



Board of Delegates Meeting
Nashua, NH
Radisson Hotel
June 23, 2019

Attendance:

Officers: Lois DeBlois, President; Jack Mahoney, Vice President; Joseph Brouillard, Treasurer; Carolyn Weiser, Secretary; Robert Bertoni, Past President & District Director
Invited Guests (non-voting)- Sally Kirtley, Tournament Manager; Peter Marcus, DIC
Delegates:

EMBA – Unit 108 - 18 - of 18

Saul Agranoff, David Aronson, Curtis Barton, Maureen Bitler, Peter Clay, Steve Diamond, Lynn Duncan, Paul Harris (Hardin Matthews Alt.), Jo Megna-Wallace, Sabrina Miles, Brenda Montague, Neil Montague (S. Hotamisligil alt.), Dean Panagopoulos, Ashok Rao , Linda Robinson, Jan Smola, AlixTaylor, Ru Hong Terajewicz
Absent, Selen Hotamisligil, Hardin Matthews

CMBA – Unit 113 - 1 of 2

Joan Kuklinski, *Absent, Jeanne Robillard*

CBA – Unit 126 -12 of 13

Phyllis Bausher, Larry Bausher, Larry, Paul Burnham, Richard DeMartino, Sandy DeMartino, Ausra Geaski, Robert Huntington, Mary Petit (S. Wavada alt.)
Michael Smith, Susan , Smith, Sonja Smith, Michael Wavada,
Absent, Esther Watstein, Susan Wavada

RIBA – Unit 145 - 4 of 4

Linda Ahrens, Maureen Fahey, Marguerite Gousie, Marshall Williams,
Absent none

NHBA – Unit 150 - 1 of 4

Wayne Burt *Absent: Ross Huntington, Krzysztof Jarosz, Sarah*

Widhu

VBA –Unit 175 - 2 of 3

Karen Hewitt Randle, Steve Randle (W. Hersey alt.) *Absent: Wayne Hersey, Phil Sharpsteen*

MBA – Unit 189 - 2 of 4

Dan Morgenstern, Jack Mahoney *Absent: Allen McRae, Teri McRae*

WMBA – Unit - 196 - 3 of 3

Robert Brodner, Peter Samsel, Bob Sagor, *Absent : none*

President Lois DeBlois called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM. She thanked Wayne and Susan Burt for chairing the tournament. She especially thanked Susan Burt for her

exceptional work at arranging partnerships. Marshall Williams took on the job for the Longest Day.

As there were no questions or corrections, the Minutes from the meeting of the Board of Delegates held in Mansfield, MA, November 11, 2018 was accepted as sent.

Treasurer's Report - Joseph Brouillard

The Statement of Financial Position shows our current Net Assets are \$156,261, This looks healthy but our Working Capital is down to \$35,256 because of our continuing losses at our regionals. A few years ago, it was \$60,000. We really need to turn a profit. We raised card fees, but this has not helped because our table count continues to decline.

The NABC Fund as of Friday was up \$3,600 to just over \$104,000. The GRF (Grass Roots Fund) money artificially boosted our assets, but this is restricted to NAP and GNT use.

The Operating Income Statement shows that we have lost \$11,554 to date. We lost \$5,594 at the Cape (Senior Regional) This follows a loss there in 2018 of \$12,539. The primary cause of the loss is a decrease in table count.

Our expenses are up a bit. We have an expense of \$951 for credit card processing fees. The NAP stipend is at \$2,000 up from \$1,000. We are \$11,554 in the red for the current year.

(L, Robinson) What returns do we get?

(J, Brouillard) All of our cash is in a Fidelity Money Market Fund, which pays 2%. We have a Long Term Liability of \$1,020 for the vouchers that have been sold but have yet to be cashed.

(L. Duncan) What is the NABC Fund money held in?

