

John Jovanovich, 11227 18th Place Southwest, Seattle, 98146.

H-004-001

MR. JOVANOVIICH: I'm really opposed to tearing down that viaduct for the simple reason it's a hell of a good design. You can get on that -- I use the viaduct a lot in our business. We use it sometimes maybe 10 times, 15 times a week. And it's so handy if you've got business downtown. You can get off right in the middle of town. You can go down to the stadiums. You can go north into that part of Seattle, and you can continue on. If you want to go to the Seattle Center, you can get off -- I forget the street you get off, but it takes you right -- Harrison takes you right up to Seattle Center. If you want to go to Ballard, you just continue.

And I feel very strongly -- I've spent 18 years in construction -- that that viaduct could be retrofitted, and I don't think they did enough research into taking that avenue. And there's several concepts that could have been studied, and one that kind of intrigues me is suspending the viaduct, in case of an earthquake. It would be like the Tacoma Bridge, with the cables down there holding up the deck.

And so I think the design is poor when you compare it to the viaduct. And I think that there's going to be a lot of angry voters if the tunnel starts causing problems: gridlock, and especially money problems. And these big projects like this do run into money problems, and money is in very, very short supply, and the Governor should know that.

H-004-002

And I just want to voice my displeasure about the way they're going about this. They're just going to ram it down everybody's throat without real big ideas and without a vote of the people. I don't think that the

H-004-001

The Final EIS Chapter 3, Alternatives Development, describes environmental documentation that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. This included evaluation of the Rebuild Alternative. After studying several retrofitting concepts, the lead agencies found that rebuilding the viaduct would not be cost effective or a prudent use of public monies. Therefore it is not a reasonable alternative.

H-004-002

Following the 2007 public advisory vote rejecting both a cut-and-cover tunnel and an elevated structure replacement, WSDOT, King County and the City of Seattle began an open and transparent public process to review options for the Alaskan Way Viaduct's central waterfront section.

The agencies assembled a Stakeholder Advisory Committee of almost 30 people, representing neighborhoods, business and freight interests, labor groups, and environmental and other cause-driven organizations to review options; hosted public meetings to share the committee's process; and sought public input.

As we initially evaluated surface and elevated options, many of the stakeholders expressed concerns about how such options would affect the waterfront as a place for people and maintain mobility in and through downtown both during and after construction. The proposed bored tunnel was seen by many as the solution that would best balance all of these goals.

In 2009, following this process, the Governor, then-King County Executive, then-Seattle Mayor and Port of Seattle CEO recommended the bored tunnel as the replacement. The Washington State Legislature passed legislation that endorses the bored tunnel and provides the budget authority necessary for its construction, and Governor Gregoire signed the bill into law. The Seattle City Council also voted unanimously

H-004-002 elected officials of one city and the county should have the power to go into a project of this size without a vote of the people, because the people are the one -- the people are the government, and they should have put that on the ballot. They put the first, open-ditch, tunnel on the ballot, and it was voted down pretty strongly.

H-004-003 And I don't know, can I make one other gripe? Okay. Well, I just wrote her a letter about fisheries. I'm in the business of selling commercial fishing equipment. And they've got a -- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife is made up, very strongly, of sports-oriented people, and they are running the show. And I think she's getting her information that's very, very biased, and she doesn't really know what's actually going on.

I have nothing against sportsmen. We could have plenty of fish if the Department was run right. They got rid of the best Fisheries director we ever had, and he had great ideas. And the guy was a scientist, and his ideas were simple ideas but solid.

And I quote him. He said, "No matter how many spawners you get on the spawning ground, we're not going to bring the salmon back if the offspring of those spawners are killed in the fresh water. And we've been trying for 10 years to get a bill through the Legislature, and I've worked really hard on that, to prohibit wading.

It would not prohibit fishing, but it would prohibit wading on the spawning grounds until the eggs are hatched and the spawning activities are over. And so then the recreational people can go -- whatever they do in the river, swim or whatever.

