



5.0 Consultation and Coordination

Consultation and Coordination

5.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, INCLUDING SCOPING

The public was notified of the National Park Service planning effort via: (1) a Federal Register notice of intent, dated June 12, 2008, (Volume 73, Number 114, page 33454) to prepare the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*; (2) distribution of the first newsletter for public scoping in June 2008; and (3) a press release announcing a public comment opportunity, including public meetings held during Summer 2008 to comment on the draft management zones and preliminary alternatives.

Newsletter #1 introduced the concepts of general management plans (GMPs) and environmental impact statements (EISs). It outlined the draft planning issues as defined by the planning team and explained the Memorial's purpose, fundamental resources and values, significance, and interpretive themes. It also contained descriptions of five preliminary alternatives that illustrated how the Memorial might look in the future, and how the draft management zones would apply to each preliminary alternative in different regards. Newsletter #1 solicited public input and participation in the refinement of preliminary alternatives through an attached comment form, by invitation to two public open houses, and via web link to the Memorial's General Management Plan website. Providing a basic timeline for the GMP/EIS planning process, this newsletter was posted on the Memorial's General Management Plan website, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on June 19, 2008, and distributed at the public open houses.

A public review and comment on the preliminary alternatives was open from June 18 through July 14, 2008. Public scoping meetings, in an open-house format, were held on June 25 and July 1, 2008, in St. Louis, Missouri. Meetings with the Memorial staff and other National Park Service employees were also held. The primary purpose of the comment period and meetings was to introduce the draft management zones and preliminary alternatives, while gathering suggestions and ideas for their refinement. Approximately 600 people attended the public open houses, and over 700 letters and comment forms (hard copy and electronic) were received as a result of the open houses and Newsletter #1.

Newsletter #2 summarized the public scoping comments. It described the history of the Old Courthouse, laid out the subsequent steps of the planning process, and provided an updated timeline for the planning process. A summary of public comments was posted on the Memorial's website in September 2008. As a result of public comment and further deliberations of the planning team, including environmental analysis, the preliminary alternatives were revised. Prior to the identification of a preferred alternative, a value analysis decision-making process, Choosing By Advantages (CBA), was undertaken. At this stage, public input, probable environmental consequences, and costs of the alternatives were thoroughly considered by the planning team.

A press release on October 21, 2008, announced the preliminary preferred alternative for the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*. The press release provided a basic explanation of the next steps, a timeline

for the remaining portion of the planning process, and an announcement that another opportunity for public comment would occur in winter 2009 on the plan. Fact sheets for each of the revised preliminary alternatives and the no action alternative were publicly posted on the Memorial's website with the press release. The fact sheets described the elements of each revised preliminary alternative and provided maps detailing the management zones. After the preliminary preferred alternative was identified, the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* was produced and made available for public review.

The public was notified that the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* was available for public review via (1) a Federal Register notice of intent, dated January 16, 2009 (Volume 74, Number 111, page 3101); and (2) a January 16, 2009, press release announcing the public comment period. The local media also provided coverage of the release of the draft plan. The public review and comment period began January 16, 2009 was open for 60 days, and ended March 16, 2009. The approximately 225 individuals and organizations on the mailing list were notified that the plan was available, primarily via e-mail. Press releases were mailed to those on the mailing list for whom an e-mail address was not available. The draft plan was sent out to 183 individuals, agencies, and organizations. It was also posted on the National Park Service's Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website, on the Memorial's website, and distributed at public meetings.

A press release on February 18, 2009, announced two public meetings on the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*. The local media also provided coverage that announced the meetings. The primary purpose of the comment period and the public meetings was to collect input on the adequacy of the draft plan. The public meetings were held in St. Louis on February 23 and 24, 2009. Both public meetings included a formal

presentation of the draft plan by the National Park Service as well an opportunity for formal public comments and an informal open house informational session. Approximately 62 people attended the public meetings. The National Park Service hosted two brownbag sessions regarding the draft plan that attracted approximately 30 individuals. These sessions were held on January 29, 2009, and January, 31, 2009, at the Old Courthouse and Ulysses S. Grant NHS, respectively. Brownbag sessions were also hosted by the Missouri Open Space Council on February 4, 2009, the East-West Gateway Council of Governments on February 6, 2009, and The Confluence Partnership at Cahokia Mounds on February 19, 2009. Approximately 92 individuals attended these brownbag sessions. The National Park Service held two informal brownbag sessions for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial employees on February 23 and 24, 2009, with approximately 18 people in attendance.

The National Park Service issued a press release on March 9, 2009, announcing that the public comment period was about to close and encouraging the public to comment. Approximately 130 correspondences (hard copy and electronic) were received during the public comment period.

The planning team carefully considered all public comments on the draft plan and made changes where appropriate before issuing this *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*. Any changes made to the preferred alternative and management zones in this final plan are discussed in the preferred alternative text (Section 2.5) and in responses to the comments on the last draft. (Section 5.4).

Documents related to this planning process are available online at the Memorial's website and the National Park Service Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website. These documents include newsletters, public comment summaries, frequently asked questions, letters, planning updates from the Superintendent, and the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*.

The *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* is also available online at (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov>).

5.2 AGENCY CONSULTATION

Consultation with American Indians

The National Park Service recognizes that indigenous peoples have traditional and contemporary interests and ongoing rights in lands now under NPS management, as well as concerns and contributions to make for the future as part of scoping processes in NPS GMPs and other projects. The need for government to government consultation between the United States and American Indians stems from the historic power of Congress to make treaties with American Indian tribes as sovereign nations. Consultations with American Indians and other Native Americans such as Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians are required by various federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies. For example, such consultations are required to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

Historically, the project study area was within the territory of the Illini Confederacy, although the Memorial and potential East St. Louis site were not the sites of villages. Disease and warfare with other tribes devastated the Illini over the course of time, leaving few survivors of the tribe. The annihilation of the tribe that lived near the Memorial and East St. Louis sites, the Cahokia, was so complete that the tribe had ceased to exist by the early 1800s. Any remnant members of the Cahokia intermarried with the Kaskaskia, a tribe which likewise suffered a catastrophic decline and merged, in 1854, with the Peoria Tribe. Today, the Peoria, who number about 2,000, live in Miami, Oklahoma.

The Osage Nation is linked to the St. Louis area through their historical involvement in the fur trade, their interests in the ancient Mississippian mound builders, and familial

ties with St. Louis residents. At the time of Lewis and Clark, the Osage were the most powerful tribe in the lower Midwest. They moved from their original home along the Ohio River to western Missouri before the beginning of the French Mississippi and Missouri River fur trade in the 18th century. By 1804 the Osage held total sway over the region of western Missouri, northern Arkansas and eastern Kansas due to their ties with French fur traders and Spanish government officials in St. Louis. The powerful Chouteau family had a trade monopoly with the Osage for many years, and intermarriages with Osage women were common. The Osage called themselves Ni-U-Ko'n-Ska, or "children of the middle waters." The two main bands of the Indians lived on the Osage River (the Great Osage) and the Missouri River (the Petit or Little Osage). Treaties, some of which were negotiated in St. Louis, gradually took Osage lands in the Territory and later State of Missouri, moving them to a reservation in Oklahoma, where their tribal government is located today.

