Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Present were: Executive Director Lee Heighton

Board of Directors Sam Ford,

Nancy Garcia, Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Curtis Smith, Dale Smith, Ally Stern, Dave Walt.

Chair Leerie Jenkins called the meeting to order at 8:35 EDT.

Guests: Kim Davis.

### Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments - Leerie Jenkins

Leerie welcomed everyone to the meeting. He welcomed guest Kim Davis. He reminded everyone that the new nomination period ends September 30, so narrowing down candidates for the Clyde Moore Hall of Fame and Judge of Year will need to be finalized via teleconference. He indicated he'd like to set a date at this meeting, perhaps shortly after CanAm.

CanAm entries close 8/25/12. We have already had a number of volunteers. Anyone who can assist as a full time or part time volunteer, is urged to contact Dave Walt. Division sponsorships are still available.

## Executive Director's Comments – Lee Heighton

## • Region 16

Lee reported that Region 16 has struggled the last few years because of its unique geographical make up. He has reached out to California about the possibility of spitting the state into two regions – one north and one south. Currently northern and southern California competitors don't compete against each other because of geographical issues including the difficulty associated with traveling through Los Angeles.

At this time, Lee has not been able to get enough input from competitors to feel comfortable making a recommendation yet, especially regarding where the dividing line would be.

Leerie moved we enter Executive Session.

The Board entered Executive Session at 8:42 a.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 9:25 a.m.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

During executive session the board discussed ongoing marketing opportunities.

### Treasurer's Report - Nancy Garcia

Nancy indicated that our American Express points are currently at 90,000. She plans to wait until the end September to start cashing points out for volunteer certificates for CanAm. Each year the gift certificates are raffled off to volunteers at the event.

She reported that money market and CD rates are still at approximately 0.5%. Rates go up to 1% for longer time periods. Nancy noted that business account rates are different than personal rates. She previously researched some favorable published rates and learned that they would not be available for business accounts. Ally suggested looking to see if the rates were different in Canada especially given that the USD/CAN conversion rate is fairly even right now.

There was discussion of shipping issues in Canada and alternate shipping companies. Lee indicated he was investigating those possibilities.

Nancy distributed financial documents to board members.

There was a discussion of bad debt. Under the rules, if tournament fees are more than 2 calendar months late, the club is placed on probation for 1 year. If tournament fees are more than 3 calendar months late, the club is suspended and the club would need to request reinstatement from the Board. Lee asked that Nancy notify him if any clubs fall into those areas.

Nancy indicated that she had to wait for the accountants to finish with the books to input some new figures.

### Secretary's Report - Dana Nichols

- 5/21/12 Kim Davis resigned from Nomination and Election Committees
- 5/23/12 Board unanimously approved via email Leerie Jenkins' appointment of Dana Hanson to replace Kim Davis on Nomination and Election Committees.
- 5/23/12 Highlights of the 5/19/12 Board meeting forwarded to Kim Davis for posting on the NAFA web page
- 6/5/12 May 19, 2012 Board meeting minutes approved and forwarded for posting on the NAFA page
- 6/15/12 Board took action via unanimous consent (via email) with written consent of all Board members, including ED and Chair. Steve Pitt, an approved Australian flyball judge, was approved to judge at the Go Dog Go tournament on July 21-22, 2012 with approval of the Tournament Director and under supervision of a NAFA supervising judge.

Leerie reported that he was the judge who supervised Steve Pitt. He reported Steve did an excellent job in the ring. It was a very positive experience all around.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

## **Standing Committee Reports**

### Election Committee - Dana Nichols

Dana reported that election costs will be slightly higher this year. The company is charging more now that they know how much work is needed to generate statistical data and administer the election. The election fee will be \$2850.00 this year, \$500 more than last year. Dana tried to obtain quotes from other companies, but most were unable to handle the type of election needs we have – unique types of ballots, administrative needs, etc. One company was able to program that type of ballot, but said the cost would be at least \$5,000.00 per election. The committee requested approval from Board for the increased cost.

Sam moved to approve the election cost. Curtis seconded. There was brief follow up discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dana asked that we schedule the nomination teleconference now. There was support for doing preliminary discussions via email. Dana will put together email information for review before CanAm.

After consulting calendars, the board teleconference was tentatively set for Tuesday, October 23, 2012 at 9:00 pm ET. If decisions can be made via email then the teleconference can be cancelled.

