

Commissioner's Comments
to
Proposed Amendments to

ARTICLE III

Officers

- I oppose the proposed amendment
- The amendment appears to require the Chair to take into account only 1) the commissioner's preference, and 2) the size of the committees.
 - Presumably the Chair should also take into account other considerations, such as the expertise, or lack thereof, of the various commissioners, the balance of states among the committees, the availability of commissioners to meet at times established by the committees, etc.
 - The relative workload of committees may require that some committees have more members than others.
 - There is no realistic way to assess whether the Chair has taken those matters into consideration, nor who should make such an assessment.
 - Essentially, the proposed clause would have the result of allowing a commissioner to complain if the commissioner was not assigned to the committee of preference without any mechanism of resolution.
- The amendment may be suggesting, although it does not actually state, that the Chair is required to appoint each commissioner to the committee each commissioner prefers.
 - This is completely unworkable – theoretically you could have some committees without any members.
- It is best to keep Article III as is, and give the Chair flexibility as to how best to constitute committees
 - If the commission does not like the Chair's performance, then the solution is to remove the Chair or elect a different Chair.
 - The IMLCC has become a substantial business with an excellent professional staff that is governed by over 80 commissioners, most of whom have full-time jobs, who have varying degrees of interest and time to devote to the IMLCC. The Chair and the Executive Committee require maximum flexibility in order to properly respond to the changing needs and demands of the IMLCC.