

NAFA® Board of Directors Meeting

August 27-28 2011, Las Vegas Nevada- Abridged Minutes

Present were:

Executive Director Lee Heighton

Board of Directors

Sam Ford
Nancy Garcia
Leerie Jenkins
Dana Nichols
Karen Oleson
Kris Pickering
Curtis Smith
Ally Stern
Dave Walt

Guest: Kim Davis

Chairman Leerie Jenkins called the meeting to order at 8:05 AM PDT.

Officers' Reports:

Chair's Comments- Leerie Jenkins

Lee thanked Sam for joining the Board and welcomed our guest, Kim Davis.

Executive Director's Comments- Lee Heighton

Lee was very happy with the number of entries received for the upcoming CanAm Classic.

Possible Realignment of Regions 6/16

Lee researched the issue and talked to a number of people including the RDs. At this time he is not going to realign the regions.

EJS

Dale Smith has received one of the two new EJS from FarmTek. It still needs a base- Greg Stopay is speaking with a welder. Lee is getting a quote for internal cases (the gun cases). The foam is one of a kind and we have to contract with the company in CA- they have the existing dyes. He would also like to buy a reasonable number of spare internal cases (6) and store them for future use at our storage facility in Michigan. Lee would also like to buy the other 6 EJS that are available to be purchased from FarmTek.

Lee asked that we enter an Executive Session. At 8:20 a.m. the chair moved that we enter an Executive Session to talk about a marketing proposal.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 8:21 a.m.

NAFA Matting

Lee requested that NAFA purchase two full rings of Tuff-Spun matting from Crown Matting- twelve rolls of three-foot matting and one four-foot roll per ring. Each roll would be 70 feet long. The mats would be used at CanAm Classic and perhaps for other promotional opportunities (e.g., demos). NAFA pays to rent matting for each CanAm event. It would be more economical for NAFA to purchase 2 rings of matting. Sam says the price of oil is down so now is the time to buy them. Delivery time is one week. In about 4 years, NAFA will have recouped the cost. It is anticipated the mats will be used over many years.

Nancy moved that we purchase the two rings of matting from Crown. Sam seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Multibreed Proposal

The advent of open class has been wonderful but participation in multibreed has decreased significantly. Since a team must have four separate breeds in the line-up, multi is perhaps the most difficult class to run. Lee proposed that we create an incentive for clubs to run a multi team by giving a 20% point bonus to multi teams. This could help create push to run multi and some regions that don't have a multi champion will have one. Since this is a major change Sam felt that it should go to a delegate vote. The change would be effective October 1, 2012. Nancy made a motion that we put to delegate vote. Dave seconded. In favour: Nancy, Sam, Kris, Curtis, Ally and Dave. Opposed: Dana and Karen. The motion passed.

There was a short break at 9:00 a.m. Leerie brought the Board back in session at 9:15 a.m.

Treasurer's Report- Nancy Garcia

The books are complete for FY 2010. There was a \$30,437.91 profit for last fiscal year (2010).

\$100,000 one year CD matured in July, earning over \$800 in interest.

UPS savings program- saved about 10% (around \$3,000). Ally is doing a study now to see if Purolator will give us better service in Canada. UPS Canada can be difficult to work with- they occasionally bill our host clubs when the bill should be sent to NAFA. Nancy would like remind host clubs: if you get billed for shipping the EJS please let Nancy Garcia know- she will take care of it.

In 2010 the cost of shipping the EJS was \$40,000. The goal is to cut that cost in half, by parking more sets in regions. A reduction in shipping costs has already been seen by keeping more sets in regions. Ideally as new sets arrive we can park more.

Canadian Interac is becoming popular as a method for payments to NAFA from Canadian clubs

Secretary's Report- Ally Stern

Since the last meeting the minutes for the April 16-17 Board meeting were approved. The April 22 and July 12 Teleconference meeting minutes were also approved. The minutes for the three meetings were posted to the NAFA website.

Standing Committee Reports:

Marketing Committee- Nancy Garcia

The 2012 Junior Participant pin is ready and a sample was reviewed by the Board.

At 9:45 a.m. the chair moved that we enter an Executive Session to discuss several marketing partnerships.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 10:00 a.m.

Finance- Nancy Garcia

Budget

At 10:00 a.m. the chair moved that we enter an Executive Session to review the 2012 budget. Due to a one-time expense, the FY 2012 budget projects a small loss.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 11:35 a.m.

Judges Committee- Leerie Jenkins

Judges Advancements

- John Fairbairn, Murphy TX - Approved to Supervising. The Judges Committee unanimously recommended advancement. Sam moved to promote the judge as recommended. Nancy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Peter Wesdyk, McLean SK - Approved to Supervising. The Judges Committee recommended that he not be advanced at this time. Dana moved that we not promote him at this time. Dave seconded. The Board appreciated his application and will provide some suggestions for him to consider with hopes that he eventually reapplies. There was no further discussion and no one was opposed.
- Dianna Jaynes, Napanee ON - Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommended advancement. Dave moved to promote the judge as recommended. Ally seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Rules Committee- Dana Nichols

- Proposal regarding knocked jumps – Bruce Stone

The Rules Committee received the following request from Bruce Stone:

I have concerns over the rule governing the issue of jumps being knocked over in the lanes. There seems to be inconsistencies in the judging circle whether a race should be stopped to prevent injury to your dog. I know the handler has the prerogative to run their dog or not with risk of losing the heat. In region 5 we witness the situation first hand and the answer seems to be "it

is up to the discretion of the judge." Being concerned with the well being of my dog and in fairness to everyone, wouldn't it be logical to have the rule written where the races are stopped, so all judges have only one option with the welfare of the dog being the only concern? Please consider this option at the next NAFA board meeting.

Regards,

Bruce Stone

The Rules Committee considered a related issue at the August 22, 2009 meeting regarding a request to permit judges to award a no-finish when a heat was called for knocked jumps. The Board declined to adopt that proposal and modified Section 8.3(j) to add the final sentence (underlined here for emphasis).

