

Issue Status: *The study accurately reflects the approved uses, including the office park, for the Special Exception. The Rezoning application does incorporate the Special Exception uses and since the Special Exception was approved (See Attachment 3), this issue has been adequately addressed. However, the revised traffic study doesn't clearly show the trip generation broken out between the approved Kincora Special Exception (SPEX-2008-0054) and the proposed Kincora rezoning (ZMAP 2008-0021) a separate table is recommended to clearly show the trip generation for each. This can be in the form of an addendum to the April 27, 2009 study.*

Comment acknowledged. A separate trip generation broken out between the approved Kincora Special Exception (SPEX 2008-0054) and the proposed Kincora rezoning (ZMAP 2008-0021) is attached at the back of this memorandum.

- 2) ***Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009):*** *The applicant has made numerous assumptions regarding recommended/anticipated improvements to be in place in the various phases of the project. OTS believes that many of these assumptions are unrealistic given OTS' understanding of funding levels and proffered/planned improvements. OTS requests a meeting with the applicant's traffic consultant to discuss the matter before providing further comment on the analysis results.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): *A meeting was held on May 27, 2009 with OTS staff to discuss the comments received on the rezoning application. Based on the discussion held at the meeting, there was some confusion regarding the planned roadway/transportation improvements stated in the report, which were based on the Countywide Transportation Plan. However, the analysis presented in the report did not take into account all of the planned improvements. The improvements necessary to improve or achieve the acceptable levels-of-service were the only ones included in the analysis. However, per the County staff's request, a supplemental analysis was requested without assuming planned roadway improvements as shown on the CTP for Route 28, Route 7 and Waxpool Road. Hence, intersections along Route 28, Route 7 and Waxpool Road were reanalyzed without assuming the planned improvements in place for the existing conditions. For the future conditions analysis, however, the planned interchanges were assumed to be in place, which was agreed to at the meeting. The supplemental analysis presented along with this memo shows the details of the capacity analysis results.*

Issue Status: *This is understood and confirmed by OTS. However, OTS continues to believe that some of the assumed future conditions, including the assumed 8 lanes on Route 7, Route 28 and Waxpool Road improvements in the future scenarios are optimistic in that they are not currently funded. OTS recommends that the applicant participate in these improvements. This will be addressed in subsequent comments.*

Please review responses to Comments # 14 and 15.

- 3) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)**: *The applicant has provided trip generation figures for each phase of the project as part of the traffic study. In each case, the study indicates that the figures represent new trips generated by the proposed development program for that point in time. OTS believes that the trip generation shown for each phase is actually cumulative (i.e. phase II = phase I + phase II). Is this correct? Please clarify.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): *That is correct. The trip generation for Phase II is cumulative of Phase I and II and the trip generation for Phase III is cumulative of Phase I, II and III.*

Issue Status: *In the review of the applicant's revised traffic study, OTS staff has confirmed this. The issue has been adequately addressed.*

Resolution appreciated.

- 4) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)**: *The interchange of Route 28/Nokes Boulevard is under construction to be a full cloverleaf interchange. The interchange of Route 28/Nokes Blvd will open in phases beginning May 2009 with full operation expected in September 2009. If not provided through the applicant's special exception application, the applicant should dedicate adequate right-of-way at no cost for the purpose of construction of the interchange and a section of Gloucester Parkway that is also being constructed from Route 28 to Pacific Boulevard as a part of the Route 28/Nokes Boulevard interchange project.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): *The right-of-way for the interchange has already been acquired by VDOT and the applicant no longer owns the area for this right-of-way, and that area is not included in the SPEX area.*

Issue Status: *The Kincora Special Exception has already been approved. However, there is a pending court case between the applicant and VDOT regarding the value of the property acquired by VDOT for the interchange. OTS staff notes that the interchange construction is now complete. Issue adequately addressed.*

Resolution appreciated.

