

German Shepherd Dog Club of America-Working Dog Association, Inc.
January 23 & 24, 2009
Board of Directors Meeting
Golden Nugget Hotel
129 E. Fremont Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
1-800-634-3454

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 Golden Nugget Hotel, 129 E. Fremont Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101, on January 23 and 24, 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, January 23, 2009:

CALL TO ORDER:

The President, Dr. Danny J. Spreitler, served as Chair and called the meeting to order at 7:10PM.

ROLL CALL:

The Secretary conducted a roll call.

DIRECTORS PRESENT:

The President (Dr. Danny Spreitler), Vice President (Cindy Petersen - absent at roll call but joined the meeting at 7:45PM), Secretary (Daniel Yee), Recorder (Danny J. Spreitler), National Training Director (Dr. David Landau), Ex-Officio President of the GSDCA (Gail Hardcastle), General Directors (John Henkel, Michael Kempkes, Clay Meadows, Dr. Tom Mesdag), and the Regional Directors from Regions 1 (Fernando Burgos), 2 (Mike Andrel - absent at roll call but joined the meeting at 7:45PM), 3 (Miriam Barkus), 5 (Dr. Joseph Barry), 6 (Russell Osburn), 7 (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger), and 9 (Ray Blomberg) were present.

DIRECTORS ABSENT:

Treasurer (Claudia Behnke), Director of Trials and Judges (Mike West), Regional Directors from Regions 4 (Charlie Starr) and 8 (Wendell Nope) were absent.

QUORUM:

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

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Heidi Landau, Georgia Cawley, Kathy Henkel, Jeannette Kempkes, Dino Quaddi, Peter K. Burmeister, Mark Viera, Leon Luszcz, Estela Molina, Chris Molina, Rolando Herrera, Carmen Battaglia, Mina Ramirez, Pete Medina, Dania Karloff, Laura Gilbert, Tish Walker and Hong Yee

CALL FOR ORDERS:

The Chair called for Orders.

Dr. David Landau requested that the following items be added to the proposed agenda: (1) Consideration of the minutes for the Specially Called Board Meeting of May 30, 2008; and (2) Presentation of the audit for 2007. The Chair advised that the audit for 2007 was not yet completed, but that it can be discussed as soon as an agenda is adopted. If necessary, the item maybe advanced on the agenda for discussion.

Clay Meadows requested that the Board listen to charges that he had filed against a Board member. This was ruled out of order by the Chair.

A short recess was taken so that Mr. Meadows may confer with the Chair.

Upon reconvening the meeting, Mr. Meadows asked that the matter concerning his complaint be discussed in Executive Session. The Chair granted this request.

At the Chair's request, it was moved and seconded to add to the agenda a discussion to set the dates for this year's election such that the results may be published at the membership meeting during NASS 2009.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried that the rules be suspended so that the Chair may address the Report of President, items VI (a), (b), (c) and (d).

REPORT OF PRESIDENT:

a. Concerns of Membership:

The Chair stated that the WDA is owned by the membership. The WDA was formed through the efforts of the GSDCA. Both organizations should not be seen as a threat to each other.

The Chair confirmed that he has no intention of seeking a seat on the GSDCA Board of Directors. The Chair, however, wanted to confirm to the members of the GSDCA Board who are in attendance at this meeting that the WDA wants to strengthen the relationship between both organizations. In this regard, the WDA wants a written agreement with the GSDCA that will allow the WDA to continue for the next 30 or more years. The WDA wants this written agreement because

we cannot predict the future and the organization is concerned about its continued existence.

The Chair confirmed that the WDA is not starting a third organization. The WDA is not petitioning the AKC to become another parent club. The WDA is working to improve the WDA.

The two organizations cannot live in fear of each other and succeed. Actions are often misinterpreted. If a joint membership for both organizations were offered, some would interpret this as an attempt by one organization to take over the other.

The WDA exists because of the blessing of the GSDCA 27 years ago. We just want to protect the WDA. No one should be worried about Chair's motives. The Chair's motive is clear: to grow the organization.

The WDA membership is concerned about a number of issues. Number one is the economic position of their families. We have members in some hard hit areas and they are suffering. It is going to be a challenge for them to come up with membership fees. The Chair has committed to find a way to keep these members. This organization will not lose these members because they lost their jobs and they are losing their cars and their homes. This organization must be bigger than that.

Second, there are a number of dual members. These dual members are actually members of four organizations. They register their dogs with the AKC. They are a member of the GSDCA. They are members of the WDA. They also are members of the United Schutzhund Clubs of America. The only thing that these people care about is their dog. They don't care about politics. We need to start looking at how we make our organizations beneficial to these members, because they are why we exist.

Third, the WDA has a temporary agreement with the GSDCA in which the WDA is processing paperwork directly with the SV. This done because the GSDCA allows it. We need a permanent agreement. There are people working on this. It will require all of us putting aside our egos and our personal agendas. We need to put the interests of the members first. Ms. Hardcastle and Ms. Walker have been very supportive every step of the way as we went down this path to take care of the membership.

Fourth, we had an informal meeting with Mr. Doug Ljungren of the AKC together with Mr. Wayne Davis who is a consultant to the AKC on the Working Dog Sport ("WDS"). We discussed the WDS. Mr. Ljungren is aware of our concerns and knows that we need to protect the WDA.

Fifth, we had discussions with the United Schutzhund Clubs of America. We are

not merging our organizations. The discussions concern other issues, such as the establishment of a universal score book, resolution of issues concerning the processing of elbow certifications, getting paperwork processed by the SV and preventing banned members from one organization from jumping to the other.

In summary, we would like to see (a) an agreement finalized between the GSDCA and the WDA, (b) WDS succeed in the right context of things, and (c) an agreement between the WDA and the UScA that will allow each organization to take care of their members.

NEW BUSINESS:

Formation of the North American Alliance with the United Schutzhund Clubs of America:

It was moved by Daniel Yee and seconded by Miriam Barkus "to approve the formation of the North American Alliance with the United Schutzhund Clubs of America".

The purpose of the North American Alliance is to preserve and protect the heritage of the German Shepherd Dog in the United States with respect to the SV breed standard through the formation and maintenance of an alliance between the WDA and the United Schutzhund Clubs of America.

Dr. Landau asked what are the conditions and the rules with regard to the alliance.

The Chair explained that there are no rules. There are no rules or policies because people may view this as a merger of the two organizations, which it is not. The two areas discussed with the UScA were the reciprocal acceptance of judges and score books. There is nothing in writing between the two organizations. The motion is merely asking the board for permission to form the alliance and then to come back to the board as things come up for further board approval. The WDA's participation in this alliance must be approved by the Board every step of the way.

Mr. Yee responded to Dr. Landau and advised that the alliance should not have any restrictions imposed upon it. If there were any restrictions, then the alliance would be prevented from exploring matters that may be in the best interest of the breed and both organizations. The committee representing the WDA in this alliance must come back to the Board for approval of everything. Mr. Yee asked the board not to restrict the committee from carrying on dialogue on subjects that may be good for the breed and the WDA.

Dr. Landau then suggested that the motion be amended to approve a committee to develop an alliance without restriction on topics to be brought back to the board for approval.

The Chair suggested that Dr. Landau's suggestion be handled as a subsidiary motion. The subsidiary motion reads: "Motion to approve a committee to develop an alliance without restriction on topics to be brought back to the Board for approval."



The original motion by Mr. Yee "to approve the formation of the North American Alliance with the United Schutzhund Clubs of America" and the motion by Dr. Landau "to approve a committee to develop an alliance without restriction on topics to be brought back to the Board for approval" were joined at the suggestion of the Chair. The Chair called for the vote. Except for Gail Hardcastle who abstained, the remaining members voted to approve the joined motions. The motions carried.

Recess at 8:00PM

Meeting reconvened at 8:15PM

SECOND ROLL CALL:

All members present for the first roll call returned to the meeting. Quorum present.

NEW BUSINESS CONTINUED:

2009 NASS COMMITTEE:

The Chair called for volunteers for 2009 NASS Committee. The following individuals either volunteered or were nominated to join the National NASS Committee: Jeannette Kempkes, Dino Quaddi, Peter Burmeister, Mark Viera, Leon Luszcz, Estela Molina, Chris Molina, Rolando Herrera, Jeannine White, Earl White and Ray Blomberg. Last year's committee consisting of the following individuals remain in place: Danny Spreitler, Nadia Adams, Mike Andrel, Pat Beauchamp, Fernando Burgos, Alethea Caldwell (NASS 2009 Chair), Beth Fuqua, John Henkel, Karen Henkel, Michael Kempkes, Dr. David Landau, Julie Martinez, Clay Meadows, Russ Osburn, Cindy Petersen, Joy Schultz, Charlie Starr and Daniel Yee. The Chair called for the vote to approve the committee as newly constituted. The committee was unanimously approved.

GSDCA PERFORMANCE AWARDS:

Ms. Laura Gilbert, the new corresponding secretary and the central office for the GSDCA, presented GSDCA Performance Awards for AD, BH and Schutzhund 1, 2 and 3 Titles earned by WDA members throughout 2008. Bronze, Silver and Gold pins were awarded as well. The following individuals received awards: Cindy Petersen, Daniel Yee, Mike Andrel, Russ Osburn, Alethea Munsinger, Joe Barry, Michael and Jeannette Kempkes and Danny Spreitler. The Chair thanked the GSDCA.

