Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

Present were: Executive Director Lee Heighton

Board of Directors Nancy Garcia,

Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith, Scott Stein, Greg Stopay

Chairman Scott Stein called the meeting to order at 8:41 AM EDT.

Guests: Chris VanWert, Karen Larkin and Ruth VanWert.

- I. Officers' Reports
- Chairperson's Comments

Scott welcomed Board members and guests. He welcomed Leerie Jenkins to his first in-person Board meeting. He discussed that this meeting has a heavy agenda of rules items for completion before the Rulebook is published with the new racing year in October. He reviewed procedures for the meeting.

• Executive Director's Comments

1. Approval of Regional Directors

Lee requested that the Board approve his current list of Regional Directors as this was the first Board meeting after the change in Executive Director.

Dana moved to approve the current acting RDs. Leerie seconded. The list of RDs from the webpage was read to verify its accuracy. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Communications

Lee inquired about having a communication option for people to be able to subscribe to an email announcement-type list for NAFA to share rule changes, web page updates, etc. It would be a list for people to subscribe to, but posts would be from NAFA sources. Dale indicated that he could put that in place. Lee would be responsible for approving anything that goes out on the announcement list. Once it is in place, links will be posted on the web page and disseminated to other sources as well.

3. New Award

Lee proposed a new award to recognize judges – a Judge of the Year Award. He suggested providing recipients a judges shirt with "20_ _ Judge of the Year" in addition to a plaque. The Board expressed general support for this idea. The matter was referred to the Judges Committee to develop language to implement for next year's election cycle.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

4. Tournament Sanctioning

Lee reported that concern was expressed about sanctioning for a tournament that was listed late because Karen was on vacation when the sanctioning request came in. There were several options discussed, including a back up person for Karen, or changing the sanctioning date from 30 to 45 days. Dana offered to backup Karen when necessary.

Another option discussed was online sanctioning. Dale discussed progress on current efforts to implement online sanctioning. He indicated he can get the system online relatively soon. The online system would also streamline the work by eliminating the need for entering most data, except for forms still received by mail.

5. Scheduling formats

There seems to be quite a bit of variability in how closely various regions follow the round robin formats in the back of the rulebook. In some areas regions are very strict and in other areas they are very lax. Right now the priorities are based on teams ranking in seeding charts.

There was discussion about whether we should look at team breaks and club breaks as higher priorities rather than when teams race. There were some concerns about making sure that the first round robin is fully completed before running a second or third round robin.

A Special Project Committee was appointed several years ago to look into these issues. Dale and Karen are still part of this project committee. They have been working on a schedule optimizing program to run schedules through to try to optimize club and team breaks. This program is not actually a scheduling program, but one in which an already completed schedule is run through to optimize any conflicts. They are ultimately looking at the possibility of automatic approval of schedules put through the optimizer. At first, use of the optimizer would be optional. Right the program handles only round robin formats. The technologically would run on Dale's computer and the results would be sent back to the clubs. Dale estimated that the program would be completed within a year, with test schedules done earlier.

6. 250 mile rule

Lee wanted to address the 250 mile rule and whether a change was needed. The Rules Committee did not realize there was a request to look at this rule. Dana offered to draft language over a break if the Board of Directors reached consensus about any change.

Various options were discussed about how to solve the problem of regions that are very close to each other. Regions 1, 2 and 20 are very close to each other and highly populated with flyball. This makes it difficult to plan tournaments because schedules of the adjacent regions must be considered in addition to the host region. This was especially problematic when taking into consideration border crossings.

There was discussion of considering a modification to the mileage limit. Dana moved to amend the rule to a 200 mile range. Alisa seconded.

There was discussion that the Board will consider moving the mileage limit further if necessary. Also, requests can still be made for permission to hold a tournament under the rule.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The proposed modification was:

"NAFA® will not sanction a tournament within 250 200 road miles of a previously sanctioned NAFA® tournament, without written approval from the sanctioned tournament's club owner."

The question was called. The motion passed unanimously.

Secretary's Report

Dana reported that the minutes have been posted on the NAFA® web page for the:

- March 21, 2009 Las Vegas in person meeting
- May 25, 2009 teleconference
- June 18, 2009 teleconference

Minutes are still pending approval for the August 6, 2009 teleconference.

Dale moved to approve the minutes. Karen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dale also ran through the current to do list. Most issues have now been resolved.

- <u>Treasurer's Report</u> Nancy will combine her report with the Finance Committee report.
- II. Committee Reports
- Judges Committee

1. Judges Video Update

Dana reported that the measuring video has been completed, except for adding a title page. The video was played for Board members and guests. She indicated that the final video will be available on the NAFA® web page for viewing by everyone, not just judges. The Judges Committees hopes to produce additional videos in an instructional series. Dan Phillips produced the video and filmed all of the footage. She expressed thanks to Dan for his work on the project.

2. Review of Supervising Judge's application process and other portions of the Judges Training Program

Dana reviewed several proposed modifications from the Committee to the supervising judge application process and to other portions of the Judges Training Program.

• Proposed modification to Chapter 2 (j)(vii) [page 18 of current rulebook]:

"Such proposals must be accompanied by <u>a letter of recommendation from</u> at least 5 different tournament directors the applicant has judged for, two fellow NAFA approved judges, and the Regional Director for the applicant's home region. *Said letters of*

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

recommendation should contain personal observations of any of the qualities referenced in (iv) above. In addition, the name of the judge applying for supervising status will be published on the NAFA webpage to allow for comment to the Board."

(viii) Prior to the application being presented to the Board, the applicant will be required to meet with the Judges Committee via telephone conference to discuss his or her application.

(the original viii will then become ix, etc.)

Dana moved to adopt the rule change. Alisa seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding the motion. There was concern expressed about whether there should be a time limit specified for posting of the information on the webpage. Several people expressed a desire to have input, especially for applicants with whom the Board and the Committee do not have much experience.

There was discussion about what the notice should consist of. The general consensus was that the posting would indicate the name of the applicant for supervisory status, that he or she had applied for supervisory status, and that any comments should be addressed to the Chair of the Judges Committee.

The last sentence of the proposed change was modified to include:

In addition, the name of the judge applying for supervising status will be published on the NAFA webpage for a period, ideally of seven days, to allow for comment to the Board

Dana amended her motion to include the new time period language. Alisa also accepted the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

Proposed revisions to Form C.5 Judge's Application.

The Judges Committee recommended modifications to form C.5 Judge's Application to include a section for the applicant to sign certifying that they meet the minimum requirements set forth in the Judges Training Program, including age and being in good standing.

