

**Detroit River International Border Crossing  
Comment Forms**

1.	Very good presentation. Joe did an outstanding job of articulating the issues and designs.
2.	The concerns I have with the East-Central proposals is the negative impacts the proposal will have on the following: Residents, air quality, parks & recreation, schools and security. The down rivers (King Road) proposal offer the best access to the Plaza with minimal impact to the concerns I raised above. We've seen the greatest decline in residents in Detroit, primarily due to the commercial property (factories), bridge, etc. These are places to rebuild the city and adding a Plaza would not add any benefit to the residents, only displace them.
3.	The improvement of regional mobility is important. However, maintaining the current community, neighborhood characteristics in my area of residence is of more importance. Since the sacrifices of regional mobility expansion were endured in the late 1950's and early 1960's with Detroit city limits, I think it is only fair Detroit be exempted. The Southern corridor seems to be the most feasible area for this expansion. Specifically Plazas S1, S2, S3 and S4 are attractive. Overall, which plaza proposal least impacts residential homes? Question: From viewing the slides it would appear that the King Road proposal has the least populated land. However, since the area is being developed at a rapid pace, are there plans to suspend development in this area?  Q#2: Will the areas (proposed plazas/routes) that least impact residential communities suspend growth until this study is complete or will these areas continue to grow? Continued growth in least populated areas would prejudice this study.
4.	I am in favor of C2 River Rouge plan. This will bring much needed traffic through a slumping town.
5.	Not all residents are opposed to this. C2 is a good plan.
6.	Issues: quality of life, health, air quality, lead & mercury, displacement and environmental justice.
7.	Do not build a bridge over Grosse Ile! 11,000 people will fight you every step. It would ruin our beautiful, peaceful island.
8.	I think the bridge should be in River Rouge or SW Detroit.
9.	For the record (again) I do not want to see a twin span at the Ambassador Bridge. Also, the crossing that has the least impact on our neighborhoods should be looked at. Perhaps the McCeatin Stell Co. site as a possibility.
10.	I am ten (10) years old and I was born and raised in Delray and I don't want a stupid bridge to ruin that 10 years at all. SEND IT SOMEWHERE ELSE WE DON'T WANT IT AT ALL 8.
11.	I am now living on Thaddeus St., 9088 Apt. 2. This is my ground and I live in Delray all my life all most but I am not wanted no bridges in our neighborhood because Delray is a better place for different project needs as for our children to live and make their choice to build here in Delray not a bridge to take away our home that we all know so please put it downriver other than Delray so we can keep our little town we will love it. Thank you for your time.
12.	Put it on a fast track process. Practical crossing is King Road, 1-75 & 275 every reach.
13.	I don't think it's right to take our homes that we live for years, where everyone going to go? Our children grew up here and grandchild, my family and me don't want to move, to bring a bridge to take our neighborhoods from us, we've lived here all our lives. It's not right to take our homes from us, most of us live all of our lives here, it memories for us and our family and friends, so we want to keep our homes. We live in the same house for years, so I want to keep my home, I don't want to lose it to some bridge, to take our house from us, and we have good neighbors, we help one another. We already lost McMillan so we don't want to louse our home, some people will have no where to go, so don't take our houses from us, it's not right, go somewhere else, we have good friends and neighbors. Leave us alone.
14.	Great visuals. Lets get the word out and make some decisions.

15.	SHOW ME THE MONEY!!! Anything with a mouth will bite but just with the right price.
16.	I just like to say, I thank you that you are not taking my house, I'm not in that area. I'm in the Fort Wayne area. Again, thank you, a good start off so far. Bridge built in the area is very fine with me.
17.	We have lived in the Delray neighborhood all our lives, invested a lot of money in our home, and we do not want to move. We do not want a bridge in our neighborhood.
18.	There are many homes, families, people in this area; we do not want you to come through our home. We raised our children here, our neighbors are our family. We would like it if you went through another area where you are not affecting so many people's lives. There are other places that you can go that are <u>not</u> residential. WE DON'T WANT YOU!!
19.	If you take over Delray, where are all the senior citizens going to go cause they cannot move with what little money they receive from Social Security and most of them do not have any family members. With everyone in our area, we all look out for everyone! Most of the people did not know about what is going on. We need our church and businesses, what we do have. We already had our roads paved. We need jobs. Please save our Delray.
20.	My concern is we are a family that sticks together, we are the Village that takes care of each other, we have a lot of people who have lived here their whole lives. We have enough traffic here already, we don't want anymore. We have established a community here, we are bringing families back here, loving, caring, working families, we are a working people community services to build and restore new homes, we have a \$500,000 community center coming up as we speak, where all the children in our neighborhood and other neighborhoods come to where they are taught values that have been forgotten about, where they can come learn and work. We have historic buildings that we love, we have preservation, and we have endangered species. Leave our neighborhood and please look elsewhere. We have affordable living here, if we were relocated, we may not be able to live. We will not have the closeness we all share in Delray.
