

Chapter 7.0 Public Outreach and Agency Coordination

From the initiation of Project planning prior to scoping, public and agency involvement has been a key element in planning the Project. This section describes the outreach and coordination activities undertaken by SEPTA and how input from that process has been used to shape the Project and enable decision-making.

7.1 Public Outreach

Public outreach is an essential component of the alternatives development and NEPA process as it establishes and maintains a collaborative decision-making process that engages the public and stakeholders in the development of the Project's purpose and need, the development and evaluation of alternatives and selection of an LPA. The objectives of public outreach are:

- Inform and educate the public and stakeholders about the Project;
- Provide opportunities for meaningful input and dialogue throughout the alternatives development and NEPA processes;
- Understand community values in order to better develop alternatives; and
- Foster productive public relations.



Project public outreach activity.
Source: McCormick Taylor, 2016.

7.1.1 Approach

SEPTA developed a *KOP Rail Public Involvement Plan (PIP)* in 2013 that outlines outreach activities and communication methods to be used throughout the NEPA process. The PIP is appended to SEPTA's 2014 *KOP Rail Draft Scoping Meeting Technical Memorandum*, which is available on the Project website, www.kingofprussiarail.com. As the alternatives development and evaluation process advanced, SEPTA enhanced outreach activities when appropriate in response to communication needs and decision-making milestones.

7.1.2 Public Outreach Communication Methods

SEPTA applied traditional as well as non-traditional methods in public outreach activities. Since the Notice of Intent, SEPTA has maintained a mailing list of people interested in the Project, with an open invitation to be included on the mailing list. SEPTA uses multiple means of communication to share project information with the public and obtain public input:

- **Project Website** - A stand-alone Project website communicates Project activities and enables users to receive timely information regarding Project activities. The website –

www.kingofprussiarail.com – is based on four key Project themes: Connectivity, Development, Access and Efficiency. Major content categories include a description of the Project background, alternatives analysis, environmental studies, public involvement, news and information, market analysis, links and other resources, and contact information. Project themes and online content are supported by graphics, tables and figures, as well as interactive links to advance the level of public involvement. Printed materials are also posted in electronic format for download. For example, SEPTA maintains “virtual meeting” capability by uploading materials from public meetings on the Project website.

- **Hardcopy Mail** – SEPTA mailed newsletters and meeting notifications to each Project study area address.
- **Email** – SEPTA responds to questions posed to the info@kingofprussiarail.com address. SEPTA also uses email to provide project updates, meeting announcements and other Project communications.
- **Flyers** – SEPTA put Project meeting notification flyers on its transit vehicles and at stations.
- **Third Party** – SEPTA coordinates with Upper Merion Township regarding posting Project meeting notices at the Township Hall and in their weekly e-newsletter. Additionally, SEPTA coordinates with the KOP-BID and major King of Prussia office buildings to post and/or email meeting announcements to tenants. SEPTA also coordinates with the KOP-BID to post meeting announcements on shuttle buses. SEPTA coordinates with GVFTMA to gain contacts of organizations (e.g., chambers of commerce) that would be willing to email meeting announcements to contact lists.
- **Social Media** - SEPTA’s Project-specific Facebook page (#KOPRail) for the public to obtain information about the Project. News alerts and meeting announcements are pushed to social media followers on a Project-specific Twitter account: www.twitter.com/KOPRail. Additionally, the hashtag #KOPRail has been used to connect people who are talking about the Project.
- **Newsletters** - In addition to online Project news and information, the public can sign up to receive Project updates through regular newsletter releases at key Project milestones. E-blasts are sent to those who request to be added to the Project database. Copies of newsletters are also provided to key stakeholders to distribute.
- **Press Releases** - SEPTA uses press releases at key milestones to alert the public of important Project decisions. Local and regional newspapers used include *Norristown Times Herald*, *Main Line Times*, *King of Prussia Courier*, *Delaware County Times* and the *Philadelphia Inquirer*.
- **Meetings and Information Sessions** – As described in Sections 7.1.3 and 7.2, SEPTA provides direct engagement with agencies, stakeholders and the public, enabling information about the Project to be shared and comments and questions from attendees

to be received. SEPTA selects venues in and near the transportation study area that provide access for persons with disabilities and are accessible by bus routes that serve the transportation study area, by bus or rail transit in Norristown, or by provision of a SEPTA shuttle during meeting times.

In its public communications, SEPTA has accommodated limited English-proficient individuals in several ways. Meeting announcements are posted in English and in Spanish, and language translators are offered, if requested, at public meetings. Included in meeting announcements is the following paragraph: "SEPTA is committed to compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements of applicable civil rights statutes, executive orders, regulations and policies. The meeting locations are accessible to persons with disabilities. With advance notification, accommodations may be provided for those with special needs related to language, sight, or hearing. If you have a request for a special need, or desire additional information, please contact planning team representative Emily Watts at McCormick Taylor, Inc., 2001 Market Street, 10th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19103, or call (215) 592-4200." At the scoping meetings, for example, a sign language interpreter was present. The website also has a multi-lingual web tool.

SEPTA monitored the effectiveness of its activities and adjusted the methods to increase public participation. For example, SEPTA expanded its public notification approach to include not only property owners but also residents in multi-family units. By supplementing traditional techniques, SEPTA was able to notify and achieve involvement from more residents and other members of the public, including current transit riders.

7.1.3 Summary of Public Outreach Activities

Public outreach activities to date have included pre-scoping, scoping, stakeholder committees, meetings with jurisdictional owners, elected officials briefings, and meetings and workshops with residents. These activities and the entities involved are described in the following subsections. A public outreach log, provided in Appendix D, summarizes the details of SEPTA's activities to engage the public.

