

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Environmental Assessment to Evaluate Alternatives for Revitalization

Public Scoping Comments

AL5000 Alternatives/Alternative Elements

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 232571 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The addition of the proposal to removal to Memorial drive seems to have occurred in a vacuum with little to no public input. The proposal was not part of the design when MVVA was announced as the winner of the design competition, and such a change is deserving of more public scrutiny. There has been little discussion of why this change in the design occurred. If the supposed logic behind the proposed removal of Memorial Drive is to avoid the need to cross the boulevard, this runs counter to another change in the proposal, the removal of three new parking structures in favor of using existing parking in Downtown St. Louis. The elimination of the proposed parking structures is a positive development but inherently suggests that visitors who arrive by car will be parking a few blocks away and walking to the park, crossing several streets along the way. To believe that having to cross an improved Memorial Drive will deter people from visiting the JNEM is nonsense.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 22 **Comment Id:** 219068 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. The plan to remove the parking garage is flawed. You can not implement a world class plan and offer no place for the visitors to park. Remember this park is in the middle of Downtown St. Louis therefore it is vital that the park continue to offer safe and convenient car, RV, and bus parking on site.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 85 **Comment Id:** 225932 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think the entrance on Memorial drive and better access from downtown is great for the many guests who are already staying in downtown hotels, but we get many, many guests who are just passing through. I think you should leave the parking garage where it is and just use the roof as park space.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 103 **Comment Id:** 226205 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I am worried about the removal of the north parking garage. In the plans I viewed at the Peabody Plaza building, I did not see any plans to supplement the removal of this parking. If you build a better Arch park to attract more people, then do not fall prey to what other cities have done and make it harder to enjoy it because you cannot find a way to park. If there is an alternative that I missed on the design, that is good, but it was not obvious so I found it worth the time to mention it.

Organization:

Commenter: Michael N/A **Page: Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL5000 Alternatives/Alternative Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 10 Comment Id: 229421 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The positive benefits of the Arch Garage far outweigh the unimaginative landscaping proposed. Forcing visitors to walk the many blocks from downtown parking to the grounds is simply insensitive and poor planning. Our population is getting older, there are more with disabilities traveling that need to be accommodated. The limited parking during sports events and their inflated fees is not the impression nor inconvenience we want the Arch visitor to have to contend. This can easily be remedied by tasteful landscaping of the upper deck yet still having parking in this area.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 229958 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: I don't think the lid will improve ADA access.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 14 Comment Id: 229960 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Add diversion drains for surface water.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 41 Comment Id: 230803 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Regarding the current Arch parking garage. I understand current plans are to remove it complete and possibly rebuild elsewhere. It would seem more cost effective to bury the existing garage and continue to use the lower levels with access perhaps only through one of the two EADs bridge archs. The other EADs arch could be used for pedestrian traffic to/from.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>

AL5200 Support Project/Project Elements

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 232522 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Here are the elements of the current plan that I like: - Kiener Plaza renovation - Luther Ely Smith Square renovation (NOT including the lid) - Arch grounds and riverfront beautification (ponds, trees, cobblestones, etc.) - The new museum entrance - Removal of the north parking garage - Cathedral Square (though the previous, expanded version would have been preferred) - Underpass Park (making the best of a bad situation under the interchange and providing incentive for redevelopment in Chouteau's Landing)

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 13 **Comment Id:** 218357 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes. I am strongly in favor of increasing access and available activities at the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 13 **Comment Id:** 218358 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think the impacts will be positive.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 17 **Comment Id:** 218570 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes, the proposed solution meets the needs for safer access to walk across I70, to have something to do when we get over to the park (I love visiting the Arch but don't need to see the movie, go up, or visit the Museum everytime I go there with friends), connect trails more easily, and make it a casual destination for everyday rather than a place to visit only when I have out of town company.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 219098 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think this is an excellent opportunity for the NPS to be a leader in accessibility and make JNEM a disability friendly destination.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL5200 Support Project/Project Elements

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 225632 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: On behalf of the AIA St. Louis Chapter Board of Directors and members, I write to advise that we appreciate the work of the National Parks Service and the City Arch River to revitalize the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. The goal to integrate the Gateway Arch and its park into the fabric of the city and improve the connection to the river is significant. Perhaps the most important stated goal is to improve the visitor experience.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 2 **Comment Id:** 229357 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Keeping these areas in good repair and making them accessible for all people sounds like a good idea to me.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 229423 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We are very happy to see the effort that is going into making the park better integrated with the city and the river, and the design concepts are really commendable.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 18 **Comment Id:** 229991 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I absolutely love the cover for I-70 allowing people [bicycles] to travel East to the river safely

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 49 **Comment Id:** 230822 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Whereas, the City of Clayton believes that development of the Mississippi Riverfront in the City of St. Louis will contribute to the vitality and sustainability of the St. Louis region and supports the Danforth Foundation in these efforts; and

Organization: City of Clayton, Missouri

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

AL5200 Support Project/Project Elements

Correspondence Id: 73 **Comment Id:** 232015 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: t. Louis is very segregated and Downtown St. Louis is cut off from all of its surrounding neighborhoods. Reconnecting the city to the Arch and Riverfront will be a huge step towards revitalizing the city and breaking down the barriers that segregate us.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

AL5300 Oppose Project/Project Elements

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234865 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Underground museum is not necessary to expand

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1 **Comment Id:** 217631 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: In the context of the needs of Downtown, and now viewing the Riverfront as void of attractions I consider this an unnecessary and ill-advised effort/study

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 1 **Comment Id:** 217632 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I dont believe the Park needs revitalizing. The Park is fine if Downtown were fine. The global need-which is the responsibility of the Park, the Fed Gov, the state gov, local government and civic leaders with power and money is our dead downtown west of Tucker

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 218110 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think this project is entirely unnecessary. I'm a liberal Democrat, but I have to I say this is a classic instance of a ridiculously expensive project being proposed to meet no need whatsoever. No person and no institution and no political entity will suffer if this project is dropped entirely, and that cannot be said of thousands of other likely cuts in government funding in the years ahead. The whole idea that the Arch grounds needed to be added to, jazzed up, etc., came from reaction to former Senator Danforth's assertions, and in St. Louis when Danforth says jump, people ask How high? people say How high?

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

AL5300 Oppose Project/Project Elements

Correspondence Id: 26 **Comment Id:** 220359 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: It isn't mentioned specifically in the EA Scoping Newsletter, but I have heard rumors that the Arch Parking Garage on the north end of the park may be removed and no other parking added. I understand the reasoning behind this is to encourage visitors to use public transit to access the park. I believe this would be a horrible mistake for many reasons. First of all, families with small children will find it difficult to travel with their strollers and without the ability to let their children snack on the way to/from the park. I know that it is possible to travel on St. Louis' public transportation with a stroller, but it is not easy and will prevent many people from accessing the park, which is what this project is mainly about. The second problem with requiring visitors to use public transit is the fact that the schedules for the transit system are not readily available at the stations/bus stops/on the busses. This will make it very difficult for people who are traveling without smartphones/computers (yes, people still travel without fancy electronics) to figure out how to get from their place, to the park, and from the park to wherever else they want to go. Also, even if people know the schedule, the public transit system in St. Louis is unreliable. There are many times the busses and/or trains are late and sometimes no way for people waiting to know.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 42 **Comment Id:** 221022 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I'm afraid that efforts to revitalize will destroy the simple charm and elegance of the magnificent spectacle of the arch grounds. Right now, it's a nice big open green space with a cool thing up in the air over it, and I like it like that.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 85 **Comment Id:** 225933 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My main concern is the parking issue. I work at the park, and one of the biggest complaints we get from visitors is that they have to walk so far from their cars, especially the elderly and handicapped visitors. If they have to park downtown and walk to The Arch it will be even farther, and more expensive (which is another major complaint). I think it may even cause visitation to fall. Some people, when they find out how far they're going to have to walk, will decide to just skip it.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 232523 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Here are some things I'm indifferent about: - The entire northern end of the park (event lawn, amphitheater, etc. - there is plenty of empty, underutilized green space downtown already) - The gondolas (gimmicky and ultimately a waste of money and a poor connection to the east side - a pedestrian bridge would have been better) - The Gateway Geyser Pavilion (not enough on the east side to make it a worthwhile excursion at this point)

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL5300 Oppose Project/Project Elements

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 232524 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: And here are the things that I absolutely condemn: - The removal of Washington Street next to the Eads Bridge is a pointless waste of money and will worsen public access to the Arch grounds, Laclede's Landing, and the riverfront.

Organization:

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 118 **Comment Id:** 232582 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I would like to posit the strongest possible objection to ANY alterations on the St. Louis Arch Grounds. As it is now, the Arch landscaping is mature, it is green, it is peaceful, and it is beautiful. It is inconceivable as to why anyone would want to convert such beautiful green space into a yet another concrete slab strip mall with the semblance of a carnival fairway with souvenir shops and hot dog stands. In fact, there are an abundance of restaurants and shopping venues directly north of the Arch. Moreover, every enterprise for riverfront dining or entertainment has failed, e.g., The Robert E. Lee, the Goldenrod, and MacDonald's. St. Louis already has a plethora of empty concrete slabs with empty box stores and weeds growing through the cracks - most subsidized by taxpayer dollars. For these reasons I strongly oppose any diminishment of the green space on the Arch grounds.

Organization:

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

CD1000 Commercial Development/Revitalization

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 229989 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We already have a major attraction in the arch, if you decide on another please compliment it with a lot of smaller scale development to support it.

Organization:

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

CD2000 Commercial Development

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 225633 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Not enough emphasis is placed on the development of the Arch grounds itself, especially at the north end where it is not currently operating as a memorial.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

CD2000 Commercial Development

Correspondence Id: 46 **Comment Id:** 221567 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: They don't go far enough. Saarinen's own plans showed much more development on the site, and adjacent/across from it. This requires much more than a landscaping solution! The small and boring plans developed to date will not inspire the commitments in time, talent, and treasure the Arch deserves.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

CN1000 Connectivity/Urban Interface

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 232569 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: While the so-called lid provides an improvement to a single point of connection between the JNEM and the City, it provides only a single pint of connection and assumes that the vast majority of people visiting the JNEM wish to enter at a single point as if it was the entrance to Disneyland. The proposed removal of Memorial Drive does nothing to improve the park and in fact puts the park edge into a very uneasy relationship with the remaining stretch of highway which divides the JNEM from the City. Currently Memorial Drive acts as a buffer between the park and the highway beyond and while itself could be vastly improved, provides a continuous vehicular and pedestrian promenade along the parks western edge. The removal of this roadway will leave the park edge directly against the depressed lanes of the highway, making the edge of the JNEM inhospitable for human habitation.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 38 **Comment Id:** 221009 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: If the purpose of the project is to reconnect the arch grounds to the city, then no, I don't believe that it will be successful in the current configuration. As it now stands, most people seem to enter through the north parking garage or in front of the old courthouse. The entire rest of the arch grounds is nearly impenetrable. This project does little to address that problem.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 221015 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My main concerns are connectivity and creating more uses for the park. The park needs to draw in and release pedestrians in all edges of the park. The southern edge connections doesnt appear to be improved and the norther edge doesnt related well to Laclede's Landing.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

CN1000 Connectivity/Urban Interface
<p>Correspondence Id: 43 Comment Id: 221030 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: No. One of the fundamental purposes of the CityArchRiver competition is to reconnect the City of St. Louis to the Mississippi River and the Arch Grounds. The proposed plan that is currently under consideration would add more infrastructure between the City and the River. One of the biggest problems with the Arch Grounds is that it is disconnected from its surroundings. It is an isolated island separated by bridges and the elevated/depressed parts of I-70.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 44 Comment Id: 221069 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Revitalizing the Arch grounds should incorporate a more fluid transition into the urban landscape. Further transportation infrastructure should be avoided.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 45 Comment Id: 221363 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The highways to the south and west are the greatest barriers and the impact seems to be largely ignored in the current plans. The underpass park and greenway connector could have been a wonderful southern entry. The additional highway ramps are just going to strengthen the depressed barrier on the west side (not to mention a huge expenditure). There need to be more bicycle and pedestrian access points and the underpass park needs to be included.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 58 Comment Id: 225444 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Closing Memorial Drive will decrease access to the Park. This change will funnel pedestrian access from the west into the new "walk over". The open interstate trench will remain which creates negative space at the west side of the Park. Instead of opening the Park on the west, this change reenforce the isolation of the Arch grounds from Busch Stadium, the hotels, and the future Ballpark Village.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 65 Comment Id: 225534 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: I think more effort has to be made in making the entrance to the arch grounds more pedestrian friendly. The proposed plans seem to be doing the opposite. I think there should be alternative exit points to take advantage of existing space downtown to park cars. If enough effort is put into the grounds close to the Arch it would be inviting to walk from a particular point downtown directly to the arch grounds.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>

CN1000 Connectivity/Urban Interface

Correspondence Id: 77 **Comment Id:** 225857 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The park and the river need to be integrated with downtown St. Louis in a way that improves connection with downtown residents, workers and visitors. Excess amounts of highway infrastructure destroys this connection and puts the arch ground on an island separated from people.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

CR4000 Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 123 **Comment Id:** 234869 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, (NHPA) [16 U.S.C. 470 §§ 470-470w-6] 1966, undertakings subject to the review process are referred to in S101 (d)(6)(A), which clarifies that historic properties may have religious and cultural significance to Indian tribes. Additionally, Section 106 of NHPA requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties (36 CFR Part 800) as does the National Environmental Policy Act (43 U.S.C. 4321 and 433 1-35 and 40 CFR 1501.7(a) of 1969). The Osage Nation has a vital interest in protecting its historic and ancestral cultural resources. The Osage Nation anticipates reviewing and commenting on the planned Environmental Assessment for the proposed NPS Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (Gateway Arch) Implementation of the Winning Design of the Framing a Modern Masterpiece International Design Competition.

Organization: Osage Nation

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 234492 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Systems can be added without visual impact to address the prejudices that have arisen regarding algae blooms and fluctuating water levels. Any decent urban water feature would contain adequate circulation, filters and an auto-fill system. These great ponds should be preserved and improved rather than denigrated by a bunch of water's edge plantings that are nice enough in their own regard, but show no sympathy for the original design intent.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

FN1000 Funding/Implementation/Schedule

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234861 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: This design layout will work out beautifully with trivial costs and tasks not giving any burdens to the taxpayers. Look at Kansas City which will gain an Aquarium management company owned Aquarium to its ground there in the near future. All we have to do is to spend building on the walkways and the infrastructure. That's it.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 220790 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The purpose, need, and objectives only partially reflect what I think NPS needs to accomplish with this project. They need to do more. They need to stop removing items from the competition's winning design and start adding more. Who cares if it's finished by 2015. What gets built is something that's going to last for at least another 50 years, so it better be darn good.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 220791 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The only concerns I can see about this project is infuriating the St. Louis public by not building the right thing. Don't give us a vanilla, scaled down, lid over the highway design after all the months of the "International Design Competition" that promised grandeur and sophistication. Do the right thing, even if it means the project isn't done by 2015. What would be more important, finishing this project by some stupid 50th anniversary deadline, or paying tribute to Eero and Dan the right way by building a FIRST CLASS park and surroundings? Every time I turn around you guys are taking out some other design feature. No beer garden? No lights on the river? No park under the Poplar Street Bridge? A tiny restaurant by the cathedral? Why'd you guys even have this design competition to begin with if you're just going to forgo building anything? All I ask is that you do the right thing and build what St. Louis deserves. Think BIG!! Forget the deadline of 2015. Take the time to collect the necessary funds to do the project right. I think it would make Eero and Dan more proud if there were mounds of dirt and debris from the torn down highway 70 during the 50th anniversary celebration then a newly finished, but highly flawed design. Do what was initially conceived in the design competition. Don't leave St. Louis behind while other midwestern cities like Cincinnati and Louisville get first class, beautiful riverside parks. We have 2.8 MILLION people in the region. If St. Louis City and County were combined we would be the 14th largest city in America. Don't treat us like a second class city. We ARE watching and we DO care!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 41 **Comment Id:** 221017 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I believe the sheer cost of the proposals to be the biggest problem. We definitely need to focus on the priority of key items. The "lid" is critical. The connection between the arch and lacledes landing is critical.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

FN1000 Funding/Implementation/Schedule

Correspondence Id: 46 **Comment Id:** 221566 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: NPS needs to develop relationships with the private sector in STL in order to find funding and co-develop enhancements beyond the current limited scope of work. The current orientation of the project continues to be insular, rather than connecting to city in truly meaningful ways. A grander scheme involving adjacent developments is required, such as those shown in other competitor's proposals. Current and long-term fiscal policy at the federal level will stall meaningful development for decades.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 78 **Comment Id:** 225860 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The proposed cost of the new design is absurd. Our city has too many other issues to put so much investment in just one feature of our city. I'm concerned we are too concerned with developing a beautiful plan than a realistic one.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 226298 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Wasting hard to come-by funding on highway infrastructure changes adjacent to the JNEM is a negative impact and will no doubt result in a trade-off of not being able to build some of the actual planned park improvements that would make the park a more attractive place to visit. An example of this is what seems to be the removal of the beer garden at the south end of the park. This is an attraction could draw many visitors who would stay in the park longer to experience this unique place. Keeping the beer garden in the plan and potentially including other real park improvements in exchange for dropping the costly removal of Memorial Drive with its expensive highway infrastructure changes as well as the removal of Washington Avenue would have a very positive impact on the JNEM. See further related comments below.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 229954 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The millions to be spent on this project should go to meet real needs of millions of Americans unemployed and underemployed. If they cannot be used for that, they should be used for maintenance on existing national parks.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

FN1000 Funding/Implementation/Schedule

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 230815 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Without better connections between the city the Arch and the river, we will end up with some shiny new stuff that will make little difference in the long term. We need to take the time to do this project right so it can have a positive impact on our community for the next 100 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 66 **Comment Id:** 232517 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The October 2015 deadline set by the City Arch River Foundation for the completion of Arch grounds improvements is already slipping. Many of the features proposed in the design competition are now planned to occur in later phases, beyond the 2015 deadline, if at all. As this is the case, the urgency of each element should be weighed against a longer term horizon. If highway removal and a new boulevard become more feasible upon completion of the New Mississippi River bridge and rerouting of I-70 out of the depressed lanes away from the Arch, then the 2015 deadline should be extended to allow for sufficient time to carry out a more optimal alternative, including highway removal, that would not be otherwise feasible by an October 2015 deadline.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 234480 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The removal of memorial necessitates spending additional money re-building highway infrastructure with the reversal of two existing ramps to funnel traffic away from the closed section and onto the highway and vice versa. In a time when funding for improvements is difficult to secure, squandering resources on highway infrastructure seems to go against everything that the park symbolizes.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 92 **Comment Id:** 234507 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Looming over the head of the NPS is a deadline to complete all park improvements by the October 2015. This deadline has forced the NPS and other agencies to severely compromise the options available to it to improve connections to the park. In particular, the vision presented by City to River has been roundly ignored and shoved aside.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 234684 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think the city just wants financial help to put 'lid' on.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

