APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 2015 Online Board Business Session Minutes
(Please see: Attachment 1 - November 2015 Online Business Session Minutes)

February 2016 Online Board Executive Session Minutes
(Please see: Attachment 2 – February 2016 Online Board Executive Session Minutes)

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

SECRETARY’S REPORT

TREASURER’S REPORT

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Judges’ Education Committee
Submitted by: Deb Gibbs, Chair, Terri Krause and Marile Waterstraat

The following is an explanation of the role of the Judges’ Education Committee. The committee is presently comprised of three members, all of whom are also mentors. This is down from past numbers but within the Board policy. The committee fulfills the responsibilities of the Board policy, except perhaps the Quackers articles. (JEC Board Policy-Attachment A)

The committee to the best of its ability uses dogs of good quality, drawn from the geographical region where the seminar is being held, usually solicited from attendees at the seminar giving site. It is important to use dogs of good quality so that judges have a mental image of a correct Toller. Judges have repeatedly stated they appreciate this.

The committee does not solicit judges’ seminars. We are asked to participate in them, aside from our requirement (again see the policy) to hold one at our National. Since the National in 2014, we have been asked to give seminars in/at Michigan, Denver, our National in Wisconsin, Eukanuba, and Portland, OR. We are asked to present at Eukanuba about once every 4 years, and Portland the same. Michigan and our National are presently the only ones that occur every year.

The presenter is reimbursed for expenses of reproducing the Club brochures. We are reimbursed for travel expenses only if we are not already going to be at that show and showing, with Board approval. People whose dogs are used at seminars are not reimbursed for any expenses.

Judges applying for licensing to judge Tollers must earn Component Educational Units. These are outlined on Attachment B. Therefore, it is a requirement of AKC that we provide education in our breed. Seminars must be approved by the JEC to “count” for a judge’s requirements. As
can be seen in Attachment B, prospective judges must/will have many chances to see and evaluate Tollers before they become permit judges and are allowed to judge. Paperwork must be filled out by the presenter, attendance be kept, and promptly returned to the AKC. (Attachment C) Included on this paperwork are the AKC requirements for seminars and breed workshops. These are usually presented on the same day, 1 1/2 hours or more for the seminar, 1 hour for the breed workshop.

Please note on Attachment C, that the presenter must not only be an expert in the breed and able to explain the form and function, history, breed type and essence, and the points of the breed relating to the standard, as well as answer questions, but must also be able to demonstrate or explain breed specific judging. During the seminar, the presenter focuses on the breed in general.

Attachment D: A letter from the AKC outlining the specifics of the judges’ education seminars at Eukanuba in December 2015.

The following is an explanation of the role of Club Ringside Mentors. The Club policy for ringside mentoring was passed by the Board in 2014. (See attachment E) The mentor must know the Standard, and be able to clearly and concisely discuss Toller anatomy, movement, current breed strengths and weaknesses, and breed-specific criteria in relation to the Standard. The mentor may give their opinion on how the breed exhibit meets the standard, focusing on the dog’s merits. The mentor must not mention the accomplishments of a dog, nor about their kennel.

While not specifically stated, mentors are expected to be available for ringside mentoring at Nationals, and at shows they are attending. It is not always possible to know if mentors will be needed. When a judge contacts the JEC requesting a mentor at a show, notice is sent out to local mentors advising them of it. In the past, mentors have sometimes refused to mentor because they are going to be showing and a member of JEC has had to fill in.

A mentor list is given to each judge with their packet at the seminar. A mentor list is also posted on the AKC website so that judges may contact club mentors if they wish. Mentors may exhibit, but must excuse themselves for classes in which they are competing (including if their dog is on a handler or friend in that class). This is an AKC rule. (Attachment F) This rule change was communicated to all mentors on June 25, 2015.

Attachment G: Letter from Jean Gilroy to Deb Gibbs.