7.1.3.1 Pre-scoping and Scoping

Prior to initiating the NEPA process, SEPTA undertook pre-scoping activities that consisted of technical work to support scoping. Technical work activities included developing a three-tiered alternatives screening and evaluation process, as well as applying the first (Tier 1) screening step to evaluate a long list of alternatives. Details regarding the screening process are provided in Chapter 2.

NEPA scoping was initiated with publication of the NOI on June 27, 2013 and continued through the tiered alternatives screening process described in Chapter 2. Public and agency scoping meetings were held on July 16, 2013. The scoping process is documented in the 2014 *Draft Scoping Meeting Technical Memorandum* for the Project. Scoping is required under NEPA regulations and guidelines. It is an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying significant issues related to a proposed action. Scoping offers the opportunity for the public and government agencies to review information on the Project and provide comments with the intent of establishing the scope and content of the DEIS.

SEPTA received 79 comments from commenters (public and agency) during the 45-day scoping comment period. Of these comments, more than one-third of them were about Purpose and Need (34%) followed closely by Alternatives at 30%. Affected Environment generated 10% of comments, Study Area 8%, Costs and Funding 6%, and Public and Agency Involvement represented 4% of the total. Outside of Scope comments were 8%. Project-related themes heard included:

- Support and non-support of increased transit services to King of Prussia/Valley Forge area;
- Minimize transfers;
- Support and non-support for Regional Rail extensions;
- Visual and habitat impacts along PECO ROW;
- Effect on water supply;
- Property impacts/proximity to residences; and
- Cost/tax effect.

7.1.3.2 Steering Committee

The Project's Steering Committee (SC) offers guidance and direction regarding overall Project activities, including the direction of the public involvement program. The SC comprises representatives from SEPTA, the Montgomery County Planning Commission, the Delaware County Planning Department, the Greater Valley Forge TMA (GVFTMA), Upper Merion Township and the DVRPC. The SC provided input at nine meetings with SEPTA during alternatives development and evaluation, including the following key themes:

- Importance of serving key destinations and businesses
- Importance of rail transit service to recently rezoned mixed-use area
- Number and locations of stations and park-and-ride facilities
- Elevated versus at-grade guideway
- Importance of US Route 202 as Upper Merion Township's "Main Street"
- Sensitivity of Upper Merion and public to construction and traffic disruptions along US Route 202
- Coordination with jurisdictional owners
- Role of the Project in supporting Upper Merion's economic development planning
- The Project role in County planning
- Safety
- Ridership modeling
- Screening process methodology
- Cost

7.1.3.3 Technical Advisory Committee

The Project's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) serves as both a sounding board and resource for the Project, providing an informed review of technical analyses, design guidance

and operational strategies. Primary membership includes representatives from FTA, SEPTA, PennDOT District 6, PECO, the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, Montgomery County Planning Commission, Delaware County Planning Department, Norfolk Southern, FHWA, DVRPC and Upper Merion Township. The committee provided input at five meetings with SEPTA during alternatives development and evaluation, including the following key themes:

- Integration of the Project and 1st Avenue Road Diet project
- Number and locations of stations and park-and-ride facilities
- Alternative alignment routes
- Consideration of noise and visual impacts
- Approach to neighborhood coordination
- Effect of mixed use rezoning on residential population
- Connection to Valley Forge National Historical Park (VFNHP)
- Future plans of jurisdictional owners
- Screening methodology

7.1.3.4 Stakeholder Advisory Committee

The Project's Stakeholder Advisory Committee provides a forum to communicate and discuss local issues and ideas important to the development of the DEIS. Primary membership includes major property owners and employers in the study area, including Simon Properties (owner of the King of Prussia Mall), Chambers of Commerce, KOP-BID, VFNHP, Montgomery County Planning Commission and the Delaware County Planning Department. The committee provided input at six meetings with SEPTA during alternatives development and evaluation, including the following key themes:

- Need for sufficient parking for park-and-ride access at terminal stations
- Travel times should be as quick as possible
- Preference for alternatives that go behind the Mall
- Number and locations of stations and park-and-ride facilities
- Alignment routes
- Guideway structure dimensions
- Property impacts
- Access to other destinations such as the Towers
- Costs of alternatives and funding
- Public impacts

7.1.3.5 Core Stakeholder Group

A core group of stakeholders regularly meet with SEPTA at decision points and milestones. Attendees at these meetings include the KOP-BID, GVFTMA, Upper Merion Township and Montgomery County, the entities that lead the land use and transportation planning decision-making process in the transportation study area. The Core Stakeholders provided input at

several meetings with SEPTA regarding the Tier 2 screening matrix during its development and application and the evaluation SEPTA conducted.

Key themes provided by the group include:

- Cost
- Ability of the alternatives to serve commercial and office areas
- Importance of providing access to jobs, large employer access
- Alignment behind the Mall preserves Mall visibility
- Screening should consider visual impacts, temporary access impacts and support for TOD
- Serve areas with redevelopment/development potential
- Ease of adopting new transit supportive zoning
- Tourism access
- Bicycle/pedestrian access
- Visual impacts
- Need for broad acceptance by key stakeholders/political leaders
- Need for County support
- Resident needs and concerns
- Construction impacts, including traffic and property access
- Potential for future extension
- Number and locations of stations

In addition, as described in Section 8.3.2, SEPTA met with the Core Stakeholders group to help SEPTA identify a recommended LPA for the DEIS. In a series of two work sessions on August 18, 2015 and September 16, 2015, the group considered the preliminary technical analysis results for the Action Alternatives (Table 8-4.1), public and stakeholder input regarding the potential benefits and impacts of the alternatives, and the factors the Core Stakeholders group identified as most important to decision-making.

