

6.0 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

The Maglev Deployment Program was authorized by Congress in *TEA 21* and represents an effort to evaluate the transportation and other benefits of this new technology. This followed an earlier environmental assessment for a proposed maglev system in the Pittsburgh area.

In July 2000, the FRA distributed the Draft PEIS for the Maglev Deployment Program. The Draft PEIS was circulated for review and comment to government agencies, local organizations, and interested private citizens. Public comments were accepted from July 21 to September 19, 2000. During that time, FRA held seven public meetings, one in each of the potential maglev project areas (Maryland, Georgia, Louisiana, Florida, Pennsylvania, California, and Nevada.) On August 24, 2000, the FRA conducted a public hearing in Washington, D.C.

On January 18, 2001, the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, Rodney E. Slater, announced the selection of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Maglev Projects to be advanced into the next phase of the competition to build and demonstrate the first maglev high-speed train system in revenue service in the United States.

On March 30, 2001, the Acting Deputy Federal Railroad Administrator approved the PEIS and the USEPA published the PEIS notice of availability in the *Federal Register* on May 4, 2001. The ROD issued on June 29, 2001 explains the agency's decision.

6.1 Early Coordination

The Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the *Federal Register* on July 16, 2001 (Vol. 66, No. 139; FR Doc. 01-18112). A public involvement plan for the DEIS process was developed in September 2001. Early coordination built on the public outreach that was conducted as part of previous studies for the project and consisted of determining the details and timeline of a comprehensive public and agency participation plan focused on involving the general public, regulatory and resource agencies, and a wide range of project stakeholders in the process. The ultimate goal of the public and agency involvement efforts was to provide input and aid in the development/refinement of alternative alignments and station locations.

In particular, early efforts focused on identifying stakeholders (i.e., federal, state, and local officials; community leaders; and interested citizens) within communities adjacent to the preliminary alignments. On October 19, 2001, a meeting was conducted to introduce public officials to the project. Public meetings were held shortly thereafter to give the public an opportunity to learn about the scope of the project and the alternatives under consideration. Project outreach efforts during that time also included identifying members for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Interagency Coordination Meetings (ICMs). The project website (www.maglevpa.com) was updated and a project information page on the PAAC website (www.RideGold.com) was created. The public involvement plan also included providing and obtaining information through public access cable television and newsletters and conducting municipal interviews. To be responsive to project developments, the plan was refined during each project phase (Alternatives Development, Refinement, and Final Comparison.)

Table 6.1-1 provides a summary of the original public involvement plan. Although the actual timetable has changed, the project has followed the course set in the plan. More detailed information can be found in the PTSF.

Table 6.1-1 Public Involvement Plan

Project Stages	Alternatives Development						Refinement							Final Comparison						
	Preliminary Alternatives						Detailed Alternatives Analysis							DEIS		FEIS				
Month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Public Involvement Activities																				
Conduct Community Research	■																			
Organize Project Stakeholders/ Committees	■																			
Develop/Refine Public Information Program			■	■			■					■			■					
Public Officials' Briefing		■			■				■					■					■	
Press Conference		■												■					■	
Community Meetings							■							■						
Technical Advisory Committee Meetings		■	■			■			■			■								
Public Meetings		■				■			■											
Special Group Meetings	■																			
Public Hearings															■					
Municipal Information Stations	■																			
Cable Access Programs	■		■				■							■					■	
Newsletters			■			■				■				■		■				
Media Relations	■																			
Project Web Site/ Toll-Free Phone	■																			
Agency Involvement Activities																				
Agency Coordination	■																			
ICMs			■			■			■			■		■		■			■	
FRA Quarterly Meetings		■				■			■			■		■					■	■
FTA Updates		■				■			■			■		■					■	■

6.2 Agency Coordination and Consultation

Three types of coordination and consultation took place during the project: agency scoping, interagency coordination meetings, and TAC meetings.

6.2.1 Agency Scoping

A project agency scoping field view was held for this project in June 2001. During the field view, agency representatives were shown the proposed preliminary alternatives and became acquainted with the study area's natural, socioeconomic, and cultural resources.

