# Leslie Cohen

Do you need my name again or hi my name is Leslie Cohen and I reside in Richland Washington. Good evening, I have a concern about whether the public has been given a complete and reliable Rev 9A package to review. The draft contains outdated material, and its attachment identifies 145 documents that Ecology acknowledges were not included in the permit. Ecology should explain whether these documents establish enforceable requirements, support permit conditions, or are simply references and identify exactly where the public can review the applicable versions. These omissions raised serious questions under WAC 173-303-840 subsection 1B which requires Ecology review the application for completeness. Subsection 2D requires the draft permit to contain all applicable permit conditions and standards. Subsection 2E requires a fact sheet that supports the administrative record and available for public comment. How can the public meaningfully evaluate proposed requirements when the package contains outdated information and leaves the status of 144, I believe, listed documents unresolved? I ask Ecology to correct the outdated material, account for every listed document, identify the controlling revisions, and make the relevant documents accessible before proceeding with permit issuance. I also requested Ecology use its authority under WAC 173-303-847 to prepare and resubmit a corrected draft permit. Once the corrected draft permit is complete, I ask Ecology to provide a full public review and comment period, so the public has a meaningful opportunity to evaluate the entirety of the package. I believe the public deserves a right to know exactly what Ecology proposes to approve. We should not have to guess which documents apply or comment requirements. We cannot examine based on documents that we can't examine and I would like for these concerns to be addressed in Ecology’s written response to comments. Thank you.