

Questions Concerning Alternative 2B-2:

1. Was the PAC Meeting of 4/15/2009 the last public meeting where the I395/Route 9 Transportation Study was discussed?
2. Have there been any other meetings held outside of a public forum with any of the impacted communities in this study area between the MDOT, the USACE or any other interagency member of this Study Group? If yes – please expand upon.
3. Refer to the handouts from the 4/15/2009 PAC Meeting for most of the first series of questions. Refer to the map of the Range of Alternatives Currently Being Considered. Explain the difference in the northern connection point to route 9. Why is alternative 2B-2 the only route connected west of route 46?
4. What is the definition of System Linkage Needs to satisfy this study?
5. Looking at the same map - are there any alternative routes, with the exception of the Alternative Route 1 Upgrade, that do not meet the system linkage need of this study?
6. Does a connection point west of route 46 satisfy the System Linkage need of this study?
7. Refer to the Impacts to Land Use (acres) table, the Displacements table and the Impacts to Streams, Wetlands and Floodplains table contained in this same handout. Please read the note at the bottom of each table: *Note: Does not satisfy the long-term system linkage need that is satisfied by other study alternatives. What is long-term system linkage? How does it relate to the current alternative 2B-2? Isn't this statement still accurate today?
8. Refer to the Purpose and Needs Matrix in this same handout. Does 2B-2 satisfy the Study Purpose? NO - Please explain why not.
9. Does 2B-2 satisfy the USACE purpose? NO - Please explain why not.
10. Does 2B-2 satisfy the System Linkage need of this study? NO - Please explain why not.
11. Does 2B-2 satisfy the Traffic Congestion need of this study? NO - Please explain why not.
12. Why was alternative 2B-2 carried further for consideration with these four known deficiencies?
13. Identify all alternative routes that, per this matrix, satisfied the purpose and needs of this study.
14. Which of these alternatives was the RING route?
15. Was the RING route the preferred route at that time in April of 2009?
16. Does the word “preferred” mean that the MDOT, USACE and all Agencies involved in this study had signed off in full acceptance of supporting 3EIK-2?
17. How long was the RING route the preferred route for the MDOT?
18. Did the RING route satisfy the Purpose and Needs of this Study?
19. Did the 2B-2 route satisfy the Purpose and Needs of this Study? Please explain why it does not.
20. Identify the four routes on this matrix that were removed from further consideration in Dec. 2010.
21. What happened to the 3A-3EIK-1 route that met the Purpose and Needs of this Study?

22. Explain the difference between the No-Build alternative and the 2B-2 alternative.
23. If you had to produce a Purpose and Needs Matrix today for 2B-2 - would 2B-2 satisfy the Study Purpose? If yes – explain what has changed since 4/15/2009.
24. If you had to produce a Purpose and Needs Matrix today for 2B-2 - would 2B-2 satisfy the USACE Purpose? If yes – explain what has changed since 4/15/2009.
25. If you had to produce a Purpose and Needs Matrix today for 2B-2 - would 2B-2 satisfy the System Linkage Need? If yes – explain what has changed since 4/15/2009.
26. If you had to produce a Purpose and Needs Matrix today for 2B-2 - would 2B-2 satisfy the Traffic Congestion Need? If yes – explain what has changed since 4/15/2009.
27. If you had to produce an Impacts to Land Use table, a Displacements table or an Impacts to Streams, Wetlands and Floodplains table today would it contain an asterisk with a note saying that 2B-2 does not satisfy the long-term system linkage need of this study? If not – why not?
28. Does 2B-2 answer the traffic concerns of route 46? If the answer is yes – explain how.
29. Does 2B-2 answer the traffic concerns of route 1A? If the answer is yes – explain how.
30. Why is 2B-2 now the preferred alternative when it clearly does not meet the Purpose and Needs of the study?
31. Why are there no routes left going into the draft DEIS that meet the Purpose and Needs of this study?
32. In the minutes of the 4/15/2009 Meeting it was mentioned that the ACOE wanted one alternative carried forward with a west of route 9 connection point. Please explain why.
33. Was the USACE the driving force in removing the preferred alternative 3EIK-2/RING route from consideration? If not who was?
34. The 3EIK-2/RING route was the preferred route for some six years. These routes have been studied to death. What did the USACE suddenly see after all that time to change their minds?
35. Was the USACE the driving force behind selecting 2B-2 as preferred? If not - who was?
36. Did the USACE support the 3EIK-2/RING route for six years as did the MDOT and the FHA?
37. Using that same logic as in question #31 – wouldn't it have been just as important to have at least one route that actually meets the Purpose and Needs going to the draft DEIS?
38. Please refer to the map as presented at the 4/15/2009 PAC meeting and the current map available on the MDOT Study web site. Can you identify any routes that satisfy the system linkage need of this study in the current map?
39. Explain how the route up the utility right-of-way to the right of 2B-2 became alternative 5A2B-2. Why was the System Linkage need for that route to the east of route 46 connection point intentionally abandoned? Why was this route pushed west and sistered to 2B-2?
40. Explain how the route up the utility right-of-way to the left of 2B-2 was modified to produce alternative 5B2B-2. Why was the System Linkage need for that route to the east of route 46 connection point intentionally abandoned?
41. What was the importance in selecting routes utilizing the utility right-of-way to the left and right of 2B-2?
42. Why wasn't 5A2E3K kept in place on the utility right-of-way in Holden and the northern connection point changed to route 9 at Meadow Brook in Eddington like 2B-2 and the two other routes?

