

Minutes

NAFA® Board of Directors Meeting - January 25, 2019 – 8:30 AM

Best Western Plus - Portland Airport Hotel 11938 NE Airport Way Portland, OR 97220

Steve Corona called the meeting to order at 8:30am PST

In Attendance:

Steve Corona
Kim Davis
Dirk Elber
Dana Hanson
John Hendriks
Leerie Jenkins
Emma Mak
Lynda Mantler
Aaron Robbins

Neil Flood was unable to attend the meeting in person and joined the meeting via telephone.

Karen Oleson was in attendance as a guest.

Officers' Reports

Chairman's Comments:

8:30 PST Meeting called to order

Steve thanked all for taking time out of their schedules to attend the meeting.

AGM tomorrow at the tourney.

Executive Director 's Comments:

- Height Dog Measuring Update

Curtis Smith has offered to analyze data collected at CanAm which utilized a measuring device developed and used in Europe by Federation Cynologique Internationale (FCI)

The data shows we acquired a representative sample of data finding there is some correlation between the measurements and jump height.

There was discussion between Aaron and Leerie regarding why we would change this, Leerie states there is not enough correlation between ulna length and withers height, however, admits that the measuring process is less stressful on the dog.

The question was raised regarding the ulna measurement being viable option for measuring. (Lynda – Y Leerie – N Dana – Not sure that it's within the tolerances we want to see. Emma - would find the measuring method acceptable if dogs are dropping in jump height, but not if their jump heights change by much more than an inch. We can look at breeds to see how that worked into the data.)

A straw poll showed the board was in favor of continuing data examination and pursuing the possibility of using the ulna as a measure to determine jump height.

Emma expressed interest in gathering more data and determining if the data was repeatable (if the dog would measure the same length twice.

After using the device at CanAm some suggestions on re-engineering the device were brought forward.

- Online Entries

Neil received an email from Julie Tune requesting NAFA pursue the ability to enter events electronically.

The board did not object to getting a quote from STDIN (Emma/Gord) for a cost and time estimate.

Emma says it shouldn't be too big of a job, likely a matter of modifying what the sanctioning secretary (Karen) currently uses

World Cup Selection – Neil asked for assistance in creating a form for World Cup selection Neil has the criteria and needs help getting it into a form.

Dana and Aaron offered to help create the form. Emma suggested the possibility of using a Google form.

Neil is in the process of obtaining appropriate shippable cases for the Multi and Regular trophies. The current cases are not appropriate for shipping.

- Donation of EJS system to Polish Flyball Association

Neil updated board on issue in Poland, NAFA received an email from Poland asking to whom the set of lights sent to Poland in 2013 were sold or given. NAFA has been asked if the lights were sold or given to an association or a set of individuals. There is a board member of the flyball association in Poland renting the lights out for events. Dana was unable to find any indication that NAFA paid for the lights to be sent to Poland nor did he find any indication that NAFA was paid for these lights.

The board discussed this and felt that NAFA should not be involved in the affairs of the flyball organization in Poland understanding that competitors in Poland would like the light rental to be affordable. The board revisited information from the June 1 2013 board meeting when it was decided to send the said lights to Poland.

From the June 1, 2013 board meeting

<<NAFA owns two sets of Hughes lights. The future Poland flyball association only has one lane of WatchDog lights. They would like to hold a tournament with NAFA rules and Lee asked the board if we would donate the Hughes sets to them. Sam made the motion to donate the two Hughes to the future Polish Flyball association/entity. Karen seconded. Discussion included who Poland might compete with as well as the possibility of a European championship with other countries. No one was opposed. Motion carried.>>

It is the board's belief that the 2013 board's intent was to donate EJS to the future Poland flyball association and they were donated to promote the sport of flyball in Poland, however no restrictions were placed on their use. Steve will reply with a recap of the 2013 meeting minutes.

Treasurer's Report:

Profit/Loss- Dana noted an increase in tournament fees in 2018 which coincides with an increase in entries confirmed by Emma. There was a 5% increase in tournament fee revenue (excluding CanAm). Participation awards were down slightly, however, there is a lag in reporting due to timing of awards. Shipping costs are up 50% so Dana will do a more detailed analysis. There was an increase in travel due in part to increased board member attendance at in-person meetings and delegate airfare to the Open Cup.

EJS rental cost is up \$1251. This cost relates to rental fees paid for EJS when they are owned by an individual and there were a few more events in those areas where individuals own an EJS.

