

From: [Terri Cole](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose proposed parking lot
Date: Monday, July 5, 2021 10:32:20 AM

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

Dear Port Commissioner,

As a long-time resident of King County, I oppose the proposed 1,500-spot employee parking lot #L06.

We are currently in the midst of a catastrophic climate crisis. Heat dome last week killed people and crops. Mt Rainer is losing snow down to ice levels. Raising 11 acres of mature forest in the North SeaTac Park neighborhood is unjustifiable given what we are up against.

Additionally, this action will perpetuate the lack of environmental justice here in King County. We have data that shows which communities experience disproportionate heat impacts due to lack of canopy. Why would you even consider getting rid of mature forest in an area that already experiences high levels of air pollutants (the Washington State "Health Disparities" analysis ranks this census tract as a 9 out of 10 in air pollution exposure).

North SeaTac Park needs more trees, NOT 11 acres less, and not a parking lot that will add to pollution AND heat in the neighborhood.

Do the right thing - do not approve this proposal.

Terri
8319 Jones Ave NW
Seattle WA 98117

Sent from [Dx̣'ḏaẉ'abš Duwamish territory](#) | Seattle, WA

From: [laura.gibbons](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Testimony for Port meeting 7/13
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2021 9:28:09 AM

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

Here is my testimony (written only) for Tuesday's meeting. This is very short, so you should have time to read the whole thing out loud at the meeting.

Commissioners,

Congratulations on being the first port to join the International Alliance to Combat Ocean Acidification (Item 11c). This is an important part of keeping our planet habitable. You list the Century Agenda as one of your initiatives for reducing atmospheric emissions of CO₂ (Action Goal 1). I urge you to make concrete plans for how you will meet your Scope 3 emission reduction targets outlined in Strategy 4, Objective 15.iii. Currently we are not on track for any reductions at all.

Sincerely,

Laura Gibbons

Seattle

From: [Anne Kroeker](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Cc: [Richard Leeds](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment for PoS Commission Mtg, Jul 13, 2021 - Aviation Growth: What Does it Mean?
Date: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 8:56:00 AM

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

Dear Port of Seattle Commissioners and Staff,

Please read the short overview below of the findings recently completed by Dutch researchers on the growth of Schiphol, a very large international airport. We have known this answer to be true, at the affected community level here also, but have not done these particular set of studies.

In addition, consider the Scope 3 emissions enabled by the Port, not addressed nor accounted for, but which have added, and continue to add, to our atmosphere, bringing about such climate change effects as our recent extreme heat event, with its human and shellfish deaths.

“A growth in the number of flights at Schiphol Airport does not benefit prosperity. A shrinkage does not necessarily have to turn out well, but prosperity can increase. Independent research and consultancy firm CE Delft came to this conclusion in a social cost-benefit analysis that it carried out on behalf of the municipality of Aalsmeer, a village at the end of one of the runways.

According to the analysis, growth in aviation always costs money: annually between 2.3 and 3.1 billion euros. CE Delft looked at more than just the development of the economy, but also at issues such as noise pollution, environmental pollution and health costs. Measures to reduce CO2 emissions and additional costs for health complaints for local residents in particular cost a lot of money.

A total of five scenarios were examined, in which prosperity fell in four cases. Only a reduction in the number of flights to the Netherlands can have a positive effect. CE Delft assumes that international aviation will grow rapidly and that measures will be taken to limit CO2 emissions.

This welfare gain is achieved, among other things, by reducing noise and air pollution. Reducing noise pollution alone yields a profit of 2 billion euros. Moreover, it is mainly transfer passengers who disappear, so that accessibility for the Dutch remains at the same level.

Schiphol says that the results of this cost-benefit analysis do not correspond with those of previous studies commissioned by the national government. The airport believes that CE Delft has not considered ‘the positive contribution to availability and the business climate’ heavily enough. The research bureau is also said to be too negative about the consequences of initiatives to reduce noise pollution and CO2 emissions.

But the research confirms what residents groups in Amsterdam had already figured out earlier: a large airport only creates demand and provides no added value for economic growth.”

Based on an article on the Dutch news site nu.nl.