MS. GAIL HARDCASTLE, GSDCA PRESIDENT:

Ms. Hardcastle took the floor to say that the GSDCA formed the WDA many years ago to enable certain activities to take place. The GSDCA set up the WDA to be self-sufficient. Ms. Hardcastle confirmed that as President of the GSDCA, she can promise that there is no ill will toward the WDA. There are many rumors circulating. Some rumors are coming from within the GSDCA and are destructive. The GSDCA has no problems with signing an agreement with the

WDA. She had told Mr. Yee to write out the agreement and she will sign it on behalf of the GSDCA.

The GSDCA has a WUSV Committee. People can be added to that committee without prior GSDCA Board approval. So, the GSDCA added two additional people to that committee for later ratification by the GSDCA Board.

The GSDCA did have a meeting with Doug Ljungren from the AKC to discuss the WDS. WDA did not participate in that meeting, so it is understandable that there is some misunderstanding about the WDS and its effect on the WDA. There was an agreement that was discussed that included the AKC, the GSDCA and the WDA and required the signatures of Mr. Ljungren, Ms. Hardcastle and Dr. Spreitler. But what is required is an agreement that meets the needs of the GSDCA and the WDA. The GSDCA does not manage the WDS. The German Shepherd Dog is just one of the breeds that is involved in the WDS. The GSDCA does not think that the WDA will be eliminated if the WDS is approved.

The WUSV wants us to have an agreement. The WUSV wants to know who will be handling the paperwork. That is what they want from us. So, we need to make a change to the WUSV committee. In Ms. Hardcastle's mind, the current temporary arrangement between the WDA and the GSDCA seems to be working. That arrangement should perhaps be made permanent.

The GSDCA would like to have the WDA Board meetings scheduled on different weekends so that it may be more involved with the WDA. Ms. Hardcastle expressed her guarantee that the GSDCA wants the continuance of the WDA. The GSDCA proudly started, proudly maintained and is proudly affiliated with the WDA. So, she encouraged that we all get the permanent agreement between the two organizations done. She also asked that the WDA not believe the rumors. She is at this meeting to stop any rumors that she can and to get any questions answered that needs an answer.

NASS 2009:

The Chair stated that he had visited the site in Los Angeles County, including the hotel. It will be a phenomenal event.

Alethea Caldwell Munsinger (Chair of NASS 2009):

Ms. Munsinger's written report, proposed NASS budget and sample brochure were distributed to the Board.

Ms. Munsinger explained that the budget was based on an estimated 400 entries, using history as a basis. She took a proactive approach with respect to actual cost and actual preliminary negotiations to arrive at the budget. The budget is realistic, yet conservative. The expenses are high. The entire Fairplex will be used. Income from donations, catalog advertising and sales, photograph sales, raffle tickets, clothing items (hats, shirts, hoodies) and entry fees are estimated at \$5,800.00. Expenses for facilities, bibs and signs, trophies, banquet, judges, website and

electronic forms, merchant banking fees, helper expenses, helper compensation, crew support, room expense, photography, clothing items, and catalog printing and binding is estimated at \$48,000.00. Expenses reflect a tremendous amount of volunteer hours.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger advised that Banquet revenues are not reflected in the budget because banquet costs in the past were covered by donations. She is hoping that we can get a sponsor this year for the banquet.

As to show catalogs, the budget assumes that one catalog will be given free of charge to each participant, with the remaining catalogs to be sold.

We are currently seeking partial donations for the clothing items.

The figure for helper compensation is based on the helper tax that comes out of the entries and is based upon last year's numbers.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger moved to approve the NASS 2009 budget as presented.

The Chair states that there is an implied understanding when the board approves a budget, that the expenses within the budget are approved. Obligations will be made to spend that money. There also is a method where the Board can approve a budget with restrictions as to a time frame.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger continues. The hotel does require a deposit, but that is not due until sometime later. The hotel also requires credit authorization for the rooms that the WDA will reserve for its people. Other than above, no other money is due to the hotel until check-in. We also expect to receive some donations prior to the event.

After discussion, Ms. Caldwell Munsinger amends her budget to add \$2,400.00 to include the payment required to guarantee 20 rooms for one night. She also amends the budget to add a \$1,000.00 contingency expense.

The budget, as amended, now reads \$58,000.00 on the income side; and \$51,400.00 on the expense side, which includes the addition of \$2,400.00 for the guarantee required by the hotel and \$1,000.00 for contingencies.

The Chair notes that some expenses would be flex expenses that should be adjusted based upon the number of entries. The flex expenses would include bibs and signs, trophies, banquet, website/electronic forms, merchant banking, helper expenses, crew support rooms, photography, and production of clothing items. Since the budget is based upon an assumed 400 entries, if the entries deviate from this, then we cannot hold to this budget. We would have to flex it up or flex it down.

The Chair called for the vote. Except for Mike Andrel and Cindy Petersen who opposed the motion, the remaining members voted in favor of the motion. The motion carries.

The Chair asked Ms. Caldwell Munsinger for the recommendation of the Committee as to the selection of the facility. Ms. Caldwell Munsinger indicated that the recommendation is the Fairplex. It is difficult to find fault with the Fairplex. Mr. Yee has the contract but has yet to review it.

The Chair called for the vote to approve the Fairplex as the venue, pending review of the contract by Mr. Yee to make sure that it is in the best interest of the WDA. The Board unanimously approved the venue pending review of the contract by Mr. Yee.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger indicates that the Committee recommends the approval of the on-site Sheraton Hotel as the Host hotel. She moves for approval of the host hotel. Ms. Barkus seconds. The motion carries by unanimous approval.

SCORE BOOKS:

Dr. David Landau states that he would like the issue of score book size to be referred to the Judges Committee for consideration. The Judges' Committee shall make a recommendation to the Board at the April Board Meeting.

JUDGES' SHEETS:

Dr. Landau moved that judges' sheets be printed by Laser or some other permanent means printer on waterproof paper. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried. The judges' sheets shall be ordered from the WDA office.

PUBLICATION OF TITLES BY THE GSDCA:

The Chair indicated that the GSDCA would like to publish in the Review the titles earned at WDA events.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger moved that the Board of Directors of the WDA allow the publication of titles earned at WDA events in the GSDCA Review. Motion is seconded and is carried by unanimous vote.

WUSV TEAM FUND RAISING:

Mr. Clay Meadows is the team captain for 2009. He was the assistant team captain in 2008. The team members and Mr. Meadows had incurred a lot of out-of-pocket expenses at the last WUSV Championships. The GSDCA's generous \$4,000.00 donation will not be enough to cover the team members' expenses to Germany in 2009. Mr. Meadows asked for assistance to raise funds for the team captain, three team members and one alternate. The Chair recommended that Mr. Meadows appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to assist him. Mr. Meadows appointed Joy Schultz, Gail Hardcastle, Daniel Yee and Alethea Caldwell Munsinger.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried that the meeting adjourn until 8:00AM

tomorrow morning.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30PM.

Saturday, January 24, 2009:

CALL TO ORDER:

The President, Dr. Danny J. Spreitler, served as Chair and called the meeting to order at 8:00AM.

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), National Training Director (Dr. David Landau), General Directors (John Henkel, Michael Kempkes, Clay Meadows), and the Regional Directors from Regions 1 (Fernando Burgos), 2 (Mike Andrel), 3 (Miriam Barkus), 5 (Dr. Joseph Barry), 6 (Russell Osburn), 7 (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger), and 9 (Ray Blomberg) were present.

DIRECTORS ABSENT:

Treasurer (Claudia Behnke), Director of Trials and Judges (Mike West), Ex-Officio President of the GSDCA (Gail Hardcastle), General Director (Dr. Tom Mesdag), Regional Directors from Regions 4 (Charlie Starr) and 8 (Wendell Nope) were absent.

QUORUM:

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

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Mark Viera, Leon Luszcz, Estela Molina, Chris Molina, Rolando Herrera, Georgia Cawley, Heidi Landau and Hong Yee

CALL FOR ORDERS:

The Chair called for Orders.

Alethea Caldwell Munsinger moved to bring forward the review of existing guidelines for formation of new clubs. The Chair directed the Administrative Policy Committee to review the

guidelines with instructions to bring recommendations for any changes to the April Board meeting, unless something needs to be done sooner.

The Chair acknowledged that an Executive Session needs to be added to the agenda. Cindy Petersen moved that the time for the Executive Session be set for 1:00PM. This motion was seconded by Mike Andrel. The motion unanimously carried.

READING OF THE MINUTES TABLED UNTIL AFTER THE EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Daniel Yee moved to table the reading of the minutes until after the Executive Session. Miriam Barkus seconds. The motion unanimously carried.

REPORT OF SECRETARY TABLED UNTIL AFTER THE EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Daniel Yee moved that the Secretary's Report be tabled until after the Executive Session. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

TREASURE'S REPORT (Dr. Danny J. Spreitler, Chair):

The Chair reported that the Treasurer could not attend the meeting. The Chair distributed to the members a number of reports for review. Dr. Landau asked for a balance sheet. The Chair advised that the balance sheet has been emailed and will be downloaded later today.

The WDA, over the course of last year, faced many obstacles because of the expenses of the club. The club lost \$18,000 in 2008. Historically, lost is usual. How a club does financially is based on membership. Our problem is that our losses are becoming focused. All programs have begun to lose money. We do not have an income stream that keeps us going.

