

[EXTERNAL] written comment(s) for 1/9/24 commission mtg

Elizabeth Burton <seattlecruisectrl@gmail.com>

Mon 1/8/2024 11:17 AM

To:Commission-Public-Records <commission-public-records@portseattle.org>

 1 attachments (4 KB)

Written commenters for 1-9-24.csv;

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Hi, Clerk Hart,

During the month of December, 2023, each of the 77 people on the attached list sent in some variation of the comment below. The comment is a detailed critique of the Port's response to previous comments, which called for the Port to cap and reduce the number of cruise sailings in Seattle. Each of the 77 comments sent in was intended as a written comment for the December 11th Commission meeting; however, none of the comments were treated as such. We are therefore re-submitting this; please consider this to be 77 comments for the January 9th, 2024 Commission meeting.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Burton
on behalf of the 77 people who sent in comments

**Written comment for January 9, 2024 Commission meeting
Topic related to Port business: cruise ship sailings****Comment:**

Thank you for the reply to my request that the Port of Seattle cap and reduce the number of cruise ship sailings. However, the Port's casual acceptance of cruise sector greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions continuing unchecked until some unspecified future date is unacceptable. The crisis, the U.N.'s "code red," is here now: global climate and ecological breakdown have reached a point where slow action is nearly as bad as no action.

Please see my specific objections, below; excerpts from your letter are in quotes.

1. The Port claims to be "deeply committed to maritime decarbonization and emissions reduction."

The climate is not responsive to your "deep commitment," your good intentions, or promises of future technology. Significant reductions are needed now.

2. The Port says it will "work to understand" how the emissions reduction schedule mandated in the Clean Shipping Act lines up with the Port's current plans.

The answer to this seems pretty simple: the schedule proposed in the Clean Shipping Act is faster and more ambitious than yours. The Act calls for reductions in GHG emissions starting in 2027 (your

reductions don't start until 2030), and it would eliminate GHG emissions from ships by 2040 - ten years earlier than the Port's goals.

3. The Port wants to understand "how capping the number of cruise ships compares with its current focus on capping emissions – in terms of the Port's operations, the local economy, and its environmental goals," and says that it "would not want to cap the number of cruise ships in Seattle only to push the problem elsewhere."

The trouble with your "current focus on capping emissions" is that you are not, in fact, capping emissions: they are rising, and will continue to rise as each year, more and more people fly to Seattle to take cruises. Furthermore, it's not enough to cap emissions: they need to be significantly reduced each year, starting in 2024.

Your concern that any reduction of cruise in Seattle would just "push the problem elsewhere" fails to acknowledge the Port's power to influence the industry and other ports. Consider the Port's admirable dedication to cracking down on sex trafficking. Like greenhouse gas emissions, trafficking is a global problem, but the Port does not say "We would not want to crack down on sex trafficking in Seattle only to push the problem elsewhere." On the contrary, the Port is actively working not only to stop trafficking in Seattle, but is also cooperating regionally to help other jurisdictions stop it, as well. I am asking that you bring this same kind of comprehensive, collaborative approach to reducing the harms that cruise ships cause. You could set a global example, joining the city of La Rochelle, France, which is already reducing cruise sailings in order to meet its climate goals.

4. The Port's primary strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from cruise ships seems to be its "Green Cruise Corridor," which it claims will not only "reduce emissions from the cruise industry locally but also have global impacts to how the industry operates worldwide."

The problem is that your so-called "Green Cruise Corridor" has achieved no emissions reductions thus far, and there's little reason to expect meaningful reductions in the time frame required by our current ecological and climate crisis. Corridor participants have made no commitment to reducing GHG emissions by any particular amount or date; the agreement includes no deadlines and no enforcement mechanisms. Participants have committed only to "explore the feasibility" of decarbonizing the cruise sector.

Both Port of Seattle Commissioners running for re-election in 2023 made it clear that the Corridor won't begin to reduce emissions for years to come; meanwhile, emissions are increasing as passenger numbers increase every year.

