[redacted]
Los Osos, CA 93402
February 27, 2006

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

I am considered a Designated Party, though the manner in which I was informed of this status was extremely ill-conceived. I could not tell that the letters sent were not just community general information letters until I got a large package of materials that I could not decipher, but which looked more directed. I doubt that it would have cost much to write a letter in simple English to explain what it concerned and what it had to do with me. The original mailing was not registered to insure its receipt. Yet, within that package was the threat to reveal my name and address unless I responded by a particular time (which happened to be a half hour before I picked up and read the mail). To reveal such information about persons, such as I, who work in [redacted] settings has the potential of endangering lives and property. I consider it irresponsible of you and those affiliated with you to not assume the potential of harm, rather than its absence. This area has [redacted] facilities as two of its major employers. In addition, I am a private party and do not feel that a public entity has any right to release information regarding me or anything of mine. I am not a criminal. I have been forced into this relationship against my will and consider this attitude punitive and hostile to my interests. In addition, I had to stay home from work in order to pick up the next mail which was registered, which I only heard about at the informational meeting I attended, and only because the husband of a friend of mine told me. I would not have known to look for it. I do not pick my mail up every day. I do not believe I break any laws doing that. Once again I think to send materials that require an answer within the same week is a hostile and punitive act. Normally I would have picked it up Saturday. Apparently your staff does not believe that any of us work regular jobs that take up the hours a post office is normally open. I imagine there are some who did not get the mail in time whom you have put in serious jeopardy. Luck alone would keep that from happening.

The meeting I attended was not described as a public meeting. When I got there I asked if those not directly involved could be asked to leave, and was told "no, this is a public meeting". It was not advertised as such. I am opposed to having the public in these meetings. I feel that my privacy is violated by nonparties being present. I f someone wants to be a designated party, let him or her replace one of us who do not want the privilege, and let them take the time from more important work to defend themselves against hostile and excessive demands on their time. Maybe they can make the time without losing vacation days and time for school related work after regular working hours.

I did attend the meeting and these are my concerns based on what I heard. We were told that the CSD would not release water usage figures. I found out after the hearing that some people pay the CSD for their water. I don't. I am single, live alone, am conservative with water usage, and

do not understand how my septic system can possibly require as frequent cleaning out as someone with four family members or who is home all day. Perhaps water usage would be a way to look at that. If this is not a punitive action, actual impact of my septic system on the estuary or aquifer would be considered. Paying for this action does not alter the eventual costs of a sewer system unless there is a legitimate alternative that only people in the field know about. It is therefore punitive unless specifically taking into account usage and impact.

The people who were able to vote were not just the affected property owners, but also renters and people who live in the area but who are not subject to the sewer costs. To allow these people to create a problem and not be taxed to create a solution is inherently unfair. If the costs had been stated, I doubt that we would be in this position now. Again, to target only a portion of the population involved in the decision-making is punitive and inherently unfair.

I admit that I am naive about the science. I attended the hearing. I felt that the biases of the staff and the audience were already solidified and that I would not have been able to get an honest impartial understanding from any one of them. I feel that as employees of the state and hence of me as a taxpayer, you owe me more consideration than what has been been shown at this time. I deserve information written in understandable language. I deserve the preservation of my privacy, meaning no cameras or reporters at the hearing, and no publications that contain any information regarding my name or location of my property which could lead to the discovery of my name. If I were an owner with renters, such information could put them at risk as well.

Conservation is encouraged when it makes a difference. If it doesn't matter how many people live somewhere, and the price is driven up anyway, renters will add to their numbers in order to pay the extra costs. Does that make sense in the long run?

I bought in this area because it was the safest area I looked at, and I could afford it. Releasing, even inadvertently, my name and address would destroy that safety. I also bought here so I could afford to go to graduate school. I am now at the most expensive part of my education, seeking an unpaid internship. Because of your action, if I have to sell in order to complete this part of my education, I will likely take a loss. As you know, your action has made selling property in this area very difficult. To rent at a rate high enough to cover costs would also be difficult. This secondary consequence of your actions is predictable and compounds the actual punitive quality of this requirement.

Surely there is a way to intelligently handle this. Certainly there is time to figure it out without handling this in the way it is currently being set out.

Sincerely,

[redacted]