

## Mike Martin

From what I understand of the information provided, I do NOT think that this is a well thought out proposal. What is worse, is that considering just how vaguely some of the terms and "definitions" are presented, the potential for ABUSE, punitive "selection", and arbitrary, selective enforcement is FAR TOO GREAT, especially in consideration of "history". Examples of potential abuse or selective "application": suppose one lives close to a stream or pond and it just happens to be frequented by LOTS of Geese and Ducks, pooping all over said property, and with rain, the stream or pond is "polluted". Or, even worse, suppose somebody's property is burdened with a community detention pond facility that collects run-off from roadways, and said community detention pond is declared a "non-point"? Sorry, I just cannot support this type of potentially oppressive and subject to punitive abuse proposal. This "non-point" proposal is bad from the get-go.