

**CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 3-5, 1997**

Index to Minutes

Secretary's note: This index is provided only as a courtesy to the readers and is not an official part of the CFA Minutes. The numbers shown for each item in the index are keyed to similar numbers shown in the body of the Minutes

(1)	MINUTES OF PRIOR MEETING.	2
(2)	TREASURER'S REPORT.	2
(3)	DOMESTIC CLUBS.	6
(4)	INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.	9
(5)	WINN FOUNDATION REPORT.	9
(6)	HEALTH COMMITTEE.	10
(7)	CFA LAWSUIT.	12
(8)	PUBLIC RELATIONS.	18
(9)	BREED DEFINITION COMMITTEE REPORT.	21
(10)	INTERNATIONAL SHOW.	21
(11)	CLERKING REPORT.	23
(12)	JUDGING PROGRAM REPORTS.	24
(13)	ADVANCEMENTS, APPLICANTS & TRAINEES.	33
(14)	JUDGING PROGRAM PROPOSAL REPORT.	34
(15)	LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE.	43
(16)	CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.	48
(17)	SHOW RULES.	52
(18)	SHOW RULES CHANGES — EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 1998.	53
(19)	CFA PLANNING COMMITTEE.	64
(20)	REGIONAL BOUNDARIES REPORT.	66
(21)	YEARBOOK COMMITTEE REPORT.	67
(22)	ANIMAL WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT.	68
(23)	MISCELLANEOUS.	69
(24)	DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS & PROTESTS.	71

Secretary's Note: Mr. Billy Wheeler and Mrs. Patricia Jacobberger, CFA Planning Committee members, facilitated the CFA Board through a Strategic Planning session for 8 hours on Thursday, Oct 2 and 4 hours on Friday, Oct 3, 1997. The results of that meeting follow the conclusion of the official Board minutes. (see page 656 of this Yearbook.)

CFA Board and Staff Present October 2-5, 1997

Mrs. Laina Aitken, NAR Director
Mr. Stan Barnaby, Director-at-Large
Mrs. Linda Berg, MWR Director
****Mrs. Diana Doernberg, Director-at-Large**
Mrs. Kim Everett, Vice President

***Mrs. Donna Fuller, Treasurer**
Mrs. Jody Garrison, GSR Director
Mrs. Willa Hawke, Secretary
Mrs. Becky Jones, GLR Director
***Mr. Dick Kallmeyer, NWR Director**
Mrs. Yaeko Takano, Japan Regional Director
Mr. Phil Lindsley, SWR Director
Ms. Joan Miller, Director-at-Large
Mr. Craig Rothermel, President
Ms. Donna J. Thompson, Director-at-Large
***Mr. Wayne Trevathan, SOR Director**
Mrs. Betty White, Director-at-Large
Mr. Donald J. Williams, Director-at-Large

Also present were Mr. Tom Dent, CFA Executive Director; Mr. Fred Jacobberger, CFA Legal Counsel; Mrs. Carol Krzanowski, CFA Associate Director; Ms. Allene Tartaglia, Special Events Coordinator, ***Mr. Michael Brim, Public Relations Director. Mrs. Takano was assisted by a Japanese interpreter during the regular board meeting. Absent was Ms. Pam DelaBar, Director-at-Large.

- * *Absent on Thursday.*
- ** *Absent from the entire Strategic Planning session.*
- *** *Attending only the Strategic Planning session.*

The Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association met at the Dulles Airport Hilton Hotel, Herndon, Virginia, on October 4-5, 1997. President Craig Rothermel called the meeting to order on October 4, 1997 at 8:00 a.m. and welcomed the Board members and guests.

(1) MINUTES OF PRIOR MEETING.

President Rothermel then invited the Board's attention to consideration of the Minutes of the June 1997 Board meetings (exclusive of the Annual Meeting, which would be considered in June of 1998) and asked for any corrections, deletions, or additions. Willa Hawke, CFA Secretary, noted none had been received. There being no other comment on the Minutes, **Lindsley Moved** to accept the minutes. **Motion Carried.**

(2) TREASURER'S REPORT.

President Rothermel next called upon the Treasurer, Mrs. Donna Fuller, who gave the following report: *Last October, this board adopted a policy limiting unbudgeted expenditures without prior approval of the full board to \$5000. As a result of a Constitutional Amendment passed in June, this policy has been superceded [sic]; instead of a flat amount restriction, the maximum will change each year based upon the average of the prior two years' net income. For the current fiscal year the limit, computed using the "changes in net assets" from the audited financial statements, is \$7850. In the future, this amount will be computed as soon as the audit is complete and will be available for the June board meeting.*

As a reminder to the board, the Budget Committee recommends a proposed Constitutional Amendment at the next Annual, to increase club dues from the current \$50 to at least \$75 and preferably to \$100. The costs of the printing, mailings, and other services now provided to all clubs exceeds the current level of dues, and with new services being proposed, we should fund such services before we add them. Prior to the publication of proposed amendments, the Central Office staff and Budget Committee plans to prepare some supporting documentation for this change.

CFA FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements as of August 31, 1997 and for the four months then ended (which you received previously) show an acceleration of the negative trend in our net income (worse than budgeted), although most of the balance sheet line items are essentially unchanged.

While the Yearbook advertising rates as well as the book prices were increased this year, the benefits of this increase do not show up in the bottom line until much later in the production process. We also have announced an increase in the advertising rates for the Almanac and are proposing an increase in the subscription rates. These increases will not apply until 1998 and therefore won't help this year's net income much. The intent of these rate adjustments is just to keep the publications' function in approximately a "break-even" position. It should be noted that if we turn these publications into substantial profit makers, the Internal Revenue Service will designate them as "unrelated business income" and tax the profits, so it does not make sense for us to look to publications as a primary solution to our financial problems.

Ordinary income has continued to decline to the point that I believe this board must now consider increasing the registration fees. This recommendation is not made without some reluctance, as there is a risk that a price increase will result in a further decline in volume and thus not produce the desired additional income. Nonetheless, I believe we have to address this since these fees are our basic functional income source. We cannot wait to see if a commercial "white knight" such as Friskies or Iams will come along to bail us out. We must be serious about changing the way we think about raising funds. Instead of finding things that we can give free of charge, we should establish a fair price for the things that our constituents value and will use, and try to recover at least a portion of the cost of providing such services. This is especially true of those services which are of interest only to a limited group: for example, charging for points-by-fax or -net which is of interest only to the very active exhibitors.

In the area of expenses, we have had excellent cooperation from the Central Office which has stayed under budget as well as under last year's expense level; also many of you have been careful to control the amounts expended by your committees. For these efforts, I applaud and thank each of you. However, I have to remind you that we did not reach a satisfactory result with the 1997-98 budget and that we need to reduce our expenses substantially or we could easily have a loss in the six-figure range.

One item which I would like to propose we change at this meeting (in time for the 1998 Annual) is eliminating the awarding of a "piece-of-art" trophy for our National Awards. As a personal recipient of each of the types of award CFA has given in the last 25 years, I can say

that my 1997 award which cost nearly \$350 is no more valuable to me and is not displayed with any more pride than those I received in 1975 which probably cost +/- \$15 each. While I am not advocating the return to a small wood plaque with generic (unpersonalized) award information, I do feel that we should reduce the tangible part of the award to something like the breed plaques we give currently. This would also be in keeping with the wishes of the delegates to emphasize breed awards - not just the Top 25/20 - and would partially offset the additional cost of the third best of breed plaques which are not included in the budget.

As a non-profit organization, CFA can withstand occasional swings into a limited loss position. However, we must not develop the mind-set that it is okay to consistently spend indiscriminately and to offer more complex and expanded services without charge. There are probably many products and services which would be valued by cat fanciers and/or the general public and which could be new sources of income to CFA. If we enlist the help and suggestions of all our members, we should be able to capitalize on these new sources and return to financial stability without placing a substantial burden on any group or individual.

REGIONAL TREASURIES

Although all regions promised cooperation with our uniform reporting system for regional treasuries, the response we received at the end of the year was inadequate to allow us to file the requested information with the IRS. This is probably the last year we can get by without filing the combined information; if we can't come up with a supportable report, the IRS will impute one and it will undoubtedly be far less favorable.

I want to especially commend the treasurers of Regions 1, 5, and 6 for their complete support and submission of requested data on a timely basis (Regions 1 and 6 even provided me with the electronic files in our formats). I have been contacted by the new treasurer for Region 4 who has promised to comply for the future but was uncertain that she could catch up the old information since the prior treasurer left incomplete records and had refused to use the accounting system that was provided to him. Region 2 promises compliance but has been too busy to deliver; I am still trying to get it from him. Region 7 used the system but did not provide any transactional data; only year-end balances. Region 3 is not computerized; the manual report provided will need to be expanded next year when we consolidate all the domestic regions. Although Region 8 is not subject to our federal reporting requirements, Mrs. Takano voluntarily provided an income statement in U.S. format for our information.

INTERNATIONAL SHOW TREASURY

We have begun receiving income from club sponsors and vendors. Fortunately, the early receipt of this income allowed me to cover most of the "up front" costs without dipping too deeply into our invested funds. Hopefully we will be able to handle all of the remaining prepayment requirements with entry fees and the balance of the other advance income and not need to rely on gate receipts for anything other than profit.

At the end of last year, there was \$700 in club pledges outstanding. I fully reserved against them (i.e., did not include them in the net income from last year's show). I am pleased to

report that all \$700 has now been collected and will be included in the income for this year. I have also been making slow but almost steady progress in collecting the one very large bounced vendor check from last year; more than half the balance and all of the bad check fees have been paid. I believe I will get the balance before the end of the year and this vendor will not be traveling to Atlanta. The two vendors who stopped payment on International Show contracts have refused to even discuss settlement; I have written them off and have blacklisted them with future International Shows and any others with which I am involved. Subject to Mr. Jacobberger's advice, I would like to publish the names of the two businesses who stopped payment on International Show vendor space checks.

SOUTHWEST REGIONAL TREASURY MATTERS

As I reported in June, I was unable to complete a reconciliation of the 1993-4 SW Region and LaPaz Allbreed Cat Club treasuries with the records available. Furthermore, I do not feel that the additional information I would get from more microfilm records would be worth the cost. Given the withdrawal of the legal actions pending in this matter and the lack of confidence that further investigation would produce a verifiable conclusion on the presence or absence of malfeasance, I would like the Board's guidance on what, if any, further action should be taken. If no further action is required, I will return the records to Messrs. Park and Lindsley.

Fuller Moved that the Board endorse a constitutional amendment to increase club dues to \$100. **Discussion:** **Lindsley** wanted to know what current costs are and how much are we increasing. Are we increasing profit here or are we just meeting increased expenses? **Dent** said he didn't have the details to provide comprehensive answers at this point in time. **Lindsley** didn't know that it would be a good move to vote on this until we know exactly what costs are and whether this imposed increase is just going to be perceived as trying to balance our books on the backs of our clubs. **Doernberg** agreed with Phil and went on to say that this is the kind of thing that pops up and is not well received and before voting on it wanted to see a breakdown and what other areas might be considered; i.e., a whole picture here. When we say, "OK, we are going to have a deficit here, so let's raise these club dues," it looks like a quick fix. We have a serious situation here and since we don't have to do this before February, it would be more comfortable to be able to give the clubs specific reasons why this is in order. **Williams** said that before we do any of these cost increases we should do an analysis of what we are spending and what we are getting before we arbitrarily agree to raise these costs. **President Rothermel** noted that we may be very surprised at the cost of the services we now provide the clubs and he then asked whether, should we find that the clubs get \$150 in services, Don would then approve of raising dues to \$150? **Williams** responded yes, but he wanted to see a breakdown of what they do get. He noted that the show package costs us a lot more than we charge for a show license. **Fuller Withdrew the Motion.** She then asked that we begin to think about increasing registration fees. The last fee increase was in 1991. **Dent** noted that always in the past when we increased fees we had a definite increase in revenue. The last time, however, was the first time that we saw a slight decline in the number of registrations being processed but we still saw an increase in revenue received. [**Note:** The Budget Committee will hold a special meeting to address all of our expenditures and services; then Donna will come back to the board in February with a more comprehensive package to consider. There was considerable conversation about the cost and value of the national awards. It was agreed that the awards chairman would negotiate with Frabel

in the hopes of reducing our costs and in addition to seek comparison in objects available from other sources.] **Fuller** noted that in the investigation of the SW Regional funds, she had come to something of an impasse regarding the SW regional treasury and the LaPaz and asked for further guidance from the board. She noted that there was very sloppy bookkeeping, a lack of keeping any support, like receipts, and it seems unlikely that definitive proof of malfeasance can be obtained. “While there is definite reason for concern we may have done all that can be done. I can’t say that anyone stole money and I can’t say that they didn’t.” **Lindsley** noted that he was asked about this with surprising frequency and he had been telling people in the region that are aware of this that there will be a report. If in fact it is the decision that additional information is not going to add anything to the conclusion, so be it, but we are entitled to a report from the committee. “I would like to see a report by the next meeting that basically details what the allegations were, what the committee was charged to do, what they asked for, what they got, what they didn’t get, and what conclusions they could reach from what they got. There were some very direct allegations that led to the formation of this committee. If the committee is going to wind up its work we should get a report.” **President Rothermel** then tasked Fred Jacobberger, with assistance from Donna Fuller, to prepare a written report that would answer the questions that Phil raised. This report will be available for the board at the February meeting. **White** – Because we do have information and whether there is a paper trail or there isn’t a paper trail, the fact of the matter is that we can still draw a conclusion. **Lindsley** – There is data that the region turned over that we got from the bank that was used from 1992 to 1994; i.e., complete records of all checks written and all deposits from the SW Region account. Included in all of that was evidence of deposit of regional funds into the LaPaz account. People know about that and want to see some type of conclusion from it all.

(3) DOMESTIC CLUBS.

President Rothermel next recognized **Laina Aitken** to discuss Domestic Club Applications. Ten clubs have submitted applications for membership to be considered at the October Board meeting. Most of these clubs plan to produce shows. With our show schedule already overcrowded and many of our clubs experiencing financial problems, I hope each board member will consider the impact of adding more clubs. I also hope each regional director will investigate the applicants carefully from their region.

One year ago the board voted to delay the consideration of THE AMERICAN WAY CAT CLUB for one year. That year has passed and at this time the club has withdrawn the application. The president of the club is hoping the American Shorthair fanciers can work together in the existing ASH club.

The clubs to be considered are as follows:

<i>ADVANCE CAT CLUB</i>	<i>REGION 8</i>
<i>CAROLINA COUNTRY CAT FANCIERS</i>	<i>REGION 7</i>
<i>COTTON PALACE CAT CLUB</i>	<i>REGION</i>
<i>CURLY WHISKERS CAT FANCIERS</i>	<i>REGION 4</i>

This club is a Cornish Rex breed club.

NATIONAL MINK TONKINESE FANCIERS REGION 4

This club hopes to produce shows in the Pittsburgh area starting in 1999 or 2000.

JAPAN SAGA CAT CLUB REGION 8

ORIENTALS WEST REGION 5

This club was dropped from membership in June for failing to pay dues and submit a membership list. The club has reorganized with new officers and a new Constitution and By-laws. The By-laws of this club do not permit it to hold shows. The club does plan to sponsor rings at other shows, have a Breed Booth, give awards and in other ways promote the Oriental breed.

PFANCIERS UNITED FOR FUN, INC (PUFF) REGION 6

This club is planning to take over the show held in Meramec Caverns. The show had been dropped by the former sponsor. The club submitted an excellent package. I hope everyone read their TRAVEL POLICY FOR JUDGES. The club has incorporated in the State of Missouri as a nonprofit corporation and is already active.

POCAHONTAS CAT CLUB REGION 8

TOY CAT CLUB REGION 8

All of these clubs seem to have paperwork in order. I will have more information on some of the clubs to present at the board table.

At the time I filed my original report, September 5, 1997, all of club applicants had paperwork in order and no negative letters had been received. As our subscribers began to receive the September Almanac (September 15-September 29) all of that changed and I was faced with an impossible situation.

Negative information on a number of clubs was submitted by letter and fax. It was impossible to follow our constitution and provide the applicants with that information with enough time for the applicant to prepare a written rebuttal before the October board meeting.

At the last annual meeting the delegation changed the constitution as follows:

Section 3 - Election to Membership. When the application and accompanying papers are received in proper form in the Central Office, it shall then be submitted to the CFA Executive Board at the next regularly scheduled meeting for consideration. If negative information is submitted regarding the applicant, the information will be provided to the applicant with enough time for the applicant to prepare a written rebuttal prior to Board consideration.

Deadlines for applications have been set to meet publication deadlines for the membership editions of the Almanac. Currently, applicants are listed in the membership edition prior to the board meeting at which they will be considered. I believe this process should be delayed so applicants listed in the September issue will be considered in February, those listed in December will be considered in June and the applicants listed in the spring membership edition will be considered in October. The additional time will give clubs a chance to discuss the impact of new clubs and respond appropriately. This will also give applicants an opportunity to prepare a rebuttal to negative comments. This will also give the membership chairman and Central Office additional time to handle the process. Perhaps with more time to investigate each new applicant we will uncover more of the fraud that is taking place.

Regardless of what we do in the future, it is impossible to follow the constitution as written. Even now we are not handling all applicants at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting. The applications we consider are those that meet deadlines. I believe the process must be changed.

The ten clubs that are scheduled for this have to be delayed until February.

*Respectfully submitted,
Laina Aitken*

Aitken added that Craig had offered another suggestion: to change the deadline for the submission of application so that the clubs would not only be advertised in the membership edition but would also be advertised in the Almanac ahead of that; i.e., August and September. This would still make it difficult because the membership edition is the one we traditionally use for official business and would still have difficulty in getting the material to the clubs so that they could prepare their rebuttal.

Aitken Moved to postpone all new club applications for this meeting until the February Board meeting. **Discussion: Lindsley** – Most of the clubs that had applied had received no negative input and I wondered if there may be a narrower way to handle this. It is unfortunate for those clubs who had not and would not have received any negative input. It also unfortunate for those clubs who may have a letter in their file that would not be considered of sufficient weight by this board. They might want to waive their right to respond in the interest of not having to wait another four months to go forward with their show plans or whatever plans they might have. **President Rothermel** noted that the issue here has to do with late receipt of the *Almanac* and to assume that clubs and individuals had received sufficient time to respond either way was an erroneous assumption. **Doernberg** remarked that passage of the new constitutional amendment indicated that many are concerned with this matter and in this instance where the *Almanac* was late many had not received adequate time to respond. **Fuller** noted the variation of receipt times for the *Almanac* depending on geographic location of the recipient and went on to say that she believed when this amendment was passed the delegation was trying to tell us that they wanted a new or better way of dealing with acceptance of new clubs. **Everett** asked why the *Almanac* was late. **Carol Krzanowski**, *Almanac* Editor, responded that there had been a printer problem: they had downsizing problems during the Summer and they could not recover from that and, as a result, they had to redo the blues for us because there were many mistakes. The other problem

was tit postal service. **Lindsley** then noted he would back off his comment as he had received his *Almanac* three weeks earlier and everyone in his neighborhood had also received theirs. He had not realized there had been a delay and with that understanding asked to withdraw his comment. **Jones** supported Laina's recommendation. **President Rothermel** said that he felt most clubs met monthly and to allow for ample time for club meetings and decision-making, a 45-day time frame appeared to be necessary. **Aitken** added that the number of the letters and calls she had received were "please delay this process so that our club can meet." **Motion Carried.**

Aitken Moved that the deadlines be changed so that applicants listed in the September issue will be considered in February, those listed in December issue will be considered in June and the applicants listed in the April issue will be considered in October. **Discussion: President Rothermel** asked to withdraw his recommendation and instead, favored this motion as presented. **Lindsley** noted that in his opinion to pass this amendment as written would put us in conflict with our constitution. **Motion Carried. Lindsley voting No.** **Aitken** asked that the board members maintain their files on these delayed clubs and remarked that any additional information received will be forwarded to each member.

(4) INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

President Rothermel noted that no report had been received, but the International Committee had received many favorable comments from the International membership regarding the meeting we held with them during the June 1997 Annual Meeting.

(5) WINN FOUNDATION REPORT.

The Winn Feline Foundation and its Veterinary Advisors met August 22 1997 in lieu of their October 1997 board meeting. The purpose of the special meeting was to explore the current state of our finances and to continue the strategic planning of the Foundation.

Assisting with the planning process was Jay Siegelaub, an experienced planner and project administrator.

Several conclusions were reached by the board members:

(1) There has been an erosion of donations as the Animal Rescue Fund and the CFA Museum have captured the interest of our clubs and individual donors. We are not a fund that represents immediate results like animal rescue or that represents activities completed with tangible results like the CFA Museum. We, in essence, represent the health and wellbeing of future generations of cats.

(2) We need to explore additional sources of funding over the next 10 years – sources of funding that go beyond the present base of funds that we have relied on for nearly 30 years. We need to develop skills which would help us understand and participate in this exploration.

(3) Relationships with other groups around us, including CFA, have changed and we agree to resolve issues within these relationships over time.

(4) *We need to have clerical/administrative support to handle the business of the foundation. We cannot grow and develop effectively without it. We will formalize and adequately staff the administrative functions of the foundation over time.*

(5) *Equally as important is our communication with our donors, our research grant recipients and others who are interested in our work. The board will continue to focus on actions which will organize and administer the work of the foundation more effectively and communicate the results more clearly*

The board took several actions as a result of our meeting.

