

Comments to [BDN article](#):

\$2.8+ million dollars has already been squandered over the past 16 years to select an alternative (2B-2) that satisfied only 20% of the study's purpose and needs at the final Public Advisory Committee meeting held on April 15, 2009.

http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/PAC041509_handouts.pdf

In January 2003—when 2B-2 was known simply as 2B—state and federal government transportation professionals removed this alternative from further consideration: “This alternative would not be practicable because it would fail to meet the system linkage need, and would fail to adequately address the traffic congestion needs in the study area. Alternative 2B would use approximately 5 miles of Route 9. Traffic congestion and conflicting vehicle movements on this section of Route 9 would substantially increase the potential for new safety concerns and hazards. Additionally, this alternative would result in substantially greater proximity impacts (residences within 500 feet of the proposed roadway) in comparison to Alternative 3EIK-2 (200 residences v. 12 residences).”

<http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> (pages ii and iii)

This connector was to provide a high-speed, limited-access connection from I-395 in Brewer to Route 9 at or near the Eddington/Clifton corporate border—bypassing the Village of East Eddington and the Route 9/46 intersection—not a connection 4.2 miles to the west of the original study system linkage need logical termini and not incorporating 4.2 miles of Route 9 that includes 148 separate/distinct access points, 10 local roads and 5 changes in posted speed limits—and—once again in the words of these same transportation professionals: “Limited opportunities exist to control access management on this section of Route 9 from local roads and driveways. There are ten local roads and 148 existing drives or access points to undeveloped lots. Assuming 10 trip ends per drive and an equal number of left and right turns, Alternative 2B’s ability to satisfy the system linkage and traffic congestions needs is questionable. There are several hundred acres that can be developed along this section of Route 9. Additionally, 200 buildings (residential and commercial) would be located in proximity (within 500 feet) of the proposed roadway. The lack of existing access controls and the inability to effectively manage access along this section of Route 9, and the number of left turns, contribute to the poor LOS and safety concerns, and the inability of Alternative 2B to satisfy the system linkage purpose and need effectively.”

<http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> (pages 20/21)

These same transportation professionals also clearly stated in their own October 2003 MaineDOT/FHWA Technical Memorandum: “To meet the need of improved regional system linkage while minimizing impacts to people, it was determined that an alternative must provide a limited-access connection between I-395 and Route 9 east of Route 46. Alternatives that do not provide a limited access connection to Route 9 east of Route 46...would negatively affect people living along Route 9 in the study area...would severely impact local communities along Route 9 between proposed alternative connection points and Route 46.”

<http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> (page 5)

These are the words of MDOT/FHWA transportation professionals—check the hyperlinked references—these statements have never been explained—just hidden away, unanswered in the back of a book that no one will read...

http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Draft_Comments.pdf