21.	Well, first of all, I think it's totally unfair of what you people are trying to do to our neighborhood. I've been living in Delray for 23-1/2 years. I have memories here. First you people close McMillian Elementary down. Delray has been changing over the years. The little community center they are building on to it – maybe it will help keep the children off the streets. That is just being pure stingy of wanting to take that much space. What about the people that can't afford to move. I can barely afford where I'm living at now. How can you people make a living off of that – take people's houses and feel good about it? Don't you have a heart? Everyone in our neighborhood helps each other out. So, why take our neighborhood from us? Where do you expect us to go? For us who don't own our house, what are we supposed to do? Come on now. I'm living off of minimum wage now and. Living in Delray has of one of cheap places because no one wants to live here because of the neighborhood. Everyone thinks it's a bad neighborhood, but it has changed a lot over the years. So, leave our neighborhood alone.
22.	Everyone leaving Delray area just for another Canada bridge is wrong. What about the problems that it will cause? The major part of us own the houses. Where are we supposed to go? Everyone grew up in the area and can barely afford a new place. If we are to leave the Delray area, what about the senior citizens and the children? It's bad enough that MacMillian Elementary School is closed. Now our neighborhood. By building the bridge it will bring more issues about money, traffic and terrorist attacks. It will destroy everything – our homes, lives, memories. Delray is improving its area. We have Leigh Park extending the center for our children to keep them off the streets and you people are trying to come in here and take what we do have away just for a bridge. How will this benefit our community, our families and lives? It's not fair and I personally will do everything I can to make sure that this bridge will not be built in the Delray area. My home and everyone's home.
23.	I have been living in Delray for 32 years. I am the fourth generation that is there. My grandchildren are the 5th generation to live there. I love my neighborhood because it is a close, loving, caring, working, friends and family place to live. We're trying to get new homes put in there. There is now a new community center that is being built there for the children and the use of the neighborhood. There are now counting five churches there that people go to every

	<p>Wednesday and Sunday. We have one gas station, one to two stores, historic Fort Wayne, Delray fishing and loading dock. Next to it, an FIA office where several hundred people go to get help. We have two to three automotive centers that work on cars, trucks and all types of vehicles. Our goal is to get new homes, new stores, new businesses built there for children and families to enjoy as it was once before. People say bad things and do bad things but all good always overrides that bad in any situation. There are so many different cultures there who come to Delray to rebuild their lives; to own a piece of land; to own the American Dream for their children and families. The land is cheap in taxes and is a good way to rebuild your dream home or a garden on any empty lot. This is my dream to have homes and businesses for families to enjoy in Delray. To bring back our families who have passed on or moved to a new location. Peoples' community center along with others have built a new community center and are now on their way to trying to rebuild a new playscape for the community to enjoy. At this community center children go to play, learn and get summer jobs. Adults go there to learn English, Spanish, learn to use the computers, get on the Internet, eat lunches, work out in the gym, play games of all kinds, grill, cook, have family reunions, parties or just go to the park to swing, play volleyball, play in the sand or just to learn how to volunteer and help others. This is my community and I refuse to see it being lost to a new bridge. We also have a high school (Southwestern) which serves so many children in the Delray community as well as others in the Downriver area. Plus the salt mines do blast under us, so you will put everyone in danger going over the bridge. We have enough traffic as it is on our streets and freeways. There is so much we can do to help our community. Please go elsewhere. Go south and put it there. What will happen to our air, our animals, our children, our friends and our family? This may mean nothing to you but it is all me, my children and grandchildren have – our memories, safety, our friends, and most important <b>OUR FAMILY! I LOVE IT HERE! HELP US, NOT TEAR US APART!</b></p>
24.	<p>I understand the concern of Delray residents. I live east of Delray, but I now see the danger of what "fair market value" would do to the consideration of alternative sites. I hope MDOT will somehow consider sites based on other criteria. One other consideration: I don't understand the limitations about Zug Island. (If a plaza were put on Zug Island, it might spare the rest of Delray.) What if the industrial operations on Zug Island were told they had to move because of "imminent domain?" There wouldn't need to be a channel all around the island. The ships that need to go to Ford could simply use the Rouge River.</p>
25.	<p>Why are we wasting our time and money if we already have the existing tunnel which can be used for a much less cost and without impacting the environment of all the other proposed sites? Downriver communities will be changed forever by your greed to make money over our heritage of family generations of living in these communities.</p>
26.	<p>1) The Grosse Ile community is usually thought of as a neighborhood as a whole. Any international bridge traversing any part of Grosse Ile will effectively destroy not only the ambiance of the community, but impact/destroy the whole of the community. Already announcement that two options traverse Grosse Ile have impacted property values, people's lives. 2) We have been surprised to learn that the international crossing study does not take as a concern <u>health impact</u>. 3) The need for a new bridge is not readily apparent. Study appears flawed. Alternatives do exist, e.g., fixing the "JOBS Tunnel" or a second span to the Ambassador Bridge; truck ferry. 4) Opposition in block from mayors/supervisors of Downriver community. 5) To have taxpayers pay for a bridge which will destroy the tax base of the whole Downriver community is a double whammy. Such a bridge will not only destroy one community, but the whole Downriver community. 6) Communities have drawn up plans for use of the space (at considerable cost I might add) that is proposed as per requirement of the state. Plans for a bridge will destroy local plans. Already your study puts those plans on hold. No consistency with local planning. 7) Environmental concerns – crossing the river and channel with a bridge will stir up years of adverse sediments from the river and soils; wetlands; disturb habitats for animals/birds on migratory routes, etc. 8) 1,200 people at Crystal Gardens on June 30 (newspaper count) and only one spoke in favor of any crossing (he had a stake in one approach). That is only a sample of the protest that will be heard. 9) This effort proposes to</p>

	destroy the Downriver community for the sake of someone else outside of our area.
