

| Timestamp | Comment: | Your Name: | Your Email: | Section of Plan | Key Comment |
|--------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| 1/2/2013 10:09:43 | <p>Page 150 "NYS agricultural districts that can be impacted by water quality issues related to wastewater discharges" Ag Districts are not an environmental feature and are not likely to be impacted by wastewater discharges as nearly all agricultural areas are not in areas of public sewer systems. They should not be included as an environmental feature on Figure 11.3</p> <p>Figure 11.3 title seems misleading as superfund sites and PCB's are not an "environmental feature"</p> <p>Figure 11.2 - Recreation areas don't fit here.</p> <p>Figure 11.4 - The Mohawk Watershed is not labeled.</p> | Laura DeGaetano | ldega@hotmail.com | Water | Comments on specific section |
| 1/13/2013 23:18:58 | <p>Include the concept of polyculture, the growing of many different types of crops over monoculture, the growing of one across wide areas. Most local farmers likely already grow multiple types of crops but for education and to support the practice of Diversifying crops, it can only improve the document. There is also the integration concept of doubling up. Promoting alley planting, the alternation of high and low growing plants, and growing crops together which can improve the output of both by way of providing protection different kinds, sun or pests, as well as other benefits.</p> | Daniel Plaat | dplaat@yahoo.com | Food Systems | Comments on specific section |
| 1/14/2013 11:49:50 | <p>Comment on the Energy component.</p> <p>My review indicates that much of the focus is on upgrading energy standards and enforcement. This is laudable but I anticipate that it will have little effect in the rural counties. Rural county government at that level has limited interest in additional regulation and limited ability to enforce codes.</p> <p>Another approach, one that was not present in the draft plan, would place greater focus on voluntary action and education. I have worked for and with local governments for nearly 40 years and am convinced that this approach is generally welcomed where regulatory approaches often receives push back.</p> <p>The Town of Greenwich in Washington County has an Energy Committee that has been working on energy issues for the last two years. We are currently trying to develop an Energy Fair. The intent is to bring together property owners, particularly residential property owners and various providers of products and services that can help individuals with their energy bills.</p> <p>We are still in the formative stage but hope to have the first fair this spring. I am hopeful that this type of local initiative, focused on voluntary action and education, has the potential to be replicated elsewhere in the region and the state and deserves a role in the plan.</p> <p>William G. Tomkins, AICP</p> | William G. Tomkins | cocawgt@omh.ny.gov | Introduction/Summary of Priority Initiatives | Comments on specific section |
| 1/14/2013 14:16:34 | <p>With regard to Energy, I noticed two things that could be added, One is the element of waste heat. Large buildings can recycle their own waste heat, which is in the LEED codes, but industry and power stations produce a lot more, some much that it can be transferred to any developments built nearby. Filed under integration, this has been done in Europe to great effect as the waste of one industry is used by another, making a more closed loop. Up to a 40% savings of material, energy etc in on such instance in Denmark. Suggest policies be pushed to guide incoming industries to attempt to piggyback on one another.</p> <p>A shorter addition is microhydro. With our lush water resources across the region small generators for 1-2 households each can be used in areas where solar and wind would be harder. Mimi dams or microhydro setups for backyard streams and ponds could be subsidized in the same way solar panels for house roofs are.</p> <p>The Last is also Integration, referred to as doubling up, as one energy generating infrastructure could be placed on static existing structures. One example is PV's on highway sound barriers. On east west roads, the area is south-facing and already cleared. A no-brainer.</p> | Daniel Plaat | dplaat@yahoo.com | Energy | Comments on specific section |
| 1/2/2013 15:02:56 | <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am contacting you in regards to the Capital District's Regional Sustainability Plan and a project that I think should be included in the plan. The Green Island Power Authority has planned and is pursuing funding to significantly expand of the capacity of their hydroelectric plant located on the Hudson River at the Federal Dam across from the City of Troy. Permitting for the project has been completed and now Green Island is looking for funding to complete the project. Our role is as Green Island's grant writers and we felt this project would be a good to mention in the plan due to the increased sustainability the project would provide the region. If you have any additional question regarding the project or would like any additional information, please feel free to contact me anytime.</p> | Jeremy Silverman | jeremy@ge.msgrants.com | Energy | Energy |
