ATTACHMENT A

Summary of Primary Considerations Raised in Support of or Opposition to the Proposed Actions		
Commenter/date	**Comment**	**Response**
C.D. Michel, on behalf of National Rifle Association, email received 11/20/2014	1.a. Generally supports the proposed regulation.	1.a. Comment noted.
	1.b. Require the publication of petitions and staff recommendations in the current agenda, or other format, prior to the expiration of the comment period.	1.b. Reject: This comment is outside the scope of the proposed regulation outlining the process under which petitions for regulatory changes will be evaluated and scheduled for receipt and Commission action, and a requirement for the use of a form for submitting regulation change proposals. The Commission may be considering meeting procedures, including meeting deadlines and posting of meeting materials, in a future rulemaking file. Under current practices, a petition, or a summary thereof, is available at least 50 days prior to the action meeting - allowing ample time for anyone wishing to comment on the petition prior to the Commission taking action on the petition. In addition, if the Commission finds there is sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned change may be warranted, interested parties may provide comments during the committee review and evaluation period and/or during the minimum 45-day comment period pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act.
	1.c. Amend subsection (c) to substitute the word “available” with “scheduled”.	1.c. Reject: The proposed amendment is infeasible as it would require items to be added to the agenda at any time up to the beginning of the meeting. Staff is unable to monitor mail, fax and email when on travel status. In addition the proposed amendment could result in regulatory petitions being added to the agenda of special hearings.

	1.d. Amend subsection (d) to substitute the word “available” with “scheduled”.	1.d. Reject: The proposed amendment could result in consideration of petitions being added to special hearings without adequate time for staff analysis.
	1.e. Amend subsection (d) to add “commission” before the word “meeting” in the phrase “after the next available meeting”.	1.e. Accept in part: The proposed text does not include the phrase “after the next available meeting”. The proposed regulation is revised to add the word “commission” in the phrase “at the next available meeting”.
	1.f. There should be deadlines for action once the Commission has accepted a petition for further consideration.	1.f. Reject: As the commenter points out, petitions vary in their scope, requiring from a few hours up to years to address. It is infeasible to establish deadlines in regulation.
	1.g. There should be established time periods by which the Commission must report the status of pending petitions; e.g. at every Commission meeting, there should be an update on them.	1.g. Reject: As the commenter points out, petitions vary in their scope, requiring from a few hours up to years to address. It is infeasible to establish fixed periods for reporting on petitions. The public is welcome to ask the Commission for updates on the progress on any petition at any time.
	1.h. The proposed regulation should also apply to petitions for non-regulatory amendments.	1.h. Reject: This recommendation is outside the scope of the proposed regulation. A process under which petitions for non-regulatory changes will be evaluated and scheduled for receipt and Commission action may be considered in a future rulemaking.
Kathy Lynch, on behalf Safari Club International, received at 12/3/2014 meeting	2.a. Generally supports the proposed regulation.	2.a. Comment noted.
	2.b. Subsection (b) provides that Commission staff may reject a petition if a similar regulation change was considered within the previous 12 months and no new information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted. The term “similar” could be interpreted to mean anything from an identical petition to one that simply addresses issues concerning a particular species.	2.b. Accept: The proposed regulation has been revised from “a similar regulation change” to “any petition requesting a **functionally equivalent** regulation change”.

	2.c. Subsection (b) provides that Commission staff may reject a petition if a similar regulation change was considered within the previous 12 months and no new information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted. The proposed regulation is unclear as to whether the Commission will reject a petition from an individual or group, simply because a different individual or group has unsuccessfully petitioned the Commission on a similar matter within the preceding 12 months.	2.c. Accept: The proposed regulation has been revised from "a similar regulation change" to "**any** petition requesting a functionally equivalent regulation change".
	2.d. Subsection (b) provides that Commission staff may reject a petition if a similar regulation change was considered within the previous 12 months and no new information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted. The term "new" could refer to data or information that was reported or published after the date of the previously-submitted petition or could refer to data or information that is simply new to the Commission because it was not submitted in the previous rulemaking [petition].	2.d. Accept: The proposed regulation has been revised from "no new information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted" to "no information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted".
	2.e. The proposed regulation should include a requirement for the Commission to post petitions not rejected pursuant to subsection 662(b) on its website and establish a 30-60 day comment period for the public to submit written comments and supporting information in response to the petition.	2.e. See response 1.b.

ATTACHMENT A

	2.f. The proposed regulation should include a requirement that the Commission post all comments for public review on the agency's website.	2.f. Reject: Commission does not have sufficient staff resources to post all written public comments on its website.
	2.g. Commissioners should sign the new incompatible activities statement.	2.g. Reject. This comment is outside the scope of the proposed regulation.
Joe Exline, oral comment at 12/3/2014 meeting	3.a. Some questions on Form FGC 1 are onerous, such as the economic analysis.	3.a. Comment noted: FGC 1 requires the petitioner to identify *any known impacts* but does not require the petitioner to provide a full economic impact assessment. If the petitioner is unable to determine, or is otherwise unaware of, potential economic impacts, the petitioner may make a statement to that effect in the response.
	3.b. The proposed regulation should distinguish between Commission meeting and committee meetings.	3.b. Reject: The proposed regulation states "commission meeting"; it is not necessary to say "excluding committee meetings" or other distinguishing language since a committee meeting is not a Commission meeting.
Ed Worley, National Rifle Associate, oral comments at 12/3/2014 meeting	4.a. Moving in the right direction.	4.a. Comment noted.
	4.b. Commissioners and Commission staff should report who they are interacting with and what compensation they get.	4.b. Reject: This comment is outside the scope of the proposed regulation.
Tom Pederson, California Rifle and Pistol Association, oral comments at 12/3/2014 meeting	5.a. Disclose nature of petition before comment deadline.	5.a. See response 1.b.
	5.b. Support comments of some of the previous speakers at the 12/3/2014 meeting.	5.b. See responses 1.a. through 4.b.