

December 21, 2014

President Walker called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Eddie Barrow

Ronnie Hooker

Tim Toler

Fred McRoy, Jr

Andy Roberts

Mike Etheredge

Chris Walker

Tonya Parsons

Kelly France

Darlene Harris

Jim Morris

Judy Jones

Kimberly Coult

Jamie Lawrence was excused motion made by Tim Toler, Second by Kimberly Coult, motion carried.

President Walker moved onto the reason for the meeting. He states that during the General Membership meeting that Jim Roberts made a motion for different committee heads get together and bring ideas to the Board on our judges program. This is to be presented to the General membership at winter meeting.

Due to quite a few things going on in my life the time has gotten away from me, and that is the reason for such a short notice on this conference call. I have sent each of you an email that is a rough proposal from the committee. I hope you have had a chance to look at it. The proposal itself is pretty detailed considering the breadth of what it covers, even with the detail I am afraid that some things may be missed, considering the overhaul we are trying to do. Before we start let me ask this question is there anyone who has not read this or looked it over.

Tim Toler: I never got it

Ronnie Hooker: I have been out of town and I haven't been around a computer so I haven't seen it either

President Walker: Ok let me pull up where I have sent this out give me just a second. Ok so we have Time and Ronnie is there anyone else who did not get the email? Let me get it in front of me and the easiest way to do this is to just read it to you.

The existing judges committee will start the process of dissolution upon the “new judges programs”, on the “New judges program” being voted in by the membership. The existing Judges program we will refer to that as the judges committee will remain intact through December 31, 2015. For the sole purpose of completing any ongoing and or unresolved investigations or disciplinary actions.

The existing judges committee shall not conduct or engage in any new business; new business does not disallow the questioning of or finding fault or guilt in new persons not previously named so long as it is related to an existing and ongoing investigation. Because the New Judges program may take away from options existing judges committee as it relates to disciplinary actions any finding by the existing judges committee shall be passed on to the new judges committee and that information shall be heavily considered in the new judges program.

Additionally any negative findings or determinations of guilt shall be turned over to the rules enforcement committee with the expectation that the rules enforcement committee will follow through with proper research and investigative measures and will resolve (17:17) or discipline the person or persons properly.

For the purpose of minutes taken from February the 7th which is the day we would be voting on this for the purposes of minutes take from February 7th 2015 to December 31, 2015 or any references in the future to that time period the new committee for the judges program will be referred to as “The New Judges Committee” after this time period it will be referred to as simply the Judges Committee. For the purposes of hearing the New judges Committee the will be referred to as such.

The new Judges committee shall be made up of 5 persons. (Here we “meaning the board” to instate that all the committee members be RHBAA members or we could state that 4 of the 5 have to be RHBAA member as and 1 being an outside person, just throwing out some ideas) The 5 persons to serve on the judges committee shall be _____. Tim and Ronnie after the fact the committee as well as other have come forth with names, I did send those names out as well, and we will get to that in just a moment but for now it just has blanks here.

The term for each seat should be 5 years for purpose of staggering the terms such that all seats do not come to vote simultaneously. With the exception to the 5 year term will be that _____ shall serve one year and _____ shall serve 2 years term and _____ 3 year term etc. The first five will be placed in a one year term, two year term, three year term, so that they are staggered.

The qualifications for the new judges committee are, you cannot be actively engaged in 18:55 Show horses they shall not make a substantial part of the living or their income from the

show horse industry. And I have several blanks there and I have followed up at the bottom with some other qualifications.

Because the main members of the new judges committee are respected and believed to have a genuine concern for the future of the RHBAA, above that of self-interest to appoint persons of like caliber to fill vacated seats. In other words when a seat becomes vacated for whatever reason that committee the 4 remaining will appoint someone to fill that seat.

Future members of this new judges committee shall do the same. A seat can become vacated by death, resignation, and expulsion by other members of the new judges committee. In other words if somebody has got something improper going on the remaining 4 can vote and remove that person (It will require a unanimous vote by the other 4 or 3 out of 4 however this board wants to do that) Or the seat can become vacated by the term ending. To reinstate an existing member to their seat or to place a new person in a vacated seat shall require 3 out of the 4 remaining members or 2 out of the remaining 3 should there be 3 seat vacated simultaneously. Prematurely vacated seats shall be filled by person that will serve out the remaining the term of the vacated seat. In other words just to make it simple if there is one year left in that term the person filling that seat will have a one year term, if there are 4 years left in the term for that seat they will have a 4 year term.