| 1/14/2013 14:24:52 | <p>The one suggestion that is doable based on the rest of the report is a tax break for new buildings that include a bike storage room. 100 to 200 sq feet, A place to store bikes on the ground floor is a boon to any one in an urban area using a bike to get around. The policy can also cover owners which lease/rent some percentage of their stock to people who own bikes. This could lead to private programs (get a bike with a signed lease), but these are up to the developers as much as anyone, but they won't happen without incentives like the others discussed. I have read about this policies in a magazine discussing bike friendly policies. Alas, I can't remember to give a detailed reference, but it was an Urban issues based one.</p> | Daniel Plaat | dplaat@yahoo.com | Transportation | Comments on specific section |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1/14/2013 14:31:45 | This comment is not for a policy addition, but a comment on the obstacles to reaching the goals set out. Waste Management, or other private companies which operates in the region may have an economic reason to prevent to creation of less waste, as the for profit model of waste disposals depends on demand to dispose of more. There is likely a case that less trash makes their oppourations more efficient but what business would they or any other company have if people began producing meager amounts compared to now. Keeping or expanding waste management as a public enterprise is needed to keep the goals of less waste as it would now be seen as cutting down on the amount of tax dollars spent. And trash is everyone's problem, no? | Daniel Plaat | dplaat@yahoo.com | Solid Waste | Comments on specific section |
| 1/14/2013 15:35:35 | My greatest concern with the Regional plan is not the content, which is good and sound; but how everything it it will be funded. I fear than like many policies, that the plans will be the best laid but it will not be well funded, or the resources need for its success will not be around. I don't by the permanent fiscal crisis the state is always in. In the energy portion, a carbon tax is mentioned. This is a partisan position, to rasie funds with taxation. I think this concept should be pushed further to include all manner of progressive taxation reforms that would but New Yorkers on an even footing while funding anything and everything in the plan and beyond. If not in this way, 1,000 million rather than 10 million should be shuffled from the budget. This is State Policy, but there are different scales at work. For the reason we've put 8 counties into a region, we have the whole state the integrate and share with. Simply, I want this to work; that means having money to give out to projects worthy. There are many in the plan which need it. | Daniel Plaat | dplaat@yahoo.com | Plan Implementation | Comments on specific section |
| 1/14/2013 15:44:05 | Having just completed a degree in architecture and having taken grad courses in topics like sustainable infrastructure, I found alot of the Plan to my liking as I saw many concepts and ideas I had studied as well as a few i had not come across. But what was missing, though the plan could well be informed by it, was mention of Permaculture and its values. Written by David Holmgren, it is a work which lays out the ethics of natural life cycles to inform the design of sustainable everything. For this work and others I would suggest it. If you have then I'm glad and would hope more mention of the principles in the future. Thank You | Daniel Plaat | dplaat@yahoo.com | Agriculture | Comments on specific section |
| 1/14/2013 15:56:21 | <p>Superstorm Sandy (part of the pattern of more frequent and severe extreme weather events) dramatized what leading scientists have been saying for years: we face catastrophic threats to our way of life as the climate overheats. A rapid transition from fossil fuel dependence to renewable energy is by far THE HIGHEST NATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITY.</p> <p>Unless we can hold the global mean temperature rise below 2C from pre-industrial levels, runaway global overheating may become unavoidable, due to positive feedbacks such as permafrost thawing releasing CH4.</p> <p>Scientists warn that the probable result would be massive crop failures and eventually melting of the continental glaciers, raising sea level by tens of meters, inundating coastal regions around the world. So far experience has been that the scientific consensus has UNDERestimated the pace of disruptive climate change.</p> <p>The policies proposed in this report will be a serious move in the right direction, but they MUST BE IMPLEMENTED urgently, as a top priority for all levels of government. There is no time to lose.