In 2006, the NASS made a little bit over \$30,000. In 2007, it made \$28,000. Last year, it made about \$5,000. The significant difference in the NASS comes from the fact that Purina in 2006 committed \$20,000. Royal Canin committed \$9,500.00. Our leather jacket program raised \$11,000.

In 2007, Royal Canin paid for the banquet and Purina put up \$20,000.

In 2008, the funds from the Sieger Show came from the pockets of the members. Royal Canin was unable to donate. Purina, because we were not at Purina Farms, did not donate. We had the expenses of paying for fields and tents. Our helpers didn't cost any more money. Our judges cost less and both judges refused to take a fee. We severely cut back on the number of rooms we paid for. We did everything we could to cut cost. About two hundred catalogs were printed at no cost. We could not get the revenue stream we needed to get the show financially a huge success. We have to find a mechanism to become more engaged in finding support of our organization. Unfortunately for the WDA, our membership isn't large enough to support the Nationals and the NASS. In all that we did, we had no educational programs. We had no programs in 2008 that discussed the breed. We cannot afford to promote the club in Dog World.



We don't have a couple thousand dollars for a full page ad. How do we go out and raise money?

On our SV programs (hips and elbows, breed surveys and judge releases), we lost \$2,800.00 last year. Remember the difficulty in a floating exchange rate and the weakness of the dollar. One thing the board considered four times last year was that we did not want to raise fees. On the World Championship Trial, we lost \$661. This means that \$661 had to come from the organization for the team, because we were short that amount in donations. We had a very poor year for fund raising for the team.

On the Newsletter, we lost \$20,665. Ms. Schultz added that the Newsletter has always been a loss. This is not a new high; it is actually a new low.

The Chair continues that this is the challenge for our Publications Committee. We have to reduce this loss. The Publications Committee is adamant that we not cut the quality or the number of issues. The Publications Committee is thinking of going strictly to black and white. The Newsletter is our voice. It is what the membership receives that is tangible from us that says "Here it is. Here is what we are doing." We are going to have to cut out the color.

Ms. Schultz stated that color printing is priced by the number of color pages. Prices vary by 4 up, 8 up and 16 up on a sheet. If you have 3 paid for color ads, you have to pay for that 4th page whether or not it is color. Rather than pay the color price for a black and white page, Carole Schultz will run something in color on that page.

The Chair states that the goal of the Publications Committee is to reduce the loss by 50%. The easiest way to reduce the loss is to sell more ads. We need more people involved, we need more articles. Let's talk about the breed and training in the publication.

Dr. Landau raised an issue about the financial report. The unaudited 2007 report shows a net income of over \$34,000. If we assume that the audited amount is fairly close, let's use that number to work with. If we backed out \$25,000 because of the difference in the NASS, that still leaves a profit of close to \$10,000 on remaining items in comparison to an \$18,000 loss. The Chair explained that the variance comes from the costs of the board meetings that we did not incur in the past. A motion was passed in January 2008 to cover rooms for two nights; this had never been done before.

Ms. Cindy Petersen added that the January 2008 meeting cost WDA around \$4000 to \$4500. The April 2008 board meeting cost WDA around \$5500. The July 2008 board meeting cost the WDA almost \$7000.

The Chair states that for the first time in 2008, the WDA took the responsibility of hosting the GSDCA-WDA National Championship/WUSV Qualification Trial. In the past, it has been hosted by a club. We lost \$8300 on that event. Last year we learned a lot.

Fernando Burgos asks whether it would save the WDA money if we had the NASS and the Nationals on the same weekend. The Chair appointed Fernando Burgos, John Henkel and Clay



Meadows to an Ad Hoc Committee to investigate this possibility.

Dr. Landau notes that on page one, there were several return check charges. A number of years ago, we passed a motion to disallow the entry of any individual that still owed the WDA monies. He asked if a list has been maintained of these individuals. The Chair answered yes.

Dr. Landau notes that on page 4, the rooms are listed for the board of directors in the amount of \$3,836.00. Dr Landau expected that amount of money would differ from the previous year. He asked what was involved in the charge for \$15,140.00. Chair responded that the charge was not for a general board meeting but for rooms that we paid for national events.

Dr. Landau notes that further down that same page, item 69016, 2008 NASS Miscellaneous Expense and asked what contributed to the over \$12,000 miscellaneous amount. Chair referred Dr. Landau to page 12 of the report (note: pages 12 and 13 of the NASS expenses sheet were missing from the distributed document). The Chair explained that miscellaneous expenses includes things such as tents. The Chair could not explain why the tents were listed here because the tents were a lease rental from a facility under a separate contract. It is an issue with using Quick Books.

Dr. Landau refers to Page 8, World Championship Income Expense Report. The \$4000 from the GSDCA needs to be added in.

Chair indicates that Page 13 refers to the National Training Seminar.

Mr. Meadows asked whether the money used to pay the representative from the WDA to attend the WUSV Championships came from the funds donated to the team. Ms. Petersen responded that she attended the World Championship to support the team and to represent the WDA because the President could not attend. All of her expenses were paid out of her own pocket. She arrived Wednesday evening. The next four days were spent dealing with WDA issues and, as such, she requested expense reimbursement for one tank of gas, room reimbursement for Wednesday through Saturday, and for the banquet. Mr. Meadows challenged not the expense reimbursement, but rather what budget the funds should come out of. Reimbursement of expenses to the representative of the WDA should not come out of the monies donated to the team. The Chair responded by saying that this was a coding issue made by the Treasurer. If Mr. Meadows believes that the expense reimbursement was deducted from the wrong account, then the Board can address that issue if Mr. Meadows can tell the Board where he believes that the funds should be deducted. Dr. Landau advised that all such issues, in the past, have been solved either by the team captain or the GSDCA/SV-WUSV liaison. Neither the liaison, the WDA representative nor any other individual had ever received any money from the team fund. The team fund has always been reserved exclusively for the captain, the team and the alternate. The Chair stated that we will determine how to properly categorize the expense reimbursement and will re-categorize the expense accordingly. We will handle this as soon as he can speak to the Treasurer.

Dr. Landau asked what was the WDA actually worth at the end of 2008. The Chair advised that

the treasurer, Ms. Behnke, was contacted last evening about getting that information for the board today.

The Chair stated that we need to shore up the budget and finance committee to be more proactive and less reactive. Ms. Munsinger's experience will be critical to that committee.

Dr. Landau moved that the Board receive the Treasurer's report with the exception of the balance sheet. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

NEW MEMBERS AND NEW 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.

REGIONAL DIRECTOR REPORTS:

REGION 1 (FERNANDO BURGOS):

We have already six events for this year. We have the Regional selected for this year. One show in April, two shows in May, one show in August and maybe one more in June. We will have our Regional meeting in April. We are trying to build a Regional website.

REGION 2 (MIKE ANDREL):

We had the Nationals last year. We are campaigning for new clubs. We have one coming up in the Pittsburgh area. We are going to local police departments trying to initiate a relationship with police because dog laws are becoming more and more severe with protection. If we don't watch ourselves, this organization will be somewhat crippled because of some of those laws. We are encouraging membership by rolling back our dues because of the money. If we don't have people in the clubs, the clubs will not grow and the club will become stagnated. Otherwise we are doing well.

REGION 3 (MIRIAM BARKUS):

We have new clubs in our region. We've been growing quite a bit. We have activities scheduled. Some of our clubs are more active than others, but they are all doing their best and provide really good help to their members.

REGION 4 (CHARLIE STARR-Absent):

No report presented.

REGION 5 (DR. JOSEPH BARRY):

We had our regional meeting last weekend. One of the items for discussion was the regional schutzhund championships requirement. We haven't had one for about four years. We have difficulty getting clubs to put on a regional championship because it is an economic loser. We have always had an excess of clubs wanting to do a regional conformation show so we've instituted a draw procedure that is now part of the WDA's procedure when there is more than one club within a region that desires to have it. We have instituted a policy that every club send an entrant to the regional or a donation equivalent to the entry to help support the regional championship. Not all of the clubs have done this, so we've tried to put some teeth into it by saying if a club doesn't do it, they'll have difficulty getting their events approved. This is something we have to talk about at the board level. We've checked out the site for the USCA Sieger Show and it looks very good, so we'll see how that works out. Central Illinois Police and Working Dog Association is having our regional schutzhund championship for this year and Topline German Shepherd Dog Club the Regional Show.

REGION 6 (RUSS OSBURN):

We had five trials last year and we already have two scheduled for this year. The Good Shepherd Schutzhund Club handled the Working Dog Sport trial in conjunction with the GSDCA National Specialty Show. We have a new club in Amarillo. I've received two inquiries for new clubs, one in Tulsa and one in San Antonio.

REGION 7 (ALETHEA CALDWELL MUNSINGER):

Our region is very active in events. Those events include the Regional Championship just before NASS. We have monthly telephone conference calls. That's the way we have discussed issues, items, problems, etc., including our regional event rotation. We've had our regional website up and running for quite some time. We are well represented at this board meeting by our members that drove in from California. Mr. Yee or I have covered every event in our region. We don't have any new clubs yet but we may have one coming up in Arizona.