Letters were sent to the Peoria Tribe (January 2009) and Osage Nation (September 2009) requesting their involvement in the planning process and comment on the document. Consultation with the Peoria, the Osage and others related to the *Draft and Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* is ongoing. The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma advised the National Park Service to contact them if, during subsequent implementation of the final plan, any archeological evidence of tribal or other American Indian habitation is found.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The Endangered Species Act requires in Section 7 (a) (2) that each federal agency, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, ensure that any action the agency authorizes, funds, or carries out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. This section of the act sets out the consultation process, which is further implemented by regulation (50 CFR 402).

In October 2008, the National Park Service initiated informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the presence of federally listed Threatened and Endangered species within the project study area and the associated effect, if any, of proposed actions to listed species. Prior telephone conversations between NPS staff and U.S. Fish and Wildlife biologists in 2003 indicated that no species were present within the existing Memorial grounds and due to the urban environment and associated disturbances suitable habitat was highly unlikely to be available in the future. With the proposal of inclusion and management of new lands in East St. Louis and a potential ferry boat operation between East St. Louis, Illinois, and St. Louis, Missouri, the National Park Service requested concurrence on preliminary determinations of effects based on proposed actions. As a result of ongoing consultation and on the ground survey work by the planning team, it was discovered that a listed Threatened species, decurrent false aster, may occur within the East St. Louis floodplain. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service advised the National Park Service of the need for compliance in any future project-specific planning for East St. Louis during implementation of the final plan due to the likely presence of the Threatened species, the decurrent false aster. As such, consultation is ongoing and will continue throughout the implementation process. Copies of the two project newsletters and a copy of the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* were provided to the agency and a copy of this final document will be provided for review.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U. S. Coast Guard

Navigation in United States waters is regulated and administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and United States Coast Guard (Coast Guard). Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403) establishes permit requirements to prevent unauthorized obstruction or alteration of any navigable water of the United States. Navigable waters are defined as “those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the

tide and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible to use to transport interstate or foreign commerce” (33 CFR Part 329). Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act, further establishes Corps jurisdiction over navigable waters and prohibits discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters without permit.

A proposed water taxi operation has been identified as part of the NPS preferred alternative and therefore requires coordination with the Corps and Coast Guard. If a water taxi operation were to be implemented within this section of the Mississippi River, it would require specific designs beyond the conceptual ideas presented in this document and could likely require a Section 10 Corps permit. The National Park Service contacted the Illinois Regulatory Branch of the Corps by telephone in November 2008 regarding a potential water taxi operation, sent copies of the draft document to both the Corps and Coast Guard for review and comment, and will send copies of the *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* for review.

Consultation with the Missouri and Illinois State Historic Preservation Officers

Agencies that have direct or indirect jurisdiction over historic properties are required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to take into account the effect of any undertaking on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The National Park Service officially requested consultation with the Missouri State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in May 2008. By letter, the Superintendent informed both Missouri and Illinois SHPOs of the initiation of this *Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* and invited these offices to participate in the planning process and comment on the draft as it progressed. The Missouri SHPO responded by placing a representative of the office, Kris Zapalac, Ph.D. on the planning team. Dr. Zapalac has

been involved in discussions, workshops, and document review for the length of the project. In anticipation of implementing the preferred alternative, the National Park Service is holding preliminary conversations with the Missouri and Illinois SHPOs and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in preparation for carrying out Section 106 for a design competition.

Copies of the two project newsletters were provided to these agencies and a copy of the draft document was provided for review. A copy of the final document will be provided for review. SHPO comments and advice were welcomed throughout the planning process for possible decisions regarding the protection and preservation of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial's significant historic properties and the State Historic Preservation Officers will continue to be engaged throughout implementation of this final plan.

Consultation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The National Park Service officially requested consultation with the U.S. EPA in January 2009 by letter. A letter received on March 11, 2009, from the Region 7, Kansas City, Kansas office of the Environmental Protection Agency provided comments on the draft plan. This office rated the draft plan preferred alternative as "Environmental Concerns -2 (insufficient information)". This letter is reprinted in Section 5.4 and includes responses to requested items for correction and suggested consultation.

Consultation with the City of St. Louis

The City of St. Louis Office of the Mayor was sent a copy of the draft plan. The National Park Service received a letter in response to the draft plan on March 13, 2009 (the full text of the letter is reprinted in Section 5.4). The National Park Service requested consultation from the Office of the Mayor regarding the rerouting or removal of Memorial Drive by letter on March 27, 2009. On April 15, 2009, June 4, 2009, August 13, 2009 and September 21, 2009, the City of St. Louis participated in meetings with the National Park Service to help facilitate the traffic study for the

Memorial Drive corridor. The National Park Service also consulted with Mayor's office regarding partnerships to expand the design competition to include city properties/streets surrounding the Memorial.

Consultation with Metro East Parks & Recreation Department

Metro East Parks and Recreation Department was sent a copy of the draft plan. The Department owns and manages the Malcolm Martin Memorial Park on the East St. Louis, Illinois riverfront, a portion of which was identified in the draft preferred alternative for inclusion within a proposed boundary expansion. The National Park Service requested consultation with the Department regarding future facility development at the site and the implications of a design competition on the site. The Department was supportive of the design competition and potential program related partnerships that could ensue.

Consultation with the East West Gateway Council of Governments

The National Park Service requested consultation from the East West Gateway Council of Governments regarding the rerouting or removal of Memorial Drive by letter on March 27, 2009. On April 15, 2009, June 3, 2009, August 13, 2009, and September 21, 2009, the East West Gateway Council of Governments met with the National Park Service to help facilitate the traffic study for the Memorial Drive corridor.

Consultation with the Missouri Department of Transportation

The National Park Service requested consultation from the Missouri Department of Transportation regarding the rerouting or removal of Memorial Drive by letter on March 27, 2009. On April 15, 2009, July 2, 2009, August 13, 2009, and September 21, 2009, the Missouri Department of Transportation met with the National Park Service to help facilitate the traffic study for the Memorial Drive corridor. The Mississippi River Bridge office also participated in the meeting on July 2, 2009.

Consultation with the Illinois Department of Transportation

The National Park Service requested consultation from the Illinois Department of Transportation regarding the rerouting or removal of Memorial Drive by letter on March 27, 2009. On April 15, 2009, the Illinois Department of Transportation met with the National Park Service to help facilitate the traffic study for the Memorial Drive corridor.

Consultation with the Federal Highway Administration

The National Park Service requested consultation from the Federal Highway Administration regarding the rerouting or removal of Memorial Drive by letter on March 27, 2009. On April 15, 2009, and August 13, 2009, the Federal Highway Administration met with the National Park Service to help facilitate a traffic study for the Memorial Drive corridor.