Section 8.3

(j) Knocked down jumps. A team whose dog(s) knocks down a jump(s) during its run shall not be penalized, provided all dog(s) clear the jump(s) as if it were standing. A "runner" or handler may set up knocked down jump(s) if so doing does not interfere with either team or guide the dog in any way. Even if the judge does not stop the heat for a knocked down jump(s), it is up to the individual competitor to decide whether it is appropriate to run his or her dog, or to accept a no finish.

There was discussion that requiring all heats to be stopped when a jump is knocked is not appropriate and might be especially problematic where a team has a dog that habitually knocks jumps. Our current rule requires a judge to restart the race when it is stopped for safety reasons, including knocked jumps. Such a requirement might also require judges to stop a heat and re-run it even where the final dog on the losing team knocks the last jump.

The Committee recommends that the rule remain as currently written. We think it is appropriate for these calls to remain at the discretion of the judge. There should be an actual safety hazard for the race to be stopped. Judges have the discretion to determine whether they believe a safety hazard exists. If none exists, the judge should not blow a whistle. We rely on the experience and discretion of our judges and believe they appropriately call this issue. If judges are not calling this issue fairly or appropriately, it can be dealt with on a case by case basis, rather than through a rule change.

Karen moved to accept the recommendation of the committee. Dana seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

- Breed challenge process

This was a carryover from the April meeting. The Board had received a number of comments for and against a breed challenge process. There was not complete consensus within the committee but the committee believed something should be put in place. Dana moved that we adopt some form of a breed challenge process. Kris seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Starting with the text provided by the Rules Committee prior to the meeting, and after much discussion, the following language was formulated:

Breed Challenge (Substantial modifications & redraft to Chapter 3):

Chapter 3 – Dogs, Teams, and Time Sheets (current NAFA rule book, p. 5)

Section 3.1 -- Dog Registration (CRNs)

(a) A competition registration number (CRN) must be obtained from NAFA (use NAFA Form C.8) before the dog competes or warms up at a NAFA sanctioned tournament. The fee for a CRN is \$20.00 in US currency or equivalent. The CRN is not transferable to another dog.

(b) The CRN shall identify the breed of the dog or declare the dog a mixed breed. If a breed is claimed, it must be a breed recognized by one or more of the following kennel clubs: American Kennel Club (including Foundation Stock Service), Canadian Kennel Club, United Kennel Club, Mexican Kennel Club, American Rare Breed Association, or American Herding Breed Association. A dog's breed is subject to challenge as provided in section 7.7 of the Corporate Policies and Procedures. A dog's breed designation may be changed at the owner's request once in the lifetime of the dog unless the breed designation has already been changed as a result of a breed challenge.

(c) Any dog listed on a time sheet in a NAFA sanctioned tournament without a valid CRN will result in forfeiture of tournament placements as well as forfeiture of all NAFA points earned during the tournament for all dogs entered on the time sheet.

Section 3.2 – Clubs, Teams, and Time Sheets

(a) A club must have a NAFA club number to enter a team in a NAFA sanctioned event. To obtain a club number use NAFA Form C.11. If a club number has not been obtained prior to the closing date of the tournament in which the club has entered, the teams entered by the club will forfeit all NAFA points and tournament placements.

(b) A current time sheet (NAFA Form C.2) shall be completed and provided to the tournament secretary before the start of racing.

(c) <Here insert sections c, d, e, and h of the current chapter 3, pp. 5-6, except in incorporating 3(h) change "penalty specified in Section 7.6" to add "of the NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures">

<Amend Section 6.2(d) of the NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures to state:>

(d) In the multibreed class, each team running in a heat must consist of dogs of four different breeds, or three different breeds and a mixed breed. A dog's breed or status as a mixed breed must match what is declared on the dog's CRN pursuant to section 3.1(b) of the NAFA Rules of Racing.

<Add section 7.7 to the NAFA Corporate Policies & Procedures as follows:>

Section 7.7 – Breed Challenge Process

(a) A dog's breed may be challenged by a NAFA supervising or approved judge or a club owner. A dog designated as a "mix" is not subject to a breed challenge.

(b) To bring a challenge, the judge or club owner must submit a completed Form C.22 and any supporting documentation to the Executive Director, and:

(i) Except as provided in subparagraph (ii) below, the judge or club owner bringing the challenge must have officiated or competed at a NAFA sanctioned tournament at which the challenged dog competed and submit the challenge within 14 days of that tournament.

(ii) If a dog's owner changes the dog's breed designation as provided in 3.1(b) of the Rules of Racing, a challenge must be submitted within one year of the breed change.

(c) The challenge, if brought by a club owner, must be accompanied by a \$100 (US) fee.

(d) A dog's breed may be challenged only once during the lifetime of the dog.

(e) On receiving a breed challenge, the Executive Director shall verify its sufficiency and promptly forward the challenge to the owner shown on the CRN and request a response within 30 days from the date the owner receives the challenge, or such additional time as the Executive Director may allow for good cause shown.

(f) An owner who receives a breed challenge may:

(i) Establish the dog's breed by furnishing either:

(a) A pedigree, including at least three (3) generations, establishing the dog as a breed recognized by a kennel club listed in Section 3.1(b) of the NAFA Rules of Racing;
or

(b) An ILP/PAL or the equivalent issued by a kennel club listed in Section 3.1(b) of the NAFA Rules of Racing;

(ii) Concede the challenge either by changing the breed designation listed on the dog's CRN to a mixed breed or by establishing a different breed pursuant to paragraph (f)(1) above; or

(iii) Request a NAFA breed review. Such a request must be in writing and be accompanied by at least five identical packets each containing 3 current photographs of the dog, providing an unobstructed view of the dog from both sides and a frontal view, and any other written material, including affidavits or declarations from recognized breeders or conformation judges, that the owner wants the NAFA breed review panel to consider.

(g) On receiving a timely breed review request, the Executive Director shall, with the approval of the Board of Directors, convene a breed review panel. The panel shall consist of at least three (3) impartial members who have specific knowledge of the challenged dog's breed by being either an established breeder of that breed, a qualified conformation judge of dogs in that breed, or another expert in the breed. Each breed review panel member shall review the materials submitted pursuant to paragraph (f)(iii) above. If the breed review panel finds that the photographs are not acceptable, the panel shall notify the Executive Director and indicate what the deficiencies are. If additional photographs are required, the Executive Director shall notify the owner to submit additional photographs curing the deficiencies noted within 30 days of receipt of such request.