REGION 8 (WENDELL NOPE-not present):

No report presented

REGION 9 (RAY BLOMBERG):

Last year, we had only two events: one trial hosted by Snohomish Schutzhund Club and a joint regional conformation show held by both the Oregon State Working Dog Association and the Western Washington Schutzhund Club. We had a lot of support from our friends in Canada. We are planning a fall Regional Schutzhund Trial. We have a problem with a Regional Conformation Show because of the financial burden placed on the clubs.

The Chair requested that Mr. Blomberg speak to the people in the region and to come back with

thoughts of how the Board can assist. Region 9 is one region in which we need growth. Some of our rules do become burdensome at times.

OFFICE MANAGER REPORT (Joy Schultz):

Ms. Schultz distributed a written to the Board members. There were no additional comments.

NATIONAL TRAINING DIRECTOR (Dr. David Landau):

The report of the National Training Director revolves around our first National Training Seminar. There was an anonymous donor. The financial report gives you an indication of the loss that the WDA would have had to pay if there had not been a donation. \$800 has gone into a restricted fund for future events as a result of this donation. The range of the participants' backgrounds went from extremely experienced to virtually nothing. There was a couple hours of class room presentation with a lot of questions from individuals. We then went to the camp out in the fields and separated into three groups. People rotated from one group to another. They had individual instruction. Since their dogs were at different levels, they received instruction at different levels. The seminar fee was \$100, that included breakfast the first morning, lunch both days, and a banquet. This event was extraordinarily successful. Dr. Landau would like to see another seminar held this coming Fall, but in a different part of the country. There was interest from the Southwest, but with the North American Sieger Show in that region, it might not be a good idea. If any of the other regions would like to be considered, please contact Dr. Landau.

NATIONAL TRACKING AND TRACK LAYER SEMINAR:

Dr. Landau then moved to suspend the rules and consider the agenda item concerning the National Tracking Seminar. The motion was seconded by John Henkel and approved unanimously.

Dr. Landau moved to approve a National Tracking Seminar and Track Layer certification for early summer or late spring in the same venue as the first National Training Seminar.

A draft budget was submitted in the event the sponsorship is not honored. This is not coming forth as a committee recommendation, it is coming forth as a National Training Director recommendation.

The Chair suggested that the board approve the concept of having a National Training Seminar but to refer to committee to decide the location. The Committee would make a recommendation to the Board or Executive Committee for approval. It was so moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

DIRECTOR OF TRIALS AND JUDGES (Mike West - not present):

Mike West was not present, but he submitted a written report which was read by the Chair.

There was a vote of the Judges Committee in which there was a tie of the new rules. The Chair could break that tie. I chose not to because I think this program is too important for the Chair to be a dictator in that instance. On behalf of Mr. West, I would like to say that he is not happy with that decision. We need to resolve this in the committee and bring this to the board. This is too important a program. The Chair will not exercise his right to vote. Mr. West will be bringing forward through the Chair later today two apprentice judge applicants.

HELPER COMMITTEE (Clay Meadows):

A list of helpers was distributed to the Board. We have 74 club, 48 regional, 13 national and 12 teaching helpers. In February, I will start calling all helpers to be sure that they have renewed their WDA memberships. Newly certified helpers are called welcoming them to the program.

The Chair requested the helper committee to meet in February to get the Helpers scheduled for the National Championship.

Mr. Meadows moved to suspend the rules and bring the agenda item concerning the Approval of National Teaching Helpers for a vote. It was seconded and approved by unanimous vote.

The Chair stated that the Helper Committee is recommending Board approval of the following four Teaching Helpers that are due for reappointment: Mr. Steve Beal, Mr. James Dalton, Mr. Clay Meadows and Mr. Steve Miller.

Dr. Landau moved to approve the reappointment of the four individuals named. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

Mr. Meadows moved to approve Teaching Helper applicant Mr. John Henkel. Mr. Henkel has met all the requirements and has the recommendation of two National Helpers: Mr. Clay Meadows and Mr. Carl Smith. Fernando Burgos seconds the motion. The motion is unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrel asked whether it is a policy requirement that a re-certification must be two days? Mr. Meadows stated that it can be one day. The Teaching Helper can make that decision based on the number of entries and the level of the participants.

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger):

The ad hoc committee diminished at the end of the year. There are some very nominal changes that were made to the trial entry form. Once we approved the HOT and BHOT rules, they needed to be added to this form.

The Chair stated that since the Board approved the rules, the changes to the forms are automatically approved.

Ms. Munsinger advised that we have two other forms that must be posted on the website.

Dr. Landau agreed that some forms can and should be provided electronically and others would cause difficulty.

The Chair asked for a blanket motion that any and all forms that can be provided in electronic format be approved so we don't have to do this at every meeting.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger moved that any and all existing WDA approved forms that can be provided electronically may be posted on the WDA website. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved and carried.

Forms will still be available for purchase from the Office.

DATABASE:

Ms. Munsinger asked about starting a database

The Chair advised that a donation was made to the WDA of an Oracle Server in which the last three years of all entries into the Sieger Shows and supporting documents have been put in place. The Chair does have the resources to convert that database into a format that would be available in Access. Ms. Munsinger offered to get the data converted. Dr. Spreitler will get it done the first part of February.

The Chair stated that we need consistency in the catalog format.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

The Chair stated that budget and finance has not been as effective as it needs to be. On February 26th, there will be a special board meeting teleconference to discuss budget.

GSDCA/GSDCA-WDA LIAISON (Dr. Tom Mesdag - Not Present):

The Chair has spoken to Dr. Mesdag. The GSDCA meets on the last full weekends of January, April and July. Dr. Mesdag has requested that the WDA not schedule its meetings on the same weekends as the GSDCA.

JUNIOR SPORTS PROGRAM:

Ms. Cindy Petersen said that Mr. Pat Kuehn is the chairperson of this program. There are some things we'd like to do with the Juniors this year. We'd like to revamp the program a little bit but we are waiting on the bylaws to go to the membership that will allow Juniors to be members of WDA.

The Chair indicated that once we get through the ratification of the minutes we will get the bylaw amendments out very quickly.

MEMBERSHIP (John Henkel):

The membership committee was tasked with dealing with an objection to a membership. There was very strong objection with supported documentation. We all came together and on a conference call and followed proper procedure for dealing with that. We were relieved of our need to conclude that matter as the applicant withdrew his application.

We are concerned that even though our membership is up over last year, 408 members have not renewed. Each and every one of those people will get a phone call and will receive an email because we want them back.

NATIONAL EVENTS (Cindy Petersen):

The National Events Committee has been perceived as a very controversial committee. That is not the intent. However, there is a protocol. Several people have expressed interest in having either the National Championship or the NASS in their back yard. The proper protocol would be to send an email to the National Events Committee and follow it up with some reasons why you would like it in your area and some suggestions as to where to host it. The Committee is looking for sites for the 2010 NASS and Nationals. We try to look at parts of the country that would be beneficial for the largest amount of people.

The Chair would like to see the board task the National Events Committee within the next fourteen days to develop a bid process for the National events so that everybody answers the same questions. Those bid packages should be received by the National Events Committee three weeks prior to the April board meeting. This board, at the April meeting, can take the recommendation of the National Events Committee to make a decision and announce to the membership where we will be going.

The Chair asked that the National Events Committee develop within the next fourteen days a bid document for these two national events and that the bid document be put out to those who requests it. The bids should be returned three weeks prior to the April board meeting so that those bids can be voted on it. It was so moved by Dr. Landau and seconded by John Henkel. Except for Cindy Petersen who abstained, the remaining members voted in favor of the motion. Motion passes.

2009 NATIONAL SchH 3 CHAMPIONSHIP/WUSV QUALIFICATION TRIAL (Chair):

Two ladies are pulling this event off: Niki Mohns and Connie Miller. They are absolutely fabulous. They sent a very short list of things they needed us to do. They took care of everything else. We have phenomenal hotel rates, a great venue, the website is up, and entry forms are coming up. We really need to promote this event. The Chair does not want to take away from the NASS, but the Nationals come first. We did have a cancellation by a judge. That judge, who is the SV President, had a calendar conflict and cannot attend. He has sent us a list of names. The Chair will send that list to the judges committee for input and will call a special meeting of the board for the vote. WT-Metall is coming on board as a sponsor and will donate the blinds for the event and hopefully a box to be raffled off.

2008 NASS (Dr. Danny J. Spreitler, Chair):

Anybody that has the money can buy a dog, and with that money they can get on a podium. But what really matters are those that are out there working every day with these dogs. Region 7 did a phenomenal job on the trophies. The food was a huge issue. The quality of the progeny and kennel groups were phenomenal. Every year, the quality of the dogs over the last three years has improved by quantum leaps. The helpers did the job they should have done and there were no complaints.

Recess at 10:30 AM

Meeting reconvenes at 11:00 AM

SPONSORSHIP COMMITTEE (John Henkel):

Unfortunately, there is very little to report. Sponsorships have dried up. We have talked to companies. We have spoken to Royal Canin. They are only interested in sponsoring specific events. Our goal, however, is to get more general sponsorships. But, no one is going for that right now. I would like to add some members to the sponsorship committee. Right now there is only Nadia Adams and myself. I would like to have Mr. Kempkes and Mr. Yee added to this committee.

There being no objections, the Chair confirms that they are added to the committee.

