Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

Present were: Executive Director Sam Ford

Board of Directors Nancy Garcia,

Lee Heighton, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Dale Smith, Scott Stein, Greg Stopay

Chairman Lee Heighton called the meeting to order on March 20, 2009 at 8:50 PM PDT. Alisa Romaine was unable to attend due to illness and gave her proxy to Dana Nichols.

Guest Kim Davis.

Chairperson's comments

Lee Heighton welcomed guest Kim Davis who is the current NAFA web master. Lee welcomed new Board members Karen Oleson and Greg Stopay. He reviewed procedures, responsibilities, and requirements for Board meetings with all members.

Executive Director's comments

Sam Ford gave a report regarding the progress of planning for the CanAm event. There will be ample space for crating inside the building. Greg is working on contacting vendors. Nancy will have reports from the Awards Committee. Formats have been fine tuned. We have been receiving a lot of very positive input, especially on the new location and accessibility. Sam fielded questions from Board members.

Judges Committee

Scott Stein reported on current requests for change in judging status.

- Anna Sheppard, Abbotsford, British Columbia, apprentice to provisional. The Judges Committee recommends advancement. Scott moved to advance her to provisional status. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Kyle Mankes, Holly Springs, NC, apprentice to provisional. The Judges Committee recommends advancement. Scott Stein moved to advance him to provisional status. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

- Jonathan Bescher, Clayton, NC, apprentice to provisional. The Judges Committee recommends advancement. Scott Stein moved to advance him to provisional status. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Dave Walt, Caledonia, Ontario, approved to supervising. The Judges Committee does not recommend advancement at this time. There was discussion about some of the concerns of the Judges Committee. There was no motion put forward. Lee relayed information supporting the Judges Committee's position.

Kris moved we enter Executive Session. Dale seconded. The Board entered executive session at 9:30 p.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at 9:59 pm

The Judges Committee does not recommend Dave Walt's approval and will send a letter explaining their concerns.

Dan Wood, Lynnwood, Washington, resubmitted his application for approved to supervising. The
Judges Committee has re-evaluated his application and continues to recommend that he not be
approved based on the deficiencies noted previously. The Judges Committee recommends that
he submit a new application specifically addressing those deficiencies and that the application be
submitted no earlier than one year from now. There was discussion about the Judges
Committee's recommendation.

There was discussion about how supervising judge applications should be considered in general.

Kris moved that we convene a teleconference with the Judges Committee with Dan Wood to address his application. Greg seconded. Dale moved to amend to have it be with the full BOD. Amendment was accepted.

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

Lee suggested that both supervising judge applications be placed on hold pending a teleconference with both applicants. There was a discussion about whether the Judges Committee should hold teleconferences with supervisory judge applicants in the future. There was also discussion about what standards should be in place for supervisory judges.

There was discussion about scheduling a teleconference with any supervising judge candidates and letting the rest of the Board of Directors know before any teleconference. This would give supervising judge applicants an opportunity to respond to any questions.

Dana moved for a teleconference with Dave Walt. Greg seconded.

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

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

Dale raised a question about whether the teleconference should be a Board of Directors meeting. Dale moved for teleconference to be a Board meeting. The motion died for lack of a second.

Greg moved to recess the meeting. Kris seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 10:50 pm PDT until 9:00 am PDT the next morning.

Lee reconvened the meeting at 9:36 am PDT.

The Judges Committee report was resumed. The Board resumed discussion of the process for dealing with supervising judge applications that are denied.

Dale moved that the teleconferences for Dave Walt & Dan Wood be Judges Committee meetings that Board members are invited to attend and that minutes be taken. Nancy seconded. There was discussion about whether the individuals would be available by telephone today. Emails were sent to see if the applicants were available.

Dale moved to table his own motion pending information on whether the judges could be reached by phone today. Karen seconded. The motion to table passed unanimously.