More bank fees are being recorded and have caused reporting to increase by \$1000.

Dana would like to do more detailed analysis and will report back on tournament, shipping, and banking fees.

Steve took the board into executive session at 11:05am.

Steve took the board out of executive session at 11:09am

Dana sent a CanAm spreadsheet to board members.

The \$12000 livestream cost was questioned and it was confirmed that the number is doubled in the report. Some of the numbers will be reclassified and the difference in loss is about the same as the increase in livestream cost (prior to correction). Dana confirmed that the vendor bucks distributed for data collection (measuring) have been accounted for correctly and were not included in the CanAm report.

Secretary's Report:

Kim reports no outstanding information between August and January. August meeting minutes were posted.

Election Committee:

- Election results

Emma provided MVP and Clyde Moore HOF results to the board. The board ratified the results. Dirk moved to ratify the election results, John 2nd. The motion passed with no opposition.

Steve took the board into executive session at 9:41am.

Steve took the board out of executive session at 9:54am.

The board elected the executive committee for the new board and ratified election results.

The board recessed for a break at 9:50am.

The board reconvened at 10:20am.

Standing Committee Reports

Judges Committee: Leerie

- Jeremiah Bolton - Hubert NC - New Novice
Leerie reports that Jeremiah Bolton is a new novice judge.
- Paula Johnson - Hamilton ON - New Novice
Leerie reports that Paula Johnson is a new novice judge.
- Steve Miller - Monroe WA - Apprentice to Provisional
The judges committee unanimously recommends the advancement of Steve Miller from Apprentice to Provisional.
Dirk moves to advance Steve from Apprentice to Provisional, Lynda 2nd.
Motion carried with no opposition.
- Josh Watson - Barrie ON - Supervising Application
The judges committee unanimously recommends advancing Josh Watson to Supervising judge. Dirk moved to advance Josh to Supervising Judge, Aaron 2nd.
Motion carries.
- Matt Goodyear - Pickering ON - Supervising Application
The judges committee does not recommend Matt for advancement and encourages Matt to develop supervising skills and consider reapplying in the future.
- Peter Wesdyk - McLean SK - Supervising Application
The judges committee unanimously recommends Peter Wesdyk for advancement to Supervising Judge.
Kim moves to accept the judges committee recommendation, Lynda 2nd. No opposition
- Mary McElligott, Fairport NY - Apprentice to Provisional
The judges committee unanimously recommends the advancement of Mary McElligott from Apprentice to Provisional.
Dirk moves to advance Mary from Apprentice to Provisional, Lynda 2nd.
Motion carried with no opposition.

The board recessed for at 10:48am.

The board reconvened at 10:56am.

Rules Committee:

1. Are 'splash balls' legal?

Initially this was raised by judges in Region 20. The rules committee was sent pictures and videos of the balls and agreed that they did not meet Section 1.2 requirement that the balls be round. They bounce and roll, but appear to be more cylindrical in shape. The balls in question were used splash balls.

Subsequently there was discussion on Facebook about whether this was a ban on splash balls. In that post, there were comments about age, size and brand of balls affecting whether they could be considered 'round' and perhaps if competitors would watch for degrading condition of the balls and didn't use them once they lost their round shape, it would be okay.

This issue was re-opened with the RC. NAFA Judge, Tim McElligott, brought some of these splash balls (new and slightly used) to CanAm and the RC's conclusion was that, even when new, they do not meet the requirements for round ball. Some of the RC did not see them as 'round' and some didn't see them even as an actual 'ball'.

RC Recommendation:

Most felt a wording change was not needed, that current wording regarding requirements for balls would suffice, and that this was more of an education issue. Leerie offered to post something to the judges' list after the coming board meeting, informing NAFA judges that the RC/board determined that these sorts of toys do not meet the requirements of Section 1.2 of the rule book. The wording will be put together by Emma and approved by the Rules Committee and the BOD.

At the request of the board, the Rules Committee has done an investigation into examined 'splash balls' as judges have questioned their suitability in reference to Section 1.2 of the rulebook multiple times twice in the past couple of years. 'Splash Balls' is a brand name, but the Rules Committee and Board of Directors extends the conclusion to include any similar type of pool toy made of foam and covered in fabric. For the investigation, the committee looked at used, lightly used and unused (new) ones, and acquired slightly used and brand new splash balls.