K-9 COMMITTEE:

No report presented.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE (Cindy Petersen):

The members of the Publications Committee are Cindy Petersen, John Henkel, Fernando Burgos and Nadia Adams. The committee is trying really hard to play catch-up because, as it has been reported earlier, the magazine costs the organization a tremendous amount of money. But, the Publications Committee feels that the one sure benefit you get from your membership to the WDA is that you receive the magazine in the mail. That being said, we want that magazine to improve. The last issue was probably the nicest issue we saw last year and we've received a lot of positive comments. The Publications Committee has a lot of good ideas. I ask this board to bear with us while we implement some of those ideas. If anyone has any ideas, they can email any member of the committee with their ideas.

This is what we have done so far: We are actively pursuing articles that may be of interest to our members.

APPROVAL OF MAGAZINE CONTENT BY THE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE:

The Publications Committee feels very strongly that we would like approval of articles that are placed in the magazine before the magazine is formatted by Ms. Carole Schultz.

Ms. Petersen moved that all magazine articles, advertisements and pictures to be used in the WDA magazine must be approved by the Publications Committee before the magazine is formatted for printing. John Henkel seconds. Discussion ensues.

Miriam Barkus asked on what basis articles would be altered or refused and what recourse would someone writing it have if their article was refused or amended. Ms. Petersen responded that we don't want to refuse or amend articles at this time. We are doing this to make sure that our magazine has a balance of content. We want articles that are of interest to the entire membership of the WDA and not always articles written by just the same person or pictures only by one photographer. We are trying to get the point of view from as many people as we can to put into this magazine. That includes SV judges, SV breed wardens, people in our organization that are at the top of their game. For instance, articles are being written on an interview with Reinhardt Meyer and Wallace Payne. There is a wonderful article being written on the problems we find in German Shepherds by a person who has conducted microbiology and who has done research for three years by collecting data from people in our sport that have German Shepherds. The only people that are accepting or refusing articles are Ms. Joy Schultz and Ms. Carole Schultz.

Joy Schultz stated that neither she nor Carole Schultz have ever refused any article. They have never prevented an article from being included in the Newsletter. What is included in the Newsletter is what has been received for publishing. Some effort really must be made to get more contributors. Ms. Schultz agrees with Ms. Petersen. More variety and review by the Publications Committee is needed. Further, every photo that has been presented in proper definition and format has been published. The photos must be in high definition and must be greater than 300 dpi.

John Henkel added that it is a goal of the committee that this magazine become the premier periodical of the German Shepherd Dog in this country. Many members have joined this organization simply to get the magazine. The fact that they get a membership card is secondary. The goal of the committee is not to reject articles. We are also very interested in making sure that content in ads is accurate.

The Chair states that basically what is happening is we are creating an editorial policy.

Dr. Landau requested the motion be read again. The motion was reread by Mr. Yee as follows: "All magazine articles, advertisements and pictures to be used in the WDA magazine must be approved by the Publications Committee before the magazine is formatted for printing."

The Chair called for the vote on the motion as read. Motion is unanimously carried.

ADVERTISING RATES:

Cindy Petersen raised a second issue. The advertising rates are quite low. A full page black and white ad for a member is only \$50. The Kennel Listing which is a business card size ad is only \$30 per year. We would like raise all advertising rates by \$20.

Ms. Petersen moved to raise all advertising rates for the WDA magazine by \$20. Motion was seconded.

Dr. Landau asked how much would that increase have raised our income in 2008.

Mr. Kempkes states that this is not enough money. A kennel listing should be at least \$100 per year and a full page black and white ad for members should also be at least \$100.

Ms. Schultz states that most of the ads that have been running for the last year, two years, three years have already been billed and paid for this year.

Mr. Henkel added that the committee had discussed raising the rates even higher. Mr. Henkel, personally, would pay even five times higher for a business card ad that runs all year. The Committee is trying to deal with the fact that we do have tough financial times. We don't want to scare people away. We realize in the future we can go higher.

Ms. Petersen advised that she will respond to Dr. Landau's question in a few days.

A friendly amendment to add an effective date of March 1, 2009 for new ads was made. The motion, as amended, reads: "All advertising rates for the WDA magazine will be raised by \$20, effective March 1, 2009." Except for Ray Blomberg and Miriam Barkus who abstained, all other members voted in favor the motion. Motion carries.

ADDITION OF A CLASSIFIED AD SECTION TO THE WDA MAGAZINE:

Ms. Petersen presented a third item for discussion. This is a new idea. We would like to have a column in the magazine that is called Classified Ads. This is not where you advertise your stud dog, or your bitch that just whelped the Siegers for the next three shows. This is a classified ad where you can advertise your kennel or that you have a bike jacket for sale.

This is to generate just one more page in the magazine where people might actually be willing to part with a few dollars. The ads for this section would be four lines for \$20 and would be a three column width. Each additional line would be \$5. If you want your line highlighted in bold letters that's an additional \$5, but all email addresses are highlighted at no charge. The ad runs for one issue and includes no pictures. The committee agreed that we would all be more than willing to put at least one ad in the March-April issue to get it started. We would like to announce in the Jan-Feb issue that the classified ads are coming. Ms. Carole Schultz said it would not be a financial burden on the WDA if we start this. It's a small way to try and generate income and it's a small way to try to generate interest.

The Chair advised that there was no need for this to go before the Board. The page already is there. Any questions on this matter may be handled outside of the meeting. We don't want to start micro-managing what we do.

PHOTO CONTEST:

Ms. Petersen said that Nadia Adams had a great idea for a photo contest. The information will be in the next issue of the magazine. Towards the end of the year, a group of people will select 12 photos that will be used for a WDA calendar that will be on sale at the NASS this year. You will be able to buy it online through the WDA office. We are hoping it will not only generate interest, we will get photos in a file that will then be used in the magazine when you have a little corner where you have nothing to put. We'll have a whole file full of photos of member's dogs, or a member and their dog. Ms. Adams is doing research on what the costs will be.

Mr. Henkel added that there will be no dog name and no kennel name in the photos.

Ms. Petersen said that Ms. Adams already has written up something about the photo contest. It will be published in the very next issue of the magazine.

MAGAZINE NAME CHANGE:

Cindy Petersen reported that the WDA monthly publication has grown from a newsletter in a magazine. Since the publication is no longer a newsletter, we felt that the magazine needed a new name. So, we ran a contest. We had three responses. The committee didn't really care for any of the suggestions: one was Hundesport Today, another was German Shepherd Unleashed and the last was the GSDCA-WDA Complete Working Shepherd. We took the last suggestion and came up with the GSDCA-WDA Complete German Shepherd Dog.

Ms. Petersen moved that the new name for the magazine will be "GSDCA-WDA The Complete German Shepherd Dog". The motion was second.

Mr. Yee spoke against the motion. The current magazine name has been around for a while. There is name recognition that is identified with the WDA. We should think seriously about the value of this branding and name recognition before changing it.

Mr. Andrej spoke in favor of the motion. I think it's phenomenal. It is the complete dog: show, sport, police. If there is one thing that we have to start, it is to be the ambassadors of the German Shepherd is the total dog.

Dr. Landau speaks against the motion. I would reinforce exactly what Mr. Yee said. I think the current name highlights the WDA. If we were to put some sort of subtitle as the complete German Shepherd, that might work well.

The question is called. The motion passes on a vote of seven to six.

NEW WEBMASTER:

Ms. Petersen indicated that there was one last item. The WDA needs a new Webmaster. The current Webmaster can no longer do our website.

Mr. Henkel reported that the Publications Committee was presented with a list of candidates. Three of the four committee members have approved Abhai Kaul. Mr. Kaul was sent a list of questions. Mr. Kaul answered the questions very satisfactorily. The committee also conferred with Dr. Spreitler. Mr. Kaul will provide a website that is much more interactive than our old website. There will be a member's area with password access. There will also be the ability to renew memberships online. Mr. Kaul has agreed to accept the same compensation as the previous Webmaster. We have not committed to a contract with Mr. Kaul.

It was moved and seconded to accept Abhai Kaul as the new webmaster.

Ms. Barkus asked how did the committee decide on the Webmaster?

Mr. Henkel advised that there was a list of credentials that were evaluated.

The Chair added that the candidates provided a list of websites that they currently have designed and hosted. We checked to see how secure the sites were and whether they could be accessed by the three mainstream browsers.

Dr. Landau asked whether we have any commitment on the speed with which new information will be posted.

Mr. Henkel said that Mr. Kaul would update it daily unless he was in school or there was some pre-standing commitment.

The motion passes by unanimous vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

GSDCA-WDA JUDGES PROGRAM:

The Chair presented this report on behalf Mike West, who was not present. Mr. West's report was communicated by email.

The Board has previously approved the Judges Program. At the April 2008 meeting in Kentucky, Mr. West provided a number of proposed program changes. The board sent that back to the committee because the committee as whole had not been called to a meeting and had not had an opportunity to review the proposed changes. Dr. Landau was traveling to Germany. There was a period of time that he could not review that because he was traveling. The committee has reviewed it. There has been an exchange of emails and the committee is deadlocked.

The Chair had previously stated that he does not have the knowledge to vote on this issue. In the best interest of our membership, the chair had refused to cast a vote. The Chair did not abstain. We have a deadlock within the Judges Committee. This board does not have the basis to release that deadlock. Mr. West has asked that we vote on the new program. In good conscience, the Chair states that he could not allow that motion to come to the floor. As such, the Chair has asked that a fifth party be added to the committee that has knowledge of judges programs, knowledge of the rules to help push this along and resolve these issues. These are technical issues that are extremely important and we need to do what's best for the membership. With that, the Chair encouraged the committee to pick someone and let's get this done before the April meeting

Dr. Landau stated that in the absence of these changes, there is no reason that we cannot progress with the existing program.

