Appendix H

Agency Coordination

(Technical Advisory Committee Meetings,
Policy Committee Meetings,
Resource Agency Committee Meetings, and
Related Correspondence)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Letter from Metro – June 17, 2005.....3
2. Metro South Notice of Intent, Federal Register, Volume 68, Number 122 – June 25, 2003.....4
3. Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – July 8, 2003.....6
4. Policy Committee Meeting – July 10, 2003.....10
5. Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – September 9, 2003.....12
6. Policy Committee Meeting – September 10, 2003.....15
7. Joint Technical Advisory/Policy Committee Meeting – December 2, 2003.....18
8. Joint Technical Advisory/Policy Committee Meeting – January 20, 2004.....23
9. Joint Technical Advisory/Policy Committee Meeting – April 14, 2004.....26
10. Joint Technical Advisory/Policy Committee Meeting – August 17, 2004.....29
11. Joint Technical Advisory/Policy Committee Meeting – September 10, 2004.....33
12. Resource Agency Committee Meeting – July 25, 2003.....36
13. Resource Agency Committee Meeting – January 21, 2004.....40
14. Resource Agency Committee Meeting – August 19, 2004.....42
15. EPA Letter – January 22, 2004.....44
16. EPA Letter – May 17, 2004.....46
17. TCIG Response to EPA Letter – July 8, 2004.....47
18. BNSF Letter – November 5, 2004.....48
19. TCIG Response to BNSF Letter – November 17, 2004.....50
20. SHPO Letter – December 2, 2004.....51
21. FRA Letter – May 4, 2005.....57

Larry E. Salci
PRESIDENT & CEO

Metro

707 North First Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2595
PH: 314.982.1400
www.metrostlouis.org

June 17, 2005

Mr. Les Sterman
Executive Director
East-West Gateway Council of Governments
One Memorial Drive, Ste 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102

Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration Region VII
901 Locust Street, Ste 404
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Mr. Sterman and Mr. Ahmad:

This letter refers to the Metro South MetroLink Extension Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Metro was a participating partner in the study and has reviewed the Draft EIS. Metro concurs with the findings in the document.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Salci
President & CEO

CFR Section	Respondent universe	Total annual responses	Average time per response	Total annual burden hours	Total annual burden cost
228.11—Hours of duty records	632 railroads	27,375,000 records	2 min/10 min	2,962,500	$103,687,500
228.17—Dispatchers of train movements.	150 dispatch offices	54,750 records	6 hours	328,500	11,497,500
228.19—Monthly reports of excess service.	300 railroads	1,800 reports	2 hours	3,600	126,000
228.103—Construction of employee sleeping quarters.	632 railroads	1 petition	16 hours	16	560
49 U.S.C. 521102—Hours of service act.	12 railroads	12 petitions	10 hours	120	$4,200

Total Responses: 27,431,563.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 3,294,736 hours.

Status: Regular Review.

Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3507(a) and 5 CFR 1320.5(b), 1320.8(b)(3)(vi), FRA informs all interested parties that it may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 18, 2003.

Kathy A. Weiner,

Director, Office of Information Technology and Support Systems, Federal Railroad Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–16093 Filed 6–24–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Environmental Impact Statement on Transit Improvements in the Metro South Study Area of Metropolitan St. Louis, MO

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, the Bi-State Development Agency doing business as Metro, and the Missouri Department of Transportation (DOT) intend to prepare an EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its implementing regulations for proposed transportation improvements in the Metro South Study Area of metropolitan St. Louis County, Missouri. The project co-sponsors include the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC) which is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) responsible for transportation planning in the St. Louis metropolitan area, Metro which is the transit agency that operates the MetroLink light rail system and the bus system in the St. Louis metropolitan area, and the Missouri DOT.

This notice is being published to notify interested agencies and the general public about the proposed action and to invite participation in the study. Scoping will be accomplished through correspondence and meetings with interested persons, organizations, and federal, state, and local agencies. A public scoping meeting and an interagency scoping meeting are currently planned.

The Metro South Study Area is bounded by the River Des Peres on the north, the Mississippi River on the east, the Meramec River on the south, and various streets including Gravois, Sappington, Watson, and Edgar on the west. Within this study area, transit improvements alternatives including light-rail transit alternatives, a transportation systems management (TSM) alternative, an enhanced bus system alternative, a no-action alternative and any additional reasonable alternatives emerging from the scoping process will be evaluated.

DATES: The public scoping meeting is scheduled for July 23, 2003 from 4 to 7 p.m. at the address given under **ADDRESSES.** The interagency scoping meeting is scheduled for July 25, 2003. Written comments on the scope of the study must be received at the EWGCC by August 8, 2003. *See* **ADDRESSES** for mailing information.

ADDRESSES: Scoping Meetings: The public scoping meeting on July 23, 2003 will be held in the gymnasium of Cor Jesu Academy, 10230 Gravois Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63123. The meeting will take place from 4 to 7 p.m. Oral and written comments on the scope of the study may be given at the meeting. The meeting site is wheelchair-accessible. Any person who requires language interpretation or special communication accommodations is asked to contact the project's public-participation coordinator, Laurna Godwin of Vector Communications at (314) 621–5566 prior to the meeting. Federal, state, and local agencies will be notified individually about the location of the interagency scoping meeting.

Written Comments: Written comments on the scope of the study may be sent to Mr. Bob Innis, Transportation Corridor Improvement Group, East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, 10 Stadium Plaza, St. Louis, MO 63102; or by e-mail to *bob.innis@ewgateway.org.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Joan Roeseler, Director of Planning and Program Development, FTA Region 7, 901 Locust Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; Telephone: (816) 329–3936.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

Scoping information material will be available at the meetings and may also be obtained by contacting Mr. Bob Innis at his address in **ADDRESSES** above or by telephone at (314) 982–1400, Extension 1767. Scoping information will also be available on the Internet at *http://www.metrosouthstudy.org* FTA, EWGCC, Metro, and the Missouri DOT invite all interested individuals and organizations, and Federal, State, regional, and local agencies to participate in articulating the purpose and need for the proposed transit improvements, defining the transit alternatives to be evaluated, and identifying social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives. During the scoping process, comments should focus on specific social, economic, or environmental issues to be evaluated and on suggesting alternatives that may be less costly or have fewer environmental impacts while achieving similar transportation objectives.

II. Planning History and Process

A multimodal major investment study entitled the Cross-County Corridor

Major Transportation Investment Analysis (MTIA) was carried out in 1995–1997. This study examined transportation problems and identified potential solutions at a conceptual level

for a large portion of St. Louis County, including the Metro South Study Area, that is the subject of the planned EIS. At the conclusion of the MTIA, the EWGCC selected a MetroLink light rail transit (LRT) extension as the locally preferred alternative (LPA) in the Metro South Study Area. That LRT extension was planned to extend along a corridor from Lansdowne Avenue south along the Burlington-Northern & Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way past Lindbergh Boulevard, across I–55 to the South County Shopping Center near I–255/270, and then across I–255 and south along the I–55 right-of-way terminating south-east of the I–55 and Butler Hill Road interchange.

However, conditions in the Metro South Study Area have changed since the MTIA was completed in early 1997. For example, a number of large new commercial developments have recently opened or are currently under construction. Therefore, at the outset of the NEPA process, the state and local sponsoring agencies will conduct a Planning Alternatives Analysis to re-establish the project purpose and need consistent with the land use and transportation goals and objectives in the Legacy 2025: Long Range Plan initiative, and to re-examine the alternative transit modes and general alignments that would serve the transportation purpose and need in the Metro South Study Area.

III. Alternatives

The alternatives to be considered currently consist of the No-Action Alternative, Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternatives, a TSM Alternative, and an Enhanced Bus System Alternative. Any additional reasonable alternatives suggested during scoping that reduce costs or impacts while still serving the transportation purpose and need will also be considered. The LRT Alternatives consist of the LPA from the MTIA described above, and alignment variations designed to serve new developments or to reduce impacts. The No-Action Alternative is the continuation of existing bus service policies in the study area. Under the No-Action Alternative, increases in service would track with increases in demand due to population or employment growth in the area, in accordance with current service policies. The TSM Alternative consists of low-cost mobility improvements that attempt to serve the project purpose and need without building a transit guideway. The Enhanced Bus System Alternative provides additional bus improvements exceeding those of the TSM in cost and possibly including segments of busway or dedicated lanes.

IV. Probable Effects and Potential Impacts for Analysis

At the present time, none of the usual impact categories associated with transit projects can be ruled out. Therefore the study will evaluate all social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives, including land use, zoning, and economic development; cumulative land use impact, land acquisition, displacements, and relocation of existing uses; historic, archaeological, and cultural resources; parklands and recreation areas; neighborhoods and communities; environmental justice; air quality; noise and vibration; contaminated sites; ecosystems; water resources; construction impacts; safety and security; utilities; finance; and transportation impacts. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation of each alternative. Measures to mitigate adverse impacts will be identified.

V. FTA Procedures

Following the scoping process, the alternatives will be evaluated in a Planning Alternatives Analysis that results in the identification of a locally preferred alternative (LPA) by EWGCC. FTA and the project sponsors will then decide which of the alternatives may be eliminated from further review on the basis of the public and agency comments on the Planning Alternatives Analysis and which alternatives must be carried forward for detailed review in the EIS. The alternatives reviewed in the EIS will include, at a minimum, the No-Action Alternative and the LPA. Scoping activities are being initiated at the outset of the Planning Alternatives Analysis to maximize the opportunity for public involvement in the consideration of transit alternatives and reaching decisions about the transportation investments that will be advanced into the EIS for detailed evaluation.

In accordance with FTA policy, all Federal laws, regulations and executive orders affecting project development, including but not limited to the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality and FTA implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508 and 23 CFR part 771), the conformity requirements of the Clean Air Act, section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Executive Orders 11988, 11990 and 12898 regarding floodplains, wetlands, and environmental justice, respectively, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, will be addressed to the maximum extent practicable during the NEPA process.

Issued on: June 19, 2003.

Mokhtee Ahmad,

Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Region VII.

[FR Doc. 03–16092 Filed 6–24–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Reports, Forms and Record Keeping Requirements; Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), U.S. Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collections and their expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on October 23, 2002 (67 FR 65184).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 25, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph P. Scott at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Office of Crash Avoidance Standards, 202–366–8525. 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Title: 49 CFR Part 569 & 574, Tires and Rims Labeling.

OMB Control Number: 2127–0503.

Type of Request: Request for public comment on a previously approved collection of information.

Abstract: New tire manufacturers and rim manufacturers must label tires and rims that are used on motor vehicles. Tire manufactures are required to maintain records of tire purchasers. Regulations specify the methods by which retreaders and retreaded tire brand name owners shall identify tires for use on motor vehicles. The methods require that independent tire dealers and distributors record, on registration forms, their names and addresses and

Attendance:

Technical Advisory Committee Members	*Transportation Corridor Improvement Group*	*Metro South Study Team*
Barry Alexander	**Justin Carney**	**Uri Avin**
City of Shrewsbury	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	HNTB
Jerry Blair	**Steve Clark**	**Chris Barber**
East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	Missouri Department of Transportation	Jacobs Civil, Inc.
Thomas Blair	**Donna Day**	**Laurna Godwin**
Missouri Department of Transportation	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	Vector Communications
Tom Curran	**Bob Innis**	**Mark Grossenbacher**
Office of the St. Louis County Executive	METRO	HNTB
Ray Friem	**Chris Poehler**	**Joe Leindecker**
METRO	METRO	Jacobs Civil, Inc
Stephanie Leon	**Gary Smith**	**Atia Thurman**
St. Louis County Highways & Traffic	METRO	Vector Communications

The first Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was held on Tuesday, July 8, 2003 at East-West Gateway Coordinating Council at 1:30 p.m. Donna Day of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC) and the Metro South Study manager, called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Ms. Day outlined the purpose of the committee and the meeting.