MI1000 Mitigation

Correspondence Id: 100 **Comment Id:** 232558 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I interpret the question to mean construction concerns and inconvenience concerns associated with the construction and re-development of the Arch Grounds. I have very few concerns about these potential impacts. I will assume construction phasing will be implemented to minimize inconveniences and account for continual use of the park throughout the project. I also assume the project teams will be consorting with all stakeholders and coordinating with the New Mississippi River Bridge construction. In all seriousness, how much worse could access to the River, Laclede Landing, and Arch Grounds get? And if we inconvenience auto travel on the elevated and depressed lanes of I-70 the reality is it will mostly be commercial truck and through-travel traffic- They will quickly learn to circumnavigate during the process.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 66 **Comment Id:** 232583 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Public comments should be published individually in the Environmental Assessment rather than aggregated as was done during the General Management Plan update. It is impossible to gauge the level of community interest in any particular issue when comments are aggregated.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 117 **Comment Id:** 232572 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The current challenge of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is fundamentally one of disconnection. Visitor numbers are slowly decreasing because, although a compelling experience, it is not enough of a destination to warrant repeat visits. It now exists solely for out-of-town tourists. The park must be made a vital and important part of St. Louis civic life in order to reinvigorate the park. The fortunes of downtown and the JNEM are inorexibly intertwined. A house divided against itself cannot stand, yet the current plan hardens the divisions around the majority of the JNEM boundaries. This sad result is largely the result of unreasoned local interference in a good design. Residents of St. Louis care deeply about this opportunity, but until now we have remained sidelined by a shamefully anemic public participation process. The National Parks Service now has a chance to exercise true leadership and to openly and carefully evaluate the merits of the current proposal alongside other strong alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 92 **Comment Id:** 232547 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Lastly, I am severely disappointed in the lack of improvements proposed for the southern half of the park. I believe the inattention and rollback of previously proposed plans constitutes neglect on the part of the NPS.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
--

Correspondence Id: 84 **Comment Id:** 231811 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: As a downtown resident, I find the Arch grounds to be blasé, boring, lacking any significant attraction other than the Arch. It seems this area has much potential to be much more than it is, by providing more to tourists and residents than the Arch (which one person does once in their life), a mediocre museum in the dank basement of the arch, a lacking boat tour, and a helicopter ride. For this reason, there needs to be a serious and robust effort to revitalize this park, which I thought was fully conveyed in the MVVA plan for the Arch grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 231695 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Noted visual rhetorician John Louis Lucaites visited the park and museum recently. He posted his comments on his Weblog, No Caption Needed (<http://www.nocaptionneeded.com/?PHPSESSID=a6c0b47af3c8a1acaa1b23f2f3acd2f5>). Expert and amateur outside opinions such as Dr. Lucaites regarding the park and museum are extremely important. What impression do visitors receive when they visit the Memorial? Is it positive or negative? Is it a unique and focuses experiences, based on the location and history, or is it a generic National Monument that tells the same story that other sites tell?

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 230828 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The current plan also falls short of three criteria that our chapter feels are important for good development in St. Louis. First, in spite of the plans stated goals, it does not focus on the River. Second, it is not sustainable because it will not generate the interest, investment and revenues hoped for. Third, it misses the opportunity to involve our cultural institutions by creating an outreach venue for them adjacent to downtown.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 49 **Comment Id:** 230821 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Whereas, the City of Clayton believes that the study conclusions recently put forth by the Danforth Foundation acknowledge the problems of declining visitors to the Arch, of the pedestrian disconnection of these assets to the city by the interstate highway, and of the substantial amount of acreage associated with the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial required for passive use; and

Organization: City of Clayton, Missouri

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 49 **Comment Id:** 230820 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Whereas, the City of Clayton supports Eero Saarinen's original vision of expanding the awareness of the heritage of this area through the addition of educational, cultural, recreational, and other amenities; and

Organization: City of Clayton, Missouri

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 49 **Comment Id:** 230819 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Whereas, the City of Clayton believes that it is necessary and important to the region to build on the world-wide reputations of the Gateway Arch and the Mississippi River and transform this area into a vibrant and welcoming place that will attract regional citizens and visitors to enjoy these significant assets of our community; and

Organization: City of Clayton, Missouri

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 41 **Comment Id:** 230805 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I heard that the commission/vendor team was ramping up a team to work the project. I would like to see more publicity on how Saint Louisans can see and apply for those jobs. No one cares more about this, than the locals.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 229963 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I don't think NPS has the money to do this if we see parks being closed and staff reduced. So this will not be accomplished by 2015. I doubt that the City has the funds to do their part either. What money we do have should be devoted to repair and maintenance of the arch--NB: numerous elevator failures recently and erosion of Arch's welded joints.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 229949 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: As for impact on historical heritage, that ship sailed 70-80 years ago when the NPS razed 40 blocks of irreplaceable cast iron architecture for green space! Not a single voice of reason to stop and think about it. I have heard all the excuses about the derelict condition of the properties but we have seen similar properties brought back to stunning splendor elsewhere in the city (central west end, Lafayette Square, even Benton Park).

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
--

Correspondence Id: 1 **Comment Id:** 229943 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Downtown St. Louis will die long before Arch 2015. Two decades of killing our primary, historic places of music art and culture to create an entertainment downtown on grand avenue, has been a most destructive strategy. It is ironic those who did-in Downtown are the mouths for this effort. They see only the Arch from their offices.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 229424 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The JNEM is a treasure--in its site, the Kiley design, and the Arch itself.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 229417 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Many concerns arise when I consider this project. While I believe it is vital to restore the and bring life to the Arch Grounds, not too much needs to be done. I am most concerned with the cost of the project and the lack of funding available.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 229415 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The public is most concerned with initial cost and maintenance cost of the project. Is it worth it to pour dollars into the environmental impact if there is not way to pay for the redesign?

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 225694 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The task for the board, the designers and the backers is to accept that this project is not about the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. Our beautiful landmark and the surrounding park are a complement to the city itself, not the focus. It's a difficult vision, I know, because so many in the region have tied their own identity to the Arch itself rather than the city in which it stands, but it's one that must be realized...and soon. Don't stubbornly insist on the C+A+R plan. There are other ideas and initiatives out there which are making headway; use them as resources, and as partners. Push for a revitalized Chouteau's Landing (Powell Square, International Photography Museum), support Old North's Branch Street Trestle, fully consider the benefits of City to River's Memorial Boulevard proposal, talk with the Delmar Trolley team and think about implementing something similar. Remember that these projects and the people behind them are the ones who will ultimately make City+Arch+River a success. In order for this project to be successful, and its purpose to be achieved, the National Park Service and the City+Arch+River organizers will need to take a chance -- and a stance -- against the status quo. Despite what may be said behind closed doors, the people who are currently the most vehemently against the plans -- the "gadflies" and "dissidents," as it were -- are actually the ones with the best interests of the city in mind.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 225693 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: If the leading philosophy behind the competition is a strengthening of connections (note "connections," plural) between the City, the Archgrounds and its surrounding areas, then no, the current direction is a failure in my mind and that of many others. While MVVA did an admirable job with its simple, elegant approach to the Grounds itself (and the beautiful new Museum entrance/interior), it still has offered nothing in the way of connections and has, in fact, severed connections at nearly every edge of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. In a project for which the goal is to increase connectivity and open the Archgrounds up to its surrounding neighbors, this is a gross -- and frankly, insulting -- oversight by the judging committee and the City+Arch+River board.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 65 **Comment Id:** 225535 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: All I can say is that the winning design should be considered more than it is at this point.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 62 **Comment Id:** 225466 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: What worries me is that this project will not have an impact and that this lack of impact, in turn, will create a negative impact. This project has woefully been under-promoted, (perhaps because all those involved are not excited about the end product?) and therefore has not created excitement and energy about it. People get excited when they see the potential for greatness and there was this chance in the design phase but it has since been lost. Most of what held potential has been stripped or cut in order to reduce costs and meet an arbitrary deadline. This project has the potential to have a HUGE positive impact but right now it is nothing more than a faint blip on the radar screen for many St. Louisans. If it takes more time than wanted to create greatness, take it. Celebrating an anniversary is important, but right now we are getting our beloved arch some gas station roses and

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

a cheap night out. If we took our time and increased the effort, just by a little, we may not be able to do anything too special on the actual anniversary itself, but plans would be underway for a grand second honeymoon. That is what we should be doing. SLOWWWW DOWNNNNNNN!!!!!! Take the time to raise more money and recreate the excitement that the project once had. After all, it's the end project that's the most important and that will be with us for the rest of our lifetime.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 42 **Comment Id:** 221021 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Can you make sure there's free parking close to the park. All the parking close to the park now is either controlled by hotels or costs too much. Maybe allow parking on the lawn?

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 33 **Comment Id:** 220812 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My main concern is that that the project isn't going to have a large enough impact for those who live closest to it, city residents. Considering the design by MVVA, the park itself looks like it will be a lot better/prettier. The landscaping will look much better, and the museum will be vastly improved. Parking will be improved. There are a lot of great parts of the design, but I feel that it only enhances the experiences for tourists at the grounds. It doesn't do enough for city residents, especially those downtown. The Arch grounds have the potential to be used everyday for those who live closest to it. Look at Forest park as an example. People run, bike, play sports, picnic, etc. everyday. They come from DeBalivere, CWE, Dogtown, etc. The design for the grounds doesn't offer downtown residents everyday use. If you put in a large bike path loop/trail using the bridges (Eads and McArthur) and crossing over to the east side (potentially connecting to the river trail as well, that's something small/easy that pulls city residents into the park everyday. Just a thought.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 33 **Comment Id:** 220811 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes, I do. I think the your goals and plans are what we need to make the park better. I just hope those objectives for those goals are being executed. St. Louis citizens haven't heard anything about progress in a long time. It would be nice to here what's going on as it affects us the most.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 31 **Comment Id:** 220771 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The route for the gondolas could be more scenic than flying over the bridge, but I understand the issues with pierings on the river. I have worked with the Army Corps of Engineers before. They fear change.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

MT1000 Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
--

Correspondence Id: 17 **Comment Id:** 218571 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I am concerned the project will be scaled back due to funding constraints and this will be our only chance in decades ahead to make real improvement. To lose this chance now would be sad.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 218534 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My concern is that we opt for some large scale albatross type project that will only have minor, isolated impact on the arch grounds. I hope planners can see how areas like the Delmar Loop, and South Grand have been revitalized and made pedestrian friendly using small scale development.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 218152 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The only concern we would have about the park is the possibility of its becoming too commercialized, or even partially privatized. We do not believe that is in the works, but the threat of partial privatization was posed in the past and we hope the Park Service will continue to protect the integrity of the public space there.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 218061 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The grounds are already well used by those downtown. The problem lies in the lack of people living downtown, not in the grounds itself. We must attract businesses. I came downtown for a quick dinner on a Tuesday night and everything was closed. Two of my favorite downtown stores closed in the past six months as a result of poor traffic. They moved to Maplewood where there is a sense of community.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4 **Comment Id:** 217828 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Historical remanants re-discovered as the grounds are altered should be preserved.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234866 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: the Saint Louis cathedral must be removing from the Jefferson ground.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 4 **Comment Id:** 217827 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The purpose, need and objectives are fine as far as they go but what is too narrow is the definition of 'improves connections to the city' which seems to mean downtown, directly west of the Arch Grounds, and excludes important opportunities to connect to the cultural and historical sites along the Mississippi going north.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 218111 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The proposed design I've seen in newspaper reports and exhibits. I think it's tacky, and inappropriate -- gondolas over the Mississippi?! -- in addition to being unnecessary. If anything should be added to the Arch grounds or facilities -- and I don't think anything is needed -- it should reinforce the sense of history implicit in the Arch symbolism -- the gateway to the West, not reconstitute the Arch grounds as an amusement park.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 218407 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Grounds should be maintained as a green space. Immediately remove /diseased/dying trees and begin to replace at once. No additional surface buildings; use space in Laclede's landing as additional education center. Maintain present parking garage.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 21 **Comment Id:** 218973 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Please consider adding housnig for purple martins, a human dependent bird species, in plans for natural areas. Any housing then would have to be managed, and perhaps I can help do that, or find someone.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 219071 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Changeing the ponds on the site from defined-edge, free-form reflecting pools to quasi-natural wild swamp areas would substitute a trendy idea for a great mid-century modernist detail. There is plenty of room on the east side of the river for installations that reflect current views of water ecology. The Park Service should consider "off limits" destroying public works of art (which the current ponds are) just because someone doesn't know how to manage the water quality.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 25 **Comment Id:** 219099 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think this project will definitely revitalize the park. Paraquad believes that accessibility for people with disabilities should be considered in every step of the process. It will be essential to have experts in the field of accessible construction and design be an integral part of this project. In addition, it would be highly beneficial to create an advisory committee comprised of experts and people with disabilities. This will help establish best practices and provide a practical experience and opinion when designing and constructing.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 51 **Comment Id:** 225385 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The St. Louis Arch is a prime spot for wedding pictures for St. Louisans. Leonor K Sullivan Blvd is often very crowded with parked cars, horse-drawn buggies, or is flooded out by Mother Nature. Plus, wedding parties typically do not want to scale the stairs to the Arch from the riverfront. Drivers have to find a way to get to the 15 minute bus parking by the Old Cathedral. Or drivers have to enter the Old Cathedral parking lot, maneuver inside that tight lot, or park there - much to the dismay of Mass celebrants. Further, during floods, the only way to get to the bus parking lane taking a long detour down I-44 East/I-55 North into Memorial Drive. The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial grounds really needs an easier way for buses and limousines (and photographers and their vehicles) to enter, stage, and exit the property for pictures. Even if that means coupling maintenance facilities and this special parking - anything is better than what we have to deal with now. Please consider 3-4 large parking spots for buses (plus 3-4 spots for photographers) for this feature - even if it needs to be hidden away to conserve the beauty of the new design, which all St. Louisans are excited to see!

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 86 **Comment Id:** 225934 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think the pedestrian experience should be improved and made more orderly and predictable, at the expense of increased traffic volume

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 226195 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: That the grounds will be commercialized. Vendors, river boats, helicopters, etc. should be allowed from the Old Courthouse to the middle of the River between the Eads Bridge & the Poplar St. Bridge. The entire area in question from the Old Courthouse to the middle of the River and from The Eads Bridge to the Poplar St. Bridge should be reserved for passive recreation and returned to a naturalistic and sustainable environment. Since the Memorial is a National Park, it should reflect the character of other National Parks rather than a Disneyfied commercial landscape.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 105 **Comment Id:** 226221 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We understand the need to respect the historical nature of the site and the designer's intentions. Still, we hope the project will be able to introduce more native plant elements into the site, including with the selection of a replacement for the Rosehill Ash trees, possible expansion of plantings near the reflecting pond, and elimination of certain invasive plants like English Ivy and Wintercreeper. Native plants have the potential to be a key element of the food web that could eventually support foraging, and possibly nesting, habitat for a variety of migratory songbirds. Millions of birds use the Mississippi River twice a year as a guide while traveling between their breeding and wintering grounds. This fact, and supporting information, could be part of an interpretive panel--perhaps in the pond area. While nature conservation and wildlife habitat are not key to the site's purpose and history, it would be a shame to not introduce the topic to site visitors. The same panel could refer the visitor to the large network of natural areas around the region and along the River, such as Forest Park, Cliff Cave, Columbia Bottom and Riverlands.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 229350 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: More uses are needed inside the park to draw more individuals, better connectivity to other parts of downtown, closing the interstate (I-70) with a more pedestrian oriented boulevard, memorial drive should remain open to traffic, and more activities such as bike trails are essential in improving the experience of visiting downtown and the Arch Grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 40 **Comment Id:** 229352 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think a renewable energy source is a MUST for the revitalization of the park. Even a water wheel on the east side of the river, activated by the flow of water, would accomplish the goal. Or perhaps a bunch of bicycles hooked up to generate electricity and let individuals pedal the bikes to see how much energy is generated. I kinda thought that renewable energy visions are supposed to be part of all projects now days.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 229360 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: In addition to improving both pedestrian and bicycle access to the Arch grounds from the surrounding city, the grounds themselves should engage and encourage people to enjoy the open space. While passive "rooms" in the landscape where views of the River and the city can be framed are important, of equal value are spaces to recreate with others. For example, consideration should be given to constructing an accessible children's playground like the one in Forest Park. An accessible water feature like the one in Millennium Park in Chicago should also be considered. A permanent concert venue like the Frank Gehry designed band shell in the Chicago park would also be very desirable. In short, parks are for people and people appreciate both passive and active spaces.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 4 **Comment Id:** 229371 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: One of the great opportunities in front of us is connecting the Arch to the Riverfront Trail going north and all of its unique cultural, recreational, and environmental features. The Mary Meachum Freedom Crossing Underground Railroad site, nationally recognized by the National Park Service, is three (3) miles north of the Arch on the River. Between the Freedom Crossing and the Arch are two other famous nineteenth century documented Underground Railroad event sites--William Wells Brown and Caroline Quarrels. Additionally, about a mile north of the Arch near the River are over a dozen Native American mound sites, including the Big Mound, and a new bike trail plan, Mounds Trail, which connects to Cahokia Mounds on the Illinois side. The only Lewis and Clark interpretive sign in the city is also located near the Freedom Crossing site. Along this stretch are two former railroad trestles which are being transformed into elevated bikeways, complete with elevated landscaping, walkways and other park features to draw thousands of tourists and community residents. The riverfront Trail is the link to two wonderful bike loops. One loop starts at the Arch, goes north 2 miles and crosses the McKinley Bridge, goes south along the River and crosses back on the Eads Bridge to the Arch (perfect for short family rides). The other continues up the Riverfront Trail 12 miles, crosses the Old Chain of Rocks Bridge and goes south on the River back to the Eads Bridge, 26 miles. All of these features can be generally categorized as being in North St. Louis City, long neglected and rarely receiving any investment. This is the perfect opportunity to significantly impact a disadvantaged number of communities and bring tourism into an economically struggling area of the city.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 229961 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Add ADA ramp from waterfront to Arch grounds on south side of steps to mirror north side stairway.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 229982 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I don't think there needs to be a major "connector" or cover over the highway. I think some simple pedestrian bridges would be fine. I also think the arch grounds need to be tied into the Landing.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 22 **Comment Id:** 229993 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The plan needs to be modified to include an major addition to the parking facility to accommodate RV's and buses. If you move forward with the current plan to remove the current parking facility, the project will fail. You must take steps now to modify the site plan to include a state of the art parking facility. Not only with the parking facility provide a safe haven for the visitor's vehicles, but it will also generate revenue to fund park improvements and maintenance. If you look at the success of Disney World the visitor begins with at the parking facility. One cannot imagine Disney World without its first class parking operation, so the Arch and museum must have its own parking facility.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 43 **Comment Id:** 230810 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Any plan to improve the park should extend the landscaping and activities underneath and past the bridges into Choteau's and Laclede's Landing.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 43 **Comment Id:** 230813 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: please bring back the Beer Garden to the final plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 49 **Comment Id:** 230823 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: hereas, the City of Clayton understands that enhancement of the Arch and Riverfront can occur only with an agreement to release the federal passivity requirement of the Arch grounds on some portion of the 91- acre site;

