

German Shepherd Dog Club of America-Working Dog Association, Inc.
April 10 and 11, 2009
Board of Directors Meeting
Danbury Plaza Hotel and Conference Center
18 Old Ridgebury Road
Danbury, CT 06810
1-203-794-0600

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the German Shepherd Dog Club of America - Working Dog Association, Inc. ("GSDCA-WDA") was held at the Danbury Plaza Hotel and Conference Center, 18 Old Ridgebury Road, Danbury, CT 06810, on April 10 and 11, 2009. Notice of the meeting was sent to the members of the GSDCA-WDA by both electronic mail ("email") as well as by the United States Postal Service, postage prepaid. The notice was sent to the members' email and U.S. Postal mailing addresses that are on file with the GSDCA-WDA. Notice of the meeting also was published on the GSDCA-WDA website, <http://www.gsdca-wda.org>.

Friday, April 10, 2009:

CALL TO ORDER:

The President, Dr. Danny J. Spreitler, served as Chair and called the meeting to order at 7:35PM.

ROLL CALL:

The Secretary conducted a roll call.

DIRECTORS PRESENT:

The President (Dr. Danny Spreitler, via telephone), Vice President (Cindy Petersen, via telephone), Secretary (Daniel Yee), Recorder (Danny J. Spreitler, via telephone), General Directors (John Henkel, Michael Kempkes and Dr. Tom Mesdag), and the Regional Directors from Regions 1 (Fernando Burgos), 3 (Miriam Barkus), 5 (Dr. Joseph Barry) and 7 (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger).

DIRECTORS ABSENT:

Treasurer (Claudia Behnke), National Training Director (Dr. David Landau), Director of Trials and Judges (Mike West), Ex-Officio President of the GSDCA (Gail Hardcastle), General Director (Clay Meadows), Regional Directors from Regions 2 (Mike Andrel), 4 (Charlie Starr), 6 (Russell Osburn), 8 (Wendell Nope) and 9 (Ray Blomberg) were absent.

QUORUM:

A quorum was present at roll call and continued through the entire meeting.

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Karen Henkel, Bruce Campbell, Kevin Willis and Joy Schultz

APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY TO PRESIDE OVER THIS MEETING:

Both the President and the Vice President attended the meeting via telephone conference because their flights were delayed. The President appointed the Secretary, Daniel Yee, to preside over this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 2009 MEETING:

The minutes from the January 2009 Board Meeting was electronically distributed to the Board Members for review and comment prior to this meeting. It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to dispense with the reading of said minutes.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the January 2009 meeting.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT (Dr. Danny Spreitler):

No report.

REPORT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT (Cindy Petersen):

No Report

REPORT OF THE TREASURER:

The President will present the Treasurer's report tomorrow.

REGIONAL DIRECTOR REPORTS:

REGION 1 (Fernando Burgos):

The region has a new website. We've had our Regional Show. A Helper Seminar/Certification is in the approval process. Four more shows/trials are scheduled for this year.

REGION 2 (Mike Andrel):

No report

REGION 3 (Miriam Barkus):

There was a regional conference call that was not very well attended. There was difficulty with background noise during the call; however, we did get the point across that we would like more clubs to consider hosting regional shows and regional trials. As of now, the Carolina German Shepherd Working Dog Club is the only club that has requested approval to host the regional show in 2010.

REGION 4 (Charlie Starr):

No report

REGION 5 (Joe Barry):

Region 5 had a regional meeting in January that was attended by the majority of the clubs in the region. We scheduled the Regional Championship for 2010 and the Regional Show for 2010. We voted again to support the Regional Championship by requiring all the clubs in the region to either send an entrant or donate an amount that is equivalent to an entry fee to help the clubs host a regional. Prior to this we had difficulty finding clubs to host a Regional Championship. Clubs that do not cooperate will not have their events approved.

REGION 6 (Russ Osburn):

No report

REGION 7 (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger):

This region had four events in January, including the affiliation event for the Lake Matthews Working Dog Association.

The Southern Cal Schäferhunde Club did not renew because of the costs of insurance, trials, etc. The Region has planned a Regional Schutzhund Championship and we are in the process of pinning down a site. We already have the Regional Show set. So, this region has met the requirements for having both a Regional Championship Trial and a Regional Conformation Show.

We had three regional conference calls since the last Board Meeting. One significant thing that was discussed is the posting of a list of breeders within the region on the regional website.

We had an incident at the Deutscher Schäferhunde Club of San Diego trial last weekend. There were seven observers who got onto the field and were asked to leave so the competitors could do their work. They did leave under some protest. There was also some controversy about the tracking. Two tracking fields were offered and were available to anyone who wanted sand versus dirt. As per our rules, we were to meet at a certain time and place so that we may travel together to the tracking fields. It turned out that the Fiesta Island area where we were supposed to meet was closed for a special event. So we met around the corner from the original meeting place. Folks complained that we had not notified them of the change. All of the participants

were notified and they were all there. The observers/spectators had the telephone numbers for the Event Chair and the other Club contacts, including my cell number. They could have called us, but they did not.

REGION 8 (Wendell Nope):

No report

REGION 9 (Ray Blomberg):

No report

OFFICE MANAGER REPORT (Joy Schultz):

Ms. Schultz distributed a written report to the Board members. The report included a list of new members, a current roster of helpers (club level, regional level, national level and teaching level) and a summary of the approved events, score books issued, tattoo/microchip certifications.

NEW MEMBERS AND NEW CLUBS (Joy Schultz):

Ms. Schultz presented a list of newly approved members and clubs.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to welcome the new individual members.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to ratify the new club members that were previously approved by the Executive Committee. It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to welcome the new club members.

GSDCA/GSDCA-WDA LIAISON REPORT (Dr. Tom Mesdag):

Dr. Mesdag spoke with Ms. Tish Walker but has not had the opportunity to talk with Ms. Hardcastle prior to attending this meeting. Apparently there is an agreement that was received by Ms. Walker last Thursday. The GSDCA Board will meet in two weeks and will then vote on the agreement. There has not been an opportunity to review it yet. Dr. Mesdag will get back to this board as quickly as possible. This agreement, as Dr. Mesdag understands it, is between the GSDCA and the GSDCA-WDA.

Daniel Yee explained to the Board what is in the agreement. The document contains three key components, all of which were discussed with Ms. Gail Hardcastle. Ms. Hardcastle supports all three of these components. The components are as follows:

- (1) The agreement makes permanent the current temporary agreement which provides the mechanism for the WDA to communicate directly with the SV. That arrangement expires on April 30, 2009.
- (2) The GSDCA sends two representatives to the World Union meetings. The

agreement provides that the GSDCA retain one seat and assign the second seat to the WDA.

- (3) The agreement confirms that the GSDCA has no current or future plans to terminate the WDA.