Metro South Study Overview & Existing Conditions

Ms. Day then proceeded to go over the presentation, which included a study overview, MetroLink planning and funding histories, and the study process and timeline.

The presentation was turned over to Uri Avin of HNTB, the lead consultant, who provided an overview of the existing conditions in the study area. This portion of the presentation outlined land use, demographics and socioeconomic factors, environmental elements, and transit and transportation conditions.

Mr. Avin then opened the floor for questions and/or comments on the data that was presented. Tom Curran (St. Louis County) indicated that there could be some criticism of an extension to South County because there does not seem to be as great of a need for transit in the study area than in other areas of the region. He suggested that the study team provide background information on transit usage and demand in the study. Mr. Avin responded that there is data on the portion of the population that do not own or only own one car, and that this information gives

some indication of transit dependency. However, transit ridership is low in the study area, for a number of reasons, including service and time disadvantage. Mr. Curran emphasized that there is a real need for transit improvements in the study area and that this needs to be clearly communicated to the public.

Ray Friem (Metro) was surprised by the length of travel time from South County to destinations in other parts of St. Louis County. He voiced that there is a misperception that travel from South County is fast and easy.

Chris Barber (Jacobs Civil, Inc.), of the study team, pointed out that the greatest problem in the study area is travel to the Clayton area, not to downtown. However, he also added that there is difficulty getting to highway 55, depending on where you are coming from in the study area. Mr. Avin noted that currently, the major orientation is to downtown, but that may change in the next 25 years. He explained that it is likely that as the population changes, it may shift and become more oriented to the Clayton area.

Chris Barber added that there is a lack of connectivity to the mid-county area. He noted that currently it is not feasible to travel to Clayton via bus. He also mentioned the fact that in 2006, when the Clayton to Shrewsbury extension opens, it will create more congestion by people using the park and ride facility and that the current road system may not be able to support the increased traffic.

Donna Day asked the committee if they thought there could be some backlash demand for extending I-170, based on this data. Tom Curran did not think so, especially since some of the stronger opponents to the I-170 extension still hold public offices. This prompted Tom Blair (MoDOT) to conclude that light-rail seems to be the only feasible option for this area. He said that road improvements would not significantly change the roadway congestion and Stephanie Leon (St. Louis County Highways & Traffic) added that road improvements would not be able to take the place of MetroLink.

Purpose and Need

Uri Avin then turned the committee's attention to the draft purpose and need statements. After reviewing them, Donna Day added that the evaluation of alternatives are directly tied to the purpose and need statements. She also noted that this study is not a safety, congestion, nor an air quality study, so the statements do not specifically address these issues. She then asked the TAC for their comments regarding the purpose and need statements.

Tom Curran suggested that the study team emphasize the fact that transit helps increase property values. He said that people will be concerned about their property values and that they need to understand that transit improvements increase property values.

Universal Pool of Potential Alternatives

The study team then presented the map of potential alternatives to the TAC. Tom Blair asked if the team planned to point out specifically to the public which alternatives came out of the Cross County and Southside MTIAs. Donna Day responded that there had been some consideration given to this, however, it was decided against this because the study team wants to present a clean slate to the public. She made it clear that they are not discounting the preferred alternatives that came out of those studies, but that there are considerable challenges and constraints associated with each one, especially the Burlington Northern Sante Fe Railroad line, and that they want to examine all of the alternatives.

This prompted Stephanie Leon to ask if routes that were infeasible had already been eliminated. The study team replied that no screening had taken place; that this was a universal pool of alternatives, and that they would be narrowed and evaluated later in the process.

This led to a discussion about evaluation conditions, specifically right-of-way. The study team made it clear that it will try to avoid residential areas – a goal that is addressed in the purpose and need statements. All possibilities will be examined with consideration given to the ability to use public right-of-way as much as possible. However, Tom Blair pointed out that there would most likely be some impact to residences because the area is predominately residential and it seems as though this cannot be avoided. A study team member acknowledged this, but also added that at present, right-of-way issues are not a focus.

Public Scoping

The discussion then shifted to the public scoping scheduled for July 23, 2003. Donna Day explained that the public would be able to view display boards with the same information as in the presentation made to the TAC. In terms of scoping activities, citizens will be given blank study area maps and asked to draw their preferred MetroLink and bus routes.

Tom Blair asked if the public would be given the map with the universal pool of alternatives, and Donna responded that they would not.

Stephanie Leon inquired as to how the data from the maps would be captured. She suggested that the maps be scanned to create one map that shows all of the routes, including those suggested by the public.

Ray Friem pointed out that most of the potential routes run along streets and that people may not recognize them as public right-of-way. He also thought the issue of safety would be a major concern. He added that a light-rail system in an urban environment is very different than one in a primarily residential suburban area. He was concerned about the public's reaction to an alignment with multiple grade crossings, and thought that safety and speed would be major issues. It was also voiced that from the perspective of Metro, who would operate the system, there would be high costs associated with this type of system and a concern with fatalities. The study team offered some examples of where this type of system is succeeding, such as Dallas,

Texas. However, Jerry Blair (EWGCC), a TAC member, expressed that grade crossings are unavoidable and that if expanding MetroLink was prohibited by this factor, it would not extend anywhere else in the St. Louis region. He also mentioned that access was a critical factor.

Wrap up and Adjournment

After passing out the Summary of the Draft Work Scope and the Draft Existing Conditions Report, Donna Day explained the next steps for the study team – the public scoping and resource agency scoping meetings. She then thanked the members for their participation and added that if they had any comments, to contact her. The meeting was then adjourned.

Attendance:

Policy Committee Members	*Transportation Corridor Improvement Group*	*Metro South Study Team*
Lou Chiodini	**Justin Carney**	**Uri Avin**
Office of Councilman John Campisi	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	HNTB
Ed Hassinger	**Steve Clark**	**Chris Barber**
Missouri Department of Transportation	Missouri Department of Transportation	Jacobs Civil, Inc.
Catherine Kolb	**Donna Day**	**Laurna Godwin**
City of St. Louis	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	Vector Communications
Dr. Richard Labore	**Bob Innis**	**Mark Grossenbacher**
St. Louis County Municipal League	METRO	HNTB
David Stokes	**Chris Poehler**	**Joe Leindecker**
Office of Councilman Kurt Odenwald	METRO	Jacobs Civil, Inc
	Gary Smith	**Atia Thurman**
	METRO	Vector Communications

The first Metro South Study Policy Committee meeting convened on Thursday, July 10, 2003 at East-West Gateway Coordinating Council. Donna Day of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC) and the Metro South Study manager, facilitated the meeting and opened by welcoming the members of the policy committee. After introductions, she proceeded with a power point presentation

Metro South Study Overview

Ms. Day gave an overview of the study, the study area, MetroLink planning and funding history, and the study process and timeline.

In providing some of the background to the study, Ms. Day outlined the preferred alternatives that came out of the Cross County and Southside MTIAS. She also provided some information as to the constraints and challenges associated with the Burlington Northern Sante Fe (BNSF) railroad right-of-way, which was the alternative suggested in the Cross County MTIA. In response to this, Catherine Kolb (Office of the Mayor – City of St. Louis) asked if there were any possibility of using the BNSF line, even if just a portion. Ms. Day responded that it was a possibility and is being considered, along with all of the other alternatives.

Les Sterman (EWGCC) asked if there were any way that this corridor could interface or overlap with the Southside corridor. Donna Day responded that this study does not

include the City of St. Louis, except for a small area south of the River De Peres. Nevertheless, how an alternative would interface with a potential Southside alignment is a consideration.

Existing Conditions

The presentation was turned over to Uri Avin of HNTB, the lead consultant, who provided detailed information on the existing conditions in the study area. This portion of the presentation outlined land use, demographics and socioeconomic factors, environmental elements, and transit and transportation conditions.

During the presentation, Dr. Richard Labore asked why the Roadway Congestion map did not show evidence of congestion along Laclede Station Road, since, according to him, it experiences congestion. It was explained that the map only reflects data along state roads and does not include St. Louis County roads. Another study team member added that Laclede Station Road has significant congestion.

Purpose and Need & Pool of Conceptual Alternatives

The presentation then turned to the purpose and need statements and the pool of conceptual alternatives. Afterward, members were asked if they had any questions or comments.

Lou Chiodini (Office of Councilman John Campisi) asked what publicity was being conducted to engage the public. He also requested contact information for the policy committee, transportation corridor improvement group, and study team. The study team responded with an explanation of the publicity activities. Donna Day also assured him that he would receive the appropriate contact information.

Next Steps

Donna Day reviewed the next steps in the process, which include hosting the public and agency scoping meetings, finalizing the purpose and need statements, and narrowing the pool of alternatives.

Dr. Richard Labore asked if the public would have an opportunity to identify preferred station locations during the public scoping. The response was “yes.”

Adjournment

Donna Day mentioned that the next meeting will occur in the fall, after the study team has narrowed the alternatives down to four potential candidates. She thanked the members for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

Attendance:

Technical Advisory Committee Members	*Transportation Corridor Improvement Group*	*Metro South Study Team*
Jerry Blair East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	**Justin Carney** East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	**Uri Avin** HNTB
Thomas Blair Missouri Department of Transportation	**Donna Day** East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	**Chris Barber** Jacobs Civil, Inc.
Tom Curran Office of the St. Louis County Executive	**Bob Innis** METRO	**Mark Grossenbacher** HNTB
Stephen Knobbe METRO	**Jeanne Olubogun** MoDOT	**Joe Leindecker** Jacobs Civil, Inc
Stephanie Leon St. Louis County Highways & Traffic	**Chris Poehler** METRO	**Atia Thurman** Vector Communications
Glenn Powers St. Louis County Planning	**Gary Smith** METRO	

The second Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting was held on Tuesday, September 9, 2003 at East-West Gateway Coordinating Council at 1:30 p.m. Donna Day of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC) and the Metro South Study manager, called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Ms. Day explained that the purpose of meeting was to discuss the preliminary transit alternatives for South St. Louis County and the criteria that will be used to evaluate the alternatives.

Atia Thurman, of Vector Communications, provided a brief overview of the public scoping that took place July 23, 2003.

High Level Screening Criteria

Uri Avin, of HNTB, began the presentation by explaining the screening process. Stephen Knobbe asked what the reasoning was for using directness and connections to major activity centers as the high level criteria that narrowed down the 90 suggested routes to 23. Mr. Avin responded that these two criteria seemed to capture the essential attributes of an alignment, in terms of speed and potential ridership. Donna Day added that these two criteria also directly correlated with the purpose and need statements, and the need for connectivity to Mid-County.

Mr. Knobbe then addressed the additional high level criteria, and asked why land use was not used. Mr. Avin replied that land use is reflected in the following two criteria: connections to major activity centers and the number of jobs and houses within half a mile of alignment. Chris Barber, of Jacobs Civil, Inc., added that potential transit-oriented development sites were defined

as future activity centers and were included in the criteria "connections to major activity centers". Mr. Knobbe responded that he was glad to hear that.

Preliminary Alternatives

Uri Avin returned to the presentation and began discussing the four alternatives that came out of the screening process. Stephen Knobbe asked if it was the study team's ideal to have more identified stations than less. Mr. Avin said "yes," and that some will be eliminated, but the logic is to have all possible alternatives available so that the public would have more on which to provide feedback.

Tom Curran added that he thought the criteria "grades" would have eliminated a few alternatives and wanted to know if a percent had been identified as a cut-off point. The reply was "yes, six percent." However, according to Chris Barber, there are ways to get around this, it does not necessarily completely rule out a particular alternative.

Mr. Knobbe commented that all of the alignments go significantly south of 270 and wanted to know the reason for this. One response was that it is better to show the alignment going further south and give the public the opportunity to comment on it. Another study team member added that several activity centers are south of 270, including General American and the St. Louis Community College.

