

Dear Governor Mills,

Many of us in Brewer, including the Brewer City Council in three unanimous resolutions of non-support since 2012, oppose MaineDOT's questionable selection of alternative 2B-2 for the I-395/Route 9 Connector. The 2B-2 alternative does not satisfy the [long-established system linkage need](#) (page 5): "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."

Alternative 2B-2 is a controlled-access connection to Route 9, to the west of the "east of Route 46" system linkage need (logical termini) by 4.2 miles.

2B-2 met only one (20%) of the study's five purpose and needs in April 2009, yet is now the (second) preferred alternative for a \$79.25 million controversial project that does not satisfy purpose and needs, a project that many of us do not want, and a project that we question the need for anymore since the project's original purpose was to reroute logging truck traffic from Route 46 to the Bucksport Mill.

[DOT's own documentation](#) (page i) states "Unless noted, most alternative[s] that were not considered practicable failed to meet the system linkage need of providing a limited access connection between I-395 and Route 9 east of Route 46." 2B-2 should never have even been in consideration, let alone become the preferred alternative, especially when 45 (57%) of the 79 studied alternatives actually satisfied the "Route 9 east of Route 46" system linkage need.

[September 21, 2010 Interagency meeting minutes](#) (page 2 excerpt below) affirmed that the "Route 9 east of Route 46" system linkage need and the need for a limited-access facility remained valid needs but deferred for 20 years as a long-term need; at that same time, 2B-2 magically satisfied the system linkage need "in the near-term" by parsing the original definition of "partially satisfies".

- 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.

A project should not be built on parsed words, a project must be built on merit and DOT management has balked at any meeting with impacted residents and their governing officials to justify said merits. They would like you to think that they gave us sufficient time for debate, but even at the May 2012 DEIS Public Hearing, they would not answer a single question and they were already intentionally withholding critical information from us as we would learn from FOAA documents obtained in March of 2013. And, that was not the last time that DOT officials would refuse to discuss the project's merits.

2B-2, by MaineDOT's own definition, is a near-term (short-term) project with long-term needs that have been deferred to our grandchildren—unplanned and unfunded and when I asked the MaineDOT about those long-term needs at the [BACTS meeting in Brewer on March 26, 2016](#), they looked at me as if I am the one lacking integrity; basically DOT Manager Rollins called me a liar and exclaimed: "This is not the forum to discuss the merits of this project..." They brushed off any discussion of long-term needs of their preferred alternative (2B-2) and abruptly changed the subject. I was left with the thought that apparently there were no long-term needs and we were lied to once again; remember that the DOT went out of their way to parse a few words to give 2B-2 the appearance of satisfying the system linkage need i.e. "in the near-term." The 9.21.2010 minutes also indicate that the DOT would "define 'near term' as the year 2030" or 20 years, so logically long-term is 20 years into the future. My point is that they sold the lack of satisfying the system linkage need of a "limited-access connection to Route 9 east of Route 46" by parsing words and deferring the system linkage need with an unfunded, unplanned promise to satisfy that need in 20 years from now; this project is based on lies and more lies. Is that the modus operandi for our DOT?

It appears to me that the whole DEIS/FEIS process was a waste of \$2.3 million for a study that I would contend had a pre-determined outcome; that is also the conclusion of several of the [PAC members](#) that were also used and abused by this process. The PAC had no say in the decision-making process and in fact were essentially disbanded on April 15, 2009; 2B-2 was on its way to preferred alternative status by September 2010 – with no knowledge of the PAC or the impacted communities – and in fact, that information was not made public until the last few days of 2011 – 32 months from the final PAC meeting.

If the DOT does not offer you the long-term planning of 2B-2 that mirrors what was stated above on September 21, 2010, then you have a bigger problem that only the State Inspector General can unravel. I can tell you that the DEIS and the FEIS were intentionally falsified to give 2B-2 the appearance of being a cheaper alternative than it was by \$32.4 million—the DEIS/FEIS construction cost does

not match the DEIS/FEIS design criteria. That is easily proved, it was intentional and it is against Maine State Statute; why has no one looked into that charge?

We must now also question 2B-2's funding as the construction funding has shifted to be more heavily dependent on the state. The DOT Commissioner committed \$39.625 million of state funds in the October 2017 INFRA grant application for a 50/50 share in funding. The INFRA grant received last summer was for \$25 million—a \$14.625 million shortfall in what was expected; that shortfall will likely come out of STIP funds from other essential projects.

This project would have cost the state \$15.85 million (20%) at the customary 80/20 funding formula—it would have cost the state \$39.625 million (50%) if the INFRA grant was fully funded—NOW—this project may cost Mainers as much as \$54.25 million (68.5%) of the construction cost!! How can it be possible that this project was so badly managed that we have gone from 20% state funding to a whopping 68.5%? How can the state afford that large an expenditure on a single controversial project that many of us see no need for, when the state can't afford to even maintain existing roads and bridges? Wouldn't that \$54.25 million be better spent on Maine's unmet transportation needs?

This project is a waste of limited state and federal transportation dollars. Please look past DOT's talking points and examine what some of these same officials have said in the past about this same alternative: "Traffic congestion and conflicting vehicle movements on this section of Route 9 would substantially increase the potential for [new safety concerns and hazards](#)." (page ii) "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)

I provided the three specific documents below in electronic form to your transition office. I hope you and Mr. Van Note have had the time to look at them; they are best viewed in electronic form as they are hyperlinked to DOT documentation, and can be easily viewed along with other documentation on our citizen's website: <https://i395rt9hardlook.com/>.

[Brewer Boondoggle](#)

[History was Dismissed...](#)

[We have no money...](#)

Senator Rosen has submitted legislation (LR 1019) for an "independent analysis of the I-395/Route 9 connector" which would seem to align with what

was stated on your campaign website: “launch a 3 month review of all state infrastructure based on external reviewers...invest funding in projects that will show a long-term benefit versus short-term appearances.”

Thank you for your time and consideration of my views,

Larry Adams

Thank you for contacting Governor Mills

Governor

1/18/2019 5:36 AM

To: Larry Adams;

Thank you for contacting me. This message is to confirm that my office has received your email and will be taking appropriate steps for follow-up.

Comments and Requests for Assistance

Your ideas and suggestions are important to me. Depending on the nature of your issue, your message may be assigned to one of my designees for direct follow-up with you. My staff and I are committed to providing you with a timely response to your issues and concerns.

Scheduling Requests

If your email is regarding a scheduling request, please make sure your message includes information about the time and location of the event and a brief summary of the agenda. Please resend your email with that information, if necessary.

Stay Informed

For news and information on issues and upcoming events, please visit www.maine.gov/governor.

Again, thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts.

Sincerely,



Janet T. Mills
Governor
State of Maine