</p> <p>Unfortunately, with comments due last week on hydrofracking, I did not have time to make detailed comments and suggestions on the draft plan, which does seem to be a serious effort to move in the right direction. I did participate in some of the public sessions earlier in the process.</p> <p>This plan should become the basis of policy in our region, overriding all short term and special interest concerns. I would hope that public input will continue to be welcome as the plan is further developed and implemented.</p> | Mark Schaeffer | markalban1@earthlink.net | Energy and hydrofracking | Comments on specific section |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1/13/2013 20:09:48 | <p>Although your plan sounds inviting, I'm writing to tell you that I cannot support the plan.</p> <p>I prefer to keep planning for my Town within my Town by ELECTED officials by the residents. We will determine our fate, our finances, our planning, our programs, our housing, and our needs. Regionalism has a pretty ring to it, doesn't it? But it really isn't pretty. Regionalism is not about the environment; but something that paves the way for central planning, and it will silence any opposition to something that will happen in our own municipality, town, village, city, etc. Localities should be the master of their land use and livability, energy, food systems, transportation and solid waste.</p> <p>Relevant plans such as master/comprehensive plans, waterfront plans, emergency management/hazard mitigation plans, public health plans, transportation plans, agriculture preservation plans, neighborhood plans, and etc. best reside with the locality and its residents who will conform to them. Municipalities should not be subject to a regional consortium but subject to the local citizens that elect them. Together we will determine our future and if necessary ways we can partner with and make use of community resources across the region.</p> <p>Your implementation section states:</p> <p>The Region must identify and empower a long-term advocate to ensure continued progress on implementing the Regional Sustainability Plan. The Regional Sustainability Coordinator will be responsible for the timely implementation of the priority initiatives throughout the Region and developing support, education, and communication around the Region's sustainability goals.</p> <p>The Coordinator will work closely with the Regional Green Alliance and assist with the development and maintenance of the Regional Sustainability Website Portal.</p> <p>I do not see a section that addresses how a municipality will elect not to participate. The study assumes all want to and will participate.</p> <p>Ahh...no.</p> <p>Now that I have pointed out this information to you, I'm certain you agree with me. Reach out to me for further information should you need it.</p> <p>If you dissent from my position, I will need a written response from you justifying why and future steps including ways communities that wish to remain independent and free from intrusion are able to do so.</p> | Kathleen Stallmer | mstallme@nycap.rr.com | Implementation | Local control |
|--------------------|---|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1/14/2013 14:02:49 | <p>THE PEOPLE OBJECT</p> <p>Everyone wants "livable communities," still everyone cherishes their property rights even more. Where in this 90-page plan is there any mention of citizens' property rights being guaranteed to not be negatively affected? We find no such language protecting our property rights. Was this an oversight?</p> <p>In regards to public concern about this plan being an implementation tool of Agenda 21, the above plan document states in Section 3.0, page 31: "there is no funding or programmatic link between the Cleaner, Greener Communities Program (C, G CP) and Agenda 21." We don't agree or accept your premise that there is no resemblance between the two programs. Let us connect the dots for you.</p> <p>An additional concern of the people is that regional planning will sweep away local elected representation. Regionalism leads to loss of local representation. Why would our local, state, national representatives allow this to happen?</p> <p>On the national level, Senators Kerry, Gillibrand, and Lautenberg just introduced the STRONG Act as recently as Dec. 28, 2012, which promotes the agenda of ICLEI (International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives). The Senators stated: "the Bill has been endorsed by ICLEI USA's Policy Council of Local Elected Officials." It is our belief that ICLEI has one charge...to implement the U.N.'s Agenda 21.</p> <p>In your proposal document, Section 13, page 170, you credit ICLEI as providing you with a list of indicators (measurements). The NYC document called "PlaNYC" openly admits their plan was written by ICLEI and gives credit to ICLEI on page 2: Acknowledgements. How can you state there is no link between these various documents?