

## **CGA Annual General Meeting**

November 21, 2009  
Radisson Hotel, Fresno, CA

The meeting was called to order at 9:15am by President Skip Hofman with 86 members present.

### **Opening and Introductory Comments – President Skip Hofman**

President Skip Hofman welcomed everyone to the 2009 State Convention and asked Parliamentarian Stacey Rivera to read aloud the CGA meeting rules of conduct. The meeting rules of conduct reminded all in attendance that members have a right to speak and be respected during the meeting. Members should begin by stating their name and keep comments to three (3) minutes for each agenda item. In addition, members should speak in order and only when recognized, keeping all personal comments and side conversations to themselves.

President Skip Hofman then turned the meeting over to Rules Chairperson Shannon Rahn.

### **I. Committee Reports**

#### **Item I. A: Rules and Judges Items – Shannon Rahn**

Before beginning discussion Shannon Rahn reminded all members that the first portion of the meeting would be the Rules and Judges Meeting. Shannon explained that while each member had a right to speak at the meeting only carded CGA Judges would be allowed to vote on the twelve (12) action items. All items that passed the Rules and Judges Meeting would immediately follow to the General Membership for final vote.

#### **1. Scoreboards with Running Times (Section 5.1b) – MAC, Shannon Rahn**

Shannon Rahn explained the issue of scoreboards had been brought to the attention of the MAC several times within the past year. The MAC agrees that scoreboards are a nice addition to any show but they should not display a running time while the rider is on course. Because Section 5.1b does not specifically state this in the Rule Book, the MAC proposed the following motion:

***MOTION*** by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to add to Section 5.1b that any scoreboard used for display at a show may not display running times. ***Seconded*** by Rodger Odom. ***No Discussion followed.***

***Motion PASSES to General Membership***

#### **2. Barrel Color (Section 7.4) & Barrel Covers – Andy Krogh**

Because this particular agenda item addressed two separate issues, Andy Krogh asked to split his item into two different motions. The first item seemed fairly self-explanatory seeing that barrels can be purchased with a natural color and the use of paint is no longer necessary for the entire barrel.

**MOTION** by Andy Krogh to remove the word ‘painted’ from Section 7.4 so the sentence shall read “*They shall be ~~painted~~ any color but shall have a contrasting band around the center section of the barrel.*” **Seconded** by Rebekah Crill.

**No Discussion followed.**

**Motion PASSES to General Membership**

Andy Krogh then addressed the use of barrel covers, reasoning it would be nice to allow districts to use a barrel cover if they wanted.

**MOTION** by Andy Krogh to allow the use of barrel covers that are less than 1/16<sup>th</sup> of an inch thick and fit the barrel/s tightly. **Seconded** by Dianna Malley.

**Discussion followed.**

Belinda Harms asked to clarify the use of barrel covers would be optional and not mandatory. Andy Krogh responded that his intent was for covers to be optional and he believed the word ‘allow’ implied optional use. Mindy Sullivan questioned what would happen if a cover were to rip during a show. Shannon Rahn responded the cover would have to be replaced or the barrel beneath would need to meet the rules. Meghan Abatti asked if the cover was required to have a contrasting band. Shannon Rahn responded that the obstacle had to meet the stated rules to be a legal course, so yes the cover would need to have a contrasting band.

**Motion PASSES to General Membership**

**3. Barrel Specifications (Section 7.4) – MAC, Shannon Rahn**

Shannon Rahn explained the MAC wanted the word ‘unaltered’ inserted into the barrel specifications prescribed in Section 7.4 of the Rules Book. The MAC believed this was necessary because the issue of districts using barrels with one end completely open (open end in the dirt) had come up during the year.

