Comments and Coordination

Public involvement and agency coordination have been essential to the development of the I-270 North EA. This section summarizes the activities and methods associated with stakeholder involvement.

Recognizing the value that stakeholders bring to the transportation planning process, the study team employed several tools to ensure there were adequate opportunities for involvement throughout the study. The study’s Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was guided by both NEPA’s requirements for public involvement and Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS). CSS is an approach to planning that helps ensure that the recommended alternative of a project “fits” into the surroundings of the area and balances costs, safety, environmental impacts, and the project’s goals. Stakeholder involvement is critical to this approach and helps build awareness and understanding. Ultimately, public involvement should lead to a final outcome that reflects an interdisciplinary collaborative process and includes input from anyone with a stake in the project.

The current iteration of the PIP (and all public involvement/agency coordination materials) is included in Appendix C. The following sections summarize the major elements of the PIP.

On June 23, 2016, MoDOT issued a press release announcing the resumption of the environmental study of I-270 North. The I-270 North EA was put on hold in early 2015 due to agency budget shortfalls (see Appendix C). The press release identified that partial funding for the initial elements of the I-270 North Corridor in the 2017-2021 State Transportation Improvement Program.

6.1 Stakeholder Briefings

Public involvement for the I-270 North EA kicked off with stakeholder briefings from May 2013 to July 2013. Stakeholder briefings were held with elected officials, community leaders, subdivision trustees, business owners, and developers within the study corridor. These briefings allowed the team to uncover potential issues that would affect the study. Table 6-1 identifies the stakeholder briefing attendees.

The briefings included an introduction to the study and the assessment process. A set of 14 standardized questions were used to set a baseline for stakeholder concerns. These questions ranged from what issues people encounter when traveling the corridor to how they want to be engaged during the study. The most pressing concern for these stakeholders was congestion and perceived dangerous traffic flow patterns at interchanges and at on- and off-ramps. The complete Stakeholder Briefing Report is included in Appendix C.
Table 6.1. Stakeholder Briefing Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Bakker</td>
<td>Director of Community Relations</td>
<td>SSM DePaul Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Beckham</td>
<td>Shift Manager</td>
<td>Burger King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Blacketer</td>
<td>Regional VP Leasing, Central Region</td>
<td>Brixmor Property Group (Clocktower Plaza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessie</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Summerwood Condominiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>Bowers</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Bridgeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marielle</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Manager</td>
<td>Trailnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>Erby</td>
<td>St. Louis County Councilwoman (1st District)</td>
<td>St. Louis County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>Vice President Operations</td>
<td>DePaul Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Northwest Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Grimmer</td>
<td>Councilman – Ward 2</td>
<td>City of Bridgeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>Johnny Londoff Chevrolet, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Pastor’s Assistant</td>
<td>Grow 2 Go Church (St. Louis Christian Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>Pastor’s Assistant</td>
<td>Grow 2 Go Church (St. Louis Christian Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>DePaul Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>City Administrator, Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of Bridgeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop L.O.</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Greater Grace Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Lackey</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Paraquad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny</td>
<td>Londoff</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Johnny Londoff Chevrolet, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolynn</td>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Greater North County Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl</td>
<td>Meese</td>
<td>Lay Minister</td>
<td>North Hills United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>MO Coalition for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>O’Mara</td>
<td>St. Louis County Councilman (4th District)</td>
<td>St. Louis County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Susan</td>
<td>Sneed</td>
<td>Reverend and Community Organizer</td>
<td>Metropolitan Congregations United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl</td>
<td>Vandiver</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Desco Group (Grandview Plaza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Ann</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Congressman, 2nd District of Missouri</td>
<td>U.S. Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almaree</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Hanaway Manor South Subdivision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the study re-start, one of the most painful developments in northern St. Louis County was the events in Ferguson. While those events didn’t occur within the I-270 North EA study area, they affected the larger community, including the transportation community. As part of the study’s effort to reach out, it was decided to make additional efforts to discuss the study with influential spokespeople for the low income/minority populations. This resulted in a series of in-person interviews. The following interviews were held:

- May 5, 2016 Matt Unrein, Assistant City Manager, City of Ferguson
- August 17, 2016 Kimberly Lackey, Staff Attorney, Paraquad
The interviews were largely freeform. The study team presented basic background facts about the study, including its status and completion. The presentation discussed the study’s goals, its recommendations, public involvement efforts to date, funding, and the anticipated public hearing. Invitations were issued for the public hearing and to review the I-270 North EA. Questions about the study were fielded. Among the most common issues that would affect low income and minority populations were the following:

- Accommodations for non-motorized users
- Concerns with existing slip ramps to and from Dunn Road
- The importance of access and its effect on neighboring communities
- Pedestrian use in the area and safety along and across I-270
- Sidewalks, paved shoulders, and lighting
- How the one-way system accommodates pedestrians
- Business impacts as a result of access alterations

These concerns and needs were acknowledged, and plan details were explained. The importance of developing safe accommodations was noted. The study team offered assurances that these will be examined more thoroughly when a project is selected for construction and detailed design is initiated. Continued coordination will be a component of the project.

### 6.2 Commuter Surveys

In August 2013, a survey team was used to administer a short questionnaire to gauge the attitudes and concerns of commuters using I-270. The survey team visited bus stops and gas stations throughout the corridor and used iPads loaded with survey software to administer the six-question survey. In all, 150 surveys were completed. The questions and top answers are summarized as follows:

1. **Main reason to use I-270?** Work (39 percent), work/shop/play (31 percent)
2. **How do you use I-270?** Car (70 percent)
3. **Issues encountered on I-270?** Congestions delays (65 percent)
4. **Where are these encountered?** Dunn and West Florissant were the most common responses
5. **Main problem to solve?** Safety at ramps (very important 83 percent)
6. **Type of respondent?** Commuter (48 percent)/resident of unincorporated North Saint Louis (27 percent)

The complete Commuter Survey Report is attached in Appendix C.
6.3 Small Group Presentations

Small group presentations are an effective method for reaching populations who may not have transportation to attend study-sponsored events, such as public meetings, or who have other special interests. Presentations to groups such as condominium associations, subdivision trustees, chambers of commerce, senior citizen organizations, and churches are the most common. On an as-needed basis, the study team made themselves available to meet with various groups requesting a presentation.

The typical presentation included a 15-minute slide show, followed by an open-ended question-and-answer session. The slide show discussed the study status and schedule. Particular audience interests were also typically a focus. Most questions focused on aesthetics, bike/pedestrian access, slip ramps, business impacts, the status of the Chain of Rocks Bridge reconstruction, and freight.

Since September 2013, the study team has made numerous presentations including the following:

- Saint Louis County Economic Council and Planning Department
- Drive Time, Inc.
- Northwest Chamber of Commerce
- Village of Calverton Park
- John Bommarito Auto Group
- Saint Louis Christian College
- City of Bellefontaine Neighbors
- City of Florissant Mayor
- Boeing
- City of Bridgeton
- Krispy Kreme Restaurant
- DePaul Health Center
- Christian Hospital
- North County Christian School
- McCluer High School
- Lambert-St. Louis International Airport
- Gas Stations (Mobil and Circle K)
- Land Developers (Brixmor, L3Corporation, and Daniels Realty Group)
- City of Hazelwood
- City of Ferguson

During the I-270 North corridor study, elected officials participated in the Community Advisory Group (CAG). For the I-270 North EA, elected officials were invited to briefings. This allowed for more meaningful dialogue. In addition to local elected officials, invitations were extended to U.S. Senator Claire McCaskill, U.S. Senator Roy Blunt, U.S. Representatives Lacy Clay and Ann Wagner, Missouri State Senators Gina Walsh and Maria Chappelle-Nadal, and the nine Missouri State Representatives who represent the corridor. Meetings were scheduled a few days before each of the two public informational meetings.

*Figure 6-1* is a typical agenda for the small group presentations. Meeting summaries are included in Appendix C.
6.4 Agency Collaboration

As part of the PIP (Appendix C), an Agency Collaboration Plan was developed to define the process by which the study team would communicate information about the I-270 North EA to the interested federal and non-federal governmental agencies.

