

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Present were: Executive Director Lee Heighton
Board of Directors Nancy Garcia,
Leerie Jenkins,
Dana Nichols,
Karen Oleson,
Kris Pickering,
Alisa Romaine,
Dale Smith,
Scott Stein,
Greg Stopay

Chairman Leerie Jenkins called the meeting to order at 9:20 AM PDT.

Guests: Kim Davis, Trudie Rester, and David Caffo.

Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments – Leerie Jenkins

Leerie welcomed all our guests. He expressed gratitude for all the hard work everyone has put in. Leerie indicated he was excited about all the progress the Board has made. He reported that he has received great comments about tournaments being sanctioned and scored quickly.

AGM

Leerie led a discussion about possible sites for the Annual General Meeting. The bylaws require the meeting to be held between December 1 and January 31. Leerie proposed holding the meeting in conjunction with a tournament in Raleigh, North Carolina on January 22-23, 2011. Kris and Alisa are not available on that date due to a tournament in Arizona.

Scott brought up that the proposed revisions to the bylaws do not permit proxy voting and that there are provisions for how many board meetings members must attend. Dana clarified that the attendance requirements include teleconferences.

There was discussion of other possible tournament dates in December and January. Nancy volunteered to check possible tournament dates in Texas.

Leerie will continue to investigate options and make a decision soon.

Executive Director's Comments – Lee Heighton

CanAm

Lee reported that planning for CanAm is going extremely well. Nancy has worked tirelessly on sponsors and budgeting. Entries are coming in steadily. He will decide on the final number of rings once entries close. We have the capability to have six rings this year.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Sanctioning Request

Lee recently received a request to sanction a tournament on the same weekend as CanAm 244 miles from the site. The date for CanAm was announced at the event last year, more than 10 months ago. The CanAm Classic is our premier event. He denied the sanctioning request. Lee indicated that in scheduling CanAm, he has tried really hard not to infringe on other club's tournament weekends. This year's date was researched and no other tournaments were sanctioned. The only conflict was a Florida tournament and that host club chose to move it so they could attend CanAm. Last year a Canadian tournament was sanctioned the same weekend as our event and we had a number of complaints. This year, Lee decided he would not permit any other tournament to be sanctioned within 1000 miles.

There was discussion from Board members that perhaps we should not allow any tournaments, regardless of mileage, competing with CanAm. Greg suggested that given this is the superbowl of flyball, teams shouldn't have to worry about conflicting with CanAm. This would be only one weekend in the year. It was discussed that we try very hard to be thoughtful of conflicting dates. Dale indicated that if there was a concern that regional championship points are the issue, we could always decide that any tournaments hosted that weekend would not count for regional championships. Discussion about not wanting to set up situation where teams, regardless of their division, are in the position of deciding between a local tournament and attending CanAm.

Kris indicated that she believed that tournament sanctioning decisions such as these fall within the Executive Director's discretion. The Board very recently received this appeal from Chris Van Wert. Leerie indicated the appeal should be addressed in new business, rather than the ED's comments.

Region 6/16 realignment

In 2004, these regions were realigned. Lee has received concerns that the current setting is no longer viable. He received a proposal to realign regions 16 and 6. In response, he contacted the RDs in that area - Bill Carter (northern 16), Dave Gillett (southern 16), and Jonnie Geen (6). They proposed a plan for realignment. Lee circulated a map they proposed. The Board agreed to address the issue in new business.

EJS proposal

At the last Board meeting, Lee submitted a proposal to expand EJS and park them in regions. He expressed understanding of the Board's concerns about the proposal.

Lee stated that the biggest issue is that our primary expenses in maintenance are as a result of shipping issues. New cases have been found that may help with shipping damage. Lee has contacted every region and each has a Regional Director or another person who has volunteered to hand carry the EJS to tournaments. Shipping is already at almost \$32,000 for this racing year. Scott indicated it was fairly standard to incur \$30-40,000 per year in shipping.

Lee proposed buying seven new EJS sets. The cost would be approximately \$8,000 per set, including cases. The cost is \$6800 per set and \$1200 for cases. There would also be a one time \$1000 charge for dies. This plan would include a Canadian spare and two spares in US.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

There was discussion about whether enough sets would be available to cover two ring tournaments.

Kris asked about the plan for sets in for maintenance. Greg relayed that he has seen quite a few small maintenance issues in the sets he has reviewed, but most of those issues have left the sets functioning. He has been assessing those needed repairs as the sets come in. Kris asked about whether we should require a contract with the people assigned to have possession of the EJS to set forth clearly that NAFA owns the lights and they must be delivered on demand.

Scott thought the cost savings were too speculative for this type of proposal.

Dale estimated that it would cost around \$60,000 to buy the sets. They would generate about \$12,000 depreciation per year. Expected overall maintenance might be slightly more due to the increased number of sets. He believed the significantly decreased shipping would help, but that the bulk of damages are usually at tournaments. The sets would likely be on the five year depreciation schedule. Greg inquired as to the reasonable life span of the lights. Dale estimated they should be in the 10-12 year range. Leerie indicated that the plan would increase good will among competitors and increase the chances of having well functioning sets at tournaments.

Lee clarified that we currently own 19 sets of EJS, with 18 in service.

Dale mentioned he wanted to make sure we are properly accounting for multiple ring tournaments on the same weekend. Lee indicated a lot of tournaments have been one ring. Several were originally just barely at two rings, but lost one or two teams to drop back to one ring.

Lee expressed concern about our current operating business model because of shipping costs, maintenance costs, and problems with getting lights to teams.

Nancy suggested phasing the plan in. With a phase in, she suggested it might be easier to see if maintenance costs are going up or down.

There was discussion about maintenance over the next few years. There was also discussion about buying sets and whether there would be updates in the near future. And would there be any cost savings to buy several sets at once in bulk.

Scott expressed concern that we still have not recouped the money that we have put out to buy the original sets. He said that we have been spending a lot of money on EJS already and we need to find a way to add positive income into our accounts. Lee mentioned that cost savings also affect our bottom line. Scott requested reports to project likely cost savings as a result of the plan, for instance showing how many sets would not have to be shipped, etc. Dale believed he could run figures based on this year and back out what could have avoided on shipping. Lee asked for help in securing those reports. Greg offered that the current practice of parking lights in Canada might be good model for figuring out cost savings.

The issue was moved to new business for further discussion.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.
Board of Directors Meeting
Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes
August 7, 2010

Region 10 unique format

Lee indicated that members from Region 10 have twice requested a modification to the five team single elimination format. The Board has denied the requests for various reasons already set forth in the minutes of prior meetings. Lee reported that he has discussed with members of the region a possible modification to the alternate 5 time single elimination bracket. He will present the modified proposed format in new business.

Treasurer's Report – Nancy Garcia

Nancy distributed quarterly profit and loss and balance sheets. These are attached to the minutes.

Nancy reported that she has opened CDs to obtain better rates for some of NAFA's surplus funds. Currently we have approximately \$100,000.00 in CD accounts and approximately \$128,000.00 in cash in various bank accounts.

She discussed various interest bearing options. Ultimately her recommendation was to put back additional funds into our money market account, rather than an additional CD.