**MOTION** by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to add the word ‘unaltered’ to Section 7.4 so the sentence shall read “*Fifty-five gallon unweighted, unaltered, plastic barrels shall be used.*” **Seconded** by Randy Young. **No discussion followed.**

**Motion PASSES to General Membership.**

**4. Judges Test – Dave Bach**

Shannon Rahn explained that with the completion of the new judges test Dave Bach’s item had been resolved. Dave was suggesting that the written part of the judges test be altered so it was less paper intensive and this has been achieved with the new multiple choice test. Shannon stated that Master Judges have received the new copy of the test and the test would be immediately available for use following Convention. Shannon also addressed the second part of Dave’s item regarding increasing the number of times an

Apprentice must judge. Shannon reasoned that the Apprentice judge's card is for the use of the Apprentice. An Apprentice can judge each event 3 times or 50 times, what matters is the Apprentice spends sufficient time in the arena judging until he/she becomes proficient in the eyes of the Master Judge.

5. **Addition to Section 6.1 Requirements to Become a Judge – MAC, Shannon Rahn** Rules Chairperson, Shannon Rahn explained that in light of recent events and much discussion, the MAC would like to give CGA Judges the right to choose 'inactive' status for up to one (1) year. Their membership must remain current during the time of inactive status.

**MOTION** by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, that a CGA Judge may request with the State Office or their Master Judge to be on inactive status for up to one (1) year. If a Judge is on inactive status for more than one (1) year, they must judge with a carded Judge until they are up to speed and then must seek reinstatement to active status by their Master Judge. **Seconded** by Randy Young. **Discussion followed.**

Shannon Rahn clarified that membership must remain current while a Judge is on inactive status. If any Judge's membership expires (whether active or inactive) for more than one (1) year, the Judge is eliminated from the database and must start the process over if they wish to re-establish their card. Bob Bucks questioned if the Judge must seek reinstatement form 'their' Master Judge or any Master Judge? Shannon Rahn stated that the Judge should first seek their Master Judge and if that does not work then the MAC will arrange and allow a different Master Judge to reinstate the Judge to active status. Eller Carr stated she would like to see the work 'their' changed to 'a' so any Master Judge could reinstate to active status.

**MOTION to Amend** by Ellen Carr to change the word 'their Master Judge' to 'a Master Judge,' so any Master Judge can reinstate a Judge to active status. **Seconded** by Dianna Malley. **Discussion followed.**

Randy Young reasoned that the wording should remain 'their Master Judge' because each Master Judge is the most familiar with their area and the Judges. Shannon Rahn stated that the Master Judges are in constant communication with one another so if a Judge could not achieve reinstatement from their own Master Judge, a different Master Judge could easily be arranged.

**Amendment FAILED**

Patrick Hoffman asked if a judge could call the State Office or their Master Judge prior to a full year of inactive status and be put back on active status without having to judge and then seek reinstatement from their Master Judge. Shannon Rahn clarified that *only if* a Judge has been on inactive status for over one (1) year are they required to judge with a carded Judge and then seek reinstatement. Lea deMontigny questioned if there was a stipulation on the number of times a judge can go on inactive status. Seeing there were no stipulations in the current proposed motion the answer would be 'no,' however an

amendment could be made. No member offered to amend the motion to provide a stipulation on the number of times a judge can go on inactive status.

*Call for the question* by Skip Hofman and *Seconded* by Rebekah Crill. *Passed.*

***Original Motion PASSES to General Membership***

**6. Consequences for Riders Under 18 Not Following Helmet Rules (Section 3.1a) – MAC, Shannon Rahn**

Shannon Rahn explained that if approved, the proposed verbiage would provide all Judges with a clear set of consequences for riders who do not abide by the helmet rules. In addition, all members would have a clear understanding of the consequences if they choose not follow the rules. Section 3.1a of the Rule Book does not currently list any consequences and the MAC believes there is a need for clearly listed consequences that Judges can use and riders be forewarned should they chose not to follow the helmet rule.