At the Chair's request, it was moved and seconded that Dr. Spreitler be authorized to sign the agreement on behalf of the WDA once the GSDCA approves it.

There was a roll call vote. All members in attendance voted in favor the motion except for Dr. Mesdag who abstained. Motion carries. Dr. Mesdag stated that he will attend the next GSDCA Board meeting and will speak in support of the agreement.

REPORT OF THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE (John Henkel):

No report.

REPORT OF THE JUDGES COMMITTEE (Daniel Yee):

Mr. Yee was the only member of the Judges Committee who was in attendance. He reported that the committee had made a number of attempts to meet; these attempts, however, were not successful.

Mr. West has recommended that Mr. Paul Schneider be approved as a WDA judge. This will be the third time Mr. Schneider's name has been submitted consideration as a WDA judge. The first two submissions were denied by the board because there is no program in place under which Mr. Schneider may be approved as a WDA judge. There has been no change in the judges program between the last submission and now. Dr. Spreitler requested that we vote on this matter tomorrow. Mr. Yee moved that this matter be tabled until tomorrow morning as the first item for discussion. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

REPORT FROM THE HELPER COMMITTEE (Miriam Barkus):

Ms. Barkus reported that there were two conference calls. There were issues with respect to one of the conference calls. Mr. Yee requested permission to read into the record a written report concerning the Helper Committee. Since the report relates to a matter that will be voted on tomorrow, it was determined that the report will be read at such time the matter comes before the board for consideration.

REPORT FROM THE NASS COMMITTEE:

Mr. Yee moved to table the NASS committee report until after the Judges Committee Report tomorrow. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

SV STANDARDS AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT (John Henkel):

Mr. Henkel reported that he had spoken with Mr. Setecki in the SV office regarding the VA titles awarded in the United States. Specifically, he discussed the recognition by the SV of VA titles awarded when the performance test was judged by a UScA judge or a non-SV judge. Mr. Setecki recognized the problem and presented an example of a dog that is in the SV records that had received a VA (Excellent Select) show rating at the UScA Sieger Show in San Jose and had also received a VA show rating at NASS 2008 in Kentucky. Mr. Setecki confirmed that the SV records reflect a show rating of "VA (US)" in both shows, making no distinction in the VA rating received from the UScA Sieger Show where the performance test was judged by a non-SV judge.

Mr. Henkel will contact Mr. Setecki next week to continue discussion on this matter. This will allow Mr. Setecki an opportunity to discuss this issue with Frau Fath, whom Mr. Setecki believes is the appropriate person to get a handle on this issue. At this time, we don't have a conclusive resolution on this matter.

Mr. Henkel would like his committee to entertain the feasibility checking dogs at NASS to see if their color has been altered. The SV Standards Ad Hoc Committee will be taking on that additional task.

Ms. Munsinger requested that a couple of other things that the committee discussed be brought up tomorrow. The committee had a conference call in which it discussed a couple of other items including the clarification of the rules describing the requirements of the VA (Excellent Select) rating. It also discussed bringing the breed standards to the board so the board members may clearly understand the same. The board also may decide as to when and which breed standard requirements are implemented in the USA with respect to providing notice and how quickly something is changed. Included in this discussion would be consideration as to the practicality, in some cases, of adopting the standards immediately. A good policy would be to bring each one of these standards to the board. Mr. Henkel will clarify these standards in writing and we would have an educational discussion about implementing them in the United States. We do need to make a few modifications in the NASS shows rules that are posted.

Mr. Yee moved that these issues be tabled tomorrow following the discussion on the NASS Committee report. This was seconded and unanimously carried.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT:

Ms. Petersen will present the Publications Committee and the SchH3 National reports tomorrow.

TOMORROW'S MEETING:

Mr. Yee moved to adjourn the meeting tomorrow at 3:10PM. Mr. Barry seconded the motion. The motion carries by unanimous vote.

In this regard, Dr. Spreitler advised that no member will be allowed to speak more than two times on any issue. Each member will be limited to a total of 10 minutes per issue. Tomorrow's meeting will convene at 7:30AM. Anyone more than 60 seconds late will be fined \$20.00. A

formal agenda will be adopted tomorrow morning at the commencement of the meeting.

RECONSIDERATION OF PROGENY RULE (Michael Kempkes):

Mr. Kempkes moved for reconsideration of the progeny group rule with regards to the effective date.

Mr. Henkel speaks against the motion. We have no way in our country of reflecting what the breeding date was. AKC paperwork only tells us when a dog is born. The rule was read from the minutes of the last meeting as follows:

"Progeny Group Entrants must have been born after the sire whose progeny group they will represent was two years of age".

Ms. Munsinger speaks in favor of the motion to reconsider. She supports the Progeny Rule, but we did not have all the facts when we voted on the rule. Specifically, she believes that the motion should be reconsidered because the language of the Progeny Rule as passed is not in complete compliance with the SV rule. The Progeny Rule is tied to the date of "whelping" whereas the SV rule is linked to the date of "breeding".

Mr. Kempkes agrees with the rule but feels the breeders need time to conform. Mr. Kempkes is requesting an extension of the effective date for the rule.

Mr. Yee spoke against the motion. The Board must carefully think about the resolutions that it passes. It does not reflect well on the board if it passes a resolution at one meeting only to change it at the next meeting. Any reason for change should be compelling. The argument raised by Ms. Munsinger concerning the language of the Progeny Rule was thoroughly discussed by the board before it passed the rule. Ms. Barkus, in that discussion, suggested that the board consider the "date of whelping plus 63 days", which would bring it into closer compliance with the SV. The board decided not to complicate matters and adopted the Progeny Rule, tying it into the date of whelping because the WDA had no mechanism in place to determine the breeding date. Further, one important reason for reconsideration (which has not been raised by anyone speaking in favor of the reconsideration) is that a participant bred a progeny with his young stud dog for the express purpose of presenting that progeny in NASS, relying on the fact that he was not prohibited from doing so even though his stud dog was less than two years old at the time that the dog was bred or when his progeny was born.

Ms. Petersen speaks against the motion. People on this board need to look at WDA as a whole and not at any individual breeders. We, as an entire board, voted unanimously for the Progeny rule. For us to turn around now because there are some breeders who are not going to have dogs in a progeny group is completely wrong.

Ms. Barkus spoke against the motion. I don't think any breeder is breeding young dogs just to present a progeny group.

Call for the question.

The motion is to reconsider the entire rule. Approval of the motion will require a 2/3 majority.

A Roll Call Vote was conducted:

Dr. Mesdag	NAY
Ms. Munsinger	YAY
Mr. Henkel	NAY
Mr. Kempkes	YAY
Ms. Barkus	NAY
Dr. Barry	YAY
Mr. Burgos	YAY
Mr. Yee	NAY
Ms. Petersen	NAY

Motion fails.

REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEMS:

Mr. Burgos requested that two items be added to tomorrow's agenda. This will be handled at the commencement of tomorrow's meeting

Motion to adjourn is seconded and unanimously carried.

Adjourned at 8:45PM

//

//

Saturday, April 11, 2009:

CALL TO ORDER:

The President, Dr. Danny J. Spreitler, served as Chair and called the meeting to order at 7:40AM.

ROLL CALL:

The Secretary conducted a roll call.

DIRECTORS PRESENT:

The President (Dr. Danny Spreitler), Vice President (Cindy Petersen), Secretary (Daniel Yee), Recorder (Danny J. Spreitler), General Directors (John Henkel, Michael Kempkes and Dr. Tom Mesdag), and the Regional Directors from Regions 1 (Fernando Burgos), 3 (Miriam Barkus), 5 (Dr. Joseph Barry) and 7 (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger).

DIRECTORS ABSENT:

Treasurer (Claudia Behnke), National Training Director (Dr. David Landau), Director of Trials and Judges (Mike West), Ex-Officio President of the GSDCA (Gail Hardcastle), General Director (Clay Meadows), Regional Directors from Regions 2 (Mike Andrel), 4 (Charlie Starr), 6 (Russell Osburn), 8 (Wendell Nope) and 9 (Ray Blomberg) were absent.

QUORUM:

A quorum was present at roll call and continued through the entire meeting.

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Joy Schultz

JUDGES COMMITTEE REPORT (Dr. Danny Spreitler):

Mr. West was not in attendance. He, however, submitted the following motions for the consideration of the board:

1. Approval of the Judges Program as revised by Mr. West and Mr. Doug Alexander with the exception of the income statement. There was a period given to the committee to review the program as amended.

The Chair is not aware that the meeting had occurred. Mr. Yee confirmed that the committee had not met. They were not able to get together by telephone. Dr. Landau was traveling for part of the time. Mr. Yee was out of the country for part of the time.

Mr. Yee believes that the committee can resolve the issues, if they can get together. Mr. Yee asked that the board not make a decision today on this motion because he believes the judges committee can resolve the very few issues that are outstanding.

Mr. Yee moved to table the item indefinitely. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

2. Mr. West requested that Mr. Paul Schneider be granted a WDA Judges license based on his meeting the requirements of the UScA judges program. Because Mr. Schneider has not fulfilled the requirements of the WDA Judges Program, a 2/3 majority of the members present is required to make an exception to the requirements. The motion to accept Mr. Schneider as a WDA judge was seconded.

Ms. Petersen opposes this motion and suggests that Mr. Schneider make application to the WDA.

Mr. Yee spoke against the motion. Mr. Schneider's name has come twice in the past for admission as a WDA judge. Each time, his request was denied because he did not meet the requirements of the WDA judges program.

Dr. Barry spoke in favor of the motion. We need judges and Mr. Schneider has apparently met USca's requirement.

Mr. Henkel spoke against the motion. We have a policy in place and Mr. Schneider should follow the procedure.

Ms. Barkus spoke against the motion. He has not submitted an application.

Except for Dr. Barry who voted to pass the motion, the remaining board members voted against the motion. The motion failed for lack of 2/3 majority.

3. Mr. West proposes judges books rather than judges sheets for use by our judges and our guest judges. The judges would have a waterproof, hard-bound cover but the inside sheets would not be waterproof.

The Chair suggests, because of a lack of information, to refer this back to the Judges Committee to present samples and prices at the July meeting.

Moved and seconded, this motion carried.

2009 NASS COMMITTEE REPORT (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger):

1. Ms. Munsinger moved for approval of an 8½" by 5" catalog of high quality for the NASS event, effectively immediately. Ms. Barkus proposed a friendly amendment to make all national events catalogs 8½" x 5". Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
2. Ms. Munsinger passed out copies of the electronic NASS entry form. This form has already been programmed. Motion to approve the electronic form was seconded.

Ms. Petersen questioned the sizes of the boxes. She also inquired as to whether all of the information in the boxes will be legible once the form is completed and printed out. It is a requirement that hard copies of all entry forms be submitted to the Office, so all of the information must be able to be read. She suggested that the tattoo field and the microchip fields be switched.

Mr. Yee noted that changes must be made to the Release and Waiver of Liability. The current release and waiver are not broad enough to protect the organization.

Chair suggested that the board approve just the construct (i.e. the body) of the form.

It was moved and seconded to approve just the body of the form. The motion carries unanimously.

3. Ms. Munsinger moved to approve the entry fees as follows: Baby Puppy Class \$50, Junior and Senior Puppy Class \$50, Youth Classes \$70, Young Dog Classes \$70, Working Dog Classes \$120, Veterans Classes \$50. The fees are the same as last year. Ms. Barkus Seconds the motion. Motion carries by unanimous vote.
4. The Chair suggests that Mr. Yee and Ms. Schultz review and rewrite the releases for the NASS entry form.
5. Ms. Munsinger passed out copies of the master payment form for the NASS website's store items. All items that will be for sale at NASS will also be available for pre-sale on the website. Banquet tickets, raffle tickets and the catalog will be added to what is already there. This is a template that can be moved to the WDA website. Ms. Munsinger moved to accept electronic payment transactions and entry fees. Pricing is to be set by the NASS committee. Ms. Barkus seconds the motion. Motion passes by unanimous vote.
6. Ms. Munsinger moves to approve the NASS advertisement for publication in the July Zeitung (the SV magazine). The motion is seconded.

There are four dates listed in the NASS Ad, but there are only three dates for the actual event. The date of the 5th needs to be removed. The Chair suggests that a friendly amendment to the main motion would be to strike the number 5. Mr. Kaul will change all the ads to read "German Shepherd Dog Club of America-Working Dog Association". Cost for the SV Ad is €225 (Euros). The only other ad will be placed in the SV catalog. Pricing for the catalog is not yet available. The Chair suggests that the price should be brought back to the Committee for information only. A friendly amendment was made to change "California" to "Kalifornia".

It was moved (a) to strike the number 5 from the dates of the event, (b) to correct the name of the organization, (c) to change "California" to "Kalifornia", and (d) to add the fax number of the office to the ad. The NASS website will be in English only. Motion passes unanimously.

7. Motion to adopt the concept of the 2009 NASS brochure to be used for fund raising and/or distribution to our members and/or the general public. Motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.
8. Ms Munsinger moved to approve Merchant Banking with Newtek.

We currently handle our credit charges through a terminal that is connected to the Bank

of America. The proposed arrangement uses SSL. Compared to the current method of processing credit cards, the proposed arrangement will save approximately \$1000 per year. With the proposed arrangement, the Office will be able to access the transaction reports immediately. The system has been tested with Newtek, a web hosting company. The arrangement has been priced out and Mr. Yee has reviewed the contract. If we move forward with this for NASS, we can then use it on the main website after NASS is finished. Motion is seconded and approved unanimously.