There was discussion about how to handle supervising judge applications in the future. Dale discussed possible time delays. In general, judge applications are considered at in person board meetings. Dale moved for supervising judge applications that will not receive a positive recommendation, the judge will be contacted by the Judges Committee with an opportunity to discuss their application at a teleconference (with all Board members invited) before the application is presented to the Board. Nancy seconded. There was further discussion.

Kris suggested that all supervising judge applicants be given a teleconference. She also suggested that the names of supervising judge applicants be published on the webpage to make sure there is an opportunity for people to provide feedback. Sam indicated it could be part of the application.

Dale amended his motion to have the teleconference be mandatory for all supervising judges. Nancy accepted the second.

Scott suggested that it be sent back to the Judges Committee for formalizing a new process. There was discussion.

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

Karen moved to have the Judges Committee review the supervising judge application process and make a recommendation to the Board at the next meeting. Dana seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Yahoo groups subscriptions for committees were updated.

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

Secretary's Report

Dana indicated that the minutes for the last Board meeting were approved & published on the web page.

Treasurer's Report

Nancy is completing the transition to treasurer from Scott. Accounts are being transferred. Nancy inquired about procedures for bounced checks. There are some Canadian checks that are somewhat old. There was discussion about publishing names of teams who have insufficient funds. Nancy indicated she would find the information and report back later in the meeting.

Nancy did not have documents with her to be able to report back and was unable to obtain the information remotely. She reported that several of the checks are fairly old. There was discussion about procedures and consequences for insufficient funds. Scott suggested that steps be made for collection, if funds cannot be collected, then the clubs and/or individuals be found not to be in good standing. Nancy indicated she would report back to the Board regarding the status.

There was a discussion about publishing information on the webpage. Previously disciplinary actions, aggression write-ups and teams not in good standing were published in the NAFA® News. Currently the rules require aggression write-ups and disciplinary actions be published on the web page. There was discussion about how to handle teams who are not in good standing. One suggestion was informing the Regional Director. There was discussion about whether correspondence should come from the Treasurer to the club owner. The consensus was that the Treasurer should be the one to communicate this to teams.

There was discussion about streamlining the process to expedite learning when Canadian funds do not clear.

Dale asked about the status of Pam Schultz's inquiry regarding her check. Pam Schultz contacted us to let us know that her check to NAFA® had not yet been cashed. Dale has a note from her dated 3/2/09 saying she hasn't heard back from Scott yet. Karen confirmed the check was sent to Scott. Scott said it was not in the deposit he made. Pam has offered to send a replacement check. Nancy will follow up with Pam. Dale asked Scott to make sure that no other checks were misplaced. He also asked that a process be worked out with Karen and Nancy to make sure. Karen explained the current process and the ability to audit. She discussed the safeguards in place. Sam asked that Lee & Sam be copied on confirmations.

Finance Committee

Scott reported that the transition to Nancy as treasurer is almost complete. Nancy has taken over all deposits and bill payments as of January. The final transition of the books is today. At that point, nearly all of the position has been transitioned.

The 990 was filed with the IRS. It will be scanned and posted on the web page.

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

No financials were presented because of the transition. Scott indicated that our year end, with depreciation included, will show an approximately \$14,000.00 loss. Scott will provide a copy of the year end financials for inclusion in these minutes

Disciplinary Committee

Lee indicated there was nothing to report.

Technology Committee

Greg indicated there is a chip available to program devices directly through Z-wave chips. He inquired about the feasibility of using these in the Signature Gear EJS. Dale will look into it.

Marketing Committee

Greg reported about the CanAm Classic. He talked about the possibility of including agility and dock diving competitions. Electrical and drape people will come in on Wednesday, vendors can come in for set up on Thursday. Lee reported we are going to have to pay an additional half-day rental fee for the set up day.

There was discussion about vendors and encouraging shoppers. All sales will have to come out of the vendors area. No one will be permitted to sell items out of the crating areas, etc. There was discussion about charging a reduced rate for 501(3)(c) rescue groups and what restrictions would apply.