5.3 LIST OF AGENCIES OR ENTITIES RECEIVING A COPY OF THIS PLAN OR NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THIS PLAN

Federal Agencies

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Federal Executive Board of St. Louis
Federal Highway Administration
Library of Congress
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Coast Guard
U.S. Department of the Interior
 Fish and Wildlife Service
 National Park Service
 Denver Service Center
 Harpers Ferry Center
 Midwest Archeological Center
 Midwest Regional Office
 Ulysses S. Grant National Historic Site
U.S. Department of Justice
 U.S. Attorney's Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Senators and Representatives

MISSOURI

Honorable Christopher Bond, Senator
Honorable Claire McCaskill, Senator

Honorable William Lacy Clay,
House of Representatives

ILLINOIS

Honorable Richard Durbin, Senator
Honorable Roland W. Burris, Senator
Honorable Jerry Costello, House of Representatives

State Agencies

MISSOURI

Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Missouri Department of Transportation
Missouri Division of Tourism
Missouri State Archives
Missouri State Historic Preservation Officer

ILLINOIS

Illinois Department of Transportation
Illinois Division of State Parks
Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer

State Officials

MISSOURI

Honorable Jeremiah W. Nixon, Governor of Missouri
State Representative Robin Wright Jones
State Senator Maida Coleman

ILLINOIS

Honorable Pat Quinn, Governor of Illinois
State Representative Eddie Lee Jackson, Sr.
State Senator James F. Clayborne, Jr.
American Indian Tribes
Osage Nation
Peoria Tribe

Local and Regional Government Agencies

City of East St. Louis-Mayor
Metro East Parks and Recreation District
Great Rivers Greenway District
Madison County Transit
East West Gateway Council of Governments
City of St. Louis Board of Aldermen
Alderwoman Phyllis Young
City of St. Louis Fire Department
City of St. Louis Office of the Mayor
City of St. Louis Office of Planning
City of St. Louis Office of Special Events
City of St. Louis Parks and Recreation

City of St. Louis Police Department
City of St. Louis Port Authority
City of St. Louis Street Department
St. Louis County Office of the Executive
St. Louis County Parks and Recreation

Organizations and Businesses

American Institute of Architects-St. Louis
American Society of Landscape Architects-
St. Louis
Archdiocese of St. Louis
Basilica of St. Louis, King (Old Cathedral)
Audubon Missouri
Audubon St. Louis
Canteen Services
Celebrate St. Louis
Chouteau's Landing Association
Coalition of Concerned National Park
ServiceRetirees
Confluence Greenway
Danforth Foundation
Downtown St. Louis Partnership
Dred Scott Foundation
East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Fontbonne College
Forest Park Forever
Gateway Center of Metro St. Louis
Gateway Foundation
Grace Hill Settlement House
Green Center
Harris-Stowe University
Jefferson National Parks Association
Laclede's Landing Redevelopment
Corporation
Landmarks Association of St. Louis
Lindenwood University
Maryville University
Mercantile Library
Metro
Mississippi River Trail, Inc.
Missouri Baptist College
Missouri Coalition for the Environment
Missouri Historical Society
National Audubon Society (St. Louis chapter)
National Park Conservation Association
National Tour Association
National Trust for Historic
Preservation Library
Nature Conservancy
Open Space Council
Smithsonian Institution of Libraries
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale

Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Southwest Illinois College
St. Louis Community College
St. Louis Community Foundation
St. Louis Convention and Visitors Commission
St. Louis County Library-Main Branch
St. Louis Public Library-Main Branch
St. Louis Public School District
St. Louis Regional Commerce and
Growth Association
St. Louis University
Terminal Railroad
Trailnet
Trust for Public Land
University of Missouri-St. Louis
Washington University
Webster University

Media

Associated Press (Local)
Belleville News Democrat
KMOV-TV (CBS)
KMOX-AM Radio
KPLR-TV (CW11)
KSDK-TV (NBC)
KTRS 550 Radio
KTVI-TV (FOX)
KWMU 90.7 (Radio-University
Missouri- St. Louis)
South County Times
Southwest County Journal
St. Louis American
St. Louis Beacon
St. Louis Business Journal
St. Louis Post-Dispatch
Suburban Journals of Greater
St. Louis Headquarters
United Press International (Local)

Individuals and Adjoining Property Owners

There are more than 200 individuals to whom copies of this plan were sent or notification as to the availability of this plan was sent. A complete list of these names is on file at the Memorial Headquarters.

5.4 COMMENTS, AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS, ON THE DRAFT PLAN

Comments on the Draft Plan

The *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* was made available for public review in mid January, 2009. Approximately 225 individuals and organizations were notified of the availability of the plan. The draft plan was then sent to 183 individuals, agencies, and organizations. The draft plan was also distributed at public meetings and posted on the Web. Approximately 130 correspondences were received on the draft plan during the public comment period.

Responses to Comments on the Draft Plan

In preparing a final general management plan and environmental impact statement, the National Park Service is required to respond to all substantive written and oral comments from the public or from agencies. The National Park Service is also required to make every reasonable attempt to consider issues or alternatives suggested by the public or by other agencies.

Letters and Web comments from federal and state agencies and from tribes are reprinted in full, along with NPS responses to substantive comments. Other substantive comments (from organizations and individuals) are paraphrased, and NPS responses are provided. The full text of letters, Web comments, e-mails, and meeting transcripts are a part of the project administrative record located at the Memorial. Comments are substantive if they do one or more of the following:

- (a) question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the document;
- (b) question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of environmental analysis ;
- (c) present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the draft document;

(d) cause changes or revisions in the proposal (preferred alternative).

Comments that simply state a position in favor of or against the proposed alternative, that only agree or disagree with NPS policy, or that otherwise express an unsupported personal preference or opinion are not considered substantive. Although the planning team is only obligated to respond to substantive comments, it has also responded to selected nonsubstantive comments for various reasons (e.g., politics, number of people responding, and the need to clarify the agency position).

On the following pages, comments from organizations and individuals are paraphrased and an NPS response is provided. These comments are organized by topic or theme, such as connectivity, design competition, or access. Following these comments, letters from agencies and organizations are reproduced in full with substantive comments bracketed and NPS responses provided.

Responses to Public Comments

DESIGN COMPETITION

COMMENT The Design Competition zone should be expanded to include a portion of the grounds near the eastern boundary of the Memorial in order to provide a stronger connection to the riverfront. This expanded zone could either include the portion of the Memorial grounds from the eastern boundary of the Memorial up to and including the railroad tunnels or the area from the riverfront to the base of the Arch.

RESPONSE In response to public comment, the planning team has placed the area between L.K. Sullivan Boulevard and the top of the slope above the railroad tunnels under a Design Competition Overlay (see Figure 2.3) in order to have design competition entrants explore creative and cohesive solutions to accessibility between the Memorial and the riverfront. All solutions offered by entrants will need to be situated in such a manner as to have as minimal impact as possible on the NHL. The Design Competition Overlay carries a requirement that all character-defining features and historic landscapes and

structures be preserved in order to minimize impact to the NHL.

COMMENT The design competition should be expanded to include additional areas within the Memorial grounds and/or areas outside of the boundaries of the Memorial.

RESPONSE In response to public comment, and to specifically address the City of St. Louis' interest in partnering with the NPS, the preferred alternative was changed to include Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard, the connections into Laclede's Landing and Chouteau's Landing, and the entire boundary along Memorial Drive in the design competition to provide for a unified approach to revitalization of the entire streetscape surrounding the Memorial. The NPS would support a further expansion of the design competition boundary to areas directly adjacent to the Memorial, so long as the competition keeps to the original purpose and intent of revitalizing the Memorial and strengthening the connection of the Memorial to the surrounding cities. A geographically larger design competition is only possible in close cooperation with the cities of St. Louis and East St. Louis and the private property owners. The NPS has no administrative control of properties outside of the Memorial boundary.

COMMENT The Design Competition zone should be included in portions of the other alternatives.