Glenn Powers also commented that equally as significant as the community college is the amount of commuter traffic that would be intercepted coming from Telegraph Road.

Mr. Knobbe also noted that the routes seem to go south of 270 and west of I-55. Donna Day responded that there is fairly low population density east of I-55. Mr. Knobbe then asked if there were any activity centers in Lemay to get a route in that area. Chris Barber responded that there were not. Mr. Knobbe further added that the Lemay area could use some redevelopment. Mr. Avin also commented that there is not a huge concentration of transit dependent people in that area. Tom Blair interjected that the I-55 study is in the conceptual phase, but there are ideas to increase access to I-55, which could spur some redevelopment in that area, such as the Stupp Brothers site. Stephanie Leon commented that instead of encouraging employers to come to Lemay, the focus should be on getting residents out of Lemay to employment centers, such as Clayton. Chris Barber said that busses could get them to a terminus. He also added that speed is a factor and that we do not want to slow down the system. Jerry Blair commented that as you push a route east, the ability to intersect traffic decreases. Mr. Avin further offered that the team looked at available parcels of land for development and redevelopment, but wanted the committee to consider that transit alone is not enough to revitalize the area.

Tom Curran expressed that the public may want to know and understand how the four preliminary alternatives compare to the total potential pool. He commented that it would be beneficial to explain the screening process in simple terms and provide the reasons as to why some routes did not work.

Uri Avin then began discussing the No-Build and Transportation System Management alternatives. He said that they were reworked to include existing bus routes, what has been proposed based on the Lansdowne station (Shrewsbury) opening, and roadway improvements from the long-range plan and TIP. Tom Blair added that nothing is being planned for this area in the next five years except for paving. Stephanie Leon also noted that despite any transportation improvements being planned, nothing could take the place of MetroLink.

Typical Light-Rail Design Guidelines

The discussion went to the topic of typical light-rail design guidelines. Stephen Knobbe wanted to know if these guidelines conformed to what Metro proposed. Donna Day replied that the new Metro guidelines are in line with these.

Chris Barber took the opportunity to explain the challenges associated with the BNSF Railway. Due to the railway's right-of-way requirements, the alignment would have to go over or under the freight line in some places. In other places, where it would run along side it, the railway requires physical barriers, but also specified that these barriers would create a problem for BNSF in serving its customers.

Tom Curran commented that during the Cross County study, it was assumed that BNSF would abandon that freight line. Chris Barber explained that, at this time, BNSF does not plan on abandoning the line; it is the mainline to Memphis.

Tom Blair expressed that the team needs to explain the constraints associated with the BNSF Railway to the public. Mr. Blair also asked what the response would be when citizens ask if traffic lanes are being taken away to run a route down a street. A team member responded that the team would let them know that, where possible, we will try to widen the street in order to add lanes.

Evaluation Criteria for Screening Preliminary Alternatives

Uri Avin reviewed the criteria that will be used to evaluate the four preliminary alternatives and explained that they are organized by the three final draft purpose and need elements. He then explained the IT spatial demonstrations that will be available at the public meetings.

Next Steps/Action Items

Atia Thurman passed around flyers to the members and asked them to post them in their places of employment and spread the word about the public meetings.

There was also some discussion as to how to engage the municipalities in the next steps of the process.

Attendance:

Policy Committee Members	*Transportation Corridor Improvement Group*	*Metro South Study Team*
Dr. Richard LaBore St. Louis County Municipal League	**Justin Carney** East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	**Uri Avin** HNTB
Larry Salci METRO	**Steve Clark** Missouri Department of Transportation	**Chris Barber** Jacobs Civil, Inc.
Les Sterman East-West Gateway	**Donna Day** East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	**Laurna Godwin** Vector Communications
David Stokes Councilman Kurt Odenwald's office	**Bob Innis** METRO	**Mark Grossenbacher** HNTB
	Chris Poehler METRO	**Joe Leindecker** Jacobs Civil, Inc
	Gary Smith METRO	

The second Metro South Study Policy Committee convened on Wednesday, September 10, 2003 at East-West Gateway Coordinating Council. Donna Day of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council and the Metro South Study Manager facilitated the meeting and opened by welcoming policy committee members. After everyone introduced themselves, she proceeded with

giving an overview of the study and outlining the purpose of the meeting, which is to present the four preliminary light-rail alternatives the study team has developed for South St. Louis County.

Preliminary Alternatives

The meeting was turned over to Uri Avin of HNTB, the study's lead consulting firm, to outline the four preliminary alternatives. Starting with the western most alternative, known as the red line, Avin outlined the baseline alternative and a potential option.

EXPLAIN ALTERNATIVES and constraints.

Avin also outlined some of the challenges with the alternatives. For the orange line, the constraint is the use of parkland along River Des Peres. Avin said that the law only allows the use of parkland if no other viable alternative is available. Mackenzie from Watson to the River Des Peres has numerous traffic lights and will affect travel times

and thus ridership numbers. Avin said the study team would be looking at these factors in the detailed analysis.

Avin told committee members that members of the study team had met with officials from the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railway to discuss the feasibility of using part of the railway for MetroLink. There are several challenges to using the BNSF railway even though it was suggested several years ago as a route at the conclusion of a major transportation investment analysis of the study area. The challenges to using the BNSF railway involve the inability to share tracks, narrow right-of-way where it crosses Gravios, and the currently unwillingness of officials to take responsibility for any liability issues.

Committee members asked several questions about the challenges of using the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railway as part of the route for the blue alternative. Les Sterman asked that since the BNSF has so many constraints, why it was even being considered as an alternative. Avin responded that several factors are negotiable so the railway should not be ruled out at this time.

Discussion also centered on future projections for developing activity centers. The study team has begun looking at this issue and Avin said the most important factor is office space. His team calculated that during the next 25 years, there would be one million square feet of office space in South County. Since Clayton is limited in how much more it can expand, development opportunities lie further south said Avin.

Larry Salci wanted to know how area officials deal with commuter rail not being considered as an option. East-West Gateway officials said that they do not want passengers to undergo a mode transfer plus everything else in the St. Louis metropolitan area is light-rail.

Evaluation Criteria

After presenting the four alternatives, Avin then outlined the criteria that would be used to conduct the preliminary analysis and discussed some of the potential design criteria. Les Sterman asked the Metro officials whether they approved of the design criteria because he wanted to make sure there would be a seamless transfer from East-West Gateway to Metro once the study was finished. Chris Poehler said "yes."

Committee members had two suggestions for further engaging the public about the study and the preliminary alternatives, outside of public meetings. Larry Salci suggested making a presentation to his full Metro board at its next meeting on September 26. In addition, Dr. Richard LaBore offered to have the St. Louis County Municipal League's Transportation Committee, which he chairs, host a meeting that would convene the officials from all the municipalities in the study area so the study team could get input from them about the alternatives. Donna Day agreed that the study team would carry out these suggestions.

Next Steps

Donna Day reviewed the next steps in the process. They include finalizing the Purpose and Need statements, finalizing the preliminary alternatives so they can be analyzed, and hosting the public open house meetings to debut the information presented today on September 17 and 18, and then performing preliminary detailed analysis on the four alternatives. Day said at the next meeting, the study team would present the evaluation results of the four preliminary alternatives.

Adjournment

Before closing, Day said that the study team was considering combining the Technical Advisory and Policy committee meetings into one and wanted to know if there were any concerns about that. There were none and the meeting ended.

Attendance:

Technical Advisory and Policy Committee Members	
Barry Alexander	City of Shrewsbury
Jerry Blair	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Tom Curran	Office of the St. Louis County Executive
Kathy Hale	City of St. Louis – Mayor's Office
Dr. Richard LaBore	St. Louis County Municipal League
Stephanie Leon	St. Louis County Highways & Traffic
Marjorie Melton	City of St. Louis – Board of Public Service
Glenn Powers	St. Louis County Planning
Larry Salci	Metro
Les Sterman	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council

Study Team Members	
Uri Avin	HNTB
Chris Barber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Justin Carney	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Stephan Clark	Missouri Department of Transportation
Donna Day	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Mark Grossenbacher	HNTB
Laurna Godwin	Vector Communications
David Holden	HNTB
Bob Innis	Metro
Jeanne Olubogun	Missouri Department of Transportation
Chris Poehler	Metro
Gary Smith	Metro
Atia Thurman	Vector Communications

A joint meeting of the Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC) was held on Tuesday, December 2, 2003 at East-West Gateway Coordinating Council at 10:00 a.m. Donna Day of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC) and the Metro South Study manager, called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Ms. Day explained that the purpose of meeting was to discuss the evaluation results of the preliminary MetroLink alternatives being considered for South St. Louis County.

Background on Development of Preliminary Alternatives

Uri Avin, of HNTB, provided a brief recap of the process and study planning that has led to the development of the four preliminary MetroLink alternatives.

Preliminary Alternatives

Uri Avin provided a detailed description of the preliminary alternatives and addressed some of the minor revisions that have been made to the map since the last meeting (i.e. changes in station locations).

Evaluation Results

Mr. Avin gave an explanation of how the alternatives were rated based on the analysis and proceeded to present the evaluation results.

Marjorie Melton, of the technical advisory committee, asked if both the orange alignment baseline and option required lanes of Germania. The response was "yes." She was also interested in knowing where the alignment was at grade and elevated since it was not discernable on the ariel map.

Les Sterman, a policy committee member, brought up the fact that a meeting with the City of St. Louis is imperative and must be conducted as soon as possible.

Uri returned to debriefing the members on the results of the analysis. The evaluation was categorized according to the purpose and need goals. The first goal discussed was "Improve Access to Opportunity."

Mr. Avin provided a brief explanation as to why the ridership figures are not correct: the model has to be corrected. However, he added that the preliminary figures are a good indication of how the alignments compare to one another, thus valid for the purpose of comparative analysis.

Dr. Richard LaBore asked if any other criteria would be impacted by a change in the ridership numbers. Mr. Avin replied that cost per rider, time travel savings, and several other criteria would be effected by a change in actual ridership numbers, but for the sake of comparison, they are effective.

Dr. Labor then asked whether the ridership projections would be satisfactory to federal standards. Chris Barber, of Jacobs Civil, answered that the team is aware of the fact that the ridership model underestimates ridership throughout the entire system and added that new data has just been obtained that would be incorporated into the model.

As Mr. Avin returned to highlighting certain criteria, Ms. Melton asked if any of the criteria should be weighted more. Mr. Avin responded that the team is considering which criteria should be given special consideration and that this is information on which the TAC, PC, and public should give input. Donna Day added that the criteria would not be given mathematical weight, but the team plans to pull out the most important criteria, based on the analysis, committee feedback, and public input.

Mr. Avin moved on to presenting data on the next goal: foster economic development. He provided some explanation of the fact that land use cannot be included in the ridership model, but land use impacts can be discussed in the New Starts application, and remains an important factor in this study.

The next goal for discussion was "Preserve Neighborhoods," and included information on how the alignments would impact South County communities in terms of residential, traffic, and other impacts.

Tom Curran asked if the blue alignment's calculations included the assumption that the alignment would be 50' away from properties. The team responded that the figures reflect that.

Mr. Avin highlighted the category "parkland taken," because of all the alternatives, only the orange alignment requires a significant amount of parkland. He explained that the team would have to address 4F requirements and standards in order to justify this alternative.

Les Sterman pointed out that all of the measures focus on specific negative impacts and not the positive benefits of light-rail. He mentioned the fact that light-rail can bolster property value and that this factor should be reflected in the evaluation criteria under this goal.

Uri Avin responded that several positive impacts are addressed in the goal "Foster Economic Development," and that this preliminary analysis has not quantified, in dollar value, the value of light-rail.

Mr. Sterman reiterated that this should be addressed under the goal "Preserve Neighborhoods," and added that relative impacts could be considered for the purpose of analysis. He expressed his concern that it would be a detriment not to document the property value benefits associated with light-rail and a missed opportunity to educate the public on such benefits.

