

Dear NRHA Board of Directors,

As most of you do not know me, first I would like to introduce myself. My name is Cyndee Hall, NRHA lifetime member #659. I have been involved with horses and the horse industry since my childhood. I was first involved through my local saddle club, then the ApHA, followed by the AQHA and then finally in the 80's the NRHA. (I helped push so that our local club became an NRHA Affiliate that for the last three years has offered a full slate of NRHA classes.) I have supported my expensive habit with a 30 plus year career in the Telecommunications industry, using all my vacation to attend the small shows in Montana, Idaho & Washington.

I have two daughters of Hollywood Dun It who I have been breeding to some of the industry's top sires and then selling the foals. Two of the foals we have raised have been to the futurity with one just missing the Intermediate Finals last year.

I have one mare that I am currently showing (she is in full-time training) and a two-year-old and yearling that will be replacing her in the next couple of years. I show in the Northwest and am a member of three affiliates. I have qualified for but never attended the Affiliate Finals and have never been to the Futurity, Derby or the NRHA Convention.

I would like to thank those of you that are donating your time to be on board of directors for doing so, without you the NRHA could never have gotten to the point it is at. Thank you for listening to the membership and doing away with a strategic plan that would have alienated the grass roots members who just want to show and have fun with their friends and family.

I am now going to ask that you again listen to the membership and DO NOT approve the recommend drug policy or the changes in the membership/participation fee. Both of these issues should wait until the full board of directors is elected by the general membership per the proposed (And Board Recommended) bylaws. This ensures that the members throughout the NRHA are being properly represented by directors they elected to represent them and not by an existing governing body and committees that have repeatedly submitted proposals that have had major opposition from the general membership.

I do believe that the NRHA does need a drug policy (I'm a group 2), but why reinvent the wheel? Why not just use the program that the AQHA has already implemented and been using successfully for years. It must be working and be economical as well, I have not received anything from them that will triple the cost of my AQHA dues. If you just have to have your own policy and want to do research about what drugs are being used on the horses at NRHA shows, why not do as recommended in the petition from several of the NRHA Professionals? Send an anonymous questionnaire to our professionals and nonpros asking them what they use, why they use it and what effects they think it has on their horse. Then form a committee utilizing some of the NRHA Professionals & Vets in the NRHA membership to make a recommendation on the drug policy. It seems that this would save thousands of dollars and mounds of useless paper work.

As far as the need for NRHA to increase their membership fees, I think that they first need to take a good look at the organization and provide the membership with supported documentation as where they are losing money and why. From the limited documentation that was provided to the membership (I used the information from 2006) it looks as if the EB is trying to raise dues to force the general membership to support a few NRHA events that most of the general membership does not participate in. IE the Futurity, Derby (in the red \$200,000), Convention & Awards Banquet, and the RHSF program (which I do not believe should be supplemented by the NRHA any more than any of the affiliates are, it should become its own self-supporting program.) These programs should all be self-sufficient & they need to be re-evaluated and restructured so that they are. I'm pretty sure that the other large events that are held as NRHA sanctioned events must be

supporting themselves (with the help of their sponsors and advertising) or they would not be taking place year after year.

I believe that the largest percent of our membership does not participate in these NRHA events why should they be forced to support them. I would like to know what percentage of the people that show at a local level also show at the Futurity, Derby or even their affiliate level. Our local affiliate had approximately 76 horse and rider teams that showed at our local NRHA shows in 2006, of those two went to the affiliate finals and one to the futurity. That is less than 3%. We also had one member show in the Futurity. Should we charge each of our members \$5 per run at our local shows and pay their way to the futurity? (A fee that a few people keep trying to get passed)

And if the NRHA's record keeping system is so far out-dated why not join the real (and competitive) world and out-source to someone that already has the resources in place (i.e.: EquiStat or the AQHA) Hasn't the NCHA joined with the AQHA in their record keeping? Are we such a control-oriented organization that we can not utilize the efficiencies in other businesses to make the NRHA efficient?

In my 30-year career in the Telecommunications industry (several years of which I worked for our area VP in Budget and Analysis) I saw huge changes in the way the industry was ran. From a subsidized monopoly to a deregulated industry forced to survive in a competitive world. And believe me when it came time to be competitive they used internal task forces that resulted in downsizing, elimination of redundant operations/functions/people and forcing people to become more efficient at their jobs (there were hundreds laid off even with increases in customers). They did not add CEO's and programs that could not support themselves; if the existing programs could not be revamped to be profitable they did not raise the price of customer service, they got rid of them! (Or the people running them!)

I think that the proposed participation fees will only hurt the NRHA and its affiliates in the fact that it will deter people from cross entering classes. I as a Limited Non Pro often enter the Limited Open and/or Novice Horse Open to have an additional class to show/school my horse in. Would I be forced to pay additional fees to cross enter? If so I would no longer cross enter these classes. Having to pay the higher owner fee to have my trainer school my horse would not affect me, he shows mainly AQHA so does not attend many NRHA shows. But I am sure that it will deter many from having their trainers school their horses, again fewer entries for the affiliates. And with the new higher costs of for the Professionals I am sure that my trainer will not be attending the few that do not have conflicting dates with AQHA or cross entering at the ones that offer NRHA classes. So with the proposed increase in participation fees I may just join him at the AQHA shows, most involve much less travel in my area.

If the Professionals Programs are not supporting themselves raise the dues to the members joining the NRHA Professionals program. And make it a requirement for those that are showing horses other than their own (so the NP's can still economically show in the open classes if they wish).

The Reiner is currently self-sufficient, so let members decide if they want to pay to subscribe, do not force them. Is this increase in the circulation going cause it to start losing money? Isn't this just a sneaky way to increase circulation to keep the advertisers happy? I know as an advertiser in the Reiner, the cost of advertising has increased over the last two years.

As far as the proposed rule changes go I am asking that you cast a no vote for 15-01-08, 25-01-08, & 25-02-08. I have visited the NRHA to cast my vote on all of the rule changes and hope that all of you folks will listen to the members voices when you make your decisions on these important matters and how they will affect the future of the NRHA

I do think that there are steps being taken in the right direction as far as the different money earning divisions, the money earned and the levels available for competitors, especially the lower level competitors. Increasing the Rookie and keeping the Limited NP as is really helps in this area and as do the Novice Horse rule changes. I feel this will help keep the new blood in the NRHA by giving them a chance to show and be competitive at a level comfortable to them. The creation of the Professional Rookie & the NonPro Apprentice Programs will almost certainly help in assuring we get and keep the best trainers in the industry.

I agree with 26-01-08 in that there does need to be a limit to the amount of money a NP can earn and still be considered a NP, but maybe possibly with the creation of a Professional NP Category or one more step between the Intermediate NP & NP. Especially when most Futurities/Derbies require that you must enter the NP to be eligible to show in the Intermediate and sometime Limited NP. (A yes vote on 43-01-08 will eliminate this)

Thank you all for taking the time to hear read my opinions, I wish that I could be there in person but that is just not possible.

Cyndee Hall  
NRHA Lifetime Member #659