

**From:** [sarah shifley](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments for 12/15 Port Meeting  
**Date:** Saturday, December 12, 2020 6:39:14 AM

---

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

Dear Port of Seattle Staff,

Please see comments below for the Port Commissioners' 12/15 meeting. Please confirm that these comments have been received and will be circulated to, **and read by**, Commissioners prior to voting, and that they will be included in the meeting minutes.

Also, please use this summary of my comment during the meeting:

- Seattle's 2018 GHG emission inventory shows that emissions from the burning of fuel pumped at Sea-Tac--considering non-CO2 impacts--**makes up 43.7% of Seattle's contribution to climate warming**. The Port's continued failure to address these emissions is indefensible.
- Sound insulation does nothing to address outdoor noise pollution outdoors or air pollution from Sea-Tac traffic. The only equitable response to Sea-Tac air and noise pollution is to eliminate the pollution or ensure that it is not concentrated in any one area.

Thank you!  
Sarah

---

Dear Port of Seattle Commissioners,

My name is Sarah Shifley. I am writing to comment on Agenda Items 8j and 10c. I appreciate your full consideration of these comments before voting on these agenda items.

**Agenda Item 8j: Funding for the National Renewable Energy Lab**

As the staff memo notes, the Port has made bold commitments to being "green." At the same time, it is aggressively pursuing expansion of Sea-Tac, which would double emissions from the burning of fuel pumped at the airport. Emissions from fuel pumped make up the *vast majority* of emissions from Sea-Tac and are a major contributor to the climate crisis.

In 2018--without even considering the non-CO2 impacts of aviation emissions--[the burning of fuel pumped at Sea-Tac comprised 19.4% of Seattle's total GHG emissions](#). Once the non-CO2 impacts are considered ([which scientists have confirmed they must be](#)), that percent jumps to 43.7%. **In other words, nearly half of Seattle's contribution to climate warming is due to the burning of fuel pumped at Sea-Tac. And yet you continue to do *nothing* to address these emissions. How is your inaction defensible?**

Any efficiencies in other sectors of Sea-Tac operations will be far outweighed by increased

emissions from fuel pumped. Instead of focusing on things like heating and cooling at Sea-Tac, the Port *must* address the emissions from fuel burned and put a stop to any expansion projects that would increase capacity. There is no alternative.

**Agenda Item 10c: Procuring Sound Insulation Consultant**

While I am happy that the Port is talking about how noise pollution impacts communities near Sea-Tac, the only equitable response to Sea-Tac noise pollution is to eliminate it, or ensure that it is not concentrated over any one particular community (which is impossible with the current scope of Sea-Tac operations). Sound insulation for homes and places of worship is nice, but it does nothing to eliminate noise pollution outdoors. Do you expect children in airport-impacted communities to never go outside? This would mean no walks in nature, riding bikes, playing at playgrounds, picnics, or soccer games. Sound insulation also does nothing to address the air pollution from airplanes, which causes a wide variety of serious health conditions. Would you choose to raise your children in an airport-impacted community? If not, why do you continue to subject other communities to concentrated levels of air and noise pollution from Sea-Tac?

Thank you,  
Sarah