



NRA election recommendations

Those of you, who have been *SASI* or *NCFGA* members, for more than a year or two, know that we provide our members with recommendations, each year, concerning those who, in our opinion, are the best choices for the NRA's Board of Directors.

This year, as in the last several years, we have the great pleasure of advising you that the recommendation list was jointly compiled, by the *Suffolk Alliance of Sportsmen, Inc. (SASI)* and *Nassau County Fish & Game Association, Inc. (NCFGA)*, as well as the fact that both organizations concur, on *all* recommendations. Our criteria is stringent, because we believe you should have *only* the best qualified, on the NRA board.

Our choices are made from among those candidates, whom we feel best represent the *interests of the membership* of NRA, not necessarily those who are picked by the NRA's Nominating Committee or those who the NRA's officers might like to see on NRA's board.

NRA is a major corporation, growing and becoming more complex, every year. Dues income, alone, produces almost \$200,000,000, in income, *each year*. Add to that, the income of the NRA Foundation, the NRA Endowment, NRA-ILA, product sales, investment income and NRA's broadcasting network, plus other, "miscellaneous" items and you have a corporation, the annual budget and assets of which are at or approaching one *billion* dollars (\$1,000,000,000), *per year*. That's bigger than many of the "name brand" corporations and larger than most firearms manufacturers.

The purpose of a Board of Directors is to *set policy*, for the corporation, which is, *implemented*, by the officers of that corporation. Directors *must be able to* evaluate, influence and understand the short-term and long-term, national and international ramifications of the multi-million dollar decisions they make. Those directors must, therefore, possess appropriate academic and/or experience qualifications. Being a "nice person," "a local activist" or a "qualified and dedicated shooter" do not, of themselves, make one qualified, to manage a major business operation.

In NRA's case, all directors are unpaid (except for reimbursement of expenses), while all officers and other employees are paid. NRA senior officers are, typically, paid six figure (\$100,000+ +) salaries, per year. They are paid, to be officers, *full time*. To allow any of them to become directors, also, would involve considerable conflict of interest. Consequently, for that reason *and that reason only*, we have never endorsed a sitting NRA officer or other NRA employee, for the board.

NRA's needs, this year, as in many years past, are for qualified, executive and political talent. Consequently, only candidates, with academic *and/or* practical experience, in business management, finance, law, influence gathering *and/or* with significant, national recognition or political prestige, should be considered. Those candidates, with professional or educational criteria, such as MBAs, LLBs/JDs, CPAs, ChFCs, etc. *and/or* qualifying experience, *i.e.*: managing substantial business entities, at the executive levels, are what NRA now needs most, for the business management side of the operations. Next, are those with national political recognition and national respect, who know how to get things completed, in the political arena.

It's a tough set of criteria, for making choices and, sometimes, it requires that folks, who we may like, personally, *don't* get our recommendation, *solely* for their lack of having *the best* and *most* appropriate educational or experience credentials.

NRA is, *no longer*, just a competitive shooting organization, with nothing to manage, except match schedules and match rules. Today, almost every program NRA implements involves millions of dollars. We need people, who properly understand the best ways of doing that. The NRA's board has, because of smart voting, gained a little, in *most* years. That pattern needs to continue and to be encouraged.

You are not required to vote for the maximum of 25 candidates and, in those years when we cannot recommend 25, we *strongly* suggest that you *not* vote for all you can. This year, we have many exceptionally qualified candidates, among whom to chose and, consequently, we can recommend a full 25. By voting, for others, *you are diluting the votes, for the strongest candidates* and, at the same time, sending a message that you will consider *and accept* less than the best candidates.

SASF's and *NCFGA's* joint recommendations, *in alphabetical order*, are:

Alstadt, Stephen J.	Howard, Susan
Allbaugh, Joe M.	Humphreville, Mark K.
Bachhuber, Frank E.	Lee, Willes K.
Bamberry, M. Carol	Malone, Karl A.
Barr, Bob	Maloney, Sean
Blunt, Matt	North, Oliver L.
Brownell, Peter R.	Nugent, Johnny
Butz, Dave	Olson, Lance
Craig, Larry E.	Sanders, Robert E.
Froman, Sandra S.	Spika, N. Stephanie
Hammer, Marion P.	Thornton, Robert E.
Hernandez, Antonio A.	West, Allen B. and

Young, Don E.