

## **AGA Board Meeting**

**8/11/2017-- On Site at 2017 US Go Congress in San Diego**

Lisa  
Andrew  
Steve  
Gurujeet  
Andy  
Chris  
Martin  
Samantha (phone)  
Diego P

Bull Gundberg  
Dennis Wheeler  
Keith Arnold  
Larry Gross  
Lee Schumacher

Approval of June Minutes

Lebl approves, DP seconds. Approved unanimously

Keith Arnold: I'm here to speak as a person who had a role in drafting the by-laws, but I speak in no binding way. The "immediately" in the by-laws is not defined, so the election for chair could happen now, but it's also not inappropriate to wait until after the General Assembly or when the full board is in place. It does seem clear that the new directors and old directors (who will continue to serve) are eligible, even though they may not be technically on the board yet. To take any board action, a quorum of people in office are needed, and that would depend on the old board. Also, Keith would argue that Steve may not have a vote, which would be an argument for waiting for September, although Steve could run.

GK: Does "immediate" mean that we can't have the vote in September?

KA: I don't think that "immediately" rules out the vote once the new board is constituted. To have a vote, someone would have to move for a vote, it would be seconded, nominations put forward, and then the vote (of the old board) be made.

AJ: Are you confident that it is the 7 votes of the people then in office?

KA: Yes, because it is the vote of the people in quorum, and only the people in quorum can vote. Immediate means immediate, but, common sense would indicate that this would not preclude waiting until September. This is definitely a departure from what's been done in the past

DP: I have been on the board and I have experienced the meetings, and I think that I would have an opinion and would move to do that now.

KA: The decision to have a vote should be public, but the vote could be private.

SC: Reading from the by-laws Section 3d (immediately); Section 5 (quorum) ?? (1st Tuesday after Memorial Day)

GK: Let's discuss other business first before we have a vote on this.

ML: Do you have any idea what was the thinking behind the Tuesday in September rule instead of Congress?

KA: I have suspicions about both the "immediately" and the delay. The first was because we didn't have a board, and the second was to allow a transition period.

GK: I think that you need a fixed date for the term since it is for a specific number of years.

GK: We have already discussed approving Samantha as Secretary. Our previous secretary has now resigned in writing, and we thank Peter for his service (acclamation)

GK: You are still willing to take the position.

SF: Yes

LS nominates, AJ seconds. Unanimous.

SF: Thank you, I look forward to serving.

GK: We normally do a President's Report, but we'll save the full report for the assembly.

AO: My search for a replacement treasurer for Roy Schmidt, who has been temporary treasurer for a year and plans to end his service at the end of August. We may end up paying for these services, as discussed, and have the official treasurer be more of a bookkeeper. We are looking at David Baron and Danny Ko, neither of whom is currently interested in the full post.

CK: What's scaring people off? The bookkeeping, the tax forms, or something else?

AO: I honestly don't know. People want it as a paid job, and we had limited volunteer interest. I would welcome any thoughts you have Keith.

KA: Of course it's the hardest job to fill because it's the job that absolutely has to do something, you can't pretend.

Lee Schumacher: Does it require accounting skills?

AO: We need someone who's experienced with 990s. Quickbooks is what we're using now, so fairly straight-forward. There are frequent requests for small disbursements, etc. Dealing with the Congress is complicated in accounting terms

GK: Did we officially authorize to pay for accounting services?

AO: I feel that you have sufficiently assented to it for me to set it up.

LS moves to authorize the President to fill our Treasurer needs by September 1st by whatever reasonable means. CK seconds. Unanimous approval

AO: Current marquee tournament at the Congress is that the current structure was somewhat board mandated a few years ago, as well as in the annual allocation of funds. Since 2014, there has been a US Open Masters with the NAMT folded into it. It was to be a modestly significant prize to attract strong players, and have more rounds to make it a better tournament. Certainly the standard of player and games has gone up, and our domestic players have done well. The downsides are that 9 rounds is a lot of one week, particularly the way we have them scheduled. Also, we do not currently have a North American Championship, and it would be nice to have a North American Champion. We are also working on having a North American Pro Championship, but that might be something different not at Congress.

AO: Some comments, some via Matthew Herschberger as US Open and US Masters TD, and from the Strong Players meeting, that 9 games is a lot and is very tiring, so they can't do anything else. They want us to consider improving the structure. I am not suggesting one now, I just want feedback from the Board.

GK: I think everyone should take the opportunity while here to get some feedback from strong players.

LS: As CC talking to IL and MH **fill this out**

AO: We don't have a Tournaments Committee. Should we have one? Should this be their purview rather than the board's? In most cases, this has not been something the Board decides.

LS: I like the idea of the Tournament's Committee.

AJ: There is also significant overlap with the Pro Committee, and tournaments that may be folded in to it, which would create work for the board deciding what is where.

GK: Who is deciding who is eligible, what tournaments, etc. is a bigger issue.

