

Has this study ignored engineering best practice?

“The system linkage need was discussed. With Route 9 having sufficient capacity for the next 20 years, the system linkage need and need for a limited access facility should be considered a long-term need. The DOT is committed to the East-West highway vision, and the system linkage need remains a valid need for this study. To help clarify when an alternative satisfies the system linkage need for the I-395/Route 9 study, the DOT will change references in Chapter 2 Alternatives Analysis and Appendix C Alternatives Considered and Dismissed to ‘partially satisfies’ the need to ‘in the near term’ (or something similar) and define ‘near term’ as the year 2030.”

[Sept 21, 2010 Interagency Meeting](#)

“A **best practice** is a technique or methodology that, through experience and research, has proven to reliably lead to a desired result. A commitment to using the best practices in any field is a commitment to using all the knowledge and technology at one's disposal to ensure success. The term is used frequently in the fields of health care, government administration, the education system, project management, hardware and software product development, and elsewhere.”
Definition posted by: [Margaret Rouse](#)

“A **best practice** is a method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means, and that is used as a benchmark.”

[Wikipedia](#)

Was it best practice in [Sept2010](#) to proclaim that: “the system linkage need remains a valid need for this study”—yet in the very next breath—defer that avowed valid need beyond “the year 2030” ([2040 as of Mar2015](#)) by merely changing [DEIS Appendix C](#) references of ‘partially satisfies’ the need to ‘in the near-term’ to enable an alternative that does not satisfy the system linkage need and the need for a limited-access facility?

Was it best practice to commit to the “[East-West highway vision](#)” of a “[limited-access connection from I-395 to Route 9 east of Route 46](#)” whilst ignoring that the study system linkage need intentionally bypassed the Village of East Eddington and 4.2 miles of Route 9 with 148 access points, 10 local roads and 5 speed limit changes to further that vision?

Was it best practice to change the decade-long, specific northeastern logical termini connection point criterion of “[Route 9 east of Route 46](#)” to the DEIS-stated non-specific “[the portion of Route 9 in the study area](#)” to enable the selection of alternative 2B-2?

Was it best practice to select 2B-2 when 2B was removed from consideration in Jan2003 for serious safety concerns with that same 4.2 mile segment of Route 9 (40.8% of 2B-2): “[Traffic congestion and conflicting vehicle movements on this section of Route 9 would substantially increase the potential for new safety concerns and hazards.](#)”

Was it best practice to “punt” 2B-2’s system linkage needs 20 years to an unknown future without an existing plan to satisfy and fund those long-term needs? If we can’t afford to maintain today’s roads and bridges—what makes one think that the transportation budgetary environment will be any rosier 20 years from now? Why burden your grandkids with the bill for long-term needs that will easily cost \$10’s of millions and could certainly make 2B-2 the costliest of all the 79+ studied alternatives?

Was it best practice to select an alternative (2B-2) based on near-term needs only and require expensive long-term needs when ZERO of the 79+ studied alternatives satisfying the “east of Route 46” system linkage need from the onset had ZERO long-term needs?

Is it best practice to spend another \$61 million on a deficient alternative (2B-2)—after already [squandering away \\$2.8 million on the study](#)—when that \$61 million would be better spent on Maine’s unmet transportation needs that exist today?