(1) *We have set up our own website on the internet. While we are still linked to CFA, we will reach the pet-owning public and veterinarians as well.*

(2) *A letter has gone out to clubs and individuals requesting donations. Our donations are down this year and need augmentation.*

(3) *We are actively searching for writer who will do individual articles or a series of articles for use in the Almanac or in pamphlets.*

(4) *We continue to be interested in what our breeders want to research. To that end, we will participate in an international scientific workshop in feline genetics. Organized by Dr. Urs Giger at the Univ. of Pennsylvania, this scientific workshop will bring together all the laboratories worldwide who are working in the area of feline genetics. Three days of scientific meetings will be followed by a breeders' workshop in which summaries of scientific data as well as areas of interest to breeders such as coat colors and reproductive issues will be presented. We are proud to be a sponsor of this workshop and to assist Dr. Giger in this endeavor.*

Our next meeting will be held in February at the same time as the CFA Board Meeting. This is our annual protocol review meeting. We look forward to funding as many worthy protocols as our funding allows.

*Joan Miller, Board Liaison, spoke on behalf of Winn and noted that it had become a struggle to maintain the donations. She asked for the support of the board to maintain those donations. She felt it is a perception that Winn is doing fine and doesn't need any help. That is just not the case. Gayle Hand is the newest Winn Board member and she is working on a bibliography of all the articles that have been written in the past years. We also have a need for increased reporting and Hilary is looking for writers who are capable of translating medical articles to lay language. [Note: at this time President Rothermel asked Joan to come up to the head table where she was joined by Donna Jean Thompson and Dan Petty who on behalf of Cat Fanciers of Washington presented her a check in the amount of \$5,000 for the Winn Foundation. **Applause!! Applause!!**]*

(6) **HEALTH COMMITTEE.**

President Rothermel next called on **Betty White**, Chairperson, to give the following report. *The CFA Health Committee is certainly one of our organization's success stories, and it*

owes that success to the care and concern of its previous Chairman, Joan Miller. Working closely with a dedicated group of volunteers in concert with the Winn Foundation, Joan forged a smooth-running organization. I am most pleased to report that these committee members have graciously agreed to remain. They are: Nikki Crandall-Seibert, DVM, Gayle Hand, Karen Lawrence, Susan Little, DVM, and Jennifer Reding. In addition I have asked Steven Hull, now in his final year of veterinary medicine at Oklahoma State University, Penny Copes, and Judy Zinn, DVM to join the committee. Joan has eased the transition enormously by providing copies of reports, information about various projects, and day-to-day questions/answers in the life of the committee.

CFA Breed Councils

Upon assuming the chair of the CFA Health Committee, I realized that continued liaison with CFA's breeders is paramount to the mission of this committee. Accordingly, in July I sent a letter to each of the CFA Breed Council Secretaries informing them of my appointment and encouraging them to contact me relative to any health concerns or interests that their members might have. While the committee certainly serves as a clearinghouse for data and information, thereby offering guidance through its many resources, it also functions in an initiative capacity in furthering our efforts to sustain and improve the health of domestic cats.

CFA Health Committee Website FAQs (frequently asked questions)

To my mind, this endeavor is of enormous help to both breeders and the general public. In a relatively short time a number of excellent articles have been made available to those online who might want more in-depth information about a number of feline health concerns. I urge you to look for yourselves at the following addresses:

- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-asthma.html>
- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-diabetes.html>
- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-declawing.html>
- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-early-spay-neuter.html>
- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-ibd.html>
- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-fiv.html>

Committee members Karen Lawrence, Susan Little, and Jennifer Reding have provided outstanding service to CFA in this endeavor. Karen continues to forward questions to me received at the site. Since I have been chair, they have covered a range of topics from a person who wanted to take issue with our stand on declawing to a medical researcher at the National Institutes of Health looking for volunteers for a cat allergy study. (In the case of the former, I believe he now has a clearer understanding of our point of view which is the cat; the latter took his project to the National Capital Cat Show.)

Structure Project

You are aware that Joan met with the breed council secretaries during the annual meeting in Naples and presented the finalized Structure Preface for review by their members. I

will be monitoring the responses during the period before the February meeting of the board. For your information, I have had a continuing dialogue with several breeders who have expressed keen interest in seeing this project move along.

New Rabies Vaccine

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has stamped its approval on the proposed field testing of a new cat rabies vaccine. The need for another product is the potential threat to the health of production personnel and to the environment in the unlikely event that a spill might occur while the virus is being grown during the production process. Use of an onpathogenic vectored vaccine, which this new one is, should substantially reduce this risk. APHIS determined that the risk associated with vaccination of animals with this experimental recombinant vaccine is low. The canarypox vector used in the vaccine is the same virus used in a modified live vaccine that has been safely used in France since 1982 as a commercial avian product. Its safety has been demonstrated experimentally after direct inoculation into humans, cats, dogs, canaries, chickens, primates, and mice.

Immunology Workshop

CFA breeders will be heartened to learn that the 2nd International Feline Immunology Workshop was held at the University of California, Davis in early August. While highly technical in nature, dealing with basic research and only open to scientist participants who came from all over the world, the papers presented suggest considerable study is being focused on the feline immune system. Joan Miller attended the presentation of Dr. Steve O'Brien, National Cancer Institute, who talked about the study of the genetic component in heritable diseases.

Sooner or later this basic research will filter down to us cat breeders in the form of studies that will aid us in understanding and treating diseases of our cats.

*Respectfully submitted,
Betty White*

(7) CFA LAWSUIT.

President Rothermel next called on **Fred Jacobberger** to give a report on the lawsuit against CFA.

You may be getting questions from your constituents concerning what is going on with the suit brought to require a new election to resolve the tie-vote in the 1996 SW Region election. Since it now appears that there will be a hearing in the case before the October board meeting, I thought it best to bring you up-to-date at this time. You will see in the accompanying file that the matter has been reactivated on the court's calendar by Order to Show Cause set initially with a July 30 return date. Due to the unavailability of our attorney on July 30, the judge was asked to reschedule the hearing either to August 13 or August 27. Latest word is that August 13 is out, and that the judge will set either August 27 or a later date for the hearing.

You may recall that the status as of last Fall was that the judge assigned to the case, who had initially ruled that Sy Howard should be disqualified as lawyer for the petitioners due to his previously having served as CFA's attorney, decided that he wanted further briefing and argument on the disqualification issue. He invited Sy to prepare and file a formal motion for reconsideration of the issue. Sy then became ill, and the matter lapsed into dormancy without any formal ruling ever having been made either on the disqualification issue or the merits of the case.

Sometime in 1997 our attorney (Kevin Castel) began receiving calls from Kirk Jones, an attorney in Massachusetts. Jones said he had been contacted by the petitioners and was attempting to find New York Counsel to take over for Sy. I am aware that there has been some talk about Jones' role in the continuation of the lawsuit. Rather than attempting to characterize that role myself, I am providing you all with the correspondence that I have received regarding the matter so that you can make your own determination.

In any event, one Cyril Moore, an attorney licensed by New York but now residing in Connecticut, has made a formal appearance on behalf of Wayne Park, Surf Sand & Sea Club and Paul Raine's Solid Color Cat Club (see 2-19-97 "Consent to Change Attorney of Record"). Santa Monica Cat Club and Beverly Hills Cat Club, listed as petitioners in the original pleadings, indicated their desire to withdraw last August, before Sy became ill, although no formal dismissal was entered. Siamese Fanciers Cat Club responded to a letter from Moore indicating a desire to withdraw. You will see correspondence from our attorney indicating that the proper procedure for those clubs' withdrawal has not been followed. This does not mean that we object to the withdrawal, only that since the three clubs are still represented by Sy of record, the remaining parties cannot simply wave a magic wand and make them gone. I think you may rest assured that, as a practical matter, those three clubs are no longer a part of the suit, and that a way will be found to formalize their withdrawal. Surf Sand & Sea, which consented in February to being represented by Moore, has also subsequently withdrawn.

You will see from the documents that we are objecting to Moore's representation of the remaining petitioners (Park and Paul Raine's Solid Color) due to a New York rule that requires attorneys practicing before New York courts to maintain an office in New York. Moore, while holding a New York license, has no such office. He has directed that we contact him through Jones' office in Massachusetts. This is an issue that the judge ultimately will have to rule upon. We are also, of course, contesting the case on the merits, and our attorneys are preparing a brief to that end that will be submitted prior to the hearing.

The above would ordinarily be sufficient to bring you up-to-date with this proceeding. However, I must also report to you a couple of bizarre twists the case has recently taken. First, Jones called our attorney on July 25 representing himself to be Moore, and carried on the conversation for some time continuing the impersonation of Moore. Jones apparently also had a conversation with court officials in which he impersonated Moore. The details are set forth in Castel's July 25 letters to Moore and Justice Belen. I have never in my career had anything like this happen, and am not sure at this time what all of the repercussions may be.

Second, I received a call from Wayne Park on July 30 during which Wayne told me that he had long ago informed Jones that he no longer wanted to be associated with the suit, and wanted his name removed from it. I asked Wayne to confirm this to me in writing, and he did so (see file). For several months I have been hearing that Wayne has told various persons that he withdrew from the suit. I was unable to contact Wayne to confirm or disaffirm his status – as CFA’s legal counsel I cannot initiate contact with an adverse party represented by counsel (as Wayne was, according to the 2-19-97 document he signed). Instead, I had our attorneys write Moore to inquire about Wayne’s status. After Wayne called me, I immediately had our attorneys advise Moore of the conversation and of confirming letter. We have not yet heard back from Moore. Obviously, continuing to pursue a lawsuit in the name of a party who has communicated his desire to withdraw is a very serious matter. All of this is pretty new, and we are considering what we should do about it. It is probable that we will ask the court for leave to investigate this issue fully, including taking depositions of the persons involved.

If further significant events occur prior to the October meeting, I will update you.

*Respectfully submitted,
Fred Jacobberger*

Jacobberger – The good news now is that it is over. What has happened since the August report is that we received a letter in response to our letter to Mr. Cyril Moore along with Kirk Jones saying that Wayne Park, in fact, had written to the lawyers in March 1997, indicating his desire to withdraw from the lawsuit. Mr. Moore did say that thereafter there were phone conversations between both him and others with Wayne in which Wayne changed his mind and said that he wanted to continue. Wayne, however, denies that and in my further conversations with Wayne, he says that didn’t happen. In any event, based on Wayne’s letter to me in July, the lawyers signed a stipulation with our lawyers and with Sy Howard and the matter has now been dismissed. That is where we are. **Discussion: Everett** asked Becky Jones how she got so involved with the SW Regional matter; i.e., calling Region 5 members, involving her son, Kirk Jones, etc.? Kim went on that she had definite problems with any member of the CFA Board instigating behavior against the ruling made by the majority of the board that would or could result in actions detrimental to the organization and our internal structure. The members of this Board are supposed to be a team, working together, not causing problems for our own corporation. She then asked Becky to address what moved her to her behavior. Jones responded that she “wasn’t moved to anything. I had a dissenting opinion with our attorney and his decision in regards to this tie vote which I never kept secret from anyone. I felt that we should have had a runoff election to determine the vote. Simply because I sit on the CFA Board doesn’t mean that I can’t have a dissenting opinion. I had nothing to do with the Southwest Region nor the law suit. I was out of the country at the time it took place. When I came back from Canada that summer a year ago, I heard that this was underway and I frankly was not unhappy because I knew that through the courts of New York would be the only bona fide real decision. In other words, I felt that there were some of us on this board that did not support the actions of the Executive Committee and therefore, I felt that for probably less than \$1,000 we could have had a NY State not-for-profit judge give us the truth – a legal opinion. In other words, he would have upheld our attorney’s opinion or he would have ordered a new runoff election and I thought it was a healthy situation to find out. There were those among us in this organization and I think this year’s

annual was overwhelming in favoring an amendment to solve this problem with a runoff election. We now have that mechanism in place.” **Everett** agreed that the runoff amendment was a good move and as early as the time of our attorney’s original decision in June 1996, he advised this Board that the next reasonable action was for us to move to initiate this type of amendment to our constitution, and he subsequently prepared such an amendment and it was ratified by the CFA Board. She asked again why Becky had involved her son in this lawsuit. **Jones** alleged that she had not involved her son, he is a litigator, and she had told him about the situation. “I think all of us who have grown children might discuss our situation over the Holidays or sometime when we get together and I told him about what was going on in this organization and what had transpired. I think the greatest tragedy in this whole thing was the tragedy that befell Sy Howard a year ago at this time. He was in the process of defending himself. Our NY attorney, Mr. Castel, spent his entire time in trying to discredit Sy Howard. I did not urge my son to become involved.” **Everett** responded that she had no problem with a board member having a right of opinion. “Everyone has that right but I am concerned when I receive calls from individuals saying that you have called people in the SW Region to encourage participation in this lawsuit. The clubs should be involved in any participation, not a board member encouraging something that is going to result in such a high expenditure. The amendment that was presented and passed is the way to solve internal problems. If we have board members getting involved in this type of thing it erodes the foundation and could literally break up this organization. We should work among ourselves to solve any problems. Kirk Jones coming into the picture is still puzzling and his role is unclear.” **Jones** responded that her son simply acted as a liaison. “You’re getting phone calls – this is hearsay. Wayne Park is a liar and talks out of both sides of his mouth. Mr. Park has told various people things and he has told other people other things.” **Jones** then stated that she was unable to verify what is hearsay but did say that her son was never the attorney of record. She asked what was the fear CFA had of allowing the judge to make a ruling. She stated personal regret that she had not asked for a runoff election during the Sunday Board meeting at the 1996 Annual meeting. **Everett** responded that she had not mentioned Wayne Park. She went on to say that many things did occur, Kirk Jones was involved and things did occur which did cost money. She then went on to ask if there was anyone else at the board table that felt they had to be involved in promoting this lawsuit or even believes that we should do this kind of thing, getting ourselves involved in situations designed to undermine the organization. Our attorney, Fred Jacobberger, had given us advice, which is what we pay him to do. When we go against the advice of our attorney we put the organization at risk. We, as a board, could have questioned our position during the 1996 Annual meeting but none of us chose to do that and that may have been a mistake; however, that is what happened. It doesn’t excuse what happened later and what it has cost this organization, and not only in dollars spent. **President Rothermel** noted that Kirk Jones had represented himself as the attorney of record. **Jones** questioned why the dollars had been spent and just how much had been spent. **President Rothermel** replied that we had to defend this corporation against the lawsuit that was filed against us. We were defending our attorney’s interpretation whether we agreed or not. This corporation’s attorney made a decision. The defense of that lawsuit was defending our attorney’s opinion of NY corporate law and CFA Constitutional law. Anybody who sits at this table has a fiduciary responsibility to this corporation or they should not be here, nor should they even run for an office of this corporation. If you choose to be an officer of this corporation, your fiduciary responsibility is to CFA.

Everett stated that this was a costly mistake. We make mistakes and no doubt will continue to make them but we must remain vigilant that we never compound our errors or jeopardize our organization. **Jones** – Who made it? I didn't make it. I had nothing to do with it. **Everett** – You became very involved to the point that it created much chaos. I really believe that when the board members are busy protesting each other and creating animosity, this board cannot be well served. **Miller** – I believe this was extremely upsetting to the board and to CFA and it cost a lot of money. Each of us has individual opinions but it is a mistake to go against the consensus of the board. We had all of the information before us, we could have decided as a Board to do something else but we determined that Fred's judgment on this was proper and once the board decides on something like that which is so important and involves money, we have to stand behind it. Even after time went by and the money was mounting up, to continue to pursue something that was against and so detrimental to the organization was wrong. It is our responsibility to put aside our disagreement with the Board in these cases and go forward with the judgment of the majority of the board. We, as board members, should not be bucking against the board decisions particularly when it involves legal aspects and an enormous amount of money as this one did. I have to support Kim's viewpoint on this matter. **Doernberg** thought Kim was making some unfounded allegations, first of all in telling us that Becky Jones talked to unnamed people in the SW Region. But putting all of that aside, clubs from the SW Region and a former regional director, with no help from Becky Jones, filed a lawsuit and a majority of the money was spent by addressing that, when Sy Howard was involved in this lawsuit. **President Rothermel** responded that Diana was making an invalid assumption by saying where the majority of the money was spent when she doesn't know that and won't know where the majority of the money was spent until after we receive a full financial disclosure that will be available when it is available. **Doernberg** reminded that Donna Fuller had told us a year ago that the amount spent at that time was \$30,000, and this isn't guesswork. **President Rothermel** said that at this moment we can't be certain that \$30,000 is a majority of the money. **Doernberg** then said that in this case, we should not be discussing the matter until we have the final financial disclosure and that Kim was out-of-line in accusing Becky of having spoken to unnamed people in the SW Region is in line. **Everett** responded that she had not accused Becky of anything but had asked for some answers and wanted to know her role as a board member and her participation in this matter. Becky gave her side of the story. Kim did not feel that board members should involve themselves internally with this sort of thing. Not any board member. We have disagreements, yes, but there is a way to do things. What was done at the last Annual, i.e., adoption of a constitutional amendment . addressing the tie-vote, was the way this should be handled. **Lindsley** – I would like Becky to have the opportunity, as she started to do here, to clear up and state her position on some of the allegations that are being made. Back in January, the lawsuit against the corporation was effectively dead and what is more important, our financial downside and the money we were spending on it was over. Now there have been allegations, and Becky you mentioned Mr. Park, that after the February Board meeting that you made specific calls to the region to parties and to Mr. Park encouraging the lawsuit to be renewed, and within a matter of weeks your son did, in fact, send a letter out to all the parties indicating that he was now taking over representation. So, could you answer – you should answer these allegations and clarify your position because right now all we have heard is rumors. Rumors are that you made specific phone calls to and had discussions with people in the SW Region urging that they resume the prosecution of the lawsuit. **Jones** – No, I never did. I am not on the Internet, I never

made any phone calls urging people to continue anything. I was not involved. I never wrote any letters. Never, I never did. I don't understand why – I understand that my son was involved as a liaison. I can't deny that. I only told him at the holiday season what was happening. He is a litigator and he chose to contact the Howards. **President Rothermel** asked if she felt that at that point and time, there was any conflict of interest, for her being on this board and her son being involved on the other side. **Jones** – No, I feel there was no conflict of interest because I don't consider that we were sued. I consider that we were or they, Sy Howard and the parties in the SW Region, were seeking the final decision that could only come from the courts of the State of New York. **President Rothermel** – Your opinion, Becky, not being that of an attorney, disagrees with the judge in this case. The judge ruled that there is no question Sy Howard argued the question that this was not a lawsuit and the judge disagreed. [Craig then called on Fred for clarification.] **Jacobberger** – I appreciate the fact that most of you are not attorneys but to assume that this action was not a lawsuit is completely absurd. The way you invoke the jurisdiction of the court is through a suit; that is how you do it. **President Rothermel** – When a corporation has a lawsuit filed against them, it would be most ridiculous not to defend yourself against it. There is not a businessman alive, when faced with a lawsuit, that won't defend himself. **Jones** – You call it defense but we are a not for profit corporation. Why can't we get the truth, why can't we get the truth? What are we defending ourselves against? **President Rothermel** – Our attorney's interpretation of our constitution and of the NY law. **Jones** – You get in a room full of attorneys and they are not going to agree on anything. **Williams** suggested that we move forward in our discussion of this matter. **President Rothermel** agreed and went on to say that while there are some further considerations in this lawsuit, they don't include further research of Becky's involvement. There is a money situation here. We have spent a considerable amount of money and our attorney has advised us that there is the possibility of us recouping some of these losses. In both of our attorneys' opinions, egregious action has taken place since the Park letter of March 1997 that was acknowledged. The failure to drop the lawsuit at that point in time was very detrimental to us and may have been illegal. I have been advised that there is the possibility of suing both attorneys involved in this case, both Kirk Whittaker Jones and Cyril Moore, for the costs incurred from the date of March 1997 forward. There is also the possibility for punitive damages because of the egregious action of not dropping the case when their client told them he wanted it dropped. So, we have the possibility of recouping our losses plus three times those losses from those attorneys. I want to know the feeling of the board as to going forward to recoup those losses. **Everett** responded that yes, we should go forward. **Williams** asked at what cost? **President Rothermel** noted that he was asking for comments from the board and had not said we were or were not going to pursue this avenue. We should ask our attorney to come back in February with full financial disclosure and a recommendation then. **Lindsley** – I would suggest that since this is being reported in the record and it may not be otherwise clear, perhaps Fred can elucidate what exactly happened in March and upon what clearly we are talking about for this to be based on. I am not sure that it has been made clear; it may be inferred and known by people at the board table but it may not be clear to others. **Jacobberger** – There is something I want to consider further in talking about this; if in fact Wayne is telling the truth, that he did not, after he sent his letter in asking to be withdrawn, thereafter agree to get back into the lawsuit permitting his name to be used again, then I think we have pretty clear violation of professional canon of ethics. Pander with the courts and pander with the opposing counsel, and pander with the client. Whether or not that is the basis for a civil lawsuit to recover money by us is something I would

have to take a look at. [**Doernberg** and **White** questioned billable time and **Jacobberger** said he probably could handle it himself and in the event another opinion was needed, we would not have to go back to the NY firm for that opinion.] **Everett Moved** that Fred brings back to the board in February full financial disclosure and a recommendation. [Note: It was decided that no motion was necessary; and the board gave consensus for this procedure.]

President Rothermel then asked if anyone on the board wanted to recommend any further action in this matter – seeing none, he then instructed the board that once away from the table, this is to be considered a dead issue. He then commented, “I never again want to see any board member involved in a lawsuit against this corporation. I think it is the fiduciary responsibility of any board member to represent and to back this corporation. If they cannot do it, they should withdraw from the issue. If they don’t withdraw from the issue they should consider whether they should be sitting on this board again. This is your responsibility as a CFA Board Member whether you agree or not. There are many of us who go away from this table who have voted in the negative, but if the majority of the board who represent the issue, that is what we support.”

(8) PUBLIC RELATIONS.

