

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
NOVEMBER 1, 2011**

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.

Agenda Pre-Notice.....	(10)
Board Email List.....	(11)
Call Meeting to Order.....	(1)
Cat Writers' Association Conference.....	(7)
Central Office Progress.....	(13)
Club Name Change.....	(9)
Household Pets – Adjust Top 15 Threshold.....	(5)
Increase Delegate Fee.....	(6)
Judging Program Advancements.....	(2)
National Show – Top 15 in Premiership.....	(12)
New Clubs.....	(8)
Safeguarding Financial Assets.....	(4)
Update on status of funds in escrow (sale of building/tax audit).....	(3)

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, November 1, 2011, via teleconference. Due to President **Jerold Hamza's** illness, Vice-President **Joan Miller** called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. with the following members present:

- Ms. Joan Miller (Vice-President)**
- Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)**
- Mrs. Carla Bizzell (Treasurer)**
- Sharon Roy (NAR Director)**
- Ginger Meeker, Ph.D. (NWR Director)**
- Ms. T. Ann Caell (GSR Director)**
- Mrs. Loretta Baugh (GLR Director)**
- Mr. Michael Shelton (SWR Director)**
- Ms. Alene Shafnisky (MWR Director)**
- Mr. Mark Hannon (SOR Director)**
- Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)**
- George J. Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Richard Kallmeyer (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. David White (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)**

Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Donna Jean Thompson, Director of Operations

Not Present:

Mr. Jerold Hamza (President)

Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)

Roeann Fulkerson, Director of Marketing and Public Relations

SUMMARY

(1) CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

No action items were presented.

(2) JUDGING PROGRAM.

Chair Mrs. Baugh moved on standing motion for approval of the following action items:

- *Grant a one year medical leave of absence from the Judging Program to Bob Bryan.* Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**
- *Approve the following advancements:*

Advance to Approval Pending Specialty:

<i>Cathy Dinesen</i>	<i>Longhair – 2nd Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
<i>Lorraine Rivard</i>	<i>Longhair – 2nd Specialty</i>	<i>15 yes; 1 no (Hannon); 1 abstain (Caell)</i>
<i>Hope Gonano</i>	<i>Shorthair – 2nd Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>

Advance to Approved Specialty:

<i>Melanie Morgan</i>	<i>Longhair – 2nd Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
-----------------------	--	---------------

Advance to Approval Pending Allbreed:

<i>Melanie Morgan</i>		<i>17 yes</i>
-----------------------	--	---------------

Advance to Approved Allbreed:

<i>Kathy Calhoun</i>		<i>17 yes</i>
<i>Carol Fogarty</i>		<i>17 yes</i>

- *Adopt the following Judging Program Rules, effective with the next reprinting:*

CURRENT WORDING	NEW WORDING	RATIONALE
SECTION II INITIAL APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM	SECTION II REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLYING TO THE JUDGING PROGRAM REGIONS 1 – 9 (New heading for clarification) INITIAL APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM	
8. a. EXHIBITING: An applicant must have exhibited at least ten (10) cats. to CFA Grand Champion/Grand Premier status in the	B. EXHIBITING 1. An applicant must have exhibited at least ten (10) cats to CFA Grand Champion/Grand Premier status in the	

<p>appropriate specialty. A minimum of six (6) of these cats must be of their own breeding.</p> <p>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 the specialty for which they are applying in addition to their major breed. An applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities</p>	<p>appropriate specialty. A minimum of six (6) of these cats must be of their own breeding</p> <p>A detailed and specific resume of exhibition experience, including agenting, must be submitted as part of the application. <u>Agenting of various breeds is encouraged as a way to familiarize an applicant with different breeds, but does not count towards Custodial exhibiting. An applicant MUST have experience including Custodial exhibiting in the specialty for which they are applying, in addition to their major breed. An applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities.</u></p> <p><u>For application purposes Custodial ownership or co-ownership is defined as: housing the kitten/cat in the applicant's home, taking care of it, grooming and taking the kitten/cat to and from the show hall. Custodial Co-owned cats/kittens MUST reside with the applicant.</u></p> <p><u>Custodial Experience is defined as: housing the kitten/cat in applicant's house/possession for a minimum of three (3) months.</u></p> <p><u>Custodial Exhibiting experience is broken down as follows:</u></p> <p><u>2. CUSTODIAL EXHIBITING EXPERIENCE LONGHAIR: In addition to the primary breed, the applicant must have Custodial ownership/Custodial co-ownership of, and exhibit each of the two (2) longhair basic body types (Persian/Exotic</u></p>	<p>Rationale: The word “agenting” has taken on a new connotation and applicants are abusing the rules by not housing and caring for the kittens/cats that they are exhibiting.</p>
---	---	--

	<p><u>and other body styles): i.e. The applicant's primary breed plus two (2) additional breeds. Persian/Exotic must be primary OR one of the additional body styles.</u></p> <p><u>The applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities. Photos are required from Applicant's home and at the show.</u></p> <p><u>3. CUSTODIAL EXHIBITING EXPERIENCE SHORTHAIK: In addition to the primary breed, the Applicant must have Custodial ownership/Custodial co-ownership of, and exhibit each of the three (3) basic shorthair body types (Oriental or Siamese, cobby and intermediate/moderate): i.e. The applicant's primary breed plus three (3) additional breeds. Oriental/Siamese must be primary OR be one of the body styles.</u></p> <p><u>Complete care and custody of the cat is required by taking the cat to the show, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in applicant's care the nights of the show throughout the show, and taking it to and from the rings. If possible, The applicant should also be responsible for before-the-show bathing and grooming of the cat.</u></p> <p><u>4. For all cats that are Custodial owned or Custodial co-owned for the purpose of meeting requirements, a form will be sent to the applicant and breeder to be completed. Both parties must sign and date the form.</u></p>	
C. ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE.	C. ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE.	

<p>2. Agenting. Agenting forms (signed by the owner of the agented exhibit) will be part of the Exhibitor' Resume</p> <p>Complete care and custody of the cat is required by taking the cat to the show, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in your care the nights at the show, taking it to and from the ring. If possible, the applicant should also be responsible for before-the show bathing and grooming of the cat.</p> <p>Photographs are required showing the applicant's care and custody of the agented cat in the applicant home and at the shows.</p>	<p>2. Agenting. <u>Exhibiting Agenting/Owning Custodial Exhibiting</u> forms will be part of the Exhibitor's Resume <u>and must be signed/dated by the Custodial owner and Custodial co-owner of the exhibited cat. The intent of the application process is to show the Board of Directors that the applicant has substantive experience in the breeding and exhibiting of cats in the appropriate specialty; and that the applicant has worked with all body types in their specialty, either through breeding of grand champions or exhibiting cats of others breeding programs.</u></p> <p>Complete care and custody of the cat is required. by taking the cat to the show, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in applicant's care the nights of the show, <u>throughout the show,</u> and taking it to and from the rings. If possible, The applicant should also be responsible for before-the show bathing and grooming of the cat.</p> <p>Photographs are required, showing the applicants care and custody of the cat in the applicants' home and at the shows.</p>	<p>Rationale: The word "agenting" has taken on a new connotation and applicants are abusing the rules by not housing and caring for the kittens/cats that they are exhibiting</p>
--	---	---

Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

<p>SECTION V TRAINEES 10.E</p>	<p>SECTION VII TRAINEES 10.E</p>	<p>New Section number after Domestic & International Sections has been established. Was Section V</p>
<p>E. Trainees will have two years 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</p>	<p>E. Trainees will have two years 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</p>	<p>Move to a more logical location. See below</p>

<p>classes in two years may re-apply after a two year period. Trainees in the Judging Program as of October 2006 are grandfathered for up to two years. Second Specialty Trainees may not begin training in the second specialty until they have advanced to Approved status in the first specialty. (This does not preclude an individual advancing to Approved first specialty and Trainee second specialty at the same Board meeting.)</p>	<p>classes in two years may re-apply after a two year period. Trainees in the Judging Program as of October 2006 are grandfathered for up to two years. Second Specialty Trainees may not begin training in the second specialty until they have advanced to Approved status in the first specialty. (This does not preclude an individual advancing to Approved first specialty and Trainee second specialty at the same Board meeting.)</p>	
<p align="center">SECTION V TRAINEES A. COLOR CLASSES FOR TRAINEES – BREED/DIVISION COLOR CLASS EVALUATIONS.</p>	<p align="center">SECTION VII TRAINEES A. COLOR CLASSES FOR TRAINEES – BREED/DIVISION COLOR CLASS EVALUATIONS.</p>	<p>New Section number after Domestic & International Sections has been established. (Was Section V)</p>
<p>1. Applicants who have been accepted to the Judging Program are designated as trainees and are eligible to do breed/division color class evaluation work under the supervision of an approved judge; however, no trainee shall be assigned to any approved judge who personally recommended the trainee for acceptance to the Judging Program.</p>	<p>1. a. Applicants who have been accepted to the Judging Program are designated as trainees and are eligible to do breed/division color class evaluation work under the supervision of an approved judge; however, no trainee shall be assigned to any approved judge who personally recommended the trainee for acceptance to the Judging Program. <u>b. Second Specialty Trainees may not begin training in the second specialty until they have advanced to Approved status in the first specialty. (This does not preclude an individual advancing to Approved first specialty and Trainee second specialty at the same Board meeting.)</u></p>	<p>Logical location. Moved from Section 5 10.E Moving from the end of the Section to the beginning</p>

Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

(3) UPDATE ON STATUS OF FUNDS IN ESCROW (SALE OF BUILDING/TAX AUDIT).

No action items were presented.

(4) SAFEGUARDING FINANCIAL ASSETS

Mr. Eigenhauser moved that we hold onto the funds and authorize the Investment Committee to come up with a safe liquid account. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Carried.**

(5) HOUSEHOLD PETS – ADJUST TOP 15 THRESHOLD.

No action items were presented.

(6) INCREASE DELEGATE FEE.

Ms. Caell moved that a resolution to increase the delegate fee be prepared and presented at the next meeting which, if approved, would be a board-sponsored amendment at the next annual meeting. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

(7) CAT WRITERS’ ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE.

No action items were presented.

(8) CLUB APPLICATIONS.

The following club applications were presented for acceptance:

- NUTMEG CAT FANCIERS (Region 1). **Ms. Roy** moved to accept. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.**
- TOKYO SKY TREE CAT CLUB (Region 8). **Tabled.**
- CATS ‘N CATS (International Division-Asia [China]). **Tabled.**
- CHENGDU CAT CLUB (International Division-Asia [China]). **Tabled.**

Ms. Roy moved that other clubs will be held off for another two months to be pre-noticed, so they would be in the January meeting. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

(9) CLUB NAME CHANGE.

Ms. Anger moved to grant the following club name change request:

<i>Current Name:</i>	<i>Michicat Pet Club</i>
<i>Proposed Name:</i>	<i>Motor City Jazz Club</i>
<i>Region:</i>	<i>Great Lakes (Region 4)</i>
<i>Conflict w/Existing Names:</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Reason:</i>	<i>More appropriate name</i>

Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

(10) AGENDA PRE-NOTICE:

Mr. Eigenhauser moved that, for our telephonic meetings, our agenda be put on CFA News at least 24 hours before the meeting. Seconded by **Mr. Hannon, Motion Carried.**

(11) BOARD EMAIL LIST:

No action items were presented.

(12) NATIONAL SHOW – TOP 15 IN PREMIERSHIP:

Mr. Hannon moved to permit top 15 awards in Premiership at the National Show, regardless of number entered. Seconded by **Mrs. Baugh, Motion Carried.** Krzanowski, Shafnisky, Roy, Eigenhauser and Kallmeyer voted no.

(13) CENTRAL OFFICE PROGRESS/SCORING ISSUES:

Mr. Eigenhauser moved to that we adhere to current scoring policy with regard to cats without a registration number, but that we ask for information from Shirley and from Donna Jean so that we may consider, as a board, whether or not to make exceptions. Seconded by **Ms. Shafnisky, Motion Carried.**

TRANSCRIPT

(1) CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Miller called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m., EST. **Anger:** While everybody is waiting, I learned that Jerry is not going to be on the call because he is sick, so probably the first thing we should do is determine who is going to run the meeting. **Roy:** It should be Joan Miller. **Anger:** I would think. **Eigenhauser:** She's online. **Anger:** Joan, are you ready for that? **Miller:** Yeah. I wish I had a little bit of notice, but that's OK. **Anger:** I just heard 5 minutes ago, myself. **Miller:** OK. I will pull up some of the agenda items and that will be fine. **Anger:** Would you like me to start by doing the roll call? **Miller:** Yes. That would be great, Rachel. **Anger:** OK. I just want to confirm Jerry is not on the call. Joan Miller. **Miller:** I'm here. **Anger:** Rachel Anger is here. Carla Bizzell. **Bizzell:** Here. **Anger:** Sharon Roy. **Roy:** Here. **Anger:** Ginger Meeker. **Meeker:** Here. **Anger:** Ann Caell. **Caell:** Here. **Anger:** Loretta Baugh. **Baugh:** Here. **Anger:** Mike Shelton. **Shelton:** Here. **Anger:** Alene Shafnisky. **Shafnisky:** Here. **Anger:** Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** Here. **Anger:** Koizumi is not going to be on the call I heard. You're not on the call are you, Kayoko? OK, Roger Brown. **Brown:** Here. **Anger:** George Eigenhauser. **Eigenhauser:** Present. **Anger:** Dick Kallmeyer. **Kallmeyer:** Here. **Anger:** Carol Krzanowski. **Krzanowski:** Here. **Anger:** Annette Wilson. **Wilson:** Here. **Anger:** Darrell Newkirk. **Newkirk:** Here. **Anger:** David White. **White:** Here. **Anger:** Ed Raymond. **Raymond:** Here. **Anger:** Donna Jean Thompson. **Thompson:** Here. **Anger:** Roeann Fulkerson won't be on the call because she has got the flu bug also. Is there anyone else whose name I have not called?

