

**CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 3/4, 1998**

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)	CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES.....	4
(2)	TREASURER'S REPORT.....	5
(3)	DOMESTIC CLUB APPLICATIONS.....	13
(4)	INTERNATIONAL CLUB APPLICATIONS.....	18
(5)	INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT.....	20
(6)	CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.....	23
(7)	PUBLIC RELATIONS REPORT.....	30
(8)	JUDGING PROGRAM.....	32
(9)	ADVANCEMENTS, APPLICANTS & TRAINEES.....	37
(10)	PROPOSED CHANGES TO JUDGING PROGRAM RULES.....	39
(11)	INTERNATIONAL SHOW REPORT.....	56
(12)	CLERKING PROGRAM REPORT.....	58
(13)	SHOW RULES CHANGES.....	60
(14)	CFA CAT BOOK CONTRIBUTOR SELECTION COMMITTEE.....	86
(15)	MINUTES FOR BOARD MEMBERS.....	87
(16)	CFA LOGO.....	88
(17)	ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULING PROPOSAL.....	90
(18)	WINN FELINE FOUNDATION REPORT.....	92
(19)	CFA LEGISLATIVE GROUP ACTIVITIES.....	94
(20)	ANIMAL WELFARE REPORT.....	99
(21)	SHOW SCHEDULING.....	100
(22)	AWARDS COMMITTEE.....	101
(23)	JOB DESCRIPTIONS.....	101
(24)	FEBRUARY 2000 BOARD MEETING.....	112
(25)	WEB SITE REPORT.....	112
(26)	CFA HEALTH COMMITTEE REPORT.....	114
(27)	USDA REGARDING ANIMAL WELFARE ACT.....	116
(28)	STATUS REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE.....	116
(29)	BREED AWARENESS REPORT.....	121
(30)	YEARBOOK REPORT.....	123
(31)	YOUTH COMMITTEE REPORT.....	124
(32)	DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS & RESULTS: PROTESTS.....	127

Executive Board Meeting

October 3-4, 1998

The Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Saturday October 3 and Sunday, October 4, 1998 at the Airport Hilton, San Antonio, Texas.

President Don Williams called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM with the following members of the Board of Directors present:

Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mr. Lonnie Hoover (GSR Director)
Mrs. Liz Watson (GLR Director)
Mr. George Eigenhauser (SWR Director)
Mrs. Linda Berg (MWR Director)
Mr. Jim DeBruhl (SOR Director)
Mrs. Bess Higuchi (Japan Regional Director)
Mr. Don Williams (President)
Mrs. Kim Everett (Vice-President)
Mrs. Donna Fuller (Treasurer)
Ms. Kitty Angell (Secretary)
Mr. Stan Barnaby (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Pam DelaBar (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Diana Doernberg (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Joan Miller (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Craig Rothermel (Ex-Officio)

Also present was Mr. Thomas Dent, CFA Executive Director; Mrs. Carol Krzanowski, Associate Director; Mr. Fred Jacobberger, CFA Legal Counsel (at 8:05 AM); Ms. Allene Tartaglia, Director Special Projects; and Mr. Michael Brim, Public Relations Director. Mrs. Lorna Malinen (NWR Director) arrived at 9:35 AM (flight detained in Dallas, Texas).

President Williams opened the meeting by welcoming the board members and guests. He announced the following changes to the agenda for Saturday, October 3: Michael Brim has to leave for a conference Sunday so he will give his report after the International Show around 9:45 AM; and there is an attorney coming in who will address the board of directors around 1:00 PM.

Stan Barnaby moved to accept the agenda as noticed with the changes added. **Craig Rothermel**: I do have a question. We have never done that. Are you saying that if it is not listed on this agenda it cannot be discussed? **Kim Everett**: There is "New Business" that covers a whole area. **Rothermel**: I would like to know why we are doing it and I'd like my question answered. Are we not going to be able to discuss issues that are not listed on this agenda? **Williams**: We are not going to discuss breed-pertaining issues. **Everett**: Don and I discussed this at great length. We are talking Show Rules and I agree we don't talk breed issues per se when it involves standards, color changes that breed councils might vote for, but if it's anything that's construed as a show rule concerning a breed, I do feel we discuss it. We did talk about a gray area

and that gray area I want to make black and white. **Williams:** That's what Fred just showed up for. **Everett:** I think we better get this thing cleared up before we box ourselves in. I don't like being muzzled. **Williams:** This is basically a Show Rules meeting; it is not on breed related issues. It does not relate to a change to a breed or anything concerning a particular breed. **Everett:** I agree with you on Standards and changing the color or something, but I don't agree with you on Show Rules. **Williams:** It is the Show Rules we're going to discuss. Any other questions?

Diana Doernberg: I think it is our policy that we have to pre-notice items in order to vote on them. **Rothermel:** We voted on "What Is A Breed?" and it wasn't pre-noticed.

Doernberg: I don't know that we want to get into a discussion.... **Rothermel:** Well you made the statement, Diana. **Doernberg:** Excuse me, I'm asking a question unrelated to what you brought up. If you want to discuss that, you can do that. I am just asking has it not been our policy not to vote if something has not been pre-noticed? **George Eigenhauser:** Well, I just want to make a corollary to that question. Isn't anything that was brought up at the annual and voted on by the delegates automatically pre-noticed for this meeting? **Williams:** That's right. **Doernberg:** I am interpreting this whole discussion to mean that an item that hasn't been pre-noticed at all could not be brought up for a vote. Such as, under New Business, if somebody had the best idea in the world and they presented it under New Business and nobody had any idea that it was coming, our policy has normally been not to take a vote on it. **Rothermel:** But, for example, "What Is A Breed?" certainly was discussed and many issues passed at the annual meeting and I can't understand why we wouldn't be taking them up at this meeting. **Williams:** Those issues will. **Doernberg:** We're talking about exactly what was brought up at the annual, aren't we? **Williams:** "What Is A Breed?" will be discussed. We are not changing any breeds or Breed Standards. **Rothermel:** I don't think that should be discussed here either, but there are some issues involving breeds that don't involve the Standards.

Williams: I just don't want to tread on our February meeting. I want it clear that this is a Show Rules meeting, not Breeds and Standards meeting. **Rothermel:** That's fine, I don't think we should change Breeds and Standards here either. **Everett:** I'm not saying we're changing breeds but when we go to the Show Rules and we reach a certain topic, it is going to have to have a solution. What I'm saying is you have to have yes or no on those Show Rules. Correct? **Williams:** We'll have discussion on it, and we'll have Fred's opinion on it. **Everett:** But you have to have a vote on it too.

Williams: Donna you said you had something to bring up? **Donna Fuller:** Yes, normally the budget committee meets only in the spring and I present the budget committee report in June. The October and February reports are strictly treasurer's reports. I want to be sure that was clear.

Williams: There is a motion on the floor to approve the agenda. **Motion carried.**
Eigenhauser abstaining.

(1) **CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES.**

President Williams invited the board's attention to consideration of the Minutes of the June 1998 Board Meeting (exclusive of the Annual Meeting, which will be considered in June of 1999) and asked for any corrections, deletions, or additions. **Kitty Angell**, CFA Secretary, noted, "I have four (4) corrections to the June Minutes:

Page 92, top of column 1 — regarding Central Office approval of show format changes, the motion should read as follows: Garrison Moved to empower Central Office to take action on show format changes *for shows 90 days or more in the future* without waiting for a board meeting.

Page 107, paragraph 7 of column 3 — Williams stated that was true because we would be conducting business as usual (Show *Rules* in October and Breed Standards in February.

Page 108, bottom of column 2, Disciplinary Hearings and Protests — Docket #98-005 CFA v. Geving, C. & Smith S.: *The board voted to dismiss S. Smith's name from the docket for no probable cause on all charges and to cite C. Geving for a hearing as recommended by the Protest Committee.*

Page 108, bottom of column 2, Disciplinary Hearings and Protests — Docket #98-008 CFA v. Senser, P.: *The board voted to cite P. Senser for a hearing on the complaint concerning violation of Show Rule 2.12 and to dismiss for no probable cause the complaint concerning violation of Show Rule 2.02."*

Everett: I sent a correction to Kitty and she said she played the tape back and Central Office played it back and they had me making a motion and I still insist that there is no way I made that motion. I want this clarified. It was page 106 when Don was making his appointments Sunday and he asked that Jody Garrison take his place. At that time Craig Rothermel brought up and I supported that, because of expense, we didn't do it before and we shouldn't do it this time. Obviously, I voted against it. There is no way in this world I am going to make a motion unless I state I have a right to vote against. I'd never make a motion for something I am vehemently against. Again, the voices may sound like something on the tape. Betty White was in favor and I'm not sure if she made the motion, but I know it wasn't me. I think we have other board members at this table that know it wasn't me. So, I want to say, for the record, each time I make a motion, my name first on the tape so there'll be no misunderstanding or our secretary will state back, "the following person made the motion," because voices can sound somewhat alike. Years ago we had a thing with Pam and me and I let it go at the time. I used to keep a running sheet of each board member, but I don't want to do that because I've got to think about things here.

Williams: In this particular case, I do know that Central Office and Kitty re-did the tapes and there was no mention that you reserved the right to vote against it. It's obvious that you voted against it and it is probably what you intended.

Everett: I'm saying I didn't ever make the motion. **Angell:** I have the tape here and I am prepared to hand the virtual transcripts to each of you. **Rothermel:** Is it necessary? **Angell:** Central Office has said she did it and I say she did it and we have the tape here; I've got a hand-

out, whatever you want to do. **Rothermel:** I think it is inconsequential at this time. **Everett:** I don't think it makes a hoot except it serves as record we state our names so we are not going to have this again. I intend to do so. **Angell:** I think it's important that you do, Kim. But you didn't in this one.

Williams: Our minutes are for what is recorded, not what was thought was recorded or hopefully said after the fact. **Eigenhauser:** I have a suggestion. Last meeting we stated our board standing rules or parliamentary proceeding rules at the beginning of the meeting. Fred wasn't here so we didn't do it this time. Maybe we could make that part of our standing rules that the maker of a motion automatically reserves the right to vote any way that they chose on the motion. That would obviate the need for this kind of discussion in the future. **Fred Jacobberger:** The slight problem is, we have no standing rules that are in any kind of written form. Perhaps we should start accumulating them.

Doernberg: My experience has been with a standing motion and then the right to vote against has been reserved when a committee chairman is presenting a lot of items, for instance, the Show Rules. They will put a standing motion in order to expedite the meeting so that somebody doesn't have to continually be waiting for somebody here to make this motion. So, the committee chairman automatically has that motion on the floor and because they're expediting the meeting they also have the right to vote against it; the same way with Standard changes. Now, on other items, what would be the point of somebody making a motion and then voting against it? That doesn't make any sense.

Eigenhauser: Sometimes you make a motion to get it on the table, people are having a little side discussion, that doesn't necessarily mean you are going to vote yea or nay, only that you feel the board should discuss it. It occurs to me that one of our standing amendments to Robert's Rules is that we don't require seconds on our motions. I assume that rule is in effect at this meeting?

More discussion to this issue took place at which time **Williams** stated that if a person making the motion wants to vote against it to please state it. He then moved for acceptance of the minutes. **Motion carried.**

(2) **TREASURER'S REPORT.**

President Williams called upon **Donna Fuller**, CFA Treasurer, to give her report.

CFA FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements as of August 31, 1998 and for the four months then ended (which you received previously) show a very disappointing net loss again this year, as well as some alarming trends which this board needs to deal with expeditiously. Revenues and expenses of the Yearbook demonstrate the most serious problem; I will deal with that later in this report.

Revenues and expenses of the Almanac are comparable with both prior year and budget. Over time, the income/loss varies just above or below break-even, depending on where we are in the rate increase cycle. We adjust the subscription rates when costs increase just enough to

prevent significant losses; the objective of the Almanac is not to make a profit, but to be a primary method of communication between CFA and its members.

Ordinary income has continued its decline. The decline in registration-related items is disguised by the \$15,000 advance on the CFA book and the effects of collecting the show license fee increases from previously licensed shows; the actual decrease in the registration-related items exceeded \$25,000. This board must consider what measures to take to stem this decline; one possible step is listed under Action Items at the end of this report.

The Central Office expenses are one of the few bright areas since they are running well below budget and nearly at last year's level. Mr. Dent and his staff have continued to exhibit cost savings through consolidation of functions as well as creative ways of reducing required expenses, which Tom will explain in more detail in the Central Office Report.

Differences in the computer expense area are primarily timing-related. The work on upgrading "Herman" is in the planning stage so no significant amount has been spent as yet.

Many of the variations in CFA Programs expenses, compared with last year, relate only to timing differences. For example, the majority of the bills from the 1998 annual were paid by the end of August, whereas a large block of the 1997 Annual expense was paid in September 1997.

This same timing anomaly applies to board meeting expense in the Corporate expense category. Most of the other Corporate items are comparable to the prior year and within budget. Of favorable note, the Professional fees category is down almost \$10,000 this year due to a lack of major litigation expenses.

YEARBOOK FINANCES

As mentioned previously, the Yearbook finances have continued a downturn – one that requires the immediate attention of this board. The most alarming item demonstrated by the August financial statements is a decrease in advertising of nearly 20% (\$43,403) as compared with 1997 levels. Although there may be a few dollars trickling in late, the amount shown through August is essentially the 1998-99 annual amount.

Even though there will be fewer pages due to less advertising, this translates to very little decrease in cost of printing. Furthermore, each year there are more "non revenue" pages included in the Yearbook (e.g. additional breed winners and national winners, etc.). We will produce fewer books due to the slow sales; however, this results in a higher amount of the base cost being allocated to each of the books produced. The sale price of each book already does not cover the cost; the factors listed above just increase this shortfall.

Sale of prior years' books from inventory has been slow and is occurring only when promoted extensively and sold at substantial discount. Although we are reducing the level of inventory, we are recovering a smaller proportion of the cost of the books.

*Unfortunately, CFA can no longer afford the \$400,000 per year needed to continue producing the Yearbook as we now know it. With the decrease in advertising and slowing sales of the Yearbook, this publication is rapidly becoming a major drain on our finances. We must make some hard decisions as to format, content, production processes, even its existence, and we must make them soon! Because of the long lead-time for many of the Yearbook features, the **decision must be made no later than the February 1999 board meeting**. I believe a special committee should be appointed to study this situation and present options to the board for action at the next meeting.*

REGIONAL TREASURIES

I have spoken with several of the new regional directors and am already working with some of the new regional treasurers. I will get the rest of the information at this meeting and ensure that all of the current treasurers have the necessary materials to adopt the standardized regional accounting and reporting system.

*In order to properly include the information in CFA's reports, I will be asking each of the treasurers to submit reports as of March 31, 1999 on all accounts held by the region. These reports will be **due to me by April 15, 1999** so I can consolidate them and get them to Central Office in time to be included in our information returns to the IRS. I am including this now so everyone has plenty of time to prepare and I can answer any questions on what is needed in advance. As always, I will be happy to provide any assistance I can; the best time to reach me is Monday through Thursday, 9 AM to 11 PM Pacific time.*

INTERNATIONAL SHOW TREASURY

We have begun receiving income from club sponsors and vendors. As these funds are received, I am transferring temporarily excess funds into our money maximizer account (about four times higher interest than the checking account) until it is needed to pay the show bills. Hopefully we will be able to handle all of the remaining prepayment requirements with entry fees and leave the funds earning higher interest for as long as possible.

At the end of last year, there was \$850 in club sponsorship pledges outstanding. I fully reserved against them (i.e., did not include them as income from last year's show). Unfortunately, this year we have not yet been able to collect from the two clubs who pledged these amounts and were listed as sponsors in the catalog. One club was from Region 3 and one from Region 4; I will provide the club names to the appropriate regional directors to see if they can persuade the clubs to honor their commitments. I have also been making slow progress in collecting the one very large bounced vendor check from Anaheim; the balance is now down to \$150.

ACTION ITEMS

The signature cards for the International Show Account need to be updated to reflect the results of the June 1998 elections. Previously, I have simply submitted the new card to the bank, but last time the bank requested a corporate resolution. To avoid any potential problems, I am

requesting a **resolution authorizing me to change the signature cards**; the proper form of such resolution to be provided by our attorney.

In June, I distributed a proposal designed to increase the number of kittens registered in each litter. (Note: additional copy of proposal attached.) I am requesting the board **discuss this proposal and implement some form of it at this meeting**.

Proposed Registration Fee

Proposal 1

If a breeder registers all the kittens in a litter at the time of litter registration, the litter registration fee will be \$7 and individual kitten registrations will be the \$5 each. Each kitten must have a name and owner specified and may be assigned a cattery suffix. The owner may be the breeder or may be a different person.

No credit will be given if all kittens in a litter are subsequently registered after litter registration; all kittens must be registered at the time of litter registration for the \$5 fee to apply. Any subsequent change of name, owner, or cattery suffix would be charged an additional \$7 transfer/change fee.

Proposal 2

If a breeder registers all the kittens in a litter at the time of litter registration, the litter registration fee will be \$7 and individual kitten registrations will be \$5 each. A name for each kitten may (but need not) be provided at time of litter registration. (For purposes of this proposal, kittens registered without a name will be referred to as pre-registered.)

I. Kittens Registered with a Name: Kittens may be registered with the breeder as the owner or with a different owner. If the owner is someone other than the breeder, a name must be provided at time of registration. A cattery suffix may be added at time of registration. Any subsequent change of name, owner, or cattery suffix would be charged an additional \$7 transfer/change fee.

II. Kittens Pre-registered without a Name: All information except a name must be provided for pre-registered kittens. Pre-registered kittens will be assigned a registration number and cattery prefix (if applicable). **Only the breeder may be the owner of pre-registered kittens.** The breeder may subsequently register a name for a pre-registered kitten without additional charge in one of two ways:

1. Return the registration slip with a name designated for the kitten. Owner information may not be changed; if the owner is different than the breeder, the \$7 transfer/change fee will apply.
2. Enter the kitten/cat in a show. Pursuant to Show Rules 4.06 and 20.07, all entries in a show must have a name. If a kitten/cat has been pre-registered and no name has been registered for the cat, the name used in its first show will become its registered name. If

the owner of the entry has changed, the name will be registered (without cattery suffix, if applicable), but the new owner information will not be applied until ownership is transferred via an official registration slip and a \$7 transfer/change fee is paid.

No credit will be given if all kittens in a litter are registered after litter registration; all kittens must be registered or pre-registered at the time of litter registration for the \$5 fee to apply. Any subsequent change of name, owner, or cattery suffix would be charged the normal \$7 transfer/change fee.

Note: A cat must have a name assigned before any offspring litters of the cat may be registered.

Fuller: I'd like to take the Treasurer's Report a little out of order and deal with a certain housekeeping item first. Under the action items on page 3: The signature cards for the International Show Account need to be updated to reflect the results of the June 1998 elections. Previously, I simply submitted the new card to the bank, but the last time the bank requested a corporate resolution. To avoid any potential problems, I am requesting a **resolution authorizing me to change the signature cards**; the proper form to be provided by our attorney. In the past we have listed the officers of CFA as signers even though for all practical purposes Allene and I are the only ones who sign the checks. I think that while we have to change the officers now because we are changing the signatures, if we list the current officers and have Allene and myself as signers, then every time there is an election and we change officers we won't have to go through this resolution thing. It's a fairly restricted account. **Jacobberger:** Each bank has a corporate resolution form. I didn't bring one from Minnesota, but all we have to do is pass a resolution from this board and then get the form for the secretary to sign. Adopting the resolution by this board should be satisfactory. **Fuller:** I would like to make a motion that the board approve my changing the signature cards and restricting the authorized signers over to Allene Tartaglia and myself, Donna Fuller. **Eigenhauser:** And we can add to that that the secretary be authorized to sign the standard forms corporate resolution authorized such account in the form required by the bank. **Fuller:** Yes. **Williams:** Does everyone understand the motion? **Motion carried.**

Fuller: While we are on the International Show treasury I just want to say that things are coming along well. We've gotten quite a bit of vendor money in. I'm getting a pretty good response from club sponsors and, at this point I've been able to move \$15,000 into a money market account. Now we will go back to the report. I was very alarmed. I had hoped to present a budget that was in the black this year. Unfortunately that wasn't the case. The registration revenue and our standard forms of revenue have continued to decline. The over-all picture is not very positive at this point. The most alarming thing is the Yearbook. The deadline for advertising is July 15th. The August 31st statements include virtually all the advertising revenue we are going to get this year. It's down a lot! I had previously mentioned that the former budget committee had made some plans on revamping the ways our publications are organized and the way it is handled. I think at this point, the picture of this year's Yearbook is so grim, that we can no longer talk about thinking about it in the future. We are going have to take some action and do it soon. By next board meeting we are going to have to decide if we are going to continue to formulate into a Yearbook that looks like the Yearbook we've come to expect. It used to be able to break even, sometimes it even made a little. Now, it's not selling, it's not selling advertising

and it costs about \$400,000 or thereabouts to put together. It is no longer feasible unless we want to publish a deficit publication and that's a decision I think before it happens, not just let it happen. I would like to see us make some hard decisions on this before the next board meeting. I think that I, and other members of the budget committee should be on this before we have any more discussions.

Rothermel: Donna knows, and Tom Dent knows that this is an issue that has concerned me for some years now. This is not something we did not see coming. This is an issue that, within the very near future, must be presented. We made some preliminary recommendations with Central Office with both Carol and Tom and then, with the change of the elections, we were not able to carry through with some of these things. But it is an issue that is getting worse. It is not the fault of the publication itself. But we feel that 50% of our sales are repeat business sales and the other 50% are from new people coming into the fancy. The problem is that our 50% of new people has decreased. I think that we are still getting most of the repeat business but the dwindling part is because we don't have the numbers of new people coming in. I don't see, at this point in time, a major influx in sales because our registrations continue to decline. Since we cannot expect additional sales then I think it becomes an expense factor. I had not planned to serve on any committee, but since this one has to be done by February, and if the chair would so desire, then I would like to be on this committee.

Dent: I'd like to give you some additional information. The Yearbook sales peaked in 1991, the same time that our registrations peaked. That volume of the Yearbook was ordered in the quantity of 7200 books. The 1998 Yearbook had a press run of 4900 books, and I am looking at a press run of approximately 4000 books for the 1999 Yearbook. So that's a decrease of 3000 copies of the book. That gives you some idea of the gravity of the issue. The advertising helps to pay for half of the cost of the book, and if we lose those advertisers, you can decrease the size of the book but you are losing a greater amount of revenue than you are realizing in savings. We also have the constant pressure to increase the number of non-revenue pages while at the same time we are seeing a decrease in the revenue pages. The books are costing us more than we are selling them for. We all know that the Yearbook is something that has been cherished by cat fanciers over the years. We all know it has set CFA apart from many other organizations. It's going to be difficult to get through this situation. We are going to have to take a hard look at all the items that are published both in the Yearbook and the Almanac and try to come up with some recommendations on what can be combined and what can be deleted and what would fall within the context of a permanent publication rather than a magazine that is seen as transient and temporary. Maybe we can come up with a solution that would serve both purposes.

Doernberg: I see the Almanac taking up a greater percentage of the advertising. I think what happened in 1991 is that people were not advertising as much in the Almanac. The Almanac has become very aggressive in going after advertising. Several times a year they are promoting ads. I think we are working against ourselves; we only have a certain constituency and so many advertising dollars and we have two entities vying for them.

Rothermel: I agree with what Diana is saying and Carol and I talked about the Yearbook becoming a publication of the Almanac. That is, have a publications department in Central Office, and have the Yearbook as an issue of the Almanac itself.

Williams: Donna, if you will come up with a committee, we'll proceed with it.

Secretary's note: The committee to review the Yearbook operation, which was approved during the Treasurer's Report on Saturday morning will consist of: Donna Fuller, Chair; Tom Dent, Lonnie Hoover, and Craig Rothermel.

Kitten Registration Proposal – Fuller: In June, I distributed a proposal designed to increase the number of kittens registered in each litter. (Note: see copy of proposal). I am requesting that the board discuss this proposal and implement some form of it at this meeting.

Doernberg: I received a very lengthy letter about this proposal. They brought up a lot of questions. First, they wanted to know, in the case where a breeder pre-registers kittens and does this early on and they are raising a color of a certain breed that is hard to determine at a young age, would, in fact, color change generate an extra charge? **Dent:** Typically, they do. **Doernberg:** Okay, they also wanted know how you keep the kitten in the data file if you go ahead with this. What type of slip would a breeder get with an unnamed pre-registered kitten? It seems to me that with a pre-registered, unnamed kitten you have double handling on every transaction. You handle it once and then send it back to the breeder and then you handle it again when you determine the name. Is this going to be cost effective? Now, if they are entered in a show and they are pre-registered without a name, what happens if the name is unacceptable? This has happened on occasion. You're going to have to check every entry in a show to see whether it is an unregistered kitten or registered kitten that has a name. If the kitten is entered in a show and it is not shown, does the name remain the same? When do they claim they're not for breeding? If this proposal passes it is possible that every kitten will have been registered twice, once when the breeder registered it and again when the owner registers it. Do they get Breeder Bucks twice? (Many chuckles) I think this proposal has some problems that I would like more explanation.

Fuller: This proposal was brought forth to elicit just this type of discussion. We are trying to come up with something that might help increase our registration income. Some of the questions you came up with, we have already thought about, but others we hadn't and I think the whole idea of putting this out in June and then coming back with it was to get people who are very practical thinking about it. That is especially true with proposal #2. Proposal #1 would be our preference because it is simple and easy.

Eigenhauser: The whole purpose of this proposal is to market registrations. The more convoluted, the trickier it is to understand, the harder it is to market. I don't think Proposal #2 is marketable. Proposal #1 is simple, clean; even I can understand it! (More chuckles). **Rothermel:** Registration is something we have tossed about for several years and I think there is a simple solution to this if we could convince our breeders. We have got to develop a rock-hard certificate of registration when the cat is not for breeding. The problem is people are registering the cat so we are just giving a blue slip to an owner that has no name on it and the owner has no impetus to even register that cat. But if we give them a certificate with a cat's name and the breeder's name on it and you say you can name this anything you want and have your own name on this cat when you register it, then they want to get their name on it. When you are given a certificate with nothing on it, a lot of times it is put aside and no one sends in the registration. I think we need to develop something that we can convince our constituency that "this cat cannot and will not ever

be used as a breeding cat.” **Williams:** And people want it when they buy the kitten. **DelaBar:** I got back a rather strange response saying “Why do we pay \$7?” I explained that it was \$6 dollars, which is a dollar more than what we had been charging a few years ago. They said, “Go to \$10.” I thought it was refreshing. People rarely want to raise prices. But I think it has merit. Make it even, go to \$10. **Miller:** We’ve tried a number of things over the years. I remember Bill Lee standing up every year and urging breeders to get their pet buyers to register. It just hasn’t happened. I think that there are two things that are going on. One is procrastination on the part of the breeder. One possibility would be a break in the fee if you met a time limitation. If you register a litter within six months you might get a break. The other thing is that the reason why the registration by pet buyers has never taken off is because the pet buyers aren’t interested in this little slip. What the pet buyer would like is a simple three-generation pedigree, that is all they need. You might just have the name of the sire and the dam and maybe the grandparents; and possibly a place to put a picture of their cat. So, in other words, you can have two types of registration, one that you pay a certain amount of money for, but when you register a kitten as a pet you might get this nice one that is like a small pedigree with a frame. Then, I think the pet buyers would go for it, they would love it. So I think it is dealing with the procrastination, by putting up time limits. AKC does that and it works very well. Another thing they do is have routine inspections of kennels for records only, and when they go in they want to see your blue slips. If they see any outdated blue slips or any that are extras in litters they are destroyed at that time. **Angell:** The other thing that I wanted to bring up is something that affected me when I was selling pet kittens. One time I sold a pet kitten, gave the blue slip and checked the “not for breeding” box, but there was nothing about “showing” and the cat showed up in Premiership. It was a pet! I’ve talked to many other breeders and they don’t want to give papers because they are afraid the new owners are going to show the pet cat in Premiership. So, could we have something that said, “not for breeding and not for showing?” **Williams:** I don’t want to limit the conversation but I think if Donna wants to work with it a little further, I will give Tom and Diana a chance to speak, but then the committee can work on it.

Dent: First I would like to make reference to the handout. What you are seeing here is at the root of many of the problems that we are experiencing today. This is it. This is why we are asking for a raise in club dues, why we’re having trouble with the Yearbook, and so on. It’s because of the decline of registration rates. It is a two-fold problem; it is not just individual registrations. We are losing people who are registering litters and, along with the loss of those litters we are losing registrations. So, it is a multi-faceted issue and I wanted you to have a graphic representation of what is going on. The second point that I’d like to make is that I’d like to come up with a scheme to instill more confidence in the “not for breeding” registration. I haven’t put it down on paper, but I’ve come up with a way to insure to the breeders that our staff will not make an error on the “not for breeding” registration. I have a method that will put total control of the “not for breeding” registration in the hands of the breeders. It will be up to them to allow a cat to be a breeding cat, and in the absence of their permission the cat will automatically be registered as a “not for breeding” cat. If the breeder puts it on a blue slip, that will enable our staff to register it as a whole cat. If the breeder omits it from the blue slip, our staff will not be able to register it as a whole cat.

Everett: If a cat is registered as a “not for breeding, showing, whatever,” and later the cat turns out to be nice, what happens? **Dent:** We will accept a notarized statement from the breeder allowing for the changes. **Everett:** Also, on this report, which is pretty dramatic, that’s a gigantic drop... **Dent:** Excuse me, by the way, each year is the end of our fiscal year. So we are seeing the little markers on the graph, which is as of April 30th. I suspect that the marker for the individual marker for April 30, 1999 will be down to 60,000 or approximately where we were in 1986. **Everett:** The other part that you didn’t address in this, maybe you will in your office report, but it does kind of coincide: the situation on our show entries seems to be dropping with the exception of maybe a National Capital or something like that. The number of shows has increased but the numbers have dropped. Financially, clubs are hurting. All the way around we are talking a money deal. You know we don’t require cats to be registered. In AKC they push and if you don’t you are in a lot of trouble. **Williams:** I’m going to let Diana speak and then Craig and we’ll call it. **Doernberg:** I just have one item. This person that wrote me this long, detailed letter had the same idea as Joan. He said the real problem is the pet buyer and not the breeder. He was not impressed with the blue slip, but he was impressed with the pedigree he got with his first cat. His suggestion was to have a little frame-able pedigree that the pet owner would like to have. **Rothermel:** I just want to correct something that Kim said. I don’t think what she said is accurate – that the number of cats being shown has declined. I think the cats being shown has remained somewhat positive but the number of shows has increased so the entries have gone down. **Dent:** As of last show season the total number of entries was in the range of the prior year; there had been no decrease. Each year we always hear comments about how the number of entries declines. The number of entries per show is about the same as it was the previous year.

Fuller: Those of you who had comments on this proposal, would you give them to me and we’ll go back and work some more on this, but at least we’re getting it out there for some input. Thank you. If there are no further questions, that concludes my report.

(3) **DOMESTIC CLUB APPLICATIONS.**

President Williams recognized **Sharon Roy**, to discuss Domestic Club applications. From a procedural standpoint, Roy told the board that she would automatically Move the Acceptance of each application, reserving the right to vote against it, based on its merit. She will also call on each regional director for comments.

Roy: We will take the clubs in order of regions.

At the October Board meeting, we will be considering the applications of seven new domestic clubs. The clubs listed below have submitted a completed application and their constitution and by-laws. In reviewing these clubs, I used the CFA guideline brochure and sample constitutions provided to me by Laina Aitken. Many thanks to Linda Siniscal for the timely forwarding of all material.

REGION 2

Steinbeck County Cat Club

This club plans to hold annual shows in the Monterey County area. None of the members are officers in other CFA cat clubs. This club has received no letters pro or con commenting on their application.

Northwest Regional Director, **Lorna Malinen** spoke in favor of the club. Motion was called. **Motion carried.**

REGION 3

Good Sport Cat Club

The club plans to hold one to two shows per year in the Denver-Metro area. They have 24 members, 15 who do not belong to any other area cat club.

This club has received numerous letters pro and con. The primary reason for the negative (non-support) letters is the current show schedule of the established area clubs and the concern that the Denver Metro area cannot support more shows.

The reasons for support are that some of the “new members” have not felt welcomed by the existing clubs and that exhibitors living in the area would like more local shows. Exhibitors often have an 8-10 hour drive for shows out of the Denver area.

Their constitution is in order.

Gulf Shore Regional Director **Lonnie Hoover** addressed the board: I spent a lot of time on the phone with people from Colorado. Basically all the favorable letters we got were all from individuals, the unfavorable letters we got were all club orientated. At the moment there are nine clubs located in the Denver area. Of the nine clubs in the area, five have produced shows. There were seven shows produced last year. They averaged 180 entries. The lowest count was 145 entries. The most disturbing factor that I felt about the whole packet was a letter we received from an attorney stating flat out that we were going to be sued if we did not approve this cat club. That is blackmailing, folks. **Rothermel** conferred with Hoover about the letter. He added that a lot of favorable letters were from out of state people, taking away credence from the application. **Eigenhauser** wanted to know if these people had been turned down for membership by the other clubs. **Hoover**: Letters from the individuals more or less stated that they feel the clubs did not want them. Letters from the clubs stated that they had never applied. **Everett** mentioned that there was a letter that said they would consider these people, so that was one option. She also thought that more shows would produce a domino effect in fewer entries. **DelaBar** spoke for the other side of the issue saying there was very bad blood between these people. She also said the letter from the attorney was based upon defamation of character. She added that she had checked out the incident along with animal control and that they both felt it was a matter of harassment. **Angell** noted that some of the members of the new club are actually members of other Denver area clubs and that it stated so in the new club’s application. **DeBruhl** pointed out that this was an extremely large number of clubs for such an area. He wanted to see a more cooperative thing

such as club sponsorship and such. **Williams** added that he would like to see CFA change its show license to include more than one club so they could work together and get some credit. **Rothermel** said that this very thing was being done in Arizona. There are five clubs that get together and put on a show once a year and they have found that the camaraderie has helped the cat fancy in Arizona. **Thompson** also stated there is a club in the Southern region and a club in the North Atlantic region that are going together on a holiday show because they both had a show in these back-to-back regions and they decided to work together. **DelaBar** brought up a letter that she felt misrepresented an existing club. **Motion failed.** DelaBar voting yes, Hoover abstaining.

REGION 5

Western Front Sphynx and Rex Fanciers

This club hopes to hold an annual show in either region 2 or 5. They are organizing a breed rescue network for Sphynx and all breeds of Rex cats.

They have received one letter of support from Ganba Kobe Cat Club of Japan.

They have 20 members associated with the Sphynx and Rex breeds.

Their constitution is in order.