Executive Director

Sam requested approval of an RD. He has appointed Sharon Atkinson as RD in Region 21. Dana moved to approve that appointment. Dale seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 11:34 a.m. PDT.

The meeting resumed at 11:49 a.m. PDT.

Standing Rules/Regulatory/Bylaw Committee

Dana handed out text of rule changes proposed by the Rules Committee which are incorporated into the minutes.

1. New C.6 form

Nancy proposed a new C.6 form for payment of tournament fees. There was discussion about the proposed form.

The fees for everything other than tournament fees (height card, new club, CRN, etc.) had been reset in August to be equal for US and Canadian dollars based on the existing exchange rate. Scott clarified that

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

the US/CAN exchange rate set by the organization at the August meeting does not apply to tournament fees. Therefore, the C.6 form should indicate USD, not CDN.

Dana moved to amend the rulebook and appendix for the fee schedule to correctly reflect that recording fees are in USD, not in Canadian. This is to correct a clerical error in the existing rulebook. Nancy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

There was also discussion about referring to the Technology Committee the task of re-formatting the current rulebook into a more manageable document.

Dana moved to publish a document on the NAFA® web page with all rulebook modifications which are effective before publishing of new rulebook. Karen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Karen suggested changing the language of Section 6.1(m)(i), page 27 of the current rulebook to indicate the tournament recording fees should be due for each "scored team" rather than each "team that competed" for clarification. The rule would then read:

CHAPTER 6 – HOSTING A NAFA® SANCTIONED EVENT Section 6.1 – Requirements

- (m) The following items will be sent to NAFA® within 14 days after the tournament, via NAFA® approved courier:
 - (i) A recording fee of \$25.00 (US funds) per scored team. A discount of \$5.00 (US funds) is offered per team when tournament data is electronically filed. Electronically filed data shall meet the criteria established by NAFA®. When multiple tournaments hosted by the same club occur on successive days, and each is scored electronically, the fee is \$20.00 USD for the tournament with the largest entry and \$10.00 USD per team for each additional tournament;

Dana moved to adopt this suggested rule change. Kris seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Dana moved that Nancy's proposed C.6 form with the suggested modifications be approved. Kris seconded. Karen and Dale suggested a few further modifications to comply with rules. Dana amended her motion to include those additional modifications. Kris agreed. The motion passed unanimously. The new form will be effective immediately. The new form will be available on the webpage and is attached to these minutes.

2. Double running of dogs at limited tournaments

The Rules Committee received a request to clarify the rule regarding when dogs can be double run at limited tournaments. There was some question of whether entries withdrawn by teams after the draw would then allow dogs to be double rule. The Rules Committee reviewed the current language and found that those circumstances did not permit double running of dogs. The Rule Committee proposed a modification of the rules to make sure there was no confusion regarding the application of the rule.

Current rule:

Page 28, Section 6.2 - Classes of Competition

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

- (h) Dogs may not compete in more than one class at a NAFA® 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.

Proposed Change:

(ii) When the entries exceed the maximum declared size of the tournament at the conclusion of the automated draw.

There was discussion regarding this proposed language. Karen proposed modifying the rule to, "When all entries received for a tournament's limited entry **regular** class are accepted at the conclusion of the automated draw."

Dana moved to approve Karen's language. Karen seconded. There was discussion that the rule change would be effective immediately. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Proposed procedures for aggression excusals

Dana indicated that Sam Ford asked the Rules Committee to formulate procedures for aggression excusals. She distributed copies of the proposed language to Board members a few days ahead of the meeting. There was a split amongst the Committee regarding how appeals would be handled if the Review Panel was not unanimous. The Committee agreed to present Scott Stein's proposal as well as the original language for consideration.