Dana moved to approve the modifications to the form. Dale seconded the motion.

There was discussion about removing the bottom portion of the form as it is not generally used internally and does not correspond to the current judging requirements.

Dana accepted an amendment to her motion to remove the bottom part of form. Dale approved the amendment as well.

There was discussion that for those filling out the form electronically without an electronic signature, "/s/" followed by a typed signature would suffice as a signature.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

> Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The motion passed unanimously. A copy of the modified form as approved is attached to these minutes as Attachment A.

Proposed modification to Appendix D, NAFA[®] Judges Training Program, novice portion:

The Committee recommends the following changes:

Requirements to Begin the Training Program

Initial requirements to begin the training program are:

- 1. The individual must be in good standing with NAFA®
- 2. The individual must be at least 18 years of age
- 3. The individual must possess a current copy of the NAFA® Rules of Racing and Corporate Policies & Procedures Manual

The individual should submit a completed form C.5 to the NAFA® Judges Committee to obtain approval to begin the Novice program. obtain a copy of the Judges Education & Training Manual and Assignment Evaluation Forms. Assignment Evaluation Forms are located at C.16.

Proposed modification to the Apprentice requirements:

The Committee recommends eliminating the "oral quiz" to be administered by a supervising judge. There is not a current area for this requirement to be reported. Our supervising judges already discuss the rules with apprentices during their assignments and often give them quizzes on various rules during their assignment.

Assignments:

Judge a minimum of 25 races at three different tournaments on different weekends under a minimum of two different NAFA® Supervising Judges.

Measure a minimum of 8 dogs at three different tournaments on different weekends under the supervision of two different NAFA® Supervising Judges.

— Oral quiz to be administered by the NAFA® Supervising Judge.

Dana moved that these modifications to the Novice and Apprentice portions of the program be adopted. Dale seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Modification of aggression excusal forms

The Judges Committee recommended modifications to the C.12 Notice of Excusal to conform with the new Aggression Excusal procedures adopted at the March 2009 Board Meeting.

Dana moved to approve the modifications to the form. Dale seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. A copy of the revised form as approved is attached to these minutes as Attachment B.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

4. Procedures for running ring without EJS

In prior meetings, the Judges Committee was tasked with drafting procedures for running a ring on manual start. There was a belief that this information was included in prior rulebooks. Research into prior rulebooks revealed that it was not included. Dana reported that the Committee had the following proposal, including drawings from Leerie Jenkins.

Proposed modification to **Chapter 5 – Judges** [page 8 of current rulebook]:

(d) 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, the Head Judge (starter and referee) should be in position to assist the Line Judges in determining winners of close heats¹. The Head Judge may confer with the Line Judges and the Box Judges before determining a winner. If necessary, a Head Judge shall reposition themselves in such a manner as not to interfere with competing teams. 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 whistle¹. Please see illustration 5.1.¹

"Ready" "Set" "Tweeet"

Illustration 5.1 – Starting positions without Electronic Judging System

Dana moved to adopt the proposed rule changes. Dale seconded.

There was discussion about whether the hand signals should be uniform among judges or whether there should be leeway for various judges. There was concern about having a more consistent approach when utilizing multiple rings. There was a suggestion to include, "In tournaments with multiple judges, uniform visual signals should be used."

¹ Without Electronic Judging System

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The motion was tabled for Dana and Leerie to redesign the paragraph.

The final language as proposed (with re-lettering of paragraphs as needed):

- (d) 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 themselves himself/herself in such a manner so as not to interfere with competing teams. The Head Judge may confer with the Line Judges and the Box Judges before determining a winner.
- (e) Manual Start (without Electronic Judging System). 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. If necessary, the Head Judge (starter and referee) should be in position to assist the Line Judges in determining winners of close heats.

Dana amended her motion to adopt the modifications. Dale approved the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Defining not measurable

Dana reported that in prior Board meetings the Judges Committee was tasked with creating a definition of "not measurable."

The proposed definition of "Not Measurable" to be added to glossary [page 15 of current rulebook]:

"Refuses to stand; refuses to stand still; refuses to stand in an appropriate measuring stance as set forth in Chapter 4 (e) and illustration 4.1, Rules of Racing, which results in the measuring judge being unable to take an accurate measurement. At any time before a final measurement is taken and committed to paper, a handler may walk away and the dog will be treated as if it had not been presented for measuring."

Dana moved to adopt the proposed language. Dale seconded.

There was discussion about the proposed language. There was clarification that this modification does not change the existing rule 4(f), which provides:

(f) The dog may be measured up to 3 times. The dog must be presented in an acceptable stand (as described in paragraph e and in illustration 4.1 above), within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed five minutes per attempt. The lowest measurement obtained by the judge shall be the dog's recorded height for that tournament.

Therefore, a dog could come back for 3 tries before being declared not measurable. We currently allow dogs that opportunity to get a different height, so it only seems fair to allow a dog to do that before they have to be declared not measurable and jump 14 inches. This also codified that a handler may chose to measure and walk away as long as it is before a final measurement is taken and committed to paper.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

> Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

Dale called the question. In favor of the motion: Nancy Garcia, Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith. Opposed: Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

6. Language regarding use of video tape instant replay

There was a request from the Rules Committee that the Judges Committee consider the issue of whether a rule should be drafted to cover the use of video in judging heats. The Judges Committee's opinion was that video should not be used to determine the winner of a heat and proposed the following rule addition.

Proposed addition to **Section 8.3 - The Heat** (m) Winner... [page 12-13 of the current rulebook]:

Add: "(iii) Video review (instant replay) shall not be used to override, or help determine the winner of a heat."

Dana moved to adopt the rule change. Dale seconded.

There was discussion regarding the proposed rule. Dale believe should continue to be able to use video to re-run a heat if the video shows an EJS malfunction. There was discussion about whether we should be permitting judges to even re-run races based on video replay.

There was a request for a vote.

There was a request for an amendment to the motion:

"Video can be used to remove a malfunctioning EJS from the ring, but it may not be used by a judge as the basis to rerun a heat."

Dana accepted the amendment. Dale withdrew his second. Nancy seconded the amended motion.

There was a request to amend the language to:

"Video shall not be used to override, or help determine the winner of a heat. Video can be used to remove a malfunctioning EJS from the ring, but it may not be used by a judge as the basis to rerun a heat."

Dana accepted this additional amendment. Nancy approved the amendment as well.

