Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

Present were: Executive Director Lee Heighton

Board of Directors Nancy Garcia,

Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, Greg Stopay

Chairman Leerie Jenkins called the meeting to order at 9:13 AM EDT. Scott Stein was absent due to work commitments. Dale Smith was absent due to a prior engagement that he knew of at the time the meeting was set.

Guest Kim Davis.

### Officers' Reports

#### Chair's Comments:

Leerie Jenkins welcomed everyone to the meeting and welcomed our guest, Kim Davis. He conveyed how much he's enjoyed working with everyone. He stated he is proud of everything the Board has accomplished so far.

Leerie asked that the Board enter Executive Session.

The Board entered Executive Session at 9:14 a.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 9:47 a.m.

### **Executive Director's Comments:**

Lee Heighton gave the following reports:

#### Signature Gear

Lee has directly contacted the manufacturer of the EJS components, FarmTek. He learned that nearly all of the EJS parts were obtained from FarmTek, except for two components – the metal base for the two poles and the interior portion of the cases that hold the tree. FarmTek welcomes a direct relationship with NAFA.

Lee relayed that due customer service problems with Signature Gear, which has increased shipping costs, we will be dealing with FarmTek directly.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

Lee said that a company in California makes the cases for the trees, but it requires a custom die. The original die was purchased by Signature Gear. The cost for us to purchase a custom die would be \$1000.00.

Lee sent Mark Kuznitz, the contact person for Signature Gear, a demand letter for return of an EJS set he was repairing. Mark said he will ship it out on Tuesday.

Kris expressed renewed concern about the Signature Gear expense.

There was discussion about whether the current cases are sufficient for shipping. The current cases have had significant damage. Greg volunteered to research options.

Lee wanted to make sure the Board understood the current status. He asked for support for purchasing the die for the foam for the light trees. There was discussion about first confirming that these cases are what we want to continue to use before going forward with purchasing any custom dies.

Our current inventory includes 18 FarmTek/Signature Gear sets. FarmTek is willing to do any needed repairs. We have already used them directly for a few repairs. They have been incredibly responsive and very reasonable in price.

Lee expressed concerns that we have one or two cases that have quite a bit of damage and need to be handled immediately.

#### **Regional EJS Proposal**

Lee began discussion of his regional EJS proposal. He emailed the specifics to the Board a few days ahead of the meeting for their review. He said that our EJS systems are our most valuable asset. Of the damage we've seen to EJS, 99% of the problems appear to be due to damage during shipping. He expressed concerns that it is detrimental to our organization when the sets show up and do not work.

He has taken some steps to identify needed repairs. Regional Directors and Judges have been asked to promptly report any problems with EJS, such as a bad pole, to the Executive Director so he can make sure repairs are promptly scheduled.

The purchase, shipping and repair costs of our Electronic Judging Systems are one of the largest expenses that our organization incurs. A significant portion of the repair costs incurred is due to damage caused during shipping. In our current operating model these expenses will continue without respite.

In an effort to reduce, and eventually even eliminate the majority of these expenses, Lee submitted the following proposal.

### Regional EJS proposal

Qualifying Regions would be allowed the opportunity to acquire EJS that are assigned specifically to their region. NAFA® would retain actual ownership of the EJS and would be responsible for any needed repairs or maintenance. NAFA® would initially purchase the EJS and assign them to qualifying regions. Each region that receives an EJS would

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

then charge a \$5.00/team entry EJS fee, at every tournament, to pay for the EJS interest free.

Any Regions that receive an assigned EJS would be responsible for storage and transport of these systems to tournaments within their region. NAFA® would agree to allow use of the Regional EJS for a minimum of 10 years. The Regionally assigned EJS would be uniquely marked for identification purposes.

#### **Regional Qualification**

In order to qualify for a Regional EJS the region would need to meet the following criteria:

- 1. A minimum of 10 NAFA® tournaments during the racing season that they apply for a Regional EJS. This would be the number of actual tournaments, not tournament weekends.
- 2. All team captains from the Region would be required to sign a letter of understanding agreeing that the Regional EJS would be used by all Clubs hosting NAFA® tournaments within the region and that the \$5.00/ team EJS fee would be charged until the system is paid for.
- 3. The region would agree not to ship the EJS by commercial freight unless necessary for repairs and only at the direction of the appropriate NAFA® representative. Each Region may only receive one EJS until reimbursement is completed.
- 4. A Region may request a second Regional EJS, after the first one is paid for, only after all requesting Regions have received a Regional EJS.

### Regional Benefits

The Regional EJS assignment would guarantee that the region had a functional EJS delivered on time for each tournament.

Each Club hosting in a Region with an assigned EJS would immediately be able to deduct \$200.00 from their NAFA® tournament fees. This benefit would continue for each Club hosting NAFA® tournaments within the region even after the EJS fee was no longer being collected.

Adjoining Regions could make arrangements to "share" their EJS in order to provide the above deduction to additional Clubs as long as the EJS is hand carried to the tournament.

### **NAFA®** Benefits

A significant reduction in EJS shipping and repair fees.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

Eliminate EJS failures at NAFA® tournaments caused by EJS being damaged during shipping.

Decrease EJS shipping management currently required in both the U.S. and Canada.

EJS service life substantially increased due to avoidance of commercial shipping.

In closing I would point out that there will be a limited number of Regional EJS available each year. As this program continues, and shipping/repair costs decrease, this number should increase. NAFA® will still need to maintain a number of EJS to supplement Regional EJS for two ring tournaments, but this program should avoid the necessity of NAFA® increasing the number of "international" EJS we currently possess.

There was discussion regarding the proposal and other options. There were some concerns expressed about having more information. Board members talked about other options for increasing regional ownership and reduce shipping costs and damages during shipment. The proposal was tabled to next meeting for further research and discussion.

The meeting was recessed for a break at 10:45 a.m.

The meeting resumed at 11:17 a.m.

#### **Customer Service**

Lee continued his report by discussing concerns expressed about NAFA's communication with its members. He said the problem seems to be one of customer service, with people not getting replies to emails or having points changed, etc. He believes changes need to be made.

One main bottleneck seems to be that all communication comes in through one email address. He discussed changing the website to automatically route emails to the appropriate individual based on clicking boxes with various subjects. This would be implemented in conjunction with programs that would minimize the spam that comes through. He plans to utilize this type of process as soon as possible.

#### **Database**

Lee reminded the Board that in January, he discussed that our organization could not continue to operate in an environment where only one person has access to the database. At the January meeting, we discussed implementing a plan to diversify and have disaster recovery plan in place by this meeting, which he hasn't been able to achieve.

Lee expressed that he wants a firm deadline set of June 1, 2010 by which time access to all data and the ability to make any needed changes would be afforded.

Lee has had extensive discussions with Gord Mak in Canada. Gord has the expertise and has agreed to help with the database. Lee would like to name Gord Statistician with rights to full database access.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

If Dale doesn't grant Gord Mak full access by that deadline, Lee suggested that NAFA research purchasing a new database. Gord has given a quote for building a new database from the ground up with NAFA owning the database and software.