27.	Yes. Who will buy my house that will not sell?? I am a former Realtor and Grosse Ile resident. Any bridge downriver is going to negatively affect the residents and business owners. More of a concern of mine is that we bought a home on Harbor Pointe two years ago. This is in the Hennepin Pointe location. We have five children. I cannot imagine the negative physical effects to my family living almost under a bridge of that magnitude. Obviously we would leave the Downriver area, however, I am quite sure we would not be able to sell our home, which is supposed to be valued at over \$450,000. The "scare" this is putting in the minds of the residents of Downriver is going to cause such an upheaval that many will leave Downriver whether it happens or not and I expect the homes will be lost. Do the people involved who are "pro" bridges downriver live under a bridge? I highly doubt it. I am outraged that so much time and money is being spent on this!
28.	Isn't this whole thing a smoke screen? Isn't the "tunnel" going across Zug Island to LaSalle? The \$16 million spent for all of this could be put to much better use. Public education. You should all be ashamed of yourselves. Anything for the \$. What is M "Maroon's" real motive?
29.	If you took all of these considerations, i.e., air quality, quality of life, truck traffic, protecting your home investment, you would <u>never</u> consider the Downriver community. This established community has beautiful homes, families, generations of families here established. Build in industry, twin the bridge. Why are you allowed to ruin our home values, our quality of life and our love for this community? We are trying to move forward to a better way of life, not backwards! The River Trenton Railroad is a terrible devastation to our community. The truck traffic alone from this company has already impacted our quality of life. How can this company ruin our community? How can this be allowed to happen?
30.	My wife and I recently moved here from New York City where we lived close to the Manhattan Bridge. It was a big move for us and all our money is invested in our house. It is the first time in almost 60 years that we have had any security and the opportunity to be so close to nature and quiet. We've yet to read all the literature available about alternatives, or even the necessity to have another bridge. Having lived only near a bridge for over a half century, I do know how noisy and dirty they are. I know it would destroy the value of our home. My wife and I are retired and not in the best of health. I could not imagine such a proposal. It would ruin our lives.
31.	The proposal on Pennsylvania Road will be totally devastating to our community in Southgate. Not only will the heavy traffic affect three high schools (Gabriel Richard, Southgate Anderson and Riverview) it will also affect (remove) most of our nature center and greenways pathway that was partially funded by grant monies and through the consortium between city and school district in Southgate. This was a 10-year project that has just come to take place. I, as a school board member, am outraged at this proposal. As a taxpayer and property owner I am outraged that this proposal cuts right through some of the most expensive and newest built homes in both Southgate and Riverview. LaSalle and River Rouge want this crossing in their area. My subdivision is only seven years old and everyone there has sunk every dime into their homes. The Pennsylvania proposal cuts right through my neighborhood - removing 1/2 the homes and destroying the property values of those that are left. I worked 30 years to purchase this home and do not intend for it to be taken because truck traffic in Canada headed to our landfills wants a shortcut and wants to avoid Windsor. I am outraged that this is even under consideration by departments in Michigan that work for me through my tax dollar.
32.	MDOT is nothing more than a bunch of homegrown terrorists!
33.	If we need a bridge then build it in the city of Ecorse, River Rouge or Detroit. Why not refurbish the old tunnel? This bridge is for the billionaires who want to own America...They want to destroy the people and our lifestyle...The rich get richer...The powerful want to rule...The power of the good people will be heard! God bless us all.