RESPONSE The purpose of public review and comment on the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* was to assist the planning team in selecting the preferred alternative to carry forward into the *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*, not to revise all of the alternatives in order to reconsider the full array again. At the close of the public comment period on March 16, 2009, and after review and analysis of all public comments, the planning team used the public responses to improve upon the original preferred alternative. The planning team moved

elements from alternatives 4 and 5 into the revised preferred alternative 3.

COMMENT The design competition should be reorganized into a series of smaller design competitions to address specific areas and issues that have been outlined in the GMP that require solutions, both on the borders of the Memorial and in East St. Louis. A large competition poses risks from designs that are incompatible with the National Historic Landmark designation and could disrupt established open space.

RESPONSE The NPS is concerned that dividing the competition into a series of smaller competitions will lead to a disjointed and potentially conflicting design aesthetic across the Memorial. The purpose of creating a single design competition for the Memorial and surrounding areas is to provide a unified approach to revitalization of the Memorial and to improve physical and thematic connections between the Memorial and the cities of St. Louis and East St. Louis.

There are parameters and criteria in place to ensure the final selected and implemented design is compatible with the purposes of the Memorial and preserves critical elements of the NHL and the fundamental resources of the Memorial, while at the same time providing ample opportunity for new and innovative connections between the Memorial, St. Louis and East St. Louis.

COMMENT A public design competition would prolong the time needed to address pressing issues when effective solutions have been proposed for the Memorial in other alternatives or exist in the original design plans that have yet to be implemented. The design competition should therefore be eliminated.

RESPONSE A GMP of this scope contains many implementation projects, many of which could be started soon after the signing of the Record of Decision, dependent upon funding and staffing. Preparation for the design competition described in the record of decision could start as soon as funding was available. The NPS is committed to working as quickly as possible to find effective solutions to the challenges at the Memorial.

COMMENT Goals, funding, and boundary delineations for a design competition remain unclear and have yet to be determined, leading to an unknown result and potentially eliminating public input. The design competition may also generate proposals and raise public expectations for those proposals that would violate National Park Service policy due to adverse impacts on cultural resources that are fundamental to the National Historic Landmark designation. The design competition should therefore be eliminated.

RESPONSE There are parameters and criteria in place to ensure the final selected and implemented design is compatible with the purposes of the Memorial, and preserves critical elements of the NHL and the fundamental resources of the Memorial. We believe the goals of the design competition are clearly articulated in the *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*.

Funding for a design competition has not been procured and would only be sought after the close of the GMP/EIS process. At that time, the NPS most likely would enlist existing partners and develop new partnerships with many organizations to jointly sponsor a design competition.

In response to public comment, the design competition boundaries have been redrawn. Two maps illustrate the revised preferred alternative. The first map (Figure 2.2) shows how the NPS intends to manage the Memorial for the next 15-20 years. The zones, as placed on the ground, describe the desired future conditions the NPS will work to attain in specific areas of the Memorial. The zones are, in essence, management goals. The design competition is now set up as an overlay (Figure 2.3) in order to show how the parameters of a design competition work across the Memorial.

We have created the overlay, based on public comments, to demonstrate our commitment to protecting the NHL and fundamental resources and values of the Memorial while providing a forum in which to gather the widest breadth of ideas to resolve current challenges. Design Competition Area A and

Area B differ in the amount of allowable change, but share the same goal of preserving the NHL. In contemplating changes to the Memorial, entrants should be mindful of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation and the Treatment of Historic Properties and Cultural Landscapes*, and the competition finalists, selected by a multidisciplinary panel of judges, will be subject to NEPA and NHPA compliance, consultation with other agencies and further public review and comment. Ultimately the NPS will select the winning entry.

COMMENT A design charrette conducted with Memorial neighbors should be considered as part of the planning process to expand NPS programs and outline how issues at the Memorial boundaries will be addressed.

RESPONSE The logistical details of the design competition have not been worked out. After the record of decision is signed that includes a design competition in the selected alternative, a professional design competition advisor would be retained as soon as practicable to assist in developing the specific program for the competition, including significant public involvement.

MANAGEMENT ZONING

COMMENT The Old Courthouse should be included in the Design Competition zone in order to define its use.

RESPONSE The Old Courthouse is zoned for Heritage Education and Visitor Amenities. This zone allows the National Park Service to enhance the building's established use for visitor education and orientation. Exhibits and other program elements would be redesigned to engage visitors in more interactive participation.

COMMENT In the preferred alternative, the portions of Washington Street, Poplar Street, and Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard that were zoned as Streetscape/Riverscape in the *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* should be changed and zoned as Design Competition in order to allow the design competition to explore better connections to the

surrounding neighborhoods and enhance the riverfront experience.

RESPONSE In response to public comment and to specifically address the City of St. Louis' interest in partnering with the NPS on the design competition, the planning team has placed Washington and Poplar Streets, Memorial Drive, Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard and the adjacent riverfront area under a Design Competition Overlay (see Figure 2.3). This change will facilitate a unified approach to revitalization of the entire streetscape surrounding the Memorial, and provides design entrants with opportunities to improve physical and thematic connections between the Memorial and cities.

COMMENT The Streetscape/Riverscape and Orientation zones are similar and should be combined into one zone.

RESPONSE The Streetscape/Riverscape zone specifically targets pedestrian-oriented areas that transition from the adjacent urban areas into the Memorial to improve connectivity between the two. The Orientation zone is characterized by visitor orientation and wayfinding. Its purpose is specifically to provide services that address visitor needs and make visits to the Memorial safer and more enjoyable. Because these two zones have different, distinct goals, the zones will not be combined in the *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*.

MEMORIAL USE

COMMENT The train tracks should be covered and brought to grade to create more usable space within the Memorial.

RESPONSE The train tracks, present along the riverfront prior to the designation and creation of the Memorial, were moved and covered in part to allow for the construction of the Gateway Arch. The railroad cuts and tunnels were designed by Saarinen and are a contributing feature of the NHL, as well as a structural necessity. The Railroad tunnels and corresponding railroad "cuts" also were specifically designed to provide ventilation. As character-defining features, they need to be preserved in order to minimize impact to

the designed landscape. The purpose of the Original Landscape zone is to preserve the NHL status of the Memorial, and it allows for sensitive rehabilitation of the landscape as necessary to provide safe visitor access and security, so long as the integrity of the NHL is protected.

COMMENT The North Overlook should include a new significant structure/landmark.

RESPONSE In the preferred alternative, the North and South Overlooks were re-zoned as Heritage Education and Visitor Amenities and included in Design Competition Area B in response to public comment. This zoning would allow rehabilitation of the overlooks to provide better visitor orientation, education, and appropriate and necessary visitor amenities. Facilities could include educational exhibits, visitor contact stations, spaces designed for educational programs, restrooms, and food service. The overlooks are character defining features that reflect the Saarinen-Kiley concept and thus contribute to the significance of the National Historic Landmark. They were designed to provide expansive views of the Mississippi River and the Gateway Arch (page 3-16) and to appear symmetrical (page 2-26), as such their symmetry is an important value to continue. In addition, the overlooks serve as a structural part of the railroad tunnels and concrete floodwalls (page 3-9), as designed by Saarinen, which contribute to the significance of the National Historic Landmark. Any improvements made to the overlooks would preserve the character defining features.

COMMENT The south end of the Memorial could be developed with a parking garage, museum, and/or shuttle terminal to balance the development of the north end of the Memorial.

