

“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](#).

- The future safety of alternative 2B-2 is highly debatable as state and federal transportation professionals avowed in their own [October 2003 Technical Memorandum](#): “Traffic congestion and conflicting vehicle movements on this section of Route 9 would substantially increase the potential for new safety concerns and hazards.”
- Alternative 2B-2 does not meet the study purpose and needs. In Sept2010, MaineDOT acknowledged that the “east of Route 46” system linkage need “[remains a valid need for this study](#)” at the same time they deferred that “valid” need for 20 years. Project selection should have been based on best engineering practices and not on parsing words to enable the selection of such an imperfect alternative.
- Notwithstanding the many cogent reasons offered on this [website](#) condemning MaineDOT’s 2B-2 selection—and once again using MaineDOT’s own words—the above statement reveals how specious MaineDOT’s selection really is—they will gleefully spend \$61 million on a project where the outcome cannot be guaranteed!! Wouldn’t that \$61 million be better spent on Maine’s unmet transportation needs??
- Is there any wonder why that statement was removed??