KA: Initially, the strong players wanted more games, and we tried to serve them, but now we are hearing grumblings mostly from the AGA Pros. Are the AGA Pros being overwhelmed by Pro duties as well as the Masters.

LSchumacher: There are non-AGA Pros, how do they fit in?

KA: the other pros aren't being asked to do other things.

AO: also the ones coming over have a lot of options

AO: One of the strong players was not a pro, and he was also being tired out by this. There are players who aren't playing or coming here because they have no chance, because the crowd has gotten stronger. I don't know what we do to address this issue.

CK: We could raise the bar to 7.5 or 8 and push some of the other people back to the US Open, although then the prize for the US Open might need to be more attractive.

GK: Shall we make this a agenda item for a future meeting, and urge people to talk to strong players while here?

CK: A formal inquiry, a survey for example, might be the most effective. We could send it to everyone above a certain level, whether or not they come to Congress

AO: It seems like we will be ending this Congress with a number of pros beating other pros, so it may be time to discuss promotion of our professionals.

AJ: The pro committee has already started discussing promotion.

AO: To have a North American Championship of some kind that is at some level open to amateurs, that is not just a filter on the Open Masters, Do we want a North American Championship?

Lee Schumacher: In the old days, we used to have East Coast and West Coast Champions, so there could be a regional thing. There could be a 3 game match for the final or something.

CK: If we have a separate North American Championship, it needs to be separately and significantly funded, so that's a consideration.

KA: I would move the survey about tournaments to 6d, because it would be good to know what the 6 dans with no room for improvement (since they can't play the stronger players) think.

KA: I would like to have a tournament just for our pros, and a North American thing.

AJ: So, we're talking about 3: the Open Open, the North American thing, and a Pro Thing.

Continued discussion by AJ, AO, KA, and ML of this, and whether we should revert to something like what we had before, with the 16 player evening tournaments.

AO: With such a large number of people playing in the Open Masters, outside qualifications haven't mattered for points, so there hasn't been a linkage between tournaments other than the ratings system.

EZ joins.

End of President's Report

GK: CK had made a suggestion that we revisit the by-laws, since it's been 12 years since we last did it.

CK: I've been told by a number of people that it's wise for an organization to look at it's by-laws every decade or so. This means it's about time to do so again.

CK moves that the board seek a committee that includes at least 1 or 2 board members, among other volunteers, and that the board form a committee for the purpose of reviewing and potentially providing recommendations for amendment. LS seconds.

AJ: If a committee is willing to go through our by-laws in detail, then great, but we might find that we could more efficiently do a more limited review of the by-laws, particularly where we have contacted the Governance Committee.

LS: **CHANGE NE TO NB**

CK: I would imagine that the committee would largely say that most things look fine, and would suggest changes as needed.

AJ: How large a committee would you like to see?

CK: I could see 2 from the board and 4 or 5 other people, perhaps advertised in the EJ.

SC: **check that the correct by-laws posted, links/dates may be wrong**

CK: I think having an umber of eyes will be good for noticing ambiguous phrases, whereas accustomed eyes may glaze over them. The idea would not be to do an overhaul, but simply to revise on a smaller scale. I would hope for no wholesale changes.

KA: The issue I would raise in terms of convenience and timing would be that the changes need to be approved of by the membership at large, so if this is a crucial thing to do, we have an At-Large election next year, and it might make sense to do the two in conjunction. Hopefully there's nothing urgent, because I would be concerned that it may not be easily done in time for next year.

Discussion of timing for the vote.

SC: Is this something that the members of the chapters vote on.

KA: The members. I'm checking to see if the Assembly needs to check off on it before it goes to the membership.

GK: Would we have the option of reincorporating in another state.

Discussion of if this would be worthwhile and what it would entail.

**Vote on the Committee formation. Passes 6-1.**

Opens up to general questions.

SC: As an incoming board member, I find it difficult to find new information on Board activities over the last 8 months, since the minutes have not been posted. I heard they were approved, but they were not submitted.

CK: This is a major concern, and it is our fault that it has not happened.

GK: We now finally have a secretary who will be performing the job. I expect that we will do much better.

SC: For the board's knowledge, I pulled some reports from our google analytics, which has been running in the background for a few years. Around election time in May/June, there was a spike in traffic to all the board pages, looking for minutes (presumably). It's tough for our membership, and even though the elections were unopposed, people looking for information from the board does not have the information to make an informed decision.

Discussion of analytics.

GK: Next, it is time to decide we should have the board election today.

Discussion by the Board.

CK moves that we vote now for a new chairperson. The incoming board member may participate, and the vote will be by the board according to the quorum. 4 votes with 3 abstentions.

AJ moves to got to executive session. LS seconds. Motion carries. Executive session entered at 4:26pm PDT.

LS, GK, 5:12.

Next AGE Board Meeting set for Sept 10.

AJ moves we adjourn. DP seconds.

Last Line