Nancy discussed the year to date profit and loss statements. The bottom line shows net income, but that is somewhat deceiving because the CanAm event spans fiscal years. This sheet shows income from CanAm 2010 sponsors and income generated from entries, but doesn't yet show most of the expenses, except from last year's event.

Nancy reported that she has been keeping figures from UPS invoices in a spreadsheet to show savings generated from program. The savings are running at approximately 7%, which is significant given the volume of our shipping costs. She relayed that in five bills, we saved \$284.00. She also clarified that the discounts do not apply to the Canadian account. Over the course of the year, she projects the savings to be around \$2,400.00.

Dale clarified that teleconference expenses should be classified under Board meetings.

Nancy reported that we currently have a balance of approximately 100,000 points in our American Express rewards account.

Secretary's Report – Dana Nichols

Dana reported on the following unanimous consent items since the last Board meeting:

5/18/10 - Modifying language of flaps/shields/wings

- **Use of flaps/shields/or wings on boxes.** Section 1.1(e)(v) (page 2 of the current rulebook) was modified:
The box shall not exceed these dimensions at any time during the heat (including any permanent attachments to the box, e.g. carrying handles, cocking devices, or flaps/shields/wings). The boxloader may not change the configuration of the box during the heat except as needed to load the ball or to straighten the box if it has shifted during the heat. If the box exceeds these dimensions at any time during the heat it will result in the loss of the heat and the team shall be

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

awarded a "No Finish." Judges have the discretion to declare a box unsafe and therefore not usable.

*note that the language "and the team shall be awarded a "No Finish."" was added via unanimous consent on May 18, 2010.

5/19/10 – Highlights posted of the 5/8/10 Board meeting.

6/21/10 – Approval of June 6, 2010 Leadership Chat transcript and posted on NAFA web page

6/27/10 – Minutes of 5/8/10 Board meeting approved by unanimous consent & subsequently posted on the NAFA web page

Standing Committee Reports

Marketing Committee – Nancy Garcia

CanAm

Planning is going well. We have 13 vendors committed with several other vendors in discussions. Nancy reported she has planned a welcome bag with several nice items. Wellness is providing the bags themselves. She has obtained a number of sponsors this year. Jane Kline is working on programs again this year. Advertising space may be sold in the programs as well.

NAFA Store

The store has currently been tabled due to work on CanAm. Nancy reported that she was hopeful it will kick off after the first of the year. The web page still needs to be designed and programs with credit card applications. There are a few more details to be worked out as well. Greg offered to help on the Canadian end.

New Club Information

At a previous leadership chat, there was a suggestion to design a welcome packet for new clubs registered with NAFA. Alisa helped draft the letter. The informational letter was circulated at the meeting. It will begin being sent out to newly registered clubs.

Greg suggested coming up with an informational packet for clubs wanting to host tournaments. He volunteered to help. Scott suggested Marketing coming up with ideas to encourage clubs to host tournaments. There was discussion about possible ideas, such as mentors. Kris discussed help with creating racing schedules, etc. Dale stated that the optimizer program has been really helpful. Dana suggested having a list of people on the web page in who contract as tournament secretaries. One stumbling block to hosting seems to be clubs who are afraid of the paperwork. Leerie requested the Marketing Committee brainstorm options for tackling blocks to hosting tournaments and report back.

Finance Committee – Dale Smith

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

American Express Account

Nancy indicated that once Scott leaves at the end of this term, we will need to have another person listed as the primary on our American Express account. She will look at options, but in the past AmEx has required us to have an individual listed. The NAFA account goes on that person's credit rating. She indicated we will need to move to another person after CanAm.

Leerie moved we enter Executive Session.

The Board entered Executive Session at 11:10 a.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 3:27 p.m.

During Executive Session, the Board passed an operating budget for FY 2011 showing a projected positive income. The CanAm event numbers are budgeted separately. Nancy presented the proposed budget for CanAm, which shows a balanced budget. The Board accepted the proposed budget.

Judges Committee – Leerie Jenkins

Judge advancements

- Beth Hudson, Pensacola FL - Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Mike Miller, Myakka City FL - Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Steve Heine, Placentia CA - Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Steve Corona, Georgetown TX – Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Nancy moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Lorraine Messier, Attetboro MA – Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Dave Dery, Cambridge ON – Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

- Ed Roth, Cedar Rapids IA – Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. There was discussion about feedback the Board received about the judge.

In favor of the motion: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Alisa Romaine, and Dale Smith. Opposed: Kris Pickering, Scott Stein, and Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

- Hugh Morrow, Etobicoke ON – Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Tammy Wilson-Teeter, Phoenix AZ – Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Alisa moved to promote the judge as recommended. Kris seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Manual Judging Rules Section

Leerie reported that the Committee is recommending that the rules be modified to specify for manual timing (without an EJS), stopwatches should be started when the judge blows the whistle.

There was discussion about possible language. Dana suggested adding a new sentence, "Timing of the heat begins with the whistle." This sentence would be added to Section 8.7(2) as follows:

Section 8.7 – Racing without EJS (Electronic Judging System)

The following rules apply when racing any heat without EJS for any reason:

a) The breakout rule (section 8.1) does not apply;

b) Racing procedures:

(1) The Head Judge (starter and referee) shall be positioned between the racing lanes in the area between the start/finish line and the lead dogs to start the heat. If necessary, a Head Judge shall reposition himself/herself so as not to interfere with competing teams.

(2) The Head Judge shall maintain a consistent starting cadence of approximately one (1) second intervals throughout the tournament, and shall indicate the start with a whistle. Timing of the heat begins with the whistle. For example, please see illustration 5.1. In tournaments with multiple judges, uniform visual start signals should be used.

Scott moved to amend the rule. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Line/Box Judging Training Video

Dana reported on status of the video. Dan has done some initial clips and the Committee is working on final scripts. To help with cost savings measures, Dan will be doing the voiceover and producing the video, rather than incurring travel costs to have one of the committee members travel. We are still hopeful to have the video completed before CanAm.

C.18 Form

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Leerie reported that an error was found on the C.18 form. It should say, "Please rate the provisional judge" and instead says "apprentice." The Committee recommends amending the form.

Scott moved to adopt the change. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Scott suggested that all judge review forms have a section for strengths and "areas for continued improvement."

Scott moved to amend all judging forms accordingly. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

There was a discussion about getting more feedback on judges, especially those who are going through approval process.

Rules Committee – Dana Nichols

1. Proposed modifications to bylaws and articles of incorporation

Kris reviewed the proposed modifications to the bylaws in more detail. The draft bylaws were posted to the website in redline and clean copies for comment in mid-July. Five people sent comments, which were distributed to the Board before the meeting and reviewed at the meeting. The vast majority of the proposed revisions were made at the recommendation of the Michigan non-profit attorney retained by the Board. This includes the change to Article IX, the vote needed to amend the bylaws. The amendment requires an absolute majority of the board to amend the bylaws, i.e., five of the eight directors must vote to amend. This is more stable than the two-thirds of a quorum at a meeting currently permitted, which could allow for amendment on a vote of just three members theoretically.

Some additional changes to the bylaws are appropriate. There were some typographical errors and consistency in language that needed to be changed, which the comments received helped flag.

Additionally, Kris recommended that language be added to the bylaws to clarify that, per the Michigan firm, director voting by proxy should not be permitted. There was discussion about whether Board members could attend in person meetings via teleconference.

Scott moved to adopt the bylaws as modified. Dale seconded.