In addition, during the April, 2023 webinar that updated the public on the Green Cruise Corridor, cruise company representatives were still enthusiastically promoting liquefied natural gas (LNG) as a "green fuel," despite the well-established fact that climate emissions from LNG are often higher than from conventional marine fuels.

5. The Port highlights "the many other tools it is using to advance cruise environmental sustainability goals including through business agreements with the cruise lines, terminal best management practices, shore power infrastructure investments, and advocacy at the local, state, federal and international levels."

None of these tools are significantly reducing GHG emissions from cruise ship operations.

While shore power - which lets ships plug into Seattle's clean electricity while at berth instead of burning polluting fuel - reduces negative health impacts on near-port residents, it has little effect on climate change. Cruise ships are plugged in for only 7 hours during each 7-day journey, so shore power can eliminate no more than $1/24 = 4\%$ of their GHG emissions. Alaskan stops such as Sitka, Juneau, and Ketchikan lack the electrical capacity to support shore power, so their residents will continue to be exposed to dangerous air pollutants, and the ships will continue to emit GHGs while in these ports. This seems like an example of "pushing the problem elsewhere."

Regarding "advocacy at the federal level," why isn't the Port using its lobbying power to support passage of the Clean Shipping Act of 2023? This Act would mandate increasingly strict GHG reductions for all ocean-going vessels over the next 16 years, eliminating GHG emissions entirely by 2040.

6. The Port touts its participation in international decarbonization efforts, including "the International Maritime Organization's Marine Environment Protection Committee meeting that resulted in an announcement by global maritime interests of a shared goal to reduce emissions."

This is not at all reassuring. It is well documented that the International Maritime Organization has been captured by industry, and has spent years systematically blocking effective action to reduce shipping emissions. It is disturbing but not surprising that the strategy developed during the meeting you attended is not aligned with the Paris Agreement to limit global temperature rise to 1.5°C.

7. The Port mentions that "local water quality and pollution prevention has, since 2004, been included in the 'Cruise MOU' and has provided voluntary protections for Washington's water quality; in 2018, Puget Sound became a no-discharge zone."

It's good that the Port's MOU prevents dumping in Puget Sound, but as soon as the ships cross the Canadian border, they can and do dump all kinds of toxic waste into the ocean, to the tune of 4 billion gallons a year. This pollution harms marine life in our waters, as well as in Canada's waters.

8. "We deeply appreciate your engagement in helping us drive the change we need."

Nothing in your response addresses the harms to climate, water and air caused by continued cruise operations. This is not "the change we need." The Port of Seattle must take action now: quantify total cruise GHG emissions (including passenger air travel) and reduce these in alignment with the Clean Shipping Act. Given what we already know, failure to act is a betrayal of the public trust.

first_name	last_name	email	zip_code	can2_phone
Derek	Gendvil	dgendvil@	89117	
Kevin	Gallagher	kevingal@	98155	
Jared	Howe	jaredchow	98108	
Jennifer	Godfrey	plantkingd	98119	
Linda	Carroll	lindalouise	99205	
Jim	Bernthal	jimbernth	98118	
Margo	Polley	polleym@l	98045	
Patrick	McKee	patmckee@	98040	
Paul	Brown	kozemchul	98107	
Mary	Hanson	hansonma	98105	
Anita	Shelton	anitamshe	98103	
Andrea	Faste	amfaste@	98117	
Beth	Brunton	bebrunton	98144	
Charles	Raymond	cfr98115@	98115-2564	
Andrea	O'Ferrall	andreaofe	98106	
Scott	McClay	scottmc@r	98106	
Jordan	Van Voast	jordanvvv	98144	
Susan	Helf	shelf30@g	98117	
Noemie	Maxwell V.	noemie_m	7043	
Barbara	Hindi	barbarahin	98119	
Don	Parada	don_seattl	98103-4829	
Valerie	Costa	valerista@	98112	
Sophia	Keller	keltiawind	98146	
Robin	Briggs	rbriggs120	98112	
Donna	Ward	donnafwar	98117	
Ron	Tjerandser	ron.tjeranc	98116	
Iris	Antman	antwoman	98118	
Antonio	Blasi	antoniobla	4640	
Dori	Rosenberg	dorirosenb	98118	
Nancy	Penrose	mue.rose@	98122	
Sara	Bliss	sara.c.bliss	98117	
Brie	Gyncild	briegyncild	98122	
Lucinda	Stroud	lucinda.str	98119	
G	Levy	bf136@scr	98125-4651	
Jeanie	Johnson	jjwildwom	98225	
Jane	Covert-Bo	sjcovertbo	98125	
Brandon	Bowersox-	brandonbc	98103	
Linda	Golley	linda_golle	98032	
William	McPhersor	wrmcpher	98102	
Linda	McCoy	lindamcco	98133	
Barbara	O'SteeO	barbarajos	98136-2406	
Miranda	Taylor	mirandom	98126	
Lauren	Wilson	lcwilson33	98116	
Lynn	Gaertner-J	lynngaern	98117-5415	
Cynthia	Ervin	cynthervin	98115	
Charles an	Bagley	candnbagl	98119	