Thank you for your attention to the above concerns,

Anne Kroeker and Richard Leeds

From: [Bernedine Lund](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Update with page 2 - public comment for tomorrow's Commissioner meeting
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 8:13:29 PM
Attachments: [7-13-2020 PoS Public Comment with Page 2.pdf](#)

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

Hi, just received another article about reducing demand - could you please use this document which has a second page. You can delete the previous e-mail I sent.

Thank you

Bernedine

On Monday, July 12, 2021, 06:01:18 PM PDT, Bernedine Lund <philandbernedine2002@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi, Attached is the file. I of course keep having medical appts though this one is for eyes, so will have to listen when I get home about 2 PM.

Hope you're staying cool.

Bernedine Lund

POS Commissioner's Meeting, July 13, 2021, Public Comment by Bernedine Lund, resident of Federal Way and volunteer for 350 Seattle aviation group

Request: Consider what 'growth' of the airline industry really means.

The PSRC Final Report of May 2021 predicts that flights will increase from 400,000 per year to over 800,000 per year by 2050. This is based on projected population growth and demand for flights. In making this prediction, the PSRC did not take into account the negative impacts of such growth, and has not provided the leadership that is needed.

Not mentioning aircraft or any specific industry, an article The Pros and Cons of 'Growth' by Sloan Winston 2020 (<https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/the-pros-and-cons-of-growth/>) describes the issues with any growth:

- Pros: "Economic growth is the path to prosperity, and thus companies and economies should make growth the core aim", and
- Cons: "An obsession with economic growth is a cancer on society that's eating up our planet and natural resources and making the planet unfit for humanity."

The public's current demand for flights is creating the growth and that demand needs to be challenged. For example, in the past there was a greater and greater demand for smoking products; however, when the dangers of smoking were made known to the public and limits were placed on advertising and where one could smoke along with tax increases on tobacco products, smoking (in the US) decreased. Similar strategies could be done with the demand for flights – make fliers aware of the dangers and costs to health and environment and increase flight costs to cover the damage done. Additionally, communications via electronic meetings can be used to reduce flights as was done this past year, and people who want to see their families several times a year will not move that far away due to the increased costs of flying. Then today there was a news item that said that insurance companies are becoming concerned over having to cover the costs of the climate disasters.

The inequity of flights can also be addressed with limiting growth by reducing noise and emissions for people who live near the airport. It is estimated that 10% of the world population lives within 10 miles of an airport, and that population also suffers the negative health impacts even though most of them do not fly.

See next page for new article with abstract on next page - just received late on 7-12-2021

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214367X21000466>

Abstract:

"Aviation is responsible for at least 3.5% of global warming, and demand is predicted to rise rapidly over the next few decades. To reverse this trend, air travel demand will need to be managed. An important question is: 'who would be affected by air travel demand reduction policies'? The answer to that question largely depends on who is participating in air travel, and how unequally it is distributed. Existing analysis suggests that participation in air travel in the UK is highly unequal and driven by richer, highly educated and urban households. However, so far little is known about how these patterns of inequality have changed over time – has air travel participation increased among low income households, e.g. due to the rise of low-cost carriers and 'normalisation' of air travel as a social practice? Would these groups therefore now be more affected by flight taxes or frequent flyer levies? To address these questions, this paper examines trends in air travel inequality between 2001 and 2018 in the UK based on two representative surveys, providing the first micro-level analysis of air travel inequality over time for this country.

We find that while disadvantaged groups have contributed to the expansion of air travel over the past two decades, they remain far less likely to be affected by air travel demand management policies because air travel inequality is still at a very high level. These findings challenge common discourses that present air travel as a widespread norm, and demand management policies as socially unfair."

The authors say that "proposals for a frequent flyer tax or levy that have been put forward by various organisations, including the Committee on Climate Change ([Carmichael, 2019](#)) should be duly considered as far more beneficial from an environmental and justice perspective."

From: [Melinda Mueller](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for Port Commission mtg July 13
Date: Saturday, July 3, 2021 2:19:54 PM

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

Port Commissioners:

I am a resident of King County. I am writing to oppose the Port's proposed 1,500-spot employee parking lot #L06, which would destroy about 11 acres of mature forest in the North SeaTac Park neighborhood.