Originally tennis balls were the only type of ball permitted. This was later expanded to include other types of round balls to allow for the size, safety and comfort of the dogs. The requirements for balls are detailed in Section 1.2. Because of the nature of their construction, splash balls do not fit the requirement of being round balls, even when brand new. As well, even after slight use, they degrade considerably into being almost cylindrical in shape. The conclusion of the Rules Committee and the Board of Directors is that splash balls do not fit the requirements of the rule book and should not be used.

John motioned to accept the rules committee recommendation. Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

2. Proposal for bonus points for 2nd and 3rd place from Jayne McQuillen: "I wanted to throw out an idea that is still in keeping with trying to make Regular more competitive but making it less do or die to get first place. Why not give 20% 15% & 10% extra points for 1st 2nd & 3rd placements. Then all the emphasis isn't on only 1st place finishes."

RC Recommendation:

There was discussion around possibly awarding both first and second place, rather than making these points more like participation rewards by awarding third place as well. As of October 1st, 2018, points (20% bonus) are being given for first place only. The thought is that these points will increase participation in Regular class which will allow for closer seeding and fairer competition within Regular divisions for first place. Rules Committee recommends keeping this item open in the committee's agenda and we can re-visit later in the year.

Discussion:

Neil requested this item be placed on the May agenda to see if participation in the regular class has changed. In general, board members expressed their desire to wait until next year to revisit the item. One comment was that it wouldn't hurt anything because it is only points. There was a suggestion to revisit this in August.

Leerie motioned to accept the rules recommendation. Kim seconded. Motion carried.

3. Proposal to lower requirement for qualification for Regional Points for Multibreed classes from four teams to three – suggestion from RD meeting at CanAm

RC Recommendation:

The RC was split on whether this would increase MB entries. There was discussion about whether making certain MB requirements laxer would be a better idea. The majority felt that what was proposed was an easy change, that would make regional championship participation easier, which is one of the reason people have for participating in the MB class.

There was discussion suggesting there aren't enough breed dogs to participate and that is what has caused the decline in Multibreed racing. Neil sees no harm in lowering the number of teams required for a Multibreed class to count for regional points. There were differing views about the effect the Open class has had on Multibreed entries. One comment stated if you can develop the interest level, you can't do any harm. Maybe it will draw more entries by creating interest in Multibreed and foster some resurgence of interest. New wording is required for this change.

Section 8.4 – Regional Champions

(v) Classes must meet all of the following criteria to qualify for points and/or tiebreaking times to count toward regional championships:

- (1) Have a minimum of four teams competing for Regular Class;
- (3) Have a minimum of three teams competing for Multibreed Class;
- (4) Include all clubs at the conclusion of the automated draw;
- (5) Regular classes limited to fewer than 20 teams shall include all teams at the conclusion of the automated draw;
- (6) Multibreed classes limited to fewer than 12 teams shall include all teams at the conclusion of the automated draw.

Leerie moved to accept the recommendation of the majority of the rules committee and the suggested change in wording, Kim 2nd. Motion carried with no opposition.

4. Proposal for change to aggressive dog rules by Paulette Suiter

“Proposal to amend the aggressive dog sections of the rules.

The rules are there to protect all the dogs and I understand that. NAFA does not distinguish between a green dog trying to learn nor levels of aggressive behavior. A dog that bites and injures another dog gets the same aggressive write-up that a dog chasing another dog gets. I understand no aggressive behavior is tolerated. It seems that if we want to be able to continue to attract dogs and handlers to the sport of flyball that we should consider ways to allow them to ease into the competitions (lots of ideas for this). Dogs, esp. green ones are not perfect. Other dog sports are on the rise, but at least in our area, there are fewer and fewer flyball tournaments each year and it seems fewer and fewer teams that are sponsoring them. The punishment for aggressive behavior is a three-year mark on the record for aggression and one more infraction in their life will eliminate them from the flyball forever. So, one infraction no matter how small looms over the owner's head and you have to ask yourself when will they be ready to take a chance that will end their career in flyball. Also, a dog that has two write-ups for aggression has the right to request reinstatement after one year. The dog that has one offense can only request it be removed after 3 years. That does not make sense that two offenses can have reinstatement sooner than one offense. One offense stays on the record permanently unless requested to have it lifted. And that all aggressive offenses are equal.