(J Brouillard) It is in 2 bond funds: the Doubleline and the Pimco Funds as well as the Fidelity Puritan Fund, which is 40% bonds. We also invest in the Fidelity Low Priced Stock Fund.

Tournament Manager's Report - Sally Kirtley

The Gold Mine Regional

We lost \$119. We had no way to accurately predict the number of players who would attend the event and we were over staffed. We will do much better next year.

Cromwell (Presidential Regional)

Cromwell is always dependent on weather. We contractually have to spend a specified amount on hospitality to offset out use of the playing areas. I will try to renegotiate this but we do have a contract. I will do the best I can.

Senior Regional

We are moving to the Hyannis Conference Center in 2020. It was a much better deal than the Cape Codder. We hope that the players will come. The playing space is large and well lit. There are many restaurants and shops nearby, many within walking distance. The Falmouth Hotel was lovely but it was a long walk to the playing area. The Conference Center has an issue with stairs, but the staff is aware of the problem and has blocked off 20 handicapped rooms for the players who need them. They will be available to help with luggage. There are no stairs from the lobby to the playing area. There is a firm that will deliver scooters.

(P. Clay) Hotel Hospitality seems to be a big issue. It was up \$20% last year. There was a big increase in Cromwell. It seems to be the pattern everywhere.

(S. Kirtley) The costs for hospitality at Cromwell was largely due to a learning curve on my part. If you look at Falmouth, we spent less than the previous year. I try to get as close as I can to the minimum we have to spend to fulfill our contract. Food costs are up. A cookie costs \$2.50 now rather than \$2.00.

(D. Aronson) Warwick seems to be where we make money and try to make up the losses.

(J. Brouillard) We made money in Mansfield and Warwick.

(S. Agranoff) Tournaments are down everywhere due to the aging population. How do D-25 tournaments match up with others?

(R. Bertoni) In 2016 & 2017, we increased by 20% and 15%. We have had a hard time holding the gains. Our decline is less than the bulk of the ACBL. Albany, for example, was a disaster.

(R. DeMartino) There is a decline across the country. Gatlinburg was down \$1,000 tables. We do significantly better than most.

(S. Kirtley) On another note, Helen Pawlowski has a new granddaughter. She loves retirement.

Presentation on Tournament Formats - DIC Peter Marcus

(A. Geaski) I played in the KO yesterday. D. Metcalf after 3 hours game us a warning. Is the KO a timed event? If it is, it needs to be publicized.

(P. Marcus) The KO's have always been a timed event. Every event is timed. We tend to be a bit more liberal with the KOs, but the KO's started at 10:00 and the next session begins at 2:15. It is difficult to use a clock as the timing is different for head-to-head matches versus 3-way. We go around and try to remind teams that are falling behind. David (Metcalf) made an announcement when there was 30 minutes to go. In reality, when you are concentrating, you may not hear it. We try, but we cannot make sure that everyone hears. There is nothing new here. In general, teams have not run into problems before.

(A. Geaski) What is the timing rule?

(P. Marcus) The general rule is 7 minutes per board. We go give a grace period. It is about 3 hours and 15 minutes. The timing does not begin until the assignments go out. Pairs are easy, but KOs are still timed.

(D. Aronson)

I was part of a team that David came around and announced that we had 4 minutes to go. If he could remind us earlier, it would be easier.

(P. Marcus) The announcement was made with 30 minutes to go and again at 5 minutes. The KOs are run the same way every KO has been run in this District. We usually hear from the A's who want to take forever. This has never happened before for those under the A's, but we did not do anything differently.

(S. Agranoff) Yesterday there was a pair game with 3 sections with 12 tables. We did not have a web. The individual boards that a given pair played were very different from those played by another pair.

(P. Marcus) We do use webs in the A/X and Midflight. We don't use them in the Gold Rush or in an A-B-C event. For 3 sections, we used 4 sets of boards. A web would have needed 8-9. This is a real cost. There are webs for 24, but they are more prone to error.