- 5) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)**: *The traffic study assumes a 10% reduction for transit service. The applicant will be responsible for providing transit facilities equal to the 10% anticipated traffic reduction; in other words, the applicant should show how the traffic impact would be reduced on the adjacent roads. In terms of transit, what mitigation measures will this applicant provide to ensure the 10% reduction in trips in the vicinity of the site? Please describe.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): An interim Travel Demand Management program (TDM) will be implemented to reduce the number of vehicle trips. This includes the use of mass transit, ride-sharing and/or other strategies. A 10% TDM reduction on proposed office, hotel and residential trips. Of note, no TDM reduction was applied to the retail trips or baseball stadium. The TDM reduction was also applied to the net trips (excluding external trips). The US census data for the Broad Run District and adjacent districts was used to compile the percentage breakdown. The details of the Census data are presented in the Appendix section. The components of the TDM program, which include Carpooling/Vanpool/Ridesharing, Telework, Shuttle Bus Connections and Flex Work Schedule was assumed to reduce the proposed site traffic by 571 a.m. peak hour, 591 p.m. peak hour, and 152 Saturday peak hour vehicle trips.

Issue Status: OTS requests that the applicant clarify how these reductions have been coordinated with Table 13: Trip Generation (Phase III- 2025) on pages 133-134 of the applicant's revised study. In addition, the applicant's proposed draft proffers (pages 25-28) relating to transit contributions and TDM program, including their perceived effectiveness in reducing single-occupant vehicle trips, will need review and comment by the OTS staff. As of this writing, a decision has not been made as to the validity of the proposed 10% TDM reduction by the applicant. Further review and discussion is needed.

The TDM program for the proposed Rezoning application is based upon the TDM recommendations of the DRAFT version of the CTP and will duplicate the approved TDM program that will be implemented with the Kincora SPEX application. The applicant is willing to meet with OTS staff to discuss this further.

- 6) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009):** The applicant has included trip reductions for internal capture. Please provide appropriate justification/documentation for these reductions. The internal capture reductions should be confirmed with VDOT.

Applicant Response (June 10, 2009): The 5% internal capture reduction was agreed and accepted by VDOT and County staff at the scoping meeting. The Chapter 527 guidelines also stipulate a 15% internal capture reduction for residential with a mix of non-residential components.

Issue Status: The question is, why 15% was applied to other non-residential uses on Table 13, pages 133-134, of the revised traffic study? The Chapter guidelines recommend using the smaller of 15% of residential or non-residential trips generated. Please clarify.

The trip generation in the traffic study has taken into account the smaller of 15% of residential or non-residential trips generated. In this case, the residential trips were smaller than the non-residential trips; hence 15% of the residential trips were deducted from the trips generated by the residential uses and non-residential uses. VDOT has agreed with this methodology. The Chapter 527 submission has been

accepted by VDOT, which upholds the calculations to be accurate and adhering to the Chapter 527 guidelines.

- 7) ***Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)***: *The traffic impact study assumes 25% - 40% as pass-by trip reductions for the proposed development in 2015. No pass-by trip reduction should be proposed for trips on Pacific Boulevard as long as Pacific Boulevard is not connected to Russell Branch. Even if a trip reduction were allowed on Pacific Boulevard, it would not apply to ingress or egress volumes at the site entrances. The assumption of pass-by reduction should be confirmed with VDOT. In a meeting with the applicant dated April 4, 2009, the applicant indicated that the 25% pass-by trip reduction was eliminated during the Phase 1 for the SPEX. The applicant may need to clarify that in the addendum taking in consideration that 25% pass-by reduction is a high reduction number even after the connection of Pacific Boulevard.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): *The 25% pass by reduction was agreed to and accepted by VDOT and County staff at the scoping meeting. The Chapter 527 guidelines also stipulate a 25% pass by reduction for retail uses. Although without the Pacific Boulevard connection to Russell Branch Parkway there will be no regional or existing traffic along the proposed section of Pacific Boulevard, the pass-by trips will be more of 'diverted trips' from Route 28. Hence, no trip reduction was applied to ingress or egress volumes at the site entrances. The total site traffic entering and leaving the entrances includes the pass-by trips.*