Kris asked what problem accounted for the delay. Lee explained that there was no specific explanation, other than work and other obligations. There was discussion that Dale has put an incredible amount of time and effort into the database. NAFA is deeply indebted to him for all of his work. Lee explained that Dale did a tremendous job of modernizing how our data was stored and accessed. Now, we have just reached the point where we need to take it to the next level. As a business model, it makes sense to have a back up person. This would allow for better customer service.

Dale has not responded yet, but has started doing some of the work requested. Tournament results are now going directly to Annie Taylor. They are copied to Karen for back up. Scoring results will no longer be sent to flyball@flyball.org. The email address is being distributed to tournament directors.

Lee indicated his biggest goal is to improve customer service. Once Dale permits access to the database, then we'll be able to get someone to help him out. This would allow for delegation of some of the duties.

Kris moved to endorse Lee's selection of Gord Mak as a statistician and direct Lee to have the transition completed by June 1, 2010. Alisa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Gord Mak has been appointed NAFA statistician with full access to the database by June 1, 2010 in an effort to improve customer service.

# **New Mailing Address**

Lee reported that our mailbox address is moving. The company is moving to a different building on the same street. The new address is:

# 1333 West Devon Avenue, #512 Chicago, IL 60660

#### CanAm Classic

Lee announced that a group of dedicated NAFA flyballers has stepped forward with a matching sponsorship program for the CanAm Classic event. The group will match donations towards CanAm, up to a total amount of \$5,000.00. The minimum donation to be matched is \$100.00. Lee will confirm that divisional sponsorships will qualify. [Note that Lee did confirm after the meeting that divisional sponsorships do qualify for the matching fund program.] The matching will apply for individuals and clubs, but will not apply for business sponsorships unless the business is owned by a flyball participant. The group wishes to remain anonymous. The Board expressed thanks for the generosity of this group.

Nancy asked for clarification as to what type of reporting documentation the group would need. Lee will find more details. Lee will also have information about the program added to web page.

### Treasurer's Report:

Nancy gave a report of the current financial status of the organization.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

#### CanAm Classic

Nancy reported that we have already received \$9,160.00 in sponsorship, vendors, etc. for the 2010 event. She has also implemented several cost saving measures, including:

- Cutting expenses for workers dramatically by asking for more volunteers to cover line and box iudaina
- Increasing entry fee from \$100 to \$125
- Using American Express points to purchase gift cards for drawings for workers
- Hospitality room for judges, staff, and full time volunteers will be bringing in food for lunches this year instead of purchasing through vendor
- Will not be piping and draping the vendor areas
- Will be selling advertising in the event program such as good luck ads, promoting Hall of Fame or MVP dogs, businesses & other ads. The programs will be given out to competitors earlier this year.
- Substantial grassy areas around building will mean we will not have to buy Astroturf for potty areas

She was also mindful that there will be some increased costs this year:

- More judges plan is for 6 rings this year
- Higher rent, utilities & clean up costs with the bigger building
- More rings will mean more mats to rent and more fencing around the rings
- More draping in the crating area

#### **Banking**

Nancy reported that her use of PayPal for receiving tournament fees and other payments has gone well. Our fees are now down to 2.5% plus 30 cents per transaction. She indicated that is comparable to what we are paying for CRN credit card fees. Her recommendation is to keep the account and expand its use to allow clubs to use it to pay for tournament fees. She has it linked to a separate bank account for security reasons.

She met with a bank officer to investigate alternative account options to earn a better return with our funds. There was discussion about possible investment options, including more long term CDs. After receiving input from the Board, Nancy will implement those options.

Nancy has also researched an incentive program through UPS. Their program is called a carrier agreement. She has now gotten someone assigned to handle our account.

### **Financial Documents**

The 990 has been completed and will be filed with the IRS. She distributed the final profit and loss and balance sheets for FY 2009. Including depreciation, there was a \$13,940.81 loss for the year ending 9/30/09. These reports, as well as the second quarter P&L and balance sheets will be attached to the minutes. [Attached as Attachments A, B, C, D & E]

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

## Secretary's Report:

Dana indicated that she will be reporting any actions taken via unanimous consent between meetings with her secretary report. The actions taken since the January 15, 2010 meeting included:

On January 24, 2010, committee assignments were approved as follows (chairs in bold):

<u>Disciplinary</u> : <b>Leerie Jenkins</b>	<u>Judges/Education</u> : <b>Leerie Jenkins</b>	Finance: Dale Smith
Kris Pickering,	Dana Nichols,	Nancy Garcia,
Scott Stein,	Dale Smith,	Scott Stein,
Dana Nichols,	Scott Stein,	Kris Pickering
Alisa Romaine	Alisa Romaine,	
	David Caffo *	Marketing/Awards:
Rules/Bylaws:		Nancy Garcia
Dana Nichols	<u>Technology</u> :	Alisa Romaine,
Kris Pickering,	Dale Smith	Kelly Price *
Karen Oleson,	Karen Oleson	
Dale Smith,		Election:
Greg Stopay		Dale Smith
		TBD *
		TBD *

<sup>\*</sup> Denotes non-board member, committee member

• On February 5, 2010, the following action was taken and posted to the organization web page:

On October 1, 2008, David Caffo, currently of Santa Barbara, California, was advanced to approved judging status by unanimous consent of the Board of Directors. This information was inadvertently omitted from the Secretary report at the November 29, 2008 Board meeting. The Board authorizes its publication now, also by unanimous consent, to correct the unintended omission.

- On February 17, 2010, the minutes of the January 15, 2010 BoD meeting and January 16, 2010 AGM were approved by unanimous consent and released for posting on the web page.
- On March 16, 2010, the transcript of the March 14, 2010 Leadership Chat was approved and released for posting on the web page.
- On March 16, 2010, DeDe Crough was approved as a non-Board member of the Marketing Committee.
- On March 19, 2010, the minutes of the March 10, 2010 teleconference were approved and released for posting on the web page.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

### **Standing Committee Reports**

### Marketing Committee:

Nancy Garcia gave the report of the Marketing Committee.

#### Media

She announced that on July 10, 2010, Lee Heighton will be a guest on Dog Talk Radio. Nancy will send out a press release to NAFA News and for the web page as the date gets closer. The interview will be available online or available on their web page through a pod cast.

#### **NAFA** merchandise

Nancy announced that she and Alisa have plans to start an online store with t-shirts, collared shirts, and hats. Alisa will handle all incoming orders on a weekly basis. The vendor will mail to the United States, but not to Canada. They are researching whether a separate store will be needed for Canadian orders. The store will be set up on the NAFA site. The web page still needs to be developed. Their current plan is for online credit card ordering only. Initially the products will be offered in grey, black, and white. Products offerings may be expanded once the store is established. They hope to have the store operational by the August meeting.

### CanAm Classic

#### Publicity:

Nancy indicated that DeDe Crough has been a welcome addition to the marketing committee. She has over 25 years of PR experience. DeDe has helped outline a press and media plan for the event. She is developing press releases and is also drafting a template for clubs to send out for their local media back home. Lee asked if there has been a flyer developed for this year's event. He suggested creating a flyer for our RDs to solicit vendors at dog shows and other events. Nancy said she and Greg would work on developing a vendor flyer. Nancy also reported that Kristi Asher, from a local club in Indiana will help reach out to the local Indianapolis area.

