

NAFA® Board of Directors Meeting, May 2, 2015, Houston TX - Agenda:

Present were: Board of Directors

Kim Davis,
Dirk Elber,
Neil Flood,
Sam Ford,
Leerie Jenkins,
Karen Oleson,
Dale Smith,
Dave Walt

Leerie opened the meeting at 8:30 AM EST.

Lee Heighton and John Hendriks were unable to attend.

Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments:

Leerie welcomed and thanked everyone for coming; and thanked Sam Ford and Kim Davis for hosting us. He welcomed Neil Flood to his first board meeting and thanked him in advance for his service.

Due to a last minute work emergency, Lee was unable to make our meeting and sends his regrets.

Yesterday we had an informal meeting to begin the process of planning our next generation of EJS. Thanks Dave Thomas for coming to help and advise us on that.

Executive Director's Comments:

Treasurer's Report:

Cash on hand is \$156,000; \$24,705 of which are in Canadian funds. Day-to-day operations issues, include checks sent to Canadian bank take a month to deposit.

Secretary's Report: January AGM and board meeting minutes were approved on March 17, 2015.

Standing Committee Reports

Judges Committee:

- EJS instructions and video updates: Dave suggested adding a script concerning battery replacements as well as placement of poles. Leerie mentioned adding graphics of pole positions, etc. Neil asked how to get out new revisions of the videos for all to see, as well as how to alert regional directors. Lee will be contacted to alert the regional directors.

- Alaska judges: There are two novice judges there. They traveled down to California to get additional assignments. The judges committee is suggesting exceptions: Allow them 18 months to get additional assignments. The second would allow them to do two assignments in one weekend with two supervising judges; one Saturday, one Sunday. Dale motioned to accept the recommendations. Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

Karen asked if CanAm Fridays could function for judging assignments. Discussion followed but nothing was determined.

- Lyndsy King, Omaha NE – Apprentice to Provisional. Judges committee is recommending that she be promoted. Dale motioned to accept the committee's recommendation. Dave seconded. Motion carried.
- Kyle Gilson, Opal MB – Apprentice to Provisional. Judges committee is recommending that he be promoted. Karen motioned to accept the committee's recommendation. Dave seconded. Motion carried.
- Nancy Denier, Estacada OR – Apprentice to Provisional. Judges committee is recommending that she be promoted. Dave motioned to accept the committee's recommendation. Sam seconded. Motion carried.

Meeting paused at 9:30 AM

Meeting back at 10:45 AM

Rules Committee:

From Amy Vanderryn <avanderryn@gmail.com>.

Proposed Rule Modification:

I wanted to propose a thought about a change in the way that penalties are issued for double listing dogs in the same class of competition. I realize that this rule has been brought up for discussion numerous times and much thought has been put into it but hopefully this is a new approach and will be considered or perhaps some similar version. After some discussions with you tonight, I am going to propose this with 2 different possibilities

1) Leave the rule alone for the regular and multibreed classes. The rule was originally put in place when these were the only classes of racing and was basically grandfathered in for open. The proposal is that open should have a separate rule since it was a class that came after the rule and a class that is used widely throughout NAFA. Open does not have any regional or overall championships involved nor any records set or recorded and I believe those were the original reasons that people were double rostering in the same class. For open, have the penalty be the loss of tournament placement for both/however many teams involved and a loss of points for the dog(s) that were double listed in the same class of racing.

The precedence has been set for the retention of points at the same time as removing tournament placing in the break out rules. So this would be an application of what is already in place but for a different violation. The addition of removing points of the 'offending' dog(s) removes the incentive of anyone who is point seeking and wants to roster his/her dog on multiple teams (outside of what is allowed). This way though, the other

dogs/handlers on the open team don't incur the point penalty.

The reason that we proposed this solution is that we felt that the captain of a club should know and be responsible for the rostering within his/her club and be able to adhere to the rule as it stands. However, open teams are often formed as they were intended with multiple dogs from other clubs and it is nearly impossible to insure that none of those dogs are rostered on another open team.

The captain can ask the dog handler, the other captain, etc.. but barring physically checking all C2s prior to the start of their own division (which could be partway through the day and they could be managing/racing other teams when a change is made to the C2 after the start of racing), there is no way to make sure that the violation doesn't occur unknown to the captain of the open team. We don't feel that it's fair to incur the harsh penalty as it stands when a team was formed in good faith and with the normal expected checks and a violation still occurs.

2) If the rules committee feels that it is not fair to treat open differently as you indicated might be the case, then in my opinion, in reality, this same proposal could be applied across all 3 classes. If the historic issue was related to trying to find out which is the fastest team and scrapping the slower team in order to win championships or create records, then applying the rule to all classes still should prevent that issue. If tournament placing is taken from any team that has a dog on it that is rostered more than once in the same class of racing, then that removes the incentive to do it. And if points are removed from the offending dog(s) then that also prevents those that are trying to increase point accumulation by rostering a dog multiple times (beyond what is already allowed). It is still a harsh penalty but not every dog/handler loses all points accumulated over a tournament.