The Chair said that we should not stop anything. We should move straight down the path.

Mr. Meadows asked for a list of the members of that committee.

The Chair indicated that the members are Mr. Michael West, Dr. David Landau, Mr. Dan Yee, and Mr. Doug Alexander.

Mr. Yee indicated that he has had a number of telephone conversations with Mr. West and that he believes that the committee may be able to resolve these issues.

Ms. Barkus suggested that the committee consider the addition of a SV judge to the committee. We have an SV judge that is a member of our organization, Rainer Voortman.

The Chair asked the committee to consider all opportunities. He would like the committee to get this off center. We took that huge step last April. We have the program, let's make the most of it. At the same time, let's not have a program that discriminates as it there is Internal Revenue Code Section 501c(7) liability. In addition to race discrimination, a 501c(7) discrimination also means the creation of a sub-class within the organization. For example, we don't want anyone over the age of 50 to hold a position of certain authority. An interesting and intriguing dilemma that I have with the Judges Program is in Germany there is a mandatory retirement age. In the United States a mandatory retirement age could be viewed as illegal. We don't allow age discrimination in the country. This matter remains unfinished and I implore the committee to use all resources to resolve that issue.

HIP AND ELBOW EVALUATIONS:

Alethea Caldwell Munsinger moved to adopt the Guidelines for submission of radiographs for SV Hip and Elbow evaluations. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

Dr. Landau asked for the actual cost to the WDA for a hip evaluation, or an elbow evaluation, or both.

Ms. Munsinger advised that there was a loss for this service last year because of the exchange rate. We are barely covering the cost this year.

Ms. Schultz added that the SV is charging 32 Euro for elbows and 67 Euros for hips. The United Schutzhund Clubs of America charges \$5.00 more than the WDA.

Dr. Barry stated that we should not be operating this program at a loss.

The Chair directed the budget and finance committee to review all of the SV program expenses and come back with a report on this issue. A special meeting will be called to address all of the SV program expenses.

Recess for lunch at 12:00 PM

The Meeting reconvenes in Executive Session at 1:40PM.

The Meeting reconvenes in general open session at 2:55PM

ROLL CALL:

All Board members present at the previous roll card are present, except for Ray Blomberg, who returns to the meeting at 3:00PM and Clay Meadows, who returns at 3:20PM. Quorum exists.

REPORT ON EXECUTIVE SESSION:

The Chair gave a report of the business handled in the Executive Session.

§ There was a very lengthy and detailed conversation about the disciplinary procedures that are mandated by our bylaws and Roberts Rules. The Board of Directors has a duty to follow these guidelines and rules.

§ At the request of the party involved, a disciplinary hearing that was scheduled for today is postponed to a date to be determined. The party involved has waived the hearing time requirements that are provided by the WDA Bylaws.

§ The Board approved the fee that will be paid to the new Webmaster of \$150.00 per month. This is the same amount that was paid to the prior Webmaster per month.

§ There was a quotation provided by Roberts Accountancy Services, San Jose, California (the current accountant for the WDA) to complete and file the WDA tax return. The fees will range from \$1500 to \$1800. We have used this firm for many years and it has always done a good job for the organization.

§ There was a proposal for insurance that was provided by a current contractor. The Board tabled the discussion on that matter to allow the Budget and Finance Committee to finish its work. The Committee will report back to the Board on this matter.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS CONTINUED:

SELECTION PROCESS FOR REGIONAL EVENTS:

Alethea Caldwell Munsinger reported that the Regional Directors were unable to get together. She, however, had a very good conversation with Dr. Barry. Copies of a compilation of emails and a copy of the current policy that was voted in on July 2007 was distributed. The system that is currently in place and is being used by Dr. Barry in Region 5 is working very well. This system is the guideline for everyone. Ms Caldwell Munsinger would like a discussion to determine whether this system should remain in place or be amended in some manner.

The Chair stated that it appears that the system is working. What came up at the Annual meeting was a disgruntled member who made the claim that it was not an objective process. The system appears to be working. The Regional Directors are handling the issues. There is no sense continuing the discussion on this issue because one guy is making a claim that it does not work.

Ms. Munsinger stated that she just wanted to make sure that everybody thinks that this framework is okay to work with.

Mr. Yee stated that we should have a process in place to help resolve disputes. The current process is in place, but it is not mandatory. We should have a mandatory process that people can refer to help resolve any conflicts.

Ms. Munsinger stated that there are two issues: one is the process and the second is the set of requirements and eligibility. She wanted to make sure that both are okay with this Board.

Michael Kempkes asked for a clarification of the difference between a Regional show or trial and a Club show or trial.

The Chair stated that the premise has always been that our Regionals need to become a larger more spectacular event. For lack of a better term, we raise the bar. There has been conversation in the past about venues, tee shirts, publicity, catalogs, etc. None of that has been formalized.

Mr. Yee reported that the issues concerning Regional Selection came up for discussion at the monthly Region 7 calls. The current process provides that there are two criteria to meet at two different levels: (1) A hosting club must meet a certain criteria to be eligible to bid on a regional event; and (2) a hosting club must meet another criteria to be eligible to hold the event. Specifically, in order to bid on an event, the club only needs to be in good standing. In order to host the event, the club additionally must have previously hosted a club trial or show.

Dr. Landau stated that he would like to put before this Board for consideration the proposal that a region be required to hold a regional trial if it wants to hold a regional show, and vice versa. It will be up to the region to decide how to do this.

The Chair instructed all the Regional Directors to get involved in this matter to arrive at a decision.

READING OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 2008 MEETING:

Daniel Yee reported that the April Board meeting minutes were circulated previously by email to the Board. It was moved to waive the reading of the April Board meetings. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr. Yee moved to approve the minutes of the April Board meeting. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JULY 2008 BOARD MEETING:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved that the reading of the July 2008 Board Meeting minutes be waived.

Mr. Yee moved to approve the minutes of the July Board meeting with corrections to be made to (1) the National Championship dates and (2) page 21 regarding missing information. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Recess at 3:30PM

Meeting reconvenes at 3:50PM

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING ON MAY 30, 2008;

The minutes were read to the Board as follows:

- § The Board approved Mr. Charlie Starr as Region 4 director
- § The motion to approve the removal of insurance for clubs failed.
- § The issue of removing the Recorder was discussed. (Mr. Yee to review audio tapes to confirm resolution.)

Dr. Landau expressed his recollection that the Board approved the removal of the Recorder position and it was to be sent to the membership for approval.

Mr. Yee will review the audio recording concerning the removal of the Recorder. The Recorder position currently is not vacant. At the July 2008 meeting, the President was appointed to that

position and he serves in a dual capacity as both President and Recorder. Mr. Yee will report back to the Board.

SPECIAL MEETING ON OCTOBER 16, 2008:

The minutes of the Special Board Meeting on October 16, 2008 were read to the Board as follows:

- § Daniel Yee moved to name Mr. Wolfgang Henke as chief judge for the WDA Schutzhund Nationals. Cindy Petersen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- § Mr. Osburn moved that Mr. Mike West will handle the tracking phase at the Nationals. The motion was seconded by Clay Meadows. The motion passed unanimously.
- § Mr. Meadows moved to approve both Hans-Ludger Göke and Otto Körber-Ahrens, the SV Judges that were recommended for the 2009 NASS. The motion was seconded and approved.

It was moved that the minutes for the foregoing two special meetings be approved as read. Miriam Barkus and Mike Andrel seconded the motion. Except for Dr. Landau who abstained, the remaining Board members approved the motion. Motion passes.

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

The Chair announced that we will begin publishing Executive Committee actions.

Ms. Schultz distributed a list of clubs and events that were approved by the Executive Committee since the last general board meeting in July.

The Chair called for a vote to ratify the actions of Executive Committee. It was moved and seconded. The motion is unanimously approved.

QUALIFYING SCORES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONALS:

Mr. Meadows said that he had received a lot of phone calls regarding the requirements for the National SchH 3 Championship.

The Chair said that the 270 qualifying score from a WDA event requirement started the day after the 2008 National Championship and runs until the closing date of the entry for the 2009 National Championship. The rule has been published in the Newsletter, on the WDA website, on the 2009 entry form for the Nationals, and on the Nationals website. It also is in the minutes.

Ms. Barkus stated that the 270 score applies to SchH3 dogs and not the SchH1 and 2 dogs.

Dr. Landau stated that there seems to be some confusion about the way the statement is made on the website.

The Chair said that we will do our best to get it clarified. We changed the website to match the minutes after that question came up.

Dr. Landau said that it may need further clarification beyond the way it is stated in the minutes. A number of members seem very confused about whether or not they had to get their 270 after January 1st, because of the effective date.

The Chair said that we will work on the questions.

Mr. Meadows indicated that there may be a lot of people who are planning on coming to the Nationals and who were not aware of this requirement because of the confusion. Is it possibility to take a vote on allowing the score from the previous year Nationals to count?

