

## Public Comments From the Flat Rock Dam Feasibility Study

The following public comments were submitted during the public open house on March 6, 2025, at the Flat Rock Community Center, and through our webpage, which was open until March 17, 2025. Comments are stated here exactly as submitted.

1. I support changes that will improve navigation by canoe or kayak by removing barriers
2. Please do not remove the dam in Flat Rock. It is an important historic landmark in ur community. The metro park bought the dam. But why? I know it is expensive to maintain but you purchased it intentionally. You should maintain it. Do whatever you have to do to find the money you to pay for the repairs.
3. The Huronriver will be environmentally impacted flatrock area surrounding Huroc Park and current river running down all the way to south rockwood,will be deplete. The Huron river in proposed metro parks plans. Are kids future,river adventures of kayaking on our huronriver, fishing at our city parks and family's living down the huronriver will be impacted. The huronriver river if pass will deplete, cause significant tax loss to our schools, city storm water concerners, businesses,residential property with river front will risk loss of 30% or more equity. Residents and community's businesses have paid in taxes to metro Park, increased housing prices,water front taxes to citys, flood insurance, for all what huronriver brings to our lifes. Neighborhoods and the whole downriver will be affected, as this river is loved by so many community, miles from miles away. The huronriver is full daily to huroc park boaters, fisherman kayakers, rafts the roar of laughter and adventure is endless down the huronriver. local kayaking company's from flat rock to rockwood driving bus loads of people daily spring to fall to navigate and enjoy the huronriver scenic views. Metro parks proposed dam removal would be detrimental to all community and people around. The proposed plan does not effectively represent the number of community, people family and businesses that would be effected by the removal of the dams that would deplete huronriver the devastation this would have on all community's parks and animals is everlasting. Metro parks Failling dams in Ann arbor where repaired and the same repairs needs to be done to flat rock. Removing not a option
4. Fix the dam wild life and fish need. this river and would turn to swamp is not acceptable effecting every thing that metro parks stand for. Also effecting the lifes that look forward to this amazing river. So many community children and animals. We pay high taxes to live and move here and pay for the metro parks this should not need to be decided this need to be done and repaired to the stranded it stands in today.
5. This river is so important for the community and surrounding businesses. Please do not get rid of the river. It brings friends and families together to have fun in the sun.
6. Don't close the dam.
7. Hi this would be a huge injustice for us in the downriver communities. I personally use the Huron River every other weekend for summers to go kayaking. It is a beautiful place to go to enjoy nature
8. Repair the dams if needed. It's been this way for many years and it's part of the history of the area. We need our local businesses along the river and don't need to destroy home values along the river. The money that we are charged by the metro parks is more than enough to pay for dam repairs if needed.
9. Advised by attorney General office to contract attention operation division, Attoruney General, State Operation Division, To whom this may concern. Flat Rock Michigan needs assistants to look into metro parks, Huron Clinton parks and partners proposed plans/feasible study grant of the Huron river / Flat rock historical dam, removing dams, altering Huron river size lowering depth to swamp land or no water, affecting multiple city from Huron twp, flatrock, berlin twp, Rockwood, South Rockwood. lat rock citizens and business along Huron river water front from Huron typ, to south rockwood would have significan oss in House property business value to 30% or more due to this proposed loss residents and businesses have paid large taxes and insurances on housing business taxes contributed towards metro parks and above city's for this rirver value Metro parks in the heart of Flat rock offer trails, Huroc Park fishing, playgrounds, and kayaking rental opportunities with companies in Flat rock and Rockwood providing transportation for community residents and visitors from all over, daily tom early spring to fall, kayaking boating and tubing for 3-5 hours

from Flat rock city to Rockwood city, which would be a loss for our community and the citizens it attracts, with the DNR present as this is a popular site City residents and businesses ask for you to look into as money and grants for repairs and maintenance, studies and fish passages in place, studies and partners show support for dam to stay and preventive maintenance to continue for all the value it shares to the community's Metro Parks have a responsibility to the dam and have received taxes grants above the dam is a railroad bridge that needs the proper enforcement on its owners possibly may help cost. Metro parks will be making a decision on the feasible study. I believe it lacks the true number value. Our future children and animals it will truly affect. Maintenance can't be what stands in the way. Attached contract and study.  
Concerned Resident