Dr. LaBore further questioned whether the team would ask the public to consider the long-term benefits of an extension for the region, and not just for the South County area. A team member responded that it is a consideration.

Dr. LaBore then asked if there were any realistic expectations for the blue alternative and asked if productive negotiations with Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway had begun.

Donna Day replied that using the BNSF corridor would be extremely difficult, and costly, considering the fact that utility lines would have to be moved, a significant amount of right-of-way purchased, tracks elevated in several places, and retaining walls built to separate light-rail and freight tracks. However, the team has met with BNSF representatives, as well as with AmerenUE.

Mr. Avin returned to the presentation and proceeded onto the last category of results: performance and costs.

Marjorie Melton asked if the cost calculated for the blue line assumed that the railway would abandon the corridor. The answer was "no," the cost assumed purchasing right-of-way, elevating tracks in certain areas, and building a physical barrier between the light-rail and freight tracks. However, Mr. Barber explained that the estimated figures are based on only three to four

percent engineering and 2003 dollars. If the alignments were fully engineered, they could cost more.

Dr. LaBore noticed that the comparative cost for the red alignment is favorable, and asked if the estimates included purchasing right-of-way from residential and business property owners. The team responded affirmatively and a member added that this alignment requires less property takings because the transportation corridor is wide and primarily publicly owned.

Development of Detailed Alternatives

Uri Avin moved on to the development of detailed alternative and discussed some of the ideas being considered as the team defines alternatives. Some of the ideas include the following: terminating at Butler Hill, as opposed to Meramec Bottom Road (for the blue, orange, and green alignments); combining routes; and using enhanced bus service to provide access to an alignment.

Dr. LaBore asked if an extension were truncated, would it be a permanent terminus. He further added that expanding in stages was not a new concept, but it may receive mixed response from the public. Donna Day explained that they have to consider what could be justified in the year 2025. If an alignment were truncated, enhanced bus service, not just feeder bus service, would be considered.

Chris Barber further added that access to park and ride is very important and that the ridership model also penalizes forced transfers (from light-rail to bus, and vice versa). However, he commented, that cost-effectiveness is a high priority to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and that is one of the reasons a truncated alignment should be considered.

Larry Salci, CEO of Metro and a policy committee member, remarked that the planning process should stay focused on the federal planning process. He commented that there is no easy alternative, but that this is a comparative analysis, and the "big picture" has to be considered. He pointed out that Metro runs the most premium light-rail system in North America and is working to make the system more cost-effective. He added that it is going to be difficult to obtain federal funding for a light-rail extension because of ridership and cost-effectiveness. He also remarked that the FTA only provides funding to construct an alignment, but that the cost for operation and maintenance is a local/regional cost.

In response to Mr. Salci's comments, Les Sterman stated that every MetroLink extension has been a "tough sell" to the FTA, but that we are charged with the task of making the best decision for the region and not the federal government. He also added that the 1/4-cent tax increase from the County would be necessary, but that voters may not support an increase without further expansion of MetroLink.

Chris Barber interjected to say that the model is demonstrating that either one of the build alternatives is a better solution that the Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative. Larry Salci added that while an extension may be the best choice for the region, the FTA likes TSM. Les Sterman remarked that he did not think the public would support TSM.

Next Steps

Mr. Avin proceeded with the meeting by explaining the team's next steps and providing some information on the open houses scheduled for the following week.

Donna Day how the members would like to be contacted or engaged once the team developed detailed alternatives. Members voiced that they preferred a meeting. The next meeting will most likely occur in mid-January.

Attendance:

Technical Advisory and Policy Committee Members	
Barry Alexander	City of Shrewsbury
Jerry Blair	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Richard Beckman	St. Louis County Highways & Traffic
Tom Curran	Office of the St. Louis County Executive
Kathy Hale	City of St. Louis – Mayor's Office
Steve Knobbe	Metro
Dr. Richard LaBore	St. Louis County Municipal League
Stephanie Leon	St. Louis County Highways & Traffic
Marjorie Melton	City of St. Louis – Board of Public Service
Councilman Kurt Odenwald	St. Louis County Council
Glenn Powers	St. Louis County Planning
Larry Salci	Metro
Les Sterman	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council

Study Team Members	
Uri Avin	HNTB
Chris Barber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Justin Carney	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Stephan Clark	Missouri Department of Transportation
Donna Day	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Mark Grossenbacher	HNTB
Laurna Godwin	Vector Communications
David Holden	HNTB
Bob Innis	Metro
Tracy Loeber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Jeanne Olubogun	Missouri Department of Transportation
Chris Poehler	Metro
Gary Smith	Metro
Atia Thurman	Vector Communications

A joint meeting of the Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC) was held on Tuesday, January 20, 2004 at East-West Gateway Coordinating Council at 10:00 a.m. Justin Carney of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC) called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Mr. Carney explained that the purpose of meeting was to discuss the draft detailed alternatives for the Metro South Study.

Summary of Evaluation Results and Public Input

Uri Avin briefly summarized the key findings from the preliminary evaluation and public input.

Development of Detailed Alternative and Draft Detailed Alternatives

Uri Avin reviewed the process of developing the detailed alternatives and presented the alternatives to the committee.

Discussion of Draft Detailed Alternatives

Dr. Labore asked is there was an alternate terminus for the Blue line, such as the mall. The response was "no."

He then asked for clarification of where the Red alternative is at grade. Uri Avin responded that it travels through the median of Watson. However, determination of the location for the station, either before or in Kenrick Plaza, will occur during the detailed analysis.

Barry Alexander commented that it would be nice to see what the team has in mind for these stations. Uri Avin replied that proposed plans would be presented and discussed during the station planning workshops.

Dr. Labore asked if ridership figures and cost/effectiveness had changed. Uri Avin replied that final numbers were not available yet because the model is still being revised. Chris Barber added that the database that feeds the model is also being revised, but figures should be available by April. Uri mentioned that the impact of development and/or redevelopment would also play a role, although it cannot be included in the ridership model.

Councilman Odenwald asked if an alternate terminus at Reavis Barracks for the Orange alternative is being considered for cost/effective reasons. Uri responded that the decision to consider this terminus is partially driven by cost/effectiveness. Then Councilman Odenwald asked about having the mall as a terminus. Justin Carney explained that there are a lot of engineering considerations for a station at the mall. Analysis revealed that the mall is not a good terminus for the alignment due to traffic circulation, bus circulation, and access to vehicular traffic.

Tom Curran commented that he thinks these alternatives will be well received, since most of the negative feedback from citizens was in response to the Red and Green alternatives. He added that the community would probably feel a sense of relief. Councilman Odenwald echoed that sentiment, and added that the public will feel understood and listened to, and will have more confidence in the process.

Kathy Hale asked if there will be or if it is required to hold a formal vote on eliminating the Red and Green alternatives. The response was "no," that this decision is part of an internal process but it does have to be justified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Steve Knobbe wanted the team to address the criteria used to determine the alignment terminus stations, especially in comparing a Reavis Barracks terminus to a Butler Hill terminus for the Orange alternative. Chris Barber replied that the team had to analyze park-and-ride capabilities and which terminuses would provide easier access to vehicular traffic. Uri Avin added that the team must also consider the shortest segment that could serve the area and meet the purpose and need objectives, thus making this segment worth analyzing. A Reavis Barracks terminus could

serve the study area, and there is an existing MoDOT park-and-ride space and additional available land.

Dr. Labore asked if the team had made in progress in their discussions with the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway. Chris Barber said that they had met with them and advised them that this is still an alternative, and sent them their ideas for sharing the corridor. BSNF has acknowledged that they are not accepting any offers, and there are no plans to abandon the right-of-way (ROW) in the foreseeable future. The railway also advised the team that if they were to share the corridor, they would require a vertical separation of at least 10-15 feet. Chris explained that these factors, in addition to the other stipulations the railway has set forth previously, significantly increase the cost of this alternative.

Tom Curran asked about the horizontal separation requirements. Chris Barber responded that currently the BNSF has one track, but would like to maintain the ability to build two tracks. This makes the ROW very narrow, and insufficient in some areas.

Kathy Hale asked if the proposed Orange alignment still cuts through the Boulevard Heights neighborhood. Uri Avin replied that, due to a strong reaction from City of St. Louis representatives to grade crossings at Carondolet and significant impacts to that residential area, the alternative had been changed to extend along Germania to I-55, thus going around, instead of cutting through, that neighborhood.

There was some discussion about Green Park Road and how a station would fit in with future development plans. Chris Barber said that the County is considering enhancements for Green Park Road, but a station there would be local in nature and would not include much development. Stephanie Leon clarified that Green Park Road is not a County facility.

Councilman Odenwald reiterated that the public would be receptive to these alternatives. He also pointed out that he felt strongly about including the mall as a station for the Orange alternative because it would serve as a major destination point. He added that without the mall, the Orange line would have no major attractions.

Conclusion

Justin Carney thanked the committee for their time and participation. He briefly went over the next steps in the study and the meeting was adjourned.

Attendance:

Technical Advisory and Policy Committee Members	
Barry Alexander	City of Shrewsbury
Jerry Blair	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Lou Chiodini	Councilman Campisi's Office
Tom Curran	Office of the St. Louis County Executive
Larry Grither	MoDOT
Kathy Hale	City of St. Louis – Mayor's Office
Greg Horn	MoDOT
Stephanie Leon	St. Louis County Highways & Traffic
Marjorie Melton	City of St. Louis – Board of Public Service
Glenn Powers	St. Louis County Planning
Les Sterman	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council

Study Team Members	
Uri Avin	HNTB
Chris Barber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Justin Carney	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Donna Day	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Laurna Godwin	Vector Communications
Bob Innis	Metro
Tracy Loeber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Jeanne Olubogun	Missouri Department of Transportation
Gary Smith	Metro
Atia Thurman	Vector Communications
Russell Volmert	HNTB

A joint meeting of the Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC) was held on Wednesday, April 14, 2004 at 10:00 a.m. at the office of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council of Government (EWGCOG). Donna Day of East-West Gateway called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Ms. Day explained that the purpose of meeting was to focus on potential land use around the stations and the upcoming detailed alternatives analysis that will be performed by the study team.

Summary of Study Team Tasks and Public Input

Uri Avin of HNTB began his presentation by describing the three alternatives that are going into detailed analysis. He also summarized the input obtained from the public at three March events. Mr. Avin noted that through further analysis and public input from City of St. Louis residents who attended a March 7 open house, the study team had decided to pursue the northside Germania option for the Orange Line alternative.

He then explained how members of the study team have been examining potential land use opportunities around the proposed station stops for each alternative. Mr. Avin made several points about land use. He said that development and/or redevelopment around stations increases

ridership by 20% and increases property values. Mr. Avin also said that people often self-select to live around station stops for accessibility. He cautioned that light-rail alone will not improve neighborhoods. Instead, it takes a public-private partnership working together to attract news businesses. Mr. Avin said that the federal government does not look favorably on cities that do not work with the private sector on land use opportunities. Thus, some attention must be given to this issue before the Metro South locally preferred alternative is submitted to the federal government for funding through its New Starts program.

Marjorie Melton commented about her reading a report recently that stated that property values for single family homes around light-rail either declines or remains flat and that the only property value increases are found among multi-family dwellings. Mr. Avin said that property values generally tend to increase around light-rail stations. Les Sterman commented that the vast majority of studies indicate that property values increase. Mr. Avin said that the study team was currently developing a fact sheet on this topic as well as on crime and safety to distribute to the general public.

Donna Day concluded the presentation by stating that the study team has a lot of work to do during the next three months as it performs the detailed analysis of the three remaining alternatives. She said the three options will be compared to No-Build, which are projects that have already been planned through 2025, and to Transportation Systems Management or TSM. The latter represents steps to satisfy the study's purpose and need without building a fixed guideway. This usually means bus route additions and/or road changes.