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

Finance Committee

Nancy gave the report of the Finance Committee. She passed out current Profit & Loss and Balance sheets. Those documents are attached to the minutes as Attachments C and D.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The documents showed an operating net income of \$15,121.50 as of 8/19/09. However, it is noted that after allowing for depreciation this will yield a net loss. None of the CanAm income is reflected on this balance sheet, nor are the full CanAm expenses. And, as mentioned, the documents do not include annual depreciation.

The meeting adjourned for a lunch break at 12:02 p.m. EDT.

The meeting reconvened at 12:35 p.m. EDT.

Ruth VanWert joined the meeting as a guest.

Nancy resumed her Finance report.

Nancy reported that she has successfully opened a new Canadian banking account that can be used in a more efficient manner. She will also be investigating a new system for depositing Canadian fees.

All income and expenses are processing well. Nancy and Karen have developed a system for depositing checks to ensure there are no lost checks.

Dale indicated that annually, when the rulebook is released, we revise the fees for Canadian/US rates for several small fixed charges.

The recommendation from the Committee is:

- New CRNs \$20 USD / \$22 CDN
- New Club applications \$25 USD / \$27 CDN
- For items \$10 and under, leave the prices the same for US and CDN.

All other fees in the schedule should be USD only. This subset of fees is set because they are commonly used items. All other fees should float with the exchange rate. This was an error in the last rulebook. It was corrected at the March meeting.

Dale moved to adopt this change in fees. Karen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Disciplinary Committee

Removal of aggression write-up for Molson (CRN#040228)

The Disciplinary Committee indicated that this dog met the qualifications to have the aggression excusal removed. The Committee recommends that it be removed.

Kris moved to remove the aggression excusal. Nancy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Marketing Committee

Greg indicated that his report would be included with the update on the CanAm Classic.

Nancy reported that the 2010 Junior Handler pins will be distributed to Regional Directors for the new racing year.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

• Rules & Bylaws Committee

1. Request from Crystal Cappel to limit number of points dogs can receive in one day:

"I really wish there was some way to monitor the runs that individual dogs do. I realize this may be a record keeping nightmare, but there has to be some way to hold these people accountable and at least put something in place to protect the poor dogs that are being ran into the ground. IF it is not able to be monitored at the tournament level then maybe put something in place that when the points are calculated that they will lose all their points if the dogs run more than the maximum number of heats allowed. Maybe each dog can only get 875 points per day maximum that is 35 heats times 25 points."

The Rules Committee considered this request and does not recommend that the Board of Directors adopt this proposed rule change. We continue to believe that excessive double running of dogs is a serious issue, but had concerns that this proposal would not address many instances where it could still occur. For example, dogs whose teams earned less than 25 points per run could face much more racing then dogs whose teams earned 25 points per heat. This also did not seem to address the idea that some dogs may not be physically capable of completing races with this number of points. There was also discussion that based on a review of the database, this rule would apply to a very small numbers of dogs currently racing. 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. At this point, the Committee was unable to draft a rule to address these concerns.

There was no motion to adopt the proposal.

The Board has received feedback from several people regarding this proposal. Most of the comments were not in favor of the proposal.

Kris clarified that another concern with the proposal is that people might believe this would set a benchmark that excuses the exercise of good conscience. Although we share the concern that some dogs may be running too much, this proposal doesn't adequately address the concerns.

2. Request from Todd Beedle to allow open class to be combined with regular divisions for racing:

"While enjoying the fact that I get to go to tournaments I would otherwise not, it is also not fun to have a team run 16 seconds and a team run 22 seconds. Also sometimes open cannot be run and is cancelled as there may not be enough entries in open class. Can NAFA look at maybe allowing teams to enter as an open team but place them with the regular divs based on seed time? This way if you don't have enough dogs to run regular you can still enter as open and not have to rely on open div entries being big enough. If there are quite a few open entries you could still have a separate open div but the events I have been to have only had 4 entries max and that was combined with vets so it wasn't the funnest racing we have ever done. We have just experienced this where we as a team don't have enough dogs to go and want to run open with another team, this event has no vets class so not enough entries for open alone and therefore no running for us. If we were able to enter as

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

open and run in the reg div based on seed time we still get to run, and the racing is a lot closer making for an enjoyable weekend, more entries for the Host team and NAFA's bank account. This would make open truly a pickup team which is what everyone I have talked to wanted when this was brought in."

The Rules Committee has considered this request and does not recommend that the Board of Directors adopt this proposed rule change. Although we are not recommending this change, we would remind competitors that there is no minimum number of teams required to hold the Open class. The Open class can be combined with the Veterans class for racing, but even with only one Open entry, the class is permitted to be held. There is no need for a club to cancel the Open class based on a small number of entries. The Committee considered the request and was concerned about the possible conflicts of combining Open with Regular for racing. Given that dogs do not have to be declared until the morning of racing, there would be no way to avoid conflicts.

There was discussion about this request. Several people emphasized that a tournament can run the open class with even one open team.

The Board received a number of comments regarding this issue. The vast majority of the comments were against the proposal.

No motion was put forth.

3. Request from Dan Wood regarding errors with Hughes lights sets:

- "I would like you all to view the linked videos please. You may have to click on full size in order to get to see the EJS early pass light (top). These three videos clearly show an inbound dog triggering the early pass, not the outbound dog. Use the pause/play in full size to step through the frames. This has happened many times here in region 7 on the Hughes EJS sets. I would like the rules and judges committees to determine:
- 1. When this happens, and the team videotapes it, can the judge go to the tape right then to determine if there was a false early triggered?
- 2. If not, should the judge call for a rerun if he/she feels it was a false early? And how many in a row before you give up?
- 3. What other actions are there for the judge, TD, team in these cases?"

The Rules Committee reviewed this request. In consultation with the Judges Committee, there was a joint response sent to Mr. Wood indicating that video tape footage should not be used to determine the winner of a heat, but that a judge may decide to use video footage to determine that the lights malfunctioned and re-run a heat. There is no limit to the number of times that a judge may choose to rerun heats due to EJS malfunctions.

The Rules Committee has determined it would be more appropriate for the Technology Committee to consider any issues regarding the status of these light sets.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The Rules Committee also determined that the issue regarding use of video should be sent to the Judges Committee to determine whether any rule changes are needed.

4. Request from Dale Smith to change rule regarding no practicing in ring 30 minutes after racing to allow it immediately after racing has concluded.