Both Southwest Regional Director **George Eigenhauser** and Northwest Regional Director **Lorna Malinen** spoke in favor of this club. Motion was called. **Motion carried.**

The next four clubs presented were from Region 8 (Japan). The Japan Regional Director, **Bess Higuchi**, addressed the board concerning these clubs. **Higuchi** talked about clubs being started in Japan for political reasons. Her opinion was that they did this to get a vote. She spoke in favor of accepting the four clubs and then putting a moratorium on adding new clubs from Japan. **Fuller** pointed out that the increase in Japanese clubs was tremendous, almost 50% since she's been on the board. In Japan, the number of registrations have not increased nor the number of entries in shows. Another thing that bothers her is receiving the many faxes explaining that "these people applying for the new club are good people." She thinks "being a good person" is not a good reason for getting a new CFA club. Her advice was to start the moratorium now and not wait to accept these four clubs. **Williams** felt it was unfair to these clubs to start the moratorium immediately. **Everett** spoke on the cultural aspect of Japan; "at least they are saying it honestly. They could go ahead and say 'we' and 'our'. but they say the truth. We don't always say the truth. You know darn well there are certain controllers in our clubs that call the shots. They say it the way it is. They speak of the individuals and they do consider the vote but they also put on shows and activities and they pay fortunes for our CFA cats and they promote CFA." **Everett** also reminded the board that she felt Japan could support 60 clubs and reiterated the large number of population in that country. She did agree with Higuchi on the moratorium but felt these four clubs should be accepted. **Barnaby** also agreed with what Higuchi said, but wanted 1) to make each club a separate motion and 2) to set the moratorium. **Rothermel** concurred with Higuchi on the moratorium.

DelaBar spoke against a moratorium. **Hoover** wanted to know if these clubs are from areas that don't have clubs, or are they from areas that are already saturated with clubs?

Higuchi: Of the four clubs, one is in Tokyo, one is out in the country, one is in Nagoya, and one is in Osaka. **Hoover** felt that if the area was already saturated with clubs they might not be able to handle another club and it would turn into a paper club. **Eigenhauser** affirmed that the reason to have new clubs in CFA was to bring in new people. He also said that he did not see a lot of "crossover" people from other clubs. On that basis of bringing in new people he would be in favor of these new clubs. **Doernberg** wanted the idea of a moratorium discussed before voting on the clubs. **DelaBar** felt we should vote on the clubs first. **Everett** reminded the board that young people coming into CFA from Japan far exceeds those that are coming into CFA in the USA.

REGION 8

Riverside Cat Club

This club was held over from June as their constitution was not in order. Their constitution has been updated. The only concern I have is that both the president and the secretary reside at the same address. Only one member belongs to another CFA club. This club hopes to hold an annual show in the Tokyo area.

Riverside Cat Club was brought to a vote. **Motion carried.** Fuller, Thompson, Doernberg, Hoover, Miller voting no.

Abu Simbel Cat Club

This club has two letters in support from Next Generation Cat Club and All Cat Partners. They plan to hold an annual show in Nagoya and hope to organize more clerking schools. Only one member belongs to another cat club.

DelaBar: I would like to see an active cat club in Nagoya. It might liven things up a little bit. **Thompson** wanted to know how many clubs we already have in Nagoya. **Higuchi:** There are eight clubs in Nagoya and two of them are putting on six shows each a year. Discussion ensued over the fact that one of the multiple show-producing clubs had more or less fallen apart and was now inactive. Motion was made to accept. **Motion carried.** Fuller voting no, Thompson abstaining.

Ace Cat Fanciers

This club plans to hold two shows per year in Osaka.

This club's constitution does not make provisions for dissolution. I also again have concerns that the president and secretary reside at the same address.

Roy told the board that there were no provisions for dissolution provided in the constitution of this club. **Jacobberger** said it was not constitutionally required but that the board may want the additional information. **Eigenhauser:** Our constitution requires that the clubs be

“not for profit.” In my mind one of the key elements in being not for profit is providing for a non-profit disposition of club assets in the event of the dissolution of the club. Without that they don’t meet the minimum membership requirements. I think it needs to go back for revision. **Everett** brought up one exception to “not for profit” status. “If the IRS rules you are for profit, that is the end of it. I am in one club that functions as ‘not for profit’ but we file tax reports and are with the IRS. We made too much on the gates.” **Hoover** wanted to know if there were other clubs in the area of this club. **Higuchi** answered that this is the second largest city in Japan. They do have eight clubs altogether but there hasn’t been a lot of activity in Nagoya lately. **DelaBar** mentioned that several of the people in this club are very high profile exhibitors that are at all the shows. **Eigenhauser** formally moved that we delay consideration on this matter until it can be referred back to them for consideration. **Roy** said that she would with the exception that if the moratorium were considered that this club is exempt. **Dent** pointed out at this juncture that CFA has never investigated what has happened to the assets of any club that disappeared. His feeling was that it was not a major issue. **Barnaby** reminded the board that our attorney rendered a decision that it would be in order to vote on this club regardless of whether that statement was in there. Then I concur with what Craig said and what Tom said and vote against this motion. **Eigenhauser**, in response to both Stan and Tom, said he understood that while we don’t always carry this “not for profit” out to the letter of the law, our constitution requires that members be non-profit.

If we are going to publicly state that we don’t care whether they comply with being “not for profit,” then this is sending the wrong message. He feels that this is a minimum requirement we need to reach.

Williams: I am going to call the question on George’s motion. If it fails, then I am going to ask Sharon to amend her motion to accept this club providing that we get this information. The motion was called. **Motion failed.** Williams, Everett, DelaBar, Watson, Higuchi, Barnaby, Berg, Hoover, Malinen voting no (a tie vote results in motion failed). **Roy** then amended the motion to accept **Ace Cat Fanciers** contingent upon them revising their constitution. They will not be in good standing until CFA receives that information. **Motion carried.** Fuller voting no. Eigenhauser abstaining.

Sun Pearl Cat Club

This club’s constitution is in order. They list 12 members, none belonging to any other cat club.

They plan to hold an annual show in the Mei-Prf and also hold clerking schools.

Higuchi explained that this club was in a new area. She felt this would be the most acceptable. She noted that it was between Nagoya and Osaka. Motion was called on accepting the club. **Motion carried.** Fuller voting no.

*Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Roy*

Higuchi then made a motion that a moratorium be placed for the time being on allowing new clubs in Japan. **Dent** said the problem with a blanket moratorium is that it disallows you to consider applicants that you may, in fact, want. He suggested instead that CFA issue a stronger statement about what constitutes acceptable candidates for clubs. Much discussion ensued, including the issuing of better guidelines for clubs to follow in order to be accepted. **Hoover** brought up the fact that imposing a moratorium would preclude clubs in an area where there were no clubs from applying. **Doernberg** talked about the time when CFA had maps showing all the clubs in every area. She felt that setting up arbitrary guidelines isn't very practical. Her understanding of the Japanese way of thinking is "one man, one club." **Rothermel** commended Higuchi for mentioning a moratorium, because it takes courage to recommend something like this. "I'd like to thank Bess for being forthright and recognizing, as we do, that there is somewhat of a problem there and for at least trying to remedy it." **Thompson** also commended Higuchi and hoped that she would go back to her people and explain to them our concept of a CFA club versus their view of a club and how it should function.

At this point **Williams** interrupted the meeting to state that there was a tape recorder running in the back of the room. He asked it to be turned off because only the two CFA tape recorders are allowed in the room. **Jacobberger** addressed the legal aspect of this action.

Everett then commended Higuchi for trying to bring peace and harmony to Japan. The only concern she has about a moratorium is that sometimes it creates a backlash from the constituents. She feels we could get into trouble with a moratorium. **Fuller** also stated that she felt a moratorium was not the way to address this problem. The way things are going, Japan will have an individual vote instead of a club vote. We need to stop allowing every individual to have a vote in CFA.

Eigenhauser asked, as a point of order, for a set of standing rules for the conduct this meeting. He feels a committee should set up a set of guidelines that the board and spectators can follow. He wants the board to have ultimate approval over what those guidelines are. At that point **President Williams** appointed Eigenhauser, Malinen, Jacobberger, and Dent to set up formal guidelines for making criteria for meetings. **Dent** said he feels we should have published rules for clubs telling them what the board will be looking at when they are under consideration. **DelaBar** spoke on the regional boundary study and how all this criteria would help our marketing studies by giving us ideas for expansion and growth. **Higuchi** restated her motion for a temporary moratorium against accepting any new clubs from Japan, to extend for one year. **Motion carried.** Eigenhauser, Rothermel, Miller, Malinen, Roy voting no.

(4) INTERNATIONAL CLUB APPLICATIONS.

President Williams called on **Stan Barnaby**, Chairman of the International Committee, to present the International club applications. **Barnaby:** Before I go into my report I would like to thank Linda Siniscal and most of the staff at Central Office for their help. I didn't realize until I took over the two committees that I am working on currently that the Central Office did as much as they do to actually help us along. **Barnaby** then named the clubs applying for membership and spoke in favor of accepting all clubs. He feels we need to build clubs in Europe. He then made the motion to accept with the right to vote against.

The following clubs have applied for CFA membership in the International Division and will come before the board for consideration at the October meeting and I strongly recommend their acceptance.

***Cat Club Sherry
Nikolaev, Ukraine***

***Formosa Top Show Cat Club
Taipei Taiwan, R.O.C.***

***La Feline Mediterraneenne
Loubet, France***

***Siberiada
Novosibirsk, Russia***

***Sozvezdie Plus
Moscow, Russia***

Yaeko Takano has promoted a lot of interest on the Asian front.

While the interest and support remains strong, I believe a wait and see attitude has been adopted to some degree in Europe and I feel very strongly that when the European Countries see the actions of the International Committee become reality, we will see an increase in club activity.

*Respectfully submitted,
Stan Barnaby*

Cat Club Sherry; Nikolaev, Ukraine. Rothermel spoke in favor of this club. **DelaBar** said the cat fancy is strong in the Ukraine. **Higuchi** recommends this club because it is 36 hours by train from Moscow to the Ukraine and they do have very good cats. **Fuller** wanted to know exactly where the club was located. The consensus was that the Ukraine was located in the south.

[**Secretary's note:** Ukraine is located in SE Europe, formerly a constituent republic of the USSR. It borders Poland (NW); Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Moldova (SW); the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov (S); Russia (E, NE); and Belarus (N). Its capital is Kiev. Estimated population 51,847,000.]

The motion on **Cat Club Sherry** was called. **Motion carried.**

Formosa Top Show Cat Club; Taipei, Taiwan. Higuchi mentioned that people from Taipei come to Japan for shows and they want to come to the CFA International Show here. **Rothermel** said that Yaeko Takano was very much in favor of this club. [**Secretary's note:** Taipei is the capital of Taiwan and a provisional capital of the Republic of China. Estimated population 2, 637,000.]

The motion was called. **Motion carried.**

La Feline Mediterraneenne; Loubet, France. Motion was called. **Motion carried.**

Siberiada; Novosibirsk, Russia. **DelaBar** spoke in favor of this club. **Rothermel** spoke on his financial concern by putting our judges in financial problems. He talked about financial problems that exist in Russia right now. He doesn't know why we want a club in Siberia because of financial concerns and is against more Russian clubs. **Watson** addressed the problem with a canceled show in Russia and supported the new club. **Fuller** agreed with Rothermel and is concerned about the financial impact of more clubs. **Berg** felt that we couldn't sit and decide the financial conditions in Russia. She has a number of her cats placed in Russia and they are all being cared for well. **Barnaby** addressed the cats being sold on the streets in Russia and said they do not belong to CFA club members. These club members are trying to stop this practice. **DelaBar** and **Malinen** both felt we should nurture Russian clubs. **DeBruhl** addressed concerns other than those presented by CFA Judges. He said the promotion of CFA was important. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.** Rothermel voting no. Fuller abstained.

[**Secretary's Note:** Novosibirsk is located in southern Siberian Russia. It is Siberia's major industrial center. 1 Million population.]

Sozvezdie Plus; Moscow, Russia. **Watson** spoke in favor of the club. The motion was called. **Motion carried.** Rothermel and Eigenhauser voting no.

[**Secretary's Note:** Moscow is the capital of Russia. Population 8,802,000.]

(5) **INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT.**

Shortly after my appointment as Chairman of the International Committee, I asked Linda Berg to assist me in all phases of the operation of this committee along with Liz Watson, who is our liaison for South America and Russia, Yaeko Takano, who is our liaison for Asia, and Peter Vanwonterghem, who is our liaison for Europe.

After carefully reviewing all information forwarded by Edna Field, many faxes and e-mails as well as phone calls, it was obvious that we needed to concentrate on communication, education and support of the clubs already established as well as enhancing interested groups into forming new clubs in all areas in order to promote the growth process.

COMMUNICATION:

With the help of Maurizio Demarchi, a website for the International Division was set up and operational early in July 1998.

A newsletter that will be sent to all clubs, being handled by Linda Berg, has been established. The first newsletter, which contained the minutes of the Annual Meeting as well as a message from me, was e-mailed to Europe for mailing to clubs.

We will have space in the Almanac for an International Division news and information update, which will enable us to reach even those who are not affiliated with clubs but might be interested in CFA.

EDUCATION:

With the help of Jo Ann Cummings and her committee, the Judging Program Committee, we are planning to hold judging seminars and/or schools for those who are Interested and who qualify for applying to the Judging Program in the International Division. This, of course, is based on the board's acceptance of the new rules being worked on and permission to hold these seminars and/or schools.

Clerking Schools and training sessions: I have appointed Jürgen Steinbrenner to head this committee, along with other capable clerks to train those interested in clerking. He will be working directly with Debbie Kusy.

Many other areas are being considered for use as forms of education, such as show manuals to assist those putting on their first CFA Show, show sponsorship to help defray the cost of putting on a show.

Show Scheduling: I have appointed Manfred Pszak as Show Scheduler and asked that he look into ways to insure each club a fair chance at entries, but realize European shows have obstacles to face that are vastly different than those we have in North America.

CLUBS:

It became obvious to us very early in our quest for information the need to communicate with all the clubs and individuals that we could reach. In order to grow it takes the efforts of all involved, not just a handful of people. We on the committee have learned quickly that well informed clubs and individuals will enhance the growth process and are concentrating heavily on this effort.

FUTURE PLANS:

Linda, Liz and I plan after the first of the year to meet with Peter in Europe and travel to as many locations as possible and meet with as many clubs and individuals as we can to answer questions and promote growth. We feel very strongly the need to ensure the International Division that we are behind them and that they are truly a part of CFA.

In accordance with the Constitution an election has been called for two representatives for this division and all clubs will be polled for names and a mail-in ballot will then be sent to all clubs. Hopefully this will be achieved by December 1998.

While we have many things in the planning stage that we are currently working on, I prefer to deal with fact. What I have outlined above is currently in place. As we grow and have more committees in place we will report our progress to you. As always, your help, guidance, suggestions and support are appreciated.

*Respectfully submitted,
Stan Barnaby, Chairman
International Committee*

International Committee Chairman, **Stan Barnaby**, gave his report and remarked that he, Linda Berg, and Liz Watson have found that, in Europe, a lot of people fail to understand that Peter Vanwonderghem is the liaison to the International Committee from Europe. “There are some people who will not work under this structure. We cannot grow with the situation as it stands now.” **Williams** felt that alleviating this problem would give CFA a perfect opportunity to nurture the European community. **Fuller**: I think what is being done is correct but I want to take on my “usual role.” This trip? **Barnaby**: We are financing it ourselves! **Fuller** (amid laughs): I have to ask that question! **Barnaby**: It is our true belief that all of these people that want to become members of CFA or are members of CFA in Europe have to meet the people from the U.S.A. who are involved with what their future may or may not be. We want to go over there, at our own expense, and give them some assurances that CFA really wants them to be a part of the organization, and also to tell them what CFA expects of them. Right now they are getting only the information that some people want them to know and we want to go over there to dispel that.

More discussion evolved around two shows being put on in Europe in close proximity at the same time with **Dent** explaining the procedure that CFA used. **Everett**: I think we should show our dissatisfaction about this event, but I don’t think we should pull the licenses. **Berg** explained that it costs about ten times the amount of money to put on a show over there and if two clubs are doing it on the same day, that close together, they are going to drown.

Barnaby then addressed a show that **Yaeko Takano**, the liaison for Asia, wants to produce in Japan. She plans to put on what she considers the CFA International Committee Asia Show. She is using the Sunflower Cat Club as host club for this show and Sheba is sponsoring it. It is confusing the Japanese clubs. He thinks, from now on, she should put the show on in one of those Asian communities and not in Japan. **Williams**: My feeling is that it would be an out of region show moving into another region, and I’m also not happy about her calling it The International Show because it is not. **Eigenhauser** agreed with **Williams** because “as much as we protect our name, we need to protect the name of our biggest and most prestigious show as well. It should be a matter of policy that we not allow a club to use the name ‘International’ as part of their show name without the permission of the board.” **Thompson**: This show by Sunflower Cat Club is already in the Almanac so it had to have been licensed some time ago, but this Asian International thing just came up recently? Was she doing this for corporate support? **Barnaby**: This was all done without any correspondence between her and myself or Linda. **Rothermel** then asked that we develop a policy to make sure that this type of thing does not happen in the future. **Barnaby** emphasized that Takano did not do this maliciously. She just went about it the wrong way. **Fuller** recently received a note from Takano and she was very excited about putting on the show to raise money for the international clubs. She got corporate sponsorship to make this a big media event.

Berg brought up a letter the committee received from Finland. They want to join CFA. Linda told her that she would bring it up at this board meeting and the lady was very excited, stating that there were many people in Finland interested in joining CFA. **Fuller**: In connection

with this, I contacted Tom Dent awhile back to see if we had a packet or anything to send a group of people that might be interested in forming a CFA club. We do not have an official packet. There is nothing that you can really give to a group that explains clearly enough that they have a fair shot at being able to prepare something that we would be able to accept. I think we need to do that. **DelaBar**: The last time that we had a board meeting in San Antonio, which was a few years ago, we discussed the International Division during that meeting. Vaughn Barber was the chairman at that time. The policy that we passed at that meeting, that has never been rescinded as far as I know, was that before a club in the International Division could put on a show they had to go through a clerking school and a class on how to put on a show. And, Stan, this may be something that you might want to consider doing again. **Barnaby**: We've already done that. Jürgen Steinbrenner was appointed head of the clerking program and we talked with Jo Ann Cummings and many of the judges that go to Europe about putting on judging seminars and schools. Some of the things that we are working on have to be held in abeyance until the new judging proposals are accepted by the board. We're trying to get people who have put on many shows to get together with clubs that haven't put on shows to teach them what it is all about. Some of the printed material put out by CFA, such as clerking manuals and show materials, will be helpful to them.

(6) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

President Williams called on **Tom Dent**, CFA Executive Director, to give the following report.

CFA has changed its long-distance provider and instate service provider to lower CFA's phone expense. We currently have a rate of 7.9 cents a minute for long-distance calls and 5 cents a minutes for calls within New Jersey. This ought to shave a couple of thousand dollars off the phone bill. In addition to that we have changed our credit card processing company. This is not to be confused with the company that issues our Affinity Cards, but it is the company that actually processes the credit card transactions that occur in Central Office. In that particular case we are reducing our discount rate from 3.75% down to 2.25%. That should shave several thousands of dollars off our credit card expense. We are continuing to investigate the automation of show records and judging records. We recently attended a small trade show and we plan to attend a large trade show. Also, we've made contact with companies that offer products that operate in this area. Essentially, the route I am looking at right now is to have the technology in the office rather than out in the field. Instead of having PCs on every judging table or a central PC at the show, we are looking at some sort of document processing system that would be in the office. A document processing system is one that utilizes a scanner to capture images. It uses various engines to convert the information on those scanned documents. A database receives the information and then processes the information as we now do. The point of this is to reduce the cost of scoring our shows and to allow us to expand the number of awards that are given out at shows. This is an ongoing project and it may be some time before we see this come to actuality, but the work is ongoing and hopefully we will be able to see something in the near future.

Dent then moved into the action items.

1. Out of Region Show Requests.

- a) *Club Name:* Western Cat Fanciers
Home Region: Southwest (5)
Show Date: April 10-11, 1999
Proposed Location: Green Bay, WI - Midwest (6)

There was discussion on where this club came from. It was determined that it was from the Southwest Region. **Berg:** The club that is still holding shows in Green Bay is a struggling club. Even though it is at a different time of year, I don't see how it is going to help. I don't think it is a good idea. **Rothermel** moved to postpone the vote until Sunday. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

- b) *Club Name:* The Tonkinese Breed Association
Home Region: Southwest (5)
Show Date: January 29-30, 2000
Proposed Location: Baltimore, MD - Southern (7)

Tonkinese Breed Association is currently a Southwest Region club. They would like to have a show on January 29-30, 2000 in Baltimore, Maryland, which is in the Southern Region. Since Maryland is very close to the North Atlantic Region, that regional director was also contacted. Both **Roy** and **DeBruhl** saw no conflicts. **Rothermel** moved to adopt. **Motion Carried. DeBruhl:** This is the type of cooperative effort that works out for everybody. **Williams:** They should be commended for what they have done.

Dent then brought up a second request from the **Tonkinese Breed Association**. In the course of the show they would like to provide judging for household pet Tonkinese, registered and unregistered, the judging to be done by breeders. The cats entered in those Tonkinese rings would not be scored for anything. Each of the cats would be judged four times by Tonkinese breeders. **DeBruhl** said that the information was not pre-noticed. **Dent:** This should have been pre-noticed. Maybe this can be brought up at a later board meeting. **Rothermel:** The objection would be a purebred cat being shown as a household pet. **Dent:** Breeders will be judging the cats, which brings up insurance issues. **Everett:** The only point I want to make is, I understand about the liability and all, but the breed awareness and we talk about registering cats with a certificate. Would this be a way to bring this to the public about honoring the cat? **Doernberg** saw no reason not to have a separate household pet show but was worried about the liabilities of breeders handling the cats. **Eigenhauser:** Since this wasn't pre-noticed, I move we table it until the next meeting. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

At this time, **Berg** asked the board to readdress the Western Cat Fanciers request. "Springfield, Missouri is the show that weekend and they would both draw from the Chicago area." **Williams:** All our clubs should be working through our show schedulers. **Dent** said that from now on, when he receives the request he will automatically send it to the regional directors. **Williams** added that adjoining regions should be contacted. **Jacobberger** ruled that the motion could be brought back by a majority vote. "If everybody is in agreement, let's not worry about the technicalities." **Williams:** Motion on the floor to reconsider this issue. **Motion carried. Berg**

then made a motion to accept this request with the right to vote no. **Motion failed.** Eigenhauser abstaining. Western Cat Fanciers' request denied.

Dent brought up one last item; no action is required at this meeting. **Berg** brought to his attention that Mid-Michigan Cat Fanciers has licensed a show for April 17-18, 1999 to be held in South Bend, Indiana. That is an out-of-region show for Mid-Michigan.

It would seem that Mid-Michigan has never received permission from the board to have that out-of-region show, so it looks like it should not have been licensed. **Dent** will go back and investigate that matter.

2. Show Rule Exemption Requests:

- a) Club Name: Sunflower Cat Club/
Asia International Cat Show
Show Date: October 24-25, 1998
Show Rule: 21.01

Sunflower Cat Club is asking for top 5 breed awards in Kittens and Championship in ASH and Maine Coons in two rings. **Williams:** I'd feel differently of it were in the Asian division rather than Japan because we're enhancing the Japanese cats and not the Asian cats. **Eigenhauser** spoke against: "I feel differently about kittens than championship because kittens aren't scored in breeds. Championship is scored, therefore I feel more strongly about it." **Barnaby:** The problem I perceive with this is that a little earlier we wanted to protect our International Show name and now the request seems to make it very much like our International Show in two breed categories. **Everett:** We add breed wins all the time. We've had many requests, like the Siamese Club and everything. I don't have a problem with this providing they don't score the additional breed awards. They are just acknowledging the two most powerful breeds in their country. **Miller** said she didn't see anything in the request that mentioned scoring, it was just talking about additional rosettes. She felt they were doing it for special recognition and suggested that maybe we could stipulate they only do this if they have more than 30 entries in the breed.

DelaBar made to **motion** to accept. **Motion carried.**

A second request from **Sunflower Cat Club** was to provide for a Best of the Best Judging. Judges would be looking at the best Kitten, Premiership, and Championship cat, and selecting a Best In Show. **Rothermel** spoke against, stating the format was too similar to the International Show. **Rothermel** moved to accept with the right to vote no. **Motion Failed.**

- b) Club Name: Hong Kong Cat Lovers' Society
Show Date: November 8, 1998
Show Rule: 21.01

Hong Cat Lovers' Society requested to have Best in Show like the previous request. **Everett** made the motion to accept with the right to vote no. **Motion failed.**

3. Release of Breed Council Voting Results.

Each year, as the deadline for the return of BC ballots passes, we have been receiving an increasing number of requests for the ballot results. It has been our policy to provide this information to BC members after we have mailed the results to the BC secretaries and to the executive board. To formalize our practice, I am requesting that the board adopt the specific policy given below.

That the results (both of elections and standard issues) of any breed council poll first be mailed to the members of the executive board and the incumbent and, if applicable, newly elected breed council secretary(ies). After five business days, they will be available to breed council members.

Discussion: Dent asked to adopt a policy regarding the disclosure of the breed council voting results. Some problems arose last year when certain breed council secretaries felt they were not being given the information prior to when it was given out to others. This was not the case. “I am proposing that the results of the breed council election and the questionnaire first be mailed to the members of the executive board and the incumbent breed council secretaries. Once those mailings have occurred, upon the passage of five days, we would release information to people calling us to get the results. This would give the board and the secretaries a chance to receive the data and be aware of the results before it is common information.” **Eigenhauser** made the **motion** to accept. **Motion carried.**

4. Faxed Breed Council Applications.

This year we received approximately 12 applications via fax on the membership deadline date. Some time ago, the board adopted a policy on faxed documents identifying which items were acceptable and which were not based on the need to have verifiable signatures, readable data, and not have eligibility issues arise due to failed and/or faulty transmissions. The breed council application was not specifically identified in the minutes but falls within the type of document deemed not fax acceptable. Unfortunately, a specific statement was not included on the membership application alerting the applicant that faxed applications were not acceptable, and it is possible that faxed applications have been accepted in the past. However, people who called this year (notably on Friday 7/31 and on the deadline date Monday 8/3) were told faxes were not acceptable. Those who sent faxes, sent them over the weekend or on Monday.

At this time, I am presenting two items for your consideration:

- a. Should the faxed applications received this year be accepted;*
- b. Should faxed applications be accepted in future years.*

If the board decides that past policy be upheld, a warning would be added to the application.

Discussion: Dent mentioned an increased activity in faxed breed council applications at the deadline. There was some varied information given out by the staff as to whether faxed

applications were acceptable or not acceptable. He wanted to know if a firm policy should be established as to fax applications. We did receive 12 fax applications prior to the deadline. My question is A) should we accept those 12 faxes that were received? B) Do you want to disallow faxed applications in the future? “My feeling is that we should allow the ones that we received this year because of the confusion on the issue. And in the future we should require a signature and that would preclude sending the application by fax.

Some discussion followed. **Doernberg** spoke against faxed application. **Eigenhauser** wants the Constitution to say, “an original signed application.” **Doernberg** then made the following motion, “**Until the close of the 1999 Annual Meeting CFA will not accept FAX applications for Breed Council membership. And that Fred Jacobberger draft a constitutional amendment to be presented to the delegation by the board asking that they ratify that action**” (Request B). **DelaBar** expressed her feeling that we didn’t need a constitutional amendment in order to carry out this action and make it policy. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Jacobberger suggested an alternative resolution in case the previous amendment fails. He also mentioned that in the legal industry faxed documents were being used more and more but they were followed up with an extra fee. **Hoover:** We are in a generation now: the FAX generation. I entry clerk 15 to 20 shows a year and you wouldn’t believe the stack of mail I will get in at the last minute. I agree with Fred, if they want to do things at the last minute, maybe they should have to pay for it.

Eigenhauser then made the motion to accept the 12 faxes filed this year (**Request A**). The motion was called. **Motion carried.** Angell, DelaBar, Thompson, Barnaby, Doernberg, Berg, Hoover voting no.

5. *Breed Council Membership Eligibility.*

Among other requirements, the eligibility rules for those who have not bred a grand are that they have bred a litter of the appropriate breed within the previous two calendar years and “have exhibited a cat/kitten of the appropriate breed/division at a CFA show within the previous two calendar years.” An issue which has recently arisen pertains to exhibition – specifically, does agenting a cat satisfy the exhibition requirement? It may be, that because the BC Standing Rules are contained within the Constitution, this question must be taken to the clubs to be voted on at next year’s annual. However, should this decision be within the scope of the board’s authority, I am requesting that the board address this issue.

Discussion: Dent brought the issue before the board as to whether the exhibiting requirement is met by agenting a cat. **Doernberg:** I’d like to go back to when these rules first became effective. You used to only have to have registered one litter of kittens to become a breed council member and members didn’t like that. They thought the requirements should be strengthened and they finally determined what we have here: you need to breed three litters, one of those litters within the past two years, you have to have exhibited one cat within the past two years if you have not bred a Grand. I think the idea behind having somebody show in at least one show (physically being there in a two-year period) was if you hadn’t bred a Grand, they wanted

you to be out there looking at what was going on with your breed. I think that having someone else agent a cat for them is not the spirit of what this issue was about. **Dent**: That is not the issue I'm bringing before you. The question is can that agent qualify for the council membership? **Everett** made the motion to accept the agent with the right to vote no. **Motion Failed**.

6. Judging Program Stipends Budget.

At the time the budget was prepared, no provision was made for the overlap that would occur in the wind-down of the previous administration of the program and the startup of the new. Consequently, the new administrators of the program did not receive a stipend for the month of July. The board is requested to add \$750 to the Judging Program budget to allow for this payment.

Discussion: Dent wanted action taken on the overlap stipend created by the new Judging Program Committee. **Fuller** said that there was no budget submitted for implementation. The month in question is July 1998 when Donna Jean Thompson and Kim Everett as well as Annette Wilson and Jo Ann Cummings were all working on the program. **Eigenhauser**: I think that next year when this comes up again we need to revisit the issue of the stipend. Now what we have for two people is being distributed over five. It's either time to start thinking about reducing the stipend or spreading it among the five. But because we already have people in place that are working very hard, at least for this one overlap it should be allowed. Although I believe in monetary conservatism, I think in this one instance, with the amount of work involved, it would be appropriate. **Everett** made the motion (with the right to vote no) to accept the \$500 stipend. **Motion carried**. Fuller and Hoover voting no. **Doernberg** then asked that the board go back to the breed council issue on agenting. She felt it should be clarified and made the motion that we interpret "exhibit" as physically taking the cat to the show. It is asking somebody to physically go into a show once in two years and show his or her cat. **DelaBar** warned about the Constitution becoming too convoluted. Discussion was held as to whether **Jacobberger** should put something before the delegation to give the board the authority to do this or clarify the situation. **Doernberg** restated her question, "**In order to qualify for Breed Council Membership that we interpret the section of the Constitution 'have exhibited' to mean that the person has to take the cat that they are trying to qualify with to a show.**" Motion called. **Motion carried**. Eigenhauser voting no. **Doernberg** then made the motion to **have Jacobberger bring something before the delegation to give the board the authority to do this**. Motion called. **Motion failed**. Everett, Eigenhauser, Roy voting yes.

7. W. Hutzler – International Division/Non-CFA Show Judging Assignment.

At its June meeting the board voted to disallow Mr. Hutzler from judging a show for the Bavarian Cat Fanciers Association. This was due to the reports that the club was deliberately promoting itself as a CFA club when, in fact, it was not. Typically, the judge would have been notified of the board's action by the Judging Program Chairperson. Unfortunately, presumably because of the transition in progress at the time, Mr. Hutzler did not learn of the board's action until he read of it in the minutes. The club had purchased a non-refundable ticket for Mr. Hutzler which he now has. He is requesting that the board reconsider its previous action.

Discussion: Rothermel explained the situation to the board and suggested to the board that the Bavarian club had been notified before they purchased the tickets and that he felt they purchased them anyway to exacerbate the situation. **DelaBar** moved to tell Hutzler to send the ticket back to the club that purchased it. **Motion carried.**

8. Web-Site Marketing.

I have had a preliminary meeting with a representative of an organization which develops “affinity” web site marketing opportunities. Affinity agreements involve the endorsement of a product/service by an organization and the payment of a commission by the merchandising company. Our credit card program with MBNA American is an affinity program.

The representative will provide a number (60-70) of retailers who are willing to sell a variety of products at a discount to CFA members who visit and purchase products at a “virtual” shopping mall located on our web site. In actuality, the “mall” and shopping transactions would be remote to CFA’s site with access through a link. Commissions would be paid to CFA based on the dollar value of sales. CFA would control which merchants could participate at our site.

There are no start-up or ongoing costs for CFA except those we choose to incur for promotion of the mall. Of course, there are issues to be resolved (e.g., what constitutes CFA membership?) before we can proceed.

At this time, I am requesting that the board grant authority to proceed with the development of this proposal. Furthermore, should we reach agreement with the developer prior to December 1, 1998 and that the logistics of the operation be in place by said date, that the executive committee be empowered to approve a contract with the developer. If we cannot achieve a “roll-out” by December 1st, the full details of the agreement will be brought to the February meeting for approval by the board.

Discussion: Dent asked the board if they want to proceed with investigating this marketing project. CFA would not be putting any money into this project. CFA’s job would be to promote the web-site. This web-site would be totally different from CFA’s web-site. He would like the board to grant him the authority to proceed. **DelaBar** so moved. **Motion carried.**

9. International Division Council.

Article IX Sect. e sets forth the rules for the establishment, membership and meetings of the International Division Council. Some provisions included in this section are

- a) *that International members shall select two representatives*
- b) *the board shall adopt rules of procedure for the appointment or election of representatives*
- c) *the board shall select the times and places for the Council to meet*

- d) *that at least one meeting be conducted each year*
- e) *that the President of the Association shall appoint a committee of at least two members of the board, one of which shall be designated as Chairman, to attend and conduct such meeting*
- f) *that the cost and expense of such Council meeting shall be borne proportionately by all International members.*

At this meeting, item b) should be addressed because if an election is the chosen route, time must be allocated for a call for declarations and the preparation, distribution and return of ballots. This process will take two months, allowing only five months for the scheduling of a meeting.

Discussion: Dent wanted the method of selecting the committee members set up at this meeting and for Central Office to set up a timetable for the election. **Rothermel** so moved.
Motion carried.

At 12:30 PM the board broke for lunch. When they reconvened they were in Executive Session. Late in the afternoon they went into Open Session with the following report.

(7) PUBLIC RELATIONS REPORT.

