

Chapter 4: Public and Agency Coordination

This chapter describes the recent public involvement and agency coordination efforts undertaken for the Provo-Orem BRT project. These efforts, primarily conducted since July 2013, have included distribution of outreach materials, city council presentations, stakeholder outreach meetings, and the formation and participation of three stakeholder working groups comprised of members of the public, business owners, and community leaders. This chapter also summarizes the outreach activities that were conducted prior to 2011. A full account of these activities can be found in Chapter 8 of the 2011 EA.

4.1 OUTREACH AND COORDINATION

Scoping

Initially, an Environmental Impact Statement was determined to be the appropriate level of documentation for the Provo-Orem BRT project. Based on this initial determination, a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the *Federal Register* on December 21, 2007. This notice initiated the 45-day scoping period, which included a public scoping meeting on January 24, 2008, attended by 12 non-project individuals; an agency scoping meeting on January 28, 2008, attended by representatives from UTA, UDOT, MAG, Utah SHPO, UDNR – Division of Drinking Water, Orem City, and Provo City; and e-mail and hard copy correspondence with interested individuals, organizations, federal, state, and local agencies, and Native American tribes. Based on preliminary findings, FTA later determined that an EA would be adequate.

During scoping, FTA sent letters inviting federal, state, and local agencies to participate as cooperating or participating agencies. Table 4.1-1 lists these agencies and their responses to the request. Copies of this correspondence are included in Appendix F.

Table 4.1-1: Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Cooperating/ Participating	Agency	Response to Invitation to be a Cooperating/Participating Agency
Cooperating, then became Lead	FHWA	Acceptance letter dated April 16, 2008 (Note: FHWA was later asked to become a joint lead agency; acceptance letter dated May 18, 2009)
Cooperating, then became Lead	UDOT	Acceptance letter dated January 7, 2008 (Note: UDOT was later asked to become a joint lead agency; acceptance e-mail dated December 28, 2009)
Cooperating	MAG	Acceptance letter dated October 6, 2010
Participating	EPA	Acceptance letter dated February 25, 2008
Participating	USACE	Acceptance letter dated March 20, 2008

Table 4.1-1: Cooperating and Participating Agencies (continued)

Cooperating/ Participating	Agency	Response to Invitation to be a Cooperating/Participating Agency
Participating	USFWS	Acceptance letter dated February 29, 2008
Participating	Utah SHPO	Acceptance letter dated January 29, 2008
Participating	UDNR – Division of Water Rights	Acceptance e-mail dated February 4, 2008
Participating	City of Provo	Acceptance e-mail dated February 15, 2008
Participating	City of Orem	Acceptance e-mail dated February 8, 2008
Participating	U.S. Department of Homeland Security – FEMA	Declined in letter dated February 12, 2008
Participating	UDNR – Division of Parks and Recreation	Declined project involvement during a phone conversation on January 22, 2008
Participating	UDNR – Division of Wildlife Resources	No response received

FTA sent scoping letters to Native American tribes and local agencies with an interest in historic resources. These letters invited the tribe/agency to become a consulting party for the project as required under Section 106 of the NHPA. Letters were sent to the following tribes/agencies:

- Orem Historic Preservation Advisory Commission
- Utah Heritage Foundation
- Utah Professional Archaeological Council
- Provo City (Certified Local Government Program)
- Utah County Commission
- Provo City Landmarks Commission
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
- Ute Indian Tribe
- Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah

Additional agency coordination in the form of letters, e-mails, and phone calls occurred with the following agencies to invite them to attend the scoping meeting and provide written comments during the scoping period:

- President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Railroad Administration
- U.S. Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource Conservation Service

- Utah DEQ:
 - DWQ
 - Division of Air Quality
 - Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste
 - Division of Environmental Response and Remediation
 - Division of Drinking Water
- UDNR:
 - Policy Group
 - Division of Water Resources
- Utah Bureau of Land Management
- Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget – Resource Development Coordinating Committee
- Utah Department of Public Safety

Public Outreach after Scoping

Public outreach continued after the scoping period ended in February 2008. A technical committee and policy committee were established to ensure that Provo City, Orem City, BYU, UVU, and individuals representing local businesses and organizations were given the opportunity to meet with the project team to participate in focused collaboration.