#### Hotel Program:

This year Nancy is working with a local person, Cindy Highberg, owner of Total Event Services, to have a more comprehensive hotel program. They have developed a list of Indianapolis hotels and negotiated rates to offer a large number of affordable options to our competitors. All of the hotel options are listed on the CanAm Classic web page. Two hotels are offering shuttle service to the fairgrounds. David Caffo was instrumental in helping Nancy set up the hotel program.

### Vendors:

Nancy reported that we are actively seeking out vendors this year. She sent invitations via email in March to 84 vendors. She has an additional 61 vendors she is approaching and will be sending out additional emails. Anyone who knows of vendors who may be interested is welcome to contact her. We already have a few vendors committed, including one with dog treats. Our main sponsors will also have

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

booths. No vending will be permitted in the crating areas. In response to inquiries for competitors wanting to set up booths, but who are also running dogs, she suggested that they pair up and go together on a 10x10 booth and work cooperatively to cover the booth during racing.

There was discussion of putting together an online bulletin board for people looking to share booth space, find dogs for open teams, share rides or hotel rooms, etc.

#### Shirts:

The CanAm "Be There" shirts advertising the event were very popular. Although initially offered to RDs and Board members, the shirts were opened up to the public. There will also be CanAm Classic shirts offered this year. The shirts will be by pre-order only. We will start taking orders beginning July 1, 2010.

#### Sponsors:

Nancy shared that we have already secured two Gold level sponsors – AKC Canine Partners and Centaur Wellness AVA Animal Health. We also have one Bronze level sponsor – FitPaws Canine Conditioning Equipment. She reported that we also have several divisional sponsors already signed up. They are listed on the CanAm Classic web page.

Nancy moved we enter executive session.

The Board entered Executive Session at 2:40 p.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 3:07 p.m.

Nancy Garcia announced that Guinness World Records<sup>™</sup> has approved application for NAFA<sup>®</sup> to attempt to set a world record in the newly established category, "largest flyball tournament."

A press release will be sent out.

### Finance Committee:

Nancy Garcia and Kris Pickering reported on the current status of the Finance Committee projects in Dale Smith's absence.

#### Fee structure

At this point, the Committee does not have a recommendation as to whether fees need to be increased. We need to take a serious look at expenditures, but it's not clear whether we will need to increase tournament fees.

#### **Budget**

Kris stated that she believes our organization needs to have a budget that is voted on and approved by the board, to be used as a guideline and planning tool. She is recommending that a budget be in place for the new fiscal year beginning October 1, 2010. The Finance Committee can draft the budget with the input of the Executive Director for review by the Board at the August meeting. This will also give us a

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

better idea of whether we need to increase fees and will give us more information before we consider making expenditures.

Nancy reported that Dale is not in favor of increasing fees now until doing further review. The Finance Committee will review the finances and develop a more formal budget in consultation with the Executive Director for review at the August meeting. They will make recommendations regarding sources of revenue, curbing expenses, and any recommendations on fees by the August meeting.

Kris discussed the major expenses on the balance sheet. Nancy has been going through our expenditures to see where we can save money. Kris also said she'd like to see a budget put in place for the CanAm Classic.

There was discussion that our organization cannot run completely on volunteer labor. Our honorariums are currently \$19,200.00 per year. Lee reported that he will probably have requests for increases.

Dana moved we enter executive session. Nancy seconded.

The Board entered Executive Session at 3:17 p.m.

The Board exited executive session at 3:21 p.m.

### <u>Judges Committee</u>:

Leerie Jenkins gave the report of the Judges Committee.

#### **Advancements**

- Hugh Morrow, Etobicoke ON Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Dana moved to adopt the recommendation and advancement. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Amy Brubaker, Durham NC Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Dana moved to adopt the recommendation and advancement. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Dirk Elber, Christiansburg VA Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. Dana moved to adopt the recommendation and advancement. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Scott Frerichs, Bartonville IL Approved to Supervising. The Judges Committee unanimously does not recommend this advancement. There was discussion about some of the Committee's concerns and concerns raised through the public comment period. The Committee held a teleconference with the applicant and addressed some of those concerns. Alisa moved to deny the application. Dana seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Phil Getty, Kokomo IN Approved to Supervising. Greg Stopay and Lee Heighton both recused themselves from the vote and left for the discussion as they are teammates with the applicant. The Judges Committee unanimously recommends advancement. There was discussion about the

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

application and public comments received. Alisa moved to adopt the recommendation and advancement. Karen seconded. In favor: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, and Scott Stein (by proxy). Abstain: Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

#### Form modifications

Leerie reported that the Judges Committee has suggested a modification to the judging review forms. The current forms have check boxes for "Provisional Judge Status," "Additional Experience Needed," and "Do not Recommend." This creates a problem when a judge is doing well for their level (first assignment, etc.), but still needs the additional experience before being advanced. The Committee is recommending that the Apprentice Judge Review Form, C.17, be changed to have two options: "Satisfactory Completion of Assignment" and "Do Not Recommend."

Dana moved to accept the recommendation of the Committee and modify the C.17. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The Provisional Judge Review Form, C.18, does not have a space for the name of the Tournament Director or Regional Director filling out the form. The Committee recommends that information be added.

Dana moved to accept the recommendation of the Committee and modify the C.18. She also moved to make the recommendation language parallel to that of the C.17 as just amended. Alisa seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Training Videos**

Dana gave an update on the status of the line & box judge training video. She indicated that Dan Phillips is going through hours of tournament footage to put together some initial clips. The Committee is hopeful that the video will be completed prior to the CanAm Classic event.

### **Technology Committee:**

No Technology Committee report was given. Lee addressed some technology issues in his Executive Director report.

### **Rules Committee:**

Dana Nichols gave the report of the Rules Committee. Kris Pickering took over secretarial duties during the report.

The Rules Committee adopted a different format for this meeting, given the number and complexity of the issues presented to the Committee. We met several times by telephone and developed or adapted proposed draft language that in turn was incorporated into a printed report circulated, first to the board, then to the website in the hopes of getting input before the meeting.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

### 1. Balls permitted

The Rules Committee received questions about whether the current rule regarding balls adequately addresses some of the balls currently in use, such as foam core balls. There was also a concern raised by Steph Doerr about the legality of balls that squeak. Our current rules do not prohibit balls with squeakers. The Rules Committee unanimously recommends the following clarification, which if adopted would also prohibit balls with noise makers.

Proposed modifications to Section 1.2 – Balls (page 3 of the current rulebook):

Each club shall have a supply of round balls subject to the size, safety, and comfort of the dogs.

Approved balls may be any color, must bounce when dropped onto a hard surface, must roll, and must perform as required per Chapter 1 Section 1.1(d). Balls may not contain a noise maker, e.g. bells or squeakers.

The rationale for adopting the proposed rule is stated in the draft. Dana moved to adopt the proposed language. Greg seconded.

