

From: [Anne Kroeker](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment for 5/11/21 PoS Cmsn Mtg
Date: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 8:58:14 AM

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

(please submit for the record, in addition to my public comment)

[Anne Kroeker - Public health concerns: short term and long term](#)

If our State, County and Cities, all have noise ordinances to disallow outside noise in public or private spaces, between the hours of 10 PM and 7 AM, why don't our Port Commissioners advocate for Port operations and aircraft to be subject to this same restriction, especially considering how loud and low some of the night flights are over sleeping residents?

"The WHO Regional Office for Europe has developed these guidelines, based on the growing understanding of these health impacts of exposure to environmental noise":

https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/383921/noise-guidelines-eng.pdf

"The South King County Fund was created in November of 2018 to provide \$10 Million in resources to near-airport communities for projects that address airport noise, environmental health and sustainability." Why have none of the funds spent to date, covered airport noise? And why fund such projects as the Sovereignty Farm in Tukwila, if precautions aren't taken to test the soil, procure clean soil and grow the crops in protection from the wind and air which brings the toxic pollutants from the near aviation operations?

<https://www.minnpost.com/second-opinion/2014/06/airport-pollution-may-have-been-seriously-underestimated-study-suggests/>

When carbon emissions from on-the-ground Port operations come in at no more than 5% of the total emissions produced by the operations of flying and shipping, why does the Port spend so much time and energy on reducing these emissions and so little support on advocating for reduction of the other operation emissions?

"...CO₂ emissions from commercial aircraft are on a pace to triple by 2050, as both passenger air travel and air freight surge worldwide, and aviation's share of transportation-sector emissions is ballooning as cars and trucks become more fuel efficient. No serious attempt to face the problem of climate change can fail to address commercial aviation. And carbon emissions are not the only environmental challenge posed by a growing aviation sector. Nitrogen oxides, particulates, noise, and lead pollution also impact often disadvantaged communities living near airports.":

<https://theicct.org/aviation>

Since current shipping and aviation fuels have been specifically exempted from our recently passed bills for Climate Commitments and Clean Fuel Standards, why has our Port lobbyist spent so much time and the Port's money on getting them passed? Given that the Port's goal is to have at most 10% of biofuel by 2028, 7 years from now, with the other 90% still jet (fossil) fuel, how is this effort of any value when we need to reduce our current carbon emissions by 50% by 2030, per both the Port of Seattle and the US pledges?

Why does the Port of Seattle continue to support expansion of facilities, with complete disregard to the fact that they have reached capacity, and in fact, are over capacity with respect to being able to mitigate the harmful health and livelihood effects to the local communities?