34.	Where to begin? Downriver has been my lifelong home. My grandparents, upon emigrating from England, moved to Wyandotte where my parents were raised. I was raised in Southgate and have spent my married life on Grosse Ile where we have raised a family and where our children are now raising our grandchildren. This Downriver community, which our U.S.

	<p>government and our state legislature are so “willing to sacrifice” <u>is</u> America, the people who built this nation, fought for this nation are the Americans you will find Downriver. My father fought for freedom of this country during WWII, my husband fought in Vietnam. You now ask our sons to fight for freedom in Iraq. What about the freedom to be fought for right here at home? Do we have no rights where our homes are concerned? This bridge, especially the King Road option, would go over the roof of our home! No sun, no clean air, no trees, no value of property. <u>Nothing!</u> We could not sell what no one wants to buy. My lungs shut down when I am exposed to exhaust fumes, so we could not stay in our house. We would be forced to walk away and lose EVERYTHING we have spent a lifetime working for and we would have nothing left. I watch great blue herons and Canadian geese flying over our house. Deer, fox and coyotes are nearby. The bike path is a beautiful, healthy route to visit friends and family. There has never been a day that I have not thanked God for my home, as well as the nature and history we all enjoy on Grosse Ile. All I ask is that we be allowed to keep it. We do not need another bridge. NAFTA has destroyed the industry of Southeast Michigan. <u>This is a redundant project.</u></p>
35.	<p>The out of country trash coming in is a disgrace. Also the railroad project at the Grosse Ile toll bridge is deplorable. Thanks Bob Ficano for your enlightening comments concerning the possible bridge crossings and stating the options against the downriver crossing. Bravo for the comments on the use of the rail tunnels – please – follow that idea/project and do it!! Who hired your firm? And why bother? No bridge or tunnel! Save our environment!</p>
36.	<p>We do not want a crossing anywhere downriver. It will disrupt our communities and hurt our environment. Find another location! Not here!!</p>
37.	<p>Downriver does not have the ability to accommodate the added traffic and public safety problems. This will affect (negatively) my housing values hence, my savings. I will not even be able to sell my house to move. No one will want it. Will you be offering fair market value to buy it? Noise, pollution, traffic, increased safety problems. This bridge cannot be put NEAR (within 10 miles). We already are getting Canada’s trash. No we have to have Canada’s bridge! I don’t care about the need! Keep it away from my home in Downriver. I will fight this!!!</p>
38.	<p>The bridge needs to go where it will hurt the least amount of people. We have more filthy industry and car and truck congestion than we need right now. GI has two bridges; county bridge needs to be replaced. What about the value of houses going <u>way</u> down? The noise, pollution, truck traffic. GI is a very unique place to live. Everyone cares <u>about</u> each other. There are many protected wildlife areas, three golf courses, etc. I think GI is the wrong place for a bridge. Where are the rights of the taxpayers? There are houses worth millions on GI. What about the old fort on Jefferson?</p>
39.	<p>We live on Grosse Ile and we are strongly against this proposal. My wife and I will do everything in our power to stop this project. Please don’t ruin our lives on Grosse Ile. It’s a beautiful community. A bridge would destroy the whole island. We’ll lose the equity in our home. Our air quality will be ruined. The noise will be unbearable. Don’t do this! Thank you.</p>
40.	<p>We do not need or want a downriver international crossing.</p>
41.	<p>King and Pennsylvania Road corridors are not an option. Placement of freeway/plazas will impede safe exodus of Grosse Ile in the event of an emergency. Downriver has begun to develop and prosper after the industrial decline. This project will serve to undo the progress made. It will cause a fleeing of the residents. Loss of retail and businesses. This project will not enhance our downriver region. It will promote pollution, stoppage of projects/developments. Our home values will decline those in the immediate area.</p>
42.	<p>Riverview is home to me and my family. I chose this area because it has everything to offer for a wonderful family life. I just paid off my home, have a beautiful landscaping layout, am close to schools and parks and want to see my children and grandchildren have the kind of life that the Old Riverview can bring. We have no need or desire for this bridge. We have worked long and hard to make our city what it is today and it will be a shame to destroy all we’ve worked for for another bridge. Let River Rouge have it – they WANT it and it will greatly improve their area but it would destroy our area. No bridge downriver would keep all cities free from unwanted destruction and ruining many, many families and homes. Please consider how many things that</p>

	will be demolished or compromised for a bridge in this area. It seems as though the decision is already made and this info is just to make us citizens happy thinking we have a "say" in the final outcome. Don't ruin a good thing. GIVE IT TO ROUGE – let them enjoy and improve their city, surroundings and economy. NO BRIDGE DOWNRIVER!!!!