The Rules Committee's proposed language:

Section 5.7 - 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. The Head Judge must report any dog excused from competition on NAFA® Form C.12. The Head Judge is responsible for sending the completed form to the NAFA® corporate address within ten days of the incident. Ordinarily, the Regional Director and dog owner/ handler (and/or club owner) should receive a copy of the incident report at the tournament. In the event that this becomes impracticable, copies shall be distributed to those individuals within ten days of the incident.

Once received by NAFA®, the completed C.12 form shall be distributed to a Review Panel consisting of the Executive Director, the Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Chair of the Judges Committee. Members of the Panel shall be impartial and shall have no conflict of interest with the dog owner or any other party involved (e.g. shall not have family or club ties with the dog owner or any other party involved). If the form does not comply with the rules, it shall be returned to the Head Judge, dog owner, and Regional Director with the deficiencies noted. Any deficiencies must be cured by the Head Judge within ten days of receipt.

Any appeal by the dog owner of an aggression excusal must be submitted in writing to the Review Panel (Executive Director, Chair of the Board of Directors, and Chair of the Judges Committee or their substitutes if a conflict exists) within 30 days of the incident. If any appeal is filed, a copy must be

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

provided to the Head Judge. The Review Panel's decision to sustain an aggression excusal is final. The Review Panel's decision to overrule an aggression excusal expunges that excusal. The Review Panel shall issue a report at the next meeting of the Board of Directors regarding any aggression excusals received and any action taken for inclusion in the meeting minutes to be published on the NAFA® web page.

A dog with one excusal for aggression may submit a request to have that incident removed from their record. The request must come no earlier than 3 years from the date of excusal and the dog must have participated in a minimum of 10 weekends of tournaments since its excusal with no further incidents. The request shall be submitted in writing to the Disciplinary Committee. The Disciplinary Committee will make a formal recommendation to the Board of Directors regarding a request for removal. A majority vote of the Board is required to sustain a removal. A dog may have only one aggression excusal removed.

A dog will be barred from future competition immediately upon the second excusal for aggression. Any dog listed on a timesheet at a subsequent tournament after receiving a second aggression excusal will result in the penalties set forth in Section 7.6 - Penalties for Ineligible Dogs Running. An application for reinstatement may be submitted after a period of one year. The application should be submitted in writing to the Disciplinary Committee. The Disciplinary Committee will make a formal recommendation to the Board of Directors regarding a request for reinstatement. A majority vote of the Board is required to reinstate a dog. Multiple requests for reinstatement will not be permitted. In the event that a reinstated dog has an additional aggression excusal, the dog will immediately barred from future competition and no further requests for reinstatement will be permitted.

Scott Stein's proposed modification to paragraph 3:

Any appeal by the dog owner of an aggression excusal must be submitted in writing to the Review Panel (Executive Director, Chair of the Board of Directors, and Chair of the Judges Committee or their substitutes if a conflict exists) within 30 days of the incident. If any appeal is filed, a copy must be provided to the Head Judge. If the Review Panel is not unanimous in its decision, the matter will be referred to the Board of Directors for final ruling. A decision to overrule an aggression excusal expunges that excusal. The Review Panel shall issue a report at the next meeting of the Board of Directors regarding any aggression excusals received and any action taken for inclusion in the meeting minutes to be published on the NAFA® web page.

There was discussion regarding the proposed language. There were suggestions for modified language. There was extensive discussion regarding these issues. Scott and Kris wanted any non-unanimous decisions to go to the full Board.

Dana moved for approval of the proposed language without the modification regarding non-unanimous decisions. Nancy seconded. In favor: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Alisa Romaine (by proxy). Opposed: Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Dale Smith, Scott Stein, Greg Stopay. The motion fails.

There was discussion regarding further modifications to the proposal. Dale had concerns regarding the language that multiple requests for reinstatement will not be considered. He indicated he was in favor of the proposal if that was eliminated.

Dale moved to approve with striking language multiple requests for reinstatement removed. Karen seconded. There was further discussion. Dale amended his motion to indicate that no more than one per year would be permitted. Karen approved amendment.