7.1.3.6 Community Working Group

SEPTA also established a Community Working Group (CWG), an advisory body made up of representatives of the various Project study area neighborhoods and residential areas as well as members from Upper Merion Township Planning Commission. Upper Merion Township Supervisors are aware of the meetings and are encouraged to attend as their schedules allow in an ex officio fashion. Currently there are 10 resident members and two members from Upper Merion Township's Planning Commission. The purpose of the CWG is to work with SEPTA during the EIS process and as the Project advances to communicate and resolve issues related to the Project. Focused meetings with the CWG include SEPTA updates of Project progress, in depth discussion of issues and concerns, and consideration of minimization and mitigation strategies.

Some of the issues the CWG is focused on include visual impacts and property impacts. To date, CWG meeting topics have included the federal DEIS process, ridership data and modeling, safety and crime. SEPTA asks guest speakers to attend and present information in topics in which they are experts. For example, Chris Puchalsky, Ph. D., formerly from DVRPC, presented information on ridership data and modeling. Upper Merion Township's Chief of Police, Thomas Nolan and Captain Charles Lawson from SEPTA's Transit Police presented on crime and safety. The CWG will continue to meet to discuss topics suggested by the members.

7.1.3.7 Public Meetings and Workshops

SEPTA has hosted meetings and workshops with the public at key milestones during the alternatives development and evaluation process. The purposes of these meetings were to convey information about the Project to the public and seek public input. For persons not able to attend public meetings, SEPTA uploads meeting materials to the Project website in the form of "virtual meetings." In addition, videos of public meetings are made available on Upper Merion's public access channel (UMGA-TV) and at <https://www.youtube.com/user/KOPRail>. The input SEPTA received from the public has been factored into alternatives development and decision-making.

Project public outreach activity, 2016.
Source: McCormick Taylor, 2016.



Additionally, SEPTA hosted less formal public information sessions at stations along the current NHSL and at other key locations. The goal of these public information sessions is to offer the public an additional opportunity to learn about the Project and provide input.

Table 7-1.1 summarizes the public meetings, workshops and information sessions for the Project to date, including locations, meeting objectives, key comment themes, and actions SEPTA has taken as a result of the input it received. SEPTA has made a conscientious effort to hold meetings at locations within the Project study area as well as at locations currently connected to the NHSL, such as in Norristown and Upper Darby. SEPTA has actively considered the public input it has received. For example, in response to on-going public concerns about the potential visual effect of the Project in the study area, SEPTA focused on conceptually designing the facility with minimum required dimensions, such as single-column supports. It has also shown examples of what the structure might look like using a number of visualization tools, including photos of similar projects as well as still and animated visualizations. Another example of an action SEPTA took in response to public input was

examining the potential for at-grade alternatives, described in Chapter 2. As a third example, SEPTA is examining the potential to shift a portion of the recommended LPA alignment to the north side of the PA Turnpike (PA Turnpike North/South Option) in response to Valley Forge Homes residents' concerns about potential Project-related impacts on their neighborhood and properties.

SEPTA has also hosted meetings with specific groups within the King of Prussia/Valley Forge area to understand local concerns with regard to the Project. Table 7-1.2 lists these meetings with other interested parties and SEPTA's actions in response to specific concerns.

Table 7-1.1: Summary of Public Meetings and Workshops

Public Meetings and Workshops			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date & Location	Types	Objective		
<p>Week of 1/29/2013</p> <p>(actual meetings 1/29 at Valley Forge National Historical Park, 1/30 at Villanova University, 1/31 at Montgomery County Planning Commission)</p>	Public (pre-scoping)	Project introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit solution to congestion needed • Visual impacts • Noise and vibration impacts • Multi-modal access and connections • Various alignment routes suggested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPTA examined suggested alignment routes considering purpose and need during Tier 1 screening (Section 2.1.2) • Potential transportation, visual, noise and vibration impacts of the Action Alternatives are assessed in the DEIS (Chapters 3 and 4)
7/16/2013 at the Radisson Hotel – Valley Forge	Scoping meeting	Formal scoping for EIS; long list of alternatives; Tier 1 screening process and results presented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urbanizing effect • Visual impacts • Noise and vibration impacts • Shadows from elevated structures • Traffic impacts including construction • Multi-modal access and connections • Benefits for impacted residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential changes to land use patterns, size of elevated structure, multi-modal access and connections and benefits of the Action Alternatives are assessed in the DEIS (Chapters 3 and 4) • SEPTA evaluated potential for at-grade segments during screening (Section 2.1.3)
1/30/2014 at the Radisson Hotel – Valley Forge	Public; elected officials briefing	At-grade alternatives introduced; scoping comments summary; examples of existing elevated and at-grade rail operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment routes suggested • Property impacts • Importance of Mall and 1st Avenue Stations • Importance of serving VFNHP • Need for multi-modal station access/parking • Visual impacts • Safety • Project cost and funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPTA retained initially feasible at-grade segments in Action Alternatives (Section 2.1.3) • DVRPC’s ridership analysis focused on King of Prussia Mall and 1st Avenue areas (Section 3.1.3.2) • Each DEIS Action Alternative would serve VFNHP (Section 3.1.3.2) • SEPTA’s station concepts address multi-modal access; park-and-ride facilities address parking (Section 2.3)

