

RC 50

October 16, 2013

To: SOA Joint Boards of Fish & Game

Re: Action/response on Proposals 28 & 29

The Joint Boards actions in concern for maintaining a productive process regarding these proposals is completely understandable. However it occurs to me (if it hasn't already to some of you as well) that a main point raised of maintaining accommodation by current Chairs to seek/allow additional input from AC representatives or others during deliberation could be addressed further. Per the (fairly strong) record developed on these two proposals, it may behoove both Boards to develop a separate policy on point reflecting those discussions that best fits with realities of their respective constituencies, and express that intent at this meeting. A draft could then be prepared by appointed members, with time for thought and scheduled for further discussion/action at a future meeting *- during this cycle.*

Following are a couple of my personal standards I think of that should be met prior to requesting the privilege of addressing a Board on record outside of public testimony or during deliberations which you ~~would likely~~ ^{may} want to incorporate somehow - if you consider this suggestion worthy of pursuit:

- 1) It should be productive, additional information, not repetitive of prior testimony, nor primarily emotional in content;
- 2) I note/perceive some significant misdirection or misunderstanding by members of subject proposals' intent and effect as reflected in course of deliberation; (this does not include relevant discussion that happens to be counter to my opinions)
- 3) It should be a matter of significant enough concern that correction/consideration warrants being established within the verbal record of deliberation.


Submitted by Greg Koczicka