It would be nice to have a bypass around the city for trucks. That being said, I'd like to express why any of the proposed overpass plans are lousy ideas.

First and foremost, the necessity of closing our two in-town crossings. The negative ramifications of that are so stupendous I question whether the steering committee was not remiss in allowing the study to continue once that fact was known. Whatever interests might be served are far outweighed by the negative impact on the community as a whole.

Neither east proposals can by virtue of proximity to the airport be accepted. And except to account for funds used, I question why they were even presented.

The current crossings alleviate some of the traffic on the existent overpass, which brings us to the west proposals. Fourth Street—that intersection is messy enough as is with Fourth Street, Lake Avenue and Highway 47 all converging, plus whatever traffic would be added by the closings.

So, we're left with First Street—a fine way for anyone who wants to bypass the city entirely.

In the meantime, whoever is on one side of the tracks and wants/needs to get to the other side has two choices. To take the scenic route on West 30—how many miles? Or use the existent overpass with its increased traffic. Want to walk or ride a bicycle, or push a pram or use a motorized chair? Get in line to use the one pedestrian walkway on the current overpass, unless a skywalk like in Brady is erected—useful perhaps a few months of the year, because the current crossings will be barricaded and unusable.

I've heard people speak as if it's a "done deal." Others say it won't go through because of the money involved—that hasn't stemmed the expenditure of an already tidy sum. "It'll go because they want it," say some. I'm not sure who the "they" are, but can't feel that "they" are concerned with what's good for the town as a whole. The railroad would like to not maintain the crossings, and as a carrot say that then they wouldn't have to blow their horns. The sound of the trains, even their horns, is a sometimes welcome relief from the incessant roar from the grain dryers.

Just because some funds are available toward this project does not make it desirable, and those funds aren't manna—we've already contributed to them. Why should we assume an additional fiscal burden just to "get our share," when to do so is detrimental to the community as an entity?

I suggest we staunch this flow of city treasure, cut our losses and put our capital to use in maintenance and repair of what we've already got. For instance, why couldn't Lake Avenue south of the tracks have been repaired and resurfaced this year? We found the money for a concrete monolith and landscaping but no place to park or sit near it.

With the opening of Avenue G overpass, the Gothenburg Times ran the headline, "City skyline changed forever." It is my fervent hope that they will not have to note, "City effectively and forever cut in half."

Perhaps I'm beating a dead horse and this truly rotten idea has been laid to rest. As long as sacrificing our ground crossings is a condition, it certainly should be.