6.2.2 Interagency Coordination Meetings

The ICMs were used as the primary communication mechanism for resource agency collaboration, consensus building, and decision-making during each stage of the project. Throughout the development of the project, federal, state, and local agencies were notified of

the project and were encouraged to participate by identifying initial and ongoing concerns. Agency coordination was accomplished through correspondence, special purpose meetings, and three regularly scheduled meetings in addition to one special meeting for the natural resource agencies. Representation included staff from the following agencies:

- U.S. Department of Agriculture (Harrisburg Office)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Pittsburgh District)
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Department of Commerce (Office of the Secretary and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (Philadelphia Office)
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Eastern Office Review)
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Offices)
- U.S. Department of Interior (Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
- U.S. Department of Transportation (Federal Railroad Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration - PA Division, Federal Highway Administration - Eastern Resource Center, Federal Aviation Administration)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Philadelphia Office, EPA Headquarters - Office of Federal Activities: NEPA Compliance Division)
- PA Department of Agriculture (Bureau of Farmland Protection)
- PA Department of Community and Economic Development (Office of Policy - Harrisburg)
- PA Department of Environmental Protection (Harrisburg and Pittsburgh Offices)
- PA Department of Aging (Bureau of Policy, Planning and Research - Harrisburg Office)
- PA Fish and Boat Commission (Harrisburg Office)
- PA Game Commission (Harrisburg Office)
- PA Historical and Museum Commission (Harrisburg Office)
- PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (Office of Policy & Communication - Harrisburg Office)
- PA Department of Transportation (Bureau of Design, Division of Environmental Quality and Engineering Assurance, PENNDOT Districts 11 and 12, and Office of Policy)
- Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission

ICMs were held to update agencies regarding the study progress, garner their input, and address agency questions and concerns. A summary of the purpose of each ICM is provided in Table 6.2.2-1. The detailed minutes can be found in the PTSF.

6.2.3 Technical Advisory Committee Meetings

The TAC represented environmental, transportation, and planning organizations at the federal, regional, and local levels. (See Chapter 2.0 for more details.) The TAC served as a means to provide the project team with technical input, expertise and recommendations, and to represent its committee members' diverse organizations concerning project issues. Five TAC

Table 6.2.2-1 Interagency Coordination Meetings

Meeting Date	Purpose
November 8, 2001	Reviewed methodologies and preliminary alternatives.
February 13, 2002	Provided a progress status report, overview of methodologies, and alternative screening.
March 19, 2002	Special meeting for natural resource agencies to discuss issues specific to their interests.
June 12, 2002	Provided a progress status report and presented alternatives to be included in the DEIS.
July 8 & 9, 2002	Reviewed GIS mapping and field view of alignments and stations.
August 13, 2002	Presented Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative to be defined in the DEIS.
February 25, 2004	Update on project, Programmatic Agreement, Airspace, permitting and mitigation.

meetings were held during the development of the DEIS (Table 6.2.3-1). The detailed minutes of each meeting can be found in the PTSF.

6.3 Public Involvement Plan

During each phase of the project, multiple opportunities were provided for information distribution and exchange with stakeholder groups. These included quarterly meetings with FRA, the TAC and ICMS, municipal meetings, community meetings, public official briefings, and special workshops. In addition to meetings, informational fact sheets, newsletters, and meeting announcements were created, regu-

larly updated, and distributed through federal, state, county, and local government offices and the media. These materials were also provided upon request to members of the public during community meetings.

During public/municipal meetings, attendees were invited to contribute comments, ask questions, and provide written feedback through a comment form.

Local community cable access television was utilized to air interviews with project team members. Regular press releases were distributed to clarify issues and concerns.

A toll-free telephone number was provided as a means for the public to have their questions or concerns about the project addressed. A contact log was maintained to track public requests and feedback received through the postal service, e-mail, and the toll-free number.

A contact database, utilized for project mailings to the public, was updated regularly. It included contact information for individuals who attended public meetings, those who received Notice of Intent to Enter letters for the environmental studies, and any individual who contacted the project team for information.

