Inconsistent statements from 9.21.2010 and 2.03.2015:

"...the system linkage need and need for a limited access facility should be considered a longterm need...and the system linkage need remains a valid need for this study." 9.21.10

"...Corps would consider a permit approval for option 2B-2 alone..."

MaineDOT Nina Fisher 2.03.2015

The inconsistency between these two statements cannot be reconciled. While MaineDOT asserts: the system linkage and need for a limited-access facility should be considered a long-term need...system linkage need remains a valid need for this study, the ACOE states: they would consider a permit approval for option 2B-2 alone. These two statements directly conflict with each other.

What will need to happen in 2040 to satisfy 2B-2's long-term-valid needs? Will 2B-2's long-term system linkage needs and the need for a limited-access facility simply be ignored—once again—as was the case in September 2010?

It is remarkably unsound to build a \$61 million deficient alternative—one that meets purpose and needs by parsing of words instead of applying engineering best practices. What makes one believe that our transportation budget in 2040 will even support 2B-2's long-term-valid needs—needs that should have never been deferred—unfunded—for your grandchildren to pay?

Today's 2B-2 is based solely on the near-term; will the Corp permit 2B-2's future (2040) long-term-valid needs when they stated in 2015 that they would consider a permit approval for 2B-2 alone?

If September 2010's long-term needs are nothing more than dissimulation to enable the selection of an alternative that does not meet purpose and needs—this study has been nothing short of dishonest and a squander of \$2.8 million. I have contended since 2012 that this study has danced around NEPA compliance. If long-term needs don't exist—I rest my case. Prove me wrong...

When will our civil servants be held accountable to answer these questions? Impacted communities deserve the truth—not just continued silence.