10. Comment --> SED 24-10 should be SED 23-10 on sediment board
11. 6 generations of family on this river should be thought about.
12. Original RR agreement mentioned maintaining dam in such a manner to not affect property value.
13. We own a property on the back channel, please consider economics lost in this area also. This will make it no longer river front property.
14. I feel as tho I am living in Nazi, Germany w/o a voice or power. Lake Erie Metropark no pool. Willow Metropark empty pond, Impoundment gone
15. Value loss 30% or more due to maintain the metroparks want to give up on
16. Transparency meaning Flat rock Dam effecting Huron river city effecting Huron twp Berlin twp Flat rock twp Rockwood south Rockwood
17. Residents w/ property touching water likely have the right of easement to the water. Some own bottomlands.
18. The stated economic benefit is based purely on theoretical benefit without consideration that this unique area of "lake river" will disappear - resulting in a river that lacks any unique draw vs the neighboring stretches of river.
19. If the dam is removed it would effect the turtles and the blue herons that use the west side of the park wetlands where the bike bridge is. Don't remove the dam!
20. You claim ownership so why don't you clean the river or clear out log jams instead the locals due your job! Train bridge is way worse!
21. I am strongly opposed to alternatives #3 and #4. I purchased my house several years ago. I was immediately attracted to the location of the property adjacent to the river. In fact, this was my sole purpose for purchasing the property and it continues to be source of great enjoyment to me. When I initially saw your expected change in course of the river following alternatives #3 and #4 I was literally shocked. The river is currently several hundred yards wide directly adjacent to my property. If the expected new course of the river is correct, the new location of the river would begin several hundred yards from my property and is only a few yards wide. The negative impact on the value of my property would obviously be huge. But possibly of more importance to me would be the complete loss of attractiveness associated with my property and my direct access to the river. There is no way I could be compensated for this loss. I can only hope that you will strongly reconsider implementing these alternatives.
22. If HCMA's plan is to remove the Flat Rock Dam, they should pay the residents on the impoundment for the loss of property value and allow them to access the river.
23. I am NOT in favor of my property values going down, and my property boundaries changing, and the pristine view of the river and connecting marshlands changing by taking the dam down. I do support routine maintenance and repair to keep it structurally sound. I believe that dismantling the dam would have BOTH economic and ecological side effects that I don't think would benefit man or nature since so much is built around the river and is not worth the effort to take the dam down.
24. It seems option 2, partial removal of the dam, would make the most sense IF something needs to be done due to the concerns of the safety of the current dam. Option 2 would be less costly and allow the impoundment, with its wetlands, abundant waterfowl and other natural beauty, to remain as a very unique scenic and recreational area.
25. I am adamantly opposed to partial or full removal of the Flat Rock and Huron dams. They should be maintained by the owners so as not to remove, destroy, cause damage or otherwise impact the river and impoundment as they exist today. If either or both are removed and the river disappears in places, who

financially compensates the property owners (whose taxes help fund 61% of the HCMA in addition to state and federal grants derived from taxes) for their immediate 30% drop in property value)? Additionally, who compensates the property owners for ongoing loss of quality of life and environment? I don't believe property owners care about increasing the fish population. There are plenty of places to fish in Michigan. I believe that this entire study is being done in an effort to escape the liability and maintenance costs of a dam the HCMA purchased and is now responsible for maintaining. I don't believe other considerations are meaningful including increasing fish population. It's all about money. What about the residents' money and investments in their property?

