

Peter Goldman

Director, Washington Forest Law Center

615 Second Ave. Suite 360

Seattle, WA 98104

pgoldman@wflc.org; 206-223-4088 x.3; 206-399-0092

Testimony of Peter Goldman Regarding Proposed Lease of Terminal 5

Before Port of Seattle Commissioners

January 13, 2015 1:00 pm

Good afternoon, Commissioners and Mr. Fick. My name is Peter Goldman. I have lived in West Seattle for 27 years and I am an environmental lawyer, concerned citizen, and board-member of Washington Conservation Voters. I am speaking on behalf of myself but my views are shared by many who will be testifying today

Over the past two years, I have worked closely with Port staff and Commissioners on freight mobility issues in Seattle's Sodo district that could impede Port operations, such as the proposed sports arena. I have learned a lot about the seaport and Seattle's maritime and industrial economy and the threats to it, and I deeply respect the Port's important role in our regional and State economy.

The Port's visionary tag line is, "Where a Sustainable World is Headed." I am here today to make the case to you that the Port enabling Shell Oil Co. to stage its Arctic drilling operation at Terminal 5 is NOT "where a sustainable world is headed."

There are two basic environmental facts at play. First, it is generally agreed that, to avoid world-wide devastation and major climactic disruption, the average global temperature rise caused by green-house gas emissions must not exceed 2 degrees C above the average global temperature of pre-industrial times. To have at least a 50% chance of achieving this limit over the next 35 years, however, we must limit our future CO2 emissions to 1100 gigatons. But it is estimated that the green-house gas emissions contained in present estimates of global fossil fuel are around **three times** higher than this. In a study recently published in the journal Nature, scientists estimated that about 1/3 of oil reserves, half of gas reserves, and 80% of remaining world coal reserves must remain unused to possibly meet this 2 degree target. Considering our need to reduce fossil fuel consumption in general, aggressive development of impossible-to-safely-extract Arctic oil makes no economic or environmental sense.

The second environmental fact is that blow-out or spill-free drilling in the harsh Arctic environment is dangerous, virtually impossible, and no technology exists to stop or contain a blow-out in this harsh environment. One needs to look no further than the NY Times magazine article two weeks ago about Shell's Kullug rig disaster in 2012. I've made 10 copies for the Commissioners and staff.

I am mindful and respect that there is an important slippery slope policy issue here. Your duty, of course, is to run a seaport and not serve as a cop policing the environmental impact of what the Port's tenants do or what goes into or comes out of the millions sea containers that cross your land. But the proposed lease of Terminal 5 to Foss is not simply meddling in your tenants' business or interfering with interstate commerce; it is **your** business decision whether the proposed change in use is consistent with the long-term interest of the Port and "where a sustainable world is headed." Enabling Arctic drilling is neither.

The Port's staff did its job, and a thorough job, vetting potential interim uses of T-5. But this leasing decision transcends ordinary staff business decisions. Port staff needs and deserves policy guidance governing how the Port should lease its facilities to the resource extraction industry.

Another consideration is the Port's social license to operate in Seattle. If the Port facilitates Arctic drilling in this highly visible manner, it will make it much more difficult for environmentalists like me to make the case to the public and the City of Seattle that the Port is an environmentally-responsible neighbor and economic resource. Losing this argument will weaken the Port's ability to operate and build its infrastructure in Seattle, which is proudly one of the most environmentally-progressive cities in the U.S.

I also urge the Port, if it decides to proceed with the Foss lease, to process this proposed lease under SEPA. SEPA generally exempts leasing decisions but does not exempt leasing decisions that propose changes in use. Here, there is a clear change in use that could produce negative environmental consequences. In this SEPA review, the Port must analyze whether and to what extent its leasing decision will have a direct, indirect, or cumulative impact on climate change and the Arctic sea.

Thank you for considering my views.