Sam asked that the nominating chair inform the board of any nominations that were rejected and the reason(s) why. Kim indicated that the procedure she followed and Dana Hanson is currently following is that when nominations are received that do not meet the criteria, an email is sent to the submitter with the deficiencies so they can be remedied, if possible. Dana indicated she would ask Dana Hanson to provide a report with the final nominations regarding any rejected nominations.

### Nominating Committee - Dana Hanson (via email)

Nominations for the current year elections opened June 1 and continue through September 30. Information about the nominating process has been placed prominently on the NAFA home page. Included are links to online nomination forms for Judge of the Year, Regional MVP and the Clyde Moore Hall of Fame and to instructions on how to nominate individuals for Board positions.

To date one reminder has been published to the NAFA News List. Nominations remain very light at this time. Reminders will increase in frequency as the closing draws near.

Leerie called a short recess and then the meeting was resumed.

### Judges Committee - Dave Walt

## Judge promotions

Geoff Brown, Raleigh NC - Approved to Supervising. Dave relayed that the committee received very positive comments regarding Geoff's application. He is very highly thought of as a judge and was elected Judge of the Year last year. Comments were received from many different areas. The judges committee unanimously recommends the promotion. Ally moved to approve the promotion. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Toby Emo, Nunda NY - Approved to Supervising. Dave reported that the committee received comments that were all very positive and from an extremely wide geographic range. The judges committee unanimously recommends the promotion. Ally moved to approve the promotion. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Glen Robbins, Ottawa ON - Apprentice to Provisional. The judges committee unanimously recommends the promotion. Ally moved to approve the promotion. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Jon DosPassos, Coatesville PA - Apprentice to Provisional. The judges committee unanimously recommends the promotion. Curtis moved to approve the promotion. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### Revisions to excusal form

Dave reported that our supply of multi-part excusal forms (C.12) is at an end. The judges committee reviewed the current form to make modifications. The primary modifications are to include name and contact information for witnesses of aggression excusals and to separate the sections for non-aggression excusals.

The current form is a four part form and it is often hard to read the final two copies. Lee suggested moving to a single carbon copy – 2 part form with the copy going to the owner/handler of the excused dog.

Curtis moved to approve the proposed C.12 with printing as a 2 part form. Dave seconded. Karen requested that a revision date be added. Curtis and Dave both approved the amendment to the motion. The motion passed unanimously. [The revised C.12 is attached to the minutes]

## Training video

Dave reported that the committee has planned a training video on hosting tournaments. The idea would be to have practical advice for clubs wanting to host tournaments with the goal of making it easier for clubs to host. We have earmarked \$1200 in the next budget for the video. With other projects ongoing currently, it is likely to be done next year.

## Racing dogs in Thundershirts

Dave said the judges committee was referred an email from a competitor inquiring about dogs racing in thundershirts. The competitor explained there had been inconsistent rulings by judges – dogs from the team had been permitted to at one tournament, but prohibited at another.

The judges committee discussed the request and felt that as long as the thundershirts or anxiety wraps were well fitted, they should not pose any risk in racing. They are generally fitted fairly tight and do not have any loose or extraneous parts that could pose a hazard. Competitors would need to be cautious regarding their use in hot weather.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

There was discussion as to whether this required an actual rule change or whether including it in the minutes and distributing to the judges list would be sufficient. The consensus was that a rule change was not necessary at this time.

Dana moved to have the board adopt the judges committee's view that racing in thundershirts or anxiety wraps should be permitted, if properly fitted, and that this information be disseminated to the judges. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Rules Committee - Curtis Smith

Curtis reported that the rules committee received a number of comments which were shared with the Board members for their consideration prior to voting on the items.

1. Handling of suspensions -- Diane Conroy

Excerpts from Diane's message:

There are a few things I would like you to consider to change under Discipline.

I'd like to see a rule change to:

When an individual is suspended, neither she or her dogs will be allowed to race until the suspension is changed.

Also, when a person gets suspended from racing, the owner of her team should receive a copy of the letter sent to the individual which outlines what she may or may not do.