Records Chair Update
Submitted by Francine Kaplan, Records Chair

(Please see Attachment 3 – Letter to the BOD)

REGIONAL DIRECTOR REPORTS
None submitted

AGENDA ITEMS:
OLD BUSINESS

Proposal #1: In-person and Annual Meeting Attendance and Reimbursement
Submitted By: Jennifer Hollis
**Proposal: A.** Officers and Directors of the Nova Scotia Duck Tolling Retriever Club (USA) (excluding ex-officio Board members) shall be reimbursed up to $500.00 for attendance at the annual in person Board meeting and Annual Meeting. Receipts for plane fare, hotel rooms, food, car rental and/or mileage shall be sent to the Treasurer for reimbursement.

**Proposal: B.** The Board meeting shall be moved to the day before or day of the annual meeting, thus necessitating Board members having to give up only one or two days of work if that applies. Board members should understand that they will be also giving up an activity during the specialty week. For example, last year would have been obedience and rally. Specialty planning committees should make an effort to rotate the order of activities/schedule so that board members do not always have to miss out on the same activities.

**Proposal: C.** The nominating committee shall provide the candidates with an address (link) to review the NSDTRC-USA Bylaws and specifically the section on duties of the Board of Directors.

**Rationale:**
It is a requirement of the by-laws that the Board of Directors shall gather at least once a year in conjunction with the Club’s Annual Meeting. This is an attempt to improve attendance by the Board both at the Board meeting and at the Annual Meeting. There is a reason why the by-laws call for face-to-face meetings once a year. It allows us to discuss what is often our most important business, in an atmosphere of congeniality and desire to work together for the good of the Club. For most of the past 30 years, attendance has not been a problem, but recently has become one. This is something we need to fix.

It was very difficult to face many members after the Annual Meeting at last year’s specialty and answer the questions about why so few Board members were present, and others were not. If the Board had been present, there would have been a quorum and business could have been brought before the Board. Not having the Board present, fosters concern for the future of the Club…are we in financial trouble, is the Club crumbling, or do the Directors just not care? In many clubs non-attendance is cause for removal from office. Many clubs do reimburse part of their director’s expenses to attend in person meetings. Some clubs ask potential nominees if they can afford to travel to their in-person meetings.

From the By-laws.
Section 3. Board Meetings.
The Board of Directors shall gather in person for at least one (1) meeting each year in conjunction with the Club’s Annual Meeting, if possible. Other meetings of the Board shall be held at such times and places as are designated by the President or by a majority vote of the entire Board and may be conducted in person, via teleconference, or videoconference. Written notice of each such other meetings shall be mailed by the Secretary to each member of the Board at least fourteen (14) days prior to the date of the meeting. The quorum for a Board meeting shall be a majority of the Board.

**Administration:** Treasurer to reimburse board members, nominating committee to provide candidate’s with information.
Financial implications:
Part A: 4 officers: $2000. 7 Directors: $3500 Potential Total per year: $5500
Part B and C: no cost

Specific Board Action Requested: Approval of Proposal A, B and C.

Proposal #2: Expansion of Judges Education Committee
Submitted by: Jean Gilroy
Responses Submitted by the JEC

Description: Responses to the above proposal for BOD discussion. The proposal will be uploaded to the forum for review.

Financial Implications: TBD

Specific Board Action Requested: To approve the responses from the JEC.

NEW BUSINESS
Proposal #1: Investigate Participation in Championship Breeders Website as a Club for General Breed Content
Submitted by: Jennifer Hollis

Proposal Description: Championship Breeders (championshipbreeders.com) is a new website under development with a public launch expected in late spring 2016. This website will help the club promote our breed to the public and is generally trying to raise awareness about purebred dogs. Promotion is free to all parent clubs. The Public Education Chair can further investigate the participation in this website for general breed content such as promotion of our national specialty, inclusion of the club’s website and Facebook group, any other events we would like to promote to the public, photos, and possible future articles or creative content.