(2) JUDGING PROGRAM.

Committee Chair: *Loretta Baugh – Letters of Complaint; Board of Directors Meeting Reports; General Communication and Oversight*
List of Committee Members: *Norman Auspitz – Representative on the CFA Protest Committee; Judging Program Rules and Updates; Mentor Program Administrator; Domestic Training and File Administrator*
Pat Jacobberger – Judges' Education Chair; Breed Awareness and Orientation School; Judges Workshops; Continuing Education
Ellyn Honey – Domestic Training and File Administrator
Rick Hoskinson – File Administrator
Jan Stevens – File Administrator; Secretary (keeps all files/records and compiles for Board report)

***Donna Isenberg** – New Applicants (inquiries, queries, follow ups, counseling); May teach Judging Application Process at Breed Awareness & Orientation School, Application/Advisor Coordinator*

***Wayne Trevathan** – Japan and International Division Trainee and File Administrator; guest judge (CFA judges in approved foreign associations, licensed judges from approved foreign associations in CFA)*

***Peter Vanwonderghem** – European Liaison*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Thank You Message: The Judging Program Committee has received a note of appreciation from Allan Raymond for his recent advancements. A copy of resignation from Queensland Feline Association was also received from Allan Raymond.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Bob Bryan has asked for medical leave for one year.

Miller: OK. Rachel, thank you. I am trying to pull up the agenda and I'm having trouble finding it. **Hannon:** The Judging Program is first. **Miller:** Alright. Let's go ahead with the Judging Program then. Loretta? **Baugh:** OK. The things that I have in open session are, Bob Bryan has asked for medical leave for a year. **Anger:** Can I butt in right there? Sorry. **Miller:** Yes. **Anger:** Generally the board approves that. **Baugh:** That's why it's – I just got that, so that's why it's on there. It should say an action item and it wasn't put in there as an action item. **Anger:** OK. Alright. Thanks. **Baugh:** OK. So, it is an action item. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. **Miller:** OK, any discussion?

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **White:** I'm sorry, as there a duration indicated? **Baugh:** He indicates a year. [for confidentiality purposes, medical details were deleted here] I figured a year would be safe. **Eigenhauser:** Wish him well for us. **Anger:** Please. **Baugh:** OK.

The Judges' Education now has its own web site and it is up and running.

Hannon: On her report, she says that the Judges' Education now has its own website. At one point, we talked about making that possibly available to everybody, not just the judges. What's the status on that? **Baugh:** Yes, we did talk about that. I don't know how far Pat has gone with it. We can check with her. There was difficulty getting it up there and it is there now, but I can confirm it with her as to how we're going to do that. I can't give you that information tonight, but I will find out. **Hannon:** If we're going to make it available to everybody, then I would like to put out a notice as to what the link is. **Baugh:** I'll have to find out. Alright? **Hannon:** OK.

Advancements: *The following individuals are presented to the Board for advancement:*

Advance to Approval Pending Specialty:

Cathy Dinesen Longhair – 2nd Specialty 17 yes

Lorraine Rivard Longhair – 2nd Specialty 15 yes; 1 no (Hannon);
 1 abstain (Caell)
 Hope Gonano Shorthair – 2nd Specialty 17 yes

Advance to Approved Specialty:

Melanie Morgan Longhair – 2nd Specialty 17 yes

Advance to Approval Pending Allbreed:

Melanie Morgan 17 yes

Advance to Approved Allbreed:

Kathy Calhoun 17 yes
 Carol Fogarty 17 yes

Action Item: Adopt the following proposed Judging Program Rule changes:

CURRENT WORDING	NEW WORDING	RATIONALE
<p>SECTION II</p> <p>INITIAL APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM</p>	<p>SECTION II</p> <p>REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLYING TO THE JUDGING PROGRAM REGIONS 1 – 9 (New heading for clarification)</p> <p>INITIAL APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM</p>	
<p>8. a. EXHIBITING:</p> <p>An applicant must have exhibited at least ten (10) cats. to CFA Grand Champion/Grand Premier status in the appropriate specialty. A minimum of six (6) of these cats must be of their own breeding.</p> <p>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 the specialty for which they are applying in addition to their major breed. An applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities</p>	<p>B. EXHIBITING</p> <p>1. An applicant must have exhibited at least ten (10) cats to CFA Grand Champion/Grand Premier status in the appropriate specialty. A minimum of six (6) of these cats must be of their own breeding</p> <p>A detailed and specific resume of exhibition experience, including agenting, must be submitted as part of the application. <u>Agenting of various breeds is encouraged as a way to familiarize an applicant with different breeds, but does not count towards Custodial exhibiting. An applicant MUST have experience including Custodial exhibiting in the specialty for which they are</u></p>	<p>Rationale: The word “agenting” has taken on a new connotation and applicants are abusing the rules by not housing and caring for the kittens/cats that they are exhibiting.</p>

	<p><u>applying, in addition to their major breed. An applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities.</u></p> <p><u>For application purposes Custodial ownership or co-ownership is defined as: housing the kitten/cat in the applicant's home, taking care of it, grooming and taking the kitten/cat to and from the show hall. Custodial Co-owned cats/kittens MUST reside with the applicant.</u></p> <p><u>Custodial Experience is defined as: housing the kitten/cat in applicant's house/possession for a minimum of three (3) months.</u></p> <p><u>Custodial Exhibiting experience is broken down as follows:</u></p> <p><u>2. CUSTODIAL EXHIBITING EXPERIENCE LONGHAIR: In addition to the primary breed, the applicant must have Custodial ownership/Custodial co-ownership of, and exhibit each of the two (2) longhair basic body types (Persian/Exotic and other body styles): i.e. The applicant's primary breed plus two (2) additional breeds. Persian/Exotic must be primary OR one of the additional body styles. The applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities. Photos are required from Applicant's home and at the show.</u></p> <p><u>3. CUSTODIAL EXHIBITING EXPERIENCE SHORTHAIK: In addition to the primary breed, the Applicant must have Custodial ownership/Custodial</u></p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>co-ownership of, and exhibit each of the three (3) basic shorthair body types (Oriental or Siamese, cobby and intermediate/moderate): i.e. The applicant’s primary breed plus three (3) additional breeds. Oriental/Siamese must be primary OR be one of the body styles.</u></p> <p><u>Complete care and custody of the cat is required by taking the cat to the show, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in applicant’s care the nights of the show throughout the show, and taking it to and from the rings. If possible, The applicant should also be responsible for before-the-show bathing and grooming of the cat.</u></p> <p><u>4. For all cats that are Custodial owned or Custodial co-owned for the purpose of meeting requirements, a form will be sent to the applicant and breeder to be completed. Both parties must sign and date the form.</u></p>	
<p>C. ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE.</p>	<p>C. ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE.</p>	
<p>2. Agenting. Agenting forms (signed by the owner of the agented exhibit) will be part of the Exhibitor’ Resume</p>	<p>2. Agenting. <u>Exhibiting Agenting/Ownning Custodial Exhibiting</u> forms will be part of the Exhibitor’s Resume <u>and must be signed/dated by the Custodial owner and Custodial co-owner of the exhibited cat. The intent of the application process is to show the Board of Directors that the applicant has substantive experience in the breeding and exhibiting of cats in the appropriate specialty; and that the applicant has worked with all body types in their specialty, either through breeding of grand</u></p>	<p>Rationale: The word “agenting” has taken on a new connotation and applicants are abusing the rules by not housing and caring for the kittens/cats that they are exhibiting</p>

<p>Complete care and custody of the cat is required by taking the cat to the show, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in your care the nights at the show, taking it to and from the ring. If possible, the applicant should also be responsible for before-the show bathing and grooming of the cat.</p> <p>Photographs are required showing the applicant's care and custody of the agented cat in the applicant home and at the shows.</p>	<p><u>champions or exhibiting cats of others breeding programs.</u></p> <p>Complete care and custody of the cat is required. by taking the cat to the show, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in applicant's care the nights of the show, throughout the show, and taking it to and from the rings. If possible, The applicant should also be responsible for before-the show bathing and grooming of the cat.</p> <p>Photographs are required, showing the applicants care and custody of the cat in the applicants' home and at the shows.</p>	
---	---	--

Baugh: That should be all I have, except for the advancements. **Eigenhauser:** No. I'm looking at the report. There's some Judging Program rule changes that have got to be in open session. **Baugh:** Right. I was going say the Judging Program rules. That was also open session. This was the part that we were supposed to bring back because of the wording on the agenting. **Hannon:** Right. **Baugh:** I don't know if everybody has read it, but we struggled to come up with something that still did what we wanted it to do without coming up with terminology that would be different and specific enough. **Anger:** This is Rachel. I have a question. To my recollection, the only thing that we approved was one item from the October minutes. There was a whole big section yet to approve, not just the part about agenting. **Baugh:** That was – I read the minutes. It was my impression this was the only thing I'm supposed to bring back. **Anger:** I'm looking at the minutes right now. To get the advisors back to mentors was the only thing that we approved. **Baugh:** No, if you look at page 68. **Anger:** Of the minutes? **Baugh:** Yeah. **Hannon:** Well, if there's more to be approved, we're not going to do it tonight because it wasn't pre-noticed to us. Can't you two discuss this offline and decide if there's more for the next meeting? The only thing we can vote on now is the agenting being changed. **Baugh:** OK. That's fine. I have a standing motion, then. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I thought you did a very good job with the description. I'm wondering why the 3 month window was chosen? Maybe you could give us some insight as to what the thought process was for you to come up with a threshold. **Baugh:** I think they wanted, that was to be a minimum. It would take at least that long for some experience to happen. We had to come up with a number, and that seemed to be a good minimum number. That's really all I can say about that. **Shafnisky:** I didn't recall asking for a minimum number. That's why I thought it was curious. My recollection may not be correct. **Baugh:** The minimum number was in the original proposal. We didn't change that. We can't just say they have to do it. I mean, we have to give some sort of a time frame. **Shafnisky:** I think what you have come up with is very good. **Baugh:** Thank you. **Eigenhauser:** Anyway, if we're ready, I'll go ahead and second. **Baugh:** OK, thank you. **Miller:** Any further discussion on this? I think it's been well worded, too. **Baugh:** Thank you.

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

<p align="center">SECTION V TRAINEES 10.E</p>	<p align="center">SECTION VII TRAINEES 10.E</p>	<p>New Section number after Domestic & International Sections has been established. Was Section V</p>
<p>E. Trainees will have two years 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 two years may re-apply after a two year period. Trainees in the Judging Program as of October 2006 are grandfathered for up to two years. Second Specialty Trainees may not begin training in the second specialty until they have advanced to Approved status in the first specialty. (This does not preclude an individual advancing to Approved first specialty and Trainee second specialty at the same Board meeting.)</p>	<p>E. Trainees will have two years 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 two years may re-apply after a two year period. Trainees in the Judging Program as of October 2006 are grandfathered for up to two years. Second Specialty Trainees may not begin training in the second specialty until they have advanced to Approved status in the first specialty. (This does not preclude an individual advancing to Approved first specialty and Trainee second specialty at the same Board meeting.)</p>	<p>Move to a more logical location. See below</p>
<p align="center">SECTION V TRAINEES A. COLOR CLASSES FOR TRAINEES – BREED/DIVISION COLOR CLASS EVALUATIONS.</p>	<p align="center">SECTION VII TRAINEES A. COLOR CLASSES FOR TRAINEES – BREED/DIVISION COLOR CLASS EVALUATIONS.</p>	<p>New Section number after Domestic & International Sections has been established. (Was Section V)</p>
<p>1. Applicants who have been accepted to the Judging Program are designated as trainees and are eligible to do breed/division color class evaluation work under the supervision of an approved judge; however, no trainee shall be assigned to any approved judge who personally recommended the trainee for acceptance to the Judging Program.</p>	<p>1. a. Applicants who have been accepted to the Judging Program are designated as trainees and are eligible to do breed/division color class evaluation work under the supervision of an approved judge; however, no trainee shall be assigned to any approved judge who personally recommended the trainee for acceptance to the Judging Program. b. <u>Second Specialty Trainees may not begin training in the second</u></p>	<p>Logical location. Moved from Section 5 10.E Moving from the end of the Section to the beginning</p>

	<u>specialty until they have advanced to Approved status in the first specialty. (This does not preclude an individual advancing to Approved first specialty and Trainee second specialty at the same Board meeting.)</u>	
--	---	--

Baugh: There was one other thing that we added. After the October board meeting, we could not find – we knew it was in the Judging Program rules somewhere, but we could not find the piece that said that second specialty trainees couldn't begin training until they were advanced to approved status in their first specialty. All of us looked for it and we couldn't find it. I actually had to ask Rachel and she found it because she knew it was where it didn't belong. **Hannon:** So you moved it to where it belongs. **Baugh:** To where it belongs, yeah. Standing motion. **Eigenhauser:** Second.