Joy Schultz read from the approved January 2008 minutes where the following motion was approved unanimously by the board present (with the exception of Michael Kempkes who was absent during the vote): "To participate at the GSDCA-WDA National Schutzhund 3 Championship/WUSV Qualification Trial the member must have a qualifying score of 270 with an 'a' in TSB with the same team earned within one (1) year of the calendar date of the national event at the GSDCA-WDA Club, Regional Trial, or at the previous year's Championship Qualifier, effective January 1, 2009."

Mr. Meadows asked if it is clear that the qualifying score of 270 or better from last year's qualifier will qualify a competitor for this year?

Chair states that even though it was not the intent of the motion, the way this is worded, he will agree with what the Board wants.

Mr. Yee indicated that we need to resolve the interpretation of the resolution.

Mr. Meadows wanted to have a re-vote.

The Chair states that regardless of the intent, the resolution was approved as is worded. It will stand.

Dr. Landau indicated that it is too late to do anything about this for 2009. The resolution as worded has been posted for a number of months. Whether this was intention or not, we have stated something that the membership has read and is acting upon. We should end this discussion now and put this on the agenda for April where we can consider in a reasonable fashion whether or not this is really what we intended.

Mr. Osburn asked whether last year's scores from our nationals may be considered for qualification into this year's nationals.

The Chair replied that the scores from last year's Nationals may be considered for qualification into this year's nationals.

FINANCE ISSUE:

The Chair advised that the WDA had appointed an audit committee to come up with a set of audit standards for the organization. In 2007, there seems to be a significant change in audit procedures that we did not comply to. We are going to have to acknowledge the non-compliance. That issue concerns internal control. One of the changes in the accounting audit practices for a non-profit requires written internal controls. This is a very minor issue. The organization was unaware of the issue and the organization was not made aware of it by the auditing firm. We are waiting for the auditing guidelines. The Chair expects no problems. The balance sheet will be emailed to everybody.

NEW BUSINESS:

APPROVAL OF JUDGE APPRENTICES:

The Chair announced that Mike West had submitted Judge Apprentice Applications for two members: Mr. Jimmy Dalton and Mr. Russ Osburn. There were a number of questions raised concerning the two applications. Each application will be considered separately.

RE: JIMMY DALTON:

Dr. David Landau believes that any outstanding questions about this applicant have been removed. Mr. Dalton has been an active military dog handler. He is now retired and continues to work for the military. Individuals who earn their living from working with military service dogs are not excluded from the program by virtue of any conflicts of interest.

Clay Meadows moved to accept Jimmy Dalton into the Judge Apprentice Program. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

RE: RUSS OSBURN:

Dr. David Landau said a review of all the comments that he has heard, Mr. Osburn is imminently qualified. The only issue concerns the question of conflict of interest.

The Chair commented that in an apprentice program, there is no guarantee that any of the individuals would successfully become a judge. It is something they have to earn. When they get to that point of becoming a judge, then this becomes an issue. The conflict of interest issue does not come up during the apprentice period. Prior to that point, this issues would not impact any aspect of an apprentice's scores or performance.

Dr. Landau sees no issue there. The original concern was that someone would begin their apprenticeship, do very well, everything is approved and then the board denies the application because the individual is receiving money for training dogs.

The Chair asked Mr. Osburn, who was present during the entire discussion, if he understands this discussion. Mr. Osburn acknowledged that he aware of the discussion and understands the same.

The Chair reconfirmed with Mr. Osburn that he understands that, if approved, he may participate in the Judges Apprentice Program with the further understanding that ultimately he may not be approved as a judge under the current rules because of the issues concerning conflict of interest and source of personal income.

Mr. Osburn confirmed that he understands the situation and stated that he is willing to assume the risk of completing the Judges Apprentice Program and not gaining ultimate approval because of the potential conflict of interest issue.

Cindy Petersen moves to accept Mr. Osburn in the Judges Apprentice Program. Mike Andrel seconds.

Dr. Landau has no concerns about the ability of these people. He sees no negative comments about the qualifications of either individual. Dr. Landau moved that the board modify the requirement of signature of the Conflict of Interest form such that it must be completed before an apprentice can be approved as a GSDCA-WDA judge and that all apprentices be so informed prior to beginning their apprenticeship.

The Chair called for the vote on the original motion to accept Mr. Osburn into the Judges Apprentice Program.

Dr. Landau votes NAY. Miriam Barkus abstains. All others approved the motion. The motion to accept Russ Osburn into the Judges Apprentice Program passes.

The Chair called for the vote on Dr. Landau's motion that the board modify the requirement of the signature of the Conflict of Interest form such that it must be completed before an apprentice can be approved as a GSDCA-WDA judge and that all apprentices be so informed prior to beginning their apprenticeship. The motion is seconded and unanimously carried.

RULE CHANGES:

PROGENY GROUPS:

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

Cindy Petersen seconds.

Dr. Landau believes that this basically is a good idea, but raised the question as to why two years of age at whelping rather than two years at the time of breeding?

Mr. Henkel responded that we do not have any mechanism in place to regulate or to determine the date of breeding. The WDA currently does not have an official method of recording breeding dates. This rule will move us closer to the SV rule and to prevent breeders from breeding with 12 month old males that have no titles or hip/elbow certifications.

Ms. Barkus suggested that the two years stated in the proposed motion be amended to state two years and two months. The Chair rules that this is not a friendly amendment.

Ms. Munsinger speaks in favor of the motion. The breed standard is two years.

Mr. Kempkes speaks in favor of the motion as stated. The size of the progeny gets larger and more important with each NASS. He agrees one hundred percent with this.

Motion carries unanimously.

REPEAT OF A FAILED BH AT A TRIAL:

Alethea Caldwell Munsinger moved to allow the repeat a failed BH on the second day of a multi-day trial. Dr. Joe Barry seconds.

Ms. Caldwell Munsinger has confirmed with more than two SV judges that this can be done in Germany at the discretion of the judge. It is not necessary that the dog be handled by the same individual. The handler for the dog may be different on each of the days. Quite often this is the first attempt of the handler to do a BH.

Dr. Landau states that a SV judge has to judge under SV rules if he is giving titles awarded by the SV. If he is giving a different title like an IPO, which is an International title and not a SV title, then he or she can judge according to those rules.

Ms. Petersen believes the rules allow two separate one day trials with the same judge on the same weekend so that you can repeat that title the next day.

Dr. Landau confirms Ms. Petersen's understanding, except that we do not allow one club to use the same judge until a year has lapsed between assignments. In a given trial, the SV officially does not allow a dog and handler team to repeat any titles, including the BH.

Mr. Kempkes confirms that two different trials with two different judges on the same weekend is allowed.

Mr. Henkel spoke against the motion. This is not compliant with SV rules.

Mr. Yee speaks in favor of the motion for two reasons. One reason is based upon the technical, legal interpretation of the currently published WDA Trial Regulations, and the other reason is based upon what is beneficial for the organization and its membership.

The current WDA Trial Regulations, as published on the WDA website, are silent as to whether or not there is a waiting period before you can repeat any title at the same trial, except for the BH. As to the BH, the Trial Regulations specifically state on page 15, that "There is no waiting period in between trials if the examination has to be repeated. Despite the outcome of the examination, the trial result must be entered in the corresponding performance documents."

Since the written regulations specifically speak to the repeat of a BH degree without a waiting period, and the regulations are silent as to the repeat of any other title, it can be argued that the repeat of a BH is allowed in a multi-day trial. This is allowed " ... Despite the outcome of the examination ... "

Allowing the repeat of a BH at the same trial is good for the WDA for a number of reasons.

The most important reason revolves around the continued growth of the WDA. The BH is the introductory degree for a handler and his/her dog. In most instances, this is the very first time that the handler/dog team is on a field. They are very nervous. We want more people to get involved and we want these new people to join the WDA. If this team fails, or even if they pass and feel that they can improve their performance, they can get right back onto the field the very next day and attempt the degree another time. This is the hook that the WDA can have to bring in new people. We need to get them involved in the sport and we need to keep their interest, not to discourage them and send them away.

Ms. Petersen speaks against the motion. We all went through it. It makes you a far better trainer when you flunk. Rules are fixed. They cannot be changed.

Mr. Andrei speaks against the motion. The handler would need the time to regroup to get your dog ready.

Dr. Landau speaks against the motion. We have been trying to be consistent with SV rules as much as possible. In fact, we just passed one change in order to do that. Perhaps to a lawyer, the rules are a little unclear. But to a physicist and SV recognized judge, it is not. In general, I would say the judges that I know have some understanding of the concerns that have been voiced here about young dogs, new handlers and do not require the same degree of accomplishment and precision for a BH as they would for a SchH1. Personally, I will always mention at the end of a BH, even if they pass whether or not I think they are well on the track to a SchH1 or whether they need to go back and do some more homework. Part of the training for a judge should be to develop this feeling for how you can help along and promote them to stay with the sport. But as we've also heard, Schutzhund is the real world. Not everybody is supposed to pass all the time. I don't see an advantage to the handlers or to the dogs and most of all, I'm very concerned what this would say about the organization. People are going to say that the WDA does not care.

They are making it as easy as possible for people to pass. I don't think that's the image we want to encourage.

Mr. Meadows is on the fence about this. It would be helpful to the new people, but it shouldn't be acceptable for the experienced. USCA did allow this to happen. DVG has one day trials. He has seen dogs fail on Saturday and then fail again on Sunday. He also has seen dogs fail on Saturday, but pass on Sunday.

Mr. Osburn believes that this issue can be easily resolved by having two clubs hold two separate trials on the same weekend on separate days.