Rosemary	Moore	rosemaryn	98040
Gregory	Denton	greg.dento	98260
David	Kipnis	dakipnis@	98116
Wendy	John	wendy.joh	98105
Peggy	Printz	peggyjprin	98115
Kristin	Fitzpatrick	kristfitz@li	98122
Laureen	France	divifran@c	98199
Wendy	Krakauer	cosauer62:	98103
Gordon	Adams	gordondas	98115
Anne	Miller	annemiller	98122
Kathy	Pendriss	kathy.penc	98177
Debra	Scheuerm	debscheue	98133
Kristen	Faiferlick	kfaiferlick@	98115
	350 Tacoma	350tacom:	98421
George	Lawson	glawson40	98261
Arun	Ganti	ganti.arun@	98122
Robert	Briggs	rsb2@turb	98070
Deborah	Stewart	dstewart98	98103
PJ	Phillips	contagious	98144
Michelle	Lissner	mmlissner@	98177
John	Bito	jwbito@pr	98103
Chris	Covert-Bo	c.covertbo	98103
Jason	Li	jasonli468@	98102
William	Livernois	william@li	98105
Stacy	Oaks	stacyoaks4	98271
Adrienne	Papermast	adriennep:	98108
Matthew	Kolenski	matthew.k	98115
Elijah	Tripi	elijah.tripi@	98058
Laura	Gomiero	laura.gomi	98115
Clement	Gomiero	clement.gc	98115
Cecile	Gomiero	cecile.gom	98115

[EXTERNAL] written comment for Jan. 9th commission mtg.

Robin Briggs <rbriggs1201@gmail.com>

Thu 1/4/2024 3:01 PM

To:Commission-Public-Records <commission-public-records@portseattle.org>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

I am resending a letter I sent on Dec. 8 so that it may be entered in the public record. I recently received your reply (thank you for that!) but I was disappointed. I would like to hear more about how the Port plans to decrease its scope 3 emissions. Here's the letter from Dec. 8:

Thank you for taking the time to reply to my request that the Port cap and reduce the number of sailings for cruise ships. However, I am concerned that the Port does not seem to be taking the needs of the climate seriously. Climate change isn't some distant possibility; it's here now, it's adversely impacting our quality of life, and this will continue to get worse until we take proactive steps to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

I know that Commissioners and staff at the Port really care about the climate and the environment as individuals. But there is a lot more that the Port could be doing, and step one is taking responsibility for the impact it has on our planet and our marine habitat, and laying out a plan for how to reduce the damage caused directly by the Port, but also indirectly by the cruise ship lines who are the Port's customers. Your plan, as far as I can see, does not actually result in emissions decreases when you include the scope 3 emissions.

Ten years ago, I would not have expected us to be experiencing the kind of warming weather, droughts, wildfires, and dying forests that we are now. Ten years from now, we may well be experiencing even worse impacts. If so, how will you look back then on the work you are doing now? On the opportunities you have to change course. No one person or group of people got us into this mess, but we will all need to cooperate and work together to get out of it.