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Baugh: Aside from the – I have the advancements which we need to do in closed session, and I do have a couple other things before we get to the advancements, to the Judging Program requirements, I should say. We would like to have it in the minutes that we have discussed both with the Judging Program Committee and with Darrell [Newkirk] that we would be able to consider an International Champion equivalent to a CFA grand. It takes a minimum of 6 shows to become an International Champion. In some instances, it's going to be harder than a grand champion. So, unless anybody has any problem. **Shafnisky:** Loretta, this is Alene. I am wondering if we have – can we be provided with maybe an outline of sort of what the requirements are? Obviously, it's not just attending 6 shows. They must have to achieve something. **Baugh:** They have to achieve 3 certificates to become a Champion. Darrell, are you familiar with it? I can look it up on the computer here. **Newkirk:** Not off the top of my head, but I know they get certificates for each of the shows that they go to, and it's a minimum of, I think, two judgments per show, so they get a minimum of 2 certificates per show, so it takes I think 6 to 7 shows, and that's if they have – if there's competition, they even have to beat their competition. **Shafnisky:** This would just be a CFA champion title. I think I misheard it. I thought you were saying CFA grand champion. **Baugh:** In the requirements for grand champion for the Judging Program. **Roy:** In other words, part of your 10 grands could be these international champions. **Baugh:** Right. **Miller:** This would be International Champions that are earned through FIFE shows or other shows or what? **Hannon:** It would be the independent associations, as well, then. **Baugh:** Right. **Shafnisky:** I'm sorry, it's Alene. And that would count toward your 10 grands? **Baugh:** Yes. **Shafnisky:** That sounds a little bit like the equivalent of what we used to do for winners ribbons, and that doesn't – **Hannon:** If it's like winners ribbons, it didn't take us 6 to 7 shows. What Darrell is telling us is that it will take a minimum of that. **Shafnisky:** It depends on what class you are in. If you're in the Maine Coon class, you may have taken 6 to 7 shows to get your winners ribbons. It sounds to me like it's a different process, and so I would like to see if maybe someone could – **Miller:** My recollection of these shows is that they only have one judging. It's very different and it's quite something if you do get a champion win or whatever. That's quite an achievement. **Hannon:** Is this something that we need to decide tonight because we've got an applicant coming up or something? Can we get more information on this and talk about it next month? **Baugh:** They are waiting to know about this, because there are people that are looking to apply and use this. I have brought it up before. **Roy:** Loretta, this is Sharon. These are people that are already judging, though, in the Independents, correct? **Baugh:**

No. This is the people that are wanting to become CFA judges. **Hannon:** But they're not necessarily already judges elsewhere. **Baugh:** No. That's correct. **Miller:** My own feeling is that I think generally we would probably go along with it, but my understanding of FIFe, as Loretta said, it's pretty difficult to get to be a champion but I think we should see some outline of exactly what's required. **Eigenhauser:** Yeah. I can't do this when it hasn't been noticed, when I haven't seen anything in writing. I know nothing of the program. I need to see a written proposal. **Krzanowski:** I agree with George. This is Carol. I have to agree. I would like to see something. An outline, of the program, anything. **Baugh:** OK, not a problem. I'll get it written up and we'll do it next time. **Miller:** Great.

[from meeting end] **Miller:** Is there a motion to adjourn, or is there anything else that's urgent that we need to talk about? **Meeker:** I would move to adjourn. **Baugh:** Wait. I was on mute. I couldn't get it off. Can I just make one quick – this is Loretta. **Miller:** Yes. **Baugh:** I found Peter Vanwonderghem's email on the International Champion and sent it out. I had Rachel send it out because I couldn't get through on my email to the board list. Please review it, and if you have any questions, I want to get them answered before the next meeting, OK? Thank you. **Miller:** Great. Alright, that's good.

Basically there are 4 titles: Champion, International Champion, Grand International Champion and European Champion.

In order to become Champion, the cat needs to defeat all OPN's in the same class. Keep in mind that in 1 show, you can only obtain 1 title, so it will take a minimum of three shows to become a Champion. In these classes, the number of entries are the highest. I remember having to compete with 15 other cats for a CAC in the black Persian male class. This is where the quality of the cats is the determining factor. With a top show Black Persian male I needed 8 shows to become a CH, simply because there were too many top show cats in the same class. (A problem we are familiar with in CFA.)

In order to become an International Champion, the cat has to obtain 3 CACIB titles, beating all the Champions in the same class. (in RUI 3 CAC and 6 CACIB are required to become International Champion).

If you look at dog shows, the CACIB - International Championship status is the highest you can obtain. The difference with the cat world is that dog breeders continue to showing their dogs after obtaining this title.

Cat breeders needed additional, new titles for them to bring their cats to the show. First they added Grand International Champion, which just means participating in 3 more shows because the classes are very small and almost always the Int. Ch. will be alone in its class. (CAGCIB)

Same for European Champion. After 3 CACE titles, the cat becomes European Champion (I think you need to get these in different countries but I am not sure).

So basically it will take an absolute minimum of 6 shows where you have to beat ALL the competition in your class (sometimes considerable numbers and quality) to become International Champion.

Personally I think this is the only correct equivalent for our GRC.

Extra note to consider: if we are only going to accept “other” judges to apply to the CFA judging program with higher titles than “International Champion”, I think none of the judges that I am currently working with and that want to apply, will be able to do so.

Baugh: There was also discussion talking about the applicants being noticed on more than just the website, and Mark had said that he would be putting them in the CFA News. **Hannon:** Right, as well as clubs that are applying. **Baugh:** Right, as well as the clubs. The applicants will be in there, as well. You probably noticed, if you’ve been reading the list, that Maureen Kramanak had her name up and has withdrawn it for February. [for confidentiality purposes, medical details were deleted here] She is just postponing it. **White:** So, in regards to that article in the newsletter, is it going to be more than just the person’s name? Is it going to include like a little background about the individual in terms of what they are applying for, where they’re located, the breeds that they work with? **Baugh:** No. It’s going to be similar to what we’ve always done in the past. We put up the person’s name and where they live, and the suggestion was made that we put up their cattery name, as well, because sometimes people don’t know individuals. **Hannon:** It also would say what they are applying for. **Baugh:** And what they are applying for. That’s all that has ever been published. **Hannon:** We’ll add a blurb as we do on the website soliciting any comments they might have and who it is to be sent to. **Miller:** Loretta, do you have anything else other than closed session items?

(4) SAFEGUARDING FINANCIAL ASSETS

Miller: And that would bring us to the next part, if Annette and Carla could talk about safeguarding the assets and any investing ideas. Is that something that you’re in the process of working on? **Wilson:** This is Annette. I sent an email to Carla in case I wasn’t able to make the call, but I really, I really am recommending against paying off the loan at this point. I think with a 2% loan and the fact that we’re not likely to be able to qualify to get a loan in the future, I think we should keep the money on hand in an investment option, in order to be secure and risk free. I would say we put aside an amount equal to the current balance of the mortgage loan in laddered CD’s – you know, CD’s that mature in 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and so on, so that if interest rates go up, we can take advantage of that. But set that aside, and that would be there to pay off the mortgage. Obviously, the mortgage balance is going to decrease, and then there just aren’t a lot of other – other than CD investment opportunities and it’s really not – I know it sounds like a lot of money, but it’s not that much money to invest. George mentioned in the last meeting, and I think Carla, too – someone did – about we need to have money available. We can’t tie it up. It’s not enough to tie up. So, CD’s and online savings accounts, anything that we can get that would pay 1% or 2% and be liquidate-able, but I’m a conservative investor. I think Rich Mastin might have some ideas, but he didn’t get back to me after the last time I emailed him, but I can email him again. Carla, if you have any? **Bizzell:** The last time I talked to him, he would recommend that we pay off the loan. **Wilson:** OK. **Bizzell:** And that would be my personal preference, but then I don’t like owing money, so that’s more of a personal thing. **Wilson:** From an only money standpoint, I agree, but from the idea that we’re never going to – it’s going to be extremely difficult in the next 5 years if we wanted to borrow that amount of money, to actually be able to borrow it, much less borrow it at that rate. **Miller:** Yeah, I would tend to agree with that. That’s a fantastic rate. **Wilson:** I mean, if it was a 4% loan or a 5% loan, I would be right there with you. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. **White:** So Carla, this is David. One of the concerns I had was, we’re not getting any credit for the loan that we have open because it’s going through the City of

Alliance. Is there any way we can have that changed so it's reported and reflected on our Dunn & Bradstreet report? **Bizzell:** Wow. That's a question more along the lines that Ed might help us with. I don't know. **White:** I tend to agree with Annette, but the only thing is, even though we have a loan out, we're not really getting credit for it. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. David, where are you getting that information? **White:** I pulled the D&B today. **Shafnisky:** The loan will be secured. **Wilson:** And the loan has not been reported. **White:** I looked into the Dunn & Bradstreet report for CFA that I shared with Carla, so Carla has it, as well. One of the issues that I see with the report itself is that our score is relatively low because, even though we have no debt. Those are things that are looked at. Having no debt is kind of like having no credit. So, unless we can get credit for the loan, I don't see any point of holding onto it, especially if we can't – I'm sorry? **Shafnisky:** I still think what Annette is saying is correct in that, you know, right now even with good credit it's nearly impossible to get loans. I'm not sure about it in the corporate world, but what I've seen has certainly been very, very negative so I would be very hesitant to give up that kind of liquid asset ability, because she's right. I don't think we're going to be able to come anywhere near another loan if something should happen. **White:** We wouldn't. That's true. However, one of the things that I think is kind of crucial is to show our borrowing power, because no bank is going to give us a loan if we have no credit history of our ability to pay back. **Raymond:** This is Ed. **Hannon:** Haven't we paid back half the loan? **White:** What's that? We're not getting credit for it. **Hannon:** Why not? **White:** Because the loan is actually from the City of Alliance. **Wilson:** It's not a bank loan. **White:** Yeah. **Wilson:** It's the banks that report to your, to the credit company. **Hannon:** So, what is David's point? That we ought to not pay off the loan and hold onto the cash because we don't have a credit history there? **White:** I'm saying, if we can get credit for the loan, I think we should hold on to the – **Miller:** Well, who would be able to investigate that and know how to get credit for a private loan? Anybody? **White:** I talked to Jerry about it and he was going to, I think, get with Ed. I'm sorry, Rich. **Miller:** Then maybe we have to wait until we get an answer to that. I think it's a good point, but I also agree that it's nice to have a 2% loan and have access to the money, especially if we can possibly get 2% or more on some sort of an investment. I don't know if that's possible. **Wilson:** You can get 2% on a – right around 2 on a jumbo 5 year CD, probably with an online bank. You can get 1% on just a pure corporate savings account in an online account. The sweep account – **White:** Did you get rates for any money markets, Annette? **Wilson:** Money markets are paying nothing. Nothing. There's just no money out there; no safe money. **White:** I'm getting 1% from Capital One. **Wilson:** On a money market, or just a savings account? **White:** Money market. **Wilson:** OK. Well, when I looked at the money market schedules, I saw nothing, but I know on ING, I get 1% just on a savings account and they have those rates. I checked. They will set up corporate accounts and they are paying that, also, but the only thing I can find close to 2% is a 5 year jumbo CD, so \$100,000 5 year CD. Now, there are other things. There's bond funds. I mean, high AAA bond funds, but your yield isn't very much because there's costs. You know, there's expenses involved in investing in those funds, but I know that I saw Rich at a show and he said he had some ideas. Carla and I need to get with him and see what he's got for suggestions. **Hannon:** This is Mark. What do we owe at this point, on the loan? **Bizzell:** As of December 1st it will be \$265,972.42. **Wilson:** See the mortgage loan balance in the right hand column? **Roy:** This is Sharon. Carla, is there a time frame that the City of Alliance wants their money back? **Hannon:** 10 years. **Bizzell:** 10 years, yeah. **Wilson:** You don't have to make a decision on paying off the loan at this point. We can pay it off at any point. My recommendation was to take \$260,000 and set it aside to pay off the loan and say, OK, we're going to put that in whatever. Put it in an account that makes 1%. That's a net 1% that we're paying, but if we don't pay off the loan, then we have about \$878,000, according to this schedule, to invest. That sounds like a lot of money but it's not that much money. We should, though, be able to get – and the