It’s been a very busy summer for the CFA Public Relations Department, both in the office and on the road. The CFA booth has attended seven CFA/Friskies Lead Shows; the American Veterinary Medical Association’s annual conference in Reno; and the Central Veterinary Conference in Kansas City. News releases were distributed on the 1996 CFA Awards and we are providing support for the 1997 CFA International Cat Show to be held this November in Atlanta. Efforts to secure new advertisers for the Almanac and the CFA Yearbook continue.

1998 FRISKIES/CFA CAT SHOW PROGRAM:

Friskies PetCare Company has signed the letter of intent to continue the Friskies/CFA Cat Show Program for 1998. The selection process has been completed for the twenty (20) CFA shows that will receive financial assistance and will be designed as Lead Shows. Two Lead Shows will be held in conjunction with pet fairs in 1998; this will allow Friskies to support both a dog and a cat event at the same time and provide a bigger bang for both animals.

The 1998 Lead Shows are: Houston Cat Club (Houston TX, Jan. 3-4); San Diego Cat Fanciers (San Diego CA, Jan. 31-Feb. 1); Cats Plain & Fancy (Boston MA, Feb. 14-15); San Francisco Revelers (San Mateo [San Francisco] CA, Mar. 21-22); Mid-Michigan Cat Fanciers (Novi [Detroit] MI, Mar. 28-29); The Crafty Cat (Charlotte NC, Apr. 4-5); Rainbow International [at the America’s Family Pet Show] (Pomona [Los Angeles] CA, Apr. 17-19); Tarheel Triangle Cat Fanciers (Raleigh NC, May 9-10); Miami Florida Cat Fanciers (Miami FL, May 23-24); Garden State Cat Club (Somerset NJ [New York City], Jul. 18-19); No Pussy. Footin’ Around (Seattle WA, Jul. 25-26); Mo-Kan Cat Club (Kansas City MO, Aug. 8-9); Nova Cat Fanciers (Pennsauken [Philadelphia] NJ, Aug. 29-30); National Capital Cat Show (Chantilly [Washington DC] VA, Sept. 12-13); Salt City Cat Club (Syracuse NY, Sept. 26-27); Peace Bridge Aby Fanciers (Niagara Falls [Buffalo] NY, Oct. 3-4); International Somali Cat

Club [at the America's Family Pet Show] (Sacramento CA, Oct. 16-18); Indy Cat Club (Indianapolis IN, Oct. 31-Nov. 1); and Lewis & Clark Cat Club (Portland OR, Dec. 5-6).

Friskies will pay CFA a sponsorship fee of \$35,000 for 1998. The fee covers the use of the CFA logo in promotions for CFA cat shows, assistance in lead show selection and support of non-lead shows. The sponsorship fee will be earmarked to cover costs associated with the program (travel to lead shows and related CFA Public Relations Department's office expenses [i.e., office rent, postage, telephone and part-time staffing]). Please note, that the CFA booth will not be at each and every lead show in 1998 due to budget limitations.

THE CFA STORE:

Jan Walker of Preferred Promotions Network, Inc., located in Stephenville, Texas, is currently working up a proposal for items that CFA can sell from The CFA Store. Her proposal will be available for your review and consideration at the October meeting. While I will be attending the Strategic Planning Session with the CFA Board Thursday and Friday, October 2 and 3, I will be leaving to attend the Peace Bridge Aby Cat Show. I request that you please consider the options presented and approve the program presented. CFA will have to provide the funds for the start-up; shipping will NOT be handled by us, the merchandise would be drop-shipped from the supplier.

ALMANAC ADVERTISING:

Pet Products Plus, will start to advertise their Royal Canine) brand of cat food in the November and December issues of the Almanac. 1998 insertions are also being considered. Subscribe Choice® is another of their cat food brands which is being offered from their booth at CFA cat shows.

CFA BREED VIDEO:

Since its release in late 1995, "A Video Guide to American Pedigreed Cats – Second Edition" has been aired on a number of television and cable stations. Sales of the video have been flat, however, so we are taking a more active promotional role to increase sales. A test television commercial will air on an upcoming "Focus on New York," a 30-minute cable television show offering a unique promotional opportunity. "Focus" segments feature corporate promotions, new products and services, cultural arts, business, health, public issues, as well as restaurants, book reviews and travel. "Focus" reaches approximately two million people. The show is aired on Time Warner Cable and reaches an upscale, metropolitan New York audience. The CFA spot will air four times at a cost of \$500.00 which includes production and airing.

CATS WILD TO MILD!

The CATS exhibit has really increased the number of official museum attendance at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. The official museum attendance since the March 16 exhibit opening was 173,688 as of August 9. According to Museum officials, "this is very high for us – up about 34% over last year at this time!" The exhibit ended on September 1 in LA and will move next to the San Diego Natural History Museum, opening on November 15

and running until January 4, 1998. Starting in San Diego, GC, NW Agonistes Commotion of Scrimshaw, 1997 CFA Cat of the Year, will be featured in the CFA case, replacing GC, NW Sol-Mer Sharif, the 1996 Cat of the Year.

CFA BOOTH:

The CFA booth is scheduled to attend between October and February 1998 the following 1997 CFA/Friskies Lead Shows: Peace Bridge Aby Fanciers (Niagara Falls NY, Oct 4-5); Indy Cat Club (Indianapolis IN, Oct 25-26); Cats Exclusive (Ft. Lauderdale FL, Nov. 2-3); Lewis & Clark LH (Dec. 6-7, Portland OR). The Delta Society (Atlanta GA, Oct. 17-19); The American Association of Feline Practitioners [Winn Feline Foundation] (Atlanta GA, Oct 19-20); Royal Winter Fair Toronto Cat Fanciers show (Toronto Ont., Nov. 8-9), and the CFA International Cat Show (Atlanta GA, Nov. 21-23). 1998 CFA/Friskies Lead Shows: Houston Cat Club (Houston TX, Jan. 3-4); San Diego Cat Fanciers (San Diego CA, Jan. 31-Feb. 1); Cats Plain & Fancy (Boston MA, Feb. 14-15).

CFA SHOW IN JAPAN:

I have been invited to bring the CFA booth to a show in Kyoto, Japan February 14-15. The show will be a joint effort of more than 20 Japanese clubs and will be held at the Kyoto Tower. The clubs will pick up all in-country expenses. I will be using airline mileage to cover the transportation cost from Daytona Beach to Kyoto. This show has been in the works for a number of years and seems to be a go this time. The show manager is Tokuko (Suzie) Yamazaki, the show secretary is Kayoko Koizumi. Takahashi Iwao is the entry clerk, with Misako Purdy handling American entries. Related expenses for this show are included in the 1997-98 budget request for the PR Department.

NEUTER/SPAY PROGRAM:

The public service announcements for television are still an ongoing program. Since receiving this task I have acquired production quotes and plan to expand the program to include radio PSAs also. Both will fall within the budgeted amounts provided by The Lams Company for just TV. We are currently contacting celebrities who own CFA-registered cats and asking them to participate in the worthwhile project.

*Respectfully submitted,
Michael W Brim,
CFA Public Relations Director*

Doernberg – questioned the portions of the report relating to the \$35,000 sponsorship fee from Friskies for 1998, the CFA Store, and the CFA Breed Video. **Dent** spoke about the CFA Store and explained that it is a project that Michael was directed to initiate to develop a line of goods beyond what we now sell. The outcome of that is to promote CFA as well as to increase our bottom line financially. Michael has been investigating that and had received the information for the proposal only last Tuesday, too late to get it to us for this meeting. We have been discussing CFA promotional items and decisions on what items to sell will be made. **Williams**

asked to be kept abreast of what items are being considered because of his work with the CFA logo. **Lindsley** mentioned our involvement in San Diego with Cats Wild to Mild and commented on what a nice presence CFA has with that exhibit. He also spoke to the neuter/spay program. He suggested that we may want to take a strong look at utilizing these funds in the promotion of neutering and spaying of feral cats. **Miller** concurred with Phil and said she is currently dialoging with Michael concerning this area of promotion. **Doernberg** wondered what was Iams' original intention for our use of this money. **President Rothermel** responded that Iams had originally agreed that the money should be used for promotion of Neuter/Spay and advertisement for Neuter/Spay program. Our plan is to develop PSAs and other promotion materials. It is possible that we may need to go back to Iams and determine if we want to take a different direction. **Lindsley Moved** that Michael contact Iams to see if promotion of some type of program for the spaying and neutering of unowned and homeless cats is an agreeable use for the funds that they have donated to us. **Carried.**

President Rothermel spoke to the earmarking of funds from Friskies. It was agreed that **President Rothermel** and **Dent** would discuss this item directly with Michael.

(9) **BREED DEFINITION COMMITTEE REPORT.**

President Rothermel next called on **Diana Doernberg**, Chairperson, to give the report. The complete report can be found on page 90 of this Almanac.

Doernberg thanked all her committee members, Pam DelaBar, Linda Berg, Wayne Harding, Anna Sadler, Tom Dent, and Michael Petersen and members of the Central Office for their efforts and then **Moved** to send the report to each BC member for input and then bring it back to the Board for further discussion in February. **Motion Carried.** [Note: The Board then went on record in thanking the committee and Diana for their efforts with this very difficult project.]

(10) **INTERNATIONAL SHOW.**

President Rothermel next called on **Linda Berg**, International Show Chairperson who gave the following report.

The International Show is coming together nicely through the efforts of all involved!

For the 1997 show we are using approximately 35,000 square feet less, which has caused some concern. It is felt with Friskies not being a sponsor we will be eliminating the stage for their Trained Cat Show and Booth which took considerable space. Things might be a little tighter but not unbearable....

There has been some talk about changing the way in which we pick the judges on Friday morning, doing it at an earlier date in order to get their names printed on the schedule, etc. After reviewing our choices it was decided to leave it the way it is as being the easiest way of doing it.

Michael is working closely with the PR Firm, Pamela Keene, and we are confident that working with the PR Firm will make a difference in the gate, etc. for the show. One of the

advertisement items will be in the AAA magazine that is put out for that area of the country. Michael is confident all of the items being looked at will increase the gate potential considerably.

Shana Otis-Kuhnert is in charge of fund-raising this year and her letter went out the beginning of August. Dan Petty informed me that at the National Capital Show she already had \$11,710 in pledges and has five judges left to be sponsored. She has adjusted her goal from \$10K to \$14K!. Dan has also asked Ande DeGeer to solicit catalog ads for the International with the same gusto she used in getting ads for the annual booklet (she got over 100 ads!). She has agreed wholeheartedly!

The 1998 Show

The show hall in Kansas City looks good. The Show Hotel is across the street and it has an underground tunnel access should the weather get nasty. We have approximately the same space that we do in Atlanta; however, if the space in Atlanta proves to be small we have the option to contract for an additional portion of the hall.

Allene attended the Mo-Kan CC show in Kansas City the end of August as a Friskies Lead Show. The gate was wonderful and she expects to be able to do the same with the International. Friskies said the media in Kansas City was very responsive. Although we may not have Friskies sponsorship and publicity in 1998, we believe we can do as well considering the media is responsive and positive about cat shows in general. We will be taking advantage of two more shows scheduled in Kansas City in 1998 to advertise the International Show. Spectators and vendors are already expressing interest at the August show about the International Show in 1998. Debbie Kusy also attended this Kansas City show to familiarize herself with the show hall.

Future Shows

We are looking at a variety of locations for the show but concentrating on the West Coast. Anaheim is out as the convention center is expanding and the expansion isn't scheduled to be finished until October 1999. However, they feel certain expansion will be done and it still might be a consideration. We are also looking at San Diego and Ontario. If anyone is aware of other halls they feel will work, contact Allene.

We are also considering keeping the International Show in the same location in the middle of the United States, preferably Kansas City. We have thought for some time now that we would have better rates, gate, etc. if we had it in the same place year after year. It gets very expensive to go in new every year; we have no negotiating power!

Last Item

We are considering changing the name of the show due to the similarity to The International Cat Show produced by Vicki Markstein. Corporate sponsors and vendors are continually confusing us with Vicki. We need to have a clear identity and now is the time as we're stepping up our advertising efforts. The goal will be to have a new name starting with the 1998 show. We need to have the word Cat in the name. One name we are considering is: The

CFA World of Cats Show. Anyone who has an idea on a new name please contact Allene. We will create a new logo once a new name has been finalized.

*Respectfully submitted,
Linda Berg
International Show Chairperson*

Jacobberger reported that Sy Howard had previously looked into the matter of whether or not we have the right to use the name and the opinion was that there is no legal impediment to our using the name. Whether it is a practical impediment or not is up to us but legally we are fine. **Lindsley** asked if the similarity of the two names is working to our detriment. **Tartaglia** answered that there is some confusion among vendors and some exhibitors. Some vendors have been unhappy with the INCATS International show and they are confused with who we are and who they are. There was also an exhibitor on the CFA list who had stated “how dare someone else use our name” so there seems to be some confusion. **Lindsley** – knew there had been some confusion but (1) Is this confusion working to our detriment making our show less than it could be, or are we losing money? (2) If you feel there is some confusion that it would warrant changing our name? **Tartaglia** responded that she didn’t know if it was that bad yet. The one thing we have started doing this year is that we added Cat back into the name of the show. We have not been doing that because in 1994 we tried using the title CFA International Cat Show and Vicky Markstein presented us with some information saying it was an infringement on her show. We have since then received a legal opinion that we are within our rights and we started using Cat again this year because it is really important to have it in there. I don’t know if that is going to cause any further problems, but we are now that much more similar again. [**Note:** After some discussion it was agreed that we will not change the name at least at this time.] **Tartaglia** next reported that she had been investigating additional California show sites and would report at the next meeting. **Lindsley** next offered some pointers and offered to assist in the search. **Tartaglia** then added that she would like to keep the International Show in the same spot and not move it around the country. [After some discussion it was agreed that this matter should be redressed in the future but not today.]

(11) CLERKING REPORT.

President Rothermel noted that we have Debbie Kusy’s written report and asked Stan Barnaby if he had any updates or additions. **Barnaby** noted that he had spoken with Debbie and she told him that at this time she had nothing further to add. She is still getting her feet wet and getting the program set up. *The three months that I have served as chair of the CFA Clerking Program have been mostly a transitional time. I made a trip to Central Office in July to see how that portion of the Clerking Program is administered by Shirley Michaud-Dent and found both the trip and Shirley to be most helpful, as was all of the Central Office staff.*

There are four clerking schools scheduled at this time being conducted by licensed MCIs, assisted, in all but one case, by a licensed Master Clerk hoping to attain their MCI title. I have also heard from quite a few people around the country that they are looking for clerking schools in their area – there is an active interest in the Clerking Program in CFA.

As of 9/1/97, there are licensed 216 Clerks, 172 Master Clerks and 34 Master Clerk Instructors, 7 of which are in Japan!

My predecessor, Chuck Reich, had asked that a Clerking Pin be awarded to licensed clerks for their years of service, similar to the pins that are given to judges. I would like to ask that this issue be addressed at this board meeting as the Clerking Program is, I believe, one of CFA's most valuable assets, and our longtime clerks deserve the recognition.

In closing, I would like to thank Craig Rothermel and the CFA Board for the opportunity to work with the Clerking Program. I feel, as I am sure you all do, that good clerks and master clerks are of vital importance to the future of CFA.

*Respectfully submitted,
Debbie Kusy
Clerking Program Chairperson*

(12) JUDGING PROGRAM REPORTS.

President Rothermel asked Kim Everett to present the various judging reports to the Board. **Donna J. Thompson** gave her report first.

Judging Program — Applicants and Trainees

I'm back in business with roses as you can see. Gloria Hoover and Debbie Ritter are both out working with all their color classes scheduled. If all goes well they will be presented for advancement in February. Should you be at a show where they are working, take five to observe and let me know of any problems and better yet, let me know if they performed well.

I have enclosed the applications for two new applicants (MaryKae Krause and Chuck Payne) as well as four second specialty applications (Rachel Anger, Rhett Bockman, Paula Boroff and Paul Patton). Thus far, all letters have been positive. Club and individual letter lists are included for your information. There is ample time for more letters and I expect them once the Almanac is delivered. Updates and all letters will be available in the reading room. I am delighted to see our CFA clubs and fanciers bearing their responsibility to the Judging Program with reference letters. THANK YOU!

THANK YOU, Directors, for spreading the word. The October Board meeting is always a difficult one for letters as the time is usually short between the September Almanac distribution and the board meeting. The letter lists are impressive.

As I become more and more comfortable with my new computer I am updating the Judging Program forms and letters for a more professional appearance.

I have heard I am receiving some undeserved credit for the Judging Program Committee, its members and assignments. I have never had any input regarding the individuals chosen to serve on the committee and learn of the assignments when announced by the chairperson at the Sunday Board Meeting.

Will see you in October. Travel safely and take care.

*Respectfully submitted,
Donna Jean Thompson
Judging Program, Domestic Applicants and Trainees*

COMMITTEE REPORT: Judges' Schools & Workshops

First, I would like to thank the board of directors for supporting Kim's recommendation of my appointment to this important position as Judges' Schools and Workshops Coordinator. I will do my best to ensure that these important elements of CFA's program of continuing education and training for judges, applicants and others are the best they can be. As you will see from the following update, I have jumped into the thick of it and have things on track.

The Judges' Workshop held in conjunction with the 1997 annual meeting was attended by 74 CFA Judges and featured presentations by the American Shorthair and Japanese Bobtail Breed Councils as well as a general discussion of colors and patterns. At the request of American Shorthair Breed Committee Chair Gar DeGeer, I organized, programmed and delivered CFA's first totally automated multi-media, multi-medium presentation of this nature. The computer generated program featured integrated digital photo images provided by Richard Katris (Chanan); a mix of graphics, line drawings and formatted text on a beautiful American Rag background designed by committee member Carolyn Lyons; a prerecorded "script" (voice-over) throughout the entire program; and, a wonderful 5-minute video produced by committee member Gayle Hand (with technical assistance by Stephen Deutch) that featured Suzi Beedy demonstrating correct and incorrect handling techniques in a way that brought just the right touch of levity to the presentation. All participants received a printed booklet containing all the presentation "slides" as well as several papers discussing colors, breed history, interpretation of the CFA ASH Standard and a recent National American Shorthair Club survey.

Next came the Japanese Bobtail program. Despite the non-delivery of expected graphic and printed handout materials that were lost somewhere in the mail system, Breed Council Chair Lynn Search bore up under the pressure to organize and moderate an excellent presentation, with several examples of both LH and SH varieties expertly handled and commented on by Douglas Myers.

Following the breed presentations, Pam DelaBar, ably assisted by Bob Agresta, led a lively discussion of color and pattern issues.

The evening's program ran very smoothly thanks to the behind the scenes efforts of Allene Tartaglia and the Central Office staff who saw to it that the set up met our needs, and the Southern Region Annual Committee, who arranged for the cages and other supplies — as well as the wonderful buffet supper that greeted attendees on arrival.

Our 2nd annual Judges School, which will be held in conjunction with the 1997 International Show in Atlanta, is proceeding nicely. In mid-July I learned that Will Thompson would be unable to present instruction on several breeds that were advertised in the Almanac. After consultation with Will, I began the search for replacements. Donna Jean Thompson and

Loretta Baugh graciously agreed to fill the void at this late date, and I communicated that information to the Central Office. Allene has indicated that these changes, as well as the addition of the missing breeds (American Curl, Japanese Bobtail, Korat), will be reflected in the September Almanac. Our complete panel of experts and their assignments are:

LORETTA BAUGH: *American Curl (LH/SH), Birman, Maine Coon, Norwegian Forest Cat, Ragdoll, Turkish Angora and Turkish Van.*

BOB BRADSHAW: *American SH, American Wirehair, Bombay, British, Burmese (Sable/Dilute), Cornish Rex, Devon Rex, European Burmese, Japanese Bobtail (LH/SH), Manx (LH/SH) and Russian Blue.*

BOB MOLINO: *Balinese, Colorpoint SH, Javanese, Orientals (LH/SH) and Siamese.*

DONNA JEAN THOMPSON: *Exotic and Persian (all divisions).*

JUDY THOMAS: *Abyssinian, Chartreux, Egyptian Mau, Havana Brown, Korat, Ocicat, Scottish Fold (LH/SH), Selkirk Rex, Singapura, Somali and Tonkinese.*

I have prepared and coordinated a presentation schedule/agenda that Karen Lawrence will post on the “Inside CFA” section of the CFA homepage, along with all other information regarding the school. As of September 9th we have eight students enrolled. I anticipate that we will reach our limit of 35 students before our “closing date,” which is November 10th.

Our 1998 Judges’ Workshop will feature the Abyssinian, Egyptian Mau and Somali breeds. I wrote to each of the Breed Council Secretaries in August to formalize presentation guidelines and requirements, and understand that work is well underway. I can also relate that some – if not all – of the presentations will utilize some form of multi-media presentation technology, in addition to examples of cats that demonstrate specific elements of the CFA Breed Standard.

I have also started the ball rolling for the 1999 Judges’ Workshop by writing to the Bombay, British Shorthair and Burmese Breed Council Secretaries to outline our requirements and their responsibilities.

Last, but not least, I am preparing a survey for our judges that will solicit their input/opinions on such areas as mandatory attendance at Breed Workshops, interest/desire to serve as an instructor at Judges’ Schools, selection of breeds for future workshops, etc. The survey will be coordinated with all members of the Judging Program Committee before I send it to CFA Central Office to print and mail.