Questions and Answers

Tom Curran shared with the group that during the planning for the Cross-County extension through Clayton, the planning team had illustrations which showed what vertical separation would look like over Forest Park Parkway. He said these illustrations really helped the public understand the design. Mr. Curran asked whether the study team could do that for Metro South. The study team has already done this for some of the options and will be doing so for the rest of the options.

Kathy Hale wanted to know how the meetings have been going with the St. Louis City Aldermen whose wards are adjacent to the Orange Line option. Mr. Avin said that to notify city residents about the March 7 open house that was geared toward them, 2,000 flyers were distributed door-to-door. In addition, ads were placed in several newspapers. Approximately 140 people attended the meeting; however, only 28 filled out comment forms. Justin Carney noted that the comments were often specific to where people lived. For instance, if they lived near the proposed line, they were against the Orange Line option. Mr. Carney also said that the study team has now met with the City Aldermen three times. Ms. Hale cautioned study team members that just because they did not receive a lot of comments, they should not think everything is fine among city residents regarding Metro South.

Kathy Hale requested more information on property values so she can use it when talking to the public. Barry Alexander noted that people are now buying homes in Shrewsbury based on MetroLink coming. He also cited a field trip that he took to Sacramento, California and how a

wealthy community with $600,000+ homes did not want light-rail at first but then changed their minds.

Marjorie Melton asked whether the study team has renderings showing what MetroLink will look like crossing River Des Peres at Gravois. Russell Volmert of HNTB said not currently but that he would do that soon.

Conclusion

Ms. Day concluded the meeting by saying that the next joint meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Committee will be to review the evaluation results from the detailed analysis. The meeting will be scheduled before the study team goes public with the results.

Attendance:

Technical Advisory and Policy Committee Members	
Barry Alexander	City of Shrewsbury
Jerry Blair	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Tom Blair	Missouri Department of Transportation
Lou Chiodini	St. Louis County Council – Office of Councilman John Campisi
Tom Curran	Office of the St. Louis County Executive
Larry Grither	Missouri Department of Transportation
Kathy Hale	City of St. Louis – Mayor's Office
Edward Hassinger	Missouri Department of Transportation
Dr. Richard LaBore	St. Louis County Municipal League
Stephanie Leon	St. Louis County Highways & Traffic
Deanna Miller	Missouri Department of Transportation
Glenn Powers	St. Louis County Planning
Rollin Stanley	City of St. Louis - Planning
Les Sterman	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
David Stokes	St. Louis County Council – Office of Councilman Kurt Odenwald
Linda Wilson	Missouri Department of Transportation

Study Team Members	
Uri Avin	HNTB
Chris Barber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Justin Carney	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Stephan Clark	Missouri Department of Transportation
Donna Day	East West Gateway Coordinating Council
Mark Grossenbacher	HNTB
Bob Innis	Metro
Tracy Loeber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Jeanne Olubogun	Missouri Department of Transportation
Gary Smith	Metro
Atia Thurman	Vector Communications

A joint meeting of the Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC) was held on Tuesday, August 17, 2004 at East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG) at 10:00 a.m. Donna Day of East-West Gateway called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Ms. Day explained that the purpose of meeting was to discuss the analysis of the detailed alternatives for the Metro South Study.

Key Activities Since April

Uri Avin of HNTB, the lead project manager for the consultant team, briefly summarized the key activities that have occurred since the committees last met in April. Some of the activities

included were refining the alternatives and criteria, refining the travel demand mode and ridership projections, conducting community meetings and investigating community issues, and collecting data.

Detailed Alternatives

Uri Avin reviewed the five detailed MetroLink alternatives including their length and number of stations. An 11x17 map of the MetroLink alternatives was distributed.

Community Outreach/Community Issues

Justin Carney of East-West Gateway highlighted the extension community engagement that the study team has undertaken, including open houses, workshops, presentations, meetings with municipal leaders and city officials, MetroLink field trips, media coverage. He also provided figures for the emails, letters, and hotline calls received to date.

Uri then went over the major community issues, concerns, and interests that have arisen as result of the community input.

Final Evaluation Criteria and Results

Mr. Avin explained that there are a total of 47 evaluation criteria, but, however, the team had pulled out 14 that provide a good representation of the entire set. He then went over the 14 criteria and the results (actual data ranges and how they compared to one another). Members followed along with the data in the Draft Detailed Alernatives Booklet that was distributed.

Donna added that detailed information on the entire set of 47 criteria and how they were developed is available in the Evaluation Methodology Report, and this could be made available to members via the web site or at their request.

Uri then asked if the members had any questions regarding the evaluation results.

Tom Curran asked if the evaluation measures would ever be weighted and the response was "no."

Dr. Labore asked if the Blue alternative would require property acquisition for right-of-way (ROW) for the entire length the line (to Butler Hill). The team responded that the ROW figure quoted included ROW needed from the Burlington Northern Sante Fe (BNSF) Rail Road, as well as some private property adjacent to the railroad in some places along the alignment. Dr. Labore then asked if the cost for ROW was included in the total capital costs and the response was "yes." He then asked if the railroad had yield on their requirement for spurs and access on both sides of their line. Chris Barber of Jacobs responded that the team had to assume that the railroad could not have access on both sides. Donna Day added that they team is scheduled to meet with the railroad again next month.

Uri returned to the PowerPoint presentation with an explanation of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) impacts on ridership. He said that the team looked at another way to verify

information coming from the conventional travel demand model by using a model created by Robert Cevero. The Cevero model does not look at projections, but uses actual data from existing light-rail from around the country. This data dives an idea of the impact of TOD on ridership, where the conventional model does not.

Major Findings

Mr. Avin then went on to highlight the major findings evident from the detailed analysis.

Next Steps

Donna Day wrapped up the presentation portion of the meeting by discussing the steps that would take place now that the analysis is complete. She then opened the floor for questions.

Questions and Answers

Rollin Stanley, of the City of St. Louis, asked if , when the team looked at jobs served (within 1/2 mile of stations), did that include existing jobs and projects. The team explained t hat both were considered. Donna and Uri then provided further that the FTA requires that land use be a constant (in the case of ridership), but that information from Cevero's model helps capture TOD change and potential. Mr. Stanley then asked if the possible development of a Casino in South County had been considered and the response was that it was not taken into account.

Edward Hassinger of MoDOT asked if the team had considered taking these evaluation results and comparing them against existing light-rail figures for the region. Rollin Stanley added to that by saying that people could relate to the information being presented (i.e. TOD potential at stations) if compared to existing examples. The team responded that they would look into that.

Dr. Labore commented that he could see the development potential at stations like Butler Hill, but not at stations such as Reavis, due to the residential character of the area. The team clarified that TOD plans are limited to stations where such development is appropriate, such as Butler Hill, Gravois, and Watson.

Dr. Labore them commented that he was having difficulty considering the Blue alternative because of the BNSF. The study team reiterated that the railroad doe not have plans to abandon this line and has not committed to any conditions of co-existing with light-rail.

Les Sterman offered that the existing light-rail system in Saint Louis occupies abandoned freight lines because there was political and civic leadership that advocated for the freight lines to be relocated to make way for MetroLink. He added that with the absence of such support and advocacy presently, he did not see the rail road accommodating light-rail expansion.

Linda Wilson, of MoDOT, asked about the purpose of the public meetings and what the team planned to gain from public input. The team responded that they wanted to share the results with the public and ask it to offer informed comment on the representative 14 criteria. The team also thought that the public should understand how an Locally Preferred Alternative is selected and

offer their input before the EWGCOG staff recommend an LPA to the EWGCOG Board of Directors. Ms. Wilson then asked if the team was presenting their recommendation of an LPA at the upcoming open houses. Donna responded "no," and added that the staff has not yet decided on a recommendation because public input will be a factor.

Deanna Miller of MoDOT asked if there was a possibility of recommending two alternatives, and Donna responded that perhaps under special circumstance, such the Blue alternative being recommended but challenges with BNSF prevent it from moving forward.

Dr. Labore asked if the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees make a recommendation to the Board of Directors. Donna explained these committees are advisory in nature and would not make a recommendation but would provide consul to the staff on their recommendation. Donna then asked the committee members if they wanted to meet again after the public meetings but before the staff plans on making an LPA recommendation. The committee members agreed to meet again on September 10, 2004.

Before adjourning the meeting, Dr. Labore offered the study team and EWGCOG staff four suggestions: 1) Recommend a truncated alternative that would go to Watson Road or along River des Peres and abandon the Blue alternative; 2) Shift the study focus from the south to either the north or the west corridors, because they already have political support; 3) Find new legislative leadership to help advocate for light-rail expansion; and 4) Help Metro stabilize their income flow.

Attendance:

Technical Advisory and Policy Committee Members	
Jerry Blair	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Lou Chiodini	St. Louis County Council – Office of Councilman John Campisi
Tom Curran	Office of the St. Louis County Executive
Dr. Richard LaBore	St. Louis County Municipal League
Stephanie Leon	St. Louis County Highways & Traffic
Todd Plesko	METRO
Glenn Powers	St. Louis County Planning
Larry Salci	METRO
Rollin Stanley	City of St. Louis - Planning
Les Sterman	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
David Stokes	St. Louis County Council – Office of Councilman Kurt Odenwald

Study Team Members	
Uri Avin	HNTB
Justin Carney	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Donna Day	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
Mark Grossenbacher	HNTB
Bob Innis	Metro
Tracy Loeber	Jacobs Civil Engineering, Inc.
Jeanne Olubogun	Missouri Department of Transportation
Gary Smith	Metro
Atia Thurman	Vector Communications

A joint meeting of the Metro South Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Committee (PC) was held on Friday, September 10, at East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG) at 10:00 a.m. Donna Day of East-West Gateway called the meeting to order. After introductions by the members, Ms. Day explained the purpose of the meeting.

Overall Community Engagement and Open House Summary

Justin Carney of EWGCOG provided a brief summary of the input collected thus far from the August 2004 open houses. He also went over the community engagement activities since the study's beginning and referenced the handout, *Draft Summary of Community Engagement Activities,* which was distributed at the meeting.

Synthesis of Pros/Cons of Build Alternatives

Mr. Carney then went into a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages for each detailed MetroLink alternative. He presented the information in the Power Point presentation and

referenced the handout given to members, *Metro South AA/DEIS Synthesis of Pros/Cons of the Build Alternatives.*

During the discussion. Todd Plesko, of Metro, asked if the study team had considered the mall for a terminus point on the Orange alternative. He said he raised the question because there were considerable costs associated with getting the alignment out of the mall to Butler Hill. Donna Day responded that it was examined, but that there are access and traffic problems with a mall terminus and added that the mall was not in favor of it. Mr. Plesko noted further that there are partnerships between transit systems and malls around the country and that perhaps it would be feasible if the mall were to redevelop in the future.

Dr. Richard LaBore asked about federal guidelines and thresholds, as they relate to performance and costs. Donna Day explained that the new name for that consideration is the Transportation System User Benefit and described how it is calculated. She added that it is a very complicated factor to calculate, but with regard to the alternatives, Orange-Reavis does best in this category.

External Factors to Consider

Donna Day went on to discuss several external factors and how they relate to the study. Included among these factors are the following: Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) right-of-way; systems planning and other potential MetroLink corridors; lack of funding; and Federal Transit Administration New Starts limitations. The study team provided a handout with key notes, *Metro South AA/DEIS External Factors Relating to Decision-making*.

Next Steps

In light of the evaluation results, public input, and other various considerations, Donna said that the EWGCOG staff would not make any recommendation at this time, but instead the study team would focus on completing the DEIS.

Tom Curran, from the office of the St. Louis County Executive, asked if there was funding for completion of the DEIS as part of the study and Donna responded “yes.”