The Rules Committee has considered this request, and after consultation with the rest of the Board at the 8/6/09 teleconference, recommends that the Board of Directors modify the definition of the "racing day" in the glossary (page 14 of the current rulebook), to permit training in the ring after racing without requiring a 30 minute waiting period, as follows:

"Racing day – the racing day begins thirty minutes before the first scheduled race and ends after the conclusion of the last race of the day and the Electronic Judging System has been removed (unless the Executive Director has granted permission for use of the EJS outside of racing)."

Dana moved to approve the modification. Karen seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding the motion.

Chris VanWert addressed the Board regarding this proposal.

In favor: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith. Opposed: Leerie Jenkins, Greg Stopay. Abstained: Kris Pickering. The motion passed.

5. Request to review and modification of language in 6.1(k) Limited Classes to clarify that not all classes must be limited:

The Rules Committee was asked to look at the language in this rule and make a recommendation as to whether language was needed to clarify that tournaments may be sanctioned with some classes limited and other classes unlimited. The Rules Committee has reviewed this rule and recommends modification of the language to clarify any confusion. The recent rule change permitting expansion of the entries in limited classes may have left some confusion as to whether all classes are required to be limited when limits are imposed. The Rules Committee has drafted the following proposed changes after consultation with the Board at the 8/6/09 teleconference and recommends the Board of Directors adopt the following rule change:

Section 6.1- Requirements

(k) Limited Classes: The host club may not limit entries to fewer than four per class offered. At sanctioning, the host club must designate the classes offered and the maximum number of teams per limited class to reflect a total number of teams permitted in the limited classes. A tournament may be sanctioned with some classes limited and others unlimited. The host club must accept all entries up to 6:00 p.m., local time of the tournament secretary, on the closing date. Seed times for teams are not needed until after the draw. Teams that get into the class are to be selected by random draw. If one or more limited classes fill, but other limited classes do not, the

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

size of the <u>limited</u> classes that filled will be expanded by the automated draw to add the excluded teams up to the maximum declared total number of teams permitted in the <u>limited classes</u>.

The Committee received alternate language from Karen Oleson after the 8/6/09 teleconference, but has decided to propose the language above. Karen's proposed language is as follows:

Section 6.1- Requirements

(k) Limited Classes: A tournament may be sanctioned with some classes limited and others unlimited. At sanctioning, the host club must designate the classes offered and their limits, if any. The host club may not limit any class to fewer than four teams. Seed times for teams in limited classes are not required until the team is accepted into the class via random draw or otherwise. The host club must accept all entries up to 6:00 p.m., local time of the tournament secretary, on the closing date. Entries will be selected into a class by random draw when entries for the class exceed the sanctioned limit. When entries for one or more classes exceed the sanctioned limit, and entries for one or more classes do not meet the sanctioned limit, the size of the classes that have excess entries will be expanded by the automated draw to add excluded teams up to the maximum declared total number of teams permitted in all limited classes.

Dana moved to adopt the Rules Committee's proposed language. Dale seconded the motion.

There was discussion. Karen indicated that her proposal changed the structure of the paragraph somewhat and also changed the term "fill" because that term was somewhat ambiguous. There was discussion about whether Karen's language would be more appropriate.

Dana withdrew her motion and moved to adopt Karen's language. Dale seconded the new motion.

The language was amended slightly to include the underlined language, "if any".

Dana and Dale both accepted the amended language. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Request from Scott Stein to review tournament sanctioning language to determine whether language should be added to codify a prohibition against sanctioning tournaments with competing organizations.

The Rules Committee has reviewed this request, including input provided to the Board of Directors from competitors (both via email and from a Leadership Chat on Jun 9, 2009), from a Board teleconference on Jun 18, 2009, and from the Executive Director. After considering the issue, the Rules Committee does recommend an addition to the current sanctioning rules to clarify that NAFA® tournaments should not be sanctioned at the same venue on the same weekend as a flyball tournament from a competing organization. The Rules Committee originally

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

drafted proposed language, but has received input from various Board members and now recommends the Board of Directors adopt the following rule change:

Section 6.1 – Requirements

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

Karen moved to adopt the proposed rule. Nancy seconded the motion.

There was discussion.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Request from Dale Smith to modify Section 8.3(h) to permit a judge award a no finish to a team instead of re-running the heat when a whistle is blown for safety reasons with knocked jumps.

The Rules Committee considered this request and is not recommending a change in the rule at this time. The concern expressed was that when a team knocks a jump over and the judge blows a whistle for safety concerns, the current rule requires the judge to re-run the heat. In a sense, this penalizes the team that has not knocked jumps. The difficulty with trying to draft a rule that permits a judge to call a no finish for knocked jumps is that it would allow a judge to call a no finish any time a single jump is knocked over. The current rule gives judges the discretion to blow a whistle to stop the heat or to allow the heat to continue. If the heat continues, the team may send out runners to reset the jump or may use their discretion in sending dogs or not. The Rules Committee recommends this issue be referred to the Board of Directors for further discussion.

The Board has received a number of comments from people regarding this issue. Most were not in favor of the proposed change. There was discussion about the issues surrounding this proposal as far as safety of the dogs.

There was no motion to adopt the proposed change.

Kris moved to modify Section 8.3 as follows:

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

Dale seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The meeting was adjourned for a break at 1:40 p.m. EDT.

The reconvened at 1:50 p.m. EDT.

8. Request from prior meetings regarding a possible realignment of when delegate votes accrue.

The Rules Committee was asked to examine whether accrual of delegate votes could be changed to reflect votes earned by a club in the immediate prior fiscal year rather than the previous year. Initially this time frame was used for calculating earned delegate votes because technology issues did not allow that calculation to be completed by the end of the fiscal year on September 30 in time to vote at the Annual General Meeting.

The Rules Committee has considered this issue and is in favor of this change. Any bylaw change must be passed by a 2/3 majority of the Board of Directors. Any legal issues should be addressed in executive session.

The Rules Committee will be proposing a change to the existing bylaw regarding delegates. The language has not yet been finalized.

Dana moved we enter Executive Session. Dale seconded.

The Board entered Executive Session at 1:52 p.m. EDT.

The Board exited Executive Session at 2:03 p.m. EDT.

There was discussion about timing associated with changing the delegate vote. The change might necessitate moving when the AGM is held to allow adequate time to obtain results and calculate the delegate figures.

There was discussion about possible language to effectuate the change.