In closing, I welcome any ideas, suggestions or other guidance you might care to offer that would improve our CFA Judges’ Schools and Workshops. Should you desire any further details on information contained in this report, please don’t hesitate to write, call or send e-mail to ZendaBob@compuserve.com

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Zenda

COURSE FOR JUDGES IN FELINE GENETICS

Prior to the CFA Annual Meeting in Florida, I contacted both Kim Everett and Craig Rothermel regarding the possibility of adding a Feline Genetics Correspondence Course to the educational opportunities available to our CFA Judging Panel. Since there is an ever-increasing interest in and emphasis on the subject among CFA cat fanciers, it seems to me that CFA should take steps to provide a method for those who desire to do so to obtain training in this important discipline. It might even be possible to make this course available to any within CFA who desire increase their knowledge and understanding of this complex subject. However, currently am suggesting that CFA adopt a formal training program which can be made available to those of our judges who would like to take it. This should also include trainees and any who plan to apply for acceptance into the Judging Program. I think that it will profit CFA if our judging panel is given a vehicle through which they might obtain formal genetics training. Currently, our judges are the most highly thought of group of feline experts in the world's cat fancy. However, I do believe that, since CFA has never emphasized feline genetics as a part of our judges' expertise, that there is probably some weakness in the area of genetics. I am also sure that some of our judges have more background in this area than others. However, I also believe that there are those in CFA who consider themselves "expert" who are really not. But then, that can be said about a lot of things. I have always believed that there is no one who knows it all; if someone gets to the point that they believe they DO know it all, they should hang it up.

I have been in contact with Heather E. Lorimer, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Genetics, Department of Biological Sciences, Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio 44555, who works with genetics at the college level and have included her suggestions regarding the probable content of the course which I envision containing five sections. We are indeed fortunate that Dr. Lorimer's academic experience and recognition satisfy our current need for genetic authority and expertise.

CFA FELINE GENETICS COURSE

1. *Basic genetics; how inheritance works.*
2. *Coat color genetics.*
3. *Coat genetics (length, the Rex gene, plus ear genes? tail genes?, etc.)*
4. *Genetic defects.*
5. *Population genetics/variability and inbreeding depression.*

I think that basic theory and coat color genetics area great starting place. I know that there have been many articles on these subjects, but I would like to see an actual step-by-step instructional road map with accompanying examinations and CFA recognized certification. For example, we currently certify Clerks, Master Clerks, and Judges. We can add genetics certification to our impressive list of CFA accomplishments.

I think that each section should be kept to a short series of lessons so that those electing to take the course will not get discouraged by going on and on seeking a difficult-to-reach pot of

gold at the end of the CFA genetics knowledge rainbow. The course will not be easy; it will be college level material. I believe that the sooner someone is “rewarded” the more eager they will be to continue with the remaining sections of the course...particularly when most of those who should be interested have been absent from the academic atmosphere for a long time.

I also believe that this series of courses should be paid for by those who elect to take them. I would hope that the bulk of our judges would do so; however, I can't really say that this will be the case. It just seems so logical and necessary to me that I would hope others will agree. At a minimum, applicants to the Judging Program should certainly be interested. Perhaps, someday, we could even make this a requirement for all. There are those within CFA who have the credentials to author and administer the course materials and testing. I believe that this can be an important addition to educational programs for CFA. For our judges, their judging fees can offset the cost of any such educational vector for those judges who elect to take the course.

I respectfully request the approval of the CFA Executive Board to work with a committee of three or more qualified people in the feline genetics discipline to develop a CFA FELINE GENETICS TRAINING COURSE. I also request that CFA recognize those who complete the course with suitable certification. The certification could be as simple as: Certified Feline Genetics I, II, III, IV and V which would indicate the number of sections of the course the person has taken and passed. A person who had completed all five sections of the Feline Genetics course would be entitled to be listed as, for example: Ima Allbreed Judge, CFG V. After successfully completing part one of the course, they would be listed as: Ima Allbreed Judge, CFG I; etc.

This would provide recognition to those who spend the time and effort to obtain this key knowledge for the future of cats and CFA. Funding for the course would be provided by those who elect to take the course; each would pay a suitable fee for each section of the course to offset the time spent in creating the course as well as in correcting the tests for each section of the course. The fee must be neither too much nor too little. The committee would be comprised of three or more feline genetic experts who would create and administer the course materials as well as the examinations. The committee will report to the chair of the CFA Judging Program.

Your approval and suggestions are requested to:

- 1. CREATE THE COURSE AS OUTLINED.*
- 2. SET FEES (WHICH SHOULD NOT EXCEED \$25.00 to \$35.00 PER SECTION).*
- 3. CERTIFY THOSE WHO SUCCESSFULLY PASS EACH OF THE FIVE SECTIONS.*

*Respectfully submitted,
Will Thompson, Judges' Training*

Everett spoke in favor of this genetics course and pointed out that it would be cost effective and valuable in providing our judges a basic genetic knowledge.

Doernberg stated that she felt a simpler way to approach this thing would be to have Heather or someone to write up a booklet or whatever she wants to get together to cover these areas, send it out to all judges and be done with it. She didn't know why we have to have a course we have to charge people to attend. She didn't feel that taking a course was necessary for our judges. She then said that It would be best to ask the judges if they are interested in this type course. They could get the information for nothing if they just know where to look.

Miller said that a knowledge of genetics was just part of our professionalism that judges should have. Heather, herself, has written a series on basic genetics. We also have the Book of the Cat and we have a lot on feline husbandry. We have an enormous amount written. If anyone is a judge and doesn't feel they are quite up to snuff in genetics, maybe it would be a matter of listing a bibliography or maybe eventually there would be something that would be available to exhibitors and judges.

Williams stated that he would rather see the judges judge by the standards rather than by genetics.

Jones Moved to ask Heather Lorimer and Deborah Mullen Faryna, President Rothermel's new Geneticists appointments to the Breeds and Standards Committee, formulate and prepare a simple genetics pamphlet for the judges' panel. This will be returned to the Board in February for review. **Motion Carried.**

JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT

Our sincere sympathies are extended to the families of Marion Hall who passed away July 30, 1997 and Ann Kimball who passed away July 5, 1997. Both Marion and Ann were long-time allbreed judges and deeply dedicated to CFA. Their contributions will not be forgotten and they will be greatly missed.

Will Thompson has requested an indefinite medical leave effective July 4, 1997.

Joan Benson's cat fancy friends held a retirement party September 13, 1997 at the Sacramento Valley Cat Fanciers show in Roseville, California. We wish her all the very best.

Erika Graf-Webster has requested a six-month medical leave of absence starting July 1, 1997 until January 1, 1998 due to ongoing problems with her foot surgery.

Joan O'Hara submitted her letter of retirement from the judging program for reasons of health and what she feels is her inability to keep up with the rigors of judging. Joan wished to convey how proud she was to have been a CFA Judge for the past 25 years and that she will miss handling the cats very much. She will fondly remember her participation as a longhair judge. We will also miss Joan as a judge and can only wish her the very best on the other side of the table exhibiting her beautiful Persians with Tom.

Mary Auth recently moved back to the Midwest to Bloomington, Illinois after moving to Sacramento (Region 2) with her job. She will be missed in the Northwest Region, however, the Midwest gets back one of their own.

Jo Ann Cummings has had the worst luck this year. She just finished up with angioplasty surgery and was back judging when she had a gall bladder attack which required surgery. She is doing nicely, however, and plans to be back judging by the time of the October Board Meeting.

Walter Hutzler had a bout with kidney stones and had to cancel one show after surgery but felt strong enough to make the trip to Queensland, Australia with Carolyn Bullotta to guest judge a show there. Walter said he had a ball and the "Aussies" were great!

Tokuko (Suzie) Yamazaki recently underwent surgery. We send her our get well wishes.

Evelyn Prather broke her wrist which required a cast and she will be out for about eight weeks much to her regret. She is coming along very well, however, so she will soon be back judging.

Our sincere sympathies are sent to Will Thompson on the loss of his mother this September. His father is still living and they had been married 65 years.

The following judges/trainee have sent letters to the board expressing their thanks for advancing them at the June 1997 board meeting: Norman Auspitz, Darrell Newkirk, Debbie Ritter and Gloria Hoover.

Guest judging assignments authorized to the following CFA judges:

- *Michael Petersen, Edna Field and Ben Ehrhardt - World Cat Federation, September 21, 1997, Moscow, Russia.*
- *Liz Watson - Assolux, November 15-16, 1997 and November 22-23, 1997 in Belarus and Smolensk, Russia, Moscow, Russia, December 13, 1997 and December 20, 1997, Assolux, Moscow, Russia - October 13-November 1, 1998.*
- *Wayne Park - 2 Assolux shows in Moscow, Russia December 13, 1997 and December 20, 1997.*
- *Gary Veach - Assolux show, October 31-November 1, 1998.*
- *Willa Hawke - Canberra, Australia, April 26, 1998 and May 3, 1998, Christchurch, New Zealand.*
- *Craig & Diana Rothermel - New Zealand Birman Cat Club, June 27-28, 1998, Auckland, New Zealand.*
- *Kim Everett - Longhair Cat Club of S.A., Adelaide, Australia, August 7-8, 1999, FIFe, Buenos Aires, Argentina, August 29-30, 1998.*
- *Kitty Angell - Colourpoint Cat Club of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, March 26, 2000.*
- *Gloria Bessemer - FIFe, Salzburg, Austria, September 20-21, 1997, FIFe, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 29, 1997, FIFe San Paulo, Brazil.*
- *Hazel Lindstrand - Assolux, Moscow, Russia, April 11-12, 1998.*

- Marilyn Cruz - July 19, 1998, Adelaide, Australia
- Mary Auth - June 27-28, 1998, FIFe, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Yaeko & Kenji Takano - July 19, 1998, Adelaide, Australia and July 26, 1998, Perth, Australia.
- Carolyn Osier - June 27-28, 1998, Adelaide, Australia. Wayne Trevathan - June 5-6, 1999, Christchurch, New Zealand, June 12-13, 1999, Hobart, Australia, June 19-20, 1999, Perth, Australia.

CFA clubs requesting permission to invite guest judges from FIFe:

- *San Jose Cat Fanciers, Dixon, CA January 24, 1998, Eivor Andersson, Sweden (AB) and Wendel Stoop, Switzerland (SH).*
- *October 3-4, 1998 - Jorgen Jensen, Denmark (LH), Ursula Loose, Germany (SH), Karl Preiss, Austria (SH) and Eveline Preiss, Austria (AB).*
- *January 30-31, 1999 - Eva Porat, Sweden (LH), Louis Coste, France (SH) and Francoise Milcent, France (AB). February 8, 1998 - Cat Friends of Germany, Arie Groenewegen, Netherlands FIFe (AB).*
- *December 12, 1997 - Cat Fanciers of Moscow - Olga Boehm (AB) Assolux and Galina Barisheva (AB) International Feline Society of Judges.*
- *Feline Fanciers of Belgium, February 14-15, 1998, FIFe judges Arie Groenewegen (LH/SH) and George Cherrie (LH/SH). Both have guest judged CFA shows previously.*
- *Cat Fanciers of Moscow, December 12, 1997, Olga Boehm (AB) from Assolux and Galina Barisheva (AB) from International Feline Society of Judges.*

Credentials on all guest judges are on file with the CFA Judging Program Chairman and with the CFA Central Office.

Revision of the current CFA Judging Program Rules needs to be revisited with changes being made, particularly concerning second specialty applicants. This has been put on hold until the committee looking into possibly changing the current Judging Program procedures has been given an opportunity to submit its report to the board. One area that needs to be immediately addressed, however, is the February relicensing of judges rule. I have included in my agenda items that re-licensing of judges be automatic each February and in cases of protests, failure to pay current license fees or any other reported infraction that these will be handled separately, which will give the judge an opportunity to respond. If a judge is found guilty there are many other options available to the board besides not relicensing. This step would be the most drastic and while there may be a need to take this course of action at some point, it would be rare and certainly should not make it necessary to vote every February to relicense the judges.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Bob Zenda for accepting to take over the Judges' Workshops and Judges Schools which Will Thompson previously handled. Will requested that

these two duties be reassigned. Bob has done so with a great deal of zeal and efficiency. Will is still handling the balance of his duties so there is no delay in service in administrating all phases of the Judging Program committee work.

*Respectfully submitted,
Kim Everett*

Everett Moved to Accept requests from judges and clubs. **Motion Carried.**

Next Kim announced the following: Kim Everett, Donna Jean Thompson, Betty White, Wayne Trevathan, Laina Aitken and Stan Barnaby will make up a committee to address the following items and bring a finished product to the February 1998 Board Meeting.

(1) A written description of what a judge's duties are and what the physical requirements are which will be filed with the CFA Central Office. (2) Portions of the CFA Judging Program Rules need to be revised, particularly regarding second specialty applicants. This would be in keeping with a favorable vote by the delegates at the 1997 June Annual and also address the serious concern of any judge or applicant having more cats than they can properly care for, as well as not placing them in a position of breaking city and/or state laws for the number of animals they may keep. In so doing, this could place CFA in a bad light regarding our own constitution, not to mention bad press with the media.

Everett then addressed the issue of one judge currently out on medical leave who would like to come back on the active roster. Also, a request had been received from another association's judge in England who is in a wheelchair asking to be considered for our guest judging panel. It was the decision of the board to take no action at this time.

Everett noted that she had received a letter from a former judge who had been dropped from the judging program and who was now requesting a reconsideration of that action. The judge felt that the file was good enough and asked the board to reconsider, based on the documentation. **Everett Moved** to ask the board to honor the request. **Discussion: Williams** asked if there was any new information that we didn't have when we made the original decision. **Everett** responded that there was no new information to consider, just additional letters of support. **Doernberg** asked for clarification. When a judge is dropped from the judging program they have the opportunity to reapply. **Everett** affirmed and added that there is a waiting period of two years after the meeting when they are dropped before reapplication. For example, someone who was dropped in October 1996 would then be eligible to reapply and be considered in February of 1999. Judges who reapply will be considered in the next lower status. **President Rothermel** asked that the board now consider whether we should get into the practice of reconsidering a reconsideration. In this case, at an earlier meeting we considered the same request by this same person to reconsider our original decision to drop them from the program and then we decided not to reconsider. We are now being asked again to reconsider it. There is a time when this Board must accept the responsibility of its decisions. The first reconsideration was not second-guessing but then, we as a board decided that we did not want to reconsider this particular situation. It behooves this board to determine if they even want to get involved with a reconsideration of a reconsideration. **Everett** stated that we reconsider things all the time, for

example the budget. We do reconsider and people do make mistakes in judgment. We can stand here and say “Boy, I made that decision and I am going to stick with it no matter what or we can reconsider as we did with the tie kitten vote. I see nothing different with a reconsideration on a judge and I stand by my motion.” **Motion Failed.** Everett and Aitken voting Yes.

Jones – reminded us of the new constitutional amendment; Article XIV adopted at the 1997 Annual meeting outlines both the process for any individual not advanced to request a reconsideration and the responsibility of the board when faced with this request. [Note: it was agreed that this particular case did not fall under that rule because of the date of the original decision not to advance.]

Everett Moved that all voting on judges be done in open session. **Motion Failed.** Everett voting Yes.

[**Secretary’s Note:** there was some discussion about this matter but it was the opinion of the majority of the board members and the CFA Attorney that the intent of the recent constitutional amendment was for the results of the voting to be recorded and published in the minutes. The board agreed to include board rationale for those not advanced.]

(13) ADVANCEMENTS, APPLICANTS & TRAINEES.

Secretary’s Note: While in Executive Session the Board undertook a consideration of those judges eligible for advancement within the CFA Judging Program. For the sake of continuity and the reader’s ease they are reported here. The actions taken during Executive Session were subsequently announced during open session. The individual balloting process was done by using signed ballots. The completed results are printed below:

Trainee Applicants	Vote
Accepted to Program	
LH Anger, Rachel	18 Yes
LH Bockman, Rhett	18 Yes
SH Boroff, Paula	18 Yes
SH Patton, Paul	18 Yes

Trainee Applicants	Vote
Not Accepted to Program	
SH MaryKae Krause	17 No
	1 Abstain (Takano)

Board Rationale: (1) Minimal basic qualifications. (2) Negative letters and articles in file indicating poor sportsmanship and attitude.

LH Chuck Payne	10 Yes (Miller, Kallmeyer, Barnaby, Lindsley, Berg, Hawke, Williams, Doernberg, Takano, Garrison)
----------------	--

8 No (Fuller, Trevathan, Rothermel, Aitken, Thompson, Everett, White, Jones)

Board Rationale: Lack of recent longhair breeding and showing activity.

Advanced to Approval Pending

Vote

LH Beedy, Suzanne

17 Yes

1 Abstain (Fuller)

Board Rationale: Needs more work in judging Persian type, particularly head type.

AB Lawrence, Roger

16 Yes

2 Abstain (Berg, Trevathan)

Board Rationale: None Offered.

SH Yurchick, Ed

18 Yes

Advanced to Approved

Vote

AB McKeehen-Bounds, Sharon

16 Yes

2 Abstain (Berg, Trevathan)

Board Rationale: None Offered.

SH Lawrence, Karen

18 Yes

AB Moser, Pam

18 Yes

AB Zenda, Robert

18 Yes

(14) JUDGING PROGRAM PROPOSAL REPORT.

President Rothermel next recognized **Stan Barnaby** and **Betty White**, who had prepared the following report:

Having examined Mark Hannon's proposal carefully, noted the discussions of this proposal at the board meeting in June, and particularly having considered both the actions and tenor of the delegation at the CFA Annual Meeting, the Judging Program Proposal Committee has determined that changes to the CFA Judging Program are definitely in order. As new members of the board, the committee would like to join the rest of the board in applauding Mark's initiative in this matter.

While the focus of the proposal is primarily with the administration of the program in a manner to facilitate board decisions with regard to individuals, it also invites wider participation in those decisions. This is an important point. To the extent that wider participation suggests more information and more involvement in the evaluation of the excellence that we all want the CFA Judging Program to represent, this new approach is both open and fair. We

believe that this is what our member clubs desire from the time an individual applies to the CFA Judging Program until such time he/she retires from that same program.

Accordingly, we propose that a Judging Committee be established to administer the CFA Judging Program, such committee to be advisory to the board. The committee shall consist of four judges and two exhibitors.

- 1. The judges shall be elected by CFA approved allbreed judges from among their ranks, such election to be conducted by the Central Office.*
- 2. No judge or exhibitor who sits on the board is eligible to serve since the board has appellate responsibilities.*
- 3. Judges not wishing to serve on this Committee shall so notify Central Office.*
- 4. Judges shall be elected in staggered terms of 1-4 years' duration, with ballots so noting; i.e., Jane – 4 years, Tom – 3 years, Dick – 2 years, Harry – 1 year.*
- 5. The exhibitors will be the owners of the preceding year's 26th Best Cat and 21st Best Kitten and shall serve for one year. Should either or both individuals not wish to serve, the President of CFA will appoint other individuals with ratification by the board of directors.*
- 6. A Judging Program Committee Secretary will be elected by the committee from its membership to coordinate the work of the committee. The committee will decide how best to handle the paperwork involved with communication both inside and outside the committee.*
- 7. A Judging Program Committee liaison board member will be appointed by the President, such board member to report the committee activities and recommendations to the CFA Board of Directors.*

The committee is responsible to:

- 1. Review applications to the CFA Judging Program and recommend acceptance or rejection. Following action of the board, notify applicants with full disclosure of rationale.*
- 2. Determine how best to achieve the goal of TRAINING each individual as he/she moves through the Judging Program, using such tools as club evaluations, committee and/or exhibitor evaluations, and/or videos. While training should be the focus of the program, it is well understood that success is in no way assured. Judges and trainees will be fully advised all along the way of areas of weakness as well as those of expertise. Recommendations to the board from the committee will therefore come as no surprise either to the affected judges/trainees, members of the board, or CFA member clubs.*
- 3. Appoint a Judging Program Trainee Administrator to coordinate training activity of all those in this portion of the CFA Judging Program. The Administrator is further empowered to initiate a mentoring program whereby trainees will be offered the support of a CFA approved allbreed judge. The Administrator will forward the reports of the color class*

training judges to the Judging Program Committee which will incorporate these reports with other evaluations and training tools.

4. Notify approved judges of any communications - good or otherwise - concerning their judging assignments.

5. Prior to the February board meeting, notify the board and the judge so involved of any problem that argues against relicensing.

6. Prepare recommendations for changes to the Judging Program Rules and submit them to the CFA Board for action.

7. Formulate content and policies for CFA Judging Schools designed for those interested in becoming judges, and appoint someone to coordinate the schools.

8. Suggest ideal training materials for breed presentations and appoint someone to coordinate Judges Workshops for the continuing education of CFA judges.

9. Prepare a Judging Program Committee Report prior to each regularly scheduled board meeting covering all activities of the committee with appropriate recommendations.

10. Prepare an annual budget proposal and submit it to the CFA Budget Committee as requested by the CFA Treasurer.

These changes to the administration and operation of the CFA Judging Program in no way relieve the CFA Board of its responsibility vis-a-vis final decisions. It must still:

1. Vote, but vote on the basis of recommendations made with more knowledge and more visibility.

2. Answer appeals from applicants denied admission into the program or judges not advanced within the program.

3. Relicense judges annually. This should be considered automatic for allbreed judges barring an unfavorable recommendation from the Judging Program Committee requiring thorough review as noted in #5 above.

Should the CFA Board of Directors adopt this Report of the Judging Proposal Committee, the following changes are proposed to the Judging Program Rules.

Section 1 - Definitions

Applicant - Change “Chairperson of the Judging Program” to “Judging Program Committee Secretary”

Leave of Absence - Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Committee.”

Deferred Trainee Status - Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Committee.”

Advanced Refresher Course - Change “Judging Program Chairman” to “Judging Program Committee.”

Section II - Application to Judging Program

A.2 Change “Chairperson of the Judging Program” to “Judging Program Committee Secretary.”