Media Alert: *The Crab & Mallet March 1998 show is featured in the National Geographic's "The Secret Life of Cats." The show will air on TBS, Sunday October 11. Check local cable listings for the time in your area.*

CFA Allbreed Judge Leta Williams and breeders from the Greater Orlando area will be featured in upcoming segments of "Petsburgh USA" on the Animal Planet Network. Filmed at Disney MGM Studios, the segments cover a number of CFA breeds. Check local cable listing for the time in your area.

On September 3, I appeared on the "Ask The Veterinarian with Dr. Jane Leon" show and talked about CFA, The Winn Foundation and the 1998 CFA International Cat Show. The hour-long live show airs on the American's Health Network.

CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program: *The 1999 program is gearing up for a start on January 1. Friskies has chosen the following shows as lead shows for the year: January 23-24, San Diego Cat Fanciers; January 30-31, Houston Cat Club; February 27-28, Cincinnati Cat Club; March 6-7, Cats-Plain & Fancy; March 20-21, The San Francisco Revelers; March 27-28, Mid-Michigan Cat Fanciers; April 10-11, The Crafty Cat; April 16-17-18, Rainbow Int. Cat Show*; May 22-23, Miami Florida Cat Fanciers; July 17-18, Garden State Cat Club; July 24-25, No Pussy Footin' Around; August 7-8, Mo-Kan Cat Club; August 28-29, Nova Cat Fanciers; September 11-12, The National Capital Cat Show; September 18-19, Mohawk Valley Cat Fanciers; September 25-26, Salt City Cat Club; October 22-23-24, International Somali Cat Club*; October 30-31, Indy Cat Club; and November 6-7, Cotton States Cat Club. Friskies still*

*needs to sign individual sponsorship contracts with each of these clubs. *Show held in conjunction with the America's Family Pet Shows.*

The master contract between CFA and Friskies has been signed for 1999. CFA will receive \$35,000.00 in sponsorship fees from Friskies. Friskies will make available judging ring signs, judge's cage cards, benching cage cards and end of row signs with the Friskies/CFA logo for use by CFA non-lead shows again. Each non-lead show will need to order them from Friskies' public relations agency, Manning Selvage and Lee (6500 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1900, Los Angeles CA 90048).

***The CFA Store:** As I reported in June, I've been talking with a Kansas City, KS company regarding CFA logoed merchandise for sale. They have proposed a program through which CFA would have no up-front cost for the merchandise. (Our exposure would come if logoed items didn't sell after a year.) A small inventory of items to start, when the program takes off we can increase the number of items offered. I visited their office while at the Mo-Kan show in August and was impressed. Some of their other clients with similar programs are the American Red Cross, Taco Bell, Pizza Hut, Arena Football, KFC, Century 21 and Rubbermaid to name a few.*

***Action Requested:** Give Tom Dent and me permission to finalize a contract with Alvin M. Clayman Enterprises, Inc. to offer CFA logoed merchandise for sale.*

***CFA Booth Schedule:** The CFA booth will be attending the following conferences before the end of the year: Oct. 4-7, American Humane Association, Anaheim CA and Oct. 30-Nov. 2, American Association of Feline Practitioners, Santa Fe NM; and the following cat shows: Oct. 22-26, America's Family Pet Show, Sacramento CA and Nov. 20-22, the CFA International Cat Show, Kansas City MO.*

***Disaster Response:** Over the past year or so discussions were held regarding my going with Pam DelaBar to cover her efforts during a disaster. I have now completed a 20-hour disaster animal response team training program and will receive my certification shortly. The training program was extremely helpful in preparing me to go with her.*

***Vet. Feline Clubs:** After attending the National Capital Cat Show, I gave an hour-long presentation to members of the Feline Club at the Virginia-Maryland Regional College of Veterinary Medicine in Blacksburg, Virginia. Eighty members of the club attended the session.*

***CFA Public Service Announcements:** I've saved the best for last! The proposed public service announcements funded by the Iams Company we've talked about for a couple of years are up and running full speed ahead. We have a celebrity and will be working the production of the PSAs around her schedule.*

*Respectfully,
Michael W Brim
CFA Public Relations Director*

Brim had one action item. He requested that he and Tom Dent be given permission to finalize a contract with Alvin M. Clayman Enterprises, Inc. to offer CFA logoed merchandise for

the CFA Store. **Brim**: They have agreed that we would not have any up-front costs as far as getting merchandise. If items didn't sell we would have the capability of keeping those numbers down and not ordering large quantities. Discussion ensued concerning details of the merchandising. **Doernberg** had a question on who had to pay for the surplus merchandise at the end of the year – does CFA have to pay for it? **Brim** answered that we can control that by the amount we order. We can also run a sale on items to reduce the inventory. **Doernberg**: What do you project as the total exposure that you are going to have? **Brim**: I would say the \$3,000 range. **Williams**: That includes the cost of printing and everything? **Brim**: Okay, \$5,000 then. We can do a nice color catalog, we can do a black and white or we can just sell the sheets. **Dent**: I haven't seen the full details of the program, but I suspect that if there is surplus inventory at the end of the contract period, if we have to buy it, we can still sell it. **Barnaby** moved to give Brim and Dent permission to finalize the contract with Alvin M. Clayman Enterprises, Inc. **Motion carried**. **Brim** also requested board action to change the CFA Logo. *See CFA Logo Committee Report on page 93 of this Almanac.

Miller thinks the new logo design is a wonderful improvement and moved to accept the new design. **Motion carried**. **Brim** had two other comments. One was to mention a thank-you received for CFA's assistance with the wildfires in Florida. The last was on CFA Public Service Announcements. We have a celebrity who has agreed to help us! **Miller** thinks it is important that people know where the money from Iams goes. "CFA received \$50,000 from Iams for Neuter/Spay programs." **Brim** added that the Iams PSAs will also include material on responsible animal ownership as well as neuter/spay information. **Miller**: In the legislative arena, mandatory neuter and spay is a very big push of a certain activist segment. Therefore, we have become very sensitive to any neuter and spay content. I would really like it if you could run any early copy of these PSAs by the Legislative Committee.

(8) JUDGING PROGRAM.

Thompson: We have some sad news from our judging program. **Jake Wojcik**, devoted companion of **Bob Bradshaw**, passed away this past week and we all extend our deepest sympathies to the families. I am sorry to have to report that Will Thompson will have to undergo heart surgery on Monday and our blessings are with him.

Thank you cards were received from Gloria Hoover, Susie Beedy, Holly Ayres and Yoshiko Sada for their advancement.

PERMISSION

Don Williams has been invited to attend a conference, and to judge a show in Sweden, March 6-7, 1999, expenses paid. This convention will be attended by the directors/presidents of the leading feline associations worldwide, and it is essential that the Cat Fanciers Association be represented. Don is already scheduled to judge a show the weekend of March 6-7, 1999 in California. However, if Don cancels his show scheduled March 6-7, and only attends the conference, the full expense for attending this conference will be the responsibility of CFA. Permission is needed from the board for Don Williams to cancel his show in California, attend the conference and judge the show in Sweden.

Discussion: Rothermel: I think it is very important that he attend this conference. The problem that I have with this is that there is precedence in this very area, and that was that I had to cancel a show in my first year of administration and I did not choose to violate the Show Rules and ask permission. I think these Show Rules are very near and dear to our people and we better pay attention. I think it would be wrong for you to cancel a CFA show and go over there and judge a FIFE show. **Williams:** I want you to know that I didn't cancel. **Rothermel:** I think we should bear those expenses and I think you should go to the meeting but I do not think you should cancel a CFA show. I would like to move Don should go to the conference and CFA should pay for the expenses. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

RESIGNATION

Loraine Kritz resigned from the program citing health reasons; we wish her the best.

Thompson moved that we accept the resignation with regret. **Motion carried.**

THE BAVARIAN CAT FANCIERS ASSOCIATION

Walter Hutzler was scheduled to judge the Bavarian Cat Fanciers Association show on April 9-10, 1999. Due to the name similarity it was decided that CFA judges not partake in this club's invitations. Unfortunately, due to the transformation process concerning the judging program, Walter did not receive a letter telling him he could not judge this show. Don sent a letter to the club informing them of this rule, but perhaps because of mail or other circumstances, the club did not receive the letter in time or did not realize this rule also applied to Walter. The club bought a ticket for Walter Hutzler to come to the show in July. Walter was not aware that he could not judge the show until he read the minutes of the June meeting in the September Almanac. Walter said the ticket is about \$300.00. It seems that we are at fault here for not informing Walter and not giving enough details to the club; perhaps the board may wish to reimburse the club for the \$300 or allow Walter to judge the show.

APPLICATIONS

*Applying for admission to the program, reviewed by the Judging Program Committee, and recommended with a favorable recommendation: **Vicki Abelson** and **Karen Talbert.***

ADVANCEMENT

***Debbie Ritter** has completed nine shows, with six out of region, her ratings are 62 Excellent and 10 very good, all positive comments, one suggested comment – could move slower. She has since corrected that problem. All clubs would invite her back and she is not a member of clubs who sponsored any shows she judged.*

*The Judging Program Committee recommends that **Debbie Ritter** be advanced to approval pending longhair.*

REFRESHER COURSE

David Mare is undertaking his Refresher Course. Will follow up on this report September 20, 1998.

SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY

Sanae Inami's application for apprentice is being postponed at this time. Her file is not complete. Due to a misunderstanding timewise, I did not make myself clear when I requested additional information. I did fax her, and she responded several days later. The following day I received a lengthy fax from her. However, part of it was difficult to read and my deadline for mailing to the Central Office was the day I received her fax. I take full responsibility for this in not making myself clear to Sanae that I had a deadline date to meet.

RECONSIDERATION

Ed Davis applied for reconsideration. The Judging Program Committee felt that a final action had been taken by the board on this matter, and in accordance with the amendment dealing with reconsideration, Mr. Davis should reapply to the Judging Program.

Jan Wydro applied for reconsideration and the Judging Program could not consider his request. The Judging Program Committee felt that the board had made a decision regarding Mr. Wydro, and the Judging Program Committee supports and upholds the board's decision. Mr. Wydro's file has been updated and we (JPC) are turning this request over to the board for final action. It is up to the board to stand by their decision or reverse it. Additional material is being supplied for Mr. Wydro.

MEDICAL LEAVES/ILLNESS

Erica Graf-Webster; Would like her medical leave extended until June, 1999.

Rothermel so moved. **Motion carried.**

Werner Kachel: Indefinite medical leave starting June 1, 1998.

Wayne Park: September 12, 1998, Wayne suffered an asthma and heart attack while judging in Sapporo, Japan. His future is uncertain at this time.

GUEST JUDGING ASSIGNMENTS

Permission was granted to:

Liz Watson 4H9 (Fair) Household Pets 08-14-98

*Chuck Gradowski &
Hazel Lindstrand Assolux 10-31-98*

Rothermel moved to accept. **Motion carried.**

ADDENDUM TO JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT

REFRESHER COURSE

David Mare has completed his Refresher Course and the Judging Program Committee recommends that David rejoin the judging panel. The majority of his ratings have been outstanding and all recommend that David be accepted back into the program. In view of the high evaluation marks that David has received from the evaluating judges, we the Judging Program Committee recommend that David now be advanced to Approval Pending Allbreed.

JOB ANALYSIS STUDY

In view of the fact that everyone is so eager to file a lawsuit in today's world, plus the fact we have a judge who wishes to come back into the program after a lengthy illness, the members of the Judging Program Committee feel that we should have a Job Analysis Study conducted. The GENRX Services, Inc. is based in Norcross, Georgia, and could come to the qualifier held in Atlanta to conduct this study. They will do an analysis on a judge, a ring clerk and master clerk for \$550.00 or one study for \$300.00. They will supply a written analysis and a video for all three positions. This could be sent to a doctor for their review to declare that their patient can return to the judging ring. This could also help us in the future if we have an applicant apply to the judging program with a disability. I am certain that none of us wishes to discriminate against anyone, however, not everyone can be a trapeze artist.

JAN WYDRO

Jan Wydro was advised that Judging Program could not consider his request and that his reconsideration request was directed back to the board; however, he had some additional updates in his breeding and showing and those are enclosed. It is suggested that since all advancements and acceptance into the program are by a two-thirds (2/3) majority favorable vote of the executive board, that Mr. Wydro's reconsideration would require the same.

WAYNE PARK

September 24, 1998, 1:15 p.m. EST, Wayne Park called me from his home in California. Doctors told him he is fit and in good shape. He is resuming all scheduled assignments.

LICENSE FEE

The idea of the \$25.00 stipend to evaluating solo judges actually came from several judges who feel that the \$25.00 license fee the judges pay every year is not fair. They say if their job started at 10 a.m. in the morning and ended at 5 p.m. in the evening, that would be different, but there are the judges dinners, and the phone calls at your home from breeders asking for

advice. If the board is not in favor of the above, maybe they would consider the following: the original proposal was for each trainee that you have during the course of a year, \$5.00 would be deducted from your annual license fee. We need to appreciate the judges for giving of their time, knowledge and talent.

RATIONALE FOR THE \$300.00 APPLICATION FEE

Programs need to start paying for themselves. I understand that some think \$300.00 for an application fee is too high. I put this on the net and received complaints of how much money it has cost them to go through the program. Let's do a little simple arithmetic: A judge takes two small shows a month, total 24 shows, 225 cats at each show. 225 cats at 24 shows = 5,400 cats at \$1.05 per cat = \$5,670.00 for the year, 10 years = \$56,700.00. Judging income is taxable, application fees are deductible.

*Respectfully submitted,
Jo Ann Cummings, Secretary
Judging Program Committee*

** * * * **

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Of the 12 remaining judges' files I have left during the transition period with the new Judging Program Committee, I have five people to bring forward at the upcoming meeting for your review and vote as follows:

- 1. SHORTHAIR APPLICANT (JAPAN) - TOHRU AIZAWA*
- 2. APPROVAL PENDING SHORTHAIR - RHETT BOCKMAN*
- 3. APPROVAL PENDING SHORTHAIR - ED YURCHICK*
- 4. SHORTHAIR TR TO APT SH (JAPAN) - KAYOKO KOIZUMI*
- 5. LONGHAIR TRAINEE TO APT LH (JAPAN) - AKI TAMURA*

Summaries or copies of their reports are attached with this cover sheet for your review. The files will also be made available in the reading room Friday evening for the board to review additional paperwork, i.e. judges sheets and in the case of the Japanese shorthair applicant, photographs of his cats showing type and condition.

If you have any questions prior to the board meeting, please let me know immediately so I will be able to answer them for you.

*Respectfully submitted,
Kim Everett*

1. New Applicant to be considered for acceptance at the October Board Meeting

Edward Yurchick - Longhair

NOTE: Ed's application was already "in the works" at the time of the creation of the Judging Program Committee (JPC), and I agreed to continue with his application through board presentation. If accepted he will work under the JPC with Annette Wilson, Judging Program Trainee Administrator.

2. Trainees to be considered for advancement to Apprentice:

Paula Boroff - Shorthair

Karen Lawrence - Longhair

NOTE: I have three trainees still working (Audrey, Miksa, Wood). One is working down to the wire. Pending receipt of a faxed report I will priority mail the file Monday Sept. 28. If you are leaving for the board meeting prior to Friday and wish these materials sent via Express mail, let me know. Otherwise I will have the file ready in the reading room just in case.

Should you have any questions prior to the meeting please call, write or E-Mail at Jeannel2@aol.com. Fax number is 703-791-2361 (home fax).

Applicant files should be reviewed in the reading room as there is ample time for additional correspondence. Enclosed you will find copies of the application materials and a listing of the letters received to date (9/10/98). Full files will be available in the reading room.

Advancement files include only the reports of the individual color class sessions. Please let me know one week prior to the meeting should you wish to review the entire color class file.

It is my opinion the JPC is off to a very good start. We've had growing pains and will surely have more, however, far less than I expected, and they seem to be working together very well. Jo Ann will have a separate report and items for board action.

Thank you notes were received from Steve Gardea, Tracy Petty and Jan Stevenson for their acceptance to Trainee Status as well as Rachel Anger and Rhett Bockman for their advancements to Apprentice.

A safe trip to one and all. See you in San Antonio.

Sincerely,

Donna Jean Thompson

(9) ADVANCEMENTS, APPLICANTS & TRAINEES.

Secretary's note: The board considered advancements, applicants, and reinstatements within the CFA Judging Program while in Executive Session. The actions taken during the Executive Session were subsequently announced during Open Session. The individual balloting

process was done by using signed ballots. The completed results are printed below. All were accepted.

Trainee Applicants **Vote**
Accepted to Program

LH Abelson, Vicki **17 Yes**
1 No (Fuller)

Rationale: (Fuller) Needs more work with Persians.

LH Yurchick, Edward S. **18 Yes**
SH Azawa, Tohru **18 Yes**
SH Talbert, Karen **17 Yes**
1 No (Fuller)

Rationale: (Fuller) Needs more work with other breeds. Would like to see more activity outside own region. (Eigenhauser) Lack of breed experience in other shorthair breeds is a concern but worth a try.

Advance to Apprentice **Vote**

LH Lawrence, Karen **18 Yes**
LH Tamura, Aki **17 Yes**
1 No (Fuller)

Rationale: (Fuller) Needs more work and attention to mechanics.

SH Ardrey, Joan **11 Yes**
5 No (Everett, Malinen, Roy, DeBruhl, Watson)
2 Abstain (Berg, Fuller)

Rationale: (Everett) Not enough progress made since last, failed to advance. 1 poor, 5 fair, 5 good. Over-handling, lack of focus, nervous, cats nervous, too slow, needs to pick up pace. Judge did not let her handle cats that were a bit testy. So, what would happen in a tough situation? Needs more progress. (Roy) Would consider with additional classes. (DeBruhl) Review of color class work with fair and poor ratings do not convince me that she is ready. (Watson) not sure she can handle the pressures of the ring. (Fuller) Too much conflict between various reports. What to believe?

SH Boroff, Paula **18 Yes**
SH Koizumi, Kayoko **18 Yes**

Advance to Approval Pending

Vote

AB Mare, David

17 Yes

1 Abstain (Fuller)

Rationale: (Fuller) Did not receive any information on work to date. (Everett) Top caliber.

LH Ritter, Deborah

17 Yes

1 Abstain (Roy)

No rationale given.

Advance to Approved

Vote

SH Bockman, Rhett

18 Yes

SH Yurchick, Edward

18 Yes

Reinstatement

APT SH Wydro, Jan

14 Yes

3 No (Fuller, Malinen, Thompson)

1 Abstain (Barnaby)

Rationale: (Fuller) Would like to see reapplication, have never seen qualifications. (Malinen) Lack of integrity. (Thompson) Unprofessional, and poor judgment in transferring cats to Northwest Region.

(10) PROPOSED CHANGES TO JUDGING PROGRAM RULES.

Secretary's note: The changes and new rules for applicants proposed by the Judging Program Committee were presented at the beginning of the meeting Sunday, October 4, 1998. For the sake of continuity and the reader's ease they are being presented here.

Donna Jean Thompson gave the proposed changes to the Judging Program Rules in the form of a motion. These have come from the new Judging Program Committee. **Thompson:** I move that the changes to the Judging Program Rules be accepted, reserving the right to vote no.

SECTION 1

DEFINITIONS

CHG APPLICANT: Any person 21 years of age or over who has filed a CFA Judging Program Application form and application fee with the **Secretary of the Judging Program Committee.**

Motion carried.

CHG PROBATIONARY STATUS: The period during which a person who has been accepted by the Executive Board to Trainee, Apprentice Judge **or Reconsideration status** may be dropped without notice or explanation by a majority vote of the Executive Board. **A recommendation may or may not be made by the Judging Program Committee for this action.**

Motion carried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

F-98 **B. A medical leave of absence may be granted by the Executive Board when requested by the judge, the Judging Program Committee, or at the discretion of the Executive Board.**

Motion carried.

CHG REFRESHER COURSE: A course for prior and current CFA Judges who have been absent from the judging arena. This course is designed to enable them to refresh and enhance their breed knowledge and skills. Hands-on judging will be performed while working under the guidance of an Approved Allbreed judge. Evaluations will be completed by the supervising judge and will be returned to the Judging Program Committee. The Judging Program Committee will review these reports and make their recommendation to the Executive Board. The status of the judge satisfactorily completing the Refresher Course will be determined by a two-thirds (2/3) favorable majority vote of the Executive Board. The number of color classes/solo classes will depend on the evaluations submitted by the supervising judge.

Motion carried.

NEW RECONSIDERATION STATUS: A formerly licensed CFA Judge who has been accepted to the Judging Program by a two-thirds (2/3) favorable majority vote of the Executive Board and is undertaking the refresher course.

Motion carried.

SECTION II

APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM

CHG 1. Applicant must be at least 21 years of age.

Motion carried.

CHG 4. An applicant must hold a certified ring clerk license for at least three months prior to application. In addition to this the applicant must complete three error-free master clerk assignments.

DelaBar asked to have added “an applicant must hold, **at a minimum**, a certified ring clerk license.” **Stan Barnaby**: We’ve spent a great deal of time hashing over the fact that there was more experience in being a ring clerk than being a master clerk. You have visual contact with all the cats coming across the table. And you have valuable discussions with the judge concerning the cats being judged. I still wonder what use being a master clerk serves? **Sharon Roy**: It would make more sense to make people do more ring clerking because you learn more sitting in the ring. **Eigenhauser**: I think some of the paper work sent in by judges gives the master clerk an idea of what is required, how the paper work is handled, and what they are going to be dealing with when they become a judge. **Dent**: The original thinking on that was that the master clerk would be able to see the larger errors in dealing with the logic of the awards rather than ring management, so that was a complimentary to the ring clerk experience. **Everett**: Actually this is less than was originally required. Some letters did come in from exhibitors that felt that dropping it entirely might not serve the purpose of a new judge. So they wanted to see the judge do an error-free under pressure. **Hoover**: I’ve either clerked or master clerked at every show I go to and even after 15 years I still get pink sheets sent back to me from time to time for a minor correction. So, I think to take out the master clerk assignments would be a sin. **Motion carried with the addition by Pam DelaBar.**

NEW 6. An applicant must have a current (CFA) Approved Cattery of Excellence. A copy of the current certificate must be provided.

Eigenhauser spoke against this new rule because he felt it was a meaningless requirement to the judging program. **Rothermel** and **DelaBar** also spoke against it. **DelaBar**: It puts our judge applicants in the same category as someone that produces 75 or more kittens a year and is a commercial breeder, To answer George, the teeth to the approved cattery of excellence program are only as good as the people who will help police it. The people who are reluctant to say “this is not right” when they see a cattery of excellence that is an absolute pit and they will not report it, well, then it is hard to have a good program. But I assure you we have followed up on a random basis on these with our veterinarians. As a matter of fact we had a vet in this area lose his license because of fraudulently doing a cattery of excellence. **Miller** spoke about the fact that this program was conceived as a voluntary program and that to have it applied as a mandatory measure in the judging program goes against the concept of a voluntary cattery inspection program. **Hoover**: I think if you put should instead of must in the wordage, I think that there would be no one applying for the judging program who wouldn’t do it. **Fuller**: In many locations people are technically not in compliance with the local zoning and anything that draws attention to the fact that there is a cattery there can be more harmful than beneficial. **Motion failed.** Hoover abstained.

CHG An application cannot be filed sooner than **ten (10)** years from the date of birth of the applicant’s first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.

Eigenhauser felt the old rule of seven years should be kept. **Everett**: In many ways I agree with this, again I agree with case by case. Many applicants would be ready in six months if they’ve got the eye. I’ve had so much contact with constituents that don’t like the ten. **Angell**: I think this is a very good measure and the reason why is that so many people get into the fancy and all they are looking for is to get in their seven years so he or she can become a judge. I really

feel that it takes ten years' worth of experience, of breeding. Don't forget, this is what we are here for, breeding cats... the promotion of the breed and the protection and benefit of the cats. I feel like it takes ten years to know what you are doing. **Williams:** Three more years of kittens that they didn't want. **Thompson:** I spoke against the ten-year rule in February and I will do it again. At that point in time I was asking that the program put in more strenuous application requirements. They have. We are going to be considering visitation and different breeding qualifications where you will have to have worked with a high profile body style. I think this satisfies me over that additional three years. **Rothermel:** I think this was reflective of the total attitude of the cat fancy. I think we have swung away from an association of breeders to an association of exhibitors. And I think there is the concern of some that the emphasis has become on exhibiting cats and not on breeding cats. I think one of the reasons this was proposed was to make sure that people get more breeding experience. I guess I'm falling into where Donna Jean is; I can give up on the seven years if we strengthen some of the other requirements and ask for additional work as breeders. **DelaBar:** One of the reasons this came up is that, over the years, when somebody came up with the minimum requirements they had not fared well in front of this board. We thought if we raised the requirements, somebody has put in some time, has gained maturity not only as a breeder but also as an exhibitor. That maturity factor is definitely what we need behind the judging table. It does not hurt anybody to wait ten years. **Watson:** Well, perhaps if a lot of people feel that this predicates the strengthening of the applications, maybe we should table this for now and see what we feel about these additional requirements for application. **Rothermel:** In response to Pam, I think it is absolutely true that when we got applicants where only the minimum categories were met, that person did not fare well at all. I think we put minimums in each category to say this is at least what you have to do in this category, but I don't think we say that you have to do just the minimum in all the categories. The statement should be made that we expect a lot more than the minimum in all categories. **Everett** wanted to concentrate on the skills. **Motion failed.** Fuller, Angell, DelaBar, Watson, Doernberg, and Hoover voting yes.

CHG 9.A. An applicant must have exhibited at least three (3) cats of their own breeding to **CFA Grand Champion status. Longhair applicants must breed and show one Grand Champion Persian. Shorthair applicants must breed and show one Grand Champion Oriental body-style breed, i.e., Balinese, Colorpoint Shorthair, Javanese, Oriental, and Siamese. The other two Grand Champions, Grand Premiers may be another breed in their respected specialty.** A detailed and specific resume of exhibition experience, including agenting, must be submitted as part of the application. An applicant must have experience including exhibiting one or more breeds in addition to their major breed. An applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities.

Eigenhauser: I'm not sure from the way I am reading this that it is clear. **Thompson:** I can see that you want Grand Champion or Grand Premier in the top, right? The intent is that the longhair applicants would have one Grand Champion, not Premier, of Persian and the shorthair applicants would have one owner-bred Grand Champion. **Eigenhauser:** I think that is what the delegates voted on in '97. **DelaBar:** What the delegates were concerned about is what I had been talking about and this is "breeding for record." If we have a British Shorthair breeder, then yes, I

definitely want them to have experience in an oriental body styled cat. I would love to see them agent several times and maybe show one in Premiership. I don't necessarily want them to have to breed that animal just to satisfy requirements for the judging program. **DeBruhl**: I have a problem when we are forcing people to breed a certain breed, even though it represents a very large portion of our registry. **Rothermel**: I agree with that theory but I do believe that exhibiting is a different situation. I agree that it is unethical of us to require people to breed cats. But I do think we should make them have breed knowledge. I can personally tell you that when a Persian litter is born you cannot tell at one hour if that is going to be Cat of the Year. **Miller**: I don't think we should breed any cats other than what we are really dedicated to for breeding. We now have new things in place such as the cattery visits and also some other ways such as the school so that we have other ways in which we can understand the various body styles; and I also think that we shouldn't give preference, particularly in the shorthairs, because it relates to the numbers of entries. There may be some intricacies in such a breed as the Korat that are just as important as a larger number of exhibited breeds. What we need to emphasize in the judging program is that people need broad experience. **Watson**: Well, perhaps instead of breeding and showing one Grand Champion Persian or Oriental body style we could simply say "exhibit to...Grand Champion." Ideally, I think they should take that animal from being a kitten and move it on up. **Everett** agreed with Joan and went on to state the same facts about breed knowledge and hands-on experience. **Eigenhauser** mentioned that showing in Premiership was as hard as showing in Championship. **Barnaby**: I've been judging now for over 35 years and I still hear "what does that judge know about my breed? He's never worked with them before." That doesn't bother me because I've worked with most of the breeds in my many years in the fancy. But I still believe if you work with a breed, and I'm sorry, Craig, I disagree with you... There are many breeds, when they are first born and they are wet, you know what that head is going to look like. A lot of people can read a book or they can read a standard but that doesn't teach them what that breed is. I think we need breeding experience. **Eigenhauser** made the motion to pass (with the addition of Grand Premier, in the first sentence.) **Motion carried.** DeBruhl, DelaBar, Rothermel, Miller, Roy voting no.

NEW 9.b. ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE: Cattery visits/agenting: Longhair must submit a minimum of five (5) cattery visitation reports. Shorthair applicants must submit a minimum of seven (7) cattery visitation reports. Agenting reports will be made in the Exhibitor's Resume and verified by the owner of the agented exhibit. The owner of the visited cattery must belong to the Breed Council of the breed to be examined.

Doernberg made the correction: longhair applicant, shorthair applicant. **Williams** asked to have added: in all cases variety of breeds is recommended. **Motion carried.**

NEW 10. An applicant must have attended the CFA Judging School for the appropriate specialty for which application is made.

Rothermel said that in the beginning this was a voluntary school and that he felt that we should not require our people to attend a judging school. He felt that it went against the principle for developing the school. He spoke against this being mandatory. **Eigenhauser** added that he got a lot of resistance from his regional people to this because of the pricing and the location.

Everett: When you are going to be a judge and make it your pay, the little time that you are in your training is nothing compared to what you are going to do later. If the region wants to put one on you can still have a judges' school. The judging school is voluntary for exhibitors and judges from other organizations. It was opened for anyone who wanted to learn about cats and it still is. But an applicant – then the burden becomes more. I don't know of any other organization that doesn't require both judges and applicants to go to these schools. **Watson:** We could say that it is recommended that an applicant attend a CFA Judging School, and open the way for regions to have their own judging schools. **Higuchi:** In Japan we have a series of judging schools and, say, a person is interested in the Somali or Abyssinian, then they would come and ask their own questions that they have in their own specialty. **Hoover:** My wife just recently went through judge's training and she has attended every judging school. She got a lot more out of the school than she got out of many of her color classes. She's walked out of these schools with stacks and stacks of documents that can be used later. She was always glad that she spent the money to go. **Rothermel** said that he did not say that the judging schools were not beneficial. He feels it should not be a requirement. **Thompson** moved to add: **it is recommended that the applicant attend a CFA Judging School for the appropriate specialty for which the application is made. Motion carried.**

NEW 11. Exhibiting: The applicant must have exhibited in at least two (2) regions outside his/her region of residence.

Higuchi spoke on the problems of doing this in Japan. **Barnaby** added the problems in other countries. **Fuller** moved to add: **an applicant from the Continental USA and Canada must have exhibited in at least two regions outside his/her region. Motion carried.**

CHG F-98 Applicants who are or were judges with other associations will be considered individually based on their background experience in their prior association as regards to club membership, breeding experience and wins that are comparable to those required by the CFA Judging Program. **CFA clerking requirements as stated in Section II, paragraph 4**, is necessary before application can be made by those judges applying to the CFA Judging Program from other associations.

DelaBar asked to clarify the last sentence to read: **Meeting CFA clerking requirements as stated. Motion carried.**

CHG 15. Approved single specialty judges wishing to apply for their second specialty will be required to furnish detailed, specific information regarding mandatory breeding and showing which must include attendance at breed seminars, CFA judges workshops, test scores, and must be pre-noticed in a CFA Member Edition of the CFA Almanac. Applicants will be expected to have technical breed knowledge on all breeds which make up their second specialty. An application must be submitted in writing together with the applicable **\$300.00** fee.

Eigenhauser: I've heard some conversation earlier about how much money people are going to make once they become judges (giggles around room), but while they are applying they are often among the poorest of the poor in the fancy. They've been showing for years, they've

been campaigning, they are paying money for schools, they are paying money to travel out of region. What do we get? A half a dozen or a dozen applicants a year? \$200 would be better.

Williams: I want to know where the \$300 is going to go. I have heard that the training judge is going to get paid (one of the recommendations). **Eigenhauser:** The bottom line is that tripling the fees in a single year is a big bite for the applicant. These people are the future of CFA. These

people we are going to need years from now. **Fuller:** I also think \$300 is excessive. I think it should be raised just slightly to cover a lot of stuff. We do spend a lot of time and there are a lot of materials going back and forth. I think we should raise it \$50, making it a \$150 application.

DelaBar: The rationale bothers me in that programs have to start paying for themselves. The one reason that we brought this in is because it is supposed to be more cost effective. The other thing I am looking at is that judging income is taxable; I think it is important that we get that out. Our training fees may not be deductible depending on how you do it in your income tax. **Everett:**

First, I want to mention they are going to be paid for judging. Nobody said they are getting rich.

\$300 is too much but I would go along with \$150 or \$200 max. **Miller:** I feel that a lot of time

and expense goes into this judging program and we do need to have the money to fund it. I think

the application fee would be justified at \$200. **Watson:** I think part of this was to pay some of the trainee judges as a way of saying “thank you” and “we appreciate what you do.” I think this is

part and parcel for the \$300, but I would agree to \$200. **Rothermel** agreed with the \$200 and

reminded the board that this program was requested by the delegation, this was not a board

request. Hopefully, they are astute enough to realize that when two people running a program

turns into five, the program is going to be more expensive to run. **Angell:** While I think it is

really nice of the judging committee to consider the trainee judges, I also think that every training

judge in CFA considers it truly an honor to be able to give back what was given to them. I, for

one, would never accept anything because this is my way of giving back to the organization that

has given so much to me. But I agree with the \$200. I think it is fair. **Motion made:** The

applicant fee changed to \$200. **Motion carried.** Eigenhauser voting no.

F-98 Co-ownership and leasing of cats/kittens is permissible when the cats/kittens are under the sole care, custody and control of the applicant.

DelaBar: The only thing that bothers me is where it says “sole care.” What happens if some else needs the animal for a week? Then it is not sole care. **Everett:** This means “resides in-house.” **Motion carried.**

REQUIREMENTS SECOND SPECIALTY

CHG BREEDING: An applicant must have exhibited at least two (2) cats of their own breeding to CFA Grand Champion or Grand Premier status.

Eigenhauser: I don’t think we especially need to be birthing more babies in a second specialty. **Williams:** Let me remind you, I don’t want to keep on changing. If you don’t like it, drop it out and the committee will come back and add something later on. **Miller:** I don’t mind the part about exhibiting two cats, what I mind is that it specifies specific breeding. **DelaBar:** It still requires additional breeding outside your own breed of cat. **Motion failed.** Angell, Fuller, Thompson, Watson, Barnaby, Doernberg, Malinen voting yes.

F-98 Longhair Second Specialty Applicant: **One Grand Champion must be a Persian. This requirement may be met by the applicant showing at least one Persian kitten through to Grand Champion status.** The second longhair breed must be shown to Grand Champion or Grand Premier and must be from one of the other longhair breeds.