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

In favor: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Alisa Romaine (by proxy), Dale Smith. Opposed: Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Scott Stein, and Greg Stopay. For tie-breaker, Lee Heighton voted in favor. The motion passed.

Lee indicated that he voted in favor because he felt this proposal was better than what we have now. He felt this was a step in the right direction. It may need to be modified later. Sam indicated that he believed this was a vast improvement over the current process for aggression excusals.

Dana moved that the new rule be effective immediately. Nancy seconded. In favor: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Alisa Romaine (by proxy), Dale Smith. Opposed: Kris Pickering, Scott Stein, Greg Stopay. The motion passed.

The final language adopted is as follows:

Section 5.7 - Aggressive Dogs

If a dog shows undue aggression at any time during the competition, the Head Judge may excuse the dog from competing. The Head Judge must report any dog excused from competition on NAFA® Form C.12. The Head Judge is responsible for sending the completed form to the NAFA® corporate address within ten days of the incident. Ordinarily, the Regional Director and dog owner/ handler (and/or club owner) should receive a copy of the incident report at the tournament. In the event that this becomes impracticable, copies shall be distributed to those individuals within ten days of the incident.

- (a) Review Process -- Once received by NAFA®, the completed C.12 form shall be distributed to a Review Panel consisting of the Executive Director, the Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Chair of the Judges Committee. Members of the Panel shall be impartial and shall have no conflict of interest with the dog owner or any other party involved (e.g. shall not have family or club ties with the dog owner or any other party involved). If the form does not comply with the rules, it shall be returned to the Head Judge, dog owner, and Regional Director with the deficiencies noted. Any deficiencies must be cured by the Head Judge within ten days of receipt. At the time that the Review Panel accepts the aggression excusal, it will send written notice to the dog owner (and/or club owner).
- (b) Appeal -- Any appeal by the dog owner of an aggression excusal must be submitted in writing to the Review Panel (Executive Director, Chair of the Board of Directors, and Chair of the Judges Committee or their substitutes if a conflict exists) within 30 days of notification by the Review Panel. If any appeal is filed, a copy must be provided to the Head Judge. The Review Panel's decision to sustain an aggression excusal is final. The Review Panel's decision to overrule an aggression excusal expunges that excusal. The Review Panel shall issue a report at the next meeting of the Board of Directors regarding any aggression excusals received and any action taken for inclusion in the meeting minutes to be published on the NAFA® web page.
- (c) Removal of Excusal -- A dog with one excusal for aggression may submit a request to have that incident removed from their record. The request must come no earlier than 3 years from the date of excusal and the dog must have participated in a minimum of 10 weekends of tournaments since its excusal with no further incidents. The request shall be submitted in writing to the Disciplinary Committee. The Disciplinary Committee will make a formal recommendation to the Board of Directors regarding a request for removal. A majority vote of the Board is required to sustain a removal. A dog may have only one aggression excusal removed.
- (d) Penalty -- A dog will be barred from future competition immediately upon the second excusal for aggression. Any dog listed on a timesheet at a subsequent tournament after receiving a second

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

aggression excusal will result in the penalties set forth in Section 7.6 - Penalties for Ineligible Dogs Running.

(e) Reinstatement Process -- An application for reinstatement may be submitted after a period of one year. The application should be submitted in writing to the Disciplinary Committee. The Disciplinary Committee will make a formal recommendation to the Board of Directors regarding a request for reinstatement. A majority vote of the Board is required to reinstate a dog. No more than one request for reinstatement may be filed in one year. In the event that a reinstated dog has an additional aggression excusal, the dog will immediately barred from future competition and no further requests for reinstatement will be permitted.