RESPONSE In response to public comment, the south end of the Memorial has been included in Design Competition Area A in order to show the NPS goal to provide improved visitor access and orientation at the south end of the Memorial grounds. It is the NPS' intention that the existing maintenance facility will be maintained in the current location in order to capture the benefits of the relatively new building while at the same time allowing for

additional uses of this underutilized area. However, the ultimate configuration and combined use of space in the north and south ends of the Memorial will be determined through a design competition.

COMMENT Additional bridges across the Mississippi River should be considered.

RESPONSE To the north of the Memorial, Eads Bridge provides visitors automobile, rail, bicycle and pedestrian access across the Mississippi River. To the south, the Poplar Street bridge provides automobile access across the river to the Memorial. The NPS does not propose additional automobile bridges across the River; however, the NPS will continue to support the efforts of the Great Rivers Greenway and its partners to develop pedestrian/bicycle connections near the south end of the Memorial, so that visitors might be able to cross the Mississippi River and connect to both east and west portions of the Memorial. NPS believes this could offer great benefits for visitor access, use and enjoyment.

COMMENT A number of ideas for program expansion were proposed such as: introducing water features (including boats and related amenities), integrating the history of the Memorial site (including reconstructing a trading post or general store), and adding amenities such as a playground, picnic tables and benches.

RESPONSE Proposals for specific features will be included in a design competition, guided by the goals, parameters, and criteria as discussed in the *Final Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* and noted elsewhere in our responses to public comments. In addition, the revised management zones for the preferred alternative (alternative 3) and the goals implicit in those zones also provide guidance for design competition entrants. In response to public comments, all management zones except the Service zone have been adjusted to allow for the inclusion of benches or site furnishings, which includes benches. Picnicking and informal games and activities are allowable and established activities on the Memorial grounds. NPS policy does not allow for

reconstruction of cultural elements except in rare circumstances (Section 5.3.5.4.4, Management Policies 2006). Designated playgrounds are not compatible with the purpose of the memorial.

COMMENT Several new ideas were proposed specifically related to accessibility, including making the Arch barrier-free accessible and providing a tram service to shuttle visitors with mobility impairments around the grounds of the Memorial.

RESPONSE Based on public comment on the draft plan, a visitor transportation system linking visitor attractions within and outside of the Memorial (alternative 5) was incorporated into the revised preferred alternative 3. In all development planning, the NPS is required by law to consider ways to provide and improve opportunities for visitors with limited mobility and other disabilities. The preferred alternative would establish barrier-free routes from the Memorial grounds to the riverfront and any new facilities would incorporate accessibility in its widest interpretation. Emerging technologies will continue to be explored for ways to make the tram and observation deck at the top of the Gateway Arch accessible.

COMMENT The East St. Louis addition should be configured to reflect the original design plan, regardless of current property boundaries and should consider integrating a master development of adjacent lands.

RESPONSE The authorizing legislation that allows the National Park Service, through the Secretary of the Interior, to designate an East St. Louis “addition” to the Memorial states “that the boundaries are to approximately 100 acres continuous with the Mississippi River between the Eads Bridge and the Poplar Street Bridge (P.L. 98-398 and P.L. 102-355).” Given these parameters, and in recognition of the existing commercial developments and existing infrastructure, the planning team considered a range of optional boundary proposals. The NPS is recommending an addition that encompasses approximately 100 acres - the earlier preferred alternative proposed an addition of approximately 70 acres. The entire East St. Louis addition is encompassed by Design Competition Overlay

Area A in order for the NPS to capture the most creative, innovative ideas for its development. To that end, the NPS embraces a design competition that would effectively integrate with and revitalize East St. Louis, strengthen the connection between the two riverfronts and support the underlying purpose of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

COMMENT Adjacent property should be acquired as a buffer to protect the Memorial from encroaching commercial development.

RESPONSE The National Park Service generally has no opposition to adjacent commercial activity provided the adjacent development does not impair Memorial resources and does not impede visitor use and enjoyment of the Memorial. Additionally, it is against NPS policy to acquire buffer lands outside park boundaries.

GMP AND EIS ANALYSIS

COMMENT The GMP/EIS needs to include an impact analysis for visitor attendance and economic impacts for each of the elements that may be part of the design competition. This analysis should incorporate the information prepared for the 2007 Danforth Foundation study.

RESPONSE The *Draft Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* included a discussion of visitor attendance and the economic impacts of the Memorial (pages 3-40 through 3-45). This analysis included the number of recreational visitors in 2003 (2.69 million) and their various economic contributions, including direct spending and other additional economic activity generated.

NPS has considered the previous work completed by the Danforth Foundation in evaluating all the action alternatives. However, most of the analysis is not relevant. This is partially due to the fact that the specific elements proposed (ice skating rink, restaurants, rock climbing wall, amphitheater, beer garden, specialty shops and retail, etc.) are not necessarily appropriate within the Memorial. Also, NPS has purposely not specified elements that could be part of the

design competition in order to not prematurely influence the creative process in determining what is possible for the Memorial.

While it was the objective of the Danforth Foundation to propose ideas and projects that provide extensive development of the riverfront, in order to maximize visitors and generate economic development for St. Louis, this is not the objective of the NPS. The purpose of the Memorial, first and foremost, is to commemorate President Jefferson's vision for a unified nation across the continent, then, to provide for visitor use in such a manner as leaves the resources unimpaired for future generations. Visitation must be considered in light of other objectives and policies such as the protection of historic, cultural, and natural resources. The geographic focus of the Danforth Foundation studies was the riverfront area along Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard adjacent to the Memorial. Their proposed development included a mix of recreational uses such as outdoor recreational facilities and restaurants. There are currently no elements similar to this proposed development in any of the GMP action alternatives. Thus, inclusion of these results into the analysis of the GMP/EIS alternatives is not appropriate.

Current visitation to the Memorial is close to three million visitors per year; these visitors provide an influx of revenue for the local economy. This influx of revenue is estimated to generate over 1,950 jobs and \$52 million in income in the region. The purpose of the GMP/EIS is to describe different alternatives for revitalizing the Memorial, and to analyze the likely consequences of those actions. The final preferred alternative includes a design competition that has not specified the elements that may impact visitation. Once the competition finalists have been selected, an environmental analysis will evaluate the impacts each of the final designs and any new facilities would have on the local and regional economy.

COMMENT The natural resource impacts typically assessed in general management plans [i.e. air quality, wildlife, etc.] were dismissed without further consideration in the alternatives.

RESPONSE The impact topics that were considered and dismissed are discussed on pages 1-12 through 1-18. These topics were dismissed from further analysis because implementing the alternatives would have little (negligible or minor) to no impact to those resources at the Memorial, or because the resource does not occur within the Memorial.

COMMENT The GMP does not include a traffic study that supports the assertion that the streets surrounding Memorial Drive have adequate capacity to absorb traffic without diminishing the level of service if Memorial Drive is closed.

RESPONSE The NPS, City of St. Louis, the Missouri Department of Transportation, the Illinois Department of Transportation, East West Gateway Council of Governments, and the Federal Highway Administration worked together to study multiple scenarios for the closure of Memorial Drive and the rerouting of traffic onto other downtown streets. The impetus for a potential closure of Memorial Drive was to eliminate the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, increasing the physical and thematic connectivity between the city and the Memorial and improving, overall, the visitor experience. Within the traffic study, analysis was based on forecasted conditions for 2011. In particular, this study identified the traffic impacts on adjacent streets and intersections to the Memorial in downtown St. Louis. Four scenarios were tested as part of the traffic study:

1. A No-Build Scenario of that assumes traffic patterns continue as they currently exist.
2. A one block closure of Memorial Drive between Market St. and Chestnut St.
3. A two block closure of Memorial Drive between Chestnut St. and Walnut St.
4. A three block closure of Memorial Drive between Pine St. and Walnut St.