But her campaign literature -- and I sent her a copy of this -- stated

to authorize the Mayor to sign a memorandum of agreement that outlines the State and City's responsibilities for the viaduct replacement program, including the proposed bored tunnel.

H-004-003

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would improve water quality compared to existing conditions because stormwater runoff would be treated prior to being discharged. Treating stormwater runoff prior to discharge would reduce potential effects to fish, wildlife, and vegetation resources compared to existing conditions. Please see the Final EIS Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) for current information about impacts to fish.

H-004-003

that the spawning grounds are now being protected. And I told her in my letter they're not being protected and never have been adequately protected, and that's why we don't have any salmon.

50 years ago, there were very few people in this state, probably around a million people. Now, we have six and a half million people. Six and half million people, and they have these -- all kinds of equipment -- high-powered motorboats that go up the rivers, and they have a force that will blow apart any nest of incubating eggs that they pass over. And when they're drifting down the river, the boat is drifting too fast to fish the way they like to fish certain holes. Then they'll throw the anchor over the back end of the boat to slow the boat down, and any nest in the path of that anchor is going to be destroyed. And there's no evidence of the nest being there because, when the eggs float up and float away, the trout eat them.

And let's see. Did I talk about the money that's being lost?

Okay. Well, I pointed that out in my letter, but I would appreciate it if I could get this to her too. Sportsmen, as an example. For the spring chinook salmon run on the Columbia River, the sportsmen got an allocation, and I don't believe in allocations. I believe in the rights of sportsmen. Everybody should have the right to fish, whether it be commercially or for recreation.

Anyway, they got 75 percent of the harvest of that fish. And for the price of a sports-fishing license and, if they go out on their own boat, they can go out and catch one or two fish, whatever the quota is. So they're getting 20 -- the commercials get \$10 a pound for those fish on the grounds,

H-004-003

not dressed, with the head on; and the eggs are very valuable too. And if they catch a 30-pound salmon, that's worth, on the spawning -- or on the river, \$300, they get \$10 a pound for those fish.

And if you go to the market -- the average person goes to the market to buy a piece of that fish, if it's available -- and if there's no commercial fishing, it's not going to be available. It's going to be available only to the person that can afford to go down there and afford to have equipment or his own boat or go on a charter boat.

And so I pointed out to her that commercially caught fish are taxed. I believe it's 5.4 percent for king salmon and chinooks. They are the prized fish. And I believe that sports-caught fish should be taxed just like commercially caught fish. And if they got 75 percent of the sports-caught fish or of the Columbia River spring chinooks, that could run into millions of dollars of tax money.

Plus that would include -- if you -- if you would charge those people -- let's say those fish are worth \$10 a pound on the grounds to the fisherman -- they should be worth at least \$3.00 a pound to a sportsman. I would gladly pay \$3.00 a pound for one of those choice kings.

And what the Governor -- I believe the Governor is not aware of this. There's a group that was formed down in Texas, and the head person that formed that group was none other than the big -- the -- I guess you would call him the executive director of Exxon, and their goal was to get rid of all commercial fishing in the Gulf, and that includes Texas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Florida.

There are no commercial fishing with nets in the Gulf, and now the ploy

H-004-003

is to try to eliminate the commercial net fishing on the Columbia River. They want to go back to methods of harvesting salmon that they outlawed way back in the early 1930s, with fish wheels and fish traps.

And the fish wheels especially, and the fish traps also, catch all kinds. They will catch not only salmon but different species of salmon. They catch chinooks and silvers and sockeye salmon and steelhead trout. And so that's not the way to harvest fish.

The commercial guys have to use nets -- they call them "tooth nets," and if you catch a fish and the -- I sell fishing equipment, by the way. That's why I know this. If you sell -- or if you use a net where the salmon can push his head past the gills, he's probably going to die. In the process of taking him out, you're going to make him bleed in the gills.