Public Meetings and Workshops			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date & Location	Types	Objective		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for property impacts and visual impacts assessed in DEIS (Sections 4.5 and 4.8); DEIS also assesses safety (Section 3.6) and reports preliminary project costs and potential funding sources (Section 8.6.2)
<p>Week of 11/17/2014 (actual meetings 11/17 at the Radisson Hotel – Valley Forge, 11/19 at Norristown Municipal Building; 11/21 for Mall tenants/employees in King of Prussia Mall's Community Room)</p>	<p>Public; Mall tenant/employee; elected officials briefing</p>	<p>Tier 2 Screening; Retained Alternatives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily support Project • Need to serve key destinations • Need for multi-modal station access/parking • Visual impacts • Property impacts along PECO-1st Ave. • Funding sources • Sinkhole conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Action Alternative would serve key destinations (Section 3.1.3.2) • Potential for property impacts, visual impacts and sinkhole conditions assessed in DEIS (Sections 4.5, 4.8 and 4.11); DEIS also identifies potential funding sources (Section 8.6.2) • Proposed park-and-ride facilities address parking (Section 2.3)
<p>3/16/2015 at the Radisson Hotel – Valley Forge and 3/25/2015 at the DoubleTree Hotel Valley Forge</p>	<p>Public meetings and workshops; elected officials briefing</p>	<p>Tier 2 screening results; five Build Alternatives for Tier 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignments behind the King of Prussia Mall preferred • Parking at western terminus station a good idea • Visual and noise impacts • Need for multi-modal station access/parking • No benefits for impacted residents • Economic and property value effects • High construction and visual impacts of alternatives using US Route 202 • High residential impacts of PECO-1st Ave. • Alternatives using 1st Avenue complement the planned Road Diet project • Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Alternatives aligned behind the King of Prussia Mall assessed in the DEIS (Section 2.2) • Proposed Convention Center park-and-ride facility retained for each Action Alternative (Section 2.3) • SEPTA's station concepts address multi-modal access (Section 2.3) • Potential for safety, economic, property value, visual, noise, and construction impacts are assessed in DEIS (Chapters 3 and 4)

Public Meetings and Workshops			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date & Location	Types	Objective		
Week of 3/7/2016 (actual meetings 3/7 at the Radisson Hotel – Valley Forge, 3/9 at Norristown Municipal Building, 3/15 at the DoubleTree Hotel Valley Forge)	Public meetings; elected officials briefing;	Tier 3 screening; recommended LPA; LPA in DEIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual and noise impacts • Project cost and funding • Economic effects • Safety • Parking and multi-modal access to stations • Property impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Turnpike North/South Option is assessed in the DEIS to reduce potential visual, noise, economic and property impacts (Section 2.2) • A PA Turnpike At-Grade South Side Option was considered during screening but eliminated due to potentially complex construction and maintenance issues (Section 4.8.3.2) • Potential for safety, economic, property, visual, and noise impacts are assessed in the DEIS (Sections 3.6, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8, and 4.10) • SEPTA's station concepts address multi-modal access (Section 2.3)
Week of 3/7/2016 Public information sessions (actual meetings 3/10 at Dilworth Park in Center City Philadelphia and King of Prussia Mall Transportation Center, 3/12 at King of Prussia Mall at the Court and King of Prussia Mall the Plaza, 3/17 at 69th Street Transportation Center and Norristown Transportation Center)	Public information sessions	Tier 3 screening; recommended LPA; LPA in DEIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual and noise impacts • Project cost and funding • Economic effects • Safety • Parking and multi-modal access to stations • Property impacts • Need for current transit users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Turnpike North/South Option is assessed in the DEIS to reduce potential visual, noise, economic and property impacts (Section 2.2) • Potential for safety, economic, property, visual, and noise impacts are assessed in the DEIS (Sections 3.6, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8, and 4.10); Project cost and funding addressed in DEIS (Section 8.6.2) • SEPTA's station concepts address multi-modal access; proposed park-and-ride facilities address parking (Section 2.3)

Table 7-1.2: Summary of Other Interested Parties Meetings

Interested Parties Meetings			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
Week of 12/10/2012 (actual meetings 12/10, 12/12, 12/14)	Stakeholder Interviews	To develop clear understandings of local issues, concerns, goals and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The King of Prussia area: has great auto access but is auto dependent; experiences cut-through traffic in residential areas off US Route 202; suffers from unpredictable bus travel times due to traffic; needs improved access to the region’s talent pool; lacks an identity •The Project is viewed positively by improving mobility options •During planning, the Project should provide pedestrian amenities at and around stations; be designed so as to reduce curves to increase rail travel speed; not create conflicts with vehicle traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reliability and access included in Project purpose and need (Chapter 1) •Station concepts include pedestrian access elements (Section 2.3) •Elevated guideway in each Action Alternative eliminates most potential Project impacts on traffic (Section 3.2.3.2)
10/29/2014	Local business outreach	To inform the business community (owners, managers and employees) about the Project and to collect feedback.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A rail line in King of Prussia would be beneficial to the area •Parking concerns •Supportive of the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Park-and-ride facilities are included in DEIS Action Alternatives (Section 2.3)
3/14/2016	Valley Forge Homes’ residents	Listen to concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Residents’ concerned they are not being heard during the outreach process •Effect on residents’ homes and surrounding area •No residential benefits •Concerns regarding the Project decision-making process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SEPTA established regular neighborhood meetings with Valley Forge Homes and Brandywine Village (Section 7.1.3.7) •SEPTA established Community Working Group to engage Project-wide residents (Section 7.1.3.6) •PA Turnpike North/South Option is assessed in the DEIS to reduce residential impacts (Section 2.2 and Chapter 4) •DEIS explains Project decision-making process and public role (Chapters 7 and 8)

Interested Parties Meetings			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
5/12 and 5/14/2016	Valley Forge Homes backyard visits	Listen to concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual, privacy impacts • Noise and vibration impacts • Property impacts • Drainage • Sinkholes • Property value effects • No benefits for impacted residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Turnpike North/South Option is assessed in the DEIS to reduce visual, privacy, noise, vibration and property impacts (Chapters 2 and 4) • DEIS assesses potential drainage and sinkhole impacts (Section 4.11) • A PA Turnpike At-Grade South Side Option was considered during screening but eliminated due to potentially complex construction and maintenance issues (Section 4.8.3.2)
6/21/2016	Valley Forge Homes' residents	Present initial concepts for north side of PA Turnpike alignment and lower elevation south side alignment; listen to concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impacts • Project impacts on population and demand on water treatment infrastructure • No benefit for impacted residents; benefits businesses only • Noise impacts, including from alignment on north side of PA Turnpike • Vibration and flooding impacts • Crime not an issue • Use trolley connection in Delaware County • North side of Turnpike alignment preferred • Project would not relieve congestion • Park-and-ride facilities would limit parking conflicts at King of Prussia Mall • Support Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Turnpike North/South Option assessed in DEIS to reduce visual, noise, vibration, and safety impacts (Chapters 2, 3 and 4) • DEIS assesses potential population, drainage, flooding and sinkhole impacts (Sections 4.3 and 4.11; Chapter 6) • A PA Turnpike At-Grade South Side Option was considered during screening but eliminated due to potentially complex construction and maintenance issues (Section 4.8.3.2)