Table 6.2.3-1 TAC Meetings

Meeting Date	Meeting Topics
October 11, 2001	Project Overview and History EIS Background Project Schedule Overview of Study Alignments Draft Purpose and Need Draft Alternative Refinement Process and Screening Criteria
November 7, 2001	Summary of Public Comments Review and Application of Recommended Criteria on Alignments
February 7, 2002	Review of Public Meetings Review of Alignment Modifications Preliminary Alignment Impacts Schedule Review
May 9, 2002	Review of Stations Refinement of Alignments Further Identification of Impacts Review of Public Involvement
August 9, 2002	Pre-Draft EIS Summary of Agency Comments Review of Alignments/Impact of Alignments Identification of an Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative Public Meeting & Public Hearing Schedule Schedule Review

6.3.1 Public, Municipal, Community, and Special Group Meetings

Five rounds of public meetings were held. Public meetings and municipal briefings were held in areas evenly distributed throughout the project area. Local municipal officials were also invited to attend a project briefing before each public meeting. The purpose of these meetings paralleled that of each public meeting, with an emphasis on increasing the municipal officials’ understanding of the project as it relates to their constituents. These meetings were conducted at the same site as the public meetings, in an open-house format with staffed information stations. A record of each meeting is available in the PTSF.

Public Official Briefings

Prior to each round of public meetings, a public officials briefing was held. Federal, state, and county officials who represented stakeholders throughout the entire region were invited to attend the briefings. The first briefing, on October 19, 2001, provided a basic overview of the project, while later meetings served to update officials regarding the study’s progress, solicit their input, and share information regarding the interests of their constituents. Table 6.3.1-1 provides the dates, locations, and

Table 6.3.1-1 Public Official Briefings

Meeting Date	Location	Number of Attendees
October 19, 2001	Omni William Penn	42
January 24, 2002	Sheraton Station Square	33
June 14, 2002	David L. Lawrence Convention Center	39
April 21, 2003	Wyndham Hotel	27

number of attendees for each public official briefing.

Round #1 Public Meetings

Approximately 295 people registered at the Round #1 public meetings, which were held in four areas throughout the project area. (See Table 6.3.1-2.) Public meetings included an introductory presentation of the project area, a video, review of the public meeting purpose, a question and answer session with key project team members, and the examination of meeting displays.

Comment forms were distributed at all of the meetings. The public was asked to give their input into various aspects of the project, including alternative alignments, safety issues, natural resources, local historical sites, and other relevant information. Approximately 145 comment forms were returned, many of which identified various concerns about the project. Noise levels and the effect on property values were among the principal concerns noted on the forms, especially in the areas of Penn Township and Monroeville. Most individuals expressed enthusiasm over the technology and hoped that the Pennsylvania High-speed Maglev Project would be selected for deployment.

Round #2 Public Meetings

Approximately 518 people registered at the Round #2 public meetings. The meetings were held in four different areas throughout the project area. (See Table 6.3.1-2.) Members of the public were asked to give their input into various aspects of the project, including whether or

Table 6.3.1-2 Public Meetings/Municipal Briefings

Meeting Date	Location	Project Phase & Meeting Purpose	Number of Attendees	Attendance Each Phase
October 23, 2001	Greensburg	<u>Development – Finalize Visioning</u> • Conducted public and Section 106 cultural resources scoping • Presented Project Needs – explained the project history and alternative locations • Educated and gained input from the public • Worked with the public to identify potential areas of public concerns and logical alternatives for elimination	45	295 Round #1
October 24, 2001	Coraopolis		66	
October 30, 2001	Monroeville		115	
November 1, 2001	Downtown		69	
January 29, 2002	Downtown	<u>Development - Preliminary Alternative Analysis</u> • Conducted public and Section 106 coordination • Explained the project history and refined alternative alignment locations • Focused on the “inter-connectivity” of maglev with current transit systems • Educated and gained input from the public • Worked with the public to identify potential areas of public concerns	92	518 Round #2
January 30, 2002	Monroeville		111	
February 5, 2002	Coraopolis		38	
February 6, 2002	Greensburg		277	
June 18, 2002	Monroeville	<u>Refinement – Detailed Alternatives Analysis</u> • Conducted public and Section 106 coordination • Presented the alternative alignments that have been studied in detail and will be discussed in the DEIS • Presented information regarding potential impacts, such as noise and infrastructure • Educated and gained input from the public on the process and technology	176	708 Round #3
June 20, 2002	Downtown		81	
June 25, 2002	Greensburg		382	
June 27, 2002	Coraopolis		69	
August 21, 2002	Monroeville	<u>Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative</u>	292	292 Round #4
April 21, 2003	Coraopolis	<u>Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative</u>	267	267 Round #5