It seems that there should be levels of punishment instead of treating all dogs the same that show any sort of chasing or crossing over behavior and more serious aggressive behavior that results in injury. I have seen dogs cross over repeatedly and not get written up.

Please consider a change in the rules as it relates to this area to consider that dogs that look like they are aggressive, may not necessarily be so, or in other words levels of aggression should be considered. Please consider adding levels of aggressive behavior that would carry punishment befitting the level of aggression:

Level 1 might be a cross over with no specific altercation (verbal warning; 2nd offense in same day-suspension for just the day of tournament-verbal) (consideration for green dogs- verbal not ready to race for the day)

Level 2 might be cross over and interaction with a dog that results in no injury (verbal warning ; 2nd offense- suspension for just the day of tournament-verbal) (request that dog not run in heat that includes the dog that came in contact) (consideration for green dogs- verbal not ready to race for the day)

Level 3 might be cross over and interaction with dog that results in minor injury but the dog called off: did not have to be pulled away. (suspension for 3 weeks-3 months) (possibly 3 weeks with no previous level 3 offenses; graduating to more for previous offenses). (Minor injury might be a bite or scrape or cut no needing stitches)

Level 4 might be cross over and interaction with dog that results in minor injury but dog did not call off and dogs had to be forcibly pulled apart. (suspension for 1-6 months) (possibly 1 month with no previous level 4 offenses; more for previous offenses)

Level 5 might be aggressive behavior that resulted in medium to major injury. (3 months to 3-year suspension depending on the serious nature of the injury) (2 offenses would be permanent suspension with reinstatement procedures as current.

Currently NAFA rules gives judges no options but to write-up every behavior that seems aggressive. This would help define the difference in dangerous behavior by dogs and dogs doing stupid dog things and what the punishment should be for graduating levels of aggressive behavior.

RC Recommendation:

The RC will clarify the punishment and appeal process for Paulette.

There is no write-up for 'aggression' only for 'undue aggression' (Section 8.4 – Aggressive Dogs). 'Undue aggression' without perceived contact is extremely rare. A green dog that crosses multiple times shouldn't necessarily be excused for undue aggression, that is generally where 'not ready to race' is used. This determination is a subjective call made by judges and RDs.

C12s are reviewed by the disciplinary committee (made up the Chair of the board, the ED, Chair of judges committee), to decide if the dog's action warranted a write-up. This includes a determination of whether the C12 is reasonable and complete, and because all C12s are reviewed by the same group, at this time a comparison can be made across the continent with similar cases so that there is a level of consistency. If it doesn't sound like undue aggression, the judge/RD is contacted and asked further about it. Occasionally "undue aggression" has been modified to "not ready to race" on the C.12.

The disciplinary committee reviews all C.12s and would bring it up with the board if there was an issue with consistency. Some RC members are open to trying to clarify aggression with and without contact, however most seemed to want to leave it up to NAFA's judges and RDs to make the call. Rules Committee's recommendation is for no change to rule book.

Leerie motioned to accept the recommendation of the rules committee. Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

5. Clarification of Ineligible dog wording in rule book – Karen Oleson

- For the 2019 Rule Book, wording was changed in Section 7.6 Penalties for Ineligible Dogs Running to lessen the penalties

- Section 7.5 Changing Clubs needs to have penalty wording removed as it currently conflicts with the changes to above

Leerie moved to accept the recommendation of the rules committee, Aaron 2nd. The motion carried with no opposition.

6. Clarification of jump height requirement for Veterans class – Colleen Morita

- current rule book states "In a veteran's class, jump heights shall be set at the minimum height stated in paragraph 8.2(a) without regard to height.". Is it really the intention that clubs not be able to take into consideration striding, etc. and set their jumps slightly higher?

RC Recommendation:

Since the wording in the rule book includes the word "shall", it currently states that 7" jumps are mandatory. A board member mentioned that there is no real competitive advantage and no penalty for jumping higher. The rules committee recommends that the wording be changed to similar wording used for jump heights for the Open class.

(f)(ii) Jump Heights. In the Veterans Class, jump heights shall be set at any height not below the minimum and not exceeding the maximum height stated in Section 8.2(s) of the Rules of Racing

Leerie moved to accept the rules committee recommendation and wording, Dirk 2nd.
The motion carried with no opposition.

Competitors and judges are reminded that judges have the discretion to remove a dog from racing for safety of the dog.