Discussion followed concerning complaints in the runback area about squeaky balls being used in the runback area but not at the box. Alisa clarified that using squeaky balls in the runback to distract another team's dogs in the runback. The sole issue targeted by the rules is the balls being used at the box that have squeakers. This prohibition does not apply to balls used in the runback area.

Dana moved to amend to add this language. "Approved balls to be retrieved from the box may be any color, etc." Greg seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The final rule as passed was:

Each club shall have a supply of round balls subject to the size, safety, and comfort of the dogs. Approved balls to be retrieved from the box may be any color, must bounce when dropped onto a hard surface, must roll, and must perform as required per Chapter 1 Section 1.1(d). Balls may not contain a noise maker, e.g. bells or squeakers.

### 2. <u>C.6 Tournament Results Form</u>

The rules committee recommends modifications to C.6 Tournament Results Form to comply with new rules for sending electronic results. Since we no longer require teams to send in time sheets, this change is needed to conform the form to the modification made in January to the current rule.

Dana moved to adopt the modifications to the form. Alisa seconded. The motion carried unanimously. [Attached as Attachment F]

#### 3. Bylaw Review

The bylaw review is still ongoing and should be in final form for the Board to vote on at the August meeting.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

### 4. Double running of dogs

Elizabeth Theesfeld wrote to express concern with double running of dogs, specifically, the safety and well being of dogs who are run on two teams. The Rules Committee previously addressed a similar issue at the August 2009 meeting and declined to recommend a rule change, stating:

We hope that dog owners know when their dogs are capable of safely double running. Many factors may go into this equation, including weight and condition of the dog, weather factors such as heat and humidity, and the age and experience of the dog. NAFA expects flyball competitors to take care of their dogs, to realize the physical limitations of their individual dogs, and treat them humanely.

The Rules Committee continues to believe that double running is an issue, but one which depends so much on handler and judge assessment of the dog's condition and what is being asked of it that no one-size-fits- all rule is adequate. We do propose, however, the following amendment to the Code of Ethics, to clarify that it is a violation to run a dog who is not in adequate physical condition for the number of races the dog is being asked to run:

Section 5.1 – Code of Ethics (page 23 of the current rulebook)

(d) Misconduct shall include, but not be limited to, abusive or foul language, demonstration of dissatisfaction with a judge's decision, inhumane treatment of a dog, racing a dog who is not in adequate physical condition for the number of heats the dog is asked to run, demonstration of poor sportsmanship, willful violation of the rules with the intent to gain an unfair advantage, or any other behavior or altercation that would leave a spectator or exhibitor with an unfavorable opinion of Flyball.

Dana indicated that the Board has received a number of complaints over the years about excessive double running of dogs. We received a recent complaint re-raising this issue. The Rules Committee remains concerned about health and safety not just of double run dogs but also dogs in general. There is no true safe harbor because excessive running varies with the dog and the dog's condition. What we're proposing to address this is to add an express provision in the Code of Ethics providing for sanctions against over-running.

Dana moved to adopt the language. Kris seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

In reviewing the rules, the Committee also noticed that non-regular classes were not included, so we are proposing modifications to make sure that a dog is not also run in non-regular classes, such as pee-wee, etc. and recommending a modification to make 3(e)(i) parallel with other rules.

Proposed rule modifications:

#### **CHAPTER 3 - TEAMS AND TIMESHEETS**

- (e) A dog may be listed on two timesheets per day unless:
- (i) All entries received for a tournament's limited entry Regular Class were not accepted <u>at the conclusion of the automated draw</u>.
- (ii) The timesheets are in the same class of competition.
- (iii) The dog is listed on a timesheet in Veterans Class. A dog listed on a time sheet in the Veteran's class at a tournament may not be listed on a time sheet for any other class of competition in that

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

tournament unless the classes are scheduled so as to be run on separate days to a maximum of one additional class.

### Section 6.2 - Classes of Competition

- (a) NAFA® recognizes five classes of competition: Regular, Multibreed, Open, Veteran's and Non-Regular.
- (b) The NAFA® Regular class of competition includes teams made up of any breed(s) of dog and/or mixed breeds and **must be offered at every sanctioned tournament**.
- (c) A Non-Regular class (Pee-wee, four-of-a-kind, etc.), is ...
- (d) In Multibreed competition, teams must consist of ...
- (e) The Open Class is subject to all existing NAFA® Rules of Racing and Corporate Policies and Procedures except that the 87 day rule stated in Section 7.5(a) of the Corporate Policies and Procedures does not apply to the Open Class. The Open Class is subject to the following additional specific rules: (i) Other Classes or Time Sheets. A dog that is listed on a timesheet for a team in the Open Class may be listed on the timesheet for one additional team in another Class on the same day, except in

circumstances where a second entry would be prohibited by Sections 6.2(f) or (g) of the NAFA® Policies and Procedures.

- (ii) Club Affiliation. A dog's club affiliation is not affected by reason of running in the Open Class.
- (iii) Seeding. ...
- (iv)Record Times and NAFA® Seed Times...
- (f) In the Veteran's class, every dog ... (i) Race Schedule...
- (ii) False Starts. In the Veteran's class, ...
- (iii) Jump Heights. In the Veteran's class, ...
- (g) No dog shall be listed on more than one time sheet in any given class of competition. A dog listed on a time sheet in the Veteran's class at a tournament may not be listed on a time sheet for any other class of competition in that tournament unless the classes are scheduled so as to be run on separate days to a maximum of one additional class.
- (h) Dogs may not compete in more than one class at a NAFA $\circledR$  sanctioned tournament except: (i) When the tournament's regular class is unlimited or;
- (ii) When all entries received for a tournament's limited entry regular class are accepted at the conclusion of the automated draw.

Dana noted that the rules for non-regular classes seem to permit the dog to be triple listed if one is in a non-regular in addition to regular and open. The Committee has proposed language to specify that this would not be permitted.

Kris moved to adopt the proposed changes. Dana seconded.

There was discussion regarding the proposed language. Karen noted that Section 6.2 had redundant language defining when it is permissible to list dogs on more than one timesheet. Dana indicated she would rather have the language in there twice to avoid any confusion. Nancy noted that the open provisions are unto themselves because they are specifically in the open section. Karen was concerned about what can and can't be on time sheets in reading from rule 6.2.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

The motion carried unanimously.

#### 5. Use of shields or other attachments to box

Lisa Peckham submitted a request to the Rules Committee for clarification of whether shield or wings could be attached to the box and, if so, what rules applied during the race.

The Rules Committee has reviewed this issue and believes that currently shields, wings, or other attachments to the box are permitted as long as the boxloader does not change them during racing. There was a split as to whether the attachments may exceed box dimension during the race, for instance, if a dog bends a wing outside permitted box dimensions during racing. The majority of the committee recommended a modification to the rule to find that any attachments could not exceed the box dimensions during racing. Other members of the committee were against such a proposal, primarily because of the difficulty of enforcing the rule.

The proposed rule change to Section 1.1(e)(v) (page 2 of the current rulebook):

The box shall not exceed these dimensions at any time during racing (including any attachments to the box, e.g. carrying handles, cocking devices, or shields/wings). The boxloader may not change the configuration of the box during the heat except as needed to load the ball or to straighten the box if it has shifted during the heat.