Sincerely

Diane Conroy

Tampa Bay Barkaneers

Recommendations: After some discussion, the committee recommends that the terms of a suspension be left to the discretion of the Board of Directors (if the suspension was the result of disciplinary charges) or the Executive Director (ED) (subject to ratification by the board). The committee believes that an automatic suspension of a person's dog(s) may not be applicable, or even feasible, in all possible cases. For example, it is not always clear who "owns" any given dog since ownership changes may not always be reflected in the NAFA database. One family member or friend may consistently run/own a dog registered to another family member or friend. Furthermore, any one person may be listed numerous different ways in the database depending on what name was used at the time of CRN registration (e.g., maiden vs. married name). With regard to notification of a suspension, all suspensions are published in board meeting minutes. The committee recommends that if club owners have any questions or concerns about the limitations imposed by the suspension of a fellow club member, they should feel free to contact the ED and/or the board directly.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Karen moved to adopt the rules committee recommendations. Curtis seconded. There was brief discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Requirements for Hall of Fame nominations -- Dave Walt

Can I suggest a change to the requirements for the Hall of Fame nominations that would include the dog be inactive in the database (have not raced for 18 months) before it is eligible.

So many sports require the athlete to be retired from the sport for a certain amount of time before being eligible and think it would be a good thing to add to NAFA's requirement as well.

Dave Walt

<u>Recommendations:</u> The committee unanimously recommends that the board adopt this proposal, which would not take effect until the nomination period for the upcoming racing year (August 1 - September 30, 2013).

There was discussion of how and where such a rule change should be added. The most logical insertion appeared to be in Section 8.5 of the Corporate Policies & Procedures (page 44 of the current rulebook). The change would be added as a new section between longevity and notoriety. Karen proposed the following language: "(ii) a nominee must not have earned NAFA points within 18 months of the close of the nominating period." Karen moved to approve the rule change. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ally wanted to revisit the longevity requirement. Ally moved to change the definition of longevity to 6 years instead of the current 4 year requirement. Dave seconded. There was discussion regarding this proposal.

In favor of the motion: Sam Ford, Ally Stern, and Dave Walt. Opposed: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Curtis Smith, and Dale Smith. The motion failed.

3. Specifying type of insurance required -- Karen Oleson

Proposed Rule Change to 6.1 Requirements (a) Karen Oleson Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 4:11 AM To: "Rules@flyball.org" < Rules@flyball.org>

I would like to see Rule 6.1 – Requirements (a) changed to more specifically indicate the type of insurance required for tournaments held in the United States. I feel this change will help to avoid confusion by clubs who are in the process of obtaining insurance.

My proposed rule follows (changes are bolded and underlined):

Section 6.1 – Requirements

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

(a) NAFA® sanctioned tournaments may only be hosted by NAFA® or NAFA® registered clubs in good standing. The host club must follow current NAFA® Rules of Racing and Corporate Policies & Procedures. Any Club in good standing may be considered for sanctioning. At least fifteen days prior to the start of a tournament held in the United States, the NAFA® Tournament Sanctioning Secretary must receive a certificate of <code>liability</code> insurance listing NAFA® as an additional insured for that tournament with limits of at least \$1 million <code>general liability</code> per occurrence. In the event the Tournament Sanctioning Secretary does not receive a certificate of insurance with coverage as stated above, the tournament sanctioning will be revoked. The first Club to apply for sanctioning with a valid sanctioning request will receive sanctioning unless the weekend meets the criteria for a reserved weekend by another Club.

I've attached a sample of an insurance certificate NAFA® receives for the committee's use. I apologize if the image appears upside down.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Oleson

Recommendations: The committee unanimously recommends that the board adopt this proposal.

Curtis moved to adopt the recommendation and make the rule change. Sam seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Consistency with elimination brackets -- Leerie Jenkins

#### From 6/18/12:

I noticed, when looking at 4 team, 6 team, and 7 team, single elims, that the Alt and "not Alt" formats don't seem to me, to be consistent. For example, in the 4 team SE, the Alt placements, is the one that includes loser races. In the 6 and 7 team formats, the "not alt" format is the one that accounts for the loser races.

#### From 7/12/12:

SEs for 4, 5, and 6 teams are all consistent with each other. The default or "non-alt" version is WITH loser races (each team guaranteed 2 races). I did however, notice an error in the Alt placements for the 6 team SE. It stated first place is the winner of race 7. However, in the Alt format, there is no race 7. So, I modified to winner of race 5.

I modified the 7 and 8 team SEs to be consistent with the 4, 5, and 6 team SEs.

There is no alt or "with loser races" version of the 9 and 10 team SE. I'm assuming it simply isn't used.

(See the elimination brackets with the suggested edits submitted by Leerie appended to the rules committee recommendations.)

<u>Recommendations:</u> To remove inconsistencies among the elimination racing schedules, the committee unanimously recommends that the board adopt this proposal.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Dale moved to adopt the proposed modified brackets. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously. [The revised brackets are attached to the minutes.]