Mr. Kempkes states that even if we pass this motion, when you do breed survey this dog, Germany may deny the breed survey. This is an issue we must think about.

Dr. Barry supports the motion. It may help grow the sport. He supports this for the reasons Clay Meadows stated. The BH is really a temperament test and not a schutzhund degree. The dog should be allowed to retry it.

Mr. Blomberg speaks in favor of the motion. I like the idea.

Ms. Barkus speaks in favor of the motion. In the current climate of the country, trying to take away the rights to have biting dogs and so forth, the BH is a tremendous public relations tool. I encourage everyone to do the BH. It also depends on why they failed. This is really a function of both the training director and the judge. If a dog failed because he just bit the judge, there's no reason to have them come back the next day. If he's borderline, failing because of some nonsense, let them come back.

Mr. Burgos speaks against the motion. They should continue training the dog and come back when they are ready. If you fail, you will be more nervous the next day.

Mr. Henkel speaks against the motion. It's very hard to fail a BH. If you fail, I guarantee that 90 percent of the time the dog's performance will be far worse on the next day. Also there are questions about the SV processing breed surveys later on. I do not believe we are doing the members a service by passing this motion. As Dr. Landau has specified, we are trying to comply with SV rules and I do not see evidence that this complies. I speak very strongly against this.

Mr. Yee responds to Ms. Petersen's statements that rules are fixed. Rules have changed. The sport of schutzhund has evolved. Old photographs show dogs jumping over a vertical wall that is described as ten feet high. That wall is now lowered. It was made easier for the dogs. This is only one example of how the rules have changed. The intended purpose of this sport is to test the "working ability" of the dogs. We can still do this by allowing the dogs and their handlers an opportunity to re-try a BH at this very basic level. We are not reducing the standards by which the dogs are ultimately tested. The schutzhund requirements stay the same.

I got involved with my club, the WDA and the sport because I love this breed of dog and what the dog can do. Passing the BH gave me the incentive to move on to the next level with my dog.

There are many members in our club who, initially, will never go on to a Schutzhund 1, 2 or 3 with their dogs. They, however, will attempt a BH. After passing a BH, their mind set changes. Some of them actually believe that they can go on and achieve a Schutzhund title with their dog. They got hooked because of the BH and now they want to move on to the next level. Others who pass the BH realize that they may not have the ability or the talent to train and trial their dog to a Schutzhund title. They, however, want to stay involved and they want to work their dog. Those people will hire trainers to train and title their dogs so that they can later work their dogs in the schutzhund routine themselves. This creates work opportunities for the trainers in this sport and will grow our organization. These people will stay involved in the sport. They may eventually get another dog which they will title. They may want their titled dogs to be breed surveyed. They may trial or show their dogs. All of these activities bring revenue to our organization and will add to its growth. I just want these people to be given an opportunity to get involved and stay involved.

We are only talking about the BH, not the other titles. The BH is a pass/fail degree. I disagree that if someone fails or does poorly one day that the person would do worse the next day. He can actually do better the following day because he now has the benefit of having heard the judge's critique and he can act upon the judge's suggestions or recommendations.

As to Mr. Osburn's suggestion that two clubs hold two separate trials on the same weekend, we need to be realistic. The suggestion is not practical. In our region, we have only three clubs that are active in putting on trials. We are located hundreds of miles apart. We coordinate the dates of our events so that there is no duplication on the same weekend. If someone fails at one event, they can cannot retry the BH until months later. By that time, the person may lose interest. He may be more ambivalent because he is now trialing on an unfamiliar field. A field that he has not trained on. We could very well have lost that person from the sport.

We talk in our meetings about dwindling memberships because members are not renewing or we are not getting new members. We cannot expect our membership to grow if we do not do things to bring them in.

The Chair states that what is going to be said has been said.

Dr. Landau presented a point of information. Two things: There is a score in the BH, you just don't know what it is. Second, the rules changes in Schutzhund over the years have at times made certain points easier and at times made them substantially more difficult.

The Chair states that this motion is going to require a 2/3 majority because it involves a rule change.

Mr. Yee disagrees. This is not a rule change. It is an interpretation of our rules.

The Chair states that unfortunately this rule interpretation sits with the Chair.

Ms. Schultz indicates that the important thing here is if these dogs go for a breed survey and the SV isn't going to recognize it that is no favor to those people. We need to find out how the SV stands on this.

Mr. Kempkes says we need more information from the SV.

Mr. Yee indicated that Mr. Henke allowed a BH to be repeated at an O.G. Agua Dulce trial.

Ms. Schultz said that he didn't write in the score book that the dog failed on one day and then passed on the next day.

Ms. Petersen said that if they are both recorded in the score book, then we have a huge problem.

Mr. Henkel believes that there is a whole set of problems. Do we not have rules about how many dogs constitute a trial? Does the dog competing in the BH on Saturday count as half a dog on Saturday and half a dog on Sunday? How can the same dog be counted twice for the same title?

Chair states that we are developing a list of questions that we cannot answer. The Chair will entertain a motion that this be referred to the Judges Committee to allow us to get these questions answered by those that are experts. Otherwise, we are going to make a bad decision.

A motion was made and seconded to refer this matter to the Judge's Committee. Motion passes unanimously.

ACCEPT READ BUT PENDING RECEIPT FOR BREED SURVEYS:

This item is withdrawn from the Agenda.

REGIONAL SCHUTZHUND CHAMPIONSHIP REQUIRED:

Dr. Landau moved that beginning January 1, 2010, a region must host both a regional conformation show and a regional schutzhund championship within that calendar year if it is to host either.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Kempkes asked for the consequences if a region does not host a regional championship trial. Some regions don't have trials.

Dr. Landau says that if a region does not do one, then it cannot do the other.

Ms. Munsinger speaks against the motion. We do not even have a requirement that a club must hold an event in a given year to remain in good standing. We need to review the requirements for a club. We are so relaxed on one end

Mr. Osburn asked for the purpose of this motion.

Dr. Landau says that he has received many complaints from Schutzhund competitors that there are really only two interesting events hosted by this organization per year: One is the National Championship and the other is the GSDCA National Specialty. Many feel obligated to go to other major events sponsored by other organizations simply because the WDA does not provide these opportunities. We need events that people want to go to. This places minimal burden on the regions. It starts us down the road to hosting more spectacular bigger style events.

The Chair indicated that Region 3, for the last two years, had applied to host a regional championship each year only to cancel both events.

Dr. Barry speaks in favor of this motion. The regional championships are typically short on support. In his region, the clubs voted to instituted a requirement that each club must enter a dog into a regional championship or, alternatively, donate an amount equal to an entry fee.

Mr. Henkel applauds Dr. Landau's motive of creating an impetus for the regions in having a regional championship. There is a problem, however, in tying the regional championship to the regional show. Mr. Henkel would not want one club that is putting on a regional show be prevented from doing so because another club cancels on its obligation to put on a regional championship.

Mr. Yee speaks against the motion. I support and I want to encourage the schutzhund sport. I want the sport to grow. That is why I supported the previous motion to allow a repeat of the BH in the same trial. The difference between this motion and the previous motion is that this motion imposes a penalty as an incentive to grow the sport. The other proposal does not. I would like to see a program that encourages growth by reward versus one that encourages by penalty. By imposing penalties, the regions will stop having regional conformation shows and will just have larger club shows. At the end of the day, we lose the regional conformation show. This will hurt the organization in the long run.

Mr. Osburn speaks against the motion. His region is mostly hard-core working dogs and there not enough support for a regional conformation show. Would like a required regional schutzhund championship but not a required regional conformation show yet.

Ms. Petersen supports the motion. We have raised the bar for working dogs by asking them to get a 270 to qualify for the national championships. Working dog people want competitions.

The Chair calls the question. The vote is tied 6 to 6. The Chair votes in favor of the motion. The motion passes.

BYLAW REVISIONS (Alethea Caldwell Munsinger):

Tabled to the April Board Meeting.

REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBERS FOR MISSING MEETINGS (John Henkel):

Tabled to the April Board Meeting. Mr. Henkel to work with Mr. Yee to insure compliance with Colorado Statute.

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A CODE OF ETHICS AND CONDUCT (Mike Andrel):

The Chair appointed an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of Mike Andrel (Chair), Clay Meadows, Russ Osburn and Steve Miller to develop a code of conduct and ethics for Board Members and the Membership to be presented to the Board at the April 2009 Board Meeting. Mr. Yee will review the code of ethics and, as such, is not included in this committee. This committee will dissolve on the day following the April 2009 Board Meeting.

ADOPTION OF 2009 OPERATING BUDGET:

The chair will call a special meeting as soon as budget and finance completes it work on the 2009 budget.

ELECTION OF 2009:

The annual membership meeting will be on November 6, 2009. Anyone running for office by petition must have their petition into the WDA Office no later than the end of the first week in September 2009.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

Board members were instructed by the Chair to think about the formation of the nominating committee. The nominating committee will consist of three members and three alternates, none of whom shall be board members. Additionally, there will be one board member who shall act as the Chair of this committee.

DVG TITLES:

Titles awarded by DVG judges have always been accepted by the WDA, but is not in the rules. The Judges committee to review this.

APRIL BOARD MEETING:

John Henkel moves that the April meeting will be on April 10 & 11, 2009 at Danbury, Connecticut. The motion is seconded and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 5:40PM