to press VDOT to adopt progressive, safer, and more economical access solutions for access management design standards for entrances and intersections.	Staff recommends retaining the VDOT definition as the County defers to VDOT for access management standards; the remaining statements should be incorporated as policies if desired by the PC	PC concurs with staff recommendation
393	PD-032409-32	2	Suburban Policy Area Roads	Referral	Planning staff recommends removing language in the description of Suburban Policy Area Roads that states that significant development potential exists within this area	Staff disagrees and supports the language as is	PC asks staff to delete the subject sentence
394	PC-060209-81	2	Suburban Policy Area Roads	Written	Suburban Policy Area Roads: If the county owns these roads, it is the county's responsibility to get it designed, funded and built. Eliminate any references to finding funding or responsibility. Enough said.	Staff notes that the County does not own the CTP roads; they are owned and maintained by VDOT; the County seeks funding for planned roads from a number of sources, including VDOT and developers, and has recently elected to fund the design and/or construction of several projects on its own; often it is unknown what the source of funding will be for certain planned roads	PC concurs with staff recommendation
395	PC-060209-218	2	Suburban Policy Area Roads	Written	Under Suburban Policy Area Roads in the Potomac Community: Route 7 Collector Road: Please provide detail on rezoning application (Westerly?) that reserved right-of-way for completion of Route 7 North Collector Road.	ROW was reserved for the collector road (to be built by others) as part of the Richland Business Center in 12/2003	No action required; PC recommended that the collector road remain on the map

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
396	PC-060409-9	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	New Policy #2 It is a priority of this plan that safety concerns, gaps in the existing road system, and connections to collector and arterial roads be addressed to serve neighborhoods and employment centers already in place.		PC recommends policy be added as new #1
397	PD-032409-42	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends changes of wording of Suburban Area Roads policy #2 to reflect County's support of efforts to complete Route 28 parallel roads to enable freeway transition	Staff concurs	PC asks staff to incorporate language as recommended in PC comment PC-060209-138 as amended by PC
398	PC-060409-10	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	(Replaces #2 & 3 & 7): New Policy #3 The County will continue to seek funding sources to complete the limited access business corridors of Rt. 28, Rt. 50 and Rt. 7, including the Rt. 28 Pub-Private Trans. Act (PPTA) consortium, road improvement bonds and other sources. #4 Completion of the parallel roads along Rt. 28, Rt. 7, and Rt. 50 will be pursued in concert with the arterial roads.		No further action - see below
399	PC-060209-105	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies: Policies 4, 5 depend on whether the roads stay on the map.	Comment noted	PC asks staff to add a policy that states "The County supports north-south connector roads to adjacent counties as shown on the map"
400	PC-060209-138	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies Delete policies 2 through 5, 7 and 8 as they are project specific and not policies.  Add new policies: "The County supports the creation of limited access freeways, including VA Route 7 for east-west connectivity and Routes 28 and 606 for north-south connectivity."  "Parallel roads shall be constructed concurrently with and shall be a condition to establishment of limited access freeways."	Staff recommends discussion on this item	PC asks staff to incorporate recommended language in comment, but with the addition of Route 50 in the Suburban Policy Area to the first policy, and the replacement of "parallel roads" with "suitable alternative access" in the second policy

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
401	PC-060409-11	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	(Replaces #4 & 5): New Policy #5 The County supports north-south connector roads to adjacent counties from Rt. 659 Relocated (Northstar Blvd.) and from Loudoun County Parkway. [Note: I don't agree with this, but if the PC supports it, here is suggested language.] Sentences below from old policy numbers 3 (second sentence), 4 (1st three lines), and 7 (second sentence) are to go into Priorities Appendix: These improvements include the construction of interchanges at Loudoun County Parkway, Ashburn village Boulevard and Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659), widening of this segment of Route 7 to eight lanes, and the completion of remaining segments of the Route 7 parallel roads west of Route 28. The County supports a funding program for short-term and long-term projects to accelerate the improvement and widening of Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659) to six lanes between Route 7 and Croson Lane and the construction of Route 659 Relocated as a six-lane facility to be known as Northstar Boulevard from Croson Lane south through the Suburban		No action - see above
402	PD-032409-43	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends changes of wording of Suburban Area Roads policy #7 to reflect County's position of exploring grade separated options for Pleasant Valley Road	Staff concurs	N/A; policy #7 has been deleted
403	PC-060209-106	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies: Policy 7 cannot be implemented until the unlimited access of Tall Cedars and the Northern collector road are built without missing links.	Comment noted; PC has expressed parallel roads to be completed prior to limited access upgrade	N/A; policy #7 has been deleted
404	PD-032409-9	2	Suburban Policy Area Roads	Referral	Planning staff recommends removing policy #8 of the Suburban Policy Area Roads section of Chapter 2 as the Bike/Ped Plan provides more guidance as to bicycle and pedestrian improvements	Staff sees no direct conflict with the Bike/Ped Plan	N/A; policy #8 has been deleted
405	PC-060209-139	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies: Policy 9: Replace "considered" with "encouraged".	Staff notes that traffic calming is not always appropriate for certain facilities, particularly collector facilities; staff recommends retaining the current language	PC asks staff to edit the policy to read that Traffic calming <i>shall be considered</i> ; PC also asks that a Countywide policy be added on Context Sensitive Design; PC also asks that traffic calming and context sensitive design be added to the glossary

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
406	PC-060209-140	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies: Policy 14: Revised to read: "The County will improve the planned and existing road network in the Suburban Policy Area by requiring road and bike and pedestrian connections between neighborhoods and between residential and employment areas.	Staff recommends adding a policy with respect to bike/ped connectivity in Chapter 4	PC recommends the policy to state "The County will continue to seek opportunities to improve the planned and existing road network including bicycle and pedestrian connections in the Suburban Policy Area with additional connections between neighborhoods and between residential and employment areas"
407	PC-060209-107	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies: Policy 15 almost gets it. The county wants to adopt the VDOT policy of supporting connectivity within and with other communities outside the planned neighborhood. Do we need to put in a policy of Complete Streets and a policy of reviewing all new road construction to ensure maximum connectivity?	Staff will add reference to VDOT SSAR - VDOT will administer these regulations	PC asks staff to maintain this policy here, with the added VDOT reference, and add reference in the Design and Construction standards policies
408	PC-060209-141	2	Suburban Area Road Policies	Written	Suburban Area Road Policies: Policy 15: Revise the first sentence to read: "The County shall develop and adopt a measurable standard...." In the second sentence, replace "should" with "shall".	Staff will add reference to VDOT SSAR - VDOT will administer these regulations	PC asks staff to maintain this policy here, with the added VDOT reference, and add reference to the Design and Construction standards policies
415	PD-032409-49	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Referral	Planning staff states that the description of the Rural Rustic Road program incorrectly states that it shall apply to roads carrying no more than 1500 vehicles per day	Staff notes that this is in fact correct as the guidelines have been updated since the 2006 document was released	PC concurs with staff recommendation
416	PD-032409-23	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Referral	Planning staff requests clarification as to why the draft CTP deletes text pertaining to the use of alternative road treatments for unpaved roads	Staff understands that VDOT no longer uses alternative road treatments	PC concurs with staff recommendation and further asks staff to delete policy #16; PC asks staff to clarify 1st paragraph of the Rural Policy Area Roads section, 4th sentence (unique)
417	PC-060209-143	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Written	Rural Policy Area Roads: VA Route 287: Revise the first sentence to read: "VA Route 287 extends from the Potomac River across from Brunswick, Maryland in the north to Route 7 Business in the Town of Purcellville in the south. In the second sentence, clarify whether the improvements are requested for VA Route 7 or Route 7 Business.	Staff will edit accordingly; the improvements are for Route 7 and Route 287 as described	PC concurs with staff recommendation, but asks that all route references be consistent and either include the prefix VA or not
419	PC-060209-145	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Written	Rural Policy Area Roads: Unpaved Roads: In the last sentence of the first paragraph, delete everything after "present state."	Staff recommends retaining the reference to safety at a minimum	PC asks the sentence to be revised to state "The County is committed to the preservation of a safe unpaved rural road network."

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
422	PC-060209-148	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Written	Rural Policy Area Roads: Unpaved Roads: In the second sentence of the third paragraph, delete "adequate levels of service and".	Staff believes that this sentence is referring to the impact of lowering densities, and is not stating that adequate levels of service must be maintained; therefore staff supports the sentence in its current form	PC asks staff to update sentence to state that the Revised General Plan has been implemented
423	PC-060209-149	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Written	Rural Policy Area Roads: Unpaved Roads: In the fourth paragraph, list the circumstances when an unpaved road must be paved.	Staff will edit accordingly; staff notes that unpaved roads must be paved when VDOT can no longer provide adequate maintenance to keep the facility in operable condition	PC asks staff to add comment response to clarify when a road must be paved
424	PC-060209-150	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Written	Rustic Road Program: Under the sixth bullet, clarify who "the Department" is.	Staff will edit accordingly; staff notes that the Department refers to VDOT, identified earlier as the manager of the program	PC concurs with staff recommendation
430	PC-032609-2	2	Rural Policy Area Roads	Verbal	CH 1 - Better define situations where rural roads should be paved for safety and discussion of evolution of County's policy (2001 Plan)	By practice, residents have come to the BOS and the BOS has supported paving to rural rustic standards; safety is defined by inability to maintain heavily traveled unpaved roads	No action required
431	PC-060209-153	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #1 – Revise to read: "...will be focused on the safety of all users and will be designed...."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC concurs with staff recommendation; all references to level of service will be deleted
432	PC-060209-154	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #2 – Revised to read: "...will be maintained in their present state except...." What about Route 50?	Staff notes that Route 50 is planned to remain a 2-lane facility in the Rural Area	PC asks that Route 621 be added to the policy
433	PC-060209-155	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #3 – Add to the end of the second sentence: ", subject to completion of parallel road improvements on the north side of VA Route 7."	Staff recommends the following: ", subject to completion of parallel road improvements, where planned, on the north side of VA Route 7."	PC concurs with staff recommendation
434	PC-060209-111	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: 5. delete and from south of Braddock Road to the Prince William County Line. I am very concerned about the domino effect of 4 lanes further north on 15 year after year until it is 4 lanes over Point of Rocks.	Staff notes that the PC has elected to remove the widening of Route 15 from the CTP	PC asks staff to carry out its recommendation
435	PD-032409-19	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Referral	Planning staff suggests revisions/clarifications to Rural Road policy #7 and Heritage Resources policy #4 regarding where the County should seek Historic Roadway District or Historic Access Corridor designation	Staff is open to discussion on this item	PC asks that the policy be generalized and then update the implementation task to reflect Planning staff recommended edits, including Edwards Ferry Road
436	PC-060209-112	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: 9. end the last sentence with Suburban.	Staff requests that the policy remain unchanged so as not to limit funding options for planned roadways	PC asks that policy #9 be deleted

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
437	PC-060209-234	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Roads Policies #9: keep deleted language "with only safety improvements to be undertaken on these roads". "where possible provided that adequate levels of service and safety are maintained."	Staff will edit accordingly; see previous staff comment also on this policy	PC asks that policy #9 be deleted
438	PC-040209-38	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Verbal	CH 2 - Rural Roads Policy 9 (strikethrough pg. 3-33) - provide justification for proposed language changes	Staff is open to deleting the level of service requirement	PC asks that policy #9 be deleted
439	PC-060209-156	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #10 – delete in its entirety.	Staff recommends that the policy be retained, but revert to the 2001 CTP language	PC concurs with staff recommendation
440	PD-032409-50	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Referral	Planning staff requests that Rural Roads policy #12 be moved to the text as it is a statement not guidance	See comment below	PC asks staff to delete policy #12 and move to the text
441	PC-060209-235	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Policy 12 is now done.	Staff recommends deletion	PC asks staff to delete policy #12 and move to the text
442	PC-060209-236	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Policy 14 add at end, "using context sensitive design techniques"	Staff will edit accordingly; see Austin edit	PC asks staff to change "requested" to "required" in the policy; the context sensitive techniques are to be addressed in a context sensitive design section
443	PC-060209-157	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #14 – Add to the end: "and consistent with these Rural Roads Policies."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC asks staff to change the language to read "as appropriate and as consistent"
444	PC-060209-158	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #15 – delete in its entirety.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC concurs with staff recommendation
445	PC-060209-159	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #19 – Enabling legislation would be required to for this? Replace "alternative' with "all".	Staff will need to research this issue; staff will make the edit accordingly	BIN; staff must research if enabling legislation exists; PC asks farm vehicles to be included [staff notes that no such legislation exists - PC also requested removal of buggies]
446	PC-060209-160	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policies: #20 – delete in its entirety.	Staff recommends that the policy be retained for safety	PC asks staff to delete policy #20
447	PC-060209-9	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Rural Road Policy #20 should only apply to certain roads--perhaps Rts 9, 287, 672 and 15. However, turning lanes hinder people trying to turn left across traffic. This would argue for not having turning lanes at all. In any case, adding turning lanes to roads such as 662, 665, 719, & 690 will damage their character.	See response to Planning Department comment; staff also notes that VDOT ultimately controls whether turn lanes are added or not	PC asks staff to delete policy #20
448	PD-032409-2	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends revising Chapter 2 by removing Policy 20 or specifically stating which roadways would be considered for turn lanes	Staff notes that allowing for the provision of turn lanes, contrary to the Planning staff's assertion, is in fact a safety concern, with minimal impact to the rural character of rural roads. Turn lanes, which separate turning movements from through movements, are of particular importance on rural roads with limited sight distance; improvements to level of service are an added benefit	PC asks staff to delete policy #20