The proposed change was to Article VII, Section 2 of the bylaws:

Section 2. Delegates. From time to time the Board of directors may submit rule changes to delegates for consideration. Affiliate Clubs will be given a number of delegate votes based on the number of tournaments each club competed in and/or hosted during a fiscal year. Affiliate Clubs must compete in at least one event during the racing year to qualify for Delegate Votes. Delegates will be calculated for a club based on competition in or hosting tournaments on the following schedule: 1 delegate for 4-5 team entries; 2 delegates for 6-11 team entries; 3 delegates for 12-17 team entries; 4 delegates for 18-23 team entries; 5 delegates for 24-29 team entries; and 6 delegates for 30 team entries or more. One delegate per club will be awarded for hosting each tournament. No Club shall earn more than 8 delegate votes in total by team entries or tournament hosting. The Board of Directors may designate delegates with special interest in flyball. Each Board member will individually receive a delegate vote over and above any delegate votes otherwise earned. Each Regional Director will individually receive a delegate vote over and above any delegate votes otherwise earned. All approved judges and supervising judges will individually receive a delegate vote

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

in addition to any other delegate votes otherwise earned. Clubs will be notified of the number of delegates earned during the preceding fiscal year. <u>Delegate votes will be determined once each year at the close of the NAFA® Racing Year based on the activities of the club or individual during the year just completed.</u>

Dale moved to adopt the proposed change. Nancy seconded the motion.

Additional discussion was held regarding modification of the AGM dates.

Contingent on first motion passing, Leerie moved to change the AGM dates to December 1- January 31. Kris seconded.

There was discussion that this change would be effective for this year's election.

Ruth VanWert made a statement regarding this proposal.

There was a suggestion that during this interim year, we would utilize a process so clubs would get the higher of their club votes.

A vote was taken on the initial motion, to change the timing of delegate votes. In favor: Nancy Garcia, Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith. Opposed: Karen Oleson, Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

Greg stated he voted against the motion because he was uncomfortable rushing through issue. Dale indicated this issue has been before the Board well over 2 years.

A vote was taken on the subsequent motion to change the timing of the AGM in light of the changed delegate vote. In favor: Nancy Garcia, Leerie Jenkins, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine, Dale Smith. Abstained: Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

There was further discussion about how to handle the interim year and possible language to effectuate that change.

Kris proposed:

"Delegate votes exercisable in FY 2010 shall be determined by number of delegate votes a club earned by virtue of activities in FY 2008 or FY 2009 whichever yields the higher number of votes."

Kris moved to adopt this language. Leerie seconded the motion.

There was a small grammatical modification to:

"Delegate votes exercisable in FY 2010 shall be determined by the number of delegate votes a club earned by virtue of activities in either FY 2008 or FY 2009, whichever yields the higher number of votes."

Both Kris and Leerie accepted the amendment to the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

9. Request from prior meetings regarding FEO, bye, and performance team races in 3/5 format – whether teams competing against a team who cannot win should be required to complete races in 3 heats in the 3/5 format and whether they should be automatically awarded 3 wins.

The Rules Committee discussed this issue and does not recommend a change in the rules. Currently teams are permitted 5 heats to complete 3 wins even when they are competing against a team who cannot win (such as a performance team, an FEO team, or a bye race against an empty lane). There was some concern expressed that this creates unnecessary racing and may prolong the racing day. There was discussion as to whether teams should be automatically awarded three wins, regardless of whether they finish the heats. There was concern that teams should not be awarded a win if they have a no finish. There was also discussion that teams should be afforded the opportunity to have all five tries to get their three wins given that they would get that opportunity if they were running against a team that was permitted to win. After discussion, the Rules Committee decided not to recommend a rule change regarding this issue.

There was discussion about this issue. There was no motion to implement a rule change.

10. Request from previous meetings regarding formulating language for interpretation of Section 1.6(b). The Board of Directors previously voted that this section should be interpreted to mean that the approval of Regional Directors happens only with the change of an Executive Director, not the reelection of the same Executive Director to another term. This was referred to the Rules Committee to formulate language.

The Rules Committee proposes the following language in conformance with the vote at the August 2, 2008 Board meeting:

Section 1.6 - Regional Directors

(b) Regional Directors shall be appointed by the Executive Director, and approved by the Board of Directors. Upon a change of Executive Director, the slate of Regional Directors shall be tendered for approval at the next in-person meeting of the Board of Directors.

Dana moved to accept the proposed language. Nancy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Request from Gord Travis regarding 6.2(g) to clarify language regarding prohibition against double listing a dog listed in the veterans class on any other time sheet.

The current rule states:

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

(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.

His suggested language is: Could the rule simply state that "a dog listed in veterans at a tournament may not be listed in another class on the same day it is listed in the veterans class."

The Rules Committee reviewed the rule and the concerns expressed. We were unable to draft language that was any clearer than the existing rule. The Committee felt that the suggested language was actually more vague in some situations.

There was brief discussion. No motion was put forth.

12. Request from 6/18/09 Leadership chat to consider language of Section 7.6 regarding penalties for running ineligible dogs in comparison to Chapter 4 (m) regarding violations for running team at incorrect height.

The current language of 4(m) states:

(m) After a protest or a measuring performed at the head judge's request, if the head judge determines a team is not jumping at least the minimum height in a round robin format, the team shall forfeit any heats won at the improper jump height. In the case of an elimination format, the team shall be excused.

The Committee reviewed this language in comparison with the amendments to Section 7.6 implemented at the March 21, 2009 meeting. The Committee acknowledges that the sanctions are somewhat different in these rules, but finds that the conduct prohibited is sufficient different to justify the variation in sanction.

The Committee was split as to whether any modification was needed to 4(m). Kris wanted the rule to remain as written. Dale, Nancy, and Dana would move to change the word "won" to "run" to indicate that a team found to be jumping an incorrect height after a height challenge should forfeit all heats at the incorrect height, not just heats won by the team.

Dana moved to change "won" to "run" in 4(m). Leerie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Referral from 8/6/09 teleconference to draft language to clarify that all racing should stop when measuring a dog pursuant to a height challenge.

The Rules Committee recommends the following modification to Chapter 4 – Measuring:

(I) Any protest with respect to a dog's jump height must be verbalized to the Tournament Director and/or the Regional Director within 30 minutes of the heat in question by the Captain of a competing team in that division or combined division.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The head judge may at any time measure a dog. At the time a dog is measured pursuant to a protest, all racing should stop until measuring has concluded.

Karen moved to adopt the proposed language. Alisa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Request from Lee Heighton to allow divisions of less than four teams to not be required to be combined with an adjacent division for racing upon approval of the Executive Director.

"Can the Rules Committee please discuss the following request. Chapter 6-Hosting a NAFA® sanctioned tournament. Paragraph (i)(i) states that "Whenever it's necessary to run divisions of less than 4 teams, combine the division with an adjacent division. etc..."