Dana indicated that several modifications needed to be considered before the bylaws could be finally voted on.

There was discussion about other changes that needed to be made, including allowing the Chair of the Nominating Committee to be any person appointed by the Board, not necessarily a delegate vote holder.

David Caffo shared some additional typographical errors.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Scott moved to adopt the bylaws with these changes and any other typographical corrections. Dale seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

Kris offered to run the additional changes by the attorney and present the final document at the teleconference.

2. Modification of rules in light of bylaw modifications

There did not appear to be any additional rule changes needed as a result of the bylaw modifications.

Kris took over minutes while Dana gave the remainder of the Rules Committee report.

3. Club sponsorships – Linda Bullard

The Committee received several emails from Linda Bullard asking about various options her club might have for using sponsorship. Her questions primarily centered on the following rule (on page 29 of the current rulebook):

CHAPTER 6 – HOSTING A NAFA® SANCTIONED EVENT
Section 6.1 – Requirements

(l) Prize money for any one team may not exceed \$500.00 USD or \$600.00 CDN per event per day. In addition, a host or sponsor may offer expense money provided the same is distributed fairly among all participating teams, based on actual expenses.

Her specific questions were whether this rule would prohibit the following:

- a. Sponsor logos on team shirts during competitions
- b. Sponsors paying expenses of teams
 - i. The host club/or sponsor paying the lodging cost of a team (or a person) competing in the tourney.
 - ii. The host club/or sponsor paying expenses for an entire team to fly in.
 - iii. The host club/or sponsor paying expenses of someone running on the host club's

My question...if, for example, the host club or sponsor is going to pay for an expense of one team (i.e., pay lodging expenses for a club that is participating), does it mean we/the host club/or the sponsor must also pay an equal dollar amount to the other clubs that are participating in the same tourney?

There was some discussion of this issue via email as well as in teleconference. Some committee members questioned whether this rule should continue to be in effect. Concerns expressed centered on enforceability of the rule and whether this rule could be easily skirted by claiming

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

payments were to individuals, rather than to a team. Other members felt that this rule protects clubs from favoritism by host clubs. Eliminating it might encourage some host clubs to pay for expenses of fast teams from other parts of the country in an effort to thwart their competition. After consideration, the Committee decided to refer this issue to a discussion of the full Board.

Greg moved to eliminate the second sentence of Rule 6.1(l), providing In addition, a host or sponsor may offer expense money provided the same is distributed fairly among all participating teams, based on actual expenses. Alisa seconded.

Discussion followed regarding encouraging competition and sponsorships.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Provisional judges running tournaments without supervision – clarification of language – Rob Bitler

Thank you for the conversation this weekend regarding this issue. I would like to see this addressed by the rules committee and clarified. Let me point out where I see the conflicts and then my thoughts on the issue.

Here are where I see the conflicts in the rules:

Section 6.1 (o) Any tournament sanctioned by NAFA® must use a NAFA® approved Head Judge.

From Appendix D:

The Provisional Judge is to demonstrate the ability to perform the functions of a NAFA® Approved Judge without supervision.

and

Learning Objective:

Ø Ability to perform the functions of a NAFA® Approved Judge without relying on the immediate input that is provided by a Supervising Judge.

When you go to the NAFA site and look at the judge page, there is a section that says "Approved Judges". The above language would indicate that this is where the selection would come from. As Leerie stated in one of his comments though, Supervising Judges are not in the "Approved Judges" list, so could they be considered?

In the Appendix in one section it says a Provisional should be able to perform "without supervision" while another section says "without relying on the immediate input that is provided by a Supervising Judge". Those are two very different thing, with the last one not necessarily meaning without ANY supervision.

Let me put my 2 cents in on the matter. Leerie, I know you did full, solo, assignments as a provisional judge. That's why you are where you are. However, let's look at the average flyball judge candidate. To get to provisional status, they have judge 75 races TOTAL. That's not even a full one day tournament in some instances. Are we really saying that someone who may not have judged more than 30 races in a block is able to

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

do a full day, non-stop? We all know what it's like when you have been out there for 60-70 races and you hit that wall. You zone out for a second, your feet hurt, you're hot, but you can't let on any of that to the competitors. A provisional judge has probably never gone through that. Do we really think they should be collecting fees, running tournaments solo, and having all that responsibility with such little experience? If they show they can't handle it on day 1, who's going to be there for the TD and teams on day 2?

If we are going to do what you propose though Leerie, why not get rid of provisional status, make all approved judges coming out of the apprentice phase "Approved Head Judges, and require all Approved Head Judges to submit the three write-ups within their first year. That would level out the responsibilities, clear up any confusion, and treat everyone pretty much the same, as it seems you may have suggested.

I disagree with doing this, but if the only difference between a provisional and "approved judge" is the three write ups, then let's level titles so it's easier on everyone.

I would appreciate your thoughts on the matter.

The Rules Committee discussed this request in detail. The Committee agreed that the current practice is that apprentice judges may judge a tournament without supervision. The language from the rulebook in Section 6.1(o) on page 30 of the current rulebook indicates that "any tournament sanctioned by NAFA® must use a NAFA® approved Head Judge." Where judges are discussed by level in the rules, they are referred to with capitalization, such as Supervising Judge, Approved Judge, etc. This rule has always been read to allow Provisional, Approved, and Supervising Judges to judge tournaments without supervision. There was discussion that this language could be somewhat confusing and the Committee agreed some clarification was called for.

As part of that discussion, the Committee also considered the request to prohibit Provisional Judges from judging a tournament without supervision. The Committee declined to adopt that request. Factors considered included the strenuous nature of the current judging training program, including the addition of the Novice section. Our current judges go through a much more rigorous training program before they ever reach the provisional stage. Provisional Judges also receive evaluations at each tournament from both the Regional Director and the Tournament Director. The Rules Committee, which included three current members of the Judges Committee, felt comfortable that Provisional Judges had the skills to judge a tournament on their own. Changing the existing rule could also create hardship for more geographically isolated areas.

The Rules Committee unanimously recommends the current rule be modified as follows:

Section 6.1(o) [page 30 of current rulebook]:

"Any tournament sanctioned by NAFA® must use a NAFA® approved Head Judge at the provisional level or higher."

Kris moved to amend the rule as recommended by the Committee. Dana seconded.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Triggering box after the ball comes out – Judges list

On a recent marathon discussion on the judges list, the following issue was brought up.

This language is on the intro page to our rules. The page between the cover page and the table of contents.

"Each dog must run in relay fashion down the jumps, trigger a Flyball box, releasing the ball, retrieve the ball, and return over the jumps."

No where else does it specifically state that the dog must: trigger the box, which then releases the ball, then the dog must retrieve the ball, and then they must return over the jumps. Does anyone think we need to remedy that?

From our rules:

"Section 8.3 - The Heat

(a) The Run. Dogs may start from a stationary or running start. Each dog is to hurdle the four jumps in succession, trigger the box, and return over all four jumps and the start/finish line with the ball in its mouth."

There are a few judges who think since the former is not actually in the rules, then they don't have to trigger the box to release the ball before retrieving it (e.g. if the ball rolled out of the cup, but the dog still triggered the box and returned over the jumps with the ball, it is ok).