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
449	PD-032409-20	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends adding a Rural Roads policy that the County will refer to the Beaverdam Creek Historic Roadways District when evaluating road improvement projects within its boundaries	Staff is open to discussion on this item	PC supports the Planning staff recommendation; planning staff to work with OTS staff on language
450	PC-060209-237	2	Rural Area Road Policies	Written	Add new policy to match Chapter 8 implementation on Rural Historic Roads: The County will protect the historic and scenic qualities of roads through documented heritage areas and entrance corridors to historic districts.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC concurs with staff recommendation
451	PD-032409-59	2	Transition Policy Area Roads	Referral	Planning staff recommends Transition Area Road policy #1 be moved to the text since it is descriptive rather than for guidance	Staff concurs	PC recommends removing policy #1
452	PC-060209-161	2	Transition Policy Area Roads	Written	Transition Policy Area Roads Braddock Road – in the parenthetical about New Road, (i) should refer to Rural Policy Area section above, and (ii) I don't think it is addressed in the Rural Policy Area.	Staff will edit to reflect PC decision to remove New Road from CTP	No PC action; staff to remove references
453	PC-060209-119	2	Transition Area Road Policies	Written	Transition Area Policies: 2. After "Major" insert "existing"	Staff recommends that the policy remain in its current form; some collectors within the Transition Policy Area have yet to be built	PC recommends suggested change
455	PV4-043009-13	2	Land Development Application Review and LOS	P Comment	Commissioner Austin asked if LOS analysis includes weekend peak hour traffic	Staff stated that LOS analyses for links in the roadway network are based on Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) which includes weekend numbers	No action
456	PV4-043009-14	2	Land Development Application Review and LOS	P Comment	Citizen stated that she believes that LOS analysis as a basis for road improvements can create conflicts with citizens' desires for the roadway network; requests the use of other approaches	LOS analysis is the standard for evaluation of road network sufficiency; it is not the only factor in determining whether a road improvement should be implemented, however. Many other factors such as environmental, historic, cultural and financial constraints are considered before improvements are undertaken	PC recommends adding staff comment language to first para under LOS
457	PC-040209-3	2	Land Development Application Review and LOS	Verbal	CH 7 - Revisit baseline acceptable LOS D standard (Equinix case) - how to deal with redevelopment ("2nd generation development") on a saturated network	Recommend staff research as part of separate follow-on process	PC to add to list of recommendations

**2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix**

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
458	PD-032409-1	2	Land Development Application Review and LOS	Referral	Planning staff recommends revising Chapter 2 of the draft CTP to further clarify that adequate level of service will be measured solely on safety factors or remove language referring to adequate level of service because safety improvements are already addressed	Staff notes that level of service and safety are inextricably linked due to the fact that as level of service deteriorates, more disturbances to the flow of traffic are introduced, and thus greater potential for accidents, particularly on rural roads with limited room for accident avoidance; in other words, level of service is in fact a measure of safety. If, however, the PC believes that inclusion of this terminology is problematic, staff is open to revising the language	PC recommends removing reference to LOS
460	PC-060209-162	2	Land Development Application Review and LOS	Written	Land Development Application Review In the penultimate sentence of the second paragraph, I think "under LOS D" should be "At LOS D". Otherwise, the next sentence doesn't make sense.	Staff believes the text should be revised to state the following: "Below LOS D, travel speeds and freedom to maneuver begin to decline with increasing volumes due to the traffic stream's limitation on absorbing disruptions."	PC recommends staff re-write section to better clarify LOS types
461	PC-060209-123	2	Land Development Application Review and LOS	Written	LOS: In this section should there be made mention of the new criteria for road acceptance as outlined by VDOT?	Staff notes that the SSAR applies to the connectivity of subdivision streets, not CTP roads; staff has recommended appropriate changes to the Design and Construction Standards policies	No action required
462	PD-032409-22	2	LOS Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends clarification of Level of Service Standards policy #1 to indicate that suburban and transition policy area roads do not all currently function at LOS D or better	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC recommends suggested change
463	PC-060209-121	2	LOS Policies	Written	LOS: 1. Improvements for (DELETE the first phase of) a development will be provided in advance of development.	Staff believes further discussion is required	PC recommends using language already developed for this issue
464	PC-060209-163	2	LOS Policies	Written	LOS Policies: #1 – In the first sentence, insert “, including upzoning,” after “Land development.” In the last sentence, replace “and adequate levels of service” with “of all users”. Otherwise, I agree with comments in staff referral.	Staff believes that the term land development is all-inclusive and therefore no changes are necessary	No action required
465	PC-060209-164	2	LOS Policies	Written	LOS Policies:#2 – Revise to read “...for new development prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the development in the Suburban and ....”	Staff believes the current language is more conservative and therefore more appropriate	No action required

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
466	PC-060209-165	2	LOS Policies	Written	LOS Policies:#3 – Revise last sentence to read: “After consultation with the applicant, transportation staff will determine the scope of the study.”	Staff notes that traffic studies are scoped with the applicant’s traffic consultant at the traffic scoping meeting; staff use professional judgment in accordance with the FSM and in consultation with the consultant to determine the scope	PC recommends replacing "agree on" with "staff will approve" in policy #3
467	PC-060209-122	2	LOS Policies	Written	LOS: 4. I don’t understand this policy. On Rezonings, the existing road network plus the improvements that the developer already did must do what?	Staff notes that this policy is stating that the phases of a project will be defined by the road network’s ability to accommodate them and/or the timing of the provision of improvements to the network by the developer/VDOT/others	PC recommends restating policy #4 as follows: "The actual capacity (LOS) of the existing road network, or improvements to be completed by the developer,...will determine the phasing of the development to be permitted by the rezoning"
468	PC-060209-166	2	LOS Policies	Written	LOS Policies:#4 – No matter how many times I read this, I just couldn’t figure out what it means. Please advise.	Staff notes that this policy is stating that the phases of a project will be defined by the road network’s ability to accommodate them and/or the timing of the provision of improvements to the network by the developer/VDOT/others	See PC-060209-166
469	PC-060209-27	2	LOS Policies	Written	Land Development Application Review: LOS Policies – Add Policy #5 – In areas where substantial development has occurred without proffered or required road improvements (such as areas of substantial by-right development) and the LOS is D or worse, new developments shall be required to provide a “fair share” contribution to improve the roadway infrastructure needed to achieve 1.) an improved level of service and 2.) the implementation of the CTP designation for the roadway. The “fair share” contribution shall be based on the anticipated increase in traffic above the by-right zoning.	Further discussion on this topic is required	PC to add to list of recommendations that "The County have the option to determine whether a fair share is appropriate"
470	PC-060209-167	2	Design and Construction Standards	Written	Design and Construction Standards In the last paragraph: In the first sentence, replace “would” with “is required to”.	Staff recommends re-evaluation of the relevance of the paragraph and will follow up with revised language	PC recommends that para 3 under Design and Construction Standards be deleted and replaced with language prepared separately by Commissioner Austin; Policies 3 and 4 to be deleted and replaced with Commissioner Austin's policy
471	PC-060209-168	2	Design and Construction Standards	Written	Design and Construction Standards In the last paragraph: In the second sentence, replace “used” with “available”.	Staff recommends re-evaluation of the relevance of the paragraph and will follow up with revised language	See PC-060209-167
472	PC-060209-169	2	Design and Construction Standards	Written	Design and Construction Standards In the last paragraph: In the last sentence, replace “need consideration” with “shall be pursued”.	Staff recommends re-evaluation of the relevance of the paragraph and will follow up with revised language	See PC-060209-167

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
473	PD-032409-62	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends a language clarification in Design and Construction Standards policy #3	Staff concurs	No action - policy #3 was deleted
474	PD-032409-10	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends that Design and Construction Standards policy #4 be amended to include all road improvement projects consistent with Bike/Ped Plan	Staff notes that bike/ped facilities are not appropriate along limited access facilities and prefers to retain the policy in its current form	No action - policy #4 was deleted
477	PC-060209-172	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies#4 – Replace “in all appropriate road improvement projects” with “pursuant to the Bike and Ped Plan.”	Staff notes that Appendix 5 details the appropriate types of facilities to be provided on specific roadways; a reference to Appendix 5 will be added to Policy #4	No action - policy #4 was deleted
478	PC-060209-124	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design Standard Policies: 4. define “appropriate”. Should it be stated....will be incorporated unless specifically denied for safety reasons....?	Staff notes that Appendix 5 details the appropriate types of facilities to be provided on specific roadways; a reference to Appendix 5 will be added to Policy #4	No action - policy #4 was deleted
479	PC-060209-125	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design Standard Policies: 5. just include the transition area in the must category. Is interparcel connection one that encourages “grid” like connections to allow for the maximum choices for traffic?	Staff concurs and notes that connectivity is required by VDOT’s SSAR; staff will be incorporating reference to SSAR; staff also notes that interparcel connections do facilitate a grid-like network	PC recommends staff’s suggested change
482	PC-060209-126	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design Standard Policies: 6. is this just for new construction? Because there are many driveways on Evergreen.	Staff notes that this policy does pertain to new construction	No action
483	PC-060209-173	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies#7 – Add to the end of the last sentence “as set forth in the Bike and Ped Plan.”	Staff notes that Appendix 5 details the appropriate types of facilities to be provided on specific roadways; a reference to Appendix 5 will be added to Policy #7	PC supports staff recommendation
484	PC-060209-174	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies #9 – What is the source of the Scenic Design Guidelines? If the Heritage Preservation Plan, please so indicate.	Staff believes that the Scenic Guidelines are those described in the sub-bullets to policy #9	BIN - Planning staff to check consistency with HPP and add reference [PC recommended addition of "see also HPP for additional information"]
485	PC-060209-175	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies#10 – Delete “of needed safety” and insert at the end “required for the safety of all users.”	Staff recommends the following "required for the safety of any or all users"	PC supports staff recommendation
486	PC-060209-176	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies#15 – Is this a policy or is this something better addressed in the FSM?	Staff believes that it should be addressed in the FSM, however, it is useful to have it as a policy in the CTP as well	No action
488	PC-060209-177	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies#16 – Revise to read: “The County will improve the planned and existing road network in the Suburban Policy Areas by requiring vehicular and bike and pedestrian connections between neighborhoods and between residential and employment areas.”	Staff recommends adding a policy to Chapter 4 to address bike and ped connectivity, rather than address in the design and construction standards for the road network	PC recommends editing policy #16 to read "...employment areas by requiring a network of connections that can be made..."

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
489	PD-032409-11	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends a language change to Design and Construction Standards policy #17 to change "should" to "will" in reference to the requirement for submission of a circulation connectivity plan with rezoning applications	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC recommends looking at policy #17 in conjunction with policies 1b and 5 and incorporating appropriate VDOT standards reference
490	PC-060209-127	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design Standard Policies: 17. ....the County will (delete should) require.... (Delete the first part of the next sentence and start with Applicants will be required.... Delete the rest of the sentence after streets. Since the bike and ped was required already.	Staff notes that VDOT has developed a standard for connectivity in the SSAR; staff will revise the policy to reflect this; however these requirements do not include bike/ped connections, therefore this part of the policy will be retained	PC recommends looking at policy #17 in conjunction with policies 1b and 5 and incorporating appropriate VDOT standards reference
491	PC-060209-178	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Written	Design and Construction Policies#17 – In the first sentence, replace “should consider developing and adopting” with “shall develop and adopt”. In the second and third sentences, replace “should” with “shall”.	Staff notes that VDOT has developed a standard for connectivity in the SSAR; staff will revise the policy to reflect this; however these requirements do not include bike/ped connections, therefore this part of the policy will be retained	PC recommends looking at policy #17 in conjunction with policies 1b and 5 and incorporating appropriate VDOT standards reference
492	PC-040209-33	2	Design and Construction Standards Policies	Verbal	CH 2 - Design & Construction Standards Policies (strikethrough pgs. 3-43 - 3-45) - language should be more certain and definitive (too much use of terms "appropriate" and "should" vs. "will"). Examples of "appropriate" requested. (Similar comment on Suburban Area Road Policies on strikethrough pg. 3-27)	Staff will work with PC to develop appropriate language for revised policies; the use of "appropriate" on P3-43 refers to facilities identified in the CTP/Bike and Ped Plan; the use of "appropriate" on P3-27 can be deleted	PC recommends suggested change
494	PC-060209-220	2	Traffic Calming	Written	Traffic Calming: Move “Traffic calming must be community-based and supported” out of introductory paragraph and into Traffic Calming Policies section.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends that a new policy not be added; add "and supported" after community-based to policy #2 and also give examples of limited circumstances

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
495	PC-040209-26	2	Traffic Calming Policies	Verbal	CH 2 - Traffic Calming Policy 3 (strikethrough pg. 3-46) - (reactive retrofit of existing issues) - guidance and discussion needed in CTP regarding how to proactively encourage development of communities/subdivisions with respect to bike/ped accommodations to head off issues like speeding and cut-through traffic (vs. reactive measures after the fact). Should be part of legislative process and/or in FSM (safety approach in FSM for by-right developments)	Policy #2 covers the pro-active approach described; staff will research VDOT guidance	PC recommends adding VDOT language from intro to policy and restating as follows "The County will work with VDOT on developing traffic calming plans as part of the Community Plan development review process"; in intro para change drivers and pedestrians to all users of the roadway
496	PD-032409-64	2	Traffic Calming Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends changing speed bumps to tables for consistency in Traffic Calming policy #4	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
497	PC-040209-28	2	Traffic Calming Policies	Verbal	CH 2 - Traffic Calming Policy 4 (strikethrough pg. 3-46) - expand to identify and test measures before installation	Staff will work with PC to develop appropriate language for revised policies	PC recommends adding the following at the end of the policy: "Measures will be analyzed to determine the most effective tool for each project"
498	PC-060209-128	2	Traffic Calming Policies	Written	Traffic Calming Policies: Delete #5. Until traffic is given full steam on other roads, people will use any method to avoid delays. This is an unattainable goal and should be deleted.	Staff notes that we regularly work with VDOT to implement traffic calming techniques with the intention of limiting/slowing cut-through traffic; we also work to establish through-truck restrictions where feasible	PC recommends changing curb to manage
500	PC-060209-180	2	Traffic Calming Policies	Written	Traffic Calming Policies: #5 – delete “cut-through traffic and”.	Staff notes that we regularly work with VDOT to implement traffic calming techniques with the intention of limiting/slowing cut-through traffic; we also work to establish through-truck restrictions where feasible	See PC-060209-128
501	PC-060209-181	2	Traffic Calming Policies	Written	Traffic Calming Policies: #6 – At the end of the first sentence, insert “pursuant to the Bike and Ped Plan”.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
502	PC-060209-182	2	Private Streets	Written	Private Streets: In the first paragraph – is A-10 supposed to be AR-1?	Staff recommends the following "Exceptions to this policy include structures in historic districts, family subdivisions and low density subdivisions in the rural policy area	PC supports staff recommendation
504	PC-060209-184	2	Private Streets Policies	Written	Private Street Policies: #2 -- In the first and last sentences, replace “or” with “and”.	Staff supports the text in its current form	PC recommends revising policy #2 to read "Neither the County nor the Virginia Department of Transportation..." in both locations