I am requesting that the language be changed to include "unless permission is received from the Executive Director."

We are running into a number of tournaments where the seed times between divisions are so large that it would be in the best interest of our competitors to allow this exception. By requiring that they receive permission, we still address one of the original concerns to make sure that a host team doesn't use this to their advantage in regards to Regional Points."

The proposed rule change was as follows:

Chapter 6 (i):

(i) Whenever it's necessary to run divisions of fewer than 4 teams, combine the division with an adjacent division, unless permission is received from the Executive Director. Division placements and break-out times for each individual division still apply when divisions are combined for racing.

Leerie moved to approve the proposed change. Alisa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

• Awards Committee

Dale reported on the nominations received. Of the regional MVP nominees, two were disqualified because they had not raced in the past racing year – Region 11, Call Me Ketch n Fool, CRN 980705 and Region 16, Tipper, CRN 000655.

There were 14 nominees for the Clyde Moore Hall of Fame. The Board is required to narrow those nominees down to five or less. The Executive Director has traditionally presided over voting and the Chair is permitted to vote on nominees.

Lee took over for the voting process.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

Alisa announced that she will abstain from the voting process as a dog in household was nominated.

After several rounds of voting, the Board narrowed the group down to five finalists:

- Klondike 010611, Staffordshire Bull Terrier, owned by Chris Romaine
- Morgan 011573, Great Dane, owned by Keri Caraher
- Radar 960326, Border Collie, owned by Aaron Robbins
- Roxanne 970122, Border Collie, owned by Jane Horsfield
- Shadow 980128, Mix, owned by Karen Larkin
- Nominating Committee

Dale reported that five nominations have been received for the three Board of Director positions:

- Zachary Chernik
- Leerie Jenkins
- Dana Nichols
- Karen Oleson
- Ruth VanWert
- Review Panel

Dana reported the aggression excusals received since the March meeting.

- Brady 070968 4/26/09
- Cooper 080004 5/31/09
- Ginny 090623 6/24/09
- Bonsai 080047 6/28/09
- Ziggy 070970 8/9/09
- Dodger 051127 8/9/09

Lee is keeping track of aggression excusals so we have better records over the years. The form for excusals has been modified to include contact information for dog owners and to conform to the new rule as far as distribution of the form.

• <u>Technology Committee</u>

Dale provided the following report from the Technology Committee:

1. Update on EJS maintenance

Currently four EJS systems are involved in maintenance activities. Three are out of circulation awaiting display repairs predominantly. One is in circulation but missing its spare green pole. Most if not all of this damage comes from placing the displays into the cases incorrectly. I can't stress enough the care tournaments need to take when repacking the EJS.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

The EJS you pack may be the same one you get back next time. I know there's a lot going on when an event is over and the site is being torn down and cleaned up, but someone has to take responsibility for carefully packing the EJS.

Additionally, the recovered EJS is still being tested. It currently appears to have a pole problem - which is why it was being shipped in the first place when it was lost. No other issues detected thus far. Blue 5 (the new designation for the half system purchased to replace what was lost in shipping) is still a partial system pending authorization to complete it.

Dale moved that the Board purchase the other half of the set. Leerie seconded the motion.

There was discussion that the cost would be approximately \$3,000 to complete the set. A full set costs approximately \$10,000.

The motion passed unanimously.

Kris asked how many sets of Signature Gear lights are currently in circulation. Dale reported that there are 14 total sets circulating right now. We own 19 sets and 5 are out with various issues.

2. Update on updating NAFA scoring program

We still need to develop a replacement for the current scoring program - fbscore. The current program does not adequately address some newer additions to NAFA such as open and veterans classes and performance teams.

In addition, some users have experienced issues with newer versions of Windows and have complained about the lack of Mac support. An individual was working on a new program and lost interest. We need to re-engage to find another interested party.

3. Formatting Rulebook

Technology is considering two programs to better format the rulebook. Both Framemaker and Quicksilver (formerly InterLeaf) are workable but we've been unable to reach a reasonable compromise between price of the program and ease of use. We'll publish the book in Word this year for hopefully the last time.

4. Older EJS systems

We've looked at a number of issues now occurring with the Hughes EJS systems. With the advancements that have been made in EJS systems, the older systems no longer provide a number of the same functions (new tie criteria, false start indications, etc). We're also trying to provide a consistent experience for competitors wherever they compete. To this end, we recommend the sunset of the Hughes EJS systems for use in NAFA sanctioned events effective 1/1/10. The Serpa systems will continue to be reserved for use in emergency situations and are not routinely used for sanctioned events. The one remaining issue we need to work out is Alaska.

There was discussion about the impact decommissioning would have on regions and on availability of Signature EJS sets. Kris expressed concern about ensuring enough working sets of Signature Gear EJS were available, especially in region 7, which has been primarily utilizing Hughes sets. Dale and Greg

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

believed that we would have enough sets of Signature Gear lights for current demands, but the Serpa lights could be used in a back up situation. The Board discussed what would be needed to provide additional EJS systems in western Canada as the Hughes systems are retired. There was also discussion that for any regions needing additional training on the Signature Gear sets, training could be made available at CanAm or at Cynosports.

Dale emphasized that the EJS system needs to be set up correctly. Many of the problems noted have been associated with incorrect set up. We have a set up guide and video instruction for the Signature Gear EJS available on the NAFA® web page. Dale and Greg mentioned that the TD and the EJS Coordinator are emailed a list of contact numbers, web address for the video, and instructions for how to report any errors.

Dale moved to sunset the Hughes EJS effective 1/1/10. Leerie seconded the motion. There was further discussion.

There was discussion about leaving a set of Serpa lights in Alaska for their annual tournament to minimize shipping costs.

Scott suggested moving the date a bit further out to make sure there is enough time to receive the additional Signature Gear set that is approved.

Dale amended his motion to have the sunset date for the Hughes sets effective 3/31/10. Leerie accepted the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Optimizing Racing Schedules

As discussed earlier, the Technology Committee, in conjunction with the special scheduling committee, is working on a program to optimize racing schedules to provide adequate breaks for Teams and Clubs. We intend to start passing more schedules through this technology and hope to make it more generally applicable and user-friendly.

6. Ballots

Mailing annual and delegate ballots remains one of the most onerous activities in NAFA. There is a large of manual labor involved in printing ballots and envelopes, collating and stuffing ballots and posting and mailing. We'd like to offer the option for delegates (Club owners and others) to opt-in to electronic delivery of their ballots. This would reduce the overall mailing load, provide quicker ballot delivery to delegates and make it easier to vote electronically as the delegate would receive a clickable link navigating directly to the balloting system.