Proposal Justification: The website creators say they have the expertise and resources to make this a highly ranked and respected website on Google and that their technical capabilities enable them to attach a large audience of people interested in purebred dogs and their future. Since participation is free and we should be able to provide a lot of our existing materials I would recommend we further investigate our participation. I don’t think it could hurt to provide our public education materials and further reference our website and Facebook page for those who might be interested in learning more about our breed.

Administration: Public Education Chair

Financial implications: none (free)

Specific Board Action Requested: Approval of proposal
Proposal #2: Use the NSDTRC-USA logo for bags to be used at the Region 2 All Breed Agility Trial in 2016. 
Submitted by: Carolyn Glenn/Kim Simons

Proposal Justification: Region 2’s all breed agility trial has been moved to a new and better location this year; inside on mats. We want to give our MACH/PACH winners, the judge and entered Tollers a goodie bag and would like to have the Club logo embroidered on the bag. This was pre-approved via email.

Administration and Financial Implication: None

Specific Board Action Requested: Approve request

Proposal #3: Revisit the Board's Actions to fill open Board/Committee position's during a term
Submitted by: Kim Simons

Proposal Description: Our current policy is when a position on the Board or on a committee comes open during the Club year, that the Board would advertise for one month to find volunteers to fill the position. In certain instances, this may not be feasible and positions would need to be filled faster than the month time frame. Does the Board want to reconsider this to allow for emergency appointments during the time we advertise to fill positions?

Administration/Financial Impact: None

Specific Board Action Requested: Discuss and determine the best policy.

Proposal #4: Review Fran Kaplan's proposed changes to ROM/ROMX program
Submitted by: Fran Kaplan/Kim Simons

Proposal Description: Fran has put together a revised ROM/ROMX program that incorporates new AKC titles. See attachment H (9 pages)

Administration: If changes are approved, Fran will revise the official program "rules" and submit to put on our website.

Financial Impact: None

Specific Board Action Required: Review proposal and determine best course of action.
Proposal #5:  Standard Committee Action  
Submitted by:  Laura White/Kim Simons

Proposal Description:  The following items need to be discussed and reviewed by the Board for the Standard Committee:
   A.  Acceptance of Peggy Parks' resignation from the Standard Committee
   B.  Approval of a "gift" of honor for her years of support for the Club
   C.  Approve Sue Dorscheid's appointment to the Standard Committee
   D.  Appoint Laura White as Standard Committee Chairperson

Financial Implication:  Up to $100 for a gift for Peggy Park

Specific Board Action Required:  Review proposal and determine best course of action.

Proposal #6:  Best Veteran Trophy  
Submitted by:  Kim Simons

Proposal Description:  To approve up to $500 to replace the Best Veteran trophy that was broken during shipment to the 2015 Specialty.  Neither the shipper nor UPS will take responsibility for replacement.

Financial Implication:  Up to $500 expenditure

Specific Board Action Required:  Approve the Proposal.

Proposal #7:  Add the ability to use live shot at Club Field tests to allow involvement of other breeds.  
Submitted by:  Alyson Casper

Proposal Description:  I am requesting the board address the ability to insure the Club field tests allowing live shot to be used, if desired.

Proposal Justification:  This is an issue specifically in areas where the number of tollers is small.  When there are a smaller number of tollers, it makes it impractical to have a Club field test just for our breed.  In order to include other breeds i.e. goldens, flat coats, or labs, live fire is required.  We have worked to piggy back with the club tests sponsored by those other breeds, but our ability to do this has been limited.  Recently, the other clubs have commented that we ask and they go ahead and include us when they do not feel this is reciprocated.  These clubs also noted they do make money at these test.  Allowing us to use live shot would increase the ability of getting more toller owners involved in obtaining field titles, just by having an opportunity to get involved.  Also, it would enable us to make money for the Club by being able to include additional hunting breeds.
Administration: The Club Field Chair would approve the Event and the Test Field Chair would administer the Event. The Treasurer would obtain insurance for the Event. The Application to hold a Field Test would have to be updated as well as the NSDTRC (USA) Field Tests Rules & Regulations.