Organization: City of Clayton, Missouri

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 49 **Comment Id:** 230824 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Now Be It Resolved That The City of Clayton: * supports retention of the passive requirement of some acreage immediately surrounding the Arch and the release of the passive use requirement on the remaining acreage to be governed by a regional oversight body; * urges our federal legislators to pursue an agreement with the National Park Service to release the passive use requirement on all of the 91 acres that comprise the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial to be governed by a regional oversight body; * urges other St. Louis County cities to support this position. Adopted the 23rd day of August, 2011

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 230827 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We are concerned, however, that at this time, the attractions planned for the Arch grounds will not attract us year-round for activities other than major events or taking visitors to the Arch. We support greater destination focus to extend visits to the Arch and its environs. This is not a design deficiency. It is, however, a lack of programming for cultural and quasi-commercial attractions, such as can be found at Millennium Park in Chicago.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 230829 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We understand and truly appreciate the responsibility of the National Parks Service to honor the memorial aspects of the site. The area, however, where real change in the Arch grounds can be most effective in attracting visitors in the way that Chicago's Millennium Park does, is at the north end. This area has been used as a parking and support facility and has not contributed to the memorial function. It is not necessary or desirable to turn the north end of the Arch grounds into a typical commercial area, but there should be year round attractions for visitors and St. Louisans alike, including commercial functions and institutional uses. Carefully designed, this can and should enhance the appreciation of the memorial image and function.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 84 **Comment Id:** 231810 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I applauded the thrilling prospect of adding new attractions that could not only draw more tourists to the park, but residents from the city to spend their day. I commend the effort to construct a cathedral square, Underpass Park, a beer garden, an ice rink, and a first-floor restaurant south of the cathedral. However, NPS's rendering of MVVA's plan changed or excluded these plans. Cathedral square and the prospect of having a restaurant with a second-floor hall space is a very exciting idea. I am unaware if the restaurant idea was eliminated in NPS's plans, but I highly encourage such a structure as this restaurant and hall space. The structure is central to all activities at the Arch grounds and the Old Courthouse and can also function as an information/visitor center. When I first saw MVVA's idea of Underpass Park, I was immediately excited over the idea. The southern portion of the park is very unsightly and ugly since it is where the park maintenance building and the interstate highway bridges are located. A well-landscaped park like the one proposed would excellently connect the Arch grounds and Chouteau Landing. This holds true as well with the proposed idea of the beer garden and ice rink located on the southern end of the Arch grounds. I realize these two prospects have been moved to Kiener Plaza under the NPS plan, but I think that was a foolish thing to do. The ambiance of the park

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

surrounding the beer garden would be great atmosphere for diners who desire to enjoy the trees and nature while enjoying a beer. The same applies to the ice rink, which can be better utilized on the Arch grounds and not at Kiener Plaza, which has a noisy, urban feel due to its location in the heart of the city.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 105 **Comment Id:** 232545 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: In addition, we request any lighting upgrades or installations include fully shielded fixtures to reduce energy use and expense but more importantly reduce glare at night and the potential disruption of birds during migration. Many species of songbirds migrate at night and depend upon natural features to do so. Studies have shown that lights and especially lighted glass buildings can be deadly to birds. The Park Service acknowledged this when incorporating a "lights-off" period for the Arch spotlights during seasonal migration. Similarly, we request that any new, above-ground building construction consider low-reflectivity, bird-legible glass, exterior shading, interior window treatments and/or other techniques to reduce the lethality of any glass and window installations. Next to habitat destruction, collisions with glass and windows is believed to be the largest human-induced cause of fatalities for birds. If incorporated in the design process, such measures may not be that expensive. Detailed concepts and techniques have been developed by New York City Audubon and the Fatal Light Awareness Program in Toronto, Canada.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 100 **Comment Id:** 232556 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Park Management and Operations objectives are too general. Cost modeling should look at life-cycle costing not just initial capital costs. Our area may be water rich, but installing flora that is either native or our plant-zone or adaptive will ensure the parks beauty does not become water burden in the future. Installation of cisterns, green roofs, rain gardens, pervious pavement, and solar PV panels should be employed to minimize maintenance and environmental impact on the micro-climate.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 119 **Comment Id:** 232581 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Comment: Lowering Memorial Drive under Market and Chestnut could eliminate pedestrian conflicts at north- and southbound Memorial Drive with Market and Chestnut without adversely affecting pedestrian and vehicular traffic around the Old Courthouse.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 234406 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Am concerned that safe access by bicycle and adequate, secure bicycle parking may not be provided.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 234407 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Beyond that there need to be more bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Arch grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 120 **Comment Id:** 234848 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We encourage the applicant to commit to creating a sustainable design implementation plan for this project. Such a plan could incorporate the use of recycled materials, natural light, passive solar heating, energy efficient lighting, water conserving plumbing, innovative stormwater management, and Energy Star equipment. For additional information regarding the LEED program and sustainable development, please access the following website: <http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CategoryID=19> & http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/sg_guidelines.htm. We are also available to assist the applicant in this effort.

Organization: US Environmental Protection Agency

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234858 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Aquarium is to be building on the southside of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and the Parking Garage building stays on the northside of Memorial ground. Aquarium and Parking Garage buildings should be almost the same in shape and material. The building of the Aquarium could be taller. Aquarium would have the covered rooftop restaurant and bar with the dancing floor above it and underneath it is a three story underground parking garage. This whole Aquarium building ought to be open till 3 am on weekends and 1 am on weekdays. And I suppose that the patrons and customers would be at ease very much knowing that their vehicles are parking safely underneath them while having fun strolling through the Aquarium and/or mingling with the crowd in a restaurant and bar.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234863 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Tents and Canopies are to be locating on the ground level west side of the Leonar K. Sullivan Boulevard for holidays and special occasions. A lot of portable removable benches could be on either side of Sullivan Boulevard.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NI1000 New Ideas or Changes to Existing Design Alternatives

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234864 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: There would be some walkways around at Eads Bridge, on the north side covered walkway attached Poplar Street Bridge, on road level or on the top of the McArthur Bridge and at East Saint Louis riverfront.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS1000 Outside Scope: East Side

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 234518 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The "gondola" should be replaced with and enhanced (half dedicated if not all) Eads Bridge with a Trolley circulator & bicycle/pedestrian accommodations. The Bridge should be a destination offering the best views of the City & the Arch.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 217721 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Bicycle & pedestrian access and connection across the Mississippi River should be improved by dedicating at least half of the Eads Bridge to these transportation modes. The view from the Eads Bridge of the Arch grounds and the city backdrop is one of the best in the area. Access to both sides of the River is critical and getting there should be part of the experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 218408 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: There should be no cable car rides that obstruct the vista toward Illinois from the Arch grounds. This is not an amusement park; it's a memorial and education center.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 48 **Comment Id:** 222062 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: St. Louis already has large and amazing parks. I'm concerned that few will use the east side park and the upkeep will be financially burdensome (see Gateway mall for much of its life). We need a project that will stimulate private sector development, and I see the greatest potential being in St. Louis city.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

OS1000 Outside Scope: East Side

Correspondence Id: 41 **Comment Id:** 230804 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Regarding the Gondola - An expensive and terrible idea. I recommend we revisit water taxis or ferry service, or leverage the Metrolink and pedestrian walk ways to get people over the river better.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS2000 Outside Scope: Riverfront

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 234650 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The plan must focus more on the River. The plan is passive in developing the River's edge and the River itself for activity.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 229983 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think along with development of some of the arch grounds the rivierfront should be developed with retail and other attractions. Maybe some marina-type developments also. We don't need giant scale development, we should go for smaller scale pedestrian-friendly development.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS3000 Outside Scope: Downtown/Adjacent Developments

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 234649 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We want improved connections to the city; the plan does not effectively connect the city to the Arch grounds except at the center, thereby missing the opportunity to unite the city and the Arch. We seek more emphasis on development west and outside of the Arch grounds.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS4000 Outside Scope: Kiener Plaza

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 234685 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: If they were so worried about visitor experience, they should remove the office building from the middle of Kiener Plaza.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

OS5000 Outside Scope: Emerald Ash Borer

Correspondence Id: 20 **Comment Id:** 229329 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Regarding the ash tree problem: maybe they cd. be replaced (in part) by a group of different species of trees. Such as sweetgum, maple, tuliptree, oak, hickory, persimmon, gingko, cherry, crab apple, and/or holly, locust - pretty trees

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 219070 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think that the Objectives with regard to the Cultural Resources should include increasing the conformity of the final product with the design intent of the original designers, Eero Saarinen and Dan Kiley. Reference the Park Service article "Landscaping the Gateway Arch Grounds" from September, 1995. The article references an inexcusable power play by local nurserymen to change Dan Kiley's selection for the trees on the arch grounds. Now that the substitute species (*Fraxinus americana*) is threated by a parasite (Emerald Ash Borer) and needs to be removed, this is a perfect opportunity to plant the trees Kiley envisioned, and that should have been planted originally (tulip poplars).

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 24 **Comment Id:** 219074 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I commend the NPS for thinking now about how to address the tree canopy on the arch grounds. I am concerned from what I heard on the radio thatthe NPS may decide on wholesale removal of the Ash trees. I strongly recommend that NPS begin a long term --30-50 year-- re planting so that the grounds becomes filled with trees of varying ages and species. The ash trees on the arch grounds are beautiful in the fall as they change color, and they do provide a certain uniformity on the pathways. The problem with trying to select one species of tree for the plantings is evident in the concerns now facing the NPS regarding ash borer and potential loss of all the trees. Moreover, the replacement of all trees at one time will create a certain loss of cover and a 10-20 year period of growth will be required to grow new trees to begin to reach the stature and quality that exists now.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS5000 Outside Scope: Emerald Ash Borer

Correspondence Id: 24 **Comment Id:** 219075 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I have heard that the NPS considers the Arch grounds a monument and that it is committed to the vision of the architect...and for some reason that NPS has interpreted this vision to include just one species rather than multiple species of trees with similar canopies. As one who has watched the trees grow from the late in the 1960s until now, I can tell you that I have always felt the NPS made a serious mistake to plant only one species...biological diversity is something that architects have often neglected. Diversity of trees will provide a more beautiful base for the arch itself and for the grounds. I have seen neighborhoods planted with just one tree species and the devastation of tree canopy that comes when those trees reach old age and begin to die. Please remember the NPS has an opportunity to interpret the architect's vision to be to maintain an obligation to create a monument that has continuous canopy that can be effectively achieved by planting multiple species of trees of multiple ages, that the canopy is stable even as the trees grow, mature and die and even if one species is attacked by pests. The notion of planting a monoculture is so unworthy of the NPS. This is a monument, but it is also a major educational site. NPS should consider the value of multiple species trees and public education to be as important as an architectural design. There are plenty of arborists and ecologists who can help NPS develop a quality canopy to achieve the architect's vision with diversity of trees.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 234860 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The smaller and narrower Memorial Drive should be moving onto the west side of the Jefferson Memorial Expansion Memorial and the Highway 70 ought to be covering by a lid with the benches and gardens on it.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 218042 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Overall yes but I have concerns that what is being done is not 'global' enough to draw people into the arch ground 24/7. Just a 3 block lid is okay but what you need is a thousand easy access points (to exaggerate) to be able to weave the ground into people's everyday life. Someone walking north-south should be able to cut in and out of the park at various points. With the proposed project you can't really do that unless you walk up to the 3 block lid or all the way north or south of the grounds. A place/park would feel safer too if it was not stuck between a river and a scary highway. I wish we could bring I-70 up to grade and name it Arch drive or something and have signalized intersections at every single block. Think Kingshighway and Forest park. I don't understand why we are hell bent on building this lid and take on the ongoing cost to maintain/light/ventilate/police the dark space underneath it. I wish common sense would prevail. City garden works because it is openly accessible on all sides. Try putting it next to a noisy highway and see how many people make the trip.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 218043 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: See above. The lid is a very unnatural solution. The at grade boulevard would be a much more elegant solution. Forget the 50 year anniversary end-point. Do what is durable and what will spur organic development towards the arch ground and increase downtown's 24-7 population and foot traffic.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 9 **Comment Id:** 218075 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think the objectives of the project fall short because they are not sufficiently forward-thinking. Clearly, the biggest problem with the Arch Grounds is its near-complete isolation from the rest of downtown. We have taken a true architectural treasure, one that should be the centerpiece of downtown St. Louis, and cut it off from the rest of the city. The plan presented seems to recognize this to a certain extent in its consideration of a "lid" over I-70. I would suggest that a "lid" should be a bare minimum in terms of steps taken to integrate the Arch grounds into the rest of St. Louis. NOTHING else will matter if we do not improve connectivity with the rest of the city. This should be the absolute number one focus of any work.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 10 **Comment Id:** 218109 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: However, The Arch and the riverfront have not always complimented each other. Many have said the Arch grounds have separated or isolated the river from the city. As far back as 1941 during the planning stages of the curent grounds business men here lead an extensive letter campaign to NPS to at least have one street, Washington Avenue, accessablbe to the riverfront. This campaign went on for almost 20 years and finally the NPS saw the importance of keeping open Washington Avenue in 1960. This street has always been the main artery to the riverfront attractions and has been an important element to their existance. Now the current plans propose the elimination again of Washington Avenue. The arguements given years ago still holds true today. With no easy access, Washington, the riverfront will be isolated, separated, and disconnected. You will have turned your back on the river. The NPS has on file all the correspondance from the past and their reasoning still holds true today, if not more so. I would hope that today's designers do not make the mistake the wise civic leaders in the past avoided.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 19 **Comment Id:** 218770 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I truly feel that a "lid" over I-70 is not a good enough solution to the dilemma that separates downtown St. Louis. I think a complete removal of the interstate and returning it to a Boulevard would offer downtown much more connection to the river up and down the downtown area. Cost of parking is not addressed either.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 220408 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No! Keeping the mistake that is I-70 through downtown will NOT fix the connectivity problem. With the opening of the new Mississippi River bridge and re-routing of I-70 in Illinois, the depressed (depressing) lanes that slice through the heart of our city must go! Please consider implementing City to River's concept of a signature boulevard to truly connect the Arch grounds to downtown.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 27 **Comment Id:** 220409 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The impact is negative or neutral. Keeping I-70 downtown is a mistake. Replace it with a boulevard. Please do not give us an expensive band-aid fix to the problem (the lid). We want TRUE connectivity and a basis for TRUE redevelopment downtown, not a temporary solution. Please FIX the problem and do not leave it to future generations.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 28 **Comment Id:** 220428 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes for the most part I do. However one thing that was left out that needs to be included is THE REMOVAL OF INTERSTATE 70 BETWEEN THE NEW I-70 BRIDGE AND INTERSTATE 64. RETURN MEMORIAL DRIVE TO A BOULEVARD. If you can't do this. Then you lose my support entirely. Much like the government already has.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 220719 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think you need to have a look at CitytoRiver's plan for a landscaped Blvd instead of the hideous, environmental and pedestrian DISASTER that is the I-70 depressed lanes. You want to make this an environmentally friendly project then remove the polluting disgusting, and unwelcoming freeway from the new I-70 Bridge to I-64 at Poplar Street. The Arch grounds won't be "revitalized" as you put it, until that disgusting freeway is GONE! At least consider it, or make a suggestion to the powers that be to get this monstrosity out of MY City. SERIOUSLY CONSIDER REMOVING THE FREEWAY PLEASE! The Government is suppose to represent the People. Well the People of St. Louis want the highway gone. So I hope your listening.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 31 **Comment Id:** 220770 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I strongly believe that I-70 must be removed to really complete the design goals of reuniting the city-arch-river. This will also open up for development several of the properties on the shoreline which have previously been undesirable due to their location adjacent to the noisy, hot, dirty highway. This would also remove a psychological barrier that has been put into place by the existence of the flyover and trench containing the highway. This move could reinvigorate an area which is much under-served creating a whole new experience for the downtown area.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 34 **Comment Id:** 220833 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. Creation of a "Lid" over I-70 will not sufficiently reconnect downtown and the Archgrounds. I-70 should be removed. With the new Mississippi River Bridge under construction, the connection of I-70 to the Poplar Street Bridge by highway will no longer be necessary. Not only do the depressed lanes significantly separate downtown from the Archgrounds but the elevation that occurs to the east of the landing present the same issue.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 34 **Comment Id:** 220834 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I support the recommendations of the City To River organization.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 221003 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: 1. Very vague question that demonstrates how little you care about the citizens of the City of Saint Louis. Adding more highway infrastructure between the Arch and Old Courthouse is exactly the opposite of what needs to be accomplished. You're splitting the park in two!

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 221004 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I am concerned that pedestrian access to the park will not improve, and will actually be destroyed by the current plans. Memorial Drive and Washington Ave. are currently walkable, but admittedly not a pleasant walk. Removing these two streets will only make the experience worse. I like the idea of embracing infrastructure like the Poplar Street Bridge interchange, but cars rushing through the MIDDLE of the park, entering and exiting the highway at important connections (from the park) to the city, will not improve anyone's experience.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 36 Comment Id: 221006 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: While I'm very excited and supportive about the redevelopment of the Arch Grounds and connecting the park to the city, I'm extremely worried my favorite part of the plan has not been thoroughly explored or has been removed. The opportunity to remove the I-70 highway that physically and mentally separates the park from the city must happen. All 5 finalist teams supported the idea but it now appears to have disappeared from the plan with no explanation.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 36 Comment Id: 221007 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Please make sure the boulevard concept or something similar (www.citytoriver.org) is in the final plan, or allowed to be built in the near future (if the deadline is the issue).</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 37 Comment Id: 221008 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: I believe that the project, in its latest form, is not living up to expectations. More highway infrastructure is not needed. The interstate must be removed/converted to an at grade Blvd. to enable the park to become what it could be ... a real part of the community ... not an isolated island that prevents a full appreciation of this national treasure.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 38 Comment Id: 221010 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Improved landscaping to finish the grounds and draw people into the park is a great idea. However, the best idea would be to develop the areas around the grounds into something that draws people to the area so that they can casually enter the park, instead of making a concerted effort to cross a scary highway with no businesses around. You can address these concerns by altogether removing the highway section separating the arch from the city and just turn it into a regular street - this will give people access to the parking in many different areas. Use the additional land from highway removal to build new businesses - shopping, entertainment, that will lead people to the park organically from the city itself instead of forcing them to drive the whole way, park at the grounds, spend no money on other attractions and then leave.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>

Correspondence Id: 36 **Comment Id:** 221006 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: While I'm very excited and supportive about the redevelopment of the Arch Grounds and connecting the park to the city, I'm extremely worried my favorite part of the plan has not been thoroughly explored or has been removed. The opportunity to remove the I-70 highway that physically and mentally separates the park from the city must happen. All 5 finalist teams supported the idea but it now appears to have disappeared from the plan with no explanation.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 36 **Comment Id:** 221007 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Please make sure the boulevard concept or something similar (www.citytoriver.org) is in the final plan, or allowed to be built in the near future (if the deadline is the issue).