9. The existing NASS show rules are a little vague. Ms. Munsinger recommends we work with the SV Standards Committee and bring this back to the board in July with recommended revisions to the NASS show rules. This matter is assigned to the Standards Committee.
10. Ms. Munsinger wants to make certain that upon approval of the NASS budget, invoices can be expedited for payment. The Chair indicates that it is easier and more expeditious to budget a specific amount of dollars and to indicate that this amount was approved by the board. Any amount requiring payment would be an expenditure against that number. That should expedite payment. The Executive Committee does scrutinize every single penny.
11. The Chair expressed his desire to supervise the protection work for both males and females. The committee welcomes that.
12. Ms. Munsinger advised that the next meeting at the NASS host hotel will be on May 11th. Anyone wishing to join us at the hotel is welcomed.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT (Cindy Petersen):

We are a very active committee. We email each other very frequently. We are in constant contact with Ms. Carole Schultz who has a vast knowledge of how much each page costs. We still come to the same conclusion that our members pay a membership fee to belong to this organization and the one benefit you get when you belong to the WDA is that you get the magazine. We are very adamant that we not cut the number of issues that we send out. We've been trying to find advertisers. We have new people writing articles for us. The total income for the January/February issue was \$1943 versus a little over \$6000 to produce, which includes costs for the editor, publisher and design/layout, etc. The income for advertising for the March/April issue was \$2548.50. So, we are seeing a growth in advertising. We had an unfortunate incident with the person who always advertised on the inside front cover – a color ad which is expensive. Due to the 270 rule, he decided to pull his ad. Ms. Carole Schultz, within an hour, had that inside front cover sold for an entire year. We would encourage anybody who has questions, comments, or articles to send them to Mr. Henkel, Ms. Nadia Adams or myself. We have turned down two articles. The first was an article bashing all dog food. If we try to get dog food companies to support us, we cannot run articles that bash every dog food company. The second article became a little controversial. It was about a club with a good heart that did a demo at an AKC event. The only problem that we had was that they did a protection work demo using

helpers we never heard of. We don't know where they came from and we could not print that article in our magazine. They are going to rewrite the article and take out the protection work. Letters to the editor – you can write what you may. You are open to speak your mind. We do not edit those.

Photographs for the Photo contest should be submitted to Nadia Adams. All other photos should be submitted directly to the Publications Committee.

2009 GSDCA-WDA SCHH3 NATIONAL (Danny Spreitler):

The Chair recollects a decision to make the Nationals a WDA event. The decision was done with great enthusiasm. Unfortunately, it is a very difficult to make this a WDA event because we don't have control. We are blessed this year to be working with Ms. Connie Miller and Ms. Niki Mohns. This year entries are down, almost in half. The caliber of entries is extremely high, maybe as high as we've ever seen. O.G. Hauptstadt has done a tremendous job on this event: a great website and a lot of passion pulling this off. Connie, Niki and everybody up there are absolutely phenomenal to work with. We have very good helpers: Steve Beal, Steve Gregalunas and Thomas Schoder. Matt Levin will be our tracking coordinator. In the past, we have had WDA judges who also were SVF judges officiate at our national events. This, however, will be the first time that we will have one of our own WDA judges who is not an SVF judge, Mike West, judging tracking. We have a good group of vendors that will be there. Our good friend Bill Campbell of K-9 Koncepts is working on the T-shirts and will be there.

Recess at 9:10AM

Meeting Reconvenes at 9:30AM

AGENDA:

The Chair called for items to be added to the agenda.

1. Fernando Burgos added two items: (a) limit the number of times that a judge can come to the same club during the year and (b) limit an SV judge to only one time per Region.
2. Alethea Caldwell Munsinger added the tattoo standard and verification.
3. Michael Kempkes added requirements for dogs coming from Germany to qualify for a VA1 show rating. Dogs should not be allowed to come into the United States, get a VA1 show rating and then leave the country. To qualify for Sieger or Siegerin a dog must be shown at least once within the previous 365 day period.
4. Dan Yee added (a) authorizing the WDA Office to certify tattoo, microchip and registration information in the SV score book and (b) requiring such information in the SV score books to be certified by the WDA Office before the SV score books may be submitted for any WDA events.

5. John Henkel added that no dog can go Sieger at NASS without presenting a progeny group.

Chair asked that the agenda to be set. It was moved, seconded and approved unanimously.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Danny Spreitler):

The cheating has to stop. Cheating cannot be minimized by arguing that it is not cheating because there is no rule to cover it. The character of the individual needs to step up so that we do not need a rule to cover everything. It is ridiculous what is going on. Dogs are being dyed. Tails are being broken. Score books are being changed. Tattoo numbers on documents are crossed out and overwritten with new tattoo numbers. This is cheating. It was done to get ahead. It has to stop.

Dogs are coming over from Germany with Noch Zugelassen hips and all of sudden they have OFA excellent hips. We have puppies from these dogs which at 5 months are x-rayed with hip dysplasia and are so crippled that they cannot move. What did we do for the breed? We need to put an end to this nonsense! We have veterinarians who would drop a button so that a dog's testicle will descend. We have accounts of a dog that came up with an implanted tooth that was previously missing. We have a moral obligation to stand up and not allow this to happen! This all has to stop!

We have puppies in shows that will fall apart if they run around the ring more than two laps. The front and rear ends of some puppies are so out of alignment that they are running in two separate time zones.

Puppies with long coats are sold on the internet for \$5,000.00. It happened last year. A dog was shaved and sold for \$5,000.00.

"VA Puppies" are sold on the internet. We don't say anything about bad breedings. Dogs from Germany are brought in for breedings that produce bad puppies.

This board must stand up and stop all of this! If any of you know about this and do not say anything, you are as guilty as the parties who are making these breedings. We are destroying the breed that we love.

On another issue, a lot of things are going on in the WDA. Many people are out of work and cannot afford to keep their dogs. We must be diligent in our management of finances. We must help relocate dogs that are victims of the current economic crisis.

Many people are working closer together. There is more camaraderie among the breeders.

Many people are using more working line dogs. I hope to see more of this. This is paying off for the breeders.

Stand up for the breed every day. Being a board member is not a part time job.

REPORT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT (Cindy Petersen):

No report

REPORT OF THE TREASURER (Claudia Behnke):

The treasurer's report was distributed to the board. The financials were accepted as presented. There were no objections to the report. It was moved to accept the financials as reported. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

SPONSORSHIP COMMITTEE (John Henkel):

Royal Canin has committed verbally to donate \$5000 to NASS 2009. WT-Metall has donated one of their metal boxes for NASS 2009.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (Daniel Yee):

A complaint was referred to an Investigative Committee after the January board meeting. The report from that committee is that the matter has been resolved. Since then, we received one additional complaint that is now under investigation by another Investigative Committee.