</p> <p>Let's review "About ICLEI" from their web site: Developing the concept of ICLEI</p> <p>"Under the auspices of the Center for Innovative Diplomacy, Jeb Brugmann consulted with local government officials from more than 20 countries to measure support. The concept was endorsed by the former International Union of Local Authorities (IULA) and an agreement was endorsed with the UN Environment Programme to host the founding congress." http://www.unep.org/dewa/westasia/data/knowledge_bases/jordan/Agenda21/chapter09.pdf</p> <p>Whenever American citizens' inalienable rights are attacked, the question needs to be raised: Are those who advance or order the infringement on such rights ignorant, incompetent, or part of a designed plan?</p> <p>Solution: Have Governor Andrew Cuomo clearly state this isn't implementation of Agenda 21</p> | William Park | whpark@adirondackcombination.com | Public Engagement | UNA21 |
| 1/11/2013 7:07:25 | As a resident of the rural county of Washington I am not interested in becoming part of a region. I choose to have this area remain a separate unique entity that is controlled via local responsive town boards rather than be governed by a remote organization. People living in this community have the ability to decide how we want our property maintained as individuals not be dictated to by a group of people who do not have any vested interest in Washington County. So I vote to stay out of this Capital District Sustainability Plan and will advise my neighbors to do so also. | Karen Gates | kgates2821@yahoo.com | General Comment | Capital Region Resident |
| 1/12/2013 16:12:25 | I am a resident of Saratoga County. This document allows some of my property rights to be taken from me for the "benefit of others" I cannot accept this. Please reject this pain. | Robert Fenton | gtcfenton@aol.com | General Comment | Capital Region Resident |
| 1/12/2013 19:58:53 | <p>How can NYS fund this gigantic project? How can local communities, most of which are having financial problems, afford these projects?</p> <p>Even if the projects are affordable, I think local control is the best.</p> <p>This plan sounds like big government. It sounds like Agenda 21 of the UN. I do not like it, I do not want it.</p> | Teddi Smit | tea7077@aol.com | Implementation | Too expensive |
| 1/11/2013 13:43:00 | <p>As a private property owner in New York State, I am alarmed and aghast over the flagrant assault that this "Cleaner Greener" sustainability regional plan perpetrates against ALL private property owners in New York. The correlations of this plan are identical to that of the UN's Agenda 21!</p> <p>I vehemently protest the consideration of this "plan" for my city, county and state. I will vow to contact my elected officials and planning boards today and force them, under the protection of the U.S. Constitution, to fight this "sustainable development" agenda and reveal its' true purpose of usurping private property rights. I will also be knocking on my neighbor's doors to inform them of the insidiousness of this cleaner greener agenda.</p> <p>To think that my elected representatives would intentionally consider the dismantling of each citizen's "pursuit of happiness" is blatantly evil.</p> | David Chew | falconashton@yahoo.com | General Comment | UNA21 |
| 1/11/2013 7:27:42 | This complete plan is terrible we do not want Agenda 21 in New York. This is taking away our property. It will create more unemployment. Our food sources will be limited and more expensive. Our transportation will be limited. Those of us who live in rural areas want to keep our areas rural. We do not want to live on top of each other. Please do not get involved with this. And remember there is no grant that does not have strings. | Lynn Clauer | rowlessfat@yahoo.com | Food, transportation, property rights | UNA21 |

| Timestamp | Comment: | Your Name: | Your Email: | Section of Plan | Key Comment |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------|--|
| LETTER DATED 1/14/13 | LAST PAGE KEY SUGGESTION: The green infrastructure aspects of the plan can be implemented on a watershed scale by partnerships between municipalities and partner organizations. Real estate development can be made more competitive with more ecologically based approaches--yet new legislative authority is required to enable stormwater utility districts. It would help if we had a few key watershed-scale demonstration projects in our region to show how effective these ideas can be in addressing many of the areas of the region's plan. To do this we will need to craft more action-oriented watershed management plans that integrate development and conservation with communities and landowners along with model legislation and funding concepts to be implementable. The benefits will be significant. | John Behan, AICP (Behan Planning and Design) | info@behanp lanning.com | Water | Green infrastructure |