The standard for identifying potential agencies for collaboration was federal and non-federal governmental agencies that may have an interest in the project because of their jurisdictional authority, special expertise, local knowledge, and/or statewide interest. The definition of “governmental” was broadened to include any organization with an official mandate. The following agencies were identified as potentially interested in the I-270 North EA:

- US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Federal Aviation Administration
- National Parks Service
- Missouri State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA)
- Saint Louis County Department of Highways and Traffic
- Saint Louis County Department of Parks and Recreation
- Metro Transit
- East-West Gateway
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Illinois Department of Transportation
- Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)
- Missouri Department of Conservation
- Missouri Federal Assistance Clearinghouse
- Missouri State Historic Preservation Organization (SHPO)

The goal of the collaboration process is to provide the agencies, which may have an interest in the study, the data they need to provide relevant input. Two primary mechanisms were developed. First, specific opportunities (collaboration points) were defined. These collaboration points are key points in the study development process, where agency input is most powerful. The anticipated points of contact are (1) when the Draft Purpose and Need is produced, (2) when Reasonable Alternatives are established, and (3) when a Preferred Alternative begins to emerge. All collaboration will occur through review/response of supplied data packages. A second coordination mechanism is specifically to invite the agencies to all public involvement meetings.

Collaboration Point #1 was distributed in December 2013. This collaboration point focused on introducing the study and the transportation problems (Purpose and Need) that affect the study area. In addition to the Draft Purpose and Need Statement, the materials provided to the agencies included all public involvement materials, detailed mapping, and the North Corridor Study. The only substantive comment came from MDNR. It identified the locations of landfills in the study’s vicinity.

Collaboration Point #2 was distributed in May 2014. This collaboration point focused on identifying the Reasonable Alternatives under consideration. The materials provided included most of the materials and references developed for the study’s second public involvement meeting. Again, minimal formal responses were received in response to this distribution of materials. However, informal dialog increased during this timeframe as a result of the cumulative effects of the study’s outreach efforts. This dialog covered a broad array of typical topics, focused mostly on understanding the specifics of the alternatives. The Agency Collaboration Plan successfully raised the profile of the I-270 North EA and engaged the interested parties.
Pursuant to the resumption of the study in 2016, a letter was sent to the regulatory agencies. The distribution list was updated. Both the letter and the updated distribution list are contained in Appendix C. It explained the resumption of the environmental study of I-270 after it was put on hold in early 2015 because of agency budget shortfalls. It explained that the study team is currently working on finalizing the EA. Once accepted by FWHA, the EA will be circulated for comment and a Location Public Hearing will be conducted. The acceptance of the EA is expected in early fall 2016. Once accepted, a CD/DVD copy of the EA will be sent for review and comment.

The status of the partial funding for the I-270 North Corridor was also explained.

### 6.5 Community Advisory Group

As part of the PIP (Appendix C), a CAG was established to assist in developing a comprehensive understanding of the study and refining potential solutions. CAG members were broadly categorized in two areas—municipal/service stakeholders (such as municipal engineers and fire chiefs) and general interest stakeholders (such as residents, business owners, and commuters).

To engage the CAG, a series of meetings were held. The CAG meeting summaries are contained in Appendix C.

#### 6.5.1 CAG Meeting 1

The primary goal of the first meeting was to explain the how the public involvement associated with the North Corridor Study relates to the I-270 North EA and to work with the group to identify/validate their key issues, goals, and desires. A clear definition of the CAG’s roles and expectations were reviewed. A preview of the first Public Information Meeting was also provided.

CAG Meeting 1 was held on July 16, 2013, at the Hazelwood Civic Center (8969 Dunn Road). Each of the 24 attendees received a binder containing an agenda (Figure 6-2), a study area map, a copy of the meeting’s presentation slides, a fact sheet, Newsletter #1, and the announcement for the study’s first Public Informational Meeting.

A presentation outlining the study was given by key team members. MoDOT Project Manager Lisa Kuntz reviewed CAG member roles, CAG meeting rules/guidelines, study decision-making authority, and the timing of future CAG meetings. MoDOT North Area Engineer Larry Welty presented a study description and background discussion. MoDOT Senior Environmental Specialist Matt
Burcham provided information on the NEPA process.

Meeting 1 also included a group exercise intended to identify specific issues along the I-270 North EA corridor. Attendees reviewed large-scale maps and noted/discussed issues that affected them or their constituents. Issues were recorded and circulated for use by the study team and at future CAG meetings. The meeting concluded with a presentation/discussion on the topics of aesthetics, flexibility, and performance measures.

6.5.2 CAG Meeting 2

CAG Meeting 2 focused on the Purpose and Need identified for the study, the performance measures, and evaluation criteria that will be applied to the Build Alternatives, and the initial iterations of the Conceptual Alternatives.