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
505	PC-060209-185	2	Private Streets Policies	Written	Private Street Policies:#5 – Revise the first sentence to read: “When a home is offered for sale on a private street, all sales material shall disclose that the street is private and that there will be maintenance costs incurred by the purchasers for the upkeep of the street.” [How about adding to mapping system as well since no one will be looking at the CTP when selling an existing home]	Staff will edit accordingly; provision of mapping information will require further research	PC to add as recommendation to BOS
506	PC-060209-186	2	Road Improvement Priorites	Written	Road Improvement Priorities In the first paragraph: I simply do not understand sentences two, three and four. Please explain.	These sentences explain the development process of the Secondary Road and Six-Year Improvement Programs; these programs involve coordination among VDOT and County staff, with consideration from elected officials as to priorities	PC recommends incorporating staff comment language
507	PC-060209-187	2	Road Improvement Priorites Policies	Written	Road Improvement Priorities Policies #1 – Delete the first, fourth and last sentences. Revise the second and third sentence to read: “The County will determine road improvement priorities utilizing the prioritization process set forth in the TransAction 2030 Plan and based on the policies contained in the Revised General Plan, the 2009 CTP, the Heritage Preservation Plan and the Bike and Ped Plan.	Staff believes this requires further discussion	PC recommends adding HPP and BPP to policy #1 while maintaing the remainder of the policy
508	PC-060209-188	2	Road Improvement Priorites Policies	Written	Road Improvement Priorities Policies#2 – Replace in its entirety with: “The County will work with the NVTA to resolve any significant differences between the 2009 CTP and the TransAction 2030 Plan.”	Staff believes this requires further discussion	No action
509	PC-060209-189	2	Road Improvement Priorites Policies	Written	Road Improvement Priorities Policies New #3 – When third party sources are not available for high priority projects, the County will pursue approval of road improvement bonds to finance such projects.	Staff believes this requires further discussion	PC recommends "... the County will pursue alternate funding mechanisms"

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
529	PC-040209-29	2	General	Verbal	CH 2 - "Complete Streets" concept need to be better incorporated into CTP. CTP focused too heavily on autos only; needs to provide additional multi-modal options (add goal statement on multi-modal facilities). Copy of Baker's white paper requested.	Staff supports the complete streets concept in the appropriate context; staff believes that with the incorporation of the transit plan and enhanced policy support of the bike and ped plan that the CTP fully addresses multi-modal options; staff notes that information on Complete Streets has been provided	No action
530	PC-040209-32	2	General	Verbal	CH 2 - CTP policies should not be project specific; revise to make more general	Staff attempted to update existing policies to be current/comprehensive; staff is willing to work with PC to make policies more general if desired	No action
531	Multiple - See Master	2	General	Various	Issue relates to identification and completion of missing links in roadway network	Staff will research this issue	PC is developing a list of missing links, no further action required
532	PC-040209-19	2	General	Verbal	CH 2 - List roads that do not match (number of lanes) with surrounding Counties	Staff will provide a summary of roads that cross the County border	No action
533	Multiple - See Master	2	General	Verbal	Issue relates to connectivity between developments and related effects	The new VDOT SSAR will address future developments; PC has indicated desire to proactively implement traffic calming	PC recommends adding reference to the VDOT standards in Policy #15, and to move the policy next to Policy #12
534	PC-032609-7	2	General	Verbal	CH 1 - More specificity in CTP policies to focus investment in Suburban Policy Area	Staff will work with PC to develop appropriate language for revised policies	No action taken
535	PC-060209-2	2	General	Written	What is the effect of a road being "local" vs "collector" on its construction, appearance, upkeep, etc.? This question is pertinent especially to the decision to include/exclude certain roads in the Transition area from the CTP. Should we broaden the explanation in the text to make this clear to the reader? Would changing a road from "collector" to "local" really change the reality of anything?	Staff notes that if a particular local road is added to the CTP network as a collector or arterial, it would be required to be brought up to VDOT standards for that specific facility type (when funding is available to reconstruct the road)	No action
536	PC-060209-10	2	General	Written	I think it's curious that Loyalty Rd (665) is a collector road but Milltown (681), which is a larger, faster road, and sees significant through, commuter traffic is not.... Why is this? What difference does it make in reality?	Staff notes that roads are considered for inclusion in the CTP network based primarily on their function; roads that are collectors or arterials are included in the network; that said, staff is unclear as to why Milltown has been excluded from the network as it seems to serve as a collector-type facility	PC recommends adding Milltown Road as a CTP road (collector); PC also recommends adding to the CTP how function/classification is determined

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
537	PC-060209-71	2	General	Written	Countywide Transportation Plan Map: Do local roads have a number of trips that keep them from being part of the CTP? If so, we ought to list the number of trips or number of houses/businesses that keep them from getting on the list. That way if a road gets busier in the future, everyone will know the threshold it needs to meet to get considered for the next CTP. That threshold should be included in the Appendix 1 definition of local/secondary road.	Staff notes that roads are considered for inclusion in the CTP network based primarily on their function; roads that are collectors or arterials are included in the network	No action
538	PC-060209-77	2	General	Written	Appendix 3 and Chapter 2: REMOVE all the roads that the County is NOT responsible for in this plan. For example, Sycolin Fly-Over will be the Town's responsibility since it is in the Town's Incorporated limits and therefore, not part of the roadways that the County is responsible to design, build or maintain. See "4. Town Joint Land Management Area..." "...towns control their own transportation planning functions within their corporate limits,...." If the county finds it within their budget to gift some monies toward elements within the incorporated boundaries, such as Rte 7 or Rte 15 bypass, that is fine to mention, otherwise items such as interchanges or roads in Leesburg, such as Battlefield, should not be listed in the County documents.	Staff has included those facilities/ improvements which, while they may be within a town's jurisdiction, directly impact the function of the CTP network; staff also notes that the County regularly works with the towns to facilitate the completion of certain facilities/improvements that are of mutual benefit (i.e. the Sycolin Road fly-over)	PC recommends adding a note to explain that Towns control their roads in the text and on the map
539	PC-060209-131	2	General	Written	MAPS: When a project falls through, does a name of a road revert to the name assigned by the County initially? Eg., Airport Area Conn. That was named something else in Peterson's application a few years ago.	Staff notes that names of planned roadways are for planning purposes only; in the case of the Airport Area Connector, staff chose to retain this name as the Crosstrail application was denied	No action, but PC is addressing names of planned roads in other locations
540	PC-060209-132	2	General	Written	MAPS: Name of roads need to be updated. NO ONE wants to live on something named Route XXX Relocated. That is just awful.	Staff notes that names of planned roadways are for planning purposes only	See PC-060209-131

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
541	PW2-042309-22	2	General	P Comment Written	Q6 - We do not like the idea of our neighborhood (Stone Ridge/Amber Spring) being trapped between a 6-lane road and a highway with huge ramps; you are ruining our neighborhood	Staff notes that the CTP describes facilities that are necessary for 2030 levels of congestion; the modeling analysis calls for these facilities in order to provide adequate levels of service	No action
542	PW2-042309-47	2	General	P Comment Written	Q3 - Protecting existing neighborhoods from being blocked in or otherwise isolated due to road expansions (e.g. Stone Ridge access to Route 50)	Comment noted	No action
543	PC-032609-1	2	General	Verbal	CH 1 - Clarification of existing traffic calming procedures	OTS follows VDOT traffic calming procedures; additional information available upon request	No action
544	PC-032609-8	2	General	Verbal	CH 1 - Integration of internal roads (developer built) into larger network to avoid gaps in network	Staff requires clarification for further discussion	No further action
545	EG-050109-1	2	General	E-mail	Questions the need for an 8 lane Loudoun County Parkway. The area around Moorefield Station needs to be more pedestrian friendly so why cut an 8 lane road through it? County needs to "take a step back" to fully master plan the CTP based on a thorough thought out General Plan/Expedited review may harm residents. What is the status of the General Plan? How is the county aligning energy conservation and carbon footprint reduction goals with the CTP? How is transit being looked at in the CTP on Route 28 and integrated into future Metro stations? Why 8 lane the LCP but only 4 lane Belmont Ridge Road and have Route 50 be only 6 lanes? The county should consider more short-distance bus service in Ashburn instead of widening roads to 6 lanes. Most 6 lanes roads are not congested. What modeling numbers support 6 lane roads. Why is Creighton Boulevard justified as being 6 lanes if it's a feeder north of Route 50?	Model analysis showed an 8-lane Loudoun County Parkway was helpful. The CTP process is underway in consideration/coordination with the General Plan. Energy conservation/carbon footprint reduction is enhanced with multi-modal CTP and mixed land uses promoted in the General Plan. Transit Plan addresses transit service on Route 28 and in Ashburn. Belmont Ridge Road is planned for the most part to be 6 lanes. Model shows that 6 lanes with interchanges is feasible. Creighton Road (not Boulevard), is planned as a 4-lane road, not 6 lanes.	No action (Route 659 is addressed in other items in the matrix)
546	Multiple - See Master	3	Planning Edits	Referral	Planning Department staff and the PC provided multiple comments on the draft Transit Plan	Staff concurs with most edits - see master for details; those that staff would like further discussion on are addressed in the appropriate section	No PC action required

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
587	PC-041409-30	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Refer to performance criteria in body of text	Performance criteria defined as average passengers per hour and is defined in the last paragraph of chapter 3-3 in the draft plan. Policy 2 and 4.a will be rewritten to include specific language related to performance criteria.	PC supports staff recommendation
588	PC-041409-32	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Relocate Infrastructure Policies 8-12 (pg. 1-10) to a more appropriate place in the document	These policies will be relocated to the Bus Stop and Shelter Program section on page 4-11, which will be part of the Costs and Implementation Appendix. These will be referred to as standards, rather than policies.	PC supports staff recommendation
589	PC-041409-35	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Shading on County maps difficult to read. Place Chapter 2 of draft (4/7/09) Transit Plan in a new appendix; do not retain the body of the final document integrated into the CTP (Chapter 3)	Shading issue to be addressed. Draft transit plan will be reorganized into a single Chapter 3 - Transit and Commuter Services chapter, with multiple appendices.	PC supports staff recommendation
592	PC-041409-38	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Add road labels to all bus route maps	The new revised maps that include road labels will be incorporated in the document	PC supports staff recommendation; staff to add label for Route 772 and define Dulles North Transit Center earlier in chapter
593	PC-041409-39	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Define timing (years/duration) of the three phases (1, 2, and 3)	The three phases are defined by benchmark in Chapter 1 -1. These benchmarks will be added to the Plan Maps for the three phases.	PC supports staff recommendation
594	PC-041409-41	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Define "7 to 7 on 7"	Definition will be added to clarify that this is the existing service that operates in the Route 7 corridor from Leesburg to the Fairfax County line at Dranesville Road. This service currently operates from 7 AM to 7 PM, five days per week.	PC supports staff recommendation
595	PC-041409-47	3	Edit	Verbal	CH 3 - Clearly identify roads on all conceptual route maps and make it clear that the routes are conceptual	The term "conceptual" will be added to the Phase maps as well as the Route profile maps.	PC supports staff recommendation
597	PV4-043009-9	3	Light Rail	P Comment	Citizen asked County to look at alternatives to autos/roads; suggested a Light Rail loop around the County, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on Route 15 and around schools	Comment noted; the light rail concept would need to be evaluated for feasibility; staff is working with VDOT on bike/ped provisions on Route 15 from Whites Ferry to Leesburg, also Route 15 is listed as a bike/ped route in the Bike/Ped Plan. Policies 18 and 19 in Chapter 4 of the CTP address the issue of schools	No action; PC recommends studying light rail in Route 28 corridor
599	PW4-043009-4	3	Light Rail	P Comment Written	Q5 - Light rail loop around County; connect to Moorefield Station	Comment noted; the light rail concept would need to be evaluated for feasibility	No action
600	Multiple - See Master	3	Metrorail	Various	Multiple public comments were made with respect to Metrorail including making it a priority, ensuring adequate parking, including a feeder bus system and providing adequate access	See Master	No further action
616	PV4-043009-2	3	Park and Ride/Bus Service	P Comment	Citizen asked the County to look at other modes of transportation to reduce congestion on Route 9	Staff responded that the County is looking at adding a Park and Ride lot at the West Virginia border, however, no site has been identified at this time	No further action