At the time this rule was originally written, the break out rule with removing tournament placing was not in place or perhaps it would have been applied with something similar to what I've proposed above.

In discussing this with a few people, one stated to me that perhaps something similar could be applied when a team brings out the wrong dog(s) for a race accidentally - in other words, that team would lose tournament placing and also points for that race, but would not lose all points for the entire weekend.

In all instances, the penalty is still significant, but it is not as harsh as those penalties that currently stand in the rules today.

Amy

Recommendation - The rules committee does not recommend a change.

From Neil Flood:

1. A change to the max heat rule (section 6.3, (b) (v)), as it only applies to the CanAm Class. The revision I would like to discuss is to remove the limitation in cases where one of the races ends in a tie, and the other 4 are completed/won by at least one team (i.e. there were no double "no finish" races). In this scenario I would propose running a 6th heat. Under the current formats of the CanAm class this would have no impact on the "max 35 heats" rule. I feel, in an elimination style event, having a race end with each team winning twice and the other ending in a tie doesn't look good. The tiebreaker would quite typically be fastest time in that race, however the "slower" team may have been holding for 2 of it's wins. There are infinite scenarios that could determine why one team was slower in it's wins. In the event there was a double no-finish, you could look to a tie breaking scenario and limit it to 5 heats. In this scenario, at least both teams had the chance to win that no-finish race and opted not

to. Otherwise I would like to see a team forced to earn that 3rd win.

2. Change the world record policy that currently excludes races in the CanAm class from qualifying for consideration. Currently the CanAm Class conforms to all the same rules and regulations of its associated “normal” class, meaning that CanAm Regular has the same restrictions as normal Regular and the same holds true with CanAm Multibreed and normal Multibreed. The jump height rules are the same and the club membership rules are the same (87 day rule), etc. The major difference is that teams must qualify to be “invited” into the CanAm Class. The notion of having an invitational class (which is truly a qualifying event more than an invite) shouldn’t impact if a team’s time would deem it world record worthy or not. The ability to qualify or be invited, is open to any club in NAFA within good standing. I would like to propose a few items:

- a. The creation of the CanAm Regular World Record
- b. The creation of the CanAm Multibreed World Record
- c. Any world record set in the above two class, that also is faster than the normal Regular or Multibreed record, would then be acknowledged as that world record for that class as well. This would compare to the concept of Olympic and World Records.

This may involve a change to Rule Section 6.2 and how we official document the CanAm Class, but I think it merits discussion and consideration.

3. Establish minimum acceptable quality of video that is submitted for world record consideration. In my review of a lot video, it has become apparent that being able to determine a valid pass, or if a dog holds a ball, can be affected greatly by the quality of the video taken. As an example, I reviewed video taken on a new iPhone 6, taken at 720p 240 fps (frames per second). The video is excellent, and you can clearly establish when a ball is dropped and also view passes in a such a way as to question if we have enough beams setup – my point is it’s exception. Taking the same video and moving it to an iPhone 5, that is only capable of processing 60 fps (ie 180 fps less), you notice that while each individual frame is clear, but the time between two frames on a dog running 3.8 seconds is over a foot of distance. That is a significant amount of distance when you want to analyze a video for world record. If we are going to make a requirement that a team must video tape the race, which I agree with, we should probably ensure the video is of sufficient quality that it is meaningful. Under the current rules it would actually be in the best interest of the team recording their world record run to use low quality video as the speed of the dogs make detecting any infractions almost impossible. They simply run too fast. Again, I would be glad to demonstrate the differences in video quality at our in person meeting in May.

Recommendation - #1 will be deferred to Lee to address. #2 will be deferred to the rules committee to come up with a document that captures the CanAm rules and send to Lee for review. #3 will be deferred to the rules committee to adjust wording for 7.2D.

From: Emma Mak <emmalmak@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dave/Leerie,

Please see Annie's question below about the 87-day waiting rule for two dogs that last ran performance with their own club.

From rulebook: (a) If a dog has earned points with a NAFA® club in a NAFA® sanctioned tournament, the dog may not be listed on a time sheet for any other class other than the Veterans or Open Class with a different NAFA® club for a period of 87 days. The 87 day wait period shall begin the day after the end date of the last day of a tournament in which the dog earned NAFA® points.

It says nothing about performance. So a dog that is running on its own club, but running performance still must

start the count for the 87 days from the end date of that tournament?

If that's the case, it's going to be difficult to enforce this rule with the scoring software that updates the db. Right now I determine the last time the dog ran on a multi or reg team that wasn't performance and that tournament's end date is used for the 87-day waiting rule. It's going to be tricky to distinguish between dogs that ran performance on their own club, vs. those that ran performance on another's club.

