

From: Rick Hausman
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 11:56 AM
To: policy@issgovernance.com

Subject: Comment on Proxy Access

Dear ISS:

I work for Clean Yield Asset Management which generally shares my views, but in this instance, since I haven't had time for a company-wide review, I am speaking for myself. I am a member of United States Proxy Exchange, and this letter generally echoes the views of USPX.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment for your 2012 Draft Policies, in this case **Proxy Access Proposals (U.S)**.

Q: Does your organization intend to generally support or oppose proxy access shareholder proposals? Would your organization's view differ based on whether the proposal is a binding bylaw resolution versus a precatory (non-binding) one? If so, how?

A: I favor binding resolutions, but as a practical matter, resolutions are likely to be non-binding for the foreseeable future. Both binding and nonbinding proxy access proposals should afford a reasonable—but not necessarily easy—means available to all long-term shareowners to nominate.

Q: If your organization is likely to take a Case-by-Case approach on proxy access shareholder proposals, are there any additional factors not enumerated in ISS' proposed policy that your organization believes are central to the evaluation of these proposals? If yes, please specify.

A: I will generally oppose proposals that I consider to be blatantly undemocratic. Specifically, I would oppose high ownership thresholds, which would disenfranchise all but the largest institutional shareowners. I would also oppose caps on the number of shareowner nominees, especially caps designed to ensure that a majority of board seats are retained by the current board's nominees.

Q: Would your organization look for specific thresholds or limits when evaluating these shareholder proposals (e.g., a minimum or maximum ownership percentage or number of board seats)? If yes, what specific parameters does your organization favor?

A: By asking what sorts of thresholds or limits respondents might support, this question fails to recognize that innovative proposals using mechanisms other than the "thresholds" and "limits" or Rule 14a-11 might deserve support. As a member of the United States Proxy Exchange (USPX), I know my organization is preparing a model proxy access proposal that includes a number of sound innovations. One of these, as the draft is currently written, would allow a group of 100 shareowners, all satisfying the Rule 14a-8 eligibility requirements, to place one nominee on the proxy. The USPX model proposal has not yet been released. When it is, I hope ISS will review it carefully and choose to recommend supporting votes for it.

Q: Would your organization oppose the shareholder proposal if it allowed 13D filers seeking a change in control to place candidates on ballots? If no, please explain.

A: I would not want any party simultaneously performing an independent proxy solicitation AND nominating under proxy access.

Thank you,

Rick Hausman, Dir. Research & Advocacy
Clean Yield Asset Management
16 Beaver Meadow Road P.O. Box 874
Norwich, VT 05055
www.cleanyield.com



This is not an investment recommendation or a solicitation to become a client of the firm. Unless indicated, these views are the author's and may differ from those of the firm or others in the firm. We do not represent this is accurate or complete and we may not update this. Past performance is not indicative of future returns. You may contact me for additional information and important disclosures. You should be judicious when using email to request or authorize the investment in any security or instrument, or to effect any other transactions. We cannot guarantee that any such requests received via email will be processed in a timely manner. This communication is solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential information. We do not waive confidentiality by mistransmission. Clean Yield Group monitors and stores both incoming and outgoing electronic correspondence.