In addition, various outreach materials were produced throughout the course of the project to keep target groups informed and to notify them of opportunities to be involved. A stakeholder list of more than 500 contacts was maintained during the course of the project and was used to notify individuals of upcoming project events. The project website (www.provo-oremrapidtransit.info, which has since changed to www.provoorembrrt.com) provided public information, including an overview of the project and details of upcoming events. Various meetings with target groups, such as Provo and Orem city staff, business owners, the general public, UVU, and BYU were held between January 2008 and August 2010.

Stakeholder Working Groups

As the project development efforts—such as conceptual engineering and cost estimating—continued for the Preferred Alternative, stakeholder working groups were developed to provide input on the conceptual design of the project. Three stakeholder working groups were formed based on geographic location along the Preferred Alternative alignment, and included representatives from adjoining neighborhoods, business owners, bicyclist community leaders, and other specific interest groups. Members of the stakeholder working groups were identified based on their proximity to the Preferred Alternative, varied interests, and potential user types. The three stakeholder working groups included:

- **Area 1** – Geographic area around BYU, including east Provo
- **Area 2** – Business district in central Provo
- **Area 3** – Orem business district along University Parkway and UVU

In summer 2013, the Provo City Council recommended that UTA initiate the Area 1 stakeholder working group to address concerns from several members of the Wasatch neighborhood located

east of 900 East in Provo. Several alternatives to the Preferred Alternative alignment for the BYU area had been brought forward by members of the Wasatch neighborhood, other working group members, and the Provo City Council. Eight options were evaluated by the project team, the Provo City Council, and the Area 1 stakeholder working group. Ultimately, the Preferred Alternative was refined to incorporate the feedback received from the Area 1 working group and the Provo City Council (see City Council Meetings discussion below). Details of the stakeholder working group meetings are listed in Table 4.1-2.

Table 4.1-2: Summary of Stakeholder Working Group Meetings

Date	Working Group	Summary
September 4, 2013	Area 1	Introduced the project, purpose of the stakeholder working group, and advisory role of the working group
October 2, 2013	Area 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed new traffic patterns due to BYU road closures and influence on BRT Brainstormed alignment options and design refinements to the Preferred Alternative around BYU
October 16, 2013	Area 1	Discussed the travel demand model, its use, and inputs and outputs for evaluating various alignment options
November 6, 2013	Area 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refined the various alignment options to be evaluated Presented evaluation criteria used to analyze the options
December 11, 2013	Area 1	Evaluated the route options and how each performed based on the established and agreed-upon evaluation criteria
January 8, 2014	Area 1	Distilled the recommendations of alignment options by the working group and determined the pros and cons of each option
January 22, 2014	Area 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduced the project to the working group Discussed estimated costs, aesthetics, construction schedule, potential parking impacts, etc.
February 6, 2014	Area 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduced the project and purpose of the working group Discussed funding, schedule, cost, and general project design
April 15, 2014	Area 2	Discussed the current design, parking, and bicycle lanes
May 28, 2014	Area 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed the parking study and examined maps to show areas where parking would be removed Reviewed the <i>Provo City Bicycle Master Plan</i>

City Council Meetings

In addition to the stakeholder working groups, UTA provided information and updates at two Provo City Council meetings, five Provo City Council work sessions, and one Orem City Council meeting to address the options suggested by the Provo City Council. Tables 4.1-3 and 4.1-4 summarize the information that was presented at each meeting for the Provo and Orem city councils, respectively.