Interested Parties Meetings			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
6/29/2016	Brandywine Village residents	Share updates on Project; listen to concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer bus service and NHSL station improvements • Use existing freight rail and nature trail corridors (Abrams Yard, NS) • Alignment under US Route 202 instead of elevated • Potable water impacts • No benefits for impacted residents • Noise, vibration, crime, property value and tax impacts • Property acquisitions • Sinkholes and drainage impacts • Emergency services impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS documents other potential alignments considered (Section 2.1) • DEIS assesses potential for safety, property value, economic, noise, vibration and water resources impacts (Sections 3.6, 4.3, 4.10 and 4.11); DEIS assesses sinkholes and potential drainage and emergency services impacts (Sections 4.11 and 3.6)
10/4 and 10/11/2016	Valley Forge Homes and Brandywine Village residents	Share updates on Project; present renderings of the recommended LPA, PA Turnpike North/South Option, and at-grade option; listen to concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about impacts to the 9/11 Memorial • Increased need for public safety services • Easements and taking of resident property • Disruption to a stable neighborhood during construction with heavy equipment and contractor vehicles • Vibration impacts • Increase in crime • Impact of additional traffic to casino • Noise and lights during construction • Visual impacts • Several residents felt the PA Turnpike North/South elevated Option is the best option • Concerns about traveling through 69th Street Transportation Center • Suggested adding a visual barrier on the guideway to offer privacy to residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS includes 9/11 Memorial Avoidance Option (Section 2.2) • DEIS assesses potential for safety, property, construction, vibration, traffic, noise and visual impacts (Chapters 3 and 4) • PA Turnpike North-South Option is assessed in the DEIS (Section 2.2)

Interested Parties Meetings			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
2/16/2017	King of Prussia Volunteer Fire Company and Upper Merion Township Board of Supervisors member Bill Jenaway	Present 9/11 Memorial Avoidance Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company to consider the potential to relocate firehouse and 9/11 Memorial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEIS assesses 9/11 Memorial Avoidance Option (Sections 2.2.8 and 4.8.3.2)

7.1.3.1 Meetings with Jurisdictional Owners

Jurisdictional owners are those transportation, utility and major commercial facility entities in the study area: PECO, PennDOT, the PA Turnpike Commission and Simon Property Group. SEPTA initiated coordination with these jurisdictional owners at the start of the Project and has met periodically with them during the alternatives development and evaluation process. Each jurisdictional owner has specific concerns for the continued operation of their facilities, such as existing and future development planning, mandatory design standards, and safety and access issues which have helped to shape SEPTA's evaluation process and, ultimately, their decision to advance the recommended LPA.

7.2 Agency Coordination

7.2.1 Approach

SEPTA developed a 2013 *KOP Rail Agency Coordination Plan (ACP)* that outlines outreach activities and communication methods to be used throughout the NEPA process. The ACP is appended to SEPTA's 2014 *KOP Rail Draft Scoping Meeting Technical Memorandum*, which is available on the Project website, www.kingofprussiarail.com. The plan specifies communication with relevant agencies on a periodic basis with the goals of awareness and involvement in the alternatives development and decision-making processes. These activities began with scoping and are ongoing. SEPTA developed and manages a master list of participating agencies, described within the following subsections, which it uses throughout the agency coordination process.

7.2.2 Summary of Agency Coordination Activities

7.2.2.1 Cooperating and Participating Agencies

SEPTA invited applicable federal, state, regional and local agencies to be involved in the EIS process by becoming participating agencies, defined as agencies with an interest in the Project. Table 7-2.1 lists the participating agencies for the Project. SEPTA works to keep these entities informed of Project activities and involved in the alternatives development and evaluation process, by means of an agency coordination committee, in addition to the other committees described in Section 4.1.3, and other consultation processes such as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended. Within the list of participating agencies, SEPTA invited several to be cooperating agencies: FHWA, USEPA and USACE. A cooperating agency commits to FTA's NEPA process so that it can use FTA's EIS to meet its NEPA responsibilities. For example, in the case of the Project requiring future environmental permitting by the USACE, that agency considered committing to being a cooperating agency so that it could use FTA's EIS to satisfy its own NEPA requirements. Through SEPTA's coordination with FHWA, USEPA and USACE, each agency determined that they would not act as a cooperating agency at this time, but each reserves the right to accept the invitation in the future, if warranted.