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
618	Multiple - See Master	3	Park and Ride/Bus Service	P Comment Written	Multiple written comments were provided which generically requested expansion of bus service and specifically requested service in the following areas: Fairfax County to include Reston Town Center, Tysons Corner and Chantilly, shopping centers in Sterling/Potomac/Leesburg areas ; service to Middleburg, Dulles Town Center, additional accommodations for those who can't drive to use commuter buses, a review of VRTA service, and coordination with Maryland	Expansion plans were described by staff in the public meeting presentations; see master for details	PC recommends accelerating direct service to Tysons, Reston/Herndon
638	PC-041409-33	3	Park and Ride/Bus Service	Verbal	CH 3 - Establish priority to Suburban Policy Area for bus service	The ranking of new/revised Transit Routes (A-3) indicates that the routes in the suburban policy area rank 1 through 10.	No action
639	PC-041409-34	3	Park and Ride/Bus Service	Verbal	CH 3 - How to best intergrate bus service to Dulles Airport? Add to route profiles	The Route 28 to Manassas service includes service to the airport.	No action
640	PC-041409-46	3	Park and Ride/Bus Service	Verbal	CH 3 - Discuss Arcola Center Park and Ride Facility	A 200 space Park and Ride lot has been proffered by the developer of Arcola Center, and will be incorporated into the commuter bus service serving Dulles South residents.	No action
643	PV6-050709-12	3	Park and Ride/Bus Service	P Comment	Citizen requested bus service going to all local shopping centers; believes buses should be more locally-oriented to improve traffic flow	The modeling analysis did not identify this as a sustainable route	PC recommends BOS study service
644	PV4-043009-11	3	Snickersville	P Comment	Citizen asked the County to consider studying the use of transit and speed limit reduction on Snickersville Turnpike to alleviate weekend traffic congestion	Staff notes that citizen also provided written comments under separate cover; with respect to the verbal comment, staff notes that establishment of routes is ridership driven and therefore efforts have traditionally been focused in the east where demand is higher	No action required
670	PC-060209-11	3	General	Written	The Countywide Transit Plan should be addressed in the CTP only to the level that Airport, Bike & Ped Plans are addressed. Full Transit Plan, etc. can be attached, but as stand-alone documents.	Staff notes that the BOS has directed that the Transit Plan be included in the CTP; staff is working on a plan to integrate the two documents	No action
671	PC-041409-31	3	General	Verbal	CH 3 - Clarify why only one (1) Urban Center designated in the County	The Comprehensive Plan defines Dulles Town Center as the one designated Urban Center for the county.	No action
672	PC-041409-42	3	General	Verbal	CH 3 - Explain why certain areas are not designated for transit service	The transit model was used on alternatives to project ridership by route. Certain routes did not meet the minimum performance criteria to meet the threshold for consideration in an area that does not have concentrations of transit-dependent populations.	No action

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
673	PC-041409-44	3	General	Verbal	CH 3 - Define "urbanized area"	A US Bureau of Census designated area of 50,000 or more inhabitants consisting of a central city or two adjacent cities plus surrounding densely settled territory, but excluding the rural portion of cities. This definition is included in the glossary.	No action
674	PC-041409-45	3	General	Verbal	CH 3 - Discuss budget allocations for transportation	Budget allocations are detailed on 4-12 in the Local Gasoline Tax budget table.	No action
675	PC-041409-48	3	General	Verbal	CH 3 - Provide justification for commuter bus routes from West Virginia & Maryland	There is no service planned from West Virginia or Maryland. There are Route profiles included for Route 15 service and Route 9 service. These were included in the plan as a means to remove traffic from these highly congested corridors. However, these routes are the lowest priority based on Performance (A-3), and there are no park and ride lots planned to serve these routes.	PC recommends retaining routes but as low priority
676	Multiple - See Master	4	Planning Edits	Various	Staff received several edit requests from Planning staff and one email request	Staff concurs with several of the minor edits - see master for details; those that staff would like further discussion on are found in the appropriate section	No action required
681	PC-060209-51	4	Introduction	Written	To remove the Bike and Ped sections to the first paragraph it should read: "In addition to roadways and transit service, air travel facilities are also integral components of Loudoun County's overall transportation system. As with roadways and transit, recent growth has also resulted in increased demand for air travel. This chapter reviews the cooperation that has and will continue to take place between Loudoun County and other agencies with respect to airport facilities."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends incorporation of language into a new separate chapter dedicated to airports
685	PC-032609-18	4	Airport	Verbal	CH 5 - Move Airport/MWAA section into this chapter	Staff is open to discussion on this issue	PC recommends incorporation of language into a new separate chapter dedicated to airports
688	PC-060209-222	4	Airport	Written	Under Air Transportation – Access to Airport Facilities: Add "... to be supported with multi-modal and intelligent transportation system technology that will support ..."	Staff believes this is referring to paragraph 2; if so, staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends creating new ITS policies in Chapters 2 and 4
689	PC-060209-52	4	Airport Policies	Written	Airport Access Policies: The County does not do all the coordinating with these agencies. Substitute "The County will continue to interface with..."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends the following language: "The County will continue to interact with..."

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
690	PC-060209-53	4	Airport Policies	Written	Since this chapter is about the airport, I need to see planning staff's report on how to strengthen the County's commitment to both airports.	Staff notes that the appendix to the planning department's referral has been provided to the PC	BIN [No further action]
691	PC-032609-17	4	Airport Policies	Verbal	CH 4 - Establish process for formal coordination with airport operators (MWA and Town of Leesburg); edit proposed policies accordingly	Staff recommends maintaining the policies as included in the draft CTP; they address the extent of coordination required	PC recommends adding the Greenway (TRIP II) as an organization to be included in policy #1; PC also recommends adding a policy that County staff will meet annually with MWA and the Leesburg Airport; PC recommends adding a Dulles Loop implementation task (Chapter 8)
692	PC-052809-10	4	Bike/Ped Introduction	Written	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities - first paragraph: change title to Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities for CTP Roads; delete "supporting and" in first sentence; replace "This document" with LCBPMMP in third sentence; replace Countywide Transportation Plan with CTP in fifth sentence; delete "the vision of" in fifth sentence; replace "with additional information..." with along CTP roads; add at end of para: Refer to LCBPMMP for the complete set of policies	Staff will edit accordingly, however discussion is required based on multiple PC member inputs	See PC-060209-56
693	PC-060209-55	4	Bike/Ped Introduction	Written	The new first paragraph for the bike/ped stand alone chapter should read: Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are embraced by Loudoun County as an integral part of the Comprehensive Countywide Transportation System. Recent growth and citizen interest has increased demand for additional bicycle and pedestrian networks and connectivity of existing paths. The County's vision and associated policies that govern the planning and operation of bicycle and pedestrian networks in Loudoun County are outlined in this chapter.	Staff will edit accordingly, however discussion is required based on multiple PC member inputs	See PC-060209-56

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
694	PC-060209-56	4	Bike/Ped Introduction	Written	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities section - Start the section with the Vision Statement: "Loudoun County is a place where pedestrians and bicyclists of all abilities have a safe, secure and convenient alternative transportation network of walkways and bikeways that enable everyone to move efficiently to and from such places as work, school, transit, shopping, libraries, parks and recreation. In addition to this portion of the Countywide Transportation Plan, in Appendix 5 there are recommendations, guidelines that are specific to the bike and pedestrian facilities which are part and parcel of the Loudoun County Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan (LCBPMMP). Resume with paragraph 2.	Staff will edit accordingly, however discussion is required based on multiple PC member inputs	PC recommends the following language for the first para: "Loudoun County aspires to be a place where pedestrians and bicyclists of all abilities have a safe, secure and convenient alternative transportation network of walkways and bikeways that enable everyone to move efficiently to and from such places as work, school, transit, shopping, libraries, parks and recreation. In addition to this chapter of the Countywide Transportation Plan and Appendix 5, which apply to bicycle and pedestrian facilities along CTP roads, there are recommendations and guidelines that are specific to the bike and pedestrian facilities which are contained in the Loudoun County Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan (LCBPMMP).
695	PC-052809-11	4	Bike/Ped Introduction	Written	Delete 2nd para	Staff supports current text	PC recommends the following language: Delete the first two sentences, and begin the last sentence with "Planning for the bicyclist..."
696	PC-060209-227	4	Bike/Ped Facilities	Written	Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: In the interim, add: "Within each Community Plan, study the feasibility and cost of work to design, map and implement a complete pedestrian and bicycle network, with appropriate linkages to adjacent communities. "	Staff requests clarification as to the location for this statement/policy	PC recommends maintaining current language
697	PC-060209-12	4	Bike/Ped Facilities	Written	Add another bullet point to "Pedestrian Mobility": <u>Lack of ample connections between subdivisions</u>	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends the following language: "Lack of connections between subdivisions"
698	PC-052809-12	4	Bike/Ped Facilities	Written	Delete concluding para under Pedestrian Mobility	Staff is open to discussion on this item	PC recommends the following language/structure change: PC recommends amending the para to say "...close gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle network..." and moving the section to the third para under Bicycle Mobility after the first sentence
699	OTS-052609-1	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Staff Observation	CH4 - Bike/Ped policy#1 (strikethrough p2-16) remove reference to equestrian trails as they are handled in the General Plan, not the Bike/Ped Plan		PC concurs with staff recommendation

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
700	PD-032409-4	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends truncation of bike/ped policy #1 to end with the first sentence	Staff does not believe the need to revise this policy has been clearly demonstrated	PC concurs with OTS staff recommendation
701	PC-052809-13	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #2 - delete "The County will work with VDOT to ensure that" and replace "are addressed" with "will be addressed"	Staff notes that the County must coordinate with VDOT as many road projects are managed by VDOT	PC recommends suggested change
702	PC-052809-14	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Delete "second" policy #2	Staff requests additional information on this comment	PC recommends the following language: Edit policy to state "Priority shall be given to providing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations and connections associated with arterial and collector roadways as identified within the CTP."
703	PC-060209-240	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Bike Ped Policies: Add as third CTP policy, Policy #2 from Plan on p. 33: All land development applications shall apply level of service standards to provide adequate internal bicycle and Pedestrian circulation systems in the form of on-street bicycle accommodations and sidewalks (per the LOS target minimums) of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.	Staff will edit accordingly; possibly add to Policy #5?	BIN - staff to obtain definition; rules of road for riding bikes; define wide curb lanes [information provided to PC; definitions added to glossary]
704	PC-052809-15	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #3 delete "The County and VDOT will consider the provision of" ; add "will be required" after Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities; add "arterial, collector and" before secondary; add "as necessary" to end of policy	Staff notes that there are circumstances where the County does not support bike and ped facilities, specifically along limited access roadways; also bike/ped provision may not be appropriate in certain rural road settings	PC recommends the following language: "Bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be required with all secondary road improvement projects as identified in Appendix 5 and will use secondary road dollars for these facilities"
705	PC-052809-16	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #4: replace "The County and VDOT will retrofit secondary roads" with Secondary roads will be retrofitted	Staff notes that it is a shared responsibility for the provision of bike/ped facilities	PC recommends the following language: "Secondary road facilities will be retrofitted for bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of maintenance and improvement projects as identified in Appendix 5 such as road widening or repaving."
706	PC-052809-17	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #5 add "consistent with the LCBPMMP" to end	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
707	PD-032409-8	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends truncation of bike/ped policy #7 after Suburban Policy Area in first sentence	Staff believes the policy addresses key concerns including the desire to not construct bike/ped facilities on limited access highways and also the fact that bike/ped facilities are not necessarily appropriate on rural roads; staff would however agree to deletion of the "excessively disproportionate " criteria which is no longer taken into account at the County or State level	PC recommends striking conditions 2 and 3 and the last sentence of the policy to read "Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations will be established as part of all new road and park and ride lot construction and reconstruction projects unless bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited along the roadway."

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
708	PC-052809-18	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #7: delete "in the Suburban Policy Area" ; delete "one or more of the following conditions" and delete all but condition #1	Staff recommends discussion of Policy #7 as there are multiple inputs - see response to PD-032409-8	See PD-032409-8
709	PC-032609-16	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Verbal	CH 4 - Clarify Bike/Ped Policy 7 -- "excessively disproportionate ... to the need or probable use"	Staff recommends deletion of condition #2; bike and ped facilities are required on VDOT, County and Developer projects regardless of cost	See PD-032409-8
710	PC-052809-19	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #10 capitalize County; replace will with may (last sentence)	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
711	PC-052809-20	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #11 replace consider with establish; add "and facilities" after routes; delete subsequent para	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change and the following language: "The County will establish priority bicycle and pedestrian routes and facilities as identified in Appendix 3." subsequent para to be placed in text after 2d para of Bicycle Mobility; PC also recommends changing the title of Appendix 3 to "Improvement Priorities"
712	PD-032409-7	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends retaining current bike/ped policy #12 which pertains to recreational trails	Staff believes the focus of the CTP should be on trails associated with transportation mobility, not recreation and continues to recommend deletion	PC recommends moving priorities of old policy #12 to Appendix 3 while confirming what has been accomplished; new policy #12 shall read "Priority shared use paths not associated with specific roads identified in Appendix 3 shall be consistent with policies and guidelines for those facilities identified in the LCBPMMP." (BIN -staff to check what has been accomplished) [information provided to PC and edits made to text]
713	PC-052809-21	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Delete Policy #12	Staff believes this policy provides a link to the Bike/Ped plan for non-CTP roads and clarifies the role of the CTP with respect to Bike/Ped	See PD-032409-7
714	PD-032409-5	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends a policy that calls for a map of existing and proffered bike/ped facilities	Staff is open to this recommendation	No action required; Mapping department is developing a map of bike/ped facilities
715	PC-060209-29	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Bicycle Mobility: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Policies – Policy #13 - "... W&OD shared use path and connections to adjacent existing or planned bicycle facilities are required for all...."	Staff requests further discussion on this issue; see PC-060209-30 for recommendation	See PC-060209-30
716	PC-060209-30	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Bicycle Mobility: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Policies – Policy #13 – add a new sentence to the end – "The county will work with NVRPA and applicants from adjacent parcels to provide connections to the W&OD trail from existing or planned bicycle facilities."	Staff notes that this language may be more suitable	PC recommends the following language: "The County will work with NVRPA and adjacent land owners to provide connections to the W&OD Trail from existing or planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities"