43. Why is it appropriate to be at this late stage in this study with NO alternative routes still in consideration meeting the system linkage needs of this study?
44. Was the MDOT, USACE or Interagency members influenced by either public opposition against or influenced in any other way from members of a directly impacted community to remove the RING route, and essentially by modification, also remove the route up the utility right-of-way in Holden east of 2B-2. How many times was the MDOT asked for private meetings and how many times did the MDOT provide private meetings? How many communities have you had private discussions with?
45. Please provide a complete definition of alternative 2B-2. Does alternative 2B-2 require a rebuild of the 4.5 mile section of route 9 from the connection point at Meadow Brook east to route 46?
46. Please provide a complete definition of alternative 2B. Does 2B require a rebuild of route 9 or does it just use the existing route 9?
47. Is it fair to say that 2B and 2B-2 only differ in how they treat route 9 from the connection point at Meadow Brook – in other words 2B-2 requires a rebuild of route 9 and 2B does not?
48. Explain how 2B-2 was developed and who came up with the idea.
49. Did alternative 2B-2 have complete public approval throughout the study area? In fact with the impacts to Brewer and Eddington - is it not fair to say that this alternative was suggested by the Town Council of Holden as their argument against the “preferred” RING route?
50. Redacted question.
51. What is the definition of sniping that is included in you Purpose and Needs document?
52. What is the definition of capricious that is included in you Purpose and Needs document?
53. Is it not fair to say that a PAC member promoting his own cause would be an example of sniping?
54. What were the rules that PAC members were supposed to operate within?
55. Redacted question.
56. Please refer to the Document titled USACE Highway Methodology Phase 1 Submission dated October 2003 page 5 of the summary. “Prior to the eleventh PAC meeting on February 20, 2002, the system linkage need was examined in greater detail to further aid in reducing the number of preliminary alternatives.” Is that a valid statement of the importance to provide a precise need to define system linkage to reduce the number of alternatives? Why wasn’t 2B-2 removed?
57. “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.” Does this statement clearly define the system need linkage of this study?
58. Wouldn’t it be fair to say that the system linkage need was the most important parameter that you were expected to meet? Yes or no. If no – why not? Does 2B-2 meet the System Linkage Need?
59. Doesn’t the above statement clearly define that the whole length of the alternative was expected to be limited-access?
60. Is route 9 going to be limited-access from the connection point at Meadow Brook east to route 46?
61. What is the definition of the word “must” in the system linkage need statement? Isn’t must an absolute or in other words something you are required to do?
62. What is your definition of system linkage?