Meeting 2 was held on October 29, 2013, at the Lewis and Clark Branch of the Saint Louis County Library. Each of the 17 attendees received an agenda and a copy of the meeting’s slideshow. The presentation addressed the Fundamental Principles of Urban Freeway Planning and Design. The overall purpose was to establish a basic understanding of how and why alternatives are being developed. The tradeoffs associated with different scenarios were also considered. The philosophical approach taken by the study team was to allow the systems roads to carry traffic as intended. Freeways handle long trips, outer roads handle trips between interchanges, and local roads provide access to individual residences and businesses.

The CAG was also briefed on the Conceptual Alternatives for two of the study’s sub-areas. This included a presentation on the iconography for the Interstate, the outer roads, the number of lanes, and direction of travel on that road. The methodology associated with dividing the corridor into 11 sub-areas was discussed, as were pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accommodations.

6.5.3 CAG Meeting 3

CAG Meeting 3 presented the Conceptual Alternatives for all portions of the study corridor. Meeting 3 was held on December 10, 2013, at the Florissant Valley Branch of the Saint Louis County Library. To facilitate the alternatives review, four tables were set up with each focusing on a portion of the corridor and showing the Conceptual Alternatives for that area. As the CAG was shown the Conceptual Alternatives, MoDOT encouraged questions and comments. The details of each alternative in each area were described to the CAG. In addition, tradeoffs were presented so that the CAG could get a better understanding of the potential benefits and impacts of each alternative. Much of the conversation was focused on the benefits of a one-way outer road system compared to a two-way outer road system. Many of the CAG members offered input related to existing Interstate operations, safety concerns, concerns about emergency services access, and locations where congestion and weaving challenges occur on a regular basis.

6.5.4 CAG Meeting 4

CAG Meeting 4 presented and discussed the Preferred Alternative. Meeting 4 was held on November 18, 2014, at the Florissant Valley Branch of the Saint Louis County Library. After a PowerPoint presentation, the CAG was invited to view the Preferred Alternative on 200-scale maps placed on tables. The improvements were summarized from the west end of the I-270 North EA corridor at I-70 to the east end at Chain of Rocks Bridge. Key changes were identified at each interchange location and questions were encouraged.
6.5.5 CAG Meeting 5

CAG Meeting 5 was held on August 18, 2016. The meeting’s goals include the specifics of the study restart, a review of the Preferred Alternative, and a discussion of next steps.

6.6 Technical Advisory Committee

As the membership list for the CAG was assembled, it became clear that many more people were interested in the study than could be effectively accommodated in a single group. Consequently, a second stakeholder group was established. Known as the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), this group was populated with individuals with a background in engineering, infrastructure design, and other technical backgrounds. This allowed for a different type of discussion than was possible with the CAG. The TAC is primarily composed of representatives from Metro Transit, EWG, Saint Louis County Highways and Traffic, MoDOT, and Lambert-Saint Louis International Airport.

To engage the TAC, a series of workshops were planned/held. The TAC meeting summaries are contained in Appendix C.

6.6.1 TAC Workshop 1

The first TAC workshop was held on May 28, 2013, at the MoDOT Transportation Management Center. The meeting focused on introducing the study and introducing the participants.

CH2M Project Manager Buddy Desai facilitated the meeting. His presentation included the following information:

- **Project Details**—The purpose of performing an EA was explained including a discussion of the expanded study area from I-70 to the Mississippi River, the desire to maintain flexibility for innovative contracting methods, and the study’s aggressive 18-month schedule, which will require efficient review periods and timely input.

- **Role of the Technical Advisory Committee**—As the technical staff for their respective agencies, the goal is to receive input/advise during the development, analysis, refinement, and selection of study solutions.

- **Project Context**—A summary of the conditions and context of the existing corridor was presented. The remainder of the meeting was an open discussion regarding the importance and meaning of the I-270 North EA to the participants. TAC members provided many detailed opinions and much specific study-related data. The meeting summary contains extensive specifics on the participants’ opinions.

6.6.2 TAC Workshop 2

TAC Workshop 2 was held on June 20, 2013, at the MoDOT Transportation Management Center. The meeting focused on corridor planning and corridor sizing.