5. Rewording of Section 8.3 Regional Champions -- Karen Oleson

Policy/Procedure Chapter 8 Awards Section 8.3 Regional Champions (e) Karen Oleson Wed, Jun 20, 2012 at 5:34 PM To: "rules@flyball.org" < rules@flyball.org"

As a result of fielding inquiries for NAFA® I notice that some rules/policies/procedures garner more questions than others. The following policy/procedure does just that.

Upon review of the wording I believe it can be improved such that it will be more understandable, garnering fewer questions without affecting the meaning.

The current Policy/Procedure reads (indented text that follows):

Chapter 8 Awards Section 8.3 Regional Champions

(e) A Club must compete in a minimum of four tournaments in separate tournament weeks within its home region in the Class for which the Regional Championship is awarded.

Classes must meet the following criteria to qualify for points and/or tie-breaking times to count toward Regional Championships:

- (i) Classes must have a minimum of four teams competing;
- (ii) Regular Classes limited below 20 teams that exclude a team at the conclusion of the automated draw will not count towards Regional Championship points or tiebreak times;
- (iii) Multibreed Classes limited below 12 teams that exclude a team at the conclusion of the automated draw will not count towards Regional Championship points or tie-break times;
- (iv) In a limited entry class of competition, if any entering Club is excluded at the conclusion of the automated draw, the class of competition will not count towards Regional Champion points or tie-break times.
- (f) Points towards Regional Championships are awarded based on overall placements of in-region teams in an event based on the following point structure, to maximum of 30 points:

The wording indicates in (e) that criteria will follow, however the list which follows consists of one criterion (i) and three conditions explaining how criteria are not met ((ii), (iii), (iv)).

Since Regional Championships apply only to Regular and Multibreed, I added "Regular and Multibreed" to the first sentence, however I am not convinced it is necessary.

Changed: (i) through (iv) to criteria statements that must be met per the header sentence.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Finally in an effort to make the policy/procedure flow better the order of the criteria has been changed from general to specific.

Proposed wording (indented text that follows):

Chapter 8 Awards Section 8.3 Regional Champions

(e) A Club must compete in a minimum of four tournaments in separate tournament weeks within its home region in the Class for which the Regional Championship is awarded.

Regular and Multibreed Classes must meet all the following criteria to qualify for points and/or tie-breaking times to count toward Regional Championships:

- (i) Have a minimum of four teams competing;
- (ii) Include all clubs at the conclusion of the automated draw;
- (iii) Regular Classes limited to fewer than 20 teams shall include all teams at the conclusion of the automated draw;
- (iv) Multibreed classes limited to fewer than 12 teams shall include all teams at the conclusion of the automated draw.
- (f) Points towards Regional Championships are awarded based on overall placements of in-region teams in an event based on the following point structure, to maximum of 30 points:

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Oleson

<u>Recommendations:</u> Members of the committee agree that the proposed wording helps clarify the criteria associated with regional champions, and therefore unanimously recommends that the board adopt the changes.

Curtis also mentioned we received a comment regarding a request to include language that clarifies the minimum of 4 teams per class. Only one of the tournaments a team must compete at in region has to count for regional points.

Dale moved to accept the recommendations of the committee and adopt the rule change. Karen seconded.

There was discussion about adding the underlined language to:

Chapter 8 Awards Section 8.3 Regional Champions

(e) A Club must compete in a minimum of four tournaments in separate tournament weeks within its home region in the Class for which the Regional Championship is awarded, one of which must qualify for regional points.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Dale amended his motion to include this change. Karen also accepted the amendment. The board discussed that this is not a substantive change to what we do today. This is how things are currently handled. This would clarify how the information is presented in the rule. The motion passed unanimously.

### 6. Changing points for veterans class -- Amanda Joudrey-Leblanc

I'd like to propose that NAFA consider changing the point system for the Vets division. I feel that after all the years of racing these vets dogs put in, and that while they have slowed down, they should still receive points. Sometimes we watch vet teams that are running 26 to 28 seconds. The dogs and owners are still having fun doing what they love, and while I realize the dogs do not know they are getting points, the owners do, and sometimes those dogs are close to some very special titles that then take forever (or they may never) to attain. I'm not sure what would be the easier way for NAFA – either award a 25 point run to all clean vet runs? Or to change the point tier system for them? Perhaps 25 points for 28 seconds and less? 5 points for 32 seconds and less? 1 point for 35 points and less?