1. This proposal flies in the face of what's urgently needed to mitigate climate change (as if last week's deadly heat wave hadn't already driven home the point). We must preserve and expand our urban forests, NOT reduce them.
2. This proposal is also contrary to principles of environmental equity. The North SeaTac neighborhood has a high immigrant population, including many people not yet fully fluent in English (and thus with less access to making their voices heard in policy decisions). 71% identify as non-white; 19% live below the poverty line. This is precisely the demographic combination that suffers from higher pollution, lower tree canopy cover, and more extreme heat islands, according to both national and King County-specific data.
3. This neighborhood is already suffering from high levels of air pollutants, due to its proximity to SeaTac air traffic (the Washington State "Health Disparities" analysis ranks this census tract as a 9 out of 10 in air pollution exposure).
4. Trees absorb climate-altering gases and air pollutants. They also mitigate heat islands.

North SeaTac Park needs more trees, NOT 11 acres less, and not a parking lot that will add to pollution AND heat in the neighborhood.

Do not approve this proposal.

Sincerely,

Melinda Mueller

7704 16th AVE NW

Seattle, WA 98117

From: [Farris Peale](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 12:10:11 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Farris Peale, I am a Washington resident, and I wish to provide public comment for the Port meeting at 12 PM today.

I write to urge the Commissioners to reject the use of invasive face surveillance technology at Sea-Tac. The proposed technologies endanger the civil liberties of Washingtonians and all travelers passing through the airport, enabling mass government surveillance. These technologies are riddled with significant racial biases that present significant justice and equity problems in any context in which they might be used. Additionally, the proposed uses of these technologies would enhance the power of agencies, like CBP, that have been shown to use the data collected to violate basic expectations of equal protection, often targeting specific communities based on race, national origin, or religious belief.

Thank you,

Farris

From: [Sarah Shifley](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for 7/13/21 Port Commission Meeting
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 4:23:59 PM

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

Dear Port of Seattle Staff --

Here is a brief comment for tomorrow's regular commission meeting. Thanks!

I am happy to see that the Port of Seattle has joined the International Alliance to Combat Ocean Acidification (agenda item 11c). Responding to increasing ocean acidification is an important part of protecting the health of the planet. You list the Century Agenda as one of your initiatives for reducing CO2 emissions (Action Goal 1). **I urge you to set concrete and measurable steps for how the Port of Seattle will meet the Scope 3 emission reduction targets outlined in Strategy 4, Objection 15iii. The Port is currently not on track to achieve any reductions.**

Thank you,
Sarah

From: cspiess@ieee.org
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Tomorrow's Port Commission meeting
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 9:48:33 PM
Attachments: [written-comments.doc](#)

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

In addition to needing the dial-in info to provide verbal public comment, I'd also like to provide written public comment, so please see the attached file.

On Mon, Jul 12, 2021 at 5:43 PM cspiess@ieee.org <cspiess@ieee.org> wrote:

Hi,

I would like to provide public comment at tomorrow's Port of Seattle Commission meeting. My comments will be agenda item 10a (the biometric order).

Thanks,
-Cynthia Spiess

July 12, 2021

Dear Port of Seattle Commissioners,

I'd like to provide written public comment in regards to agenda item 10a (Biometrics Order 2021-06) for the July 13th, 2021 Port of Seattle Commission meeting.

There are numerous gaps in the Port's Biometrics Order 2021-06.

The Port's definition of mass surveillance is incorrect. The legal definition of surveillance from Cornell Law includes covert and overt forms [1], so giving notice doesn't make it not surveillance. The Port's current use of biometric technology is considered "mass surveillance" or what is commonly called "bulk collection" as defined by academics [2], the US Committee on Responding to a Presidential Policy Directive[3], and the EU Parliament [4].