| LETTER DATED 1/14/13 | CONCLUDING SUGGESTIONS: Many of the recommended actions are best implemented at a county, regional or watershed level. This particularly true in the case of stormwater management. Unlike potable water and wastewater, stormwater is not fully subject to controlled flows. Improper stormwater management in one jurisdiction can impact another in the same watershed. This is one of the reasons that the recommendation to establish clear legislative authority for Stormwater Utility Districts is a lynchpin to the success of the stormwater initiatives. A recently survey showed that 30 other states and the District of Columbia currently authorize this approach. Other jurisdictions have also used the user fee aspect of Stormwater Utility Districts to incentivize landowners to adopt improved land use practices and even to retrofit existing facilities -- all at private expense. As a separate but related matter, the plan should also address the inefficiencies inherent in the way the rules require the dedication of large areas of otherwise developable land for stormwater control purposes. Rather than require separate mitigation at each development site, other jurisdictions have explored the use of off-site mitigation, analogous to the approach used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in wetland mitigation or to that of transfer of development rights. Placement of stormwater controls off-site can result in a more efficient use of limited land resources and can enhance community aesthetics in receiving areas with features such as nature trails. | Robert H. Feller, BOND, SCHOENEC K & KING, PLLC | rfeller@bsk.c om | Water | Green infrastructure and Stormwater Utility Districts |

| Timestamp | Comment: | Your Name: | Your Email: | Section of Plan | Key Comment | Additional comments |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 12/31/2012 14:02:57 | I'd love to read the full report my I am unable to download it. Is there a different way I can access the report? Thanks -Melissa | Melissa Chinigo | mchinigo@glenfallshosp.org | General Comment | Communication - Problem with getting email or report | Follow-up email sent |
| 1/13/2013 14:01:56 | Not happy about the time frame for the comment period. Not only is it short, but during the holiday period. How about extending the comment period for another couple months. | George | | General Comment | Communication - want more time | NO EMAIL ADDRESS TO RESPOND |
| 1/13/2013 19:49:13 | There has not been enough time to read this plan. I want to see more time to have better and more communication of this program and opportunities for the general public ot ask questions and obtain clarifications. | Barbara Martin | bjmartin@karmartinengineer.com | General Comment | Communication - want more time | Follow-up email sent |
| 1/12/2013 15:44:13 | I was disappointed but not surprised that, even though I had signed upto receive Updates, my name was deleted from the contact list several months ago and I received no notices of upcoming meetings or of the release that the Full Report had been published. | Tom Ellis | tomellis309@yahoo.com | General Comment | Communication Problem | Follow-up email sent |

| Timestamp | Comment: | Your Name: | Your Email: | Section of Plan | Key Comment | Additional Comments or Points made |
|--------------------|--|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| 1/2/2013 21:56:16 | Hi there, | Michael Cote | michaelcote | General Comment | Tea Party emails on | |
| 1/11/2013 8:41:52 | This master plan should not be implemented. It takes away the right of local people and communities to decide for themselves what best suits our | paul | | General Comment | Local control | It takes away the right of local people |
| 1/11/2013 12:05:22 | I am against virtually every provision in this plan. You seek to identify which foods we are to eat, which energy resources we are to use and how | Richard | RSardoPLS | General Comment | Local control | Business climate and local control, |
| 1/11/2013 12:23:06 | It appears to me that this plan marginalizes private enterprise, leaving us with fewer and fewer choices as private citizens. | Leah Davis | davisL3@nyc | General Comment | Local control | |
| 1/13/2013 16:12:34 | Whereas some of the objectives of the plan are admirable, I ask that you reject the plan as a whole if: | Wilma Koss | wskdbk@nyc | General Comment | Local control | Property Rights |
| 1/13/2013 19:52:37 | I am against giving a regional authority the power to make local decisions which are better made at a local level by local people. My worry is that | Kenneth | kamartinengi | General Comment | Local control | |
| 1/14/2013 14:46:59 | The goals defined in the recently published Capital Region Sustainability Plan represent gross abuse of authority, circumvention of local | Kelly | | General Comment | Local control | |
| 1/14/2013 15:38:21 | Please be advised of my complete and total opposition to this plan. I believe land use policies should be done by the municipality in which they are | sandra verola | nverola@nyc | General Comment | Local control | |
