

From: [laura gibbons](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] written comment for 11/16 Port Commissioners meeting
Date: Saturday, November 13, 2021 1:41:36 PM

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

Commissioners,

I am pleased that you will be adopting Resolution No. 3792: A Resolution to Adopt Charting the Course to Zero: Port of Seattle's Maritime Climate and Air Action Plan, insofar as it plans for net-zero emissions by 2040. That is excellent.

By now you may have heard me often enough to know that I'd like you also to have plans for implementing your Scope 3 goals, beyond what can be achieved with a limited supply of alternative fuels.

Sincerely,

Laura Gibbons

Seattle

From: [Noemie Maxwell](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Request for inclusion of document to accompany public comments at today's Port meeting
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 10:07:56 AM
Attachments: [NoToAirportParkingPetitionDeliveryCoverMemo.pdf](#)

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

Hello,

Thank you for sending me the link to join today's meeting of the Port Commission. I look forward to presenting my comments.

I'm signed up to comment on delivery of a community petition to the Port.

If it is not too late to do so, please include in the public record for this meeting the attached document as written supplement to my comments. It is the cover letter to the petition.

Many thanks!

Noemie

**Delivery to the Port of Seattle
No to Airport Parking in North SeaTac Park Petition
November 16, 2021**

To: Port of Seattle Commission President Fred Felleman; Commissioners Stephanie Bowman, Ryan Calkins, Sam Cho, and Peter Steinbrueck; Commissioners Elect Toshiko Hasegawa and Hamdi Mohamed; Port of Seattle Executive Director Stephen Metruck and Senior Director of External Relations Pearse Edwards

From: Petition organizer Noemie Maxwell Vassilakis, Burien, WA

Form of delivery: A full list of signers is provided by email to Senior Director Pearse Edwards. Signatures including first and partial last names of public signers, along with hundreds of their comments addressed to Port officials, is available at KCTreeEquity.org

I. Introduction

Between May and August 2021, approximately 2,400 community members signed the No to Airport Parking in North SeaTac Park petition, calling on the Port of Seattle to:

1. Remove from its Sustainable Airport Master Plan the proposal for parking lot L06, which would have destroyed an estimated 11 acres of mature forest and mountain bike trails within North SeaTac Park.
2. Re-evaluate the additional proposals in the SAMP that would result in the removal of large numbers of trees from land near this park for other airport structures.

Signers include fourteen City Councilmembers and Deputy Mayors from SeaTac, Burien, Des Moines, Tukwila, and Normandy Park; two King County Councilmembers; and Port Commission candidates Toshiko Hasegawa and Hamdi Mohamed.

Although the Port responded to the first call-for-action in the petition by removing the proposal for Lot L06 and beginning the process of an inventory of

the ecological, and recreational attributes of 55 acres within North SeaTac Park that are most at risk from Port development plans, it has not publicly responded to the second call to action in the petition.

Documents related to the Port's Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) and Real Estate Strategic Plan (RESP) indicate that the Port has identified for potential destruction in the near to mid-range future more than 100 acres of forest inside and immediately surrounding North SeaTac Park - all within approximately one mile of SeaTac Airport. (1)

The forested areas in and around North SeaTac Park at risk from Port development contain high numbers of mature coniferous trees.

In a 2020 report delivered to the state legislature pursuant to House Bill 1109, Seattle - King County Public Health specifically recommended **increasing coniferous tree coverage**, in the neighborhoods within 10 miles of SeaTac Airport to capture particulate matter, thereby reducing people's exposure which now contributes to shorter life spans, higher rates of death and hospitalization from a wide range of maladies, and a greater percentage of infants born prematurely or with low birthweight within this 10-mile area and, most intensively, within 1 mile of SeaTac Airport. (2)

II. Call for The Port of Seattle to Develop a Comprehensive Plan to Halt Deforestation and Increase Healthy Tree Canopy on Land it Owns in and around North SeaTac Park and Within 10 Miles of SeaTac Airport

If the Port has not already developed alternative plans to the intensive urban deforestation of our community reflected in the SAMP and RESP, it should begin to do so now. Current Port Commissioners and those who have just been elected should work together to ensure that this is done.