Besides the inaccuracies previously described to the Commission regarding facial recognition technology for women, black folks, & transgender individuals [5 - 10]; biometric systems also have the following issues:

- * Fingerprint scanners won't be inclusive for the 20%-40% of combat amputees in U.S. conflicts in the global war on terror that have sustained major upper-extremity amputation. There are nearly 2 million people living with limb loss in the U.S.; and black folks are up to four times more likely than white folks to have an amputation [11 - 13].
- * Manual labor has been shown to degrade the friction ridges in fingerprints resulting in people unable to enroll in fingerprint scans [14].
- * Certain types of cancer can impact whether fingerprints can be recognized [15].
- * "Several dermatological diseases such as dermatitis, eczema, and psoriasis may cause temporary scaling, wrinkling and increased whitelines, or loss of ridge detail", which all make detecting fingerprints difficult [16].
- * Fingerprint readers on smartphones have been repeatedly shown to be easy to hack using paper & ink and/or glue & liquid-rubbers [17 - 20].
- * Fake fingerprints don't require physical access to the person. Instead they can be generated from HD images alone (such as was done against the German Defence Minister) [21 -22].
- * Just like any other system, biometrics systems can face data breaches, such as happened to a major vendor providing fingerprint & facial recognition access control systems [23]; but unlike data breaches of passwords, victims can't realistically be expected to get new fingerprints or faces. Even CBP had their Automated License Plate Reader system hacked in 2019 and the data sold on the dark web [24].

Facial and fingerprint images can disclose various medical conditions (including multiple genetic disorders) [25 - 27], thus causing these images to be form of medical information not covered by HIPAA. Even fingerprints alone can be used to predict age, sex, & ancestry [28 - 31].

NIST's own Digital Identity Guidelines state, "A biometric also does not constitute a secret. Accordingly, these guidelines only allow the use of biometrics for authentication when strongly bound to a physical authenticator", which would be something like a passport/ID-badge/etc; and further states, "...biometrics, when employed as a single factor of authentication, do not constitute acceptable secrets for digital authentication"; and NIST articulates further a list of reasons as to why they only support

limited use of biometrics for authentication and a list of requirements to be met by biometric systems [31 - 33]. This means following NIST guidelines would still necessitate the use of passports and boarding passes.

There is also a significant issue of informed consent not being possible for all passengers. People speak/read different languages, have different cultural expectations/norms, and/or have visual/mental/physical disabilities that could impede or prevent them from providing informed consent. Even just within Washington state, it is a sternuous for local governments to surmount these communication challenges. This problem would be even worse at the Port given the diversity of the global population. How would it be ensured that a broad diversity of travelers be informed when (say) opting into an airline's biometric data collection for baggage drop-off that they don't have to consent it? Or worse, if the airline is using TVS (for non-federal workflows), then how is it even possible to ensure that 100% of such a variety of people understands that: no the data isn't going to the airline, yes the data is going to CBP, no you don't have to opt-in to this even though it involves a federal agency (and the passenger may have just recently gone through "required" biometric screening by CBP)? It is not reasonable to assume this distinction is understood by all passengers, even when they "opt-in". (This is part of the reason why (at a minimum) TVS for non-federal workflows should be banned by the Port.)

Biometric data collection is not inherently better from a virus contamination or public health standpoint. Facial recognition technology only works if people take their masks off, which obviously means touching the mask (not advised) and taking it off (also not advised) thus removing the only prevention of expelled mouth droplets carrying disease. Similarly, fingerprint scanners only work for those not wearing any protective gloves and everyone must touch the same surface with their fingertips (which is not sanitary and also not advised).

No use of biometric technology at the Port of Seattle is Justified. It also won't be Private, Lawful, or Ethical. CBP's TVS doesn't comply with the Port's Principal of "Ethical" since CBP certainly doesn't comply with the Welcoming Port Policy Directive [34]. CBP's TVS, which is apart of a suite of DHS systems that use and/or store biometric or other traveler data, doesn't meet the Port's definition of the Principle of "Private". Depending on the individual or the type of data, the data could be in TVS, ADIS, ATS-UPAX, and/or IDENT. Moreover, this traveler data doesn't stay within CBP. CBP shares it with other DHS departments (OBIM, ICE, TSA, and S&T), FBI (via NGI/IAFIS), the U.S. Coast Guard (via eNOAD), and possibly other federal/state/local authorities. Any statements about data retention in TVS ignore the fact that some traveler data is persisted in other systems for sometimes very long periods of time (i.e. 75 years) [35]. The Port focusing on TVS and framing it as safe, while not mentioning all these other hops our data takes, is exactly what CBP would like you to do. The Port requesting an audit of TVS would never include this full scope of where our data goes and who all is tracking us. Additionally, The Identity Project has previously provided to the Commission detailed information about how CBP's gathering biometric data collection is not Lawful [36 - 37]