43.	I am totally opposed to <u>any</u> downriver bridge crossing. I <u>cannot believe</u> any consideration is being given to having a bridge crossing span my residential neighborhood, Grosse Ile. The economic impact on me personally and Downriver overall would be devastating. All of Downriver is against a Downriver crossing. End this nonsense immediately! No Downriver crossing.
44.	I have been to all of the meetings this month (June). There are more than 10 times the number of people here (Downriver) than at any other meeting. I have some observations and conclusions: 1) We are all going to be impacted by this process, and we all want the bridge located elsewhere. 2) We need to know our enemy. [REDACTED] has identified himself as the proponent of the downriver crossing. He states that Grosse Ile is a ghetto and its people are idiots. 3) The Atofina chemical plant had an accidental disaster on July 14, 2003 resulting in three deaths; three cities evacuated; the river traffic shut down; and a fine of \$6.2 million – the second largest in Michigan history – for failure to follow safety procedures. It'll be too late to ask why we built a bridge over a chemical plant in the event of a terrorist attack. No other plazas are located this close to a working chemical plant. Conclusion: S1, S2, S3, S4 are not viable for safety reasons. The last thing we need is a disaster caused by an attack that SHUTS down the bridge and causes an international issue.
45.	No crossing Downriver! How dare you disregard the will of the people. It is unconscionable to consider a downriver crossing. No way!
46.	I listen to you say that our input counts. I reason (when I read your material) that overriding considerations throughout the evaluation may occur. Don't pacify us. This feed 'em and hope that they don't read the fine print or hear the ambiguous words thrown in now and again is ridiculous. Politics is extremely suspicious when you can't even tell us whether or not a crossing would be publicly or privately owned. Feel free to speak with Downriver doctors and allergy specialists about the already-present large population with asthma and environmental allergies. Then take the time to reflect on what the impact of excessive fumes would be. We deserve better than that. You might consider calling two groups of five up at a time to the microphones to increase efficiency of these meetings. Why is so much money being spent on a "study" when we have no plans to actually build a crossing? I resent the fact that my tax dollars are being spent in this manner for a possible (probable?) private company. It's not too late to stop the study now (except that you lose a paycheck). Please don't send me a form response. Answer my concerns specifically.
47.	1) Mr. Corradino pointed out that traffic peaked in 2000. Down three percent in five years. As U.S. auto plants and suppliers close/move to Mexico, China, traffic will continue to decline. 2) With your (15) proposals why does your study fall short of including revamping the existing JOBS train tunnel or double-decking the Ambassador Bridge? To eliminate these studies displays your inability to study this project thoroughly and professionally. 3) The Corradino firm should be dropped now and replaced with a firm capable of doing a professional and thorough job. 4) Why do all studies presented tonight fall short of showing the impact to Grosse Ile? Again not thorough or professional. Not getting our \$16 million worth. 5) For the Corradino company to state no study will be done on health effects to the building is inexcusable and again shows Corradino is not thorough or professional.
48.	Adding an additional crossing may be a great idea <u>but</u> not in the Downriver area. This area has natural wildlife habitat and has been hit by economic conditions over time. This will be another cross to bear. Our waterfront has been scarce over time. Now that industry has left this area, whit waterfront is becoming available to use via golf courses, parks and boat access. Why take this away from us and in return give us more traffic and potential loss of property values? Leave us alone. We don't want any crossing Downriver. After seeing and listening to the presentations, there are too many disruptions to our locale in proceeding forward. Do not sacrifice our lifestyle

	because of money, commerce, profits, etc.!!
49.	I realize this is going to happen, regardless of public opinion. However, I feel that the bridge should be put in an area (i.e., Ecorse) that wants it – providing soil and all factors are conducive to the project. If you wish to say it's a vote by popular demand, put it where it will increase property values and allow for an increase in jobs as well. Ecorse/Rouge/Delray area needs improvement anyway due to age of area and declining population. This should be a major determining factor in location choice. Also, advisory board members should live in the areas they represent.
50.	Position: I do not want to see an international border crossing located in Trenton, Grosse Ile, Riverview or Wyandotte. Reasons: 1) Our air quality is already very poor compared to the rest of the nation. 2) The above communities are home to the International Wildlife Refuge. The bridge complex would cut through this sensitive area. The bridge and the heavy traffic are inconsistent with a wildlife refuge. 3) The bridge would pass through established residential areas degrading property values and quality of life. For some homeowners their homes represent their largest asset, and this asset would be cut. The bridge location needs to be located where residential units are least impacted. 4) Many of the Downriver communities have been working very hard to enhance quality of life for residents and wildlife along the Detroit River. They have made significant progress, but still have a way to go to realize their dreams. An international bridge is inconsistent with this planning. 5) The noise level from a bridge would be disruptive to residents and wildlife. We already have to put up with a lot of truck traffic on our roads (many of these trucks are carrying garbage to garbage landfills west of our communities). To sum up, frankly the Downriver communities are tired of being dumped on! We seem to end up with projects that are degrading to the environment and our quality of life. We want to send a strong message that we are willing to fight for our rights and stop any future degradation down here.