4. Application of penalty for timesheet violations discovered during racing

The Rules Committee received requests from several individuals to consider how the rule for penalties for time sheet violations should operate when a violation is discovered while racing is still in progress. Currently when the database catches a timesheet violation when results are submitted after a tournament has concluded, the violating teams are taken out of the placement for that division and the next team placing moves up. The question posed to the Rule Committee was when the violation is discovered while racing is still ongoing, whether the races already run should be re-scored. After examining the rule in great detail, the Rule Committee recommends that the races should not be rescored, but all future races against the violating teams are losses. The violating team(s) still lose all points and placements, but the Committee was concerned that re-scoring previous races would cause serious difficulties in that many heats and/or races would have to be re-run. In an elimination format, the entire bracket for one or more divisions might have to be re-run. Even in round robin formats, heats with no-finishes would have to be re-run. This would create problems with the maximum number of heats per day per team, and potentially set up situations where racing might not be able to be concluded in a reasonable time. Additionally, the teams would not have much incentive to use this rule to affect the outcome of placements because the violating team(s) are required to forfeit all points and placements for the entire tournament. The Rule Committee put forth language to clarify this position.

Current rule:

Page 34, Section 7.6 – Penalties for Ineligible Dogs Running

Any dog(s) listed on a time sheet in violation of Chapters 3 and 7(d) of the Rules of Racing, sections 6.2(g) and (h) and 7.5 of the Corporate Policies and Procedures and any appendices pertaining to eligibility will cause forfeiture of all NAFA® points earned during the tournament for all dogs on the team(s) on whose time sheet(s) the ineligible dog(s) appear. Team(s) with dog(s) violating these rule(s) will also forfeit any tournament placements.

Proposed Change:

Add the following language to the existing paragraph:

When a violation is discovered during a tournament, the offending team(s) will be deemed to have declared itself For Exhibition Only from that point forward. Races completed before the violation is discovered will not be rescored, but all future races will be scored as losses.

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

Dana moved to adopt this language. Kris seconded. There was discussion. Dana wanted the change to be effective immediately so it would be uniformly applied through all regions. There was discussion about timing of implementing rule.

Dana indicated that the request to review the rule was in response to a situation that happened at a tournament. The Rules Committee was not tasked with deciding whether anyone acted inappropriately, but to determine how the rule should operate in this situation. Lee removed himself from the meeting at 1:41 pm.

Scott took over as Chair and called for the vote.

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

There was a recess for lunch 1:43 p.m. PDT.

The meeting reconvened at 2:25 p.m. PDT at the Golden Nugget during lunch. Kris Pickering took over secretarial duties during lunch.

Lee appointed Kim Davis to be chair of the Nominating Committee. Dana moved to approve the nomination. Nancy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Awards Committee

Nancy discussed the status of CanAm awards. She reported on the options available and price ranges, depending on sponsorships, for welcome gifts and awards for the various classes and racing days and for the championships.

The meeting was recessed again at 3:05 p.m. PDT.

The meeting resumed after lunch at 3:40 p.m. PDT. Dana resumed secretarial duties.

Outstanding Business

Dale ran through to do list items from previous meetings to see what issues were still outstanding.

New Business

1. Request from Karen Larkin regarding 150,000 point award

The Board received a request from Karen Larkin to reconsider creating an award for 150,000 points. Greg moved that the Board recognize a 150,000 point award. Scott seconded. There was discussion. Greg indicated he didn't see any reason why the award should not be created. He did not believe the Board was qualified to decide what is safe or healthy for dogs. Dana indicated she was against creating an actual award. Dogs continue to accrue points and while it is admirable that this dog got that high, she was against creating award at this level. There was discussion regarding various options. Dale pulled

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

database information regarding the feasibility of dogs reaching that point. Other than Karen's dog Shadow, there were very few dogs who were likely to reach that award. There are currently over a dozen dogs who have earned the Hobbes award for 100,000 points and several more who are close.

In favor: Scott Stein, Greg Stopay. Opposed: Nancy Garcia, Dana Nichols, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romaine(proxy), Dale Smith. The motion failed.