(h) If a majority of the breed review panel is convinced that the dog is not the designated breed, the dog's breed designation listed on the dog's CRN shall be changed to a mixed breed, otherwise the dog's breed will remain as designated.

(i) The dog's owner and the challenging party shall receive written confirmation of the panel's finding. If the dog's owner does not timely respond to a breed challenge or to a request for additional photographs by a breed challenge panel, the breed designated on the dog's CRN will be changed to "mix." If the breed is changed to "mix" as a result of the breed review process, the fee, if any, paid to bring the breed challenge shall be refunded to the club owner who remitted it.

(j) No other penalties shall be pursued other than the breed of the successfully challenged dog shall be changed to "mix."

Same made the motion to adopt the text (above). Kris seconded. In favour: Nancy, Sam, Dana, Karen, Kris, Curtis and Dave. Opposed: Ally. The motion passed.

- Request to define "course" – Dave Walt

This was a carryover from the April meeting. The Rules Committee received the following request from Dave Walt to add a definition of "the course" to the glossary. The issue came up in a discussion of training in the ring and the Board's May 8, 2010 explanation of what conduct would constitute training in the ring.

IF we were to define "course" in the rule book, based on what we actually want it to mean, would we not be better off saying the course starts from the point were one releases their dog and ends at the finish line? I feel this would clear up EVERYTHING and give no room to not understand what NAFA means.

There was concern that defining the course to begin where the dog is released might have ramifications on other rules. For instance, the second page of the rulebook discusses it being a 51 foot "course." It might also cause problems with how runback is defined and other ways in which the term course is used throughout the rules.

The Committee expressed concern that the minutes from the May 8, 2010 meeting have been repeatedly provided to judges and competitors for guidance as to what constitutes training in the

ring to no avail. In light of the continued confusion, the Committee recommends that this language be formally included in the rulebook. Suggested changes are underlined below.

Chapter 3 (page 5 of the current rulebook)

(c) Each team is to consist of a minimum of four dogs and four handlers, with a maximum of six dogs and six handlers, plus a box loader and at the discretion of the team, a runner or two, to pick up loose tennis balls, to set up knocked down jumps, or to otherwise assist the team, provided doing so does not interfere with the judges or the opposing team and does not in any way assist the dogs in navigating the course or violate the rules. Other people may assist the dogs and handlers, but may not assist the dog in actually navigating the course. A person helping catch the dog in the back area, or revving the dog up before they run would not violate the rules. But, a person funneling a dog into the jumps or running alongside the dog as they run over the jumps (even outside the ring) would not be permitted. Using food in the ring is permitted, as are tugs and other motivators.

Dana moved to adopt this and add it to the rule book. Sam seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- Request to modify aggression excusal rules to permit a judge to excuse a dog for the weekend, rather than a tournament – Mike Miller

The Rules Committee received the following request from judge Mike Miller:

Currently how the rules are worded and applied, if a dog is excused for aggression on one day of 2 of consecutive one day tournaments, the dog can compete the following day. I think it should be up to the head judge(s) to have the excusal for one or both days of the consecutive tournaments on the same weekend. If it is a 2 day tournament, the dog is excused for both days, but a technicality allows the dog to run on day 2 of 2 one day tournaments. The head judge should be able to determine if the aggression resulted from a heat of the moment and allow the dog to return the next day or if the aggression is likely to be present the next day, ie bites a person.

As a TD, we had this situation arise this past weekend. The dog in question bit a person in the crating area and left bruising and puncture wounds through jeans. The same dog has bitten several other people in the last 3 years that I know of, but had not been reported to the head judge for excusal for whatever reason the person may have had at the time. Now that there is a paper trail on day 2 of the same tournament, my liability and NAFA's liability greatly increases since the problem is a known issue and the problem was willfully ignored and our insurance would have likely denied paying out if someone would have sued if it happened again. Fortunately it did not, but it was a big risk.

The C.12 form could be modified to add a box for the excusal to be for the day only or weekend to be assigned by the head judge. It could be marked as for aggression only.

The Rules Committee considered this request and was concerned that there were allegedly prior instances of aggression where the dog was not excused. If someone witnesses an

incident that might be appropriate for excusal, it should be brought to the attention of the judge. A judge has the ability to excuse a dog for aggression even when he or she does not personally observe an incident. The incident may occur outside the ring, but still on the tournament grounds. A judge may issue an excusal based on witness statements and/or physical evidence where the judge believes an excusal is warranted.

The Committee does not recommend that the current rule be changed. There are a multitude of examples of dogs excused once who never again exhibit aggressive behavior. If a dog is excused a second time, the dog is banned from competition.

Dana moved that we not adopt the proposal. Sam seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- Inside interference – Judges Yahoo Group

There was an issue raised on the Judges list about a dog from the same team re-running themselves while the team is still racing. For instance, the first dog successfully completes her run and then gets away and re-runs while dog 3 is running. Some judges were not calling a flag on dog 3 as long as he successfully completes the run, despite any interference from his teammate dog 1. Other judges believe that if anything crosses the line, including a dog, it must be flagged. There appears to be some split on whether these judges are calling the early pass on dog 1 or calling it as a flag on dog 3. The judges in the first camp believe that once a dog has successfully completed her run, she cannot later flag and any re-running by her is only to the detriment of the team. All agree that it should not be called as interference because a team cannot interfere with itself.

The Rules Committee was split in its assessment of this issue. Some members of the Committee believed that a team cannot interfere with itself and any additional re-running of dogs was only to the detriment of that team. Those members believe that no flag should be called as long as the correct dog on the course successfully completed all aspects of the run. Other members of the Committee believed that it was inherently dangerous to have two dogs on the course at the same time and that the heat should be blown dead for safety. These members believe there should be an exception to the safety rule to permit judges to call a no finish in instances where two dogs were on the course at the same time, rather than re-running the heat. There was some concern raised that this would require heats to be stopped even when the dogs were not close enough to each other to truly create a hazardous situation (e.g., Dog 3 at the box while Dog 1 briefly crosses the start/finish line before returning safely to the handler). There was also discussion that other aspects of racing can be unsafely executed, such as extremely early passes or dogs and handlers colliding in the runback area.

