

## Public Meeting Comments

### Public Meeting – Downriver Area, April 11, 2005

The Planning Commission has already failed in several areas.

(1) This forum shouldn't be held on a Monday evening for Wyandotte (like the majority of other cities in United States) hold their weekly council meetings on Monday evening.

(2) With such a controversial issue as the Detroit River International Border Crossing, a larger facility would have accommodated the number of people here comfortably and, more importantly, safely.

(3) Public notices should only be created and mailed by one set commission, organization or group. When you have different groups posting time, location and program schedule, they tend to misinform the public, i.e., many people were under the assumption that the presentation was to begin at 5 p.m., when it was actually 6:30 p.m.

My concern is this: recent reconfiguration, job loss and pay cuts have taken place within the employees of Border Patrol. Why is it that money can seemingly appear to fund a study such as yours, yet the government states they cannot afford its own employees. Is this another case of money being misappropriated? I'd prefer to see the government rehire those border patrol folks that lost their jobs.

With respect to the pot hole problem, the government (Michigan and United States) is unwilling to rehire border patrol. Maybe they should do a study on the roads and highways in Wisconsin, North Dakota or Minnesota.

---

Another dumping ground for Downriver. We have now Riverview/Trenton RR, landfills, chemical plants, power plants. Enough is enough. We want quality of life. Truck traffic is enormous. We want quality of life. We want our major investments and our homes valued. I, my family and friends are greatly opposed to this border crossing.

---

Please also consider the historical significance of the Downriver area. Downriver is the location of the Wyandotte Indian village of Monwuagone. All of these ruins and artifacts have not been located. It would be inexcusable if they were lost.

---

My opinion is that Riverview is not a good choice. Zug Island would be a better choice to place this bridge. That's my opinion about this bridge placement.

---

I believe the proposed Zug Island area would be more of an ideal location, due to it being an industrial and high traffic area opposed to the other entry points, due to historic landmarks and light industrial areas.

---

Absolutely NO bridge or tunnel. It will create more congestion, loss of quality of homes, increased noise. Will ruin the Downriver area.

---

1. What are the basic assumptions underlying the need for additional crossing capacity? Where are these assumptions documented for public inspection?
  2. Why is "public health" NOT one of the stated "needs" of this study?
- 

I am totally against the proposal for the following reasons:

1. It will destroy the tranquil atmosphere of the Downriver area.
2. It will increase another opening of transport of dangerous materials.
3. Open borders to terrorists (U.S. cannot handle open borders they already have).
4. It will depreciate the area, make it more industrial instead of residential.
5. It will increase level of danger to residents, by increase of truck traffic. It will unite undesirables to cross border.
6. It will increase the number of illegal aliens in the area.
7. It will increase crime in area.
8. It will necessitate Riverview, Wyandotte and Trenton to increase police protection.
9. It will add to pollution on the road – hazardous materials – it will increase traffic deaths.
10. The area will deteriorate – like the Ambassador Bridge area – Lafayette, which is a disgrace. It has never been cleaned up.
11. The heavy truck loads will deteriorate Michigan highway roads and cost Michigan more highway dollars – Michigan loses.
12. It will increase number of Mexican aliens to enter U.S., also terrorists.
13. It will increase number of road deaths.

Clean-up the Ambassador Bridge area first ... it is a mess!

---

Why is this being proposed again – when previous meetings steadfastly told you NO!

How foolish to disrupt the huge progress Downrivers made in improving the area.

Let depressed areas – like River Rouge and Ecorse and Del Ray – have the so-called "benefits" of a new border crossing, but let it be planned so as to make surrounding areas beautiful, not crummy as at the exits from Ambassador Bridge in USA (and Windsor).

How will financing be provided (1) for the study, (2) for the meetings "in advance," and (3) for construction.

How will it affect future taxes for us as residents?

How will (and who will) maintain our roads if crossing becomes a reality?

---

We do not support a crossing in Wyandotte. We are concerned about traffic and our community. We live by Bishop Park, and this is too close to a highly populated area. I am concerned that everyone in Wyandotte was not notified by mail. Friends at 9<sup>th</sup> and Elm were not notified. I am concerned about my property values and quality of our life.

## Public Meeting – River Rouge Area, April 12, 2005

I am very excited to hear about the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) project. I would like to get involved or assist in any way. I am a manager of the Great Lakes Works (US) Corporation.

---

In the study of economic impact, how much revenue would River Rouge receive on a tax basis over 10 years (2013 – 2013)?

---

One issue that is important to Downriver is economic. So much of Downriver is tied to manufacturing – an area in which jobs are declining.

I think and agree that another traffic connection would mutually benefit both the U.S. and Canada.

Most people do not know the Ambassador Bridge is going to have to shut down more often to repair.

If a community is dead set against the idea, it is probably because they are worried about noise, traffic and small businesses hurting as traffic bypasses them.

I live in Lincoln Park and work at River Rouge High School.

River Rouge (the city) and the schools are both hurting severely for money. The population and taxes that are with it have declined.

If a small portion of fees collected would go to the city and the school with the majority going to pay for the project, I think River Rouge would be receptive to looking at the idea of Zug Island connecting to Canada.

I think there needs to be tangible reward – 5¢ for every vehicle – so the city and school will be guaranteed to benefit, not all the fees leaving River Rouge.

---

Communications – please get the word out about meetings. We need to have lots of information.

---

## Public Meeting – Central Area, April 13, 2005

Once again, I wonder how MDOT did outreach for these meetings. I have been active with the DIFT meetings and on that mailing list for years, and live about ¼ mile from the Bridge. Perhaps someone could have determined that it would be important to notify me and my neighbors. So, how was outreach conducted?

I missed the presentation, but from comments I heard, the community's concerns around the existing crossing haven't been addressed adequately. There are too many trucks creating not just traffic hazards but environmental issues. Asthma rates are much higher around SW Detroit than other areas.

I agree with Deb Summer that MDOT never communicated that their Gateway project was in part to accommodate a 2<sup>nd</sup> span until a public meeting 2-3 summers ago. How can the community trust a government body that changes such a significant message mid-stream?

Joe Corradino mentioned studying the community impacts but my experience with the DIFT, both in person through public hearings/meetings and through interaction with LAC members who represented the community. In short, the community needs have been marginalized with MDOT taking feedback and incorporating it when they desired and ignoring most of it. Joe Corradino emphasizing the national and international concerns of the project only heightens my fears of this occurring again.

---

I live two blocks west (25<sup>th</sup> Street) of the bridge plaza (homeowner 69 years).

1. Truck traffic going to and coming from the Ambassador Bridge creates hazardous driving on I-75 and Fort Street.
  2. The increase in above should a new span be built. How would it affect I-75?
  3. The increase in pollution for the neighborhood caused by item 2 above (environmental impact).
  4. The owners of the current bridge do not care anything about the neighborhood. My perception is that they are trying to destroy it and, in a number of areas, they have been successful in this.
  5. There is also the problem of noise pollution.
  6. Why aren't you doing a health study of how this pollution is affecting the people of Southwest Detroit? This should also include the effect of the intermodal sites on the neighborhood. These studies should not stand alone.
-

## Public Meeting – Belle Isle Area, April 14, 2005

Comments – NONE RECEIVED.