CHG

F-98 Shorthair Second Specialty Applicant: **One Grand Champion must be of an Oriental body-style breed, i.e., Balinese, Colorpoint Shorthair, Javanese, Oriental, and Siamese.** This requirement may be met by the applicant showing at least one of the breeds in this category from kitten through to Grand Champion status. The second shorthair breed must be from one of the other shorthair breeds.

After considerable discussion **Thompson** suggested that she go back to the committee and tell them that it appears to be the feeling of this board that breeding is not totally essential for second specialty requirements but we do want exhibiting, cattery visitations, agenting, and the judging school. **Barnaby** asked Thompson if she would remove her standing motion and then he made the following motion: **All previous motions stand with requirements for second specialty going back to committee. Motion carried.**

SECTION III

MECHANICS OF APPLICATION

CHG C. A recent color photo of the applicant and a check or money order payable in U.S. funds to the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. for the required application fees of \$300.00 must accompany any application sent to the Judging Program Committee. If the applicant fails to gain admittance to the Judging Program, a fee of **\$100.00** will be retained by CFA and the sum of **\$200.00** will be returned to the applicant. However, such applicant may re-apply for admission to the program after a lapse of one year. Re-applications require a new application fee of **\$300.00**.

The board changed this amount to **\$100 return fee and \$200 re-application fee. Motion carried.** Eigenhauser voting no.

CHG E. If the applicant is accepted into the program, the **\$300.00** fee will, in part, cover the expenses of CFA for activities until such time as the applicant is advanced to the status of approved judge.

Change to \$200 fee will cover expenses of CFA. Motion carried. Eigenhauser voting no.

CHG

F-98 5. An application which has not been completed within one calendar year of the date appearing upon it shall be rendered inactive. If such applicant wishes to apply for admission to the Judging Program at a later date, such application will be treated as a

new application and must be accompanied by an additional **\$300.00. Signed** and documented negative letters **must** be substantiated, and must be received by the Judging Program Committee three weeks prior to an applicant's consideration for acceptance into the Judging Program by a **two-thirds (2/3)** vote of the Executive Board at a regularly scheduled Executive Board Meeting.

The board changed the fee to **\$200. Motion carried.** Eigenhauser voting no.

- CHG 6. When all requirements for application have been received by the Judging Program Committee no less than **sixty** days prior to the meeting, the application will be submitted in its entirety to the Executive Board for consideration at the Board Meeting following listing of the applicant's name in a CFA Member Edition of the CFA Almanac.

Thompson explained that the committee needs a little more time when they consult with one another. When the Almanac comes out in the fall it makes it very difficult to receive all the material. **Motion carried.**

SECTION IV

ACCEPTANCE TO THE JUDGING PROGRAM

- CHG 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 executive board at the first meeting held not less than **sixty** days after receipt by the Judging Program Committee of the completed application, including all related material.

Motion carried.

- F-98 B. After a full **review** of the recommendations of the Judging Program Committee, a **written ballot** vote will be taken and the results of each board member recorded. A two-thirds (2/3) majority affirmative vote of the members of the Executive Board present is required for acceptance to the Judging Program.

Eigenhauser asked for the following wordage change: **A written ballot vote will be taken and the vote of each board member will be recorded. Motion carried.**

- F-98 F. An applicant, once accepted, will not be dropped from the program except by action of the Executive Board **by a two-thirds (2/3)** majority vote of the members present.

Motion carried.

SECTION V

TRAINEES COLOR CLASSES AND SOLO CLASSES

- CHG 2. Trainees will secure written permission from the show manager of clubs at whose shows they will do any type of breed/division color class evaluation training. **This must be sent to the Judging Program Trainee Administrator (JPTA) with the names of the officiating judges for that show not less than three weeks prior to the opening date of said show.**

The JPTA will assign the trainee to the instructing judge, who he feels will best benefit that trainee. However, the trainee may request permission to work with a judge in order to learn a particular breed and the JPTA will try and accommodate the trainee. A trainee authorized to work with two supervising judges at the same show will count as one show/class credit.

DelaBar asked for the following change in the last sentence, “Shows where a trainee...” **Everett** asked for the following change in the second paragraph, first sentence “who he/she feels will best benefit that trainee.” **Motion carried.**

- NEW 5. **Trainees must attend the CFA Judges Workshop held in conjunction with the CFA Annual Meeting immediately following their acceptance to the Judging Program.**

DelaBar: This is also saying they must attend the Annual Meeting, too. **Williams:** they have to be there for that day. The board settled on the following wording: **It is suggested that Trainees attend the CFA Judges Workshop. Motion carried.**

SUPERVISED COLOR CLASSES FOR TRAINEES

- CHG a) **The instructing judge will determine along with the guidance of the Judging Program Trainee Administrator** what breed/division color class training the trainee will judge. When it has been determined what color classes the trainee will handle, he/she will duplicate the judges slips for his/her awards, copying carefully from the official judge’s book. **The trainee may accept a judge’s book provided by the club but cannot ask for one to be provided.**

Motion carried.

SOLO COLOR CLASSES FOR TRAINEES

- CHG a) When the trainee has judged satisfactorily a sufficient number of color classes to be deemed by the **Judging Program Training Administrator** ready for more advanced work, he/she will be assigned to judge color classes alone with the instructing judge under whose tutelage he/she is working, observing his/her work from a point outside the ring. **Solo classes may take place over a two-day period, however, the trainee may work with only one instructing judge.**

Motion carried.

NEW F. **A trainee will have one year to complete the required breed/division color class evaluation training. An extension may be granted by the Executive Board for medical reasons or extenuating circumstances. Those trainees not completing color classes in one year may re-apply to the judging program after a three year period.**

Rothermel felt that a three-year wait was excessive. **Everett:** I think we should go back to the two-year rule. **Eigenhauser:** I thought that we just voted on something earlier where it took 2/3 to drop and that seems to imply an automatic drop. **DelaBar** moved to have added: “**after training or be automatically dropped from the program.**” **Eigenhauser** moved for the change: “**a trainee will have two years to complete the required breed/division color classes evaluation training.**” **Hoover:** One year is almost out of order because it requires three weeks in between each color class and so if you multiply this out and figure out that you are going to have a difficulty, it’s going to be hard to get it into one year. **Williams** agreed. **Thompson** felt there was ample time to do it in one year. **DelaBar:** Don, why don’t we go from three years to one to two years on re-applying. Otherwise it would just prolong the pain. **Rothermel:** In other words, you’ve got two years to complete your training and two years to re-apply. **Motion:** A trainee will have two years to complete the required...Those trainees not completing color classes in two years may re-apply to the judging program after a **two year** period. **Motion carried.**

SECTION VII

REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADVANCEMENT FOR APPRENTICE AND APPROVAL PENDING JUDGES

F-98 1. A minimum of two shows must be judged outside the judge’s region of residence or **not less than 500 miles from their place of residence** for each advancement consideration with the exception of those judges residing in the International Division or Japan. Two shows outside the country of the judge’s residence in the International Division will be required by all judges in the apprentice and approval pending categories to be eligible for each advancement, and two shows at least 240 kilometers away from the judge’s residence in Japan will be required for all judges in the apprentice and approval pending categories before being eligible for advancement consideration by the Executive Board. The judge must not be a current member of the two clubs sponsoring these shows.

Motion carried.

F-98 B. Apprentice specialty judges must satisfactorily judge a minimum of ten complete championship shows, two of which must be out of region **or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence**, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approval pending specialty judge.

Motion carried.

- F-98 C. Approval pending single specialty judges must satisfactorily judge a minimum of ten complete championship shows, two of which must be out of region **or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence**, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approved specialty judge.

Motion carried.

- F-98 D. Any judge who is approved in one specialty and approval pending in the second specialty must satisfactorily judge a minimum of twelve (12) complete championship shows, two of which must be out of region **or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence**, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approval pending allbreed judge (approved any specialty).

Motion carried.

- F-98 E. Approval pending allbreed judges must satisfactorily judge a minimum of twelve (12) complete championship shows, two of which must be out of region **or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence**, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approved allbreed judge. Approval pending allbreed judges not advance to approved status after three (3) considerations shall be removed from the approval pending allbreed status and designated approved any specialty judge. (All judges currently in the Judging Program before October 5, 1996, are GRANDFATHERED under the October 1994 rules, but only if reports are favorable.)

Motion carried.

- CHG G. Advancement **upon** completion of requirements is by written ballot vote of the Executive Board. **After consideration by the Judging Program Committee and the Executive Board** of the evaluations forms, reports on the work of the judge and any other pertinent information which has been made available to the Judging Program Committee and the Executive Board, a two thirds (2/3) favorable majority vote of the members present of the Executive Board is required for advancement.

Eigenhauser: The way this is worded is in conflict with our new rule on abstentions. This rule will count an abstention as no. **Jacobberger** clarified from the Constitution that an abstention would be counted as absent. **Motion carried.**

SECTION VIII

LICENSING

NEW

- F-98 **F. Any judge in the Apprentice or Approval Pending category receiving five or more no votes will be advised, in writing, the specific reason(s) for concern will be noted.**

Motion carried.

G REPLACES F

- CHG **G. A judge must have judged a minimum of five shows within a period of 12 months, exclusive of leave of absence, or he/she shall be dropped from the Judging Program.**

Williams: I'm opposed to this; we have some judges that, for whatever reason, only want to judge every once in a while or they can't and I really don't want to drop these judges. We have some of our long-time judges that have been judging 30 or 40 years and to drop these people after that for lack of activity would be wrong.

It was decided by the board to change this period to **24 months. Motion carried.**
Williams voting no.

H REPLACES G

- F-98 **H. Apprentice judges are licensed by the Executive Board and are in a probationary status.**

Motion carried.

I REPLACES H

- F-98 **I. Trainees hold no license and remain on the Judging Program in a probationary status by the Executive Board.**

DelaBar moved to change wording to "**Trainees hold no license and remain in the Judging Program in a probationary status.**" **Motion carried.**

J REPLACES I

- F-98 **J. Trainees and apprentice judges, being in a probationary status, may be dropped from the Judging Program at any time without notice or hearing for violation of any of the existing rules and regulations, and for violation of any which may hereafter be adopted. They may also be dropped from the Judging Program when, in the opinion of the Executive Board, it has become evident that such trainee or apprentice judge does not have sufficient handling ability, knowledge of mechanics, breeds, and standards; or is unable to translate his/her knowledge into actual practice in the show ring; or that he/she does not possess the intangible qualities necessary for the smooth and authoritative control of a show ring in all its aspects, in short, has not demonstrated the necessary knowledge, ability, and qualities required to contribute to CFA's prestige and public image. A two-thirds (2/3) vote of the members of the Executive**

Board present is required to drop a trainee or apprentice judge from the Judging Program.

Motion carried.

Drop M. Drop the current L If One-Year Rule Is Adopted.

SECTION IX

INTERNATIONAL DIVISION

- F-98 1. CFA Judging Contracts will be used on all authorized non-CFA shows to be completed by judges and host clubs and on all International Division CFA affiliated clubs. **Show Rules and Breed Standards for non-CFA shows are to be followed by CFA judges authorized to officiate as guest judges.**

Motion carried.

NEW

- F-98 2. **Invitations from clubs affiliated with foreign cat associations are subject to the approval of the CFA Judging Pro-gram/Board and may be considered only by Approved Allbreed, Approval Pending Allbreed (eligible for specialties) or Approved Specialty Judges.**

Invitations from CFA clubs in the International Division may be considered by Approved Allbreed, Approval Pending Allbreed (eligible for specialties) and Approved Specialty judges. A judge may judge on the specialty in which he/she is approved.

Eligible judges receiving invitations to guest judge MUST request permission from the CFA Judging Program Committee before signing a contract.

Everett moved to strike (**eligible for specialties**) after Approval Pending Allbreed in both paragraphs. DelaBar moved to add **only** to the last sentence of the second paragraph, reading: **“A judge may judge only the specialty in which he/she is approved.”** There was discussion pro and con. **Motion carried.**

SECTION X

CONDUCT OF ALL TRAINEES AND JUDGES

- F-98 D. Each person connected in any capacity with this Program should conduct himself/herself at all times in a professional and dignified manner, **in and our [sic] of the judging ring**, remembering that he/she is serving in the capacity of an ambassador for CFA, and seek to be a credit to this organization.

Add **out** instead of our in “in and out of the judging ring.” **Motion carried.**

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO
INTERNATIONAL JUDGING PROGRAM**

SECTION II

**INTERNATIONAL REQUIREMENTS
APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM**

- CHG 8. A. An applicant must have exhibited at least three cats of their own breeding, and at least one must be a Grand Champion or Grand Premier. The longhair applicant’s grand must be a Persian. The shorthair applicant’s grand must be an oriental body-style cat, i.e., Balinese, Colorpoint Shorthair, Javanese, Oriental, and Siamese. A detailed and specific resume of exhibition experience, including agenting, must be submitted as part of the application. An applicant must have experience including exhibiting one or more breeds in addition to their major breed. An applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities. (Applies to first time applicant not current in any specialty. (See Section VII, paragraph B and C).

After a lengthy discussion, **DelaBar** moved that the International requirements be tabled with **Barnaby** going back to the judging program committee to refine these rules. One change agreed upon was “**Equivalent titles from other associations will be accepted until 2004.**” **Motion carried.**

9. An applicant must attend the judges school which is held in conjunction with the International Show and a judges school held in Europe, or attend the judges workshop held in conjunction with the CFA Annual Meeting during their first year of evaluation training.

Note: Change in 9. To read “**the International Show, a judges school held in Europe, or attend the judges workshop....**” **Motion carried.**

REQUIREMENTS SECOND SPECIALTY

BREEDING: Applicants must have exhibited at least one (1) Grand Champion or Grand Premier of their own breeding. These cats must be shown in the Championship or Premiership classes and attain titles in these classes.

Longhair Second Specialty Applicant: One Grand Champion must be a Persian. This requirement may be met by the applicant showing at least one Persian kitten through to Grand Champion status. The second longhair breed must be shown to Grand Champion or Grand Premier and must be from one of the other longhair breeds. (See Section VII, Paragraph D-1)

Shorthair Second Specialty Applicant: One Grand Champion must be of an Oriental body-style breed, i.e., Balinese, Colorpoint Shorthair, Javanese, Oriental, and Siamese. This requirement may be met by the applicant showing at least one of the breeds in this category from kitten through to Grand Champion status. The second shorthair breed must be from one of the other shorthair breeds.

Miller moved to send this section back to the judging program committee. **Barnaby** spoke against sending it back to the committee. **DelaBar** pointed out that this would come up again in February so how much difference would that make? **Barnaby**: Because they are waiting to hear what we have to say. **Everett** mentioned that there are some allbreed judges internationally that could technically apply for double specialties and this does not quite handle it. More discussion ensued. **Barnaby**: Can we get the statement included that anyone applying for a double specialty will be handled individually? **Rothermel**: This is not alien, this is what we require of our own people. **Miller**: I think the title, instead of “Breeding:” should be “Showing,” **Williams**: Let’s try to add a small paragraph on Change 8 A. to say, “If you are applying for both specialties these requirements must be met for both specialties” and then we can send the other one back. **Thompson** provided the final wording: “**Double specialty applicants must meet the requirement of paragraph 8 for both specialties:’ The word “Breeding” will also be changed. Motion carried.**

SECTION III

MECHANICS OF APPLICATION TO INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

- CHG B. If the prospective applicant feels he/she is fully qualified to seek admission to the Judging Program, the application form is to be completed in duplicate. The original is to be returned to the Judging Program Committee Secretary. The duplicate is to be forwarded to the International Chairman. The International Chairman will sign the copy of the application sent him/her and will forward it directly to the Judging Program Committee Secretary.

Duplicate of application to be sent to the International Chairman. Motion carried.

SECTION VII

REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADVANCEMENT FOR APPRENTICE AND APPROVAL PENDING JUDGES

- CHG B. For advancement to approval pending an apprentice judge must breed a second Grand Champion in the specialty they are licensed in. Apprentice specialty judges must satisfactorily judge a minimum of ten complete championship shows, two of which must be out of their country or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approval pending specialty judge.

- CHG C. For advancement to approval pending single specialty judge must breed a third Grand Champion in the specialty they are licensed in. Approval pending single specialty judges must satisfactorily judge a minimum of ten complete championship shows, two of which must be out of their country or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approval pending specialty judge.
- CHG D-1 Any judge who is approved in one specialty and an apprentice in the second specialty, must breed a second Grand Champion in their second specialty, before being advanced to approval pending status.
- D-2 Any judge who is approved in one specialty and approval pending in the second specialty must satisfactorily judge a minimum of twelve (12) complete championship shows, two of which must be out of region or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approval pending allbreed judge (approved any specialty).
- CHG E. Approval pending allbreed judges must complete and receive their Master Clerk license, satisfactorily judge a minimum of twelve (12) complete championship shows, two of which must be out of region or not less than 500 miles from their place of residence, before becoming eligible for consideration for advancement to the status of approved allbreed judge. Approval pending allbreed judges not advanced to approved status after three (3) considerations shall be removed from the approval pending allbreed status and designated approved any specialty judge.

DelaBar: I don't see how we can put in a requirement for breeding for advancement for judging. I cannot vote for this unless we strike it out. **Watson:** As I remember, when this was being discussed they wanted to get these people in and get them judging and then in order to move them up they wanted to bring them more in line with what we had to do here in the United States. As I understand it, these people can judge in the International Division only, but once they get three grand champions or to the highest level, then they could come over here and judge. **Barnaby** and **Everett** saw problems with record keeping. **Rothermel:** My biggest problem with this is, I don't want second-class citizens in our judging program. Either you are or you are not a CFA Judge. If we have this person listed as a CFA Judge I don't think we should limit their participation in this organization. If a club over here wants to invite a CFA Judge from Europe to judge a show I think that should be their prerogative. **Watson:** I don't think we are implying these people are second-class citizens and this only goes until 2004. We're simply trying to get this off the ground. **Williams** asked **Thompson** to take the advancement program back to the judging program committee.

Everett: Pam and I recently judged with Vaughn Barber in Brazil and a lot of people are interested in becoming judges over there. They would love to come here and do some training but we are talking big bucks to get here. Pam and I were talking about a mentoring program, and why couldn't we mentor some of them when they come here to do classes. That would be strictly an optional thing. We could get them over here and they could stay at people's places and visit catteries and do all kinds of things. We might have some extra mileage to give them. It's just an

idea that Pam and I had and it would be kind of a good-will thing. **DelaBar**: We're taking it a little further and even talking about some of our more solvent clubs in the USA and Canada taking on sponsorships or sisterhood clubs in the International Division. Maybe they could sponsor sending a judge over, or sponsor a ring of rosettes, something to help them. Other organizations, when they are expanding, are coming up with some type of help this way until the clubs can get on their feet financially. Another thing that helps is when the USA judges bring back the show package and express mail it from the USA. It gets to Central Office a lot quicker, gets their cats' championships a lot quicker, which really helps the morale in the home country.

Barnaby: I am very much in favor of this. One of the things that Linda and I have been working on is coming up with sponsorships, which are very hard to get over there. Linda suggested to me the possibility of some of the companies that have been so kind to us here in the USA sponsoring the rosettes for a show, pay for a judge going over there, something to relieve some of the expense. This would go right along with what we've been hoping for.

Everett then spoke on the importance of getting people to stay with CFA rather than going to a competing organization. This would be a mass effort and a positive approach.

Thompson thanked all the board members for working so hard on the judging program revisions: "I think we've made some great headway. I, personally, do and I am sure the committee will think so. I'd like to ask that the International committee work very closely with the judging program committee on these requirements for the International part of the program. Because of my job, I am not able to travel to Europe, as I would like. I am not that familiar with the barriers and the problems and I think you are better able to deal with these matters. **Watson** thanked the committee who worked on this program for us and for the way they presented it. There were only minor changes to be made.

(11) **INTERNATIONAL SHOW REPORT.**

At the beginning of August, Allene, Michael, Pamela Keene and I met at the Mo-Kan Show in Kansas City. Pamela and Michael met with potential groups for promoting the show and explored different aspects of advertising it. We all stayed at the alternate hotel, The Holiday Inn. We found it to be an older, historical hotel, and although the elevators are a bit small, it is clean and should work well for the overflow hotel.

We were given a \$20,000.00 advertising budget and to date we have put aside \$6,700 for radio/traffic, \$3,000.00 for billboards and \$4,200.00 for the KC Star which covers the Sunday before the show and the Friday we open. We expect to do something in suburban newspapers so we can negotiate a promotion/ticket giveaway. Michael and Pamela are still working on details for this. We were also able to get some of the PR cheaper as we are signing up for next year also.

The Iams company will be a Gold Sponsor for the 1998 show in Kansas City. Their support will provide \$10,000.00 cash and \$15,000.00 in kind (Saturday night's reception and to bring in a cougar to help drive up the gate for the show). Michael is still searching for additional sponsorship.

Shana Otis-Kuhnert is working on the fund raising. She is up to \$7,500.00 as of this date and is expecting to surpass last year. She has some more ideas to get more people involved and we have given her the go ahead to get the job done.

Patty Jacobberger and Larry Ritter have worked out the software problems for judging without titles. Patty will be talking with the entry clerks to explain the procedure and will have all information ready to explain the process to the judges the morning of the show.

If you remember we decided to eliminate three judges that had judged the most from this year's CFA International Cat Show ballots for the 1999 show. Those three judges were Kim Everett, Wain Harding and Craig Rothermel. The judges from this year will be back on next year and the next three judges who have judged the most shows will sit out for one year. This hopefully will allow for new judges to judge the International Show and hopefully encourage all clubs to send in their ballots.

Having been on this committee for two years now it has become very apparent to me that this committee needs continuity. In my year and a half on this committee I have learned a small portion of what is needed to put on this show. If I remain on this committee I would expect by the time I leave office in June 2000 I still won't have all the details down. Then the committee will start over with a new committee chair, not good for continuity.

In August I spoke with Michael and Allene on their vision of what this committee should be. We all agreed it should have some degree of permanence and that is almost impossible if the committee chair keeps changing after each election. I then spoke with President Williams about his feelings on this committee and his desire to see this show profitable.

The conclusion we came to is to make this a permanent committee consisting of Michael and Allene, Donna as treasurer and possibly myself and several other people. I don't think this committee can afford to continually be in transition from one board member to another. It needs stability and continuity to become profitable and continue as the popular show it has become. We also don't want to make it a Central Office show so we would have people from different sections of the country to keep us aware of all problems and concerns. I would appreciate your input on this and whether you see this as a feasible option.

*Sincerely
Linda M. Berg*

Judges for the 1999 Show were announced: L. Adkison, K. Angell, S. Barnaby, R. Bradshaw, P. DelaBar, P. Jacobberger, G. Powell, W. Trevathan, G. Veach, E. Watson, D. Williams, and R. Zenda.

Board action item: Permanent committee recommended. Committee to be Michael Brim, Allene Tartaglia, Donna Fuller, Linda Berg, George Eigenhauser, and Mark Hannon. **Berg** made the motion that we give as much permanence to this committee as possible. Williams brought the motion to a vote. **Motion carried.**

Williams remarked that he was very much in favor of the continuity of the show. **Miller** also stressed the importance of continuity, stating that people were complaining about such things as moving the show from place to place. Public relations should also be kept with the same person for the sake of continuity. **Miller** stressed that it was important to get this in the minutes because a lot of people wonder why we are using a PR person from Atlanta, Georgia for a show in Kansas City. "As Michael said, she's got big plans for Kansas City. She now has the continuity of someone we have trained. She is getting involved in the cat fancy. She is knowledgeable, she is a top notch PR person and she is devoted to what we are doing." **Malinen** asked how many clubs voted. **Berg**: This year 265 clubs sent in ballots for the International Show judges. It was my understanding that many clubs were not voting because they didn't feel that their input was getting in. Last year 263 clubs voted, this year it was 265, that is up by two. I talked to Carol; I am going to run something every other month until the next election about the fact that IF they don't vote that we are not going to pull judges any more. By the second year they should realize that their vote does count and the apathy should be gone. If it is not, then I don't think we should be penalizing the judges by pulling them. **Malinen** wants to publish in her newsletter the clubs in her region that voted. At this point all the regional directors agreed that they would like to publish the clubs that voted in their newsletter.

Miller brought up concerns voiced to her about the new mode of judging at the International Show (judging without titles) and also wanted to know about points. **Berg**: That has all been worked out by Patti Jacobberger and Larry Ritter. The cats will all get their winners ribbons and grand points. **Tartaglia**: A detailed description of how this is all going to happen will be published in the International Show catalog. Each judge and ring clerk will receive this information. **Williams**: There will be two ring clerks for each judge, is this correct? **Tartaglia**: It is up to the judge as to whether there will be one or two. Tartaglia then gave the board a detailed description of how the new judging procedure for the International Show would work. She also announced that the show hotel for the International Show was filled, however, the overflow hotel still had some rooms. **Berg** announced that a famous picture from the 1800's, worth 1 million dollars, would be flown in for the show to be on exhibit. The owners are providing their own guards. This should bring in more gate. **Tartaglia** stated that the committee was trying to bring in more things every year that would be of interest to the people and add to the gate. **Williams**: That's what we want to do, get the gate!

(12) **CLERKING PROGRAM REPORT.**

Lonnie Hoover presented **Debbie Kusy's** Clerking Program Report.

Good morning.

The clerking test has been returned by most of the CFA licensed Clerks, Master Clerks and MCIs and for the most part, the scores have been very high. Also, for the most part, those clerks that failed to pass at the required level on their first test were able to score higher on their second test and pass. There were, however, several Master Clerks who failed to receive a grade of 90 or better on their second test – those Master Clerks that have requested it have received a regimen to regain their Master Clerking license.

I have several modifications to Show Rule 13.05, which deals with Clerks' and Master Clerks' fees that I would like to have passed. These have been forwarded to Becky Jones, Show Rules Chairperson for the board's approval, under the Show Rules portion of this meeting. However, I would like to highlight these at this time.

Under Show Rule 13.05d, change from:

*The CFA **licensed** certified clerk performing the function of master clerk shall be compensated at the rate of six (6) cents for each catalog entry in each judging ring. A CFA master clerk shall be compensated at seven (7) cents for each catalog entry in each judging ring. The minimum compensation for master clerk shall be sixty (60) dollars per weekend or forty (40) dollars for a four-ring, one-day show*

I would like to have this changed to:

*The CFA **licensed** certified clerk performing the function of master clerk shall be compensated at the rate of **seven (7) cents** for each catalog entry in each judging ring. A CFA master clerk shall be compensated at **eight (8) cents** for each catalog entry in each judging ring. The minimum compensation for master clerk shall be seventy (70) per weekend or (50) dollars for a four-ring, one-day show*

In addition, I would like to have passed the following change to the same rule:

As it now reads:

If no contract exists, payment schedule shall be based on the status of the clerk on the first day of the show. CFA licensed certified clerks performing the chief ring clerk function shall be compensated according to entries as follows:

<i>Under 200 entries</i>	<i>\$30.00 per weekend</i>
<i>201 to 300 entries</i>	<i>\$45.00 per weekend</i>
<i>301 to 450 entries</i>	<i>\$60.00 per weekend</i>
<i>225 back to back or 1-day shows</i>	<i>\$30.00 per day</i>

I would like to have this changed to:

*If no contract exists, payment schedule shall be based on the status of the clerk on the first day of the show. CFA **licensed** certified clerks performing the chief ring clerk function **shall receive minimum compensation** according to entries as follows:*

<i>Under 200 entries</i>	<i>\$45.00 per weekend</i>
<i>201 to 300 entries</i>	<i>\$60.00 per weekend</i>
<i>301 to 450 entries</i>	<i>\$80.00 per weekend</i>
<i>225 back to back or 1-day shows</i>	<i>\$45.00 per day</i>

These requested changes will accomplish two things: first of all, it will establish that these are minimum pay schedules and that clubs are not held to those minimums, they can pay more. That was the intent of this show rule when it was originally passed, but was not clear in its wording.

Secondly, this change is somewhat overdue, this show rule was passed in 1993, and six years without a pay raise is a long time. I would ask that these changes be effective with the new show season, May 1, 1999, to allow for clubs that have already worked up a budget to not be affected by these changes.

Lastly, I would like to report that there is now a CFA-Clerks list on the Internet for all clerks and any judges who would like to participate. It was started and is being monitored by Richard Cullen, a licensed MCI. It is not CFA sanctioned (much like the other lists on the Internet), is relatively new, but has provided some lively discussion on clerking. For information on subscribing to this list, clerks and judges can contact Mr. Cullen.

Thank you for your time and interest in the Clerking Program.

*Respectfully submitted,
Debbie Kusy
Clerking Program Chairperson*

He first commended Debbie for doing a good job. He felt her clerking test was very fair and he felt the results were very good. There were two (2) items that require board action. It was decided to bring these items up with the Show Rules.

Williams: Tomorrow, I want to address the new and changed rules presented by the Judging Program Committee. Then we will go through the Show Rules. The meeting was adjourned at **7:30 PM**.

Sunday, October 4, 1998

President Williams called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM. The first item on the agenda was to vote on changes and new rules presented by the judging program committee (see Index item 10).

(13) SHOW RULES CHANGES.

Doernberg presented the following Show Rule changes, reserving the right to vote no.

Rule 1.19 **Modify** by adding the word “calendar” before “month” wherever there is reference to age as follows (new words underlined):

CHAMPIONSHIP CLASSES

- a. The NOVICE CLASS (International Division ONLY) is for listed (unregistered) cats 8 calendar months old or older whose color is CFA registerable.

This class is for licensed shows in the International Division ONLY.

- b. The OPEN CLASS is for CFA registered cats of a color accepted for Championship competition, of either sex, 8 calendar months old or older on the opening day of the show, except cats that have completed requirements for Championship confirmation. When a cat has completed requirements for confirmation, it is ineligible for the Open Class at any subsequent show. (See Para. 31.01.)

AND

Rule 1.20 PREMIERSHIP CLASSES

- a. Premiership Classes are for CFA registered, neutered or spayed cats, 8 calendar months old or older, that would, as whole cats, be eligible to compete in the Championship classes.

Motion carried.

Article II Change the article name to (new text underlined): ELIGIBILITY/INELIGIBILITY FOR ENTRY.

Motion carried.

– 13 – Mo-Kan Cat Club, Inc.

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article II – Eligibility for Entry, Section 2.05 c. to read as follows (addition underlined):

In the event an exhibitor shows a cat in a show where the presiding judge is the breeder of a cat or kitten, or the judge's cattery prefix/suffix is on the cat or kitten, or the cat or kitten is owned by a member of his/her immediate family which includes father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter, step-children, step-parents, or in-laws, the show will be scored without counting the mandatorily absented ring, i.e., in a six ring show with one "x'd" ring, the cat's points will be divided by five rings.

RATIONALE: Adding the underlined wording adjusts the rule to correspond to the addition of 27.02 d. concerning a mandatorily absented ring. **CARRIED. 2/3 majority vote.**

Rule 2.05.01 New Show Rule using existing wording from show rule #27.04 as follows:

“Entries co-owned by a judge or owned by a member of the judge’s household are not eligible for competition in any ring at a show at which that judge is officiating, provided that this restriction shall not apply to the judge who is judging Household Pets only.”

Motion carried.

Rule 3.01.01 New Show Rule as follows: “A cat for which an entry form was not submitted prior to the close of entries is subject to disqualification. A cat being exhibited must match the entry form which was submitted for entry to the show.”

Rothermel commented that this was a very good show rule. **Everett** asked if this rule was to apply to Household Pets. **Rothermel** told her it doesn’t matter. **Motion carried.**

Rule 3.02.01 New Show Rule as follows: “A cat or kitten transported to the show by an officiating judge is subject to disqualification.”

AND

Rule 11.31 New Show Rule as follows: “An exhibitor must not exhibit a cat transported by an officiating judge if the cat was transported in conjunction with travel related to the judging assignment.”

Barnaby mentioned that, because of the distances from airports to show hotels, exhibitors were sometimes transported in the same hotel van as judges. He felt this should not be construed to violate these show rules. **Williams:** As long as it is not your vehicle and you didn’t travel with the cat, it is okay. **Everett** clarified that “unless you are actually carrying it, it is not a violation.” **Motion carried.**

Rule 6.06 Modify as follows (new text underlined, deleted text struck out): “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 statement to the Master Clerk request to be submitted to the Central Office, ~~submitted~~ with the show records of the show, requesting that the ring not be counted for scoring purposes.”

Motion carried.

Rule 12.04 New Show Rule as follows (to be added as the second to the last paragraph of the rule before the paragraph starting with “A change from a two-day....”): “Format changes may be permitted provided the request is received in the Central Office with a postmark of at least 90 days prior to the opening day of the show. Revised judging contracts must be obtained before the format change request is submitted if a judge’s ring type is being changed”

Eigenhauser: This seems a little anomalous to me. We currently allow shows to be licensed up to seven days before the show. It makes no sense that I can cancel a show and put on an entirely different show 90 days out but I cannot change the format of the show. If you can put on an entirely new show on that date, why can't you change the date on the existing show? Currently, we discourage that by having a progressively more expensive fee. I can see going back and doing something similar. But it makes no sense that you can completely cancel a show and replace it with a different one, but you can't change its format. **Dent** answered that "the policy we are going to be following to address that very issue is that we are going to consider any request to cancel a show and re-license it the same day by the same club to not really be a cancellation and a new license but rather a revision. The problem is that by 90 days before the show, ads have appeared in the Almanac, judges know what they are going to be judging, and exhibitors have made their plans. We are trying to discourage changes to the show license.

Eigenhauser: I think a \$50 fee, a \$100 fee, and then a \$500 fee is a discouragement enough.

Fuller: I think this rule is the result of things that were done in the past where clubs would put out a flyer with a certain format and then a couple of weeks before the show, when all the flyers were out and most of the entries were in, change it to be something else, with only a few people knowing about the change. This is just trying to put everything on a fair and even ground.

DelaBar agreed with Eigenhauser's theory. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.** Eigenhauser and DelaBar voting no.

Rule 13.05 d. Change to read: "A CFA licensed certified clerk performing the function of master clerk shall be compensated at the rate of seven (7) cents for each catalog entry in each judging ring. A CFA master clerk shall be compensated at eight (8) cents for each catalog entry in each judging ring. The minimum compensation for master clerk shall be seventy (70) dollars per week-end or fifty (50) dollars for a 4-ring one day show...If no contract exists, payment schedule shall be based on the status of the clerk on the first day of the show. CFA licensed certified clerks performing the chief ring clerk function shall be compensated according to entries as follows:

Under 200 entries	\$45.00 per weekend
201 to 300 entries	\$60.00 per weekend
301 to 450 entries	\$80.00 per weekend
225 back to back or	
1 day shows	\$45.00 per day."

