



Rabbit Creek Community Council <rabbitcreekcc@gmail.com>

Re: Board Approval of the Seward Rumble Highway Resolution & the HLB 5-Year Plan Letter

1 message

Hezekiah Holland <kyrholland@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 27, 2018 at 7:47 AM

To: Frank Pugh <rccc.fpugh@aol.com>

Cc: davidrsterling@gmail.com, wikaworld@gmail.com, millertreehouse@gci.net, lawrence.keil@earthlink.net, paulandsusanne@gmail.com, jdusel@awr-eng.com, ky@kyholland.com, bert.lewis5@gmail.com, nancypease2@gmail.com, inquiries@cmcavanaugh.com, rabbitcreekcc@gmail.com, rabbitccccommunications@gmail.com, elsajess@gmail.com, agrappoport@gmail.com, jvrg@acsalaska.net

Frank,

It might be useful for you and Mat to chat about the correspondence committee work flow. Mat, Bert and I met earlier this year to review the original work flow process that Bert and Vivian had documented for the CC a year ago to bring clarity and transparency to the process. We found the process was still sound though Mat was interested in updating guidelines on letter content reflecting the current interest in the issue of how much detail to include in the recommendations. I'm sure Mat can provide you a copy of the original (may 2017) work flow guidelines and his thoughts from that meeting that might supplement my thoughts herein.

As this relates to the rumble strip resolution, I believe the situation is confusing. The CC general membership voted on a position and content to be sent to the DOT, and now there is a "vote" taking place with the Board. There is in my opinion no precedent or procedure for a Board vote by email, outside of a meeting, on action already approved at an official council meeting. There is precedent in the past for asking for board input on a draft letters when it was felt that the correspondence committee needed input on something that was not well formulated at the meeting where writing the letter was approved.

In my opinion, there should not be any "vote" taking place at the moment. If the correspondence committee feels that board input is needed to insure the letter being sent accurately captures the vote at the meeting, then a more informal straw poll or request for comments might be requested. In this case however the motion and content was explicit and only needed to be checked for grammatical errors and sent in.

In asking the board for comments on a draft letter, the only question is whether the content accurately captures the vote intent correctly. In this case, you had my "vote" indicating I felt it did. You have a Nay vote, and that should come with some explanation of the error that someone feels was made in preparing the document and capturing the will of the body at the last meeting. Speculating, I expect the Nay vote you received was perhaps from someone that already voted Nay on the original motion and is voting that position again. The original motion from the general meeting is not up for debate.

On top of all of this is the issue of email. Many people these days do very little with email, scanning it only. I'd expect that there are number of people that have missed that there might be any "vote" taking place since that is not a normal procedure and the rubble strip issue has been worn down sufficiently (ha ha)

In the past there was discretion for the chair to work with the correspondence committee to finalize a letter and if the chair felt the letter was done and accurate, to send it in without any further review. I know you are concerned now about maintaining a transparent process and wanting explicit review of documents, but I think the current effort of holding a second vote will at best slow down our response, and at worse confuse the debate and clarify on the will of the body that has made a decision.

I would recommend that if you and the correspondence committee feel the letter is finished and accurate, that you send it in and move on. If the Nay vote indicates an error in the letter, then you and the correspondence committee can discuss the concern and decide whether a change is needed and consistent with the vote taken at the meeting. I would assume all other non voting responses are an indication that no change to the letter is requested. In the future, if a letter needs board review, I'd suggest it only be sent out for comments with a deadline, and then a review of any comments before sending the letter, tested against the motion made at the meeting.

Ky

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 26, 2018, at 9:16 PM, Frank Pugh <rccc.fpugh@aol.com> wrote:

RCCC Board,

I only have 1-Yea & 1-Nay thus far, please review and respond if you want the documents submitted.

Thanks,

Frank Pugh
RCCC Chair
rccc.fpugh@aol.com