### Alternate proposed language:

The box shall not exceed these dimensions at any time during racing (including any attachments to the box, e.g. carrying handles, cocking devices, or shields/wings). The boxloader may not add or remove any attachments during the heat except as needed to load the ball. There should be no moving parts operational during the heat other than those responsible for moving the ball. Parts of the box should not move except for loading and launching the ball.

Dana reviewed the history of the issue. Previously there were teams attaching a flexible flap or wing or shield to the side of the box to help with the dog's turn. When Sam Ford was Executive Director, he examined these outside a board meeting and decided they were legal. Initially the challenge was whether these constituted training in the ring. It was discussed in a Board meeting in August of 2007 concerning a prototype box with a foam jump board attached to mat in front of the box. On a split vote, the Board of Directors determined it did not constitute training in the ring. Later, though, pictures demonstrated a safety concern that hadn't been initially appreciated and so Sam disapproved the box.

There was some question whether these devices are still legal if they bend outside the permitted box dimensions during the race. Sam's decision on this issue wasn't recorded anywhere so Dana consulted with him. He indicated that in his prior decision, the devices would still be legal. He did specify that flaps could not be taken on and off by boxloaders between dogs. They must stay the same during the entire heat, unless inadvertently removed by a dog hitting them.

The issue has now resurfaced because it seems to be called differently by different judges. Some judges have called inflexible shields as dangerous and impermissible unless they flex; other judges rule that if they flex outside the dimensions of the box, they violate the rules.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

The Rules Committee decided to research the issue and work from the ground up. The Committee reached consensus that the flaps should not be able to be attached and detached during racing. The majority of the Committee believed that the box should not flex outside the dimensions during racing, and that shield or flaps flexing outside the size limitations would be prohibited by the rules as written. One committee member expressed concern about how a judge would know if a box had flexed outside the dimensions or not.

The Committee drafted two versions of modifications to the current rule. The second version prompted several comments from box designers concerned that the language would prohibit a springback type box. The Committee did not want to discourage or outlaw use of these types of boxes.

Greg expressed that there should be no training aid attached to the box while racing, including these types of flaps or wings. He felt there was risk to the safety of the dog inherent in any training aid that is attached to the box because the incentive exists to use a rigid piece that is unsafe to the dog.

Alisa noted that inflexible pieces may not be a safety concern where dogs are adequately trained on the boxes. She also asked why there should not be any moving parts.

Kris expressed the opinion that the Board does not want to stifle creativity in box design.

Lee indicated that an opinion offered by an ED is not binding as a rule interpretation. He was concerned that the prior ED's interpretation was being taken as binding.

The Rules Committee's primary goal was having clarity in the rule so that the rule was uniformly applied by judges. This also gives more consistency for competitors.

Dana indicated that the Board has a number of options. Flaps can be allowed without limitation; be allowed, but have some limitations; or be prohibited completely. There is some legitimate interest in promoting innovative box design; conversely, it causes a host of potential safety and training-in-the-ring concerns.

Karen noted that if it could be designed safely and did not exceed the dimensions, the aids should be fine but otherwise not.

Greg moved to disallow use of wings, shields, or flaps as training aids on boxes in competition. Nancy seconded.

There was further discussion of whether as worded this would prohibit a 20 inch box with 2 inch curved foam on either side. The consensus was that it would probably be prohibited. It could be a different issue depending on construction and, if an integrated design, could and should be submitted to NAFA for review as to whether it would be permitted or not. Worry was expressed about the term "integrated" – would depend on whether it's a flap, wing or shield, not whether it's integrated.

Kris shared an opinion expressed by Scott Stein in anticipation of this issue being raised at the meeting:

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

I do not want NAFA getting into approving new box designs. We have set specs regarding how large a box should be, and provided boxes fit within those specs throughout the race, that should be good enough. I am of the opinion that every box evolution is designed to make the dogs turn better through changing the shape of the box. Putting a flap there that makes a dog's turn tighter is just an evolution in box design and not training in the ring (provided the box stays within specs during the race).

In favor of Greg's motion: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, and Greg Stopay. Against: Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, and Scott Stein (by proxy). The motion failed.

Kris moved to adopt the language, "The box shall not exceed these dimensions at any time during racing (including any attachments to the box, e.g. carrying handles, cocking devices, or shields/wings)." Alisa seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding this motion. Dana argued that this language makes the rule even more permissive than it already is in that it removes the current limitation that it stays the same throughout the race. She indicated that we are already more permissive than any other dog sport regarding warming up and training in the ring before each race. Greg shared that opinion.

Kris amended her motion to add "during the heat" instead of "during racing." Alisa accepted the amendment.

In favor of the motion: Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, and Scott Stein (by proxy). Against: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, and Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

Lee Heighton vetoed the motion. He indicated he supports the Board's prerogative to address whether to allow wings or not and to address the penalty for boxes that move outside the plane. But, he is adamantly opposed to the language passed because adding and removing attachments during the race is changing the configuration of the box while racing and is blatant training in the ring.

Karen pointed out that the conduct of the boxloader pursuant to Section 8.3 "the heat" does not allow the boxloader to change the configuration of the box during racing.

Dana believes it needs to be clarified regardless of Section 8.3 because of the current inconsistent interpretations of the rule.

Karen moved to adopt the following language:

The box shall not exceed these dimensions at any time during the heat (including any attachments to the box, e.g. carrying handles, cocking devices, or flaps/shields/wings). The boxloader may not change the configuration of the box during the heat except as needed to load the ball or to straighten the box if it has shifted during the heat. If the box exceeds these dimensions at any time during the heat it will result in the loss of the heat.

Alisa seconded the motion.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

There was discussion regarding the motion. Dana clarified that the rule would be similar to how they are currently handled, except that if the flap exceeds the box dimensions during the heat, it would result in a loss. There was further clarification that it would not be a flag where the dog could be rerun, but that the team would essentially forfeit the heat.

Leerie asked if the Board was comfortable that the judge retains the authority to deem a box unsafe? He suggested that the rule should include a sentence that says, "Judges have the discretion to declare a box unsafe and therefore not usable."

There was discussion that although the rules express the concept that dog safety is paramount above all, there is no harm to making that explicit in this setting.

Kris suggested an amendment to the motion to add, "Judges have the discretion to declare a box unsafe and therefore not usable." Karen and Alisa accepted the amendment.

There was a note that if this proposal is adopted, it should be included in the line and box judge training video because box judges will be in the best position to judge whether the flap exceeds the dimensions while racing. Dana expressed that as a practical matter, many teams may choose not to use this type of aid given the risk of exceeding the dimensions and forfeiting the heat.

In favor of the motion: Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, and Alisa Romaine. Against: Nancy Garcia and Greg Stopay. Abstained: Scott Stein (by proxy). The motion passed.

The final language passed was:

The box shall not exceed these dimensions at any time during the heat (including any attachments to the box, e.g. carrying handles, cocking devices, or flaps/shields/wings). The boxloader may not change the configuration of the box during the heat except as needed to load the ball or to straighten the box if it has shifted during the heat. If the box exceeds these dimensions at any time during the heat it will result in the loss of the heat. Judges have the discretion to declare a box unsafe and therefore not usable.