Table 4.1-3: Summary of Provo City Council and Community Leader Meetings

Date	Summary
July 9, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at city council work session • Described the route from the Orem Intermodal Center to the Novell campus • Explained estimated ridership by station • Compared ridership, frequency, and reliability of current bus route to opening day BRT • Compared examples in Eugene, Oregon, and Cleveland, Ohio • Provided renderings and visual simulations of future BRT in Provo • Provided overview of project costs and funding • Presented overview of the project schedule and next steps
September 17, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at city council work session • Presented current alignment • Provided updates on the formation of the stakeholder working groups • Provided an updated schedule • Discussed funding plan assumptions
November 12, 2013	Meeting with Hal Miller (Council – District 3)
November 26, 2013	Meeting with Dave Sewell (Council – City Wide 1)
January 10, 2014	Meeting with Stephen Hales (Council – District 5)
January 21, 2014	Council work session
January 24, 2014	Meeting with Gary Garrett (Council – City Wide 2)
January 28, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed the council of the project timeline, preferred alignment, evaluation criteria, public preference, route comparison, public concerns, and potential resolutions • Summarized risks associated with environmental clearance, federal funding, local funding, and construction associated with Option 4 and Option 6
February 4, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at city council work session and a public hearing held during the general council meeting • Compared the ridership, travel time, and ability to serve markets among Option 4, Option 6, and Option 0 • Compared community and economic development opportunities • Compared left-turn access issues, partial acquisitions, relocations, and utility poles in proposed right-of-way between each option • Reviewed community support and estimated cost for each option • Reviewed environmental clearance, federal funding, local funding, and construction risks associated with Option 4 and Option 6
February 18, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at city council work session • Discussed ranking of Option 4, Option 6, and Option 0 based on project criteria • Determined that Option 4 out-performs the other options considered

Table 4.1-4: Summary of Orem City Council Meeting

Date	Summary
September 9, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented current alignment • Provided updates on the formation of the stakeholder working groups • Provided an updated schedule • Discussed funding plan assumptions

Meetings with Target Groups and Individuals

Table 4.1-5 summarizes project-related meetings that were held with various target groups and individuals as part of the public involvement process.

Table 4.1-5: Target Group and Individual Meetings

Date	Target Group	Details
September 16, 2013	BYU	Discussed traffic modeling in relation to the Campus Drive closure
November 19, 2013	Representatives of LDS Church	Discussed master plan for Missionary Training Center redevelopment
November 2013	Downtown Provo Inc.	Presented information on project background
January 7, 2014	Provo Transportation and Mobility Advisory Committee	Introduced BRT project and presented alternative routes generated by Area 1 stakeholder group
January 14, 2014	Provo Transportation and Mobility Advisory Committee	Discussed comparison of performance and cost of Area 1 alternative routes
January 15, 2014	Provo Mayor John Curtis	Discussed comparison of performance and cost of Area 1 alternative routes
January 24, 2014	Provo Mayor John Curtis	Provided update on alternative route evaluation
January 24, 2014	LDS Missionary Training Center	Discussed station size and location at Missionary Training Center with Missionary Training Center staff and their architecture and traffic team members
March 27, 2014	BYU	Discussed the location and design of the stations on 900 North and near the Missionary Training Center

Website

The project website (<http://www.provoorembtr.com>) has presented public information, including an overview of the project and details of upcoming events over the last few years. The website has been used to inform the public of the decision to develop this EA for modifications to the Preferred Alternative and to inform them of additional alignments being considered (e.g., 900 North and 700 East in Provo).

Public Outreach Events and Materials

A public information booth was provided at the Provo City Council meeting on January 28, 2014. The booth contained a general project information sheet, figures of each option presented to the council, an evaluation criteria summary, and a cost-benefit analysis. In addition, a video of the five-minute bus frequency was shown at the booth. This video helped the community understand how often buses would be passing along 900 East.

UTA held a “BRT Bus Event” on March 18, 2014. The goal of the event was to display the amenities of a BRT bus and allow the community an opportunity to interact with UTA staff. In preparation for the event, an invitation with general project information was created, as well as a project information sheet. Both materials explained the benefits of BRT, provided projections, and displayed a typical section graphic.

Public Notice and Review

In association with making this document available for the public to review, public notices were published in the following newspapers:

- *Salt Lake Tribune*
- *The Daily Herald*
- *Deseret News*

In addition, postcards were mailed to residences and businesses within the study area. The postcard mailing list was compiled from parcel data received from Utah County. These notices announced the availability of this EA and provided information on where to review the EA in-person and electronically and how to submit comments.

The public is being provided with 30 days to review and comment on this document.

4.2 AGENCY COORDINATION

Lead Agencies

Lead agencies identified for the overall multi-modal Provo-Orem BRT project and 2011 EA included UTA, FTA, FHWA, and UDOT. MAG is a cooperating agency. UTA, UDOT, and MAG have continued to coordinate during the course of the project development. FTA and UTA are the lead federal and local agencies for the transit elements of the multi-modal project, including this EA.

Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Table 4.1-1 lists all federal, state, and local agencies that were identified and agreed to be cooperating and participating agencies in association with the 2011 EA pursuant to Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. Each agency will receive an electronic copy of the EA and will have an opportunity for review.

Utah SHPO

Coordination with the Utah SHPO in conducting the Section 106 process has been ongoing since 2010. In association with the development of this EA, additional coordination was conducted to evaluate potential effects to historic resources associated with the Preferred Alternative, including newly identified historic resources along 900 North and 700 East in Provo and previously identified properties along 900 East and 700 North. Copies of written correspondence regarding the APE, as well as the DOE/FOE are included in Appendix F and Appendix E, respectively.

Intergovernmental and Private Agreements

UTA has or will enter into interagency and utility agreements with the government agencies and private entities listed in Table 4.2-1. These agreements will ensure that the project is properly funded and constructed in a manner that will not damage public and private utilities.

Table 4.2-1: Interagency and Utility Agreements

Intergency Agreements
UDOT Project Funding Agreement
UDOT Lease Agreement
Utah County Funding Memorandum of Understanding
Utah County Funding Interlocal Agreement
Provo City Lease Agreement
Orem City Lease Agreement
Utility Agreements
BYU
CenturyLink
Comcast/AT&T
Google
Integra Telecom
Orem City
Provo City
Questar Gas
Rocky Mountain Power
UDOT Region 3
UTOPIA
Veracity Networks
Verizon Business
XO Communication
West Union Canal Company
Lake Bottom Canal Company

4.3 NEXT STEPS

This EA is being made available for public review beginning January 5, 2015, through February 7, 2015. The public comment period closes on February 7, 2015, and all comments must be received or post-marked by that date. The public will have the opportunity to formally comment on the EA through e-mail (provo-oremrapidtransit@hwlochner.com) or through the project website (<http://www.provoorembrrt.com>) for the duration of the comment period. Formal comments may also be mailed to Janelle Robertson, UTA Project Manager, at 669 West 200 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101. During the comment period, a copy of the EA will be available on the project website and at the public locations identified in Table 4.3-1.

Table 4.3-1: Public Review Locations

Facility	Address
UTA FrontLines	669 West 200 South Salt Lake City, UT
UTA Timpanogos Business Unit	1100 South Geneva Road Orem, UT
Orem Public Library	58 North State Street Orem, UT
Provo City Library	550 North University Avenue Provo, UT
Orem City (Engineering)	56 North State Street Orem, UT
Provo City (Engineering)	1377 South 350 East Provo, UT
MAG	585 East 800 North Orem, UT
Lochner	1245 East Brickyard Road, Ste. 400 Salt Lake City, UT
BYU Library	150 East 1230 North Provo, UT
UVU Library	800 West University Parkway Orem, UT

In addition, the federal, state, and local agencies listed in Table 4.3-2 will receive an electronic copy of the EA to review and will have the opportunity to submit comments during the comment period.

Table 4.3-2: Agency Distribution

Agency	Address
FHWA	2520 West 4700 South, Ste. 9A Salt Lake City, UT
UDOT	4501 South 2700 West PO Box 148450 Salt Lake City, UT
MAG	586 East 800 North Orem, UT

Table 4.3-2: Agency Distribution (continued)

Agency	Address
EPA	1595 Wynkoop Street Denver, CO
USACE	533 West 2600 South, Ste. 150 Bountiful, UT
USFWS	2369 West Orton Circle, Ste. 50 West Valley, UT
Utah SHPO	300 Rio Grande Salt Lake City, UT
UDNR – Division of Water Rights	1594 West North Temple, Ste. 220 PO Box 146300 Salt Lake City, UT
City of Provo	351 West Center Street Provo, UT
City of Orem	56 North State Street Orem, UT
U.S. Department of Homeland Security – FEMA	Denver Federal Center Building 710 PO Box 25267 Denver, CO
UDNR – Division of Parks and Recreation	1594 West North Temple, Ste. 116 Salt Lake City, UT
UDNR – Division of Wildlife Resources	1594 West North Temple, Ste. 2110 Salt Lake City, UT