7. Newbie class proposal from Karen Green, Bay Racers

"Rationale for this proposal:

- It's difficult to provide 'tournament-like experience' to dogs in any other environment. We do as much as we can to expose dogs to other environments besides our practice field. We hold group practices with other clubs at our field or theirs and we participate in numerous demos. However, none of these have the sustained energy over 2 days that a tournament does.
- For a small club, it can be difficult to have enough people to manage warmups effectively for new dogs/handlers when all our experience handlers are racing dogs on that team.
- I believe the existence of entry level opportunities in UFLI and other dog sports has led to a decline in NAFA participation (at least in Region 16). I have personally heard from dog sport participants that started 'competing' in the other organization because there was a chance for their newbie dog to be in the ring for preflight/single/doubles and they naturally transitioned to 4 dog racing and stay with UFLI tournaments since that's where they have more points.
- It is difficult to keep new handlers interested and engaged in flyball and attending tournaments, if their dog is too new to race and there's no space for a warmup dog in a lineup.
- A 'newbie' division would provide another revenue source for host clubs at a time when tourney entries are down in N. California and hosting costs are increasing. Many host clubs are barely breaking even.

Proposed 'Newbie' Class rules:

- The 'newbie' class will consist of warmup time only for the teams in this class.
- Race schedule - the host club will list the number of warmup 'races' and time allotted per 'race' when posting the tournament or rules could dictate the number of 'races' and time. (Rationale - recommend ~5 minutes/race, ~4 races/day but not sure the rules need to state a minimum or maximum. Prefer host teams price the division in alignment with the warmup time provided)
- "Newbie" teams will be assigned races/lanes on the Race Schedule, with another newbie team in the other lane.
- One to six dogs will be listed on the time sheet for a "Newbie" team, with a maximum of four dogs participating in a warmup 'race' period.
- Warmup activity is at the discretion of each team. They may arranged for head to head racing during the allotted time if desired, or work independently from each other.
- A dog listed on the time sheet for "Newbie" Class must meet all NAFA rules for eligibility
- A dog that is listed on a time sheet for a team in the "Newbie" Class may be listed on the time sheet for one additional team in another class on the same day. (Rationale - this would allow a team to bring experienced dogs into the warmup time while still allowing the experienced dog to race on a real team. Would also allow a newbie dog to be listed as a backup on a regular racing team and if it demonstrates the ability to run during the 'newbie' class could be used in the racing lineup)
- A head judge must be present to observe during the warm-up period and shall stop the warmup for interference, fouling in the racing ring, too many dogs in the ring or undue aggression by dog or

competitor. The team with the infraction shall forfeit the rest of that race/warmup period, while the other team may continue.

- Line and box judges are not required.
- NAFA recording fees apply

Other considerations:

- There's no need to create separate divisions within the "Newbie" Class. Racing against opponents and right/left assignments should be balanced as much as possible, but not required to be round-robin where all teams race each other.
- Host clubs may limit the entries
- Chapter 7-Warmups and Sections 8.4-Aggression and 8.5-Condition apply as well as most other relevant rules for safety, etc."

RC Recommendation:

Some clubs in some regions offer 'Green Dog Racing', typically on the Friday night before a tournament. The host club is permitted to allow the use of the EJS, providing only two dogs run in succession. Some RC members wondered if the person suggesting this knew that this option was available, and whether this would solve the problem (Karen Green's response to this way, it is not feasible with the travel times to tournaments in her area). However, nobody was opposed to considering offering this as an optional class, as another means of providing an income boost to tournament hosts. The Rules Committee would like to get feedback from the rest of the board before delving further into considering this new class.

The board does not support creating a class at this time. Neil stated that for some small tournaments in Texas and Alaska, within the past year, he has been asked for, and granted, exceptions to allow mat time during racing days. The board referred the proposal back to the rules committee for further discussion and recommendation regarding green dog participation. There is not support for a new class and more flexibility to use the mats during breaks in the schedule can be explored. Board members felt that communication should go out regarding how to improve awareness of the option to use EJS outside of the racing day. The RD list and NAFA NEWS should send out a communication regarding ring use and EJS use during and outside of the racing day.

Finance:

Nothing further

Nominating Committee:

Nothing to report.

Marketing Committee:

Nothing to report.

Disciplinary Committee:

Wendell – CRN 120871 – Request to Expunge Aggression Excusal

Leerie reports the dog has met and exceeded the requirements to remove the excusal. The disciplinary committee recommends the excusal be expunged.