Hoover presented this show rule change. **Rothermel** only disagreed with one part of this proposal and that was with the minimum compensation for a master clerk. "I think we should adopt it without a minimum." **Eigenhauser:** That minimum is in the current rule. The rationale that it was going to establish that the clerking fees are minimum doesn't match the resolution itself. Nowhere does it say the clerking fees are minimum. **Fuller:** I think that, while it is time to increase this, on the ring clerk function they are asking for a 33.3% increase. I think that is really excessive. Judges have gotten 5 cents (5%) in the last ten years. I also feel the minimum on the master clerk should not be a minimum. It should be just like the judges and on a per cat basis. **DelaBar:** On the Internet this past weekend we have had a real problem with Canadian clubs being able to afford to put on shows. It says here that payment must be in US currency. For a

Canadian club to be able to meet this requirement, it is going to throw most of them out of business on putting on shows. I cannot vote for this. **Eigenhauser**: Most of the shows in my region have a \$30 minimum a day anyway. You just can't find qualified clerks for less than that. I think one of the reasons to establish what the rationale says rather than what the rule says is for that small handful of clubs that interpret the current rule as being the maximum and are paying clerks less than they are paying their stewards. They are treating it as a fixed amount. **Watson**: If you think that this is excessive could you vote for some type of change for them? **Hoover**: The biggest problem right now is we just can't get clerks. I master clerked a show last week and two clerks showed up for eight rings. At 11:00 AM, Kitty still didn't have a clerk. I had to go out and get someone. **Angell**: You? I went out and grabbed him by the neck! (chuckles) **Williams**: We have to give them some incentive to leave their cats. **Rothermel**: I just want to reiterate that I, personally, do not have a problem with raising the clerking fees. The only problem I have with this is the minimum. **Doernberg**: I think what we should do then is to submit a show rule to change the minimum. So I will withdraw my motion. **Rothermel** then moved to delete "minimum compensation" sentence. **DelaBar**: I want Sharon Roy to talk to us about how this is going to affect a large number of clubs in her region. **Roy**: It is certainly going to affect the Canadian clubs and we have plenty of certified clerks up there. \$45 dollars is going to cost the Canadian club \$65-70 a day in US funds. **DelaBar** wanted more discussion on Canadian clubs and US currency but **Doernberg** said, "The issue here is with Craig's motion that is on the table." **Rothermel**: I would like for Pam to speak against the total motion after my motion to delete minimum compensation is either accepted or negated. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion passed**. Eigenhauser, Doernberg voting no. DelaBar abstaining. **Hoover** and **DelaBar** continued the discussion on whether Show Rule 13.05 e. (payment in US currency) would be affected by this clerking raise. **Roy**: For those of us who work in business, none of us have seen a 30% raise in 5 years. I just think it's a big jump. **Hoover**: I've been clerking in CFA for 18 years and it has been \$30 for 18 years. At the 1993 meeting I came up with this scale, where the 201 to 300 came into effect. That was in October. But for 18 years the minimum has been \$30. **DelaBar**: Well, Lonnie, don't feel bad, I am not going to vote for a judge's increase for that same reason. **Eigenhauser**: While I have sympathy for the Canadian clubs being hard-pressed by the currency situation, we can't base our show rules on "this exhibitor lives here or this club is there." We have to look at the overall organization and overall the majority of the clubs are in the USA. **Fuller** pointed out that "we've been concentrating on the ring clerks but there are changes in here for the master clerks also, which I have mixed feeling on, but I do want to point out that a CFA master clerk who clerks an eight-ring show can make more than an apprentice judge." **Williams** called the motion. **Motion failed**. Angell, Thompson, Eigenhauser, Rothermel, Miller, Doernberg, Hoover voting yes. **Doernberg** then asked if a compromise could be worked out of maybe 10%. **DelaBar** suggested that someone re-work the proposal during lunch and then bring it back.

Secretary's Note: The revised proposal for a clerking raise was considered after the board returned from lunch. For the sake of continuity, it is being presented here.

Hoover explained the Revised Version of the clerking raise (*see addendum). He also made the motion for approval. **Motion carried**. Fuller, DelaBar, Roy voting no.

Rule 18.11 c. New Show Rule as follows: “The Master Clerk will notate the official marked catalog with “W/D” for those cats withdrawn from a judge’s ring as provided by show rule 6.06.”

Rothermel: Are some people trying to make a statement with W/D instead of A?

DelaBar: The only problem I have with this is that W/D in the official catalog does not match A on the judge’s sheet. **Everett:** Then it should. **Doernberg** then read show rule 6.06 for clarification. **Dent** made a further clarification for the board. **DelaBar** restated her original point. **Everett:** We have new board members and we’ve discussed X’ing out. We don’t want X’ing out just because they don’t like a judge (bad sportsmanship). They can still go up to the clerk and say, “my cat will be absent from this ring.” That’s a softer way of saying “I’m not going to be in the ring.” This “withdrawing” is a little harder way. **Dent:** It wasn’t the Central Office that asked that the first rule be put in place. The delegation did. What we are asking for is a method to insure that what that other show rule provides for, actually gets accomplished in the office. All this is doing is establishing a back-up or quality control to insure that the exhibitor, who already has the right to withdraw their cat, does not get charged with the ring. **Eigenhauser:** This only goes into the official catalog that goes to CFA. The judges don’t see it. I don’t see where this will hurt anybody’s feelings. **DelaBar:** However you want to end up doing it, you still need to put it in 29.01. **Williams:** It doesn’t go in Judge’s Records. **Williams** then called the vote. **Motion carried.** DelaBar and Everett voting no.

– 26 – *Internet Cat Club*

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article XXIII, Ribbons and Rosettes, section 23.03 as follows:

The use of permanent flats be expanded to allow clubs the option to use a permanent flat for the Best Champion/Premier of Breed/Division award.

RATIONALE: This would be basically a “housekeeping” change. The majority of other ribbons are listed as optional for use as a permanent flat; Best Champion/Premier of Breed/Division is not yet listed. The cost of fabric ribbons continues to rise, and the addition of the Best Premier of Breed/Division award will add to that cost. Many exhibitors do not take the fabric champion/premier ribbons at present, so clubs could lower costs by using permanent flats for this award. However, as with other permanent flats, the option of a fabric ribbon would still be available for exhibitors upon request. **CARRIED. 2/3 majority vote.**

– 27 – *Internet Cat Club*

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article XXIII, Ribbons and Rosettes, section 23.03 as follows:

The use of permanent flats be expanded to allow clubs the option to use a permanent flat for the Winners Ribbon.

RATIONALE: This would be basically a “housekeeping” change. The majority of other ribbons are listed as optional for use as a permanent flat; the Winners Ribbon is not yet listed. The cost of fabric ribbons continues to rise. Many exhibitors do not take the fabric Winners

Ribbons at present, so clubs could lower costs by using permanent flats for this award. However, as with other permanent flats, the option of a fabric ribbon would still be available for exhibitors upon request. **CARRIED. 2/3 majority vote.**

Rule 27.02 d Modify to read as follows (new text underlined): A judge may not judge a cat owned or co-owned by a member of his/her immediate family which includes father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter, step-children, step-parents, or in-laws. **If the family member does not reside with the officiating judge, the cat may be judged in all other rings. (see Rule 27.04).**

Doernberg explained rationale. Various members expressed some opposition.

Doernberg: I'm not clear on what the objection is to the show rule. I think Tom needs to be clear on it. **DelaBar:** It's appearances, Diana. **Tartaglia:** This came about when I was modifying the show rules with last year's changes. When I looked at these in conjunction, it was confusing to me. Does this mean that a stepchild who lives somewhere else can't show in any ring in that show? This is the intent of the rule: that they be allowed to show in other judges' rings just not that one judge. So, it is a matter of clarifying what is permitted. **Dent:** When Mark Hannon made the proposal to modify 27.02, he did not intend that family members not living with the judge be disallowed at the show. **Everett:** This hasn't gone to the delegates at all, right? They haven't had a shot at this. It's just us and look how weak this operation is. What would be wrong with passing it on to them and see what they think? **Miller:** They are just making it clear. **Williams:** My reading of this is that it just clarifies what we have, it does not change any existing rules. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.** Fuller, Rothermel, Barnaby voting no. Williams abstaining.

Rule 28.16 Reference should be made to wrong color rather than wrong color class. Modify to read as follows (new text underlined, text being deleted struck out):

Wrong Color ~~Class~~. "A judge shall mark the entry "WCC" when, in his/her opinion, an entry has been entered as in the wrong color ~~class~~ and:

- a. the ~~correct~~ color class for the correct color has already been judged, or;
- b. the ~~correct~~ color class for the correct color has not yet been judged but the owner refuses permission to transfer, or;"

AND

Rule 18.07 When an award is withheld by the officiating judge under the provisions of Paragraphs 28.16, 28.17 and 28.18, the chief ring clerk shall clearly mark in the judge's copy of the ring catalog the reason: i.e., "Wrong Color ~~Class~~" (WCC), "No Award-Condition" (NA/Cond.), "No Award-Insufficient Merit" (NA-IM), "Disqualify-Undescended Testicle(s)" (DISQ-UT) or "Disqualify-All Other Reasons" (DISQ).

A lengthy discussion ensued over what constituted wrong color over wrong color class. **Dent** finally explained that, "years ago the policy was established that you had to win all your

winner ribbons in the same color. Now we are getting arguments from people who are in breeds where there is only one color class that they can compete under six different colors and still are entitled to a winner ribbon. There is no wrong color class for their cat because there is only one color class. That is why ‘wrong color class’ is inappropriate.” **Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Rule 26.01 **Change to read:** Judging fees are as follows:

- a. Approved judges will receive **\$1.10** per scheduled paid entry with no minimum.
- b. Approval Pending judges will receive **\$.80** cents per scheduled paid entry with no minimum.
- c. Apprentice judges will receive **\$.50** 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 **\$.90** cents per scheduled paid entry with no minimum when officiating as an Allbreed judge. Sections e., f., g., h., of SR 26.01 remain unchanged.

Eigenhauser: This brought the greatest reaction at our meeting last week. The rationale actually made it worse. If there had been some light at the end of the tunnel we may not have been as upset. But to say that they’re going to relentlessly raise it every year until they get what they want, that scared the h— out of them. Once every couple of years is enough. We don’t have to raise judging fees every single year. **DelaBar** took exception to the last sentence of the rationale and said that she already “appreciated” getting to judge. **Fuller:** I don’t think that we, as judges, should be asking for increases. I voted against the one last year and I will vote against this one. We’re not out there for judging to be our primary source of income. We’re out there because we like to judge cats. The clubs fully reimburse us for all of our travel and expenses and I don’t think we should be asking the clubs to provide us with income. **Angell:** I just want to make a point of clarification. Possibly the semantics of this rationale could have been a little better. But I’d also like to give you a little background. The Judge’s Association voted to present this in a realistic and logical manner. Last year we voted that for the next several years we would ask for a 5 cent or 5% raise. Our last raise was 11 years before and they had given us a 25-cent increase. We were trying to do it in a more gradual and incremental manner as it is done in the business world. Unfortunately, because of the wording in this, I see where people would be upset. But I would like to reiterate here that all the members of the Judges Association and I, personally, feel all the judges are very, very happy to be judging for CFA and feel that anything they get is fine. This was something they voted on and they just wanted to keep the continuity of it going. **Everett:** I want it to go on record that I feel it is a definite honor to be a judge. We got the nickel. I think that’s important. We judge in Australia. New Zealand and other countries – we get nothing, zero. They judge for free. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion failed.**

The Board broke for lunch at 12:15 PM Sunday, and reconvened at 1:05 PM.

President Williams called the meeting to order. After the clerking raise (addendum to 13.05 (d) was addressed and passed, the board moved on to Non-Show Rule Resolutions Passed from the Annual Floor.

– 35 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

RESOLVED: to rescind item 3 of What Is A Breed Definition which states “CFA will establish guidelines for outcrossing for a breed should its health and well-being require it” and replace it with the following:

The CFA Board will approve guidelines for outcrossing for a breed when at least 60% of the voting breed council of that breed submits its outcrossing breeding plan. The breed council of each breed is responsible for determining the outcross breeding plan for its breed. The timetable for breed council submissions is to be established by the CFA Board.

RATIONALE: Only the breeders who have invested study, time, work and money in a breeding program of a specific breed truly understand the strengths and weaknesses of their breed. Their understanding of what their breed needs cannot be matched by cat fanciers in general, including judges and/or board members. Experienced breeders in a given breed have produced, registered and shown cats of their breed. They have qualified to become breed council members. Only breed council members are in a position to know what is best for their breed. Therefore, the consensus of the breed council members of a given breed should determine breeding practices of that breed. **CARRIED.**

– 36 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

RESOLVED: to rescind item 4 of What Is A Breed Definition which states “within the next two years ... Oriental and Somali” and replace it with the following:

Each breed council with a 60% majority will determine when it is safe and appropriate to set cut-off dates for outcrossing.

RATIONALE: Only breeders who have expended the time, effort and money in a specific breed to qualify for the breed council of that breed have sufficient knowledge to make sound decisions concerning outcross policy. Secondly, the CFA Board’s effort to limit outcrossing contradicts the Constitution’s direction to promote the welfare of all cats which includes pedigreed cats. **CARRIED.**

– 37 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

RESOLVED: propose to rescind item 5 of What Is A Breed Definition which states “Certain breeds may be ... e.g. Scottish Fold.”

RATIONALE: If #34 and #35 above are passed, this item is not necessary. **CARRIED.**

– 38 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

RESOLVED: that the CFA Board will implement the judging program committee and that committee will be composed of three allbreed judges and three exhibitors who are NOT judges and who have exhibited at least 12 times in the past show year.

RATIONALE: Breeders/exhibitors have spent a lot of money to produce litters, register them and put their cats in the show ring. With so much time, effort and financial investment the breeder/exhibitor gains a great deal of knowledge, including breed standards, and pays attention to what goes on in the judging ring. The frequent exhibitor does a lot of observing, sees many judges and can recognize when a cat is handled with skill. The hard fact is that exhibitors observe many judges in many situations more than other judges do. They understand what qualities are needed for a judge to have good rapport with cats, exhibitors, and spectators and can handle awkward and difficult situations with tact and kindness. Above all they are keenly aware of the desired behavior that shows respect to cats and people. Exhibitors need to be represented for they have an important contribution to give to this committee and without it the committee would be incomplete. **CARRIED.**

Williams stated that he wanted to address the “What Is A Breed?” issues before any board members had to leave for an early flight. **Eigenhauser** asked as a point of clarification if the pointed Orientals issue would be included as part of the WIAB discussion. **Williams:** I want to discuss WIAB in relation to what was passed and when it comes to the particular show rule that has to do with the Orientals, then we will address that. **Everett:** My pre-notice about that WIAB is just to cover a board policy that anything that we wish to discuss must be pre-noticed. Since it is in the show rules and we are going to discuss it, my stuff is not relative. Because I discovered that I would not be denied the chance to talk. Because if a board member comes unpre-noticed, well obviously you are out of order right there. But Becky included everything in the show rules, which I felt was open for discussion. **Doernberg:** Just to clarify some issues here at the beginning, it is my understanding that we are talking about five specific items. Three of the items were resolutions pre-noticed to the delegation addressing modifications to sections of the WIAB. They wanted to change the interpretation or the intent of those three sections. The other two resolutions from the floor dealt with the Colorpoint/Oriental AOV issue which is a separate issue from the WIAB, was never connected to the WIAB. It arose because of the competition situation with the Oriental AOV’s being shown in Colorpoint classes and we were discussing it at the same time the WIAB was being discussed, but it never was a part of the WIAB discussion. The Colorpoints have had this issue on their ballot for several years and I want everyone to understand that the two are not synonymous. The last resolution brought up from the floor was the definition of “affected.” In the constitution, a long-standing part of the breed council rules was the interpretation of “affected.” At the last February board meeting (here again it was not a part of the WIAB, it just happened to coincide with that meeting) when we voted on the WIAB, we stated clearly that nothing that was done at that meeting was to be influenced by the provisions of the WIAB. So the definition of “affected” has nothing to do with what happened with the WIAB because we did not enforce any provisions of the WIAB at that meeting. I hope we can keep in mind exactly what we are dealing with here. Is that everybody’s understanding? **Everett:** I think everything the delegates brought up has a right to be discussed, particularly when dealing with a specific show rule or policy. There is no reason to suppress this board from discussing anything. **Doernberg:** I am not suppressing the board, I am trying to define the show rule and policy resolutions that were brought up at the annual meeting. My understanding is that’s what we are addressing at this meeting. **Everett:** Well, why can’t we just take WIAB and go down the line. **Doernberg:** We are dealing with numbers **35, 36, 37**. They were modifications to specific provisions of the WIAB. **#44** was addressed to the Oriental/Colorpoint question which was not related to the NAB. The last one was **#53**, which deals with interpretation of “affected.”

And another item that we need to look at also, varying on that, was the constitutional amendment that did not pass, which also was seeking to define “affected.” Last year the board was advised by Fred Jacobberger that he questioned, in his mind, how this would apply to the question we were addressing at that meeting. The board voted that “affected” did apply and they also interpreted how it applied. That was a vote, by the board, directed toward specific breed council ballot issues. It did not have anything to do with the WIAB. It was clearly stated that we were not applying the WIAB sections at that meeting. Does anybody understand that counter to what I have explained?

Eigenhauser: There is one more thing I want to put in and that is Resolution #8. The constitutional amendment stating the “once a breed is accepted for championship status...” and I would like a ruling from our attorney on whether that has any bearing on this discussion.

Jacobberger: My opinion is it does not apply. There is no hint of retroactive intent in the amendment itself. That being the case, it does not affect the board action. The board action was already taken and finalized even though the effective date that was listed by the board was after the amendment. In my opinion, had the delegates wished to affect that board action, they would have done so in a more specific language. **Rothermel:** I have a little bit different interpretation of that and it’s not legal. At the point of time this amendment was enacted, indeed, every breed that was in existence at the time would be included. Whether or not we had “terminated something in the future,” I think if you have something that is in existence at that particular time and you have a constitutional amendment that covers that particular thing, I think the constitution would override anything that the board had enacted. The constitution, in my mind, would take effect and not a board action. **Jacobberger:** I think the constitution would certainly control board actions prospectively but not retroactively. **Doernberg:** I think that Fred and I both agree that this is a most confusing amendment to the constitution. It starts out “Once a breed is accepted for championship status, it cannot have its registration status rescinded.” The Oriental AOV’s are not a breed they are AOV colors. They did not have their registration status changed in any way. They were always AOV’s, that was their registration status. It remained the same. What was done was that their ability to compete in the Colorpoint Shorthair color classes was rescinded. They did not have their registrations changed. They weren’t a breed unto themselves. The board had allowed them to compete in Colorpoint Shorthair classes. A breed is never placed back in AOV status. I don’t know how that applies in this amendment whatsoever. A breed could have been considered to go through provisional status, so that would apply. If the intent of this was to disallow a removal of a group of cats from a competitive situation, that is not what this says.

Jacobberger: I think this amendment will cause us some interpretation difficulties. But I don’t think it needs to cause us any difficulties with respect to the Oriental issue. I don’t think it has retroactive application in any event. **Eigenhauser:** I am going to disagree with Fred for precisely the reasons Diana said. Nowhere does CFA ever take a breed and put a breed back into AOV status. That clause in there could only be a specific reference to the situation with the pointed Oriental, there is no other logical or rational interpretation. It has never happened that a breed has been placed into AOV status. That could only be a very clear, direct reference to a decision this board had already made. **Jacobberger:** In fact, it could have been worded clearly but it was not. I have to deal with the language as it is shown. I don’t know what the drafter had in mind. And even if the drafter were to come to me now and tell me what they had in mind, I would still have to tell them, “it doesn’t matter what you had in mind, what matters is what you wrote.” If you

wanted to rescind this specific board action, you should have said so. **Everett:** I'm sure that amendment is going to cause an uproar. And I am sure the club that wrote it will feel they have to put some teeth in it, and they will re-write it next year and make it very clear. The other thing, somebody just talked about the AOV's in competition being moved out. What AOV's? We're talking about Orientals in that class and it would be moved out. That's still a breed being moved out of another breed, isn't that what we just talked about? **Doernberg:** That is not it at all. I am saying the Oriental AOV's, the AOV's that come out of colorpoint breedings that are identical in color to recognized Colorpoint Shorthair colors have been given the privilege of competing in those recognized Colorpoint Shorthair classes. They are AOV's; they have never been changed. **Everett** made mention of the Dilute Burmese and the Himalayan Persians carrying special numbers and then asked if they were AOV's also. **Doernberg** explained to her again that the pointed Orientals carry AOV numbers; the Dilute Burmese and the Himalayan Persian carry special numbers but the numbers are not AOV numbers. **Miller:** I totally agree with Diana and George that this thing has not been worded properly. But there is yet another conflict that I see also very important. This resolution has to do with a breed and whether it is in a certain status. Our constitution is very clear about the purpose of the breed council. The breed council serves in an advisory capacity regarding show standards. These are not even matters according our constitution that should even require a 2/3rds breed council approval. That, I think, is the conflict. Unless you consider moving a breed to provisional status, for instance, a show standard matter, it would be in conflict with what our constitution already says. **Rothermel:** But it is there. We can't change that.

Doernberg: We've had the opinion from Fred that the constitutional amendment did not apply to the Oriental/Colorpoint Shorthair issue and I am just going to move on with that. The first resolution was to rescind item 3 of the WIAB. I want to address this. This is basically what I would categorize as "guidelines for outcrossing." The intent of this section of the WIAB report was to respond to the desire of a majority of the breed council members to guarantee that some formal mechanism would be established to address this need for outcrossing should it ever arise within a breed. We have never had a formal policy that a breed could look to and say "this is how we are supposed to go about an outcrossing plan." We are still in the early stages of working on this outline. It is highly unlikely that many of the breeds in CFA will ever need to do this. We have, perhaps, the largest gene pool in the world for some of these breeds. In any case, the Havana Brown breed worked for at least three years to adopt a proposal that was passed by the membership this past June, 16 to 0. Craig mentioned how nice it was to have a unanimous vote on this outcrossing plan. During this process the following concerns were addressed: 1) The need to consult the breeds that the Havana Brown Breed Council wanted to use in their outcross program. 2) A form was developed to be signed by each person who participated in the program for the Havana Brown regarding AOV's produced by the program, which meant that when a Havana Brown breeder would use another breed, they would sign a statement that the AOV's produced by their outcrossing would never be asked to be put back in the parent breed gene pool. In formulating this policy the board has now got some ideas, some guidelines that would be good for using with any breed that wanted to outcross. What I am presenting to this board is: what this resolution presented to the delegation and what it said was "we the breed council members want to do this all on our own, we do not want any input or control by the board. We'll present you with a plan and you can pass it when 60% of our breed council says it is fine." This is the

question before this board: I don't think that any board member wants to hinder the ability of any breed to develop an outcrossing program. However, this was a new area. I think the board and the individual breed councils need to work together on this. This resolution would eliminate input by the board. I don't think eliminating the board from this process would serve any of these breeds well. **Dent:** Let me just say that one of the biggest things that I have difficulty with are the registration processes that are proposed in some of these situations. Some of them are totally unworkable. They are totally illogical. So there has to be a need for oversight. **Doernberg:** If you want to respond to this proposal and you want to pass it you are cutting out all ability of the board to have any control or say-so over this portion of the WIAB. I think what the board has now is a partnership with the breed councils. We can't do something they don't want but we have a veto power. If they want to do something and we don't think it is good for CFA or we don't think it is good for other breeds, we can say no. **DeBruhl:** I don't agree with Diana that it takes away all authority from this board. I think it is very important that breed councils map out whatever plan they consider important for the future of their breed. I am in favor of this resolution. **Eigenhauser** completely disagreed with Diana's legal interpretation of this provision. "This is not a constitutional amendment. This board does not have the power to divest itself of the power to act on these issues. If this board unanimously adopts it here today, a majority of us can overturn it in February. If something comes up that is truly not well thought out we can take the issue up again and vote the other way. This should in no way affect the board's ability to speak to the breed councils about what is an appropriate guideline, to work with them and listen to them. And if they do something foolish we'll change our minds. This is not set in stone." **Williams:** This is one of my points, George, in this case no matter what we did, I really didn't want to pass it until we ran it by the breed councils. If by February we got word that what we did was not appropriate, we don't have to change it in February, we can adopt it in February. At least the people out there that don't know what we are doing here today will have a chance to review it. I would rather leave it in there until February until the people come back to us and tell us what they want. **Everett:** I can't possibly believe that over 2/3rds who voted for this didn't get the picture. **Doernberg:** It didn't pass by 2/3rds, it carried. **Everett:** Okay, it carried. But there was a large discussion on it on the floor and they passed it. How many things are going to be waiting until February for a decision? **Rothermel:** I think if we have done anything wrong with WIAB it is that we voted on it too early. I agree with a lot of things that are in WIAB. I am a fairly conservative person. But what bothered me is we entertained the motion to pass WIAB when, in fact, a lot of our constituency was under the impression that what we were doing was polling them to get some information and it was going to be brought back later. I think the resolutions from the floor were things where the people would have liked to have some input into this committee, but because we voted on this too quickly, this was their only mechanism to get things done. **Williams:** That's what we would be doing if we voted to approve this. We'd be going back and working with the breed councils. If they agree with this, come February it's history. If they want to change something within that, we would make the modifications and change it. We wouldn't be doing it hastily like you said we did before. **Rothermel** wanted it clarified that he thought it was an overwhelming for on all the issues. [sic] **Miller** suggested that, when it came to gene pool expansion and not necessarily crossbreeding, it might be better to go to a country of origin with an import policy and this might be even better than going to crossbreeding. These are the things on which the board and the breed councils should be able to work in partnership. "I think the reason why the vote was so strong was that there was a certain amount of fear in the

room that the board would do something the breeders wouldn't like or if an overwhelming number of breeders wanted to outcross, then the board would veto it. I truly feel that the partnership is the ideal. I would rather see a wording that when we see at least 60% of the breed council voting for it, we should 'consider' it." **Hoover** asked **Jacobberger** to clarify a point. He gave a hypothetical situation using the new resolution. The breed does not have to take into consideration the fancy as a whole. A breed council of 20 breeders, 12 wanting a certain issue, can dictate to the group as a whole after they are accepted as a breed. Then those 12 people could modify that breed to anything they want, without the approval of the board. In other words they could take an Abyssinian and outcross it to a Persian and with this 60% rule it says we must approve it. This is something we wouldn't want in the first place! **Jacobberger**: I think you answered your own question. Yes, it would be true if this were a constitutional amendment, but in this case the language remains mandatory but it is the board's own language and the board can change that language or ignore it. **Hoover**: Every time, then, that one of these breed council issues comes up we will have to change our own language in order to disapprove it. **Barnaby**: When we passed WIAB we didn't set it in concrete, we passed it. It went out, some people liked it and some didn't like it. There was nothing in any of the action we took that prevented any of these people from suggesting a viable change that could be considered. Where are the viable changes to this? We can change WIAB, just give us a viable change. **Fuller** thought that neither the WIAB nor the resolution is the answer. She thought we should go back and work on this. **Berg** felt that the WIAB has caused many problems in the fancy. "There are two of us here who, had we known what would happen when we voted on WIAB when we were on that committee, we would never have voted for it. The biggest mistake was we did not include the public and the breed council secretaries when we voted on it. I don't know that we should rescind it but I do know that it should go back to the table for more input from the breed council secretaries and make the changes that they all deem necessary. **Eigenhauser** moved that the WIAB as passed on in February be suspended and all aspects of it held in abeyance. That these resolutions (35, 36 & 37) along with WIAB be referred back to the committee to present a new proposal to the board. More discussion followed on what was considered by some as the hasty actions of the board. **Doernberg** wanted to know if the board intended to throw out the whole concept. She thought the people were only concerned about three specific issues. "If we are going to throw out the whole concept, that would include item 1, item 2 and the definition. I don't think the delegation in any way had that as its goal. I don't think anybody came to the annual and said "throw the whole thing out." It seems to me we ought to leave it in place and work on this particular item that they are unhappy about. I don't know that this was so premature, George. We worked on this for over two years. We sent all the documents that the committee considered to all the breeders. They came back with their suggestions. We expanded the committee; we reviewed all those suggestions. We came back with a second definition. We sent it out to the breed council members and it passed by 60%. If we start back at square one we are going to put ourselves in the position where we are going to be reinventing the wheel. **Everett**: I think saying that two years is a long period of time is wrong when the whole future of this organization is at stake. All the people want is more time. More discussion continued in the same vein. **DelaBar** said she still liked the definition of a breed in the WIAB but it was everything else that she questioned. **Eigenhauser** said he would change his motion to include the definition of WIAB but hold in abeyance 1 through 5 and resolutions 35, 36, and 37 of WIAB and whatever concerns the exhibitors and breeders might bring up and send it back to the committee for consideration.

Doernberg closed her debate by saying “I don’t think you are going to appease the cat fancy, I think you should separate out the Oriental/Colorpoint issue and deal with the questions that came up at the annual and try to reword these sections to make them more in line with what people want.” **Williams** called the motion after considerably more discussion. **Motion carried.** Angell, Fuller, Thompson, Barnaby, Miller, Doernberg, Hoover voting no. **Everett** then made the motion that after this goes to the committee that these be directed to all the breed councils to vote on. Each breed council’s vote will be identified separately. We need all the technical information we can get. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Rule 26.02 b. Judges Expenses: Addressing SR 26.02b.

1. If driving, mileage at the current IRS yearly allowance (*note: the 1998 rate is 32.5 cents per mile*), or the equivalent of Coach class airfare, whichever is less.

Doernberg: Each year we should just automatically insert the IRS current figures for mileage. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Rule 30.02 a. Change to read “The NOVICE CLASS is for “listed” (unregistered) cats, 8 calendar months old or older, whose color is CFA registerable. Winners ribbons **are awarded** in the Novice class. Upon the cat’s registration with CFA, the Winners Ribbons will be posted to the cat’s record as official Winners Ribbons towards the Champion title.”

Rule 30.02 b. The OPEN CLASS is for CFA registered cats of a color accepted for Championship competition, of either sex, 8 calendar months old or older on the opening day of the show, except cats that have completed requirements for Championship confirmation.

When a cat has completed requirements for confirmation, it is ineligible for the Open Class at any subsequent show. (See paragraph 31.01).

Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Article XXXII Provisional Breeds: Add the following:

“The breeds listed below are eligible for entry in this division.”

AND

Article XXXII Miscellaneous Breeds: Add the following:

“The breeds listed below are eligible for entry in this division. Any breed accepted for CFA registration, but not listed below, is also eligible for entry in this division immediately upon its acceptance.”

Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

DelaBar then brought up a modification that was needed in Article VIII – Championships and Premiership, **show rule 8.03 *See addendum. Modify** by deleting Argentina & Singapore and adding Asia (except Japan, Mexico, Central America, South America (new words underlined.)

...in Hawaii, Asia (except Japan), Mexico, Central America, South America and United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) four (4) Winners Ribbons won under at least three (3) different judges **plus in Russia and Singapore, four (4) winners ribbons won under at least two (2) different judges** are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation...

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Article IX Grand Championships/Premierships

9.03 b. **Modify** by deleting Argentina & Singapore and adding Asia (except Japan), Mexico, Central America, South America (new words underlined)

...In Hawaii, Russia, Asia (except Japan), Mexico, Central America, South America, and United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) seventy-five (75) points are required for Grand Championship; twenty-five (25) points are required for Grand Premiership.

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

8.03 and 9.03 b. were both made retroactive to May 1,1998.

NATIONAL/REGIONAL AWARDS,

REGIONAL ASSIGNMENT SECTION

Discussion: We're proposing the rule be restructured and modified. The rule as currently written is difficult to apply to individually owned cats/kittens whose owners maintain two residences in different regions. As we believe a cat's regional assignment should be stated/set by the last show week-end in February, regardless of individually owned or co-owned, references to individually owned or co-owned cats has been deleted with the exception of cats whose ownership transfers and none of the former owner(s) retains interest in the cat/kitten. You may recall the original intent of the February deadline was to avoid any last minute changes in regional assignment for co-owned cats/kittens. The effect of an individually owned cat whose owner maintains two residences in two different regions is essentially the same as a co-owned cat whose owners reside in different regions. The regional assignment section has also been restructured by placing the general rules at the beginning rather than at the end of the section.

The proposed revised section to read as follows:

- Regional assignment is determined separately for each competitive category, i.e. kitten, championship, premiership.

- The region listed in the catalog must be the site of the residence of the owner or any one of the co-owners. It is not necessary that the region listed in the catalog match the address contained in the official show records.
- A show falling on the split week-end, February-March, will be considered a February show.
- A catalog correction may be made at a show to change the region listed in the catalog. The only acceptable proof (s) of a catalog correction are, 1) that the master catalog received in the Central Office has been marked to indicate the change, or 2) the exhibitor has a properly executed copy of a catalog correction request form.
- A kitten is assigned to the region which is listed in the catalog of either a.) the last show in which it earns points as a kitten, or b.) the last show in which it earns points as a kitten prior to and including the last show week-end in February, whichever show (a. or b.) occurs first.
- An adult cat is assigned to the region which is listed in the catalog of the last show in which it earns points prior to or on the last show week-end in February.
- The regional assignment for any cat/kitten which first scores points within a competitive category at a show occurring after the last show week-end in February, will be the region listed in the catalog of the first show at which the cat/kitten earns points.
- Changes in regional assignment are permitted after the last show week-end in February only if a transfer of ownership has occurred in which none of the former owners retains ownership interest in the cat/kitten. The cat/kitten will be assigned to the region listed in the catalog of the first show after the last show week-end in February at which the cat earns points. In the event of a transfer of ownership, the applicable transfer date is the date the application is received in the Central Office.

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.** Eigenhauser voting no.

Delete any reference to the allowance of regional assignment changes occurring after the last show week-end in February if a transfer of ownership occurs in which none of the former owners retains ownership of the cat/kitten. (The last paragraph in the proposal above, if passed).

Rationale: if a cat's ownership changes after the last week-end in February and none of the former owner(s) remains as an owner/co-owner, should it be permissible to allow the regional assignment of the cat to change and have the cat transfer into a different region at the end of the show season unbeknownst to anyone?? Although this can only happen within March and April, this does not allow enough time to publish the new regional assignment. The rules currently allow someone to transfer ownership the week before the last week-end in April and be scored in a new region (provided the cat is shown and earns points in the last week-end of April).

Williams called the motion.