other thing to look at is, what are we going to do with income from that? If we put it in some, if we buy bond funds and things like that, that should be able to throw off maybe \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year. Do you reinvest that, or does that become part – there's just a lot of things to look at. I just don't know how far out we want to go and how much risk we want to take, when even getting a little bit of income is going to take some risk. **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Wilson:** If we had \$1.8 million to invest, it would maybe be a different story. **Miller:** If we get a certain amount of income like you're saying, maybe \$20,000 or \$30,000 from bond income, would this jeopardize our non-profit status in any way? **Bizzell:** It shouldn't jeopardize our not-for-profit status, but I haven't looked into it. It could be subject to tax, depending upon what we invest in. **Hannon:** Is this in open session? **Eigenhauser:** I assume we're in open session. **Miller:** Yes, we're in open session. **Eigenhauser:** Anyway, let me just say here, the reason to keep cash on hand isn't to make money with it. If we get zero on the money, the reason to have cash on hand is, in times of economic uncertainty, you need to have a certain amount of cash on hand to weather bad up's and down's. For a business our size, we should have about a year's worth in the bank. Six months is probably OK. A year and a half would be better still, but we're an over a million dollar a year business, and \$600,000, \$700,000, \$800,000 isn't even a year's income, so the goal is not, "we're going to take this money and go to Vegas and make a whopping load of profit on it. The goal is, we need to have enough liquid cash on hand to weather any kind of a down turn, any kind of a storm. When you're talking liquid, you're always talking about extraordinarily low return on investment, and the trade-off is, "but it's safe" and that's what we need to be thinking about. I don't care if we get 1-1/4% or 1-5/8% or 1-7/16%. The goal here is to keep that money safe no matter what, so that we have an emergency reserve to get us through any eventuality. Any investment that requires us to lock it up for any period of time, any investment that puts principle at risk, is an inappropriate investment for your emergency cash on hand. So, I don't care if we're only getting a half a percent or somebody can go up to some place and get 1%. The question is, how much emergency cash do we need to have on hand, because the problem we're facing is, if we do use it to pay down the mortgage, we may not be able to pull it out in time of emergency. That's the down side of paying off the mortgage. We may not be able to get the same interest rate, we may not be able to get the same amount of money out, we may not even have the credit rating to get even a substantial part of it back, I don't know. So, I know we're all talking about, you know, couldn't we check with Capital One? That's a detail that I'm perfectly willing to let Carla deal with. If people know of a good place where you can get a good, safe rate of return, post it all to Carla as a suggestion, but the question we need answered today is, how much of a safe liquid cash reserve do we need to have on hand to get us through economic times? I'm looking at the news, I'm looking at what's going on, and a lot of big businesses, a lot of people a lot smarter than me are keeping a lot of cash on the sidelines right now because they're worried. Keeping it in cash is a decision we can always change later. We can always pay off the mortgage tomorrow or next week or next month or next year, as long as we park that money someplace safe. Paying down the mortgage is a decision we may not be able to undo, because if we put the money to pay down the mortgage and property values go south, or credit becomes a problem, we may not be able to pull it back out, so all other things being equal, as long as we're parking it someplace safe, to me it's not about whether we can get a good return on investment, it's how much cash should we have on hand to feel safe? I would be comfortable holding it on the sidelines for now. **Miller:** George, would you like to make a motion that we hold our paying off of our loan? **Eigenhauser:** Sure, and authorize the Treasurer to come up with a safe and – I don't know. Carla, give me some good words to say for this, but I don't mind if it's staggered CD's or whatever, but just a liquid, a safe liquid account. **Bizzell:** Could we amend that to say the Investment Committee, since this is why the Investment Committee was put together? **Eigenhauser:** OK, Investment Committee. As long as we keep

that money on the sidelines, let the Investment Committee come up with some safe liquid investments and put it in. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol. I'll second that. **Miller:** Carol, go ahead. **Hannon:** She just seconded it. **Krzanowski:** I'll second the motion. **Miller:** Alright. Alright, good. Any more discussion?

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Miller:** OK, it carries. Anything else on the financial situation?

(5) HOUSEHOLD PETS – ADJUST TOP 15 THRESHOLD.

Miller: Alene, why don't you talk about the top 15 Household Pets? **Shafnisky:** OK. This is just for discussion. I want to put that out there because I've sort of been talking through it and have some additional thoughts. I wanted basically the board's permission to go ahead and talk to Monte and look into two situations. One is because we've got the Household Pets with the top 15, and I know everybody wanted that to encourage people to do the Household Pets. I know in my region we had that one show that had, quite often gets somewhere near there but I don't think we're getting more than one or two shows a year that are reaching that threshold, so it's really not – I don't know. It seems like something that maybe we should look into and say, OK, how many shows even reach 30? So, are we really looking at a fair threshold for a top 15? In talking with people about that, it seems like we may have a similar issue in championship and I'm not sure what the right answer is. Again, I emphasize that this is all just for discussion purposes, but I thought that it would be maybe worth our while to go back into the numbers and sort of compare it to when we first instituted top 15 in Premiership, how many shows reached that goal? Then compare that to how many shows are reaching that goal in Championship and say, OK, given what our economic realities are, here's what we want to do and maybe we should look at some other threshold for the Championship, as well, just because that seems to be the other class that just never reaches that threshold. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Shafnisky:** I don't know if anybody else has comments. **Miller:** OK, Mark. **Hannon:** The end of October, we're half way through the show season. Perhaps we could ask Donna Jean and the Central Office to come up with some numbers for us on Kittens, Championship, Premiership and Household Pets, how many reach various thresholds. How many shows have reached 150 in Championship, how many have reached 140, 130, whatever, so that we can look at these and say, well, we want some shows to be able to offer top 15. We still want it to be somewhat unique, but we don't want to say there's only been one show the whole year that's going to be eligible to do that. Same with Household Pets. We don't want to say that it's just not a realistic number to say 45 if nobody's reaching 45, so let's find out what is, you know, happening at our shows the first 6 months of the season. Donna Jean, is that something that makes sense? **Miller:** I like the idea of getting some data before we talk about it. Is this something that the delegates should maybe have a chance to discuss? **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Shafnisky:** We're not talking about passing anything. We're just, again, this is just discussion to see whether it would be appropriate to discuss some kind of change to the top 15 standard, as Mark describes. **Eigenhauser:** This is George. I agree with Alene. The idea here is not necessarily for the board to take action, but to present information to the delegation so they can make an intelligent and informed decision. A few other things I want to mention is that it might be relatively easy to get these numbers for championship, kitten and premier, but since Central Office doesn't score Household Pets, there will be a certain amount of hands going through the catalogs to get this information. **Shafnisky:** That's why I thought Monte might be able to get us that information. **Eigenhauser:** Right. And the other thing I want to mention is, I don't know if you guys are aware of it, but we're still only doing top 5 in Household Pets in our show rules. Six through ten is optional. Maybe it's time to revisit that issue because, you know, it's been awhile since I have shown a Household Pet, but I

remember always being cranky when some club somewhere would have their top 5, even though they have 20 or 25 Household Pets. **Hannon:** OK, so bring that up to Monte. **Eigenhauser:** This is something I think we should just toss out to Monte, get the information, and then we can see where we go from there, but knowledge is good. I agree with Alene. Let's get the information and then let's see what happens with it. **Hannon:** But I would like to look at the information for more than just the Household Pets. I think if we're going to look at top 15, let's look at it across the board and get the data for all of those classes. **Eigenhauser:** Absolutely. **Miller:** OK. I think that's very clear. Anyone else have anything on that? **Hannon:** Is Donna Jean on the call? Is she listening to this? **Thompson:** Yes, I'm here. **Miller:** Oh, good. OK. **Hannon:** So, do you understand what we're looking for? **Thompson:** Yes. You want the data for the shows, the number of cats entered in each category – championship, kittens, premiership and Household Pets. **Hannon:** Right. We want it in some sort of categorization. How many shows got 45 or more Household Pets? How many got 40 or more? 35 or more? So, we can look at – what we ought to really consider is a revised number for the show rules. **Miller:** I think we should have some history so that we know whether this is going down dramatically or just a little bit or not going down at all. We want a perspective in that regard. **White:** Do you want her to look at a couple of years? **Miller:** Yeah, I think we should. **Hannon:** Not for Household Pets. Like Alene or somebody said, that's manual. We've got all the rest of the data in the computer and it spits it out for Monte to do his statistical article each year, but the Household Pets are something that's got to be manually researched. I don't know that that's – **Miller:** I don't think we need it for household pets, but I think for kittens and championship and premiership, it would be valuable to get a feel for the trend. **Hannon:** Alright, but that's not something – I want Donna Jean to understand that's not something that she has to do. Monte's already got that, so she could ask Monte to do the championship, premiership and kittens. All we want from Donna Jean is the Household Pets for, my suggestion was, the first six months of the show season. Do you want to go further than that, since it has to be manually researched? **Miller:** No. That should be enough for Household Pets, I think. **Shafnisky:** I think we have to do at least a full year. We've been asking for special permission for top 15 for Household Pets for awhile now. I think at least one full year has to be looked at because, you know, if we just look at the past 6 months, that may not include shows in January that promote Household Pets. **Hannon:** OK, so you want to look at November 2010 through the end of October 2011? **Shafnisky:** I would like to. I would really like to see sort of last season's data and this season's data so far. I'm not sure that it's going to – the officials that have the information will probably have it for last year, as well. **Eigenhauser:** Donna Jean, how hard would it be to do all of last year's Household Pets and year-to-date for Household Pets? Is that doable? **Thompson:** I don't think we keep any records in the computer for something like that. **Hannon:** No. No, you would have to go to the catalogs. **Eigenhauser:** You have to physically go to the catalogs. **Thompson:** The catalogs, and I'm wondering what no one has mentioned. I think most of the regions have their own Household Pet scorer. **Shafnisky:** Yes. **Thompson:** Those people may have those records. **Shafnisky:** That's what I thought. Let me go to Monte and also to Beth Cassely and see if maybe it was her. I know she does that points book that has a compilation. Maybe we can figure it out a different way, as far as the Household Pets. **Meeker:** Alene? **Shafnisky:** Yes. **Meeker:** Alene, this is Ginger. My Household Pet scorer has been doing that task for almost 5 years now and – **Shafnisky:** For the entire nation? **Meeker:** Kendall Smith. **Hannon:** For her region. **Meeker:** And she's got it by region, so you might want to contact her and see what she has. **Eigenhauser:** The problem is, we still have one region that doesn't score Household Pets. **Shelton:** True. If we can knock this test down somewhat, to only have to have Central Office go through the catalogs for that region, it will still make it a lot easier, because I think Ginger's right. I've had the same person in Region 5 doing this for a long time, as well, and I'm sure she's going to have records. **Caell:** Right, and I have a person in

Region 3, Toni Huff. She's done this before and she picked it back up again. She is calculating everything. **Shafnisky:** And that's fine if we want to just get, you know, the information on the championship classes from CFA and then just send the information for all your regional Household Pet people, we can probably figure it out. **Hannon:** Monte already has the – **Miller:** Monte has the championship and kittens and premiership. **Hannon:** Right, because he does a statistical wrap-up each show season, so he's got it through the end of last show season. **Shafnisky:** That's fine. That's fine. **Meeker:** This is Ginger. Why don't you put together a list of the questions that you want answered and send it to the RD's and then we can forward it to our Household Pet scorer and see what we can pull together for you? **Shafnisky:** OK. **Roy:** I think that works. **Miller:** OK. Any more on that topic?

(6) INCREASE DELEGATE FEE.

At the GSR Fundraiser Show the R3 2014 Annual Committee met to start the ball rolling. One of the requests to bring in additional revenue for CFA was to increase the delegate fee. Currently it is \$20.00. Some members thought it should be raised to \$100 and some thought it should be only a slight increase. But everyone felt the fee should be raised.

When the Annual Meeting Responsibilities committee met this past week I brought it up with them for discussion and they were in agreement to increase the fee as well.

Generally, most think the fee should be raised no more than \$10.00. If it goes too high, we could lose delegates from those clubs that are on the brink of folding.

It's been several years since the fee was increased and perhaps this would be a good time to raise it to \$30.00. We will have to have the vote at the annual since it would require a change to the constitutional amendment, but I'd like to have this discussion at the meeting tomorrow night, if possible.