I feel the vets should get some special recognition points wise for their miles ran!

Thank you for considering.

~Amanda Joudrey-Leblanc Maple Leaps

Recommendations: The committee wishes to acknowledge the contributions made to flyball by older dogs, especially those who have had long careers in NAFA. However, the committee believes that no additional advantages of running a dog in the veterans class are needed. Dogs already jump at the minimum height and can run with any club regardless of present affiliation. One member of the committee also expressed concern that if the proposal were adopted, some competitors might take advantage of the extra incentive to the detriment of their dogs by either racing older dogs more years than they should or by bringing dogs out of retirement for an easier chance to earn additional points. For the above reasons, the committee recommends the board not adopt the changes requested in this proposal.

Karen moved to accept recommendations of committee and not adopt the proposed change. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### 7. Exception for Iron Dog Award -- Valerie Whiterock

I recently read the minutes from the January 20, 2012 BOD meeting and I was happy to see that you discussed the Iron Dog Award requests for changes in requirements. I would, however like to see this issue re-visited. In short the minutes stated "The Rules Committee and Board received several requests for changes to the recently recognized Iron Dog Award. The requests generally asked that the award be modified to earning at least one point in ten years, rather than ten consecutive years." "Lee Heighton provided additional information to the Committee via email that there would be an additional 69 dogs who would currently qualify for the award if the requirements were changed to be ten years of racing, rather than ten consecutive years. The Rules Committee acknowledged that there are a number of truly

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

great flyball dogs who do not qualify for the award, either because of injury, breed longevity, or other issues that may prevent dogs from earning a point in 10 consecutive years. At the time the Board created the award, it recognized the award would not be attainable by most dogs. Members of the Board had also expressed concern that if the Iron Dog award were given for points earned in 10 nonconsecutive years, some dogs would be brought out of lengthy retirements to run again despite the potential detrimental effects. Given that this award is so new, the Committee does not recommend adjusting the requirements, subject to reconsideration later."

If the issue was that "some dogs would be brought out of lengthy retirements to run again despite the potential detrimental effects", couldn't the Iron Dog Award have "grandfathered" in these "nonconsecutive" dogs? The award could have stated that only "non-consecutive" dogs that had 10 years as of Oct 2011 would be considered. I believe that this may be an answer to your concerns.

I do also have a personal reason for asking that this award be amended, as I have a 15 year old JRT who sits by my side with over 10 productive "non-consecutive" years running flyball. I feel that the "grandfathered" dogs should be accepted for the Iron Dog Award, especially since in past years there was much less opportunity for these dogs to race; with the Open and Vets divisions just recently been instated. My boy will always be an Iron Dog to me, but I would really appreciate if he, and other wonderful "non-consecutive" dogs could received this honor from NAFA.

Thank you, Valerie Whiterock, NASDOG Racing

Recommendations: The committee understands that there are many incredible, meritorious flyball dogs who unfortunately do not qualify for the Iron Dog Award. With regard to the grandfathering of non-consecutive years of racing, some committee members believe there would be no fair way to draw the line. If dogs with 10 non-consecutive years as of Oct 2011 were given the award, one could argue that equally deserving would be those dogs with 9 non-consecutive years of racing as of Oct 2011 and who continue to race for several years to come. While the committee does not intend to diminish the accomplishments of those dogs who have numerous non-consecutive years of racing, we recommend the criteria for the Iron Dog Award remain as originally declared.

Dale moved to adopt the rules recommendations and not change the requirements for the award. Dave seconded. There was brief discussion regarding additional comments. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Ten consecutive calendar years for Iron Dog Award -- Sally Miller

July 13, 2012

Dear NAFA Board of Directors,

I recently was looking at the web site and found out about the Iron Dog Award for those dogs that have had points for ten consecutive years. I think this is a wonderful way to honor those dogs. It takes a special dog to be able to compete for that many years. I have one of those dogs, Oreo (CRN 021003). Our first event with points was in Amana, Iowa in October 2002 and she retired herself last year in Amana in August 2011. That represents ten years of consecutive racing, but unfortunately it is ten calendar years and not ten years of NAFA years. I understand that you need rules to administer this

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

award, but to say that my dog is any less than an "Iron Dog" than the NAFA year dog is not fair. I would hope it was not the board's intention to not include those dogs. My dog was 13 years old on her last race. I feel flyball is a demanding sport for the dog, so to still be racing at 13 is an accomplishment in itself. I feel very blessed that I was able to be in the sport for that long with my first flyball dog.

