

## Jean Hilde

Your power point states that monitoring and sensors, ultrafine particles (from overflying aircraft), and on-road vehicles are examples of "ineligible projects." But those are exactly the most offending issues for my neighborhood of Briarcrest in the city of Shoreline (eligible community number 8):

1. We have no air monitor.
2. We are in the southbound arrivals flight paths for SeaTac Airport and Boeing Field Airport, and both the arrivals and departures flight paths for Paine Field Airport, with flights as often as two per minute and as low as 2500 feet. We are also frequently overflown by general aviation small planes headquartered at Kenmore Air with altitudes as low as 1000 feet.
3. My neighborhood is bordered by SR 523 and 15th Avenue NE with SR 522 and I-5 just a short distance away. While all four roadways are heavily traveled by commercial freight trucks, buses, utility vehicles and commuter traffic, the nearest (SR 523, just two blocks from my home) has all day high frequency local transit with an average of over 30,000 vehicle trips per day including annual freight movement of over 2,630,000 tons annually. These numbers will only go up as the city of Shoreline widens and improves SR 523 and two nearby light rail stations become operational.
4. All of this occurs in a setting of regular weather inversions which trap close to the ground (and close to the people who live here) the air pollution caused by all the above.

So if the issues that burden Briarcrest the most are not eligible, what is? If the goals of the grant program are to "reduce air pollution and protect public health" why are there limits imposed on those very things? What exactly constitutes eligible "criteria air pollutant emission reduction projects" and how will they help my overburdened community?

You ask "How can we mitigate or eliminate potential harms of this grant program?" Well, you could start by removing the illogical limits that have created "ineligible projects", leaving overburdened communities with empty promises and no better off than they were before.