

Commission-Public-Records

From: Gregoire, Courtney
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Kent Palosaari
Cc: Dressler, Amy; Creighton, John
Subject: Re: A father's request

Categories: Public Comment

Kent,

Sincere thank you for the note and for taking the time to bring your daughter to our previous Commission meeting to provide comments on the flight corridor safety program. I pledge a more complete response to your thoughts, but wanted first and foremost to ensure that your email below was entered in the record as part of today's Commission meeting [October 25th] in absentia.

We recognize the hardship that travel to Pier 69 during the middle of a work day can present, and wanted you to know your comments will be part of the official record.

Best,
Courtney Gregoire

From: Kent Palosaari <kentpalosaari@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 10:51 PM
To: Albro, Thomas; Bowman, Stephanie; Creighton, John; Felleman, Fred; Gregoire, Courtney; CityCouncil@ci.seatac.wa.us; council@burienwa.gov; citycouncil@desmoineswa.gov; citycouncil@tukwilawa.gov; council@rentonwa.gov; council.members@ci.normandy-park.wa.us; jeri-lynn.clark@cityoffederalway.com; dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov; rod.dembowski@kingcounty.gov; larry.gossett@kingcounty.gov; kathy.lambert@kingcounty.gov; jeanne.kohl-welles@kingcounty.gov; claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov; pete.vonreichbauer@kingcounty.gov; joe.mcdermott@kingcounty.gov; reagan.dunn@kingcounty.gov; kcexec@kingcounty.gov; Keiser, Sen. Karen; tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov; Mia.Gregerson@leg.wa.gov; Peter Kwon; kcampbell@ci.seatac.wa.us; Lynn Thompson; Brand, Natalie; shauniewheeler@ibew77.com; sharonne@eec-wa.org; Mauricio Ayon; info@sococulture.org
Subject: A father's request

October 24, 2016

To the Port of Seattle

Dear Friends,

I visited you with my five year old daughter, Mira, a couple of weeks ago, at your downtown office. I really wanted to come to your meeting tomorrow at the airport, but I guess you have decided to move it back to Seattle. Unfortunately, it costs me about \$400 to take off the time to go downtown, whereas, I probably would have lost about \$125 to go to the airport, since I live only a couple of blocks away. Instead, I am writing to you about a topic that is important to both of us, the Port's relationship with the surrounding communities around the airport. Because of my over 25 years of experience as a marriage and family therapist, I guess you

could call me a relationship expert at some level. From this perspective, let me give you some impressions around the issue of the tree cutting at Seatac International Airport.

I brought my beloved daughter with me to the last meeting with the Port in order to put a face to the many children whose health should be paramount on whatever decision you make. I realize that you are between a rock and a hard place. You have the duty to have your airport be as safe as possible and to save the taxpayers as much as possible by making the airport as profitable as possible. To that end, that is your reasoning for cutting down the trees and replacing them with shorter, less intrusive trees. I don't want planes crashing into trees either, but I also know that more than twice as many deaths per year are due to Aviation gas related toxins than to deaths related to crashes.

Consequently, you need to be twice as concerned for my daughter's life as you are for the chances of crashes. Furthermore, I have learned from a couple of seasoned pilots who have landed airplanes at Seatac who have said that your proposed number of trees is a bit draconian. There is a long history of health problems associated with the emissions Seatac airport, which you all should know. Although, I know you believe that you can mitigate the problem with 4 saplings per downed mature tree, I think we both know that it will take years, if not decades before they will replace the mitigating effects of the trees you are planning to cut down. I have difficulties in trusting "your people" because they will be inherently biased, especially when the last Environmental Impact study would have cost you billions of dollars had you adhered to it's recommendations. That is human nature. What is also human nature is to come up with a plan that best serves you and then to defend it. In my world of marriage counseling, this is a common pattern of relationships in distress. I find this pattern in the Ports' dealing with the communities effected by the third runway. Although, I was encouraged by your desire to have an open discussion with residents on November 1st, I was equally discouraged by the fact that you will do this after you have made a decision. When I see this in marriage counseling, making a unilateral decision without collaboration, this usually results in resistance and escalation of the differing views and solutions. I would hope you wouldn't want that, especially if you truly care for your relationship with the communities most effected. Our lives are at stake, so anything less than collaboration is unacceptable. To that end, I have the following suggestions.

Please, Please, delay your ultimate decision until you have had many discussions with the populous. I would recommend that you should take more of a round table discussion that isn't so much arguing differing views, but using the collective wisdom to come up with collaborative solutions. This will create a more robust solution and create more community support. You see this approach in more functional businesses and in healthy marriages and families, as well as being the heart of a democracy. I think that having unbiased professional facilitators would be necessary for this. I would not be one of those people because I am way too close to this issue, but I am sure you could find trained professionals to do so, Because of the serious nature of this situation, I think an EIS is essential, and morally imperative. I realize that this will delay your plans and potentially cost you a great deal of money, but it will do wonders in creating public trust and support for whatever is decided. If we need to bring in other players, such as the FAA and the EPA, so be it. The last EIS had a great number of public meetings, which I feel helped create very good recommendations. I believe you should follow these recommendations this time and do what is your moral duty and not just your legal duty.

You did not reply to the last letter I sent you, and I do understand that you are very busy people, but it would mean a lot to me, if you could considerately reply to this one.

Sincerely,

Kent Palosaari, M.A.

Cedar River Counseling, PLLC
Kent Palosaari, LMHC
15 S Grady Way Ste. 631
Renton, WA 98057
1611 116th Ave NE, Ste. 102
Bellevue, WA 98004