Eigenhauser: I voted against the other one because it still permitted regional show changes after the last weekend in February. I support the idea that once February rolls around “you is where you is.” **Fuller** has a concern that if someone sells a cat to someone in another region and the cat is well on its way to winning something (total ownership, no co-ownership) you are depriving the person that bought the winning cat of any recognition. **Williams:** They got the recognition in the region they bought it in. **Rothermel:** This is where responsible breeders come in. If you tell this person that the cat will not be scored in their region, then if they are just buying the cat to get a winner, then I’m kind of glad they won’t get it. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

SHOW RULES PASSED FROM THE ANNUAL FLOOR

– 41 – Presented by Pat Jacobberger. Sponsored by No Dogs Allowed, Cat Springs Irregulars, Torrey Pines Cat Club, MO-KAN Cat Club and Houston Cat Club.

RESOLVED: Amend CFA Show Rules, Article 1 – Definitions, Section 1.04 as follows:

~~“A BENCHED CAT is one present and qualified for competition and judged in at least one a ring. Each ring in a CFA show shall be counted and scored for grand championship/grand premiership and/or regional/national awards. Any cat/kitten competing in a ring, including those which have been a disqualified cat or had an award withheld, is considered a benched cat for scoring purposes.~~

So that it reads:

A BENCHED CAT is one that is present and qualified for competition in a ring. Each ring in a CFA show shall be counted and scored individually for grand championship/grand premiership and/or regional and national awards. Any cat/kitten competing in a ring, including those which have been disqualified or had an award withheld, is considered a benched cat for scoring purposes.

Also amend:

National/Regional Awards Program-Scoring Procedures/Policies under Show Points – Official Show Count – number 3: ~~A cat/kitten handled by a judge in one ring is considered as competing in all rings.~~ Each ring will be counted separately and cats/kittens will be scored on a ring by ring basis.

This change to be retroactive to May 1, 1998, pending ratification by the board of directors on Sunday, June 21, 1998. We would ask that this new procedure not affect points earned toward grand championship/grand premiership prior to June 21, 1998.

We recognize that the Central Office will need time to “gear up” and make changes necessary to accommodate this procedure. We also realize that as a result there may be some minor changes in total point counts for some cats once rescoring is completed.

Also add to CFA Show Rules, Article XVIII – Responsibilities of Clerks, Section 18.08, a new subsection to be labeled, “f. The chief ring clerk of each judging ring will provide the unofficial ring count for kittens, championship and premiership including champions and premiers prior to each final.”

Also amend CFA Show Rules, Article XVIII – Responsibilities of Clerks by removing Section 18.15 in its entirety.

And, then renumber the remaining Sections of Article XVIII as a housekeeping item.
RESOLUTION CARRIED.

Also amend: National/Regional Awards Program-Scoring Procedures/Policies under Scoring, first sentence by adding the word “available” so the new sentence will read (addition in bold): “At the completion of the show season, the points earned by an entry at each show are converted to an average ring value for each of the rings in that show by dividing the total points earned by the number of available rings in the show.”

Tom **Dent** presented the following Alternate Scoring Proposal:

At this meeting you will be asked to consider a change in the method of computing both grand and national/regional points. In brief, the proposed method would utilize a separate count for each ring instead of one count for the show as we currently do. The change is being proposed as a method to address the practice of “stuffing” which many exhibitors believe is unfair as indicated by the vote at this past Annual Meeting. While it is proper and desirable to address this situation, the cost associated with the proposed remedy should be considered. For this reason, I am submitting an alternate proposal for your consideration which has most of the benefits of the individual ring count proposal, at a significantly reduced cost.

The individual ring count proposal (IRCP) assumes that “stuffer” cats will not be presented for judging in all rings and, therefore, the benefit to those participating in stuffing will be reduced. The IRCP may, in fact, discourage stuffing altogether. However, it is not known if those who now bring stuffer cats to shows will continue to do so under the proposed rules and, if they do, whether the cats will be presented in more rings than is the current practice. If stuffer cats are no longer brought to shows, the proposed change will have been 100% effective. Of course, if these cats are brought to a show it is reasonable to expect that they will be presented in all of the rings scheduled for that day. If shown in all rings that day, the effectiveness is reduced to 50% (assuming a two-day show). If brought to both days of a two-day show, the stuffer cats could be shown in all rings reducing the effectiveness of the proposed rule to 0%. The IRCP could be highly effective in discouraging stuffing and, in the least, would reduce the incentive to stuff for all but the most determined exhibitors. In either case, the benefit would be that other exhibitors would rightfully believe that the scoring rules provided for a “fair” competitive environment. Unfortunately, thousands of dollars will be spent on additional scoring costs, yet those who “stuff” may continue to do so at current levels.

The impact of the proposed rule on the practice of stuffing is not known, but it is clear that those who engage in this practice will be hard-pressed to reap the benefit they now enjoy under the current rule. And most people would applaud the change because it addresses a

practice seen by many as unfair and unethical. Unfortunately, this attempt to curb the perceived abuse of the current system by the few people who engage in the practice of stuffing comes at a cost which is significant and material at this point in our financial position. Actually, there are two costs associated with the proposal - those that are tangible (readily identifiable) and those which are intangible (difficult to assess). The tangible costs are those arising from the physical process of arriving at four, six, or eight different counts for a show. Keep in mind that the AB count is computed by adding the LH and SH counts together which in championship are determined by the individual breed/division counts. Each breed/division must be counted separately as many times as there are rings. This could mean up to eight separate countings of the 45 breeds/divisions in championship or a maximum of 360 individual breed/division counts (# of rings x # of breeds/divisions), and the data entry of 360 separate counts. Currently, it takes approximately 20-25 minutes to perform the counting function for both systems (grands and national/regional). Using an average of six rings per show, the total time will increase an average of two hours per show for both scoring systems, times 400 shows for a total of 800 hours per year. The use of overtime and/or the addition of a P/T person would be needed.

The costs classified as intangible are those which arise when an exhibitor challenges the points awarded for a particular show. Exhibitors will be given ring counts, by each ring clerk and will base their point expectation on these counts. When challenges arise, the most common cause for differences is the point count. With not one point count per show but an average of six, it is reasonable and prudent to expect that not only will the number of challenges increase, but the time required to address the point differences will also increase. Calls that now take five to 15 minutes can easily expand to twice that amount of time or more.

My estimate for both the tangible/intangible costs including payroll taxes and payroll based fringe benefits is \$12-15K per year.

Alternate Proposal

Grand Scoring

I propose the current method of determining “grand” points be kept in place. It is absolutely true that some exhibitors are “buying” grand titles. And while this practice is objectionable and should be addressed as soon as possible, I believe that within the next two years, technology can be brought to bear on this situation providing a low-cost solution.

National/Regional Scoring

I propose this system be divided into two segments: breed/division scoring and finals scoring.

Breed/Division Scoring

I propose the current method of determining breed/division points be kept in place. As in “grand” scoring, a cat/kitten present in one ring would be counted as present in all rings. Yes, this allows for the abuse we currently see and would like to curtail; however, because of the

proposed changes in finals scoring the abuse will be contained at lower levels and be of little or no benefit to those whose cats frequently final.

Final Scoring

- a. *There will be one LH, one SH and one AB count for each show (just as we have now).*
- b. *The LH and SH (and thus the AB) counts will not be determined by adding together the individual breed/division counts, but instead an average absentee count will be computed and then deducted from the total entered to determine the final count for LH/SH.*

An example of how this system would compare to individual ring counts follows:

Averaging Method

54 LH cats entered including 6 stuffers
-8 (48 total absentees ÷ 6 rings = an average # of 8 absentees per ring)
46 LH count
-1 (your cat)
45 points/ring
x 6 rings
270 points for 6 “Best” cats

Individual Ring Count Method

54 LH cats entered (6 stuffers)
Ring 1 54 present (6 stuffers present) = 53 pts
Ring 2 47 present (7 absentees: 6 stuffers + 1 “regular”) = 46 pts
Ring 3 46 present (8 absentees: 6 stuffers 2 regular) = 45 pts
Ring 4 48 present (6 absentees: 6 stuffers 0 regular) = 47 pts
Ring 5 44 present (10 absentees: 6 stuffers + 4 regular) = 43 pts
Ring 6 37 present (17 abs. 6 stuffers, 5 reg., 6 left early) = 36 pts
(48 total absentees) 270 pts for 6 “Best” cats

Essentially, there are two differences between the methods. The IRCP uses individual breed/division counts to determine the specialty count, the alternate does not. The IRCP establishes from four to eight counts per specialty or AB ring, the alternate proposal establishes one count per specialty and/or AB ring. The total value of points achieved using either method are almost identical - small differences will occur due to rounding.

The IRCP is the “purer” scoring method, yielding points only for cats actually competing. The alternate proposal, due to averaging, denies points in rings where more cats are present and provides “bonus” points in rings where more cats are absent.

The IRCP requires more labor due to the need to count and enter the individual breed/division counts four to eight times (up to 360 data elements/show). The alternate requires breed/divisions to be counted once (45 data elements) and the computation of the average absentee rate.

Neither solution is perfect; the IRCP gets an A+ for scoring fairness, a D- for cost effectiveness and an incomplete for effect on stuffing; the Alternate an A for scoring fairness, a B- for cost effectiveness and also an incomplete for effect on stuffing.

I am continuing to investigate how the processing of show results can be automated. Once this occurs, we could advance the scoring procedures to use individual ring counts. In the meantime, the alternate proposal approaches the benefits of individual ring scoring with considerable cost savings. I am requesting that no action be taken at this meeting (October 1998) but that the fancy be provided an opportunity to evaluate this proposal. A decision can be made at the February 1999 meeting on the scoring process we will implement.

Dent told the board members that “when we got back to Central Office after the June Annual and started investigating the “individual ring count” proposal, we found that it was going to increase our cost dramatically. The reason why is because it is a building block system of scoring. You have to score each of the major divisions and record those counts for each ring. If you were going to have an eight ring show you might have to determine up to 320 individual breed/division counts and record all of those counts. So, that will extend the amount of time to score shows tremendously. In addition to that, you don’t have show counts anymore, you have ring counts. It is going to increase the number of inaccuracies, it is going to increase the number of calls we’re going to get because an exhibitor disagrees with the number of points they were awarded for a show, and it is going to take us longer to get it resolved. To implement this, according to my figures, we are looking at a cost of from 12 to 15 thousand dollars. Whether or not we adopt the individual ring count method of scoring or an alternate proposal, there is no guarantee that the people that bring extra cats (stuffers) are going to stop bringing them. What I am proposing is that we adopt the average absentee rate or the average present rate. I like to propose it from the absentee rate because it is quicker to count up the total number of absents that there are in a show rather than the total number of cats present at the show. For the average absentee rate we would count up all the cats that are absent, divide that by the number of rings in the show, take that number from the number of cats entered and that gives you your average number. The averaging method takes away some points in some rings and adds points in other rings. The bottom line is that the total amount of points earned by all the cats receiving finals under the averaging method is equal to the amount of points that would be received by a cat finaling under the individual ring count average. **Eigenhauser** said his constituents were not really in favor of the individual ring count average, citing financial costs, etc. He felt that **Dent’s** proposal was better because it leaves Grand points alone. This is something a person could approximate. **Fuller** stated that if we felt we had to change the scoring, then she would urge the

board to consider Dent's proposal and not the other. But she felt that even Dent's proposal would cost more money. **Williams** asked the board to table the motion until the February meeting.

– 38 – *Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers*

RESOLVED: that the CFA Board will implement the judging program committee and that committee will be composed of three allbreed judges and three exhibitors who are NOT judges and who have exhibited at least 12 times in the past show year.

RATIONALE: Breeders/exhibitors have spent a lot of money to produce litters, register them and put their cats in the show ring. With so much time, effort and financial investment the breeder/exhibitor gains a great deal of knowledge, including breed standards, and pays attention to what goes on in the judging ring. The frequent exhibitor does a lot of observing, sees many judges and can recognize when a cat is handled with skill. The hard fact is that exhibitors observe many judges in many situations more than other judges do. They understand what qualities are needed for a judge to have good rapport with cats, exhibitors, and spectators and can handle awkward and difficult situations with tact and kindness. Above all they are keenly aware of the desired behavior that shows respect to cats and people. Exhibitors need to be represented for they have an important contribution to give to this committee and without it the committee would be incomplete. **CARRIED.**

Rothermel felt that we should leave the judging committee alone until June and see how it progresses throughout the year since they are already a working committee. **Williams:** We do have one person coming off the committee at the end of the one-year term and at that point we could put either an exhibitor or another judge on. **Fuller** had problems with the qualifications of the exhibitor (not judges and who have exhibited at least 12 times in the past show year.) "What this means is that a person could be in the fancy for just three months and would be competent to pass on the qualifications of our judges. I think not." The board then decided to **table** the resolution.

– 42 – *Presented by Marianne Clark. Sponsored by Longhair Japanese Bobtail Club and Willamette Valley Cat Club.*

RESOLVED: Add to CFA Show Rules, National/Regional Awards Program, scoring, the following paragraph after paragraph 3: In order to be eligible for a Regional Award, a cat/kitten must be shown at least once in the region of final assignment. (See Regional Assignment). **RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

– 54 – *Presented by Chip Blaney. Sponsored by New Hampshire Feline Fanciers.*

RESOLVED: To amend CFA Show Rules, Article XV, Responsibilities of show manager, section 15.08a, to read as follows (changes underlined, 2nd sentence struck):

The show manager must provide illumination most closely simulating daylight (full spectrum light, color temperature 5000-3K) as may be reasonably available in each judging ring sufficient to allow thorough examination of each entry.

RATIONALE: Housekeeping, focusing on requirement. **RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

– 44 – Presented by Bob Agresta. Sponsored by Ancient Capital CC; Northern California CF; Just Cat-In-Around; Michi Pet; Paws & Claws; Royal Canadian; Valley View Cat Fanciers; Cleveland Persian Society; Specifically Orientals; Oriental Shorthairs of America; Westchester CC; Coastal Cat Club; Sophisto Cat Club; Appalachian; Thumbs Up CF; Seneca CF; Golden Triangle CF; Buffalo Cat Fanciers; Ontario Cat Fanciers; Black Tie & Tails Cat Club; Salt City Cat Club; Grandview Cat Fanciers; International Bombay Society; Syndi Cats; Atlantic Himalayan Club; Copper City Cat Club; Himalayans of the West; Orientals West; Sunkat Feline Fanciers; Peace Bridge Aby Fanciers; Mohawk Trail Cat Club; Fantastic Felines of CNY.

RESOLVED: That the board take whatever steps are necessary to assure that the 16 pointed Oriental colors that have shown for 15 years have no lapse in their championship status:

RATIONALE: If no action is taken, these cats will be unable to continue their 15 years of competition at the end of this show season. Because of the actions of the February board meeting, these cats will revert to AOV status, with less than 15 months for the Oriental breeders to develop a resolution. Pointed Orientals represent 1/3 of Oriental registrations, or about 400 cats per year. They are grand champion, grand premier, distinguished merit, regional winners, national winners and represent more than half the cats shown in today's Colorpoint classes. Let the board know your support for continued showing of these fine examples of our breed.

RESOLUTION CARRIED.

– 53 – Presented by Bob Agresta. Sponsored by Ancient Capital CC; Just Cat-In- Around; Michi Pet; Paws & Claws; Royal Canadian; Cleveland Persian Society; Specifically Orientals; Oriental Shorthairs of America; Westchester CC; Sophisto Cat Club; Seneca CF; Golden Triangle CF; Buffalo Cat Fanciers; Ontario Cat Fanciers; Black Tie & Tails Cat Club; Salt City Cat Club; Grandview Cat Fanciers; International Bombay Society; Syndi Cats; Atlantic Himalayan Club; Copper City Cat Club; Peace Bridge Aby Fanciers; Mohawk Trail Cat Club; Fantastic Felines of CNY; Kittyhawk Felines; Canton Hall of Fame; Mt Fuji, Tokyo; Mt Fuji, Hokaido.

RESOLVED: That with respect to the interpretation of Article XI of the CFA Constitution, which states in part that “the approval of 60 percent of the members voting of the specific breed council(s) “affected,” that the delegates’ interpretation of this is as follows:

1. That the word “affected” refers principally to the breed/or breeders whose standard(s) is/are changing.
2. That other breeds that have an interest in this change should be polled for their position, and their vote will provide valuable input on the proposal, but that their approval is not required for consideration of the issue by the board.

RATIONALE: The February 1998 board meeting’s expanded interpretation of the word “affected” was discussed at length during the presentation of proposal 11. Although a 2/3 vote was not achieved, discussion indicated a majority of the delegates did not agree with the most

recent broadened definition. Passage of this advisory proposal will advise the Board of the original intent of Article XI's language. **RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

Jacobberger mentioned that 44 and 53 are both on the Oriental/Colorpoint Shorthair issue. The issue is, did the board make a mistake when it did what it did. Then let's address that straight up. What we're doing is kind of coming around the back of the barn here with parliamentary shenanigans to achieve an objective. With all due respect to Diana, the way to do it is not to consider whether or not the resolutions from the floor were in or out of order. With all due respect to Kim, your objective is to get that changed and I don't think the way to do it is to try to adopt some definition of the constitution that, in my view would stretch the point of words there pretty far. It can be done directly. This board can either alter or keep or throw out. I would like to see a motion to that effect. **Eigenhauser** wanted an amendment to the resolution.

Doernberg: Just for the record, I would like to say that my objection to this particular resolution was that the delegation had put an amendment in the constitution that they wanted the delegation only to vote on general matters. They did not want the delegation to vote on things that affected a specific breed, color or division. It has been a long-standing policy going back to the 1981 annual meeting and talked about exactly the same thing. Fred's feeling was that because they made a general request, it was not out of order. But I would like to have my objection to consideration of this stated in the minutes. I really think that this is terribly premature to do it this way. Both of these breed councils have proposals on their ballot to try to resolve this impasse. What I would like to see is that we wait until the breed council ballots come back to see whether these breed councils, by themselves, can resolve their problem and then take it up again in February.

Rothermel mentioned the cats "in limbo" by this situation. He didn't want to disenfranchise any cats. He also felt that if the Oriental issue was addressed first we would not have gone through a year of a lot of this problem. "I think some of us would have been more sympathetic to the Colorpoint situation had we ruled the Oriental issue out of order." **Everett** said she remembered the discussion extremely well. Pam was the first one to bring it up and she asked if we could do the two breeds together and she was denied. "I remember your statement, Diana, you said "let's do the Colorpoints first and I realize some of you have strong feelings on the Oriental/Colorpoint. You're going to get your chance when we get to them." I thought, "Oh good, I've got my chance for those breeders." I remember exactly what happened, I got snookered and that will never happen again. Anyway, George has a motion on the floor behind Diana's. What the delegates have said is do not cut these guys off. I support what they said as a show rule only, that this board shows to them good faith after 15 years of breeding and spending money. They want us to insure them in some way that we are going to make it possible through the breed council ballot, a place for these cats to continue championship and retain color. Is it so hard for us to vote today merely to assure our delegates that we are taking care of business and vote for this?

Williams: I would rather vote on it in February based on the two breed councils' results. **Miller** brought up a posting on the Internet by Bob Agresta. It said, "There were three proposals submitted to me to deal with the Oriental/Colorpoint situation. All three were placed on the ballot and submitted to the Colorpoint secretary for inclusion on the Colorpoint ballot. The proposals: 1. The first is to establish an Oriental Pointed Shorthair division for the 16 colors and patterns currently being shown in the Colorpoint Shorthair classes. 2. To join the two breeds with the Colorpoint being called the Colorpoint Division. 3. The Honey-Huggins proposal, which calls for continued showing during the next 10 years and provisions for converting pointed Orientals

to Colorpoints. Agresta also recommends voting for all proposals that they find acceptable alternatives. Voting for only one proposal is a mistake. They will divide the vote and prevent all three from achieving the sufficient 60% support.” I feel that Bob is going in the right direction. When I read this it convinced me that we must wait for this information to come forward and not do anything now on this. **DelaBar**: In 1984, when the board decided to allow colorpointed Orientals to be shown as Colorpoint Shorthairs, I was absolutely livid at the board. What I went back and did is breed a better Colorpoint. What this comes down to is no matter what decisions we make at this board table, they don’t go away. They live with us 15 years later. As mad as I was about this being instituted in 1984, we still cannot go back and tell our fanciers “you don’t count anymore.” After 15 years, you cannot disenfranchise people. I don’t have a problem with tabling this until February, but I think these proposals have slim to none chances of getting in. **Angell**: We have eight new members on this board and a lot us could stand a little more input from the breed councils. I was very impressed with the e-mail from Bob Agresta. I think it is something we all need to look at. We keep talking about hasty decisions and we are going into another hasty decision. I think we need to see what the breed councils come up with in February. **Rothermel** suggested making the cutoff date 2000 instead of 1999. That would give us another year with these cats, a year past the breed ballots that are going to be coming in February that we can look at. Then we have a year. If they don’t pass, we can make some other decision that would be effective maybe a year down the road. I would like to see us give this breed a little more breathing room until we can reach some kind of decision. **Williams**: I asked Bob Agresta this same question and his answer to me was, “No, I don’t want this. I want it done now.” **Miller** reminded the board that if the Honey-Huggins proposal were accepted, it would give the breeders 10 years, not just one year, to be showing. More discussion ensued with **Everett, Williams, Rothermel, Roy, and Doernberg** each making points concerning the issue. **Doernberg** withdrew her motion. **Eigenhauser** then moved to put the colorpoint Orientals back into championship status. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion failed.** **Eigenhauser** voting yes. **Roy** then moved to allow the two breed council ballots to go through and if they cannot come up with a solution through their ballots by a majority, then we will take action to return these cats to championship competition. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

– 47 – Presented by Geri Fellerman. Sponsored by Garden State Cat Club of New Jersey, Inc. and Morris and Essex Cat Club.

RESOLVED: That the name of the CFA Legislative Fund be changed to the Sy Howard Legislative Fund.

RATIONALE: This measure is intended to honor the memory of the wonderful man who served as CFA’s legal counsel for many years. His dedication to CFA and the concern and caring he extended to all of the CFA’s members should be remembered as the ideal for all cat fanciers to emulate as we go forward. **RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

– 49 – Presented by Gayle Hand. Sponsored by Tri-County Cat Club.

RESOLVED: To require clubs to submit to Central Office proposals for resolutions to amend constitution and show rules in the form of “red line/strike out” so that the section

amended appears in its entirety with the parts to be deleted in strike out (line through print) and the parts to be added underlined.

RATIONALE: Currently it is very difficult and confusing for delegates to figure out what changes are actually being requested. The Central Office doesn't have the time or staff to "edit" submissions and the clubs probably would not want them to. If the sponsor cannot figure out how to do this, maybe they shouldn't be amending documents as important as our CFA Constitution and Show Rules. **RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

– 52 – Presented by Anna Sadler. Sponsored by Fort Worth Cat Fanciers.

RESOLVED: That Central Office prepare a program whereby, for a fee, a registered CFA cattery name can be secured permanently. Our suggestion for criteria for this proposal is that this option be offered to anyone upon first renewal of that cattery name if the cattery has produced one grand champion or grand premier.

RATIONALE: We feel that this option is very important to the historical basis of tracking the pedigrees of our breeds. **RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

President Williams called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Eigenhauser moved that any breed council secretary wanting to talk to the board in February may come at their own expense and speak three minutes. **Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

At this time Barnaby, Everett, Thompson, Fuller, Berg, Watson, Miller, Doernberg, and Roy had to leave. A quorum was still present.

(14) CFA CAT BOOK CONTRIBUTOR SELECTION COMMITTEE.

Work has begun on the "Book" with the first order of business having been the creation of a Contributor Selection Committee tasked with the selection of writers/contributors for the book. The committee's decisions are crucial as the authors will determine the quality of the book. This committee's responsibilities will not be ongoing throughout the entire book project and should be completed within the next month or two. The members of this committee are Kitty Angell, Mark Hannon, Pat Jacobberger, Carol Krzanowski, Mordecai Siegal, Leta Williams and myself as chair. Each member was provided a worksheet outlining the preliminary table of contents with space to fill in recommended writers. Two committee members have returned their completed worksheets and I expect to have received the others by the board meeting. Once I've compiled the input, a teleconference will be scheduled to discuss the results and make some final decisions regarding writers to invite for contributions to the book.

BREED PHOTOS: *As mentioned in a previous memo, there will be one color photo per breed/division printed in conjunction with the respective breed sections. The selection of photos can be a sensitive issue and I am asking for your ratification of a photo solicitation/selection policy at this board meeting.*

Photo Solicitation

The pictures printed in the book will be anonymous (photographer credits will be given). Pictures will be solicited from the cat fancy at large by placing an ad in the November, December and January Almanacs as well as in the Exhibitor's Corner of the CFA website with a deadline for submissions of February 1, 1999. Pictures will also be solicited from the most active photographers in the cat fancy with large libraries of cat pictures (e.g., Chanan, Carl Widmer, Vickie Jackson, Larry Johnson, etc.). We will ask for current pictures ("current" as defined by the panel of judges - possibly within the past two to three years).

Photo Selection

I propose we consult a panel of CFA allbreed judges for the initial review process as follows:

- 1) Consultation panel to consist of 3 CFA allbreed judges whose names will be randomly drawn from the 1998 and 1999 CFA International Cat Show judging panels. (The random drawing to be conducted at this board meeting, if applicable.)*
- 2) The panel of judges will meet and choose a total of 5 pictures of each breed/division from the photos provided, keeping in mind the photo quality, the overall appeal of the picture and other important factors. The pictures will be identified by number only and the selection panel will not know the individual identity of the cats/owners/breeders.*
- 3) The appropriate Breed Council Secretary will be asked for their input regarding the pictures (again, the pictures being identified only by number).*
- 4) The final selection will be made by the editorial staff giving consideration to technical picture quality, appeal, surrounding pictures and other criteria.*

Also, we will be finalizing the table of contents very soon and I urge you to review the preliminary table of contents provided in May and provide us with any recommendations on subjects you feel should be covered which we haven't listed and vice versa.

*Respectfully submitted,
Allene Tartaglia*

Allene Tartaglia needed the board to take action on the committee to choose the pictures for the new CFA Cat Book. The consultation panel will consist of Wayne Trevathan, Bob Bradshaw and Gary Powell. **Angell** so moved. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

(15) MINUTES FOR BOARD MEMBERS.

Malinen wants to receive the board minutes before they are published. **Angell** moved to provide a copy of the minutes to the board of directors prior to their being published. **President Williams** called the Motion. **Motion carried.**

(16) CFA LOGO.

The CFA Logo is a trademark design, and to make it more identifiable with The Cat Fanciers' Association, several variations of a new design with "The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc." written under the logo itself were presented at the June Board Meeting. The version that the majority liked had a line above and below the words, but a revision was requested to do away with the line below the wording.

The revised logo is to be presented as an action item at the October Board Meeting. Michael Brim will present the new logo image to the board for your approval.

We continue to have the occasional problem with people on the Internet who download the color CFA logo for use on their personal web site. As I come across these sites, the webmasters are sent a letter asking that the logo be removed. The majority comply quickly, but unfortunately also delete the link to the CFA web site.

Usage of the CFA logo on a personal web site would increase the visibility of CFA, as well as traffic to the CFA web site. Public relations would also benefit, and with it, the possibility of recruitment of new fanciers. I therefore recommend that the black and white line art version of the CFA logo be made available for people to use on their personal web sites to denote their "affiliation" with CFA. In order to use this logo, a waiver must be signed releasing CFA from any and all liability in the event of a lawsuit being filed. A copy of the waiver is attached. The logo image file will be supplied upon request, and must be used exactly as supplied.

A waiver appears below that will require the signature of anyone requesting permission to use the CFA logo in conjunction with their cattery advertising, i.e., cattery business cards, cage signs, letterhead, etc.

We currently have six businesses licensed to use the CFA logo in conjunction with their products: B-Unique, ladies clothing and accessories; The Gold Bug, jewelry; Kitty's Wonderbox Inc., disposable litter trays; Precious Pets, jewelry; FRS Industries, awards and promotional items; Visions International, embroidered T-shirts and sweatshirts.

*Respectfully submitted,
Karen Lawrence, Chairman*

**USE OF CFA TRADEMARK (LOGO) WAIVER -
CATTERY ADVERTISING**

If I choose to use the trademark (logo) of The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. (CFA) in connection with advertising for my cattery, I acknowledge that CFA has not, and does not endorse any product or service that I provide, not any opinion that I hold, not statement(s) that I may express, and I agree fully to indemnify and defend CFA, and its officers, directors, and agents from and against all claims, demands, causes of action or proceedings of any nature whatsoever, in whatever forum or venue any such matters may be brought, judicial or otherwise, arising or allegedly arising in any way out from my products, services, opinions or statements, or out of my use of said trademark. I agree further that my obligation to defend, includes,

without limitation, paying for all expenses associated with any such defense, including attorneys' fees and costs, and extends to such expenses incurred prior to the commencement of formal proceedings in an attempt to avoid such formal proceedings. If I fail adequately to provide any such defense, CFA, may, at its option do so for me, and I agree promptly to reimburse CFA for expenses so incurred.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State/Province: Zip/Postal Code _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

**USE OF CFA TRADEMARK (LOGO) WAIVER -
WEB SITE**

If I choose to use the trademark (logo) of The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. (CFA) on a personal web site, I acknowledge that CFA has not, and does not endorse any product or service that I provide, not any opinion that I hold, not statement(s) that I may express, and I agree fully to indemnify and defend CFA, and its officers, directors, and agents from and against all claims, demands, causes or action or proceedings of any nature whatsoever, in whatever forum or venue any such matters may be brought, judicial or otherwise, arising or allegedly arising in any way out from my products, services, opinions or statements, or out of my use of said trademark. I agree further that my obligation to defend, includes, without limitation, paying for all expenses associated with any such defense, including attorneys' fees and costs, and extends to such expenses incurred prior to the commencement of formal proceedings in an attempt to avoid such formal proceedings. If I fail adequately to provide any such defense, CFA, may, at its option do so for me, and I agree promptly to reimburse CFA for expenses so incurred.

CFA Logo image must be used as supplied by CFA.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State/Province: Zip/Postal Code _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Carol Krzanowski presented a request asking that people could use the CFA logo as long as they sign a waiver. **Hoover** moved to accept. **President Williams** called the motion. **Motion carried.**

(17) ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULING PROPOSAL.

With more and more events occurring in conjunction with the CFA Annual Meeting (e.g., breed council meetings, seminars, International Division meetings, judges' workshop, committee meetings, etc.) there seems to be less and less time available to accomplish all that needs to be done. Several clubs within my region have devised alternative schedules relative to the annual meeting and would like the board's input prior to formalizing a constitutional amendment for presentation at the June 1999 Annual Meeting.

CFA SCHEDULE OF EVENTS - Plan A

<i>Monday:</i>	<i>8:00am --12:00</i>	<i>Reading Room open</i>
	<i>2:00pm--7:00pm</i>	<i>CFA Board of Directors Meeting</i>
<i>Tuesday:</i>	<i>9:00am--6:00pm</i>	<i>CFA Board of Directors Meeting</i>
	<i>6:00pm</i>	<i>Winn Feline Found. Bd. Meeting</i>
	<i>9:00pm</i>	<i>Hospitality</i>
<i>Wednesday:</i>	<i>9:00am--12:30pm</i>	<i>CFA BD. of Directors meet with Breed Council Secretaries</i>
	<i>1:30pm--4:00pm</i>	<i>CFA BD. of Directors Meet with International Div. Reps</i>
	<i>1:00pm--6:00pm</i>	<i>Animal Rescue/Disaster Training Workshop</i>
	<i>6:00pm--9:00pm</i>	<i>Delegate Registration</i>
	<i>9:00pm---?</i>	<i>Hospitality</i>
<i>Thursday:</i>	<i>7:00am--11:00am</i>	<i>Delegate Registration</i>
	<i>12:30pm--5:30pm</i>	<i>Annual Meeting</i>
	<i>6:30pm--10:30pm</i>	<i>Winn Foundation Dinner/Symposium</i>
	<i>?????---??????</i>	<i>Excursion?</i>
	<i>9:00pm--??????</i>	<i>Hospitality</i>
<i>Friday:</i>	<i>9:00am--5:00pm</i>	<i>Annual Meeting</i>
	<i>12:00pm--1:30pm</i>	<i>Luncheon IAMS??</i>
	<i>6:30pm--10:00pm</i>	<i>Judges Workshop</i>
	<i>6:30pm--10:00pm</i>	<i>Breed Council Meetings</i>
	<i>6:30pm--????</i>	<i>Excursions</i>
	<i>9:00pm--???</i>	<i>Hospitality</i>
<i>Saturday:</i>	<i>9:00am--???</i>	<i>Excursions/Shopping/Sleeping</i>
	<i>9:00am--4:00pm</i>	<i>Breed Council Meetings (may have breakfast/brunch/ lunch)</i>
	<i>3:30pm--4:30pm</i>	<i>Judge's Association Meeting</i>

	5:30pm--6:15pm	Awards Banquet Cocktails
	6:30pm	Awards Banquet
Sunday:	7:30am--10:30am	Breakfast IAMS??
	9:00am--12:00pm	CFA Board of Directors Meeting

CFA SCHEDULE OF EVENTS - Plan B

Tuesday:	8:00am--11:00am	Reading Room open
	12:30pm--6:00pm	Board of Directors meeting
	6:30pm--???????	Winn Found. Bd. meeting
	9:00pm--???????	Hospitality
Wednesday:	9:00am--12:30pm	CFA Bd. of Directors meet with Breed Council Secretaries
	1:30pm--4:00pm	CFA Bd. of Directors meet with International Div. Reps.
	1:30pm--6:30pm	Animal Rescue/Disaster Training Workshop
	6:00pm--9:00pm	Delegate Registration
	9:00pm--???????	Hospitality
Thursday:	7:00am--11:00am	Delegate Registration
	12:30pm--5:30pm	Annual Meeting
	6:30pm--10:30pm	Winn Found. Dinner/Symposium
	??????--???????	Excursion
	9:00pm--???????	Hospitality
Friday:	9:00am--5:00pm	Annual Meeting
	12:00pm--1:30pm	Iams Luncheon
	6:30pm--10:00pm	Judges Workshop
	6:30pm--10:00pm	Breed Council Meetings
	6:30pm--???????	Excursions
	9:00pm--???????	Hospitality
Saturday:	9:00am--???????	Excursions/Shopping/Sleeping
	9:00am--4:00pm	Breed Council Meetings (may have as a breakfast, brunch, lunch)
	3:30pm--4:30pm	Judge's Association Meeting
	5:30pm--6:15pm	Awards Banquet Cocktails
	6:30pm	Awards Banquet
Sunday:	7:00am--10:30am	Breakfast Iams?
	8:00am--12:00pm	CFA Board of Directors Meeting

Rothermel moved to accept with the right to vote no. **Motion failed.**

(18) WINN FELINE FOUNDATION REPORT.