Section III - Mechanics of Application

A, B, C, G (4) and G (5) Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Committee Secretary”

Section IV - Acceptance

A. [New paragraph] The name of each applicant for admission to the Judging Program will be noticed in a CFA Member Edition of the CFA Almanac and then submitted to the Judging Program Committee for review. After a thorough examination of the completed application and all related material, the Judging Program Committee will submit the application with its recommendations to the Executive Board at the first meeting held not less than 60 days after receipt of said application and attendant materials.

B. [New first sentence] After a full discussion of the recommendations of the Judging Program Committee, a written ballot vote will be taken.

E. Replace “Judging Program Chairperson” in two places with “Judging Program Committee.”

Section V - Trainees

A.8a), e), and 9a) Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Trainee Administrator.”

B. Change this paragraph to read: “The instructing judge in each instance will complete and sign an evaluation form which will be mailed to the Judging Program Trainee Administrator. Judges are requested to make pertinent comments on both the tangible and the intangible aspects of a trainee’s qualifications for judging in addition to answering the specific questions on the form and also to make any suggestions which they feel will be helpful to a trainee for the future and for the Judging Program Trainee Administrator and Judging Program Committee in making a realistic evaluation of a trainee’s progress. It is important that the Judging Program Committee have as much information as possible on the performance of a trainee in the ring before the Judging Program Committee must decide whether to recommend to the Executive Board to promote, defer, or drop a trainee from the program.”

Section VI - Apprentice Judges

A. Change this paragraph to read: “The names of trainees who have met the above requirements to the satisfaction of the Judging Program Trainee Administrator will be presented to the Judging Program Committee for possible recommendation to the Executive Board for advancement to the status of apprentice judge.”

B. Change this paragraph to read: “After discussion of the report by the Judging Program Trainee Administrator and any other pertinent information about the trainee which may have become available, the Judging Program Committee will send its written recommendation to the Executive Board. A two-thirds (2/3 majority favorable vote of the board members present is required for advancement.”

G. Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Committee.”

Section VII - Requirements and Procedures for Advancement for Apprentice and Approval Pending Judges

F. Change “Judging Program Chairman” to “Judging Program Committee.”

Section VIII - Licensing

A. Remove second sentence.

D. Change “Judging Program Chairperson” where it appears to “Judging Program Committee.”

L, M. Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Committee.”

Section IX - International Division Judging Program Rules

5. Change “Judging Program Chairperson” to “Judging Program Committee.”

*Respectfully submitted,
Stan Barnaby and Betty White*

Jones noted and asked the committee to address the issue of exhibitors being on the Judging Program Committee (JPC). **White** acknowledged that there is concern among the judges and the board members on whether exhibitors should be on this committee. Our thoughts included lines of communication and accountability and wouldn't exhibitors provide a perspective unlikely to be duplicated any other way? Wouldn't these exhibitors, just like the judges on the committee, think about accountability in weighing anecdotal information as opposed to solid facts? We are all in this CFA together, those of us who are on the board, those of us who are judges, those of us who are exhibitors. It seems to me that perhaps those exhibitors and those who might one day be judges have a stake in the quality of the judging panel. As the committee rotates, it raises the probability of openness and accountability. It might even inspire the judges to be the very best that they can be, at least that was our thinking about this. **Lindsley**

– I would definitely compliment Betty and Stan for the obvious amount of work that has gone into this. I am pleased not only with the amount of work but that we have a proposal that is so precise. There is nothing vague about this at all. I **Move** for the adoption of this proposal with the following changes. 1) Paragraph 3, the committee be comprised of three exhibitors and three judges. 2) Change item 1 to read Approved AB Judges shall be elected by all CFA judges from among their ranks... 3) The other changes as a part of my motion would be to item 5, the method for selecting the exhibitors who would be on the committee. The three exhibitors would be appointed by the President and ratified by the Board. 4) Change item 4, line 2 to Jane – 3 years; Tom – 2 years.

Rationale: for 1) The exhibitor is ultimately the consumer of the services provided by our judging program and they are the ones most affected by the presence of quality or the absence of it. I think to the fancy and to the judging program it would be beneficial for this committee to be perceived as not particularly under the control of anybody but to be a committee that needs to reach a consensus. If the committee is three and three, everyone will understand that it is an action that has reached a consensus of judges and exhibitors.

Rationale: for 3) I see problems in the original proposal's method of selecting exhibitors based on who finished in a particular slot in the prior year's national standings. It may be somebody who is brand new to the fancy. It may be somebody that is a judge. It may be somebody lacking the experience to make the necessary decisions.

Discussion: Fuller was not unhappy with changing the judging program procedures but was uncomfortable with the idea of having exhibitors on a licensing board for our judges. The Board of Accountants does not contain clients to license CPAs; the Bar Association does not contain clients to decide the qualifications of lawyers; the same is true in the case of doctors, engineers, and most other professions. The ultimate consumer may not be the best person for determining qualifications of our judges. That should be left to other people who are already qualified as it is with other professions. Doctors certify doctors, lawyers certify lawyers, accountants certify accountants and engineers certify engineers. That is my only disagreement with this proposal. **Barnaby** agreed with Donna's statements but pointed out that for years judges have been licensed by the CFA Board and many members of the board are not judges. **Williams** felt that if the people who are on the committee are chosen very carefully, we also have judges who are also exhibitors and they should be included. We do have judges who are no longer exhibitors. **Everett** – First, I commend the committee's work in putting together their proposal stemming from Mark Hannon's original proposal this past June. This is a step forward and I feel certain some suggestions will be workable; however, others need further review and input. Here are my thoughts: Rather than a JPC consisting of four judges and two exhibitors, I feel the committee will be better served by having five approved AB judges and no exhibitors, particularly not campaigners as suggested. By selecting the two exhibitors as originally suggested, i.e., owners of 21st Best Kitten, and 26th Best Cat, would send a signal to our clubs and judges that the board endorses qualifications of individuals to serve on the JPC to only campaigners. What if there are co-owners involved on cats in these positions? Who would then serve on the committee? What if an owner is relatively new in the fancy and lucky enough to have a winning cat? They would not be qualified in the skills and knowledge required to serve on this committee. Second, the proposal states that only approved AB judges would participate in

the election of the four judges to serve; however, the proposal does not spell out if the judges on the committee will be AB judges. This needs to be determined. All judges in the program should participate in the voting procedure. Who, more than the apprentice and approval pending judges have a more vested interest in the program? I concur that no judge who sits on the board will serve on the committee since the board will ultimately be voting on the reports and recommendations submitted by the committee. I also concur that any judge not wishing to serve on the committee would so notify the Central Office. The terms of elections as set forth are reasonable. I would like to see the election of a committee secretary from a panel of five AB judges. A JPC liaison (CFA Board member) should be appointed by the President to report the committee activities and their recommendations to the board as proposed. There are many points to consider before passing such major changes in the Judging Program without additional input. We have not had an opportunity to see how the new voting procedure will work regarding applicants and advancements nor have we yet put in place some changes in the Judging Program rules, particularly in regards to second specialty applicants. It was apparent that the delegates and the second specialty applicants didn't see the need to require them to have so many breeds of cats and why agenting and showing a cat to grand or grand premier with someone else's cattery name should not be credited. I feel there is merit to non-show rule resolution #58 and it needs to be considered as one of the changes, at least in part. It is important to consider those judges in the current program(s) and to develop a transition plan so not to jeopardize any applicant or judge currently in the system. We must also consider the Judges' Schools and the Judges' Workshops already set up two years out. Again, many points of the proposal are excellent; however, to pass it at this meeting without any input from our judging panel could result in a backlash which can be avoided if the board sends a copy of the proposal together with the comments by board members for our judges' review. Who, more than our judges, should be included in drafting an all new judging program? The survey to the judges prior to the June 1997 annual netted a tremendous return that resulted in valuable and usable information. It would be wise to also publish the proposal and the board members' comments in the Almanac and ask for feedback from our clubs and exhibitors. The data received from the judging panel, clubs, and exhibitors would provide the JPC valuable information for use in drafting an amended proposal for the board's further consideration in February. This delay would also provide time to make changes to the current Judging Program Rules for consideration at the February meeting. This more realistic time frame would enable us to get a new system in place no later than June 1998. Judging Program Rules have been changed over the years with many excellent changes; however, state, county, and city legislation laws restricting the number of cats have entered the picture as the number of breeds which have been accepted. The entire training program is another area that needs to be revised to give more in-depth study prior to a trainee going into the ring at a show. We have received some excellent ideas along these lines which need to be considered. It has become apparent that committees off the board should be used more often to help deal with the enormous amount of paperwork and telephone calls but we must also keep in mind the frequent requirement for responsive personal contact. I can assure you that my hours as chair of the current JPC are not 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.! My final comments will address the matter of the "Judging Program Trainee Administrator." I wonder if it is a correct assumption that since no member of the committee will be a current board member, and since the board has appellate responsibilities that this person will be selected from one of the JPC members? If so, is it the intent of the proposal to allow exhibitors to serve in this position? This is just not clear. **White**

pointed out that point number one of the proposal says the judges will be elected by approved CFA AB Judges from among their ranks, so there is no suggestion that the JPC would consist of any judges other than AB judges. **Barnaby** quipped “Congratulations Kim, I think your remarks are longer than our report.” He then went on to remind everybody that “this is a Judging Program Proposal Report and what was done was to take Mark Hannon’s original proposal and make some changes to it that we felt were necessary and we are presenting it to the board today for their consideration and/or changes. This report is in no way meant to reflect any discredit toward the job that Donna Jean or Kim has done because we think they have both done super jobs. We are looking for something that takes the work off the board table. This is only a recommendation, change it as you will but we don’t want it buried.” **White** commented that it was her sense that it is not just the delegation that is unhappy but the judges as well. Morale among the judges is low and they have taken out some of their frustration on the board. However, more of them are beginning to understand that it is just a matter of a large organization having outgrown a program that is in place and we need something a little more up to date. “We were asked to take the original draft proposal, clean it up a little bit and put it in final form and bring it back and that is what we did. Concerning item 5, we felt those people who show their cats a lot would be very able to add perspective to the committee. We were also trying to take it out of the political process.” **President Rothermel** acknowledged that the committee had tried to approach it in an unbiased way but the result doesn’t have an unbiased look. He was bothered by the possible perception to the rank and file exhibitors that we cater to campaigners. **Aitken** believed that all the judges in the program should have an opportunity to vote and wondered why the proposal limited it AB judges. The new judges coming into the ranks would like to participate and it might help them to have the right to vote for those people who administer their program. One exhibitor would be sufficient and that should be a very experienced exhibitor. **Miller** – So far we have been concentrating on who votes – and who sits on the committee and the mechanics of this. No one has spoken about that it is clear in this report that this group is going to be making recommendations, which is good. It doesn’t relieve the CFA Board of its responsibility, which is good, and the relicensing being automatic barring unfavorable recommendations, these are major steps forward. Some of the things in the report that are deviations from thinking in the past is to determine how best to achieve the goal of training and TRAINING is in capital letters. My understanding of the judging program process now is that the judges enter the program trained although we call them trainees. Harking back to the Gebhardt days, and he was adamant about this, was that judging applicants are trained and fully knowledgeable about all the breeds. That is why we go over their application, to make sure they have that knowledge. That is why I understood that we were setting up a procedure so that rather than breeding a lot of kittens we would have other methods by which people would learn more about the breeds, but I always understood that in the past when you entered the judging program, you were trained and it was more getting experience in the ring and the handling and being evaluated seemed to be the impetus. Now training has become the focus of the program. Now we have changed the wording to program trainee administrator. This is the concept we should be discussing, as well as who sits on the committee. **Garrison** – I have a serious problem with having exhibitors on the committee. Exhibitors are exhibitors and I just don’t think it is a good idea. I also have a serious problem with having an even number sitting on the committee. I think it should be an odd number. I agree that Stan and Betty have done an excellent job and this is probably one of the best reports ever to come to this board table. **Lindsley** – On behalf of the board members who are exhibitors and not

judges, at least on behalf of myself, I take issue with the suggestion that the problems this board has had recently vis-a-vis the judging program are attributable to exhibitor board members voting on these matters. We have had problems but I don't think that is where they came from. The problems were systemic. While our judges are professionals, what they do is not analogous to the practice of medicine, where a layman is not capable of judging competency. How can someone that does not hold medical knowledge judge the competency of another doctor? In the State of California, there are at least 100 licensed professions and on most of those the majorities of their licensing committees are comprised of customers. Consumers are considered the ultimate users of their services. In our circumstance, to suggest that three exhibitors appointed by our President would not be capable of adequately, intelligently, knowledgeable, discharging the duty of making recommendations to this board is an insult to every exhibitor in CFA. It is an insult to the backbone of this association. This proposal is still advisory to this board. Nothing changes the mechanics of the decisions of who is advanced and who is not. Right now, the judging program chair prepares all the Judging Program materials and sends it to the board with their recommendations. This is to simply substituting a different procedure for who will be assembling all the materials, evaluating it and making this recommendation. **Kallmeyer** felt the proposal could go even further and suggested that members of this committee evaluate the judges up for advancement by sitting in rings, observing and reporting on all the judges as the opportunity presented itself. **White** agreed that one of the problems has been that there is not sufficient information. "I am not really going to plead this for the exhibitor but if you don't have exhibitors on this committee, it is going to be very hard to convince other folks that you are not somehow trying to do something. They are going to be the one making the recommendations to you" **Doernberg** said the exhibitor idea is a good one. They will serve for one year. If the president appoints he can vary the location of the exhibitors and provide a mix of campaigners and non-campaigners. We need to get candid opinions from exhibitors. We can get opinions that judges who have been judging for a long time may not even think about. It might make quite an impression on a new exhibitor and so it is really an interesting idea. **President Rothermel** agreed that appointments should come from various areas of the country and with differing backgrounds. He assured if he is the president he will consider those elements. **Barnaby** noted that we seem to agree that whoever is on this committee should be a fair-minded person, an open-minded person, whether it be a CFA Judge, an exhibitor, a Central Office employee or whoever. **Garrison** – The board has a history of opening mouth and inserting foot when we make very quick decisions. I could accept it the way it is but I think it may need some refinement and I think that we need to take the time to get more input. **Williams** suggested we reduce the JPC by taking away either one judge or one exhibitor to make it an odd number. **Lindsley** responded that we might consider that later but right now did not want to amend his motion any further. He reiterated his belief that in this instance of an advisory committee that it would be beneficial for all that they would have to reach consensus. I don't see this committee being deadlocked three and three; however, if does prove to be a problem, we can always come back and say "Hey, this isn't working, we need an uneven number of members." **Motion Carried.** Aitken, Takano, Jones, Kallmeyer, Fuller, Everett, Trevathan and Garrison voting No. [**Note:** it was the consensus of the board to vote on the motion and then ask the committee to get together and develop a transition process and bring it back to the table on Sunday.]

[Secretary's Note: The following resulted from the overnight work by the committee but is listed here to provide continuity and ease for the sake of the readers.]

President Rothermel called on Stan and Betty and they brought us the following information. Confidentiality will be stressed by making this a condition of membership on the committee. An infraction would be punishable under Article XV of the CFA Constitution. 1) Election will be among judges who have indicated a willingness to serve and each ballot shall request a vote for three: One for a 3-year term; one for a 2-year term; and one for a 1-year term. The Central Office will determine the highest three total vote getters. Among these three the "years of term" votes received shall be added, and the one with the highest total term year votes shall be elected to 3-year term. Second to 2-year term. Third to 1-year term. After this initial election, each year one judge will be elected to a 3-year term.

Transition Team: The following people have been selected for the transition team:

- Kim Everett
- Donna Jean Thompson
- Tom Dent
- Stan Barnaby
- Betty White

A report will be given on the transition plan at the February board meeting pending the report. There will be no changes enacted prior to the February board meeting and the program will continue under the existing rules. **Barnaby Moved to Accept. Motion Carried.**

(15) LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE.

President Rothermel next called on **Joan Miller** who gave the following report:

Legislative Group Activities - Procedure:

With no break in the legislative activities since the Legislative Group started officially July 1, 1997, we are, unfortunately, dealing with crisis situations on a continuing basis. As I write this the phones, faxes and e-mail messages are non stop because of this week's emergency, which happens to be in Peoria, Illinois. A City Council meeting is pending and we expect public comment hearings to be scheduled next week. Linda Berg was quick to forward a copy of the ordinance amendments and the local dog club contact's history of Peoria problems. The Kennel Club began their Alert and have their telephone trees in place. Sharon Coleman prepared our six-page CFA legal analysis today which was forwarded to Linda and the Kennel Club vice president and it will be used in my preparation of a CFA position paper for all Council Members. Discussions with Linda, who is coordinating the Illinois cat fanciers grass roots response, have resulted in a plan which includes getting a flyer printed for the CFA show in Peoria this coming weekend and for the regional website. She obtained all names, addresses and phone numbers for council members and fanciers have started calling. The shelter manager is now upset by this. I have completed the wording for the flyer with edits and advice from Anna Sadler. Martha Battenfeld, our helpful TICA ally in Illinois, put out the Alert this weekend on the

Internet calling for help from cat fanciers in the Peoria area and she will use our flyer for the TICA show Sept. 20-21st. Margaret Martin of the CFA Peoria club, Country Cousins Cat Club, has informed the shelter they cannot have their information table, usually offered, at this year's show considering their role in the proposal, and she is helping with coordination. Anna, who has just returned from the No-Kill Shelter Conference in Boston late Sunday night, has faxed and emailed a comprehensive report on these meetings and is now preparing for a major strategy meeting in Dallas tomorrow night to discuss animal rights motivated harassment of breeders in Texas. Tomorrow I leave for a Legislative Committee meeting in San Diego. There is still much to do in Peoria. We need PEOPLE to attend hearings to let the city know there are individuals who care and who will fight against this ordinance. In addition, the CFA position paper for the City Council must be completed and we want to prepare packets of information for each council member, prepare press packages for the media so they will understand our side, make signs and/or buttons for hearings when they are scheduled; locate feral cat caretaker groups in the area to get their support in exchange for ours. And, next week there may be another ordinance. Though our "procedure" has become one of ongoing emergency responses we are starting to accept and expect it as the routine. We are gradually becoming more efficient. Shante Middleton in the CFA office is keeping files, sending out materials, obtaining laws and maintaining contact and follow up when needed. I have finalized today the system with the Pet Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC) in Washington DC to do a daily state and national legislative tracking search. Information will be e-mailed on a regular basis weekly and I will receive an updated chart monthly.

Communication within CFA:

The Legislative Group communicates primarily through e-mail on a daily basis. We include members of the CFA Legislative Committee (Phil Lindsley, Tom Dent, Fred Jacobberger) and often others in our dialog when needed. Phil has been closely informed on most of our problem issues and regularly offers strategy and grassroots advice. We contact and work with local liaisons by email, phone and fax. Regional directors, such as Phil and Linda, have web sites which report legislative activities. I would like to hear from the other regional directors who have web sites. Anna, as Information Liaison, will work with you to get and keep cat fanciers up-to-date on regional issues and laws.

Currently we rely on fanciers' list postings to keep cat fanciers informed; however, we realize this excludes many interested individuals who are not online. A high priority item is the regular publication of a "Legislative Updates" newsletter, which Anna will produce, in order to communicate by mail.

We continue to build our database of Network Liaisons throughout the country so that we will be ready to establish telephone trees and other responses wherever needed and so that we will be informed of legislative proposals as quickly as possible. Names were added at the CFA Annual in June and a mailing has been prepared which will go out to clubs to add more names. This will also be the basic mailing list for the "Legislative Updates" newsletter. Shante is working on the database.

Victories

The “cat tax” was defeated in San Bernardino and Solano County, California:

In August we had two stunning victories in California. On Monday, August 18th the San Bernardino City Council rejected a cat licensing (cat-tax) proposal recommended by the local Animal Control Department as a means to raise revenue. Hearing of the plan only the Wednesday before the meeting, Southwest Regional cat fanciers had to go into action quickly. Mandi Wooldridge took the lead and many others helped with telephoning, making signs, sending letters and speaking at the hearing. All councilmen received the CFA letter and opposition paper before the hearing and a complete binder full of backup data and information. We prepared press packets and Phil followed up with an article after the hearing, published in the San Bernardino Sun.

Solano County is Kim Sturla’s home territory. She was instrumental in setting up a task force with the goal of achieving cat licensing in the county. The proposal was quietly slipped in through political maneuvering. Thanks to the outcry against the “cat tax” by CFA cat fanciers this proposal was stopped even before the hearing process began. In fact, a supervisor suggested they consider “unlicensing dogs,” as reported in the Vallejo Times 8/14/97.

We have the arguments and we can win with cat fanciers’ help in the local areas. Cat licensing is the start of more onerous laws. Once the shelters have the owners’ names then these are the easiest to target when they move on to “intact permits” and other laws. In some parts of the country it is too late as cat licensing is in place but when we can we want to hold the line.

Outreach:

Anna was a speaker at the Annual American Dog Owners Association (ADOA) meeting in San Francisco, August 7-9, 1997. Both Anna and Sharon were also on a panel discussion with attorney Marshall Tannik, who has litigated various canine cases and limit law cases; Patti Strand, AKC Board Member, who presented her observations on animal rights groups and their effect. Rich Avanzino was a speaker and escorted the attendees on a tour of the new SF-SPCA facilities under construction. Anna and Sharon were most impressed with the innovative programs and concrete evidence that a shelter can thrive and grow without public funding from providing Animal Control services and without intrusive legislation. Anna’s report follows.

Anna attended the No-Kill Shelter Conference outside of Boston, September 5-7, 1997. Day one was a “Focus on Ferals” put on by Alley Cat Allies; days 2 and 3 were filled with sessions and heated battles between the “traditional” and “no-kill” organizations. Shelter alternatives are a) the animal in the traditional (kill) shelter will probably be killed; b) the animal at the no-kill shelter will continue to take up room that will prevent another animal from being taken in. Philosophy sessions were intense; discussions concerning restrictive ordinances and cat licensing made Anna’s tongue suffer. The exposure to the animal rights and animal welfare movements of today is discouraging and negative; however, it is important to understand the changing perspectives in planning our strategies.