not they would use maglev, if they believed that any additional screening criteria should be included, if any of the alternative alignments that were put on hold should be reconsidered, and how important they believed the project was to the future of southwestern Pennsylvania. The public’s perception of maglev elicited the following positive themes:

- Improved access for the region;
- Economic development, jobs;
- Image, prestige of region;

- Progress - major step forward;
- Region needs maglev to compete, survive;
- Relieve congestion, traffic;
- Good for the environment/no emissions;
- Attractive for visitors, tourists; and
- Timing - long overdue, need right now.

The following negative themes appeared on comment forms:

- Potential low ridership;
- Too costly to build, expensive to ride;
- Impractical, unnecessary;
- Won't serve everyday commuters; and
- Environmental impacts, including scenic views.

The comment form also asked the public how important maglev would be to the region and if they believed any additional screening criteria should be used in reviewing the alignments. The majority of respondents (68 percent) believed that maglev was very important and 70 percent suggested no additional screening criteria be considered in reviewing alignments. Of those who believed that additional screening criteria should be considered, the most frequently mentioned criteria were impacts to personal property and making use of existing corridors (i.e., railroad and highways). Property concerns were greatest in project Sections B and C. Other comments included: fit with existing plans and studies, and connectivity with other transportation routes (i.e., rails, mass transit, and highway). Several participants at the meeting for Section B, especially Penn Hills municipal officials, felt that the connectivity rating for the Thompson Run station should have been higher because of the Mon/Fayette Expressway ramp planned for that area.

Less than one in five (19 percent) of the comment form respondents felt that one or more alternative alignments should be analyzed in more detail. Detailed survey results by alignment section are available in the PTSF.

Round #3 Public Meetings

Approximately 708 people registered at the Round #3 public meetings. (See Table 6.3.1-2.) Each participant was given a twelve-page handbook that provided information including:

- A welcome and introduction to the maglev project with a project map and schedule;
- Refined alternatives and environmental studies, with detailed aerial mapping of the Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative's screening criteria indicating impacts along the alignments;
- An introduction to the maglev technology (with overview and video simulating the ride through Section C); and
- Insight into community interest, with information on right-of-way, noise, costs, and ridership.

At the comment station, members of the public were asked to indicate whether they supported the project, didn't support the project, or felt otherwise. They were also asked to relay any other comments and concerns on comment forms.

Highlights from the comment forms indicated that 381 of the 708 attendees completed the form with:

- More than half (53 percent) of the comment forms being received from the June 25 Public Meeting.
- Most (63 percent) of the comment forms being completed by residents in Section C.

Round #4 Public Meetings

A fourth round of public meetings was held on August 21, 2002 in Monroeville, a central location in the project study area. The primary purpose of the meeting was to present to the public, and seek feedback on, the Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative. Each of the 292 people who registered was given a twelve-page handbook that provided information that included:

- A welcome and introduction to the maglev project with a project map and schedule;
- An overview of 20 alternatives considered during the project (with an overview map);
- The Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative with matrices that detailed each alternative's and station's environmental, cultural, agricultural, Section 4(f), and displacement impacts;
- Public involvement and community interests;
- A project update and timeline; and
- Information regarding upcoming public hearings.

The comment station consisted of two methods for gathering feedback. An electronic polling survey was conducted to solicit attendees' perceptions about the project. A second method was to provide attendees with a form to record any other comments that they had to express.