As a general rule in an open event, we tend not to use them. Yes, we did have 12-table sections. At 2 o'clock, we had 11 table sessions sold up to that time. I am not sure why the director on the floor made the decision he did. Was it rational, yes. I would not do it if there had been time to plan. It is simply safer. If there is an error in a 12-table web, you can't fix it.

(P. Clay) Communication needs to be better. I was in the KO and I never heard the announcement. You get in the zone and don't hear.

(P. Marcus) It never happened before. It was a learning experience. We will do better.

(P. Najarian) In the Thursday KO, we were ahead at the half. The other team decided to switch their N/S Pairs (for East/West) We lost the event. The same thing happened the next day. What are our rights?

(P. Marcus) Call the director. No one has any rights in the middle of an event. As a rule, if you are behind, you may choose to change positions. This has been true in seeded KOs, but we do not seed any more. If you have any other questions, get in touch with me. I will send you the answers.

Tournament / Scheduling Committee Report - Bob Bertoni for Vice President Jack Mahoney

Sponsor Program

We are moving forward with the Sponsor program at Regionals. It should be in place by 2020. Individuals or companies can participate. Companies might get a right off. It is a way to try to get some money into the coffers.

Maximizing point awards

We will add a Gold Rush flight under both the Team and Pairs events- AXY-BCD. For example, on Wednesday the winners in the pair game received 30+ points where as the winners in the team game received just over 11. This was because there was no flight under the teams. We will try to maximize the point awards for both teams and pairs.

Senior Regional - changes in location

The ACBL confirmed that there is no requirement that we hold the Senior Regional on the Cape. We are looking at several possible sites including a casino. It cannot happen in 2020 as we could not find a suitable site that was immediately available.

We are asking for a vote regarding a proposal to change the format for the midweek KOs. The ACBL has changed the way we can run KOs. In the past, you had to have 9 teams in each bracket for a 4-session event. We tried the new format at the Cape. We had 24 teams in 6 brackets. 67% of the teams made the overalls and received gold. There were issues. The current proposal would use this format only for teams whose total points were under 10,000. We would try for 5-teams in every bracket. 80% would go on to the next day and earn gold. The current plan, partly as a marketing ploy, is to give the one losing team a free entry to a single session event. It would be "win gold or play free." There are those that are concerned with the free play as the district is bleeding money. The executive committee voted to eliminate the chits for Sunday, saving \$6,500. The event is called the Knock-in Knock Out. 80% of the teams that enter will get gold. 67% if there are 6 teams. The marketing slogan is "Win Gold or play free." Option 1 is to give the free play for the Side game series. This would cost us only \$11.50 per table. This

wasn't discussed at the Executive Committee meeting because there was a motion to remove the free play. There are four choices: Play free at a 2-session event if knocked out. Play free at a Side Game, reject the free play entirely, reject the idea entirely. This would apply only to teams with total mps over 10,000. The motion was passed was that the Knock-in Knockouts be run without the Free play component.

(R. DeMartino) Did the ACBL approve this? It's outrageous. Long term, if you give everyone gold..... Five teams with 4 winners. The masterpoint awards will not be trivial. We've been selling masterpoints, but they become LMs and stop coming. Long term the effect will be negative. It is too easy to get gold. Half the board must have been sleeping when this was passed. A 5-team KO will pay more than winning the Life-master Pairs.

(R. Bertoni) It should be illegal. Many districts have trouble with KOs. The top bracket will be more than 6 teams. The ACBL published this format guidelines. The Executive Committee (of the ACBL) did pass it.

(L. Duncan) What is the implication of we voted against it. Would it affect it?

(B. Bertoni) If you vote against it, we could not do it here. It would have no effect on the ACBL or if the format could be used elsewhere. It is designed to maximize the awards to all players. People will come to play to get gold.

(L. Duncan) Our vote would only affect us.