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 37 **Comment Id:** 221008 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I believe that the project, in its latest form, is not living up to expectations. More highway infrastructure is not needed. The interstate must be removed/converted to an at grade Blvd. to enable the park to become what it could be ... a real part of the community ... not an isolated island that prevents a full appreciation of this national treasure.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 38 **Comment Id:** 221010 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Improved landscaping to finish the grounds and draw people into the park is a great idea. However, the best idea would be to develop the areas around the grounds into something that draws people to the area so that they can casually enter the park, instead of making a concerted effort to cross a scary highway with no businesses around. You can address these concerns by altogether removing the highway section separating the arch from the city and just turn it into a regular street - this will give people access to the parking in many different areas. Use the additional land from highway removal to build new businesses - shopping, entertainment, that will lead people to the park organically from the city itself instead of forcing them to drive the whole way, park at the grounds, spend no money on other attractions and then leave.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 43 **Comment Id:** 221031 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My concerns primarily relate to the way the existing plans will wall off the park even further by adding infrastructure (new on-ramps and off-ramps). Further, the stretch of I-70 that currently exists will be redundant and unnecessary once the new I-70 bridge is completed. Please don't add another obstacle between the City and its River and the Arch. Leave open the opportunity for elevated/depressed lanes along I-70 to eventually be removed and replaced with the Boulevard. If studied, it can be shown that building the Boulevard will save taxpayer funds by decreasing the costs of maintaining infrastructure. After all, there will be fewer overpasses, depressed lanes, and other ongoing capital needs to contend with. You don't have to advocate or fund the construction of the Boulevard, but PLEASE do not impede its eventual creation by adding more barriers in the form of highway on ramps and off ramps between the City and the Arch.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 221069 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Revitalizing the Arch grounds should incorporate a more fluid transition into the urban landscape. Further transportation infrastructure should be avoided.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 221070 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My concern is that the project is allowing for an already ill fitting transportation design to be replaced with another. The NPS's assessment should be sensitive to the concerns of sustainability in the downtown area. We need greater connectivity to the Arch grounds, rather than cumbersome highway infrastructure. City to River has provided an excellent alternative to CityArchRiver. Solutions should be taken from City to River's plan in order to amend the shortfalls of the current plans.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 221362 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. Additional highway ramps are not needed. We need real connections between the city, the Arch, and the river. The removal of the depressed lanes would be ideal.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 221363 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The highways to the south and west are the greatest barriers and the impact seems to be largely ignored in the current plans. The underpass park and greenway connector could have been a wonderful southern entry. The additional highway ramps are just going to strengthen the depressed barrier on the west side (not to mention a huge expenditure). There need to be more bicycle and pedestrian access points and the underpass park needs to be included.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 47 **Comment Id:** 221617 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Mainly yes, but considering the placement next to a major interstate, I think the NPS needs to better consider the impact that road infrastructure has on the park. I'm concerned that there is already too much planning in place to 'retro-fit' the park's frontage to better accommodate the interstate. However, i think the NPS and highway administration need to consider replacing the interstate with a more suitable approach to the park. The interstate will require major reconstruction or even replacement in a decade or two anyways. The problem is, I haven't heard much about the plans to rebuild or reconstruct this once the park's renovation is completed.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 47 **Comment Id:** 221618 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The interstate is a major concern. Noise, approach, connectivity to the rest of downtown St. Louis. These could all be addressed by removing the highway and reconstructing it at grade as a boulevard. Major interstate traffic will be rerouted away from downtown with the opening of the new Mississippi river bridge. Aren't we already spending the money to relocate I-70?? The depressed lanes are not a vital connector once this bridge is completed.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 48 **Comment Id:** 222061 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The only way to activate a park is to stimulate its edges. Any plan that fails to focus on the redevelopment of Laclede and Chouteau's Landing is lacking. I believe the connections to surroundings are too weak in this plan. St. Louisans are used to this industrial area being inaccessible and not walkable. The only way to change that is to radically change the park-adjacent land. Turn 70 into a boulevard with world class lighting and landscaping. Find developers to focus on areas north and south of the arch more than on the east side.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 50 **Comment Id:** 224746 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Topic Question 1: PLEASE at least study removing HWY 70 between the new bridge and the PSB. There is no need for it you can make the same change on the East side of the river. REMOVE IT! Topic Question 2: PLEASE at least study removing HWY 70 between the new bridge and the PSB. There is no need for it you can make the same change on the East side of the river. REMOVE IT! PLEASE at least study removing HWY 70 between the new bridge and the PSB. There is no need for it you can make the same change on the East side of the river. REMOVE IT! PLEASE at least study removing HWY 70 between the new bridge and the PSB. There is no need for it you can make the same change on the East side of the river. REMOVE IT! PLEASE at least study removing HWY 70 between the new bridge and the PSB. There is no need for it you can make the same change on the East side of the river. REMOVE IT! PLEASE at least study removing HWY 70 between the new bridge and the PSB. There is no need for it you can make the same change on the East side of the river. REMOVE IT!

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 225386 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: City to River does not believe that the purpose, need and objectives reflect what the NPS needs to accomplish with the revitalization project. Specifically, the proposed closure of Memorial Drive and addition of longer Interstate highway ramps do not preserve the integrity of the Arch grounds. These changes represent unacceptable impacts on the cultural landscape of the City of St. Louis. Any additional highway infrastructure creates a larger barrier to visitors and further harms the visitor experience, doing nothing to promote extended visitation to the Arch, the city or the river.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 54 **Comment Id:** 225404 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We need to remove the depressed section of the interstate and create a boulevard. The interstate is just that depressing.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 55 **Comment Id:** 225409 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No, I do not. It's unfortunate that NPS is subscribing to near-term "solutions" that will create other problems. A "lid" is fine, but not if it then requires additional highway infrastructure and closes city streets. The city street grid is what makes downtown predictable and a joy to visit. How is a visitor supposed to find the Arch when they have to drive around a maze to get there? The only exception is for those arrive via Interstate ramp and the park and city should not be prioritizing that over those who live and work in the city. In addition, the existing plans will make for a worse pedestrian experience for visitors once they arrive. The removal of I-70 and its replacement with an at-grade boulevard must be studied.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 55 Comment Id: 225410 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: As currently planned, more highway infrastructure will have a detrimental effect on the visitor experience. Some areas may improve, but the overall experience will not. It will in fact be worse for many - those trying to navigate downtown streets etc. Eliminating downtown streets is the opposite of increasing connectivity. Removing one pedestrian crossing does nothing to encourage people to explore the city and remain downtown - where, one much cross many, many streets. Crossing streets is NOT what deters visitors - the crushing maze of I-70 infrastructure is. The removal of I-70 and its replacement with an at-grade boulevard must be studied.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 225436 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The proposed closure of Memorial Drive and addition of longer Interstate highway ramps do not preserve the integrity of the Arch grounds. These changes represent unacceptable impacts on the cultural landscape of the City of St. Louis. Any additional highway infrastructure creates a larger barrier to visitors and further harms the visitor experience, doing nothing to promote extended visitation to the Arch, the city or the river. The re-routing of I-70 from the Poplar Street Bridge to the new Mississippi River Bridge makes possible an at-grade boulevard between the two. The boulevard should be studied as an alternative to promote connectivity, protect and enhance the cultural landscape of the city and Arch grounds, enhance the visitor experience and encourage extended visitation. We believe that this is the best way to accomplish what the NPS set out to accomplish with this project.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 57 Comment Id: 225437 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Additional highway infrastructure is an adverse impact that should only be considered as a last resort and only if there is no other option. Alternatives to the current proposal have not been adequately considered and there is no public comprehensive traffic study informing this proposal. An at-grade boulevard, potentially with a one block depression under a lid, is a feasible alternative to additional infrastructure and provides far superior connections along the entire length of the Arch grounds and to Laclede's Landing and North Riverfront. Therefore, the highway removal alternative endorsed by all five competition finalist design teams, including the winning MVVA team, should (at the very minimum) be studied before "improvements" are made that would preclude this option for decades to come.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 58 Comment Id: 225443 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Access to the Arch Grounds needs to be enhanced on all sides of the Park. Interstate and or entrance/exit ramps need to be removed from the Arch Grounds edge. Pedestrian friendly environment with slow auto traffic avenues are a requirement. This means open street patterns that facilitate people entering and exiting the Park.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 58 **Comment Id:** 225444 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Closing Memorial Drive will decrease access to the Park. This change will funnel pedestrian access from the west into the new "walk over". The open interstate trench will remain which creates negative space at the west side of the Park. Instead of opening the Park on the west, this change reenforce the isolation of the Arch grounds from Busch Stadium, the hotels, and the future Ballpark Village.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 59 **Comment Id:** 225445 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The goal should be to remove all the highway infrastructure and reconnect the city to it's greatest asset(s) on the river front. Any plan to add even more highway infrastructure to the downtown area completely opposes the goals of the larger community and would be detrimental for decasdes.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 59 **Comment Id:** 225446 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: You can reviatlize the park unless people are there. People won't be there until you reconnect the city with an at grade boulevard.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 60 **Comment Id:** 225455 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I echo City to River's comments here: <http://citytoriver.org/blog/?p=574>

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 61 **Comment Id:** 225460 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The elevated and depressed lanes of I-70 need to be replaced with an at grade boulevard.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 61 **Comment Id:** 225461 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Implicate City to River's plan.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 62 **Comment Id:** 225465 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I believe the number one priority of this project should be to connect the arch grounds with the surrounding downtown area as much as possible to help stimulate a better walking experience for locals and tourists alike. While creating a large pedestrian bridge certainly makes it much easier for people to reach the grounds, it does nothing to create an experience. Regular roads and buildings are needed to create shelter, activities and an environment for pedestrians. Simply putting a lid over an atrocious highway is clearly a band-aid tactic that will not solve this problem. Keeping street connections and having street life is vital to the success of this project. That is what creates a good city. Take Millennium Park in Chicago. The area is bustling with life along Michigan avenue and as you walk deeper into the park and towards the water, activity begins to drop almost immediately. It is the street that creates the life. Not a lid, not a highway, but a regular street.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 63 **Comment Id:** 225519 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. It seems to me that the suggestion of widening I-70 is antithetical to the goal of revitalizing the Arch and improving its connectivity with Downtown St. Louis.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 63 **Comment Id:** 225520 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Please, please consider replacing I-70 adjacent to the Arch grounds with an at-grade boulevard in the revitalization plan.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 66 **Comment Id:** 225538 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: As a city resident and downtown office worker and frequent visitor to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, I am concerned that the purpose, need and objectives reflect what the NPS needs to accomplish with the revitalization project. The proposed closure of Memorial Drive and addition of longer Interstate highway ramps negatively impactg connectivity to the Arch grounds. The proposed solution increase impacts from adjacent transportation systems Pedestrians utilizing the popular Washington Avenue entrance will suffer an expanded highway barrier between downtown and the Arch grounds and riverfront. A study of the feasibility of alternative traffic solutions of for the area around the Arch grounds, including replacing the depressed lanes of I-70 with an at-grade boulevard should be completed to finalizing plans.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 66 Comment Id: 225539 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: A proposal to build a lid over the depressed lanes and Memorial Drive should be considered in combination with a boulevard and highway removal. This option has not been analyzed to date. Highway removal was viewed as the optimal solution by all finalists in the Arch design competition and deserves a thorough review and serious consideration before finalizing traffic plans. Highway removal is being proposed and implemented in downtowns across the country and warrants serious consideration in St. Louis.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 67 Comment Id: 225600 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The purpose is to connect the city to the arch and river, this project does not accomplish it. At all. It widens the highway, when many cities are removing highways from their downtowns. Please do the same for St. Louis. Remove the highway.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 67 Comment Id: 225601 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Removing the highway. Build the boulevard, as detailed on CityToRiver. That's all I want. I want to St. Louis to have a front street not a highway. I want to be able to get to the Arch grounds by simply walking east from busch stadium. If you want to connect the Arch grounds to the city build the boulevard.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 70 Comment Id: 225704 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: No, get rid of the highway lanes and put in a regular street.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 70 Comment Id: 225705 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: A regular street allows more comfortable access to the park from more directions. The highway lanes are a blight on downtown and the entire city. They detract from all the goals of the Arch redesign.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 72 **Comment Id:** 225829 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Unfortunately, no. While I commend the NPS for taking part in such a large and potentially advantageous proposal, I'm concerned that a very important element is being overlooked or even mishandled. I support the ideas put forward by the group City to River (citytoriver.org). Connectivity should be a priority for this project. Several of the design firms that submitting proposals were in support of the removal of the redundant section of I-70, including the winning firm, Michael Van Valkenberg and Associates. The groups that weren't in complete support of this plan, were not opposed to it either. Please do not let an arbitrary deadline limit the success of the Arch grounds plan. Leaving the existing highway infrastructure in place (or worse, reinforcing it by building longer ramps and closing Memorial Blvd.) would be a disservice to this city and would further separate the city itself from our cherished monument. I would ask that you please conduct a traffic study and consult those in the urban planning profession on these ideas.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 73 **Comment Id:** 225838 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. The main problem with the arch grounds are that Interstate 70 cuts them off from Downtown. Removing the stretch of I-70 that runs through downtown St. Louis (soon to be obsolete due to the new Mississippi River Bridge) is the best way to connect the national park to the city.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 73 **Comment Id:** 225839 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The park's centerpiece, the Gateway Arch, is already the symbol of St. Louis and a top attraction. The revitalization of the park should improve accessibility, and encourage arch visitors to explore downtown. Again, the physical barrier created by I-70 needs to be removed before the park and city will be experienced together.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 74 **Comment Id:** 225852 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I believe this project has strayed away from the actual needs of the Arch grounds. The memorial needs to be connected to the city more, not separated by more highway infrastructure. There is no need for an expanded ramp system on park property. It will create even more of an island effect for the Arch than what is currently realized. The project needs to connect the city to the arch and river.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 74 Comment Id: 225853 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The planned expansion of highway infrastructure is completely backwards from what is really needed by this city. The sheer amount of real estate value increase from removing I-70 or connecting the Arch to the city in some other way would vastly outweigh the costs.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 77 Comment Id: 225857 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The park and the river need to be integrated with downtown St. Louis in a way that improves connection with downtown residents, workers and visitors. Excess amounts of highway infrastructure destroys this connection and puts the arch ground on an island separated from people.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 77 Comment Id: 225858 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The park needs to be more connected to the city, not less. The service should look into removing the depressed lanes of interstate 70 since the new Mississippi River bridge will carry the interstate north of downtown. There is no reason to keep the connection in downtown St. Louis blocking pedestrian access and street grid connections to the park. Washington Avenue should remain as a connection to the riverfront and the additional downtown east-west streets should be extended to the park entrance.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 78 Comment Id: 225859 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Yes, I feel like the effort to revitalize the Jefferon National Expansion Memorial has bee met and while I feel that this would be increased with the proposed design. I think simply removing the barrier to downtown (Intersate 70 & Memorial Drive) would have a greater impact. Also, I'm happy to see some time and effort was spent considering the Illinois experience.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 79 **Comment Id:** 225861 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: feel that the expansion and preservation of the current Interstate 70 downtown is the biggest problem facing any attempts to revitalize the Arch grounds. Highways in all shapes and forms, especially I-70, stand as a barrier to all modes of other transit: pedestrians, cyclists, horse & carriage tour guides, etc. This barrier though does not prevent people from crossing but makes the total environment that much more unsafe. This especially applies to tourists and families who bring small children to see the largest man-made monument in the world. Even with the idea of a lid, the elevated and depressed sections of I-70 will remain as a barrier to all people living and visiting the area. The only course of action is the total removal of I-70 downtown with the replacement of an at-grade boulevard. This major change would change the entire environment around it: downtown, the arch grounds, convention center, bottle district, lacelede's landing, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 80 **Comment Id:** 225866 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Not at all. Removing Memorial Drive while retaining the highway that severs the Arch grounds from downtown St. Louis is a huge mistake. Capping the highway for a few blocks is a "band-aid," and an expensive one at that.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 80 **Comment Id:** 225867 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The park will never be truly revitalized until the highway is removed. Retaining the highway flies in the face of the face of all current urban planning tenets. Cities like Seattle, San Francisco and Milwaukee (among many others) have already set a template for us to follow. Removing the highway and creating an at-grade parkway will free up prime land for future development - an exciting prospect for downtown St. Louis. Capping the highway and removing Memorial Drive will prove to be a huge mistake that will haunt STL for decades. We have the opportunity to do the right thing now - why not do it? Not only will the Arch grounds benefit, but Laclede's Landing and the rest of downtown will benefit as well. We finally have the chance to reunite the Landing and Arch grounds with the rest of downtown by removing the highway - it just makes so much sense, it's shocking to me that the City to River concept has not gained more traction. Please, please, please do the right thing for the future of St. Louis and remove the highway and install an at-grade parkway. It should have never been built in the first place, but now we have a chance to right this wrong. Don't fail us.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 225868 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. By far, the most important aspect of this project is reconnecting the memorial to downtown Saint Louis. In light of this, it is absurd that the most obvious and most effective means of attaining this goal, the removal of the depressed and elevated lanes of I-70 through downtown Saint Louis, has not even been considered. These obsolete lanes create a physical, mental and aesthetic barrier that will not be alleviated by a block-long "lid". Considering that an at-grade boulevard would cost less to maintain than the current aging bridge and tunnel infrastructure, as well as the potential for economic development in the space now occupied by the highway, it makes one wonder about the motives of those who are either opposing the removal of the highway or avoiding the subject. In the end, if the elevated and depressed lanes of I-70 are not removed, this project - including its gondolas and pavilions and pretty museum entrances - will not bring about any substantial change.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 225869 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: most concerned that obvious solutions are being overlooked and that money is being wasted in favor of superfluous signature accessories like gondolas and lids while the elephant in the room (i.e. the depressed and elevated lanes of I-70) is being ignored. Moreover, it's ridiculous that anybody thinks it's a good idea to close Washington between Memorial Drive and Leonard K. Sullivan Blvd. only to build another 1000 feet of entrance and exit ramps that further sever the park from downtown! This is exactly the OPPOSITE of what the NPS is trying to accomplish! NO MORE HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE! With the elevated lanes removed, it would be a relatively simple task to reconfigure this intersection - like any other 4-way intersection - to be pedestrian friendly. Firstly and most importantly, I want to throw my complete support behind the arguments made by the City To River group at <http://citytoriver.org> for the removal of the depressed and elevated lanes of I-70. In my opinion, this is the single most important aspect of this project and the one that will be most beneficial for both the park and the city.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 82 **Comment Id:** 225870 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I do not believe the project accomplishes the needs, purpose, or objectives. The large dividing barrier between the Arch grounds and downtown St. Louis will not be mitigated, and creating longer interstate on/off ramps only increases this barrier. Without removing the depressed section of I-70 and replacing it with an at grade boulevard, I feel that any and all redevelopment of the Arch grounds will be a moot point. This concrete river is the real reason why traffic does not flow from downtown St. Louis to the Arch!