Ultimately the Committee decided to refer the issue to the Board for further discussion and determination of whether any rule changes or clarifications were appropriate.

There was a discussion whether the rule should be amended to provide for a NF when a team's own dog creates a safety issue on its own side of the ring (multiple dogs on the course). Leerie asked if there was a motion. Dana moved if a dog crosses the beam after it has already run it is

not a flag. Nancy seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.
Language added:

Rules of Racing, Section 8.3 (f) added "...The time will be marked as estimated and will not be used to determine placement. If a dog crosses the start/finish line after it has already successfully completed the course, it is not a flag."

- Penalty for a child re-entering the ring

At the April meeting, the Board made a new rule effective immediately regarding children in the racing ring. The language was adopted at the January meeting and was originally scheduled to be effective October 1, 2011, but the Board decided to make it effective April 17, 2011 because of the strong safety concerns. The new rule provides:

Children who are too young to be able to participate safely, (e.g., children in strollers, car seats, baby carriers, or being held in a person's arms) are not permitted in the ring during racing or warm-up periods.

The Judges Committee was contacted by a judge who encountered some resistance when enforcing this rule. The competitor claimed that a prior judge had allowed her child, who was not yet two years old to be in the ring. The current judge indicated he would not permit the child in the ring and discussed the situation with the competitor. She reluctantly removed the child from the ring, but then allowed the child back in the ring during the warm-up period for a subsequent race.

Essentially the question that the Judge and the Judges Committee had was what penalty is to be imposed for violation of this rule. Is it excusal of the parent or guardian for unsportsmanlike conduct for failing to comply with the judge's ruling excluding the child? Should the team suffer a penalty such as forfeiting the heat or forfeiting the race? Or would some other penalty be more appropriate?

The Rules Committee considered this issue and unanimously recommends that there be a penalty specified for this rule. The safety issues inherent with children who have been deemed too young to participate safely are serious. There was a split in the Committee as to whether a penalty should be imposed if the child re-entered the ring with a team or parent different than the team or parent who was in the ring when the initial excusal occurred. Some members of the Committee also believed that whether any penalty was imposed should be left to the discretion of the judge.

The majority of the Committee recommends the Board adopt the following addition to the rule:

If a judge excuses a child and the club either refuses to have the child leave, or the club re-enters the ring with the child at that tournament during warm-ups or racing, the team will forfeit the race.

The Committee acknowledged that this could constitute a hardship for other teammates, especially in the Open and Veterans classes, but the majority felt this would also provide greater

incentive for the team to ensure all of its members were complying with this important safety rule.

The members of the Committee who objected felt that it would be inappropriate to punish an entire team in the situation where a child re-enters the ring with an adult who may be unaware of the judge's prior ruling.

There was also an issue raised after the Committee's teleconference as to the timing of a violation. If the child re-enters the ring after some heats of the race have been run, would the team still forfeit the entire race, or would they only forfeit their remaining heats.

Reworded:

If a judge excuses a child and the club either refuses to have the child leave, or the club re-enters the ring with the child at that tournament during warm-ups or racing, the team will forfeit the race (retroactively if the child enters the ring after the race has begun). This is effective immediately.

Dana moved that this wording be adopted. Nancy seconded. The motion passed.

- Proposed change to limited tournament draws – Dirk Elber

I would like to propose a slight change to chapter 6 section 6.1(k) limited tournaments.

As the rules currently state if any limited class overfills at the time of closing of entries then an automated draw will be held for all limited classes. The teams then have 96 hours to notify the tournament director if they would like to pull a team, and the next team on the alternate list then gains entry into the tournament. However at this point if one or more classes have teams withdraw and open slots for the assigned number of teams, and the remaining classes still have an alternate list waiting on entry into the tournament, the tournament organizers have no ability to adjust slots around.

My proposal is:

a) if any classes do not meet the sanctioned limit are no longer fully filled after the 96 hour mark due to teams having withdrawn, and other classes still having teams on the alternate list, to allow the tournament organizer (TD/Secretary) to contact the ED for manual reallocation of the vacant slots to the other divisions with the following rules

Justification for change is to allow the maximum amount of teams to participate in any limited tournament, up to the original number set at sanctioning, without penalizing the organizers or applicants for higher demand in certain classes than was expected. This allows the organizers to maximize not only the number of teams that can participate in the tournament, but also maximize the potential that hosting a tournament is a profitable venture for the clubs. The reason to keep the Regional pts and cross listing rules as they are is to prevent any manipulation of the entries, post automatic draw, to change the status of the tournament.

Thanks for taking the time to review this proposal.

Dirk Elber

There was discussion that this issue is currently being addressed on a case by case basis through requesting a waiver from the Executive Director. The Committee discussed whether this change would allow clubs to gain an unfair advantage during the draw period. After due consideration, it was determined that any abuse of this rule could be dealt with on an individual basis. Therefore, the Rules Committee recommends adoption of the proposal.

This is already being done when requested. Dana moved that we accept the following wording effective immediately. Kris seconded. There was no further discussion and no one opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Change to limited tournament draws:

Corporate Policies & Procedures, Section 6.1 (k)(vi) If any classes do not meet the sanctioned limit after the 96 hour mark due to teams having withdrawn, and other classes still have alternates, the tournament organizer (Tournament Director/Secretary) should contact the Executive Director for manual reallocation of the vacant slots to the other classes.

- Rules Clean up - CRN

During discussion of another topic, the Committee noticed that CRN is referred to in two different ways in the current version of the rulebook – Competition Registration Number and Competition Racing Number. It appears that Competition Registration Number is the correct language. Therefore the Committee recommends the instances of Competition Racing Number be changed to Competition Registration Number.

Update: Based on further research after the meeting, it was determined that CRN referred to Competition Racing Number as far back as 1995.