Miller: Then Ann, you mentioned the raising of the delegate fee and you mentioned I think \$20, so let's have a little talk about that. Why don't you start out? **Caell:** OK. We had a meeting at one of our shows recently of the annual group for our 2014 Annual, and this came up as a means of increasing revenue for CFA and also helping with the annual. The current fee now is \$20 and Carla, you were in on the call when we went to the annual meeting group there last weekend. I don't know first of all how long ago the fees were raised to \$20. Does anybody know? It's been several years. **Anger:** Yeah. It was Debbie Kusy's motion, so it was some time ago. Probably 2004 or 2005. **Baugh:** It was \$20 in 2008 when we did it in Louisville, I know that. **Caell:** That was just 3 years ago. **Baugh:** It was prior to that. **Caell:** It's been 3 years ago right now, as of today, but I'm just thinking that might be a way to bring in some addition revenue that would help offset some of the costs that the regions will have in putting together the annual – putting it together, because you figure you have 400 delegates and you get an extra \$10 out of the revenue that's coming in for that, so that's going to go a long way as far as helping out with the annual and the delegate – not only the delegate bags, but other aspects of the annual, too, so it could be something we could work with perhaps. I'm just tossing it out there for discussion if anybody was interested. I thought it was a good way to raise money. Granted, it's got to be a constitutional amendment and we have to go through proper channels to get it proposed and written up and all that stuff, but this is just a discussion tonight. So, does anybody have any thoughts or ideas? **Eigenhauser:** George here. Yeah, George has a comment. **Miller:** Go ahead, George. **Eigenhauser:** I like the idea of moving some of the burden off of the regions and more national. I've mentioned before, one of the things I really regretted about being regional director was back in 2002, the early part of 2002, and every show I went to, I was

hawking something; it was raffle tickets or it was calendars or it was some other piece of bric-a-brac that I was trying to sell exhibitors in order to raise money for the 2002 annual. That shouldn't be the primary function of a regional director. They need to be more than fundraisers for the annual and I understand that the regions want to be able to give their own color and their own flavor at each annual, and I appreciate that. Some regions have done a very good job. I really liked the Southern Region annual, but by the same token, if we can take some of the burden off the regions and shift some of the cost elsewhere, that frees up regional directors to do other things in their region, like dealing with clubs and dealing with show scheduling and carrying on their role as board members on various committees. If you don't ask, you don't get. There's no harm in asking the delegation if they are willing to go along with it, and if they say no, they say no. **Caell:** Yeah. We had this discussion and one of the members of the Gulf Shore Region said, "I think we should raise it to \$100", and I thought that we won't have any clubs bringing delegates at all. But Ginger and Sharon and I, and Carla, are on this Annual Meeting Responsibility Committee now, so all this, we discussed this all last week, too, and part of what we discussed was shifting some of the responsibility from the region back to the CO. For instance, the rosettes now, last year I guess they were ordered by the region and then paid for by CFA. That sort of thing we need to look at. We're in the process now of going through this 57 page manual that Jodell put together for us and determining what we could – we're discussing what we think maybe we should talk to the Central Office about as far as taking back and giving us some, you know, relief from some of these responsibilities. When Region 7 had their annual, CFA was in the middle of this major move and everything, so a lot of that responsibility shifted over to your region, Mark, and you did a wonderful job with everything. There's no question about it. Maybe it's time to look at giving some of this back, responsibility. **Hannon:** It was also a unique time because it was the first annual without Allene Tartaglia, and she had done an awful lot of the work on previous annuals. Without Allene's expertise, the Central Office didn't have it so the region just sort of – Jerry assigned it to the region to pick up. **Caell:** Yeah. **Meeker:** I think that was one of the main reasons that the annual manual was compiled. All those tasks and duties have never been really outlined and plotted before. When you look at that thing, it truly is a daunting task. **Hannon:** We had the advantage, though, of access to Allene Tartaglia and her notes and her brain, so we picked her brain a lot. Is that not true, Donna Jean? **Thompson:** Definitely. **Caell:** It helps that she's in your region. **Miller:** Well, would this be something that we want to propose at the board? A proposal for the annual for a particular amount of money? **Caell:** I'm just tossing it out. We thought maybe \$5 to \$10. \$10, would that be too high? Too much to ask? **Miller:** I think \$10 is good. It would give about \$4,000 more for the annual. That's not going to take care of all the problems. **Caell:** It will help. **Miller:** It will cover something. **Hannon:** One less raffle they have to do. **Roy:** Less calendars. **Caell:** Yeah. I mean, it can all go for different projects and different aspects of the annual, but if we increase it to \$30 for the delegate fee, I think that would make a big dent. **Hannon:** Ann, are you – **Meeker:** Can we do that without delegate approval? **Hannon:** No, you can't but the board can make a proposal or a constitutional amendment. **Miller:** I would say that included in the proposal should be that the money is used for annual expenses, not for anything else. **Eigenhauser:** I think it was 2004 that it got raised. **Bizzell:** Oh, that long ago. **Hannon:** Do we want to make that motion tonight, or do we want to sit on it for awhile? **Eigenhauser:** We can make the motion that somebody bring back a proposed resolution to the next meeting. **Caell:** OK. I'll do that. You want me to? **Miller:** Anyone want to second it? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. **Miller:** OK. Any more discussion?

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Miller:** Who is going to come up with the – **Hannon:** Ann is. **Eigenhauser:** Ann is. **Caell:** I'm going to work with some people to get the right wording. **Miller:** You have a committee? Alright.

(7) CAT WRITERS' ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE.

Miller: OK. Then, Rachel, you put the Cat Writers' Association Conference on the agenda, so why don't you start on that topic? **Anger:** Alright. Unfortunately, they are having the conference the same weekend as our National Show and I believe it's the same weekend as the Meet the Breeds that AKC is doing with the TICA. I am aware that there are some CFA people that are going to go to Meet the Breeds because they live there anyway. Because of our CWA sponsorship, we get a couple of tickets and they were hoping that we would have a speaker that would speak for from 5 to 15 minutes, so this is what I am looking for some information on, if anybody is aware of somebody that might want to attend that could speak on CFA's behalf. Joan, you have been to those conferences in the past. **Miller:** Yes. I used to go to every one of them until we had Meet the Breeds. The main thing is that the very last award given at the end of the whole banquet is the CFA President's Award. It's very good because the president decides among all the other award winners which the president personally liked as far as an article or a book or a video or a website or whatever the categories are. Because it is a CFA award and it's the most important one, really, and the final thing of the evening. When I was there, I always was the one that made the presentation on behalf of CFA and spoke about how important the Cat Writers' Association was to CFA and to the cat world, etc. I think last year I tried very, very hard to get someone to go and I believe Allene did it. **Eigenhauser:** Allene is going to be there this year, too, right? **Miller:** She is now the Treasurer of the Cat Writers' Association but she can't speak on behalf of CFA very easily. **Hannon:** Why not? **Miller:** Because she doesn't work for CFA anymore. **Hannon:** She still could represent us. **Miller:** Yes, she could. **Hannon:** She didn't work for us last year. Didn't you say she was there last year? **Miller:** I think she was the one that went last year. **Anger:** I think it was Karen Lawrence that went. **Miller:** Oh, that could be. Yeah, it might have been Karen that actually made that award. I think Allene was there, but I think Karen may have made the award. Well, I don't know. Maybe we could put it out on the CFA News asking if someone will be attending. **Eigenhauser:** The problem is, you don't know who is going to volunteer and then you've got to turn them down if they're not the right person. **Miller:** Yeah, I know. That's true. **Anger:** One person I know that is attending the Meet the Breeds deal is Julie Keyer. **Hannon:** That doesn't help if she's going to Meet the Breeds. Is this in conjunction with Meet the Breeds? **Miller:** It's in White Plains. It would be hard to go from New York City to White Plains. **Hannon:** There's a TICA show in White Plains that weekend. **Anger:** Oh, it's at the TICA show. **Miller:** The TICA show is always – yes, they put it in conjunction with a TICA show the last couple of years, but then they are also having Meet the Breeds so I was wondering how they were going to cover both events. **Hannon:** Ironically, I talked to the regional director in TICA and she told me that ironically a lot of the people that attend that TICA show are CFA people. They go there to sell kittens because they get a tremendous gate at that show. So, they don't think there's going to be any problem with having a successful show in White Plains and working Meet the Breeds. **White:** I know AKC is not happy about a cat show event not far from Meet the Breeds. **Hannon:** Yeah, but the cat show came first. White Plains has been traditional. **Miller:** Can we maybe privately try to find out someone that's going to be there? Maybe just some of us put out some feelers? I have no idea who is going. **Hannon:** Well, it's in Sharon's region. Sharon, do you have any way to find out who might be going to the show, as opposed to Meet the Breeds? **Roy:** Yeah. Let me see what I can find out and get back to you. There are a lot of Region 1 people that go to that TICA show. **Hannon:** There might be somebody that would be quite good at representing us at the Cat Writers' Association. **Roy:** Right. **Miller:** Well, there are going to be some excellent talks, as there always are, and now one of the good things about the Cat Writers' Association is that next year's conference is going to be in Los Angeles and it's also going to be on a different date. It's

the first weekend of November. I already have it in my calendar because there's no – I would love to go to it, and so we won't have this conflict again. I believe they are planning at least two years in LA. I don't know what they will do after that, and then again, Mike, are you aware of this and do you know if there's any show that there's going to be? I would like it to be in conjunction with a CFA show, rather than a TICA show if we can do it. Are you aware of it at all? **Shelton:** I hadn't heard about it. In general, the first weekend in November is dark in Region 5 because it's a traditional date for a bay area show and we haven't scheduled against that. That's Santa Clara Valley's date. We can – Ginger and I can talk about whether or not we want to change that for next year because of this, and whether Santa Clara would be amenable to maybe changing with somebody else. They're not doing a show – or, they didn't do a show this year. They're not doing a show this year but they are scheduled beyond that. **Miller:** I'll forward anything that I get on the conference and the plans to you and to Ginger so that we can start thinking about next year. I don't think we'll have any problems with people attending next year. Maybe that's one of the reasons why they want to get back to a weekend that's free and maybe a weekend that we could have a CFA show in conjunction with it. That would be great. So, anyway, we can talk about that later but I think we've got a direction on this. Sharon, you can let us know what's going on with someone in your region and otherwise we'll just have to – I mean, if it isn't someone right in Region 1, maybe there's someone that wants to fly in to the conference from another region. George used to like to go to it. It's very important for us in the legislative world. **Eigenhauser:** I could drive down to it. **Miller:** I don't mean Los Angeles, I mean this year. **Hannon:** This year, in New York. **Eigenhauser:** This year, there's nothing I can do. **Miller:** This year is a problem, but it doesn't have to be Region 1. I mean, maybe there's someone that didn't get into the show that would be willing to go to the conference from, say, Region 7 or Washington D.C. area. It's not that far away. So, maybe Mark, you could put out some feelers, too. **Hannon:** Yeah. **Miller:** OK.

Anger: There's one other issue on this. Regardless of whether or not we send somebody, we are also entitled to a sign or a banner at the event. Are there generally signs or banners of the sponsors up at the CWA conference, Joan? **Miller:** Yeah, they do have signs – logos and things. I don't remember that they were all that prominent, but I do remember that there were some there. **Hannon:** Do we have one? **Anger:** I don't think we did last year. We didn't have much of a presence at all, but she is inviting us to have a sign or a banner this year. **Hannon:** Can we assign that to the Central Office to create one and have it sent to them? **Miller:** Yeah. We may need to get some more information. Maybe just our logo on a poster board might be enough. I don't remember exactly what the banners were. **Hannon:** I know that in the past we have had pieces of fabric with the CFA logo on it, and it's probably not the most current logo, but we've had them at the International Show, for example, hanging from pipe and drape in the Best in Show ring. Maybe something similar to that with the latest logo on it. But it looks like we are going to have to act quickly on that because it's just a couple weeks off. **Meeker:** Joan? **Miller:** Yes. **Meeker:** For a banner, this is in Region 7? **Hannon:** No, 1. **Miller:** This is in Region 1. **Miller:** 1, OK. What about the use of the CFA – what are we calling it – display banner for the region? **Hannon:** That's an 8 foot by 5 foot thing and it doesn't sound like that's what they are talking about. **Meeker:** Oh, OK. I didn't hear what the size dimension was. I thought that might be a good use for it. **Miller:** As I recall, they just have a collection of everybody that's a sponsor; something to indicate that they are sponsoring it. Just a logo or some small thing, but I think we need more information and maybe it is something that the Central Office could handle. I think it's well worth it. **Hannon:** Maybe Rachel could send that correspondence to Donna Jean, and Donna Jean can continue the correspondence with the Cat Writers' Association and find out the specifics of what they want in the way of a banner so that we can provide it. **Miller:** I think

that's a good idea. **Anger:** Sure, I can do that. **Miller:** OK. **Hannon:** Is that alright with Donna? **Thompson:** Sure, that's fine. I would like to do it as quick as possible because we're also finishing working on the signs for the National Show and it would be best to do them all at once. **Miller:** That's right. **Hannon:** OK. So, Rachel will get that off to you tonight, I'm sure. **Anger:** I did. I hit send.