I would respectfully ask you to consider including ten calendar years in addition to the ten NAFA years for this award. I realize you had to start somewhere with the rules for this award. If there was a real reason why you decided not to include the ten calendar years, I would like to hear those reasons. Were there too many dogs that would be eligible? Too costly for computer programming? I would just like to know. In my heart, I know that Oreo is an Iron Dog, but I would like NAFA to honor her, along with any other dogs that have the same situation.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read my letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sally Miller

Oreo (CRN 021003) ~2002-2011

Recommendations: The committee discussed the fact that the date used to begin a "year" is rather arbitrary, which is to say for any given date, some dogs will have obtained a seemingly unfair advantage by having raced on days that closely span the transition point (e.g., Sep 30 - Oct 1 for racing year, Dec 31 - Jan 1 for calendar year, or Mar 31 - Apr 1 if a "year" that starts April 1). Thus, if the Iron Dog Award were expanded to include those dogs who race ten consecutive calendar years, it would be fair to include those dogs who race 10 consecutive years for all 365 possible transition dates, which is not feasible. Therefore, since the NAFA database and all associated statistics are based on the racing year (Oct 1 - Sep 30), the committee recommends that the board not make any changes to the criteria for the Iron Dog Award.

Dana moved to accept recommendation of the committee and not change the requirements for the award. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Comment period for supervising judge applicants -- Leerie Jenkins

Suggested rewording for Corporate Policies & Procedures, Chapter 2 - Judges, (j)(vii), where underline indicates additional text and strikethrough indicates deleted text.

Prospective judges for Supervising status may be proposed to the Board of Directors in writing by any Board member, judge, or participant in official NAFA® events. Such proposals must be accompanied by a letter of recommendation from at least 5 different tournament directors the applicant has judged for, two fellow NAFA approved judges, and the Regional Director for the applicant's home region. Said letters of recommendation should contain personal observations of any of the qualities referenced in (iv) above. In addition, the name of the judge applying for supervising status will be published on the NAFA webpage for a period, ideally of at least seven days, to allow for comment to the Board.

Recommendations: Committee members agree that the suggested change helps assure there is an adequate amount of time to obtain comments from flyball community, especially in light of how

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

quickly announcements can be disseminated via the NAFANews YahooGroup and the NAFA Facebook page. Thus, the committee recommends that the board adopt the proposal.

Dana moved to adopt the proposal and change the rule as requested. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Time limit to get alternates -- Christine Helmus

Date: Tue, Jul 17, 2012 at 3:37 AM

Subject: [flyball.org] <rules> The use of alternates

To: rules@flyball.org

In section 3.2.d it states that an alternate may be inserted after a heat is complete. The rule does not state how long a team has to get the alternate dog.

We think the rule should include a time limit or that the alternate dog should be in the arena at the time the alternate is decided to be inserted into the next heat.

Today the whole match can be held up when a team member needs to leave the ring to get the alternate dog.

Thank you Christine Helmus

Recommendations: Members of the committee recognize there are unfortunately instances when teams do not properly prepare for planned and/or foreseeable substitutions by having one or more additional dogs ringside (e.g., multiple dogs are sharing a slot, having a backup ready for a green dog). Nevertheless, for a variety of reasons, the committee recommends that a limit not be placed on the time to get an alternate dog. For one, dogs often need to be crated far away from the ring at some tournament venues, especially outdoor tournaments where shade may be scarce; and extra distance means extra time may be required to make an unexpected substitution. It would also be a difficult to codify a rule that specifies when the clock to get an alternate dog should start ticking for all possible scenarios (e.g., injuries--immediately after the injury occurred vs. after the team has attended to the needs of the injured dog/person). Some committee members also expressed concern that if a time limit were imposed, some competitors would feel compelled to take the fully allotted time even though a substitution could be made more quickly.

As an alternative to the proposal, the committee suggests the board discuss the possibility of adding the following text (or something similar) to either Section 3.2(d) and/or Section 8.3 of the Rules of Racing:

Teams must be ready to start each heat in a reasonable amount of time. The first unreasonable delay by a team will result in a warning by the head judge. Subsequent offenses will result in a forfeit of the heat.

Such an addition to the rule book may also help fix the problem created when teams spend an inordinate amount of time on tasks at the end of each heat that are unrelated to substitutions

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

(e.g., reviewing video footage of passes). The committee trusts that head judges would only invoke such a rule in the most extreme and egregious situations.