Issues Summary: *OTS requests that the applicant clarify why the 25% pass-by reduction is shown in trip generation Table 3, for Phase 1 (year 2011) on pages 43-44 of the applicant's traffic study. Also, the proposed 40% pass-by reduction for drive-thru banks exceeds the 25% allowed under Chapter 527 and has not been documented. Please clarify.*

As mentioned in the previous response, the trip generation reductions were agreed to and accepted by VDOT and County staff at the scoping meeting. The Chapter 527 guidelines, for pass-by reductions, state:

“ Unless otherwise approved by VDOT, the following pass-by trip reductions may be used:

- 1. Shopping Center – 25% of trips generated may be considered pass-by***
- 2. Convenience stores, service stations, fast food restaurants, and similar land uses – 40% of trips generated may be considered pass-by”***

The drive-thru bank, as discussed at the scoping meeting, falls under the similar land uses described in the Chapter 527 guidelines. Hence, a 40% pass-by reduction was applied to the drive-thru bank. As mentioned earlier, the Chapter 527 submission has been accepted by VDOT, which upholds the calculations to be accurate and adhering to the Chapter 527 guidelines.

- 8) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)**: *Given the size of the proposed development, a significant contribution towards regional transit facilities is anticipated. Further discussion with the applicant with respect to the nature of the contribution is necessary.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): *Comment acknowledged. A meeting has been scheduled with County transit staff.*

Issues Status: *This meeting has already occurred and OTS staff has set forth a series of recommendations, which are outlined in comment #19.*

Please review response to Comment # 19.

- 9) **Initial staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)**: *The Loudoun County Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan adopted October 20, 2003 and the CTP adopted on July 23, 2001 include policies for Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities. The Loudoun County Bike and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan calls for the construction of a multi-purpose trail along Pacific Blvd and Gloucester Parkway. The applicant should construct these trails and may be required to dedicate additional ROW in order to do so. In order for VDOT to maintain a trail, the trail must be built within the public right-of-way; otherwise, it is the responsibility of the applicant to maintain the trail. To ensure the safety of bicyclists and motorists all bicycle facilities must be designed according to AASHTO standards. These standards are documented in A Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, AASHTO, 1999, and may be obtained through AASHTO's website www.aashto.org. Per these standards, multi-use trails should be constructed with a 10-foot paved travel-way with 2-foot graded shoulders on both sides of the trail.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): *Comment acknowledged.*

Issues Status: *The applicant has provided for trails in the draft proffer statement. Please clarify that the proposed trails are to be within the public (VDOT) right-of-way. In addition, these trails need to connect with existing trails or be set up to connect with planned future trails. Please clarify.*

The zoning plan and proffers address the location of trails that will be located within the public ROW for Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway. As Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway are constructed by the Applicant across Broad Run, they will be connected to existing trails, or will be constructed with a terminus allowing others to connect where existing trails do not exist at the connection points for Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway.

- 10) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009)**: *The applicant should provide a link level of service and queuing analysis for the proposed typical sections along the frontage of Pacific Boulevard.*

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): Comment acknowledged. The results of the queuing analysis and link LOS analysis for the proposed typical sections along the frontage of Pacific Boulevard for the years 2011, 2015 and 2025 are presented in Tables 1-6 in the response memo. The results are expressed in terms of 50th percentile and 95th percentile queue length (feet).

Issues Status: The issue has been adequately addressed.

Resolution appreciated.

- 11) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009):** The site plan shows that most of the internal roads are private roads; therefore, they should comply with the Loudoun County Facility Standards Manual. The public roads should be compatible with VDOT standards.

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): Comment acknowledged.

Issue Status: The applicant has noted this in the in the draft proffers. This issue has been adequately addressed.

Resolution appreciated.

- 12) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009):** The applicant should construct sidewalks on both sides of the internal roads. The Owner's Association (OA) will maintain all sidewalks and trails, other than those located on public ROW.

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): Comment acknowledged. Please refer to the revised Special Exception plat.

Issues Status: It is unclear, however, how this is being handled with this rezoning. The draft proffers discuss the HOA responsibilities under the VII. Owners Association paragraph on pages 33-34 which appear to cover private trails and sidewalks. Please clarify.