Stephanie Leon, St. Louis County Highways and Traffic, inquired as to when a recommendation would occur if one was not necessary to proceed with the DEIS. Donna and Justin gave some explanation on when the selection of the LPA is necessary – before Preliminary Engineering and the FEIS (Final Environmental Impact Statement). Larry Salci, of Metro, also offered a more detailed clarification of the process with some discussion on federal funding and authorization of transit projects.

Afterwards, Dr. LaBore distributed his suggestions to the group and said that they were meant to spark discussion amongst the members. He also noted that his feelings had turned cooler toward the Orange and Blue alternatives, however, in light of some information that was presented at the meeting, he was becoming more charitable with the Orange alternative.

Todd Plesko commented on Dr. LaBore's point that EWGCOG focus on planning for a MetroLink extension north from downtown and then west. He said that he would like to see a planning study that would look at these extensions, plus a Southside expansion. He pointed out that, from an operating standpoint, the entire system should be considered in any future planning, and that the Southside had some advantages.

Tom Curran noted that the discussion had turned to regional planning, and wanted to redirect, for a moment, back to Metro South. He stated that the office of the County Executive was not in favor of the shorter alternatives because they offered few benefits at a relatively great cost. Nor does it think the Blue alternative would be a wise investment because of the cost, time, and ROW challenges with BNSF. Additionally, he said that it would be difficult to gain political momentum for the short lines. The County Executive's office does, however, favor the Orange alternative, specifically to Reavis.

Les Sterman, of EWGCOG, provided several comments in response to Dr. LaBore's notes. He said that point #3 – identifying new leadership for mass transit and stabilizing Metro's income – was of the utmost importance and was a precursor to any further regional planning. With regard to point # 2, focusing funds and resources on planning for a north and westward expansion, there is none available. He clarified that there is the possibility that EWGCOG could receive tax credits to do a DEIS for portions of the Northside and Southside that are in distressed communities. He has received oral approval of the credits in the amount of 2.9 million dollars, but there has been no written commitment, and the status of the approval is unclear. Larry Salci then asked for more specifics on how the tax credits work and Les gave a brief explanation.

Getting back to Dr. LaBore's key points, Mr. Sterman stated that he did not want to recommend a "No Build" to his Board of Directors and felt that it was best to see the study through and complete the DEIS.

Lou Chiodini, St. Louis County Council, offered, on behalf of Councilman John Campisi, that they preferred the Orange alternative (to Butler Hill) and agreed that stabilizing income for mass transit be a legislative priority. He also said that since momentum for Metro South has been established, it should go forward.

Dr. LaBore further pointed out that enticing voters on Proposition M2 needed to be considered.

Donna wrapped up the meeting by outlining the next steps: EWGCOG staff will make a presentation to its board in October; the study team will complete the DEIS; and the decision not to make a recommendation at this point will be relayed to the public via a newsletter. She thanked the committee members and the meeting was adjourned.

Metro South Summary Report
Resource Agency Scoping Meeting
July 25, 2003

Prepared by:
East-West Gateway Coordinating Council

Metro South
Resource Agency Meeting

Meeting Date: July 25, 2003
Location: MoDOT offices, Jefferson City

Study Team Attendees:

Donna Day (EWGCC)	Justin Carney (EWGCC)	Gary Smith (Metro)	Bob Innis (Metro)	Steve Clark (MoDOT)
Uri Avin (HNTB)	Mark Grossenbacher (HNTB)	Chris Barber (Jacobs)		

Resource Agency Attendees:

Name	**Agency**	**Name**	**Agency**
Mary Ann Stigeman	FHWA	Kathy Harvey	MoDOT Environmental
Ward Lenz	Corps of Engineers	Jim Radamacher	FHWA – Mo. Division
Rick Hansen	U.S. Fish and Wildlife	Mark Bechtel	FTA – Region VII
Brian Weiler	MoDOT Multimodal	Jane Beetem	Mo. DNR
Janet Sternburg	Mo. Dept. of Conservation	Kevin Sullivan	FHWA – Mo. Division

The Metro South study team met with the state and federal resource agencies on July 25, 2003, at the MoDOT offices in Jefferson City, Missouri. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the study (the background of planning MetroLink in the St. Louis metropolitan area and the origins for studying light rail in the South County area), present the findings from the existing conditions report, and solicit input from the resource agencies on the purpose and need for a South County light rail alignment. After a detailed PowerPoint presentation, the study team discussed with the agency representatives the needs and opportunities in South St. Louis County, particularly as they related to the responsibilities of the respective agencies. Below is summary of the issues raised during the resource agency meeting.

Summary of Issues Raised:

Mark Bechtel asked about the current quarter-cent tax being used entirely by the construction of the Cross County via Clayton to Shrewsbury extension, and to clarify that additional funding was necessary for any future expansion of the MetroLink system, including Metro South.

Rick Hansen inquired about the BNSF line, if it was currently in operation.

Brian Weiler followed up and wanted to know if we had contacted the railroad and if they have weighed in on the Metro South study at all.

Mark Bechtel asked about how we might integrate the public comment maps into our map of the pool of conceptual alignments. He also wanted to know why our pool map did not include any alternatives in the far southeast portion of the study area.

Janet Sternburg asked if we were considering other modes (such as enhanced bus or BRT) in our alternatives, if we will have a combination of LRT and bus alternatives. She also confirmed that any alternatives (whether in-street LRT or BRT or enhanced bus) would be on existing roads and would not include any new roads to be constructed.

Rick Hansen wanted to know the status of the Cross County via Clayton to Shrewsbury extension, and what alignment the north-south portion of the extension follows. He also wanted to know the status of the Southside corridor and how it affects the Metro South study. He then posed a series of funding questions, including: whether or not we will go after the additional quarter-cent sales tax; how the extension from SWIC to Scott AFB was funded; how the original alignment was funded (and where the local funding/match came from); and, why we need to go after local funding prior to asking FTA for federal funding.

Mark Bechtel, in response to the discussion on funding, also mentioned the implications reauthorization may have on future MetroLink expansion, including the shift in local match percentage and the amount of funds available.

Rick Hansen expressed general frustration that the share for transit was shrinking.

Rick Hansen then commented from his perspective with US Fish and Wildlife. He wondered where we expected the terminus of the extension to be, whether or not it would reach the Meramec River. Short of impacting the Meramec River (he mentioned Indiana Bathis (?) and some mussels), he could not think of anything that would affect permitting other than to make recommendations on any stream crossings. He foresees his agency having very little comment and is in general support for the study.

Janet Sternburg commented from her role with Missouri Department of Conservation. She mentioned two conservation areas not in our table – Gravois Creek (Grants Trail?) and Davidson Memorial Conservation Area. She said there was no identified state endangered species in our study area, though the Cave Snail was located at the Cliff Creek County Park, which we will very likely not be impacting. She said there were many mussels and snails we listed in our existing conditions report that were actually not within our study area.

Rick Hansen, at the mention of the Cave Snail, mentioned that they would be interested in karst topography, caves, and other underground features (which can be found in the southeastern portion of our study area).

Jane Beetem said that DNR would also be interested in any impacts to karst areas and wetlands, but that there were no state parks in the study area and light rail was good for air quality. She said DNR was generally positive about the study and would support the study. She did say that one key area they would be concerned with on Metro South would be cultural resources and historical/archeological issues. She said these are likely to be prevalent and they would need to be involved. She said we should stay away from Whitehaven.

Ward Lenz said that as far as the Corps of Engineers was concerned there were no major impacts foreseen, but that they would be concerned with any impacts on wetlands as well as any minor tributaries.

Mark Bechtel said he met briefly with EPA (who could not attend the meeting) and that they had no real concerns, but that he would keep the study team apprised of any issues that might arise. He then said he would forward to the study team a study on waste water systems along the Meramec River.

Metro South
Resource Agency Meeting
January 21, 2004

Location:

Attendance:

Summary of discussion:

Question: What are the right-of-way requirements on the BNSF/Blue Line?
Answer provided: Approximately 125' total for BNSF and LRT operations.

Question: How would we coexist with the BNSF?
Answer provided: It would be a shared corridor with no shared facilities (including flying over crossings).

Question: What are the issues with using the BNSF?
Answer provided: The vertical and horizontal separation required by the railroad, the presence of utilities in the ROW, the lack of a consistent 100' of ROW, and the fact there are new homes abutting the ROW.

Mark Bechtel: Why were there no Preliminary Alternatives along Telegraph Road (eastern edge of the study area)?
Answer provided: The general lack of residential density; the lack of activity centers to connect and provide access to; and, lack of ability to expand the system (further south) at some future date. It was noted that this area is expected to be served with feeder/circulator bus service.

Brad McMahon: Why would there be displacements (along the Red and Green Alternatives) if the alignments are running down the middle of the road?
Answer provided: Depending on traffic volumes, the lanes will be replaced, requiring the roads to be widened. In many instances, particularly along Mackenzie Road south of Gravois Road, the homes have very short setbacks. There is also engineering considerations for turning radii that might impact homes and businesses where turns need to be made.

Joni Roeseler: Given the parkland issues of the Orange Line, need to add Department of Interior (out of Omaha, Nebraska) to the list of resource agencies.

Joni Roeseler: Have we received anything in writing from the BNSF?

Answer provided: No, we have only received verbal comments from a meeting and telephone call. At this time, their comments seem to be their starting negotiation points.

Joni Roeseler: Need to begin to introduce the TSM and No Build to the public and begin to build public understanding of how they fit into future (Detailed) evaluation.

Answer provided: We have not emphasized the TSM and No Build with the public yet in an attempt to minimize confusion, since the Preliminary Alternatives evaluation was between build-alternatives and not against some baseline. We will introduce the TSM and No Build with the Detailed Alternatives as we move forward.

Joni Roeseler: Asked about the consideration of BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) as one of the build alternatives.

Answer provided: BRT was not fully explored as a build alternative for a number of reasons. This is an Alternatives Analysis to expand the MetroLink system from its future terminus at Lansdowne, and forcing a mode change would not be optimal. There is a desire and need to extend MetroLink further into South St. Louis County, and to not have the Lansdowne station be a terminus station.

Discussion: What exactly the TSM (Transportation Systems Management) is and how it relates to the Baseline used in the New Starts evaluation.

Discussion: What are the cost estimates for the Preliminary Alternatives ($40-$50m/mile) and what sort of funds are used to build MetroLink (competitive New Starts funds, though projects with $25m or less in federal funds do not have to be rated).

FHWA: What about consideration for a road/highway alternative?

Answer provided: This is a continuation of the system planning that started with the Systems Analysis in the early 90s and the Cross County MTIA, which was a multi-modal study that resulted in a transit/light rail alternative. A major highway alternative was considered at that time, and then dropped.

Joni Roeseler: FTA is working on new cost categories for the New Starts application process. These categories will help make cost estimates more uniform across applications, and will attempt to make them more accurate throughout all phases of project development. These categories may be available as soon as this summer, which would impact the Metro South Study.

After the meeting:

- Mark Bechtel needs to be involved in the Madison County MetroLink Feasibility Study.
- Brian Weiler would like samples of in-street running from around the country, as well as leads to have his staff begin to investigate how state safety regulators work with local/regional light rail planning agencies to implement in-street running.
- Mark Kross discussed alternatives analysis and DEIS documentation for alternatives that impact parklands.

RAC meeting summary
August 19, 2004

In attendance:
(I have the sign in sheet for whoever needs it)

Heidi Liske – FHWA
Jeanne Olubogun, Kelly Cox, Brian Weiler, Robert Kraus, Rodney Massman – MoDOT
Mark Bechtel – FTA
Ward Lenz – Corps of Engineers
Chris Barber - Jacobs
Donna Day, Justin Carney - EWGCOG
Uri Avin - HNTB
Gary Smith, Bob Innis - Metro

The purpose of these notes is just to document comments and questions.

Donna gave an update using the presentation given the previous day to FTA, as we had new people at this meeting that hadn't been involved.

Donna indicated that DNR was not at the meeting and we would need to follow-up with them, particularly the SHPO.