So now, they're very much restricted. They have to use a net which they call a "tooth net." And it won't get past his nose, hardly. And what the salmon -- when he hits a net, his teeth get entangled in the netting and it just holds him there.

He may be able to shake himself loose but, if he can't, when the net comes and the guy sees that he's got a fish hanging by his teeth, they have a revival box that's not required on gill-netters, and if the fish looks like he's pretty played out, they put him in the revival box, that has fresh Columbia River water being pumped into the revival box all the time he's in there. And within 15 minutes, that salmon is just like he's never been in the net or the box. And so the mortality rate is next to nothing compared to sports fishing.

Whereas up river, the sportsmen -- they catch chinook salmon the same

H-004-003 way they've always caught them -- with a barbed hook -- and the salmon have no chance to shake the hook. And being on the line and a hook, they're going to fight for all their life. And by the time they get to the boat, they're almost dead. And so I don't know how they release those fish.

If their -- if their adiposal fin has been clipped, that means it's a wild fish. No, excuse me. That means it's a hatchery fish. If they have a fin, that means it's a wild fish, and those are the fish we're trying to save for spawners. And so the ones that are caught on hook -- and if they're handled, where you grab them and squeeze them and hold them real tight till you get the hook out, by the time you throw him back, he can barely swim. And there's no way of telling what the mortality is. That fish could sink to the bottom and die, or he could continue swimming real slow, and the next seal or sea lion that comes along is going to have a feast. So I think we're losing a lot of very precious spawners that way.

Another thing that really bothers me: I called Fisheries, and each sports fisherman must have a punch card, but there's no way to tell how many fish are being caught because there's no requirement to return your punch cards, like there is with deer or elk. If you shoot an elk or a deer -- in fact, it's got more restrictive. You have to return your card whether you got an elk or deer or not.

And the fishermen, the sports fishermen, are not required to do that. Commercially caught fish -- they have to be issued a fish ticket when they sell their fish to a processor. And on the fish ticket, there's a rate of taxation they have to pay, and that -- they get that taken right out right there, I believe.

H-004-003

So in summary, the sportsmen are not taxed on the fish they catch, and they're getting a lot of fish free. They should at least pay three bucks a pound, minimum, for that species of salmon; and for silvers, maybe a little less. That could be figured out by the people in the Fisheries Department.

And one other point that bothers me. When they got rid of the -- Dr. Koenigs, who was a scientist, and he was with Alaska Fish and Game in Alaska, they appointed a guy that's never been to college, and he has a charter-boat operation, and I feel that that is a conflict of interest. And I pointed out to the Governor that I've been to their meetings, their commission meetings. You've got three minutes to talk. It's impossible to talk for three minutes and make a point. And nobody is going to drive, like in my case, over 100 miles to talk for three minutes. My name is so long, it takes me three minutes to tell them what it is.

So that's got to change. What needs to happen is, they should have open hearings, like they do in Washington, D.C. -- all-day hearings if necessary, and two-day hearings if necessary -- so that people can tell exactly what's going on.

The legislators don't know what's going on. I served in the Legislature myself, about 30 years ago, and I was aghast. I told a friend of mine, I says, "I never went to college, and I might feel out of place down there." He says, "You won't." He says, "The first week, you're going to maybe feel out of place, and you're going to wonder how you got there. And after the first week, you're going to wonder how most of the other guys got there." And that's true.

I mean, there's extremely good people in Olympia, but there's people

H-004-003 in Olympia that are duds. As a point, I point out that the chairman of House Resources -- Natural Resources Committee told me that "we could probably do something with your bill if you could take out the part about walking around on the spawning grounds." That is the bill. I mean, he should have at least brought it to a vote, and he should have allowed testimony to be presented to point out why that bill is so critically needed.

So I think that sums it up. You might say that I was a strong supporter of hers. I gave her 300 bucks and, to me, that's a lot of money.

(End of comment.)

(End of public comments.)