The licensing of judges shall be by invitation only, by the new judges committee a person may let their desire to be a judge known to the new judges committee via letter or email and the new judges committee shall create their own set of guidelines by which they can invite one to be a judge but the guidelines shall consist of at minimum the person must

1. Be of good reputation and standing within the membership
2. Have the reputation within the horse industry of being a person of integrity and good character
3. Be one that has demonstrated a willingness and ability to put the RHBAA and others above their own self interest
4. Be one that has a common knowledge of the racking gait and able to verbally communicate the details of the entire gait and the differentiating qualities within the gate
5. Be one that has or will commit to be engrossed with the rule book as it relates to the requirements of each division and or class that would be hat attire rider gait conformation.
6. Be one that is willing to attend certain training sessions that is determined by the need of the judges committee
7. Be one that passes an initial test and passes tests periodically as the new judges deems necessary throughout their term
8. Be one that has been, is and will be a team player within the RHBAA and moving it in a decided direction

21:50 Referring to the committee, the term of the judge shall be two years and then the new judges committee can choose to invite that person back to be a judge or not. The nominee for a

judges license shall be 4 out of the 5 judges committee member votes to receive a judge's license. At any point the committee can withdraw the classification of judge from a person without reason or obligation including but not limited to

During a horse show event by a 4 out of 5 vote

Judges for the spring show and the world celebration shall be chosen by the new judges committee for the World celebration 6 judges shall be used the 3 being utilized for each class there shall be 3 performance judges identified and used for the performance classes and three identified and used for the pleasure classes.

In the event that a judge misses a nightly performance the new judges committee shall pull one of these already named judges to fill that position, or shall have liberty to allow absolution.

There shall be 4 judges hired for the spring show and the new judges committee will choose to utilize 3 of the 4 in each class by rotation they can use all 4 and drop one after the class before the class is tied, by way of drawing, popcorn machine, or like process or can utilize all 4 judges by way of considering what is best at the time.

The requirements to polygraph the judges at world celebration will be eliminated but shall remain as an option that the new judges committee can be given to any judge at any time during the world celebration, spring celebration or any other time throughout their term as a judge relating to any show and or unscrupulous behaviors suspected or otherwise that negatively reflects upon the RHBAA.

The use of cameras from center ring or otherwise or any other idea or mechanism at the new judges committee deems necessary or a help in holding accountable in a (23:30) Fashion for future decision makers shall be at the discretion of the new judges committee with only the financial implication needing to be approved by the board of directors.

President Walker: I know that was a lot of information there and for those of you who have it in front of you it's still a lot. That all said and read the committee itself we had response from Greg Johnston and Barry they both brought a lot of good information along back and forth Lance did call me last night we had a great conversation for probably 45 minutes. I did not hear from Sue Dunn, from Danny Musick or Leanne and there was one more I didn't hear from and we reached out to all those several times.

So out of Greg, Lance and Barry, myself and Melisa this is kind of what we have come to, on the overall view of this everyone was really excited about it. Greg had one opposing concern and we have gone back and forth but I told him I would share it with the board, and that idea was, leaving the judges committee in place as it is and they basically do all the work, the new judges committee would set the new guidelines and the new rules and really be in place to hold the judges committee accountable. The judges committee would still be the ones doing all the things they are doing now the new judges committee would just kind of be over the existing

committee. He did at the he thought it would be ok for the new judges committee to select the judges but that would come from a list presented by the existing judges committee. He and I debated that back and forth, for me that just another layer of encumbrance. That was his concern and I just told him that I would present it to the board, we all agreed on this other but I did tell him I would share that idea.

Anything from the board any thoughts or questions

26:30

Jim Morris: One of my concerns about it why relinquish all the judges that we have already in existence why leave the judge that we have and make them more accountable by the judges committee

President Walker: Why not keep the judges that we have, and then just put the new judge's committee program in place basically holding those existing judges accountable or better accountable

Jim Morris: Right

President Walker: My thought there and I am going to be blunt and honest with the answer to that question, there are a handle full of judges that absolutely have zero confidence among the membership. It's going to be one of those situations where you will be beating your head against a wall in my opinion. Now out of that judges list, that would absolutely be the first place in my opinion that the new committee would go to, to come up with judges from the existing judges list. I think that they would absolutely start at that place.

In addition to that I guess the better answer to that is truly that it is just to get a complete new start. We are having to make adjustments as we go forward with everything even our horse, based upon what society and the government wants etc., and we have had to make a lot of changes as an organization, I think this is just one that the membership has been crying out for, for a long time. But even more so recently, I think it's good for everyone's mind and attitudes just to start fresh. Again with that being said a lot of those judges will still become judges I would think.

Tonya Parson: I have a question, the only objection I have about this is there aren't enough shows out there to apprentice again. So how do you expect the judges to get back to where they need to be, you know single A double A or triple A.

President Walker: Well I think on the A, AA, and AAA, first of all, I think that would go away with the judges program. Now I think there would only be two levels, and you know all this stuff is brand new and up for discussion and debate, so what I am throwing out to you is not the gospel, what I am saying is just the way I see it. There would be two levels that the new judges committee, if the go to the list we have now, let say they select 10 AA and AAA judges. Those judges would have a higher position I don't know what it would be called but more experienced judges. And so those more experienced judges would be more utilized and fashion by the new judges committee in place such as world celebration and spring celebration. The judge that has

been a single A judge or someone who is a brand new person to the program, someone that the judges committees says “John Doe over here he knows horses and has been around and has tons of credibility and lots of integrity among his peers. Let’s see if he would be interested in being a judge” If he came one as a judge that person would be in that level labeled as inexperienced, they obviously wouldn’t be invited to do World celebration. So that is kind of the way I see that.

Any other questions?

Fred McRoy: I want to thank you for all this work I know that your time and effort and I like this, I only have one thing that I would like to see changed, is where you said it would take 4 out of the 5 judges to take a judge out of the ring, what if we don’t have 4 or 5 judges, I think that should be a majority. You might get down here with just 3 of them.