*MOTION* by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to add clarification to Section 3.1a; “If a rider under 18 is mounted on a horse without a helmet they should be asked to dismount until properly attired & a warning should be issued. If a rider under 18 enters the arena without a helmet correctly worn they will be disqualified from the event. If a rider under 18 has more than one violation of the helmet rule in the same day, they should be disqualified from the show.” *Seconded* by Randy Young.

***Discussion followed.***

Amber Castle asked what could be done if a rider has blatant and repeated violation of the helmet rule. Shannon Rahn responded that if a district cannot handle locally and with the rules, they should contact and address this with the area Master Judge and the member would be dealt with individually.

*Call for the question* by Chris Rowles and *Seconded* by Dianna Malley. *Passed.*

***Motion PASSES to General Membership***

**7. Violating Section 5.11 Use of Illegal Drugs or Alcoholic Beverages - MAC, Shannon Rahn**

*MOTION* by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to provide clarification to Section 5.11 Use of Illegal Drugs and Alcoholic Beverages by adding “Anyone who has been seen violating or willfully admits to violation of the drug & alcohol rule when questioned shall be notified by a judge that they are banned from further participation in the show for the remainder of the day.” *Seconded* by Belinda Harms.

***Discussion followed.***

Shannon Rahn explained the proposed verbiage is already a CGA rule but the MAC believed it needed further clarification in the Rule Book. Any member who has consumed an alcoholic beverage/s may not participate in any fashion – arena help, riding a horse, ect. Arlene Tsuji asked how districts could enforce the rule. Several other members shared Arlene’s concern in being able to enforce the rule. Shannon Rahn replied that show management and the carded Judge or Senior Judge should continuously ask the individual/s to leave the arena if they have been drinking. Districts also need to consider the potential ramifications of blindly allowing intoxicated individuals to participate should they get hurt. Nathan Rowles questioned if this rule also applied to a rider taking a prescription medication and then feeling a bit under the weather. Shannon explained this would be the Judges discretion to allow the rider to participate based on safety. Dave Bach asked if the rules applied to all CGA shows or strictly CGA sanctioned shows. Shannon Rahn clarified the rules apply to all CGA shows – both the state and district level. Eller Carr was concerned about the subjective nature of decisions on who had been consuming alcohol and could not participate. Ellen believed CGA should use safety to guide their decisions in disqualifying members from participation.

Chris Rowles believed the discussion had been taken out of proportion and *called for the question. Seconded* by Andy Krogh. *Passed.*

***Motion PASSES to General Membership***

**8. Addition to Section 4.3 Enter the Arena and Begin the Course - MAC, Shannon Rahn**

***MOTION*** by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to insert a final sentence to Section 4.3 that reads, “By starting the course the rider accepts the course.”

***Seconded*** by Bob Bucks. ***Discussion followed.***

Shannon Rahn emphasized that in no way does this sentence apply to an illegal course. The MAC believed the sentence needed to be added to the Rule Book to address a variety of issues: obstacles at the side of the arena, pole setting (are they straight), asking for a rake, ect. Ellen Carr questioned if the proposed verbiage would apply to a lightly chalked Keyhole line that a rider completed the course and then complained about. Shannon replied that ‘yes’ the rider did not request a heavier line prior to ridding the course so they accepted the course. Shannon explained the motion gives the riders some responsibility for acceptance of the course and helps eliminate riders from finding something wrong with a legal course just for a re-ride. Arlene Tsuji questioned what happens if a pole on a course is slightly short and later in the event the pole gets changed, would it mean the previous riders accepted the course and must keep their time? Shannon again responded, ‘yes’ the course was legally set and the rider accepted the course. Further the MAC has determined that poles don’t have to be exactly the same for a course to be legally set. Sally believed the motion needed further clarification and proposed the following amendment:

**MOTION to Amend** by Sally Rivera Lingafeldt to insert at the end of the proposed sentence “assuming the course is legal.” **Seconded** by Dianna Malley.