63. Has the MDOT, the USACE or any other Interagency member intentionally dropped the System Linkage Need requirement? If there are no routes left that meet that need - it seems that the need has been negated. Any comments?
64. Why are we going into a draft DEIS with no alternative that meets the system linkage need?
65. Are there any known negative impacts to a west of route 46 connection point?
66. "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." Alternative 2B-2 would be not practicable by this statement. True or false.
67. Per the statement in question 57 - Alternative 2B-2 would not provide a substantial improvement in region mobility and connectivity by the above statement. True or false.
68. Per the statement in question 57 - Alternative 2B-2 would negatively affect people living along route 9 in the study area by the above statement. True or False.
69. "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." Does that statement not indicate that you can expect severe impact to local communities along the section of route 9 from the connection point of 2B-2 at Meadow Brook all the way 4.5 miles east to route 46? True or false.
70. Is there any difference in impacts between connecting to a rebuilt route 9 or using the existing route 9? Doesn't alternative 2B-2 when used in conjunction with a rebuilt route 9 directly impact some 22 residences along the complete route?
71. If 2B-2 is connected to the existing (not rebuilt) route 9 – haven't you changed 2B-2 into route 2B?
72. How many times has 2B been removed from further consideration?
73. Refer to the Document titled USACE Highway Methodology Phase 1 Submission dated October 2003 page ii for a description of alternative 2B. Was 2B practicable?
74. Would alternative 2B meet the system linkage need?
75. Would alternative 2B address the traffic congestion needs in the study area?
76. Alternative 2B uses approximately 5 miles of route 9. Would you expect a substantially increase in the potential for new safety concerns and hazards?
77. Would alternative 2B 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)?
78. In fact isn't this proximity to 500' of the roadway almost identical to what can be expected with the 2B-2 alternative? (190 residences)
79. "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." Doesn't a connection point west of route 46 negate the improved regional connection need that this study was to provide? True or false
80. "Such alternatives meet the intent of the East-West Highway Initiative." Does the alternative 2B-2 meet the intent of the East-West Highway? Yes or No
81. When was the Study web site updated with the current map and text indicating that the only routes left in consideration were 2B-2 and two other similar routes though Brewer?

82. At any time, since the last PAC meeting of 4/15/2009, would anyone have received a timely update of the Study if requested via email?
83. When was the news of December 2010 available to the public?
84. Was anybody told not to release the information from the December 2010 Interagency Meeting until a later date?
85. Why was a private citizen, who clearly stated that he was impacted by 2B-2, not provided information from the December 2010 meeting when the private citizen specifically asked for it in an email to the project manager on March, 02, 2011?
86. Please refer to the following article in the July 29, 2004 Bangor Daily News for the following questions: "The other alternative under consideration is 2B-2, a 10.7-mile connector which skirts the edge of Holden and calls for improvements to 4.5 miles of Route 9 in Eddington to handle the increased traffic." Is that a fair representation of alternative 2B-2?
87. "2B-2 would extend I-395 at its current Wilson Street junction and would roughly follow the Holden-Brewer lines until entering Eddington and connect with a rebuilt Route 9". Is that also a fair representation of alternative 2B-2?
88. What is the difference between improvements to route 9 or a rebuilt route 9? Isn't it the same?
89. What are the current plans to rebuild route 9 to connect to alternative 2B-2?
90. Which comes first the alternative construction or the rebuilding of route 9?
91. How much of that 4.5 miles east of route 9 from the 2B-2 connection point will be limited-access?
92. "Maine Department of Transportation officials have made it clear that their top choice is the 10.6-mile 3EIK-2 and are considering only it and a no-build option. The Federal Highway Administration also endorsed 3EIK-2. DOT compared the two routes in October 2003 and chose to stick with 3EIK-2, which affects the least amount of wetlands and residents, according to the study. "If it doesn't improve or decrease the impacts, why would we take a step backwards?" DOT Project Manager Raymond Faucher said Wednesday." The FHA and the MDOT made it clear that they chose to stick with alternative 3EIK-2/RING route which affects the least amount of wetlands and residents according to the study. Are these statements accurate? Is this a comparison of the complete alternative 2B-2 including the impacts from the rebuilt 4.5 mile section of route 9?
93. "According to the route comparison, 2B-2 does not satisfy the purpose or needs of the study, it exceeds the design criteria and it displaces 22 residents." Does alternative 2B-2 still exceed the design criteria? Was that a true statement in July of 2004?
94. Does 2B-2 displace 22 residents? Was that a true statement in July of 2004? Isn't it still accurate today? Why isn't this impact from route 9 included in the overall alternative impact data?
95. Does 2B-2 satisfy the purpose and needs of the study? Was that a true statement in July of 2004? Isn't it still accurate today?
96. "The 3EIK-2 route meets all of the DOT study requirements and displaces only two homes." Is this a correct statement? Is it fair to say that 20 more homes are impacted by alternative 2B-2?
97. "The total number of buildings within 500 feet of the planned roadway is another factor, with 2B-2 having 190 displacements and 3EIK-2 only having 24." Is this a correct statement and what table would this data be found in on 4/15/2009 and today?
98. Isn't it a fact that alternative 2B and 2B-2, because of route 9, has the largest amount of proximity impacts to residences than most any other alternative studied, including the 3EIK-2 route?