Financial Implications: Although I am not sure of the cost of the insurance or if it is obtained per incident or for the year, but this would allow our regional clubs to make money for the NSDTRC-USA by hosting tests where additional breeds can be included.

Specific Board Action Requested: To approve the use of live shot at Club field tests when requested.

Proposal #8: Region 1 to Host the 2018 National Specialty  
Submitted by: Shelly Kurth

Proposal Description: Please see attachment I (4 pages)

Specific Board Action Requested: To approve Region 1 to Host the 2018 National Specialty.

Proposal #9: Award Best Owner Handler at Nationals and have it NOHS eligible  
Submitted by: Rochelle Kurth

Proposal Description: Now that the Owner Handler is a special attraction and open to all clubs (was exclusive to All Breed), I would like to see the NSDTRC-USA add it to the final lineup of ribbons at a national specialty. This would be a National Owner Handler series win and the appropriate amount of points would be awarded through AKC. I would also like to see this as a permanent change, something to hold at every national.

Justification: Tollers are still predominately owner handled, and looking at our rankings, NOHS is very supported by Toller owners. The rankings for this current year (2015) have 73 dogs ranked. 2014 had 48 dogs ranked. 2013 had 27. This is continuing to gain popularity and I would like to see the NSDTRC – USA on board with it.

Administration: No one new. Some additional paperwork for the Nationals Chairman, they would need to submit a special attraction form to the AKC (see Attachment J (2 pages)), add a box to check for owner handler to the entry form, and make sure it is advertised in the premium. The steward’s job will increase a bit too. He/she would need to keep track of who is an owner handler (only those who check the box are eligible) and make sure they don’t go too far from the ring if they are needed back in for owner handler.

Financial Impact: An Additional rosette, usually seen as orange or rainbow, added to the final lineup of rosettes at a national. The hope is that entries will increase by this and the cost of the additional rosette will be covered by the profit from the increase.
Additional Info: If anyone who does not compete in NOHS or needs additional info on it, it can be found here: [http://www.akc.org/events/nohs/](http://www.akc.org/events/nohs/)

Specific Board Action: Accept the proposal as written and implement it immediately so the 2016 national has time to get the appropriate paperwork in.

Proposal #10: Owner Handler Sweepstakes
Submitted by: Rochelle Kurth

Description: With the possibility of Sweepstakes opening up to professional handlers who also breed and own Tollers, I think it would be very beneficial to add an event specifically for owner handlers. Several other clubs have Owner Handler sweepstakes, I have loosely modeled ours after the way the German Wirehaired Pointer Club of America does theirs. Please note this is also owner handler sweeps, not amateur owner handler, so the rules are also loosely based off the National Owner Handler series. The prize money and ribbons are based off of existing NSDTRC (USA) Sweeps.

Class Description/set up:

Owner Handler Sweepstakes

This is a non-regular competition to showcase our owner handlers. No points are awarded for it for the NOHS or any AKC title. Dogs must be handled in this class by an owner of record. To be eligible for this class, the exhibitor must not be a professional handler* or a current handlers assistant**. In the event of the same owner winning multiple classes, the additional dog may be passed off to an exhibitor meeting the above criteria for best in sweeps.

*Professional handlers are defined as any person who belongs or has belonged to a professional handlers organization, distributed rate cards, or otherwise advertised or represented themselves as handling dogs for pay within the last 5 years.

**Professional handlers assistant is defined as someone who was paid to help show, groom, or perform other tasks for a professional handler within the past 6 months.