| 1/8/2013 12:12:25 | I do not like this plan. If Greener communities are to be put in place allow it to happen organically in the Market. I do not want my property rights | Robert Arrigo | robrigo80@a | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/8/2013 18:40:36 | I am 100% against this sustainable development scam and the governments attempt to control our lives. We will be fighting you every step of the | Dominic | dlostritto@ny | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/9/2013 6:01:12 | I am opposed to any action that supplants local and county governments. Also opposed to any actions that weaken property rights. Thank you. | Philip | Ppolizotto@a | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/11/2013 21:59:08 | Some good ideas, some not so good. Riding a bike or walking are not viable for 7 months out of the year. Why would we want to limit the amount | David | dfbuchyn@liv | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/12/2013 15:39:33 | This plan does not protect my property rights. I do not agree with giving them up got the so called "common good" Please do not approve this plan | Robert | | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/14/2013 12:55:22 | I have read this full report. This document and plan does not protect my personal or local property rights. This document removes our local control | Anastasia | strawbryhl@ | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/14/2013 15:05:54 | I already made a comment, but as I thought more about the Capital Region Sustainability Plan, I realized a few things that were bothering me: | Theodora | tea7077@aol | General Comment | Property Rights | Local Control, Second email comment |
| 1/14/2013 15:22:29 | Gentlemen: The Capital Region Sustainability Plan is a plan to change the whole structure of governing in our region. None of the initiatives | Diane | dclm@nyca | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/14/2013 16:17:03 | What do you have to guarantee the private property rights of local property owners are not infringing, how about a legally binding document to be | Thomas | tchand1@ny | General Comment | Property Rights | |
| 1/2/2013 21:00:37 | Please view the the video "Agenda 21 for Public Officials: http://www.youtube.com/my_videos?sq=Agenda+21+for+Public+ | Hal Shurtleff | shurtleffhal@ | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/8/2013 10:42:17 | This whole Agenda 21 plan is unconstitutional! All of this is to get more control over We the People. I hope I get the opportunity to leave this state | Patricia | rbvmorgans | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/8/2013 18:14:19 | This is nothing more than the largest grandiose plan of Agenda 21 implementation that will do nothing more than destroy our constitutional liberties, | Cat Young | sacredconstit | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/9/2013 11:56:07 | This whole agensa needs to be thrown out. I see more and more the loss of our freedoms through govermenmt controls. This is not what the | Carol | Carol39@NY | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/11/2013 10:12:36 | This is based pure and simple on Agenda 21. Coumo is one of the authors of the massive nation-wide action plan to eliminate local governance | Reimund | | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/11/2013 11:48:47 | Quite shocked at the thought of this type of central planning. I was amused at the constant use of the phrase "sustainable development" as if | Peter | Medick | General Comment | UNA21 | Loss of local control |
| 1/13/2013 16:36:03 | Our property rights are in danger of being torn away. We all need to educate ourselves and each other. We will continue to learn about Agenda 21 | donald&maur | mtdulmer | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/14/2013 11:55:34 | If I could hear future generations now they might be saying - "How could you be so callous, so selfish and so cold as to co-opt sustainable for | Howard | | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/14/2013 16:02:26 | This entire Agenda 21 is just another huge scam on the public to create gov't control over every aspect of our lives. Government's purpose is to | Janice Cowie | cowiejc@veri | General Comment | UNA21 | |
| 1/15/2013 15:14:27 | I have read through the draft plan for the capital region and have some concerns. | Brenda | warpmail.net | Questions and | local control | |
| 1/1/2013 7:07:41 | I am 100% against this regional plan for the Capital Region. We do not need a board to come into our towns to tell our public officials and | Amy Roelen | 3@yahoo.co | Questions and | UNA21 | |
| 1/11/2013 5:37:20 | We have a system of government that has just barely protected our private property rights under the onslaught of the environmental community | Scott | @netzero.co | Questions and | Property Rights | |
| 1/13/2013 17:41:06 | I have a few comments/questions on the plan: If we get into this program and decide it is not for us, how can we get out of it? Is there going to be | Yuzynko | msn.com | Questions and | local control | |