Specifically, Port officials are urged to convene a task force to inventory all forested land in the communities within ten miles of SeaTac Airport that are at risk of destruction from Port development plans and to survey and act to secure all potential sources of funds and technical assistance from federal and state jurisdictions that would enable this deforestation to be halted and for restoration and reforestation to take its place.

Large amounts of such resources are now newly being made available from multiple federal and state sources specifically for the purposes of mitigating climate impacts and restoring and expanding urban forests and tree canopy cover in communities, like those immediately surrounding North SeaTac Park, where residents are burdened by high levels of disproportionate environmental health impacts, including historical cumulative impacts.

Such resources may include funds from the recent federal infrastructure law, Evergreen Communities Act, Washington’s HEAL Act, and the Washington Department of Ecology Climate Commitment Act.

As part of this work, the Port should coordinate with the City of SeaTac to enable the zoning of North SeaTac Park to be changed from Aviation Commercial to Park, and to coordinate with all appropriate partners in order to legally protect the park’s 200+ acres as a “park in perpetuity”, and to restore the health of its forests and waterways.

Port officials have a moral obligation to act with all due haste to take advantage of such resources to save human lives on land owned by the Port within ten miles of SeaTac Airport. The Port must halt its intensive deforestation plans in our vulnerable communities and honor the commitment it made as a partner in the King County – Cities Climate Collaboration to “protect and restore the health of urban and community trees and forests”.

III. Partial Description of the Public Health, Ethical, and Legal Basis of the Port’s Responsibility to Protect, Restore, and Expand the Forests on Land it Owns in Communities Near SeaTac Airport

Trees protect human health against particulates and other pollutants deposited on the communities around North SeaTac Park by the Port’s aviation operations. Coniferous trees, specifically, are protective against the ultrafine particle pollution that Port operations generate in our neighborhoods. (2)

The forested areas in and around North SeaTac Park at risk from Port development contain high numbers of mature coniferous trees.

In a 2020 report delivered to the state legislature pursuant to House Bill 1109, Seattle - King County Public Health recommended increasing specifically **coniferous tree coverage**, in the neighborhoods near the SeaTac Airport to capture particulate matter, thereby reducing people’s exposure.” (2)

That report details specific health impacts found for those living within 10 miles of SeaTac airport, and especially those within a mile, including shorter life spans, higher rates of death and hospitalization from a wide range of maladies, and a greater percentage of infants born prematurely or with low birthweight.

All the neighborhoods surrounding North SeaTac Park appear on the Washington Department of Health Environmental Health Disparities as highly impacted by environmental health disparities due to high environmental exposures, sensitive populations, and socioeconomic factors. (3)

The Port has, over decades, destroyed large numbers of coniferous and other trees in these neighborhoods, replacing them with parking lots, cargo warehouses, and the like, thus intensifying the harmful impacts on nearby residents of the pollutants, heat, and noise from its airport operations. In large part due to Port actions, SeaTac's tree canopy, estimated in 2019, at 21% (4) - is considerably lower than the national average of approximately 30%, (5) leaving this community more vulnerable than it should be to airport impacts.

In addition, the Port has allowed invasive weeds to dominate the forested land that it owns in and around North SeaTac Park. These weeds are killing the trees that are so important for protecting this community's health.

Presidential Executive Order 12898 promotes the principles of environmental justice in all Departmental programs, policies, and activities.

US Department of Transportation Order 5610.2 requires that, pursuant to Executive Order 12,898, the FAA must analyze impacts – including cumulative effects - on low income and minority populations, and “determine if any low-income or minority populations experience a disproportionately high level of cumulative effects.”

All these neighborhoods around the park meet the description of populations requiring protection under Order 5610.2.

In addition to these compelling human health and environmental justice reasons to refrain from intensive deforestation in our community, other circumstances applicable to this community and its natural areas make the Port's deforestation plans inappropriate and injurious:

- Tub Lake, understood to be the last true bog in the Seattle area (6), is situated very close to the areas that the Port proposes to remove large

numbers of trees from. In the last 15 years, the Port has removed large amounts of forested land all around this lake, leaving it vulnerable to incursions from invasive weeds and other impacts that could harm or even destroy it.