President Walker: Oh your saying what happens if the entire new judges committee isn’t in attendance at a show, your wanting just a majority vote of the judges committee in attendance.

Fred: Yes I think that should just be listed as a majority vote.

President Walker: I’m open to that

Fred: That is the only flaw I found with it at all, I like it other than that.

President Walker: I guess the reason I put that in there, one when we put these folks in place, the idea is that they will be the caliber of folks that won’t be a runaway train. But the idea was put in place to keep it from being a runaway, but your right if you run into the problem what if only 3 of them are at the show.

Darlene: Chris I have a question about this, basically this is the outline and the start and then the 5 people; are they going to be making up some rules and regulations, as far as the program goes. We’re not making out the entire program; this is what you have to follow we are coming up with a couple things we are giving them ideas on and then they are going to basically make up the program. Is that right or not?

President Walker: Yes and no, I think what is going to have to happen, I think we are going to have to put some pretty tight parameters and I think what we have here, is a good enough skeleton to wrap up into a motion and put forth, if within that motion I do think we need to give liberty to the new judges committee to still be able to tweak this program as they go forward. Because as I said earlier there is no way we will be able to capture everything, we can’t think of every little thing, and they will encounter some things that we will not have thought about. I do think that the new committee needs some liberty within the motion, that there is something along the lines of that this particular motion is exempt from the two year rule that you can’t change

anything once it's been voted on. That needs to be exempt from this for the sole purpose of the new committee with the board's approval being able to tweak or change within this program for a time of at least one year maybe two years, that way we don't have wait for a whole two years to roll around before we can tweak and improve this. But I think we can do that within the motion itself, we will just include in the motion that this particular program will be exempt to the new committee as long as they get approval from a majority vote from the board to make frequent changes to this program.

Jim Morris: Chris, with all the tweaking that you're talking about don't you think this is kind of putting the cart before the horse. With the trying to make a motion so soon.

President Walker: Well I have got two opposing calls from that, my personal opinion is it makes me just a little bit nervous moving this quick on this big of a program, or this big of a change. I would have preferred I suppose to sit down face to face with the committee members that were in charge of presenting to the board, I would have liked to have met face to face with them and got this closer or I would have preferred meeting with the board face to face and got this closer. Now there are those and most of the ones on the committees that were coming up with these ideas, they felt like that time was of the essence and we needed to get started and what we put together was a good enough skeleton that it certainly would get it off the ground and give enough parameters if which they could operate, without any problems knowing that they would encounter some things that we would not think of, even if we had a whole year to do it. So the committee as a whole I guess felt more burdened to go ahead and get this thing going. Now the motion that cowboy presented at general membership was that it be put out to post 45 days before winter meetings and be ready to be voted on at the winter meetings. I'm a little bit nervous about it although I do think we have spent a lot of time on this, I do think it gives enough outline and enough parameters, that the new committee could take it and run with it. I like to be a little more prepared I guess but I do understand what Greg and Barry and Leanne had to say about it and they do certainly feel like there are enough parameters here that they could work under.

Jim Morris: My concern is historically and the majority of votes would agree that we end up making decisions and then look back at the decisions that we have made and realize that you know we needed to check into this and we needed to wait a little bit. The chain issue is still hanging over our head. But we have historically done that a lot. We will pass something and then think you know what maybe we should have waited.

President Walker: I think where that comes from Jim you know you look at the polygraph test itself, that's another good example, in my opinion of something that needed to play out before we knew the pros and cons of it. Unfortunately there are so many things that we have tackled that there is no way of knowing all the loop holes and scenarios until you start to engage in those

processes. It requires us to go out on a limb and do things. So I don't necessarily look at all those things as negative, the polygraph test, and I am just voicing my opinion here, if I had that to do over again I would have probably voted against it. Now it has a lot of pluses to it but I have a lot of doubt nonetheless about the test, so in hindsight I would probably be more reluctant or apprehensive about having voted yes on that, however that said I'm glad that we voted it as we did because we wouldn't have experienced and learned what we did about the polygraph test, had we not went down that road. So we are more educated and more experienced in that regard, and we never would have got that had we not voted that in. And chains are the same way, I am still a believer that removing the chains by far is the right decision, I still believe that my biggest concern there was how much, I have already shared that, but the reason that I backed up on that a little bit was not because I felt like it was the wrong decision, there was some other things that came into play there that in hindsight I'm glad we did drag our feet some because my situation personally changed, but it was also good, because it allowed us to gain better insight on the membership as a whole, in my opinion I feel like we learned where people stood on the issue but we never would have really known that had we not done what we did. I don't necessarily look at those things as negative, I do hear what you saying and I do agree to a point I really do that why I am a little bit apprehensive and I am a little bit nervous about this program in the same fashion but I don't know how much more we would come up with if we had another two months to think on it, I still think we are going to miss a lot of things.

(38:54)Member: Something to look at too Jim is to look at the horses we starting last year if we don't get this program going and people see that we are trying to do something how are you going to be starting this year, if you don't get this voted on in February, you will have to lay out until the April meeting and how many times have we not had quarrel come up and then we would have to throw it back to the winter meetings. I think it needs to be done. I don't want to lose any more horses or any more people.