Round #5 Public Meetings

One public meeting was held on the project on April 21, 2003, to serve as the fifth round of public meetings. This meeting was held in the vicinity of the project's western terminus at the request of local officials in this area. The purpose of the meeting was to present the Environmentally Preferred Build Alternative and answer questions about potential impacts in Section A.

Community Group Meetings

Community group meetings were held following the Round #2 public meetings, using a similar open house format. These meetings were held to assure that individuals who received a Notice of Intent to Enter letter had an opportunity to meet directly with project staff and ask questions. In addition to the information stations, a formal presentation by technical team

members was followed by an opportunity for questions and answers. A project fact sheet was prepared for these meetings. It defined maglev, provided a project schedule, illustrated the environmental clearance process, provided a preliminary alternative alignment refinement map, and offered several technology facts related to maglev.

Over 400 people registered at the community group meetings, which were held in eight areas throughout the project area. As with each public meeting, in order to identify the communities in which the attendees were from and in an effort to gauge concerns by community, the registration sheet specifically asked for zip codes, and the comment form requested neighborhood identification. During these community group meetings, similar support and concerns about the project emerged.

As with the Round #2 public meetings, the majority of respondents (70 percent) suggested no additional screening criteria be considered in reviewing alignments. Of those who believed that additional screening criteria should be considered, the most frequently mentioned criterion was again impacts to personal property.

A list of the community group meeting dates, locations, targeted areas, purposes, and number of attendees is found in Table 6.3.1-3.

Table 6.3.1-3 Community Group Meetings

Meeting Date	Location	Targeted Area	Purpose	Number of Attendees
March 14, 2002	Harrold Middle School	Hempfield Township	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of Preliminary Alternatives Analysis 	100+
March 18, 2002	Wyndham Hotel	Moon/Kennedy/Robinson		27
March 20, 2002	Verona Volunteer Fire Department	Verona/Penn Hills/Oakmont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted public and Section 106 scoping 	39
March 21, 2002	Pittsburgh Cathedral Hall	McKees Rocks/Coraopolis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain project history and refined alternative alignments 	19
April 1, 2002	Community College of Allegheny County - Boyce	Monroeville/Penn Hills/Murrysville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on "inter-connectivity" of maglev with current transit systems Focus on community input 	113
April 4, 2002	Stephen Foster Center	Strip District/Lawrenceville		76
April 8, 2002	Hill House	Hill District/Pittsburgh		23
April 10, 2002	Sheraden Senior Center	Esplen/Sheraden		20

Special Group Meetings

These meetings were held in response to requests for project information by community or planning organizations. Over 60 special group meetings were held across the study area. Information on each of these meetings is found in Table 6.3.1-4.

Table 6.3.1-4 Special Group Meetings

Meeting Date	Location	Purpose
December 11, 2001	Penn Township	Provided municipal planners and supervisors with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
December 18, 2001	Hempfield Township	Provided municipal planners and supervisors with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
December 18, 2001	Municipality of Murrysville	Provided municipal planners with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
December 19, 2001	Westmoreland County Planning Office	Provided the deputy director of environmental planning and development with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
December 21, 2001	Penn Township	Provided municipal planner with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 9, 2002	Wilkins Township	Provided municipal planners and supervisors with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 9, 2002	Verona Borough	Provided municipal planners and supervisors with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 11, 2002	Moon Township	Provided municipal planners and supervisors with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 15, 2002	Municipality of Penn Hills	Provided municipal planners and supervisors with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 16, 2002	Penn Township	Provided municipal planners with an additional overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 16, 2002	City of Jeannette	Provided municipal planners with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 17, 2002	Manor Borough	Provided municipal planners with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.

Table 6.3.1-4 Special Group Meetings (continued ...)