99. 2B-2 had more impacts than 3EIK-2 when adding the impacts of a rebuilt route 9 to the equation. That doesn't appear to be what is seen in the data from 4/15/2009. Can you comment on that?
100. "It [2B-2] would take out the village and essentially put a highway through our town," Smith told selectmen at a July 20 meeting. "It connects with Route 9 at the foot of Meadow Brook." This is a statement from the Town Manager of Eddington. Can you address his concerns? What does a rebuilt route 9 do to the Village of East Eddington?
101. "The 10.7-mile 2B-2 alternative could affect 48.3 acres of 21 wetlands and would displace 22 homes. Eleven of these homes are on the planned road and 11 are on the rebuilt Route 9." (BDN article from 8/23/2004). Are these facts true? Why does this data differ that the data presented at the 4/15/2009 PAC meeting showing only a displacement of 10 homes?
102. What displacements are in your current data?
103. When considering alternative 2B-2 and the fact that it was promoted as connecting to a 4.5 mile rebuilt or improved section of route 9 - is this impact data included in the overall impact data to alternative 2B-2? It doesn't seem to be in the impact data. Does that mean the MDOT has abandoned the rebuild or improvements of route 9?
104. If you take away the route 9 rebuild from the equation you have 2B again. If that's the case 2B has been removed from consideration several times over this study and twice by the end of 2002. If what you are currently studying is in fact a resurrected 2B - don't you think you should remove it once again? Doesn't 2B have known impacts to the community and people of Eddington? What route are you studying? Is it 2B-2 or 2B?
105. At the December 2010 Interagency Meeting - every route that met the purposes and needs of this study, including the RING route, was removed from further consideration leaving only three routes remaining that do not meet the purpose and needs. Why wasn't the preferred mantle immediately applied to the No-Build alternative? If you look at the Purpose and Needs Matrix of 4/15/2009 there's not much difference between the No-build and 2B-2. What is the difference?
106. Will a west of route 46 connection point do anything to relieve traffic concerns on route 46 and route 1A?
107. Will any alternative keep trucks from using route 46 as a shortcut to the mill in Bucksport?
108. What is the environmental impact of choosing a connection point for 2B-2 on route 9 at Meadow Brook and Cummings Bog?
109. Is there anywhere within this whole study area that does not have some kind of environmental impact? Why is it okay to save one community only to sacrifice another?
110. What logic was used when deciding what properties to impact as far as the alternative routing?
111. How flexible is the routing?
112. What are the plans for noise abatement for residences within 500' of the roadway?
113. What assurances have been made that our wells will not be contaminated by water run-off especially due to salting operations in the winter months?
114. If a right-of-way is shown inside your property lines - does that mean you can expect to lose your property?
115. Have right-of-ways been procured for this project yet?
116. Will eminent domain be forced upon a property owner to obtain right-of-way or properties to support this connector?