The Memorial Drive Traffic Study (NPS 2009) lists the potential impacts to vehicular circulation on the streets surrounding Memorial Drive, as measured by Level of Service (LOS), for each potential scenario. This measurement calculates the seconds of delay at a particular intersection, giving a qualitative score to the length of time it takes a vehicle to

pass through the intersection. See Appendix J for the table of intersections analyzed as part of the Memorial Drive Traffic Study.

MEMORIAL DRIVE AND I-70

COMMENT Changing the traffic patterns around the Memorial by manipulating the actual street configuration could include closing Memorial Drive between Walnut Street and Pine Street, rerouting the traffic to 4th Street and Broadway Street, and closing or reconfiguring Chestnut and Market Streets between 4th Street and Memorial Drive (while leaving vehicular access to the establishments along those blocks).

RESPONSE The NPS, City of St. Louis, the Missouri Department of Transportation, the Illinois Department of Transportation East West Gateway Council of Governments, and the Federal Highway Administration worked together to study multiple scenarios for the closure of Memorial Drive and the rerouting of traffic onto other downtown streets. The Memorial Drive Traffic Study (NPS 2009) examined the impacts to adjacent downtown streets and intersections, including Pine, Chestnut, Market, Walnut, 4th, and Broadway Streets, that would result from a potential one, two, or three block closure of Memorial Drive adjacent to the Memorial. Each of the scenarios modeled as part of the traffic study considered potential changes to the lane configurations and on-street parking spaces that would be needed in the event of a partial closure of Memorial Drive.

The revised preferred alternative includes the option of a one- or three-block closure of Memorial Drive to vehicular traffic.

In addition, we agree with the commenters that vehicular access to the existing parking garages on those blocks would need to remain. The blocks adjacent to Luther Ely Smith Square are zoned Streetscape/Riverscape and are included in Design Competition Area A, and as such may evolve depending upon the results of the competition.

COMMENT Memorial Drive should be redesigned into a pedestrian friendly, at-grade boulevard to best reconnect the

Old Courthouse and the rest of downtown to the Memorial.

RESPONSE The revised preferred alternative includes the option of a one- or three-block closure of Memorial Drive to vehicular traffic, in both directions, as part of the design competition mandate to improve connections between downtown St. Louis and the Memorial. This potential closure is based on the previously mentioned traffic study and could significantly contribute to improved pedestrian conditions at the Memorial by eliminating Memorial Drive as a continuous high-speed traffic corridor. In place of Memorial Drive, some combination of a single elevated deck, multiple bridges, or improved at grade crossings could occur, depending upon the outcome of the Design Competition, connecting the Gateway Arch to the Old Courthouse.

COMMENT On-street, metered parking would meet future parking needs, particularly along Memorial Drive, and contribute to traffic calming.

RESPONSE The preferred alternative anticipates meeting all future parking needs at the site of the existing parking garage at the north end of the Memorial, next to the Old Cathedral, and through the numerous on- and off-street parking facilities within downtown St. Louis, surrounding the Memorial. As previously mentioned, the Memorial Drive Traffic Study (NPS 2009) examined the effects of potentially closing a portion of Memorial Drive to vehicular traffic. Should a one- or three-block closure of Memorial Drive occur as an outcome of the design competition, it could significantly contribute to traffic calming and improved pedestrian conditions adjacent to the Memorial by eliminating a portion of the street as a single, continuous high-speed vehicular traffic corridor.

Due to the potential re-configuration of adjacent downtown streets to accommodate re-routed traffic off of any closed section of Memorial Drive, the remaining portions of Memorial Drive would be unable to accommodate on-street parking. This is due to the needed capacity of those remaining

segments of Memorial Drive, particularly as they function in relation to I-70.

COMMENT The portion of I-70 adjacent to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial should be removed in order to eliminate the physical and psychological barrier it creates.

RESPONSE The National Park Service would prefer and strongly supports the removal of the Interstate highway between Poplar Street Bridge and Eads Bridge at some point in the future. We recognize an undertaking of this magnitude may not be possible during the time frame this GMP addresses (15-20 years), but we would amend the GMP should such an opportunity become feasible prior to the expiration of this plan. The NPS will continue to coordinate with the City of St. Louis, Missouri Department of Transportation, East West Gateway Council of Governments, the Federal Highway Administration, and all other related agencies regarding impacts to the Memorial and Memorial visitors due to the location and configuration of this highway. The NPS is committed to finding ways to mitigate the physical and aesthetic challenges of the interstate. Please refer to our responses concerning the potential of a partial closure of Memorial Drive, the creation of a civic plaza, and west portal to the Memorial.

COMMENT A new, below-grade parking structure could replace the sunken lanes of I-70 adjacent to the Memorial and should be mentioned in the design competition.

RESPONSE As mentioned above, the National Park Service would prefer and strongly supports the removal of the Interstate highway between Poplar Street Bridge and Eads Bridge at some point in the future. If the removal of I-70 became feasible, options for the vacated I-70 corridor would then be explored. Future parking needs at the Memorial will be met at the site of the existing parking garage, next to the Old Cathedral and potentially underneath Luther Ely Smith Square, as determined by the outcome of the design competition.

INTERPRETIVE THEMES

COMMENT The prehistory of the area is not addressed in the General Management Plan

and it should be, especially because of the close association with Cahokia Mounds on the other side of the Mississippi River.

RESPONSE The management and planning for units of the national park system is based, in large part, on the reason for the park's existence or park purpose (see page 1-5), those things that make the park distinctive (significance) and the fundamental resources and values that exemplify the park's purpose and significance. The Memorial's purpose, firmly established in legislation, is to commemorate President Jefferson's vision of building a nation that stretched across the continent, to interpret the role of St. Louis in exploiting and peopling the "West", and to preserve the Old Courthouse as the site of the Dred Scott case.

Though the story of the prehistory of the region is compelling, it is not the Memorial's purpose to preserve, commemorate or interpret the prehistory of the area. Based on the archeological investigations that have taken place both within and around the Memorial grounds, it is unlikely that prehistoric materials exist under the early historic remains (see page 3-21), and early maps which chronicle the location of a mound group well to the north of the current Memorial indicate that there were no mounds or evidence of habitation sites in the area of the Memorial. Exhibits may be rehabbed to reflect the fact that the region was populated by Native groups of various types for thousands of years prior to colonial, territorial and Federal habitation, but this level of planning is outside the scope of the GMP.

COMMENT The original vision of the Memorial is limited by its Eurocentric context and does not embrace the diverse and holistic nature of westward expansion.

RESPONSE Jefferson National Expansion Memorial's purpose statements are derived from the 1935 executive order designating the Memorial as well as subsequent legislative history specific to the Memorial and laws and policies that govern all national parks. These purpose statements, together with the park's significance statements, fundamental resources and values, and interpretive themes, include recognition of the important role cultural diversity played in westward expansion and specifically highlight the significance of removing American Indian tribes from their lands and the important role the Dred Scott court case played in the expansion of slavery into western lands (pages 1-6 through 1-9).