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
717	PC-060209-241	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Bike Ped Policies: Add after policy #16, policy #2p.36 from Plan: The County will encourage the School Board to initiate a "Safe Routes to School" Pilot Program designed to increase the number of students [who] safely bicycle or walk to school. This pilot program shall be based on existing models used in Maryland and elsewhere to plan physical improvements and implement safety education programs and enforcement initiatives at one or two schools, with the intent toward expanding its implementation over time.	Staff will edit accordingly; possibly add to Policy #19?	PC recommends the following language: "The County will encourage the School Board to initiate a "Safe Routes to School" program designed to increase the number of students who safely bicycle or walk to school"; the language will be added as a 2nd sentence
718	PD-032409-6	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends retaining current bike/ped policy #17	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC supports staff recommendation
719	PC-052809-22	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy 17 - is encouraging transit operators to offer bike-on-bus racks and bike-on-rail accommodations in the transit plan?	Staff notes that it is not specifically addressed, however, the practice contained in the policy is in widespread use	PC recommends adding a policy requiring bike lockers at park and ride lots and transit nodes
720	PC-060209-242	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Bike Ped Policies: Reverse Policies # 17 and 18.	Staff requests clarification on request since policies 18 and 19 both relate to schools	No action taken
721	PC-052809-23	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Policy #19 Delete "The County schools should incorporate" and state "Bicycle and Pedestrian access shall be incorporated on school sites..."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested changes
722	PC-052809-24	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Add new Policy #20: The County shall strengthen laws and policies to better protect pedestrians and bicyclists including increased safety measures and design standards for roads, walkways, bikeways and shared-use paths	Staff would like further discussion on this comment to better understand where the laws are deficient with respect to safety; if policies are deficient, we can address as part of this update	BIN - follow up on design guidelines and police enforcement [information provided to PC]
723	PC-060209-239	4	Bike/Ped Policies	Written	Bike Ped Policies: Add Note: Refer to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the complete set of policies.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested changes
724	PW6-050709-24	4-Map	Bicycle Loop	P Comment Written	Q6 - I would like to see the plan include a section dedicated to the development of a bicycle byway primarily to connect the tourist hubs (i.e. Brunswick, Harper's Ferry, White's Ferry, Middleburg)	Comment noted	PC recommends a new policy "develop a bicycle route to connect historic and cultural sites"
728	Multiple - See Master	4-Map	Route 7 Crossings	Various	Multiple citizens requested safe crossing(s) of Route 7 in Potomac/Sterling	Staff has a process to handle these types of issues outside of the scope of the CTP; staff notes that the BOS has indicated that this particular issue is a priority; see Master for details	PC recommends adding this request as a project on the proposed PC priority list

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
729	PC-060209-223	4-Map	Route 7 Ped Xing	Written	Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: Pedestrian/bike overpasses are critical and have been requested for at least 20 years for the area between NVCC Loudoun Campus and Algonkian Parkway/Fairfax County Parkway. Eastern Loudoun gateway communities should have priority to these overpasses over other Route 7 communities.	Comment noted	PC recommends adding item to proposed priority list
757	S2-051909-29C	4	General	P Comment	Requested the standing up of a bike/ped advisory committee	Comment noted	PC concurs with recommendation
758	PV6-050709-10	4	General	P Comment	Citizen expressed concerns about Algonkian Parkway becoming a "speedway"	VDOT conducted a corridor study in 2008 to identify measures to improve pedestrian safety and move traffic more efficiently. The study is under review by the BOS and the BOS will determine how to implement	No action required
759	PC-032609-13	4	General	Verbal	CH 4 - Accommodation of on-road bike lanes on existing roads by restriping and/or use of shoulders	Recommend further discussion to determine what facilities to look at and allow for further study to determine appropriateness	BIN - staff to investigate what facility types could accommodate on-road bike lanes [staff researched and found that each facility must be studied across a number of factors, not just type]
760	Multiple - See Master	4	General	Various	Two citizens requested that the County hire a bike/ped coordinator	BOS is evaluating options for staff resources in this area	No action required
763	PW2-042309-64	4	General	P Comment Written	Q4 - Allow bike lanes and curb access at sidewalk/road intersections; handicap curbs in Cedar Crest	Comment noted	Planning Department to investigate status of bond; no PC action required
764	Multiple - See Master	4	General	P Comment Written	Multiple comments were received that requested better integration of all bike/ped facilities, including between neighborhoods; specific requests included implementation of connections to W&OD and along Loudoun County Parkway	Comment noted, see CTP, Bike/Ped Plan; see Master for details	No action required
777	PC-032609-9	4	General	Verbal	CH 1 - Provide discussion of retroactive policies - how to upgrade/connect older infrastructure (retrofit facilities like sidewalks, SWM facilities, etc) in older communities (e.g., Potomac Farms, Cardinal Glen) -- provide goals, strategies, policies to address deficiencies in existing communities	Existing communities are addressed through outreach efforts; implementation requires adequate funding; the BOS allocates \$500,000 annually for such requests and allocates according to adopted criteria; a staff member with dedicated bicycle/pedestrian facilitation duties would assist this effort	No action required
778	PC-032609-14	4	General	Verbal	CH 4 - Prioritize bike/ped connections in areas with identified needs; identify and complete gaps in bike/ped network	Recommend policy to address request; if priority list is desired for appendix, use place holder for future effort	PC to develop priority list

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
779	PC-041409-25	4	General	Verbal	CH 8 - Identification locations of "minor" (very minimal) bike/ped connections that could be easily implemented	This is a staff resource issue; discussions are ongoing with the BOS regarding obtaining an additional staff member with bicycle/pedestrian facilitation duties	No action required
780	PD-032409-3	4	General	Referral	Planning staff recommends separating air travel and bicycle and pedestrian facilities into two chapters. Staff further recommends restating the vision and goals from the Bike/Ped Plan in the Draft CTP and only including policies that strengthen and/or provide further clarification to the Bike/Ped Plan	Staff is open to the idea of separating the air travel and bicycle and pedestrian chapters into two chapters; staff is open to discussion of revision of Bike/Ped language and policies	PC concurs with recommendation for separate chapters; text and policy changes are noted above
781	Multiple - See Master	4	General	Various	Two citizens requested that the County pursue transportation enhancement funds and other grants for bike/ped facilities	Staff will research this issue; staff notes that the County takes advantage of a number of County, State and Federal sources to fund Bike/Ped projects	No action required
785	PC-032609-12	4	General	Verbal	CH 4 - Incorporate Bike/Ped Plan in its entirety into the 2009 CTP (possibly as an appendix) – if not incorporated, at minimum provide more bike/ped detail in the CTP	Recommend the Bike and Ped Plan be bundled with the CTP, but not directly integrated to allow for ease in future updating	PC recommends text and policy changes as noted above
786	PC-041409-14	4	General	Verbal	CH 8 - Bike/Ped - Safety considerations; appropriateness of bike/ped facilities on all roads	Staff is open to discussion with the PC on this issue	No action required
787	E-050109-2	4	General	E-mail	Provide specifics for bicycle corridors as to where they should go. Provide incentives to Employers for using bicycle corridors. The Loudoun County Economic Development office should work bike tours in with tourist destinations. The CTP should decrease vehicular loads on roads by encouraging alternative transportation like rail, bicycle and bus routes. The County should take the lead in encouraging their employees to use alternative transportation through policy changes. Designate staff to implement the Bike & Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan	Bike/Ped Plan provides guidance on location of bicycle paths/corridors. TDM policies will be intergrated into transit chapter of 2009 CTP. BOS is evaluating implementation/resource options for Bike/Ped Plan.	PC concurs with staff recommendation
788	PC-060209-50	4	General	Written	I agree with the planning staff observation to break the Airport out from bike and ped. Change Title to: "Air Travel Facilities"	Staff will edit accordingly	PC concurs
789	PC-060209-54	4	General	Written	Create stand alone chapter for Bike/Ped - New Title: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	Staff will edit accordingly	PC concurs

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
790	Multiple - See Master	4	General	Various	Require Bike/Ped connections with development	The County requires bike/ped connections currently; CTP reinforces with Appendix 5; for off-road facilities, refer to the Bike and Ped Plan	PC concurs with staff recommendation
793	PC-040209-31	4	General	Verbal	CH 2 - Need to make walking to school option a priority - requested copy of school board policy (walkable schools and school access)	Staff believes that policies 18 and 19 of Chapter 4 adequately address this issue. Staff will request the school policy	BIN - Planning staff to request school policy [information provided to PC, new policy added as drafted by PD]
794	PC-060209-57	4	General	Written	I would like to include all the planning staff suggestions on this section from their March 24th note.		See all PD line items for details of PC recommendations
795	PC-060209-221	4	General	Written	Chapter 4: Air Travel and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: Separate into two chapters. Air travel belongs in its own category.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC concurs
796	PC-060209-224	4	General	Written	Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: The Bike and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan vision statement specifies " Loudoun County " as a place where an alternative transportation network of walkways and bikeways enable everyone to move efficiently to and from such places as work, school, transit . . . ." HOWEVER, it does not specify the "use of bicycle transport as an alternative to car transport". Is the goal not to plan for communities where there is less reliance all together on automobiles? Where have we planned for "car-free communities" as alternative life style communities for those who choose to minimize the use of automobiles?	Staff notes that there are several planned mixed-use and/or transit-oriented development communities around the County designed to reduce automobile dependence.	PC recommends the following language: Under Bicycle Mobility, 1st para, add to end of 2nd sentence "...and as an alternative to car transport."
797	PC-060209-225	4	General	Written	Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: The current Master Plan needs serious revision. I do not agree, for example as noted in the Roadway Planning and Design Policy (p. 26) that "Transportation facilities in Loudoun County (with the exception of limited access freeways will be planned, designed, constructed and maintained to accommodate shared use by motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians." They need not be shared; a separate and complete bicycle and pedestrian network should be considered.	Staff notes that the intent of this policy is to require the inclusion of planning for these facilities, and typically this is in the form of a separate trail or sidewalk, yet parallel to the facility and within the same right-of-way	BIN [no further action]

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
798	PC-060209-226	4	General	Written	Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities: I recommend that the Bike and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan be updated and revised by the year 2015 (in conjunction with the next review of the CTP). As far as the Potomac-Sterling Communities, it is a good first cut at the needs of the community but still very inadequate.	Comment noted	PC recommends that the BOS update the Bike/Ped Plan as soon as possible and then integrate CTP and BPP as one document for future updates; this recommendation should be included in text of Chapter 1, para 3, and as a policy in Chapter 4
799	PC-060209-228	4	General	Written	<p>Bike/Ped RESOURCES:</p> <p><b>Physically Separated Bike Lanes:</b>  <a href="http://www.streetfilms.org/archives/physically-separated-bike-lanes/">http://www.streetfilms.org/archives/physically-separated-bike-lanes/</a></p> <p><b>Critical evaluation of controversy over bike transport:</b></p> <p><b>Facilities of Fashion: From Bike Paths to Bike Lanes</b>  <a href="http://www.wright.edu/~jeffrey.hiles/essays/listening/ch7.html">http://www.wright.edu/~jeffrey.hiles/essays/listening/ch7.html</a></p> <p><b>Design Guidance Accomodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach:</b></p> <p><b>A US DOT Policy Statement Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation</b>  <a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm</a></p> <p><b>Lakefront Bike Path Woes:</b>  <a href="http://featuresblogs.chicagotribune.com/theskyline/2008/07/lakefront-bike.html">http://featuresblogs.chicagotribune.com/theskyline/2008/07/lakefront-bike.html</a></p> <p><b>Groningen Master Bicycle Plan</b>  <a href="http://www.bicyclinglife.com/Library/Autum-of-bike-Master-Plan.pdf">http://www.bicyclinglife.com/Library/Autum-of-bike-Master-Plan.pdf</a></p>	Comment noted	No action required
800	PC-060209-238	4	General	Written	Chapter 4 Air Travel and Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Policies <b>for Roadways.</b>	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
802	PC-060209-229	5	Introduction	Written	Chapter 5: Regional, State and Local Coordination: Introduction should include some historical background on and Loudoun County's involvement with the various organizations noted.	Staff will have to research this issue	PC recommends suggested change