[Please note that after the meeting, the Board received some questions as to whether the language adopted resulted in a no finish as well as a loss of the heat. The Board adopted modifications to the language by unanimous consent on May 18, 2010 to state, "If the box exceeds these dimensions at any time during the heat the team shall be awarded a "No Finish." ]

#### 6. Minimum runback

The Rules Committee received a proposal from Jon DosPassos requesting tournaments with less than 45 feet of runback not count for regional points.

The current rulebook specifies a minimum runback of 29 feet. The Rules Committee discussed at length possible safety and training issues involved with tournaments with runback this short. Training methods have changed substantially over the years and there was concern that the existing minimum runback rule did not provide adequate runback for an increasing number of dogs and teams. After discussion and research, the Committee was unanimous in recommending that the minimum runback be increased to 50

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

feet. The Committee was also unanimous in recommending that the Executive Director should be empowered to grant exceptions to the minimum runback where adequate notice was given to teams and appropriate safety measures were put in place. The Committee was split as to whether tournaments where exceptions were granted should count for regional points.

The proposed rule modification is:

### Section 2.4 - Ring Layout

(a) The minimum area required for two regulation lanes is approximately 30 feet by 110 feet. There shall be two racing lanes set a minimum of 12 feet from center to center and a maximum of 17 feet center to center. In cases of racing lanes being placed on hard surfaces or carpet (such as indoor/outdoor carpet where rug burns are possible), each racing lane shall be matted at a minimum 4.5 feet on either side of the racing lane center line for the length of the racing lane leading up to the first jump and an area from the last jump to the backstops. Where sod, dirt, grass or similar surfaces are available, matting shall not be required. All racing surfaces must be free of apparent contaminants. The length of the racing lane shall include an area not less than 50 feet leading up to the start/finish line and an area behind the box and in front of the backstops to a minimum of 5 feet and that the backstops may protrude up to 2 feet in front of the box line. For tournaments held in venues that will not accommodate 50 feet of runback, the tournament director may apply for an exception from the Executive Director if adequate notice is given to teams and appropriate safety measures are put in place. If the Executive Director grants an exception, the tournament will/will not count for regional points.

The Committee also recommends a modification to the diagram in the rulebook to reflect any changes to the minimum runback.

Dana reviewed the proposal received by the Rules Committee. There was concern from the Committee that it was long overdue to modify the minimum runback. The Committee unanimously recommended increasing the minimum runback to 50 feet. There was concern, however, for venues that cannot meet this requirement and might dramatically affect a regions ability to host tournaments. The Committee felt that the ED should have discretion to approve a site with fewer than 50 feet provided it could be demonstrated it wasn't a safety problem. The committee split as to whether sub-50-foot discretionarily approved runback venues should be eligible for regional points.

After the Rules Committee discussed this issue, several corollary issues arose: (1) an email received shortly before the meeting reports a tournament venue was advertised as having 60 feet of runback and in fact there was only 40 feet of matted runback with the remaining 20 was unmatted concrete; and (2) a related concern was sent in about the types of mats being advertised and used – advertising tough spun and then everything other than where the jumps themselves are was something much thinner. There was also an additional comment received noting that the backstop behind the box should be measured from the box line, rather than from the back of the box. This concern was included in the language below.

Dana moved to adopt the following language:

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

The length of the racing lane shall include an area not less than <u>50</u> feet leading up to the start/finish line and an area behind the box <u>line</u> and in front of the backstops to a minimum of 5 feet and that the backstops may protrude up to 2 feet in front of the box line. <u>For tournaments held in venues that will not accommodate 50 feet of runback, the tournament director may apply for an exception from the Executive Director if adequate notice is given to teams and appropriate safety measures are put in place. If the Executive Director grants an exception, the tournament will not count for regional points.</u>

Nancy seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding reasons to not place the Executive Director in the position of determining whether tournaments would count for regional points. Dana noted that if the runback is too short then it might pose a safety issue where bigger or more powerful dogs should not run. Removing regional points would also take away any incentive to thwart the regional championship points by intentionally hosting in venues that dogs used to longer runbacks cannot handle. If we take away regional points, there is not the same incentive for teams to feel compelled to attend

The counterargument posed by Greg Stopay and Kris Pickering is that if the venue is not sufficiently safe to run a regional championship team there, then it should not be accepted for any dogs to run there.

In favor of the motion: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, and Alisa Romaine. Against: Karen Oleson and Greg Stopay. Abstained: Kris Pickering and Scott Stein (by proxy). The motion passed.

There was discussion about the second part of this issue: Matting and Surfaces.

Dana proposed: "A host team must declare in its sanctioning request what the footing is going to be at its tournament. That footing will be presumed to be the same throughout the entire ring, including the declared runback, unless otherwise stated in the sanctioning request."

There was discussion that this type of a rule would allow teams to choose which tournaments to enter and to rely on what was said in the sanctioning information as the conditions they will find in the tournament they enter. There was concern about enforcement of the rule. Several people pointed out that the modification just made would require 50 feet of matted runback for indoor concrete surfaces. Dana withdrew her motion finding there was no need for further rule amendment.

### 7. New Racing Format Request

Jules Comeau presented a request for recognition of a new racing format:

After the round robin is done in a 5 team division, each team has raced 4 races. Instead of running a single elimination round which will leave one team with 5 races and the others with at least 6 and the possibility of 7 races, tournaments in region 10 have, for several years, been using a tournament format that we call extended round robin every time there are 5 teams in a division. We started using it when it was proposed by one of our tournament directors and was approved by Sam. This format has become very popular and is supported by all clubs in the region. It works like this:

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

Teams are reseeded after the round robin based on the result of the round robin. The extended round robin has 5 races: 1vs2, 2vs3, 3vs4, 4vs5, 5vs1.

The Rules Committee considered this request, but does not recommend its approval. Some of the considerations were that the existing round robin and elimination formats already provide adequate options for tournament directors. And, the proposed format may put teams seeded in second place in a more challenging position than those in third and fourth place.

Dana discussed the history of this request. At the August 2009 meeting, Lee reported that in Region 10 a format was being used that was not found in rulebook. The Board determined that Lee should disallow this format. In response to that ruling, Jules Comeau the Region 10 RD, presented this proposal to have the format formally incorporated into the rulebook. The Rules Committee considered the proposal and does not recommend its adoption because the way in which it sorts the competitors builds in unfairness for the second and third place teams. The 2d place team faces tougher bracket than the third seeded team.

The Rules Committee advised the proponent of its recommendation ahead of the meeting. Jules provided additional comments for the Board to consider, including a petition showing the format has wide support within their region. Despite that support, the Board still believed that this format was inappropriate and based its decision on how it would affect regions throughout NAFA.

Dana moved to reject the proposal. Greg seconded.

There was further discussion. Karen pointed out that if they chose 4/4 or 5/5 formats, the region could still achieve the number of heats they were seeking.

In favor of the motion to reject the proposal: Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, Scott Stein (by proxy), and Greg Stopay. Against: None. Abstained: Nancy Garcia.