Meeting Date	Location	Purpose
January 18, 2002	North Huntingdon Township	Provided municipal planners with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 22, 2002	Findlay Township	Provided municipal planners with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 22, 2002	McKees Rocks Borough	Provided municipal officials with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 23, 2002	Plum Borough	Provided municipal officials with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 23, 2002	Kennedy Township	Provided municipal officials with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 24, 2002	City of Pittsburgh Planning Department	Special coordination meeting with the City of Pittsburgh officials.
January 24, 2002	Robinson Township	Provided municipal officials with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
January 31, 2002	City of Pittsburgh Planning Department	Met with City of Pittsburgh planners to discuss the list of questions/topics concerning maglev.
February 22, 2002	City of Pittsburgh Planning Department	Met with the City of Pittsburgh Urban Redevelopment Authority to provide a forum to learn about existing issues in the neighborhoods located within the alternative alignments under study and to identify the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh's initiatives both underway and planned.
February 25, 2002	Borough of Oakmont	Provided municipal officials with an overview of the project and collected information and materials including municipal map, zoning map, emergency services, Census information, comprehensive plan, and other relevant municipal information.
February 25, 2002	City of Pittsburgh Planning Department	Met with the City of Pittsburgh Economic Development Department to obtain information on outreach methods for hard-to-reach populations and meeting techniques for use at upcoming neighborhood meetings.
February 28, 2002	City of Pittsburgh Planning Department	Met with the City of Pittsburgh Urban Redevelopment Authority to provide a forum to learn about existing issues in the neighborhoods located within the alternative alignments under study and to identify the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh's initiatives both underway and planned.
March 1, 2002	University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg	Provided an overview of the project to Westmoreland County Smart Growth Partnership and identified initiatives underway.
March 1, 2002	Westmoreland County Courthouse	Provided Westmoreland County Commissioners with an overview of the project and answered questions.
March 6, 2002	Murrysville Council Chambers	Gathered input and answered questions regarding the Maglev project during the Murrysville Council meeting.

Table 6.3.1-4 Special Group Meetings (continued . . .)

Meeting Date	Location	Purpose
March 12, 2002	City/County Building	Updated City Council members, whose districts the alternative alignments currently under study traverse, of the EIS activities to date and informed them of upcoming community meetings within the City of Pittsburgh.
March 13, 2002	Mellon 2, Downtown Pittsburgh	Introduced the station locations and the project to the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
March 13, 2002	Monroeville Mall	Provided an overview of the project, reviewed the Monroeville station with Turnberry Associates, and determined if there were fatal flaws in this location.
March 18, 2002	City Planning Building, City Community Development Corporation	Updated the community-based organizations, whose districts the alternative alignments currently under study traverse, of the EIS activities to date and informed them of upcoming community meetings within the City of Pittsburgh.
April 4, 2002	Westmoreland County Courthouse	Reported back to Westmoreland County Commissioners on Alternative Alignments C5 and C6, which were introduced at the March 1, 2002 special municipal briefing.
April 9, 2002	Allegheny Valley Railroad Offices	Discussed the issues associated with the maglev alignment through the Pittsburgh area and the potential effects on the Allegheny Valley Railroad.
April 26, 2002	Westmoreland County Courthouse	Reported back to Westmoreland County Commissioners on Alternative Alignments C5 and C6, which were introduced in March.
April 30, 2002	Moon Township	Reviewed the modifications to Alternative Alignment A5, particularly in regard to the impact on the Cherrington section, with township supervisors.
May 1, 2002	Greensburg Tribune Review	Reviewed efforts to work with officials in Westmoreland County.
May 14, 2002	Monroeville Municipal Building	Reviewed Section C alternative alignments and answered Monroeville municipal officials' questions regarding the project.
May 21, 2002	Pittsburgh Brewing Company	Provided a project overview and public involvement opportunities for Pittsburgh Urban Magnet Project (PUMP) members.
May 22, 2002	Lawrenceville Community Development	Obtained additional information on the neighborhood's view of the project, gathered information about the community, and discussed specific methods of effectively interacting with the Lawrenceville community.
May 23, 2002	Mt. Washington Presbyterian Church	Provided an overview of the Maglev project to general members' meeting of Southern Pittsburgh Economic Revitalization Team at the request of Charles Peterson (member).
May 28, 2002	Project Offices	Reviewed concerns and modifications regarding Alternative Alignment A5 through the McKees Rocks Industrial Park with McKees Rocks municipal officials and industrial park representatives.
June 7, 2002	PAAC	Updated the Allegheny County Airport Authority regarding the status of the multi-modal corridor major investment study and PA Maglev EIS.
July 16, 2002	Westmoreland County Courthouse	Held an open discussion regarding the alignments in Westmoreland County.
July 24, 2002	Downtown, Regional Enterprise Tower	Updated the Riverlife Task Force regarding the project and answered questions about impact to rivers.
July 31, 2002	Westmoreland County Courthouse	Presented efforts to address Westmoreland County Planners' concerns regarding the Alternative Alignment C6.
August 5, 2002	Monroeville Municipal Building	Requested by Monroeville to review current alignments in the Monroeville area.

