

2B-2: Not the best alternative—it is just the cheapest while failing to meet original study criteria:

YES

To Next Page

Does the alternative satisfy Study Purpose and Needs to include the original and decade-long System Linkage Need stipulating “a limited-access connection between I-395 and Route 9 east of Route 46” as per MaineDOT/FHWA/ACOE documentation?

I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study PAC Meeting April 15, 2009					
Alternatives	Meets Purpose		Meets Needs		
	Study Purpose	USACE Purpose	System Linkage	Safety Concerns	Traffic Congestion
	2B-2	No	No	No	Yes

NO

2B-2 does not satisfy the original System Linkage Need.

“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.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> page5

- Alternative 2B-2 did not meet the System Linkage Need in April 2009 as can be easily seen above in an excerpted official MaineDOT document.
- System Linkage Need criteria was changed in Sept2010: “...the system linkage need and need for a limited access facility should be considered a long-term need.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/FCA%2009-10a.pdf> Note: long-term duration is not defined in MaineDOT/FHWA documentation.

Does the 2B-2 alternative “negatively affect people living along Route 9”?

“Alternatives that do not provide a limited access connection to Route 9 east of Route 46 would not be practicable because that would not provide a substantial improvement in regional mobility and connectivity and would negatively affect people living along Route 9 in the study area.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> page5

YES

Does the 2B-2 alternative “severely impact local communities along Route 9”?

“Alternatives that would connect to Route 9 west of Route 46 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> page5

YES

Does the 2B-2 alternative “provide a substantial improvement in regional mobility and connectivity”?

“Alternatives that do not provide a limited access connection to Route 9 east of Route 46 would not be practicable because that would not provide a substantial improvement in regional mobility and connectivity and would negatively affect people living along Route 9 in the study area.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> page5

NO

Is “the system linkage need” still “a valid need for this study”?

“The DOT is committed to the East-West highway vision, and the system linkage need remains a valid need for this study.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/FCA%2009-10a.pdf>

YES

To Next Page



Will the connector be built to “MaineDOT design criteria for freeways” as per the DEIS?

As stated in the DEIS: “...designed using the MaineDOT design criteria for freeways.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/DEIS/00Sum.pdf> page s12/s13
FOAA documents indicate: a downgrade in end-state design “using rolling criteria”.

NO ↓

Will the travel lanes be “within an approximate 200-foot-wide right-of-way”?

As stated in the DEIS: “...within an approximate 200-foot-wide right-of-way.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/DEIS/00Sum.pdf> page s13
FOAA documents indicate: a “100’ to 125’ ROW width”.

NO ↓

Does the 2B-2 alternative meet the original criteria of “a limited-access connection”?

Original study criteria: “...it was determined that an alternative **must** provide a limited-access connection between I-395 and Route 9 east of Route 46.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> page5
As stated in the DEIS: “...2B-2 would be a controlled-access highway...” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/DEIS/00Sum.pdf> pg. s12

NO ↓

Will the 2B-2 alternative be upgradable to provide a future 4-lane divided highway as original criteria quantified?

“Change made to typical section since our last meeting, the project considered having two lanes of highway constructed within right-of-way sufficient to accommodate four lanes in the future. That has now changed to two lanes of highway within right-of-way that accommodates two lanes but does not accommodate four lane construction in the future.” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/EIS%2010-11-11c.pdf>

NO ↓

Does alternative 2B-2 “meet the intent of the East-West Highway Initiative”?
“...Route 9 east of Route 46...”

“Alternatives providing a direct connection between I-395 and Route 9 east of Route 46 will provide improved regional connections between the Canadian Maritime Provinces and the Bangor region and reduce traffic on other roadways. Such alternatives **meet the intent of the East-West Highway Initiative.**” <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> page5

NO

To Next Page →

After expending \$2.5+ million on this Study, MaineDOT/FHWA decided an alternative removed from further consideration at the start of 2003 is now the best choice for this project. Alternative 2B-2 has been downgraded in design criteria multiple times since Sept 2010. 2B-2 does not meet the most important Study Need – the System Linkage criteria requirement of a limited-access facility from I-395 in Brewer to Route 9 in Clifton to the east of Route 46 as per the original intent of the NOI. The System Linkage Need was changed to a long-term need and punted 20+ years to an unknown future. The MaineDOT/FHWA faces a conundrum: explaining not only their “hard look”, the cornerstone of their 2B-2 selection, but how they plan to engineer and set aside the necessary funding to satisfy 2B-2’s long-term System Linkage Need. Some say that with all the changes made at the end of the Study, even the project outcome has changed - no longer a connector from Brewer to Clifton - it is the North Brewer Bypass. 2B-2 will cost \$61 million to construct not including future construction costs to satisfy long-term Purpose and Needs that should have been met at the onset.

Does alternative 2B-2 meet the original intent of the NOI?

"The EIS will examine alternatives to improve transportation system linkage, safety, and mobility between Interstate 395 (I-395), Brewer and State Route 9 (Route 9), Clifton in southern Penobscot County, Maine."
<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2005-12-01/html/05-23529.htm>

NO ↓

Does 2B-2 meet the established (original) study "logical termini" criteria?