On top of all these issues, the Port has not been honest with the public or the Biometrics External Advisory Group (BEAG). The Port was already collaborating with CBP on Biometric air entry at least as early as April 2020, which is well before the Commission would vote on the biometric air entry at tomorrow's (July 13th, 2021) Commission meeting. Port staff also requested that CBP edit the materials they presented to the BEAG. And multiple Port staff gave CBP reassurances that the Commission was only going to define policies around the use of biometrics and the Port has no intention of taking a stand against biometrics [38].

There's significant downstream ramifications if the Port continues to normalize invasive and ubiquitous surveillance. Who in a free society wants to have their body parts digitized and cataloged by the government and for-profit companies? The Port has ignored the rippling effects that can happen by making biometric technology seem benign. Commissioners, future you will regret not having done more to fight against this. Bad decisions/behavior by other Ports doesn't justify the Port of Seattle also making bad decisions.

Please ban all use of biometric technology that is under the Commission's authority to do so. If actually listening to your constituents is too unpalatable to you, then here are at least some cosmetic improvements that are maybe easier for you to incorporate:

- 1) Ban the use of TVS for any non-federally mandated workflows. There is no reason that private tenants (for non-federal workflows) should be allowed to aide CBP (and through them ICE, DHS, FBI, etc). If the purpose is for private sector functionality, then the private sector needs to provide the complete end-to-end implementation.
- 2) Only opt-in workflows should be permitted (not opt-out under any circumstances).
- 3) Require entities to provide actual data (such as from case studies or sample testing, etc) as to what the benefits of their proposed use of biometric technology are for their specific type of workflow. They should not be permitted to make baseless claims as to why the benefits outweigh the risks. Generalizations about say processing speeds by CBP air exit would not be relevant to say baggage or rental car use cases. You would need actual example data from a baggage or rental car workflow (respectively) to make such a claim. Generalities about supposed benefits painted in broad brushstrokes without specific evidence should not be permitted by the Port.
- 4) Similarly, entities should be required to provide accuracy data for their specific workflows. The accuracy of the CBP system is based on their workflow only comparing the sample image (the passenger presenting at the gate) against the collection of known images for individuals identified to be on the same flight based on the flight's passenger manifest. As the pool of images a person is compared to increases, the accuracy of the matching system decreases. For non-federally mandated workflows, it is unclear to the public what pool images the traveler is compared against. If the pool of images is (for example) everyone-departing-the-airport-in-the-next-2-hours, then the accuracy will be reduced and pointing to the accuracy from the NIST test of TVS is not applicable to this workflow and over-inflates the accuracy (even for private entities using TVS under the hood).
- 5) Require that external cybersecurity professionals be contracted & consulted when drafting the Port's Biometric Data Security & Privacy Guidelines.
- 6) Require that the Port's Biometric Data Security & Privacy Guidelines are published publicly on the Port's website.
- 7) Require the Port's Biometric Data Security & Privacy Guidelines go through a periodic review process, such as annually, to ensure the Guidelines stay relevant and up-to-date in their technical, security, & privacy content.
- 8) Require that the Port's Biometric Data Security & Privacy Guidelines are finalized before any RFPs are submitted by the Port or any private sector proposals for biometric technology are approved by the Aviation/Maritime Managing Directors.
- 9) More concretely define and implement the process by which the Port will notify an operator of their violation of the Port's policies regarding biometric technology. The current description in the policy recommendation documents is too vague. There should instead be a formal process for the notifications to make them unambiguous. Additionally, the Port should specify a time limit by which the operator must resolve their non-compliance with the Port's policies.

10) Require that when a traveler's data is provided to a law enforcement agency that (if there is no gag order present) a notification of such data transfer must be provided to the traveler (if the contact info for them is known) and the same data is made available to themselves and/or their legal representative (if desired by the traveler).