Table 6.3.1-4 Special Group Meetings (continued ...)

Meeting Date	Location	Purpose
August 8, 2002	Port Authority of Allegheny County	Requested by R.L. Banks and Penn Township, to respond to questions raised by R.L. Banks and Penn Township regarding the C alignments. These questions were transmitted to the Port Authority in previous correspondence.
September 6, 2002	Airport Chamber of Commerce	Provided an update on Port Authority studies including Airport Multi-modal, Urban Land Institute, Maglev and Visioning.
September 11, 2002	Robinson Township Municipal Building	Provided at the request of the Robinson Township Planning Commission to learn more about the ongoing studies.
September 19, 2002	Port Authority of Allegheny County	Introduced the Pennsylvania High-speed Maglev project to the Allegheny County Transit Council, obtained their feedback, and answered any questions they had.
September 19, 2002	St. Vincent College	Presented an overview to the economic summit.
September 23, 2002	Committee for Accessible Transportation	Introduced the Pennsylvania High-speed Maglev project to the CAT, obtained their feedback, and answered any questions they had.
October 23, 2002	Robinson Township Municipal Building	Provided at the request of the Robinson Township Planning Commission to learn more about the ongoing studies.
November 23, 2002	Phil Marcus Cable-TV Show	Provided information regarding the project.
January 9, 2003	SPC Enterprise Tower	Introduced projects to be included on the Long-Range Transportation Plan.
January 15, 2003	Pittsburgh Geological Society & Association of Engineering Geologists	Provided a summary of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) procedures and results.
January 15, 2003	Air and Waste Management Association and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers.	The intent of the meeting was to introduce the Pennsylvania High-Speed Maglev Project to the joint Annual Meeting of the Air and Waste Management Association and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers. A secondary goal was to share with attendees the significant work effort conducted by GAI Consultants on the pre-planning/ pre-environmental impact statement activities that occurred before the formal EIS process to assist in meeting the 18 month EIS schedule established by the Federal Railroad Administration.
February 20, 2002	Nemacolin Woodlands Resort	The meeting retreat sponsored by SPC gathered area government and transit officials to discuss SPC's forecasts and economic development and a status report on major studies of the long-range plan.
March 3, 2003	Robinson Township Municipal Building	Evaluated and held an open discussion of the alignments in Section A.
April 7, 2003	Robinson Township Municipal Building	Held an open discussion of the alignments in Section A.

Table 6.3.1-4 Special Group Meetings (continued ...)

Meeting Date	Location	Purpose
May 8, 2003	Engineers Society of Western Pennsylvania	Presented environmental and socioeconomic concerns/issues.
June 16, 2003	Robinson Township Municipal Building	Reported the results of the April 21, 2003, public meeting and held an open discussion of the alignments in Section A.
October 1, 2003	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Workshop to review engineering and technical considerations for A5-South and A6 Option 2 alignments.

Station Workshops

Workshops were held to focus on the locations of the stations. Meetings were held in each of the four areas with a proposed station location (i.e., Airport, Downtown Pittsburgh, Monroeville, and Greensburg). The purpose of the station workshops was to meet with community leaders and public officials to identify the potential options, benefits, and concerns of the possible station locations. Station working groups consisted of 25-30 representatives from each location representing economic development, planning, transportation, and community organizations. This group of individuals assisted in screening station locations. A total of eight meetings were held. (See Table 6.3.1-5 for the meeting dates, locations, and purposes.)