Table 7-2.1: List of Participating Agencies for the Project

Federal Agencies
Federal Highway Administration (potential Cooperating Agency)
Federal Railroad Administration
National Park Service, Northeast Region
Natural Resource Conservation Service
United States Environmental Protection Agency Region III (potential Cooperating Agency)
United States Army Corps of Engineers (potential Cooperating Agency)
United States Fish & Wildlife Service (potential Cooperating Agency)
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Regional Office of Environment
U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance
U.S. Geological Survey, Environmental Affairs Program
State Agencies
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 6
Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission
Pennsylvania Game Commission
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission
County Agencies
Delaware County Planning Department
Montgomery County Department of Economic and Workforce Development
Montgomery County Division of Parks, Trails and Historic Sites
Montgomery County Assets and Infrastructure Department
Montgomery County Planning Commission
Municipal Agencies
Bridgeport Borough
Lower Merion Township
Municipality of Norristown
Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Radnor Township
Tredyffrin Township
Upper Darby Township
Upper Merion Township
Upper Merion Department of Planning and Development
Upper Merion Department of Public Works
Recognized Native American Tribes
The Delaware Tribe
The Delaware Nation
The Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
The Oneida Indian Nation
Stockbridge-Munsee Community of Mohican Indians

7.2.2.2 Scoping

During Project scoping, six agencies provided comments: Montgomery County Planning Commission; Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission; USEPA, Region III; United States Coast Guard, 5th District, Bridge Branch; PHMC and VFNHP. The key themes of these comments, with the responsible entity noted in parentheses, were:

- Support the Project purpose and need (Montgomery County)
- Non-support for alternatives using N. Gulph Road, as there is limited opportunity for intensification of transit supportive land uses (Montgomery County)
- Concern for use of PA Turnpike ROW (PA Turnpike Commission)
- DEIS content guidance (USEPA)
- Project is outside jurisdiction; declined participation (US Coast Guard)
- Section 106 consultation regarding historic resources is advised (PHMC)
- Project would benefit VFNHP (VFNHP)
- Include VFNHP in assessment (VFNHP)
- Consider stop in proximity to VFNHP (VFNHP)

7.2.2.3 Agency Coordination Committee

SEPTA established an Agency Coordination Committee (ACC) whose responsibility is to review technical methodologies used in the DEIS, the alternatives analysis process, and assist in decision-making regarding the Locally Preferred Alternative. Primary membership in the committee includes representatives from FTA, SEPTA, FHWA, PennDOT District 6, Federal Railroad Administration, PHMC, USEPA, PADEP, USACE, US Coast Guard, National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service and VFNHP. Key themes and guidance from coordination with the committee include:

- NEPA procedures
- Planned transportation projects
- Section 106 of the NHPA procedures
- Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice guidance
- Indirect and cumulative effects guidance
- PA regulatory guidance on activities in and near waterways
- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act guidance
- Section 9 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 guidance
- General Bridges Act of 1946 guidance
- US Department of the Interior, National Park Service Management Policies guidance
- Endangered Species Act guidance
- VFNHP access goals

7.2.2.4 Field Tours

SEPTA offered a tour of the study area for any agency interested in such a review. FTA and USACE accepted the invitation and visited the study area on March 3, 2015. The USACE visited the study area again on September 18, 2015, investigating streams and wetlands.

7.2.2.5 Section 106 Consultation

As described in DEIS Section 4.7.1, the NHPA, protects historic and archaeological resources including above-ground (architectural) and below-ground (archaeological) “districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture” greater than fifty years of age and eligible for inclusion in or listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, FTA initiated consultation with the PHMC in March 2013. Through consultation, historic and archaeological resources were identified and the potential effects of the recommended LPA upon these resources were evaluated. FTA and SEPTA are also engaged with other consulting parties, such as Native American tribes, in this evaluation process. Specifically, FTA and SEPTA met with the consulting parties on September 8, 2016 to discuss protected resources in the Project area. Key Project-related themes from the consulting parties are listed below with references to DEIS sections for further information as appropriate:

- Need to assess potential for impacts of Project elements on archaeological sites, including stormwater management facilities, power substations and signal huts (Section 2.6);
- Consult the *Delaware County Archaeological Resource Inventory and Management Plan, Volume I* for information on resources in the County;
- Is Valley Forge National Historical Park a consulting party? (Section 4.7.1);
- Project would not endanger sites of interest to the Delaware Nation (Appendix C);
- No significant cultural resources concerns from the Stockbridge Munsee Community (Appendix C);
- No additional comments regarding cultural resources from Montgomery County (Appendix C).

FTA and SEPTA have considered the consulting parties’ comments in the DEIS and as part of the Section 106 consultation process. Documentation of Section 106 consultation activities including PHMC concurrence on eligibility and potential effects is provided in Appendix C. When an LPA is selected after publication of the DEIS and completion of the public comment period, FTA and SEPTA will complete consultation.

7.2.3 Summary of Key Agency Themes and SEPTA Actions

Table 7-2.2 summarizes the agency correspondence, coordination, meetings and field tours undertaken for the Project to date, including key comment themes, and actions SEPTA has taken as a result of the agency input it received. SEPTA has actively considered the agency input it has received, particularly in regard to comparing the alternatives as to ability to avoid or

minimize impacts, identifying potential strategies to minimize or mitigate negative impacts, assessing future permitability, complying with applicable assessment methodologies, and documenting results. For example, input from the USACE during field tours and ACC meetings informed SEPTA's evaluation of potential Project impacts on wetlands and waterways. This coordination revealed differences in the location and extent of resources compared with available historic mapping.

Table 7-2.2: Summary of Agency Comments and SEPTA Actions

Agency Coordination, Meetings and Field Tours			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
3/27/13	ACC meeting	Purpose and need, Project background, screening process, initial alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •USACE tabled cooperating agency invitation •FTA's LPA does not have to be the USACE's least environmentally damaging yet practicable alternative •PHMC interested in consulting parties list for Section 106 consultation; USACE suggested additional consulting party coordination to meet USACE's Section 106 process •Potential need to document Project compliance with Section 404(b)(1) guidelines in DEIS •Alternatives development and screening process •Composition of ACC •Impacts on NHSL and 69th Street Transportation Center facilities •Cost as a factor in screening 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •USACE retained as participating agency (Section 7.2.2.1) •USACE comment regarding identifying the least environmentally damaging yet practicable alternative, and documenting compliance with Section 404(b)(1) is tabled pending USACE decision to be a cooperating agency; •Consulting parties list provided to and approved by PHMC (Appendix C)
8/14/13	USEPA letter	Scoping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Recommendations regarding studies and analyses to be included in the EIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DEIS responds to recommendation regarding purpose and need (Chapter 1), natural and human environment impacts including air quality (conformity), community, noise, visual, traffic, hazardous materials, environmental justice, indirect and cumulative effects (Chapters 3, 4 and 6), and agency coordination (Chapter 7)
8/14/13	PHMC call	Scoping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Approach to Section 106 consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Section 106 consultation activities respond to PHMC's recommendations to initiate consultation, identify and engage consulting parties, assess eligibility of properties, and assess