Leerie moved to accept the recommendation of the disciplinary committee, John 2nd. The motion carried with no opposition.

Disciplinary Committee Report:			Effective Date(s)
Cash, 140545	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	04/25/2015
Tommie, 100016	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	06/08/2014
Taj, 090259	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	05/04/2014
Tux, 100191	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	10/29/2013
Roxie, 051102	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	8/22/2011

Marion Brinkman	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Mike Mattos	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Janet Nelson Morris	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Dave Mueller	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Cheryl Mueller	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Jennifer Nelson	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely

Review Panel:

- Trixie – CRN 120437 - Aggression Excusal
Neil will reach out to Trixie's owner with information on how to appeal the excusal.
- Flirty – CRN 170754 – Aggression Excusal
- Blitz – CRN 180596 – Aggression Excusal
- Magic – CRN 160678 – Aggression Excusal
- Rogue – CRN 180535 – Aggression Excusal

Special Committee Reports

Progress of Light Tree Prototype

Expenses to date are around \$1K. Dave Thomas plans to submit for reimbursement soon. Prototype development activity is now done. Need go-ahead for the design before further costs are incurred.

Tested vertical version of Light Tree prototype at Fur Fun tournament. Functioned in parallel with, and exactly like the Farmtek Light Tree (except indications for both left and right displays are in single unit). No issues observed.

For horizontal – flag left and right indications will be on the left and right of the display. Win left and win right (green LED) will be center left and right.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gK5aEJ4GHvo>

Second pass hardware – fourteen bands rather than ten band display so will be more visible, several other improvements, will be used at DGF tournament at the end of this month.

Next steps for testing:

- operating time before battery charge required (dependent on judge and head table) –
- Dave will write code to keep stats for each state (start sequence, fault indication, etc. to figure out battery duration) two tournaments of use to get this data
- Range testing should be done – comparison side by side – likely not an issue

Likeliest fail points:

- connectors, micro-SD card (programmed spare for less than \$10), batteries

Skills needed to build light trees if Dave is not available:

- placing components, soldering, reflow process (pcb manufacturer can do this but setup is \$300 to \$500), assembling the enclosure from the acrylic (Dave to supply step-by-step documentation)
- Dale has confidence that with PCB and assembly specs and some instructions on assembly these could be made without Dave, if needed

Next steps:

- perhaps shipping of prototype to other regions for feedback/buy-in, and/or providing pictures/video
- new tree isn't going to fit in same spot in case – need to consider shipping and storage for new tree – Dave may be able to help with this by making some modification

Cost Estimate for Production Light Trees

Overall around \$250 for a tree, plus batteries and charger, plus parts shipping costs:

Cost for central unit and cylindrical display is \$230 (not including shipping, which will vary by amounts ordered and is significant – could be as much as 20% for small quantities) includes:

- Raspberry Pi (\$40), radio module (\$30), voltage regulators (\$55), LED strips (\$45)

DeWalt brand fast charger is \$36 (overnight chargers are under \$5 – like the one used on Farmtek tree

Battery cost is estimated between \$30 to \$150

Laser cutting service – \$56 for two sets (not including shipping cost for material, material or return shipping)

Solder paste (enough for five in a production build) \$15

Dave is offering to build a few systems, but suggests we could offer them as kits with mailing envelope of enclosure parts, card assembly, fasteners, mailing tube for polycarb tubes. Kit builders could buy their own RPI, battery, charger, led strips to save money.

Battery strategy: we could ship batteries and chargers with tree, or club could be told in advance which style of tree they're getting and purchase batteries and charger.

Xemics radio modules

No longer in production – we should consider at least buying five (Dale suggested doubling this) – the ones used in the prototypes can be re-used if necessary. Will also be needed for the prototype for numeric display. If we move to next generation EJS we don't need radio modules but they are required for interface with Farmtek EJS. As long as we're going to use white poles, we need them. They are likely used in head table console as well.

Cost Estimate for Timer Display Prototype – using TV for display

Estimated cost \$150 (excluding TV for display). Dave is also going to provide estimate for thin, flat, lightweight display device (<1/2") using LED strips next week. Likely construction will be LED strips added to thin acrylic, fronted with thicker acrylic, any size we want.