Mr. Yee moved to ratify all Executive Committee actions. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. 2009 Budget Proposal;

Ms. Munsinger circulated a copy of the 2009 Budget Proposal and moved to approve the budget as presented. The motion was seconded and discussion ensued.

Correction was made to page 2 under Expenses to drop wording from 2 board meetings to 3. The \$12,976.00 number is correct.

The committee is proposing to eliminate one issue of the magazine, combining the last two issues into one.

Mr. Henkel spoke against reducing the number of the magazines. There are a good many people that join this organization simply because they want an informative periodical coming to them.

Ms. Petersen spoke on behalf of the Publications Committee, against reducing the number of magazines. She reaffirmed that the Newsletter is the only thing that the members get for their \$50.

Ms. Munsinger spoke in favor of reducing the number of magazines. She has received an opposite reaction on the magazine from the people she deals with. Some don't even look at the magazine.

Mr. Burgos noted in the Income that we have raised the costs of breed surveys to \$65 and we have added a \$2 Administrative Fee per show/trial entry.

Chair stated that we can balance the budget. We are not going to budge on the magazine. Find \$14,000 worth of expense cuts and we can balance the budget.

Ms. Barkus suggested cutting the expenses of the board meetings. In the 14 years that she has been on the board, all board members had to pay all of their own expenses.

The Chair wants to see the board meeting expenditure of \$12,976 stricken from the budget. The Chair would also like to see \$1,300 stricken from the budget. All Miscellaneous categories should be stricken from the budget.

The Chair would like the two members of the budget committee who are present at the meeting to come back after lunch with the new numbers.

It was moved to table this motion until after lunch. Motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

2. Tattoo Verification Certification:

Alethea Caldwell Munsinger proposed an ad-hoc committee consisting of Ms. Joy Schultz, Ms. Munsinger, Ms. Karen Henkel and Mr. John Henkel to revise the tattoo verification certification program to allow different approaches to tattoo/microchip verification and certification. These approaches will include, without limitation, (a) the use of a Breed Warden, (b) the current use of a veterinarian and (c) the use of a Körmeister. The committee will come back to the July meeting with a new form, a new proposal and a new procedure and policy for tattoo/microchip verification.

3. Regional Directors Unfinished Business:

We have unfinished business with respect to duties and requests to review geographic regions. We have not completed that task. Ms. Munsinger will attempt to have the Regional Directors meet and review and try to get a recommendation back to the board in July.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Regional Events (Danny Spreitler):

- a. Regional events need to be elevated from a club event.

- b. There should be a \$2 fee paid to WDA for each regional entry.
- c. There should be a standard catalog format to include breed survey status, hips and elbows.
- d. There should be a back-up plan for inclement weather.
- e. There should be a standard ring size and standard field size. If it is 2/3 of the standard that would be acceptable.
- f. Regional events must allow youth handlers.
- g. Clubs should work together to host a regional event.
- h. Cap put on entry fees.
- i. Must require both a regional conformation show and a regional trial in order to have either one or the other.
- j. Chair asked for a small group of members to be the Regional Event Committee chaired by Ms. Petersen, with Dr. Barry and Mr. Yee to come back in July with recommendations.

2. NASS PHOTO BOOK:

Daniel Yee would like to produce a photo book of the NASS events. Mr. Yee has the resources to put together a team to produce such a publication. The NASS Photo Book will be modeled after the URMA book that documents the German Sieger Show, but will go beyond that. It will include judges' critiques for the top placing dogs. It also will include photographs of all events surrounding the NASS.

The NASS Photo Book will be a resource that breeders and German Shepherd Dog enthusiasts can use to view and to evaluate the dogs that are shown and bred in the United States.

Mr. Yee will finance this venture at no cost to the WDA. He, however, will not invest the funds or commit the required manpower necessary to begin the Photo Book unless he has assurances from the WDA (a) that he will be granted the full exclusive control as to who will photograph the dogs and the events at the NASS and (b) that he will be granted the exclusive access to all the Judges' critiques. In exchange for these exclusive rights, Mr. Yee will make a monetary donation to the NASS in an agreed schedule of donations, commencing with the 2011 NASS.

Mr. Yee has delivered a proposed contract to the President for review. The contract provides for the terms discussed above. The initial term of the contract is for three (3) years, commencing with the 2009 NASS. The contract will include automatic one (1) year extensions/renewals starting at the end of the initial term and will continue each year thereafter for so long as Mr. Yee continues to make the monetary donations to the WDA as provided for by the contract. There will be a minimum donation amount stated in the contract.

Mr. Yee will prepare a release that will be incorporated into the NASS entry form. Mr. Yee and the President, on behalf of the WDA, will agree upon terms concerning the use

of photographs and judges' critiques for the purpose of reporting on the NASS in the WDA magazine. Mr. Yee expressed an interest to produce a similar publication for other WDA National events, if the Photo Book is successful.

Ms. Petersen moved to allow Mr. Yee to develop a Photo book. Ms. Munsinger seconds.

Ms. Barkus supports this proposal by Mr. Yee. She suggests that the protection work be photographed from multiple angles to better showcase the bite work at a Sieger Show.

Mr. Kempkes asked whether the Photo Book will have any photographs of the protection work since there are no such photographs presented in the URMA book.

Mr. Yee advised the board that the present intention is to go beyond what is presented in the URMA publication. Presenting photographs from the performance testing is a definite consideration.

The Chair would like a reciprocal license right to use a limited number of the photographs for the WDA magazine to report on the NASS.

Ms. Petersen indicated that the NASS is a WDA event. She was under the impression that Mr. Yee's photographers would be in addition to the official NASS photographer. Also the critiques are the property of the WDA. Our goal is to serve the members and the members have the right to have the critiques reported in the NASS issue of the WDA magazine.

The Chair and Mr. Yee confirmed that all the photography at the NASS will be under Mr. Yee's request for exclusivity. In this regard, Mr. Yee will have full control over all the photography and photographers at the NASS. There is no separate official NASS photographer.

As to the judges' critiques, Mr. Yee expressed his agreement to release the judges' critiques for the limited purpose of reporting in the NASS issue of the WDA magazines, if the WDA will bear the cost of translating the critiques from German to English. This is an expenditure that Mr. Yee will not incur unless he has the exclusive right to the critiques.

The Chair states that we want to protect the members on one side, but we also have a commercial enterprise on the other. We need to iron out these issues, which the Chair believes that we could accomplish.

Dr. Barry confirmed that the WDA had to incur the expense of translating the judges' critiques in the past. We cannot expect Mr. Yee to incur this expense and just turn over the critiques to the WDA.

The Chair states that there is motion that has been seconded. Mr. Yee and the Chair can work out the details of the contract, if the board approves the concept of Mr. Yee's proposal.