Brian Weiler asked if we have had any significant opposition. Justin addressed this and said most had been NIMBY opposition.

Kelly Cox asked if there were any 6f takings. The answer is no.

Bob Kraus asked to highlight where the orange alternative crosses River Des Peres.

Mark Bechtel asked if we could highlight the business and residential benefits, similar to how we have highlighted the impacts.

Kelly Cox asked if we have looked at all sensitive receptors beyond just residential? Yes.

Ward Lenz said we now separate wetlands, waters of the US etc. We need to combine them for the USACOE purposes.

Bob Kraus asked about community cohesion and why we were addressing it. Are we affecting the community access?

Kelly Cox spoke to 3.17a and 3.17g. He asked how they we different? All wetlands are considered waters of the US. We are considering waters of US as navigable. Table needs to be restructured.

Kelly Cox also brought up viewscape, and whether there were any that were eligible of historical according to the SHPO.

Bob Kraus asked when we get to the point of saying GO or STOP with the BNSF. We answered that if the condition with the BNSF changed, we would revisit the situation.

Mark Bechtel asked that when we have a staff recommendation, would we come back to the RAC. Donna indicated we would mail/e-mail updates but will schedule a meeting if something changes.

Rod Massman asked if we truly only had one grade crossing. Yes and a discussion ensued about Morganford.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

JAN 22 2004

Mr. Bob Innis
Transportation Corridor Improvement Group
East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
One Memorial Drive, Ste. 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102

Dear Mr. Innis:

Thank you for the invitation to attend the Metro South Study meeting held on January 21, 2004 in Jefferson City. As we were unable to attend this meeting, this letter provides the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's scoping input with respect to human health and environmental issues for the study area. Our major interests focus on air quality, historical resources, parks/recreational land, noise, water quality and wetland impacts.

Air Quality - This project could have a positive impact on air quality in the St. Louis area. Reducing the number of motor vehicles in this travel corridor and along the existing MetroLink route would be a beneficial project outcome. We encourage you to quantify and present projected air quality improvements of this transportation alternative over current and other conventional travel options in the environmental impact statement.

Historical Resources and Parks/Recreational Land, Section 4(f) - Due to the historical nature of the study area, we advocate avoidance, or minimization, of impacts to historical resources and parks/recreational land as you develop the alternatives.

Noise - In viewing local media coverage of this project, it appears that there is strong public interest in the potential noise impacts of the project. We recommend that the comparisons among alternatives provide particular attention to noise impacts.

Water Quality - Due to the developed nature of the study area, it is essential to address water quality impacts to streams. Waterbodies that may receive project induced impacts would include, but are not limited to, the Meramec River, the River Des Peres and the Mississippi River. We also encourage you to investigate opportunities within the project to make improvements in water quality by reducing overland flow or by constructing vegetative buffers to filter sediment.

Wetlands - As a jurisdictional responsibility, we are especially interested in any potential impacts to wetlands. We advocate avoidance and minimization of impacts to "Waters of the United States"; this include wetlands, as well as lakes and streams. If any of the proposed alternatives involve impacts to our nation's water resources, please contact Ward Lenz at the U.S. Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, phone number 314-331-8186.

Please note that this is a summary of our concerns at this time. We would appreciate it if you could send us a copy of any of the project materials that were handed out at the meeting along with the meeting minutes as they become available. Thank you for providing us with project information and updates. We look forward to working with you as the study progresses.

Sincerely,

Kimberly O. Johnson, P.E.,
NEPA Reviewer
Environmental Services Division

cc:
Joan Roeseler
Director of Program Development Planning

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

MAY 17 2004

Mr. Bob Innis
Transportation Corridor Improvement Group
East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, 10 Stadium Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63102

Dear Mr. Innis:

RE: Metro South MetroLink Extension AA/DEIS

This letter is in response to your submittal of the draft Purpose and Need and Preliminary Alternatives Development and Analysis for our review. Thank you for including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in your ongoing review as you develop the environmental analysis for this project.

Overall the documents are well written and easy to understand. Consequently, we only identified the two areas that need further clarification.

In Section 2.5 of the Purpose and Need document, the income discussion states that income affects travel mode choices and Figure 2.2 illustrated the median household incomes for subareas within the study area. We recommend expanding upon how the household income trend within the study area influences the use and need for transit improvements and how this will affect the development of the proposed alternatives.

In Section 6 of the Alternative Analysis document, we were surprised that the Purple Line Alternative was added as an independent alternative. Due to the fact that this alternative only provides service to a small northern portion of the study area, this alternative will not improve accessibility and congestion or reduce transit times for the majority of the study area. We recommend re-evaluating the usefulness of this alternative in meeting the purpose and need of the project.

Please note that this is a summary of our concerns at this time. Thank you for providing us with project information and updates. We look forward to working with you as the study progresses.

Sincerely,

Kimberly O. Johnson

Kimberly O. Johnson, P.E.,
NEPA Reviewer
Environmental Services Division

RECYCLE
PAPER CONTAINS RECYCLED FIBERS

EAST-WEST GATEWAY
Council of Governments
Creating Solutions Across Jurisdictional Boundaries

July 8, 2004

Chair
Joseph R. Ortwerth
County Executive
St. Charles County
Vice Chair
Alan Dunstan
Chairman, Madison County Board
Treasurer
Francis G. Slay
Mayor, City of St. Louis
Executive Committee
John Baricevic
Chairman, St. Clair County Board
Charlie A. Dooley
County Executive, St. Louis County
Mark Mertens
Presiding Commissioner
Jefferson County
Ed Hillhouse
Presiding Commissioner
Franklin County
Franklin E. Kohler
Chairman, Board of Commissioners
Monroe County
Members
Carl E. Officer
Mayor, City of East St. Louis
James F. Shrewsbury
President, Board of Aldermen
City of St. Louis
John W. Hamm
President, Southwestern
Illinois Council of Mayors
Gerry Welch
St. Louis County Municipal League
Gerald E. Daugherty
Vice President, Southwestern
Illinois Council of Mayors
David Meyer
President, Southwestern Illinois
Metropolitan & Regional Planning
Commission
Michael Fausz
Chairman, Board of
Commissioners, Metro
Regional Citizens
Donald W. Bennett
Pierre Blaine
Richard Kellett
George Lanxon
Judith Nelson
Bill Straatmann
Non-voting Members
Dave Snider
Missouri Department of
Transportation
Randall S. Blankenhorn
Illinois Department of
Transportation
Jacquelyn White
Missouri Office of Administration
Edie Koch
Illinois Department of Commerce
and Economic Opportunity
Executive Director
Les Sterman

Ms. Kimberly Johnson, P.E.
NEPA Reviewer
United States Environmental Protection Agency
901 N. 5th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

Dear Ms. Johnson:

RE: Metro South Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Thank you for your review of the draft Purpose and Need and Preliminary Alternatives Development documents for this study. In regard to your request for clarification, the responses are listed below:

Figure 2.2 of the Purpose and Need shows that there is a discernable split between the areas roughly defined as the northeast and the southwest halves regarding incomes. With the northeast lagging the southwest in an area where overall the median income is less than that of the County as a whole. This indicates that potential latent transit demand may be stronger in that half of the study area than further south and west. Furthermore, such demand may be higher here than in the County as a whole. Consequently, several alternatives developed as part of this project were, in part, located to test for such potential transit dependency. This clarification will be addressed in the finalize Purpose & Need document.

Regarding the Purple Line alternative, the study team believes that this alternative does meet the purpose and need of the project due to the Enhanced Bus component associated with this build alternative. The Enhanced Bus is based on a distinctive vehicle operating on alternative fuels and equipped with a Global Positioning System (GPS) and Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) that will transmit data to the real-time variable boards at limited bus stops. Exclusively to this alternative, the Enhanced Bus improvements will improve accessibility and reduce transit travel times in the study area.

Again thank you for your comments. Your input into these studies is very important. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Bob Innis
Transportation Corridor Improvement Group

Gateway Tower
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2451
314-421-4220
618-274-2750
Fax 314-231-6120
webmaster@ewgateway.org
www.ewgateway.org

BNSF

WALTER N. SMITH
General Director
Commuter Construction

The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company

740 E. Carnegie Drive
San Bernardino, CA 92408
Phone: 909-386-4910

2454 Occidental Ave
Seattle, WA 98134
Phone 206-625-6335

November 5, 2004

Ms. Donna Day, Project Manager
Metro South AA/DEIS Project
East-West Gateway Council of Governments
Gateway Tower
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102

Dear Ms. Day:

I am writing with respect to Metro South's proposed use of The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company's (BNSF's) rail corridor on BNSF's River Subdivision in connection with Metro South's DEIS Project.

From the first meeting between our two organizations at Kansas City in May of 2003, BNSF has maintained that the side by side operation of light rail and freight rail presents significant safety concerns which cannot be mitigated absent a substantial separation of the two services.

As a part of the Joint Rulemaking on Shared Use, the FTA/FRA raised several safety issues which are of concern to the agencies from a safety regulatory stand point. Due to the different types of service, light rail equipment is not required to pass the same level of crash-worthiness that heavy passenger rail equipment is required to pass, thereby dictating the two modes be operated totally separate.

Our Right-of-Way is of limited width which we must protect so that we can continue to serve our customers, now and in the future. Freight growth will dictate that we must expand our facilities at some point. Freight expansion, existing trackage and the separation of service dictated by the Joint Rulemaking stresses the limits of BNSF property. Additionally we must retain access to the property to maintain our assets, further exacerbating the situation.

Both BNSF and Metro-South will use heavy equipment, cranes and vehicles to maintain the track, signals and structures. This will create a risk that our equipment could interfere with the light rail operation, or that Metro-South maintenance equipment could interfere with BNSF operations, unless there is a significant separation of the two services.

As such, BNSF has encouraged Metro-South to pursue other options including the elimination of the use of BNSF's rail corridor as a potential route. Alternatively, we have recommended both vertical and horizontal separation of the two operations similar to what is used in Portland, Oregon. This clearly does create additional cost which can be avoided on a different route.

At BNSF, safety is our highest priority. The driving factor behind BNSF's recommendations has always been the safety of passenger and freight operations and would require the separation of the two operations.

Based on the issues highlighted in the Joint Rulemaking, BNSF can not support Metro South's plan to utilize BNSF's rail corridor and urges Metro-South to pursue an alternate route for the extension.

Sincerely,

Walter N. Smith – General Director

Cc: Robert J. Boileau - BNSF
Chris Barber – Metro South

EAST-WEST GATEWAY
Council of Governments

Creating Solutions Across Jurisdictional Boundaries

Chair
Joseph R. Ortwerth
County Executive
St. Charles County

Vice Chair
Alan Dunstan
Chairman, Madison County Board

Treasurer
Francis G. Slay
Mayor, City of St. Louis

Executive Committee
John Baricevic
Chairman, St. Clair County Board

Charlie A. Dooley
County Executive, St. Louis County

Mark Mertens
Presiding Commissioner
Jefferson County

Ed Hillhouse
Presiding Commissioner
Franklin County

Franklin E. Kohler
Chairman, Board of Commissioners
Monroe County

Members
Carl E. Officer
Mayor, City of East St. Louis

James F. Shrewsbury
President, Board of Aldermen
City of St. Louis

John W. Hamm
President, Southwestern
Illinois Council of Mayors

Gerry Welch
St. Louis County Municipal League

Gerald E. Daugherty
Vice President, Southwestern
Illinois Council of Mayors

David Meyer
President, Southwestern Illinois
Metropolitan & Regional Planning
Commission

Michael Fausz
Chairman, Board of
Commissioners, Metro

Regional Citizens
Donald W. Bennett
Pierre Blaine
Richard Kellett
George Lanxon
Judith Nelson
Bill Straatmann

Non-voting Members
Dave Snider
Missouri Department of
Transportation

Randall S. Blankenhorn
Illinois Department of
Transportation

Jacquelyn White
Missouri Office of Administration

Edie Koch
Illinois Department of Commerce
and Economic Opportunity

Executive Director
Les Sterman

November 17, 2004

Walter N. Smith
General Director, Commuter Construction
Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad Company
740 E. Carnegie Drive
San Bernardino, CA 92408

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for your letter dated November 5, 2004 concerning the Metro South MetroLink Extension Alternatives Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Study (AA/DEIS.) In this letter, you encouraged us to eliminate the BNSF right of way as a potential corridor for MetroLink expansion.

