

Without reading any of the hundreds of emails and documents that I have sent out over the last eight years, you only have to look at this one single page and ask yourself: do we really want to spend \$79.25 million on a project that requires a disclaimer instead of a simple YES?

Alternatives	Description	Meets Purpose		Meets Needs		
		Study Purpose	USACE Purpose	System Linkage	Safety Concerns	Traffic Congestion
Alternative 2B-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfies design criteria • Length: 6.1 mi. of new alignment, 4.2 mi. of Route 9 without additional improvements • Bridge length: 2,232 ft. • Earthwork: 2.2 mcy (1.2 mcy cut, 1.0 mcy fill) 	Yes	Yes	In the near-term (Year 2035)	Yes	Yes
Alternative 3EIK-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfies design criteria • Length: 10.6 mi. of new alignment • Bridge length: 1,948 ft. • Earthwork: 4.2 mcy (2.1 mcy cut, 2.1 mcy fill) 	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

[Click here to view DEIS Appendix “C” page 258.](#)

3EIK-2 was the preferred alternative from May 2003 until Sept. 2010. 2B-2 became the second preferred alternative in September 2010.

At the same time in April 2009, 3EIK-2 met 5 of 5 (100%) of the purpose and needs and was the preferred alternative—while alternative 2B-2 met only 1 of 5 (20%) of purpose and needs!!

2B–2 is a near-term project with long-term needs deferred for 20 years beyond the ribbon cutting!