

Adrienne Naumann

What I was originally going to say was premised on the fact that everybody agreed on what the changes were. And if everyone agreed on that, then I did have, I'm a lawyer, I've worked in front of federal agencies my whole career. So what I was going to say has changed because now I'm going to have to put it in a written comment, because it appears I will have to read everything very closely to see why there appears to be a conflict between what your agency says the changes are and what these ladies have observed to be the changes as well as the ones I got in the handout from the from the opposing parties.

Assuming that these, my original concerns, are confirmed, even though it's not under the federal Administrative Procedure Act, I would respectfully submit, in my written comment, that it's ultra vires what the Commission proposes to change the regulation to is (a) ultra vires what his authority is under whatever the relevant statute is.

And secondly, I see working in the background some very serious constitutional concerns about doing some of these things that affect people's property without due process. And then I would go on to say people should, if they're sufficiently concerned, which I don't know how many people were on the previous call, maybe they will have to take it to the courts. I've got a class action person, maybe there's something there that would help control costs. Yeah, I'll have to put it in my written comment after I very closely look at what everything says, look at it very closely. Because there's a conflict between what these ladies are saying and my understanding of what your agency says the proposed changes are. Thank you very much for your time.