#### 8. Clubs electing into adjacent regions

Request from Tammy Bonas for a rule change to 8.3(c) (page 39 of the current rulebook):

(c) All points and tie-break times for Regional Championships must be earned in the Club's home region, i.e., an "in-region" team. A Club's home region, absent a written request for change, is the place of residence of the Club owner shown on NAFA® Form C.11. A Club that is located within 60 miles of the regional border may change regional affiliation by written request to NAFA®. Requests to change regional affiliation to an adjacent region must be received before the start of the racing year to take effect that year. A host club's regional affiliation shall determine the region in which regional points accrue for tournaments hosted by that Club.

Tournaments hosted out of region, but declared in region because of a regional exemption on the host club, must be within 60 traveling miles of the region border, otherwise the tournament will count for regional championship points in the geographical region where it is held.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

The Rules Committee considered these requested rule changes. None of the Committee supported placing a limitation on clubs being able to elect into an adjacent region based on a mileage limitation from the club owner's residence. Clubs often comprise members from different locales and, in geographically large regions, especially towards the mid-west and west, this type of mileage restriction would be unworkable.

The Committee was split as to whether there should be some form of mileage restriction on how far tournaments could be from the regional border. Some members felt a mileage restriction, although larger than that proposed, would be reasonable. However, others are concerned about the potential impact, especially in the geographically larger regions. All members agreed that if there was repeated abuse, such as a club hosting many tournaments per year in a remote location not readily accessible to the region, this should be able to be addressed to the Executive Director.

Dana reported that a competitor proposed a number of changes to the rules regarding electing into an adjacent region election rules based on mileage from the club owner's residence. This seemed unworkable, given teams often have members in different cities and given the geographical size of some regions. Another concern raised by this competitor was when a team that's elected into another region hosts in its geographical home, it counts for their elected region. This can cause a hardship for others in that elected region. This competitor suggests there be a mileage restriction on the distance from the regional border to the venue is for it to qualify.

There was discussion about this concern. There was consensus that if the practice became abusive, the ED should be able to stop it. The proposal is a 60 mile border limit, which everyone believed is way too small. There was also concern was also expressed that teams could use this as a tool to make border crossings a factor in regional champion contests. One idea is sponsoring tournaments by clubs in two adjoining regions, which would allow for sanctioning to produce regional points in each region.

Discussion followed that Sam had permitted and Lee also permits two host teams with regional points being awarded to each region. There was a question as to how delegate votes are handled and whether both clubs would get delegate votes. In order to allow this type of sanctioning, both clubs would have to agree to waive the 200 mile rule and it has to be approved by the Executive Director.

While the Board would be denying the request, this does clarify another option available.

Dana moved to deny the request. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 9. Assessing regional points for multiple tournaments on the same weekend

The Rules Committee received a request from Zac Chernik for clarification of how regional points are assessed when a region has two tournaments in different cities on the same weekend. Specifically the question was whether a club could accrue regional points from both tournaments if they sent teams to both tournaments.

In reviewing this request, the Rules Committee unanimously agreed that the answer depends on whether more than 7 weekends of tournaments were held in that region during the racing year. If more than 7 weekends of tournaments are held, then under Section 8.3(f) (page 40 of the current rulebook), then

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

points would only be awarded based on the club's best finish. To clarify the rule, the Rules Committee recommends modifying as follows:

When a region hosts events in more than 7 tournament weeks, a Club will earn regional points from up to 80 percent of the tournament weeks in that region based on the Club's best finish from any event to a maximum of 10 tournaments held in separate tournament weeks. In the case where multiple events exist in a tournament week, regional points are still awarded based on in-region placement within each tournament. When regional points are not awarded due to a Club's prior win in the <u>same</u> week, the points will not be awarded to teams finishing lower in the tournament. For example, if a Club finishes first on each day, then the fastest time will be used for that Club's regional points but no first place points will be awarded on the second day as the winner has blocked out the win from other Clubs.

If there are 7 or less tournament weeks in a racing year for the region, then points are awarded from tournaments regardless of the number of tournaments in a tournament week, so a club could receive multiple points from multiple locations.

Dana moved to adopt the Rules Committee's recommendation. Nancy Garcia seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

### 10. Training in the ring

The Rules Committee received questions from Emily Venator about various types of conduct inquiring whether they would constitute training in the ring. In reviewing these questions, the Rules Committee had concerns about whether the current rules gave sufficient support to a judge to call training in the ring when the assistance was from someone other than the handler, whether that person be inside or outside the ring. The Rules Committee recommends the following change:

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.

This rule change would make it clear that 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.

The Rules Committee received a number of questions regarding training in the ring. The Committee's concern was with making it clear that judges have the right to disallow outside assistance for the dog.

Dana moved to add the words "in navigating the course" into the rule as follows:

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

(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 <u>in navigating the course</u> or violate the rules.

Nancy seconded the motion.

There was discussion about the proposed change. The Committee received a comment from a competitor who was concerned that the new language could prevent assistance during warm ups. The Board agreed that this rule as outlined in the rulebook only applies to heats and not warm-ups. This is covered elsewhere in the rulebook, so there was no need seen to change language further.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. Consolidation of rules for running without EJS

Dana Nichols requested that the Rules Committee consider consolidating rules that apply when racing without an EJS into one location.

### Section 8.7 – Racing without EJS (Electronic Judging System)

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

- a) The breakout rule (section 8.1) does not apply;
- b) Racing procedures:
- (1) The Head Judge (starter and referee) shall be positioned between the racing lanes in the area between the start/finish line and the lead dogs to start the heat. If necessary, a Head Judge shall reposition himself/herself so as not to interfere with competing teams.
- (2) The Head Judge shall maintain a consistent starting cadence of approximately one (1) second intervals throughout the tournament, and shall indicate the start with a whistle. For example, please see illustration 5.1. In tournaments with multiple judges, uniform visual start signals should be used.

# INSERT: Illustration 5.1 – Starting positions without Electronic Judging System "Ready" "Set" "Tweeet"

- (3) Early passes and other infractions will be indicated by the Line Judge and/or the head judge;
- (4) If necessary, the Head Judge (starter and referee) should be in position to assist the Line Judges in determining winners of close heats.

These sections would then be deleted from the current locations in the rulebook.

Dana moved to adopt recommended modification to remove the rules regarding running without EJS and incorporate them in one place. Greg seconded.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

There was discussion that a modification was needed to section 5 to clarify how the winner is determined.

(5) <u>In determining</u> When a heat is judged to be a tie with, the head and line judge's decision as to the winner of the heat, the Line Judges' decision must be unanimous and shall be based on their visual view of the finish line, **not on the clocks**. If the Line Judges are not in agreement, the Head Judge shall consult with the Line Judges and either declare a winner or declare the heat to be a tie.

Greg accepted the amendment to the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### 12. Modification of aggression excusal

The Rules Committee received an email concerning the dog aggression rules from Ken Bullard. This email came in after the two lengthy pre-meeting conference calls to prepare for the May 8 meeting the committee conducted and thus has not been discussed in formal committee meeting at this time. The request was that this be addressed at the May 8 meeting and so we have listed it on the committee report. (Note that rules amendments normally have an effective date of October 1.)