Although the original vision of the Memorial may have been somewhat limited, subsequent interpretations broadened that conception and have enabled the interpretive program to evolve, just as perceptions of the West by both historians and the general public have evolved. The Memorial commemorates change on a vast scale and the main challenge in interpreting the site is to convey a far more complex story than may have originally been recognized.

Responses to Agency Comments

(Please see responses to agency comments following the original letter.)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 7
901 NORTH 5TH STREET
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101

11 MAR 2009

Superintendent Tom Bradley
Jefferson National Expedition Memorial
11 North 4th Street
St. Louis, MO 63102

Dear Superintendent Bradley:

RE: Review of Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, General Management Plan, Implementation, St. Louis, MO

Regions 5 and 7 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial GMP. Our review is provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. 4231, Council on Environmental Quality regulations 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508, and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The DEIS was assigned the CEQ number 20090004.

The GMP/DEIS includes four alternatives and six management zones for use within the Memorial. There is a no action alternative and three action alternatives (3, 4, and 5). Alternative 2 was withdrawn from consideration. Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative, "Program Expansion," would capitalize on multiple opportunities to expand the visitor experience throughout the Memorial. To gain the widest breadth of ideas for expansion, a design competition would be initiated by the National Park Service in close coordination with partners.

Based on the fact that the design competition for the preferred alternative has not yet begun, and that the result of an implemented design may cause "moderate to major long-term adverse to beneficial impacts on transportation" (conclusion, page 4-30), the EPA has rated the DEIS for this project Environmental Concerns-2 (insufficient information). A copy of EPA's rating descriptions is provided as an enclosure to this letter.

Overall, the document conveys a sense of thorough evaluation and wide encompassing coordination. Particularly noteworthy for use in comparative analysis of effects is Section 4.2, (Methods and Assumptions for Analyzing Impacts). We also commend the National Park Service for entering into an agreement with the St. Louis chapter of the National Audubon Society to turn off the lights that illuminate the Gateway arch during the Spring and Fall bird migration.



EPA offers a few observations and recommendations as follows:

1. Park land holdings contain considerable urban fill. Caution should be exercised when building new infrastructure with respect to asbestos, and wastes from previous activities undertaken on Memorial lands (e.g. W.H. Bull Medicine Factory).
2. Metropolitan and State transportation planners (East-West Gateway, Missouri Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Authority...) might assist in influencing the design competition specifications to preclude designs that are likely to result in an adverse effect.
3. The results of American Indian consultation with the Peoria Tribe, and others, should be completed and those results included in the Final EIS.
4. The FEIS should include any commitments on behalf of the NPS to adhere to E.O.13423, "Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management," and/or Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design goals. We suggest informing design competition entrants about the sustainability commitments of the NPS at the beginning of the design competition.
5. In addition to the general air-quality mitigation measures listed on page 1-15, please also consider adding:
 - construction equipment and tour buses will be shut down when not in use,
 - how anti-idling measures will be enforced, and
 - retrofitting all diesel powered construction equipment with diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters.
6. The following typographical errors:
 - Page 1-13, Environmental Justice Section, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence needs clarification.
 - Page 4-13, Sections 4.3 and 4.4, the letters "e" and "n" are substituted for each other in the titles of those sections.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding this project and your DEIS. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Joseph Cothorn at (913) 551-7148.

Sincerely,



Ronald F. Hammerschmidt, Ph.D.
Director
Environmental Services Division

cc: Julie Guenther, U.S. EPA, Region 5, Chicago, IL
Nick Chevance, NPS, Omaha, NE

RESPONSES

1. In locations where new infrastructure would create substantial ground disturbance at depths that may encounter previous urban fill, drill core samples would be taken to determine substrate materials. If hazardous materials are determined to be present, appropriate mitigation would be taken at that time to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the general public and employees.

2. Substantive comments were received regarding transportation. In the process of responding to those comments, the National Park Service initiated a transportation study to more fully understand how a change to Memorial Drive might impact downtown transportation. The NPS, City of St. Louis, the Missouri Department of Transportation, the Illinois Department of Transportation, East West Gateway Council of Governments, and the Federal Highway Administration worked together to study multiple scenarios for the closure of Memorial Drive and the rerouting of traffic onto other downtown streets.

3. Tribal consultation with the Peoria Tribe and the Osage Tribe has occurred and would proceed throughout subsequent planning stages as the selected alternative is implemented.

4. One of the goals of a design competition - noted in the *Draft General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement* - carried through to the *Final General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement*, is the NPS commitment to “Operational efficiency and effectiveness for the Memorial’s operation in

a sustainable manner (page 2-12).” Further, the National Park Service’s commitment to overall operational sustainability and LEED™ certification is described in Chapter 2 of this document (page 2-41).

5. As authorized by the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Chapter 1, Parts 1-7, the 2009 Superintendent’s Compendium of Designations, Closures, Permit Requirements and Other Restrictions Imposed Under Discretionary Authority specifically prohibits the idling of engines in the bus pullout zone near the Old Cathedral. This regulation is enforced by commissioned Park Rangers and through the issuance of citations to drivers violating the anti-idling restriction. Construction equipment anti-idling measures would be incorporated into Memorial operations for work done by employees and addressed on a contract by contract basis for work done by contractors.

The Memorial operates one diesel powered backhoe using low sulfur fuel that met EPA standards at the time it was purchased. When this piece of equipment is replaced or NPS acquires additional diesel powered construction equipment, new equipment will be fitted with either diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters. All contractors performing work on NPS property will be encouraged to use equipment fitted with either diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters.

6. The typographical errors have been corrected (pages 1-13 and 4-13).



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY OF ST. LOUIS
MISSOURI

FRANCIS G. SLAY
MAYOR

CITY HALL - ROOM 200
1200 MARKET STREET
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI 63103-2877
(314) 622-3201
FAX: (314) 622-4061

March 13, 2009

Mr. Tom Bradley
Superintendent, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial
National Park Service
United States Department of the Interior
11 North 4th Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Dear Superintendent Bradley,

The purpose of this letter is to thank you and the National Park Service (NPS) for your hard work and willingness to consider changes to the grounds of the Gateway Arch.

As you will recall, I have asked three of St. Louis' leading citizens – Walter Metcalfe, Dr. Robert Archibald and Dr. Peter Raven – to advise my administration. I know my advisors have been active in your General Management Plan process as you consider the future of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. I am pleased to learn that NPS has placed an emphasis on improving connections between the Arch grounds and downtown and that there is a willingness to consider a new destination attraction.

I have attached the statement prepared by Mr. Metcalfe and Drs. Archibald and Raven. I fully endorse this statement and urge you to give it great consideration. There are many important points, but I would like to briefly focus on two: the proposed design competition and a completion date for improvements.

The Arch and its surrounding grounds have stood in isolation far too long. NPS and the City of St. Louis have an opportunity, as a result of your planning process, to work together to enhance the Arch and the

1 City. I urge you to expand the design area to include the St. Louis riverfront, the connections into LaClede's Landing and Chouteau's Landing and the entire boundary along Memorial Drive where the Arch grounds meet the City. Within that design area, we can work together through an international design competition to develop a destination attraction and improved parking and pedestrian connections that enhance the Riverfront, the Arch and downtown – some of the greatest assets of our region.