Thank you for your engagement, and for reading to the end of the letter,

Robin Briggs

[EXTERNAL] Enough with the Green washing and excuses

Lynn Fitz-Hugh <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>

Fri 1/5/2024 12:18 PM

To:Commission-Public-Records <commission-public-records@portseattle.org>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Commission_Testimony Port Meeting,

I am submitting this as a written comment for the next 2024 Commission meeting.

Dear Port Commissioners & Staff,

Thank you for the reply to my request that the Port of Seattle cap and reduce the number of cruise ship sailings. However, the Port's casual acceptance of cruise sector greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions continuing unchecked until some unspecified future date is unacceptable. The crisis, the U.N.'s "code red," is here now: global climate and ecological breakdown have reached a point where slow action is nearly as bad as no action.

Please see my specific objections, below; excerpts from your letter are in quotes.

1. The Port claims to be "deeply committed to maritime decarbonization and emissions reduction."

The climate is not responsive to your "deep commitment," your good intentions, or promises of future technology. Significant reductions are needed now.

2. The Port says it will "work to understand" how the emissions reduction schedule mandated in the Clean Shipping Act lines up with the Port's current plans.

The answer to this seems pretty simple: the schedule proposed in the Clean Shipping Act is faster and more ambitious than yours. The Act calls for reductions in GHG emissions starting in 2027 (your reductions don't start until 2030), and it would eliminate GHG emissions from ships by 2040 - ten years earlier than the Port's goals.

3. The Port wants to understand "how capping the number of cruise ships compares with its current focus on capping emissions – in terms of the Port's operations, the local economy, and its environmental goals," and says that it "would not want to cap the number of cruise ships in Seattle only to push the problem elsewhere."

The trouble with your "current focus on capping emissions" is that you are not, in fact, capping emissions: they are rising, and will continue to rise as each year, more and more people fly to Seattle to take cruises. Furthermore, it's not enough to cap emissions: they need to be significantly reduced each year, starting in 2024.

Your concern that any reduction of cruise in Seattle would just "push the problem elsewhere" fails to acknowledge the Port's power to influence the industry and other ports. Consider the Port's admirable dedication to cracking down on sex trafficking. Like greenhouse gas emissions, trafficking is a global problem, but the Port does not say "We would not want to crack down on sex trafficking in Seattle only to push the problem elsewhere." On the contrary, the Port is actively working not only to stop trafficking in Seattle, but is also cooperating regionally to help other jurisdictions stop it, as well. I am asking that you bring this same kind of comprehensive, collaborative approach to reducing the harms that cruise ships cause. You could set a global example, joining the city of La Rochelle, France, which is already reducing cruise sailings in order to meet its climate goals.

4. The Port's primary strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from cruise ships seems to be its "Green Cruise Corridor," which it claims will not only "reduce emissions from the cruise industry locally but also have global impacts to how the industry operates worldwide."

The problem is that your so-called "Green Cruise Corridor" has achieved no emissions reductions thus far, and there's little reason to expect meaningful reductions in the time frame required by our current ecological and climate crisis. Corridor participants have made no commitment to reducing GHG emissions by any particular amount or date; the agreement includes no deadlines and no enforcement mechanisms. Participants have committed only to "explore the feasibility" of decarbonizing the cruise sector.

Both Port of Seattle Commissioners running for re-election this year made it clear that the Corridor won't begin to reduce emissions for years to come; meanwhile, emissions are increasing as passenger numbers increase every year.

In addition, during the April, 2023 webinar that updated the public on the Green Cruise Corridor, cruise company representatives were still enthusiastically promoting liquefied natural gas (LNG) as a "green fuel," despite the well-established fact that climate emissions from LNG are often higher than from conventional marine fuels.

5. The Port highlights "the many other tools it is using to advance cruise environmental sustainability goals including through business agreements with the cruise lines, terminal best management practices, shore power infrastructure investments, and advocacy at the local, state, federal and international levels."

None of these tools are significantly reducing GHG emissions from cruise ship operations.