Darlene: What do we feel is the meat of this what are we giving these 5 people the right to do. What are we really changing here?

President Walker: These 5 people, what is happening here is the slate is being wiped clean as it relates to judges when this is voted in there is a split moment in time where there are no RHBAA judges. And this new committee will be charged with immediately inviting if you will or coming up with a list of folks while going through a full process to get the judges on board. That is there charge and there charge is to pick those judges based upon the criteria we just laid out within this.

Darlene: And yes I agree with all that, but then when it comes down to it so are these five people the one that say you need to justify your placing or you need to go.

President Walker: Yes that is correct

Darlene: They can do that at that time, before this we haven't had anyone that has had that authority; to actually go and take out a judge if they didn't like them.

President Walker: That is correct, this committee would have that ability because they are responsible for having brought these judges on, theoretically they will bring on high caliber folks, and they will have less trouble out of them but, in the even that there is trouble, this new judges committee has the ability to then immediately on the spot hold them accountable for that decision. It doesn't mean that they will just jerk them out of the ring and let them go, but it does mean, right now there is a lot of discomfort from me personally and from the judges committee and show committee its very uncomfortable to call a judge in and question them about a tie that they made say during world celebration, because you really don't know where the line is at, there are a lot of grey areas in what you are allowed to do and what you aren't allowed to do. And for us to give this committee the opportunity, flexibility I should say, to be able to hold a judge accountable on the spot if necessary.

Jim Morris: How would that change from what it is right now?

President Walker: The difference is right now we are four or five months removed from the situation that happened back 4 or 5 months ago, still waiting on a resolution, so that is one area that would be resolved you wouldn't be waiting for what would turns out to be 6 months to a year. For just about any decision that the judges committee has to make, it the process by which they have to go through. But really 6 months to a year being able to get to a decision place, then the other side of that is there is still a lot of membership that just don't have a lot of confidence in popular vote. And so we get folks voted into this and voted into that, and get put on this committee and that committee and then there is just not a lot of confidence in that, a lot of this is about perception trying to change that mindset of the membership.

Darlene: Judges that are at one night shows, are they going to select those judges to go to each show.

President Walker: It's not currently in this plan, and the committee didn't even talk about that I did think about it, but I didn't bring it up, and I can't get in my mind if that's a good thing or a bad thing just yet.

Darlene: Well who would handle that at this point?

President Walker: Its will be just like it is now as far as the new judges committee will have a list of judges to pick from and a show chairman, on a Saturday night show will do just as they do now. As its written now, but this is up for discussion this board may say they have a better idea. That's up to this board to come up with a proposal, but currently they will have a list and the show chairman will pick their own judge.

Darlene: All this goes back to the complaints, the complaints on the one night shows, that they did a really bad job or very biased all of that will go back to this committee.

President Walker: that's the reason it came to my mind is because I get more phone calls out of the Saturday night shows than I do the world celebration, so in thinking about that that's the reason it came to mind to being with, maybe that would be a good idea, the reason I didn't bring that up to the board is because there is a part of me that feels we are already giving this committee a lot of power if you will and I didn't want to get into the Saturday night shows. My hope was this new committee will elect high enough caliber judges that if you look at a list of twenty that anyone of those twenty will be (or whatever the number may be) I would that the judges they elect would have a high enough caliber respect that no matter who is chosen they will go and do a good job, and the fact that this judges committee can hold them better accountable, even on the Saturday night shows, I am hoping all of that will make a difference and we won't have to get into hand selecting judges for the Saturday night shows; although that is an option.

Jim Morris: If you had a complaint about a judge on a one night show, what would the procedure be, send that to the judges committee?

President Walker: Speaking from the person who had the complaint; yes they would send that to the new judges committee

Jim Morris: So would that go to the show chairman and the show chairman would forward that to the judges committee and how long would the committee have to resolve the issue about the judge

President Walker: I guess it would depend upon, there would be a whole lot of factors, it depends on the allegations, it depends on the proof, etc.

Jim Morris: Chris I know you have put a lot of work into this and the committee members did as well but I see a lot of tweaking that needs to be done and I do not like to see something pushed through so it can be voted on at the winter meetings.

President Walker: I understand, to answer your question it would be up to the committee how quick, and due to the information, the person filing the complaint, and frankly speaking there has

to be a little bit of judge in character onto the person making the complaint you know as well as I do that there are people who want to complain and have no business complaining. So you have to give a little bit of ability of the judges committee to judge the complaint itself and the proof given, they should be able to act on that within a meeting or so. Have a meeting talk to the judge and make their decision on what they are going to do.

Tim Toler: Pretty much I am going to state what everyone else has already said obviously you have put a lot of time and effort into this, Chris, and it's obvious that y'all have some really good ideas, I would have to lean with Jim, I'm slow and I think deep but it takes a long time for me to get that deep, and I would be hesitant to vote on anything that might come off as knee jerk, because we have done it in the past, the other thing is this committee is going to have a tremendous amount of power. More power than anyone in the RHBAA, by far no question about it. Not saying that it can't happen but they better be really reliable individuals because they are going to have a tremendous amount of power.

