

## Commission-Public-Records

---

**From:** Anne Kroeker <annek@36524.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2019 9:15 AM  
**To:** Bowman, Stephanie; Calkins, Ryan; Felleman, Fred; Steinbrueck, Peter; Gregoire, Courtney  
**Cc:** Metruck, Steve; Lyttle, Lance; Commission-Public-Records; Merritt, Mike  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Aviation Special Committee 2019 Charter  
**Categories:** Public Comment

**WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Dear Commissioners Bowman, Calkins, Felleman, Steinbrueck and Gregoire,

Today you will be approving the 2019 Charter for the Aviation Special Committee at your Commission meeting in Seattle. As I had expected to be able to comment on the contents prior to this stage, I will still hope to enter my remarks into the public record at the same time as your vote. I hope you will still consider their value, despite the late submission. In any case, I appreciate and thank you for your attention to them.

Amongst the scope of work of the Aviation Special Committee, is to provide advice and recommendations to the Port regarding the Century Agenda's Strategy 1, Objective 3. What is not explicitly written into this goal, as presented in part A, is what I would like to address. This objective to "triple air cargo volume" has been, and remains, single-bottom line, with the 20<sup>th</sup> century view that basing goals in a fossil-fuel based economy, borrowing against the future, is acceptable. The double bottom line, adding in the measure of social impact, while considered elsewhere in the Century Agenda for other objectives, is not brought forth in conjunction with any of Strategy 1 points. In addition, the now accepted triple bottom line, adding in the consideration of environmental impacts, which I would argue are part of social impacts, is also nowhere to be seen. While the Committee may be considering some of these impacts, especially through the Century Agenda's Strategy 4, the fact that they are not written out and specific for any of Strategy 1 objectives, is of great concern to me.

Not only our South King County communities are vastly affected by the Port of Seattle's activities, but also Seattle neighborhoods, such as Beacon Hill, well defined in this most recent article: <https://crosscut.com/2019/05/fighting-clean-air-one-seattles-most-polluted-neighborhoods>. Clearly, the nature of the work of the Commissioners within this Committee is critical to all the Port's surrounding urban and natural areas.

Even if mitigation to the sacrificial and most grossly impacted communities is also being considered separately, there is no way to take back the effects of pollution, whether it be immediate in the ability for individuals, human or non-human, to breathe clean air, touch non-contaminated ground and function in quieter surroundings, or longer term for them to deal with associated diseases brought on by the constant short term pollution, or in global terms of our ever-increasing carbon input, resulting in major environmental degradation for all living beings.

Tripling the air cargo volume directly over any of our heads is not acceptable for these reasons. It is not necessary for Seatac to be the sole answer to international trade and indeed, it should be their moral prerogative to ask how we can bring a better solution to the economic and environmental intertwined choices going forward, for the state, the region and the world. We are proven leaders here in our forward-thinking policies and actions – I'm asking you to be so for this goal, too.

Thank you again for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Anne Kroeker

Des Moines WA