Dale moved to allow delegates to opt in for voting electronically. Leerie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business

1. CanAm Update

Lee gave an update on the event. Entries have progressed extremely well.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

Lee recognized the efforts from Board members and others. Kim Davis has done a great job with the live update and information on the webpage. She redesigned the whole front page to highlight CanAm. Karen has done a good job with entries. She is still trying to tabulate final numbers due to the large number of entries we've received. The preliminary numbers are – over 80 Friday and approximately 115 for Saturday and Sunday. The numbers were current as of Thursday at noon. Leerie and his volunteer program are doing extremely well. He has gotten a good number of volunteers.

At this point, it looks like Friday's racing will probably be held in 3 rings. Saturday and Sunday will be likely be held in 4 rings. This will be the largest flyball tournament ever held.

The location and indoor venue seem to have been critical in increasing entries. We believe early marketing of the event also helped dramatically.

Nancy has been working on the awards. She has some great awards in store. She shared some of the plans with the Board.

This is a large venue and has quite a few requirements. There will be a welcome letter to communicate information to competitors. There will be costs for parking. Nancy is working on getting multiple day parking passes. Because of the fairground concession contracts, no outside food will be permitted. Competitors will be permitted to bring in water for dogs, but will need to buy food and drinks from the fairground concession. The fairground has an exclusive contract with Pepsi, therefore no advertisements or banners, etc. are permitted from Coke. The venue also has requirements for electricity. Competitors will not be permitted to run electrical cords to the walls. Drops are available to teams at a cost of \$61 per drop.

Shirts and hats sales went over very well. We have already had a large number of orders. Nancy reported that she plans to do another order afterwards for people to order with shipping costs.

Securing vendors has been somewhat more difficult. This is the first year for this event. Next year we expect to see a large increase.

Dan Phillips is handling media. He expects to be able to offer live streaming video of the event. He is also coordinating photographers for event. Dan is an event sponsor and will be providing substantial prizes, which will be announced at the event.

2. AGM

Scott announced that the change to the delegate votes required that we change the existing time frame for the AGM. Our new range is December 1 – January 31. The two current requests we had were for November. He indicated he will be seeking locations for the meeting in association with tournaments during that time. Several Board members indicated a desire to have a date set relatively soon because of work calendars and other obligations.

IV. New Business

1. Proposal from Sandy Dankemeyer to change NAFA points system

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

Scott reported that he received the following proposal from Sandy Dankemeyer:

To NAFA,

Last year Feb. 2008 NAFA Board Meeting Attachment F; Lori Whitney wrote to you about the possibility of changing the point system and getting it to the point of a possible vote by NAFA delegates. She sumitted the letter with many region 4 teams and there team members signing in support of the porposal.

I think it did not move forward as you may of thought that it was a reply to the lower jump hight porposal.

Is there any way we can get this brought up again and possibly get a vote on it.

Thank you, Sandy Dankemeyer Rapids Intens-A-Flyrs

Lori Whitney wrote:

I am sure you have not thought about it but we were talking about the possibility of under 32 seconds= 5 points, under 28 seconds=10 points and under 24 seconds 25 points. There are some teams out there, that don't ever get under 24 seconds and get only 1 and 5 point runs, obviously these dogs will never get the needed points required for higher NAFA titles, but none the less

are still running their hearts out and having a good time. I do understand teams in the top divisions with the super fast dogs wont care as they always rack up 25 point runs, for but the vast majority of us who are unable to do so, it would be a welcome change to come out of a tournament with a few more points, while some teams are up into the tens of thousands of points some of us would be happy with 5000. I understand the name of the game is to have super fast dogs with a fast little height dog, but some of us have the breeds we love and will not get a super fast dog just to get more flyball points. Some of us were talking about this and I volunteered to

share the thought with you, thank you for your time and consideration of this, Either way, we love flyball and love this great organization.

Sincerely, Lori Whitney Dogcrzy1@wctc.net Rapids Intens-A-Flyrs flyball team

Karen moved to approve the proposal. There was no second. The motion died for lack of support.

2. Request from Chris VanWert to revoke sanctioning for tournament 09032100

Scott had distributed prior to the meeting the following request from Chris VanWert:

Subj: Agenda Item for the 08/22/09 NAFA Board Meeting, Detroit, MI

REF: Armada, MI NAFA Tournament Event #09032100

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

REF: NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures, Chapter 6-Hosting a NAFA Sanctioned Event, Section 6.1 (a), (b)

To The Chairman of the NAFA Board, Scott Stein, To The Executive Director, Lee Heighton, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the NAFA Board,

I respectfully request the NAFA Board revoke sanctioning of the above referenced NAFA Event because sanctioning of this event by NAFA is a violation of the above referenced section of the NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures as it relates to revoking a previously sanctioned NAFA event that is protected by NAFA policy as a Reserved Weekend.

Reserved Weekend status for NAFA sanctioned events is considered to be a sacred and honored tradition. The "prior NAFA practice" of a Legacy Weekend was conceived and put into practice by the past Executive Director, the late Clyde Moore. Past Executive Director, Steve McAvoy, continued this practice and it promoted NAFA Events as more Clubs began to host their own events. Past Executive Director, Sam Ford further refined and strengthened this policy by committing it to writing and the NAFA Board then in office supported his proposal by approving its incorporation into the NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures as Chapter 6 - Hosting a NAFA Sanctioned Event; Section 6.1 - Requirements; sub-section (b) Reserved Weekends. The NAFA Board has affirmed the importance of protecting a host club's Reserved Weekend by including a clause in Chapter 6.1 (a) specifying how it is to operate when NAFA finds it is necessary to revoke sanctioning a tournament that meets the criteria of a Reserved Weekend.

Chapter 6.1 (a) states ".....the tournament sanctioning will be revoked. The first Club to apply for sanctioning with a valid sanctioning request will receive sanctioning <u>unless the weekend meets the criteria for a Reserved Weekend by another Club."</u>

FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE:

On 06/09/09, NAFA revoked sanctioning of Event #09010800 hosted by the Ballistics Flyball Team in the city of Vassar, MI for September 5 & 6, 2009, citing an *unwritten* NAFA practice of the Executive Director.

The NAFA Board upheld this action as evidenced by the minutes of the Board Teleconference Meeting held on 06/18/09. This decision by the NAFA Board affirming revocation of NAFA sanctioning for Event #09010800 was communicated to the event's designated Tournament Director, Shannon Seeger, and contained the following language: "...the weekend was now open for NAFA sanctioning."