Agency Coordination, Meetings and Field Tours			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
				Project effects on historic properties (Section 4.7)
2/21/14	ACC meeting	Scoping summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Need for USACE permits •Desire for USACE field tour •Public input on at-grade versus elevated guideway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •USACE field tour date occurred on 9/18/15 •DEIS Action Alternatives avoid or minimize impacts to waters of the US and wetlands (Section 4.11)
10/20/14	ACC meeting	Preliminary Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Status of environmental justice outreach •At-grade alternatives status •Consider local pedestrian access plan •Pedestrian/bicycle access to VFNHP provided by station near VFCR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Outreach methodology described in documented in Section 7.1; activities described in Section 4.14 and outreach log in Appendix D) •Coordinated with USEPA Environmental Justice Coordinator •Station concepts address pedestrian access in general (Section 2.3) and access to VFNHP (Section 4.6.3.2)
3/5/15	ACC meeting	Build Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No input 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No new action
9/18/15	USACE Field tour	Regulatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •USACE regulates direct impacts to waters of US; shading and tree removal are only regulated if a direct impact also occurs •PADEP regulates impacts to waterways and wetlands •Viewed 7 stream and potential wetlands locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DEIS Action Alternatives avoid or minimize impacts to waters of the US and wetlands (Section 4.11). Reviewed PADEP regulations regarding waterway and wetlands impacts (Section 4.16) •Documented USACE jurisdictional areas for on-going planning (Section 4.11)
12/30/15	PHMC call	Section 106 consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Discussion of approach and schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •On-going consultation
2/2/2016	ACC meeting	recommended LPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In DEIS, acknowledge project's indirect economic effects, role of County and Township in economic development, and partnership of these entities with SEPTA in New Starts planning for the Project •Water resources permitting for Project later in design could warrant evaluation of alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Economic effects are discussed in Section 4.3.3.2 and Chapter 6 •Water resources permitting is discussed in Section 4.16 •Each resource section in the DEIS includes a methodology and results by alternative. Chapter 8 compares the results among the alternatives

Agency Coordination, Meetings and Field Tours			Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
Date	Types	Objective		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DEIS should document resource evaluation methodologies and compare results among alternatives 	
10/25/2016	ACC meeting	March 2016 public meeting outcomes, design options, DEIS publication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Water resources should be avoided; unavoidable impacts should be minimized and/or mitigated to satisfy applicable federal and state regulations •Share Section 106 consultation record with USACE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PA Turnpike North-South Option and 9/11 Memorial Avoidance Option carried into DEIS (Section 2.2) •Elevated structure concept spans waterways to avoid most impacts; potential for small wetland impact to be examined as design is refined after DEIS (Section 4.11) •USACE copied on Section 106 consultation memoranda
3/3/16	PHMC call	Section 106 consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PHMC to concur on area of potential effects •Coordination on properties to be surveyed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PHMC concurred on eligibility and effects determinations (Section 4.7)
9/8/16	Section 106 Consulting Parties meeting	Section 106 consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Assess potential for impacts of Project elements on archaeological sites, including stormwater management facilities, power substations and signal huts; •Consult the <i>Delaware County Archaeological Resource Inventory and Management Plan, Volume I</i> for information on resources in the County; •Is Valley Forge National Historical Park a consulting party; •Project would not endanger sites of interest to the Delaware Nation; •No significant cultural resources concerns from the Stockbridge Munsee Community; •No additional comments regarding cultural resources from Montgomery County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PHMC concurred on effects assessment for archaeology (Section 4.7) •Consulted the <i>Delaware County Archaeological Resource Inventory and Management Plan, Volume I</i> for information on resources in the County (Section 4.7) •Valley Forge National Historical Park is a consulting party (Section 4.7) •Consulting party documentation in DEIS (Appendix C).
12/8/2016	PHMC call	Section 106 consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Additional information required for McCoy quarry property if formal concurrence from the PA SHPO is wanted for DEIS purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •PHMC concurred on eligibility determination for McCoy quarry property (Section 4.7 and Appendix C)

7.3 Role of Input in Recommended LPA Selection

In the NEPA process to date, SEPTA has held over 100 public meetings, including pre-scoping and scoping meetings, public information sessions, public meetings and public workshops, committee meetings (steering, technical advisory, stakeholder advisory, and agency coordination committees), agency coordination meetings, elected officials' briefings, public hearings, community working group meetings, neighborhood meetings and backyard visits. The culmination of this program is a recommended LPA and two design options that reflect the community's input.

SEPTA received over 3,100 comments in this process from stakeholders, agencies and the public. Opinions included support or opposition to all or parts of the Project and the Action Alternatives. Comment themes pertained primarily to the purpose and need, the Action and No Action Alternatives, the potential impacts of the Project on the natural and human environment (particularly in regard to proximity noise and visual impacts, safety, economic development and parking), study area geographical coverage, costs and funding, and public outreach.

As SEPTA considered not only the Tier 3 technical screening results, but also the input received from agencies, stakeholders and the public, the possibility of identifying a recommended LPA became apparent. PECO/TP-1st Ave. was the best performer in terms of avoiding or minimizing impacts while responding to the most agency, stakeholder, and public issues and concerns. DEIS Chapter 8 provides more explanation in this regard.