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 82 Comment Id: 225871 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The "Lid" concept only creates more interstate infrastructure on the Arch grounds...which is a negative impact on the overall project. Again, creating a boulevard to replace the depressed interstate would allow for traffic to flow from downtown to the Arch grounds and back. All five teams recommend a boulevard replace the depressed sections of I-70. So why put a band-aid on this big issue? Remove the concrete river that divides the Arch from downtown! It will not only connect the two but open up a plethora of development opportunities throughout downtown.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 83 Comment Id: 225915 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The renovation of the St. Louis Arch grounds is a once in a lifetime (or 2-3 lifetimes) opportunity. I fully support the City to River plan of connecting downtown st. louis to the arch grounds by making memorial drive an at grade boulevard.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 83 Comment Id: 225916 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: My concern is that this park will be underutilized if it does not connect with the downtown area. I believe removal of the I-70 depress section and the rebuilding of Memorial drive could address this issue and make the arch grounds the gateway to the west it was intended to be. This is it... we only have one shot at making this right. The City to River plan would be such a boost to our fading yet enthusiastic city. Fears about traffic and congestion are mistaken, I believe. Yes, we would certainly have more traffic, but that would be a small price to pay to connect our Arch to our city.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 84 Comment Id: 225931 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: I am disappointed about the idea of the 'lid' covering a portion of I-70. Again, I advocate the removal of the downtown portion of I-70. Since much of this existing infrastructure is dated and in ill-repair, the cost of repairing and maintaining the infrastructure outweighs the benefit of keeping it.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 86 **Comment Id:** 225935 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Less highway, not more! That area is our best asset, why cut it off? So it will take longer to zip through. If there is some density, there will be some reason to get out, instead of take flight. People are scared of our city, and they should be. Highway infrastructure strangles communities. And yet this is a spectacularly beautiful place. Stop hating yourself, St. Louis! Look in the mirror, you're gorgeous, stop letting bad decisions defile you!

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 87 **Comment Id:** 225959 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: While I think the improvements to the grounds and new entrance to the museum will be beneficial I think the project is not living up to expectations of connectivity between the park and the city. More needs to be done in exploring the idea of removing the elevated and sunken portions of I-70 that separate downtown from the park and Laclede's Landing. With the new Mississippi River bridge going in north of downtown the need for a separate highway through downtown is unnecessary. I have read that the latest plans include additional closure of Memorial drive and new longer entrance and exit ramps. This seems to laugh in the face of connectivity and I will be greatly disappointed if this plan goes forward.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 87 **Comment Id:** 225960 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The plan to close Memorial and add new longer ramps to I-70 will only further lead to awkward and dangerous situations for the pedestrian and confusing navigation for the driver. We need to reestablish our street grid if we truly want a vibrant and walkable downtown. The proposed plan will funnel people through only one area where there will be a safe passage across I-70. Pedestrians and vehicles should have several options to get where they want to go and reinstating the street grid can do this. By eliminating the elevated and sunken portions of I-70 in favor of an at grade boulevard the pedestrian will be welcome to comfortably cross between downtown, the park, and Laclede's Landing. This will lead to a more enjoyable experience and a greater willingness to walk further knowing they don't have to return via the only "safe" crossing. I really hope that more time is put into studying other options for the I-70 debacle that separates our city from this great park and river. I'd hate to have this process completed with less than stellar results just to meet the 50th anniversary deadline. We need to do this the right way so we don't have to do it again in another 50 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 89 **Comment Id:** 225974 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. The main "need" associated with this project is the elimination of the depressed (and soon to be obsolete) highway lanes separating the Arch grounds from downtown St. Louis. Any other changes made to the park grounds including a small "lid" over the highway simply serve as window dressing in relation to the bigger problem. Thus, the objectives proposed are incomplete and unsatisfied by the current plans.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 89 **Comment Id:** 225975 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: y concern is that the proposed "lid" over the highway or reduction of Memorial Drive are half-measures that don't truly address the problem or provide the best solution. The Arch grounds are just one part of the issue, and the solution needs to be coordinated with what is best for the City as a whole. The current road conditions along the depressed lanes mean that the buildings fronting the Arch grounds have their "backs" turned to the river and the Arch, because the road configuration is so undesirable. This sends a strong statement about the magnitude of the problem, as the obvious configuration of a building near a desirable park, river, or ocean would be to face in that direction. St. Louis can't afford to have only a partially reconnected riverfront. We need a full reconnection with an at-grade boulevard replacing the depressed and elevated highway lanes. If a "lid" is constructed, it will make it that much harder to eventually eliminate the highway as is obviously needed. Related to the above points, it's disturbing that the best plan for St. Louis (the one proposed by citytoriver.org) is not being fully embraced, and we are rushing toward completing a far less desirable plan for the Arch grounds in order to meet a silly anniversary date. It's more important that the right plan be completed, regardless of whether that means missing the 2015 target.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 90 **Comment Id:** 225987 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: i agree that the proposed closure of Memorial Drive and addition of longer Interstate highway ramps does not preserve the integrity of the Arch grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 90 **Comment Id:** 225988 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: i agree that the current proposal to close a large portion of Memorial Drive as part of the lid concept has led to the proposed addition of more Interstate highway infrastructure on-site. This is the total antithesis of increasing connectivity, a primary goal of this multi-hundred million dollar effort. An at-grade boulevard, potentially with a one block depression under a lid, is a feasible alternative to additional infrastructure and provides far superior connections along the entire length of the Arch grounds and to Laclede's Landing and North Riverfront. i agree that a boulevard in place of the Interstate highway would provide for additional development opportunities, fulfilling not only the desire for improved connections, but very explicitly creating attractors adjacent to the Arch grounds that would promoted extended visitation to the Arch, city and river.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 91 **Comment Id:** 225992 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No - please consider the signature, at-grade boulevard. Not only would it allow much greater development potential, it would much better connect St. Louis with the riverfront as this project is intended to do!

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 91 **Comment Id:** 225993 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We will be doing all of these enhancements, yet you refuse to at least study the boulevard option! Do it right the first time and you won't have to do it again. Please, at the very least, study the boulevard option as put forth by City to River.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 92 **Comment Id:** 225994 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: One of the primary objectives of the effort to revitalize the JNEM is, from the project newsletter, "Ensure that revitalization of the park improves connections between the city and the park and from the city". Current ideas to improve the park's connection to the city include building a wide landscaped bridge across I-70 between Market and Chestnut, removing Memorial Dr from between Market and Chestnut, and removing Washington Ave from the north side of the park. I believe if these changes were made, then the NPS will have utterly failed in meeting its objective to improve connections between the park and the city. Yes, the changes will mean connections will be marginally better, but they will remain inadequate compared to what the City of St. Louis deserves.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 92 **Comment Id:** 225995 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: City to River presents a vision to remove I-70 from in front of the JNEM grounds and turn Memorial Dr. into an urban boulevard. City to River's vision would improve connections between the park and city leaps and bounds better than any option currently under consideration by the NPS and MoDOT. Due to the constraints of the October 2015 deadline imposed by the NPS, every finalist in the design competition included a landscaped lid across I-70. However, every single finalist also said that the vision presented by City to River would significantly improve the connections between the city and the park which, again, is one of the NPS's primary objectives with this project.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 93 **Comment Id:** 226010 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I think that the objectives are good, but they are not completely fulfilled by the plan. The plan, in my opinion, does not satisfy the objective of connectivity. Need to remove the highway barrier. This is the only way to completely revitalize the Arch grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 93 Comment Id: 226011 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The closure of Memorial Drive would decrease, not increase, connectivity. This seems to favor the highway over a possible at-grade boulevard.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 94 Comment Id: 226017 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: This project affords the opportunity to remove the soon-to-be decommissioned lanes of Interstate 70. I feel the feasibility of removing the highway section between the Gateway Arch grounds and Downtown St. Louis and replacing them with an at-grade boulevard needs to be studied.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 94 Comment Id: 226018 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: The potential positive impact to the park will be best realized by removing the no-longer-necessary Interstate highway cutting through Downtown St. Louis. Although the "lid" (a band-aid solution to downtown's connectivity problem) is being studied in detail, there has been no effort whatsoever to study the feasibility of replacing the downtown highway with a boulevard, or a boulevard's compatibility with the "lid." CityToRiver believes that these concepts can work together, but ONLY if new highway infrastructure is not constructed in a way that physically precludes the boulevard for decades to come-which currently appears to be the road the project is going down.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 96 Comment Id: 226039 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Naturally, the Arch needs to be presented in a beautiful and unique way. That's given. However, it is ESSENTIAL that the Arch connect visitors to the rest of the city. The current highway mess that is I-70 downtown is unacceptable. As the concierge of the largest hotel downtown, I see firsthand how difficult and scary it can be for families to walk to the Arch from downtown. Memorial Drive is NOT pedestrian friendly, and the I-70 underpass only makes families more nervous about taking the trip. There's an organization called City to River that is trying to get I-70 eliminated downtown since the new river bridge will carry I-70 across it. I feel that this needs to happen for the Archgrounds redesign to be considered a success. The current proposal of putting a lid on I-70 and adding new ramps will not solve the problem. Many of the guests at my hotel utilize Washington Avenue to get to the archgrounds. Have you ever walked to the arch that way? It is horrendous. And creating a new exit ramp from I-70 right there will make the intersection even more treacherous. Are we trying to make families like they cannot leave the arch grounds once they are there? St. Louis has much to offer, but many of the arch visitors park on the archgrounds, go to the arch, then get back in their cars and go home. That is a shame. Our city has attractions, restaurants, and shops that visitors would love, but many don't feel welcomed by the rest of downtown. I feel that City to River's proposal of removing the highway MUST be done for the downtown area to connect properly to the archgrounds.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: Yes</p>

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 99 **Comment Id:** 226186 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I do not believe the purpose, need, and objectives reflect what the NPS needs to accomplish with this project. It was my understanding that the purpose of the project was not only to improve and revitalize the park and memorial, but to enhance the connectivity between the memorial and the city itself. The depressed lanes of I-70 create a substantial barrier between the memorial and the city and anything less than complete removal of the freeway would be an unsatisfactory solution. The proposal to close portions of Memorial Drive and Washington Avenue does further damage to the connection of the memorial with the city by complicating navigation around downtown which already can be confusing for visitors, these proposals should be scrapped and the current street grid should be left intact. The proposal that makes the most sense and would benefit the city, its residents, and its visitors the most is to replace I-70 and Memorial Drive with an at-grade boulevard as proposed by the organization City-to-River. With the opening of the new I-70 Mississippi River Bridge the freeway connecting the new bridge and the Poplar Street Bridge becomes unnecessary and redundant. Removal of the section of freeway would have a minimal impact on traffic, but a significant impact on the connectivity between the city and the memorial as well as to completely change the pedestrian experience in Downtown St. Louis.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 99 **Comment Id:** 226187 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My biggest concern is that a large sum of money is being spent to simply "refresh" the memorial grounds and not "reinvent" the memorial grounds which will do very little to revitalize the park or downtown itself. It is my opinion that the current proposal to close roads and add additional freeway infrastructure would actually make the connection between the city and memorial worse than it currently is. I would argue that replacing I-70 and Memorial Drive with an at-grade boulevard thereby enhancing connectivity would do more to draw residents and tourists into the park than any amount of new landscaping and/or additional museum space could hope to accomplish. The complete replacement of I-70 and Memorial Drive with an at-grade boulevard should be included as part of any revitalization of the memorial grounds. There are numerous examples of successful freeway removal projects across the United States which in-turn have lead to economic development of the area the freeway was located and there is little doubt the same would occur in St. Louis. Replacing I-70 and Memorial Drive with a new at-grade boulevard presents St. Louis and the Jefferson Expansion National Memorial with an exceptional opportunity to completely transform the front door of the city from drab and unexciting to a vibrant welcoming place. St. Louis has been a victim of complacency and not thinking boldly for the past 60 years and I believe revitalization of the memorial, which should include as a cornerstone the replacement of I-70 and Memorial Drive, as a grand opportunity for a grand city to begin to reinvent itself.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 226194 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. The depressed lanes and elevated portion of I-70 should be removed once the new Mississippi Bridge is open, Lenore K. Sullivan Blvd. should be vacated and elevated above flood stage. All commercial activity should be moved North of Eads Bridge or South of the Poplar St. Bridge. All this should be done if we are really serious about connecting the City, the Arch and the River.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 102 **Comment Id:** 226198 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: In many ways, the purpose, need, and objectives reflect what the NPS needs to accomplish with this project--increasing connectivity among downtown St. Louis, the Mississippi River, and the Arch grounds. The NPS will miss the mark entirely, however, if improvements are designed and constructed that prohibit the comprehensive solution to the connectivity problem--the removal of the downtown highway segment and construction of an at-grade boulevard. By failing to study and plan for a long-term solution to the problems created by the elevated and depressed lanes, the NPS (and any other agencies involved in related projects, such as MoDOT) will be missing a huge, once-in-a-generation opportunity.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 102 **Comment Id:** 226199 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My concern is this project will not even formally study the possibility of replacing the (soon-to-be-redundant) highway with a boulevard, and in fact that it will be designed and constructed in a way that preclude the development of the boulevard for decades to come. The NPS (and any other agencies involved in related projects, such as MoDOT) should, at the very minimum, study the boulevard proposal to see if it is possible, before "improvements" are designed and/or constructed that will make the boulevard impossible. Although the "lid" (a band-aid solution to downtown's connectivity problem) is being studied in detail, it appears that there has been no effort whatsoever to study the feasibility of replacing the downtown highway with a boulevard, or a boulevard's compatibility with the lid. It appears possible for a boulevard and the lid to work together, but ONLY if new highway infrastructure is not constructed in a way that physically precludes the boulevard for decades to come-which currently appears to be the road the project is going down.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 106 **Comment Id:** 226230 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The existing pedestrian experience surrounding the Arch grounds is an embarrassment to St. Louis and the NPS. I am very familiar with it, because I work in an office to the immediate north of the site and walk and drive through the area daily. The plan to close Memorial Drive in front of the Arch does not lend themselves to the most successful outcome for the city, NPS, and visitors because vital auto connections will be severed, and traffic will be shifted in such a way that will lead to even MORE pedestrian un-friendly situations along the perimeter of the park. Instead, an at-grade boulevard to replace Memorial and I-70 would offer a calmed traffic experience with continued connectivity for automobiles and drastically improved pedestrian safety.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 106 **Comment Id:** 226231 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My main concern is how traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, will be addressed along the park perimeter. There is a singular opportunity to transform the roadways surrounding the site at this time, with the concurrent completion of the new Mississippi River bridge to divert I-70 northward. A bustling boulevard could take its place, giving the entryway to our great monument a drastic upgrade while taking into consideration the needs of cars, people, bikes, etc. The current state of roadways surrounding the Arch is an embarrassment. I cringe when watching families try to navigate the many lanes of traffic on Memorial and over frightening bridges above I-70. I hate to see people in wheelchairs or pushing strollers attempt to find a connected set of crosswalks from Washington Avenue to the west across Memorial, underneath I-70, and onto the Arch grounds to the east. This is a perfect opportunity to reinvent the "welcome mat" for our national monument. "Build the Boulevard"!!

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 108 **Comment Id:** 226234 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Get rid of the big 'elephant in the room'. The depressed/depressing lanes of I-70 in between the arch grounds and downtown. Please don't deny us the clear benefits of removing this noisy dangerous barrier. It truly is holding the riverfront back.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 108 **Comment Id:** 226235 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: A shortsighted lid for 2-3 blocks will not keep people flowing in and out of the Arch Grounds. Open access points on its entire length. There is a simpler, more elegant solution. Please don't ignore the comments of concerned, urban minded and engaged residents. We are the people you want to attract downtown. People all over St Louis have been pleading for a consideration of an at grade boulevard instead of the soon to be duplicated I-70 downtown but so far have been pushed aside by a wave of the hand. Stop pursuing a silver bullet. The removal of the Embarcadero in San Francisco has helped to revitalize the piers. Numerous other examples all over the nation.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 109 **Comment Id:** 226248 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I was and remain convinced that St. Louis cannot compete with other cities and regions. If it does not consider removing the redundant depressed sections of highway 70 then this is yet another example which validates this reality. If the NPS does not study highway removal, as all of the planning firms which participated in the competition recommended be done, then this is a useless exercise. Downtown cannot be connected to the Arch Grounds without removing the highway. Given it has been shown by Development Strategies that more than a billion in economic development could result from removing the highway, I do not understand why this is not one of the options under consideration in the Environmental Assessment? Nearly every property owner lining Memorial Drive supports the idea of removing the highway and replacing it with an at grade boulevard like what exists in Chicago. St. Louis needs to lead and make bold decisions or it will continue to be economically insignificant on the national and global stage. Connecting our downtown to the Arch Grounds signals that St. Louis is a progressive City willing to recognize its mistakes and define its future. Progress or Decay? Without at least studying the removal of the now redundant highway, St. Louis is obviously choosing

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

decay by relying upon obsolete automobile infrastructure. Many other cities are stressing the pedestrian realm and reconnecting neighborhoods by removing such failures such as highways cutting through our urban built environment. Why is that not the case here?

Organization:**Commenter: Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 109 **Comment Id:** 226249 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The NPS must study and implement removal of the depressed section of highway 70 as it is redundant with the upcoming Mississippi River Bridge. This would be a game changer for downtown St. Louis and the Region. Why are other cities studying highway removal, or have already done it, while St. Louis remains stuck in the status quo of failure?