The above list is just window dressing though. **Again, please ban all use of biometric technology that is under the Commission's authority to do so! Please listen to your constituents!**

Thank you,
-Cynthia Spiess
independent security researcher
Seattle resident

[1] Legal definition of "surveillance": "The act of observing persons or groups either with notice or their knowledge (overt surveillance) or without their knowledge (covert surveillance)." from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/surveillance>

[2] "Thus, mass surveillance is indiscriminate, by definition. It involves methods that sweep up the data and communications of the entire population, notably including those of innocent people." ... "By contrast, targeted surveillance is portrayed as the collection of the data and communications of those who are considered to be the legitimate targets of government investigation and repression." from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0163443716643006>

[3] "Based in part on briefings from the IC [Intelligence Community], the committee adopted a definition better suited to understanding the trade-off between civil liberties and effective intelligence: If a significant portion of the data collected is not associated with current targets, it is bulk collection; otherwise, it is targeted." from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/uploads/prod/2019/09/Bulk-Collection-of-Signals-Intelligence.pdf>

[4] "On 9 March 2004, the European Parliament (2004) declared that any form of mass surveillance was unjustified and that only targeted measures were justifiable. Targeted surveillance refers to the surveillance of a specific individual (or individuals) on a case-by-case basis, based on reasonable suspicion (or probable cause). This type of surveillance was only authorized if it included appropriate safeguards such as the requirement of search warrants or court orders. Any measure that did not meet these requirements of surveillance is - and in the case of the European Parliament was - considered unjustified." However, this view changed and per the the European Council's Declaration on Combating Terrorism (adopted on March 25th, 2004). "The mass surveillance of movement (PNR and biometric IDs) and of communications (data retention) were now all said to be justified." Thus the definition of mass surveillance was unchanged but situations where it was considered justified did change. See: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S175606161100070X>

[5] <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a/buolamwini18a.pdf>

[6] <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/6712710>

[7]

https://journals.lww.com/plasreconsurg/Abstract/2020/01000/Facial_Recognition_Neural_Networks_Confirm_Success.42.aspx

[8] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0889540620301888>

[9] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0266435619301639>

[10]

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/224148498_Plastic_Surgery_A_New_Dimension_to_Face_Recognition

[11] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6417699/>

- [12] <https://www.amputee-coalition.org/limb-loss-resource-center/resources-filtered/resources-by-topic/limb-loss-statistics/limb-loss-statistics/#1>
- [13] <https://www.ishn.com/articles/97844-statistics-on-hand-and-arm-loss>
- [14] <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2003-02-23/hard-work-steals-craftsmens-identities/2690040>
- [15] <https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMicm1409635>
- [16] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0379073819300398?via%3Dihub>
- [17] <https://www.forbes.com/sites/daveywinder/2019/11/02/smartphone-security-alert-as-hackers-claim-any-fingerprint-lock-broken-in-20-minutes/>
- [18] <https://nakedsecurity.sophos.com/2016/03/08/your-smartphone-fingerprint-reader-could-be-hacked-using-paper-and-ink/>
- [19] <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0dc9/39b07c4deb8ab79a04ca3f2fe77b0b3737c6.pdf>
- [20] iPhone fingerprint reader hacked just 2 days after the phone was released:
<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/sep/22/apple-iphone-fingerprint-scanner-hacked>
- [21] <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-30623611>
- [22] <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/dec/30/hacker-fakes-german-ministers-fingerprints-using-photos-of-her-hands>
- [23] <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/aug/14/major-breach-found-in-biometrics-system-used-by-banks-uk-police-and-defence-firms>
- [24] <https://www.cnn.com/2019/06/17/politics/customs-and-border-protection-data-breach-license-plates-leaked/index.html>
- [25] <https://www.gwern.net/docs/genetics/heritable/2019-gurovich.pdf> and associated supplemental materials: https://static-content.springer.com/esm/art%3A10.1038%2Fs41591-018-0279-0/MediaObjects/41591_2018_279_MOESM1_ESM.pdf
- [26] <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ajmg.1320080407>
- [27] <https://www.amazon.com/Dermatoglyphics-Medical-Disorders-B-Schaumann/dp/364251622X>
- [28] <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26397817/>
- [29] <https://academic.oup.com/lpr/article/18/2-3/177/5576153>
- [30] <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7033162>
- [31] <https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/9075/90750F/Exploiting-quality-and-texture-features-to-estimate-age-and-gender/10.1117/12.2048125.short?SSO=1>
- [32] <https://pages.nist.gov/800-63-3/sp800-63-3.html>
- [33] See section "5.2.3 Use of Biometrics": <https://pages.nist.gov/800-63-3/sp800-63b.html>
- [34] https://www.portseattle.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/Policy_Directive_Welcoming_Port_Current.pdf
- [35] <https://www.dhs.gov/publication/departure-information-systems-test>
- [36] <https://papersplease.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/IDP-SEA-Port-Comm-25FEB2020.pdf>
- [37] <https://papersplease.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/IDP-SEA-Port-Comm-10MAR2020.pdf>
- [38] Based on documents attained via PRA request.