The proffers commit the HOA to provide maintenance for trails and sidewalks located outside of the Public ROW.

- 13) **Initial Staff Comment (First Referral April 27, 2009):** OTS will provide a review of the draft proffers once we have had a chance to evaluate the revised traffic analysis.

Applicant's Response (June 10, 2009): Comment acknowledged.

***Issue Status:** OTS Staff has reviewed the submitted draft proffers (dated July 23, 2009) and comments are incorporated below.*

Please see response to comments # 16, 17, and 18

NEW TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS:

14) *The applicant's traffic study includes an extensive review of the surrounding road network. It outlines a number of intersections which are operating below LOS D and includes recommendations for improvement in conjunction with each development phase. The issue is, however, that the applicant's draft proffers do not address transportation improvements to the various off-site intersections. The applicant needs to provide these improvements to the various intersections as laid out in the study. The study has specific recommendations (Attachment 15), as well as with each phase, which need to be addressed in the proffers. For example, the study recommends that the Waxpool Road/Pacific Boulevard intersection include signal timing/cycle length adjustments, the addition of additional northbound and southbound left-turn bays and the addition of a 4th eastbound through lane. Yet the draft proffers are silent as to funding or construction of these needed improvements. The applicant needs to develop a phasing plan with specific improvements that address failing intersections and road widening in the general vicinity of the site. In addition, the phasing thresholds in the draft proffers don't match with the phasing with the traffic study. The specific traffic impacts of the phased development in the proposed draft proffers need to be clarified.*

The Applicant through the proposed development proffers has committed to the construction of the following regional roads in the vicinity of the proposed development:

a. Pacific Boulevard:

- **Additional 2-lane section from Severn Way to Nokes Boulevard**
- **4-lane divided section with ten foot wide bicycle trail from Nokes Boulevard to Russell Branch Parkway**
- **Includes construction of the bridge required to cross Broad Run with such 4-lane section and a ten foot wide bicycle trail**
- **Approximate cost associated with construction of the bridge = \$12,000,000**

b. Gloucester Parkway:

- **4-lane section with ten foot wide bicycle trail from the planned terminus of Route 28/Gloucester Parkway interchange to Loudoun County Parkway**
- **Includes construction of the bridge required to cross Broad Run with such 4-lane section and a ten foot wide bicycle trail**
- **Approximate cost associated with construction of the bridge = \$32,000,000**

The roadway links mentioned above are shown on the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and are critical sections/links required in eastern Loudoun in order to provide alternative parallel routes to Waxpool Road, Route 7 and Route 28. The traffic study shows that the additional capacity that will be generated by constructing the Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway links will be used by site generated as well as regional traffic in the area. Figure 1 displays the additional capacity that will be generated by the construction of these roadway links and surplus capacity that will be available, which will be mostly utilized by regional traffic in the area.

As is the case with standard travel demand forecasting and trip distribution models, in areas where roadway links are operating at optimal capacity, construction or addition of parallel links to existing network helps alleviate the traffic from the existing roadway links. In this case, the proposed development will generate traffic that will primarily use the two roadway links (Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard), and will to some extent trickle site traffic on to the existing regional roads such as Route 7, Route 28 and Waxpool Road. However, the additional or surplus capacity that will be generated by constructing the two critical links (Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard) will be far greater than the volume added to the regional roads such as Route 7, Route 28 and Waxpool Road.

In addition, the cost associated with constructing the bridge sections for both the roadway links to cross Broad Run (Pacific Boulevard and Gloucester Parkway) is approximately \$44,000,000 (Design and Construction). Based on the Fair Share calculations presented in the traffic study, approximately 40% of the traffic utilizing the Pacific Boulevard connection and approximately 60% of the traffic utilizing the Gloucester Parkway connection will be regional traffic. To be conservative, even if only the Gloucester Parkway connection is accounted for regional improvement contribution, the regional contribution just based on the construction of Gloucester Parkway equates to approximately $\$32,000,000 * 60\% = \$19,000,000$

Hence, with the construction of regional roadway links as part of the proposed development, the roadway capacity generated exceeds the volume of traffic generated by the proposed development plus regional traffic utilizing these roadway links. Hence, the utilization of the proposed roadway links by regional traffic plus the availability of surplus capacity, more than mitigates or negates the minor off-site impacts from the trips generated by the proposed development.