26. I am not in favor of my property values going down, and my property boundaries changing and my view of the river connecting Marlin's changing by taking the dam down. I do support routine maintenance and repair to keep it structurally sound. I believe that dismantling the dam would have both academic and ecological side effects that I don't think would benefit man or nature so much is built around the river and it's not worth the effort to take the dam down.
27. Instead of removing the dam, take that money and improve the area for recreation. In my opinion the removal of the dam will disrupt the wildlife up stream since the dam has been in place for 100 years. Since non removal was not an option, I would have to say the least offensive option would be the partial removal for the improved fish ladder
28. After attending the feasibility study meeting of March 6th I would like to submit my recommendation of alternative #1 - replacement of fish ladder with no dam removal. After visiting each presentation that focused on what you propose, there wasn't enough information (facts) of how the consequences would affect the whole proposed area after these changes are implemented. The economic proposal was really hard to accept as an actual proposition, especially as in terms of improved recreation and green spaces regarding value. This whole project has not been publicized or made extensively known in our city or neighboring communities. This park and dam are an important part of life for thousands, for fishing, playground, safe walking, biking, picnics or just being able to enjoy nature, the water in a special setting. More public knowledge and opinion is needed as it affects so many, not just those who will suffer huge losses that live on the current waterfront above the dam. Homes bought in good faith, more cost for the privilege, and especially retirees who counted on the value of their properties and that will be all lost. It is my sincere hope that our whole community will become more involved before your decisions are made as well as state representatives, and citizens who stand for what's best and good, not just \$\$\$\$\$. Our nation is currently recognizing what's best for all of us and that also applies to our cities and states.
29. Again I am adamantly opposed to full or partial removal. Dam should be maintained to protect ecology and quality of life plus investments in personal property. Doubt this would be up for discussion for Ann Arbor riverfront property owners.
30. Taking water away will also take away the animals that live in that water. I see the fish, beavers, muskrat, and waterfowl from my window. Very easy for the waterfowl to relocate but what about the others? PETA should be contacted about how you plan to treat those animals. Why isn't there any consideration for residents who bought waterfront property who will no longer have waterfront property after you decide to take the water away? You have a choice not to do it. No one in their wildest dreams would've thought that someone would come and take the water. Given the choice of knowing that someone would take the water one day, we would not have bought waterfront properties that would soon become marshland/mosquito haven. Please don't do this.
31. My feedback is that the removal of the water in front of the homes in Flat Rock would result in a significant loss. The water is highly valued by myself and many others in the community. I grew up in a house situated on the water, and it holds many cherished memories for me. The water is an integral part of Flat Rock's history and sense of community. It is essential that we preserve the dam or implement a solution that reduces its impact, such as a compromise that satisfies both property owners and opposing parties.
32. My concern is the swampland that could be behind my house and we will be inundated by mosquitos and unknown people who could walk up on to my property and help themselves to private property.
33. The amount of information is overwhelming.
34. It doesn't appear that anyone has come to any clear conclusion about what the future holds.

35. There didn't seem to be any clear comparison to this situation. From the economic benefit to the community to the adjacent property values, there is no clear answers. It's all best guess scenarios.
36. Information, specifically in the historical timeline information (only information through 2007), indicates that HCMA has not demonstrated integrity with regard to lease payment, maintenance, or the intended concern for the neighbors in the community.
37. I am concerned about the removal of the dams if we are relying on any level of integrity from the HCMA. The spirit of these comments are not meant to be antagonistic or provocative. I'm just trying to communicate honestly. Thank you for the opportunity.
38. I would add that Option 2 Partial Dam removal does seem quite acceptable, as presented with no reduction in water level. As presented, it seems like it would satisfy maintenance concerns and allow migrating fish to travel upstream, while not affecting the impoundment, quality of life and property values for residents. The shallow dam also seems like a recreation opportunity for kayakers such as myself.
39. In 1951 and again in 1986 the legal firm of Miller Canfield stated the Authorities obligation to "maintain the dam so as not to adversely affect the rights of nearby owners of river-front property".
40. Please do NOT remove the dam in Flat Rock. This decision will significantly impact residents, businesses, and anyone who utilizes the river - affecting property values, recreation, and commerce.



29TH DISTRICT  
STATE CAPITOL  
P.O. BOX 30014  
LANSING, MI 48909-7514

MICHIGAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

**JAMES DESANA**  
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

PHONE: (517) 373-0475  
FAX: (517) 373-5061  
JamesDeSana@house.mi.gov

Wednesday, October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Ms. Amy McMillan, Director  
Huron-Clinton Metroparks  
13000 High Ridge Dr.  
Brighton, MI 48114

SUBJECT: Flat Rock Dam Feasibility Study

Dear Ms. McMillan:

I am writing to you to express my strong sentiment that the Flat Rock dam still serves a vital purpose in my community. In addition, I believe the impoundment that the dam has created is a critical wetland that should remain for years to come.

The Flat Rock Dam has served as a vital infrastructure component within Huron Township for many years, providing various benefits including recreational opportunities and environmental conservation. I believe that the removal of the Flat Rock Dam could have significant negative impacts on the quality of life in our community, including loss of recreational amenities, a decrease in property values, and disruption of local ecosystems.

As this dam is located within my district, I oppose any measures to decommission or remove the dam, including even a partial removal. I believe that alternative solutions, such as dam maintenance, upgrades, fish ladder improvements, or other appropriate modifications can and should be explored to address any safety or environmental concerns associated with the Flat Rock Dam.

Please keep me posted on your process and any developments regarding these decisions. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James DeSana".

James DeSana  
Michigan House of Representatives