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
803	PD-032409-24	5	Regional Coordination	Referral	Planning staff questions the statement in Chapter 5 which states that the DC region has obtained conformity for specified pollutants in recent years	Staff notes that it is in fact true that while the region is a non-attainment area for air quality, it has been within its budgets for conformity as required by Federal law, if this were not the case, Federal funding would be jeopardized for transportation projects. The idea behind conformity is to help the region move towards attainment of air quality standards	PC recommends that the staff explanation be added to the text
804	PD-032409-68	5	Regional Coordination	Referral	Planning staff recommends a language change in Chapter 5, VDOT description to suggest that road improvement matters are handled solely through the Chapter 527 process	Staff does not support this recommendation as the County works with VDOT and developers in many ways with respect road improvements, and the Chapter 527 process is merely one example of this	PC recommends adding description of Chapter 527 process
805	PC-060209-191	5	Regional Coordination Policies	Written	CHAPTER 5: Add Regional Transportation Coordination Policy #3 as follows: "The County will coordinate the 2009 CTP with the TransAction 2030 Regional Transportation Plan to the extent consistent with the County's land use, environmental and historic preservation policies."	Staff recommends further discussion on this item	PC recommends not including suggested policy
806	PD-032409-12	5	State/Cty/Other	Referral	Planning staff recommends a change to the second paragraph text in Chapter 5 (VDOT section) which refers to seeking changes with respect to road standards to accommodate County land use and community design objectives to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities	Staff notes that the focus of this statement is flexibility in rural road design which may/may not be compatible with bike/ped facilities	PC recommends the following language: Combine 3rd and 4th sentences of 2nd para under VDOT to read "The County intends to continue the current VDOT/County relationship, but will seek to implement changes in VDOT policies and standards as necessary to ensure that the County can provide a cost-effective and safe road network with flexibility to accommodate the County's land use and community design objectives."
807	PC-032609-24	5	State/Cty/Other	Verbal	CH 5 - Update Hibbs Bridge project as being completed (strikethrough pg. 4-6) and re-order paragraph	Staff will provide updates for PC review	PC recommends suggested change
808	PC-032609-26	5	State/Cty/Other	Verbal	CH 5 - Add discussion of Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to State section	Staff will provide updates for PC review	PC recommends suggested change
809	PD-032409-69	5	State/Cty/Other	Referral	Planning staff recommends a language change in Chapter 5 under other coordination that would streamline the paragraph	Staff does not support this recommendation as it leaves out the discussion of coordination efforts with respect to referrals and also the discussion of the legislative program in Richmond	PC recommends retaining current draft language

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
810	PC-060209-192	5	State/Cty/Other	Written	Under Other Coordination second bullet, use proper noun to describe the legislative program.	Staff requests clarification on this comment	PC recommends the following language: "The County is actively involved in annually developing a legislative program that includes transportation at the Viginia General Assembly. The County coordinates with other jurisdictions on transportation matters of mutual interest through the state legislature."
812	PC-032609-19	5	State/Cty/Other Policies	Verbal	CH 5 - Clarification of "Partnership Policies" (strikethrough pg. 4-7)	Staff requires further information to address	PC recommends combining the 1st sentence of the 2nd policy and the last sentence of the 3rd policy into one policy. The last sentence of the 2nd policy and the first sentence of the 3rd policy will be come two separate policies
813	PC-032609-20	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt	Verbal	CH 5 - Clarification of "Local Control and Management Options Policies" (strikethrough pgs. 4-9, 4-10)	Staff notes that the language is meant to indicate that the County defers to VDOT, as they have ultimate authority	No action required
814	PC-060209-193	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt	Written	Under Local Control and Management Options, clarify whether the voter approval required is Loudoun County voters or Virginia voters (second request).	Staff notes that Loudoun voters would have to approve; staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
815	PC-060209-194	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt Policies	Written	Under Local Control and Management Options Policies: #1 – replace "jurisdiction over" with "responsibility for management of"	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change plus that addition of ", except incorporated communities larger than 3,500 people." to end of policy
816	PC-060209-195	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt Policies	Written	Under Local Control and Management Options Policies: #2 – replace "favorably consider" with "encourage"	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change with a comma added after operation and the comma after County deleted.
817	PC-060209-196	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt Policies	Written	Under Local Control and Management Options Policies: #3 – Add to the end of the first sentence: ", provided that the County will actively seek to implement changes in VDOT policies and standards to ensure that the County can provide a cost-effective and safe road network with flexibility to accommodate the County's land use and community design objectives.	Staff recommends this language be incorporated into design and construction standards policies rather than local control and management (see policy #8)	PC supports staff recommendation
818	PC-060209-197	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt Policies	Written	Under Local Control and Management Options Policies: #3 – Move the second sentence to Chapter 2 policies.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
819	PC-060209-198	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt Policies	Written	Under Local Control and Management Options Policies: #4 – delete “participate in the” and “of”	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change and to delete the slash and make it a dash
820	PC-032609-25	5	Local Ctrl/Mgmt Policies	Verbal	CH 5 - Clarify/further discuss Chapter 527 process/requirements as to traffic studies (strikethrough pg. 4-7) and add language "... which requires that ... " to Policy 4.	Staff will provide updates for PC review	PC recommends additional information of Chapter 527 process, but does not support change to policy #4
821	PC-032609-21	5	General	Verbal	CH 5 - Provide organizational chart/diagram for agency relationships	Staff notes the relationships are multi-layered and very complex and do not lend themselves to diagram format	PC recommends that a basic diagram showing fundamental relationships be provided; PC also recommends inclusion of organizations in glossary
823	PC-032609-4	5	General	Verbal	CH 1 - Provide update on VDOT SSAR revisions	New requirements take effect July 1; a copy of the document will be made available to the PC	PC recommends addition of information on SSAR in policies and text of Chapter 2
824	Multiple - See Master	5	General	Various	Multiple comments were received that requested restriction of trucks on roads during rush hour	Staff notes that they are unaware of any enabling legislation for this; it would require an act of the General Assembly	BIN - staff will research [no further action]
828	Multiple - See Master	5	General	Various	Multiple comments were received that requested truck restrictions on Gum Spring Road for quarry trucks	Staff notes that uncovered trucks would seem to be a law enforcement issue; re-routing of trucks also would seem to be problematic given that those trucks originate on that road and are thus not through trucks	No action required, however see previous related BIN item
840	PC-060209-58	6	Air Quality	Written	Chapter 6 Air Quality: What is the difference between metrorail and light rail? If the rail we are getting in Loudoun is metrorail where is light rail in the County? If it isn't here, delete the reference.	Metrorail is considered heavy rail; light rail generally has lower capacity and lower speed; it often involves electric rail cars and is considered more flexible; that said, there are no plans for light rail in the County; staff will edit the text accordingly	PC recommends staff edits
841	PC-060209-59	6	Air Quality	Written	#3. How does the County plan to reduce a commuter's trip length. If the house is at point A and the office is at point B, how does the County plan to reduce miles traveled?	Staff notes that the policy refers to implementation of land use policies, which would result in the cumulative effect of reducing average trip lengths/VMT	No action required
842	PC-060209-199	6	Air Quality	Written	CHAPTER 6: Under Air Quality: Combine the third and fourth sentences to read "...and fine particles (PM2.5), which means that potential..."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
843	PC-060209-200	6	Air Quality	Written	CHAPTER 6: Under Air Quality: Revise second sentence to read: "The County's land use policies, calling for high density development at major transit nodes and implementation of transit routes, are important factors."	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
844	PC-032609-34	6	Air Quality Policies	Verbal	CH 6 - Edit Air Quality Policy 3 (strikethrough pg. 4-10) to include "telecommunications towers and facilities" as listed land use measures that can reduce vehicle trips	Staff will provide updates for PC review	PC recommends suggested change; PC also recommends adding ERT recommendation to explain Clean Air Act Attainment Plan and air quality conformity evaluation process in text

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
845	PC-060209-201	6	Air Quality Policies	Written	Under Air Quality Policies: #3 – insert “telecommunications facilities” after “mass-transit options”	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
846	PC-032609-30	6	Water Quality	Verbal	CH 6 - Check RGP for all priorities for wetlands mitigation and ensure consistency in CTP	Staff will follow-up with PC on this issue	BIN - staff will research [no further action]
847	PC-060209-202	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	Under Water Quality Policies: #1 – Revise the first sentence to read “Road crossings of Green Infrastructure will avoid or, when avoidance is not feasible, minimize and mitigate disturbances within floodplains and steep slopes.”	Staff is researching with B&D	PC recommends suggested change; insert "the" before "green infrastructure" in all cases.
849	PC-060209-32	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	Water Quality: Policy #1, 3rd sentence “..... extend within and parallel to the floodplain will be avoided should be minimized.”	Staff is researching with B&D	PC recommends maintaining current language
850	PC-032609-29	6	Water Quality Policies	Verbal	CH 6 - Clarify road crossings (of streams) to include bridges	Staff will follow-up with PC on this issue	PC recommends maintaining current language
851	PD-032409-17	6	Water Quality Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends updates to water quality policy #2 to avoid allowing mitigation of impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands outside of the geographic policy area	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC recommends ERT language as follows: "Unavoidable filling of jurisdictional waters and wetlands will be mitigated according to the following priorities: 1) adjacent to the road crossing or within the same stream watershed and geographic policy area, 2) within the same stream watershed outside of the geographic policy area, or 3) elsewhere within Loudoun County."
852	PC-060209-33	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	Water Quality: Policy #2, add to end of paragraph “4) within the local watershed district.”	Staff is researching with B&D	See PD-032409-17
853	PC-060209-60	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	Water Quality Policy 2. at end of first sentence add: “, whichever is more stringent.”	Staff is researching with B&D	See PD-032409-17
854	PC-060209-61	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	At end of Water Quality policy 2, is there any Ches Bay verbiage that should be added?	Staff is researching with B&D	See PD-032409-17

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
855	PC-060209-203	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	Under Water Quality Policies:#2 – Revise the first sentence to read “Road crossings will avoid or, when avoidance is not feasible, minimize and mitigate the filling of jurisdictional...” Add #5 – The County will amend the Zoning Ordinance to implement the Chesapeake Bay Water Protection Act, which provide minimum setbacks from Green Infrastructure for road improvements.	Staff is researching with B&D	See PD-032409-17
856	PD-032409-73	6	Water Quality Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends correction of a typo in Water Quality policy #3	Staff does not believe that this is a typo and believes the current language is adequate	PC recommends making edit globally throughout the document
857	PC-060209-34	6	Water Quality Policies	Written	Water Quality: Policy #4 – How will this policy be enforced if the road construction is completed by a group different from the group building a structure?	Staff is researching with B&D	No action required
858	PC-032609-27	6	Water Quality Policies	Verbal	CH 6 - Clarify whether Loudoun Water (LCSA) review of water quality policies has been completed	Staff notes that the water quality policies are not under Loudoun Water's purview	No action required
859	PC-032609-28	6	Water Quality Policies	Verbal	CH 6 - Ensure consistency/interface of water quality policies with adopted FSM	Staff notes that the water quality policies of the CTP are not related to the requirements of the FSM	No action required
860	PC-032609-22	6	Water Quality Policies	Verbal	CH 5 - Discuss relationship between County and US Army Corps of Engineers	The extent of the County's relationship with the Corps with respect to transportation is included in Chapter 6, Water Quality policies	PC recommends adding information to introduction of Water Quality section as to how the County interfaces
861	PC-032609-31	6	Noise	Verbal	CH 6 - Regional coordination needed with adjacent jurisdictions re: future noise wall installations near County lines	This type of coordination would fall outside of the bounds of the CTP; possibly requiring interjurisdictional agreements	PC recommends addition of policy for noise from road expansions and addition of information on noise attenuation materials
862	PC-032609-32	6	Noise	Verbal	CH 6 - Additional research needed on noise wall standards, including specific standards/requirements for noise wall installation along roads built after adjoining residences	Staff will research this issue	See PC-032609-31
863	PD-032409-76	6	Noise Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends a language change to Noise policy #2	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC recommends suggested change
864	PC-060209-62	6	Noise Policies	Written	Noise Policies: 3. Insert a year that the County will amend the Zoning Ordinance so it will trickle down to the FSM to begin implementing the State policy.	Staff notes that the timing of the amendments to the ZO is unknown	No action required; staff to incorporate changes as recommended by ERT

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
865	PC-060209-204	6	Noise Policies	Written	Under Noise Policies: #5 – Revise first sentence to read “Structural noise abatement measures, such as concrete walls, shall not be used unless federal and state noise levels cannot be reached by other means.” Replace “should” with “will” in each of the second and third sentences.	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
866	PC-060209-205	6	Noise Policies	Written	Under Noise Policies:#6 – Revised to read “Construction and maintenance costs associated with noise abatement measures needed for land development activities will be borne by the associated development(s).	Staff will research the issue	BIN - PC supports language if permitted; staff to research [language is permitted but not binding]; PC also recommends adding policy that requires noise impacts be addressed regardless of who builds; define Leqh in glossary; add when State policy was adopted in para 1 of Appendix 4 and remove motion language
867	PD-032409-18	6	Noise Policies	Referral	Planning staff suggest adding a noise policy to provide noise protection through passive noise abatement measures consistent with the General Plan	Staff is open to discussion on this item	PC recommends that staff incorporate C8 policy
868	PC-032609-33	6	Heritage Resources	Verbal	CH 6 - Edit Virginia Byway Description for US Route 15 (James Monroe Highway) and Routes 673/681 (Milltown Road) (strikethrough pg. 4-14)	Staff will provide updates for PC review	PC recommends suggested change for US Route 15; Milltown Road can remain as is; Cider Mill Road should be added
869	PC-060209-35	6	Heritage Resources	Written	Heritage Resources: Has the Heritage Resources Commission been formed?	Staff notes that the Heritage Resources Commission has not been formed	No action required
870	PC-060209-63	6	Heritage Resources	Written	Heritage Resources: Insert the year that the County will get the designations for 626 and 50.	Staff notes that the timing of this designation is unknown	No action required; PC recommends names of local byways be added to map
871	PC-060209-206	6	Heritage Resources	Written	Under Heritage Resources : Third bullet – insert “and” after “Maryland State Line”	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
872	PC-060209-207	6	Heritage Resources	Written	Under Heritage Resources :Seventh bullet – Route 673 is not Milltown Road	Staff understands Route 673 to be Milltown Road from the Lovettsville town line to the intersection with Route 681	PC supports staff recommendation to keep current language
873	PC-060209-208	6	Heritage Resources	Written	Under Heritage Resources :Penultimate paragraph – replace “provides an opportunity for” with “empowers”	Staff will edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change
874	PC-060209-209	6	Heritage Resources	Written	Under Heritage Resources :Last paragraph – insert “and the Heritage Preservation Plan” after RGP.	Staff wil edit accordingly	PC recommends suggested change

