

## **THE FUTURE OF THE GATEWAY PILLARS - WHERE WE ARE NOW**

**(April 18, 2022)**

After the public forum on April 12, and the deluge of emails and posts that we received, the issues are coming into sharper focus. Here is where we are at the moment:

**Unanimity** – It's fair to say that the unanimous view of everyone who has offered an opinion is that the pillars should be preserved in some form. Destruction and removal are not options.

**Consensus** – While there is no consensus on some issues, several points of general consensus have emerged:

1. The pillars should be located on a site where they will not again be subject to further movement or disturbance.
2. Any relocation must be to a governmentally owned space because:
  - a. Ownership by a governmental entity is needed to provide perpetual maintenance.
  - b. The monument should not become identified as part of a commercial enterprise.

**NOTE:** While it has been suggested a private landowner might be persuaded to donate/sell a small parcel to a governmental entity for the pillars, it seems extremely unlikely that a governmental entity would take on the responsibility for a small parcel that is not attached to a larger parcel owned by that entity.

3. Any solution should enhance the pillars' visibility as a memorial.
4. The pillars should be moved in tandem; moving one pillar alone is not an option.

**Preferences** – Though perhaps not rising to the level of requirements, a few majority preferences are apparent:

1. *The pillars should be located at a site as near as possible to the current location.* While the builders' original hope of using the Gateway to attract tourists to Boulder has long since disappeared, the pillars over the decades have become a sentimental landmark for Boulder County residents. If possible, a relocation site should recognize that sentiment and keep the pillars where they will continue to be easily and routinely enjoyed by Boulder County residents.

2. *If relocated, some semblance of a "gateway" appearance should be maintained.* The pillars were never designed as a stand-alone monument, but instead were intended to be integrated along with the canon park into the Road of Remembrance. While the Road of Remembrance cannot now be recreated, any relocation should attempt to maintain some of that character.

3. *The pillars should have reasonable visibility for persons in vehicles passing by on a nearby highway or street.* While there has been discussion about providing for pedestrian access to the pillars, the pillars' original setting was not pedestrian friendly. Nor were the pillars designed with features (e.g., sculptures, mosaics, dioramas) to attract close examination by foot traffic. Instead, the Gateway was specifically designed to be viewed from passing vehicles; even the signage (plaque, cornerstone) was located for viewing from a vehicle passing between the pillars.

Using these parameters, the list of potential alternatives can be narrowed, leaving the following list (in order of distance from present location):

1. *Leave the pillars in place, but repair and enhance.* For some, keeping the pillars in their current location remains paramount. If that option is chosen, the clear consensus is to repair the pillars and find some way with signage to promote their history and memorial purpose.

2. *Reconfigure the intersection to better protect and display the pillars.* Several persons argued that the intersection should be rebuilt, both to protect the pillars and improve traffic safety.

3. *Erie property on the southwest corner of the intersection (old Prince Reservoir No. 2).* Within the parameters, but not discussed at the forum.

4. *Proposed transit superstation on US 287.* Though not discussed in depth at the public forum, relocating the pillars to the proposed transit superstation on the west side of US 287 south of the intersection fits within the parameters thus far identified.

5. *Erie Lake.* Not on the prior list, Erie Lake (located north of the intersection on the east side of US 287) fits the parameters.

6. *Future intersection of Arapahoe and Aspen Ridge Drive (entrance for Silo and Tebo developments).* Within the parameters, but not discussed at the forum.

7. *Bullhead Gulch – Yarrow Park.* Located on the north side of Arapahoe west of the current location, these areas are owned by the City of Lafayette. Not previously discussed.

8. *Forest Park.* Small park owned by the City of Lafayette on the southeast corner of Arapaho and 95<sup>th</sup>.

9. *Legion Park.* County owned property west of 75<sup>th</sup> Street.

10. *Davidson Mesa Scenic Overlook on US 36.* CDOT-owned.

Assuming no more serious alternatives emerge, the next step is to start exploring the feasibility of the various options. While we will be gathering information on all of the listed alternatives, anyone with an interest in a particular location is encouraged to do their own research and thinking, and offer a more detailed outline of a plan for that location.

Bill Meyer