Classification

- Puppy Dog(6-18) - For dogs that are at least 6 months of age and under 18 months of age who are not a champion of record with the American Kennel Club
● Adult Dog(18+) - For dogs that are over 18 months of age who are not champions of record with the American Kennel Club
● Champion Dog - For dogs of any age who are a champion of record with the American Kennel Club
● Veteran Dog - For dogs that are at least 7 years of age, does not have to be a champion of record with the American Kennel Club
● Puppy Bitch(6-18) - For bitches that are at least 6 months of age and under 18 months of age who are not a champion of record with the American Kennel Club
● Adult Bitch(18+) - For bitches that are over 18 months of age who are not champions of record with the American Kennel Club
● Champion Bitch - For bitches of any age who are a champion of record with the American Kennel Club
● Veteran Bitch - For bitches that are at least 7 years of age, does not have to be a champion of record with the American Kennel Club

Distribution of Owner Handler Sweeps money

35% of the money is to be retained by the Club for expenses. The remaining 65% is known as the sweepstakes fund and will be divided as follows:
● Best in sweeps - 20% of Sweepstakes Fund
● Best of Opposite to Best in Sweepstakes - 15% of Sweepstakes Fund
● First Place - 15% of Sweepstakes Fund
● Second Place - 7.5% of Sweepstakes Fund
● Third Place - 5% of Sweepstakes Fund
● Fourth Place - 2.5% of Sweepstakes Fund

Ribbon Prizes

First Place - Rose Ribbon or Rosette
Second Place - Brown Ribbon or Rosette
Third Place - Light Green Ribbon or Rosette
Fourth Place - Grey Ribbon or Rosette
Best In Sweepstakes - Pink and Green Ribbon/Rosette
Best of Opposite in Sweepstakes - Lavender Ribbon/Rosette

Administration: Nothing formal. Potentially the Specialty chairmen looking into ineligible entries, but nothing new from other sweeps already implemented.
Financial Impact: I haven't seen a need for any money from the Club. The ribbons/rosettes/prizes will be sponsored by the general public or taken out of the expenses portion of the entry fees. There is potential for the club to make money though, off of entries. The only impact I see where we might need money from the club is if the entries are very low - which I don't foresee based on how the NOHS has taken off in our breed. I can see people supporting this as well.

Specific Board Action:
To accept the proposal as written and implement it immediately so that the 2016 national has time to get everything ready to hold it. If the board rejects this because they feel it needs a committee to debate it, I would like to be a part of the committee. I have done a lot of research on the subject and would like to work with them to make this happen.

Proposal #11: Re-define who is eligible for Sweepstakes at Nationals
Submitted by: Rochelle Kurth

Description: My goal is to make a permanent definition for who is eligible to compete in the sweepstakes classes. Last national (2015), the definition was vague, contradicting itself, and very very restrictive. It was changed twice and still very restrictive. I would also like to make this definition a permanent NSDTR Club definition, instead of allowing the national's committee to pick and choose each year the one it wants to have. They would have to use the club provided definition.

Proposed definition: Professional handlers* may not compete in sweeps unless he or she is an owner or breeder of record of the dog(s) being handled.

*Professional handlers are defined as any person who belongs or has belonged to a professional handler’s organization, distributed rate cards, or otherwise advertised or represented themselves as handling dogs for pay within the last 5 years.

Note to the Board: This is very easy for the club and Nationals committee to police without having to deal with hearsay. (ex: I heard so and so handled so and so's dog for money, like was seen at the 2015 national). If a handler comes into question, it is a very simple process to provide the akc paperwork of the dogs entered, and is easily accessible online nowadays and is public record through AKC for anyone who has a free account.

Justification and Financial Impact: When in this sport long enough, you usually end up doing one (or two or three) of 4 things eventually. You become a handler, a judge, a BOD member for a Breed or All breed club, or end up as a chairman or committee member for an event. All 4 of those - you don't stop being a breeder, or an owner. All 4 can have politics attached, and all 4 can
be completely honest. Which is the reasoning for no handlers - politics. But that criteria can apply to many different aspects of dog showing. Why is only one class of people being excluded? We are still breeders, and should have the ability to show in an event meant to showcase a breeder's up and coming, their hunting dogs, their veterans. I understand not allowing a person to hire a professional for sweeps, but those who are both breeders and handlers should not be punished. We are viewing this as a type of discrimination and I would like to resolve it.

