

From: [sarah shifley](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] [Possible Scam Fraud]Public Comment for 10/27/2020 Commission Regular Meeting
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2020 6:46:55 PM

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

WARNING: Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat.

The sender may trick victims into passing bad checks on their behalf.

If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

My name is Sarah Shifley. I am a volunteer with the 350 Seattle Aviation Team and am offering these comments on the Port's proposed 2021 legislative agenda.

In a recent press release, Commissioner Felleman reminded us that we're in an "urgent time for the climate and our community's health." He's right—we now have [nine years to cut our emissions in half](#) to avoid even more catastrophic impacts of climate change.

Looking at the legislative agenda, it appears that when it comes to aviation, the Port's solution is to push for aviation biofuels. A recent press release from the Port presented a goal of having 10 percent of fuel used at Sea-Tac be a biofuel blend. However, a little simple math quickly shows that, even if this goal is met, aviation biofuels will not reduce aviation's impact on our climate and communities from what it is today. Moreover, focusing on biofuels in this "urgent time" only distracts from real solutions and while we treat steadily further into crisis.

The Port's goal is to have 10 percent of aviation fuel used at Sea-Tac be biofuel by 2028. If the Port is correct that biofuel emits 50-80 percent less CO2 and it meets its goal, then CO2 emissions from fuel pumped at Sea-Tac in 2028 would be 5 to 8 percent lower than they otherwise would be. However, the Port is concurrently pushing for expansions that would *double* the amount of airplane traffic at Sea-Tac in this same time frame, which would double overall CO2 emissions. So all told, even if the Port reaches its goal, CO2 emissions from fuel pumped at Sea-Tac would continue to quickly increase between now and 2028, and then beyond.

Additionally, it is now undisputed that [aviation emissions warm the climate at approximately three times the rate](#) of that associated with aviation CO2 emissions alone (a fact which the Port continually fails to acknowledge). It is unclear how much the

biofuels being promoted by the Port would do to eliminate the non-CO2 warming impacts of aviation emissions.

Deployment of biofuels would also do nothing to address the disparate impact aviation noise pollution has on communities under flight paths. As you well know (because I testified about it at your last meeting), noise pollution can lead to countless life-threatening health conditions, higher rates of depression and anxiety, and lower learning outcomes.

Instead of investing time and money in aviation biofuels, the Port needs to focus on actions that *can actually* reduce aviation emissions, like limiting demand for aviation and supporting investments in truly sustainable forms of transportation.

Thank you,
Sarah