Dr. Mesdag likes direction that Mr. Yee has taken on this and thinks that it is phenomenal that this can be done. But, there are issues to be decided upon such as (a) the conflict of interest of a board member doing something like this and (b) the potential of the club working with other photographers in other commercial arrangements. Dr. Mesdag suggests that we continue this discussion in the next board meeting.

Ms. Munsinger states that the URMA book is a publication that is much more limited than what is proposed by Mr. Yee. Nonetheless, that publication is a valuable enterprise and because of that, it continues. We have had criticism of the lack of quality photographs at past NASS events. This is an enterprise that has value to the organization. This is what is being proposed. This project will be at the expense of others, not the WDA. Mr. Yee has the commitment of professionals who can provide a quality product to memorialize the NASS. We have not had this in the past.

The Chair indicates that time has run on the debate of this issue.

The Chair called for a vote to approve the concept proposed by Mr. Yee with the details of the contract to be worked out between Mr. Yee and Dr. Spreitler.

There being no further discussion on the motion and with the exception of Mr. Yee and Dr. Mesdag who both abstained, the remaining board members approved. Motion carries.

3. AUDIT:

Mr. Yee moved to have an audit done for fiscal year 2008. The motion is seconded by Fernando Burgos. The motion passes by unanimous vote.

4. ANNUAL MEETING OF MEMBERS:

Mr. Yee moved to approve November 6, 2009 as the date for the annual meeting of members. Mr. Burgos seconds. The motion passes by unanimous vote.

5. ELECTION:

a. Setting Dates of Election Based on Bylaws:

The slate of candidates from the nominating committee must be presented to the Secretary on or before July 10, 2009. The Secretary shall mail the annual meeting notice and the list of candidates to each member of the club no later than August 8, 2009. Additional nominations that are made by written petition must be

addressed to the Secretary and received by the Secretary on or before September 8, 2009. The Secretary shall mail to each member in good standing by October 8, 2009 the ballot. By Friday, October 30, 2009, the ballots must be received by the agent that is appointed by the Board. The Secretary, Mr. Yee, will receive a sealed envelope with the count of the ballots enclosed. Mr. Yee will deliver that sealed ballot to the President at the annual meeting at which time he will attest that he has not opened it and it has been sealed since receipt. He will then open it and read the results of the election. These are the dates established pursuant to the bylaws. The dates need to go out in the HundeGram as soon as possible. It as moved and seconded to accept and ratify these dates. Motion passes by unanimous vote.

b. Agent to Tally the Results of the Ballots:

Ms. Munsinger proposes the accounting firm of BeachFleischman PC, 1985 E. River Road, Suite 201, Tucson, Arizona 85718-7176 to tally the results of the election ballots. Dr. Mesdag said the GSDCA has found a few auditing firms that will fit the needs here. He will submit their names to Mr. Yee as soon as he gets back.

Ms. Petersen moved that the board consider BeachFleischman PC and the list of other possible firms to be provided by Dr. Mesdag. After consideration and investigation by Mr. Yee, the Agent will be appointed by the full Board of Directors at the July meeting. Motion is seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

c. Nominating Committee:

The bylaws provide that the Nominating Committee shall be chosen by the Board of Directors at the April meeting. The Nominating Committee shall consist of three (3) members and three (3) alternates, none of whom shall be members of the Board of Directors or members of their immediate family or immediate household. In addition, there shall be one (1) Board Member or an alternate Board Member serving as Chairman of the Committee, both of whom shall be selected by the Board and who shall have a vote only in case of a tie. An alternate shall serve only in case a Nominating Committee member for whom he is an alternate is unable or unwilling to serve.

Per Roberts Rules of Order, the Chair shall be nominated first. Ms. Petersen nominated Claudia Behnke. Mr. Yee nominated Miriam Barkus. Ms. Barkus accepted. Motion to close the nominations. Seconded. Ballot vote: Chair is Ms. Barkus.

Dr. Spreitler announced his intent to seek office for a second term

The following Officers and Directors indicate their intent:

Ms. Petersen will seek office for a second term
Mr. Barry will seek office for another term
Mr. Burgos will seek office for a second term
Ms. Munsinger will seek office for a second term
Mr. Kempkes will seek office for a second term
Mr. Mesdag will seek office for another term

Nominations for nominating committee:

Mr. Yee nominated Earl White, region 7
Ms. Munsinger nominated Nadia Adams, region 3
Mr. Kempkes nominated Carl Smith, region 3
Mr. Mesdag nominated Natalie Gonzalez, region 9
Mr. Burgos nominated Patrick Kuehn, region 1
Mr. Barry nominated Ray Silvertrust, region 5
Ms. Petersen nominated Mandy West, region 3
Mr. Henkel nominated Connie Pinckert, region 8
Ms. Barkus nominated Mark Wellick, region 5

After conducting a ballot vote, the following individuals are named to the nominating committee:

Miriam Barkus, Chair (Alternate Claudia Behnke)
Carl Smith (Alternate Mark Wellick)
Earl White (Alternate Connie Pinckert)
Nadia Adams (Alternate Natalie Gonzales)

All members and alternates of the nominating committee have been confirmed to be members of WDA in good standing.

Recess for lunch at 11:57AM

Meeting reconvenes at 12:48PM

ROLL CALL:

All Board members present at the previous roll card are present. Quorum exists.

1. 2009 Budget Proposal (Continued Discussion from Unfinished Business):

The Budget and Finance Committee met during lunch to review the proposed 2009 budget.

Ms. Munsinger reports that the committee proposes to amend the 2009 proposed budget as follows:

- \$ Reduce board meeting expenses to \$6,976
- \$ Remove the miscellaneous entry of \$600
- \$ Restore the number of magazine issues per year to 6, thereby adding \$4,500 and increasing that line item to \$43,600

These proposed changes will result in a bottom line of \$123,210.

The committee further recommends an increase of the breed survey fee from \$50 to \$65 and the addition of a \$2 fee per entry in all WDA events.

a. Increase in Breed Survey Fees:

It was moved and seconded to increase the breed survey fees from \$50 to \$65. With the exception of Ms. Petersen, who abstained, the remaining board members voted in favor of the motion. Motion carries.

It was moved and seconded to make these fees effective on May 1, 2009. This motion passes unanimously.

b. Addition of a \$2 per entry fee for all WDA events, except Breed Surveys:

It was moved and seconded that a \$2 fee be added to every entry into a WDA event, excluding Breed Surveys.

Discussions ensued concerning the application of this fee. UScA charges a similar fee for entries into its events. There typically is a separate entry form completed for each of these events. This fee is applied to all events (AD, BH, SchH, FH, OB, etc.), except for Breed Surveys. By way of example, a dog entered into the same trial in one weekend who obtains an AD, a BH and a SchH1 title will be assessed a \$2 fee for entry into each of these three events, for a total of \$6.