The other thing on the Saturday night shows I want to speak up for the judges committee for a second, on these Saturday night shows and these other shows you're going to have the same situation if you have 5 people or 50 people, choosing these judges, these people will bitch, moan, complain and argue, they did a bad job up here, you know how many letters the judges committee gets on it none All they do is bitch and complain they don't do any formal complaints, and you're going to have the same problem no matter how many people is picking the judges they sit there and want to talk about the judges committee not doing anything, but guess what they are the ones that do not bring it to the judges committee, and you're going to have the same situation no matter how many people is on that committee. I am about tired of hearing it.

President Walker: I agree

Mike: That is the problem we had this year, with all the complaints, they call and want to complain about all the judges, take London for example, and you call these people up and well we don't want to write a letter on it, we just want to tell you so we don't have to write a letter. If we come forward we are going to get black balled.

Tim Toler: Well what do we do, do we just take someone's license because you didn't tie good at a show, but you just call and complain but you won't put your name on a paper, you won't make a formal complaint we are just supposed to go and throw that judge out. I mean that's the problem you have with disciplining the judges there is nobody who will bring forth any information against the judges except for calling and bitching about it, and that's the same issue you are going to have again, if you have one person on the committee or have 100 that's the same problem you're going to have. And I apologize for my language but I have been involved in it for a while and that's the way it is.

President Walker: Oh I agree I don't know, like I said I get more complaints about Saturday night shows and as I said earlier the only way that I know how to help that situation more so than any other way is to have a better list of judges to pick from or they don't have the option to pick. Like Tim said they are still going to be complaining, there is no getting around that. And like Mike and Tim said 9 out of 10 of them are not going to be willing to put their name to it. They are just going to want to call and complain.

Member: 50:17

Chris do you not think that the membership would not give your committee came forward at the membership meeting and discussed with them, the situation that there is a lot involved with and you all have done a lot of research so on and so forth with this in this situation. Do you not think they would understand why it takes a little longer to do something like this?

President Walker: Oh I think they would understand, I don't think it matters at this point if we don't put forth the motion, there won't be anything to understand.

Member: I guess I just mean it's not going to, it will let them see that we have been working on it like you said you were going to but there was more thought process needed.

President Walker: Right, I don't have a problem if the board decides to sit on this for a while; I don't have a problem with that. I don't know how you can be bound by a motion that in hindsight was almost impossible to get that far along, I don't know how you can be bound by that just because there was a motion voted on by the membership. I guess one could make that argument, that there was a motion was voted on and we didn't have an option except to bring it to winter meetings, but what are they going to do at the end of the day.

Kimberly: I want to bring this up; I think the shows need to be at least for the state of Texas need to be defined more by number of classes or something like that versus just a one night show. Because we drive 5 hours my minimum drive is about 3 hours to a horse show we stay overnight and we split the classes between two nights, so if you're talking about, them having to have hire a racking horse judge, but we hire racking horse judges out here that have dual license that can judge walking and racking, whatever, you know again if you guys are making these determinations they need to be based upon more than just whether its one night or whether it's a certain number of classes like that just because we are split between two nights versus just one.

President Walker: I hear what you're saying, any other thoughts or questions.

Darlene: I am thinking maybe we are thinking this was too fast but not really knowing how much time was put in, in the back ground coming up with what you have put together, maybe it really isn't all that bad.

This is the first we are hearing of what the committee has come up with, and how much we are going to do in the mean time between now and winter meetings are the rest of us even thinking about it about adding to this or putting things together.

President Walker: Here is the answer to that I guess, it's probably a lot more overwhelming to this board when you first read this, and there is no question that it is overwhelming because there is a lot of detail in it. And many of you have voiced your thought one this, I'm sitting here thinking I'm not sure how much more I could add to it. How many more parameters I could put on it, because I have spent, I couldn't even begin to name the hours I have put into this. In truth I have probably spent a year in thought on this, but in thinking about it, and working really hard on it for that last 3 to 4 weeks I just can't at this moment think what else I could put on it to make it any more detailed or anymore explainable other than to say it's pretty overwhelming kind of like reading a set of blue prints, when I first get a set of blue prints it's like oh my goodness I will never get this. Then I will read it and read it and I will read it for a week and it still doesn't make sense then one day it will just click. There is so much to this, that's the way it is working. If this board sat down and read this every night for a week eventually you would reach a night where you say oh I see it better now. The only way you're going to get more comfortable with it will be doing something along those lines. It's not going to be by me or the committee putting more time into it. There is no question that we have forgotten some things and there will need to be tweaking, but I just don't know that we could spend another two months and get any closer; but I would be glad to do so if that's what the board wants to do.

Fred McRoy: I'm scared if we don't do this, if you tweak it some more, how many times have we not been able to get an April meeting together. You're going to be another year off as far as I'm concerned if we don't do it now.

Mike Etheridge: I counted the list of the judges that we have, and we have 69 judges on file right now. Are we going to through all these judges and I am going to say $\frac{3}{4}$ of the judges never had a bad letter or anything in their files or anything and we are going to throw all this away and then expect 5 people. Like what if someone on that committee had a problem with somebody that's never done nothing wrong, or they feel like, he cheated me at a show two years ago I'm not going to let him have his license.

