

**Subject:** Re: Get The Facts and Demand Answers From Paavo

**From:** The Razor [REDACTED]

**Date:** Thu, 14 Oct 2010 12:41:22 -0700

**To:** David Congalton [REDACTED]

Dave,

By stating, "You have no control over what happens," it is implied that I should be held responsible for my message to have a conversation, a non-violent questioning of issues, when someone -- who looks at what I wrote -- does not adhere to that message and misconstrues it. Therefore, you are saying that even you should be held responsible for someone who misunderstands the purpose behind your statements. The consequence of such extraneous responsibility deters us from making any definitive statements of taking action.

I'm looking forward to being on your show today.

Aaron

On 10/14/2010 12:19 PM, David Congalton wrote:

Aaron,

You have published the home addresses of public officials. You have urged people to ring their doorbells and knock on their doors, but you have no control over what happens, do you? I'm especially concerned about Ogren since he has young children in his house.

You have crossed the line and I'm calling you on it.

Dave

On Oct 14, 2010, at 12:12 PM, The Razor wrote:

Hi Dave,

I received your e-mail since it was posted to my mailing list.

Thank you for providing your point of view, and will take it into consideration. For now, I must respectfully disagree with you, and here's why.

In the event that a response is not given by the very authority that requires under the law and their fiduciary duty to respond, it is at the people's discretion to contact said authority by any non-violent means necessary. I have not called for even civil disobedience *because* of the consideration of family members. In the article, it reads, "Go ahead, ring their doorbells. Knock on their doors. Give them a call. Let them know you want a conversation. Let them know you want your questions answered." There is no danger and irresponsibility or anything unethical in calling a public official and knocking at their door of residence to show that the people need answers to life-changing issues. I am asking for a conversation, a non-violent protest, not a confrontation and I did not urge a confrontation.

However, a confrontation will only exist when the questioner has the proclivity to be "dangerous and irresponsible," and it appears that you have placed the "anti-BOS crowd" in that category -- and such comments are offensive. Not only do you limit the dissenting opinion to petty dislike of the Board of Supervisors, you are saying that these people are unable to transcend the misconception, and to that extent, you are giving them a "bad rep."

Here are the facts in question. The County of San Luis Obispo has not responded or engaged in a willingness to fully respond to questions pertaining to a wastewater project that -- one could reasonably assume -- would displace fixed and low-income residents. This is not an issue of whether their responses are something that we "don't want to hear," but whether the County of San Luis Obispo has the right to *deprive* the people of Los Osos of answers when the contentiousness of the wastewater project naturally invokes questions -- and what can people do to get a response? To answer this question, we must objectively identify the severity of homeowner hardship in proportion to action taken by Public Works and the BOS. Second, we must look at whether their contributory output outweighs community input, and it does. I can concede to the fact that the public is given three minutes of public comment, but there has been no thorough response to that input other than project updates; and even then, the County converts qualitative questions and concerns into oversimplified rhetoric that, in effect, mocks public outcry.

Mr. Congalton, I couldn't disagree more with your positions.

Sincerely,

Aaron Ochs  
Razor Online