51.	We don't need the bridge.
52.	Why are so many downriver communities being affected to build a new bridge when building a new bridge near the existing bridge and tunnel would keep all border patrol issues in a central location? The representative at the Detroit River International Crossing Study map said that Homeland Security does not want all of the crossings in one location. This does not make sense. The number of people crossing will not change. The new bridge will only make it faster and easier. Putting a bridge 20 miles (or less) downriver will not make much difference in terms of a possible terrorist attack. A bridge downriver will negatively affect all downriver communities and should not be considered.
53.	My family and I have lived in this (Wyandotte) area for the past eight years. During that time the city and neighborhood have made significant improvements. I believe putting the "new" bridge in this area is a mistake. It would dramatically impact the area in a purely negative way.
54.	No bridge in Riverview – I smell a rat!
55.	S4 over Hennipen's Point.
56.	There are many concerns of which pollution is one of the most important. Air, noise, dirt flowing in and over us would be unbearable. The health of thousands of people would be endangered. But since the concerns of people seem to be unimportant, how about the health of our feathered friends, animals and fish? Surely the environmental concerns should have weight. A bridge over Grosse Ile would destroy the entire Downriver area.
57.	A bridge in the Downriver area will cause a problem: in air, water and pollution, the quality of our lives forever. Our homes will go down in value, neighbors will leave the area.
58.	Design the bridge to allow bicycle traffic to cross. I like S4 design.
59.	A King Road proposal only works on the main land. On Grosse Ile too many houses are impacted. Quality of life issues are affected on the entire island. River Rouge, on the other hand, wants and needs it.
60.	If we can stem the tide of trash coming from Canada, ruining our roads, damaging the environment, and filling our landfills, maybe we can avoid many related expenses. I have lived downriver 65 years. Have visited Windsor, also, all those years to relatives. The traffic situation

	is awkward at times but is doable. The expense of another bridge, the disruption it would cause, the few jobs it would create are not acceptable to me.
61.	Use Rob Ficano's idea to use the old train tunnel – fiscally responsible, logistically responsible. Public hearings should serve the purpose of LISTENING AND IT SHOULD IMPACT YOUR DECISION. NO B RIDGE DOWNRIVER (except the foot of Southfield where they want it).
62.	The river is <u>too</u> wide at Grosse Ile. It will cost many millions more!!!
63.	I think consideration should be given to the flight patterns to the Grosse Ile airport. A new study for the need for such a bridge.
64.	In my wildest dreams I would not imagine a bridge being put over, under or anywhere near our beautiful island home. I hope our elected officials will put all of their efforts in stopping this madness or it will be remembered. Downriver is not a dumping ground!!
65.	This type of structure and the accompanying traffic that will result should not be put in a residential area such as Southgate, Riverview, or Trenton. There are other appropriate locations. Noise, traffic and the lowering of property values are not acceptable.
66.	Downriver crossings are too disruptive to established, stable communities.
67.	Downriver has enough environmental problems. We don't need another that further degrades the area. Also, creating an entirely new infrastructure, including a three-plus mile bridge can't be less expensive than upgrading existing facilities. There is a great suspicion, at least on my part, that what we would be doing here is accommodation of more Canadian waste with little positive impact to our area. We don't need it here.
68.	The traffic study that this study is based on is 10 years old. Current and projected volume is down and does not support the need for an additional bridge. This study should be terminated immediately! We do not need an additional bridge downriver.
69.	I have a home in Canada (Lake Erie) and Riverview. Happy to see a bridge south of Ambassador site. Hope the "C1 or C2" site works out (Shortest overall project? Lowest cost?). Many people may have the image of the current Ambassador Plaza in their mind. It is a lousy first impression for the U.S. Sharing early plaza design drawings may help with some worries. Otherwise, good luck and can't wait to use it!
70.	There is no good reason to destroy Grosse Ile, Trenton, Riverview and Southgate by plopping a horrendous bridge in the middle of stable, developed communities. There are other cities in the area north, i.e., River Rouge, who seek the bridge for their community.
71.	You have to be kidding. Leave Downriver alone.
72.	The King Road plan will destroy some of the most scenic and livable real estate in southeast Michigan. The affected communities are learning to exist beyond the smokestack economy of last century. Putting the bridge there will be a death blow. River Rouge seems to want this for economic reasons. Put it there.