(8) CLUB APPLICATIONS.

The following Club Applications report prepared by **Club Membership Chair Liz Watson** was presented.

Committee Chair: Liz Watson

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Presented new clubs applying to the CFA to be approved by the Board.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Two new clubs have applied for membership into the CFA. They are:

*Nutmeg Cat Fanciers: Region One
Cats 'N Cats: International Division – Europe (France)*

Two clubs that were tabled in October are now presented

*Tokyo Sky Tree Cat Club: Region Eight
Chengdu Cat Club: International Division—Asia (China)*

NUTMEG CAT FANCIERS' INC: REGION ONE

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twenty-one members. This is a reinstatement of an old club that was dropped because a membership list was not sent in. The regional director supports this club. The president and treasurer reside at the same address. This is an Allbreed club which plans to sponsor one show a year. Dues have been set and should the club disband, excess funds will be donated to an organization consistent with the guidelines set by the CFA. Several members are members of other clubs.

CATS N' CATS: INTERNATIONAL DIVISION, EUROPE

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are eleven members,; no members are members of other clubs They do not plan to incorporate. This is an allbreed club which wishes to put on one/two shows a year in the Paris area. The dues have been set and if disbanded, monies will be donated to an organization consistent with the guidelines of the CFA. The International chair supports this club with a caveat.

TOKYO SKY TREE CAT CLUB: REGION EIGHT

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twenty members of which six belong to other clubs. There are no members that are officers/directors of other clubs. This is an Allbreed

club which hopes to put on a show in Tokyo once a year. The dues have been set and should the club disband monies will be donated to the Winn Foundation. The Regional Director supports this club.

CHENGDU CAT CLUB: INTERNATIONAL DIVISION

Constitution and by-laws are in order. There are thirteen members with none belonging to other clubs. This is an Allbreed club with no plans to incorporate. The club intends to do charity work to promote cats and to put on a show once a year. Dues are set and should the club disband, monies will be donated to a charity for stray cats. The Asian liaison supports this club.

Future Projections for Committee:

Process and submit new club applications for consideration by the Board

Time Frame:

November, 2011 to December, 2011

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

All new clubs that have applied for membership

*Respectfully Submitted,
Liz Watson, Chair*

Miller: Now, the new clubs. Who is going to handle that? There was a situation of whether they were pre-noticed or not. Who wants to take the lead on discussing that? **Hannon:** Why doesn't Sharon, since Sharon has a specific interest in Nutmeg. [**Bizzell** leaves the conference] **Miller:** Oh, that's right. **Roy:** That is right. I don't have a problem with sending back the other clubs. I just, you know, felt that this club – they really aren't changing much of anything. They were an existing club for, I don't know, 50 years approximately. **Hannon:** Is it basically the same people, though? Because when I used to go to the show, all those people died. **Roy:** It's almost all the same people. Priscilla had originally – Priscilla and Carl Eldridge had kept it going, and then they had Katia Kingston take over as president and then she had some personal issues and that's where the ball fell. But, the rest of the club is all really the same people that have in the club a long time. **Hannon:** It seems like a large enough group. **Miller:** And it also seems like they are all just members of Nutmeg practically. Very few of them are even in any other club. I think, considering they are thinking of a February show, I certainly think we should consider making an exception for that club, but going along with what others have said, that we need to have ample time for input on these clubs that are applying. I think we could make an exception for Nutmeg. **Hannon:** Aren't two of the four clubs hold-over's from the last meeting, since we wanted more information? **Anger:** They weren't pre-noticed for that meeting, either. **Hannon:** Alright, so you're talking about pre-noticing all three of the other clubs, and just talking about perhaps accepting Nutmeg tonight? Is that what we're talking about? **Miller:** Yes, that's what I think. **Hannon:** Maybe Sharon should make a motion. **Roy:** I make a motion that we accept Nutmeg Cat Club and the second part of the motion is, the other clubs will be held off for, I would think, another two months to be pre-noticed, so they would be in the January meeting. **Miller:** That would be fine. **Eigenhauser:** Second.

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried. Miller:** OK, that carried.

Roy: This is Sharon again. I do want to say we accepted a club last time – it’s fine, it was a breed club – but I heard from a lot of people in my region because they didn’t know anything about the club. Unfortunately, I didn’t know anything about the club, either. There was no way to tell people, so I think we really do need a chance to get that information out. **Miller:** Right. I think so, too, and I certainly think that Darrell needs to talk about the international clubs and give us some idea of what some of the people that are behind them, and Dick Kallmeyer, too.

(9) CLUB NAME CHANGE.

Current Name: Michicat Pet Club
Proposed Name: Motor City Jazz Club
Region: Great Lakes (Region 4)
Conflict w/Existing Names: None
Reason: More appropriate name

Miller: OK, I think we have covered the advancement part. Does anyone have anything else they want to talk about? **Wilson:** There was a club name change on here. **Miller:** Yeah, that’s right, there was. Club name change, and the proposed name was Motor City Jazz Club, from Michicat Pet Club. Is this Region 4? **Baugh:** I don’t have any problem with that. I think it’s very good that they are making this club active again and would support the change. **Miller:** OK. Does anyone want to make a motion about it? **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I just wanted to throw something quick out there. I think in the time since this club formed, there is now someone with a cattery that’s Michicat, so that could cause confusion, so I think this is a good idea. **Miller:** OK. Any further discussion on it? Is there a second to the motion, or is there a motion? **Eigenhauser:** I’ll second. I’ll call it Rachel’s motion and I’ll second.

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Miller:** OK, that carried.

(10) AGENDA PRE-NOTICE:

Eigenhauser: While we’re on the subject of notice, did the agenda for this meeting ever get out on CFA News? **Hannon:** No. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to move that for our telephonic meetings, that our agenda be put on CFA News at least 24 hours before the meeting. **Miller:** And the reason for that, George, is, you think we need input? **Eigenhauser:** To let people know. Yeah, transparency, openness – a lot of nice words that people toss around that we ought to be following. **Caell:** I’ll second. **Miller:** Do we need to have any more detail than just listing like “Cat Writers’ Association Conference”. No one would know even what we were talking about, really. **Hannon:** Let’s say that the people that provide the suggested agenda items to Rachel have a requirement to give, you know, a sentence or two explanation of what they’re talking about. **Miller:** I think that would be better. If we’re going to put it out there, I think they should have some idea of what – **Eigenhauser:** In the real world, I deal with legislative things and the thing on some city council agenda might be, “accept proposed resolution #27”. That’s their idea of pre-noticing something, so I understand. On the other hand, how do you explain how much is enough information? I think if we could get it out there, we can use common sense as to how much information is needed to explain what it is we’re going to talk about. **Hannon:** It’s going to vary. I mean, like we talk about the Judging Program. If all we’re going to talk about is advancements, then we don’t need a lot of detail. **Miller:** That’s true. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Miller:** Let’s give it a try. **Anger:** Can I say that I am taking this in the spirit that this will help define my job, while on the other hand reiterating the sword I have thrown myself on several times already, that I was on vacation the last part of last week and, you know, when you get back

to work on a Monday, I would have loved to have had it out like I always do, but there was this issue with clubs that I spent a great deal of time Monday trying to figure out. **Miller:** I really think everybody totally understands this, Rachel. I mean, this has nothing to do with this particular agenda or anything else. I just think it's something that people are wanting for transparency, in general. **Eigenhauser:** If nothing else, it might focus people on getting their agenda items on at least 24 hours before the meeting. **Miller:** That's right. **Eigenhauser:** It now creates a deadline. **Miller:** Right. And if Rachel is taking a vacation, then they have to be aware of that and get them even sooner. **Hannon:** My suggestion would be, our meetings are generally on Tuesday nights. Why don't we say, by 6:00 Friday we have to have our agenda items in to Rachel? That gives her the weekend to pull it together, Monday we can send out a CFA News notice. **Caell:** You mean, she works on the weekends? **Miller:** Yes, she does. **Eigenhauser:** Can we just make it a clean motion that was originally made, that we get it out at least 24 hours before and we'll let Rachel work on what kind of lead time she needs. We can deal with that as we come to it. **Miller:** Let's see how it goes. **Shafnisky:** Can you hear me? Hello? **Miller:** Go ahead. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I have a question that kind of goes a little bit back to the Judging Program but it ties into this. First of all, I agree, because I sent Rachel a mess of a statement for my line item and I should have been better about that, but I'm wondering, and maybe, Loretta, you can clear this up for me, if people can send input? I think some people would appreciate knowing who is up for acceptance when, because sometimes what I've found in actually several occasions now, we have judges who have already been accepted and maybe someone joins CFA after that happens and then they never really know who or when to send input. You know, maybe they have something to say about the person, I don't know if it's too late. I'm all for if they have a complaint, they have to make a written complaint to the JPC so that the person can respond to it, but can that be added as the advancements and some kind of statement as to whether it's appropriate for people to make a comment if they have one, instead of just waiting on, as we have discussed, the club evaluations which aren't always the most accurate things. **Miller:** – 24 hours before a meeting. **Hannon:** Are we talking about new judges? **Shafnisky:** Yes. Yes, as they are being advanced. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol. I think Alene is talking about judges that are – **Miller:** Let's talk one at a time. Carol. **Krzanowski:** I think Alene is talking about judges that are up for advancement within the program, not new applicants. Is that right, Alene? **Shafnisky:** That's correct. Sometimes, depending on how someone progresses through the program. Let's say somebody is in the program and is doing one specialty and a new breeder joins and something bad happens and they figure – most people right now figure, "oh, they're already accepted so there's nothing I can say." I don't know if that's true or not, quite frankly, but I thought maybe if their names were up and it said, "hey, so-and-so is up for advancement at this meeting", especially if we had a little bit more lag time – a couple of weeks maybe – and said, you know, if someone can send in a written, signed statement so the judge can obviously respond to it, that might actually be a good thing. Maybe that will give Rachel more time, as well, for the agenda. We'll give a cut-off there because we need to get feed-back if there is any to be had. Or, should we be directing these people to write to the JPC? I'm not even sure really what the correct answer is here. **Miller:** My concern is that anybody that writes us about judges being advanced, the judge needs to have some opportunity to apply. I don't think the agenda would matter. **Shafnisky:** That's why we would say it would be several weeks in advance that it would have to be written, and then it would have to be at least two weeks for the judge to be able to respond to it, or else we wouldn't even take it up. **Eigenhauser:** My suggestion would be, why don't we refer questions about how that is handled, to the Judging Program Committee and let them kind of explain what the process is, but let's just vote on the motion as made now, because we seem to be drifting now into making changes to notice requirements in the Judging Program. All we're talking about – **Shafnisky:** I was just thinking of

putting the names on the agenda for when it's published, so like today's agenda would have said, "Judging Program Applications, potential advancements" and then put a name. **Eigenhauser:** But that would have been too late for comment under our current rules, because it wouldn't give them a chance to reply back with a comment. **Miller:** Yeah, that's what I'm concerned about. **Shafnisky:** I see what you're saying. We can refine it. **Miller:** Loretta, do you have any comments on this? **Baugh:** Yeah. I think there's a process in place if people have a problem. That's not a door I would be real willing to open, because they had the opportunity when they applied, they had an opportunity at any time to voice a complaint. If it's serious, they can file a protest or a letter of concern and we have a regular process in place for that. Then, we're going to run into having – here again, having the opportunity to respond. **Shafnisky:** It would happen if it was a situation where it was the same complaint. It would not even be looked at. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Baugh:** We have not ever done that. To me, a complaint is a complaint and I think we would be holding people back from advancing while we are waiting for responses to letters. I have a real issue with doing that. I think the system that we have works. **Shafnisky:** OK. **Baugh:** I have no problem listing their name so that people know they are coming up, but at this point I wouldn't be comfortable soliciting information from them. The clubs are the ones that are hiring them and the clubs are the ones that are evaluating them. I think maybe the better road to go is, maybe look at the evaluation process a little differently. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Shafnisky:** I think we need to tell our exhibitors that writing a letter is the appropriate solution at any time, really. **Baugh:** Right. **Hannon:** What I would prefer to do is to put in one of the monthly newsletters a blurb that Loretta would write letting exhibitors know that the Judging Program is open to their input. You know, if they have positive or negative comments to make at any time, please feel free to submit them and tell them to whom they should be sent. **Baugh:** No problem. **Hannon:** That way, if there's an incident, long before they're up for advancement, the judge has been notified, the judge has had a response and then the board is going to be aware of both the complaint and the response at the appropriate time. **Shafnisky:** I think that's more what I hear, is that exhibitors just don't know. They feel they can't make a complaint because they don't know how, so I think that's a really good idea. **Hannon:** And I think that we ought to say that even if it's an approved allbreed judge who is not up for advancement, they are still up for relicensing every year and the Program is open to receiving comments, pro or con, about a particular judge. **Baugh:** Absolutely. I like that. Not a problem. **Miller:** Someone else? **Meeker:** Yes, this is Ginger. I had a question for Loretta on the Judging Program. **Eigenhauser:** Before we – excuse me. Before we change the subject, there's a motion pending that's been made and seconded. Could we discuss the motion before we – **Miller:** Is there a motion on the agenda item? **Eigenhauser:** Yes, there was. **Miller:** OK. Alright, then let's call that one. **Hannon:** That we publish it 24 hours in advance via the CFA News. **Miller:** We were talking about the agenda. It was – you are talking about the motion on the agenda item? **Hannon:** Correct. **Miller:** OK then, let's get that over with. The motion was that the agenda would be at least 24 hours made available to the board members, right? **Eigenhauser:** No, published in CFA News. **Hannon:** Published in CFA News. **Miller:** Sorry, published in the CFA News. Yeah, that's right. OK. Any more discussion on that?

