

Anonymous

It is difficult to give appropriate and accurate feedback when the provided draft permit information is outdated. One example is the Central Waste Complex (OUG 6) contains references to the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility (CUG 47), which is mislabeled on Ecology's draft permit page, as though it is part of OUG 6. The Part A's indicates CUG 47 is not part of OUG 6 but various addenda provided in OUG 6 indicates the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility is included in OUG 6. OUG 6 Part A identifies Dangerous Waste Management Units (DWMUs) that are not included in various OUG 6 addenda but are named as DWMUs in CUG 47 addenda but not in CUG 47 Part A. This leads the public to conclude that Ecology is not acting in good faith by providing data that is no longer true, accurate, and complete for public review.

This is only one example of inconsistent data, it is this commentors opinion that the provided time for public comment is insufficient for the public to review if the data is true, accurate, and complete; let alone to cross-reference with the law to ensure Ecology is providing sufficient oversight of the Hanford Site with federal and state regulations.

Ecology should terminate the current comment period, review all files for accuracy, update all outdated files, and start a new comment period.