Other minor inconsistencies within the rule book were also discussed, and Dana moved that Curtis remove them from the rule book. Dave seconded. There was no further discussion and no one opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

- Changes to forms- Karen Oleson

C.3 Sanctioning Form

- Currency specification redundancy removed.
- Form is changed to assume all classes are unlimited unless otherwise noted.

C.6 Tournament Results Form

- Consider removing "EJS Shipping Cost (attach receipt). Specify payment in USD or CDN funds" as it tends to cause confusion.

C.10 Height Card Form

- Alisa Romaine requested wording from the rulebook be added to this form in an effort to make the signature requirements clearer.

C.11 New Club Form

- References to 'Team' changed to 'Club' as 'Club' is more accurate.
- Remove the "Team Captain" line. The database only allows information for a Club Owner and Club Contact. The database tracks only the Club Owner and Contact.

C.17/C.18 - add number of dogs measured.

The Rules Committee recommends that the requested changes to the forms be made in the new rule book. Dana moved that the Board accept the recommendation. Kris seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

- Clarification regarding forfeiting of races by teams from same club – Dave Walt

Dave Walt posed the following questions:

1. If a club's A team and B team are scheduled to race each other and the A team has an injury (either before or during the race), and after the injury, the A team cannot field a team, what is the ruling?

2. If a club's A team and B team are scheduled to race each other and the A team shows up more than three minutes late after the warm up period (and has no excused ring conflict), what is the ruling?

The rule that applies is:

CHAPTER 6 - REPORTING FOR RACES

(a) If a team is more than three minutes late from the conclusion of the designated warm-up period, the Head Judge will declare a forfeit of that race by that team unless an excused ring conflict exists. Any ring conflicts must be reported to the Head Judge or the Head Table prior to the race in question.

(b) Teams that win by forfeit must complete the minimum required heats scheduled to qualify for points awarded in round-robin or to advance in double elimination competition. If another team is not available to compete, the team shall race without an opponent.

(c) Forfeiting teams that do not show just cause may be excused from the tournament by the tournament director and may be subject to further discipline. Forfeiting teams may not run any dogs in the heats that are forfeited. If a team forfeits a heat and then subsequently runs a dog(s) in violation of this rule, they will automatically be considered as For Exhibition Only (FEO).

(d) If a team has to forfeit when its "A" and "B" teams are in the same race, the faster seeded team must run and the slower seeded team must forfeit.

The Committee was split in its assessment of the questions. Some members believed that the rule should be read strictly to indicate that the club's B team would be required to be the team to forfeit regardless of the status of the A team. Justification for this position included that the rule was put in place to prevent clubs from giving their B team a benefit in placements by forfeiting the faster team. Allowing the A team to forfeit instead of the B team just encouraged teams to adopt such conduct to get around the rule.

Other members believed that in neither situation should the B team have to forfeit. If the A team had an injury, then that team was not capable of racing, therefore, the club did not have two teams in the same race. There was no indication of whether this would apply if the A team was able to complete later races against other teams.

As to the scenario where the A team is more than 3 minutes late to racing, some committee members believe that the B team should not have to forfeit because the A team had already forfeited. Others thought that both teams would be required to forfeit under the current language of the rule and to avoid circumvention of the rule to gain an advantage.

The Committee referred the issue to the Board for ruling and to see if any additional language was needed in the rule.

There was no motion but the Board clarified. If a club's A team pulls from the tournament, then the club's B team should not have to forfeit when scheduled to race the A team. But, if the A team is forfeiting just the race, or is late, then the B team must also forfeit the race.

Disciplinary Committee - Leerie Jenkins

No issues currently pending.

Election Committee- Dana Nichols

- Ratification of results

Under the previous election system, final votes were tabulated at the Annual General Meeting and results were announced to the Board and the general public at the end of the meeting. The Board then ratified the results at the next in person Board meeting, which was usually several months later. With the transition to an online system administered by outside company, we now have to close the polls on a business day prior to the AGM, generally at midnight on Thursday. That gives the election company Friday to compile results and send us the information. Because the results are available sooner, there doesn't seem to be any reason to delay ratification. The Election Committee unanimously recommends that the Board receive the results in executive session at the Board meeting held just before the AGM (generally held on Friday, the day before the AGM). The Committee recommends the Board ratify the results during the meeting and then announce results to the general public at the Annual General Meeting the next day.

Dana moved that the Board accept this proposal. Kris seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

- Creating standard operating procedure for calculation of votes

During the transition to the outside online voting service, we realized that a number of issues are not specifically covered in bylaws regarding how votes are allocated, primarily in regards to number of team entries. In order to preserve institutional knowledge about how the votes should be calculated, the Election Committee recommends the creation of a standard operating procedure for how votes are calculated. The overall recommendation is that if NAFA fees are collected, it should count as a team entry for voting calculations. Examples would include:

- a. Performance team entries: The host club still pays a fee for these teams and they receive NAFA points. Therefore, they would count toward delegate vote calculations.
- b. Teams who forfeit: If a team races a single race which is scored, then the host club has to pay tournament fees and this would count towards vote calculations. If a team enters, but withdraws prior to racing, no tournament fees are collected and the entry would not count towards vote calculations. If a team forfeits an individual heat or race, but still completes at least one heat which is scored, then the host club pays tournament fees and the entry would count towards vote calculations.
- c. Teams who go FEO: FEO teams would generally count towards delegate votes because they are required to run at least one heat before going to For Exhibition Only status. The host club would be required to pay tournament fees so the entry counts towards vote calculations.
- d. Open teams: Open team entries count as a vote calculation for the club they are entered under. The same would apply for veterans teams.

Dana moved that the Board accept this proposal. Sam seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- Creating standard operating procedure for how ballot is drafted

The Election Committee also recommends that there be standardization in how ballots should be drafted. This would ensure consistency between future elections.

- a. Abstain or None of the Above options – The Committee discussed whether an abstain or “none” type option should be provided on the ballot. The overwhelming consensus was that this seemed almost unsportsmanlike in some situations, especially where one dog is nominated for MVP, etc. Voters have the option to skip voting in a race if they decide they do not wish to vote for any of the candidates.