2 Like before, I completely endorse the use of the regional, nonprofit trust to sponsor the design competition and to help raise funds for the new destination attraction. As Mayor of the City of St. Louis, I pledge to work with NPS and the trust to conduct the design competition with this expanded area to bring about many positive improvements for the Arch and our City.

3 Finally, I urge you to set the 50th anniversary of the completion of the Arch, October, 2015, as the completion date for the project. It is critical that we have a shared goal and timetable to rally the interested parties to realize the possibilities of the Riverfront and Park.

We have an opportunity to once again celebrate the Arch – to once again be reminded of excitement and magnificence of the Mississippi River and daring optimism and energy of westward expansion. I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Francis G. Slay
Mayor, City of St. Louis



RESPONSES

1. In response to public comment, and to specifically address the City of St. Louis' interest in partnering with the NPS, the preferred alternative was changed to include Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard, the connections into Laclede's Landing and Chouteau's Landing and the entire boundary along Memorial Drive in the design competition to provide for a unified approach to revitalization of the entire streetscape surrounding the Memorial. The NPS would support a further expansion of the design competition boundary to areas directly adjacent to the Memorial, so long as the competition keeps to the original purpose and intent of revitalizing the Memorial and strengthening the connection of the Memorial to the surrounding cities. A geographically larger design competition is only possible in close cooperation with the cities of St. Louis and East St. Louis and the

private property owners. The NPS has no administrative control of properties outside of the Memorial boundary.

2. If a design competition is included in the selected alternative, the NPS most likely would enlist existing partners and develop new partnerships with many organizations to jointly sponsor a design competition.

3. Until the National Park Service has signed a Record of Decision selecting the alternative that is to be implemented, it would be pre-decisional for the agency to set a completion date. The implementation of the approved GMP depends on future funding and a host of external factors outside the direct control of the National Park Service. The approval of the plan does not guarantee funding, though the NPS would be diligent in its efforts to procure necessary funding.



PEORIA TRIBE OF INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

118 S. Eight Tribes Trail (918) 540-2535 FAX (918) 540-2538

P.O. Box 1527

MIAMI, OKLAHOMA 74355

CHIEF

John P. Froman

SECOND CHIEF

Jason Dollarhide

January 14, 2009

United States Department of the Interior
Attn: Thomas Bradley
Superintendent
National Park Service
Jefferson National Expansion Memorial
11 North Fourth Street
St. Louis, MO 63102-1882

RE: Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

Thank you for notice of the referenced project. The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma is currently unaware of any documentation directly linking Indian Religious Sites to the proposed construction. In the event any items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during construction, the Peoria Tribe request notification and further consultation.

The Peoria Tribe has no objection to the proposed construction. However, *if any human skeletal remains and/or any objects falling under NAGPRA are uncovered during construction, the construction should stop immediately, and the appropriate persons, including state and tribal NAGPRA representatives contacted.*

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'J. Froman', is written over a horizontal line.

John P. Froman
Chief

xc: Bud Ellis, Repatriation/NAGPRA Committee Chairman

TREASURER
John Sharp

SECRETARY
Hank Downum

FIRST COUNCILMAN
Carolyn Garren

SECOND COUNCILMAN
Jenny Rampey

THIRD COUNCILMAN
Alan Goforth



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Columbia Ecological Services Field Office
101 Park DeVille Drive, Suite A
Columbia, Missouri 65203-0007



Phone: (573) 234-2132 Fax: (573) 234-2181

MEMORANDUM

To: Superintendent Tom Bradley, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial,
National Park Service (NPS)

From: Charlie Scott, Field Supervisor, Columbia Ecological Services Field
Office, U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service)

Subject: Informal Consultation – Future Management Alternatives for Jefferson
National Expansion Memorial

We have reviewed the information in your November 7, 2008, memorandum pertaining to four management alternatives being considered for future improvements and expansion of the Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri and East St. Louis, Illinois. You provided an assessment of the action's impact on species listed under the Endangered Species Act. You determined that the Indiana bat and gray bat were unlikely to occur in the project area and that the action is not likely to adversely affect the pallid sturgeon and decurrent false aster.

We concur with your determinations on the pallid sturgeon, Indiana bat, and gray bat. We are deferring further informal consultation and concurrence for the decurrent false aster in Illinois to the Marion, Illinois Ecological Services Field Office. As stated in your memorandum, the project site in East St. Louis contains suitable habitat for this plant and nearby survey information by the Illinois Department of Transportation indicates that the species may occur at this location. Based on this information, a survey of the site for the decurrent false aster may be necessary. As project plans progress for the East St. Louis site, you propose that the NPS and Service coordinate and evaluate the effects of more specific alternatives on the decurrent false aster and its habitat. Please coordinate with Ms. Joyce Collins of the Marion, Illinois Ecological Services Field Office pertaining to We appreciate the opportunity to review this action. Please contact me if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Charles M. Scott
Field Supervisor

cc: Joyce Collins, USFWS, Marion, IL ESFO w/cy of incoming memorandum and attachments



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Marion Illinois Suboffice (ES)

8588 Route 148

Marion, IL 62959

(618) 997-3344

January 12, 2009

Memorandum

To: Superintendent Tom Bradley, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, National Park Service (NPS)

From: Joyce Collins, Assistant Field Supervisor, Marion Ecological Services Sub-Office, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service)

Subject: Informal Consultation – Future management alternatives for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

We have received and reviewed the information in your November 7, 2008, memorandum regarding the proposed expansion of Jefferson National Memorial in Saint Louis, Missouri and East Saint Louis, Illinois. This action consists of four management alternatives, including a no action alternative. You listed actions that may merit consideration by the Fish and Wildlife Service including the potential redesign and restructuring of some areas of the Memorial grounds on the Missouri side of the Mississippi River, expanded use and development of properties east of the river, including a possible ferry connection across the Mississippi River, riverfront and museum development and a potential reconfiguration of local highways.

The Columbia Ecological Services Field Office sent a memorandum to your office concurring with your determinations on the pallid sturgeon, Indiana bat, and gray bat and deferred further informal consultation and concurrence for the decurrent false aster in Illinois to our office. As stated in your memorandum, the project area on the river side of the levee flood wall in East St. Louis appears to contain suitable habitat for the decurrent false aster and a positive finding by the Illinois Department of Transportation one mile north indicates that the species may occur within the project area.

Information in the memorandum indicates that given the general nature of the planning effort and the ability to take into account and plan for the preservation of any populations of decurrent false aster during future implementation of any proposed actions in East St. Louis, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial has made a “may affect but not likely to adversely affect” determination. Additionally, the NPS proposes that the NPS and Service communicate and

evaluate individual site-specific project designs and construction proposals for the East St. Louis Addition to determine specific effects to the decurrent false aster and its habitat.

Provided that any future site-specific project designs and construction proposals are coordinated with our office during the early planning stages, we would concur that the proposed activity may effect but not likely to adversely affect the decurrent false aster. Depending on future project designs, a survey of the site for decurrent false aster may be necessary. In addition, we would recommend that any future project proposals that include a possible ferry connection across the Mississippi River or in channel construction be coordinated with this office to determine potential effects to the pallid sturgeon and its habitat.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed project alternatives. We look forward to coordinating with you on this project in the future. If you have any questions, please contact Matt Mangan of my staff at (618) 997-3344, ext. 345.

Sincerely,

/s/ Joyce A. Collins

Joyce A. Collins
Assistant Field Supervisor