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
875	PC-041409-9	6	Heritage Resources	Verbal	CH 8 - Route 15 - Implementation techniques/programs for Journey Through Hallowed Ground	This is an evolving process in which staff is participating; it would be premature at this time to incorporate and provisions with respect to JTHG	No action required
876	PD-032409-25	6	Heritage Resources Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends that Heritage Resources policy #2 be amended to include language that states that the County will require archaeological surveys for state-funded projects	Staff notes that the County cannot compel the state to perform these studies, however the state already is required to perform archaeological surveys as part of SERP	PC recommends the following language: "The County supports the State requirement for archeological studies for state-funded improvements"
877	PC-032609-35	6	Heritage Resource Policies	Verbal	CH 6 - Planning staff requested to provide review of Historic District Roadway Policies (Heritage Resource Policy 3, strikethrough pg. 4-15); provide copies of State Code sections referenced in policy; ensure coordination/consistency with Heritage Preservation Plan; provide status of Heritage Preservation Plan and formation of Heritage Commission	Staff will coordinate with appropriate planning staff for follow-up by Department of Planning	PC recommends adding a reference to the County Zoning Ordinance
878	PD-032409-80	6	Heritage Resources Policies	Referral	Planning staff suggests removing second sentence of Heritage Resources policy #3 to reflect proper reference as the Zoning Ordinance, not State Code	Staff is open to this recommendation	PC recommends changing second sentence of policy #3 to reflect proper reference as Zoning Ordinance
879	PC-060209-36	6	Heritage Resources Policies	Written	Heritage Resources: Policy #3 – 2nd sentence "No property may be placed... majority of the property owners in the district." Is this a part of the cited state legislation? How is the district defined?	Staff will defer to the planning department for clarification	PC recommends retaining current language; PC also recommends adding the year that the County joined Journey Through Hallowed Ground in the Historic Resources section
880	PC-060209-64	6	Heritage Resources Policies	Written	Heritage Policies 4. insert year that Evergreen will get designation. Do the same on the next two bullets.	Staff notes that the timing of this designation is unknown	PC recommends Evergreen Mills Road be added to the implementation and/or priorities listing(s); staff to check with VDOT on the process for roads being designated as Byways [information provided - no further action]
881	PD-032409-81	6	Heritage Resources Policies	Referral	Planning staff suggests adding Cider Mill Road to Heritage Resources Policy #4	Staff is open to this recommendation	No action required, however PC recommends adding Cider Mill Road to list of byways as previously noted
882	PC-041409-15	6	Heritage Resource Policies	Verbal	CH 8 - Other - Ensure better coordination with the Heritage Preservation Plan (suggested New Policy in Chapter 2 re: protection of rural historic roadways/existing districts)	Staff will coordinate with planning staff for follow-up	PC recommends Commissioner Austin to provide language for new policy

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
887	Multiple - See Master	7	Planning Edits	Various	Staff received several edit requests from Planning staff	Staff concurs with several of the minor edits - see master for details; those that staff would like further discussion on are found in the appropriate section	No action required
888	PD-032409-82	7	Edit	Referral	Planning staff recommends removing contextual opening to last sentence of second paragraph of General Funding section of Chapter 7 with reference to the funding atmosphere	Staff believes this statement accurately reflects the funding situation and believes it should be retained as is	PC recommends the following language: replace "Given the funding atmosphere..." with "Accordingly..." in the second para under General Funding subheading
891	PC-040209-17	7	Funding Sources	Verbal	CH 7 - Revise/update Table 5-1 and retain in CTP	Staff will revise the table to include sources discussed in the text and re-insert into the document	PC recommends amending the table and placing it before State Funding sources
892	PD-032409-13	7	Funding Sources	Referral	Planning staff recommends changes to Chapter 7 to be consistent with Chapter 9 of the Bike/Ped Plan	Staff is open to discssion on this item	PC recommends adding bike/ped funding sources and transit funding sources as separate sections within the chapter
893	PC-040209-9	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Funding Policy 1 (strikethrough pg. 5-9) - is it the County's consensus that we are getting our "fair share" of state and federal funds?	Concerning Federal funds distributed through NVTA, the County receives its fair share based on its population percentage; at the state level, staff believes that the County does not receive a fair share since funds are distributed by formula based on lane-miles, not vehicle miles traveled (VMT)	PC recommends the following language: change from "The County will seek to maintain its fair share..." to "The County will seek its fair share..."
894	PC-040209-5	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Why are roads specified in Funding Policy 4d (strikethrough pg. 5-10)	Staff will work with PC to develop appropriate language for revised policies	PC recommends removing road references from policy
895	PC-060709-1	7	Funding Policies	Written	Policy #4.d – delete references to specific roads and add priorities to appendix	Staff concurs	See PC-060709-1
896	PC-040209-10	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Funding Policy 4e (strikethrough pg. 5-10) - do not lower safety standards just to reduce costs	The purpose of this policy is to facilitate adaptation of standards for rural roads to improve safety while at the same time lowering costs (i.e. rural rustic and pave in place programs)	PC recommends adding language from staff comment to policy #4e
897	PC-040209-11	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Funding Policy 7 (strikethrough pg. 5-10) - is this policy even needed?	This policy defines the process and staff believes does no harm; staff recommends it be moved to #1 position to set stage for policies that follow	PC recommends combining policies 7 and 9 and moving the new policy to #1 as follows: "The County will seek funding for the construction of the planned facilities as outlined in the 2009 Countywide Transportation Plan and the Loudoun County Mobility Master Plan through a variety of public and private funding sources including federal, state, and local funds, public-private partnership funds, private-sector proffer donations, and private property owner easements, and citizen donations."

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
898	PC-040209-12	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Funding Policy 9 (strikethrough pg. 5-10) - explanation as to why private property owner easements and private donations are mentioned but noth further discussed	Staff requires further information to address; staff supports current policy as is	PC recommends that policy #9 be deleted
899	PD-032409-85	7	Funding Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends adding a reference to the Bike/Ped Plan to Funding policy #9	Staff concurs	PC recommends that policy #9 be deleted
900	PC-040209-13	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Funding Policy 10 (strikethrough pg. 5-10) - provide definition of "private sector contributions"	Staff plans on inserting the glossary upon completion of the draft and is willing to include this as a definition	PC supports staff recommendation
901	PD-032409-86	7	Funding Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends adding references to the Bike/Ped Plan to policy #14, Chapter 7	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
902	PC-040209-8	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Expand Funding Policy 14 (strikethrough pgs. 5-11, 5-12) to include standardized formula for identification of infill safety needs	Policy pertains to use of gas-tax funds; recommend staff research as part of separate follow-on process	BIN - this item to be discussed as part of Chapter 2, LOS policies (staff to develop appropriate language) [addressed in PC recommendations - no further action]
903	PD-032409-87	7	Funding Policies	Referral	Planning staff recommends adding references to the Bike/Ped Plan to policy #19, Chapter 7	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change
904	PC-040209-6	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Expand Funding Policy 20 (strikethrough version pg. 5-12) to include "proffer flexing"	Recommend a proffer flexing policy be added under the proffer policy section of Chapter 7	PC supports staff recommendation and recommends adding proffer flexing to glossary; PC also recommends the following language for policy #17: "The funding of needed safety improvements is a County priority"; policy #17 to be moved to the #2 position
905	PC-040209-7	7	Funding Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Add funding policy for County-monitored pooling of proffer and other funds ("road club")	Staff will work with PC to adapt policy #20 of funding policies to include "road clubs"	PC supports staff recommendation; PC also recommends deleting policy #21; PC recommends adding new policy that states "The County will seek to apply funding to the priorities identified in Table _ "
906	PC-060709-2	7	Proffer Policies	Written	Policy #2 – add a statement indicating the County's preference to have roads built in lieu of cash for road construction.	Staff notes that this is included in the text, but will add as a policy	PC supports staff recommendation

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
907	PC-060709-3	7	Proffer Policies	Written	Add a policy describing proffer flexing and combining proffers to provide for road construction.	Staff concurs	PC recommends suggested change; PC also recommends the following language changes: In Proffers section, 1st para, last sentence, insert "... in the form of physical improvements or cash contributions,..." after "Proffers..."; Proffer policy #1, change to read "...including those for roads, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities,..."; policy #3f, change to read "Warrant studies and traffic signalization at intersections."; policy #3o, delete "...will be built into project design as possible.";policy #5, change to read "The transportation capacity to serve a project must be available at the commencement of the project or, when phasing a project, the transportation capacity to serve each phase of the project must be available at the commencement of that phase."; policy #6, delete "The County anticipates that" and change last sentence to read "The value will be based on actual cost at the time the cash-in-lieu trade-in is exercised."
908	PC-040209-16	7	Proffer Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Proffer Policy 5 (strikethrough pg. 5-14) - specify that proffers for single-phase (one phase only) projects should be provided up-front	Staff believes the lanuage of the CTP adequately addresses this issue	See PC-060709-3
909	PD-032409-26	7	Proffer Policies	Referral	Planning staff questions the adjustment of the language in Proffer policy #6 to base the value of a cash-in-lieu contribution on the actual construction cost at the time improvements are constructed	Staff notes that the purpose of this change is to obtain more accurate values for contributions; costs adjusted over time do not necessarily reflect true costs at the time of construction as construction costs can change rapidly	See PC-060709-3
910	PD-032409-27	7	Proffer Policies	Referral	Planning staff requests adjustment to Proffer policy #7 to replace guidance for cash-in-lieu contributions to be used within the sub-planning area in which they are located with Policy Area	Staff notes that this procedure was established in concert with the BOS and Zoning Administration and any changes should involve these parties	BIN - staff to discuss with Zoning [issues resolved - policy edited - no further action]
911	PC-040209-1	7	Proffer Policies	Verbal	CH 7 - Infill proffer policy - look at developing a standardized formula for commercial development based on square footage (such as recent Cameron Chase application)	Recommend staff research as part of separate follow-on process	BIN - issue to be discussed as part of Chapter 2 items [discussed in PC recommendations to BOS - no further action]
919	PC-040209-4	7	General	Verbal	CH 7 - Review of improvements required with by-right developments	Staff will follow-up with PC on this issue	BIN [information provided - no further action]

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
920	Multiple - See Master	7	General	P Comment	Stakeholders suggested a number of different funding mechanisms that the County should pursue including special tax districts, the Commercial and Industrial Tax, the CIP/bonds, PPTAs and CDAs	Comment noted	No action required
927	PC-040209-15	7	General	Verbal	CH 7 - In general, proffers need to be explained/defined as cash or improvements	Staff believes the lanuage of the CTP adequately addresses this issue; staff also notes that proffers are in the existing glossary	No action required
928	PC-040209-18	7	General	Verbal	CH 7 - Request that County's proffer manager provide comments/evaluate proposed policies regarding need for language addressing how proffers are written	Recommend PC have discussion with County Attorney on form and standardization of proffers	PC recommends that proffer manager review final draft
929	Multiple - See Master	7	General	Various	Several comments were received requesting evaluation of contingency funds to address unanticipated development-related transportation issues	The County already uses Gas Tax for contingency issues such as signals, sidewalks, etc; proffered contributions for contingency items would require legal review; Staff notes that it may be challenging to implement such a policy, given that proffers are voluntary; also, the traffic studies are meant to avoid unanticipated transportation issues	BIN - staff to evaluate possibility with County Attorney's office [staff's understanding is that it could be requested, but as proffers are voluntary, it would be difficult to justify to applicants]
932	PC-032609-23	7	General	Verbal	CH 5 - Clarify/further discuss Route 28 Tax District Commission and Advisory Board	Staff is open to providing additional information as part of Chapter 5 in the State, County and Other Partnership Roles section	PC supports staff recommendation
933	PC-040209-2	7	General	Verbal	CH 7 - Review of impact fees vs proffers requested	BOS has taken a position to not implement impact fees; will research decision and findings	No action required
934	Multiple - See Master	8	Planning Edits	Referral	Planning staff provided several minor comments on Chapter 8	Staff will make the edits accordingly	No action required
938	PC-060209-13	8	Major Transportation Corridors	Written	Rt 7 <u>East</u> of Algonkian: what is the northern collector road? Or this referring to missing part of Riverside Drive? If so, it doesn't belong here.	Staff notes that this is referring to the missing section of Jennings Farm Drive	No action required
939	PC-060209-14	8	Major Transportation Corridors	Written	Add objective at Rt 7 East of Algonkian: <u>improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity across Rt 7 at Countryside</u> . Implementation: <u>design and construct pedestrian bridge</u> . Also add other locations as needed.	Staff will edit accordingly if desired by PC	PC recommends the following language changes: change Implementation topic to "Route 7: East of Algonkian Parkway/Atlantic Boulevard"; add objective #5: Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections across Route 7 between Farifax County and the Algonkian Parkway/Atlantic Boulevard intersection."; implementation task #2: replace "innovative" with "a variety of" and add task #5: "Design and construct bicycle and pedestrian crossings."
940	PC-060709-4	8	Major Transportation Corridors	Written	Item 2 – Route 7 east of Algonkian – Implementation task #2 – remove “innovative” and substitute “a variety of”.	Staff concurs	See PC-060209-14

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
941	PC-060709-5	8	Major Transportation Corridors	Written	Item 6 – Route 15 N&S of Leesburg – Implementation task #2 – JTHG program reference – define what this means.	Staff notes that the Journey Through Hallowed Ground program is described in Chapter 2	No action required
942	PC-060709-6	8	Major Transportation Corridors	Written	Item #7 – Greenway – add Implementation task to work with Greenway ownership and SCC to establish graduated toll structure.	Staff concurs	PC recommends adding a task that states the County will advocate a graduated toll structure; this task is also recommended to be added to the priority list
945	PC-060709-7	8	Neighborhood Issues	Written	Item #1 – Implementation task #1 – add Russell Branch Parkway and Gloucester Parkway to list of road priorities.	Staff concurs	PC recommends adding a new section B called Missing Links that includes the objective to "Complete the Road Network" and a task that lists construction of Russell Branch Parkway, Gloucester Parkway, a new Route 606/607 connection, Tall Cedars Parkway and Jennings Farm Drive
946	PC-060709-8	8	Neighborhood Issues	Written	Item #1 – add new implementation task to provided needed lane expansion to Waxpool Road.	Staff concurs	PC recommends adding line item under corridors to include Waxpool Road with the following objective "Provide needed operational improvements to Waxpool Road." and an appropriate task (language to be determined by staff)
947	PC-060209-17	8	Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	Written	Bicycle & Pedestrian Accommodations Implementation Task #2: to "Create a bicycle and pedestrian facilities map..."Add <b>"and include in the CTP"</b>	Staff notes that this is an on-going project and it will not be completed in time for inclusion in the current CTP update	PC supports staff recommendation and supports the following changes to this category's implementation tasks: 1. Use Appendix 5 in the review of all development applications and ensure that these facilities are included in all scoping, planning, design and construction plans; 2. Create a bicycle and pedestrian facilities map detailing the location of existing and approved facilities; and 3. Identify funding to integrate bicycle and pedestrian facilities into the road network."
948	PC-060709-9	8	Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	Written	Add Objective 2 – Expand and connect bicycle and pedestrian accommodations within existing networks.	Further discussion is required with Planning staff	See PC-060209-17
949	PC-060709-10	8	Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	Written	Add Objective 3 – provide sidewalks as a component all development applications.	Further discussion is required with Planning staff	See PC-060209-17
950	PC-060709-11	8	Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	Written	Add Implementation Task #5 – require that all development applications provide sidewalks and eliminate allowance to be provided when adjacent property builds them	Further discussion is required with Planning staff	PC recommends adding a policy to proffer policies and bicycle and pedestrian policies that requires that all development applications provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities and eliminate allowance to be provided when they are built by adjacent properties.