Organization:**Commenter: Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 110 **Comment Id:** 226250 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The most important objective of this project should be to re-connect the Gateway Arch with the rest of the city. The biggest problem with the Arch is its isolation which is caused by the I-70 highway trench. Replacing the I-70 trench with an at-grade boulevard would be the best way to revitalize the Arch grounds, reintegrate the memorial with the rest of the city, fulfill the vision of the original architects, and maximize the potential of the Arch and Gateway Mall. An at-grade boulevard bordering the Arch grounds could function in a comparable manner to South Michigan Avenue in Chicago which provides the western boundary to Grant Park-Millennium Park. Grant Park had a similar isolation problem to the I-70 highway trench bordering the Gateway Arch. A below street-level railroad right-of-way/parking lot acted as a barrier against the rest of the city. Millennium Park replaced the railroad/parking lot trench and re-connected the park with the rest of the city. As a result, Millennium Park is now one of the most popular tourist attractions in the state of Illinois and one of the busiest and most utilized parks in the entire metropolitan area. In addition, the entire South Michigan Avenue neighborhood has been completely transformed with redevelopment of previously abandoned skyscrapers as well as new office, residential and retail projects. An at-grade boulevard bordering the Arch Grounds could spark the same type of transformation. Public and private funds could be leveraged to maximize the revitalization efforts of the Arch Grounds as well as the surrounding area.

Organization:**Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 110 **Comment Id:** 226251 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The Gateway Arch is one of the most important and recognizable landmarks in the United States. It will never fulfill its potential until the isolation issue is fully addressed and the park is re-connected with the surrounding city. The "highway removal" option was endorsed by all five competition design teams. The current plan of spending money on additional highway ramps for an obsolete highway makes no economic sense and is contrary to the goals and objectives of the revitalization plan. Restoring the street grid through an at-grade boulevard provides a unique opportunity to address the isolation issue in a cost effective manner and completely transform the park and surrounding area.

Organization:**Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:**

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 111 **Comment Id:** 226267 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I am concerned with the proposed plan to add more highway ramps and divisions. I think these concerns can be addressed by removing the small section of I-70, which is made possible by the construction of the new I-70 bridge just north of downtown.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 226297 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The largest failure of the JNEM is its disconnection with the surrounding City that has plagued the park since its original construction. For years there has been a push for a greater re-connection between Downtown St. Louis, the JNEM and the riverfront beyond. With Interstate 70 slated to be re-routed over the New River Bridge now under construction north of Downtown, an opportunity exists to replace the existing aging and crumbling highway barrier with a front door that is fitting to the monument and to the City and which would connect them as they have never been before. This new front door would be an at-grade boulevard with regular controlled intersections and crosswalks which would give the park multiple access points from busy Downtown St. Louis as any urban park should have. Please see further related comments below.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 113 **Comment Id:** 226315 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Mostly, with the exception of the highway planning. I thought a major concern of the design process was to reconnect the Arch grounds to the city. The lid plan connects one part, but the ends are left unaddressed, which is especially unfortunate since the north end of the park intersects with the most bustling part of downtown, Wash Ave. The boulevard option, which I'm sure you've heard about at Naumess, would do a much better job of reconnection than the currently proposed overly complex traffic rerouting schemes. Let's do this once and do it right. At a minimum, let's leave the best option available in the future by avoiding a massive expenditure on infrastructure that's only going to exacerbate the current problem.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 113 **Comment Id:** 226316 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: As I said above, I think the traffic plan is a terrible idea, and the construction of an at-grade boulevard, with a possible dip under the proposed lid, should be seriously considered.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 115 **Comment Id:** 226324 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I believe that the biggest current problem with the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial is access between the park and the city. The plan, in its current form, may serve to worsen those problems rather than correct them. Specifically, the stretch of I-70 currently separating the city from the park needs to be removed after the completion of the new Mississippi River bridge currently under construction.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 115 **Comment Id:** 226325 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My chief concern is that the proposed project will not address the park's most glaring problem, which is the interstate highway that separates it from the city. The closure of Memorial Drive and addition of highway infrastructure will hurt the park in the long term and turn this project into a waste of hundreds of millions of dollars. The removal of I-70 should be fully studied, and a proposal that includes the removal of the highway should be developed for public consideration and comparison to the current plan. Jefferson National Expansion Memorial has the potential to be a true asset for the city of St. Louis, the state of Missouri, and the US. However, any proposed renovation should work to improve access to the park by the citizens of and visitors to St. Louis. Please fully study the removal of current I-70 to be completed after the highway is rerouted from the Poplar Street Bridge.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 116 **Comment Id:** 226326 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The project absolutely does not meet the purpose, need, or objectives the NPS needs to accomplish with this project. The stated goals of connectivity are being completely ignored by the design, and in many respects are being made worse. Closing parts of the street grid, adding obtrusive highway ramps. These are ways to make connectivity worse. A new pedestrian connection at one point does not solve the problem, and adding new highway ramps makes the connection at Washington Ave (downtown's main street) far worse. It is paramount to study obvious alternatives. Specifically, highway removal would result in a solution that actually does meet the goals of the connectivity prescribed in the competition. As City to River has shown, the boulevard and lid are not only compatible, but also complimentary. To not study such an obvious, economical, and beneficial solution would be a travesty and a complete failure by all parties involved.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 116 **Comment Id:** 226327 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: An obvious concern is that the proposed "solution" of adding more highway infrastructure will make the problems with the park connectivity worse. Worse yet, highway ramps create an ADDED barrier and would preclude truly solving the problem of comprehensive connectivity within the Arch grounds and downtown for decades. Having a direct connection to a new entrance is a pitiful substitution to having downtown connected with the river again, and in no way is the sign a of a successful competition. Quite the opposite. The only way to address these concerns is by studying highway removal. All five design teams praised it's benefits and it remains is the only way to fix the issues the competition was supposed to address. It simply has to be studied.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 117 **Comment Id:** 226329 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The most disturbing element of the revitalization project will be the effects caused by the removal of Memorial Drive and the preservation and illogical expansion of a redundant and soon to be de-designated highway. The removal of Memorial Drive, an action taken without public input, has never been subjected to public scrutiny or comprehensive study. Although curiously eliminated from the scope of this EA, the removal of Memorial Drive will require new highway ramps. Based on current practices these ramps will require a significantly larger infrastructure, will finalize the disconnection of the Arch from all but a select sliver of downtown, and will have ecological repercussions on the immediately contiguous arch grounds. If the National Park Service does not want to risk turning the gateway to western expansion into a receptacle for windfall refuse from passing cars or an under-engineered arboreal carbon sink for truck exhaust, the NPS must undertake a comprehensive public study of the tangible costs, benefits, and management challenges ? environmental, logistic, and economic ? of removing Memorial Drive and lining the Arch Grounds with additional highway infrastructure. Such a study should thoroughly investigate at least the following options at a minimum: 1. Removal of I-244 (currently known as I-70) and replacement with a linear park/urban boulevard similar to the Embarcadero in San Francisco or the Rose Kennedy Greenway in Boston 2. Elimination of the proposed Washington Avenue SB entrance and NB exit and relocation of all exits/entrances to the Cass Ave. I-70 interchange 3. Elevation of I-244 to 24 feet above street level (similar to the Strada Aldo Moro adjacent to the old harbor of Genoa, Italy) 4. Maintenance costs of the status quo and attendant expenses in continually decreasing tourism.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 229349 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The connectivity between downtown and the Arch Grounds is supposed to be improved however it appears that the interstate is going to remain and Memorial drive is not going to be reduced to foster pedestrian activity and spur development. The closing of Memorial drive will be a disaster by splitting this entire part of downtown in half. Please do not remove part of Memorial drive otherwise 10-15 years down the road it will prove fatal to this part of downtown

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 8 Comment Id: 229413 Coder Name:

Comment Text: The highway is a major issue and concern. Focus should be kept here. People will visit the grounds if they are easily accessible.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 9 Comment Id: 229420 Coder Name:

Comment Text: When I say the lid should be a bare minimum in terms of steps taken, I mean that the truly effective and forward-thinking step would be to remove the downtown section of Interstate 70 and replace it with an at-grade boulevard. This approach, championed by the City to River project, seems far-fetched but is actually quite reasonable. This stretch of Interstate 70 is not a vital artery for the city, and the recent closing of Interstate 64 (a much more important stretch than 70 downtown) has shown us that commuters have a great ability to adapt to changes. Recent success stories in both the US and internationally have shown that highway removal is a boon for development in the city. Removing this stretch of I-70 would incorporate the park into downtown, provide commercial opportunities to further attract visitors, and unite the St. Louis downtown into a cohesive whole. Upon examining the evidence, it is quite obvious that removing I-70 would not hurt the Arch Grounds or downtown at all, and would instead promote their growth. I realize it is a huge project, but it is also unequivocally the right thing to do. We can't let the scale of a solution scare us off from doing what is best for the Arch and what is best for St. Louis.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 30 Comment Id: 229994 Coder Name:

Comment Text: I am most concerned by the notion of not addressing the pedestrian barrier of I-70 to the Archgrounds. Quite simply, great cities are removing unnecessary interstates across the country. I-70 in front of the Arch will be highly unneeded after I-70 is rerouted north of downtown. It is an embarrassment to have a trench (and it's still a trench when you put a "lid" on it) in front of one of the world's most breathtaking monuments, and one of the country's National Historic Landmarks. It is beyond time to begin planning the removal of the I-70 lanes from in front of the Arch. Having an active boulevard in front of the Arch will do more to improve the park than any other single or collection interventions that might be undertaken. I can't tell you how many times I have heard the following statement: the Arch is beautiful, but there's nothing to do around there. It's time to remove the trench that separates downtown from the Arch! Get rid of I-70 and you'll have a very successful project!

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 230796 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Politicians love drilling into our brains about how our country's infrastructure is aging and in disrepair. Well here's a golden opportunity to remove a ton of aging infrastructure (Highway 70) and actually make the arch grounds and downtown better!! Build the boulevard! Ease the congestion on Poplar Street Bridge. Highway 70 would be a redundant road once the new MRB is built. Why keep the depressed lanes and build a lid over them? This makes absolutely no sense!! Build the boulevard, add prime real-estate for new downtown high rises, make the arch grounds as pedestrian friendly as possible. Do it!!

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 33 **Comment Id:** 230798 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: We need to remove I-70 downtown. That stretch of highway is the single largest obstacle to connecting the city to the Arch grounds. Yeah, its not simple, but neither was building the Arch. Its not exactly in the project scope, but you're a national park funded by the federal government. You've got to have some pull, right?

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 35 **Comment Id:** 230799 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: This plan is not what we signed up for as residents of Saint Louis. Do not waste your money ripping up our streets for a plan that WE have to live with for another half century or more. We want tourists to enjoy the city in the same manner that they enjoy the arch grounds. With the current plan, they [tourists] will drive to the arch grounds, look at the city from a small window 630 feet in the air, then view the city at 60mph from a car window on their way home. This is a backwards plan in a time when people want to experience city life, whether its for an hour or for the rest of their lives. But once again, we need highway access readily available in a neighborhood where some people don't even own a car. Highways destroyed our city, and now they are going to destroy a national park.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 43 **Comment Id:** 230811 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: More importantly, the section of I-70 that fronts the park should be removed and replaced with an at-grade Boulevard. The boulevard could present an opportunity to create a connection point between the Arch Grounds and the City where people can walk, dine at outdoor cafes overlooking the grounds, and celebrate the City and the Memorial.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 43 **Comment Id:** 230812 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Please do not build any new on-ramps/off-ramps. Down the road, it will be cheaper and easier to maintain and at-grade boulevard than expensive on ramps/off ramps/overpasses/and the trench. Your actions now will have reverberations for years to come. If you leave the opportunity to build the Boulevard open, the matter can be studied and planned independently from the Arch Grounds improvements. Please save taxpayer dollars by beautifying the Arch Grounds and do not add any infrastructure that will prevent or inhibit the eventual removal of former I-70.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 47 **Comment Id:** 230817 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: When will this design process address issues tied to the interstate? Other than reviving 'the lid' project, I've heard nothing. Is one 'lid' really supposed to address ALL major concerns from the interstate? When I think of a park, I picture a quiet, serene, pedestrian friendly place. When I think of a highway, I picture a loud, busy, road that is the least pedestrian-friendly place imaginable. Any park next to an interstate is a paradox - what we think of when we picture a park just isn't possible when it sits next to a highway. Please consider my suggestion to rebuild the interstate highway to be more pedestrian friendly.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 48 **Comment Id:** 230818 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Endorse the City to River Plan and take the concerns and vision of those of us who live in St. Louis seriously. Hold more public comment sessions in various neighborhoods north, south, and west.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 56 **Comment Id:** 230825 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: This project will be a failure without the removal of the I70 highway. It is ridiculous to make this type of progress on a project of this scale and miss on the most important aspect. The city and river need to be connected.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 65 **Comment Id:** 230826 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I would love to be able to walk straight to the new arch grounds without having to cross a highway. It makes no sense to add more exits and more traffic. I think we should consider alternative routes because this might be our only chance for at least another 20 to 30 years.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 231670 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Many of my concerns are based on infrastructure -- the removal of Washington Avenue east of Memorial Drive, the closure or semi-closure of Lenor K. Sullivan Drive, the diversion of Memorial Drive at Walnut and Pine (and onto Broadway and 4th Street), and the creation of more divisive highway installations on the park's north end. Under the current plan, all these components lead to further segregation of the Archgrounds, the river and the city. While the good intentions of the plan are clear -- namely, to allow safe, comfortable access for pedestrians through downtown's Gateway Mall corridor, the resulting solution is a large step backward. I suspect that the problem lies not in the deciders, but in a faulty conclusion that vehicular traffic is a negative as it relates to the park. That's not entirely true. Traffic, in certain circumstances, can be a positive, and even provides a sense of place and a sense of safety. If Memorial Drive were re-imagined as a Boulevard (rather than the highway off-ramp it currently serves as) coupled with well-timed stoplight switches and pedestrian-friendly crosswalks, the Archground's entire western edge would likely become an active, attractive location and a deserving entryway into the city of St. Louis. At present, the wrong type of traffic is represented, in that the I-70 lanes are fast, dangerous and impersonal. If any lanes should be removed, it is these, and yet they are the ones which -- in the current design iteration anyway -- are receiving upgrades and expansions.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 231671 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Within the design proposed by the City to River citizens group, a potentially transformative opportunity exists. This design competition has the opportunity to lay the foundation on which private businesses, active organizations and imaginative individuals will build. While I have personal qualms with many of the independent features added or removed from the design, the many issues surrounding Memorial Drive, Washington Avenue and I-70 is the most impactful, and therefore presents the most potential harm. When used in tandem with the existing Memorial Drive, the lid concept is a worthwhile strategy to mitigating the negative physical and psychological barriers of the sunken Interstate 70 lanes. It strengthens access points across four pedestrian walkways and succeeds in pulling the Archgrounds into the city, and vice-versa. However, the most logical concept of a simple lid within the boundaries of the existing North-South Memorial Drive has morphed into something that somehow complicates movement on a working street grid, encourages Interstate driving and limits pedestrian accessibility to the central lid. All this, while also creating new highway infrastructure which further separates this beautiful city and its equally stunning monument. In an era where movement back towards the central city is picking up steam and where public transportation -- and yes, even walking or biking -- is becoming less socially divisive (be that due to rising gas prices or environmental awareness or other), it is unfair and irresponsible to take steps which further reward and expand the highway system. City to River, its organizers and its supporters have already done the legwork on a design plan that does away with what will soon become a superfluous Interstate connector.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 231672 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: By removing I-70 in its entirety -- from south of Poplar Street to the new Mississippi River Bridge at Cass Avenue -- Memorial Drive will take its rightful place as one of downtown St. Louis' main boulevards, rather than serving as a glorified exit ramp. A true grid can be built, connecting all East-West streets to the park, opening up the Grounds to the full breadth of the city and, in turn, the full city to its visitors. In time, it alone could be the major catalyst for lucrative individual developments in downtown St. Louis: south at

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Chouteau's Landing, past the Archgrounds, adjacent to and across from the historic Laclede's Landing district, near the Edward Jones Dome, past the Bottle District and onward, to and through North Broadway, Old North St. Louis and more. The resultant change would allow new visually-appealing, pedestrian-friendly connections not only from the Gateway Mall, but from Busch Stadium, Washington Avenue, the burgeoning Old Post Office Plaza district, and more. All that potential (something St. Louis has in spades) is now under perilous risk, pending the decision making of City+Arch+River's advisors, designers and backers. An Archgrounds corridor open to the city and free of loud, speeding vehicles signifies a forward-looking effort of growth and community. A decision to expand the highway infrastructure and terminate Memorial Drive in both directions continues a disgusting and disappointing trend of slighting forward progress for standard practice.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 74 Comment Id: 231673 Coder Name:

Comment Text: People need to understand that the Arch is what people know our great city for, yet it can be hard to access the Arch from many points in the city due to the obnoxious depressed highway through downtown. If this was capped or removed, with no new infrastructure anywhere else, people would start to flock to the grounds like never before.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 78 Comment Id: 231675 Coder Name:

Comment Text: I'm not actively involved with the local City to River effort but I'd encourage you to strongly explore their suggestions to reconnect our city to the Arch Grounds and the Mississippi.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 Comment Id: 231729 Coder Name:

Comment Text: The visitor experience will also be harmed by proposed changes to Memorial Drive and I-70. The proposed solution does not reduce impacts from adjacent transportation systems, but in fact, makes them worse. Pedestrians utilizing the popular Washington Avenue entrance will not only have I-70 looming above, they will contend with fast-moving and increased traffic entering and existing I-70. This significantly worsens an already bad pedestrian experience. Removing the street grid by closing Memorial Drive and Washington Avenue also harms connectivity by making the visiting experience less predictable and more confusing. Downtown streets become a maze to be navigated in order to find the Arch grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231731 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The re-routing of I-70 from the Poplar Street Bridge to the new Mississippi River Bridge makes possible an at-grade boulevard between the two. The boulevard should be studied as an alternative to promote connectivity, protect and enhance the cultural landscape of the city and Arch grounds, enhance the visitor experience and encourage extended visitation. We believe that this is the best way to accomplish what the NPS set out to accomplish with this project.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231735 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The current proposal to close a large portion of Memorial Drive as part of the lid concept has led to the proposed addition of more Interstate highway infrastructure on-site. This is the total antithesis of increasing connectivity, a primary goal of this multi-hundred million dollar effort. Additional highway infrastructure is an adverse impact that should only be considered as a last resort and only if there is no other option. Alternatives to the current proposal have not been adequately considered and there is no public comprehensive traffic study informing this proposal. Whatever is built represents a substantial investment in time and money, such that a further reconsidering of connections to the Arch grounds will be unlikely for several decades. An at-grade boulevard, potentially with a one block depression under a lid, is a feasible alternative to additional infrastructure and provides far superior connections along the entire length of the Arch grounds and to Laclede's Landing and North Riverfront. Therefore, the highway removal alternative endorsed by all five competition finalist design teams, including the winning MVVA team, should (at the very minimum) be studied before "improvements" are made that would preclude this option for decades to come.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231736 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The MVVA team stated in their winning proposal "the benefits of removing the highway altogether are clear". The design team also kept Memorial Drive open and did not place additional infrastructure between the city and the Arch grounds. There has been no explanation to-date regarding why the proposal now calls for the opposite of what the winning design team chose and the opposite of what dozens of St. Louis community stakeholders have proposed; the removal of the most significant barrier to Arch grounds connectivity.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231738 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Communities across the nation as diverse as San Francisco, Milwaukee, New Haven, Syracuse and New Orleans are examining and implementing new proposals to remove outdated highway infrastructure and return streets and boulevards to central cities. Many of these real-life case studies have shown that removing highways from urban cores cause property values to increase substantially and significant redevelopment and revitalization of the area to occur. We are not the only ones to identify this opportunity for St. Louis: the Congress for New Urbanism has placed I-70 in downtown St. Louis on their list of "Freeways Without Futures".