While shore power - which lets ships plug into Seattle's clean electricity while at berth instead of burning polluting fuel - reduces negative health impacts on near-port residents, it has little effect on climate change. Cruise ships are plugged in for only 7 hours during each 7-day journey, so shore power can eliminate no more than $1/24 = 4\%$ of their GHG emissions. Alaskan stops such as Sitka, Juneau, and Ketchikan lack the electrical capacity to support shore power, so their residents will continue to be exposed to dangerous air pollutants, and the ships will continue to emit GHGs while in these ports. This seems like an example of "pushing the problem elsewhere."

Regarding "advocacy at the federal level," why isn't the Port using its lobbying power to support passage of the Clean Shipping Act of 2023? This Act would mandate increasingly strict GHG reductions for all ocean-going vessels over the next 16 years, eliminating GHG emissions entirely by 2040.

6. The Port touts its participation in international decarbonization efforts, including "the International Maritime Organization's Marine Environment Protection Committee meeting that resulted in an announcement by global maritime interests of a shared goal to reduce emissions."

This is not at all reassuring. It is well documented that the International Maritime Organization has been captured by industry, and has spent years systematically blocking effective action to reduce shipping emissions. It is disturbing but not surprising that the strategy developed during the meeting you attended is not aligned with the Paris Agreement to limit global temperature rise to 1.5°C.

7. The Port mentions that "local water quality and pollution prevention has, since 2004, been included in the 'Cruise MOU' and has provided voluntary protections for Washington's water quality; in 2018, Puget Sound became a no-discharge zone."

It's good that the Port's MOU prevents dumping in Puget Sound, but as soon as the ships cross the Canadian border, they can and do dump all kinds of toxic waste into the ocean, to the tune of 4 billion gallons a year. This pollution harms marine life in our waters, as well as in Canada's waters.

8. "We deeply appreciate your engagement in helping us drive the change we need."

Nothing in your response addresses the harms to climate, water and air caused by continued cruise operations. This is not "the change we need." The Port of Seattle must take action now: quantify total cruise GHG emissions (including passenger air travel) and reduce these in alignment with the Clean Shipping Act. Given what we already know, failure to act is a betrayal of the public trust.

Lynn Fitz-Hugh
lynn@fitz-hugh.org

Olympia, Washington 98501

1/9 Public Comment

Kageyama, Janeen <Kageyama.J@portseattle.org>

Tue 1/9/2024 11:04 AM

To:Commission-Public-Records <commission-public-records@portseattle.org>

Good Morning,

I am sharing this public comment from a community member. Brenda emailed it but received a bounce back.

Thank you,
Janeen

To whom it may concern,

My name is Brenda Gonzalez health program coordinator at Villa Comunitaria, a nonprofit organization in South Park serving our diverse Latine immigrant communities of South Park and throughout King County. Over the last (almost) 2 years it has been a great pleasure for me to support with programming that aims to meet the health and wellness needs of our community. From vaccine pop up clinics to community events, Villa Comunitaria would not be able to do this work without the support of our community partners especially that of the Port of Seattle's Duwamish HUB. One of the biggest issues we face is to effective programming is limited space capacity. The Duwamish HUB is not only a space for us to hold these events and carry out important programming year after year, but it's also a place that the communities we serve are connected to and feel comfortable receiving our services at. The Duwamish HUB is an integral part of our work and a valuable resource to Villa Comunitaria, throughout the years we have been able to foster a reciprocal relationship to the HUB and the Port of Seattle Team, this has allowed us to learn and share about the work that the Port of Seattle does with the communities we serve. I am strongly in support of the Seattle Duwamish HUB lease renewal, and I am looking forward to another year of programming at the HUB and continued collaboration with the Port. Thank you.

