

## Further analysis of the vanishing DEIS statement...

---

“However, **future development along Route 9** in the study area **can impact future traffic flow** and the overall benefits of the project.” [DEIS](#) | Summary page s19

Click here to view how [MaineDOT scrubbed this statement from the FEIS](#).

---

—MaineDOT was against this alternative before they were for it—

- “Alternative 2B was dismissed prior to PAC Meeting #16 on January 15, 2003 because it would inadequately address the system linkage and traffic congestion needs.” [Oct2003 Tech Memorandum-page 20](#)
- “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.” [Oct2003 Tech Memorandum-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.” (LOS stands for Level of Service) [Oct2003 Tech Memorandum-page 21](#)

---

Current and future development on Route 9 (aka Main Road, Eddington) necessitates an access permit from the MaineDOT. 148 access points and 10 local roads already exist on 2B-2’s 4.2 mile section of Route 9. This study’s system linkage need (limited-access to the east of Route 46) intentionally bypassed that 4.2 mile section of Route 9 by design and best practices. Any alternative that met the system linkage need—45 out of 79—had zero added access points. These Route 9 issues exist because the MaineDOT intentionally selected an alternative discounting study criteria after 10 years of study. The MaineDOT cannot guarantee the overall benefits of 2B-2—and—they cannot guarantee that traffic flow will not be impacted in the future which will lead to traffic congestion, [safety concerns and hazards](#). If this project’s outcome hangs so precipitously on whether or not Eddington is able to develop, maybe the MaineDOT should take another “hard look” before wasting any more money on such a deficient connector. If it comes to protecting 2B-2’s legacy or promoting development in Eddington—who do you think will win?