The California Council of Companion Animal Advocates (CCCAA) will present the Fourth Pet Overpopulation Symposium at the University of California, Davis, Friday and

Saturday, December 5-6, 1997. Enrollment is limited; \$50 per person; registration by November 1, 1997. Included on the program is a report of recent studies by the National and California Councils on dog and cat relinquishment to shelters epidemiology (Dr. Phil Kass). I plan to attend this. CFA Legislative Committee

The Committee will meet all day Friday, September 12th in San Diego and I will provide an update to the board following this meeting.

Legislative Hot Spots

We plan to list all of the legislative activities in a future "Updates" publication. The following, however, will provide a synopsis on the current focus in Illinois:

Peoria, Illinois - Amendment to Code, Chapter 4

The amendments mandate sterilization of all dogs and cats over the age of 6 months. Exceptions are made for those who purchase an "intact permit" (\$25) and an annual "breeding license" (\$75) for each animal. If litters are born without these licenses the shelter would be allowed to impound and dispose of any litter and to sterilize the adult animal(s) at the owner's expense. Advertising registration numbers must be displayed in any ad and are to be obtained from the animal shelter manager. Cats cannot produce more than one litter per 12 month period. Anyone selling any animal must report the name and address of the buyer to the animal shelter manager. Among other restrictions, the ordinance prohibits feeding of "feral" or abandoned cats except to "bring such cat for proper disposal." In addition to being inhumane, misdirected and intrusive, there are serious flaws and process issues surrounding this ordinance.

This is an example of an extreme law which is part of a tactic to reach an eventual "compromise" through the shelter agreeing to remove the most objectionable seizure and sterilization provisions with the intention of leaving in place an intact permit, breeder license and advertising registration number. We want to defeat this law in its entirety so a model or precedent is not established.

Status Report

USDA Animal Welfare Act Regulations – the Doris Day Animal League and Collective Petition: USDA now estimates that more than 18,000 public comments were received and approximately 12,000 of these were preprinted DDAL cards which were included in their promotion and financial solicitation mailings. Thousands of well-written comments personalized by dog and cat fanciers were sent in and will carry more weight. The USDA must complete their report by November, or request an extension. They may refuse to open the regulations to changes proposed by DDAL or they may suggest alternatives. We will continue to monitor the situation.

*Respectfully submitted,
Joan Miller*

American Dog Owners Association Annual Meeting August 7-9, 1997

Our participation in the American Dog Owners Association Annual Meeting and Conference came about as a result of an invitation by that group to provide a speaker to explain cat fancier interests in the legislative arena.

ADOA is a long established national group, originally founded in response to what is called “breed specific” legislation, in which ownership of certain breeds such as Pit Bulls and Rottweilers is banned. Several of these laws and ordinances have been successfully overturned in court, including one here in Texas, with the court costs being funded from the Canine Legal Defense Fund established by ADOA for that purpose. For some years, the AKC contributed matching defense funds to that Canine Defense Fund but no longer does so. ADOA retains an attorney and has several attorneys who are members and who provide pro bono work in these cases. In the last few years, ADOA has begun intervening in other animal laws and ordinances including testing two Minnesota local numbers limit ordinances. A reorganization during the last year has resulted in the organization looking to a broader constituency, primarily to include the cat fancy.

Cat fanciers have often faced unexpected problems in legislative battles, as dog fanciers have unknowingly “sold them down the river.” Our husbandry and breeding needs are so different that a proposal that appears reasonable to dog fanciers can spell disaster to cat fanciers. My address to this group was an opportunity to explain those differences and the varying needs. When there has been a clearer understanding of each other’s concerns and issues, cat and dog fanciers can accomplish a greater unity of purpose.

My hour-long address was well-received by the approximately 75 delegates, and I fielded good and perceptive questions. I have great hopes that those in attendance will take the cat fancy message back to their dog clubs throughout the country, and that it will pave the way for improved communications and cooperation in many areas both on local and national levels. We can certainly benefit from this group’s experience in litigation, and they can benefit from the cat fancy’s growing involvement in political matters.

ADOA maintains a file of what they consider good ordinances and state laws which they provide to fanciers upon request. Our input in this process is critical, because the ADOA is widely perceived in the dog fancy as an even greater authority on animal law than is AKC. Sharon Coleman, the third member of our CFA Legislative Group has close relationship with ADOA, and will be able to provide valuable input.

*Respectfully submitted,
Anna Sadler
CFA Legislative Information Liaison*

Miller then added that there had been a committee meeting after the submission of her report. The Legislative Group is working on an information plan and it is going to include web site materials, updates, newsletters, continuing to have a series on advocacy in the Almanac and other articles and several other efforts being developed for information. A correction to the report was to an incorrect figure for responses for the USDA matter. There were actually 36,000 responses and out of those responses, 12,000 to 14,000 resulted from the Doris Day Animal

League clips that came with their membership mailings. The report stated 18,000 public comments and that is incorrect. The content of these responses is being reviewed more than the numbers. This matter probably will be going on and we need to be prepared for it.

(16) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

President Rothermel called on **Tom Dent** to present his CO report. **Dent** commented that the CO is very concerned about the decline in numbers of registrations, both individual and litter registrations. To address those declines, he will be bringing forward some specific proposals in February. Some of the things being looked at include redesign of the not-for-breeding program, offering incentives to those who participate in not-for-breeding; introduction of a formal lease program; development of surveys for distribution to breeders. Data recently developed from CO information suggests that the largest declines in the numbers of litters and registrations are not coming from the people who raise the largest numbers of litters. The largest decline is coming from the people who raise the smallest number of litters; i.e., the one to four/five litter category. It is there that we see the largest decline in the number of participants, decline in the number of litters, and decline in number of individual registrations coming from those litters. In addition to putting together a proposal for the board, we will be starting a pedigree sale that is going out to people that register individual cats and who have not purchased a pedigree. We will try to bring the pedigree revenues back up to the level that we have seen and that has been sustaining the organization over the past five to seven years. Along with our normal chores, we will be trying to see if some of the things in decline can be turned around.

Central Office/Action Items

Requests for Show Rule Waiver (Items 1, 2):

Item 1. San Francisco Revelers – Waiver of Rule 13.15 for 1998 show. The club seeks permission to bring horses into the show hall for a brief period of time. **Jones Moved** to Accept. **Discussion: President Rothermel** said in light of recent happenings he was concerned about the clubs following the rules with no exceptions. **Jones** commented that we have made exceptions at this board meeting. “When they come and ask us in October we are more lenient.” **Miller** didn’t feel that cats have an adverse reaction to horses and their smell as they do with wild cats. **Barnaby** said, “Don’t you feel if we bend the rules for one club then next we are bending the rules for another one, and on and on?” **Motion Carried.** Doernberg and Barnaby voting No.

Item 2. Iroquois Cat Society – Waiver of Rule 15.08(e) for November 2, 1997 show. The club seeks permission to use 10 cages in the judging rings. **White Moved** to Accept. **Discussion: Jones** said that Iroquois had put on shows for years in their limited space and always used 10 cages with no problem resulting. The largest entry the club had ever received had been about 180 and she recommended that we grant their request. **Miller** suggested that they be limited to an entry of 200. **Motion Carried.** Williams, Lindsley, Takano, Fuller, Rothermel, Everett, Miller, and Barnaby voting No.

Requests for Show Format Changes – Waiver of Section 12.04 which disallows format changes(Items 3,4, 5):

Item 3. Mid-Michigan Cat Fanciers, May 16-17, 1998 show. **Everett Moved** to Allow. **Discussion: Lindsley** offered that the opinion the Protest Committee had written regarding the Sign of the Cat was based on analysis that 12.04 did apply in situations such as these but we had no reason to second guess Central Office's finding of an emergency in these matters. I acknowledge that and because of that position, I would like my vote recorded as an abstention based on 12.04. **Motion Carried.** Lindsley Abstaining.

Item 4. Greater St. Louis Cat Club, Inc., April 1998 show. **Everett Moved** to Allow. **Discussion: Lindsley** offered that the opinion the Protest Committee had written regarding the Sign of the Cat was based on analysis that 12.04 did apply in situations such as these but we had no reason to second guess Central Office's finding of an emergency in these matters. I acknowledge that and because of that position, I would like my vote recorded as an abstention based on 12.04. **Motion Carried.** Lindsley Abstaining:

Item 5. North Central Florida Cat Club, February 7-8, 1998 show. **Thompson Moved** to Allow. **Discussion: Lindsley** offered that the opinion the Protest Committee had written regarding the Sign of the Cat was based on analysis that 12.04 did apply in situations such as these but we had no reason to second guess Central Office's finding of an emergency in these matters. I acknowledge that and because of that position, I would like my vote recorded as an abstention based on 12.04. **Motion Carried.** Lindsley Abstaining.

Item 6. The Cat Fanciers' Judges Association has prepared a document entitled "Judging Protocol" and they are requesting that it be included with other show related materials which are distributed by the C.O. If the board approves this request, the document would first be submitted to the Show Rules Chairperson for review and approval. **Kallmeyer Moved** to Accept. **Motion Carried.**

Item 7. Proposed change in the publication of Disciplinary Suspensions/Probations: The amount of space used in the Almanac for this purpose is growing. Carol has developed new guidelines which will reduce the space used and still serve the intended purpose of this practice. We propose that we purge this list to eliminate those permanent and temporary suspensions which were effective more than five years ago and that each month we publish only those which have gone into effect within the last five years. However, for historical purposes we will publish all permanent suspensions, regardless of the effective date, once a year in the September Almanac. Since September contains the CFA Constitution as well as reports from the annual meeting, it would be appropriate to include the entire list in this issue. **Everett Moved** to Adopt. **Motion Carried.**

Item 8. Almanac subscription rate increase. Rates were last increased in May of 1994. The new rates would take effect May 1998. During this span of four years, both production and postal costs have increased. Breed Council members would continue to receive a discount. We are recommending a \$4.00 increase across the board for the various one year subscription options with the two year options offering a \$5.00 savings over the cost of two single year subscriptions. **Fuller Moved** to Adopt. **Motion Carried.**

Item 9. Corporate Banking Resolutions: The bank which maintains the account used for our credit card transactions has requested an updated “Corporate Resolution” for their records. Also, we are negotiating with a different credit card processor for a reduced discount rate. If agreement is reached, we will be switching banks and will need a “Corporate Resolution” for the new bank. The banks under discussion are:

- a.) Fleet Bank
- b.) Michigan National Bank

In brief, a “Corporate Resolution” establishes a relationship between a corporation and a bank and authorizes certain, specific, banking services and transactions. **Lindsley Moved** to Accept Fleet Bank. **Motion Carried. Lindsley Moved** to Accept Michigan National Bank. **Motion Carried.**

[**NOTE:** After Tom’s Central Office/Action Item memo was completed and copied for the board, Tom added a letter from Roger Robb, Tonkinese Breed Assoc., requesting permission to hold an out of region show in August 1998 which was photocopied separately for Tom to distribute and was not noted on Tom’s memo.]

Item 10. Tonkinese Breed Association had submitted a request to have an out of region show in August 1-2, 1998. Club is assigned to region 5, the show is planned for region 6 in St Louis, MO. **Aitken Moved** to Accept. **Motion Carried.**

Everett asked Tom Dent to address the European Burmese issue. **Dent** stated that President Rothermel had appointed Eby McCabe as the new BC liaison for the European Burmese. Mr. McCabe has been investigating the document that was distributed by breeders who feel that the rules for the registration of the European Burmese should be different from those that were adopted by the board back in June 1993. There has been some correspondence to indicate that the names of some of the people listed on the petition to change the rules were really not put there with the approval of the persons so named. There has been some discussion of the validity of the position. During the June meeting we reported that there was controversy regarding the registration procedures for the European Burmese and we had these two camps of people with divergent ideas how the breed should be registered and what the registration rules should be. We indicated that we would be data gathering between June and the February board meeting and we would be bringing a final report to the board then.

White spoke to some of the problems faced with CFA’s present computer-based entry clerk program and suggested that we might begin to move toward a different program that would be user-friendly and financially beneficial to CFA. She distributed a Show Automation Study by In Touch Software that is compatible with Windows. **Dent** recited some of the history of how the current program had come to be adopted. He went on to say that at this time there isn’t staff available in CO to tackle this project. He will be working toward this end.

Lindsley Moved to adopt the following pre-noticed proposal:

Resolved: That Central Office shall make available to the Regional Directors, as soon as practicable, Regional Standings of Cats, Kittens and Premiership Cats for inclusion on Regional Webpages. This information can be displayed only on Regional Webpages, and must be accompanied by the following warning:

“The following information is copyrighted by the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. It is available on a subscription basis by calling (980) 528-9797, or by writing the Cat Fanciers’ Association. It has been provided for demonstration viewing only on this Regional Webpage. Any attempt to copy, download, or otherwise duplicate this information is a violation of the CFA’s copyrights to this material.”

Rationale: The Regional Websites are a growing resource for communication and dissemination of important information among Breeders, Exhibitors and CFA. This information can include Legislative Alerts, Information on Disaster Preparedness, Regional News and Announcements, fundraising efforts, etc. etc. The inclusion of Regional Standings will be an attraction that will draw people to the Webpages, and expose and condition them into the other benefits and resources that can be found there. Regions that currently have a Webpage should note an increase in Webpage awareness and usage. Regions who’s directors have lacked a volunteer to construct a Website will most likely find they have volunteers once this program is in place.

Central Office has informed me upon my request for this information, that it in fact can be done, and that they were planning to do so on a subscription service similar to “points by fax.” The inclusion of the Website version of this will most likely serve to advertise the product and possibly even increase the demand therefor. The copyright warning set forth above should minimize the problems in duplication seen to have made the “Points by Fax” Program no more than a break-even proposition for CFA, while increasing product awareness among potential subscribers. Read only files and demonstration software has been proven to be highly successful marketing tools in information services, and there is no reason to believe that the inclusion of this information on the Webpages will in any significant way harm the proposed subscription program. What we are certain of is the beneficial impact to Regional communications, and the good will inherent in providing a service to our customers.

Discussion: Fuller – We have already planned on providing regional points by FAX and points by NET for a fee. I would really hate to see the regionals giving away something that CFA could charge for. We are trying to come up with new ways to make money and can’t afford to keep giving away our services. **Garrison** – I have been complaining this entire weekend about CO give away. People are beginning to expect CO to do everything for free. Come on, people, we need money, why should we give this to the regions for free? It would be great to have this but there should be a charge with the money going into CFA’s coffers. **Lindsley** – We really don’t know what the success with regional points by subscription would be. The Points by FAX has not been a good success. What we do know though is how this would be received by our customers and the people in the region and the effect it would have on them. **Motion Failed.** Berg, Lindsley, and Williams voting Yes.

President Rothermel adjourned the meeting for the night at 5:00 p.m.

Sunday, October 5, 1997

President Rothermel called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The first order of business was show rules.

(17) **SHOW RULES.**

President Rothermel recognized **Mark Hannon**, Show Rules Chairman, to present the proposed show rule changes. **Hannon** – On the cover letter to the original proposal I asked what the board’s wishes were in regard to eliminating duplication in the show rules. Before I attempted to do that I wanted to know if that was the board’s wish. My understanding of why we have duplication is there was an attempt to put it on every page possible where somebody might logically look to find such a rule. There seems to be some concern that it is counter-productive to put a rule in more than one place. Do you want me to go through this exercise of removing duplications for a future meeting? **President Rothermel** remarked that when this was first enacted there was no directory in the back to find where these rules were located. Now that such a directory exists it might be a lot easier if they were only listed in one place.

Discussion: Dent – It is not just the duplication of the rules that needs to be addressed. If you look at the rules, you will see rules that are poorly worded, poorly structured and seemingly out of place. It would be good not only to eliminate duplications but to move rules around so that they are properly situated under the right headings and in the right place. For example, we have rules that really speak to the conduct of the exhibitors and they are currently in the Judging Procedures. What I was suggesting was an overhaul, but before Mark and I really got into something like that, we really wanted to have the feedback of the board to see if that kind of an attempt would be welcome because it really would be a major undertaking. **Jones** noted that you will find the exhibitors’ section to be a duplication of everything and was done for the benefit of the exhibitors during a show. When you are under the stress of a show, duplication is often helpful because the more places you can find the rule the more apt you are to hit it when you are looking for it. I believe that the duplication should be left in the show rules. This project would take time and money. **Hannon** didn’t see any big amount of money being required as he was willing to take a day, drive to CO and work with Tom to accomplish the task at a minimum of cost. The other cost would be at the board table when we review the project. He didn’t want to take the time and effort if the board is not interested in the results of that exercise. **Aitken Moved** that Mark Hannon and Tom Dent undertake an examination of the show rules and possible change of format and clean up and bring back a proposal. **Motion Carried.** **Hannon** then asked that the Judging Program and the Clerking Program provide him with feedback as a result of the judges’ tests and the clerking test. If you are in the process of taking the test and you run across some rules that may be ambiguous or you may be able to take in a different way than it is intended, let us know about those so that we can kind of clean those up. Again, any board member that has suggestions for wording that is not clear that you would like to see addressed, please let me know. **Doernberg** asked for the time frame. **Hannon** replied next October at the show rules meeting. **Williams Moved** to Accept proposed Show Rule changes with provision to vote No.

[**Note:** President Rothermel advised Mark Hannon that he would be permitted to speak to the rules during this presentation.]

(18) **SHOW RULES CHANGES — EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 1998.**

[**Note:** Additions in bold italic, deletions in bold brackets]

Rule 2.12 The show committee may permit cats or kittens, 4 months or older, to be present for display or sale. ***Only cats or kittens eligible for CFA registration may be sold.*** No kitten... ***This does not apply to animals being adopted from Humane Organizations.***

Discussion: Show Rule 15.12 requires CFA litter registration certificates as proof of age. This infers that only cats that are eligible for CFA registration may be sold in our show halls. This new rule makes it clear as to our intention. (Submitted by Mark Hannon.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 3.01 A cat or kitten shown in the wrong class or under incorrect name, ownership, or registration number [***may***] ***shall*** be disqualified by the Central Office and any wins voided.

Discussion: The word “may” is discretionary and indicates that the rule will be enforced at the whim of whomever is involved at the Central Office. (Submitted by Wayne Trevathan.)

Discussion: Trevathan commented that this came up in Region 7 and it stemmed from concern about Central Office inconsistency in procedure. **Dent** was disturbed that some people think CO does things based on how an individual may feel on any given day. The CO strives for consistency in the way the rules are applied, consistency in the way policy is acquired. “If you make this change and we have to disqualify everyone that has a wrong name or a wrong number or an ownership name, define some of these things; i.e., what is a wrong name, is it spelling of a prefix or suffix? We will be voiding entries left and right. You will have mayhem.” **Doernberg** noted that what is needed here is a definition of when do you disqualify or void the win. My interpretation of wrong class would be when it is shown as a grand and it is really an open. If it is an incorrect name – a totally incorrect name – or under totally incorrect ownership or the registration number is just one they made up. What does apply at CO? **Dent** responded that “we do not disqualify cats when they have the wrong owner listed in the catalog, when they have an incorrect name, or where the name is wrong and something has been omitted. We advise people if it comes to our attention. Now when it comes to registration numbers, if a cat’s number is printed in the catalog and there is a change to the printed number and the change consists of an entirely new number being inserted for that cat, we will look to see when the cat was registered. If the cat was registered less than four weeks prior to the date of the show, we will void the win and that is provided for under one of the rules that is listed in the rules. If we find the cat was registered more than four weeks prior then we will simply fix the number and go on. Also, if we find that a registration number has been changed and the change is simply a transposition of two numbers we totally ignore that and give credit to the win and we go on. The only time we do void wins is when we find that an entirely new registration number has been entered in the catalog and the cat was registered less than four weeks prior to the show. This currently is a subject of

controversy on the Internet. **Doernberg** – So the name doesn't really apply, the class doesn't really apply, nor does the ownership apply? **Dent** – that is typically true. When you say the wrong class, i.e., open as champion, champion as grand, there are times when we try to accommodate the situation. In other words, let's say that a champion is shown as a grand incorrectly. If the results of the show allow us to give that champion some points, we will. If we can't, we don't and we void whatever happens. You have honest mistakes and then you have recurring mistakes. The recurring mistakes are seen more as a pattern of behavior rather than something that is inadvertent. You may want some type of rule that allows you to address the situation where there is a recurring, ongoing situation. There are people who deliberately will omit a breeder's prefix. If that happens once we will write and say you are showing the cat wrong. We start seeing it again and again, we will say you are not getting credit. **Motion Failed.** Trevathan voting Yes. Jones Abstaining.

Rule 3.03 Any exhibitor, judge, clerk or show committee member suspecting any cat or kitten of having fungus, fleas, ear mites or any contagious or infectious illness shall report same to the show manager and it will be the duty of the show manager to remove such cat or kitten, *along with all other exhibits belonging to the same exhibitor, being agented by that exhibitor, or traveling with that exhibitor*, to an area outside of the benching and judging rooms until a veterinarian can pass upon the health of the suspected cat or kitten. In the event that a veterinarian confirms and/or diagnoses fungus, fleas, ear mites or any contagious or infectious illness, *that entry as well as all other exhibits belonging to the same exhibitor, being agented by that exhibitor, or traveling with that exhibitor* shall be disqualified. If a veterinarian certifies the entry as free from fungus, fleas, ear mites, contagious or infectious illness, the entries shall be returned to the show room and...