Brenda



Brenda Gonzalez | She/Her

Healthy Community Coordinator

206.741.2520

Brenda@villacomunitaria.org

www.villacomunitaria.org

8201 10th Ave S STE. #8, Seattle, WA 98108

[EXTERNAL] PUBLIC COMMENT for October 27, 2020

Patrick McKee <patmckee@sbcglobal.net>

Tue 1/9/2024 11:12 AM

To:Commission-Public-Records <commission-public-records@portseattle.org>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Commissioners, Executive Director, Staff -

Looking at proposed Seattle cruise numbers for 2024, this would appear to be the 2nd year in a row with slightly fewer sailings - more passengers, but fewer sailings. Welcome news as far as it goes, but what's behind it? Hopefully not just another mysterious arrangement nobody sees fit to share with the public, a question to file alongside: Why are we even talking about sustainability without accounting for Scope 3 emissions? Who's tolerating cruise ship work-arounds on low sulfur fuel regulations? When is it ok - in our state - for billion dollar corporations to pay employees \$2 an hour? How does a city of 30 thousand accommodate 1.65 million visitors in a single summer?

So, I'll ask. What is it that's causing cruise lines to reduce the number of Seattle sailings? Capacity? Demand? Conscience?

The Port is Presenting Sponsor for CLIA's Pacific Northwest Cruise Symposium, right here in Seattle, at the end of this month. Is this the long awaited open forum to discuss cost / benefit assumptions driving cruise decision making, the experiences of destination port residents and shipboard workers, regional health and environmental outcomes? No. It's an exclusive private affair, tickets (for insider partners only) starting at \$250 - well, plus another hundred for the opening reception, plus travel, per diem, housing, etc.

We all know that deals made in rooms like these - often by our elected officials - have very real consequences for our lives and livelihoods. Why doesn't the Port Commission tell CLIA they're going to open the event to the public? Invite community representation - not just the tourism sector? Livestream it for stakeholders up and down the coast; make tickets available to relevant organizations; take questions from citizens, scientists, journalists? It's long past time for CLIA and the Port of Seattle, and their various partners in profit, to take seriously the health of the ocean and the stakes for the planet, and acknowledge the legitimate concerns of impacted communities.

Thank you,

Patrick McKee
Mercer Island, WA
323.336.3651

[EXTERNAL] Your Disappointing Response Regarding Cruise

Lauren Tozzi <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>

Tue 1/9/2024 12:34 PM

To:Commission-Public-Records <commission-public-records@portseattle.org>

WARNING: External email. Links or attachments may be unsafe.

Commission_Testimony Port Meeting,

I am submitting this as a written comment for the next 2024 Commission meeting.

Dear Port Commissioners & Staff,

Thank you for the reply to my request that the Port of Seattle cap and reduce the number of cruise ship sailings. However, the Port's casual acceptance of cruise sector greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions continuing unchecked until some unspecified future date is unacceptable. The crisis, the U.N.'s "code red," is here now: global climate and ecological breakdown have reached a point where slow action is nearly as bad as no action.

Please see my specific objections, below; excerpts from your letter are in quotes.

1. The Port claims to be "deeply committed to maritime decarbonization and emissions reduction."

The climate is not responsive to your "deep commitment," your good intentions, or promises of future technology. Significant reductions are needed now.

2. The Port says it will "work to understand" how the emissions reduction schedule mandated in the Clean Shipping Act lines up with the Port's current plans.

The answer to this seems pretty simple: the schedule proposed in the Clean Shipping Act is faster and more ambitious than yours. The Act calls for reductions in GHG emissions starting in 2027 (your reductions don't start until 2030), and it would eliminate GHG emissions from ships by 2040 - ten years earlier than the Port's goals.

3. The Port wants to understand "how capping the number of cruise ships compares with its current focus on capping emissions – in terms of the Port's operations, the local economy, and its environmental goals," and says that it "would not want to cap the number of cruise ships in Seattle only to push the problem elsewhere."

The trouble with your "current focus on capping emissions" is that you are not, in fact, capping emissions: they are rising, and will continue to rise as each year, more and more people fly to Seattle to take cruises. Furthermore, it's not enough to cap emissions: they need to be significantly reduced each year, starting in 2024.

