

Scott Holbrook

- 1) Did the study tell us exactly how the contaminate got into the ground and aquifers? If so we need to focus first on stopping any and all activity that puts these chemicals in the ground water. Once the input has stopped the remediation plan can be solidified and implemented of course paid for by the offending party(s).
- 2) Is there any plan in all this for compensation to the residents in the affected area(s)? The Air Force also practiced using these same chemicals and I would guess that the Airport would be the vastly larger user of the chemicals.
- 3) So is there a proportional liability for all those who contributed to the issue based on their proportional contribution? I know it would be very difficult to know that distribution but based on purchase receipts one could make a well educated attempt at defining a number.
- 4) Or does the worst offender pay for all small offenders and would this be fairly justified?
- 5) We know that most airports are continually expanding and adding more terminal space, runways, taxiways and ramp space and we have heard that the Spokane International Airport is planning expansion. Will these major issues of what devastating chemicals they use during construction and operation of the airport be addressed now and in the future. As for the Air Force and the International Air Port way more potential runway fire training goes on than actual fires. So it is the training that gives us concern. The Air Force has done it's share of contaminating grounds and ground waters all over this country. And many people have been negatively affected. The Air Force usually gets more bad press than the local Airports and International Airports. We are concerned that once the focus dies down that all this will not happen in the future. What measures are in place or will be in place to not allow this in the future?