

Greg Mason

Jeremy,

Please see attached document. My mailer regarding public input says comments can be made May 22 - June 22

My fiancé and I own a house in the Jim Hill estates neighborhood. We have a 9 month old son so this topic is quite important to us. We don't care how long the cleanup process takes. We want what is best for the safety and health of the residents of this neighborhood. Most of the residents in this area are opposed to the freeway project all together. We see it as waste of money at a time when poor existing road conditions have plagued residents for years in areas where budgets are already tight... Let me first off start by saying that I'm quite disappointed in both local and state authorities who have prioritized the building of the North-South freeway over the health and safety of the local residents.

However, I'm appalled that the information on this pollution has been public knowledge for over 20 years and even 11 years after the tank was removed, cleanup has yet to begin. I also find it was very irresponsible for BNSF to continue storing petroleum based mixtures in the tank for seven years following the photo released in the mailed document. It is apparent in 1999 the tank was leaking... Why was use not discontinued sooner? At what point does this shift from being a cleanup effort to a case of continued negligence on the part of BNSF? Why has it taken 11 years to conduct a study (If you want to call it that) while the highway build pushes on? I believe this study was inconclusive and biased towards the side of the PLPs... I think an independent study paid for using the MTCA fund rather than the PLPs needs to be assessed to get the clear picture. If this cleanup was done properly back in 2006 and followed up on rather than taking the word of the responsible party as cleanup was complete, we wouldn't be in this situation right now. It appears the misleading information in regards to the 2006 cleanup coupled with the lack of oversight from the WSDOT on this part of the project is what got us into this hasty situation to begin with.

Why can't the study to be more accurate? "Up to 14 years...Up to 13 years" is not an accurate window for cleanup. They know how large the plume is, its 7 acres and we know how deep it is to the aquifer. One of the primary goals of the study is to evaluate the magnitude of contamination. Has this been completed? If not then the study is incomplete. A qualified company would be able to hammer down a more direct timeline. This is misleading information.

We as neighborhood residents are NOT willing to change the path of the proposed freeway or raise the roadbed to accommodate. This area already has an issue with excessive noise and vehemently opposed to any changes that would increase that noise pollution beyond already designed plans. The PLPs need to come together and take responsibility for this cleanup. For years, this part of town and Spokane as a whole has been bullied by BNSF and victimized by its lack of transparency and accountability.

We find it completely unacceptable as local residents that the PLPs get to "Cap" off the contaminated soil. They need to take responsibility and remove the dirt and clean all

contamination. There is no other option. In regards to water cleanup, I see that Option A isn't even legal under WA state law. However this first method shows just how dedicated the PLPs are to cleaning up this mess. They'd rather do nothing and let nature do the work if they could get away with it. Option B is natural biodegradation with addition of oxygen wells to speed up the process. Not surprisingly this is the cheapest method and hence the chosen method for cleanup by the PLPs. Option C (our preferred method) uses forced air biodegradation and manual separation. Option D uses a method of injecting steam into underground wells to help break up the mixture. Message to Marathon Oil: You can keep your fracking problems in Texas. This is a neighborhood not an oilfield. We are opposed to any injections of hot pressurized steam into underground wells or chemicals being pumped into our drinking water. Being a father of young son, the last proposal infuriates me the most. The fact that they want to combust or literally ignite and burn off thousands of gallons of Oil over the period of 7 years! This is completely unacceptable.

What kind of respiratory problems will this cause? What happens when all that raises to the surface? How dare you propose a contradictory idea that would further contaminate the area now adding poisoned air to the mix. We have enough sources of air pollution from the trains and existing traffic. On a regular basis we can smell the oil fumes in the air blowing from the facilities that already border the old blank tank property. The health and safety of the residents continues to be neglected to this day even from current tenants.

This furthers my request for an additional independent study be conducted using the funds for the MTCA Model Toxics Control Act rather than the funding from the pocket books of the PLPs. I think this study is potentially covering only the preferred methods of the PLCs and we aren't getting the whole picture. Furthermore, I would like to see the pros/cons on each method of cleanup and why methods such as slurping and skimming were never mentioned. I think it's in the best interest of the PLPs to educate the public as little as possible on the subject. That is unfair and proposing these methods to the un-educated public is useless. All it does is meet a requirement for the PLP but does nothing to resolve the problem. The public notice states that although the Ecology Dept doesn't fully agree with the study, it meets the minimum requirements required by law. Why are we moving forward if the Ecology Dept doesn't support the findings of this study?

I see in the notice that there are monitoring wells onsite that are regularly checked to ensure they are not turning up contaminated water. Where are these published? What is being tested for? Are you testing for heavy metals? Because they don't remain on top as the oil breaks down. How can the public hold you accountable for what you're saying? We are not accepting that this 7 acre plume of thick crude is not affecting drinking water. This is misinformation just to save face in the case of a public outcry. The fact the Ecology dept sees it as "acceptable" is

morally deploring. The only acceptable amount of crude in my drinking water source is 0% and there should be no exception. You will find this is the feeling of any resident in any town across the United States.

I know that the city would like to disregard Hillyard and its residents as a low-income neighborhood. However, we are entitled in this neighborhood to the same basic rights of clean air and water as the next taxpayer. If this was happening on the North side of town (Wandermere) or Five Mile prairie I feel this would already have been addressed and clean up started. Maybe overall exposure to the issue needs to be raised? Maybe this letter needs to go to the Spokesman-Review as well. I understand the closest well-pump to our household is upstream of the contamination so I'm "not to worry." However, I'm also concerned about the people downstream that could have their water contaminated with heavy metals? Are they getting a notice? I'm sure they would like to know what could be happening to their drinking water as well. Stop feeding us misinformation and putting us on the back burner and do what's right for the people of Spokane.