

What's the long-term cost of 2B-2?

The original and still valid system linkage need and the need for limited-access connection between I-395 and Route 9 east of Route 46 were unceremoniously transformed to long-term needs in Sept2010; facilitated by superseding the original eastern logical termini criteria of “Route 9 east of Route 46” with “the portion of Route 9 in the study area”.

How does the state propose to satisfy these long-term needs, triggered by the problematic selection of an alternative not meeting Purpose and Needs in the first place?

A downgraded 2B-2 may be the cheapest to initially construct, but what happens in 20 years, when 2B-2's long-term needs kick-in?

2B-2's estimated cost is \$61 million in 2011 dollars; what will the additional 4 or 5+ miles of new roadway, essential to establish the long-term limited-access connection to the east of Route 46, cost in 2035-2040 dollars OR is the plan simply to remove local access from that specific 4.2 mile section of Route 9 by then?

We can't afford to maintain existing roads and bridges, and the 2015-2017 highway and bridge programs incorporate an annual \$119 million shortfall (\$357M), including annual unmet bridge needs of \$70 million (\$210M); yet 2B-2, a short-term band-aide fix that will unquestionably cost \$Tens of millions to meet future long-term needs, marches on...

Championing a downgraded, deficient alternative by kicking project needs down the road so your grandchildren can pay for them is fiscally irresponsible; all new project funding should be immediately re-appropriated to meet Maine's existing unmet transportation needs.

Larry Adams/Brewer