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
951	PC-060709-12	8	Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	Written	Add Implementation Task #6 – Develop retrofit policies and guidelines which will allow for bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be provided within ROW's of existing roadways and other areas.	Further discussion is required with Planning staff	No action required
953	PC-041409-16	8	General	Verbal	CH 8 - Other - Add funding/CIP status as a new column to Table 8-1	Staff will provide updates in Appendix 3 for PC review	PC recommends suggested change
954	PC-041409-17	8	General	Verbal	CH 8 - Other - Possibly move funding status "scorecard" to an appendix for more streamlined update process	Staff will provide updates in Appendix 3 for PC review	PC recommends suggested change
955	PC-041409-20	8	General	Verbal	CH 8 - Update priority list in Appendix 3 annually and note projects completed since previous year	Staff supports this recommendation	PC recommends suggested change
956	PC-041409-24	8	General	Verbal	CH 8 - Revised Chapter 2 policies to be more general, leave specifics for implementation (Chapter 8)	Staff supports this recommendation	PC recommends suggested change; PC also recommends adding a new section A to cover "Overall" topics including 1. Complete Streets and 2. CTP Performance
957	PC-041409-19	A1	Edit	Verbal	CH 8 - Integrate Maps into Appendix 1	Recommend that due to time constraints this enhancement be incorporated in a future annual appendix update	PC to add to list of recommendations to be forwarded to BOS
958	PD-032409-28	A1	Edit	Referral	Planning staff requests that typical sections to be included on page A1-124 of Appendix 1 be consistent with the Bike/Ped Plan and Design Toolkit	Staff is open to discussion on this item	BIN - staff to check consistency and look at appropriate way to integrate complete streets [complete streets policy language included in draft]
959	PC-060209-246	A1	Climbing Lane	Written	Reconsider the "climbing lane" proposed for Rt. 7 west of Leesburg due to safety concerns of local residents making left turn maneuvers onto Rt. 7 east. (Bob Wertz at Sterling input session).	As noted at the worksessions, staff recommends that the scope of the project include measures to address safety concerns for local residents	PC supports staff recommendation
961	PC-060209-244	A1	Purcellville	Written	Appendix of roads: Retain Purcellville area roads in draft CTP, pending final action on Purcellville's transportation plan.	Staff notes that the PC will need to consider action on the extension of Purcellville's northern collector road and the new western collector road, just outside of the western limits of the Town	No further action required
963	PC-060209-245	A1	Route7/690 Interchange	Written	Make the Rt. 690 and Rt. 7 Bypass interchange a priority to serve the new high school.(Town of Purcellville at input session.)	Comment noted	PC recommends adding to the priority list; PC also requested a searchable pdf for final version of CTP
964	PC-060209-74	A1	General	Written	Road Policies by Geographic Policy Area: I would like to see Appendix 1 contain the Priority Status (ie. High, medium and low) and project timing and estimated costs listed in bullet form in Appendix 1. I could not find ANY of this information in Appendix 2.	Priority status is included in Appendix 3. Staff prefers to keep the information separate for ease of updating; staff also notes that Appendix 1 contains planning/design guidelines for the roadways themselves	PC supports staff recommendation; staff to double-check that appendices are numbered properly throughout text

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
965	PC-060209-75	A1	General	Written	Appendix 3 is unnecessary if you combine the information into Appendix 1. Further it would be better, given the uncertainty of the cost of oil thus macadam, to only list costs for "Near-Term Priority" roads. Anything in 2015 and further is not even a guess.	Staff notes that the intent of Appendix 3 is to meet new requirements for transportation plans	See PC-060209-74
967	PD-052909-3	A2	Growth, Travel and Land Use	Referral	Planning staff recommend updating Growth, Land Use and Travel Patterns to include the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a strategy to reduce trips.	Staff will update accordingly	PC supports recommended change
969	PC-060209-21	A2	Rural Road Turn Lanes	Written	Items 100-104, &108: Strike additional ROW for turn lanes. These roads are quite rural in character--addition of turn lanes destroys their character. It might be reasonable to reserve additional ROW to insure sight distances, and even widen the roadways by 3-4 feet to allow bicycles to travel more safely, as these roads are heavily used by bicyclists. However, adding width to the roadway may result increased rates of automobile travel and further endanger cyclists. These roads besides being narrow, also have multiple bends, and vertical changes in alignment that obscure vision. The question is what is to be done? There probably is not one simple answer. Policy language is needed to establish approaches to the solution(s).	Staff recommends including language with respect to turn lanes; staff considers turn lanes to be safety measures; staff notes that turn lanes are recommended only on rural roads; staff further notes that VDOT may require turn lanes at entrances to certain developments	PC recommends adding a new rural policy that states the following: "In order to protect the character of rural roads, turn lanes will only be constructed when fully warranted or required for safety."
971	PD-052909-1	A3	Bike/Ped Accommodations	Written	Planning staff recommends adding bicycle and pedestrian accommodations consistent with the Bike/Ped Plan and Appendix 5 to road improvement priorities in Appendix 3. Also, need to clarify if the costs include bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Staff will update accordingly	PC supports recommended change

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
972	PD-032409-30	A3	Route 28 Parallel Roads	Referral	Planning staff questions the inclusion of a note in Appendix 3, Route 28 Corridor Intermediate Priority projects which alludes to the fact that should private sector development occur along certain corridors where road construction would be anticipated due to proffers or Community Development Authority, these projects would move to near-term priority	Staff does not believe the need to revise this policy has been clearly demonstrated and supports the note as is	PC recommends that staff move note to page A3-2 as a general comment; PC also recommends that an "Overall Top County Priority List" be added to the beginning of the appendix and also that a scorecard be developed for project progress (BIN) [PC supports staff suggestion to include 3 categories in the scorecard: funding status, designed? (Y/N), constructed? (Y/N)
974	PC-060209-76	A3	General	Written	Also, I believe that given the current state of the economy, that you might want to bump all intermediate to long term. That would give you flexibility in completing all the near-term improvements by 2015. The six-year plan that was presented to the Board on June 2nd that secured matching Federal Funds only listed: Pacific Boulevard: Missing segment and robbed from a bunch of other planned projects, but nothing to do with the listed Near-Term projects. Route 659: Paving existing road from Route 7 to Greenway-Reconstruction. Does not match (even for the PE) any of the Near-Term projects on A3-8. Gleedsville Bridge: This isn't even mentioned in Near-Term Projects. Evergreen Mills (Rte 621/Rte 772) and Ryan Road: This intersection improvement isn't mentioned in the Near-Term Projects. The remainder of the six-year plan is also not mentioned in App 3. There is a big disconnect from fixing the CTP roads and what is getting fixed in reality.	Staff believes further discussion is required	No action required
975	PC-060209-190	A3	General	Written	Appendix 3: Priorities should be based on the greatest benefit to the transportation network as a whole, not on which segment has the lowest grade. Please explain more about how the priorities are determined.	Staff believes further discussion is required	No action required
982	PD-032409-16	A5	Edit	Referral	Planning staff recommends that a note be included in Appendix 5 to state that the County may require additional or wider facilities in high activity corridors	Staff is not aware of the need for requiring facilities that are wider than standards and notes that such a provision could have significant cost implications in terms or right of way acquisition	PC recommends that a note be added that states that standards do not preclude the County for asking for more

2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
983	PC-052809-24	A5	Introduction	Written	Delete concluding sentence; also what governs, the design toolkit or A5?	Staff concurs with edit; staff deferes to Planning staff on question of governance	PC recommends suggested change and for staff to check consistency with Bike/Ped Plan & FSM
984	PD-052909-2	A5	Table Updates	Written	Planning staff recommends updating Appendix 5 to state that all widths are minimums, reductions in widths and the design of bike lanes should reference the Toolkit, update table to include bike lanes along four lane roads.	Staff will update accordingly	PC recommends suggested changes and also that under implementation, a task be added that recommends reviewing County documents for consistency; staff to verify consistency of A5 with FSM and Bike/Ped Plan [PC recommends adding recommendation to BOS for update of BPP with potential for dedicated commuter bike lanes]
986	Multiple - See Master	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Various	Staff notes that various comments were received that appear to be out of the scope of the CTP	Staff can make these issues available upon request (see Master); staff has included those comments received from the PC below for reference	No action required
987	PC-040209-37	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 2 - Private Street Policy 5 (strikethrough pg. 3-48) - enforcement mechanism for sales material distribution at closing? Should be done earlier in the purchase process.	Staff believes that this issue falls outside of the scope of the CTP; further research could be accomplished as part of a separate follow-on process	BIN - staff to discuss with County Attorney's office [staff's understanding is that this would be difficult to enforce for subsequent sales]
1008	PC-040209-21	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 2 - Request to work with VDOT regarding reduction of speed limits on existing roads	Staff has an established relationship with VDOT to address this operational issue; issue falls outside of CTP scope	No action required
1009	PC-040209-22	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 2 - Identify how much money Loudoun spent on transportation last year (amount of transportation funds in CIP)	Staff notes that it is difficult to provide exact annual expenditures due to the fact that projects often span multiple years before completion; staff will provide program documents for County and State programs	PC recommends that references be added in the funding chapter
1010	PC-040209-24	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 2 - Identify all funding sources for road planned improvements	Staff will research this issue; staff notes that we do not have a comprehensive proffer list	PC to add this item to list of recommendations to be provided to the BOS
1011	PC-040209-27	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 2 - Need to address measures to fix safety issues (i.e., need for traffic lights or pedestrian crossings)	Staff has an established relationship with VDOT to address this operational issue; issue falls outside of CTP scope	No action required
1012	PC-040209-39	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 2 - Propose that planning period (horizon year) be shortened from 20 years to 10 years	The CTP is a long-range plan designed to preserve travel corridors for future demand; shortening the time horizon could jeopardize the County's ability to retain these corridors	PC supports staff recommendation
1013	PC-041409-2	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Concern that additional construction costs as a justification to SCC for rate (toll) increase	This issue is outside of the scope of the CTP and outside of the County's perview; the staff notes however that the Greenway would be required to obtain SPEX approval to widen to 8 lanes	No action required
1014	PC-041409-4	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Process and timeframe for de-privatization of the roadway	The Greenway turns over to the public in the year 2056	No action required
1015	PC-041409-5	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Clarification as to what authority does County have over the roadway? Only the zoning (special exception) process?	See response to PC-041409-2	No action required

**2009 Draft CTP Issues Matrix**

	B	C	E	F	G	H	I
2	Reference Number	Chapter	Category	Medium	Issue	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Position
1016	PC-041409-3	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Implementation of graduated tolls?	The County cannot compel the Greenway to implement graduated tolls, however, the County could advocate through policy	See PC-060709-6
1017	PC-041409-6	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Re-evaluation of Greenway issues annually	Staff recommends policy addition to meet annually with the Greenway to discuss issues as needed	PC supports staff recommendation
1018	PC-041409-7	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Dulles Greenway - Develop/foster additional interaction/coordination with Greenway owners (TRIP II)	Staff recommends policy addition to meet annually with the Greenway to discuss issues as needed	See PC-041409-7
1019	PC-041409-8	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Route 7 - Look into potential to re-stripe area just west of Route 28 merge to improve traffic flow	Westbound improvements will be in place with the Loudoun County Parkway interchange (mid-2010); there are no current plans to modify eastbound striping, however VDOT could look at as part of modifications to Richfield	No PC action required
1020	PC-041409-27	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Identification of roads of "statewide significance" on local plans	Staff will research this issue	No action required - VDOT addressed issue during worksession
1021	PC-041409-28	N/A	Scope Issue/Question	Verbal	CH 8 - Add policies to CTP regarding trees/landscaping in medians and benefits thereof - reduce view of oncoming traffic (improved flow) an beneficial "stress effects"	It is believed this issue would need to be addressed in the FSM; must follow VDOT standards however; it is also a cost issue	PC recommends that staff add policy in complete streets section that lists benefits; also PC recommends adding as an implementation task