Ms. Petersen moved that a \$2 entry fee be received by any WDA Club for any event other than a breed survey will be sent to the WDA office along with the show or trial paperwork. Motion is seconded and carried unanimously.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried that the foregoing \$2 entry fee shall become effective on May 1, 2009.

c. Notice to Members of Fee Increases:

Ms. Schultz and Dr. Spreitler will cause an email notification of the foregoing information to be sent on Monday to the membership.

d. Motion to Approve Proposed Budget, as Amended:

It was moved and seconded to approve the proposed budget, as amended. Except for Ms Petersen and Dr. Mesdag, who both opposed, the remaining board members approved. The motion carries.

e. Motion to Reconsider the Effective Date of the Foregoing Fee Increases:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to change the effective date for the foregoing fee increases to June 1, 2009.

2. Provisional Breed Surveys:

Ms. Munsinger moved to reconsider provisional breed surveys for those dogs entered in WDA-sponsored breed surveys that have submitted to the WDA Office their hip and/or elbow x-rays for processing, that have already been submitted to the SV with the understanding that should they not meet the standard for the hips and elbows the breed survey will become null and void.

This is a motion for reconsideration and cannot be raised by Ms. Munsinger because she was not on the prevailing side of the previous motion.

Ms. Barkus, who was on the prevailing side of the previous motion, makes the motion as stated above. Mr. Kempkes seconds.

Ms. Petersen speaks against the motion. This would be a paperwork nightmare.

Mr. Henkel speaks against the motion. Dogs that are provisionally breed surveyed can be shown and can be bred. This is a very dangerous situation.

Mr. Yee speaks in favor of the motion. Allowing provisional breed surveys would provide an additional revenue stream for the WDA. In addition to charging the regular fee, the WDA may assess an additional "Provisional Breed Survey Fee". The WDA could use the additional money. Provisional Breed Surveys are allowed in Germany. This could be a "win-win" situation for both the WDA and the membership. We do not have that many breed surveys in any given region. If a dog misses a breed survey in any given

region because the hip and elbow x-rays are in process, then that dog must either wait until the next available breed survey which maybe months later or the member must travel great distances to get to another breed survey at substantial additional expense. Provisional Breed Surveys do not create significant additional paperwork for the WDA Office. The members will pay a little more for the price of a provisional breed survey. But this additional cost would be less than what it would cost for a trip to a breed survey located a distance away. The WDA will receive the extra revenue. Both parties win.

Mr. Kempkes speaks in favor of the motion. Charging more for Provisional Breed Surveys is fair. The WDA could use the additional income from provisional breed surveys.

Mr. Munsinger speaks in favor of the motion. We are in constant communication with the SV. We can ascertain very quickly whether a dog's hip or elbow x-rays have been read. Provisional breed surveys would save a member from having to drive great distances to a later breed survey because the dog's x-rays are not ready for the current breed survey.

Mr. Burgos speaks against the motion. The dogs should be hip and elbow x-rayed sufficiently in advance for the breed survey.

Mr. Henkel speaks against the motion. The SV may not agree to continued inquiries of hip and elbow results.

Ms. Schultz states that the provisional breed survey will only work if the breed survey secretary collects, in advance, the additional fee for the provisional breed survey and withholds the Bescheinigung until the x-rays are read and certified and the breed survey is completed.

The Chair called for the vote to reconsider the motion to bring this back to the table for debate. Motion requires a 2/3 majority. Motion failed.

3. Policy and Guidelines:

Ms. Munsinger moves to create a procedure and guidelines document for trial secretaries similar to the one that is in place for breed survey secretaries that will spell out all the duties of the trial secretary, paperwork required, checklist required with the clarification of the requirements in the General Part of the Trial Regulations. The General Part is not as detailed as it should be.

The Chair assigns this matter to the Administrative Committee to complete and bring to the July board meeting.

4. GSDCA-WDA Website:

Ms. Petersen moved that the Publications Committee be allowed to inform the Webmaster to develop a page on the WDA website for the youth handlers. Seconded. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Munsinger advised the board that the proposed budget that was just approved does not provide for this and she does not know if we can find the money for the development of a new page on the website. Mr. Henkel offered to pay for the development of the page.

Motion passes unanimously.

//

//

5. Acceptance of DVG and UScA Judges:

The Chair asked the board to formally accept DVG judges and UScA trial judges to judge at WDA events. This was done in the past.

Mr. Yee moved that the WDA formally accept DVG and UScA judges to judge WDA trials. Motion is seconded.

The President has spoken to the DVG concerning this issue. A process will be put in place by the DVG regarding this. DVG judges will use our rules (i.e. VDH rules) if they judge at WDA trials. We have not heard back from UScA on this issue so we do not know if the UScA will approve this.

Judges may award only one title at one trial. Note that DVG titles are not accepted for breed surveys, although these titles are recognized by the WDA for trial purposes only. The Chair advises that the National Training Director, Dr. Landau, supports this. The Chair has not heard from the Director of Trials and Judges, Mr. West.

With the exception of Ms. Barkus, who abstained, the remaining members of the board approves. Motion carried.

6. UScA Judges becoming WDA Judges:

Dr. Barry asked whether UScA judges who had judged WDA events in the past and were subsequently thrown out of UScA can become WDA judges?

Dr. Spreitler spoke to Lyle Rotemeyer concerning this issue. We are aware that Gunther Diegel traveled to the United States to conduct a certification program for UScA judges to be recognized by the SV in the United States. Effectively, their titles will be recognized by the WDA for the United States valid breed survey (i.e. these breed surveys will be recognized only in the United States). There have been a lot of things that have

gone on behind the scenes that has strengthened the UScA judges program. Dr. Spreitler did not hear from Mr. West about this.

7. Motions Concerning Attendance of Board Members at Regular board Meetings:

- a. Mr. Henkel moved that any member of the GSDCA-WDA Board of Directors who misses three consecutive regularly scheduled Board Meeting shall be immediately removed from the Board of Directors at the conclusion of the missed third meeting irrespective of cause. Ms. Barkus seconds.

Mr. Yee supports the motion in general, but advises the board that, in his opinion, this motion does violate Colorado law. Colorado has a statute which provides that any board member put in place by election of the membership can only be removed by that same method. That vests the power of removal with the membership, not the board of directors.

Dr. Barry supports the sentiment of the motion, but does not wish to violate the law. Some board members do not have the financial means to attend the meetings and they are voted in by the membership.

Question is called. Dr. Barry, Ms. Petersen and Dr. Mesdag oppose. The remaining board members approve. Motion carries.

- b. Mr. Henkel moves that any member of the GSDCA-WDA board of Directors who misses two consecutive regularly scheduled Board meetings may be removed from the Board of Directors unless said Board Member can demonstrate good cause at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting (hereinafter "next meeting"). Good cause shall be determined by the majority vote of the voting members of the Board of Directors who are in attendance at the next meeting. Motion is seconded.