(B. Bertoni) Round robins would still be legal. They would not be scheduled purposefully in 5 or 6 teams.

(P. Clay) I agree with Richard. The implications of selling gold have a positive short-term effect but the long-term effect would be negative if we agree to do this.

(L. Robinson) The Executive Committee voted for it. What number do we need to revote it?

(R. Bertoni) 51%

(M. Fahey) I'm at the bottom. If you do not pass this, I will go to other regionals. We need to draw the players once and get them to come back. If we don't pass it, I will go elsewhere.

(D. Morgenstern) This was discussed last night. Our financial condition is poor. We need to attract tables. This is an attraction that can help our financial position.

(R. Bertoni) Very likely. More teams will come and we will get more income. I was against it. The Gold Rush players when they get to 750 points won't come anymore. We will get short-term income, but the consequences will last. We will get many tables. We need to generate newer players coming (to regionals).

(J. Kuklinski) This degrades the whole event.

(R. Terajewicz) This is my first meeting here. I never heard of trying to draw players, especially at this level. We did the Gold Mine Regional. It had a good turnout. Personally, I direct games of 36 tables. There are very few Life Masters. Few of the players understand Swiss, let alone KOs. They would not care if there were 5 teams or 9 teams. The need to understand the event. During the Gold Mine-Rainbow, I ran into many of my students. Everyone complained about the flyers. That they were misleading. This is the reason they will not come back,

(R. Bertoni) How does this relate to this question?

(R. Terajewicz) We need to do more to address these complaints.

(J. Smola) I am very much against 5-team brackets. If you are trying to bring in new players, did the players in the traditional KOs a few years bring in new players, No. I don't think this will help.

(P. Burnham) There is a 10,000 limit. Could an eligible team choose to play up? My objective isn't gold points.

(P. Marcus) Gold points benefit the new players. Sue (Miguel) said that from Rhode Island alone she could bring 10-15 tables. Another thing is the overalls. We don't have games for the 751 player. The can come and play in the midflight and win overall. Our target is the bottom and the middle. The 10,000 is because we want to avoid what happened with the STaCs. We want to keep the pros out. We have had a lot come back as a result of the free KO. The total was 9 teams, now it is 40. Nothing is perfect. Will they get gold faster, yes. Will this help the 750 player, yes. The ACBL is in a bad state. We are trying to get the players to come and come back. First, we have to get them to show up. If it fails, we can drop it.

(M. Wavada) I look at attendance by masterpoints for every regional. What does worse and worse is the 0-300. We lost 3 tables from the Thursday/Friday KOs. We had 4 brackets. This could be 20-30 brackets if we publicize it correctly. If we have people explaining it at their local games, it would have a gigantic short-term affect.

(R. Bertoni) I agree 100%. It will create a lot of excitement.

Call the vote to support the decision of the Executive Committee (as explained above) By a show of hands: 17 for/ 16 against.

President DeBlois noted that a review of the bylaws was important to Allan Clamage. I made a promise to him. Paula Najarian talked to Allan. He died before the procedure could be completed. I cannot thank Paula (Najarian) and Linda (Ahrens) enough for the time they have spent. You have had several weeks to digest the changes. I hope that we can make a single motion to accept the changes. A full review would be very time consuming.

(P. Najarian) Linda (Ahrens) and I applaud the time you have taken to review the several documents that you have received over the past several months. Any suggestions that were sent were sent were incorporated into the bylaws or a response was made.

Proposed By-law Revision - Paula Najarian and Linda Ahrens

(B. Montague) I have a question about the wording

Treasurer

Part 2 - when both the President and Vice President are not available to chair. There seems to be a conflict. In part 2, At an Executive Committee meeting the Immediate Past President will preside. At a Board of Delegates Meeting, the Treasurer will preside.

(P. Najarian) The Immediate Past President is not a member of the Board of Delegates, therefore the Treasurer would preside. The Secretary is busy with other matters.