We fully support your concern with maintaining safe operations in any corridor that might be shared by freight and light rail, and we are familiar with the provisions of the FTA/FHWA Joint Rulemaking on Shared Use. The conceptual design for the Blue Alternative in the Metro South Study includes substantial vertical and horizontal separation and other engineering features in accordance with your recommendations to our consultant, Chris Barber of Jacobs Civil.

I am enclosing a copy of the staff report that was approved by our Board of Directors on October 27, 2004. You will note that the Board agreed to defer a decision on selecting a preferred alternative for a MetroLink route in the Metro South study area. Therefore, no project will be advanced at this point. Staff is now focusing on completing the Metro South DEIS, and will shortly begin work on further examining potential MetroLink corridors in other parts of the region.

We appreciate your assistance on the Metro South study and will keep you informed of any further developments.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Day
Division Manager,
Transportation Corridor Improvement Group

Encl.

Gateway Tower
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2451

314-421-4220
618-274-2750
Fax 314-231-6120

webmaster@ewgateway.org
www.ewgateway.org

STATE OF MISSOURI
Bob Holden, Governor • Stephen M. Mahfood, Director
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
www.dnr.mo.gov

December 2, 2004

Mr. Bob Innis
Transportation Corridor Improvement Group
East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Re: **SHPO Project Number: 019-SL-05** - Proposed Metro-South Alternatives Information, South St. Louis County, Missouri (FTA)

Dear Mr. Innis:

Thank you for submitting information concerning the above-referenced project for our review pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (P.L. 89-665, as amended) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's regulation 36 CFR Part 800, which require identification and evaluation of historic properties.

After reviewing the information provided, we have determined that there are no archaeological concerns with the project area provided the project stays on existing roadways. However, if the project has any new ground disturbance an archaeological survey will need to be conducted. In addition, the project will need to undergo an architectural survey.

Please be sure to take into account the Area of Potential Effects (APE) when submitting the project information to the selected consultant for the architectural history survey. For architectural history the APE includes view shed. Because the project is similar to a road project, we recommend that the consultant use the Draft Architectural Streamlining Methodology that the Missouri Department of Transportation uses when conducting an architectural survey. A copy of this methodology is included.

A list of independent consultants who can perform such services is available from the Department of Natural Resources' Division of Administrative Support. The lists can be obtained by calling 573/751-0958 and requesting the "architectural historian consultants lists". If an archaeological survey is necessary, as similar list of archaeological consultants is available at the same phone number. If you chose a consultant not on the list, please be certain to include his or her curriculum vitae in the report.

If you have any questions please write Missouri Department of Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office, Attn: Review and Compliance, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102, or call Alison Dubbert at (573) 751-7958. Please be sure to include the **SHPO Project Number (019-SL-05)** on all future correspondence relating to this project. If the information is provided via telephone call, please follow up in writing for our files.

Sincerely,

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

Mark A. Miles
Director and Deputy State
Historic Preservation Officer

MAM:ad

Enclosure: As stated

C: Ms. Joan Roeseler, FTA
Ms. Jane Beetem, DNR

Architectural Streamlining Methodology
Missouri Department of Transportation
April 2004

Architectural Resources numbers will be documented on all forms, maps, and photographs. Right of way parcel numbers will be used when available; if right of way numbers are not available the numbers will be assigned in a reasonable manner, which will be described in the methodology.

If resource falls within two categories described below (e.g. a subdivision in a historic district) the category requiring the most information will be applied to the resource.

If a property is recommended as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) than it will have all the documentary requirements of properties constructed before 1945, regardless of the date of construction.

Area of Potential Effects

The area of potential effects (APE) for the architectural survey will include the project footprint and 50' to 100' on either or both sides of the footprint, depending on the proposed improvements and whether the area is urban or rural. The district consultant engineers will identify the exact width of the project footprint. Properties in the APE shall be delineated on aerial photographs or project maps and, in some cases, topographic maps.

Examples of architectural APEs for the project follow:

- Rural sections will require widening the existing interstate approximately 150 feet to one side or the other, plus a buffer of 100 feet.
- At some locations, the APE may include both sides of the interstate. At these locations, a construction corridor of [illegible] feet and an additional 100-foot buffer will be surveyed on both sides of the existing interstate.
- If a new frontage road is required a construction corridor approximately 50 feet and a buffer of 100 feet will be surveyed.
- Urban sections will have a construction corridor approximately 100 feet wide and a buffer area of 50 feet.
- In urban areas, if parcels will be acquired and their building removed therefore changing the viewscape, then the adjacent parcel (bordering the proposed improvements) will be surveyed.
- Any new alignment assume an APE of 500 feet for the construction corridor plus a buffer of 100 feet to either side.
- Interchanges typically will cover an area of one-half square mile, plus a surrounding 100-foot buffer. For interchanges covering greater distances, only the construction corridor and a buffer of 100 feet will be surveyed.

Draft

Examples of APE

Project Location	**Improve (Widen) Existing Alignment/Facility** (The APE is not restricted to the new R/W, easements, and adjacent 50-100' "buffer"; it must also include existing R/W and easements)		**Construct New Alignment** (Relocated Facility)	**Viewsheds**
	Widen One Side	Widen Both Sides		
Rural Areas	150' Construction Corridor (widen one side 150') + 100' buffer on one side = 250' APE	75' Construction Corridor (widen both sides 75') + 100' buffer on both sides = 350' APE	500' Construction Corridor + 100' buffer on both sides = 700' APE	
Urban Areas	100' Construction Corridor (widen one side 100') + 50' buffer on one side = 150' APE	50' Construction Corridor (widen both sides 50') + 50' buffer on both sides = 200' APE	500' Construction Corridor + 100' buffer on both sides = 700' APE	Survey adjacent parcels when neighboring buildings removed
Frontage Roads			500' construction corridor + 100' buffer on one side =150' APE	
Interchanges	1) .5 mile surrounding 100' buffer 2) construction corridor + 100' buffer			

Architectural Documentation

- The one-page State Historic Preservation Office Architectural/Historic Inventory Survey Form (inventory form) used by MoDOT will be completed on all properties having at least one building structure within the APE that dates prior to 1945, or if the property is being recommended as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).
- Resources dating between 1945-1970 do not need to have an inventory form completed unless they are being recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP. At least one photograph of all 1945-1970 resources should be taken.

Complexes:

- For complexes with multiple resources, if one of the resources is within the APE and if at least one resource on the property is pre-1945 (even if it is outside the APE), then entire property will be documented on the inventory form and all resources on the property will be photographed.
- Include all resources within the complex including fences or gateposts, signs, landscape features, etc.
- For very large parcels (greater than 100 acres) consult with MoDOT/SHPO regarding presentation of the resource.

Subdivisions and Commercial Strips:

Subdivisions and commercial strips will be treated as a single property/complex and will receive one resource number. Subdivisions do not have to be documented on an inventory

Draft

form; it can be a narrative discussion. If only one or two buildings of the subdivision are within the APE, then may not have to document entire subdivision. Should consult with SHPO.

- Pre-1960—provide photographs of streetscapes and representative samples of individual buildings, copies of subdivision plat maps and floor plans if available, a narrative history including discussion of builders, developers, development period, stages of growth of the subdivision, associated ethnic groups if applicable, transportation mode it was associated with. Look beyond just the buildings in the APE. Show locations of houses photographed and where streetscapes were taken on maps.
- 1960-1970—provide photographs of representative streetscapes, include boundary on maps. Show locations of houses photographed and where streetscapes were taken on maps.
- Post 1970: include on maps and resource table

Cemeteries:

- Fencing, gateposts, architectural and artistic elements of cemeteries will be documented on inventory forms, and photographs will be provided.

Potential Historic Districts:

- Buildings within the recommended period of significance (contributing and noncontributing) within the APE will be documented on inventory forms.
- Recommended boundaries of districts/landscapes in the APE will be delineated; however district boundaries that extend beyond the APE are not expected to be defined except in general terms. The boundaries may be discussed in the report, but do not need to be shown graphically unless they are within the APE.
- Buildings outside the APE but within potential district/landscape will not be documented on survey forms. They should be briefly mentioned in the discussion of potential historic districts.

Landscapes:

- If landscape elements can be dated to before 1945 documentation should be included on the inventory form. Information included should include, at a minimum, photographs, maps, historic documentation and description of the landscape elements.

Landscapes can include designed landscapes, rural landscapes and cultural landscapes. Please see applicable National Register guidelines for more information about identifying and evaluating landscapes.

Signage:

- Pre-1945 signage should be photographed and included on the inventory form with the associated property.
- 1945-1970 signage associated with a commercial property should be photographed along with the other resources on the property.
- 1945-1970 Stand-alone signage (billboards, etc) will only be photographed if it has a fixed message or design and are not standard billboard type. Consult with MoDOT and the SHPO before presenting in a report.

Draft

Trailer Parks or similar complexes:

Provide photographs of representative samples and streetscapes. Inventory forms should be completed only if trailers represent a classic type from before 1945.

Photographic documentation

- Provide at least two photographs of buildings or structures constructed pre-1945, showing opposite angles when possible; details of character-defining features also should be photographed. For complexes, multiple ancillary buildings may appear in a single photograph (i.e., two pre-1945 sheds and a new shed in one photograph is acceptable).
- Only one photograph of resources constructed between 1945 and 1970 is necessary and streetscapes with several buildings in one view are acceptable for high-density areas with only contemporary resources.
- Resources dating after 1970 do not need to be photographed unless they are recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP or are part of a complex being documented.
- Photographs should be in color and measure at least 4 x 5 inches.
- Mount photographs on paper to create photo plates. Label plates with options that include county, job, and resource number.
- Digital photos are acceptable as long as images are in resolution and the prints are clear in the report or attached files, printer settings for photo plates should be at least 600 dpi. Please note the resolution that camera is set at in the methodology.

Do not photograph:

- Cellular towers or associated buildings
- Contemporary billboards
- Barbed wire or other non-substantial fence

Mapping

- The location of all buildings, structures, sites, objects and districts, within the APE should be clearly marked on project maps. Boundaries for properties recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP should be delineated on the maps.
- Properties having pre-1945 or recommended NRHP eligible resources should also be identified on appropriate USGS quadrangle maps at 1:24,000 scale.
- Site plans (if not have to be to scale) will be drawn for all complexes having three or more resources. Site maps are not be necessary for residential properties within urban areas containing house, garage and shed, unless the property is being recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP.
- Site plans will be made for all resources recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP, regardless of the number of resources on the property, and shall include the project impacts.
- Site plans should include a North arrow, and scale or statement that it is not to scale.

Additional Information Requests

When requested by SHPO or MoDOT staff, consultants will provide additional information to assist in the evaluation of architectural resources in the project area.

Draft

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Railroad
Administration**

1120 Vermont Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

MAY – 4 2005

Ms. Donna L. Day
Division Manager
Transportation Corridor Improvement Group
Gateway Towers
One Memorial Drive, Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2451

Dear Ms. Day:

Thank you for providing a copy of the Metro South MetroLink Extension Alternative Analysis and Draft Environmental Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement dated February 2005.

We have reviewed this very comprehensive document and have no substantive comments to provide.

Thank you for writing and best wishes.

Sincerely,

Richard U. Cogswell

Richard U. Cogswell
Staff Engineer

cc: Ms. Joan Roesler