TAC Workshop 2 proceeded with CH2M Project Manager Buddy Desai facilitating the meeting. The presentation, given by CH2M Senior Technical Advisor Tim Neuman, covered the following topics:

- Existing conditions and projected traffic
- Infrastructure conditions
- Lane continuity
- Existing LOS
- Existing land use
The concept of corridor sizing around a master or ultimate planning vision for the corridor was presented. The building blocks for corridor planning is the basic number of continuous lanes along the corridor, which define the base capacity. In terms of a basic lane plan, there is an important distinction between having a plan and implementing a plan. Having a long-term basic lane plan does not obligate any individual project to construct the full basic lane plan. It simply allows each individual project to be designed and constructed in such a way that it does not preclude the ultimate basic lane plan from being constructed in the future or result in the tear out and replacement of infrastructure that has not met its design life.

MAP-21 establishes performance-based planning and decision-making. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) has developed a number of recommended performance measures based on goal areas specified by MAP-21.

The remainder of the meeting was an open discussion and a group exercise associated with performance measures.

6.6.3 TAC Workshop 3
TAC Workshop 3 was held on October 8, 2013. The goals of this workshop were to discuss the principles of freeway planning, to examine the process for alternatives development, and to present the available portions of the Conceptual Alternatives. The details of each alternative were described and discussed.

6.6.4 TAC Workshop 4
TAC Workshop 4 was held on November 18, 2013. The goals of this workshop were to present the Conceptual Alternatives for the full corridor and to discuss the performance measures to be used to analyze them. To allow for more detailed attention, the TAC was broken into two groups. Each was given roughly 2 hours of review.

6.6.5 TAC Workshop 5
A fifth TAC workshop was held on November 13, 2014. The workshop presented and discussed the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative presentation discussed (1) study history, 2) flexibility in design, 3) the Preferred Alternative, and 4) next steps. The remainder of the meeting allowed for one-on-one review of the Preferred Alternative. This provided the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the Preferred Alternative.

6.6.6 2016 TAC Update
A letter was sent to the TAC members before the study resumed. The letter is the same as provided to the regulatory agencies and contained in Appendix C. It provides the members with the data they need to understand the status of the study, the Preferred Alternative, the anticipated conclusion of the NEPA process, and the nature of the available funding for design, right-of-way, or construction.

6.7 Public Involvement Meetings
Public meetings represent an important opportunity for direct engagement with the larger, general public. Two public informational meetings were held.

Both meetings were open houses and interactive. Study team members staffed display boards and were available to discuss, explain, and help attendees understand the information so they could provide
6.7.1 Public Informational Meeting 1

The meeting was held on July 30, 2013, at Saint Louis Community College at Florissant Valley. The purpose of the open house was for attendees to learn about the study and to share their experiences traveling the corridor. This information was intended to help the study team develop solutions.

Eighty-five people attended the open house. Study team members manned five stations that included 30 informational display boards. The stations included (1) a study overview, (2) a review of NEPA, (3) a summary of the issues, goals, and vision for I-270, (4) a discussion of performance measures, and (5) a station for involvement and input.

The heart of the meeting was Station #3, which included large-scale corridor maps where attendees could mark on the maps with dots where they encounter problems when traveling the area. Study team members were on hand at the stations to document the dots and any corresponding information attendees provided. Participants could also mark locations on the maps where they knew of any environmental issues.

There were six questions on the comment form with a seventh area for any additional comments. Fifty-seven attendees completed a comment form. Additionally, five people completed a comment form online and one person mailed comments. Thus, 63 people provided input.

The most important solution to attendees is upgrading the interchanges/intersections followed by addressing the safety concerns at the slip ramps. A more detailed summary of the comment forms is contained in the meeting summary in Appendix C.

6.7.2 Public Informational Meeting 2

Public Informational Meeting 2 was held on March 18, 2014, at the Hazelwood Civic Center East. The purpose of the open house was for attendees to learn about the study’s Reasonable Alternatives.

Ninety-two people attended the open house. Study team members manned five stations that included the following:
1. Project Overview—This station included an overview video describing the study.

