



MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

TO: Karl Stressman, PRCA Commissioner
Jim Williams, Canby Rodeo

FROM: Honorable James L. Roeder
Ret'd. Superior Court Judge, State of California
Chairman, PRCA Grievance Review Committee

DATE: June 9, 2014

RE: Appeal to Grievance Review Committee

The appeal of Canby Rodeo under Bylaw B11.3 of the PRCA Grievance Procedures was heard by the Committee via conference call on June 5, 2014. The appeal was regarding four (4) issues: (1) Use of "extra" animal in the timed events; (2) Tie Down stock charge; (3) Steer Wrestling entry limit; (4) Tie Down entry limit. The Hearing Panel and designated alternates were provided written materials and received oral presentations from Jim Williams, Aaron Enget, Mike Johnson, and Darrell Petry.

Upon submission of the matter, and following full consideration, the designated Hearing Panel rules as follows:

- (1) Use of "extra" animal in timed events – GRANTED (3-2 vote)
- (2) Tie Down stock charge – GRANTED (3-2 vote)
- (3) Contestant limit (60) for Steer Wrestling – DENIED (5-0 vote)
- (4) Contestant limit (60) for Tie Down – DENIED (5-0 vote)

The Hearing Panel finds and emphasizes that this Decision is limited to the 2014 Canby Rodeo and is based on all the evidence and circumstances presented in this appeal. It is very important that rodeo committees, event representatives, and the PRCA engage in full and open communication when considering proposed ground rules in an effort to present the best possible PRCA product.

It is agreed that contestants should compete on the animal drawn for them if circumstances permit. It is also in the best interest of the PRCA that fans and sponsors have the opportunity to witness the best possible PRCA product. PRCA Rule R11.3.7.1 addresses escaped animal, and the Hearing Panel suggests that rule could be used to provide flexibility to accommodate special rodeo committee circumstances. The request by Canby Rodeo to consider its fans and sponsors, as well as possible hardships to its

many volunteers, is not unreasonable. Canby Rodeo has three (3) week night performances, afternoon slack, and has recently experienced their fans and sponsors missing a World Champion compete.

A concern for the Hearing Panel is the perceived inconsistency concerning stock charges. There are bylaws for a stock charge outlined in B15.9.3.5.3 (Team Ropers) and B15.9.3.5.4 (Steer Wrestling), but not Tie Down ropers. It does not seem unreasonable for the PRCA to assist a valuable event such as Canby Rodeo with its production costs considering that rodeo provides one calf and back-to-back arrangements to assist Tie Down ropers with traveling costs, scheduling, etc. A rodeo should not be automatically denied a Tie Down stock charge solely because it is not a designated "Tour" rodeo.

PRCA Bylaw B15.1.5 provides that ... "a rodeo must be open for competition to all Contestant Card Members, unless specific limitations ... are approved by the Director of Rodeo Administration and the Event Representative." This check/balance avoids unilateral authority to make a decision. The Hearing Panel finds that Canby Rodeo in 2012 had 78 Steer Wrestling entries (8 drawn out due to qualifications) and 71 Tie Down entries. In 2013, Canby Rodeo had 73 Steer Wrestling entries and 61 Tie Down entries. Lowering the limits to 60 contestants in these events would result in significant less pay to the contestants and prevent competition for circuit rodeo contestants. Further, Canby Rodeo presented insufficient evidence to support its proposition that Canby Rodeo circumstances mirrored those for which Pueblo, Colorado rodeo limits of 60 were granted. Perhaps a negotiated adjustment of added money and reduced contestant limits, which would not reduce total payoff, could be achieved.

The Committee feels strongly that this case illustrates perceived "disconnect" and lack of communication between the PRCA, event representatives, and rodeo committees. Specifically, if local rodeos and committees (comprised of primarily non-paid volunteers and local sponsors) conclude the PRCA and event representatives are arbitrary, inflexible, and unwilling to work with local committees, there could be potential loss of PRCA rodeos for contestant competition. That is not to say that rodeo committees should feel free to challenge decisions that are supported by PRCA rule and bylaws. Practicing open and expanded communication by the parties could facilitate mutually beneficial operation and conduct of rodeos in an effort to grow the sport of professional rodeo under the PRCA brand. Perhaps the Competition Committee of the PRCA could participate in making recommendations concerning this subject.

The Hearing Panel expresses its appreciation to the parties for their courteous and thorough presentation of the issues in this matter.

/as

cc: Grievance Review Committee
Aaron Enget, Director of Rodeo Administration