Discussion: Housekeeping. (Submitted by Mark Hannon.) [It was noted that this change used to be a part of the show rules and somewhere along the way had been inadvertently dropped from the rule.] **Motion Carried.**

Rule 3.07 The excessive use of white powder, or chalk, or the use of any colored powder, colored chalk, tints, color rinses or other artificial coloring or concealment media on a cat or kitten entered in a CFA show is strictly forbidden. The plucking of buttons or lockets; the use of any device, substance or chemical; e.g., tranquilizer, hormone, antihistamine, that will alter the natural actions or appearance of a cat or kitten, is forbidden *including the surgical alteration to the cat's anatomy such as cropped or stapled ears, docked or shortened tails*. Evidence of such, as determined by the personal opinion of the judge, will result in the immediate disqualification of the entry *in that ring*. (Submitted by Wayne Trevathan.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 6.06 When the contracted judge does not officiate, an exhibitor may withdraw his entries from competition in that ring prior to the commencement of any judging, but may not remove them from the show room for this reason. *The cat(s) will be scored as if they were present in such a ring unless the exhibitor provides a*

written request to the Central Office submitted with the show records of the show requesting that the ring not be counted for scoring purposes.

Discussion: At the present time the Central Office scores such cats as if they were present in all rings rather than subtracting the ring when computing the Ring Point Average for the exhibit. This rule makes it incumbent upon the exhibitor to insure the Central Office is aware that the cat was withdrawn in accordance with SR 6.06. (Submitted by Mark Hannon.) **Motion Carried.** Lindsley Abstaining. [Note: It now becomes incumbent upon the exhibitor to let the CO to know that entry is not to be scored in that ring.]

Rule 6.07 Show management shall assign benching cages for all entries. *End-of-row benching must be provided to exhibitors with bona fide handicaps at no extra charge. These requests must take precedence over paid requests by exhibitors without handicaps.* All entries of a particular... (Submitted by Becky Jones.) [Note: after considerable discussion the board asked Fred Jacobberger and Mark Hannon to research and rewrite this show rule and to resubmit it during the October 1998 board meeting.] **Motion Withdrawn.**

Rule 9.02 Breed and Division Points

a. Cats which receive the award of Best Champion/*Premier* in each of the Breeds/Divisions currently recognized for Championship/*Premiership* competition (see paragraph 31.01) will receive one Grand Championship/*Premiership* point for every benched Champion/*Premier* defeated within the Breed/Division. (*Delegates passed by 2/3.*) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 9.03.a. A cat must have at least one win of Best Champion/*Premier* or Second Best Champion/*Premier* or a final award of Best -Tenth Best Cat in either a CFA Specialty or Allbreed final in order to qualify for the title of Grand Champion/*Grand Premier*. (*Delegates passed by 2/3.*) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 11.01.1 (New Number) *Exhibitors should transport cats into and out of the show hall in an enclosed, secured carrier.*

Discussion: It is not uncommon to see a cat/kitten leaving the show hall without being in a carrier. Although this situation usually occurs when a cat/kitten has been adopted from a humane society booth, it is important that it not happen in other instances as well, e.g. breeders selling kittens, etc. (Submitted by the Central Office.) **Motion Carried.** Miller, Lindsley voting No.

Rule 11.01.2 (New Number) *Any person offering a cat(s)/kitten(s) for sale, must ensure an enclosed, secured carrier is used for the transport of the cat being sold.* (Submitted by the Central Office.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 11.02 (New. Renumber current 11.02 through 11.29) *Exhibitors with bona fide handicaps shall be responsible for making their special needs known to the entry clerk.* (Submitted by Becky Jones.) **Motion Carried.** Lindsley voting No.

Rule 11.03.b. If any of the information as printed in the catalog is in error, or a kitten registration number has not been printed in the catalog, it is the exhibitor's responsibility to provide corrections of the information printed in error and/or lacking kitten registration number to the master clerk at the show. An official catalog correction request form must be used *and the exhibitor submitting the form must obtain a copy of the catalog correction form signed by the Master Clerk, or designated representative, showing the correct information has been supplied. This receipt should be retained by the exhibitor in the event any question might arise at a future date regarding an entry.*

Discussion: *It is important exhibitors obtain and retain a signed copy of the catalog correction request form to address any questions regarding their entry (Submitted by the Central Office.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 11.07.a. Each entry must be accompanied by the stipulated entry fee. *If the club opts to accept fax entries, such entries must be paid in full within 10 days of receipt or prior to the start of the show, whichever is first.*

Discussion: *Housekeeping. (See Show Rule 4.07 which acknowledges faxed entries.) (Submitted by Mark Hannon.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 11.07.b. If the club sponsoring a show finds, after the opening of a show, that an exhibitor's check for fees is not collectible, *or the fee for a faxed entry is not paid*, the following actions shall be taken.

1. The club will notify both the exhibitor and CFA Central Office by certified, return receipt mail that if the monies for the fees plus the bank penalty charges, *if payment was made by an uncollectible check*, are not received within thirty (30) days after notification, that all wins, *if applicable*, for that show ...
2. If the club receives the fees plus *any applicable* bank penalties within the 30 day period ...

Discussion: *Housekeeping (Submitted by Mark Hannon.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 11.07.b. 4. (New. Renumber so current paragraph 4 becomes 5.) *CFA Central Office requires a photocopy of the certified post office receipt for all certified letters sent to the exhibitor in accordance with this rule. (Submitted by the Central Office.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 11.17.c. (New) *If an exhibitor wishes to withhold an entry from a particular judge's ring, the exhibitor should so indicate on the Official Entry Form. The judges' book and the catalog will indicate that the entry was "withheld" from the ring and will be treated as an absentee.*

Discussion: Exhibitors in Japan have indicated a desire to withhold their cats from certain judges' rings due to the limited number of judges available. There is currently no way to accommodate such exhibitors. When Bill Lee was chairman of the CFA-Clerking Program, he accepted a notation of "W/H" to indicate the exhibitor's intention. We believe this practice should be reactivated and made available not only to Japanese exhibitors but to all exhibitors worldwide. (Submitted by Yaeko Takano.)

Discussion: Takano – We have been using W/H when it is preprinted in their catalog like a big notice to everyone in that show hall that the exhibitor will not show under that particular judge and it is an insult to that judge and is being done for that reason. When an exhibitor has a problem with some judge, their insisting on having W/H preprinted in the show catalog is not an acceptable way to solve the problem. It is not the exhibitor's right to "punish" the judge. This current procedure employed in Japan is wrong and must be stopped immediately. Everett noted that she had told the Japanese about this in the past and in fact, a previous board gave a directive to Japan telling them not to do this. **Doernberg** – If Yaeko wants to know how the board feels about this procedure the answer seems obvious. We do not like it. **Takano** said that she didn't like it because it is poor manners. She then recommended that Central Office send a memorandum to all the CFA Clubs and judges in Japan telling them to cease. She next recommended that Kim, Judging Program Chairman, send a memorandum to all the Japanese judges telling them to "Don't Do - Bad Manners." **Hawke** – I will now make a recommendation to the Japan Regional Director. She should notify all the Japanese clubs and all the Japanese judges in her newsletter, or by a special mailing, and during her regional meetings that this procedure is unacceptable and will not be done." **Motion Failed.**

Rule 11.20 An entry must be present and available for judging when the time for judging each entry is reached. An entry not so presented or available will be marked absent and the class judged as if such an entry had not been benched. It is the responsibility of the exhibitor or the exhibitor's agent to see that the cat or kitten is presented for judging when the entry number is called the first time. *[Only one call to the judging ring is required.] If the cat is not present after one call, a second call (at a minimum) will be made as a courtesy to the exhibitor.*

Discussion: Despite the best of intentions, there are any number of valid reasons why a cat may not be presented after one call. Common courtesy requires that a second call be made. It sets a bad tone to the show to have announcements that only one call will be made. (Submitted by Mark Hannon.)

Discussion: Hannon – felt that it gives a very poor impression when on Sunday morning announcements are made that this ring will only have one call because the judge has an early flight and I hear it over and over again. It just sends a bad message. **Hawke** – While I don't disagree with Mark's assessment, I would just like to add that often the last one to know that such an announcement is going to be made is that particular judge. Sometimes our clerks becomes over-zealous in their effort to assist the judge. **Lindsley** indicated that he believed this to be the type of rule that would benefit from a floor discussion with delegates during the annual meeting. **Everett** noted that handicapped exhibitors have to really rush in a big show to get their cat up with the one call. **Garrison** said she understood the rule but didn't feel it was a good rule

and could not support it. **Jones** pointed out that the show rule as written is that only one call to the judging ring is required. **Motion Failed.** [Note: it was suggested that the matter of rude announcements should be addressed to the clerking program and to the judging program.]

Rule 12.04 (Insert before last paragraph) *A change from a two-day show where all judges and entries are present both days to a back-to-back show is not considered a format change (see 12.07 b.3.); however, Central Office and all contracted judges must be notified of the change by the club.*

Discussion: Clubs frequently license shows well in advance and in anticipation of holding large shows. In some cases, for whatever reason, as the date draws nearer a club finds it must change the two-day show to a back-to-back show. The club will then call the Central Office, concerned that this “format change” is not currently allowed. Since Central Office considers this to be a scheduling change only, adding this information to the Show Rules would assist clubs who may be placed in this position. (Submitted by the Central Office.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 13.18 (New) *Unsportsmanlike conduct will be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with Article XV of the CFA Constitution.*

Discussion: While there is at the present time a show rule covering unsportsmanlike behavior of exhibitors, we think there should be a similar show rule for judges, show management and the show committee. (Submitted by Yaeko Takano.)

Hannon noted that Takano had submitted several of these changes in a variety of places. The unsportsmanlike behavior now appears in the exhibitor section but these changes would distribute the same change to all places where it is needed. **Motion Carried.**

Rule 14.10 (New) *Unsportsmanlike conduct will be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with Article XV of the CFA Constitution.* (Submitted by Yaeko Takano.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 15.02.1 (New) *The Show Manager must ensure that any cat/kitten being adopted leaves the show hall or show hall lobby in an enclosed, secured carrier.* (Submitted by the Central Office.)

Discussion: **Lindsley** said that if the motion read “must advise” instead of “must ensure” he could support the rule; however, as written it is asking that the show manager be responsible for something that may be out of their control. **Motion Failed.**

Rule 16.10 The show secretary MUST send the following to the Central Office by EXPRESS MAIL Next Day Service, UPS OVERNIGHT, FEDERAL EXPRESS or an equivalent overnight service, *[no later than 12:00 noon]* on the first (1st) business day after the close of the show. This must arrive at the delivering service prior to the time such service requires for delivery to arrive at CFA Central Office the next day (the second [2nd] business day after the close of the show.) (Delegates passed by 2/3.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 16.10 (New)

i. Show information sheet.

j. Completed “Unofficial Count” form.

Discussion: Housekeeping. These forms are provided to the clubs and are used by the Central Office; however, the show rules do not currently list them as items to be included as part of the show scoring package sent to the Central Office. (Submitted by the Central Office.)

Motion Carried.

Rule 17.06 (New) *The show entry clerk must pass on to show management all information received regarding benching requests for reasonable accommodation by handicapped/disabled exhibitors. (Submitted by Becky Jones.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 18.08.e (New) *The chief ring clerk shall verify titles (OP, CH, GC, PR, or GP) which the judge has entered on the finals sheets for cats receiving finals awards in the Championship and Premiership classes prior to submitting the sheets to the Master Clerk.*

Discussion: The titles listed on the finals sheets are sometimes incorrect, thereby causing scoring errors for grand points. Verification of these titles by the ring clerks will also help catch some mechanical errors at the show. (Submitted by the Central Office.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 18.13 The master clerk is responsible for initialing and posting the official (pink) copies of the color class sheets that have been fully checked. The sheets should be posted in a manner readily accessible to all exhibitors. Once the master clerk has completed checking the color class sheets and has initialed the sheets, *[the awards are to be considered final and may not be changed, except by action of the CFA Executive Board.] the awards can only be changed as follows: If a mechanical error is not discovered until after the master clerk has initialed the sheets, the error may be corrected by the judge. The judge’s written confirmation of the correction must be provided with the show records. The only other method of changing the awards after they have been posted is by action of the CFA board.* (Delegates passed, but not by 2/3.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 18.13 ** If a mechanical error is discovered after the close of the show, the Central Office will void the affected win(s). (Submitted by Mark Hannon.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 18.14 The master clerk is responsible for the safekeeping of the **completed** official CFA copies of the judges’ color class sheets until such copies have been released to the show secretary for transmittal to the Central Office. *(Delegates passed by 2/3.)* **Motion Carried.**

Rule 19.01m *Accurate* information on handicapped accessibility, including specific limitations, e.g., lack of ramps, handicap equipped restrooms, etc.... (Submitted by Becky Jones.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 20.09 (Current wording) CFA titles of Champion, Grand Champion, Premier, Grand Premier and Distinguished Merit must not appear in the catalog listing as part of an entry's name.

(Proposed) *CFA titles must not appear in the catalog listing as part of an entry's name.* (Delegates passed, but not by 2/3.) **Motion Carried.** Hawke, Fuller voting No.

Rule 22.02 (Current numbering) In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings the Championship finals will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best and 2nd Best Champion; the Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten [*if 35 or more kittens are entered, Best through 5th Best Kitten if fewer than 35 kittens are entered*]; the Premiership finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat [*if 35 or more cats are entered in Premiership; Best through 5th Best if fewer than 35 cats are entered*], Best and 2nd Best Premier. (Resolution submitted to the floor of the Annual by Jody Garrison and passed by the delegates.)

Discussion: Garrison said that she favored this rule and noted that in many shows where she does specialties and the required number of premiership and kitten entries are not available that the clubs have already purchased the rosettes and they are just left hanging. She feels it is good for morale and a positive move in the right direction. **Fuller** noted that with the possible exception of traditionally really large shows, more often than not in premiership those bottom five rosettes are not hanging there. **Lindsley** remarked that people come to cat shows because they want to have fun and this is just another way to make it fun – getting recognition and an award. Considering the last three days and our discussions on how to encourage new people we need to take positive steps to make that happen. **Miller** felt that in CFA having fun means winning under tremendous competition situations and real fun is to have achieved something. I am afraid we are lessening the quality of CFA wins and it could work against us. **Motion Carried.** Aitken, Jones, Thompson, Fuller, Doernberg and Miller voting No.

Rule 22.02 (New. Renumber current 22.02 and 22.03) *In Allbreed rings an alternative to 22.01 is available. Clubs may choose to offer the following awards: Best through 3rd Best Allbreed Champion; Best through 3rd Best Allbreed Premier.* (Delegates passed but not by 2/3.)

Discussion – Fuller felt that this will just become another method to cheapen our grands. We have not raised our requirements for grand since 1978 and if we are going to do these types of things and give out extra grand points that we make the grand mean something again. If we choose to pass this then we need to increase the number of points required to grand. **Williams** spoke in favor and reminded us that this is an alternate format and the club must request this format. **Everett** spoke in favor of the amendment noting that the delegates at the annual meeting are our serious breeders and they want this award. **Thompson** noted some confusion about the

intent of the rule and therefore did not support it. **Dent** asked for clarification and was told AB rings would still award best and 2nd best LH & SH champions/premiers and 3d Best will be in addition to those awards in AB rings. He then said we would be foolish to assume that some clubs would not want this. if this rule is to be passed, it should not be optional, it should be mandatory. **President Rothermel** suggested that we should actually be considering that within an AB ring there should be four AB champion wins but no specialty wins should be awarded. **Motion Failed.** Williams, Lindsley, Takano, Kallmeyer, Everett, Rothermel, Garrison, Trevathan, and Berg voting Yes. [**Note:** It was suggested for Mark to come back with this rule and to investigate awarding the top four AB Champions and no Specialty Champions in AB rings.]

Rule 23.03 Add...

Best Prem of Breed/Div Ribbon/Rosette Purple. (Delegates passed by 2/3.)

Discussion: Hannon asked to have the wording for the purple ribbon read best champion or premier. **Motion Carried.**

Rule 25.08 A contract that has been signed by both the judge and an officer of the club is binding on both judge and club. *The club may not alter the contract. If the club wishes to make any changes, the club must obtain a new contract from the judge.* (Submitted by Mark Hannon.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 26.01 Judging Fees are as follows:

- a. Approved judges will receive [~~\$1.00~~] **\$1.05** per scheduled paid entry with no minimum.
- b. Approval Pending judges will receive [~~70~~] **75** cents per scheduled entry with no minimum.
- c. Apprentice judges will received [~~40~~] **45** cents per scheduled paid entry with no minimum.
- d. An Approval Pending Allbreed judge shall be paid as an Approved judge when officiating as a Specialty judge and shall be paid [~~80~~] **85** cents per scheduled paid entry with no minimum when officiating as an Allbreed judge.

Discussion: It has been over nine years since judges have received an increase. While many judges feel that a larger increase should be proposed, this might be an unrealistic request. Rather we would ask for a 5% or 5-cent increase each year over the next few years (that increase to be determined by the board each year) to obtain a reasonable compensation level. (Submitted by the JA.)

Discussion: **Everett** didn't think this 5-cent raise was unreasonable but noted that we all got the sense of the delegates in June that they are opposed to a judges' raise and therefore would like to see this go back to the delegation in June. **Jones** didn't agree and felt we should start to

address the situation. The Judges Association addressed this situation very strongly last June and they are now approaching it practically by pennies. She highly recommended that we start to do something about this and added that she did not judge for a living so didn't really care but also did not think it was fair to be ignored completely by the delegation as the professionals that we are. We are never going to get the delegation to pass a raise. **Fuller** felt very strongly that no one should be judging cat shows for a source of income. We should be doing it because we love the cats and want to make a contribution to the cat fancy and that the fees for judging should be nothing more than an off-set of expenses that are not directly reimbursable such as dry cleaning bills, cat sitters, extra clothes, etc. I don't feel increasing the judging fee is necessary and should not be tied to cost of living index or anything else since no one should be living off judging fees. **Everett** – I went to the JA meeting and told them that I would support them in this request at the board table because our judges are very professional. The committee then came up with this increase of a nickel. I will support this nickel raise but will not support their rationale for returning to the board for a percentage increase yearly. **Garrison** agreed that she didn't look to judging fees to provide her a living even though the extra money was nice. She did not favor the rule because clubs were already suffering from increased expenses from many sources. **White** had previously been against this because she agreed that nobody should be doing this for the money but instead for the love of handling the cats. However, she was sensitive to the judges who feel they are not considered professional. It has been a long time since we have recognized that we care about our judges. To that extent she favored a 5 cent raise. **Lindsley** felt the delegates were amazingly unambiguous about how they felt about this and the delegates are the clubs. Clubs are faced with growing expenses across the board in almost every area. "I think the delegates are totally opposed to this, and I remain opposed." **Doernberg** felt the delegates were opposed to the June proposal but also felt that it is sort of mean-spirited to always address the judges and always expect them to sort of come hat in hand. The clerking program from time to time receives an increase, other areas of the show costs increase, it is reality. I don't think a 5-cent increase is inconsiderate here and just gives a sign that we consider the judges to be an important part of CFA and if there is no other way to show it, they have asked for this increase. I don't think this is going to make or break anybody – \$10 for 200 cats – but I do look at it as a sign of, "Yes, I think they deserve some consideration so I will support this." **Everett** – This is a way to boost the morale of our judges. I say give it to them. **Williams** agreed that all expenses have gone up including judges' expenses, i.e., cleaning, pet sitters, expenses incurred that come out of that judging fee and judges' expenses have gone up considerably in the past few years. **President Rothermel** commented that one of the problems here is this should not be instituted by this board. **Kallmeyer** felt we need to step up to the responsibility. It is a measure of respect for the judges and we should do it. **Motion Carried.** Williams, Lindsley, Fuller, Rothermel, Garrison, Barnaby, Hawke voting No.

Rule 27.02.d. *A judge may not judge a cat owned.... by a member of his/her immediate family which includes father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter, step-children, step-parents, or in-laws.* (Submitted by Mark Hannon.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 27.13 (New) *An officiating judge is not permitted to perform the duties of Master Clerk or Assistant Master Clerk.*

Discussion: Housekeeping/clarification, (Submitted by the Central Office.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 27.13 (Or 27.14 if above is adopted] *Unsportsmanlike conduct will be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with Article XV of the CFA constitution.* (Submitted by Yaeko Takano.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 28.03 Where a public address system is used, all numbers of all cats and kittens to be carried to each judging ring shall be announced over the system. This includes cats and kittens needed for finals. Only an entry's number with its breed/division and/or competitive category description may be used to call an entry to the judging ring. *[Only one call is mandatory. Second and third calls are given as a courtesy.] if the cat is not present after one call, a second call (at a minimum) will be made as a courtesy to the exhibitor.* (Submitted by Mark Hannon.) **Motion Withdrawn.**

Rule 29.01 All judges' color class sheets must be signed by the judge. All judges shall mark the Best and Second Best of Breed or Division as well as Best Champion of Breed or Division on the judges' color class sheets, if the judge determines these awards at the completion of judging the breed or division. If the breed or division wins are not awarded at the completion of the breed or division, the judge's sheet will be submitted to the master clerk without the wins marked. All judges must initial all error corrections. All judges' finals sheets must be completed, *including the titles for cats receiving finals awards in the Championship and Premiership classes*, and signed by the judge at completion of finals.

Discussion: Same as for SR 18.08 above (Submitted by the Central Office.) **Motion Carried.**

Rule 31.01 The following breeds and colors are: recognized as entitled to win Championship or Premiership honors. [**NOTE:** Male cats of any of the following colors are never eligible for *Kitten*, Championship or Premiership competition: Shell Tortoiseshell, Shaded Tortoiseshell, Tortoiseshell Smoke, *Shell Blue-Cream*, *Shaded Blue-Cream*, Blue-Cream Smoke, Silver Patched Tabby (Torbie), *Blue Silver Patched Tabby*, Brown Patched Tabby (Torbie), Blue Patched Tabby (Torbie), Tortoiseshell, Blue-Cream, Calico or Dilute Calico, Van Calico or Dilute Van Calico, *Tortoiseshell Smoke and White*, *Blue-Cream Smoke and White*, Calico or Dilute Calico Smoke and White, Tortie Point, Blue-Cream Point.) (Delegates passed by 2/3.) **Motion Carried.** Lindsley voting No.