**No Discussion followed. Amendment PASSED**

Seeing the above amendment, if passed, the sentence inserted into Section 4.3 would read “By starting the course the rider accepts the course, assuming the course is legal.”

**Motion with Amendment PASSES to General Membership**

**9. Lead Line Wording Change (Section 2.3) – MAC, Shannon Rahn**

The MAC proposed the following changes to the lead line verbiage due to the fact that there are adults who are interested in participating in lead line and the MAC wants to eliminate any discrimination.

**MOTION** by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to change the wording in Section 2.3, the heading and first sentence so it shall read, “2.3 *Special Lead Line Rules for Riders Who Need Assistance / The CGA is interested in providing an opportunity for riders who need assistance to participate in CGA shows.*” **Seconded** by Andy Krogh.

**No Discussion followed.**

**Motion PASSES to General Membership**

**10. Figure 8 Flags and Lead Line Riders (Section 2.3) –Barry Rahn**

Barry Rahn explained he believed Figure 8 Flags presented a safety issue for lead line riders, reasoning the event is similar to Hurry Scurry and presents several opportunities for inexperienced riders to get hurt – sharp flags, blowing fabric, ect.

**MOTION** by Barry Rahn to remove Figure 8 Flags as an event for lead line riders.

**Seconded** by Belinda Harms. **Discussion followed.**

Rebekah Crill believed removing Figure 8 Flags as an event for lead line riders was no necessary and stated their district had yet to encounter and issue with this event. Lea deMontigny felt all riders should have a right to participate in all events. Dianna Malley believe this was an event that was adding revenue to CGA and should be left as an option to lead line riders.

**Motion FAILED**

Shannon Rahn asked Sheri Heckkorn to temporarily Chair the meeting while she presented the next item which was not a recommendation from the MAC, but rather a personal recommendation.

**11. Addition to Section 4.1 General –Shannon Rahn**

Shannon believed there was a need to clarify when re-rides are necessary and offered the following motion:

**MOTION** by Shannon Rahn to add Section 4.1f “Re -Rides: The only time a rider should be required to rerun an event is if the timers malfunction or a course is improperly set. If a rider has successfully completed a legal course & then it is determined there was a problem (for instance the ground is/was unsafe or there was some sort of interference) the affected riders should be given the option for a re-ride.” **Seconded** by Andy Krogh.

*No Discussion followed.*

**Motion PASSES to General Membership**

Sheri Heckkorn returned the microphone and Chair back to Shannon Rahn to complete this section of the meeting.

## **12. Wording Change to Section 6.1g – Lea deMontigny**

Lea deMontigny offered the following wording change to Section 6.1g:

**MOTION** by Lea deMontigny to strike the word ‘volunteer’ in Section 6.1g and insert ‘required to judge’ so the sentence shall read ““*CGA Judges are required to judge and may not accept payment for their services.*” **Seconded** by Patrick Hoffman.

*Discussion followed.*

Lea believed precedence had been established with members that Judges are required to judge and the rules should reflect this requirement. Ellen Carr strongly believed the organization is a volunteer organization and should stay that way. Arlene Tsuji happened to agree with the motion simply because the Judges Disciplinary Procedures state a Judge cannot refuse a reasonable request by upper management. The membership has the prerogative to help, but Judges do not. Andy Krogh thought all members should help based on a ‘reasonable’ request and the word ‘reasonable’ was important. Gerelee Azevedo simply stated that if a Judge did not want to judge they should not have taken the judge’s test. Lea deMontigny reiterated her belief there was a need for clarification because a Judge should have the option to judge, whether it be a personal reason or not.

**Motion FAILED**

The President called for a ten (10) minute break at 10:40 am.

The meeting was called back to order at 11:00 by President Skip Hofman.

## **Item I. B: Rules and Judges Committee Items for Final Vote**

President Skip Hofman reminded all members that the following section of the meeting included those items passed in the Rules and Judges Meeting. All items carried forward were now left to the general membership for final vote.