That statement is a clear violation and contradiction of Chapter 6.1 (a) which specifically **exempts** sanctioning a Reserved Weekend held by another Club.

There is NO disputing the fact that Ballistics Flyball Team met all the criteria for Reserved Weekend as outlined by Chapter 6.1 (b).

- Ballistics is and always has been in "good standing" with NAFA.
- They have hosted this event on the same weekend in the same venue for 11 consecutive years.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

 Ballistics turns in their valid sanctioning requests 1-2 years in advance of their event. Currently, NAFA has approved this event for Ballistics for Labor Day Weekend 2010. THAT'S how far in advance planning is this Club for their Reserved Weekend.

Ballistics met all the requirements for hosting a NAFA sanctioned event as published by NAFA in Chapter 6.1 in all Sections and sub-sections. They met all the criteria for a Reserved Weekend. The Executive Director has a duty and an obligation to follow the NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures whenever and wherever they are written, *even when enforcing an "unwritten" prior NAFA practice*. The consequences for a Club that has its valid sanctioning request revoked because of an "unwritten" NAFA practice enforced by the Executive Director CANNOT be greater than a **written** NAFA policy for revoking a NAFA event. It doesn't matter how "inconvenient" honoring Ballistics Reserved Weekend for Labor Day weekend is/was, Chapter 6.1(a)&(b) clearly protects their Reserved Weekend for 2009 and it is not available to any other Club for sanctioning by NAFA without the written approval of their Tournament Director, Shannon Seeger.

CONCLUSIONS

NAFA's Corporate Policies and Procedures are written for and meant to be followed by NAFA's own Officers, Personnel and volunteers. They are a blueprint and a promise to those seeking NAFA's services that this is how NAFA conducts business. The NAFA Board of Directors should take very seriously any incident or issue which casts doubt in the public mind about NAFA's intentions and integrity. We need to feel certain and confident that NAFA follows NAFA's rules.

I acknowledge that in the next three weeks the possibility exists that the hosting Club for the Armada, MI tournament may independently cancel their event before the NAFA Board has the opportunity to discuss this issue and thus, render my concerns as "moot". No matter what transpires between now and the Board Meeting on 08/22/09, the Board needs to go on record affirming the protection of Reserved Weekend in its written policies. The NAFA Board of Directors has a duty to repair the damage caused by this violation of Chapter 6.1(a)(b) and take action to revoke the sanctioning of the Armada, MI tournament, NAFA Event #09032100 immediately.

Thank you for your time considering this matter.

Sincerely,

Christine E. VanWert NAFA Club #455, Region 1

There was no motion put forth.

3. Request from Todd Morningstar to automatically revoke sanctioning for tournaments not providing proof of insurance 14 days prior to the tournament date

Scott reported that the Board received the following request from Todd Morningstar, which was forwarded to all Board members:

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

> Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

Karen

Thank you for your reply. This makes for a very interesting debate. One would be able to look at that NAFA has knowingly allowed stated rules not having to be followed. To be correct the insurance was given to you 9 days before the event in this case. But what is more interesting is that in "past practice" the ED your employer has allowed written rules not to be followed. I would like to think that NAFA upholds all written rules and policy, but is is very evident that they have not.

Scott

I'm requesting that this is brought up at your Detroit meeting and I'm using Karen's direct response the e-mail below of why this has been allowed to go on. This is in violation of written "published" rules and allowed to go on. Please acknowledge that you have received this request.

Thank you Todd Morningstar

--- On Wed, 7/29/09, Karen Oleson <flyballsanc@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Karen Oleson <flyballsanc@yahoo.com>

Subject: Proof of Insurance

To: "Todd Morningstar" < todd_kari@yahoo.com>

Cc: "Scott Stein" <betterk9@comcast.net>, "Dale Smith" <dgsmith@us.ibm.com>, "Dana Nichols"

- <workinglabs@comcast.net>, "Nancy Garcia" <nancykgarcia@comcast.net>, "Greg Stopay"
- <greg stopay@bellnet.ca>, "Alisa Romaine" <pistaffy@direcway.com>, "Leerie Jenkens"
- <leerie@triad.rr.com>, "Karen Oleson" <flyballsanc@yahoo.com>, "Lee Heighton"
- <springloaded@comcast.net>

Date: Wednesday, July 29, 2009, 4:09 PM

Hi Todd,

Thank you for your inquiry regarding the proof of insurance for the Region 1 tournament less than 14 days away.

I would like you to know that I received a copy of the proof of insurance today. The NAFA database has been updated with the insurance information and today's date.

This is not the first NAFA sanctioned tournament that has been listed without insurance less than 14 days prior to the tournament date. As of this date, sanctioning has not been revoked when host clubs have made it known that they were in the process of obtaining insurance. NAFA was aware that the host club was in the process of obtaining insurance.

Sincerely,

Karen Oleson NAFA®

There was no motion put forth.

Board of Directors Meeting Detroit, Michigan

Abridged Minutes August 22, 2009

4. Request from Glenn Hamilton regarding combining divisions in elimination formats

Scott reported that the Board received a recent request from Glenn Hamilton:

Hello all,

I appreciate any consideration that you may give to the following request.

Recently, we attended an event where Div. 1 and 2 were combined due to a small entry. It is normal for the Round Robin portion to be combined in such a circumstance but at this event, the Single Elimination portion of the racing was also combined. No-one racing or even Regional Directors from outside the region felt this was acceptable yet it was allowed to stand.

This format left some Div. 2 teams racing Div. 1 teams but being limited by a BO while other Div. 2 teams were racing each other with the same BO. As this was an elimination round, the Div. 1 vs Div 2 was clearly unfair when compared to the Div. 2/Div. 2 match up.

The Regional Director approved this format stating that there was no where in the rules that said it couldn't or shouldn't be done.

Please clarify the rules for the upcoming season indicating that Elimination Rounds may not be combined across divisions.

Sincerely,

Glenn Hamilton Some Ruff Competition

Email: Glenn.hamilton@dunkinbrands.com

There was discussion regarding this request. The following language was proposed to modify subsection (i) of Chapter 6(i):

(i) Whenever it is necessary to seed a division of fewer than 4 teams, the division shall be combined with an adjacent division for race scheduling purposes, unless permission is received from the Executive Director. If an elimination format is used, the divisions shall not be combined for that portion of the schedule. Division placements and break-out times for each individual division still apply.

Kris moved to adopt the modification. Karen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dana moved to adjourn the meeting. Leerie seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM EDT.