There was a discussion on the Judges' email list that some judges felt there needed to be clarification that the dog must actually retrieve the ball from the box. There was concern expressed that the language of the current rule may leave some question as to whether the ball could roll out before the dog got to the box, but if the dog triggered the box and retrieved the ball from the ground that would suffice as a clean run. The Rules Committee unanimously agreed that conduct should be flagged. The Committee discussed the following language to correct any possible confusion.

"Section 8.3 - The Heat

(a) The Run. Dogs may start from a stationary or running start. Each dog is to hurdle the four jumps in succession, trigger the box, releasing the ball, retrieve the ball, and return over all four jumps and the start/finish line with the ball in its mouth."

There was additional language suggested to include:

"trigger the box so it releases the ball" and "trigger the box thus releasing the ball"

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Dana moved to adopt "(a) The Run. Dogs may start from a stationary or running start. Each dog is to hurdle the four jumps in succession, trigger the box, releasing the ball, retrieve the ball, and return over all four jumps and the start/finish line with the ball in its mouth." Dale seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. Runback matting – from Cindy Henderson

I have a question to make sure I fully understand the change in the rule regarding the 50 feet of runback. The question that has come up in my region is what the definition of "runback" is with regards to the matting. Does that mean that all 3 of the mats in the run back area must be at least 50 feet in length or just the center mat that goes up to the box? Similarly if a club advertises their minimum runback at a tournament is say 65 feet does that mean that all three of the mats in the back area must be at least 65 ft in length or is it only the center mat that must be 65 feet and the 2 side mats can be shorter (what if they are only the 50 feet for example).

There was an issue with this in the past in my region and I want to make sure I fully understand the rule and can advise the host clubs in my area that they may need to purchase additional matting to ensure all 3 of the mats in the back area must meet a required length not just the center mat.

There was discussion in the Rules Committee about the current language surrounding runback and how matting should be handled. The Committee members all agreed for an area to be considered part of the runback area, it must have an appropriate racing surface (ie mats over concrete) for not only the center line, but also at least 4.5 feet on either side of the center. So, practically, when matting a ring with 3 foot wide mats, it means that the runback area would have 3 mats - the center mat, plus two side mats - for the full length of the runback. There was some question among committee members if the current language in the rule might require teams to cut mats where the center mat extends slightly longer than side mats. That was not the intention of the rule. To make clear that mats could be of uneven lengths, but that runback would stop counting where all 3 mats are not present, the Committee recommends adding definitions to the glossary of "racing lane" and of "runback." The following language was unanimously recommended:

Racing lane – The racing lane extends from the backstop behind the box, through the course, through the start finish line, to the point where the racing surface (grass, matting, etc.) no longer extends at least 4.5 feet on either side of the racing lane center line. See also the diagram in Section 2.4 – Ring Layout.

Runback – That area of the racing lane leading up to the start finish line, before the course, which consists of the racing surface (grass, matting, etc.) a minimum of 4.5 feet on either side of the racing lane center line. This distance is required on the sanctioning form to sanction an event.

There was some concern from committee about whether language needed to be included in the rule or definitions to clarify that lanes & runback should give equal opportunity to both teams

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

competing in the ring. For example, the right lane should not have more runback area than the left lane. No language was developed at this time.

Dana moved to adopt the definitions as recommended by the Committee. Dale seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Dogs leaving ring & children in the ring - Lana Luhring

I request that NAFA adopt appropriate rules related to entering and exiting the ring with dogs on leash and under control similar to those required in other dog sports like agility.

I further request NAFA determine under what circumstances small children are appropriate to be in the racing lanes when not acting as junior handlers. These were raised as concerns at a recent tournament where I was tournament director.

Dogs on leash when leaving the ring – The Committee felt that this rule would be very hard to enforce as a sport-wide rule. Each venue is different and has unique challenges. Some outdoor venues would be particularly difficult to delineate where a dog had to be on leash. The Committee members did acknowledge that in some venues, especially crowded indoor venues, it might be an especially good idea for all dogs to be on leash as they exit the ring. We would encourage competitors to keep safety paramount. We would strongly recommend competitors be aware of their surroundings and their dogs at all times. Entering and exiting the ring can be a chaotic time, especially in cramped quarters. We would also encourage people to show consideration for their fellow competitors and spectators.

The Committee also acknowledged that Tournament Directors do have the authority to impose rules regarding leashing dogs outside the ring, especially in venues that have rules prohibiting dogs being off leash. Regional Directors may excuse competitors who disregard these rules as unsportsmanlike conduct. We would encourage TDs and RDs to emphasize these rules during the captains meeting in tournaments where they are imposed so that all competitors are aware of them. At this time, the Rules Committee does not recommend that the Board implement any rule change.

Children in the ring – The Rules Committee discussed the safety issues that may arise with children in the ring. Ultimately these issues will fall to the discretion of our judges. We would encourage our judges to be watchful for possible safety issues of all types, including those with children who are not appropriately supervised. Parents are responsible for the safety of their children at the tournament, and in the ring. Parents should take into account not only their own dogs, but also other dogs that may be in the ring. The judge always has the discretion to rectify unsafe situations in the ring. Handlers may bring situations they perceive to be unsafe to the attention of the Head Judge.

The Committee does not recommend the Board set a minimum age for junior handlers. Children mature at different rates. They have different levels of experience handling dogs and team responsibilities. Parents should be the ones to determine whether their children are physically and mentally capable of participating in our sport.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

The Rules committee reports its recommendation. Kris disagreed with responding to this hypothetically without a specific proposal.

Dana clarified that Ms. Luhning sent us a specific request that asked for a rule change outlawing children below a certain age in the ring and requiring that all dogs leave and enter on leash which request was thereafter modified. When we contacted her to report our recommendation with respect to her original request, she modified it. No motion was made.

8. Procedures for re-draw – Lee Heighton

If an error is made, such as an omitted team or the failure of the database to shift the extra vet spot to regular in the first place, then the draw is invalid. I have no problem asking that the Rules Committee put this in the rulebook. Pretty simple to state that if the ED determines that the draw was completed incorrectly than the draw will be repeated.

The Executive Director, Lee Heighton, requested the Rules Committee consider modifying Section 6.1(k) regarding draws for limited classes to clarify that when an error is made in a draw, then the entire draw for the event must be repeated. The Committee recommends the following additions to the current rule:

- (iv) If any limited class in an event requires a draw, then all limited classes in that event must be drawn.
- (v) If the Executive Director determines that the draw was completed incorrectly, then the draw for the entire event will be repeated.

The Committee was split over the adoption of this language, primarily as to the language construction of the paragraph, not over the right of the Executive Director to order a redraw of the event.

Dana moved to adopt the language recommended by the Committee. Dale seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Modifications for handicapped dogs – Jennifer Staton

The Committee received a letter from Approved Judge Jennifer Staton concerning what modifications should be permitted, if any, for teams running handicapped dogs. Her specific question was regarding a team running a deaf dog and their request to have the box loader make a hand gesture of encouragement to the dog, much like verbal encouragement is permitted for a dog who can hear. She was concerned about the variation in judges' rulings on this issue and proposed that the Committee adopt a process to allow handlers to apply for a specific accommodation and have the Board rule on an individual basis for each dog. Her suggestion was that the handler be given a written letter outlining the approved accommodation to show judges at the tournament.