National/Regional Awards Program

Scoring Procedures/Policies & Awards

SHOW POINTS

Eligible Wins

Points are awarded for the wins listed below.

1. Kitten classes - all finals awards as provided in the current show rules, **best and 2nd best of breed/division. Points are awarded for only one win per ring, that which carries the most points.**
2. Championship classes - best through tenth best cat, best and 2nd best of breed/division. Points are awarded for only one win per ring, that which carries the most points.
3. Premiership classes - best through tenth best cat as provided in the show rules, **best and 2nd best of breed/division. Points are awarded for only one win per ring, that which carries the most points. (Delegates passed but not by 2/3.) Failed.**

SCORING

Note: requests to restore wins voided by the Central Office or to receive credit for awards/points earned at a show but not posted to the cat's record, due to the presence of an incorrect registration number or the lack of a registration number in the catalog, can be considered only if a correctly completed registration application for the cat in question was received in the Central Office no later than **[four (4) weeks for adults or three (3) weeks for kittens] 21 days** prior to the opening day of the show in question...

Discussion: With most shows staying open until a week prior to the show, it is reasonable to shorten the registration time frame. (Submitted by the Central Office.). **Carried.**

AWARDS

The awards presented each year are:

National Awards

Best - 25th Best Cat*: Trophy, Rosette

Best - 20th Best Kitten*: Trophy, Rosette

Best - 20th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter)*: Trophy, Rosette **Best of Breed/Division: Plaque

**Second Best of Breed/Division: Plaque

**Third Best of Breed/Division: Plaque

(No change to the remainder of the section)

(Delegates passed by 2/3.) Carried.

[**Secretary's Note:** The rules changes set forth take effect on May 1, 1998. All clubs, exhibitors, and judges, are encouraged to thoroughly review the new provisions well in advance of that date.]

(19) CFA PLANNING COMMITTEE.

President Rothermel next recognized Willa Hawke, CFAPC Chairperson, who distributed some of the results from the Strategic Planning Session and noted that the committee

had worked hard preparing for the October Strategic Planning Session. Pat Jacobberger and Allene Tartaglia did the advance preparations for the meeting. Billy Wheeler and Pat Jacobberger facilitated the session. [Note: a narrative report prepared by Billy Wheeler detailing the sessions can be found following these minutes.]

The purpose of the Strategic Planning Session was to:

- Identify and develop a consensus as to the priorities of the Association.
- Identify the threats and challenges to the Association.
- Identify strategies to maintain and/or increase the Association's competitive position in the marketplace.

Detailed plans to address these areas were developed, along with timetables for implementation. Some of these plans entail the appointment of special committees as early as the coming CFA International. While the actual committees and their duties have not been finalized, it is likely that the following will be among them:

1) Junior Handling Committee: Goal: Increase youth involvement by 25 percent within five years of program implementation. Committee is to be appointed by 10/97 with a report to the board by 2/98 and ready to present the program during the 6/98 Annual. The implementation date will be no later than 1999-2000 show season.

[Note: **President Rothermel** announced the appointment of the committee chair, Debbie Stevenson, to develop a Junior Handler Program. He also mentioned that he was recommending Valerie Heeden from Southern California to serve on the committee, but that Debbie would be making the actual selections.]

2) New Exhibitor/Novice Program: Goal: by the year 2000 at least 50 percent of CFA Clubs will have the novice program in place. Appoint committee by the 1997 International. Interim report for the 2/98 board meeting.

3) Mentoring Program: Goal: 100 mentors by 1999. Appoint committee by the 1997 International. Interim report to board 4) Review CFA

4) Review CFA Scoring System: Goal: Measure satisfaction with current system, and develop possible alternatives for presentation to delegates 6/99. Appoint Committee by 1997 International. Interim report by 2/98.

President Rothermel remarked that the Strategic Planning Session had been very productive but now he was faced with appointing the committees. He asked for the board's help in going forward with implementing these committees and for each member to come forward with suggestions and with names for these committees. He then indicated a need for the board to work further on the plan with another facilitated one-day session in Houston. **Williams** said that we have to work on some of the projects that we have here before we have another facilitated meeting. "We need to work on this before we get some facilitator telling us what else we have to do." **White** – Since Willa, Patty, and Billy were all there for the whole session they can put this

together, give us another document and go forward. **Lindsley** – We have a chance for having a good product coming out of what we have done this weekend. Many of the committees and the timetables set for them involve committee assignments as early as this coming International. What we really need here now is to go through this document, pull out for our chair what committees that have been tasked in this need to be formed and what he needs to appoint. We can keep on time and go forward to this. Keep on track here. **Hawke** – I think we may be talking about two different things here. What Don addressed was that we don't need another facilitated meeting to go forward with another project and in that, he is right on track. However, we are not looking for additional projects. We will now need follow-up and guidance to see that what we have here is on the timetable to meet our goals and stay on target. These new committees are only a part of this larger strategic plan. **Aitken** noted that she was already on a committee to address judging program rules and asked if that committee should continue with that work or would it be turned over to the new Judging Program Proposal Committee. **President Rothermel** then said that Kim, Donna Jean, Betty, Stan, and Tom are now working in a transition of the entire judging program. So it is up to those five to decide how they want to proceed. **Aitken** – We also had another committee formed at this board meeting with another task and I am inquiring about that. **President Rothermel** repeated that if those five people just named are in agreement that they want the other committee to continue with that project, that is fine. **Williams** – If we have another facilitator at a meeting I would not like to see it much sooner than one year because that will combine our accomplishments up to a point. **President Rothermel** then said it did not seem to be the desire of the board to have another facilitated meeting in February. He went on to say that he felt the Planning Committee had done a wonderful job in its effort to get this organization focused on some of these issues. The meeting was great. **Hawke** then thanked those who had attended the Strategic Planning Sessions for their hard work and noted that this type of work is very tiring and difficult. Also, it is imperative that this plan and these committees reach fruition. Previous CFA Boards have had an unfortunate history of performing many tasks and then having nothing come of them. We must not let that happen to this work. It is imperative that every board member work on this and provide names and suggestions. **President Rothermel** went on to say that Willa would be under considerable time constraints for the next three weeks with preparation of the minutes. More time and work than any of you realize goes into our minutes. **Miller** agreed to send any comments and corrections to the draft directly to Willa. The following key people from each work group were designated to review their assignments: Tom Dent, Joan Miller, Allene Tartaglia, Kim Everett, and Michael Brim. Each of these key people will send any corrections to the draft and ideas directly to Willa to be compiled.

(20) REGIONAL BOUNDARIES REPORT.

President Rothermel next called on **Jody Garrison**, Regional Boundaries Chairperson, who gave the following report: Through a notice in the Almanac, I am asking for input from any and all who might have ideas. The deadline for written suggestions will be January 15, 1998. We will have a progress report ready at the February board meeting and a final report at the Philadelphia Annual. [Members of the committee are: Jody Garrison, Chairperson, Dennis Ganoe, Dan Petty, and Jan Wydro.]

(21) YEARBOOK COMMITTEE REPORT.

MR. PRESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, AND GUESTS:

Working on the 40th Anniversary Yearbook has been a major undertaking this year. Spending hours and hours going back through the previous books has made doing this yearbook a greater challenge than ever.

Patty and I realize more than ever the importance of accurately documenting, dating and following through to make sure that all the important information in the CFA Yearbook is complete and historically correct.

This is our busiest time and the stress of keeping up with the deadlines - proofreading and finalizing the book - is something to be reckoned with. We do want to keep you apprised of how the book is progressing and also some of the schedules that you need to be concerned with.

At this point having overcome delivery strikes and all other challenges that arise - we are still on schedule.

Notices for the Grand Champions, Grand Premiers, and Distinguished Merit Cats to be pictured in the 1999 Yearbook will be mailed at the end of January 1998. Please have your photos ready - but wait for your notification to come from the Yearbook Office. Review the instructions printed in the Yearbook or if you have any questions - please call.

Have you helped publicize our publication? PLEASE, all Regional Directors, Board Members, and Clubs include Yearbook ads in your publications, newsletters, catalogs, and mention the book at your meetings. It's urgent to give it all the publicity possible. This helps makes the Yearbook the perfect advertising medium and an international showcase for our cats.

This is the time to think about submitting features for the next Yearbook. We urge you to become a part of our publication by not only advertising, but also writing for us.

All suggestions are considered, discussed with others, and seriously taken under advisement. We value your opinion and input.

This Yearbook belongs to all of us, and the more fanciers that put their "mark" on it, the more personal and valuable it becomes.

This is the Yearbook to order. Take advantage of our pre-publication savings.

An anniversary tribute to CFA's "Top Cat" dating back to our first Yearbook will be pictured. The feature will include heirloom photos (all 40 of them). You will be thrilled (as we were) at this collection. Photos from some annuals dating back to 1958 will also be shown.

An in-depth feature on the American Shorthair and the Abyssinian are also included. Many other attractions as well as all the important history of CFA will be included in the book.

Order Now! and Thank You.

*Respectfully submitted,
Marna Fogarty/Patricia Decker*

(22) ANIMAL WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT.

As an aside from the Animal Welfare Committee, I have been appointed to be the board liaison for the development of a CFA Youth Handling Program. Debbie Stevenson is spearheading this effort. We have met and discussed a basic program to involve youth in CFA. Basically, we are looking at children and teens ages 7 through 11 and 12 through 16. Debbie will have a complete report and proposal for the board's consideration at the February board meeting.

Connor Michael, logistics coordinator for the American Humane Association-(AHA), was able to purchase the Zodiac boat for \$4,200. (Five thousand dollars was approved by the board in June.) It is bright red, a real attention getter! The Zodiac Futura Fastroller Mark 3 is 15.5 feet long, weighs 163 pounds, holds up to eight passengers and has a usable engine range of up to 40 horsepower. We are currently investigating the best signage for the sides of the boat to advertise CFA. Michael Brim, with Nicholas Gillman, AHA Disaster Director, will display the boat at the AHA Conference at the end of this month, and do a publicity photo shoot featuring the boat and CFA's contribution to animal disaster relief.

Michael Brim and I are investigating several sources for the Disaster Relief team T-shirts and caps. We think that bright orange T-shirts and complimenting caps should fit the "bill."

I have been approached by the Veterinary School at Texas A&M University to help develop a Trap, Test, Vaccinate, Alter, and Release program at the University We are planning to meet early in 1998 to formulate plans and courses of action. As cats are sometimes abandoned at the end of semesters and school years by students leaving the campus, this program could be very applicable to other college and university campuses across the United States, especially those with schools of veterinary medicine. I definitely want to see CFA take the lead, especially in coordinating with veterinary schools.

Diane Vetterl at CFA Central Office and I will be revising the notification letter and fine tuning the cattery inspection form. We will have this completed before the next round of mandatory inspection notifications (late January 1998).

I am sorry I could not attend the board meeting this weekend. However, I am indeed grateful that my parents are able to celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary this weekend, despite major health issues with both of them.

*Respectfully submitted,
Pam DelaBar*

(23) **MISCELLANEOUS.**

Future Board Meetings:

February 1999, Orlando, Florida - Don Williams is to find a suitable site and report back to the February 1998 meeting. If no suitable facility can be found in Orlando, then other sites to be considered included San Francisco, San Diego, and Las Vegas.

October 1999, Newark, New Jersey area.

CFA Web Site:

Since its unveiling in November 1995, CFA's web site continues to provide educational information about cats and the cat fancy to the general public. The most recent statistics as of 9/20/97 indicate that the site has received 3,687,086 overall hits (accesses to any page on the site by someone using the Internet) - quite an impressive number!

Our breed profiles are receiving the greatest number of hits, followed closely by the show schedule and cat care information. We receive many e-mail requests for information on everything from cat health to breeder referral. Inquiries on cat health issues continue to come in and we are working with our Health Committee members to include additional health related articles on the site. The CFA Yearbook and book/video pages have prompted many orders from around the world. The site has also been valuable as a publicity tool in promoting the CFA International Show and offers a coupon that may be printed and used for an admission discount.

All areas of the site have been expanded, and the most notable addition has been the creation of the Exhibitor's Corner which is geared toward the needs of CFA's breeders and exhibitors. This section has been used to disseminate information on CFA business and events such as the annual meeting, the International Show, the Almanac, the Yearbook, breed council membership, and most importantly, the Doris Day Animal League's proposed changes to the USDA regulations. The Show Entry Form is now available online and our statistics indicate that it received 237 accesses during the first week alone. Plans are underway to make additional forms available soon.

CFA's web site continues to receive many accolades and awards and is frequently recognized for excellence. Through a collaborative effort with the Natural History Museum in Los Angeles, the entire CFA site will appear on the Cats! Wild to Mild CD-ROM soon to be released. A screen capture of the opening page will be included in Mosby's Netvet: A Veterinary Guide To The Internet, to be published by Mosby-Year Book, Inc. Our show schedule page is listed as a favorite link in an interview with author Sylvia H. Kreng, author of Cat Quotes, published by Bartlett Publishing.

Our site currently includes links to three other web sites: Cats! Wild to Mild, National Geographic Cats: Nature's Masterpiece, and the National Animal Poison Control Center. Requests for links are considered on an individual basis and proposed sites are evaluated for professionalism and educational merit. The owner of the site is also considered as part of this

evaluation process to ensure that the organization does not maintain policies which are in conflict with those of CFA.

The attached server statistics give a graphic representation of overall hits as well as home page accesses. Overall hits include any access to any page on our site and could be partially the result of links provided on personal cattery sites and regional sites directly to CFA's breed profiles and show schedule pages. Home page access refers to the main opening page of CFA's site. The dramatic increase in home page accesses during the last six months may be attributed to our reciprocal links with Cats! Wild to Mild and National Geographic.

*Respectfully submitted,
Carol Krzanowski*

Fine for Incorrect Registration Numbers in Catalogs:

Dent asked if the board would be receptive to a proposal next October for Central Office to initiate a \$25 fine for incorrect registration numbers printed in show catalogs (numbers that had not been corrected with master clerk). The board indicated they would favor this.

Job Descriptions:

Everett Moved that each committee member on the CFA Board provide a job description of the duties they are required to do, in writing, to be filed with the CFA Central Office as a matter of record. [To be submitted at the February 1998 board meeting.] **Motion Carried.**

Protest Filing Fees:

Everett brought the following agenda item. The continuing stream of protests being received by the Protest Committee that ultimately comes to the attention of the CFA Board for action is taking away precious time, not to mention thousands of dollars, from other activities of a positive nature that would benefit CFA, its clubs and exhibitors. Granted, there are certain protests of a serious nature such as animal abuse or poor cattery conditions which need to be addressed promptly; however, there are others which get into contractual agreements, "cat fights" between two prior friends where a fall out has occurred and the friendship breaks down, alleged forgeries where the parties involved will not admit to doing it and other infractions by clubs which they were not aware they had broken any rule and certainly not with any intent. Therefore it seems reasonable: **Everett Moved** to place into effect a mandatory \$100 filing fee on any protest except those concerning animal welfare issues, by the filing party or parties. If they win their case they would receive their \$100 filing fee back. If they lose they would not.

Perhaps it is time regional directors should be given more authority to handle some of the less serious protests and resolve them at a local level. **Discussion: Lindsley** noted that the Protest Committee had discussed this matter and was not in favor of it. It doesn't seem right to ask people to pay \$100 to bring show rule infractions to our attention. Several board meetings ago, I brought forward the idea of implementing an informational cover sheet, something that would at least separate sincere people from frivolous ones. We haven't implemented that and we

certainly could and should. I am just not comfortable with this filing fee. **Motion Failed.** Williams, Aitkens, Fuller, Everett, Rothermel, Hawke, Garrison voting Yes.

Protest Administration:

[**Secretary's Note:** During the Friday afternoon session, Donna Fuller asked the board to address the issue of CFA vs Whoever rather than Whoever vs Whoever and asked to have the resulting information reported in the minutes.] **Discussion:** Fuller understood that we had decided to change in the case of show rule violations that were not a specific person versus a specific person to CFA vs Specific Person, but when it is a Specific Person versus a Specific Person that it would be so stated. **Jacobberger** said that when the board reviews a case from the Protest Committee and determines that such a case shows probable cause and is escalated to the hearing stage that it then becomes CFA vs Whoever. **Lindsley** understood that anything even at the Protest Committee stage that alleged a violation of the CFA Constitution or Show Rules would be given the title CFA versus. For instance if ABC Cat Club had a protest against a judge it would read CFA versus rather than ABC Cat Club versus so long as what they alleged would be in violation of the constitution or in violation of a show rule. The exceptions are contractual cases that do not state a violation of our Show Rules or Constitution and would continue to maintain the names of the two parties. **Dent** – The reason we say CFA vs Whoever is because the alleged action that was taken by one party was considered to be a violation of a CFA Show Rule or the Constitution. We don't care whether or not two people had an agreement or a contract and it was violated. That has nothing to do with it and the only reason we are involved is that we have a constitutional provision that states that we as an organization will take action whenever there is willful misrepresentation in the filing of a registration application, and that is why we are hearing these cases and that is why it is CFA vs Whoever. **Barnaby** stated that we have Fred Jacobberger as our attorney for a very good reason - direction. If he is satisfied that CFA vs whatever is going to work for us, I look at the size of what we have before us today and can't help wondering how we got so hung up on this matter. **President Rothermel** offered the analogy that in the State of Pennsylvania, or the State of California, when there is a crime and their law that is broken it is the State of Pennsylvania or the State of California vs Whoever, it is not Smith versus Jones. In these cases, it is CFA's laws that have been broken.

There being no other business to come before the board, **President Rothermel** declared the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

(24) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS & PROTESTS.

Secretary's Note: Although printed as a separate section of the minutes, these reports are nonetheless a part of the official minutes of the proceedings of the CFA Executive Board during the period from October 3-5, 1997. When used in this section, the term "cited for a hearing" means only that the CFA Executive Board considered the Protest Committee's recommendations and determined that sufficient cause existed to believe that the individual(s) or club(s) involved may have violated a show rule or a provision of the CFA Constitution. In such cases, the involved individual(s) or club(s) is "cited for a hearing," meaning that the executive board has scheduled a fact finding hearing on the alleged violation, pursuant to the provisions of the CFA Constitution. The CFA Executive Board's actions and considerations in disciplinary

hearings and various matters previously submitted by the CFA Protest Committee resulted in the following actions:

[Secretary's Note: During closed session, the protests that were on the agenda were considered and in most cases, the board followed the CFA Protest Committee's recommendations.]

PROTESTS:

[The following cases were submitted by the Protest Committee with finding of probable cause for citation to a board hearing]:

- a. **Case #97-013** **CFA vs Power; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec.4 (d).**
- b. **Case #97-46** **CFA vs LaMothe; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec.4 (a) and (g).**
- c. **Case #97-049** **CFA vs Arisawa; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec.4 (b).**
- d. **Case 97-069** **CFA vs Goller; Violation of CFA Show Rules 2.09 & 2.10.**
- e. **Case 97-093** **CFA vs Smithson; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b).**

Note: The following cases have been rescheduled:

Case #97-023-0204 **CFA vs Brown; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Secs (a) and (g) -February 1998 hearing.**

Case #97-044-0428 **CFA vs Adkison; Violation of CFA Show Rules 27.01 and 27.05 – February 1998 hearing.**

Case # 97-037 **CFA vs Leavitt; Violation of CFA Show Rule 3.07 - June 1998 hearing.**

HEARINGS:

- a. **Case #97-034** **CFA vs Chamberlin; Violation of CFA Const. Article XV, Sec. 4 (b) (Forgery). Dr. Roger G. Miller, spoke on her behalf. Following his testimony, the board excused him from the room, went into closed session and found the defendant **Not Guilty.****
- b. **Case # 97-021** **CFA vs Bulson; Violation of CFA Const. Article XV, Sec.4 (a) and (g). No representative was present. Following discussion, in**

closed session, the board deliberated and voted to find the defendant **Guilty. Penalty - Permanent Suspension.**

- c. **Case #97-023** **CFA vs Brown;** Violation of CFA Const. Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) and (g). **Hearing Delayed until February 1998.**
- d. **Case # 97-024** **CFA vs Powers;** Violation of CFA Const. Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) and (g) (Animal Cruelty). No representative was present and following closed session deliberation, the board voted to find the defendant **Guilty. Penalty - Permanent Suspension.**
- e. **Case #97-022** **CFA vs Grewell;** Violation of CFA Const. Article XV, Sec.4 (a) and (g) (Animal Cruelty). No representative was present and following closed session deliberation, the board voted to find the defendant **Guilty. Penalty - Permanent Suspension.**
- f. **Case #96-087** **CFA vs Furlotte;** Violation of CFA Const. Article XV sec. 4 (g) (Forgery of Veterinarian Health Certificate). No representative was present and following closed session deliberation, the board voted to find the defendant **Guilty. Penalty - 1 Year Suspension and \$1,500 fine.**
- g. **Case #97-042** **CFA v Bryant;** Violation of CFA Const. Article XV, Sec 4 (b) (Forgery). No representative was present and following closed session deliberation, the board voted to find the defendant **Guilty. Penalty - 1 Year Suspension and \$500 fine.**
- h. **Case # 97-003-0108** **CFA v Salob;** Violation of Article XV, Sec 4(b) of the CFA Constitution. No representative was present and following closed session deliberation, the board voted to find the defendant **Guilty. Penalty -1 Year Suspension and \$1,500 fine.**