Table 6.3.1-5 Station Workshops

Meeting Date	Location	Purpose
December 11, 2001	SPC Regional Enterprise Tower	Downtown Station Meeting
December 12, 2001	Pittsburgh International Airport – Terminal A	Airport Station Meeting
December 13, 2001	Monroeville Municipal Building	Monroeville Station Meeting
January 23, 2002	University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg	Greensburg Station Meeting
February 11, 2002	Allegheny County Airport Authority	Airport Station Meeting
February 11, 2002	SPC Regional Enterprise Tower	Downtown Station Meeting
February 21, 2002	Monroeville Municipal Building	Monroeville Station Meeting
April 11, 2002	Monroeville Municipal Building	Monroeville Station Meeting

6.3.2 Other Information Dissemination

Other types of information included newsletters, press releases, cable TV, letters to the editor, a toll-free telephone line, and a project database.

6.3.2.1 Newsletters, Press Releases, Local Cable Access, and Letters to the Editor

Two newsletters were disseminated (Winter 2001 and Spring 2002) for the project. The Winter 2001 edition introduced the project, presented the project schedule, and invited the public to participate in the process. It also illustrated the original alignments. The Spring 2002 newsletter provided a project update, including alignment refinements, Frequently Asked Ques-

tions, a review of maglev benefits to the region, the screening criteria, and a summary of the public’s comments along with an invitation to review maps at selected locations. Meeting guides were sent out upon request. They provided information about the alternatives studied in detail, project schedule, and upcoming public hearing opportunities.

A total of eight press releases were distributed to local and regional newspapers. Two cable video interview shows were produced and aired on Moon Cable and Adelphia Cable. Fliers that advertised the public meetings were placed at local malls, on PAAC and WCTA buses, and distributed at technology shows. Take-One fliers were placed in local libraries, churches, and at local community centers. In preparation for the Round #3 public meetings, posters with tear-offs were distributed to areas frequented by the public, including:

- Robert Morris University - Moon Township Campus
- Ventana Hills - Robinson Township
- Hill House - Hill District
- Focus on Renewal - McKees Rocks
- Lawrenceville Boys and Girls Club
- CCAC Boyce Campus - Monroeville
- Monroeville Giant Eagle
- Westmoreland Mall Shop-N-Save
- Westmoreland County Community College
- University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg
- Greensburg County Courthouse
- Robert Morris University - Downtown Campus
- Station Square - Pittsburgh

Aerial maps were also distributed to affected municipalities throughout the duration of the project.

6.3.2.2 Toll-Free Number and Other Contacts by the Public

A toll-free number, project e-mail, and mailing address served as a means for the public to ask questions and express concerns or support for the project. These will stay operational until the FEIS is prepared and distributed. All contacts, to date, have been recorded in a contact log and assigned to a team member for follow up. A record of staff follow up is recorded on a contact report form and included in the PTSF.

6.3.2.3 Database

The database of contacts was regularly updated and includes over 5,000 unduplicated entries to date. A summary of the distribution of stakeholders for the maglev consolidated database is shown in Table 6.3.2-1. The database has been used to distribute meeting announcements.

Table 6.3.2-1 Stakeholders in Database

Category	No. of Entries	Percent
Libraries	44	1%
Government Agencies	263	5%
Municipal Offices	235	4%
Community Groups	372	7%
Businesses	629	12%
Public Officials	778	14%
General Public	3,067	57%
Total	5,388	100%

6.4 Public Hearing

A public hearing will be scheduled in accordance with federal regulations. During the public hearing and comment period, oral and written testimony will be collected about the project and DEIS. All substantial comments and questions will be addressed in the FEIS.

6.5 Summary of Key Issues to Date

In summary, public concerns revolved around:

- Economic viability;
- EMF impacts;
- Environmental impacts;
- Funding availability and funding allocation;
- Health impacts;
- Intermodal connectivity;
- The alternative selection process;
- Noise impacts;
- Property impacts and right-of-way impacts;
- Validity of ridership estimates;
- Safety impacts, including security and terrorism;
- Traffic access; and
- Visual impacts.