

All of these documented problems—in MaineDOT’s own words—and their best defense of the 2B-2 selection is that I am apparently a liar!!

“Traffic congestion and conflicting vehicle movements on this section of Route 9 would substantially increase the potential for new safety concerns and hazards.”

“poor LOS and safety concerns”

“ten local roads and 148 access points”

“Limited opportunities exist to control access management on this section of Route 9 from local roads and driveways.”

“the number of left turns”

“ability to satisfy... traffic congestions need is questionable”

[Note: Quoted references are from MaineDOT/FHWA/ACOE Oct 2003 Technical Memorandum.](#)

“lack of existing access controls”

“negatively affect people living along Route 9 in the study area”

“inability to effectively manage access along this section of Route 9”

“severely impact local communities along Route 9 between proposed alternative connection points and Route 46”

“inadequately address traffic congestion needs”

35 access points/mile on 2B-2’s 4.2 mile section of Route 9. The 45 alternatives that met the study system linkage need had zero added access points—not 148 access points that Rte. 9 foists upon 2B-2!!

You are 1,036% more likely to have an accident on the new 2B-2 alternative than the 45 studied alternatives meeting the system linkage need!!

[FHWA acknowledges:](#) “In rural areas, each access point added increases the annual accident rate by seven percent.”