15) *The applicant's traffic study notes, on page xi, that Route 7 and Route 28 will require widening to 8 lanes in the vicinity of the site. In addition, the study also notes that Waxpool Road and Loudoun County Parkway will require major lane improvements. Please note that there are no public funds to provide these needed future widenings. The applicant's draft transportation proffers do not address these improvements even though the proposed development, even when allowing for all of the proposed reductions as well as the approved portion of Kincora under SPEX 2008-0054, the proposed development will generate approximately 5,200 a.m. peak hour, 6,600 p.m. peak hour and 62,000 daily vehicle trips. The proposed development will heavily impact the proposed road network. The applicant needs to make significant contributions and construction to the surrounding road network including Route 7, Route 28, Waxpool Road and Loudoun County Parkway to offset the site generated traffic impacts. This would also include widening the two-lane segment of Pacific Boulevard between Nokes Boulevard and Severn Way and the two-lane segment of Loudoun County Parkway in the vicinity of the Redskins Park Drive and Gloucester Parkway.*

As presented in the response to comment # 14, the applicant has committed to the construction of two major roadway links identified on the CTP – Pacific Boulevard connection from Severn Way to Russell Branch Parkway and Gloucester Parkway from Route 28/Nokes Boulevard interchange terminus to Loudoun County Parkway. The cost associated with construction of these roadway links and the percentage of fair share site traffic utilizing these links shows that the proposed improvements will provide mitigation measures in excess of that necessary to accommodate the impacts from the proposed development.

The Applicant has committed to the construction or widening of the two lane segment of Pacific Boulevard between Nokes Boulevard and Severn Way. Please refer to the draft proffers dated October 5, 2009.

As mentioned in response to comment # 15, by constructing Pacific Boulevard section from Severn Way to Russell Branch Parkway, a much needed parallel north-south road to Route 28 and Loudoun County Parkway will be in place. This north-south link will serve site generated and regional traffic between Route 7 and Waxpool Road. Hence, by constructing this critical regional roadway link, the applicant has accounted for any other off site impacts from trips generated by the proposed development. The traffic study shows that the widening of the Loudoun County Parkway section in the vicinity of Redskins Park Drive and Gloucester Parkway is required solely due to background/regional traffic and is not attributed to site generated traffic. By constructing Pacific Boulevard as a four-lane roadway parallel to Loudoun County Parkway and Route 28, the applicant has in fact provided another avenue for regional traffic traversing in the north south direction.

16) *In the event the Board of Supervisors does not create a community development authority (CDA), the applicant proposes to provide transportation improvements in accordance with phased development in the draft proffers. The applicant's transportation proffers focus primarily on the internal development of Pacific Boulevard, the extension of Pacific Boulevard north to connect with Russell Branch Parkway and the extension of Gloucester Parkway west from the site to Loudoun County Parkway. The connection of Pacific Boulevard north to Russell Branch Parkway is proposed to come relatively late in the proposed development phasing. The applicant's draft proffers, in III Transportation D 5 on page 21, indicate that Pacific Boulevard will not be connected off-site to the north to Russell Branch Parkway until zoning permits are issued for 1,700,001 square feet of non-residential uses, the 501st hotel room or the 1,069th residential unit. This means that up to 1,700,000 square feet of non-residential, 500 hotel rooms and 1,068 residential units could be constructed on-site without any connection of Pacific Boulevard to the north or Gloucester Parkway to the west. Assuming the townhouse/condo, hotel and office park (and not the higher retail) trip rates for the above land use totals from the applicant's traffic study, this level of proposed development would generate over 31,000 daily vehicle trips and continue to rely on the existing Route 28/Nokes Boulevard interchange as well as the failing Waxpool Road/Pacific Boulevard intersection to the south and other failing intersections in the vicinity. This is not acceptable. It is recommended that the applicant connect Pacific Boulevard north to Russell Branch Parkway with access west to Loudoun County Parkway much earlier in the development process. This is because many of the intersections adjacent to the site are shown in the traffic study to operate at inadequate levels-of-service currently and in the future. It is recommended that the applicant tie the off-site extension of Pacific Boulevard to an earlier development threshold. For example, the Waxpool Road/Pacific Boulevard and Waxpool Road/Loudoun County Parkway intersections are failing now and any additional site traffic will simply exacerbate the delays. At the same time, OTS recognizes that the cost of constructing this improvement will require a certain development threshold. However, OTS recommends a significantly lower maximum development threshold prior to the completion of the Pacific Boulevard connection to Russell Branch Parkway. Further discussion is needed.*