### **1. Scoreboards with Running Times (Section 5.1b)**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to add to Section 5.1b that any scoreboard used for display at a show may not display running times. Seconded by Rodger Odom.*

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED.***

**2. Barrel Color (Section 7.4) and Barrel Covers**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the first motion: *Motion by Andy Krogh to removes the word 'painted' from Section 7.4 so the sentence shall read "They shall be painted any color but shall have a contrasting band around the center section of the barrel." Seconded by Rebekah Crill.*

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED.***

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the second motion: *Motion by Andy Krogh to allow the use of barrel covers that are less than 1/16<sup>th</sup> of an inch thick and fit the barrel/s tightly. Seconded by Dianna Malley.*

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED.***

**3. Barrel Specifications (Section 7.4)**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to add the word 'unaltered' to Section 7.4 so the sentence shall read "Fifty-five gallon unweighted, unaltered, plastic barrels shall be used." Seconded by Randy Young.*

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

**4. Addition to Section 6.1 Requirements to Become a Judge**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, that a CGA Judge may request with the State Office or their Master Judge to be on inactive status for up to one (1) year. If a Judge is on inactive status for more than one (1) year, they must judge with a carded Judge until they are up to speed and then must seek reinstatement to active status by their Master Judge. Seconded by Randy Young.*

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

**5. Consequences for Riders Under 18 Not Following Helmet Rules (Section 3.1a)**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to add clarification to Section 3.1a; "If a rider under 18 is mounted on a horse without a helmet they should be asked to dismount until properly attired & a warning should be issued. If a rider under 18 enters the arena without a helmet correctly worn they will be disqualified from the event. If a rider under 18 has more than one violation of the helmet rule in the same day, they should be disqualified from the show." Seconded by Randy Young.*

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

**6. Violating Section 5.11 Use of Illegal Drugs or Alcoholic Beverages**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to provide clarification to Section 5.11 Use of Illegal Drugs and Alcoholic Beverages by adding "Anyone who has been seen violating or willfully admits to violation of the drug & alcohol rule when questioned shall be notified by a judge that they are banned from further participation in the show for the remainder of the day."* Seconded by Belinda Harms.

Sally Rivera Lingafeldt proposed an amendment to the original motion – add the wording “due to safety concerns.” Parliamentarian Stacey Rivera stated that no amendment could be presented because the motion had moved out of the committee meeting (Rules and Judges Meeting) where only Judges could decide what moved forward to the general membership. Any amendment would need to be approved by Judges at the Rules and Judges Meeting. Not to mention any amendment could jeopardize the intent of the original motion. Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

**7. Addition to Section 4.3 Enter the Arena and Begin the Course**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion with the approved amendment: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to insert a final sentence to Section 4.3 that reads, "By starting the course the rider accepts the course, assuming the course is legal."* Seconded by Bob Bucks.

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

**8. Lead Line Wording Change (Section 2.3)**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn, on behalf of the MAC, to change the wording in Section 2.3, the heading and first sentence so it shall read, "2.3 Special Lead Line Rules for Riders Who Need Assistance / The CGA is interested in providing an opportunity for riders who need assistance to participate in CGA shows."* Seconded by Andy Krogh.

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

**9. Addition to Section 4.1 General**

Secretary Meghan Abatti reread the motion: *Motion by Shannon Rahn to add Section 4.1f "Re -Rides: The only time a rider should be required to rerun an event is if the timers malfunction or a course is improperly set. If a rider has successfully completed a legal course & then it is determined there was a problem (for instance the ground is/was unsafe or there was some sort of interference) the affected riders should be given the option for a re-ride."* Seconded by Andy Krogh.

Seeing no further discussion, President Skip Hofman called for the vote.