Dana moved that we not include abstain or none of the above as an option on ballots. Sam seconded. Our bylaws do not currently address an abstain option for voting. See Article VII, Section 5. The motion passed unanimously.

- b. Hall of Fame tabulation – The Committee also felt some clarification was needed in tabulating Hall of Fame results. The rule indicates that a dog must receive “35% or more of the ballots returned and validly voted.” The rule is silent as to whether it is 35% of the

ballots returned and validly voted in that race, or whether it is of the overall election return. The Committee researched prior elections and unanimously recommends that the tabulation be made from the number of votes validly received in the HOF election itself.

Dana recommended that we adopt the following wording (the change is underlined): in order to be inducted into the Hall of Fame a dog must have 35% or more of the ballots returned and validly voted in that race. Curtis moved that we adopt this language. Dana seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

- Creating standard operating procedure for how results should be reported

The Election Committee reviewed how results are reported and the options available through the outside online election company.

a. Percentage returns – with the new online system, it is difficult for the company to filter for unique voters in elections where a vote is split out. For instance, when a person votes a portion of votes for one candidate and then goes back and votes other votes for another candidate, the online system may read that as two voters when giving overall results. Similarly, the filters are difficult to set to capture which region a person voted from if a vote is not lodged in the MVP race, or if that region did not have MVP candidates.

b. Raw numbers – Should just the raw numbers be disclosed, rather than actual percentages? And, which numbers should be released – actual number of voters or numbers of votes or both.

c. Additional statistics – what additional statistics, if any do we want to release publicly? Have to make sure that online system is set up to filter for those parameters ahead of time.

After reviewing the available data and capabilities of the outside online election system, the Election Committee recommends that for future elections the results be reported as number of votes received, rather than by voter.

The Committee recommends that the following data be collected and reported:

Overall – total number of votes outstanding and total number of votes returned.

By each race – total number of votes outstanding and total number of votes returned.

For each region – the total number of votes outstanding and the total number of votes returned.

In each case, the percentage may also be listed for overall return and number received for each candidate.

The Election Committee contacted the outside online election company. The company has indicated that it can set up this information to be reported for this election. There is a small fee for generating the custom reports.

Dana moved that we follow this recommendation. Kris seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

- Progressing to fully online election

At the July 12, 2011 Board teleconference, the Board adopted the Election Committee's recommendation to progress to a fully online election this year. This would mean that all ballots will be distributed digitally via email through the outside company. All ballots would be voted online through their service. No paper ballots would be mailed. This will save our organization over \$1,000.00 in costs, as well as conserving paper. Voters are encouraged to update their email and other contact information with NAFA. A push will be made late summer/early fall to update voter contact information via the new database.

- Election Company

At the July 12, 2011 Board teleconference, the Board adopted the Election Committee's recommendation to again retain BigPulse as our outside online election service. They are familiar with our complicated election structure and have committed to capturing the statistical data we have requested regarding results and voter turnout.

Nominating Committee:

Nominees for the 2012 election (lists are in alphabetical order)

Board of Directors (3 positions available):

- Sam Ford
- Nancy Garcia
- Dale Smith

Judge of the Year finalists:

- Geoff Brown, Raleigh, NC
- Scott Chamberlain, Mount Wolf, PA
- John Fairbairn, Murphy, TX
- Kevin Gordon, Goffstown, NH
- Dave Walt, Caledonia, ON

Hall of Fame Finalists (Kris did not take part in the HOF ballot selection)

- Bainbridge Savannah "Hannah", 981124, Australian Shepherd, Sharon Atkinson of Omaha Speedracers
- Braehead's Pleasure of Q (Teez). 000981, White German Shepherd Dog, Maurice Seeger of Ballistics
- Glide, 960417, Border Collie, Cindy Arnold of Paws-a-tive Attitude

- Marco, 001440, Pomeranian, Kim Cagle of Flat Out Flyers
- Snap, 000470, Mix, Tooie Crooks of Flying Colors

2011 Regional MVP Nominees

Region 1

- Dahlia - Miniature Pinscher - Karen & Chet Day - Fur in a Blur
- Gwen - Border Collie - Gregory Homann - Rockin Flyball Gang
- Tess - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Linda Anderson - Paws-a-tive Attitude

Region 2

- Daisy - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Carol-Anne DeVenne - Balderdashers
- Jack-Jack - Whippet - Gord Mak - Extreme Chaos

Region 3

- Elvis - Mix - Jennifer Rohling - Balls Out
- Zing - Border Collie - Julie Tillman - SuperNova

Region 4

- Cricket - Australian Shepherd - Gloria Budziak - Ruff House
- Scout - Mix - Christina Tresch - BC Boomerangs

Region 5

- Katy - Border Collie - Diane Bissell - Texas Twisters
- Merlin - Bassett Hound - Tammy Allison - Paws And Effect
- Minnie Louise - Border Collie - JoAnne Sigler - Flat Out Flyers
- Pippin - Pomeranian - Beverly J. Taub - Do Run Run
- Shiner - Mix - Donald Watson - Hot Rod Hounds
- Trixi - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Kim Galusha - Dogz Rule!

Region 6

- Snap - Mix - Tooie Crooks - Flying Colors

Region 7

- Phoebe - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Joy Adiletta - Jet City Jumpers

Region 9

- Scandal - Shetland Sheepdog - Julie Jenkins - Fur Fun
- Skeet - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Todd Pope - Carpe Pilam

Region 10

- Caber - Border Collie - Craig & Shari Dawson - Fast 'n FURious
- Fling - Australian Shepherd - Jennifer Stairs - Carleton County Flyball
- Shadow - Shetland Sheepdog - Richard Landry - F.A.M.E.