[note: the Immediate Past President could be a member of the BoD but not in the capacity of Immediate Past President.]

(L. Robinson) I would like to separate section 414. This section changes the powers of this body.

(P. Najarian) This was reviewed by the Executive Committee. The consensus was that a 2/3 vote was better.

(L. Robinson) I believe that it should continue at 50%. Two-thirds is impossible.'

(S. Agranoff) I am also not in favor of 414. I would like a separate vote.

(L. Robinson) I make a motion that we take a separate vote on 414. The motion was seconded and so approved.

(P. Najarian) There will be a separate vote.

(D. Aronson) You swapped 9.1.2. It is now 9.1.1. There seems to be a conflict between the 2010 version where there could be an amendment from the floor and the change where the delegates would need a 15-day notice for any amendment.

(P. Najarian) It was just a switch in the numbers. They can amend but there must be a 15-day notice before any vote. The wording is the same as 2010.

(D. Aronson) I move to put the 15 days in.

(P. Najarian) The only change was to move from a majority to two-thirds.

(M. Smith) I move that there be a separate vote on 9.1.1. The motion was seconded and so voted.

(R. DeMartino) We just had a 17 to 16 vote on an important issue. Many of the members are here for the first time. They can't have the knowledge of the background that the Executive Committee would. They come to these meetings all the time. They should have a veto power, but not by a majority.

(P. Najarian) This was addressed in the bylaws. In the new by-laws, the President could have voted and we would have had a tie. The Board of Delegates can question and make motions, but it should not have the final say.

(B. Bertoni) I put this one in. This body should have a veto power. The people in the Executive Committee and the Committees have hashed everything out. In the Executive Committee, every Unit gets a vote. Each Unit is represented. Here, EMBA and CBA have the majority of the votes and could overrule all the Units in 1 vote. This group is more fluid than the Executive Committee and the Committees that work every day. In Mansfield, a vote might go the opposite way.

(Ash Rao) The vote was 50.1% of those who voted.

(L. Duncan) Can we get to the vote.

A motion was made and seconded that the bylaws as sent out be accepted with the exception of the two items that will be voted on separately in Mansfield. The Motion was seconded and so voted.

(R. Bertoni) The practices of the Alzheimer's Foundation were brought up at the last meeting. They have an excellent rating. According to Tel-e-tax 4% goes to advertising, 19% to fundraising and 77 to disease care.

Old Business-

Longest Day participation- Marshall Williams

Bowls with appropriate signage and bowls were placed at all of the sites where entries were being sold on Friday, June 21, 2019 for the Longest Day for Alzheimer's. District 25 donated the money it earned from the Super Point game held that evening.

Rosemary Tator volunteered to help. No money was collected from the bowls and the total from the Super Point game was \$133. (written report handed in due to time constraints)

District Director's Report - Robert Bertoni

Because of time constraints, DD Bertoni announced that his report would be posted in its entirety on his website as well as on the District 25 website. (www.district25director.org)

New Business- none

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am.

Respectfully submitted, Carolyn Weiser, Secretary, District 25

Addenda

Post Meeting - Peter Marcus

After the meeting, I did some research on the issue of KO seating rights in an unseeded KO. The rules were changed some time ago (not recently). If there is a disagreement as to how the two teams will sit at the beginning of the match, each team captain must write down his/her line-up (who will sit North, South, East and West) and then give that information to the director who will enforce that seating arrangement.

However, at the half-way point, if there is a disagreement as to how to sit for the second half, the team that is behind has seating rights, i.e., the team that is ahead sits down as it wants to and then the team that is behind decides how they want to sit knowing how the other team is sitting.

Executive Committee vote regarding adoption of the Knock-In/Knock-Out

(J Mahoney) I make a motion that the Knock-in Knockouts be run without the Free play component. The motion was seconded. The motion passed with 10 voting against the inclusion of the free play provision.