Mr. Yee states that, in his opinion, this motion is not in compliance with Colorado Law per the discussion in the previous motion.

Ms. Munsinger speaks in favor of this motion. There is a lot of work that needs to be done on the board. We need members who participate so that we may get this work done.

Ms. Petersen speaks against the motion. Just because an individual does not come to meetings does not mean that the individual does not work for the organization.

Call for the vote. Dr. Barry, Ms. Petersen and Dr. Mesdag oppose. Others vote in favor. Motion carries.

- c. Mr. Henkel moved that any Board Member who is removed from the Board of Directors by virtue of that Board Member's failure to attend Board Meetings shall be prohibited from seeking election or appointment to the Board of Directors for the next immediate term. Ms. Barkus seconds. Motion is unanimously carried.

8. 2010 NASS:

- a. Ms. Petersen moves that the 2010 NASS be held at Purina Farms, Gray Summit, Missouri. There is a brand new field that is 180x450. There will be no charge for the facility. Motion is Seconded.

Dr. Barry requested consideration of an alternative to go to Chicago at the same site of this year's USCA Sieger Show. The Parks District provides all the tents, port-a-potties, everything for \$5000. There is a 420 room hotel that is located right next to the field.

Mr. Henkel spoke in favor of the motion to go to Purina Farms because the facility is at no cost and Purina will make a donation of \$20,000 to the event.

Ms. Munsinger spoke against the motion because we are not following procedure for the selection of the site.

Dr. Spreitler has talked with Mike Dolan at the Holiday Inn and the room rates will be less than prior Sieger Shows.

The question is called. Dr. Barry, Ms. Barkus, Ms. Munsinger and Mr. Yee opposes. The remaining members of the board vote in favor of the motion. Motion carries.

- b. It was moved and seconded to approve the dates of October 15 to 17, 2010 for the 2010 NASS. Motion carries by unanimous vote.
- c. Ms. Petersen moved to approve Rüdiger Mai and Reinhardt Meyer as the judges for the 2010 NASS. Mr. Yee seconds. Motion passes by unanimous vote.

9. Restriction against Judges for NASS:

The issue of a judge not being allowed to judge for another club within 6 months of NASS is tabled to the July board meeting.

10. 2010 National Championship:

At this time there is no club interested in co-hosting the 2010 National Championship. An email will be sent to the clubs on Monday concerning this.

11. Helper Tips at National Events:

There can be no tipping of helpers at our National Events.

Mr. Yee read an emailed message from Dr. Landau regarding tipping:

"I am definitely against allowing Helpers at the NASS to accept tips. This is what the Helper tax is for. Simply put, allowing tips does not pass the 'smell test'. Anyway, the Helpers receive far more compensation than do the judges, the NASS Chair, or anybody else, so I do not feel that they are being mistreated."

It was emphasized by the Chair that there can be no tipping of helpers at our National Events. This rule is in place, but it is not being followed. The penalty for violating this rule is disciplinary action.

12. Open Class at NASS:

Ms. Petersen moved for reconsideration of a prior board action that eliminated the Open class at NASS. Motion is seconded by Mr. Burgos. This requires a 2/3 vote. Motion fails on a vote of 3 in favor and 6 against.

13. Limitation of Judges Coming to Judge in the Same Region:

Mr. Burgos moved to limit the number of times that a judge may come to a region in any given year to judge, to one time per year. This motion fails for lack of a second.

14. VA Rule:

- a. Mr. Kempkes moved to require any dog living outside of the United States to go Sieger or Siegerin, that dog must be shown at least once within the year at a WDA show preceding the NASS. The motion is seconded.

Mr. Henkel requested a friendly amendment to make this rule apply to all VA dogs.

Dr. Barry suggests that "Sieger/Siegerin" is sufficient. It is not necessary to include all VA dogs, since anyone showing will expect to win the Sieger/Siegerin title.

Mr. Kempkes amends his motion to require all dogs, not just dogs living overseas, to be shown in a WDA event the year prior to the NASS.

Mr. Henkel speaks in favor of the motion. He disagrees with Dr. Barry that it is not necessary to require that this rule apply to all VA titles. He knows

many competitors who have expectations to achieve a VA rating for their dog, but not to win the Sieger or Siegerin title. The spirit of this rule is to prevent a dog from coming into the country just before the NASS, taking a VA title and then going back the next day.

Ms. Munsinger speaks in favor of the motion. Dogs who fly in from another country with VA titles from overseas are expected to take a VA title here.

Ms. Barkus speaks in favor of the motion. This will help the local clubs because entries in the local shows should increase.
The Chair recognizes that this rule also will affect brokers

After discussion, the motion is amended to read: "In order for a dog to be awarded a show rating of VA at NASS, it must be shown at least one time in a GSDCA-WDA conformation show in the calendar year prior to NASS." The motion passes by unanimous vote.

- b. Mr. Henkel moved that the above rule be effective for the 2009 NASS. The motion is seconded and passes unanimously.

15. Certification of SV Score Books by the WDA Office:

- a. Mr. Yee moved that the dog tattoo/microchip numbers and dog registration numbers in a SV score book must be verified and certified by the WDA Office before it may be submitted in support of a breed survey, trial or other WDA event. This motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
- b. It was moved that the foregoing rule be effective immediately. This motion is seconded and passed unanimously.

16. Progeny Requirement for VA1 Title:

Mr. Henkel moved that a dog must present a progeny group at NASS in order to be eligible for the Sieger title. Motion is seconded.

Dr. Barry spoke against the motion. This is an unfair advantage to the large breeders. The progeny group carries a lot of weight with the judges. We should trust the judges. If the progeny group carries weight in Germany it will carry weight here. We should give them the opportunity to do their job.

Mr. Yee spoke against the motion in part of what Dr. Barry presented. When we start imposing extra rules and implementing additional requirements to qualify for Sieger, it creates appearances that we are fixing the rules to let only a very small group of people qualify. When this happens, the value or worth of the titles that we award at the shows

get discounted. We need to protect the value of our awards. We must eliminate any appearances of bias, real or perceived.

Mr. Kempkes spoke against the motion. We cannot pay too much attention to the progeny group. Maybe the dog is just two years old and he has a super anatomy. The dog deserves to be Sieger.

Mr. Yee agrees with the statements articulated by Mr. Kempkes.

Ms. Barkus spoke against the motion because of the impression that it would have on the organization to limit the number of dogs.

Ms. Petersen spoke in favor of the motion because a two year old male has not proven himself.

The question is called. Mr. Henkel, Ms. Petersen and Mr. Burgos vote in favor of the motion. The remaining members vote against the motion. The motion fails.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05PM