In considering this request, the Rules Committee was concerned that doing an individual review of each dog would be incredibly time consuming, both for competitors and for the Board. In reality it seemed that the most obvious case where accommodation was requested was with deaf dogs. After discussion,

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

the Committee unanimously recommended that the Board permit box loaders to use a subtle hand signal for deaf dogs and that the rule be modified to specifically indicate this accommodation.

The proposed rule modifications are as follows:

Chapter 2 – Judges

(f) A judge is allowed to make a reasonable accommodations and/or exceptions to the Rules of Racing for the needs of a handicapped dog and/or handler so long as these accommodations do not interfere with other competitors. For deaf dogs, box loaders should be permitted to use a subtle hand signal as long as it does not interfere with other competitors. (page 20 of the current rulebook)

and

Section 8.3 – The Heat

(e) Conduct of the box loader. Except during the warm up, to retrieve a loose ball, or to get a fresh supply of balls to load for the current heat, the box loader must remain in the upright position behind the box, and may offer verbal encouragement only, as long as such encouragement does not distract the opposing team. For deaf dogs, box loaders should be permitted to use a subtle hand signal as long as it does not interfere with other competitors. As a courtesy to opposing teams, the box loader is to remain in position until the outcome of the heat is determined by the Head Judge. If, in the judge's opinion, a box loader has violated any of these rules, their team may forfeit the heat.

Dana moved to adopt the amendments as recommended. Nancy seconded.

Dana found another section regarding the line and box judge that will need modification as well. The motion would include that rule as well

The motion passed unanimously.

Note that the additional section is:

Page 13, section 8.3(k)

Intervention. Should the ball bounce back in the cup as the dog tries to catch it, the box loader may re-set the box for the dog to trigger it (without penalty). For deaf dogs, box loaders should be permitted to use a subtle hand signal as long as it does not interfere with other competitors. ~~This is~~ These are the only times at which the box loader is permitted to signal a dog to push the pedal.

10. Code of Ethics regarding repeatedly and obviously holding back dogs – Judges list

Dana summarized the discussion from the judges and rules committees concerning the current rule for teams who are obviously and repeatedly holding back their dogs in tournaments. Several judges requested that the Rules Committee consider eliminating this rule. There were a number of lengthy discussions and a variety of arguments from many sides. The current rule states:

Section 5.1 – Code of Ethics

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

(g) Regional Directors should warn teams and file unsportsmanlike conduct charges if teams are obviously and repeatedly holding back their dogs in tournaments.

The Committee discussed this rule and ultimately decided it should go to the full Board for discussion. Basically the Committee felt that the Board had a number of options:

- (1) Keep the rule as it currently exists.
- (2) Eliminate the rule entirely.
- (3) Modify the rule in some way. One suggested was to add language at the end of the rule, "to gain an unfair advantage."
- (4) Allow teams to earn NAFA dog points even when a team breaks out.

The Committee also asked for a summary of some of the arguments made on the Judges list so that Board members could try to understand more fully all points of view regarding the issue. This was distributed to the Board members via email before the meeting.

Dana reviewed the Rules Committee's report and outlined the various issues surrounding this rule. She reviewed the various options the Board has. She also discussed that the rule is not being enforced equally across the regions. Some regions enforce it strictly. Other regions do not enforce it at all. And others are all along the spectrums in between. Dana expressed the view that widely variable enforcement is not desirable; flyball should be similar across regions.

Greg commented that some teams hold back to go five races, so they can push the 3/5 format to 5 so teams can get additional points.

Read literally, the rule applies to holding back, regardless of the motivation or reason. And it also appears to apply to all teams, including performance teams and teams who have already broken out and are no longer in contention for placement.

In view of wide divergence of points of views, Dana suggests starting with various extremes, i.e., eliminating the rule all together.

Dana moved that we eliminate section (g) from 5.1 of the Code of Ethics. Kris seconded.

There was discussion about this option. Dale stated that although it would simplify the rule for the judges, people will consistently modify the releases so they always win. The original rationale was that people didn't know how to appropriately seed themselves and would end up being unfair to others who were seeded fairly and are running their best.

Lee noted that the subjectivity of the rule makes it difficult for the widely varying personalities among the RD's and judges to oversee its enforcement. Nancy stated she believed that the call should be made by the judge, not the RD as currently stated in the rule.

Greg also stated we want to put on a show for the people that are watching. Teams racing neck and neck is more exciting.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Scott noted that the rule states the RD shall warn the team and then the conduct is reported as unsportsmanlike conduct. The Disciplinary Committee would then make a determination of whether it is unsportsmanlike. Lee clarified that the Regional Director can excuse the team from the tournament for unsportsmanlike conduct.

Dana notes that the rule also applies to open and performance teams.

The rule currently states tournaments in the plural, indicating it must happen over the course of several tournaments.

Dana called the question.

In favor of the motion to eliminate the current rule entirely: Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, and Kris Pickering.

Opposed: Nancy Garcia, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith, Scott Stein, and Greg Stopay.

The motion failed.

Dana then moved to amend the current rule to add "to gain an unfair advantage" and to modify the breakout rule to provide that teams receive NAFA dog points even when the team breaks out. Greg seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding this proposal. Dale indicated that this would still leave the onus on RD to infer intent; however, it removes the obvious things like a person holding back a green dog until the distractions in the other lane die down. This rule would say you can race as fast as you want with no penalty. Nancy gave an example of a team that is faster than the division it should be in and then holds back the fourth dog just enough to win but at the same time to avoid the loss of points breakout currently results in. Karen debated whether that's in fact trying to gain an unfair advantage.

Dana advocated making it clear that what a mis-seeded team should do is run its best even though it breaks out. If the team breaks out three times, it would not place in the division, but still be able to earn dog points. This will accommodate clubs who make an honest seeding mistake, yet still encourage them to run as fast as they can. Lee agreed but maintained that this would not change whether certain RDs are willing to enforce this rule, given its subjectivity. Of note, judges can call such conduct to the attention of the Regional Director.

Scott called the question.

In favor of the amendment: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith, and Greg Stopay.

Opposed: Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, and Scott Stein.

The motion passed.

11. Modifications to forms regarding NAFA address and email address

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

The Rules Committee recommends changes to some of the existing forms to correspond with the change to NAFA's mailing address and retiring of the flyball@flyball.org email address.

Dale clarified that NAFA owns flyball@flyball.org, www.flyball.org, and www.nafacanam.com as well as all related email names and domains. He will get Gord a login to Network Solutions.

Scott moved to change all appropriate forms to include the new NAFA physical mailing address. Dana seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

The following issues were received after the Rules Committee met via teleconference and thus there is no specific recommendation from the Committee.

12. Equipment between the racing lanes – Julie Norman Jenkins

As you know, we raced in Texas this weekend. I just can't abide the way they set up a line of slat buckets in between the lanes! I don't understand why judges are allowing it and why there isn't a rule about it. It is definitely a safety hazard AND a training aid

During one of our warmups, a dog on the opposing team who was doing boxwork, slipped and broadsided a bucket. The bucket tipped and spilled into our lane right in the path of our green dog who was doing a full run warmup. It seriously spooked her, she wouldn't go back to the box in that race. I'm sure we can get her over it, but it doesn't change the risk those buckets pose.

I propose a rule change to specify the area between the lanes shall be free of any equipment. Period.