***Motion PASSED***

### **Item I. C: Riders Program Items**

Sheri Herchkorn, speaking on behalf of the Board of Governors, explained the need for CGA to alter the Senior Elite awards program to make it more cost effective. Although listed first on the agenda, Sheri asked to delay her item pending the outcome of Sally Rivera Lingafeldt's two (2) items. The BoG felt the outcome of the Sally's items would determine if their proposal was necessary. Before beginning any discussion, Sheri provided a breakdown of the cost effectiveness of both the Senior Elite and ROC Programs in 2008 and 2009. In 2008 the Senior Elite program lost \$475.00 and in 2009 lost \$738.00. In comparison, the ROC Horse and Pony programs both paid for themselves in those two (2) years.

#### **1. Require Senior Elite Rating in Twelve (12) Events – Sally Rivera Lingafeldt**

Sally Rivera Lingafeldt began by expressing her desire to preserve the original intent of the Senior Elite program. Sally explained the Senior Elite program is currently not paying for itself, as evidence of the numbers Sheri reported, and a change was necessary to maintain the program. To make the program more cost effective, Sally felt the number of events required to rate Senior Elite should be increased. Sally reasoned that riders would have to ride more often thus generating more revenue for the program. Sally diligently compiled and calculated five (5) years of Senior Elite, ROC Horse and ROC Pony data to give a recommendation based upon statistics and percentages. Sally believed all programs should share a similar achievable percentage and modification to the Senior Elite time matrix may be necessary to achieve this goal.

***MOTION*** by Sally Rivera Lingafeldt to increase the number of events a Senior Elite rider must rate from ten (10) to twelve (12) to make it comparable the ROC programs and modify the time matrix to retain a similar achievable percentage to the ROC horse program. ***Seconded*** by Joanne Galbraith. ***Discussion followed.***

Andy Krogh questioned if the time matrix would be floating (changing each year) or static. Sally Rivera Lingafeldt clarified the matrix changes would be based on percentages and comparable to the ROC programs. Sally wanted to set the matrix based on these percentages and then leave it static until a change was recommended or needed. Dianna Malley questioned why the Senior Elite awards program has the highest buckle cost, knowledge she had picked up from previous discussions. Because the Senior Elite program has a different shaped buckle and the names of the recipients are engraved, it increases the cost of the buckle. Stacey Rivera clarified that to vote on a matrix that is not set, the motion could not be retroactive and would have to take affect with the 2010-2011 show season. Allison Shiffar believed the number of events should be increased to match the ROC programs but also recognized this would make it harder to achieve for some riders. Based on figures provided by the State Office, Rodger Odom stated that when the Senior Elite program only awarded Top Five (5) the program paid for itself. Skip Hofman questioned what the anticipated costs would be to change the CGA

software for a new matrix. Rodger Odom believed it would only cost a few hundred dollars. Joanne Galbraith wanted to see the program maintain the current rating requirement (ten (10) events) because some riders cannot achieve the more difficult skill events due to age. Joanne felt the program should simply go back to awarding the Top Five (5) to make it cost effective. Margo Abatti felt that because Senior Elite is already difficult to achieve for the older riders, increasing the number of events may deter riders from signing up for the program.

***Above Motion FAILED.***

**2. Require AAA Champion Rating to Earn ROC & Senior Elite Awards – Sally Rivera Lingafeldt**

Sally Rivera Lingafeldt explained that the AAA Champion rating is currently required for ROC and Senior Elite riders to earn the Top Rating awards. However, there is currently no rating requirement to earn the other program awards: All Around Champion, Champion and Reserve Average and Record Holder. Sally believed that changing the requirement to a AAA Champion rating to earn all ROC and Senior Elite awards would increase the cost effectiveness of the programs and ensure riders ride a sufficient number of events before earning expensive awards.

***MOTION*** by Sally Rivera Lingafeldt to require all ROC and Senior Elite riders to rate AAA Champion to be eligible for any award. ***Seconded*** by Shannon Rahn.