President Walker: I would hope that this board is better than that, and selecting that type of a person. That's why I want this board to do it and not another board; I would prefer this board to do it, because I have confidence in this board's ability to put in people that are going to do a good job. I do have confidence in this board to be able to find 5 people, they are out there, I

think of Cowboy and I just think of him because he is a person in my mind that I have sat on a committee with him, judges committee specifically there have been times that he could have taken a stab at some folk and he just absolutely refuses to do that. He does a great job at separating personal experiences and job choices. I think this board has the heart and the mindset and the ability to pick good members that will hopefully over look those kinds of things.

Mike: for me at one time we were talking about getting other judges to come in, like getting walking horse judges to come down and take a test and be able to judge our spring and fall celebration, we are wanting in this letter, racking gait tied. We get walking horse judges in there they aren't going to tie the racking gait; they are going to tie either that walk-y lick or 1970 lick. I know you have put a lot of time into this and it has a lot of good points in it but I just think it needs to have a little more done to it.

Jim Morris: I think to me as a board member if I was to say ok I voted this in and they say what's the procedures, and we say we don't know yet, and who is going to commission a judge, well we don't know yet, well how are you going to go about getting a judges license, well we don't know yet. Do you understand what I am saying, there are too many we don't know yet. So how can I vote on something when there are too many ifs or when's.

President Walker: I guess I understand it because you're not engrossed with it like I am, I have an answer for all of those things in my mind, a little bit harder to explain but I do have an answer. I do understand exactly where you are coming from. You aren't as engrossed with it as I am so it would be hard for you to ask all those questions and not know where the answer is coming from.

Member: 59:24 Jim the membership will be able to vote on that and ask questions on that in the meeting, in February.

Jim Morris: Will it be done by February

Member: Well yeah if we put it on tomorrow it would be voted on in February

Member: If I understand this all you are asking us to do is vote on whether or not to move forward with this.

The membership will feel like they have to vote again won't they.

President Walker: That is correct what the board is supposed to do is to look at this skeleton of what we have tonight and say are we in agreement with this and putting this forth as a motion for the membership to scrutinize and vote on. That is what the board is charged with

Member: So really any decision we make is just to be asking the membership whether they want to agree or disagree with this. And you basically have 45 days to put together the answers for those questions.

President Walker: You can't change the motion whatever the board, if the board said yes let's do this, and whatever we wrote up for tomorrow to put up for posting, we can't change that. As far as being able to answer questions yes we would have that time to get questions and answers together. Now what that would entail is immersing yourself in it, there is a lot in it, it would be like giving you the rule book and saying lets vote on it, you can't just read through it once and know all the answers. You have to study it.

Darlene: I guess that was my point, how many of us are going to be able to add anything more to this between now and winter meetings.

I was reading this as, this was a beginning, and this is the whole written in stone. There are still a lot of other points to be brought in.

President Walker: Right there are parameters for the new committee and parameters what we would call minimums for the new committee to operate within but the new committee within this motion would have the ability to set their own guidelines and policies, so I guess this board could physically try to come up with every detail that the new committee would have to abide by and there isn't a lot left. It's pretty laid out already as to what they have to do, and how they have to conduct business, but there are probably some other guidelines that they can add too, but it's pretty well laid out.

104min

Darlene: You have to understand during winter meetings and your April meetings you will have new board members that aren't even aware of this and us that will be off will have no vote.

President Walker: Right, but the board that we have together tonight has a vote tonight

Darlene: I'm just saying there will a few of us that come January will not have a vote

President Walker: Exactly, that's why I said a moment ago, without saying a whole lot that I do trust THIS board, and it's not that I distrust the future board; I just haven't had a chance to work with them yet. I have worked with this board and I have the confidence in this board to do the right thing whatever it is. Whatever you decide tonight I will believe you have put your best foot forward.

Member: (1:05) who were the other candidates that go voted in from the other states?

President Walker: We have Dewey Hannon for MS, Jason Todd for TN, Carol Missildine for NC and SC and Darlene is off and
So we gain lose 3 and gain 3 but we lose 2 altogether.

Judy Jones: I agree with Tim that's a lot of responsibility and a lot of power. Who exactly is going to nominate, decide on this board. This board I can throw out some names that the committee and others have pitched to me.

President Walker: I sent those names out with the email; ultimately it will be this board whenever we vote upon it you would fill in those 5 names. And I think I had given you about 8 or 9 names, now you may have other names that you want to talk about but as of right now you have 8 or 9 names now with that said, if it goes in tomorrow for posting we obviously don't have time to talk to each of those individuals so I thought about how would we do that we could do is in the motion you would list all the people that are being considered for those 5 positions and in that motion what the membership would be voting on would be this program with the belief that the 5 out of those however many will be selected by the board to sit in that seat. So they would be voting on any 5 of the grouping that we would list. Then that would give this board time to list out talk about and talk to each person listed.

Right now what we have if you all

Barry Troxtell

Mike Meisenheimer

Harley Taylor

Joshua Burchfield

Judy Jones

James Burk

It's the board's decision whether we move forward with this or not.

Member: (1:10) actually we are just voting on whether or not to let the membership vote on it.