The traffic study shows that the proposed transportation roadway phasing is capable of handling the proposed phased development program. As acknowledged by the reviewer, the cost of constructing the Pacific Boulevard link and bridge connection is approximately \$12,000,000, which will require the stipulated development threshold identified in the proffer conditions. In addition, as noted by the Applicant in the proffer conditions, in the event the Board of Supervisors creates for the Property a community development authority (CDA), the Applicant has committed to construct Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard connections within three (3) years of the date the CDA is created by the Board.

Further discussion is required (Regarding timing of Pacific Blvd. connection).

17) *Similar to Comment 16 above, in the absence of a CDA, the applicant includes phasing in the draft proffers for the proposed connection of Gloucester Parkway from Route 28 to Loudoun County Parkway. It is recommended that this connection occur much earlier in the development phasing than proposed by the applicant. The applicant's draft proffers call for the extension of Gloucester Parkway prior to the issuance of 2,400,001 square feet of non-residential uses. Assuming this proposed development is 100% office park and not the higher retail traffic generators, this would add over 7,700 daily vehicle trips over and above the traffic (approximately 31,000 daily vehicle trips) noted in comment 16. It is recommended that this improvement be in place prior to the completion of the Phase I (year 2011) development. At the same time, OTS recognizes that the cost of constructing Gloucester Parkway between Route 28 and the Loudoun County Parkway will require a certain development threshold. However, OTS recommends a significantly lower maximum development threshold prior to the completion of the Gloucester Parkway to Loudoun County Parkway. Further discussion is needed.*

The traffic study shows that the proposed transportation roadway phasing is capable of handling the proposed phased development program. As acknowledged by the reviewer, the cost of constructing the Gloucester Parkway link and bridge connection is approximately \$32,000,000, which will require the stipulated development threshold identified in the proffer conditions. In addition, as noted by the Applicant in the proffer conditions, in the event the Board of Supervisors creates for the Property a community development authority (CDA), the Applicant has committed to construct Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard connections within three (3) years of the date the CDA is created by the Board.

Further discussion is required (Regarding timing of Gloucester Pkwy. connection)

18) *The applicant's traffic study recommends that the Waxpool Road/Loudoun County Parkway intersection will need to be converted into a grade separated interchange. The applicant's traffic study indicates that over 25% of the site traffic would traverse through this intersection. Therefore, the applicant's draft proffers need to address amelioration including a significant contribution including an interchange study. Please note that this interchange is not included in the current CTP. This potential improvement needs to be discussed as part of the ongoing CTP update for possible inclusion.*

The total site generated traffic at the intersection of Waxpool Road/Loudoun County Parkway for the future conditions is approximately 15%. However, as shown in the traffic study, 10% of the existing traffic travelling southbound on Loudoun County Parkway and turning left to travel eastbound on Waxpool Road was rerouted to use the proposed Gloucester Parkway link. In addition, similarly, trips generated by background developments in the vicinity of Loudoun County Parkway shown in Figure 36 of the Traffic Impact Study, were rerouted to use the proposed

Gloucester Parkway link. The additional volume imposed from the proposed development on Route 7 or Waxpool Road is mitigated by providing additional capacity to accommodate regional /existing traffic that will be diverted from Waxpool Road and Route 7 to utilize the proposed Gloucester Parkway link. Hence, the proposed Gloucester Parkway link provides the much-needed east-west alternative corridor to Waxpool Road and Route 7. By committing to construct this link, and attracting existing + regional traffic along with the site traffic, the applicant indirectly has committed to mitigate the impacts from site generated traffic along Waxpool Road and Route 7.