Notes:

- same electronics as light tree prototype central unit ('EJS receiver') with some modifications
- one TV can plug directly with HDMI connector, virtually unlimited displays if use Wi-Fi
- TV display has enough space to allow for display of split times for the heat
- Heat counter could also be displayed between heats
- Same TVs could be used for APES – split times could be superimposed over pass images, but removed for the end of heat composite image
- using Wi-Fi laptops, tablets, smartphones can be used to display as well
- dumb TVs can be used with \$35/\$40 RPI per TV
- TV displays could only be used for indoor tournaments – some of the existing displays are only a few years old, perhaps these displays could be parked in California/AZ/NV
- Dave suggested clubs could choose to use TVs and perhaps their own EJS receiver(s) and NAFA could break out equipment rental + shipping costs. Charging separately for equipment shipping could be big cost saving for NAFA

The board thanks the technology committee and Dave Thomas for their diligence in working on this new prototype.

- Online Sanctioning Request from Julie Tune
Covered during the ED report.

Communications Committee:

Neil and Steve are aware this committee is underutilized. Timing is difficult with the need to get some information out very quickly leaving little time for the committee to draft wording. Emma suggested making the committee smaller to encourage initiative on the committee.

CanAm Steering Committee:

Nothing to report at this time.

Old Business:

Breed Category:

Submitted by Tuggie Arnold

Request to add Miniature American Shepherd

Her dog Scout is listed as a Mini Aussie / North American Shepherd. Tuggie looked through the NAFA list of breeds and found numerous cases where the same breed is divided into categories. Tuggie asserts that The Miniature American Shepherd is not a category of anything. It is an AKC distinct breed.

Karen reviewed emails going back since 2012 and it looks like four breed names identify the same dog.

Miniature American Shepherd
Miniature Australian Shepherd
North American Shepherd
Toy Australian Shepherd.

Currently recognized by NAFA as "Mini Australian/North American/Mini Am Shepherd"

Emma proposed Miniature American/Australian Shepherd

Steve reiterated Tuggie's request to add Miniature American Shepherd as a singularly recognized breed in the NAFA database.

There was no support for this addition.

The board will not create a separate breed designation for dogs known by different names in multiple registries.

Leerie moved to change the Mini Australian/North American/Mini Am Shepherd to "Miniature American/Australian Shepherd", John 2nd.

Motion carried with no opposition.

New Business:

Steve took the board into executive session at 3:15pm.

Steve took the board out of executive session at 3:50pm

The board discussed the disciplinary process.

Other new business – No other new business was presented

Steve took time to personally thank Kim for her service to the board as a board member and Secretary for the past six years.

Steve recessed the meeting.

Steve reconvened the meeting at 5:30pm

New Business:

NAFA and Regional Champions

Steve announced the 2018 NAFA Champions.
 NAFA Champions – Regular Spring Loaded, Multibreed Fur Fun
 Regional Championships Results –

2018 NAFA Regional Champions		
	Regular	Multibreed
Region 1	Fur In A Blur (681)	-
Region 2	Spring Loaded (490)	Spring Loaded (490)
Region 3	Animal Inn (2)	-
Region 4	Canine Dirt Diggers (85)	-
Region 5	Lone Star Ruffnecks (406)	Texas Twisters (642)
Region 6	Crazy Train (757)	Crazy Train (757)
Region 7	Run Free (801)	Jet City Jumpers (219)
Region 8	Holeshot Racers (734)	-
Region 9	Fur Fun (171)	Fur Fun (171)
Region 10	Prepare for Takeoff (717)	-
Region 11	Celtic Mayhem (1025)	Barkaholics (883)
Region 12	Northern Power Paws (475)	-
Region 13	2 Fast Fur U (763)	2 Fast Fur U (763)
Region 14	Chattanooga Chomp (634)	Dixie Flyers (906)
Region 15	Blue Ridge Blast (898)	Happily Evfur After (797)
Region 16	Bay Racers (481)	Pacific Pups (904)
Region 18	Alaska Dogs Gone Wild (695)	-
Region 19	Agents of Chaos (842)	-
Region 20	Muscle Memory (1019)	-
Region 21	Omaha Speedracers (299)	Omaha Speedracers (299)

Two clubs on the list were checked for their current standing in NAFA.

John moves to ratify the 2018 NAFA and Regional champions (excluding R21). Leerie 2nd. Motion carries.

Kim moves to recess the meeting, Kim, Aaron 2nd. No opposition. The board recessed at 5:48pm