Ok, vent complete:) thanks!

Julie

Dana recommended adding a rule, "no equipment or other items may be between the racing lanes from the backstop to the start/finish line except those needed for utilizing the electronic judging system." Greg seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

13. Limitations on Open Class – Andy McBride

To prevent abuse of the open class I would suggest a requirement that in every heat 2 of the dogs must be from the club who entered the team.

As an example there is nothing in the rules stopping me from creating phantom clubs and flooding a limited tournament then using what I got in for the real club.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

There was concern expressed that by trying to address one abuse we might cause more problems than is warranted.

No motion was made.

14. Updating HOF, MVP, and other awards to reflect submissions may be made by mail, fax, or electronically

Dana moved to update the rules concerning Hall of Fame, Regional MVP, and other award to reflect submissions may be made by mail, fax or electronically. Nancy seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

15. Modification of rules in Section 8.4 Aggressive Dogs (page 13 of current rulebook) to reference procedures for excusal in Section 5.7 Aggressive Dogs (page 26 of current rulebook) and 8.5(c)

Currently Section 8.4 refers to reporting the excusal to the Executive Director, "*The Head Judge must report any dog excused from competition to the Executive Director on NAFA® Form C.12.*" The section needs to be updated to reflect new procedures adopted for excusal in Section 5.7, including the Review Panel.

Dana moved to modify the rules as recommended. Nancy seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dana resumed minute taking responsibilities.

Disciplinary Committee – Leerie Jenkins

No matters to report.

Technology Committee – Dale Smith

Dale indicated he would provide a written report for inclusion in the minutes, which follows:

EJS Cases

When cases were first designed for the new EJS systems, we did not yet have all the final components and so some sizes were estimated. This has allowed some of the parts to move around in the cases leading to wear on the cases. We spent a full day with the case company we use redesigning the cases for our EJS systems. These new cases are thicker (for better resistance to rough handling) and a better fit for the EJS parts. Its also harder to put things in the wrong place in the new cases. We have three

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

sets of the new cases thus far and are using them to replace some heavily worn cases. The cost of the new cases was also better based on a volume purchase at \$1100/set.

Schedule Optimizer program

We've been working on a program to produce and optimize a racing schedule for a tournament. The program accepts a seeding list in a specific format, generates a racing schedule and then optimizes that schedule for dog rest and Club rest. It favors dog rest over Club rest as Clubs can always ask for a little more time to properly cool down and air dogs that have just raced. The program has improved as more people have used it and it can now handle a wide variety of racing formats. Schedules generated by the program can be approved as-is by RDs if they desire. Anyone interested in running their schedule through the program (tournament hosts or RDs) please contact Karen Oleson as the focal point.

EJS software

An update is being worked on for the EJS systems to provide enhanced functions including easier setup for Veterans racing as well as countdown timers and better integration with computer-based scoring programs.

Electronic voting

At the request of the Rules Committee we have looked at an outside provider of electronic balloting services. The initial assessment indicates that most current functionality can be supported by the outside service. Questions remain around mixing paper and electronic ballots and printing paper ballots. Additionally, a unique userid and password will likely be required for each ballot in order to vote electronically. This effort is based on the Board's desire to move away from a NAFA voting system to one provided by an outside company. Other providers may yet be evaluated.

New Database Functions

All new functions for the NAFA database have been put on hold for a short time as the database is rewritten by Gord Mak under contract to NAFA.

Election Committee – Dale Smith

Dale indicated the Board would need to decide about 90 days before the Annual General Meeting whether to utilize an outside firm for balloting. He and Dana have looked at a company suggested by Kris. Dale indicates he believe that it could work, especially since preferential balloting has been eliminated in the bylaw revisions.

Nominating Committee – Kim Davis

Kim announced the nominations.

Executive Director

❖ Lee Heighton

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Board of Directors (3 openings):

- ❖ Eric Foster
- ❖ Alisa Romaine
- ❖ Curtis Smith
- ❖ Ally Stern
- ❖ Chris VanWert
- ❖ Dave Walt.

Executive Director Lee Heighton presided over voting for finalists for Hall of Fame and Judge of the Year.

Hall of Fame

The nominees for Hall of Fame included:

- Bainbridge Savannah – Australian Shepherd, Sharon Atkinson, Omaha Speedracers
- Braehead's Pleasure of Q (Teez) – White German Shepherd Dog, Maurice Seeger, Ballistics
- Casey – Toy Poodle, Linda Carter, Dependable Paws
- Foster – Australian Cattle Dog, Kim Shepherd, FBI
- Glide – Border Collie, Cindy Arnold, Paws-a-tive Attitude
- Jetta – Border Collie, Belinda Lang, Moonspinners
- Rocket – Jack/Parson Russell Terrier, Kathy Austin, Fly Ball Insanity
- Shayla – Mix, Kelly Robbins, Rocket Relay
- Shea – Golden Retriever, Jane Kline, Music City Road Dogs
- Smack – Mix, Craig Knowles, Slammers
- Snap – Mix, Tooie Crooks, Flying Colors
- Static – Mix, Diana Murphy, Fast 'n FURious
- Sweep – Border Collie, Amanda Brown, DogGoneFast

After several rounds of voting, the five finalists were determined:

- ❖ Bainbridge Savannah
- ❖ Rocket

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

❖ Shayla

❖ Smack

❖ Snap

Judge of the Year

There were 13 nominees for Judge of the Year, as follows:

- Scott Chamberlain – Mount Wolf, PA
- Lawrence Cox – Richmond, TX
- Cyril Edmonds – Moncton, NB
- John Fairbairn – Murphy, TX
- Brian Fay – Hannah City, IL
- Paul Ferlitto – Wilsonville, AL
- Phil Getty – Kokomo, IN
- Todd Heinemen – Champlin, MN
- Leerie Jenkins – Climax, NC
- Kurt Johnson – Coalhurst, AB
- Todd Morningstar – Milan, MI
- Carla Mortensen – Brandon, MB
- Dave Walt – Caledonia, ON

Leerie Jenkins declined the nomination. After several rounds of voting, the five finalists were narrowed to:

❖ Scott Chamberlain

❖ Lawrence Cox

❖ Brian Fay

❖ Phil Getty

❖ Dave Walt

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Regional MVP Nominees

- Region 1
 - Risky – Whippet, Rachel Kennedy, Paws-a-tive Attitude
 - Thug – Mix, Russ Helganz, RPM Dog Sports
- Region 2
 - Rooter – Jack/Parson Russell Terrier, Linda Breton, Rezidue Dogs
 - Tandie – Dachshund, Miniature Long Hair, Debbie Woods, TAMSU
- Region 4
 - Pepper Jack – Border Collie, Carl Gavin, Paw Position
 - Scout – Mix, Christina Tresch, BC Boomerangs
 - Scully – Mini Australian/N American Shepherd, Scott & Tija Mohr, High Fives
 - Siobhan – Golden Retriever, Linda Strub, Rapid Intens-A-Flyrs
- Region 5
 - Ginger – Border Collie, Chris & Teresa Turner, K-9 Kommotion
- Region 6
 - Phantom – Staffordshire Bull Terrier, Alisa & Chris Romaine, Heat Wave
- Region 7
 - Riot – Mix, Cheryl Wood, Dogwood Pacesetters
- Region 8
 - Hudson – German Shorthaired Pointer, Christine Poley-MacTavish, Furry Flash Dogsports
 - Ryker – Jack/Parson Russell terrier, Lisamarie Schultz, KAOS
 - Sweep – Border Collie, Carly Rosinski, KAOS
- Region 9
 - Scandal – Shetland Sheepdog, Julie Jenkins, Fur Fun
 - Sweep – Border Collie, Amanda Brown, DogGoneFast
 - Taz – Nova Scotia Duck Tolling Retriever, Joy Gochman, DogGoneFast
- Region 10
 - Lewis – Border Collie, Shane & Darlene MacDougall, Fast ‘n FURious
 - Niska – American Eskimo, Lynette Brown, F.A.M.E.
 - Raine – Nova Scotia Duck Tolling Retriever, Holly Kirkpatrick, Prepare for Takeoff
 - Willow – American Cocker Spaniel, Bonnie Theakston, Maple Leaps
- Region 11
 - Phantom – Border Collie, Brenda Carroll & Sean Mathias, Too Hot to Handle
 - Sweep – Mix, Mike Pape, Ketch This
- Region 13

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

- Bailey – Golden Retriever, David & Peggy Hoyt, Infurno
- Jet – Labrador Retriever, Hollis McGuire, White Mountain Mayhem
- Region 14
 - Shea – Golden Retriever, Jane Kline, Music City Road Dogs
- Region 15
 - Darby – Mix, Gabrielle Woodward, Release the Hounds
 - Foster – Australian Cattle Dog, Kim Shepherd, FBI
- Region 18
 - Bree – Border Collie, Brian Sheridan, Northern LightSpeed of Alaska
 - Zorro – Jack/Parson Russell Terrier, Sasha Andreis, Alaska Dogs Gone Wild
- Region 19
 - Daisy Mae – Miniature Schnauzer, Laura Dolph, RUFF
 - Puzzle – Border Collie, Dana Nichols, LAUNCH
 - Willow – Jack/Parson Russell Terrier, Jackie McCourtie, Denver Speed Demons
- Region 20
 - Liam – American Pit Bull Terrier, Louis Bédard, DogZworth

Scheduling of Candidate Chats

There was discussion of scheduling candidate chats, as well as the quarterly leadership chats. Leerie indicated he will schedule a leadership chat near the end of September and then in December. Kim will schedule candidate chats. Because the AGM is far away, there was a suggestion to have an opening season chat relatively soon.

Annual General Meeting

There was discussion again about possible dates for the Annual General Meeting. Nancy was able to confirm that there will be a tournament January 29&30, 2011 in Huntsville, Texas. The host club is Texas Twisters. Mike Smith, club owner, is willing to host the AGM with this tournament. Scheduling the AGM this late would also give sufficient time for the Board to utilize an outside online ballot service if they chose to.

Review Panel – Leerie Jenkins

- Kaycee 090572 – 6/12/10 excusal
- Lady 081061 – 6/4/10 excusal, affirmed on appeal 7/6/10
- Lizzy 080423 – 4/24/10 excusal

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

- Logan 080284 – 6/13/10 excusal
- Vader 100764 – 6/6/10 excusal, affirmed on appeal 7/30/10
- Bling 090563 – 7/11/10 excusal, appeal pending
- Seven 050888 – 8/1/10 excusal, appeal pending

Old Business:

None to report.

New Business:

1. Chris Van Wert appeal

The Board received the following appeal via email on August 5, 2010:

*To: The Executive Director, Lee Heighton
and members of the NAFA(r) Board of Directors, et al.,*

This is an Appeal to overturn the Denial of my request to sanction a tournament. A copy of the sanctioning request is provided by attachment to this email. I am invoking the authority that the NAFA Board of Directors has to review actions of the Executive Director. That authority is stated in Article VI of the By-Laws:

ARTICLE VI

Section 4. Executive Director. The Executive Director shall report to the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall be the chief operating officer of the Corporation, and shall, subject to of the Board of Directors, generally supervise, direct and control the business of the Corporation and shall have the responsibility for the day-to-day management of the business and affairs of the Corporation. The Executive Director shall attend meetings of the Board of Directors and shall make periodic reports to the Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall appoint Regional Directors and other staff as necessary for the day-to-day operation of the corporation.....The Executive Director shall implement decisions of the Board of Directors and shall act, subject to the Board's authority and guidance, to enforce NAFA® policy, rules and regulations. The Executive Director may sanction individuals or Clubs for infraction of NAFA® policies, rules or regulations subject to ratification by the Board of Directors at it next meeting. The Executive Director may, subject to the Board's approval, delegate portions of these responsibilities to qualified individuals within NAFA® for the purposes of enforcing NAFA® policies, rules and regulations....

On 07/28/2010, I submitted to the Tournament Sanctioning Secretary of NAFA(r) a valid sanctioning request which is attached in PDF format to this email. Her reply was that my request had been denied.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

Quote: "Unfortunately I am unable to sanction your October tournament as it occurs on the same weekend as the NAFA® CanAm.

The ED received input from several board members after the 2009 NAFA® CanAm regarding tournaments competing for entries with the NAFA® CanAm. At that time the ED determined that no tournaments would be sanctioned within 1,000 miles of the 2010 NAFA® CanAm.

This decision is supported in the NAFA® Rulebook.

CHAPTER 6 – HOSTING A NAFA® SANCTIONED EVENT

Section 6.1 – Requirements

(p) NAFA reserves the right to deny or revoke tournament sanctioning in the event that the tournament proposed would not be in the best interest of NAFA®. This includes, but is not limited to, sanctioning an event at the same venue, on the same weekend, as an event scheduled by another flyball sanctioning organization."

There are several different issues that I have identified that may of interest to the Board, any ONE of which, may be used as a "reason" to grant my appeal and approve my sanctioning request.

- *My tournament as proposed satisfies **ALL** the written and published conditions and criteria of NAFA(r) concerning Hosting a NAFA(r) Sanctioned Event. The **only** section that governs distance between tournaments is this:*

CHAPTER 6 – HOSTING A NAFA® SANCTIONED EVENT

Section 6.1 – Requirements

(f) NAFA® will not sanction a tournament within 200 road miles of a previously sanctioned

NAFA® tournament, without written approval from the sanctioned tournament's club owner.

1. *My tournament is 244 road miles distant from the CanAm. So, on the basis of NAFA's written and published Rules, I request that the NAFA Board of Directors overturn this decision and "approve" my tournament for sanctioning.*
2. *The second related issue here is: "Is it the intent of the Board to allow the ED to modify or change NAFA's written and published rules by invoking the section which reads, in part, " the tournament proposed would not be in the best interest of NAFA®." without asking for and requiring the ED to provide to the Board facts and evidence which support the ED's opinion that the tournament proposed would not be in the best interest of NAFA®. ?"*

The "best interests of NAFA" is only an opinion. That phrase alone cannot suffice as a "just cause" for changing our written and published rules in favor of "special interests" by the decree of only one NAFA Official. Proof in the way of facts supported by evidence should be required before allowing unique circumstances to tilt the balance of protection and justice afforded this organization through its Rulebook. Not through emotions and opinions.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

- *The proposed tournament is located in a declining Region. By that, I mean that NAFA sanctioned events have steadily decreased from a high of 18 events in 2005 to merely 12 events in the last two racing seasons. NAFA's purpose is "to promote flyball and to encourage national and international competition." **How does not sanctioning a tournament that satisfies all written and published criteria for hosting a NAFA(r) event promote that vision?***

From the very beginning, the NAFA BoD and the ED have been committed to creating a "National Event" (Cynosports World Championships in combination with the CanAm Classic) that adhered to ALL of NAFA's written and published Rules.

In a search of documents published on the NAFA website:

Edited transcript for NAFA® Leadership Chat August 23, 2006

<i>Lee_Heighton</i>	<i>Zac, a 2/3 majority is needed for any change to the Rules of Racing.</i>
---------------------	--

<i>BCSam</i>	<i>The Games will be run under the normal rules of a tournament</i>
--------------	--

Later in the same chat transcript, we find this:

<i>dgsmith</i>	<i>jhhh> So Glenn shouldn't Div 1 and possible NAFA champions be held to high standards and isn't part of those standards measuring.</i>
----------------	---

<i>Lee_Heighton</i>	<i>Shouldn't everyone be held to the same standards</i>
---------------------	--

I agree. EVERYONE should be held to the same standards. The standards written and published by NAFA(r) in the Rules of Racing, Corporate Policies and Procedures and the By-Laws should apply equally to the National Event as it does to my proposed tournament by my little team.

Finally, I researched the history of the National Event in order to compare the effects of competing NAFA events on the number of team entries received. The results were very surprising, even to myself. Essentially, the National Event did better whenever there were NAFA events taking place on the same weekend. The one weekend when there were NO competing NAFA events, that was the only year that entries for the National Event actually went down from the previous year. 2009 was the first time an event was sanctioned within the 1000 mile radius of the National Event and that was a record-setting entry. The breakdown is all noted in the document attached (three file versions).

*Aren't there other options available to NAFA(r) other than "denial" for sanctioning? Our proposed tournament closes well after the closing for the National Event. I would be willing to accept restrictions, such as "not accepting any entries until after the CanAm closes." Or even, no promotion or publishing of our event on the NAFA website until **after** the CanAm closes.*

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

The best interests of NAFA(r)

- *Support the efforts of clubs to host their first tournament, particularly in Regions that have been identified as in decline.*
- *Support the concept that no one dog, one club, one division, one Region, one "event" is any more important than another and that all of our rules should be applied equally across the board.*
- *That NAFA(r) demonstrate that it has a system of "checks and balances" and that The NAFA Board will review any case or circumstance brought to its attention that it has jurisdiction.*
- *That the "best interests of NAFA" do not depend on the opinion of one NAFA Official alone but, require facts and evidence be presented at the request of the NAFA(r) Board.*
- *That NAFA(r) will not change its rules or policies by "decree" but only through the decisions, authority, approval and guidance of the NAFA(r) Board.*

Please, the issues I have raised deserve a discussion so, whatever it takes to allow discussion, please do that so that the NAFA public knows you have their best interests at heart in addition to the best interests of NAFA.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Christine VanWert

Wooferines NAFA #455

Dana moved to deny appeal and affirmatively find that Lee exercised his discretion as Executive Director appropriately in this circumstance. Kris seconded.

There was discussion regarding the issue. There was concern expressed about how the CanAm could affect reserve weekends in the future. Due to site and scheduling limitations, CanAm might not always be held the same weekend every year. There was discussion that the entire board supports the Executive Director's discretion in the area of tournament sanctioning. The Board would have authority to overturn an ED decision if abuse of discretion, but in this case there was no abuse of discretion.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Region 16/6 realignment

There was further discussion of the proposed regional alignment. Kris expressed concern that not all competitors in the regions were consulted and that those on the borders of the north/south California line and in southern Utah may have objections to where the lines are proposed to be drawn.

Alisa moved to adopt the regional alignment presented by Lee from the Region 6 & 16 Regional Directors. Greg seconded.

Alisa discussed some advantages to the alignment. By including southern California teams with the current region 6, those teams would be much closer to racing than they currently are to the tournaments

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

in northern California. Region 6 would benefit from having more clubs able to host tournaments and a larger draw at existing tournaments.

Scott moved to table the motion to get more input from competitors in these regions. Dale seconded.

Discussion about whether it should be tabled. Kris asked that the tabling be to a meeting before the fiscal year end. The motion was amended.

In favor of tabling the issue: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Dale Smith, and Scott Stein.

Opposed: Alisa Romaine and Greg Stopay.

The motion to table passed.

Lee indicated he will have information posted on the regional lists soliciting input. The issue may be considered at the teleconference which will need to be held a few weeks after the Board meeting to handle other issues.

3. EJS proposal

Lee indicated that he believed this issue required more research before having the Board consider it. Lee, Dale & Greg are going to generate some statistics and proposals.

4. 5 team elimination bracket

Lee presented a modified 5 team single elimination bracket. This would be similar to the alternate brackets for 7 and 8 team single elimination formats. Leerie will put the bracket in more final format.

Lee discussed that this alternative would be compromise for the proposal from region 10 previously declined by board. This new bracket would allow all teams to get two races following a round robin, but would not exceed the maximum number of races.

There was discussion that the proposed bracket would give seed 2 more of an advantage than seed 1.

Karen pointed out that another option would do the same thing goal of giving all teams two races, but would not give the advantage. But that would give a problem with the placements.

Due to late hour and the desire to discuss possible modifications with region 10, Lee withdrew the request and indicated he would present it via teleconference.

5. Fees for two day tournaments

Dana moved to change fee for tournaments more than 1 day to \$30/\$35 and modify any corresponding forms. Greg seconded.

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.

Board of Directors Meeting

Las Vegas, Nevada

Abridged Minutes

August 7, 2010

There was brief discussion. The Board agreed to reconsider fees after fees were reduced for second tournaments over the same weekend. This modification was made a few years ago and NAFA has consistently lost money each year since that change was implemented, despite considerable steps to reduce shipping costs. This proposed change would bring fees for two-day tournaments to par with two one-day tournaments. Presently, two one-day tournaments pay \$20 + \$10 = \$30 for each team that runs over the weekend and one two-day tournament pays \$20 for each team. This proposed change in the fee structure would have the two different tournament formats paying the same fees to NAFA for the weekend.

Leerie indicated that there were more NAFA resources utilized in two one day tournaments. He was concerned that it would cause clubs to increase entry fees for two day tournaments. He also said he believed it may drive more clubs to offer two one day tournaments instead.

Dale and Karen both indicated they believed there was not a noticeable difference in scoring two one day tournaments from scoring one two day tournament. The shipping costs are the same to send EJS, which is actually the primary NAFA expense associated with tournaments.

This change would be effective October 1, 2010. Club may adjust the format, including whether the tournament is one two day or two one day tournaments up until the closing date. This change will be announced in the highlights to give those clubs the opportunity to consider if they need to make changes.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. C.6 Tournament results form

Karen moved to change the C.6 results form to include the post office box in Westfield where results are currently being sent. Nancy seconded.

There was brief discussion regarding whether this address should remain static in case of change in staffing. Nancy withdrew her second for the motion. Greg seconded the motion. There was further discussion regarding the issue.

The motion passed unanimously.

Kris moved to adjourn the meeting. Alisa seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 PM PST.