Your concern that any reduction of cruise in Seattle would just "push the problem elsewhere" fails to acknowledge the Port's power to influence the industry and other ports. Consider the Port's admirable dedication to cracking down on sex trafficking. Like greenhouse gas emissions, trafficking is a global problem, but the Port does not say "We would not want to crack down on sex trafficking in Seattle only to push the problem elsewhere." On the contrary, the Port is actively working not only to stop trafficking in Seattle, but is also cooperating regionally to help other jurisdictions stop it, as well. I am asking that you bring this same kind of comprehensive, collaborative approach to reducing the harms that cruise ships cause. You could set a global example, joining the city of La Rochelle, France, which is already reducing cruise sailings in order to meet its climate goals.

4. The Port's primary strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from cruise ships seems to be its "Green Cruise Corridor," which it claims will not only "reduce emissions from the cruise industry locally but also have global impacts to how the industry operates worldwide."

The problem is that your so-called "Green Cruise Corridor" has achieved no emissions reductions thus far, and there's little reason to expect meaningful reductions in the time frame required by our current ecological and climate crisis. Corridor participants have made no commitment to reducing GHG emissions by any particular amount or date; the agreement includes no deadlines and no enforcement mechanisms. Participants have committed only to "explore the feasibility" of decarbonizing the cruise sector.

Both Port of Seattle Commissioners running for re-election this year made it clear that the Corridor won't begin to reduce emissions for years to come; meanwhile, emissions are increasing as passenger numbers increase every year.

In addition, during the April, 2023 webinar that updated the public on the Green Cruise Corridor, cruise company representatives were still enthusiastically promoting liquefied natural gas (LNG) as a "green fuel," despite the well-established fact that climate emissions from LNG are often higher than from conventional marine fuels.

5. The Port highlights "the many other tools it is using to advance cruise environmental sustainability goals including through business agreements with the cruise lines, terminal best management practices, shore power infrastructure investments, and advocacy at the local, state, federal and international levels."

None of these tools are significantly reducing GHG emissions from cruise ship operations.

While shore power - which lets ships plug into Seattle's clean electricity while at berth instead of burning polluting fuel - reduces negative health impacts on near-port residents, it has little effect on climate change. Cruise ships are plugged in for only 7 hours during each 7-day journey, so shore power can eliminate no more than $1/24 = 4\%$ of their GHG emissions. Alaskan stops such as Sitka, Juneau, and Ketchikan lack the electrical capacity to support shore power, so their residents will continue to be exposed to dangerous air pollutants, and the ships will continue to emit GHGs while in these ports. This seems like an example of "pushing the problem elsewhere."

Regarding "advocacy at the federal level," why isn't the Port using its lobbying power to support passage of the Clean Shipping Act of 2023? This Act would mandate increasingly strict GHG reductions for all ocean-going vessels over the next 16 years, eliminating GHG emissions entirely by 2040.

6. The Port touts its participation in international decarbonization efforts, including "the International Maritime Organization's Marine Environment Protection Committee meeting that resulted in an announcement by global maritime interests of a shared goal to reduce emissions."

This is not at all reassuring. It is well documented that the International Maritime Organization has been captured by industry, and has spent years systematically blocking effective action to reduce shipping emissions. It is disturbing but not surprising that the strategy developed during the meeting you attended is not aligned with the Paris Agreement to limit global temperature rise to 1.5°C.

7. The Port mentions that "local water quality and pollution prevention has, since 2004, been included in the 'Cruise MOU' and has provided voluntary protections for Washington's water quality; in 2018, Puget Sound became a no-discharge zone."

It's good that the Port's MOU prevents dumping in Puget Sound, but as soon as the ships cross the Canadian border, they can and do dump all kinds of toxic waste into the ocean, to the tune of 4 billion gallons a year. This pollution harms marine life in our waters, as well as in Canada's waters.

8. "We deeply appreciate your engagement in helping us drive the change we need."

Nothing in your response addresses the harms to climate, water and air caused by continued cruise operations. This is not "the change we need." The Port of Seattle must take action now: quantify total cruise GHG emissions (including passenger air travel) and reduce these in alignment with the Clean Shipping Act. Given what we already know, failure to act is a betrayal of the public trust.

Lauren Tozzi
lrntozzi2@gmail.com

Seattle, Washington 98103