There was a lack of support among board members to implement a time limit to get alternates. Instead, the board discussed the above alternative presented by the rules committee. Several judges on the board explained that currently judges cannot do anything about teams who create huge delays during racing, unless such a delay is deemed a breach of the Code of Ethics (e.g., unsportsmanlike conduct). For teams who are late to the ring, they can be put on the clock, but judges don't have the ability to put a team on the clock between heats.

There was discussion about whether the rule would apply per race or per day. Several members expressed reservations about having it apply per race as that would allow a team to continue to create unreasonable delays without much consequence. Others were concerned that applying the rule on a per day basis could allow judges to abuse the rule. Judges committee members indicated that a core part of this rule would be stressing to judges that it should only be used in extreme situations where there was an extremely long delay. A number of different scenarios were discussed. Judges would also be cautioned to consider all of the circumstances surrounding the situation, such as an injury to a dog or other factors that might delay the start of the race, but would not be unreasonable. And, if a judge were to abuse the rule, it could be dealt with on an individual basis through the judges committee.

Judges at tournaments with more than one judge, and especially more than one ring, would need to coordinate and utilize a system such as notes on racing sheets to communicate to other judges when a team had been formally warned due to unreasonable delays.

Dale moved to accept the language provided by the rules committee. Dave seconded. There was additional discussion about where the new language should be inserted.

Ultimately members agreed that placing this as a new subsection (b) in Section 8.3 of the Rules of Racing pertaining to the heat would be most logical. The subsection would begin with a title of "Ready to race." followed by the new language.

There was again discussion that the minutes should reflect that this option should only be utilized by judges in the most extreme of situations. The current rules do not afford judges any ability to deal with unreasonable delays by teams unless such a delay is deemed a breach of the Code of Ethics (e.g., unsportsmanlike conduct) – meaning they can't be put on the clock as that only applies to initially reporting for racing. This rule would give judges a tool for dealing with teams who continue to unreasonably delay racing.

Dale modified his motion to include the location of the rule. Dave accepted the modification to the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Leerie adjourned the meeting for lunch and the meeting resumed afterwards.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

### Marketing Committee - Nancy Garcia

Customized Awards

Nancy indicated the marketing committee was still discussing options and would give a report at the next meeting.

In Memoriam Recognition of Flyball Dogs

Nancy reported that the committee suggested producing a banner with the names of all dogs who are recorded as deceased in the database. She explained that a period would need to be permitted to have people update the status of their dogs in the database. The banner could be unveiled at the AGM, and then rotate between the RDs to be displayed at tournaments. There was discussion that deceased and retired dogs are removed from the reports seen on the database. Some members were concerned about wanting their dogs to remain on the visible database rosters.

The board discussed alternative ways to honor dogs. There was discussion about opening it up to allow honoring any dog, living or deceased. Sam suggested referring the project back to Marketing to work out details in reasonable period of time. There was hope expressed that a plan might even be ready to be unveiled at CanAm.

Finance - Nancy Garcia & Curtis Smith

Curtis reviewed the current Canadian/US currency exchange rate. He recommended that the Schedule of Fees in Appendix A of the rulebook be modified to list US and CAN as equivalent. This schedule applies to fees that are mailed in to NAFA for CRNs, new club registration, height card applications, etc. For items on the Schedule that are listed solely in US funds, payments in Canadian funds will be computed using the current exchange rates from TD Canada Trust to purchase US dollars.

Dale moved to accept the recommendation. Curtis seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Leerie moved we enter Executive Session.

The Board entered Executive Session at 1:46 p.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 3:05 p.m. During executive session, the board discussed a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year.

Dale moved to increase the fee for new CRNs from \$20 to \$25. Dave seconded. There was discussion that this fee has not changed in many years. The new fee would still be in line with what other dog sports charge for similar types of fees. And it will make a positive impact on next year's budget. This would be effective for CRNs issued starting 10/1/12. The motion passed unanimously.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

## <u>Disciplinary Committee</u> – Leerie Jenkins

Ginny - 090623, Request to remove excusal

Leerie reviewed the request to remove a prior aggression excusal on this dog. The dog meets the qualifications set forth in our rules. The disciplinary committee unanimously recommends removing the excusal. Dana moved to accept the recommendation and remove the excusal. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### Review Panel - Leerie Jenkins

Leerie reviewed the aggression excusals since the last meeting.