Emma Mak
NAFA Election Committee
NAFA Technology Committee

To: emmalmak@hotmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Performance Team
From: alynnta@aol.com
Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2015 11:03:32 -0500

Hi Emma- I have a weird situation I want to clarify. I want to make sure that I tell her correctly.

Mindy has formed a new team and has moved some of her dogs over already.

However, they last ran on a performance team that was listed as her old team High Desert Sundogs. So... since it was the home team of some of these dogs

- Duke for example

061035 – that still counts as regular racing for him and so that date 2-1-15 is what you would enter into the 87 day calculator right?

It is the same situation for Ellie- 110358

Moose- Last ran regular with his home team Westside Woofers on 8/31/2014 and was ran open since then until running on performance team 2/1/15 which was not his home team.

Kaycee – last ran regular with Westside Woofers in June then ran open until running on this performance team on 2-1-15.

Also not her home team.

So the way I see it – Moose and Kaycee are clear to run anywhere at this time.

But Duke and Ellie start there 87 day wait from 2-1-15 so they can't run until April 30th. does this make sense?

Annie
Andrea L. "Annie" Taylor
North American Flyball Association, Inc. (R) Awards and Scoring

- Recommendation from the Rules committee – Section 7.5 (c) (v) Club Affiliation. A dog's club affiliation is not affected by reason of running on a performance team.**

Question on GoPro cameras and recommendations for usage.

Recommendation –Up to the judge's discretion whether the usage is safe.

Nominating Committee: N/A

Election Committee: N/A

Marketing Committee:

- JR Participant pin design/contest – specifics still to be decided.
- CanAm shirt logo design/contest – specifics still to be decided.
- Tournament checklist update – Note that insurance not needed in Canada.
- Sponsorships for Flyball with larger pet-related companies?

Finance:

- 990 information has been sent to the accounting firm and an extension filed in February
- The Finance Committee reviews monthly reports consisting of
 - Working Balances of all bank accounts
 - Balance of American Express account
 - Bills received and due in the next 30 days
 - Accounts Receivable
- UPS Bills are reviewed for Shipping Charge 'Corrections' and unnecessary corrections are disputed as time allows.

| Leerie asks to enter Executive Session at 1:45 pm.

|
Exited Executive Session at 2:30 pm.

The board reviewed finances.

Disciplinary Committee:

- Dolly 120046 – The committee received a request to expunge an excusal for Dolly. The Disciplinary committee unanimously recommended the excusal be expunged. Dirk motioned to accept the committee's recommendation. Karen seconded. Motion carried.

Review Panel:

- Cash 140545 – 04/25/2015 – 2nd excusal
- Nitsa 140732 – 04/04/2015
- Addie 080713 – 03/14/2015

- Emma 041057 – 03/01/2015 – 2nd appeal
- Cash 140545 – 01/30/2015
- Mistie 091066 – 01/18/2015
- Bear 130903 – 01/17/2015
- Velvet 150149 – 01/17/2015
- Rugby 130100 – 01/03/2015
- Penny 130757 – 12/07/2014 – upheld on appeal
- Darby 100623 – 09/07/2014 – upheld on appeal

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
Gimli, 040608	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	11/17/2008
Junior, 000165	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	07/13/2002
Tucker, 960374	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	06/24/1996
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

Special Committee Reports

Technology Committee:

Had the first discussion toward the next gen EJS.

NAFA/Flyball History Committee:

N/A

CanAm Steering Committee:

N/A

Old Business:

New Business:

●—Iron Dog Award —

---- Sally Hull <[sally@...](#)> wrote:

To Whom it May Concern;

I have been speaking to quite a few people regarding the inability for us to receive the Iron Dog award for our dogs that have been unable to run for one reason or another during their lifetime, whether due to injury or in my case I was building a club from the ground up, with brand new people and dogs that had never run flyball. My dog, Frodo, was my very first Border Collie (I now run a Border Collie rescue and have my own flyball club). We have been running together for 12 years. This Sunday, on my birthday, I am retiring him. He still loves the game, and he is still in excellent shape as per my veterinarian, but it is time. He never made his

Many people have said they too, are very disappointed that their dogs were unable to receive the Iron Dog Award for their dogs due to be out for rehab etc.

Everyone I have spoken to agrees the "ten consecutive years" rule is unfair.

I understand this was put in place to stop people from running dogs who are incapable of running just to get a title. Most people would not do such a thing, and the judges I know would not allow a dog to run if they saw the dog struggling. I honestly don't think this award is any different from any others this regard. I am asking that you would please reconsider this ruling, and allow dogs like my Frodo to receive the Iron Dog Award.

It would mean the world to me for Frodo to receive this.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely;

Sally Hull - Warp Factor Flyball Club

- Dave motioned to not change the existing qualifications for the Iron Dog award. Neil seconded. Motion carried.

Sam motioned to adjourn. Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned 4:22 pm.