73.	I moved to the downriver area from Sterling Heights three years ago. I moved to Grosse Ile because I liked the Victorian houses, the township green spaces, the wildlife (deer, coyotes, birds, etc.), the outstanding schools, the parks in Trenton and Wyandotte, the rich history of the island, the water, etc. I also enjoy the quaintness of Wyandotte and Trenton with their 19th Century buildings and places to walk to. I appreciate how they have turned brownfields into golf courses, tree lined streets, aesthetically pleasing condos, etc. For the life of me, I can't understand how you could even consider putting a bridge over Grosse Ile. How does it benefit us as citizens of Michigan to destroy Grosse Ile?
74.	A bridge/tunnel in the Downriver area would devastate our quality of life. Also the tremendous economic decline to our residents would change our lives for the worse.
75.	How many people are on committee decision-making that live downriver? Also have you actually driven on Grosse Ile? You should!
76.	Wildlife refuge – Hennepin Point – north and south marsh should not be destroyed! Grosse Ile economic value will be destroyed! Should use the JOBS tunnel. This would save thousands in taxes for Michigan. Grosse Ile's airport flight patterns would be affected!
77.	To build a bridge in the (south) downriver area would devastate the whole area and families involved. There are too many communities affected by a bridge in this area. It definitely will

	affect our quality of life!!
78.	Totally opposed to bridge project due to impact on the region. Please study tunnel refurbishment project. Who is your client? You have not answered clearly. We will need a larger venue for the next meeting I am sure.
79.	If Canada is willing to pay 90 percent of the cost to restructure an existing tunnel, why are you entertaining other expensive options that would destroy so many downriver areas?! We pay high taxes and work hard to maintain the standards of which we are very proud and are totally against a bridge in this area. Totally unacceptable!!!
80.	We are post 9/11 and putting an international bridge over housing when homeland security is not in place is baffling. Another option needs to be found – NOT DOWNRIVER AND NOT OVER HOUSING. What about health? Why not a study on how this will affect our health? Why?
81.	NO. Damage environment, damage quality of life, ruin infrastructure.
82.	How does a bridge over Grosse Ile affect our property values, our wetlands, historical sites, air quality, quality of life and increased traffic and crime rate? We believe we have too much to lose. The answer is “NO” – NOT DOWNRIVER.
83.	The King Road proposal will have the expressway from I-75 to I-275 go right over my home. I am concerned about the recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling that says the government can take private property away from citizens and the government is not obligated to even give market value for the confiscated land.
84.	Put the bridge where the community <u>wants</u> it. We moved to Riverview two years ago because we love its small hometown feel. A bridge in Riverview would destroy many homes and would leave Riverview devastated. We <u>do not</u> want a bridge in our city.
85.	Must do health impact study. Increased traffic – unacceptable. No real need for an additional bridge. The real data does not support it. Adverse effect on environment and numerous species of waterfowl and fish – critical breeding ground exists in the downriver area.
86.	Air Quality. Noise. Disturbing the migration paths. Adding more pollution to the river. Prove that there is a need for another crossing.
87.	Why are areas beyond Belle Isle (going upriver) not being considered, i.e., Grosse Pte.?
88.	We have heard studies and consideration for cemeteries, schools and businesses. Never once was the study aimed at determining the impact on housing and the way of life on Grosse Ile. It was never considered that lives and economic health would be destroyed. This is wrong!! “Not under, over or on Grosse Ile.”
98.	Use the tunnel per the Ficano plan.
99.	I think most of us here tonight felt that Bob Ficano spoke for most of us. We are small cities or townships and a bridge would destroy most of us.
100.	Not needed. Not wanted. Will ruin our standard of living. Environment not friendly. No positive effect from the bridge can be seen. Community is building network between the communities will destroy that.
101.	To consider this bridge in the Downriver area would adversely impact our quality of life and decimate the value of homes that we all work hard to maintain. The negative impact on the environment, health-related issues, noise and pollution can't be stressed enough. But, most of all, Downriver would become a depressed, commercial, trucking center that, by 2015, may not be needed in the first place.
102.	It will destroy our quality of life in all forms.
103.	We do not want the bridge in our downriver area. You will destroy our homes, health and our life! We will not allow you to put up a bridge!!!!
104.	I want my home just the way it is. “NO BRIDGE.” We want to be able to breathe.
105.	No bridge Downriver.
106.	Downriver project, King Road proposal goes directly over my house. Concerned with property values. DO NOT want our rural area disturbed. Take it somewhere else. NOT DOWNRIVER!
107.	Increased traffic, especially truck traffic, lower real estate values. Displace many

	homeowners/businesses etc. Buildings (homes/businesses) located under or near the bridge approaches will be turned into ghetto areas. Quality of life for Downriver residents.