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231739 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: There is no reason to believe that St. Louis will have a different experience than other cities that have benefited from highway removal; in fact, a leading real estate consultant has identified \$1.2 billion in development potential over the next 20-25 years as a result of replacing the former I-70 segment with an at-grade boulevard. The benefits of transforming downtown St. Louis and its riverfront into a connected, walkable and vibrant community is clear. Failure to fully study this opportunity means that the best solution to address the stated goals of the NPS will be wholly ignored without even a modicum of consideration. City to River strongly encourages the NPS not to close the door on this opportunity without giving it the serious consideration it is due.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231740 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: A boulevard in place of the Interstate highway would provide for additional development opportunities, fulfilling not only the desire for improved connections, but very explicitly creating attractors adjacent to the Arch grounds that would promote extended visitation to the Arch, city and river. According to a recent study conducted by Development Strategies, removal of the former Interstate 70 and its replacement with the new Memorial Drive creates up to 500,000 square feet of new developable land. This includes land facing the Arch as well as land adjacent to the boulevard reclaimed from highway right-of-way. The newly available property will support the creation of nearly \$1.2 billion in additional real estate market value over the next 20-25 years. Such an opportunity for new development will not happen with the existing configuration of I-70, nor would this redevelopment be catalyzed by the current lid proposal. The greatest potential for development lies in the areas along the elevated sections of I-70. This massive infusion of ideally located new development property presents the greatest opportunity for economic revival that St. Louis has seen in decades.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231742 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: All five finalist design teams in the Framing a Modern Masterpiece competition identified replacing I-70 with an at-grade boulevard as the best solution to meet the challenge set forth by NPS and City Arch River: "Not only would our design not be in the way of a boulevard, but we designed so that it purposely works with a boulevard." ? PWP "We predict fanfare should the elevated highway that cuts off Laclede's Landing be removed." - ? Behnisch "the benefits of removing the highway altogether are clear?" ? MVVA "Full Circle's grand loop of transportation facilities could be easily integrated into its [City to River's] design." - Weiss-Manfredi "City to River articulates an enormous number of benefits arising from such a scheme?" ? SOM-Hargreaves-BIG

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231745 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: In addition, the following have endorsed City to River's plan to replace I-70 adjacent to the Arch grounds with an at-grade boulevard: Chivvis Development ? developers of Chouteau's Landing, just south of the Arch Citizens for Modern Transit ? local transit advocacy organization Coldwell Banker Commercial ? leading area commercial real estate firm Drury Hotels ? Drury Plaza, Drury Inn ? Convention Center ? major Midwest

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

and downtown hotel operator Environmental Operations ? developers of former St. Louis Centre mall and One City Centre office tower Gentry's Landing ? high-rise riverfront apartment community Hilliker Corporation ? leading area commercial real estate firm Laclede's Landing Merchant's Association ? organization representing Laclede's Landing businesses Laclede's Landing Redevelopment Corporation ? organization representing Laclede's Landing property owners Landmarks Association of St. Louis ? St. Louis' leading historic preservation organization Lodging Hospitality Management ? owner/operator of Ballpark Hilton LoftWorks ? Craig Heller ? developers of Syndicate Trust, The 411, City Grocers, and several other Downtown buildings Mansion House ? high-rise riverfront apartment community City of St. Louis Mayor's Vanguard Cabinet ? Planning and Land Use Committee North Riverside Holdings ? Tim Tucker and Mark Schulte ? owners of Cotton Belt building on North Riverfront Open Space Council ? committed to conserving, protecting and sustaining land and water resources throughout the St. Louis region Spinnaker St. Louis ? Amos Harris ? developers of Laurel project in former downtown Dillard's building St. Louis Convention & Visitors Commission ? lead St. Louis convention agency St. Louis Chapter of American Institute of Architects ? local chapter of national organization William Kerr Foundation ? committed to projects designed to improve education, enrich the environment and promote health and accessibility with offices on North Riverfront.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 96 **Comment Id:** 231785 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: If nothing else, there should be some kind of study on I-70 and how traffic would be affected if the highway between the Poplar Street Bridge and the new Mississippi River Bridge were removed. I'm certainly glad that the NPS has given the public an opportunity to give their opinions about this. However, the City to River group and its supporters have been trying to get something done for years, and it has barely been addressed by the NPS at all. Why is the NPS so fearful of at least studying the City to River proposal? Highway removal is gaining popularity throughout the country, and this terrible section of highway downtown needs to be on the list to come down.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 84 **Comment Id:** 231812 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Another objective identified in the newsletter was 'enhancing the visitor experience and reducing the impacts from adjacent transportation systems.' However, the NPS's revitalization project includes the addition of more road infrastructure adjacent to the park by adding a new access to Washington Avenue from the interstate. This proposition will inevitably add more traffic around the northwest corner of the park and Laclede's Landing. This area is already a difficult pedestrian experience because of the inclined portion of I-70. Now, NPS desires to add more traffic and highway infrastructure to the area, which will hinder and harm visitors' experience to the Arch grounds. I also want to add that not only is it a hindrance, but also an embarrassment for the city to have a tremendous eyesore near the park. My chief concern about the current NPS change to I-70 and the concept of the 'lid' is that these propositions suggest the long-term use of the I-70 stretch through downtown. After the construction of the new I-70 bridge north of downtown, this stretch of I-70 will be obsolete. I do not understand why should NPS's current project should include drastic changes to I-70 (the lid and the changing of the ramps) when perhaps this portion of highway may not be necessary after 2014. Therefore, if the NPS is concerned with enhancing visitors' experience at the Arch and limiting the impacts of the surrounding transportation systems, they should realize that keeping the I-70 stretch through downtown is not a sustainable option for the future. Since many of the Arch visitors stay in hotels in the downtown, there is a major disconnect between the city and the Arch.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 232007 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Closing memorial drive is the worst mistake that this plan proposes which may improve the Arch Grounds but other surrounding areas will suffer which will then have an impact on the Arch Grounds in the future. I would like to see the interstate removed and more of a less car dominated memorial drive with reduced lanes and more attractive for pedestrians.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 79 **Comment Id:** 232519 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Furthermore, the replacement of I-70 with an at-grade boulevard would not only change the environment, it would save a ton of money over the long run. Currently, I-70 has to be constantly maintained whether it be by regular cleaning to re-striping, paving and inspections. These items and more amount to a significant cost, especially when the current infrastructure is due for reconstruction. The cost of reconstructing a highway like this would only inflate the costs associated with it. The repetitive cycle of maintenance costs would never end. Furthermore, attempts at easing congestion would fail as the relationship between highway expansion and increased congestion have been proven time and time again by top economics and transportation experts. Furthermore, with the state of MODOT's finances being in poor shape and the layoff of many workers, spending money on preserving and expanding the highway would only inflate MODOT's budget and prevent other investments from being made, like expansion of bus service and light rail.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 79 **Comment Id:** 232520 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: With the replacement of an at-grade boulevard, less land would also be used allowing MODOT to sell this land to developers, minimizing the cost of the project and allowing other investments to be made. The replacement of an at-grade boulevard would also significantly increase surrounding property values resulting in a stronger financial position for both downtown, the surrounding areas, the city, and state as a whole. The replacement with an at-grade boulevard should not be considered as an expense, but as an investment. Replacing the repetitive cycle of maintenance costs with a new boulevard surrounded by properties with an increased property value. Thus, promoting more development, more visits to the arch, and a better experience for all. These experiences, like all, will be naturally shared between others. Thus, more residents in the metropolitan region will want to visit and spend money. And more tourists will want to come visit St. Louis.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 79 **Comment Id:** 232521 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I fear that the highway will remain and any other attempts to revitalize the park will fail because of the psychological barrier separating them from the arch grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 88 **Comment Id:** 232525 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: It is my understanding that the boulevard concept is being completely dismissed without being studied for it's efficacy. Please reconsider this short-sighted decision, and how it will affect our city in the decades to come.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 94 **Comment Id:** 232531 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The boulevard concept should not be dismissed as some half-baked idea of a handful of urban activists, unworthy of even a modicum of serious consideration. Consider: The boulevard is supported by many key business and community stakeholders; Every single design finalist for the Arch grounds project voiced support for the boulevard concept, with the winning MVVA team stating that "the benefits of removing the highway altogether are clear, and we have purposely created a proposal that is compatible with either solution" (i.e., the lid or the boulevard); A well-respected real estate consulting firm has identified an enormous amount of development potential in downtown St. Louis and the Near North Riverfront resulting from the removal of the soon-to-be-redundant highway segment; and The boulevard is representative of a larger trend that has been successfully implemented in other cities around the world, with the well-respected Congress for New Urbanism recently placing St. Louis on its list of "Freeways Without Futures".

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements
<p>Correspondence Id: 94 Comment Id: 232532 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: It is unfathomable that all of this would simply be disregarded without so much as a preliminary study. City to River understands that there are concerns with its proposal, particularly relating to traffic, that need to be addressed. What the group is asking for is simply that its proposal be seriously studied to see if it is possible, before "improvements" are designed and/or constructed that will make the boulevard impossible. Can that be too much to ask? The wholesale dismissal of this bold idea just seems unacceptable, particularly in the context of a project that has given so much lip service to being transparent and taking the public's ideas into account, and the entire purpose of which is to reconnect the City of St. Louis to the Arch and the Mississippi River.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 114 Comment Id: 232543 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: Please fix the highway issue. We need the arch grounds connected to downtown, not cut-off by an interstate.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>
<p>Correspondence Id: 109 Comment Id: 232544 Coder Name:</p> <p>Comment Text: There is no reason that this highway should not be removed upon completion of the new Mississippi River Bridge. As a region we top the list in the number of highway miles per capita. We need to invest in order to compete; St. Louis will never have this opportunity again. We cannot afford to be so overly risk averse when such windows open for our leadership to act. If the NPS does not study highway removal then clearly the will of the people and experts, who have expressed through the democratic process their support for that alternative, are not of any concern in this process.</p> <p>Organization:</p> <p>Commenter: Page: Paragraph:</p> <p>Kept Private: No</p>

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Correspondence Id: 102 **Comment Id:** 232546 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The boulevard concept should not be dismissed as some half-baked idea of a handful of urban activists, unworthy of even a modicum of serious consideration. Consider: 1. The boulevard is supported by many key St. Louis business and community stakeholders; 2. Every single design finalist for the Arch grounds project voiced support for the boulevard concept, with the winning MVVA team stating that "the benefits of removing the highway altogether are clear, and we have purposely created a proposal that is compatible with either solution" (i.e., the lid or the boulevard); 3. A well-respected real estate consulting firm has identified an enormous amount of development potential in downtown St. Louis and the Near North Riverfront resulting from the removal of the soon-to-be-redundant highway segment; and 4. The boulevard is representative of a larger trend that has been successfully implemented in other cities around the world, with the well-respected Congress for New Urbanism recently placing St. Louis on its list of "Freeways Without Futures". It is unfathomable that all of this would simply be disregarded without so much as a preliminary study. Concerns with the boulevard proposal, particularly relating to traffic, certainly need to be addressed. What St. Louisans are asking for is simply that the boulevard proposal be seriously studied to see if it is possible, before "improvements" are designed and/or constructed that will make the boulevard impossible. Can that be too much to ask? The wholesale dismissal of this bold idea just seems unacceptable, particularly in the context of a project that has given so much lip service to being transparent and taking the public's ideas into account, and the entire purpose of which is to reconnect the City of St. Louis to the Arch and the Mississippi River.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 92 **Comment Id:** 232549 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: As mentioned in question 1, one of the primary objectives of the NPS's overall project is to improve connections between the city and park grounds. The NPS aims to fulfill this objective by building a landscaped lid across I-70 and closing Memorial Dr between Market and Chestnut. This improvement will marginally improve pedestrian connections at this narrow location, but it has repercussions elsewhere. In order to not further "cut-off" Laclede's Landing from the rest of the city due to the closing of Memorial Dr, the NPS and MoDOT have proposed reversing the highway ramps on the southern side of Washinton Ave. This will have the effect of increasing traffic at Memorial Dr and Washington Ave and possibly making the intersection more dangerous than it is today. Further, it is entirely likely than in order to reverse the direction of the highway ramps, MoDOT will need to WIDEN the depressed section of I-70 past the Arch grounds. This action alone, widening the I-70 trench, should be unacceptable to the NPS as it would only serve to enlarge the divide between the city and the park.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 92 **Comment Id:** 232550 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: All five finalist design teams in the Framing a Modern Masterpiece competition identified replacing I-70 with an at-grade boulevard as the best solution to meet the challenge set forth by NPS and City Arch River: "Not only would our design not be in the way of a boulevard, but we designed so that it purposely works with a boulevard." ? PWP "We predict fanfare should the elevated highway that cuts off Laclede's Landing be removed." -? Behnisch "the benefits of removing the highway altogether are clear?" ? MVVA "Full Circle's grand loop of transportation facilities could be easily integrated into its [City to River's] design." - Weiss-Manfredi "City to River articulates an enormous number of benefits arising from such a scheme?" ? SOM-Hargreaves-BIG In closing, I highly urge the NPS and MoDOT to fully study the vision presented by City to

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

River. I say this as a concerned native citizen who is unaffiliated with City to River and someone who believes their vision can significantly improve the way residents and visitors perceive their connection with St. Louis's most recognized landmark and icon.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 100 **Comment Id:** 232553 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Visitor Use Experience Objectives should be paid the most attention. Bullet point #1 "Ensure that revitalization of the park improves connections between the city and the park and from the city and the park to the river..." I do not feel this has been adequately addressed by considering a "lid" over the depressed lanes of I-70. Currently visitors have terrible access to the Arch ground regardless of transportation mode. Simply adding a lid over a 1-block section of highway does nothing to improve overall connection and further reduces connections at the ends of the park. This idea funnels pedestrians and cyclists across at a central location removing them from the existing commercial areas the exist on the west of the park on the North (Washington Ave.) and South (Market, Broadway Blues District, Busch Stadium) ends. Furthermore this scheme does little to address the terrible automobile access cause by I-70 in the first place. With the new Mississippi River Bridge being built this would be the ideal time to remove both the elevated and depressed lanes of I-70 and consider development of an urban boulevard similar to that of the Embarcadero in San Francisco. This idea would allow for pedestrain, cyclist, and auto access at multiple points increasing interchanges between the park the city tenfold. We have a once in a lifetime chance to get this right, let's not cut off our city from its water from for another 50 years. If we fail to do this correctly this will be sighted in case-studies for the next 50 years as an NPS failure and will be a disgrace to the design teams involved.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 232570 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The proposed removal of Washington Avenue along the north edge of the JNEM will sever a vital historic connection to the riverfront. Washington Avenue appears on the earliest original maps of the village of St. Louis and the street was one of only a few that extended beyond the village fortifications connecting St. Louis with destinations beyond. Most of the street grid of the original village of St. Louis was removed to create the JNEM, Washington Avenue remains one of the few original connections to the riverfront that remains. Washington Avenue has been widened from its original width and could use some traffic calming and streetscape improvements, complete removal of this historic connection to the riverfront is an un-needed over-reaction. Washington Avenue is also an important connection to adjacent Laclede's Landing, which remains an economically fragile commercial district and the only adjacent neighborhood that is not separated from the JNEM by a highway.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 119 **Comment Id:** 232579 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The biggest concern that the EA must address is how visitors, especially out-of-town visitors, will be directed to reach the National Register Gateway Arch. Closing north- and southbound Memorial Drive and Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard to vehicular traffic and removing the Arch grounds parking structure eliminate the direct and obvious visitor approaches from the interstate highway ramps to the Arch, degrading this National

OS6000 Outside Scope: Transportation Infrastructure Elements

Register property's accessibility. Downtown's oneway streets complicate a vehicular approach to the Arch and require out-of-direction travel and out-of-view navigation around downtown's tall buildings to get to the Arch for drop-off and to multiple scattered-site parking locations, which have considerable competition for use during typical weekdays, especially nearer to the Arch.

Organization:

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 234500 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: - The expansion of the I-70 entrance and exit ramps that would accompany the reconfiguring of the intersection at the north-west corner of the park is ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE and 100% antithetical to the purpose of this project. - A short-sighted band-aid in the form of a one-block lid over the depressed lanes is just irresponsible given the many long-term advantages (economic and otherwise) associated with their complete removal and replacement with a landscaped, pedestrian friendly at-grade boulevard.

Organization:

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 120 **Comment Id:** 234850 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: A main concern that was addressed in EPA's comment letters on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial General Management Plan Draft and Final EIS's was that the result of an implemented design may cause "moderate to major long-term adverse to beneficial impacts on transportation." This issue has been addressed in the FEIS, as design requirements for the competition were amended such that potential impacts may now result in "moderate to major long-term beneficial impacts on the transportation resources of the Memorial." Please give due regard to these statements and consider any potential impacts resulting from the final design and implementation of this project.

Organization: US Environmental Protection Agency

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

PN7000 Purpose And Need: NEPA And CEQ

Correspondence Id: 120 **Comment Id:** 234851 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: EPA commends your coordination efforts with MoDOT & FHWA regarding their concurrent EA to assess the effects of proposed changes to I-70 & Memorial Drive. EPA supports the continuation of these collaborative efforts and recommends that the EA address these and any other potential activities or sources that may contribute to overall cumulative impacts.