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Miller:** OK, that carried.

(11) **BOARD EMAIL LIST:**

Miller: Now, I have one thing I would like to talk about. It's not a big thing, but I am finding it very difficult with our board list because somehow it was changed so that it no longer says [CFABoardList] and when I come on my computer, I have sometimes 150-200 emails and I

have to search for board issues. I used to be able to just pull up in my search [CFABoardList] and all the emails would come up and I could take care of them all together. I don't know if other people have that problem, but I sure wish that we – I don't know why that happened. Maybe somebody can say why, but I wish we could go back to that. Do you understand what I'm talking about? **Meeker:** Um-um. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I can tell you one problem I've had recently, because Android has updated their platform and now when I hit reply to a mailing list, it automatically does a dual reply all to a whole bunch of the people on the list. **Miller:** I don't have an Android. **Shafnisky:** It might be something you could be manually checking and making sure you're not sending the emails twice to the same people. Because I know that's happening when I'm sending some of my emails. **Hannon:** Sharon is running into that, because I'm getting duplicates from Sharon. **Roy:** Yeah, I'm running into that, too. **Krzanowski:** I've had that problem, as well. This is Carol. **Caell:** So have I. **Miller:** I can't comment about Android, but I really wish we could go back to the – I don't know how it was changed or why it was changed, where we would have, on the subject it would say [CFABoard] and then it had the subject, so all I would have to do is put in my search, either "board" or "CFABoard" and they would all come up. **Hannon:** Joan? **Miller:** Yes. **Hannon:** Can I suggest that you discuss it with Connie [Sellitto] since I'm sure Connie is the one that sets up these mail lists. **White:** Are you asking what the issue or what the change was? **Miller:** Yes. **White:** All the lists were managed through exit109. **Miller:** Yes. **White:** Now that we have kind of moved away from exit109, it's set up through Outlook now, so the mailing list is managed through Outlook versus exit109. **Hannon:** Perhaps there is something Connie can do to put in the subject – is that where you want it, Joan? In the subject line? **Miller:** Yeah. It used to be, the prefix of the subject was always in parenthesis, [CFABoard]. **Hannon:** Right, and then perhaps there is something Connie can do. It's worth asking Connie. **Miller:** Alright. I didn't know Connie was still helping us on the IT thing. **Hannon:** Yes. **White:** Actually, that would need to go to Dennis. Send it to me, Joan, and I'll talk to Dennis about it. **Miller:** Alright. That would be great. I guess, I don't know if I'm the only one that has that problem, but because of Legislation and Outreach and everything, I just get a huge number of emails every day, and I can't find what the – I mean, I have to search everybody's name to find any emails from any of you. It's just a pain. **Eigenhauser:** Joan? **Miller:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** I had the same problem when it first switched over, but in Outlook I can change it, so that rather than sorting into my board members folder, based on having that specific wording in the subject line, get sorted into the board member folder based on the board member list being the sender. I think part of the problem is, you're on AOL. **Miller:** Yeah, that is the problem, I know. I can't do that on AOL. I wish I could. **Eigenhauser:** I'm sure there's a way to do it on AOL. You've just got to find somebody that got their first computer when dinosaurs walked the earth and they're still on AOL. **Miller:** Everybody I know just calls it AO-hell and they won't do anything about it. As you know, the only reason why I stick with it is because I've got over 5,000 contacts in AOL and I don't want to – I have not been able to transfer them out. **White:** You can go to gmail, and gmail has a transfer option where you can just move everything over, which is what I did recently. **Miller:** Did you move AOL over? **White:** Yep. **Hannon:** All the contacts on AOL? **White:** Yep, yep. **Hannon:** Maybe the two of you can talk later, and you can help Joan do that. **Miller:** OK, great David. Then you're going to have to help me with it.

(12) **NATIONAL SHOW – TOP 15 IN PREMIERSHIP:**

Miller: Anybody else have any other items? **Hannon:** Yes. I have a couple. One of them had to do with top 15 in Premiership at the National Show. We won't know until Monte closes on the 14th whether we actually have 75 cats entered in Premiership, which would permit top 15.

He said it's bouncing back and forth between 74, 75, 76, so I would like to move that, regardless of how many cats we have entered in premiership at the National Show, that we award top 15. We know it's going to be in the ballpark of 75. **White:** Why don't we know, if the show is already closed? **Hannon:** Because people are doing substitutions. **Eigenhauser:** When is the shut-off for substitutions? **Hannon:** The 14th. Monday the 14th, the week of the show. [inaudible due to multiple speakers] I'm sorry? **Shafnisky:** Why don't we just wait until it closes and see what the result is? **Hannon:** Why can't we just vote now and let people know now that there's going to be top 15 and there's no pressure on Monte to have to fiddle with the numbers? People are offering to pull a cat and put in a premier in order to get them to 75 and I just don't think we need to manipulate it that way. If we end up with 74 – **White:** We don't do that with any other show, so why should we do it with this one? **Hannon:** We do all sorts of things. **Shafnisky:** I think we do for the International. **Miller:** We're doing an awful lot for this show that we don't do at other shows. **Eigenhauser:** Any other show is able to close on the Monday before the show or the Tuesday before the show even, and deal with the ambiguity about top 15 in the classes. I don't think that the National Show, you know, 15 rosettes is 15 rosettes, regardless of the show. I don't see that we need to bend this particular rule. Every other club deals with the ambiguity of not knowing what your count is until it closes. The National Show can deal with it just as easily. We don't have to change every rule just because it's the National Show. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol. I agree with that, too. We bent the rules for the International Show, but you have to keep in mind that show is not scored. So, scoring the show puts it on a whole different platform. **Miller:** That's absolutely true. **Hannon:** Well, I've got a motion on the floor. Is there a second? You can vote it down if you want. **Miller:** Is there a second? **Baugh:** I'll second it.

Miller called the motion. **Miller:** I think I'm going to have to ask the names of the people opposing, because I can't really tell. **Krzanowski:** Carol. **Shafnisky:** Alene, as well. **Roy:** Sharon. **Eigenhauser:** George is opposed. **Kallmeyer:** Dick. **Miller:** Carol, Alene, who else? **Kallmeyer:** Dick. **White:** David. **Roy:** Sharon. **Miller:** OK. One, two, three, four, five. **Eigenhauser:** George. **Miller:** George, seven. I guess I don't get to vote, right? **White:** Only in the case of a tie. **Miller:** Wait a minute. I can't hear. **White:** Only if there's a tie, you get to vote. **Miller:** Oh. Is there a tie? One, two, three, four, five, six. I count seven, and we have – Darrell is not here. **Eigenhauser:** How many yeses are there? **Hannon:** Yeah, let's do that. **Miller:** Alright, do the yeses. **Hannon:** Mark. **Anger:** Rachel. **Baugh:** Loretta. **Miller:** Alright, let's do them. Mark, Loretta. Next? **Bizzell:** Carla. **Wilson:** Annette. **Brown:** Roger. **Caell:** Ann. **Meeker:** Ginger. **Shelton:** Mike. **Miller:** That doesn't look like a tie. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. No, that's clearly passed. **Motion Carried.** Krzanowski, Shafnisky, Roy, Eigenhauser and Kallmeyer voted no. **Miller:** OK, then that clearly passed. Then, that means that we will have an unknown on that. **Hannon:** It means we're going to do top 15. **Eigenhauser:** Top 15, regardless of entry. **Miller:** OK, regardless of entry.

(13) CENTRAL OFFICE PROGRESS:

Hannon: The other subject I had was, we're seeing a lot of complaints from people who have taken months to get a cat or a kitten registered, and they're showing these kittens and losing points because they don't have a number back yet. I think we need to give some relief to that. What I would propose is that if somebody can show us it has taken them – pick a number – six weeks – to get a registration number back on a kitten and they've been showing this kitten, that we should be able to give them the points for those shows, and I know that we are doing it in some cases, but I think we ought to have a policy, rather than just base it on somebody complaining to Jerry. **Miller:** Is this problem being rectified? **Hannon:** Well, I'm proposing that

we set a policy of rectifying it. I know that Jerry has told individuals that if they would send him the data to support their claim, that he would grant their kitten points. **Miller:** Well, it should be available to everyone, so I agree with you, Mark. We're going to have to have a policy. **Caell:** Right. This is Ann. **Roy:** Joan, this is Sharon. **Miller:** Yes, Sharon, go ahead. **Roy:** Are we going to do this indefinitely, or just until things straighten out in the Central Office? **Miller:** Well, I can't imagine that indefinitely we're going to have 6 weeks' wait for registrations. Maybe Donna Jean can comment on this. **Thompson:** I'm not aware that anyone has received their points. Our ongoing response has been no. Today, I asked Shirley if, how many cats were involved. Were there a number of cats that had lost a significant value of points? In a very, very cursory glance, it was not that many. **Miller:** How many? **Thompson:** I said it was not that many, in a very cursory glance. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to get the information from Shirley, how many cats are affected, how long it's been going on, how many of them are cats that have happened recently and how much of it is back in June and July before we vote on this. I don't want to just do a blank check. **Hannon:** I know Jerry told me this week – **Eigenhauser:** As part of my motion, then, that Jerry can't do it. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I want to add to that. We can't have individuals on the board, no matter what their title is, randomly telling people in show halls that we're going to change the policy when we haven't even discussed it. I think we have so much to look at here before we make this decision. No one can be saying to an exhibitor yes, we're going to do it. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to make a motion that we adhere to current scoring policy with regard to these cats, but that we ask for information from Shirley and from Donna Jean so that we may consider, as a board, whether or not to make exceptions. **Miller:** Yes, I agree with that, George. That's a good motion. Anyone want to second that? **Shafnisky:** I will second that. This is Alene. I will second that. **Miller:** OK, any more discussion on this? **Caell:** This is Ann. The only discussion I have is, is there something that Jerry could send out and I guess Donna Jean can back it up and Mark can send it out in your newsletter about if the individual, the exhibitor, has sent in the registration form and it's been longer than two weeks or three weeks before they receive it back and they have been directed to contact Donna Jean or Jerry and the Central Office to have them investigate a little bit as to why this registration is 6-8 weeks late or whatever, you know, more than 2 or 3 weeks. I think that I've gotten a lot of comments, a lot of complaints, from people in our region about this. They are all throwing up their hands, like, "well, it doesn't do me any good, I can't get through to anybody." I know Donna Jean and her troupe is doing a wonderful job, everything they can do, but we need to have some guidelines, I think. If there is a deadline, that might help. If you go beyond 3 weeks without getting a response or something. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Miller:** OK Mark. Go ahead. **Hannon:** I would like Donna Jean to address with us now the common complaint that we're hearing, that people aren't answering the phone, they're getting automated responses, people aren't returning calls. What can we tell these people? What are the facts? **Thompson:** Well, the biggest problem we have is, the main time period is between 12:00 and 3:00 as the lunch hour moves across country. During that time, we can have all the phone lines going, but we're really not that overloaded. I realize some people do have difficulty getting through, but during that specific time period, our people have to have their lunch hour, too. They don't all go at once. We have them going on staggered lunch hours so that we can accommodate the customers, but there is that one time period when it's very severe. [inaudible, due to background noise] ... having everyone take time on answering calls and responding, but the biggest problem we have in some of that is the repeated calls. I mean, one day we had someone sending in – a woman sent an email, I took it. Two other people took it. Four hours later, she sent the same request and in the afternoon, 3 of us were in the hallway trying to get the information to solve her problem, because all 3 of us had received individual emails. There is a lot of time wasted when people are doing the same thing. Now, we are trying to address that. We're trying to get the staff to look at the email, the person

that picks it up will email everyone that they sent to, but some of them are slippery little devils. They are blind copying. Several of us will be getting what we think is our single request for help. **Eigenhauser:** Can I speak? **Thompson:** That's our biggest nightmare that we have to deal with. **Eigenhauser:** Can I say one more thing? **Miller:** OK, yes. Is this Mark that wants to say one more thing? **Eigenhauser:** This is George. **Miller:** OK, go ahead, George.