The Winn Feline Foundation Board of Directors will meet on Friday, October 2, 1998. This board meeting will concentrate on general business and election of new board members and consultants.

The Winn Feline Foundation Symposium held on Thursday evening, June 18, 1998 was well received by those attending. Julie Levy from the University of Florida spoke on Feline Vaccinology and her recommendations for vaccine regimens. The second presentation by Joan Miller and Diane Eigner, VMD, entitled "The Veterinarian and Pedigreed Cat Breeder Relationship," included hints on how to keep that relationship going well. Diane, a feline specialist, comes from Philadelphia and writes a veterinary column for the CFA Almanac.

The First International Feline Genetic Disease Conference was held the weekend following the annual at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. The Winn Feline Foundation co-sponsored the event with Ralston Purina. Scientists from around the world met Friday and Saturday to discuss current research on feline genetic disease, feline gene mapping, and related topics. For some of these scientists, it was their first opportunity to speak face to face with colleagues. On Sunday there was an all-day program for breeders and their veterinarians which recapped the scientific conference. There were about 150 breeders and practitioners present and the organizers turned away another 50 people because the facilities would not accommodate them. Everyone agreed that the conference was a success and plans are underway for a second conference in the year 2000 at the National Cancer Institute.

Several articles have been written about the conference and about specific presentations. Look for them in the coming months in the CFA Almanac, the Yearbook, and on our web page.

Election of new board members and veterinary consultants will take precedence at the October meeting. With the resignation of two of our board members (Joan Miller who has served on the board for 20 years, and Becky Jones who has served the board for 19 years), the board will be assessing its needs and directions. In addition, at our February Board meeting (1998) the board voted unanimously to extend the term of our veterinary consultants to three years. The term of John August will expire in 1999. At our October meeting we will be identifying candidates for the three year veterinary consultant term that begins in 1999.

Administrative issues will occupy the board during this meeting. The Winn Symposia for 1999 and 2000 and our participation in the 1998 International Show will be discussed as well as several ongoing projects that need to be completed (including a database of articles that have resulted from our grants which can be put on our web page for reference; streamlining the writing of acknowledgements to clubs and individuals who donate to the Foundation; work on the spreadsheet for clubs and individuals who have donated during past years; rewriting of pamphlets; writing a bequest pamphlet; updating our policy manual). We will look at the resources needed to complete these projects both within the Foundation and outside.

In addition, it came to our attention at the International Feline Genetics Conference that the Winn Foundation is of interest to other cat associations around the world. Some of these

groups have approached us about how they might participate with us in funding grants or how they might start Foundations like ours. The board will discuss how to respond positively to these groups so that they can participate with us in working for the health of cats.

The Winn Board is looking forward to the chance to meet for a more extensive period of time to discuss these and other issues that affect us as a Foundation.

*Respectfully submitted,
Hilary Helmrich*

Members of The Winn Feline Foundation Board met Friday, October 2 for an all-day working meeting. In brief summary, decreasing financial support was the central recurring theme throughout the meeting.

The decreased CFA donation (from 10K to 5K) combined with our increased educational role in cosponsoring veterinary/breeder conferences (FIP in 1994 and Genetics this past year) has negatively impacted the Special Purpose Fund for operating expenses. The Foundation remains unique because 100% of the general donations fund health studies. In order to continue this tradition, it is essential to have additional funding for administrative expenses. Thus, other sources of support will be explored.

The Winn Foundation, Ralston Purina and the University of Pennsylvania cosponsored the first International Feline Genetics conference in June 1998. Both the scientists and the breeders who attended report that it was a very successful meeting. We look forward to the opportunity to cosponsor the next conference tentatively scheduled in two years at the National Cancer Institute. Participation in events like these benefits the Foundation in several ways: Needs that were identified in the 1996 Winn health survey are being addressed; it gives us valued collaborations with scientists, breeders and veterinary practitioners in a new and exciting venue; and it brings needed exposure and recognition for the Foundation.

The 1998 Winn Foundation Symposium will be the subject of articles in the CFA Yearbook, the CFA Almanac and Feline Practice, a veterinary journal.

Plans are underway for the 1999 and 2000 Symposia as well as the Winn benefit raffle at the upcoming International Show in Kansas City.

The Winn Policy manual was updated to include policies on Equal Opportunity and Sexual Harassment. These were needed in order to limit organizational liability.

Interest in The Winn Feline Foundation is being expressed by organizations from all around the world. Tuff Cats, a new mail order firm with quality products, and Fine Feline Furniture will be enclosing our WFF brochures with their products. It is anticipated that this pro bono distribution will reach the general cat lover and help expand our donor base outside the fancy.

This past June, Becky Jones and Joan Miller declined reappointment to the Winn Board, leaving two vacancies. Joan has agreed to remain our board liaison and Becky will continue to

help with special functions such as the International Show raffle. While considering filling the vacancies, current financial constraints and needs were discussed. Although there are many qualified candidates, it was decided to appoint only one new board member at this time, John August, DVM. Dr. August is currently at Texas A&M, and is known among feline veterinary practitioners and breeders as the editor of three volumes of Consultations in Feline Medicine. He has been our veterinary consultant for protocol review and a valued board participant over the past two years, so it was with pleasure that we welcomed Dr. August to our board. He will serve a dual role as our veterinary consultant for the remainder of his term.

The February Protocol review meeting will be Friday February 5 in Houston, TX. Proposals are beginning to arrive and we anticipate that our reviewers and board will be challenged to decide among the many excellent, qualified proposals. An ongoing and troublesome concern is that donations may not be sufficient to fund all the worthy, needed projects.

*Respectfully submitted,
Hilary Helmrich*

(19) CFA LEGISLATIVE GROUP ACTIVITIES.

USDA – opposition to federal regulation of breeders selling at retail

Over the last several months much of our emphasis has been on grass roots response to the USDA Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking announced June 24, 1998. Through our Alerts on the Internet and mailings to CFA clubs, thousands of letters have been sent by cat fanciers to the USDA expressing opposition to the consideration of regulation and licensing of breeders selling directly at retail to pet buyers. We have guided CFA clubs in points to make, setting up letter writing tables at shows, and have answered numerous questions on the issues that were published in the USDA Notice. CFA, working with the American Kennel Club and the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, submitted a request for an extension of the comment period. We were successful in obtaining the extension giving 30 more days. The deadline for comments is now September 23, 1998.

We are currently preparing the detailed CFA response, which opposes any change in the existing regulations that may cause pedigreed cat fanciers to lose their exemption from regulation. We want the USDA to continue to regulate and license wholesale breeders according to the intent of the federal Animal Welfare Act, and we are opposed to eliminating some of these breeders in order to expand regulation into direct retail breeder activities. We realize, however, that the USDA may force regulation of some breeders selling at retail in response to the petition filed by the Doris Day Animal League (DDAL). The USDA has suggested that the criterion for retail breeder regulation might be based on the numbers of breeding females that are maintained at a breeder's premises. We have taken a position against using a quantitative method as a means to determine regulation on the basis that numbers of animals do not give a good indication of commercial activity, which is the intent of the Animal Welfare Act. If they ultimately decide to consider expansion of regulation to include some direct retail breeders, we strongly assert that the USDA should only consider licensing breeders who are clearly engaged in

breeding as a commercial for-profit business and not those for whom the sale of cats and dogs as pets is an ancillary activity.

Whatever is decided on the federal level will influence regulation and licensing of breeders eventually on the state and local levels. Therefore, this matter is of the utmost importance to CFA. Anna, Sharon and I have been gratified by the tremendous grass roots cat fancier support throughout the country for presenting our views to USDA. Clubs and individuals have quickly been able to grasp the issues and have submitted letters with excellent substance. We have coordinated with the dog fancy throughout the comment period so that we are consistent in our positions as the groups most directly affected by these federal regulation changes being considered.

Regional Coordination

I have been in contact with all CFA Regional Directors to discuss legislative representation and general guidelines for a strong grass-roots Liaison Network. Almost all of the regions have now appointed cat fanciers either by state or area to handle legislative issues. I am in the process of communicating some of the procedures and ground rules, established by the CFA Legislative Committee, to everyone. The cooperation has been excellent and we are now in an even stronger position to effectively contact and mobilize cat fancy participation in any part of the country when it is needed.

CFA Legislative Committee

The CFA Legislative Committee met on July 11, 1998 at the San Francisco Airport. All Committee members were present – Tom Dent, Phil Lindsley, Fred Jacobberger and myself. Also attending were George Eigenhauser, Region 5 Legislative Network Chairman, Anna Sadler and Sharon Coleman. We discussed concepts concerning the USDA matter and had an extended telephone conference call with Jim Holt, AKC Legislative Liaison in Washington, DC.

The Committee also discussed the status of the CFA Legislative Fund, ways in which we can solicit and increase donations in the future, as well as the best uses of the funds designated for the legislative efforts. We are interested in providing partial funding for projects that will help further define the reasons for euthanasia of dogs and cats in shelters. The major motivation for coercive legislation directed against breeding stems from the concept that mandatory neuter/spay and regulation of breeders will best affect this problem. We have learned from existing previous studies (several initiated and funded partially by CFA), that there are many important factors involved that contradict those assumptions. When our comments to state, city and county legislators suggest alternatives to punitive laws based on facts and data, we have been able to achieve our most effective opposition successes. In addition, cat fancier efforts to support studies defining the factors are beginning to result in effective solutions to the problems of shelter euthanasia.

The Committee reviewed and approved a study to be executed by the Center for Animals in Society University of California, Davis; R. Lee Zasloff, PhD, Lynette A. Hart, PhD, Principal investigators. This study, “Pet Care Practices, Attitudes, and Problems with Cats and Dogs in

Salt Lake County, Utah,” will help determine the human factors contributing to the problem of dogs and cats relinquished to shelters. Information about the presence of and interactions with unowned, free-roaming cats, practices regarding identification, sterilization, and sources of animals will be obtained through a mail survey questionnaire building on previous study surveys related to cat and dog population dynamics and feral cat situations. The study will be in cooperation with the staff at Salt Lake County Animal Services. The CFA Legislative Fund contribution of \$5,000 was a match for \$5,000 donated by the San Diego Cat Fanciers. Other donations include funds from the County Animal Services.

The Committee also reviewed a preliminary proposal outline for an epidemiology study to assemble data on the characteristics surrounding dogs and cats relinquished by owners at the City of Oakland, California Shelter. This study is to be executed by Philip H. Kass, DVM, PhD, University of California, and will be in collaboration with and compared to data from the Salt Lake County Utah study. The Committee approved \$5,000 earmarked as a partial contribution to match donations from two non-profit organizations. We expect to receive the final study protocol and initiate this study in the next few months.

New enthusiasm for fund raising within the cat fancy for the CFA Legislative Fund has begun and club donations are increasing. The “beany baby” raffle at the November International Show will add to the fund and individual raffles at shows are greatly appreciated. Regional legislative network liaisons are also beginning to raise funds in local hot spot areas to be able to quickly send out Alerts or pay for other costs involved in regional grass roots efforts.

National Council for Pet Population Study and Policy (NCPSP)

CFA is represented by Tom Dent and Fred Jacobberger on the NCPSP, a coalition of 11 American animal organizations concerned with the issue of unwanted pets in the United States. One of the goals of the National Council has been to determine why pet dogs and cats end up in shelters. The results of the recent study conducted by the National Council have been published in the July issue of the Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science (JAAWS). This study, “Human and Animal Factors Related to the Relinquishment of Dogs and Cats in 12 Selected Animals Shelters in the United States,” has given us an extremely interesting perspective on the nature and scope of the problems involved in animal euthanasia. In addition to reasons for relinquishment factors presented, other information about animals coming into shelters is interesting and includes the neuter status and the sources of dogs and cats. “Mixed-breed” animals accounted for 68% of dogs and 93% of cats; unknown breed status was 2% for both. Thirty percent of the surrendered dogs and 6% of cats were classified as purebred (though some may not be accurately identified). I would encourage all cat fanciers working on legislative issues and interested in data concerning the complex problems of dogs and cats entering animal shelters to obtain a copy of this article from the CFA Legislative Department at the Central Office.

No-Kill Conference, Concord, CA

I attended the No-Kill Conference in Concord, CA, Sept. 10-13, 1998 and was impressed with the many interesting talks and workshops. The “no kill” concept is now clearer to me and

the tremendous growth in this movement is apparent. In 1995 75 people attended the Conference. This year there must have been over 400 including only a few individuals from the “traditional” animal welfare organizations, such as HSUS, American Humane Association and the NY/SPCA. PetsMart Charities is actively involved in the promotion of adoptions for no kill groups.

Critical to the No-Kill concept is terminology. No-kill facilities, whether shelters, rescue groups or sanctuaries, do euthanize animals. However, they abide by the strict definition of euthanasia as “causing the humane death to end suffering.” They do not kill healthy animals to reduce shelter census. The emphasis in the movement is to prevent unwanted births, to enhance adoption efforts and to find alternatives to the killing of healthy, homeless animals. No kills are organizations that choose to specialize. Their missions are to serve a specific number of animals and they limit their admissions to those animals that meet their criteria. They work in cooperation with Animal Control, but do not incorporate government supported animal control functions in their services. Much of last weekend’s workshop dialog was directed toward education of the people getting started in the no-kill philosophy and in dealing with the anti-no-kill rhetoric. Among the excellent presentations, one of the best was on managing feral/unowned cats by Alley Cat Allies and the SF/SPCA.

The no kill movement has had a major boost with the announcement that Richard Avanzino, President of the San Francisco SPCA, a successful model no-kill shelter, will become Executive Director of the Duffield Foundation in January 1999. Avanzino will have over \$200 million to extend the no-kill concept throughout the entire country by awarding grants to animal welfare organizations committed to this specialized way of handling animals. The foundation’s goal is to “revolutionize the status and well-being of companion animals.”

Legislative Hot Spots

Arizona:

Tucson - *An extremely restrictive ordinance has been proposed in Tucson, and is currently undergoing some revisions. The revised proposal is scheduled for City Council study session September 21, with public meetings to follow. The proposal, written by a local ad hoc committee that did not include a dog or cat fancier, currently addresses only dogs. It calls for a \$100 unaltered license, a \$100 litter fee (with only one permit per female per year issued), and mandatory neuter/spay upon second impoundment. Permit numbers are required to be published with any advertising, and mandatory penalties including forfeiture of the litter for non-compliance. Cat fanciers, led by Gretchen King, are working with dog fanciers in Tucson. At any time the revisions could include the words “and cats.”*

California:

Berkeley - *A proposal will be presented to the Berkeley City Council on Sept 16 in response to the council’s directive to create an ordinance to reduce the shelter euthanasia rate. Cat fanciers Mimi Cary and Wain Harding, both members of the city’s Humane Commission, were instrumental in developing this proposal. It includes a feral cat TTVARM program, a low-*

cost spay/neuter voucher program, targeted educational programs in high-risk areas, and mandatory sterilization upon second impound and for adopted dogs or cats as well as for dogs classified as vicious. Some local animal protection organizations are complaining that the ordinance does not go far enough and are lobbying for breeder licensing as well.

Los Angeles – *Two organized factions are proposing entirely different animal ordinance provisions, both of which are unacceptable to fanciers. Both are calling for high intact license fees as well as other restrictions on breeding. Los Angeles fanciers honed their lobbying skills in the recent victory in defeating a cat licensing proposal, and are waiting to see which, if either, of these two opposing factions finally submits a finished proposal to City Council. The possibility of a cat fancier proposed solution is in the works as well. A very active cat fancy grass roots group there includes Chuck Ober, Carolyn Osier, Mandy Wooldridge, Nancy Wells and others.*

Canada:

Toronto, Ontario – *In a complicated amalgamation of what had been many suburban cities, each with its own local ordinances and by-laws, committees and lawmakers are now attempting to reconcile those various ordinances to create a single code. The animal control ordinances range from extremely lenient to quite restrictive. Under consideration currently are cat licensing with significant neuter/spay differential, nuisance provisions that would include a cat “leash law,” mandatory microchipping and pet numbers limits. A fanciers organization has been formed led by Amanda Bright, Tabatha Holtz, Karen Lawrence and Pat Slater, and members are collecting data and information for use in combating these proposals.*

Coquitlam (suburb of Vancouver), British Columbia – *Just announced today (9/15/98) is a bylaw requiring a cat breeding permit. The bylaw requires that anyone keeping a cat over six months of age must meet one of three criteria: the cat must be spayed/neutered; the owner is not normally a resident of Coquitlam and ensures the unaltered cat does not run at large while in the city; or the person has a cat breeding permit issued by the Poundkeeper. This surprise legislation went through three readings quietly within a three-week period. The final stage is signature by the mayor on October 5th.*

Florida:

Martin County – *A local task force is working on changes to the licensing ordinance in that county that would set a cap on licensing fees for multiple animal owners, purportedly to encourage licensing compliance by owners of more than five animals. The proposal would also require that those owners provide a written disaster evacuation plan. Local fanciers Penny Copes and Shona Darress are working with the Legislative Group to analyze this proposal, and determine strategy and possible support.*

New Mexico:

Bernalillo County – *Bernalillo is the county in which Albuquerque is located. An ordinance proposal there would not immediately affect Albuquerque residents, but would set a dangerous precedent. This proposal is a complete and lengthy rewrite of the entire animal code, including a redefinition of “hobby breeder” for purposes of a permit that exempts those persons*

from a six-pet limit. The old permit allowed annual inspection by the breeder's veterinarian for humane conditions; the revision requires inspection by animal control, and the permittee must prove compliance with all zoning provisions. These and other objectionable provisions are being opposed by county dog fanciers. While we have been unable to locate a cat breeder who lives in the unincorporated part of the county, Betty White is working with dog fanciers to support their efforts.

Texas:

Waco – A pet numbers limit has been proposed for Waco, and several council members have expressed an interest in some sort of mandatory neuter/spay provision. The Legislative Group is working directly with Waco dog fanciers on this, as we have thus far been unable to locate a local cat fancier.

Virginia:

Arlington County – Cat fanciers are working closely with Alley Cat Allies in preparation for opposition to amendments to this county's animal ordinance currently in the draft stages, which include cat licensing, increases in fines, vaccination requirements and prohibition against cats running free. Other surrounding counties have expressed an interest in this type of ordinance, so it is important to prevent a precedent being set. Ellyn Honey, Donna Jean Thompson, Debi Faryna and others are working with the Legislative Group to defeat this proposal.

*Respectfully submitted,
Joan Miller, Chairman, CFA Legislative Committee*

(20) ANIMAL WELFARE REPORT.

1. I have been invited to participate in a conference concerning domestic violence and its relationship to animal cruelty. This conference is slated for the San Antonio area, yet involves nationwide experts in this emerging field of concern.

2. David Jones of Jones, Kurth, and Andrews law firm will update the board on the current lawsuit involving Animal Welfare. I am sure everyone will be rather relieved to learn the facts of this case rather than the speculation that has been circulating.

3. Michael Brim has completed D.A.R.T. training in the State of Florida and is now trained to help in disasters. The next time we deploy to a disaster area Michael will accompany the response team. Additionally, Michael and I are also enrolled in the Federal Emergency Management Agency modules on Animals in Disaster - Awareness and Preparedness, and Animals in Disaster - Community Planning. These are the only recognized FEMA courses for emergency management of animals in disasters.

4. Pending approval by the CFA president, the Disaster Relief Fund will be donating \$1,000 to the following shelters that were affected by the disastrous fires in Florida:

West Volusia County Humane Society, Southeast Volusia Humane Society, and Halifax Humane Society. Michael Brim will arrange ceremonies to present these checks.

5. *I responded to requests for assistance when Hurricane Bonnie struck North Carolina in essentially the same area that Hurricane Fran struck two years previously. We worked with the Carolina Animal Protection Society, as before, and fortunately had many fewer requests for assistance. We currently are on alert to go into one of several areas affected by Hurricane Georges - there are several at the moment and most are next to impossible to get to. It is also not very comforting to think that alligators are a nuisance item in these very same areas!*

6. *I have attached at enclosure 1 a copy of the Code 3 schedule for the month of October to show where the Zodiac boat - with CFA logo, and the Code 3 disaster response unit - also with two CFA logos, will be on display. Additionally, I have attached, for your information, some of the press CFA has received from working in disaster areas.*

7. *Finally, I just wanted to remind everyone that, though fiction may be more fun, fact is stronger.*

*Respectfully submitted,
Pam DelaBar*

DelaBar: Anyone wanting to take the FEMA course should contact her.

(21) SHOW SCHEDULING.

This committee is in the process of formalizing a list of the show schedulers/coordinators appointed by each of the regional directors to serve in this capacity for his/her region. In the past the duties and responsibilities of this position included, but were not limited to, keeping an accurate and up-to-date calendar of upcoming shows within a particular region, assigning "traditional show dates" as needed, assisting new show producing clubs in the region to obtain show dates, providing updated information to CFA or regional websites regarding any show information needed by exhibitors or spectators, and serving as the initial contact regarding "show date conflicts" resulting from close proximity of two or more shows either in-region or along regional boundaries. It is the opinion of this committee that in-region conflicting show date issues are best resolved by the regional director, the parties (clubs) involved, and the show scheduler/coordinator for that particular CFA Region. However, this committee has been charged with "opening a dialog" between the show schedulers/coordinators of geographically adjoining CFA regions in an attempt to prevent show conflicts along regional boundaries.

It is the intention of this committee with the assistance and information/data supplied to it by each regional director and show scheduler/coordinator to identify existing and potential geographical "conflicting locations" situated along any CFA Regional Boundary. This committee reports that a preliminary draft of relevant survey questions is near completion and upon receipt the list of the new appointees will be mailed to each show scheduler/coordinator. This committee extends in advance its appreciation to each regional director and each show scheduler/coordinator for their assistance and co-operation. This committee will continue to encourage "open discussion" on such matters between respective representatives of

geographically adjoining CFA regions in order to eliminate “border” show conflicts. A follow-up report on this topic will be given by this committee at a later date.

*Respectfully submitted,
Jim DeBruhl, Chairman*

(22) AWARDS COMMITTEE.

This Committee has requested, received, and reviewed information from three (3) sources and/or vendors of professionally manufactured high quality awards, trophies, plaques, and rosettes. This information was in the form of product catalogs supplemented with follow-up faxes or telephone conversations. Based on the directions provided by this committee one of these vendors will be instructed to manufacture and produce CFA’s National Awards for the present 1998-1999 show season. Due to budget reductions applied to the awards program this committee is presently engaged in what could be termed “serious comparative shopping.” It is the opinion of this committee that the high quality, impressive design, and the uniqueness attributed to these special awards over the past years shall not be minimized, jeopardized or in any way sacrificed. This committee reports that initial contacts have been made and discussions are underway for final cost estimates and design specifications. While cost is a major consideration, the high standards for these prestigious awards will not be lowered. It is the collective opinion of this committee that every CFA National Award shall always serve as a fitting tribute to each deserving cat and as an appropriate honor to the breeder and/or owner for a job well done.

*Respectfully submitted,
Jim DeBruhl, Chairman*

(23) JOB DESCRIPTIONS.

JOB DESCRIPTIONS

POLICES AND PROCEDURES

REGIONAL DIRECTOR

- a. Guidelines for regional awards show and awards banquet*
- b. Regional Secretary*
- c. Regional Treasurer*

CFA INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE, ASIA – Yaeko Takano

- a. Guidelines for International Committee*

BREED AWARENESS COMMITTEE REPORT – Kim Everett

- a. Committee setup plan*

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE – Lorna Malinen

JUDGING PROGRAM SECRETARY – Jo Ann Cummings

a. *Duties*

**GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL AWARDS SHOW
AND AWARDS BANQUET**

- I. *The Regional Director (R.D.) is the chairperson.*
 1. *R.D. appoints the Regional Awards committee.*
 2. *R.D. appoints the host clubs.*
 3. *R.D. appoints the regional raffle chairperson.*
 4. *R.D. is responsible for securing donations of/for rosettes for the regional show from region clubs.*
 - A. *Clubs may donate ring rosettes and need to provide and set up these rosettes at the Northwest Regional Show.*
 - B. *R.D. may appoint a person to order ring rosettes. Clubs must provide this person with a written agreement for ring rosettes and a check for the appropriate amount by April 15 of that year.*
- II. *Format: The Northwest Regional Show shall be a 6 ring show, 3 allbreed and 3 LH/SH specialty rings or 8 ring show, 4 allbreed and 4 LH/SH specialty rings. If HHPs are included in the regional show, host club(s) need to notify R.D. as soon as they know. Also, they need to let the R.D. know if the HHPs are top 5 or top 10.*
- III. *The host club(s) shall begin early to do the following as soon as it is known who will be the host club(s):*
 1. *Select Judges: Judges for the Northwest Regional show shall be Northwest Regional judges. In the event that the regional director is a judge, he/she shall not judge the Northwest Regional show. In case Northwest Regional judges cannot judge the Northwest Regional show, then judges outside the Northwest Region may be invited.*
 2. *Secure a show hall.*
 - A. *CFA insurance coverage*
 - B. *Details, fees for tables, chairs, electricity, security, P.A. system, concession, and hospitality billing.*
 3. *Secure a show hotel.*

NOTE: Consider proximity of show hotel to show hall.

- A. *Contract for room rates and blocks of rooms for exhibitors.*
 - B. *Book judges' rooms and ask for master billing.*
4. *Secure banquet facilities and caterer.*

NOTE: Consider proximity of banquet facilities to show hotel and show hall.

- A. *Check on size of the room.*
- B. *How many will a table sit? 8 per table is best.*
- C. *MENU and cost per person*
- D. *10 - 15 eight foot tables for regional awards*
- E. *A centerpiece for decoration on awards tables*
- F. *PA and audio visual system. Equipment:*
 - 1. *One screen*
 - 2. *Slide projector with extra bulb or extra projector*
 - 3. *Microphone*
 - 4. *Podium*
 - 5. *SVGA video projector*

NOTE: Communicate with the chairperson of the Regional Awards Committee!

- 5. *Select an entry clerk.*
- 6. *Contract for cages.*
- 7. *Select Show Committee early:*
 - A. *Show Manager(s)*
 - B. *Show Secretary*
 - C. *Show Treasurer*
 - D. *Banquet Chairperson*
 - E. *Publicity*

F. *Vendors*

8. *License show with CFA*

NOTE: Do this as soon as judges contracts are returned.

9. *Choose your theme (if one is to be used). Do this early and let the Regional Director know as soon as possible.*

10. *Flyers*

A. *Try to have them out by end of February.*

B. *Look through CFA Show Rules to make sure particulars are current and correct. Don't forget the CFA logo!*

C. *Make sure banquet information and reservation form is on the regional show flyer.*

11. *Publicity*

A. *Coupons in the newspaper*

B. *Make every effort to get TV and newspaper coverage on Saturday.*

C. *Posters*

12. *Miscellaneous:*

A. *First aid kit*

B. *Master clerk/ring clerks/stewards*

C. *Decorations for show hall*

D. *Show room supervisor*

E. *Benching*

F. *Gate*

G. *Deodorizing*

H. *Litter/litter pans/food*

I. *Paper towels/disinfectant*

J. *Judging schedule*

- K. *Set up and tear down*
- L. *Printing of the catalogue*
- M. *Ribbons (flats)*
- N. *PA system*
- O. *Regional raffle done by Regional Raffle Chairperson and committee*

IV. *Accounting for the Northwest Regional Show*

The host club(s) shall set up a separate account in the name of the Northwest Regional Show, and all regional show funds will go through this separate account. Such funds will include entry fees, which should be made out to the Northwest Regional Show. The host club(s) will provide the initial seed money for this account. This account shall be closed out within 90 days after the regional show. Upon closing this account, the host club(s) will take back their seed money and send all profits to the Northwest Regional Treasurer. At this point the host club(s) will also send a full accounting of funds including the bank statements.

NOTE: In the case that the host club(s) need help in getting the initial seed money, then the host club(s) may contact the Northwest Regional Treasurer and such moneys will be supplied.

V. *Regional Awards*

- 1. *The regional awards shall be:*
 - A. *Best - 25th Best Cat*
 - B. *Best - 20th Best Kitten*
 - C. *Best - 20th Best Premiership*
- 2. *All Cats who earned a Distinguished Merit (D.M.) in that show season*
- 3. *HHP Best - 20th Best*
- 4. *Best, 2nd, 3rd Best of Breed or Division*
- 5. *Best of Color (50 point minimum for eligibility),*

VI. *Regional Awards Committee (R.A.C.)*

- 1. *Host club(s) please communicate with R.A.C. chairperson.*
- 2. *R.A.C. chairperson will order regional award rosettes and trophies*

3. *Rosette Colors*

A. *Show years ending in even number (e.g. 1999-2000, 2001-2002) Black background for all:*

1. *Championship – Gold with Gold Print*
2. *Kittens - Silver with Silver Print*
3. *Premiership – Bronze with Bronze Print*
4. *HHP - White with White Print*

B. *Show years ending in odd numbers (e.g. 2000-2001, 2002-2003) White background for all:*

1. *Championship – Gold with Gold Print*
2. *Kittens - Silver with Silver Print*
3. *Premiership – Bronze with Bronze Print*
4. *HHP – Black with Black Print*

C. *Distinguished Merits are White on White with Gold Print in every Show year.*

4. *R.A.C. shall have up to \$300 to spend on a special or service award, e.g. a gift for an outgoing regional director or any other person who has contributed appropriate service to the region. The Northwest Regional Treasurer shall be informed of this expense, if used.*

5. *Other*

A. *Order regional awards, rosettes, and breed flats.*

B. *Notify regional winners and request slide(s) and a photograph.*

C. *Compile and print the regional awards booklet.*

D. *Compile and read at the banquet: A list of Grand Champions and a list of Grand Premiers. (This latter is unnecessary if we have a slide presentation with the names of the Grand Champions and Grand Premiers during the dinner portion of the banquet.)*

E. *Compile slide presentation.*

F. *R.D. is in charge of the regional awards program.*

1. *Master of Ceremonies*
2. *Announce Grand Champions and Grand Premiers, if necessary*
3. *Presenters - including judges to help*
4. *Organize Breed and Color Class awards*
5. *Show slides*
6. *In case of a duplicate award and rosette (i.e. multiple owners), the region will furnish one award and one rosette. The owner(s) would pay for additional awards and/or rosettes.*

Committee Members: *Martha Auspitz(Chairman), James Barkley, Susan Ernst, Beth Holly, Susan Johnson, Wilma Van Scoyk.*

REGIONAL SECRETARY

Inform member clubs in the local region of any new information as to what is going on.

- A. *Show schedule in catalogues.*
- B. *Up-to-date message from the Regional Director of what's going on to be placed in show catalogues. This is one way the Regional Director can inform the region without having to send out Newsletters.*
- C. *Should there be any feedback from exhibitors, the Regional Secretary can inform the Regional Director.*

If the Regional Secretary attends a meeting where the Regional Director is holding a meeting, she/he will keep notes and when the meeting is completed, turn minutes over to Regional Director. It's not necessary the minutes be typed up when the meeting is completed.

REGIONAL TREASURER

The treasurer is responsible for the funds of the organization. She/He receives and disburses the monies as described in the bylaws and as directed by the Regional Director.

She/He maintains a permanent record book with detailed account of all money received and all money paid out. Corrections should be clearly indicated in red and never erased. The treasurer is also responsible for any federal, state, or local taxes and the timely filing of required tax forms.

The treasurer should give a brief report at each meeting. This report should be a summary of the collections and expenditures calling attention to any unusual items.

The treasurer may also be responsible for the preparation of a budget, which is an itemized summary of anticipated income and expenses for the upcoming fiscal or administrative year. The budget is prepared based on expense and facts as recorded in the financial records.

The treasurer should be a person of unquestioned integrity and should have a knowledge of how to keep, or supervise the keeping of, financial accounts.

The treasurer collects and disburses funds only as directed by the Regional Director, the bylaws. The treasurer does not have the power to borrow money or issue funds or checks except as authorized to do so by the bylaws.

CFA INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE, ASIA

I have been working on the International Committee in Asia since the last board meeting. Our cat club SUNFLOWER CAT CLUB will hold a CFA Show on October 24-35, 1998. We will have a very large sponsor, SHEBA, a large show hall, as well as much publicity and TV stations. I would like to hold this show as the first CFA Asia International Cat Show and hope to hold the same show every year with SHEBA. There are many CFA Clubs in Japan that will help with this large show.

I have some ideas for this cat show:

1. *I would like to invite exhibitors from CFA clubs in Asia and also people who are interested in joining CFA in the future. There have been several people from Asia that will come to help and assist as ring clerks with this year's show. I am sure that it will bring many wonderful CFA members in from Asia.*

2. *With next year's show, I would like to hold a CFA ASIAN MEETING in Tokyo just before or after the cat show I would like to invite the President, the Vice President, the International Committee Chair, Tom Dent and the representatives from each CFA club in Asia for this meeting. We would have a discussion about the situation of CFA and what we can do in the future.*

3. *We will be able to give a donation to the Winn Foundation, Animal Welfare and the International Committee from the profit of that year's show. We also will donate to CFA clubs in Asia when they are holding cat shows.*

We are planning some events with this year's show. I would like to ask you to support my requests at the October board meeting. I have sent a letter to Tom Dent and asked that he bring up my requests.

1. *We would like to give special rosettes to American Shorthairs and Maine Coon Cats in just two rings. The rosettes are from AMERICAN SHORTHAIR CLUB IN JAPAN and MAINE COON BREEDERS & FANCIERS ASSOCIATION (USA) from Best of Breed to Fifth for Kitten and Championship. As you may know, we have many entries with both breeds, approximately 30 each.*

2. We will prepare another special rosette for the highest scoring cats and kittens from Best to 10. We would like to choose *THE BEST OF THE BEST IN SHOW* among the three best high scoring cats and kittens. It would be very much like the International Cat Show. We would ask Bess Higuchi to judge this as she is the Regional Director for Japan.

Respectfully submitted,
Yaeko Takano

BREED AWARENESS COMMITTEE REPORT

This is a new committee appointed by President Don Williams so there are no guidelines from a past committee to follow. Therefore, I have outlined what I feel this committee should set up a plan to do as follows:

1. *Cat Shows: This is a perfect setting for our judges who wish to involve themselves in speaking about the various CFA pedigreed breeds to the audience to help make them familiar with the differences and uniqueness of each breed.*

2. *CFA Breed Councils: Utilize the Breed Councils and their members in getting correct information about their breeds for use by judges and exhibitors, i.e., breed booths, educational rings at shows, shopping centers, schools, retirement homes, etc.*

3. *Breed Books/Yearbooks & Almanacs: These publications have a wealth of information that could be used in educational programs.*

4. *The ultimate goals which would involve funding by some means, perhaps in part by sponsors and breeders of the individual breeds, would be a complete library on every breed which could be purchased by the public as well as by breeders. AKC has this program which they have had for many years. Originally it was started just for the breeders but later expanded to include the public and has been very successful. A professional grooming video on grooming the shorthair and longhair breeds would also be highly beneficial.*

5. *Put on specialized breed shows in different sections of the country, which includes our International countries, which would showcase the top 10 of each breed in kittens, championship and premiership. To make the show more interesting for the media, since the media is what this type of show would target, add groups for a top 5 overall from the kittens, championship and premiership and then the bests of each group would go on for the best in show. This format is much like AKC's Westminster Show that is nationally televised each year for two evenings, live, and later programmed on tape for television viewers.*

The concept of this show after a trial run around the country would be a once a year show which would not conflict with the CFA International Show in any way.