Original Criteria: *"Specifically, the eastern logical termini was refined. Alternatives that did not connect to Route 9 east of Route 46 were dismissed from further consideration."* <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf>
 As stated in the DEIS and after changing the definition of the original criteria: *"The logical termini of the project was identified and defined as (1) I-395 near Route 1A and (2) the portion of Route 9 in the study area."*

NO ↓

Does MH/FHWA think 2B-2 meets Purpose and Needs?

"Mark's comment the 2-lane/2-lane ROW Preferred Alternative does not satisfy the Purpose and Need...Mark is concerned the criteria change to a 2-lane/2-lane ROW of the Preferred Alternative will alter the impacts and prior alternatives analyses is not comparable (apples to apples) as those done with 4-lanes/4-lane ROW." FOAA

NO ↓

Does alternative 2B-2 satisfy Safety Concerns Need and Traffic Congestion Need?

"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."
"...Alternative 2B's ability to satisfy the system linkage and traffic congestions needs is questionable."
<http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf> page ii/20/21

NO ↓

Does 2B-2 provide "high speed, limited access connection to the east of East Eddington Village"?

As stated in the DEIS: *"Route 9 would not be improved, and it would not provide high-speed, limited access connection to the east of East Eddington Village."* <http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/DEIS/00Sum.pdf> page s13

The NO/RED/STOP and YES/GREEN/GO colors were intentionally reversed from the Apr2009 Purpose and Needs Matrix. IMHO, MaineDOT/FHWA/ACOE's Sept2010 "hard look" was merely a cover-up for the fact that management, for reasons still unknown, preselected 2B-2. 2B-2 is a GO, no matter how deficient it may be or how many \$millions the long-term System Linkage need will cost your children and grandchildren after 2035...

NO ↓

Can "future development along Route 9...impact future traffic flow and the overall benefits of the project"?

As stated in the DEIS: *"However, future development along Route 9 in the study area can impact future traffic flow and the overall benefits of the project."*
<http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/DEIS/00Sum.pdf> page s19

YES

To Next Page 



Does 2B-2 generate a significant impact to residents within 500' of the roadway?

Alternative 2B-2's proximity displacement, buildings within 500' of the edge of roadway, is 7.9 times that of the previous 3EIK-2/preferred alternative and the most by far of all the 79+ studied alternatives @190 proximity displacements. After studying 79+ alternatives, the MaineDOT/FHWA decided to site this connector within the most populous segment of the Study area. Alternative 2B-2 will have a significant negative impact on many residential properties. Alternative 2B-2's residential displacement is 4 times that of the previous 3EIK-2/preferred alternative @8 residential displacements.

YES ↓

Does "the speed of traffic through the East Eddington Village" present "a concern"?

"The speed of traffic through the East Eddington village has always been a concern. As a built up area, it poses a challenge to making connections to Route 9 west of the East Eddington Village."
http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/PAC041509_summary.pdf

YES ↓

"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." Does this statement ring as true today when discussing 2B-2 as in Oct 2003 when MaineDOT discussed 2B?

"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." page 20 "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." page 21
<http://www.i395-rt9-study.com/Pubs/Alts%20Tech%20Memo.pdf>
158 distinct access points exist on that section of Route 9 making up 40.8% of the overall length of 2B-2. Any of the 79+ studied alternatives that met System Linkage Need had zero access points while bypassing that same section of Route 9. FHWA documentation stating: "In rural areas, each access point added increases the annual accident rate by seven percent." suggests you are 1,106% more likely to have an accident on 2B-2 than any of the 79+ studied alternatives that satisfied the original System Linkage Need. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/publications/rural_areas_planning/page07.cfm

YES ↓

MaineDOT/FHWA selects a preferred alternative (2B-2) that met only 20% (1 in 5) of the Study Purpose and Needs in April/May 2009.

- 2B-2 did not meet Study Purpose and Needs until the original decade-long study criteria and needs were changed starting in September 2010 and the changes - to only 2B-2 - continue today.

MaineDOT/FHWA selects a preferred alternative that meets 100% of the original Study Purpose and Needs from the onset of the project without further dissimulation and changes in design criteria. The five alternatives removed from consideration in Sept 2010, including the 3EIK-2/preferred alternative, were the only alternatives to meet 100% of Purpose and Needs at the same time in April/May 2009 when 2B-2 only met 20% of the Purpose and Needs.

Alternative 2B-2 is not the best alternative for this study—it is simply the cheapest—alternative 2B-2 fails to meet much of the original study criteria. The still-valid System Linkage Need has been changed to an unidentified long-term need that will have to be addressed 20+ years from now with another project to repair alternative 2B-2's existing deficiencies. Wouldn't it make more sense to build a connector that meets Purpose and Needs from the onset instead of punting known issues to the future? Our roads and bridges are crumbling—the State of Maine has many unmet transportation needs and record shortfalls in transportation funding—spending \$61 million on a project that does not meet Purpose and Needs at the onset is fiscally irresponsible and not within engineering and finance best practice standards...