These two (justification and financial) are also combined for an important reason - one of the reasons for the change is the amount of money the club and national lost. This year alone, the 2015 national affected at least 15 known people, and lost 26 known entries. 26 entries = $442 in entry fees. I would like to stress that this is a known lost amount, this is minimum. There is a much greater unknown loss amount that can't be measured at this time. How many people chose to not come and support the national at all because they felt discriminated against? How many chose to cut their entries down or left dogs at home because they felt discriminated against? How much are both the known number of discriminated against breeders and the lost entries going to increase by should this continue to future nationals? AKC encourages Junior Handlers to work for professional handlers, I predict that number of discriminated against breeders will continue to rise. And considering the discriminated against people are also breeders, they will continue to produce dogs. I can see this becoming a major loss for the club.

**Final notes/thoughts:** I also understand the need to recognize the owner handler in some way, but discriminating in sweeps is not the way to do it. Please see my proposal concerning Best Owner Handler added to the final ribbons and Owner Handler sweeps to showcase our owner handlers without discriminating against and excluding an entire section of people from our club. These affected breeders pay dues to this club, they attend club events - and are very hurt by the blatant exclusion of from an entire section of events.

**Specific Board Action Requested:** To accept the definition exactly as written. If the board would like to make changes to the definition, please contact me, we can rewrite the proposal with board requested changes. As one of the affected breeders and the one representing the majority of the affected breeders, I would like to be included in the changes start to finish.

**Proposal #12:** Update the Supported Entry Application with a line item for AKC Division and the physical address for the Host Show Chair

Submitted by: Ann DiSilvestre

**Description:** The Supported Entry Application should be updated to include a line item for AKC Division and the Host Show Chair’s mailing address.
**Justification:** The current policy is to allow two Supported Entries per AKC Division. Since the NSDTRC (USA) Regions do not match the AKC Divisions, there is some confusion as to whether or not an Entry is allowed. For instance, NY and PA are in the same AKC Division but in Regions 1 and 7 respectfully. By adding the AKC Division on the form, it should be much clearer. Additionally, the Host Show Chair’s name, email, and phone number are listed on the form but not their address. An Official letter stating that the NSDTRC (USA) has approved the Supported Entry needs to be mailed to the Host Show Chair. It would be greatly appreciated if this information was provided on the application since it can be very time consuming tracking down this information.

**Administration:** A one-time change to the Supported Entry Application by the Webmaster.

**Financial Implication:** None

**Specific Board Action Requested:** Approve the updates to the Supported Entry Application.

---

**Proposal #13:** Separation of Supported Entries Dates to Encourage Maximum Participation

**Submitted by:** Betsy Fogg- Vice President

**Description:** To ensure maximum member participation in supported entries by requiring a minimum of two weekends between the dates of supported entries in the same region or if the supported entries are within 500 miles radius of each other.

**Justification:** Our club has always restricted the number of supported entries allowed and required majors to guarantee high membership attendance. This year Region 1 and Region 7 will be holding supported entries on the same weekend. This will force club members to miss one of the few chances they have for a supported entry. To attend both, members will first have to drive significant distance to get to one supported Friday night, show Saturday and then drive 250 miles to get to the other supported entry Saturday night, then drive home on Sunday. Saturday evening seminars, dinners, fund raisers etc. are a part of many supported entries, and will be harmed by the current arrangement as will overall entries. Many supported entries hold events in addition to a show and have grown their member participation, number and type of events offered, and introduced members to events they have never before participated in with their tollers. We should be doing all we can to encourage more participation and cross participation in multiple events at our supported entries, not limiting members ability to attend.

**Financial Implications:** It is expected to see an increase in participation of club members which if the supported entries are properly run will result in a net financial gain.

**Specific Board Action Requested:** The Board of Directors will need to approve a policy of requiring a minimum of two weekends between the dates of supported entries in the same region or if the supported entries are within 500 miles radius of each other. It is requested this action become effective for all supported entries held after Jan. 1, 2017.
Proposal #14: Change in 2016 Specialty Dates
Submitted by: Kim Simons

Description: Due to venue availability, the dates for the 2016 National Specialty need to be changed to October 16 – October 19, 2016.

