

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am sorry to not be able to attend tonight's session, hope to attend next month, and wish to comment on last month's session.

Last month the set agenda was discussion of the energy and minerals elements. By far the energy element received most comment, and by far, those comments were in favor of the most "conservative", as in conservation and renewables oriented approaches. The "Alternative A" sections received the most positive input, hands down.

After the last public comment, the one from the HELP representative suggesting that since an energy element was optional, not required, it should not even be in the plan, the hearing was closed to further public comment. At this time two of the commissioners pretty much agreed openly with the HELP rep's statement.

Now what bothered me about this was that the generation of the draft plan has been a multi- year public process. The public has clearly come down in favor of **having** an energy element, a strong one which plans for local self-sufficiency, renewables, conservation, and efficiency.

I would also mention that even though the state and federal governments do indeed have layers of regulations regarding energy and minerals, that does NOT preclude localities having some say over their own resources and hopes for the future. Waiting for the federal government to lead on the energy front capitulates our rights and duties as citizens to lead our leaders. Our federal government's (in)action on energy is part of what has us in a war right now.

Please, do not subvert public process or undermine our right and duty to try to envision and effect a future that is less bleak than that offered from the feds; a perpetual state of war.

Thanks for considering my remarks.

Sincerely,

Claire Perricelli
2259 16th St.
Eureka