From: [Jessie Turner](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re. Port Ocean Acidification Action Plan
Date: Saturday, July 10, 2021 7:53:21 PM
Attachments: [OAA J. Turner Letter of Support Port of Seattle OA Action Plan.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)
[PastedGraphic-2.png](#)
[ATT00002.htm](#)

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

To whom it may concern:

Please accept my written testimony in support of the Port of Seattle's Ocean Acidification Action Plan, as scheduled for discussion at the Commission meeting on July 13, 2021.

In gratitude,
Jessie Turner



July 10, 2021

Re. Port of Seattle Ocean Acidification Action Plan

Distinguished Commissioners,

As Director of the International Alliance to Combat Ocean Acidification (OA Alliance), I am pleased to write a letter of support and gratitude for the Port of Seattle's Ocean Acidification Action Plan (OA Action Plan.)

The OA Alliance was launched in 2016 by the three states of Washington, California, Oregon and the province of British Columbia, Canada in direct response to some of the first observed impacts of ocean acidification on oyster hatchery production across the North American West Coast during the mid-2000s. The OA Alliance aims to: 1) elevate ambition for climate action; 2) integrate ocean and coastal issues across climate policies and multi-governmental frameworks; and 3) translate knowledge into policy action.

To accomplish this, the OA Alliance supports national, state, city, local and Tribal government members in the development of "OA Action Plans" which describe real, tangible actions that government members will take to better understand and respond to the threat of climate-ocean change and ocean acidification regionally and locally. We also engage with non-government affiliate members like NGOs, seafood and aquaculture industry, associations and intergovernmental collaboratives who are end users of ocean acidification knowledge and information.

The Port of Seattle joined the OA Alliance in 2020, and in doing so, became the first ever port government in the world to formally recognize the many ways in which ocean acidification (OA) impacts the maritime sector and make a commitment to address OA within the Port's capacity through the creation of an OA Action Plan. As you well know, port governments have a unique ability to electrify operations, implement low carbon fuel alternatives, reduce pollutions, protect and restore aquatic lands, educate the public, invest in community projects and collaborate with seafood and marine shipping companies. In releasing a formal OA Action Plan, the Port of Seattle is helping to lead and inform discussions across climate and ocean policies, ensuring that commitments and communications accurately reflect their interdependence.

I can't underscore enough how efforts like the Port's impact other governments all over the world. In many instances national governments have looked to actions taken by city, port and state governments—adopting or replicating example case studies, unique projects or related commitments. Not only will the Port of Seattle's leadership and example help inspire other ports across the U.S., I am certain it will have an impact on partners internationally.

The document before you outlines the Port's stellar work and helps to connect and describe the many causes drivers of climate related ocean change including nutrient loading, algae growth and decomposition. This helps other governments understand how projects undertaken by the Port may have remediation effects or other added co-benefits to ecosystem and species resilience. This OA Action Plan will provide a roadmap for other port, local and regional decision-makers in better understanding climate impacts to marine resources and further implementing actions that will increase biodiversity, adaptive capacity and resiliency now and in decades to come.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jessie Turner', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jessie Turner
International Alliance to Combat Ocean Acidification, Director
Jessie@OAalliance.org