2. Purpose and Need—This station summarized the transportation problems that this study will address.

3. Alternatives—This station presented the Reasonable Alternatives.

4. Impacts and Benefits—This station discussed how the potential solutions will perform.

5. Input and Next Steps—Comment forms manual and iPads versions were available.

The heart of the meeting was Station #3, which included large-scale maps depicting the Reasonable Alternatives (Figure 6-4). Copies were mounted to the meeting room halls. Other copies were mounted to long tables. Study team members were on hand to explain the alternatives under consideration. The preferences expressed at the meeting are summarized in Table 6-2. A more detailed summary of the comment forms is contained in the meeting summary in Appendix C.

In addition to the physical meeting, virtual public meetings were held on March 19, 2014 (at noon), and March 20, 2014 (at 8:00 pm). These live chat sessions presented the same information as the physical meeting. They also included a narrated study overview video, as well as four videos explaining the various Reasonable Alternatives along the corridor. Although the virtual attendance was low, it furthered the study team’s efforts to engage as many stakeholders as possible.

Figure 6-4. Typical Example of Public Informational Meeting 2 Exhibit
6.8 Project Website

A study website (Figure 6-5) was developed to serve as the main portal for all information regarding the EA. Visitors are able to learn about the study, get updates, and download the technical documents. They are also able to submit comments and sign up for the study’s mailing list. For those unable to attend the public meetings, the information displayed at these meetings are uploaded to the website, along with comment forms so they can participate electronically.

The study website is located at http://www.I-270North.org.

6.9 Communications Materials

As part of the process to kick-off this complex study, two handouts were developed. These were intended as broad summaries that could be distributed to anyone interested in the study.

The first was a fact sheet. It describes the EA, its purpose, and the process, including a timeline. The purpose of the fact sheet is to help ensure that the correct study information is being communicated to the public.

The second handout was an informational newsletter. This newsletter introduced the study, outlined important milestones, and announced the first public open house.

These documents are contained in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasonable Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of PIM #2 Respondents Viewing the Configuration as “Very Beneficial” or “Beneficial”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 1: I-70 TO MCDONNELL BOULEVARD</td>
<td>ST. CHARLES ROCK ROAD</td>
<td>Alternative 1: Diverging Diamond Interchange 80 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2: Diamond Interchange 28 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDONNELL BOULEVARD</td>
<td>Alternative 1: Diverging Diamond Interchange 76 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2: Partial Cloverleaf Interchange 41 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 2: EAST OF MCDONNELL BOULEVARD TO HANLEY ROAD/GRAHAM ROAD</td>
<td>LINDBERGH BOULEVARD</td>
<td>Alternative 1: Partial Cloverleaf Interchange 73 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA 3: HANLEY ROAD/GRAHAM ROAD TO OLD HALLS FERRY ROAD</td>
<td>HANLEY ROAD/GRAHAM ROAD</td>
<td>Alternative 1: Diamond Interchange (One-Way Dunn/Pershall) 78 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2: Diamond Interchange (Two-Way Dunn/Pershall) 32 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Alternative</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Percentage of PIM #2 Respondents Viewing the Configuration as “Very Beneficial’ or “Beneficial”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW FLORISSANT ROAD TO WASHINGTON STREET/ELIZABETH AVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Split Diamond Interchange (One-Way Dunn/Pershall)</td>
<td>78 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Split Diamond Interchange (Two-Way Dunn/Pershall)</td>
<td>32 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST FLORISSANT AVENUE TO OLD HALLS FERRY ROAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Split Diamond (to Old Halls Ferry – One-Way)</td>
<td>73 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1a</td>
<td>Split Diamond (to New Halls Ferry – One-Way)</td>
<td>76 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Split Diamond (to New Halls Ferry – Two-Way)</td>
<td>73 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2a</td>
<td>Split Diamond (to Old Halls Ferry – Two-Way)</td>
<td>73 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREA 4: EAST OF OLD HALLS FERRY ROAD TO RIVERVIEW DRIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Partial Cloverleaf Interchange</td>
<td>76 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROUTE 367</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Diamond Interchange</td>
<td>59 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Partial Cloverleaf Interchange</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEFONTAINE ROAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Diamond Interchange</td>
<td>59 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Partial Cloverleaf Interchange</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LILAC AVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Diamond Interchange</td>
<td>54 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Partial Cloverleaf Interchange</td>
<td>22 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVERVIEW DRIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Diamond Interchange with Two-Way Dunn Road</td>
<td>63 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Partial Cloverleaf Interchange</td>
<td>42 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>