

**ATLANTA FALCONS PRESIDENT & CEO & COMPETITION COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN RICH MC KAY
2012 ANNUAL MEETING MEDIA AVAILABILITY
PALM BEACH, FLA.**

March 28, 2012

There were seven total rule proposals voted on today. Five of those passed; two of those did not.

The two that did not pass: One was submitted by Buffalo, which was a change in instant replay to move the decision-maker from the referee to the replay assistant upstairs, which did not pass. The second was to change the horse collar rule that we have and take out the exception that we have for the quarterback in the pocket. It did not pass.

The other ones all passed, including Pittsburgh's proposal to take our modified sudden death overtime procedures and move them into the regular season. It did pass. All of the rest of them that I have covered with you before, those all passed.

On the bylaw side, we passed Bylaw Proposal No. 1, which is a very simple cleanup trying to make Thanksgiving day and Christmas day or Christmas night games the same as our other night games.

We tabled a number of the ones that dealt with the player and roster movements, including some IR (injured reserve) proposals. We felt there was some really good input and we felt like we would table them. We will vote on them in May. That would include the trade deadline; the overall roster limit of 90; the one activation you could make off of IR; and the one concussion-diagnosis exception to our active/inactive list that was proposed. We just have some work to do on those. We tabled those so that in essence is our work of today.

On why Playing Rule Proposal No. 2, which would have removed the horse collar penalty exception for quarterbacks in the pocket, did not pass despite that it may promote player safety:

We never are going to back up from player safety. We are always going to push the agenda as much as we can. We appreciate when teams push it, also. In this instance, the rule was developed for an open field tackle where we felt like a defender had a chance with an alternative to do something else, and we felt like the injury risk was going to occur because the defender was able to actually use the runner's momentum against himself and swing and fall on the back of his legs. We never thought that necessarily applied in the pocket. We watched the tape and didn't feel that was a change that was also fair to the defender. The defender in the pocket is fighting off an offensive player, grabbing and just trying to do everything he can. We just didn't see the injury risk and that is why we didn't support it. It is not a place we like to be because we are always going to promote player safety; we just didn't think this had an impact on player safety.

On discussions on Thursday night games and limiting travel:

There was. Howard Katz gave a report and gave us some guidelines that he is going to try to use as they schedule those and when the commissioner creates the schedule. Those were shown to the teams and talked about. The teams were pretty comfortable with those guidelines.

After he went through them yesterday, we asked people if anybody wanted to take an opportunity to stand up and repeat it, and nobody took that opportunity. I will leave it to the written word for you to find.

On if resistance to the bylaw proposals that focused on the roster caused them to be tabled:

No, there were some really good ideas and suggestions. There is not necessarily resistance. We have just got to work on the language a little bit. They do not need to be passed today. We will pass them in May, we will deal with them and we will show them to the union and do all the normal steps. We knew

coming in that we traditionally do that a lot with bylaws, and we felt like in this instance that was the way we would go and we would table them.

On further discussing Bylaw Proposal No. 6 which would allow for a designated player to return from injured reserve after a defined time period:

The IR rule, perhaps there are a couple of amendments we may propose to that, yes.

On if average time of game could decrease as a result of the approval of Playing Rule Proposal No. 7, which calls for all turnovers to be confirmed by the instant replay official:

It potentially could. When you see it, it feels like it would slow the game down because you are taking what would be a challenge and taking it upstairs for confirmation. We didn't see that in the scoring plays, and we think in the turnovers, it will have the same effect. It is pretty much even, although in this instance the difference is we have a lot of plays that are turnovers, we go to a commercial break and the coach challenges coming out of the commercial break, which now really slows down the game. You will have none of that in this instance because the confirmation will occur before that. We like the way the procedure worked on scoring plays, and we felt like this was a change we could make without adding game time.

On how much time was added to the average game length by the instant replay official confirming all scoring plays:

One second additional time with respect to replay added on.

###