

**From:** [Joe Rashid](#)  
**To:** [Garneau, Allen M CIV](#)  
**Cc:** [toocool999@live.com](mailto:toocool999@live.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Raymond Stanley's Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 24, 2016 1:48:57 PM

---

Mr. Garneau,

I am submitting this on behalf of Mr. Raymond Stanley

Thanks,  
Joe Rashid

Dear Mr. Garneau,

I am urging that the USCG to please deny the Ambassador Bridge Enhancement Project (Public Notice 09-01-16) application for second span. First, the Bridge Co has no plans to closing their current bridge. I have heard the Bridge Company state that they would use it for "overflow." What does that mean? The USCG has a duty to ensure that the application is honest and complete. An international crossing in a neighborhood with already high rates of asthma should motivate the USCG to do its due diligence with this application. Remember that this is the same company that claimed they owned all the property for a new bridge the last time they applied, they started building their new bridge without proper approval, they gutted a state interchange project and their owner had to go to jail before Gateway had to be completed by the State of Michigan. You are not dealing with a typical company. They have proven over and over again that they like to take short cuts to prevent spending money or some other immoral reason.

As a lifelong resident, war veteran and tax payer, I have every right to be protected by the law. This project deserves an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Ambassador Bridge Company has not been honest about their full plans for that site. They are segmented the project to prevent having to address the requirements in NEPA. USCG needs to investigate the fact that they have stated a much larger plan for the area that they intentionally keep out of their application to avoid having to conduct an EIS.

I am also dumbfounded that the Bridge Company continues to state they own Riverside Park. They don't. A press conference and an illegal resolution/agreement from Detroit City Council does not give them ownership, just like illegally fencing it off from the public didn't give them appropriate ownership. Please read both letters from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources & U.S. Department of Interior National Park Service. Riverside Park is still a public park. They don't own all the property necessary for their new bridge as required by federal law.

They are also using outdated processes to study the air quality impact. They need to go back and do the right thing. Use the MOVES2010a as required by the EPA!

I urge USCG to do its due diligence and protect the public.

Sincerely,  
Raymond Stanley,  
Detroit resident and

Vietnam Veteran