Region 11

- Dusti - Shetland Sheepdog - Christine/Richard Sells - Too Hot to Handle
- Scooter - Miniature Poodle - Cindy Doerr - Dogs Of Anarchy

Region 12

- Jonah - Border Collie - Pat LaValley - Redline Dogsports

Region 13

- Bero - Entlebucher Mountain Dog - Melissa Gugliotti - Fast Attack
- Blu - Australian Shepherd - Chris and Trish Bjurling - Howl
- Highwater Bennington - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Valerie Whiterock - NASDOG Racing
- Hype - Border Collie - Cheryn Breeling - Maine Coast Runners
- Mea - Australian Shepherd - Cheryl Doyle - Ruff Enuff
- Shadow - Border Collie - David Dubois - Canine Mutiny

Region 14

- Huey - Whippet - Dana Hanson - Double Dog Dare
- Jax - Labrador Retriever - Jeanne Harem - Dixie Flyers

Region 15

- Mischief - Border Collie - Russell Bobb - Scallywags

Region 16

- Molly - Australian Shepherd - Laura Collett - Heat Wave
- Skyler - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Stacie Popejoy - Surf City Flyball
- Toby - Jack/Parson Russell Terrier - Anne Lamonica - Arizona Supercharged

Region 18

- Ginny - Mix - Christy Garrett - Alaska Dogs Gone Wild

Region 19

- Cutter - Australian Shepherd - Kay Radinsky - Westside Woofers
- Gypsy - Labrador Retriever - Caryn Ashbay - Agents of Chaos
- Kona - Australian Shepherd - Jo Crickenberger - Rocky Mountain Flyball

Region 20

- Kassie - Mix - Blair Carroll - Paws on Fire
- Niki - Mix - Marie-H Lacasse - Leading Edge
- Niki - Siberian Husky - Nadine Marcotte - Burnin' Rubber
- Olive - Border Terrier - Sara & Bobby Ogilvie - Ready Set Go
- Striker - Whippet - Irene Doucet - Hot Diggity Dogs

Region 21

- Camden - Mix - Stephanie Hanson - Outrun
- Jester - Mix - Steven Branin & Jayne McQuillen - Skidmarkz
- Schemer - Border Collie - Michelle and Mary Bolton - Omaha Speedracers

Review Panel - Leerie Jenkins

- Lindsey - 080546, 04/02/2011
- Ginger - 100203, 04/03/2011
- Kaylee - 110282, 05/14/2011
- Dexter - 110597, 05/21/2011 - Appeal
- Gabby - 110570, 05/22/2011 - Appeal

- Roxie - 051102, 05/22/2011 - Second Excusal - Upheld on Appeal

Special Committee Reports

Technology Committee- Karen Oleson

FarmTek is currently working on a veteran class mode. The warm up countdown will also be included in the EJS upgrade and the judge will be able to reset the lights from the judge's remote. EJS output testing is going well. Next an interface will be developed.

Leerie reported that he is working on a new FBscore program.

The chair requested that we enter an Executive Session at 6:30 p.m. The Board discussed the transition to the new database.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 6:50 p.m.

NAFA/Flyball History Committee- Karen Oleson

Leerie requested we change the history special committee. Dave is chair, Ally is a member and Dale will be left on it. There was also a discussion about adding an additional non-board member.

Delegate Accrual Committee

There was extensive discussion about the Committee's recommendation and other possible options to equalize the vote distribution for clubs entering and hosting multiple one day tournaments with tournaments held over multiple days. Several different alternatives were discussed, all with varying pros and cons.

Committee proposal, analysis, and recommendation:

Delegate vote assignment proposal

Goals:

- Make delegate vote assignment more directly linked to benefit provided to NAFA®
- Treat regions and Clubs equally regardless of tournament format (multiple single day events in a week or one multi-day event)
- Make all clubs that participate in NAFA – regardless of size – feel involved

Primary changes:

- Change the primary unit of measure from event to week
 - Hosting one or multiple tournaments in the same NAFA week is treated the same
 - Credit for scored teams entered during a NAFA week is restricted to maximum scored teams in any single event that week
- Extend the range used for calculating number of delegate votes per team entry - one vote for every five entries or fraction thereof, with a minimum of two.
- Remove the cap on the number of delegate votes that can be earned by a Club
 - No longer any concern over a single Club dominating a region or NAFA
 - Remove penalty on larger Clubs who make a significant contribution to NAFA

Conclusion:

The proposed changes accomplish the goals of aligning delegate votes more closely to contributions to NAFA while removing penalties for large Clubs and allowing more small/new Clubs to participate in the election process without diluting the value of a vote.

Further analysis

The analysis used the statistics from the 2010 racing year as it is the most current year for which complete statistics are available. The following table shows the percentage of total votes assigned to each region under the current and proposed formulas. Some regions gain and others lose – but changes are proportional to the participation in NAFA (hosting and competing) and remove the imbalance from single day and multi-day events.

	Current	Proposed			
Region 1	5.4%	6.1%	Region 12	3.7%	3.7%
Region 2	8.2%	10.4%	Region 13	6.0%	6.6%
Region 3	4.0%	3.8%	Region 14	5.0%	4.4%
Region 4	5.9%	4.9%	Region 15	7.1%	9.4%
Region 5	6.1%	5.8%	Region 16	8.2%	6.7%
Region 6	0.8%	0.5%	Region 17	0.0%	0.0%
Region 7	7.4%	5.9%	Region 18	0.6%	0.6%
Region 8	6.4%	5.1%	Region 19	4.2%	3.3%
Region 9	4.6%	7.3%	Region 20	3.3%	4.1%
Region 10	3.3%	3.4%	Region 21	4.3%	3.4%
Region 11	5.4%	4.6%		100.0%	100.0%

Further analysis was conducted to look for any other unexpected results caused by the change in calculation. The following table provides additional insight into the changes with the proposed method:

	Current Votes	Votes Prop.	Clubs With Zero Votes	Clubs w/Fewer Votes	Clubs w/More Votes	Clubs w/>8	Was 0 now more	Was more now 0	Max Votes for a Club	Club Max % Region	Club Max % Total
Region 1	85	94	2	2	7	2	2	0	12	12.77%	0.77%
Region 2	130	161	6	1	13	6	4	0	15	9.32%	0.97%
Region 3	63	59	1	8	2	2	0	0	13	22.03%	0.84%
Region 4	93	76	1	14	1	1	0	0	16	21.05%	1.03%
Region 5	97	90	0	9	4	1	1	0	9	10.00%	0.58%
Region 6	12	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	42.86%	0.19%
Region 7	118	92	0	16	2	0	2	0	8	8.70%	0.52%
Region 8	101	79	1	14	1	1	0	0	12	15.19%	0.77%
Region 9	73	113	1	2	8	3	2	0	30	26.55%	1.94%
Region 10	53	52	4	7	3	3	0	0	13	25.00%	0.84%
Region 11	86	72	0	11	4	2	0	0	9	12.50%	0.58%
Region 12	59	58	0	4	4	2	0	0	11	18.97%	0.71%
Region 13	95	102	3	2	9	0	0	0	8	7.84%	0.52%
Region 14	79	68	0	11	2	2	0	0	11	16.18%	0.71%
Region 15	113	146	1	0	14	5	1	0	16	10.96%	1.03%
Region 16	130	104	5	19	3	2	1	0	10	9.62%	0.65%
Region 18	10	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	77.78%	0.45%
Region 19	67	51	0	11	1	1	0	0	14	27.45%	0.90%
Region 20	52	63	1	1	7	2	2	0	13	20.63%	0.84%
Region 21	68	53	0	12	1	1	0	0	13	24.53%	0.84%
	1584	1549									

Note: Analysis uses entries and hosting data from the 2010 racing year and current Club assignments to regions.

The total number of delegate votes remains almost constant – declining only slightly (bottom row). For each region, you see the current number of delegate votes earned (Current Votes) as well as the new number earned (Votes Prop.) under the proposed change. You can see that voting power remains well-distributed among the regions – proportional to participation (entries and hosting).

The next several columns show the number of Clubs receiving zero votes, fewer votes, and more votes respectively under the new system as compared to the current. The following column (Was 0 now more) illustrates the number of clubs receiving one or more votes with the new system that have zero under the current system. Conversely, the next column shows that no clubs drop to zero which had votes under the current system. Column Clubs w/>8 shows the number of clubs which will have more than 8 votes under the proposed system.

The last three columns provide some insight into Clubs that might have power to dominate an election. This was the primary concern of NAFA when the old maximum of 6 votes (later increased to 8) was instituted. The Max column shows the maximum number of delegate votes that would be earned by a Club for the 2010 racing year under the new system. The 30 earned by one Club in region 9 is an outlier, with 20 and 16 being the next two highest values across NAFA.

The second last column looks at the ability of a single Club to dominate a regional election. Other than regions that presently have the issue due to too few Clubs, no Club is granted dominance by the proposed system. Likewise, across NAFA, the highest percent of total vote assigned to one Club is just under 2% showing that no single Club can dominate a NAFA-wide election.

Dana moved effective October 1, 2011, we will change our current delegate structure to award delegate votes for team entries on a per week basis and award delegate votes for hosting on a per racing day basis. Kris seconded.

The new rule would read (Article VII - Affiliate Clubs and Delegates, Section 2. Delegate Vote Calculations):

(a) Affiliate Club Delegate Votes. An Affiliate Club must compete in at least one (1) event during the preceding Racing Year to qualify for delegate votes. An Affiliate Club earns delegate votes by competing in or hosting tournaments according to the follow schedule: one (1) delegate vote for 4-5 team entries; two (2) delegate votes for 6-11 team entries; three (3) delegate votes for 12-17 team entries; four (4) delegate votes for 18-23 team entries; five (5) delegate votes for 24-29 team entries; six (6) delegate votes for 30-35 team entries; seven (7) delegate votes for 36-41 team entries; eight (8) delegate votes for 42-47 team entries; nine (9) delegate votes for 48-53 team entries; ten (10) delegate votes for 54-59 team entries; eleven (11) delegate votes for 60-65 team entries; twelve (12) delegate votes for 66-71 team entries; thirteen (13) delegate votes for 72-77 team entries; fourteen (14) delegate votes for 78-83 team entries; and fifteen (15) delegate votes for more than 83 team entries. Team entries are the greatest number of entries on a given day during the tournament week. One (1) delegate vote per Affiliate Club will be awarded for hosting each tournament day. No Affiliate Club shall earn more than fifteen (15) delegate votes in total by team entries or tournament hosting.

This will not affect the upcoming election (January 2012). If teams would like to change their sanctioning for 2012 they may do so.

There was some discussion. In favour: Sam, Dana, Kris, Ally and Dave. Opposed: Karen and Curtis. Abstain: Nancy. The motion passed.

Curtis was concerned about the inequity of earned delegate votes for entries in a single day tournament versus a multiple day tournament (for entries only). This goes into effect on Oct 1, 2011 but it would not affect the election in Jan 2011. It affects how delegate votes are earned in the 2012 fiscal year. If teams would like to change their 2012 sanctioning they many do so.

New Business:

- Regional Tournament Mileage Restriction

The Board received complaints from several competitors about tournaments being held hundreds of miles from their regional border when clubs had elected into the region. Dana moved that we adopt the following language:

A host club's regional affiliation shall determine the region in which regional points accrue for tournaments hosted by that club, except when the tournament is hosted more than 200 road miles away from the opted-in regional border, in which case the regional points will accrue for the region where the tournament is geographically located. This would be effective October 1,

Karen seconded. There was no further discussion and no one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

- Election Period Dates and Deadlines

Since the AGM date was moved further back, the election season is now 6 months long. Dana moved that we change all nomination deadlines to September 30, effective October 1, 2011.

Curtis seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- Max number of heats per race

Dana moved that the following text be added to Corporate Policies & Procedures, Section 6.3 (b)(v): A race may not consist of more than five heats. Tournament Directors will publish the tie breaker for races (for example- fastest time in the race). This includes the elimination rounds.

This would be effective October 1, 2011. Dave seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Curtis moved that the meeting recess at 8:50 p.m. Karen seconded. No one was opposed.

The meeting resumed at 9:10 a.m. on Sunday.

At 9:14 a.m. the chair requested that the Board enter an Executive Session to discuss the use of Dave Thomas' "Autopass Evaluator" at the CanAm Classic.

The board exited Executive Session at 10:02 am.

At 10:04 a.m Dana motioned to adjourn the meeting. Dave seconded.