To the Offices of the Honorable Senator Collins, Senator King and Congressman Poliquin:

The 2.19.2016 Bangor Daily News web posting titled: "Salmon in the spotlight: NOAA devoting resources to Maine fish" raises questions reference the importance of or the non-importance of Atlantic salmon "listed as an endangered species with designated critical habitat in the study area (NOAA, NMFS 2012)." FEIS Chapter 3, page 66.

I have posted my concerns - dated 2.19.2016 - on our citizen's website: I-395 Rt.9 Hard Look.

I make no excuses for being a strong voice against the I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study. A myriad of state and federal agencies seem hell-bent in their efforts going forward with 2B-2, an alternative that satisfied only 20% of study purpose and needs in April 2009.

Alternative 2B-2 is described as the "least environmentally damaging alternative" even though 2B-2 crosses 2 streams that contain anadromous fish (Atlantic salmon) with an AADT of 12,000+ vehicles (per day) by the year 2040.

The previous preferred alternative (3EIK-2) impacted frogs and salamanders – BUT - alternative 3EIK-2 <u>did not impact</u> anadromous fish.

Citizens impacted by alternative 2B-2 deserve to know why frogs and salamanders in vernal pools, pools that may not even exist from one year to the next, are seemingly more important to the environment than endangered Atlantic salmon and their designated critical habitat.

Impacted citizens deserve to know why these agencies continue the mantra of "least environmentally damaging alternative" when 2B-2 impacts Atlantic salmon <u>and</u> designated critical habitat <u>while</u> the previous preferred alternative (3EIK-2) <u>did not</u>.

Impacted citizens deserve to know how NOAA-National Marine Fisheries Service can spend \$25 million on projects aimed at stopping the decline of an endangered species and seek \$9 million in applications for community-based habitat restoration when Atlantic salmon designated critical habitat <u>is</u> already being threatened by 2B-2's construction.

NOAA-National Marine Fisheries Service shares jurisdiction over Atlantic salmon with USFWS and opted to let the USFWS work this issue, however NOAA needs to explain to the impacted citizenry and their duly-elected community leaders why they should spend millions to save a species - at the same time that a project under their direct purview impacts that same species. Impacted citizens deserve real answers to their questions and not simply brushed off by a factless buzz-phrase such as "we took a hard look".

Thank you for your consideration, Larry Adams/Brewer citizen