19) *Transit-related recommendations for this application, including a per unit transit contribution, have been discussed with the OTS transit manager. These include:*

- *Removal of the proposed temporary community parking lot described under draft proffer I. under III Transportation on page 25.*
- *Provision of \$575 per dwelling unit for use in providing transit and please insure that the applicant's proposed TDM program is identical to that approved under the Kincora Village Office/Recreational Complex under SPEX 2008-0054.*
- *Insure that the proposed bus shelters included under draft proffer J. under III Transportation on page 25 are in addition to the approved shelters under the Kincora Village Office/Recreational Complex under SPEX 2008-0054. Also, there needs to be language included in which the applicant will design and locate the proposed bus shelters with approval from the Loudoun County OTS staff.*
- *Under draft proffer L. Employee / Shuttle, it is recommended that this be a general service to serve the site with adequate (20 minutes recommended) headways and not limited to employees only. This would include changing the name to the Kincora Shuttle. Also, the draft proffer for this needs to be revised such that the 1,500,000 square feet threshold would include the square footage already approved under the Kincora Village/Office/Recreational Complex approved under SPEX 2008-0054. This service needs to be privately funded and operated. The phrase in the last sentence of draft proffer I "...provided there are uses located in Land Bays L, N, and Q that generate ridership demand deemed sufficient for such shuttle service." needs to be deleted as it would limit service.*
- *Finally, the proffers need to note that the specifications of this service will need review and approval from OTS.*

The revised proffers dated October 5, 2009 address the specifications of this service.

20) *In the applicant's draft proffers under III Transportation F. Traffic Signalization on page 24, the proposed*

\$160,000 set forth as a cash equivalent for signals is inadequate and is recommended to be \$300,000 in keeping with current cost estimates for the design and construction of a traffic signal. Please note that the conditions approved for the Kincora Village Special Exception (SPEX 2008-0054) condition the applicant to fund all signalization costs without a dollar cap. Also, it is unclear as to the number and location of these signals in the proffers. Please clarify.

The proffers state that signal warrant studies will be conducted at all site entrances providing full access along Pacific Boulevard for each phase. If the studies show that a signal is warranted, the applicant has committed to the installation of these traffic signals. In addition to the site entrances along Pacific Boulevard, the applicant is also committed to provide traffic signal at the intersection of Gloucester Parkway and Pacific Boulevard, if it has not been provided by others and subject to the approval of a traffic signal warrant study to VDOT. The cash equivalent amount has been adjusted in the revised proffers.

21) In the applicant's draft proffers, under III. Transportation C. Construction of Public Roads With A Community Development Authority (CDA) on pages 16-17, input from the County Attorney's Office is recommended. This is a road funding mechanism proposed by the applicant as an option to construct public roads.

Comment noted.

22) The proposed trip distribution percentages need to be better clarified in the immediate vicinity of the site for each of the proposed phases. This will help to clarify the impacts of site traffic in the immediate vicinity of the roads.

The traffic study provides separate graphics showing total site trips and site trips by each land use (office, residential and retail) for each study intersection for each phase. The site trip distribution shown in the graphics is not limited to site entrances, but also all regional intersections in the area identified in the scope. The graphics are attached at the back of this memorandum.

23) The proposed signal timing modifications proposed in the study for the Route 7/City Center Boulevard need to be reviewed in light of the Wells Study for the Dulles Town Center application dated October 1, 2008, and subsequent study dated June 18, 2009, with VDOT. Further discussion is recommended.

Comment noted. The signal timing modifications in the study for the intersection of Route 7/City Center Boulevard were suggested under background conditions. Of note, Dulles Town Center was considered as a background development.