President Walker: It's up to this board if they want to put this up as a motion form, now or if you want to do this at a future date.

Judy: But in the end the general membership will have to vote on it correct?

President Walker: Yes, it is a bylaw and they have to vote on by the membership.

Any have any other questions or comments on the program itself?

Member: (1:11) the list that you have given, that we are supposed to choose these 5 people from, have all these people been spoken to and willing to serve on it.

President Walker: No, that's where I said we need to make write in this motion that we will have time to talk to everyone on this list. The motion will read, we would have the ability once this is voted upon to name 5 out of the list, so the membership would see a list of 8 or 10 or 12 and then we would talk to and choose 5 for the positions.

Member: That's what I'm asking if you are putting this in the form of a motion and nothing about a motion can be changed how we know that any of the 8, 10 or 12 would be willing to serve. What happens if none of them are?

President Walker: Honestly that would be worse case scenario, if you had 12 and you couldn't get 5 out of those 12 to agree that certainly would be an issue.

Judy Jones: Read those names again please

President Walker:

Barry Troxtell
Jim Roberts
Judy Jones
James Burk
Harley Taylor
Mike Meisenheimer
Joshua Burchfield
Chris Walker
Jimmy Yager

Member: You have some on this list that have been showing

President Walker: That's correct

Melisa: They can't show according to what you have put into the rule

President Walker: Right now part of the call tonight was to discuss some of the specifics such as that rule, and I said in the email that the part of that, that I liked best may in fact create the biggest challenge. Coming up with 5 folks that they can't show a horse, I like that rule as much if not better than I like any other rule that we have in here, but it could create the biggest challenge coming up with 5 good candidates.

Member: What about other family members, or spouses exhibiting.

President Walker: You would have to limit that to spouse's children that are still in the home, and you would probably have to stop there.

Member: So you are saying that they also could not show.

President Walker: Correct, in other words let's make it up but if Joshua Burchfield is on there, then his wife couldn't show, and if he had children in the home then they couldn't show.

Member: Chris could you write this motion where there will be 5 appointed by the board and the names will be given at the winter meetings

President Walker: You could do that just write into the motion that the board will present 5 candidates for that position by winter meetings.

Member: That gives us more time to come up with names

President Walker: They would be named before they voted on it.

Member: Well you automatically eliminate the first two Jim Roberts and Barry Troxtell

Melisa: Barry Troxtell doesn't show anymore

President Walker: If we leave that rule in there we have eliminated cowboy.

Melisa: You would have

Barry Troxtell

Jimmy Yager

Chris Walker

James Burks

Member: But if we write it this new way it will give us a month to come up with new names.

President Walker: If we do this motion, tomorrow we would need to decide to leave that rule in or take it out, as far as showing horses.

Member: Well we have 3 good names right here that don't show, we would only have to come up with 2 more.

Tim Toler: This is what I'm talking about there is just a lot of hesitancy and a lot of grey area; I just can't support it at this time. And to be really honest with you I'm not real sure it's going to solve anything anyway. But that's just me and my opinion. I do appreciate what you are trying to do, and I do appreciate that time that was put into it but as soon as we do this there will be another complaint. The structure of what we need is in place we just aren't getting the information to do anything about it.

President Walker: I do agree with you on part of that, but another big part of this is that it says, they can remove a judge without reason or classification if they see fit. Not we can't do that, as you know better than most, the whole process that you have to go through to get to a place to discipline a judge is ridiculous.

Tim Toler: You're right it is a bureaucratic night mare. But one thing that I have a problem with is the show committee can't get rid of a judge, how can they get rid of a judge before the show, or if they fail a lie detector test but they can't go out and pull a judge from the show. If you have the authority to fire them before or after you have the authority to go out during.

Member: Most people don't want to say anything because you will get black balled, if you get black balled by one you get it from several.

Judy: Tim from yours and my perception of this thing, I have always said that the head of the Judges Committee should not be a showman or an owner of a horse, or a horse trainer we put you in a position that kills Mike, you have to slap their hands this week but show under them next week. If we had a better way of electing the judges and letting the show committee have more authority and have a strong man over the judges that did not show did not train could we not eliminate a lot of this.

Tim: I don't think that I would disagree with you, it does put that person in a bad spot, I think changing that would eliminate some of the problem, and I don't know if it would cure it but I think help.

Member: I think the show manager full authority to do what he or she see fit to do and the committee should stand behind them at that time.

Judy: I think that is the only way to do this.

Member: I do to

Mike: I have always felt that whoever is over the judges committee should not be a trainer also but I know since I have been over it you wouldn't think of it as being black balled but you do get black balled especially after what we have done for a couple of judges last year, and this year,

the committee that we have had for the past two years has not backed down from that we have suffered some consequences from it but we have not backed down from it. In fact we have 4 judges we are looking into and 2 of them have seen what is going to happen. I think whoever is over the judges does need to have the authority to walk out there tap them on the shoulder and say you mess up again your out. And if you have the judges committee or even the board at the spring or world celebration and they see stuff going on and they go to the committee and tell them something is going on will you pull the cards and if this judge is off in left field you bring him in and talk to him, and he goes back out the next night and is doing the same thing, you just walk out and tell him he can go home and collect his pay next week. I believe our show committee can do something like that if it is put in the rule book. It used to be in there. I can remember Joe Bright walking out there and doing that one night. And if we can fire a judge before the celebration ever starts then we can walk out there and do it during the show.