The trial shows to start with would invite judges through their show committees. Breed judges would be separate from group judges and the best in show judge must be totally separate and not involved in any of the judging except best in show.

If this type of show meets with success, the idea is to then go on with the once a year event with the breed councils selecting their breed judges by ballot. Group judges would be selected by those councils which their breeds fall into. The best in show judge would be voted on by all breed councils.

AKC's pedigreed breeds of dogs are very well known and the Westminster is probably the biggest advertisement they have going on an annual basis. There are dog shows with thousands of dogs entered throughout the country every year but like the cat fancy and our shows, these reach only so many people within the immediate area. Do you see all these dog shows on TV? If so, it would be very rare. It's the Westminster the public waits to see every year. This can be the show format to have a trial run to see if it will work and if it does, we could go from there for CFA's big BREED SHOWCASE.

A full detailed report on this show format will be presented at the February 1999 board meeting requesting permission to proceed with trial shows using this concept. To begin with clubs would be the sponsor. If it comes about that a once a year show is adopted, a special name would be given to this event. The show would be open to all breeds of cats; there would be no prequalification show. The Westminster is open now to only champions; however, we are willing to take on the workload required. Committee members' names will be announced at the February 1999 board meeting.

*Respectfully submitted,
Kim Everett, Chairman*

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

The Credentials Committee determines the number of voting members present through registration which may be conducted by the committee or by staff. The committee examines the credentials of each delegate/proxy, then prepares a list of the clubs who are entitled to vote. The number of voting members registered determines whether a quorum is present. (A quorum is the minimum number of members that must be present to legally transact business. It is usually stated in the bylaws.)

The Credentials Chairman should be chosen for the ability to plan and direct the work of the committee and to function well with its members. Unlike the president of CFA, the chairman of the committee takes an active part in its discussion and deliberations.

There is no parliamentary rule requiring that the member who proposes the creation of a committee be appointed as chairman or member of it, and there is no rule barring such appointment.

DUTIES OF THE JUDGING PROGRAM SECRETARY

1. *The Secretary of the Judging Program Committee shall take care of all correspondence, except for the committee members who chair another position which are:*
 - (a) *The Judging Program Trainee Administrator, United States Judges.*

- (b) *The Judging Program Trainee Administrator, Japan and International Judges.*
 - (c) *Chairman who oversees Education and Judges Honors.*
 - (d) *Chairman who oversees Protests and Complaints.*
2. *The Secretary will verify that all necessary forms are received from the potential trainee before processing application. This will include: a completed application; application fee; copy of cattery registration dating back at least seven years; copy of seven year litter registration; copy of cattery of excellence; documentation that they have attended a CFA judges school; documentation from club that they have been a member for five years, signed by president and secretary (unless secretary is the applicant, in which case another officer of the club must sign); a current photo of themselves; a copy of their cattery breeding experience resume, exhibitor experience resume, and club experience resume.*
- The application along with club recommendations and personal recommendations, character references, recommendation from the Regional Director, or negative comments will be copied and forwarded on to the rest of the members of the Judging Program Committee.*
3. *Mail out applications along with related material to applicants who are interested in the judging program.*
4. *The Judging Program Trainee Administrator shall store all records of trainees, then pass to the Secretary, the Secretary will store records until the person going through the program is approved allbreed. The files of the person who is approved allbreed, will then be shipped to the CFA Central Office.*
5. (a) *The Secretary shall act in a timely manner to make sure that the following is presented to the liaison in suitable time for the following board meetings: Judges who have not judged five shows in a 24 month period, exclusive of leave of absence, for relicensing in February.*
- (b) *Applicants eligible to become trainees, who have been recommended (favorable or unfavorable) by the Judging Program Committee will be presented to the CFA Board in February, June and October.*
- (c) *Apprentice judges eligible to advance to approval pending status, and who have been recommended (favorable or unfavorable) by the Judging Program Committee will be presented to the CFA Board in February, June and October.*
- (d) *Approval pending judges eligible to advance to approved status, and who have been recommended (favorable or unfavorable) by the Judging Program Committee will be presented to the CFA Board in February, June and October.*

6. *Prepare a Judging Program Committee Report prior to each regularly scheduled board meeting covering all activities of the committee with appropriate recommendations.*
7. *Prepare an annual budget.*
8. *Notify all judges of negative or positive letters that are sent in and then are entered in their file.*
9. *Record the minutes of the meetings and send all JPC members a copy.*

*Respectfully submitted,
Jo Ann Cummings*

Malinen wants board members to send in job descriptions.

(24) FEBRUARY 2000 BOARD MEETING.

Williams brought up the need for a meeting site for the February 2000 board meeting. Many areas were discussed, but in the end, the general consensus was for a place that was inexpensive and easy to get to in the winter. Houston, Texas was picked. **Doernberg** moved to go to Houston. **Motion carried.** Eigenhauser and Everett voting no. ***Secretary's note:** This action took place on Saturday, October 3, 1998.

(25) WEB SITE REPORT.

By the time of the October board meeting, all top cat and breed profile pages on the CFA web site will have been updated to present the 1998 National Award winners and their photos. In addition to honoring the Best of Breed winners on the breed profile pages, this year we are also recognizing the Second and Third Best of Breed cats by including their photos, if available. A few people have contacted us because they are still seeing the old photos when they look at some of these pages. Since previously accessed pages are automatically stored in the web browser cache, simply clicking on the reload button in the menu bar will solve this problem.

The site has been expanded in many areas. Recently added are past Almanac articles on the American Curl, the Bi-Color & Calico Persian and the Japanese Bobtail. Other new pages include a Sphynx breed profile, an article on Feline Dental Pathology and Care, a complete list of candidates for breed council secretary, a summary of 1998 disaster relief efforts, and three new books offered in the online book store.

Once again our Legislative Alert pages on the site have proven valuable in disseminating information regarding the proposed changes to the Animal Welfare Act and in generating letters of comment to the USDA.

CFA's web site is being used as a publicity tool for the 1998 International Cat Show. Some of the information available online includes the show announcement, directions, frequently asked questions and a discount admission coupon. A page is also included for the CFA Judging

School being held in conjunction with the show. Exhibitors can find information on the regional qualifier shows as well as links to show announcement pages for each qualifier.

Our statistics show that the number of successful hits (requests for pages) on the CFA site is rising steadily with the show schedules and breed profiles continuing to be the pages most frequently requested. We have experienced an impressive increase in numbers and while the statistics for the month of September are not yet available, the report for the period of September 1-22 shows the average hits per day continue to rise.

Month	Total Hits	Avg. Hits per Day
<i>May</i>	<i>212,263</i>	<i>6,848</i>
<i>June</i>	<i>224,831</i>	<i>7,496</i>
<i>July</i>	<i>261,445</i>	<i>8,435</i>
<i>August</i>	<i>256,654</i>	<i>8,281</i>
<i>September 1-22</i>	<i>178,813</i>	<i>8,577</i>

America Online has been granted permission to place our breed profiles and photos online in the Pet Care Forum of AOL on a three-month trial basis. The information is identified as CFA's with our logo prominently displayed, and they have also provided various links to our site. We have experienced an increase in breeder referral requests from AOL addresses since the breed showcase first went online at the end of August.

We have recently granted permission for Pets 'n People in Paradise, a quality comprehensive pet site in Hawaii, to reprint a different CFA breed profile each month in their online publication. They are providing appropriate credit to CFA as well as an active link to our site.

Through an agreement with the AVMA, we have established a link to their site, which provides current information on health topics for cat owners and the veterinary profession, including news from the Vaccine Associated Feline Sarcoma Task Force and the American Association of Feline Practitioners. The AVMA site is displaying our breed popularity and registrations list in their "Buying A Pet" section along with credit to CFA for providing the statistics.

We are proud to announce the CFA web site has recently received two additional awards: Discover It! - The Best of the Web, and Key Resource - Links2Go Key Resource in the Cats topic. A full listing of the awards received by our site can be found at <http://www.cfainc.org/site-awards.html>.

As of this time three regions have followed our recommendations in establishing domain names for their regional sites:

- *Great Lakes Region - <http://www.CFAGreatlakes.org>*
- *Southern Region - <http://www.CFAsouthern.org>*
- *North Atlantic Region - <http://members.aol.com/narcfa/CFAnorthatlantic/>*

Note that a domain name cannot be used on AOL, but it is still possible to set up a separate identity. We are hopeful the remaining regions and the International Division will soon register domain names as well and once this is accomplished, we will proceed with providing links to the regional and international sites from the CFA site.

We are still experiencing a problem with people downloading the color logo for use on their personal sites. The information, including text and photos, on the CFA site is copyrighted by CFA and cannot be used on another site without permission. When we come across an unauthorized use of any CFA material, the site's webmaster or administrator is asked to remove it and is offered the alternative of linking to the information on CFA's site.

The volume of e-mail that is sent to the CFA site continues to be great. Karen Lawrence handles most e-mail inquiries, while others are referred to the appropriate person or department. We wish to remind everyone who answers one of these inquiries to please "cc" Karen on all replies so that she knows the inquiry has been handled.

*Respectfully submitted,
Carol Krzanowski*

(26) CFA HEALTH COMMITTEE REPORT.

PKD (Polycystic Kidney Disease) Seminar

The PKD Seminar was held in Philadelphia at the CFA Annual on Saturday at 2 p.m. and lasted, with questions and answers, until 4 p.m. Pamphlets were available for pickup - reproductions of the CFA Health Committee web site article on PKD.

Joining me on the panel were Debi Faryna (NIH and one of our genetics advisors to Breeds and Standards), Sue Helmke (Marhei Persians), Hilary Helmrich (President of Winn Foundation/Abydos Abyssinians and Persians), Dr. Leslie Lyons (NIH and presently involved in the Havana Brown project), and Anna Sadler (CFA Legislative Committee/Brannaway Persians).

The recommendations of the PKD Subcommittee were relayed to those attending by Sue Helmke. They are:

- ***We suggest that you DO scan your cats.*** *The criteria for the radiologist or sonographer is experience in diagnosing PKD in cats, not necessarily a veterinarian, but a technician aware of what he/she is looking for.*
- ***The equipment must be at least 7.5 mghz with a 256 gray scale.*** *This equipment will diagnose most (98%) of the cats by the age of 10 months. It is recommended that the cats be shaved. However, Dr. Biller said that since the hair coat is so fine on Persians, alcohol can be used to wet the hair down after it has been parted at the appropriate place.*

- **Scanning your cats will have to be an individual informed decision.** We do not wish to engender panic which leads to euthanizing of cats or catteries. Most PKD-positive cats will not die from PKD. However, PKD is an autosomal dominant (NOT carried recessively) gene which expresses itself in varying degrees; moderate to severe; randomly.
- **We suggest that you take a deep breath and proceed in a calm, level-headed manner in making your decisions about screening to eliminate positive cats from your breeding programs.** There will be a small percentage of PKD-positive cats that will pass the early screening. By two years of age, scanning should be extremely accurate when executed by qualified examiners with good equipment.

AVMA Conference

This year I joined Michael Brim at the largest general meeting ever of the American Veterinary Medical Association, July 25-29, 1998 in Baltimore. I attended scientific presentations, met researchers, and helped Michael answer veterinarians' questions about CFA.

We were very busy. The presentations of scientific papers began at 8 a.m. daily and covered a number of broad categories, Companion Animal Medicine being the one of most interest to those of us who fancy cats. The scientific program was awesome, with 9-10 lecture possibilities offered for every time slot in each category. It was not difficult to find a feline-specific presentation of interest to attend, and I selected discussions on lymphocytic-plasmacytic inflammatory bowel disease, lower urinary tract disease, chronic renal failure, and hepatic disease. (Since a full report of this conference is being published in the Almanac, I should like to refer you to that article when it appears [October 1998, pg. 92].)

The break times between these scheduled seminars were the busiest times for the booth, with veterinarians and student veterinarians visiting the many vendors throughout the vast exhibit hall. We were pleased when they knew of us, but even more pleased to be acquainting so very many who had never heard of either CFA or The Winn Foundation. (Over a hundred "Feeding A Stray? - Neuter or Spay!" bumper stickers flew out of our booth the first day.)

CFA Health Committee Website FAQ (frequently asked questions)

The Health Committee continues to be pleased with the response to our web site. It is one of the ways that CFA can effectively disseminate knowledge about feline health concerns and care. We have added a new topic to the web site since my June report and wish to call this to your attention:

- <http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-dental.html>

(Jan Bellows DVM): discussion of feline dental pathology and care

Web Site Pamphlets

The first of our web site articles to be published in pamphlet form deals with Polycystic Kidney Disease. These pamphlets were available in Philadelphia. Additional health articles now ready for purchase by clubs and individuals are listed below:

- *Cat Scratch Disease*
- *Declawing of Cats*
- *Feline Asthma*
- *Feline Diabetes*
- *Feline Immuno-deficiency Virus*
- *Inflammatory Bowel Disease in the Cat*

It is highly likely that more titles will be available by the time this report is published in the Almanac.

Almanac Articles

The detailed account of the PKD Seminar held at the Annual Meeting in Philadelphia was published in the September Almanac [pg. 116]. As previously mentioned, a similar account of the AVMA Conference in Baltimore has been written and will appear soon.

Pain Relief in Cats

A study funded by the Morris Animal Foundation with full sponsorship support from the Arkansas Veterinary Medical Foundation is evaluating the effectiveness of the fentanyl patch. A potent pain-controlling medication, fentanyl contained on a self-adhesive patch offers the possibility of pain management for cats that could be used at any veterinary facility and in the owner's home. It is designed to automatically release the appropriate dose, and happily, can be used for most types of pain. We will watch for the scientific conclusions of this study with great interest.

*Betty White, Chair
CFA Health Committee*

(27) USDA REGARDING ANIMAL WELFARE ACT.

Please see special Legislative Report on page 102 of this Almanac.

(28) STATUS REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE.

The CFA National/Regional Scoring Task Force met for the first time on June 16, 1998. The Task Force was charged with the following by the 1997-98 board of directors:

- *Review the history of CFA scoring methods for national and regional awards.*
- *Review alternative scoring methods.*
- *Identify important characteristics of any scoring method.*
- *Develop a recommendation for a scoring method for national/regional awards.*
- *Prepare a plan for feedback and adoption.*

The Task Force is composed of the following individuals:

- *Dot Brocksom*
- *Pam DelaBar*
- *Shana Ellzey*
- *Mark Hannon*
- *Valerie Hedden*
- *Phil Lindsley*
- *Ann Pevey*
- *Christy Safron*
- *Yaeko Takano*
- *Kathy Young*
- *Facilitators:*
 - *Willa Hawke*
 - *Pat Jacobberger*
 - *Allene Tartaglia*
 - *Billy Wheeler*

In our review of the various scoring methods used by CFA between 1975 and the present, we found the following common themes:

- *Concerns related to the costs*
- *Concerns related to the welfare and well-being of the cats*
- *Concerns related to the attitude and morale of the CFA fancier*

We reviewed a number of alternative scoring methods including:

- *American Kennel Association*
- *American Parrot Association*
- *TICA*
- *CFA fanciers' suggestions*
- *CFA Fanciers' List*
- *Task Force members*

We also reviewed the CFA Survey results. Recall that the survey methodology resulted in:

- *A non-random sample*
- *With 482 respondents*

and that it was:

- Solicited at CFA Shows from March 14 to May 3, 1998
- Solicited on the CFA Internet home page

The Survey Results Included:

Should CFA change the current scoring system for determining Regional and National Awards?

- Yes - 77%
- No - 16%
- No Opinion - 7%

Should CFA change the way Regional Awards are determined?

- Yes - 71%
- No - 11%
- No Opinion - 11%

Which of the following elements would you include in a change?

1. *Increase the opportunity for anyone to achieve an award*
2. *Improve morale at shows*
3. *Emphasize breed awards*
4. *Recognize cats shown within region of residence*
5. *Simple and easy to apply*
6. *Increase show entries*
7. *Increase the number of year end awards*

There were additional comments forwarded to the Task Force through the survey as well. (NOTE: the numbers in parentheses are the number of responses from the 482 respondents... it is not the percentage of responses!)

- *Eliminate ring point averaging (34)*
- *Regional Awards for cats shown in region (23)*
- *Limit the number of rings (21)*
- *Eliminate titles in judges' books (21)*
- *Do not give out entry information (21)*
- *Don't allow judges to show (12)*
- *National Winners identified from International Show (5)*
- *Score final independent of number of entries (4)*

*The Task Force Identified the **IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS OF A SCORING METHOD**. They are:*

- Promotes easier and less expensive exhibiting
- Promotes financial balance for CFA and member clubs
- Is simple and understandable
- Promotes meaningful awards
- Encourages sportsmanship
- Increases regional participation
- Promotes the health of the cat
- Emphasizes breeds
- Addresses “phantom points”
- Reduces “end-of-season-craziness”
- Reduces pressure and burden on judges

The Plan:

The Task Force accomplished the following as a result of our work in June, 1998:

- *A recommendation went to the International Show Committee to remove the titles from judges books in the championship and premiership rings and evaluate the outcomes. **The international Show Committee adopted the recommendation.***
- *Present a resolution to score shows ring by ring retroactive to May 1, 1998. This resolution would work to prevent the “phantom point” phenomenon that causes so much angst among average exhibitors. **While this resolution did not pass, the Task Force prepared a show rule change for consideration at the October 1998 Board of Directors’ meeting.***

The Task Force planned to evaluate a number of scoring formats that showed promise by having the CFA Central Office rescore several years of previous winners according to the principles .of those formats. The scoring formats that were utilized were:

1. *High/Low Score*
 - *Throw out the highest and the lowest ring scores from a show and average the remainder*
2. *Quarterly Scoring - “Seasonette Format” **
3. *Scoring for the first 120 rings for CH/PR and first 50 rings for kittens*

Initially we planned to rescore every other year for ten years retrospectively and then review the data at the 1998 International Show. We then planned to bring a number of potential solutions to the member clubs and request feedback and input. Finally, we planned to review the feedback and make a recommendation in the form of a resolution that would be voted on by the member clubs at the June, 1999 CFA Annual Meeting.

President Williams requested that we consider a “fast track” for our process. As a result of that request, the Task Force requested that the Central Office assist us in scoring the past show season (May 1, 1997-April 30, 1998) alone. In reviewing the work associated with the Seasonette Format, we elected to reject that as an alternative and to rescore only using methods 1 and 2 above.

A sub-committee of the CFA National/Regional Scoring Task Force met on September 12, 1998 to review the data. As a result of that review, we are recommending that feedback be obtained from the member clubs and participating individuals for the following methods:

- 1. High/Low Scoring*
 - Throw out the highest and the lowest ring scores from a show and average the remainder*
- 2. Scoring for the first 120 rings for CH/PR and first 50 rings for kittens*
- 3. Pass the show rule resolution addressing “phantom points” before you this weekend (or another resolution intended to prevent “show stuffing”) and leave the current method (ring point averaging) in place*

The plan for the fast track process is as follows:

- October, November and December 1998 - Article in the Almanacs requesting feedback from exhibitors. The article will include the National Scoring data and the CFA Ring Count Analysis for the Show Season Ending in 1998. It will outline the history of scoring in CFA and will explain the rationale for considering a change in the scoring method. It will also inform people what other data (regional and breed data) is available and where they may obtain it.*
- October, 1998 - Send the Regional and National Scoring data to the member clubs in October with a request for feedback.*
- October, 1998 - Place all of the data and information on the CFA Web Site.*
- November, 1998 – Use the International Show as another site for collecting feedback from exhibitors.*
- November, 1998 - Task Force to review the feedback to date at the International Show. December 1, 1998 - All feedback and recommendations due to the CFA Central Office.*
- January 10, 1999 - Prepare the final recommendation to the board of directors for their consideration and vote at the February 1999 board meeting.*
- May 1, 1999 - new scoring method goes into place. New ring-by-ring scoring goes into place.*

**The Seasonette concept is based on dividing the show year into four quarters, and using a championship or premiership cat's highest scoring quarter to determine regional and national wins. If an exhibitor wanted to campaign a cat for only three months, there would still be the possibility of getting a regional win or national win. However, it also allows for an exhibitor to campaign the entire season if s/he wanted to, and keep only the best quarter's score. A kitten's wins would be based on the best two consecutive calendar months, rather than an entire quarter.*

The barriers that we identified with this method are:

- *Need to write the software to do the pilot - labor intensive and involves almost a total rewrite of the computer program*
- *For purposes of scoring we would need to use weeks rather than months*
- *Even so, there would be an inequity between periods (quarters) due to the Annual Meeting and International Show*
- *Scoring under this method would be labor intensive for the following reasons:*
 - *the clock would have to start on a per cat/kitten vs exact date*
 - *could be scoring up to four seasons per cat*
 - *would be a reporting nightmare*

(29) BREED AWARENESS REPORT.

This is a new committee appointed by President Don Williams so there are no guidelines from a past committee to follow. Therefore, I have outlined what I feel this committee should set up a plan to do as follows:

1. *Cat Shows: This is a perfect setting for our judges who wish to involve themselves in speaking about the various CFA pedigreed breeds to the audience to help make them familiar with the differences and uniqueness of each breed.*

This is also cost effective since there would be no expense and this committee does not have a budget to work with.

2. *CFA Breed Councils: Utilize the breed councils and their members in getting correct information about their breeds for use by judges and exhibitors, i.e., breed booths, educational rings at shows, shopping centers, schools, retirement homes, etc.*

3. *Breed Books/Yearbooks and Almanacs: These publications have a wealth of information which could be used in educational programs.*

4. *The ultimate goals which would involve funding by some means, perhaps in part by sponsors and breeders of the individual breeds, would be a complete library on every breed*

which could be purchased by the public as well as by breeders. AKC has this program which they have had for many years. Originally it was started just for the breeders but later expanded to include the public and has been very successful. A professional grooming video on grooming the shorthair and longhair breeds would also be highly beneficial.

and

Put on specialized breed shows in different sections of the country, which includes our International countries, which would showcase the top 10 of each breed in kittens, championship and premiership. To make the show more interesting for the media, since the media is what this type of show would target, add groups for a top five overall from the kittens, championship and premiership, and then the bests of each group would go on for best in show. This format is much like AKC's Westminster show which is nationally televised each year for two evenings, live, and later programed on tape for television viewers.

The concept of this show after a trial run around the country would be a once-a-year show which would not conflict with the CFA International Show in any way.

The trial shows to start with would invite judges through their show committees. Breed judges would be separate from group judges and the best in show judge must be totally separate and not involved in any of the judging except best in show.

If this type of show meets with success, the idea is to then go on with the once-a-year event with the breed councils selecting their breed judges by ballot. Group judges would be selected by those councils which their breeds fall into. The best in show judge would be voted on by all breed councils.

AKC's pedigreed breeds of dogs are very well known and the Westminster is probably the biggest advertisement they have going on an annual basis. There are dog shows with thousands of dogs entered throughout the country every year but like the cat fancy and our shows, these reach only so many people within the immediate area. Do you see all these dog shows on TV? If so, it would be very rare. It's the Westminster the public waits to see every year. This can be the same for our wonderful cats if the board would agree to allow this show format to have a trial run to see if it will work and if it does, we could go from there for CFA's big BREED SHOWCASE.

A full detailed report on this show format will be presented at the February 1998 board meeting requesting permission to proceed with trial shows using this concept. To begin with, clubs would be the sponsor: If it comes about that a once-a-year show is adopted, a special name would be given to this event. The show would be open to all breeds of cats and there would be no pre-qualification show. The Westminster is open now to only champions, however, we are too new for doing this and it would be better to leave it open for all to enter.

I am in the process of selecting additional members for this committee who are willing to take on the workload required. Committee members' names will be announced at the February 1999 board meeting.

*Respectfully submitted,
Kim Everett, Chairman*

(30) YEARBOOK REPORT.

Mr. President, Members of the Board, and Guests:

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. However, we feel it is important to keep you apprised of how the book is progressing. We also want to remind you of some of the schedules that will concern you.

At this hectic time, Patricia Decker and I are placing the latest minutes, fine tuning some features, and preparing the index by cattery and breeder. One final check for the 2,500 pictures of grands pictured and not pictured. On a continuous roll - we are also finalizing visi proofs - while proofreading sections of brownlines. We have finalized the inside and outside cover and are also looking at press proofs. It's an incredible task; but it's a mighty large book. We experience an incredible fight against time. By the time you read this Patty and I will be on our way to final countdown.

Notices for the Grand Champions, Grand Premiers, and Distinguished Merit Cats to be pictured in the "2000 Yearbook" will be mailed at the end of January 1999. 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 the Yearbook Office (828) 465-1997.

This year has presented a tremendous challenge. For the first time we have seen a decrease in the amount of advertising that was submitted. We feel that this was the result of many contributing factors. Some of our more faithful advertisers have retired. More catteries have had unexpected expenses and problems with PKD testing. Catteries are experimenting with their own homepage on the Internet and placing their advertising dollars in that media. Many of our excellent photographers are no longer available to do shows. Registrations are down. All of this has affected CFA as well as the Yearbook. The value of the dollar in Canada and Japan has also had a marked effect on the cost of placing an ad in the Yearbook. We need your support more than ever now in order to continue having a successful CFA Yearbook.

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

All suggestions are seriously considered, discussed, and taken under advisement. We value your opinion and input, and will be happy to work with you.

This Yearbook belongs to all of us and the more fanciers who place information in it, the more personal and valuable it becomes.

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 will be the Yearbook to purchase. Tell everyone in the cat fancy about it, and assist us by advertising the book wherever possible. It will contain all the data that keeps us informed of everything important to the cat fancy – not only current data and photographs, but historical documentation that you will refer to year after year. Also included will be many new and exciting features. Always there for you to look at, show to others, and enjoy, the Yearbook is truly the only book of its kind in the world.

*Respectfully submitted,
Marna Fogarty, Editor*

(31) YOUTH COMMITTEE REPORT.

At the June meeting the committee voted to make some changes to the initial program, and outlined the goals it wished to meet over the summer.

The committee would like to call the program the CFA Junior Showmanship Division. They voted to keep the show season for Junior Showmanship the same as the regular season, and spread the eight shows out so that they would be compatible with the busy schedules of young people and their parents. For example: no Junior Showmanship rings during September when kids are returning to school. The committee decided on three trial shows in three regions (North Atlantic, Great Lakes and Southern) to begin January and run through April with a full report on their success to the Annual delegation in June of 1999. The first full show season would run 1999-2000. Awards and a recognition ceremony would be given at the 2000 Annual for the best performers in Junior Showmanship.

The committee also clarified the actual competition. For the youngest group, ages 8-11, there will be two parts. For the novice part the children will present their own cat. While the cat must be a CFA registered cat, it need not be of grand championship quality. The challenge will be for the child to identify the differences between his/her cat and the ideal standard. The child will also be required to answer several questions about the care of the cat, grooming, feeding, health and to be aware of issues such as neuter/spay of cats not used for breeding and the reasons for keeping cats indoors. A child must successfully complete six such competitions in order to advance to the next stage. (Once again, it must be repeated that the goal is to educate and improve and it is expected that the child receive positive reinforcement. No child should be kept from succeeding at this stage.) The child will receive scoring sheets from the judge on his/her performance, and when he/she has received six they will be sent in to CFA and the child will be promoted into the senior part of the younger division.

In the senior part the child will be asked to compare his/her cat against another cat of the same breed and explain to the judge how the cats compare to the standard for the breed. The judge will both evaluate the performance and seek to broaden each child's interpretation of the

written standard. The child will also be asked questions appropriate to their age about the care, health and grooming of all cats. The goal of this part of the program is to teach the child about the standard using different animals for each show. The idea is for each score sheet given by the judge to show improvement in evaluating the animals presented. Medals will be given to participants who successfully handle and present both cats and who answer the questions correctly. Participation ribbons will be given to all those who enter.

The older division of ages 12-15 will be expected to have successfully competed in the first division. While not eligible for the older division before age 12, if a child enters Junior Showmanship for the first time he/she must first fulfill the requirements of the younger division to compete in the second part. The competition in the advanced division will be held in three parts. For this part cats will be donated for the day by exhibitors, similar to the parade of breeds cats. For the first part a competitor will select a cat of his/her choice. He/she will present that cat to the judge, handle it in an appropriate manner and compare the qualities of the cat to the written standard. When a competitor has demonstrated that he/she can describe the strengths and weaknesses of the cat by receiving a score of 90 or higher on three score sheets, they will advance to the next level.

At the next level a cat will be randomly assigned to the competitor. He/she will know ahead of time and can read up on the standard for that breed. He/she will present the cat to the judge, and attempt to explain the strengths and weaknesses of that cat compared to the written standard. When the competitor has received six scores of 90 or higher in six different breeds, he/she moves to the final level.

For the third level the competitor would be randomly assigned two cats of the same breed. They must demonstrate to the judge their competence in handling and presenting both cats, and must knowledgeably explain the strengths and weaknesses of both cats, comparing and contrasting them to each other and to the written standard. Competitors' score sheets would be kept in Central Office and awards for categories of achievement would be given at the regional awards banquets.

For the first year of this program the committee will only be working with the first part of the program, and will not have an age requirement. It is hoped that the more advanced part can be implemented beginning in the 2000-01 season.

The committee also discussed the need to reach out beyond the immediate cat fancy for children to involve in this program. Two ways were discussed. One is to create a web page connected to the CFA web page where anyone interested in cats could learn about the program. Michelle Bernard, who designs web pages professionally, has volunteered to donate her time to creating one for Junior Showmanship.

The second way is to create a slick similar to the one CFA includes in registration packets. This could be given to kitten buyers with children in the family in order to let them get information on the program. We would like to create a kit and a membership into Junior Showmanship that could be purchased for \$10.00. The slick would give kitten buyers info do that membership for their children. [sic] The kit would include a pin, membership card (similar to a

clerk's card), information on the program and a show schedule for their area. We hope to eventually produce a newsletter for the club that could include info on grooming, health, and spotlight the achievements of members.

Currently we are working on developing the membership kit, and writing a guidebook to the care of the pedigreed cat. We are also attempting to line up shows that could be used to hold the first trial Junior Showmanship rings. As a source for material for the guidebook we are using material already available from CFA pamphlets. We would like to include information on both showmanship and cat care in this booklet. This booklet would serve as the Introduction into Junior Showmanship for the competitor. It would give him/her the basic information on cat care that would be needed to answer questions posed by the judge as well as explaining how Junior Showmanship worked. The booklet would be included in all membership kits.

A concern of the committee is to attract new youths from outside the cat fancy. The easiest way seemed to be to create a slick that could go in the envelopes with the individual registration papers. This way families with newly registered pet kittens would learn about the program. However, Tom Dent feels that this would increase the postage too much. Perhaps there is a way to identify registrations that do not come from breeders so that the Junior Showmanship info could be targeted to these other people. It is important to reach children outside of CFA about this program, and those with newly purchased kittens that spend the time and money to acquire registration papers would be the type of people we would like to attract.

The committee is also working on creating the forms necessary for the JSD. We will need an entry form, and a score sheet for the judge. We also need to know from the board if we will be able to hold a Junior Showmanship ring at an eight-ring show. Cats that are entered in JS can also be entered in the show. However, the JS ring is quite different from a regular ring in that only its owner handles the cat, not the judge. We would like to have the JS rings exempt from the eight-ring rule, if possible, as it will give us more flexibility in finding clubs willing to hold JS rings.

Currently there are three clubs in Florida willing to commit to having trial JS rings in February, March, and April. No decision has been made yet, as the committee still has work to do before it feels ready for an actual show. We do hope to be able to proceed with JS rings by April at the latest, and to use the info gained from the participants to go ahead with more formal competition by the fall of 1999.

A meeting is currently planned for the International Show, Thursday evening, Nov. 19th.

Respectfully submitted,
Debbi Stevenson, Chairman

The Sunday, October 4, 1998 meeting adjourned at 4:15PM

Respectfully submitted,
Kitty Angell, Secretary

(32) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS & RESULTS.

PROTESTS:

The Protest Committee recommended the following cases for citation for hearing by the board:

1. **Case #98-051: CFA v. Cabe, D.; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) & (g).**
2. **Case #98-064: CFA v. Starr-Kelty, J. & Denton, J.; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b).**
3. **Case #98-072: CFA v. Taylor, R.; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (g) and Show Rule 11.27 (both as to all parties).**
4. **Case #98-082: CFA v. Bowman, E.; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (g) and Show Rule 11.27 (both as to all parties).**
5. **Case #98-073: CFA v. McGaw-Fronk, R.; Violation of Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b).**
6. **Case #98-095-1007: CFA v. West, C.; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) & (g).**

Note: the following cases have been rescheduled for February 1999 hearing:

1. **Case #97-037-0402: CFA v. Leavitt, I.; Violation of CFA Show Rule 3.07.**
2. **Case #98-005-0312: CFA v Geving, C.; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b).**

HEARINGS:

Case #97-087-0827: CFA v. Oakley, Joyce; Violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) and (g) (6/98 Postponed to 10/98 Hearing).

Mrs. Joyce Oakley appeared in closed session. Kathy Vetter, Attorney & Counselor at Law; Parker, Colorado, represented her. Also present were her daughter, Cara and a friend, Cynthia King. Following Mrs. Oakley's testimony and the testimony of her daughter and friend, her attorney gave a closing statement. The board found her **not guilty** of violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Sec. 4 (a); **guilty** of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Sec. 4 (g). **Penalty: 1-year suspension (time served); \$1,000 fine (suspension to remain in effect until fine is paid).**

Case #98-046-0420: CFA v. Summers, Christopher & Evans, Reed; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV Sec. 4 (a) & (g).

Christopher Summers and Reed Evans appeared in closed session to speak on their own behalf. Following their testimony the board found them **not guilty**. A letter will be kept in their permanent file, cattery inspection will be required, and the file will be flagged if they ever breed a litter.

Case #98-003-0309: CFA v. Senser, Patricia; Violation of CFA Show Rules, 2.01 & 2.02.

No representative was present and following a closed session the board found Patricia Senser **guilty** as charged. **Penalty: \$100 fine.**

Case #98-024-0414: CFA v. Karen Stephens; Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b).

No representative was present and following a closed session the board found her **guilty**. **Penalty: 1-year suspension and \$100 fine.**