***Discussion followed.***

Margo Abatti agreed with Sally's motion with the exception of the Record Holder award. Margo felt that if a rider was able to achieve the fastest time of the year they should not be stripped of that bragging right or award. Record Holder awards are medallions, which pale in comparison to the cost of the other awards – buckles and jackets.

***MOTION to Amend*** by Margo Abatti to add 'with the exception of Record Holder.' ***Seconded*** by Joanne Galbraith. ***No Discussion Followed. Amendment PASSED***

If passed, the motion with amendment would read: "to require all ROC and Senior Elite riders to rate AAA Champion to be eligible for any award, with the exception of Record Holder."

***Motion with Amendment PASSED***

Sally Rivera Lingafeldt clarified the motion would take affect with the 2010-2011 show season.

**3. Senior Elite Awards – BoG, Sheri Herchkorn**

Seeing the outcome of the previous items and in an effort to make the Senior Elite program more cost effective, Sheri Herchkorn proposed the following motion:

**MOTION** by Sheri Herchkorn, on behalf of the BoG, to change the Senior Elite awards program to Top Five (5) instead of Top Ten (10). **Seconded** by Bob Bucks.

**Discussion followed.**

Rebekah Crill believed with the AAA Champion rating now a requirement to earn Senior Elite awards riders would have to ride more times and thus generate more revenue. Seeing this Rebekah questioned if there was still a need to reduce the Top Rating awards.

**Above Motion PASSED (39 in favor / 25 opposed).**

Sheri Herchkorn clarified the motion would take affect with the 2010-2011 show season.

**4. CGA Junior Ambassadors Council – Dave Bach**

Dave Bach asked to table his item until the February Board Meeting to give him more time to organize his thoughts for a junior council. Stacey Rivera confirmed the item could be voted on at the BoD meeting because District Delegates represent the general membership and the proposal may involve BoD Policy. Dave was encouraged to open the floor for discussion to determine if the concept was worthy of further pursuit.

Dave Bach stated his general idea was to get the younger membership more involved by creating a Junior Ambassadors Council for members 12-17 years of age. Dave envisioned the council working with the President and Board Members to bring items to the attention of the board, essentially giving younger members an avenue to voice their opinion. Dianna Malley appreciated the idea of a junior council but reasoned all meetings are open for members to participate, both young and old, so everyone has a voice in the organization if they so choose. Dianna suggested organizing the younger members to become more involved with the State Show teen activities that Sally Rivera Lingafeldt organizes. Arlene Tsuji believed a junior council was something for implementation at the district level and districts should be encouraging youth boards to prepare them for the future. Morgan Easel spoke of her experience on a district youth board and agreed the concept should remain at the district level. Morgan questioned if 12-17 year old members were prepared for the challenges of a state level council. Sue Engelhardt also spoke in favor of keeping junior councils/boards at the district level to help prepare the younger members for future participation at the state level.

**5. Information Manual Wording Change to Section 9.3.4 a – Lea deMontigny**

Lea deMontigny asked to withdraw her item seeing the vote on item #12 in the Rules and Judges Meeting. Lea did ask the Board (BoG and BoD) for clarification of the word ‘volunteer’ at the February/Mach Board of Directors Meeting.

**6. Information Manual Wording Change to Section 10.5– Lea deMontigny**

Lea deMontigny again asked to withdraw her item.

**7. Addition to Information Manual Section 10.5 Judge– Lea deMontigny**

Lea deMontigny questioned if the item could be presented or should have been in the Rules and Judges Meeting? Several side conversations began regarding the appropriateness of the item in the Riders Program section with no definitive conclusion.