- The forested land that the Port proposes to destroy is part of an ecosystem filled with an intricate system of waterways - some with salmon - that are within and near the park. These include the headwaters and numerous tributaries of Miller Creek, multiple wetlands, and Tub Lake. These trees are part of a much larger forest system spanning multiple jurisdictions, the entirety of which is weakened each time any part of it is removed.
- Mature trees in a forest setting provide health protection and climate stabilizing benefits that newly planted trees in dispersed locations don't approach.
- The FAA acknowledged in a 2016 Compliance Review of SeaTac International Airport, that the park “is the culmination of a long term and very open planning process to compensate the area's residents for cumulative airport impacts” and is “the best compatible use of a severely airport-impacted area.” (7)

IV. Conclusion

Port of Seattle officials are commended for effective and timely action on the first call-for-action in the No to Airport Parking in North SeaTac Park petition. You are urged to address the second call to action in this petition.

If the Port has not already developed alternative plans to the intensive urban deforestation of our community reflected in its Sustainable Airport Master Plan and Real Estate Strategic Plan, an estimated greater than 100 acres of deforestation in highly impacted communities within a mile of SeaTac Airport, it should begin to do so now. It should take advantage of the considerable resources being made available through federal, state, and other sources that are specifically designed to protect communities, such as ours, that are highly impacted by environmental health disparities and in which adequate tree cover will save lives.

Port officials, including current Port Commissioners and those who have just been elected should work together to ensure that this is done.

V. Sources

(1) Port of Seattle Sustainable Airport Master Plan Scoping Information, July 2018, p. 14 and Port of Seattle Real Estate Strategic Plan, 7/26/2016 p. 17-23.

<u>ESTIMATED PLANNED TREE LOSS</u> <u>IN & NEAR NSTP</u>		
Sustainable Airport Master Plan (Near-Term SAMP)		
a.	<u>Cargo Warehouses</u> Sites C02 & C03 (26.2 acres)	a. 26.2 Acres
b.	<u>Parking Lots and Receiving and Distribution Center (RDC)</u> L05 & L07 and S10 (RDC) (17 acres combined: 13 + 4)	b. 17 Acres
c.	<u>Westside Maintenance Campus</u> S07 (Rough estimate of acreage = 5 Acres)	c. 5 Acres
Real Estate Strategic Plan (RESP)		d. 31.5 Acres
d.	<u>Food Innovation Center and other "useable acres"</u> Inside North SeaTac Park near Tub Lake Bog (31.5 acres)	e. 27.7 Acres
e.	<u>Supporting SAMP and SR 509 Extension (L-Shaped)</u> S. 200th Street (27.7 acres)	TOTAL 107.4 Acres

(2) Community Health and Airport Operations Related Air and Noise Pollution: Report to the Legislature in Response to Washington State House Bill 1109, December 1, 2020

(3) Washington Environmental Health Disparities Map, www.doh.wa.gov/ibl select Environmental Health Disparities

(4) Green SeaTac Partnership Urban Forest Enhancement Guide, Forterra, City of SeaTac, Port of Seattle, 2019, p. 14. Accessed on 5/20/21 at https://forterra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/GC_Seatac-guide_032621_WEB.pdf

(5) Declining urban and community tree cover in the United States David J. Nowak, Eric J. Greenfield, Urban Forestry & Urban Greening. V. 32, May 2018, Pages 32-55 https://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/jrnl/2018/nrs_2018_nowak_005.pdf

(6) PNW Nature Scavenger Hunt Post, David B. Williams, March 16, 2015 Street-Smart Naturalist <https://geologywriter.com/blog/pnw-nature-scavenger-hunt-post/>

(7) FAA Compliance Reviews of Airport Noise Land Use & Financial Operations: SeaTac Intl Airport, 2016

From: [Earnest Thompson](#)
To: [Commission-Public-Records](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Landscape plan
Date: Thursday, November 11, 2021 7:33:05 PM

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

What percent of the master landscaping plan is certified as native plants ?

Regards ,

Earnest Thompson

Sent from my iPad