President Walker: I agree with that the show committee probably does have the power to do that, but here is part of the challenge. When the show committee votes to fire a judge that has failed the polygraph test, 1 that's in the rule book, that's automatic, they have something that is black and white that shows that in Jackson's situation you had two judges that put forth the same story from two different angles that had not communicated and they were willing to put it in writing. There you have such black and white evidence that I think it's going to be a hard case to get a show committee that's made up of exhibitors and owners and trainers to come together and say I don't like the way that guy is judging it doesn't look like he is doing a good job. You are getting in a grey area there and to put that on a show committee made up of people that have to then show under this person they just won't do that.

Kelly: That's why I think show manager

President Walker: yes but what if you become show manager Kelly

Kelly: I won't be showing

President Walker: You won't be at that show but you will show again and that judge will remember, it puts you in a bad spot as show manger. You will show at other shows.

Tim Toler: I'm not saying that what you are suggesting Chris and what you have been doing won't work and might be the solution, I just personally have not had time to soak it in and that's my issue.

President Walker: Another reason why I like this idea is the one component that we have missed for years is it is hard to get this group of people on the same page doing anything. As we talk about a direction for the RHBAA that new direction doesn't necessarily need to be set by this

committee however I would suggest that it's the board responsibility to set a direction whatever that direction is. If that direction involves addressing the gait that really needs to come from the board. If that were the case, this board has the ability to get the judges on the same page, right now you have judges from one end of the spectrum to the other in fact you have judges that will judge one way in one class and another way the next class. You don't have any consistency within our program as it is now.

We might not like the direction that, that will go in, but the board and the new committee might decide they like a ridged horse, I may not like that but at the end of the day if they get everyone on the same page I have to abide by that ruling. Or they may choose something in the more racking gait. But getting people on the same page whatever that page is I think is going to be the bigger benefit than we may realize and I think this committee has the ability to do that, if they will approach it from that standpoint.

1:30

Member: I don't have 100% confidence in it, but we need to do something to be prepared for the winter meetings.

Ronnie Hooker: There is a lot of this that I like my problem is there are so many unanswered questions. But just because they want us to do something I don't think we need to be pressured into doing something. I don't want to sound negative against it because I think it's a great idea but I think there needs to be some more explanation in it.

President Walker: If that is what the board wants, you will have to present questions to me because I have answered everything that I can think of within this already.

Jim Morris: Wouldn't this be a good time to present this at winter meetings and just say this is what we have been working on, do you have any questions. And gather questions and answers then.

President Walker: That's fine with me but thinking from a political side if you present at winter meetings answer questions and say you're going to vote in April it will fail. You have two choices, either do a mail out ballot or hold it off until September or the next winter meetings.

Jim Morris: I think something this important should be a mail out ballot anyway

President Walker: Maybe that needs to be the answer any way, if everyone agreed that it needs to be a mail out ballot it would give us the next 2 to 4 weeks to hash it out, and then when we post it, it can be listed as such that it says it will be voted on by mail out ballot, and we will still be able to talk and discuss it at winter meetings.

Member: I think that's the best idea so far. To put everything together and present at winter meetings then do a mail out ballot.

President Walker: Let's take an unofficial vote if you like the idea of posting this in two weeks, and then we would do a mail out 45 days later. If you like that idea vote yes, If you would prefer to move on it now just vote no.

If we decide to do this, this board needs to appoint those 5 people soon, they won't be making any changes as of yet but they need to basically start operating as if they everything was starting. So that they would be up and ready to run if it is voted in.

Yes means you are in agreement of wait 2 to 3 weeks before posting and mailing out a ballot after winter meetings

No means you would prefer to move on it now

Melisa calls votes

Eddie Barrow: Yes

Ronnie Hooker: Yes

Tim Toler: Yes

Fred McRoy: No

Andy Roberts: No

Mike Etheridge: Yes

Chris Walker: _____

Tonya Parson: Yes

Kelly France: Yes

Darlene Harris: Yes

Jim Morris: Yes

Judy Jones: Yes

Kimberly Coult: Yes

President Walker: So based on that we will wait for two to three weeks no more than three weeks to post this thing, which means you need to send questions to me. In my mind it's basically ready to go so if you want more detail I need your help with questions. So that I can either answer your question, or add more information to address the issues.

Melisa do we have anything else to address?

Melisa: We do have appeals from Ken Jackson and Jerry Thacker so we will need to be setting those up.

President Walker: We can do those at winter meetings Thursday night.

Melisa: Nominating committee where are we at

Jim Morris: When would be a good time, tomorrow night would that be ok 7 pm.

Melisa: ok 7pm tomorrow night nominating committee conference call.

President Walker: Ok sounds good, just a reminder please send me emails, what traditionally happens is I don't hear anything, I feel like this is ready to go now, so I won't be able to add to it without your questions and concerns also please send more names if you come up with someone the more we have the better. We can meet at 3pm On Thursday for our meetings.

Tim Toler: I make a motion to adjourn

Jim Morris: I will second it

President Walker: Meeting Adjourned