Organization: US Environmental Protection Agency

Committer: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

PN7000 Purpose And Need: NEPA And CEQ**Correspondence Id:** 92 **Comment Id:** 232548 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I severely disagree with the decision to separate this Environmental Assessment by the NPS from the Environmental Assessment soon to be performed by MoDOT. Both of these EAs are intimately linked and by separating the project into 2 EAs, I believe MoDOT and the NPS are attempting to downplay the significance of the impacts their project proposals may have.

Organization:**Commenter: Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**PN8000 Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action****Correspondence Id:** 100 **Comment Id:** 226191 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The purpose seems fine if only looked at in the context of a focused vision of the GMP and supported by the objectives. The important item that is mentioned Objectives under General in bullet point #2 is this revitalization must "catalyze increased vitality in the St. Louis region and create attractors to promote extended visitation to the Arch, the city, and the river." In my opinion it should increase vitality in the City/region first, the Arch second and the river 3rd. Even at St. Louis' worst people came to visit the Arch, we need people to visit St. Louis and make the Arch just one of the stops along the way. Cultural Resources objectives seem both adequate and reasonable.

Organization:**Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**PN8500 Purpose and Need: Objectives****Correspondence Id:** 120 **Comment Id:** 234849 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Green Building Design Future NEPA documentation should discuss opportunities to incorporate elements of sustainable design and to certify buildings through the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design program. LEED is the nationally-accepted benchmark for the design, construction, and operation of high-performance green buildings intended to maximize operational efficiency while minimizing environmental impacts.

Organization: US Environmental Protection Agency**Commenter: Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 5 **Comment Id:** 217840 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The purpose, need, and objectives are relatively conservative, and may benefit from more out-of-the-box thinking, especially regarding the purpose of renewing the park.

Organization:**Commenter: N/A N/A Page: Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No

PN8000 Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 218151 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes, I think the NPS has done a good job of identifying the purpose and need.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 18 **Comment Id:** 218618 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The objectives of this project have been well matched.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 26 **Comment Id:** 220358 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The purpose and need states why the NPS is involved in the project and the directions given to the NPS by the GMP. It doesn't necessarily reflect what needs to be accomplished by the NPS. I think the objectives reflect what the NPS needs to address in regards to the project.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 41 **Comment Id:** 221016 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes, I believe the focus of the project is correct. It is critical to create a connected, visitor friendly environment between the Arch Grounds and the surrounding city areas. I work downtown in Laclede Landing. It is amazing how many visitors never leave the park grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 51 **Comment Id:** 225384 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Yes. The purpose, need and objectives are what are required in order to more beautifully and more functionally showcase St. Louis' centerpiece.

Organization: All About You Limos - Driver

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 96 **Comment Id:** 226040 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Again, the plans for the park look nice, but the aim cannot be only on the park itself. We must make the park accessible to the downtown area, and I simply do not think the current revitalization plans do that.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

PN8000 Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 230830 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The plan should refocus on achieving two essential goals of the competition: - Create attractions to promote extended visitation to the Arch, the City and the River. - Weave connections and transitions from the city and the Arch grounds to the River. We think the above elements are crucial to the success of success. This is not an issue of design talent, of which there is considerable on the MVVA team. It is, moreover, a planning and programming issue(s) that can only be addressed by the National Parks Service, City Arch River and the St. Louis.

Organization: AIA St. Louis

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 84 **Comment Id:** 231806 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Frankly, no. According to the Public Scoping Newsletter, one of the objectives is to 'create attractors to promote extended visitation to the Arch.' Since it has been in the interest of the NPS to scale back on the MVVA Arch proposal, the Arch grounds will sadly and inevitably not achieve this objective. The revised plan proposed by NPS simply bastardizes or degrades that MVVA plan, which compels me to ask why the Arch competition was even organized if the NPS was just going to change it.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 117 **Comment Id:** 232573 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: As the NPS is undoubtedly aware, this EA process itself has removed the entire East Bank part of the project from consideration. In addition, requested park amenities along the riverfront and South end (water gauges, South skating rink/beer garden, underpass park) in the MVVA Plan have been removed from the original MVVA Arch Grounds. These changes remove much of the activities needed to energize the Arch Grounds while other functions have been displaced away from the Arch and River to Kiener Plaza. These actions are in direct opposition to the criteria established in the City Arch River competition goals, the NPS GMP, and through significant public input.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 117 **Comment Id:** 232574 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The current City Arch River proposal addresses neither the majority of significant issues raised during the General Management Plan process nor half of the articulated goals of the City Arch River 2015 Foundation. During the GMP Process key concerns such as access, connectivity, and boundary were raised (GMP §1.6, p.1-10). The NPS opened the door to rethink the difficult journey from city to park to river, how the riverfront might play a pivotal role for both visitors and residents, and the half-realized vision for the memorial might be broadened to encompass both banks of the river ? achieving Saarinen's vision after a six decade lacuna. These intentions were supported not only by the NPS, but by the general public as well. During an energetic series of meetings, residents articulated their deference for the daring of the Saarinen monument and advocated equally bold new action. Public comment mandated including the Riverfront in the design competition (GMP §5.4, p.5.8), expanding the design competition beyond the park boundary to study better connections to downtown along Spruce, Locust, and Olive Streets (GMP §5.4, p.5.10), redeveloping the lifeless South end of the Arch Grounds (GMP §5.4, p.5.11), and multiple views supporting the removal of soon-to-be redundant lanes of I-70 and replacement with a pedestrian friendly at-grade urban boulevard (GMP §5.4, p. 5.14-15). Building on these

PN8000 Purpose And Need: Objectives In Taking Action

intentions, the City Arch River design competition included the following goals in the competition structure: 2. Catalyze increased vitality in the St. Louis region 4. Weave connections and transitions from the City and the Arch Grounds to the river. 5. Mitigate the impact of transportation systems 6. Embrace the Mississippi River and the East Bank in Illinois as an integral part of the National Park. 8. Create attractors to promote extended visitation to the Arch, the City, and the River.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

PN9000 Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses

Correspondence Id: 120 **Comment Id:** 234847 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Environmental Justice Part of the reason for conducting an environmental justice analysis is to determine if an adverse effect on a low income or minority population significantly exceeds that of a comparable reference area or population. We recommend the EA provide information regarding whether or not impacts are disproportionately high and adverse on minority populations and low-income populations. The EA should detail what course of action (avoidance, minimization, and mitigation) will be considered to address any possible EJ effects. While we understand that development is not currently planned for the east side of the Mississippi River and is outside of the scope of this EA, our analysis indicates that East St. Louis, Illinois, is a community living with environmental justice concerns. Any actions taken on the west side of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial will have consequences for those living adjacent to it on the east side. We recommend that any actions be mindful of the East St. Louis community's concerns.

Organization: US Environmental Protection Agency

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

SE6000 Socioeconomics

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 231741 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Below is a breakdown of the potential value of new development adjacent to the boulevard. These figures do not include the increase in value of properties more than a few blocks away, such as the Ballpark Village site, or existing buildings currently adjacent to the Arch. Chouteau's Landing District \$133,000,000 Broadway and Spruce Lot developed \$126,000,000 New Parcels facing Memorial & the Arch \$ 69,000,000 Surface lots on Broadway near Convention Center \$ 21,000,000 New Parcels east of Jones Dome \$ 22,000,000 Laclede's Landing Parcels @ Eads Bridge \$107,000,000 North Riverfront fronting Memorial \$136,000,000 Bottle District & off boulevard North Riverfront \$543,000,000 Total Real Estate Value \$1,156,000,000

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

SE6000 Socioeconomics

Correspondence Id: 8 **Comment Id:** 229414 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The general public is not well informed of the plan. They need to see the economic impacts the project will have on St. Louis. How can NPS better inform the public?

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

Correspondence Id: 119 **Comment Id:** 232580 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: --What routes will be designated for out-of-town visitors to get from downtown's interstates to which parking facilities with available spaces and then walk or be shuttled to the Arch? --How will Arch visitors navigate the one-way pair of Fourth and Broadway during the peak-summer season when the Baseball Cardinals shut down lanes of Broadway at Busch Stadium, especially during rush-hour, or when a parade or run is scheduled? --How will Arch-visitation pedestrians safely negotiate downtown's intersections around the Old Courthouse with the added auto and truck traffic displaced from Memorial Drive and frustrated with their circuitous route in and out of downtown? --How will RV drivers be directed to reach the RV parking designated under the Poplar Street Bridge approach, or if this RV parking is removed, where will RV visitors be directed to park? --How will access to a new visitor arrival area on Washington Avenue be made understandable and acceptable for auto and bus drop-off, given the complicated intersection at the approach to the National Historic Landmark Eads Bridge under 1-70 and over MetroLink; the narrow, cobble-stone streets of Laclede's Landing; and the steep grade of Washington Avenue down to Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard?

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 100 **Comment Id:** 232555 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Interpretation/Education objectives seem great, but not nearly focused enough. It's important our City/region understands what existed on the Arch Grounds in the mid 1900's, the 1800's and 1000+ years ago. This land has a rich history of Sative Americans, war, and even a once thriving riverfront that was torn down for the the construction of the park. That story needs to be told, so we do not forget what we had.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 80 **Comment Id:** 231787 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I also thought that the Cathedral Square restaurant and combination beer garden/skating rink were two of the strongest features of the winning design concept, and I have heard nothing about them since that concept was chosen. If I'm not mistaken, the beer garden/skating rink have been removed from consideration. This makes no sense to me, as these two features would go a long way toward enlivening the Arch grounds. Give tourists more to do while they're there; give locals a reason to come down.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 231698 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: It is also important to integrate the purpose and idea--the story--of the memorial, the park, and the museum AS A WHOLE--not merely consider elements separately. Separating park considerations from the rest of the renewal project will reinforce the curiously isolated purposes of the memorial as a whole. Visitors to the Arch and its grounds may be disoriented by the somewhat quaint and ill-considered museum exhibits beneath a space-age modernistic monument. The constructed history of American Expansionism is available EVERYWHERE, but the Arch is unique. The park and museum should not only be integrated as a holistic experience, they should also reflect something unique about St. Louis as a starting point for Westward Invasion. I mean Expansion--but that was just one way to alert you to a more complex set of interpretations that the Memorial is uniquely positioned to provide to visitors. From a visual standpoint, even the style of the exhibits in the museum should be less traditional and more modern, in keeping with the beautiful Arch. The Arch has no visual relationship to the museum, and the museum has very little content or visual relationship to the Arch. The Arch is the strong point of the Memorial--use it as a starting point to integrate and celebrate the entire Memorial.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 95 **Comment Id:** 231677 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I like the museum entrance; the current entrances are small and crowded at times. The only thing I don't see that I think is extremely important for St. Louis is permanently illuminating the Arch at night. It is so spectacular to look at and is impressive to visitors and natives alike.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 47 **Comment Id:** 230816 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Noise is my biggest concern. Traffic is as loud as a jet airplane when you stand in this area of downtown. Noise would keep me from using the area of the park near to the interstate.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 45 **Comment Id:** 230814 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: There need to be more offerings that will extend visitation hours. The beer garden and ice rink should not be left out of the plan.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 42 **Comment Id:** 230806 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The lid sounds like a good thing, but there still needs to be a good parking lot built somewhere or else why bother walking over the highway at all? The biggest impediment to my enjoyment of the park right now is parking. All the good spots downtown are controlled by hotels and the parking lot is too expensive -- too much to pay to play in the grass. I would visit a lot more often if I could park for 3 bucks. 10 bucks isn't a bad fee for a vacationer who has always dreamed of going to the arch, but it's way too much for a family that just wants to

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

hang out and have a picnic in the park. I'm really not at all interested in the museum or going up to the top of the arch. I like it fine as a sculpture and a park. Maybe when my kids are older, I'll take them inside, but they're too young for the museum -- and we've all been plenty high before, so going up inside the arch just isn't worth the fee.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 18 **Comment Id:** 229990 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: When the review period was under way of the 5 finalists, I personally choose MVVA. The naturalist point of view for the Arch-W and the ARCH East grounds impressed me. I am concerned about flooding issues. Their plan and further review will resolve intense flooding issues allowing spill over unto grounds without harming plant or construction. Is there some place we can stop say for 5-10 minutes and allow visitors to get out of a car just to see this park.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 229988 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: St. Louis is an unusual city. St. Louisans are not going to pay to park to go somewhere, (Ilok @ UNion Station and the former St. Louis Center). Please be smart and develop this area with a parking and safety plan. By safety I mean for people and their cars. Plan on having a lot of free parking. There is a lot of available parking areas down by the arch, but the city has them marked as no parking. Work on the city to free up these spaces. There is so much available space down there you could really do something great if you pay attention to what has been successful in St. Louis, and not necessarily what has been successful elsewhere.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 229350 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: More uses are needed inside the park to draw more individuals, better connectivity to other parts of downtown, closing the interstate (I-70) with a more pedestrian oriented boulevard, memorial drive should remain open to traffic, and more activities such as bike trails are essential in improving the experience of visiting downtown and the Arch Grounds.

Organization:

Commenter: **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

Correspondence Id: 104 **Comment Id:** 226220 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: 1) Will there be adequate parking? There should be parking on both the north and south sides of the arch grounds. Maybe some undergrouns parking . 2) With the museum expansion will they still be able to have large gatherings on the Arch lawn such as the 4th of July concerts? Like I said above, the over-all project is exciting. I will be great to have a "lid" over interstate 70 leading to a new entrance to the museum. My main concerns are how will bring the riverfront to life, and the plans for the east side seem inadequate, compared to the over-all scope of the project.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 104 **Comment Id:** 226219 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: Overall, the project is exciting. I have two concerns. 1) Can this project revitalize the river front and make it more of a world class riverfront...a destination for people? 2) Besides the view, what will attract people to the east side of the river? 3) The grain silos will still be in the way of the overall view. The fountain, though impressive, is off-center. The plan for the east side does not impress me. It's lacking.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 101 **Comment Id:** 226195 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: That the grounds will be commercialized. Vendors, river boats, helicopters, etc. should be allowed from the Old Courthouse to the middle of the River between the Eads Bridge & the Poplar St. Bridge. The entire area in question from the Old Courthouse to the middle of the River and from The Eads Bridge to the Poplar St. Bridge should be reserved for passive recreation and returned to a naturalistic and sustainable environment. Since the Memorial is a National Park, it should reflect the character of other National Parks rather than a Disneyfied commercial landscape.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 39 **Comment Id:** 221014 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: No. Originally we were supposed to be getting more uses such as an ice rink and beer garden which have now been eliminated. In order to make this a vibrant space were are going to have to create more things to do other than soley visiting the Arch. Otherwise there will not be much of an improvement than in its current state.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: Paragraph:

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 33 **Comment Id:** 220812 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: My main concern is that that the project isn't going to have a large enough impact for those who live closest to it, city residents. Considering the design by MVVA, the park itself looks like it will be a lot better/prettier. The landscaping will look much better, and the museum will be vastly improved. Parking will be improved. There are a lot of great parts of the design, but I feel that it only enhances the experiences for tourists at

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

the grounds. It doesn't do enough for city residents, especially those downtown. The Arch grounds have the potential to be used everyday for those who live closest to it. Look at Forest park as an example. People run, bike, play sports, picnic, etc. everyday. They come from DeBalivere, CWE, Dogtown, etc. The design for the grounds doesn't offer downtown residents everyday use. If you put in a large bike path loop/trail using the bridges (Eads and McArthur) and crossing over to the east side (potentially connecting to the river trail as well, that's something small/easy that pulls city residents into the park everyday. Just a thought.

Organization:**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 22 **Comment Id:** 219069 **Coder Name:****Comment Text:** The lack of visitor parking is a huge concern. If visitors are unable to find a safe and convenient parking facility, they will not come!**Organization:****Commenter:** **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 22 **Comment Id:** 219068 **Coder Name:****Comment Text:** No. The plan to remove the parking garage is flawed. You can not implement a world class plan and offer no place for the visitors to park. Remember this park is in the middle of Downtown St. Louis therefore it is vital that the park continue to offer safe and convenient car, RV, and bus parking on site.**Organization:****Commenter:** **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No**Correspondence Id:** 18 **Comment Id:** 218619 **Coder Name:****Comment Text:** I am concerned about the recent rash of car break ins at public garages. I am pleased we are reusing current garages and getting people walking from the West to the East. I really appreciate the current Museum. The circular design from less industrialization to greater impact fits the information so well. I hope you retain that concept when flipping the entrance Museum to the West.**Organization:****Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** Yes**Correspondence Id:** 16 **Comment Id:** 218533 **Coder Name:****Comment Text:** I think the park-grounds surrounding the arch are underutilized. I would like to see some retail development and some other developments that would attract people to the arch grounds, (along with free parking).**Organization:****Commenter:** **Page:** **Paragraph:****Kept Private:** No

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 218459 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I question the covering of the highway with a grassed area at the riverfront. Currently, the bridges, when closed to traffic at the VP Fair, provide a good view of the highway below, and allow fairgoers to view traffic passing through. The traffic goers, also, can view fireworks in the air because the space above them is not closed to sight or sound.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 15 **Comment Id:** 218458 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I saw a long line at the entrance to the Arch museum, on the 4th. I didn't see people squirming to get out of the line, and I think a lot of people have, still, not been to the top of the Arch. Waiting for this sight is not a problem. Perhaps, putting a water pump at/in the river, which would create a fountain and some water cooling for the crowd, would be a good idea. Every year, there is flooding in front of the Arch, cutting off circulation at the river.

Organization:

Commenter: M.F.A. **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 218111 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The proposed design I've seen in newspaper reports and exhibits. I think it's tacky, and inappropriate -- gondolas over the Mississippi?! -- in addition to being unnecessary. If anything should be added to the Arch grounds or facilities -- and I don't think anything is needed -- it should reinforce the sense of history implicit in the Arch symbolism -- the gateway to the West, not reconstitute the Arch grounds as an amusement park.

Organization:

Commenter: Page: **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 6 **Comment Id:** 218021 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I do believe the purpose, need, and objectives reflect what I think the NPS needs to accomplish with this project. However, some ideas for respite from the sweltering summer heat would be welcome. The City Garden provides a good example of how to incorporate interactive water features. Large fans like those used at the Munny in Forest Park could also be considered for the performance venue.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 5 **Comment Id:** 217841 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: I am concerned that the attempt to link the Jefferson National Expansion with downtown may fail. There are many failed construction, revitalization, and "renewal" projects in downtown St. Louis. The real audience for the park is not merely local inhabitants, but visitors. There should be a way to assess their opinions on the park's accessibility and appeal to out of towners.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

VE6000 Visitor Opportunities, Programs, and Visitor Services

Correspondence Id: 3 **Comment Id:** 217722 **Coder Name:**

Comment Text: The Park should provide for more active recreation rather than be simply a passive setting for the Arch. While the Arch is a national monument, the surround area is a park and should encourage active engagement with nature & the environment.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes