

From: [Sharla Dodd](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Port of Seattle Port Meeting public comment
Date: Sunday, November 15, 2020 3:08:18 PM

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

Hello,

I recently emailed a comment in regards to the 2021 Port budget and tax levy increase and was very surprised to hear of the upcoming meeting to presumably move forward with said budget. I think it is unconscionable that you plan to shift the onus of the cost from large corporations to the individual taxpayer, many of whom do not have the means to travel by plane and yet would be forced to subsidize airlines during a pandemic-caused economic downturn. If the Port truly intends to serve the public then the equitable way forward is NOT to increase the taxpayer's burden each year (\$78+ million in 2021 followed by additional increases in 2022 and 2023) while reducing fees for airlines, including passing on savings from cuts to operational costs and utilizing federal stimulus money. The stimulus money could, for example, be used to aid low-wage airport workers who might have lost their jobs or do not have access to health insurance. Any cost savings and federal stimulus money should NOT benefit corporations (especially given that airlines mismanaged their absurd profits with shareholder payouts, for example, instead of setting aside money for emergency situations like Covid-19, expecting federal and taxpayer bailouts to come to the rescue) and should instead be used to reduce the burden on taxpayers and assist low-wage workers, without whom the Port would not be able to function.

Secondly, during this time of dueling emergencies (climate change will soon make Covid-19 look like a minor blip), the Port budget does not even attempt any meaningful reduction in its operational emissions, the vast majority of which come from fuel burned at Sea-Tac. The only emissions reduction method mentioned is the use of "sustainable aviation fuels" (biofuels, by a less euphemistic name), a specious plan at best. CO2 emissions will not be reduced by switching to biofuels and it remains unclear whether biofuels would reduce other particulate emissions or radiative forcing. Furthermore the proposed growth at the Port would more than erase any minor biofuel emissions reductions achieved. The only way to reduce emissions is to reduce flights, antithetical to your entire budget proposal that prioritizes increasing flights, airport capacity, and thus corporate profits. Any budget that lacks proper climate-safeguarding built-in emissions reductions should NOT be approved. Our governments and leaders, including the Port, need to lead the way in rectifying the disastrous climate spiral we find ourselves in rather than doubling down on the same growth-first, business-as-usual approach.

The budget also largely fails to address (let alone even acknowledge) the massive inequities caused by Sea-Tac's daily operations. The noise and air pollution due to continually growing airport operations disproportionately affect nearby marginalized communities and communities of color. This pollution leads to many dismal health outcomes (increased preterm births, lower learning outcomes in children, decreased mental health, increased levels of dementia) and decreased property values and tax bases. The Port must reverse course and begin to take responsibility for the negative externalities (air and noise pollution) inherent in past and current airport operations and invest money (paid for by users of Sea-Tac) into programs that address, mitigate and redress the hardships that have fallen on these impacted communities.

Some possible steps the Port could take to create a budget that is in line with its stated Century Agenda, helps achieve equity and sustainability, and truly serves the public are as follows:

1. Stop spending on Sea-Tac projects unless necessary for safety.
2. Redirect money for Sea-Tac expansion projects (e.g., IAF and NASF) to mitigation projects to immediately reduce harms to airport impacted communities (sound insulation and air purifiers for homes, day cares, and schools).
3. Halt the "Sustainable Airport Master Plan" and redirect funds for the SAMP to research and development of modes of passenger and cargo transportation in our region that are actually sustainable (not airplanes burning biofuels), such as rail.
4. Invest in research to determine how best to reduce air and noise pollution on airport-impacted communities.
5. Fund programs to ensure accurate accounting, reporting, and education regarding all types of emissions from Sea-Tac.

In regards to the proposal to spend \$22 million on Sea-Tac parking garage upgrades, I urge the Port to abandon this idea and instead focus on the only effective plan that will reduce CO2 emissions - degrowth. The specious justifications for this parking garage update and expenditure claim that it will result in a CO2 emissions reduction by 17-20 metric tons per year (almost nothing in comparison with the almost 6,000,000 metric tons of CO2 emitted from pumped fuel in 2017). Another greenwashing justification for the updated garage is that the number of EV charging stations will double to 96 (still less than 1% of spots in the garage). The Port of Seattle should stop pouring money into Sea-Tac infrastructure and should instead focus whole-heartedly on taking action to avoid climate catastrophe. We have little time to make these necessary changes and thus must start to severely reduce CO2 emissions through an immediate plan of degrowth. Any available funds (\$22 million for the parking garage) should be used to mitigate the current harm that noise and air pollution from Sea-Tac operations have on impacted communities.

Please confirm that my comment has been received.

Thank you for your time,
Sharla Dodd