A few members questioned if the item was even necessary seeing the previous passing of an 'inactive' status option for Judges. Parliamentarian Stacey Rivera stated that a Rule Book change had to precede a change in the Information Manual because there would be verbiage in both manuals regarding a Judge's status options. Only Judges can decide what items move out of committee and go to the general membership for final vote in order to change the rules and the Information Manual change follows. Shannon Rahn clarified that what Lea was asking to present was actually different in wording and options than what was just passed. From the verbiage on the agenda, it appeared Lea wanted to give judges the same status options (active, inactive, retired) as granted to Master Judges in Section 11.7 Master Judge Status. Secretary, Meghan Abatti stated she had placed the item on the agenda where she thought appropriate, but that did not mean it was ultimately the correct place. Meghan believed that Lea should not be stopped from presenting her item if it was an error in placement on the Secretary's part. If the membership wanted to essentially go back to a Rules and Judges Meeting to hash out the idea and move it on to the general membership for final vote, then that's what should be done. In light of the inability of the room to come to a consensus on the appropriateness of the item, Lea opted to skip the item and move on with the agenda.

**8. Information Manual Wording Change to Section 11.4 d– Lea deMontigny**

Lea deMontigny explained that she wanted to insert wording into Section 11.4 d that clearly stated a Judge's card could be suspended for refusing to judge at a show. Lea believed this was a necessary addition so Judges realized their obligation to judge and the chance of losing their card should they refuse to judge.

***MOTION** by Lea deMontigny to add to Section 11.4d "refusing to judge at a show" so the sentence shall read "If a Judge is not judging fairly, making bad calls consistently, refusing to judge at a show, ect., the Master Judge has the authority and responsibility to temporarily suspend that Judge's card, pending a review by the MAC.".* **Seconded** by Morgan Easel. ***Discussion followed.***

Rebekah Crill believed the motion was in direct conflict with Judges being volunteers and the issue had already been clarified. Meghan Abatti explained she believed Lea's intent was to remove some of the subjectivity in suspending a Judge's card and to somewhat clarify the phrase 'reasonable request.' Ellen Carr felt the item should be tabled until the work 'volunteer' was clarified at the next BoD Meeting. Margo Abatti thought the original sentence was intended to give examples and the proposed wording was unnecessary because 'ect' is all encompassing. Randy Young felt the discussion was skating around the real issue, the phrase 'a reasonable request.' Any member has the right to refuse to help, so the question at hand was really why a judge is required to help and not given the option to opt out of helping like every other member? Several members felt the discussion boiled down to the phrase 'a reasonable request,' which is really subjective to the individual asking and their interpretation of the Judge's response.

***Above Motion FAILED***

**Item I. D: By Laws Items**

No Items submitted for discussion and vote.

**Item II: Other Issues/Comments and Concerns**

**CGA Manual Summary/Overview** – Stacey Rivera presented a spreadsheet she developed to help members understand the ‘who, what, where, when, why and how’ of CGA manuals. Stacey created the spreadsheet after repeated questions from members regarding what goes in each manual, who can change them, what voting percentage it takes to amend, ect. The spreadsheet required some revisions but Stacey hoped to have it posted on the website soon.

**Senior Elite Program** – Timmi Lemen stated she would like to see CGA research the costs of the Senior Elite awards program to see if lowering the award costs would make the program more cost effective. Timmi stated she would like to discuss the results of this research at a later meeting if possible. Stacey Rivera commented the awards program/s are determined by the State Office and the BoG. While the BoG appreciates the input of the membership, award choices and decisions require no vote or approval.

**Older Hall of Fame Riders** – Joanne Galbraith explained she would like to see the 55 and over Hall of Fame riders and trainers have the ability to rider in a division lower than AA at State sanctioned shows. Joanne asked to have this item for discussion and vote at the February/March Board of Directors Meeting. Ellen Carr added she would like to see this choice for all Hall of Fame riders regardless of age.

**Item III: Convention Location for 2010**

A motion was previously passed to allow the State Office to make decisions on future Convention locations thus there was no need for discussion regarding Convention 2010.

**IV. Adjournment**

*MOTION* to adjourn the meeting was made by Randy Young and *Seconded* by Chris Rowles. *MOTION CARRIES.*

Meeting was adjourned at 12:15 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Meghan Abatti  
CGA Secretary