Nancy thought would be nice to have some type of recognition for this dog, but was not in favor of setting an award based on this one dog alone. Dale mentioned that when ONYX was first recognized, he was recognized and then the award was created later. There was discussion that this was a slippery slope. There was discussion about other possibilities such as creating special awards for lifetime achievement. Greg will look into an article on Shadow for the NAFA® web page.

2. Offer from Alliance Reservations company

Lee said he received an offer from a company who books hotels. Lee referred it to the Marketing Committee for further investigation.

3. Request to host 2009 AGM

Revolution Flyball in Pennsylvania has offered to host the 2009 AGM tournament. There was discussion about areas of the country that have never had an AGM. Lee will look into the issue.

4. Longevity Award

The Board received a request from Natalie Moroz-Cornell to establish a longevity award for dogs. Karen moved to refer it to the Awards Committee to come up with a proposal for a Longevity Award. Scott seconded. Scott discussed that this would be skewed against breeds with shorter life spans. There was discussion about other options for recognizing a longevity type award. Dale looked at statistics in the database.

In favor of the motion to refer it to the Awards Committee: Nancy Garcia, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering, Alisa Romain (by proxy), Dale Smith, Greg Stopay. Opposed: Dana Nichols, Scott Stein. The motion passed.

5. Limited tournaments – do they count for regional championship points when the limits are adjusted dynamically by the new draw.

Dale brought up that there needs to be clarification as to whether limited tournaments whose limits are adjusted by the new draw method count for regional championship points. In other words, does the limit set at sanctioning apply or is the one that applies at the end of the automated draw. Dale moved to modify language of page 36, 8.3(e) language to reflect that if limits are shifted by the automated draw to allow all teams to enter, then the tournament should count for regional points.

Dale moved to table. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously and the issue was tabled.

Board of Directors Meeting Las Vegas, Nevada

Amended Abridged Minutes March 20, 2009

There was discussion regarding a conference call with supervising judge applicant Dan Wood. There was discussion regarding the questions to be asked.

Lee initiated a teleconference call with Dan Wood. He received a letter in August 2008 denying his application for supervising judge. The letter has specific issues and he was asked to address those if he reapplied. No additional application was submitted, but he requested to have his original application reconsidered. He was asked questions about addressing issues stated in the denial letter. Several Board members asked questions regarding concerns.

Dana left the meeting at 5:45 p.m. due to travel obligations and gave her proxy to Dale Smith. Nancy Garcia took over secretarial duties.

The conference call with Dan Wood ended at 5:50 p.m. and a recess was taken.

The meeting resumed at 6:14 p.m.

Dale moved to resume discussion regarding his motion to amend 8.3(e), three sub parts to:

(ii) Regular Classes limited below 20 teams that exclude a team at the conclusion of the automated draw will not count towards Regional Championship points or tie-break times; (iii) Multi-breed Classes limited below 12 teams that exclude a team at the conclusion of the automated draw will not count towards Regional Championship points or tie-break times; (iv) In a limited entry class of competition, if any entering Club is excluded at the conclusion of the automated draw, the class of competition will not count towards Regional Champion points or tie-break times.

Karen seconded the motion to bring the issue back into discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

There was a vote taken regarding Dale's motion to modify 8.3(e). The motion passed unanimously.

Alisa re-assigned her proxy to Karen at 6:38 p.m. PDT.

Kris moved to approve Dan Wood as Supervising judge. Karen seconded. There was discussion. Kris impressed by Dan's willingness to stand up and by the letter of the rules. Discussion of the pros and cons of the application followed.

In favor: Nancy Garcia, Karen Oleson, Kris Pickering. Opposed: Dana Nichols (by proxy), Dale Smith, Scott Stein, Greg Stopay. Abstained: Alisa Romaine (by proxy). The motion failed.

A conference call still needs to be held with Dave Walt in regards to his supervisory status.

The next Board meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 22, 2009. The location has yet to be determined.

Dale moved to adjourn. Greg seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m. PDT.