Ken Bullard proposes to modify 8.4 – Aggressive Dogs as follows:

If a dog, not provoked, bites, regardless of damage, a person or other dog or exhibits escalating aggressive behaviors, the dog may be suspended by the judge for the duration of the tournament (weekend). The participant may be warned as a precursor to excusal. If however, a dog, unprovoked, inflicts injury on another dog or person, then the dog will be excused from racing and a determination will be made by NAFA as to the dog's continued participation in flyball events. With regard to the judge, he/she must be willing to clarify any decisions made during a tournament.

The current rule states (on page 13 of the current rulebook):

#### Section 8.4 - Aggressive Dogs

If a dog shows undue aggression toward another dog or handler at any time during the competition, the Head Judge may excuse the dog from competing. Dogs that are excused, are excused from competing for the remainder of that event. The degree of aggression that warrants excuse is to be determined by the Head Judge. The Head Judge must report any dog excused from competition to the Executive Director on NAFA® Form C.12.

The proposal appears to be substantially copied from the U-FLI rule on aggression.

As noted, we received this too late to evaluate it formally. Some members of the committee are concerned that, under the guise of providing more specificity, the proposal actually seems to narrow the instances in which aggression can be effectively addressed. The use of the word "unprovoked," for example, suggests that aggression isn't subject to the rule even if it's hugely disproportionate to the provocation. What is meant by "escalating and continuing aggression" is also unclear. Last, it seems to mandate excusal and perhaps an outright ban even if a dog bites accidentally, in going for a tug or in two dogs going for the same ball or toy.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

Any rule must allow the head judge the discretion to assess the situation at the time. Under our existing rules, the head judge has the ultimate decision as to whether to excuse a dog for undue aggression. Our judges go through a rigorous training program and we trust in their ability to make appropriate decisions. Additionally, Section 5.3 (page 26 of our current rulebook) was amended last year to provide review of aggression excusals and provide an appeal process for owner/handlers of these dogs. Our judges also have many other tools to ensure safety in the racing lanes. If there is interference, judges stop the heat immediately and the interfering team is awarded a no finish. And, if the judge believes that a dog poses a threat to safety, they may be excused from the tournament using the same C.12 form. While we expect judges to indicate the reason for their decision and reference the rulebook where appropriate, we do not think it is appropriate for judges to engage in protracted discussion with disgruntled competitors. This is another area where we believe training and experience give our judges a good guide to appropriate conduct.

Dana indicated that this proposal came in after the Rules Committee had conducted several lengthy teleconferences on pending issues, but because Rules was asked to consider this at this meeting, the Committee tried to accommodate this request. The rules committee does not recommend its adoption for the reasons stated above. The Board considered all written comments regarding this requested change.

Dana moved to deny the request to modify the rule. Greg seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding the proposal. Karen commented that part of what was suggested could put a judge in violation of an existing rule stating that a judge should not engage with a disgruntled competitor. Lee noted that these are often highly charged situations and it's one of the more difficult calls a judge has to make. Dana emphasized that we have great judges who are quite receptive and professional in dealing with people in highly stressed situations.

The motion to deny the request to modify the rule passed unanimously.

### 13. Definition of runback or runoff

The Rules Committee also received a request from Ally Stern to include a definition or clarification of minimum runback or runoff. Her concern was that for tournaments held indoors on concrete, the minimum amount of runback or runoff should be the minimum matted runback or runoff. To include non-matted portions does not adequately address the safety concerns.

The Committee received this request after the above request, but before the May 8, 2010 meeting. Although not able to debate the issue at length, the Committee indicated it would address this issue when addressing the minimum runback raised in #6 above

In light of the rule passed in number six above with regards to minimum runback, the Board decided no further modification was needed.

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

### 14. Modification of 7 and 8 team single elimination brackets

Lee was made aware of a typographical error regarding placements for the 7 and 8 team single elimination brackets. He raised this with the Rules Committee shortly before the meeting. The Board reviewed the brackets and recommended his proposed changes to the brackets.

Dana moved to modify the brackets as shown in the attached revisions. Nancy seconded. The motion passed unanimously. [Attached as Attachment G]

There was discussion that this should be made effective immediately and be disseminated through the NAFA News.

### 15. Rules opinions

Dana brought up an issue of how opinions from the Rules Committee should be handled. In the past there has been discussion of whether Committee opinions should be published in some form. The difficulty becomes that then competitors would need to read not only the rulebook, but also any committee regulations or rulings. This might become quite onerous. After discussing the topic, the consensus was that Rules Committee opinions need not be published, especially when they are dealing with an isolated or routine issue. If the issue is one of greater concern, at the discretion of the Committee, it may be shared with the Board or included with the Rules Committee report at the next Board meeting. We are all volunteers, trying to be as responsive as possible. It seems best to focus on rule changes and amendments as need arises on specific, actual issues that have arisen, rather than hypotheticals.

#### 16. Status of Bylaw review

Dana moved that the Board enter executive session. Alisa seconded. 9:23 pm

The Board entered Executive Session at 9:23 p.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 10:54 p.m.

Alisa moved to ratify the results of the 2010 election by adoption of the following resolution:

### NORTH AMERICAN FLYBALL ASSOCIATION, INC.

Proposed Resolutions Ratifying 2010 Election of Directors

WHEREAS, prior to the January, 2010 election of directors of North American Flyball Association, Inc., the corporation took steps to correct errors in the composition of the Election Committee and to revise the form of delegate ballot provided to club representatives; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors wishes to ratify the outcome of the January 2010 election, it is hereby

Board of Directors Meeting Indianapolis, Indiana

Abridged Minutes May 8, 2010

**RESOLVED**, that effective immediately Sections 2 and 4 of Article IV, Section 2 of Article VII and any other applicable provisions of the Bylaws of the corporation are hereby amended to provide that all expiring and vacant positions on the Board of Directors shall be filled by resolution of the Board of Directors:

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that effective immediately (and to the extent not done previously) the following persons are hereby elected of the Board of Directors of the corporations for terms ending in 2013:

Karen Oleson, Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that all actions previously taken by the Board of Directors during 2010 are hereby ratified and confirmed; and

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that effectively immediately after the adjournment of this meeting, the amendments to the Bylaws of the corporation made in these resolutions are rescinded and that the Bylaws shall be in the form they existed prior to the adoption of these resolutions.

Greg Stopay seconded the motion. Karen, Leerie, & Dana abstained from any discussion or vote regarding this issue.

In favor of the resolution: Nancy Garcia, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, Scott Stein (by proxy), and Greg Stopay. Abstained: Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, and Leerie Jenkins.

The motion passed.

### Disciplinary Committee:

Leerie reported there were no actions.

#### Review Panel:

Leerie noted that because he is both Chair of the Board and Chair of the Judges Committee, he has appointed Dana Nichols, prior Chair of the Judges Committee and current Chair of the Rules Committee as the third member of the Review Panel.

Leerie reported that the Review Panel considered two aggression excusals, both of which were sustained.

- Calvin, CRN 080141 April 17, 2010
- Fling!, CRN 090997 April 24, 2010

Greg moved to adjourn the meeting. Scott (by proxy) seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 PM EDT.