- Ramses 111044, 05/26/2012
- Murdoch 100054, 05/26/2012
- Rocky 100073, 05/26/2012
- JD 120525, 06/20/2012 under appeal
- Rake 041013, 07/28/2012

#### **Special Committee Reports**

#### Technology Committee - Karen Oleson

EJS Updates Phase I which includes the manual Judge override and countdown timer has been implemented on all NAFA light sets. Dale indicated there are two consoles left to be distributed.

Phase II specifications (computer output) are in the process of being developed.

The new database is on schedule to cut over in early October after all tournaments for fiscal year 2012 have been scored and year end reports have been run and compared. During the transition the database will be down for a couple of days.

People continue to utilize NAFA's optimizer for tournament scheduling which now has more flexibility for specifying breaks between club and team races.

Dale indicated he has two new light systems that are awaiting feet to be manufactured for the poles. Those are in process. As soon as they are delivered, he will obtain cases and get the sets into circulation.

### NAFA/Flyball History Committee - Dave Walt

Dave reported that he continues to work through this project, but it has been fairly slow.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

> Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

#### **Old Business:**

Training Column – Ally Stern

Ally reported that when she volunteered to take this project, she didn't realize Aaron & Kelly Robbins were about to unveil a new training web site. She recommended we eliminate the question and answer forum and instead list links to the Robbins site and other flyball resources. Several board members expressed interest in a question & answer type forum and thought that it would not detract from the Robbins training site. Lee indicated he was too busy with work and executive director duties to continue to be one of the trainers answering questions. Several board members encouraged Ally to contact other trainers to see if they would be interested in participating. There was also discussion of expanding NAFA's page to include links to resources, such as local classes or trainers. Ally indicated she would send out an invitation for schools, trainers, and clubs to submit listings for classes.

Eight dog multibreed roster proposal

Curtis distributed comments to the Board ahead of time via email as well as in printed form at the meeting. Curtis relayed that the Board received 27 comments regarding the proposal. Six were in favor, 16 were opposed, and 5 suggested other alternatives.

There was discussion about some of the alternatives that were received. One proposal submitted by Andy McBride included modifying the performance team rules to permit multibreed performance teams to run with less than four different breeds. The current rules require performance teams to comply with all rules of racing except the 87 day rule regarding changing clubs. This means that performance multibreed teams currently must run with four different breeds, but some of those dogs may be from other clubs.

There was discussion that this change would be relatively simple and would not fundamentally change the multibreed class. But, it would provide teams entering multibreed with some options in case of injury or other emergency prior to the start of racing. There was some discussion of whether this proposal could be abused by teams, especially in cases of limited tournaments or in regions with smaller multibreed entries. Ultimately, Section 7.5 of the Corporate Policies & Procedures currently permits a team to declare performance only in certain situations:

With the permission of the Tournament Director for cause shown, a team entered in a regular or non-regular class may be converted from its original status to a Performance Team entry prior to the start of the tournament. The intent of this conversion privilege is to allow teams that have already entered a tournament but who, for unforeseen reasons, find themselves unable to field a complete team, to run for points with a dog or dogs from another club. "Cause" shall include but not be limited to circumstances such as dog injury, illness, or other unforeseen situation. A team may not enter a tournament as a Performance Team.

Board members discussed that any abuse of the performance team designation should be addressed with the Executive Director.

Board of Directors Meeting Toronto, Ontario

Abridged Minutes August 11, 2012

Sam moved to expand the performance team rule to allow multibreed an exception to the four breed requirement. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion of the appropriate language for rule. Karen suggested modifying Section 7.5(c) to insert a new subsection (ii) with the wording and then renumbering the remaining subsections. "When a team in the multibreed class declares performance, the requirement of four different breeds set forth in Section 6.2(d) does not apply."

Sam moved to adopt the suggested rule change. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Leerie called a brief recess and then resumed.

### **New Business:**

• Electronic Judging Systems – Lee Heighton

To assist in reducing shipping costs, host clubs are strongly encouraged to participate in efforts to hand carry EJS to and from tournaments. This not only reduces shipping costs, but also reduces damage to sets during shipping. Keeping shipping fees low helps keep fees as reasonable as possible.

Lee requested that we purchase two or three more sets of EJS. He suggested purchasing two sets this year and three sets next year.

Leerie moved we enter Executive Session.

The Board entered Executive Session at 4:35 p.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 5:11 p.m. During executive session, the board voted to approve the purchase of two new sets of EJS.

Dave moved to adjourn the meeting. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm EDT.