

John Hancock

Personal Comment on the Agreed Order

A. Ecology's evidence- and process-based Airport historical narrative does not reveal when and who knew what about PFAS in Airport groundwater, and with whom it was revealed and discussed. Contrary evidence, finger-pointing, and confidentiality reveal a failure of conflict-of-interest duties among the 3 Parties and their subsidiaries. This is beyond the duty of Airport's engineers, but it's clearly within the scope of what the neighbors would like to know. I have confidence now in Ecology, but until this whole endeavor is discussed in public by the elected leaders of the Parties, the difficult and conflicting methods of protecting both the citizens and the Airport cannot be understood. The long-lasting and unimaginably expensive path ahead will win public support only if it's explored in public, not in Executive Sessions, with all documentation available freely and constructively to anyone.

B. Airport's story-telling and map references about FAA regulations does not reveal whether Airport actually followed the rules it quotes. Commissioner French's testimony in his recall hearing contradicts Airport's reports about the amount of AFFF storage and application; and in his own historical report, the claim that Fairchild PFAS migrated eastward beyond the Airway Heights paleochannel, onto property tested by the Airport itself.

C. This home filters plan duplicates, depending on location, the funding and technical eligibility of the PFAS Task Force filter project. These 2 projects will require close coordination, so no home is omitted nor duplicated.

D. The PFAS boundary with Fairchild is arbitrary. I recommend a special interagency method of timely updates to assessment and planning on both sides of Hayford Rd.

E. I applaud the PFAS property tax implication study by the Spokane County Assessor, and I urge all parties to integrate that information into long-term cleanup feasibility planning.