Financial Implication: None

Specific Board Action Requested: Approval to change the dates to October 16 – October 19, 2016

Proposal #15: Mock Field Test
Submitted by: Kathy Zirolli; rb Cody@comcast.net; 860.673.8852 (home); 860.558.7779 (mobile); 76 Tamara Circle, Avon, CT 06001

Description: Host a “Mock Field Test” training day on Saturday, April 2, 2016. This will be a training day for members and non-members (if guests of a member) to prepare their dogs for field hunt tests. There will be birds and bumpers for retrieving and tolling. We will be using dead and live birds and live ammo for this event. The location is Nod Brook WMA in Simsbury, CT. The date/field has been secured with the CT Department of Energy & Environmental Protection.

Justification: This event serves to prepare for upcoming hunt tests and to increase future participation in club field tests.

Administration: Kathy Zirolli and Jason Cyr will be organizing this event.

Financial Implications: There is no cost to the club to hold this event. All costs will be covered by participants.

Specific Board Action Requested: Provide approval to hold this event and proof of insurance.

Proposal #16: Nova Scotia Duck Tolling Retriever Club (USA) AKC PAC Fund Drive
Proposal
Submitted by: Bob Eisele by way of Ann DiSilvestre

Description: I am proposing the NSDTRC form a Fund Drive committee, to soliciting club members to donate to the AKC PAC. The goal would be to collect an average of $10 per member.

1) Throughout the year we would solicitation donation through the club newsletter. Each newsletter would have a list of the members that have made a donations to date.
2) First direct solicitation would be an email.
3) Second direct solicitation would be to those club members that have not made a donation, would be made via US mail with a stamped returned envelope enclosed.
4) Third solicitation to those club members that have not made a donation would be via email.
5) Depending on the whether we have met our goal, a second mailing would be sent, without returned envelope.
6) Donations would be made payable to AKC PAC and mailed to an assigned person to keep track of who has made a donation and should be removed from further solicitations.

**Justification:** The American Kennel Club has taken the lead in supporting legislation across the country that protects the rights of responsible dog owners. The AKC Political Action Committee gives us an additional tool with which to interface with legislators. Through this non-partisan PAC, we can demonstrate a unity of purpose that helps us advance a positive legislative agenda. The AKC PAC collects voluntary contributions from individuals and uses these donations to support candidates who defend dog owners' rights and can effectively influence legislation impacting animal owners. Our donations will be pooled with contributions from other AKC club members across the country to strengthen our support for reasonable, enforceable laws that protect the health and welfare of purebred dogs and do not restrict the rights of breeders and owners who take their responsibilities seriously. Contributions to this fund are not deductible on federal tax returns. Federal law requires us to use our best efforts to collect and report the name, mailing address, occupation and name of employer of individuals whose contributions exceed $200 in a calendar year*. The maximum annual contribution to the AKC PAC is $5,000. All contributions are voluntary.

**Administration:** In 2012 I chaired the Siberian Husky Club of America PAC Fund drive following the same process I described above. The club had 600 members and we were able to collect over $5,000. Not everyone contributed, many contributed more than the suggest $10 minimum. I used Quickbooks to merge the member’s names and addresses into the form letters.

**Financial Implication:** It must be understood the club is not permitted to contribute to the PAC, but there are no rules against the club spending money to solicit donations. The cost to the club would be the cost of stationary and postage.

**Specific Board Action Requested:** Needed would be the approval to spend the club money on stationary/postage. Approval would be needed to post requests for donations and a list of donors in the club newsletters. Approval would also be needed to get the contact information of all club members, with email addresses, in either Quickbook export file format or Excel format.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

**Proposal #1:** Personnel Issue

**Proposal #2:** Consideration for a NSDTRC-USA Club Approved Mentor in the AKC Mentoring Program
ADJOURNMENT