Prior to making its decision, SEPTA, in coordination with FTA, examined all agency, stakeholder, and public input received up to and including the March 2016 public meeting and questionnaire. The focus of the March 2016 meeting and questionnaire was specifically to obtain public input on the recommended LPA. The March 2016 *Public Meeting Summary* and 2016 *Survey Reports* describe each event and the public input received. Among that input, SEPTA identified and responded to comments specifically related to the selection of the recommended LPA (Appendix D).

Key themes among those comments are summarized in Table 7-3.1. Of the alternatives presented in the DEIS, the recommended LPA has the most support. Other alternatives that would use the US Route 202 corridor or the PECO corridor west of the Turnpike have little public support. Despite these findings, the recommended LPA has opposition, primarily from residents in King of Prussia who live adjacent to or near the proposed alignment in the vicinity of the PA Turnpike. SEPTA acknowledges these concerns and is responding in three initial ways:



Project public outreach activity.
Source: McCormick Taylor, 2016.

- Examining design and alignment refinements to reduce or eliminate impacts;
- Visiting affected residents (backyard visits) to view the Project context and listen to their concerns; and
- Facilitating a Community Working Group to focus on concerns as the Project advances.

SEPTA anticipates that public concerns about the recommended LPA cannot be resolved completely at the current conceptual level of design. For this reason, SEPTA's initial responses and commitments will become active parts of the agency's program for advancing the Project if the recommended LPA is adopted. SEPTA is committed to these activities to improve the fit of the Project in the King of Prussia/Valley Forge area.

Table 7-3.1: Summary of Key Decision-making Comment Themes and SEPTA Actions

2013 to 2016 Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives using US Route 202 would have intolerable construction impacts and would negatively change King of Prussia’s “Main Street” • PECO-1st Ave. would impact the most residents • Alternatives using PECO/TP would impact some residences • Alternatives using 1st Avenue would serve more businesses than Alternatives using N. Gulph Road; using 1st Avenue would better support township economic development planning • Route behind the Mall is preferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The five Action Alternatives are assessed in the DEIS. SEPTA identified the recommended LPA, in part, because of majority public non-support for using US Route 202 or PECO
2016 - Key Comment Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives using PECO/TP would impact residences • PECO-1st Ave. residential property impacts are unacceptable • Support recommended LPA except for need to address residential property impacts • Alternatives using US Route 202 would have the most full residential property acquisitions • A station on US Route 202 would be useful to some residents • Transit along N. Gulph Road is needed to address future congestion on that road • Should use freight alignment along Schuylkill River to avoid impacts and save money • Prefer regional rail expansion • Prefer no action alternative; Project is not needed • Potential residential property impacts and vibration impacts to residential foundations from alternatives using PECO/TP • Residential property construction impact concerns with PECO/TP alternatives; area is prone to sinkholes. • Concerns with privacy • Concerns with noise • Potential for decreased residential property values with PECO/TP alternatives • Impacts to the 9/11 Memorial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPTA is examining ways to reduce or eliminate residential impacts along the PA Turnpike portion of the recommended LPA. It is examining refinements to the proposed alignment height as well as the potential to move the alignment away from residences • SEPTA went on backyard visits with potentially affected residents to hear their concerns and see where they worried about visual impacts (Section 4.1.3.7) • SEPTA also established a community working group to focus on concerns as the Project advances (Section 4.1.3.6) • SEPTA did not select an alternative along PECO ROW west of the Turnpike because of the high number of potential residential impacts SEPTA did not select an alternative along US Route 202 because of non-support from residents and Upper Merion Township (described further in Chapter 8) and because of the high number of full residential property acquisitions • SEPTA considered an alignment along the Schuylkill River during Tier 1 screening; it was determined infeasible to co-align the Project with active freight services; it is also remote from defined key destinations and would require an additional transfer • SEPTA determined that regional rail service and the No Action Alternative would not address the Project purpose and need • SEPTA identified three design options along the recommended LPA: a PA Turnpike North/South Option, an at-grade option along the south side of the PA Turnpike, and a 9/11 Memorial Avoidance Option. Each was presented at a series of neighborhood meetings.

2016 Public Questionnaire – Key Themes	SEPTA Response Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Project supporters (49%) and non-supporters (51%) are fairly evenly divided •Majority of Project supporters (89%) also support the recommended LPA •Majority of Project non-supporters (88%) do not favor recommended LPA; opposition is largely concentrated in the single King of Prussia zip code where direct Project impacts would occur •Key concerns are negative impacts on residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Traffic •Property values •Noise •Visual •Project cost and funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SEPTA acknowledges the ongoing concerns of potentially affected residents in the King of Prussia zip code and continues to work toward reducing or eliminating residential impacts along the PA Turnpike portion of the recommended LPA. The agency is examining refinements to the proposed alignment height as well as the potential to move the alignment away from residences •In the DEIS, SEPTA assessed and reported potential negative impacts of the Project in each key area of concern. This assessment acknowledges that, in its design and public outreach activities, SEPTA will continue examining ways to eliminate or reduce impacts as the Project advances •SEPTA did not select an alternative along US Route 202 because of non-support from residents and Upper Merion Township (described further in Chapter 8)

7.4 Next Steps

As described in the DEIS Abstract, publication of the DEIS is followed by a 45-day public review and comment period. SEPTA, in coordination with FTA, will hold a public hearing on the DEIS during the comment period, which will provide an opportunity to agencies, stakeholders and the public to provide comments on the DEIS. After the public comment period ends and FTA and SEPTA consider the DEIS comments, SEPTA may choose to select a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The LPA will be the subject of a combined FEIS/Record of Decision (ROD); in the FEIS/ROD, will FTA and SEPTA will document and respond to DEIS comments. After completion of the environmental process, SEPTA will consider officially adopting a Project alternative for implementation.

As on-going two-way communication is critical to the success of the Project, SEPTA will continue its program of agency, stakeholder and public coordination described in this chapter as the Project advances.