108.	I do not want a bridge to Canada over Grosse Ile. It will affect our quality of life and natural environment. NO to a bridge over Grosse Ile.
109.	We don't want this!
110.	Not Downriver. Not in my lifetime!!
111.	I want to attend meetings that include Canadians. They have as much to consider as us. Where do they want it? Obviously some of the proposed sites will not be approved by Canada. In other words, some of your sites are just proposed to make us think they might be approved, etc. Delay is right across Windsor residential area. We would be dumb to think that would be approved.
112.	The proposals for the bridges downriver are totally ridiculous, comical at best. There are much better sites upriver, including the JOBS tunnel. Curious to know why not add to the existing bridge.
113.	We moved to Grosse Ile for its quiet, safe and peaceful place to raise a family. We do not want our home destroyed by this bridge. It needs to go somewhere other than Downriver.
114.	I, of course, am totally and absolutely opposed to an international crossing that so negatively impacts our area. Our property values will tumble and our peaceful, tranquil island will no longer exist. For the sake of an improved economy for the state you will totally destroy an entire downriver area. We've worked in this area very hard to improve and clean up the riverfront. Our quality of life is improving and we do not want any part of something so destructive to the community.
115.	Downriver needs to continue with the plans to beautify and utilize our shoreline for the enhancement of our way of life. No more dirty industry or air pollution. We want less of them all. Shore enhancement with recreation and suitable business will bring in a good tax base with good neighborhoods.
116.	We have a beautiful house and we do not want to lose it over a <u>stupid</u> bridge. I did not work all my life to have a project that will only hurt the environment, destroy my house. I will not stand for this dumb bridge destroying my house. <u>Go Home!!</u> Don't come back!!
117.	Eliminate Downriver from the list "NOW!" We are feeling money issues already.
118.	You will never be allowed to destroy our community and our environment. We people work hard to keep our community. You terrorists must not be allowed.
119.	Put it in Detroit right next to the other one. Yes, we do have a problem with it downriver. Property values decrease. All our lives working for nothing if it comes in. Yes, there is a need for a new bridge or tunnel anywhere but HERE!
120.	You are proposing to destroy our quality of life and our environment. You can forget it!
121.	A bridge in the downriver area would be devastating to our area. Why not pick an area less densely populated? Figure 6 shows piers in river and on Fighting Island. River width only 1.8 miles.
122.	(Trucks only). No garbage!!
123.	One of the most appealing facts Grosse Ile and surrounding areas have to offer is the peaceful, tranquility that comes from not overcrowding an area with roads, highways, or interstate bridges and other heavy traffic. I grew up in this area and would do anything in my power to oppose the southern corridor options.
124.	I attended the meeting at Crystal Gardens. I am assuming the need for an additional crossing is being supported by the inordinate delays at the existing two bridges. For my observation, the delays are the result of the truck inspections necessitated by the increased security considerations, not a substantial increase in the volume of traffic itself. So it would seem a solution to the "traffic" problem would devote considerable resources to remedy the security problems as well as any projected increase in vehicular traffic. Although I am opposed to any of the proposed crossings at Ecorse or south primarily because it will destroy the residential property values (and tax basis) of the surrounding communities, it occurred to me that a second crossing parallel to the existing Ambassador Bridge might solve both the traffic and security issues. Parallel bridges

	<p>would allow for adjustments to reflect traffic flow. The two Chesapeake Bay Bridges, for example, at peak traffic times, have six lanes going east and two lanes going west (and vice versa) to accommodate the traffic heading to and away from the resort beaches. A similar arrangement here, for example, might designate one bridge for commercial vehicles only, or close all but two lanes to cars from midnight to 5 a.m., etc. I think a crossing dedicated to commercial traffic would make the most sense from a security perspective, too. Not only would it confine the risk to a single location, but the security could be enforced with less manpower than it would take to service a new crossing anywhere else. From an expense point of view, it would seem more economical (assuming construction cost for the bridge is the same at any crossing). The current network of established routes could be reconfigured for less than it would take to create all new access plazas (I would think), and it wouldn't have the devastating effect on the residential areas currently under consideration. Finally, I am somewhat amused at the fact that you subordinate people's homes, lifestyle and economic wellbeing (not to mention the community as a whole) to such things as cemeteries, park areas and wildlife when it comes to establishing a preferred route for a massive commercial venture such as the proposed bridge. First, think about the effect on people, then worry about the other stuff.</p>
125.	<p>A bridge across Grosse Ile or anywhere downriver will destroy the area and have an adverse effect on all downriver communities. Bridge should be at Delray and Zug Island. The area is already depressed and this development has little effect on individuals.</p>