Eigenhauser: We have another problem, and I'm not sure how severe it is, but I know it's coming up. Number one, when people call the old New Jersey phone number, they're not getting a referral to the Alliance – **Thompson:** We know that, George. We know that, George. I have been fighting with the phone company since the end of last week on this. **Eigenhauser:** And people are sending emails – **Thompson:** I've waited as long as 45 minutes and not gotten anywhere. **Eigenhauser:** And people are sending emails – **Miller:** Wait a minute, George. **Eigenhauser:** I'm still speaking. I'm still speaking. I don't appreciate being interrupted. The other problem we're having is that people are still sending emails to email addresses that are no longer being monitored by Central Office. That's one of the complaints I'm getting. "They sent it to so-and-so." Well, so-and-so is not with CFA anymore, but I appreciate Mark getting the word out recently about the new contact numbers at Central Office, the staff phone numbers, their email addresses. I think we really need to beat that and just keep pushing it out there and pushing it out there, as well as our new phone number, because I think part of the frustration is that people are sending the information, they're sending the requests, they are calling a phone number that doesn't exist and they're sending an email to people that don't work there anymore. And if we can eliminate some of those, I think we can eliminate some of the frustration. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Miller:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** Can David or somebody answer a technical question? If something is addressed, an email is addressed to anybody@cfa.org, shouldn't it be able to go to a central person to respond. If it's addressed to, let's say Allene or Merilee, shouldn't it still come in to somebody? **White:** If we have that email address set up in Outlook. That's what you have to remember, we're using Outlook as our vehicle for communication, so I know we set Allene's email up in Outlook. Since she was the previous Executive Director, we know that she gets a lot of email requests and we have those routed to Roeann. **Hannon:** Can you do that for all the old employees? **White:** We would have to have enough licenses to do that. That's going to cost some money to do that, so we didn't want to set every user up. We can't manage the email volume that's coming in now, so I can imagine how things are going to get lost if we start adding people that don't exist. **Hannon:** Do we still have active email addresses, like registrations@cfa.org and publications@ or almanac@ or yearbook@? Are those still active? **White:** Yep. Yep, they are. **Hannon:** So, the ones we're talking about now are ones that are for individual employees that are no longer with CFA. **White:** Yep. People that don't exist anymore. **Hannon:** Alright. What happens with people that have recently left. Let's say, Shawn was dealing with somebody in Europe on registering a cat by pedigree. Shawn left. Does her email now go to Nancy? **Thompson:** Yes. **White:** And that stuff we can do for people that were, you know, set up in Outlook until that person is replaced. Once that person is replaced, they will get their own email account. **Hannon:** You and Donna Jean are saying different things. You are saying, if Shawn leaves and we hired Nancy Gebhard, then Shawn's email goes away. Donna Jean is saying that's not true, that Nancy is getting Shawn's email. **White:** Well, we can define that for a certain period. We don't want her to have to manage two emails, right? **Hannon:** Yeah, you do, as part of good customer service. **White:** Nancy isn't Shawn, though. Why would we want Nancy to continue to get emails under someone else's name? **Hannon:** Because she's got Shawn's job. If somebody is writing Shawn about a work-related item and Nancy is now doing that work, we want Nancy to get it. **White:** People need to know where things need to go. We can't indefinitely have people managing multiple emails. **Eigenhauser:** Let me phrase it a little

bit differently. When we have somebody leave, is there a way to set up an automatic notification on their email address so that when somebody sends an email to that address, they would automatically get a reply that says that's no longer the person to send it to, here is the new address. **Miller:** That's a good idea. **Meeker:** Can an email be forwarded, like an automatic forward like we do with telephones? **White:** That's what we're doing now. I can't hear because somebody has a lot of noise going on. **Miller:** Yeah, I can't hear either. Someone is really rattling papers or chewing potato chips or something. I think George's idea is very good, to let the sender of the email be aware that their email is not going to go through. Then, they can put the new address in their own address book and send a new email. But for them not to hear anything because their email just sort of dies is not good customer service. **White:** Well, actually it bounces back to tell them that it's an invalid email. **Miller:** Yeah, but it doesn't give them politely in a nice way, "here is the proper name for you. In the future, please put it in your address book." **Shelton:** You can do that using the out of office assistant in Outlook. I turn it on every time I go on vacation at work. **Miller:** Even AOL has that. **Hannon:** So David, is that something that you can work on? **White:** If you give me the names. You're just talking about Shawn and Nancy, right? **Hannon:** Well, what about the IT guy? Does he get email? I don't know. **Miller:** Mike. **Meeker:** And Lisa. **White:** Yeah, Michael's is being managed by Dennis. **Hannon:** What about Lisa? Did she get much email, Donna Jean? **Thompson:** Lisa's is switched, as well. **Miller:** Who? **Hannon:** Lisa Sheridan. She left. **Meeker:** I think that was the one on the list that was getting the comment about not being able to get through to her. **Caell:** Open session. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol. In the past when I worked at CFA, if somebody, say somebody who handled clubs – Marion Donahue handled clubs. When she left and Gwen took over clubs, we left Marion's email in place for a certain period of time, but just had it automatically forwarded to Gwen. We didn't do that ongoing forever, but we did it for a few months until people got used to the new person handling the clubs. Couldn't something like that be done? **White:** Yeah, that's what we're doing, except for the people that were in New Jersey. I don't think we did that for New Jersey. **Hannon:** So, you're saying, if people write to Merilee, they just get an email back saying that email address no longer exists? **White:** I don't think they are getting anything. I don't think. **Hannon:** So, they are writing Merilee and waiting for an answer. **White:** Could be. They are getting a response that the email is no longer valid. **Hannon:** Well, that's what I said. So, as long as they are getting something. **Miller:** Yeah, but they really need to know who they should – if they have a problem, they have to know who they should contact. **Hannon:** It would seem to me that an awful lot of the people that deal with CFA are not dealing with CFA every month. They may deal with CFA once a year, once every two years. So, the last person they dealt with is no longer there. Getting a response back saying it's an invalid email address doesn't help them. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol again. That's why we kept that type of a system in place, where we just automatically forwarded to the new person handling those responsibilities. **Hannon:** I don't know that a couple months – **Krzanowski:** We probably did it for something like 3 to 6 months after the former employee had left. **Hannon:** In this case, we're talking about a wholesale loss of staff, not just one person. So I think, you know, we need to set up something and maybe even last longer than 6 months. The current system, I don't think is satisfactory. Just getting an automated response that it's an invalid email address doesn't help. **Krzanowski:** I agree. **Hannon:** We're losing customers over that. **White:** Well, we'll talk to Jerry. If he wants to invest in additional licenses to have everybody that was in New Jersey set up in Outlook so we can forward it to, I guess, whoever is responsible for their previous role or tasks, we can do it. **Hannon:** We need to find out, was every employee in New Jersey getting a fair amount of email, or were there some like Brian that don't get a lot of email? We don't need to set up Pete probably for email forwarding. **Krzanowski:** Right. There were certain people in New Jersey that weren't getting much emails. **Hannon:** So I wouldn't recommend going to the

expense for them, but for people that, you know, dealt with the customers on a regular basis, yeah, I think we need to go to the expense. **Krzanowski:** Key areas. Definitely key areas, yeah. **White:** Well, we should have brought this up a long time ago. **Thompson:** A lot of the emails went through the webmaster, too, and then they would sort them out and send them to various committees if it wasn't something that was on a registration or a Central Office issue. We don't have that in place anymore. **Hannon:** What we had, Donna, was something – there was an email, cfa@cfa.org and Karen Lawrence handled all of that. When Karen left, that process changed. I believe – **Miller:** Mark, the only – go ahead, I'm sorry. **Hannon:** I believe David told me at the time, the primary responsibility for handling that email was Mike. Michael Lynn, the IT guy. Is that his name? **White:** Michael Lynn. **Hannon:** Michael Lynn, and that the webmistress was a back-up. Kathy Durdick was a back-up for that. I don't know what the process is, now that he's gone. Who is handling email that goes to cfa@cfa.org? It's still coming in. What Karen would do would be, she had formatted responses to questions that came in on a regular basis, and if it needed to go to a particular employee, she forwarded it to the regional director or to a staff member to respond, as appropriate. Who is handling that now? Donna Jean, do you know? **Thompson:** They apparently are all going to Donna Lewis. **Hannon:** OK. So, somebody is getting it, and she's responding to them? She is forwarding them to appropriate people for responses or whatever? **Thompson:** As best she can. She's only one person. **White:** Lisa was doing it, right Donna Jean? **Thompson:** No, no. **Miller:** We have the same problem. George and I are dealing with legislation@cfa.org. Anything that comes in that is not really legislation used to be handled by Karen Lawrence. She would reroute it. For instance, we get lots of the Japanese who think "legislation" is "registration". That's the way they pronounce it. We got one today. George answered it. I answer some of them. If both of us are out of town, then no one is going to answer them now because Karen used to do it. I know we've asked Donna Jean if somehow, somebody can be monitoring these. I mean, George and I are trying to keep up with them, but we get several a week. **White:** Alright. We'll take a look at it. Let's move on now. **Miller:** OK.

Miller: Anything else that people can think of that they want to? **Eigenhauser:** Joan, I don't think we ever called the motion. **Miller:** Was there a motion? **Eigenhauser:** Yeah. I made a motion that we continue our present policy regarding whether we score cats without registration numbers, and that we ask that the information be brought to us before we consider making an exception to the policy. **Miller:** OK. Let's see, who seconded that motion? **Shafnisky:** I'll second it. **Miller:** Alright. Let's see. OK. Now, are we going to put a time on this, like 6 weeks that they haven't heard, or do we just – **Eigenhauser:** We're asking to get information back so that we can make a decision about whether to make a 6 week rule or a 2 week rule or a 2 month rule. **Hannon:** Donna Jean said that she was going to get it from Shirley. **Eigenhauser:** Yeah. **Thompson:** I've got a print-out already. It's just going to be a matter of having to go through it. Do you have a threshold on how many points? **Miller:** The question was, whether this should be a new policy or whether it should be a board policy and not just left up to one person to be giving points to kittens. Is that what it was? **Eigenhauser:** My motion was that we adhere to current policy. **Miller:** OK. **Eigenhauser:** But that we ask for a report back from Shirley and Donna Jean so that we can consider formulating an exception. **Miller:** Alright. That sounds good. OK, that we adhere to the current policy, but we ask Shirley and Donna Jean for – so that we can consider another policy. Alright. Any more discussion on that?

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Miller:** OK, that carried. OK, are there any more office issues that anyone wants to talk about, or are we – **Thompson:** May I ask a question or a suggestion? **Miller:** Go ahead, Donna Jean. **Thompson:** I was not surprised when George brought up the issue about the old New Jersey address, but quite honestly, I found that out all on

my own last week quite by accident. I had heard a couple of people make comments, and I thought, well, what the devil is going on here, and I called the phone number and got, “this phone number has been disconnected.” Well, then I called the phone company and found out that, oh yes, you had 30 days, and I said, but I’m paying a phone bill for another number. I found out that we had a 3 year contract and the reason they were paying that very small monthly phone bill was because if it was more economical, which I think I don’t agree with unless I’ve been misinformed by Verizon, to pay for to keep one line going than to break the contract because there was a fee if you break the contract and it was a 3 year contract that we had signed. It’s good until 2013. So, then I said, “well, why aren’t we using our main number? Why are we using this back line?” Well, this is what we were told to do, and I said, “well, we need coverage on our main number.” I said, “no one is calling this other phone number.” They had a phone number that had remained there and was set up apparently by my predecessor, was a back line for the convenience for the workers in the event that there were a family emergency or something, and someone needed to reach them quickly. I mean, this phone number now serves no useful purpose but to keep us out of a contract. Now, I have been working with them since late last week, and I was supposed to have a message on the old phone number for \$5.05 a month in an agreement for a year, but the last time I checked this afternoon, it wasn’t there yet, and I thought, well, the day’s not over, I’ll check it out first thing in the morning, but I didn’t know. I didn’t know, and obviously George had heard complaints about that but they had not reached me. **Hannon:** Do you have any other issues, Donna Jean? **Thompson:** No. I mean, if you hear about something like that, I mean, that to me was serious. Very serious, and I have desperately been fighting with Verizon to get it changed and fixed. Hopefully it’s going to come about as quickly as possible, but I can’t fix things I don’t know about. **Miller:** Alright.

Miller: Alene, did you make a motion to adjourn. **Meeker:** I did. Ginger.

Miller called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:16 p.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary