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EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Wednesday, June 17, 1998

Secretary’s Note: Two meetings were held on Thursday June 18, 1998. The first meeting was between the CFA Board and the combined CFA Breed Council Secretaries and the second meeting was between the CFA Board and representatives from the International Division. (Minutes from the International meeting, will be prepared by Willa Hawke, approved by Mrs. Edna Field and Mr. Larry Adkison and published at a later time).

CFA Board and Staff Present on Wednesday, June 17, 1998

Mrs. Laina Aitken, NAR Director
Mr. Stan Barnaby, Director-at-Large
Mrs. Linda Berg, MWR Director
Ms. Pam DelaBar, Director-at-Large
*Mrs. Diana Doernberg, Director-at-Large
Mrs. Kim Everett, Vice President
Mrs. Donna Fuller, Treasurer
Mrs. Jody Garrison, GSR Director
Mrs. Willa Hawke, Secretary
*Mrs. Becky Jones, GLR Director
Mr. Dick Kallmeyer, NWR Director
Mr. Phil Lindsley, SWR Director
Ms. Joan Miller, Director-at-Large
Mr. Craig Rothermel, President
Mrs. Yaeko Takano, Japan Regional Director
Ms. Donna J. Thompson, Director-at-Large
Mr. Wayne Trevathan, SOR Director
Mrs. Betty White, Director-at-Large
Mr. Donald J. Williams, Director-at-Large

Also present were Mr. Tom Dent, CFA Executive Director; Mr. Fred Jacobberger, CFA Legal Counsel; Mrs. Carol Krzanowski, CFA Associate Director; Ms. Allene Tartaglia, Special Projects Director; Mr. Michael Brim, Public Relations Director; Ms. Mirei Tanaka, Japanese Interpreter from San Francisco, CA.

*Due to flight problems, Jones and Doernberg were absent until 10:15 a.m.

President Rothermel welcomed the board members and guests to the meeting.

(1) CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES.

President Rothermel as the first order of business recognized Willa Hawke, CFA Secretary, who submitted the following corrections to the February 1998 CFA Board Meeting Minutes (as published in the April 1998 edition of the Cat Fanciers’ Almanac):

a. Page 105, Column 3, Strike: Aiken—When they come in for championship, they don’t talk about their hybrids. They are going to pet them out. (Laina says she didn’t make that
comment. She never uses the term “pet out” and she finds it objectionable. In reviewing the tape it was unclear who actually made the comment.)

b. Miller noted that during the February meeting official action was taken to adopt the Feral Cat Statement which appeared on page 118, Column 2. No report of the action appeared in the minutes of the meeting. Therefore, immediately following the Feral Cat Statement Add – Miller Moved to adopt the Feral Cat Statement. Motion Carried.

Williams moved to accept the corrections to the minutes. Motion Carried.

(2) TREASURERS REPORT.

The next order of business was the treasurer’s report and President Rothermel called on Donna Fuller, CFA Treasurer. She gave the report which was distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

CFA FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

You have received copies of the internally generated financials for the year ended April 30, 1998. The audited statements with accruals and year-end adjustments are available now from Mr. Dent. The largest such adjustment impacting the income statement was a charge of $10,476 to fully reserve against the 1993 International Show loan; since there has been no payment on this in nearly three years, the auditors questioned the collectability. The budget proposal that will be presented on Sunday is based on the internal statements so won’t agree exactly to the audit report.

Once again, CFA’s balance sheet reflects a healthy position with sufficient working capital for normal operations and no long-term debt. Unfortunately, the bottom line this year is very disappointing with a loss of over $73,000 as compared to a profit of $105,000 last year. The actual loss was also more than triple the budgeted loss of $23,000. There were a number of factors contributing to this performance which I will discuss below, but it is important now for this entire board to keep an open mind to changes in the future which can increase revenues, cut expenses, and bring CFA back to a healthy financial position.

Registration revenues continued their decline again this year. We will need to find ways to encourage more registrations. The Budget Committee believes that an increase in the registration fees now will just result in fewer registrations so we are not recommending an increase at this time. These basic revenues previously funded not only the operation of CFA’s basic functions, but also covered many of our other programs such as scoring and awards. Assuming the profit from registration continues its decline, it will be necessary to either find new ways to fund our programs or reduce these programs.

In addition to the reserve for the 1993 International Show loan mentioned above, items of ordinary income that declined substantially from the prior year included funding from corporate sponsors ($53,000 decline) and International Show profit/loss ($51,000 decline).

The CFA Yearbook also experienced a disappointing year. For the first time in many years, the advertising space was not sold out. Sales of the 1997 Yearbook were disappointing,
resulting in a large inventory of unsold 1997 Yearbooks. For the 1998 Yearbook, we reduced the number of books produced in an effort to avoid the large inventory problem, but that results in a smaller number of books over which to spread the fixed costs, resulting in a smaller margin. Almanac revenues and expenses were close to budget and comparable to last year; since previously announced rate increases were too late in the year to produce a noticeable positive impact.

Our Central Office had a very good year with expenses coming in substantially under budget as well as less than the prior year. I believe we should thank Mr. Dent and his entire staff for providing us with a bright spot in what otherwise was a dismal year.

CFA Programs expense was again negatively impacted by costs of defending ourselves in the SW Region litigation. This matter is resolved now and should not affect future years, but we should be careful to try to avoid situations that are likely to generate litigation. Several of the other Programs and Committees had notable increases in costs. This was the first year in which the amount charged to the income statement for national awards and related costs was based on a predetermined accrual. Hopefully the actual costs of the awards and related expenses will be within the accrued amount, so it won’t be necessary to make up a shortfall in the current year funding.

The budget that will be presented to the board on Sunday morning will project net income for next year, but this was possible ONLY by cutting nearly $100,000 from amounts requested for various programs and functions. The Budget Committee struggled hard to avoid presenting a “loss budget” for the second year in a row, which I will explain in more detail with the budget proposal I will be distributing. Even with the drastic reduction in program expenses, the “balanced” budget will not be possible without the increase in show licenses and club dues. I have prepared supporting material (including overheads and handouts) to try to influence the delegation to support these increases. However, increasing club dues and certain other fees will not solve the big problem. We need to find ways to restore slipping registration levels, to find new sources of revenue, and avoid instituting new program expenses without first finding funding for them.

We are well on the way to being operational with the program for recording leases of cats. Mr. Dent can comment on this more fully during his Central Office report.

Secretary’s Note: The following action item was deferred until Sunday’s board meeting.

One of the items mentioned at the February meeting concerned instituting a charge for confirming grands similar to the current one for champions/premiers. At our Budget Committee meeting, we discussed this and concluded that it would be much easier (and cheaper) to administer if we just increase the champion/premier claim fee to $10 thereby collecting in advance for some of the cost of tracking grand points, etc. The claim fee has been at the $5 level for many years and probably should be raised just to cover inflation, etc., but if we can use even a dollar or two of a $10 claim fee to partially offset some of the grand scoring, it would be a step in the right direction. I therefore request that the board authorize an increase in the champion/premier claim fee to $10 effective January 1, 1999. It has also been suggested that we
institute a fee to claim Distinguished Merits; the merits of this proposal are certainly up for
discussion at this point.

Fuller Moved to increase charge for Championship/Premiership claim fee from $5 to
$10. Discussion: Barnaby asked what it costs to score them? What are we trying to offset here?
Fuller noted that this had been mentioned in February. Scoring includes the process of show
records for championship, grand championship, premiership, grand premiership, national and
regional points, publication of show reports, grand certificates, premier certificates, and
championship certificates, which amounts to $68,000 per year. We are looking at salaries in the
case of scoring plus the cost of printing certificates, mailings, listing of grands, etc. DelaBar
indicated that she would have liked to have had more pre-notice before this meeting. White
indicated that it is more costly for CFA to score to confirm a grand than a champion and the
additional charge should be placed. Lindsley was reluctant to vote for a fee increase motion that
was not pre-noticed. Berg agreed with Phil and Pam. Dent explained that it is actually a better
deal for the exhibitor and the association to process one fee. The cost for the additional paper
work involved in collecting a second fee and subsequently processing it, would end up being
more than a $5 fee for the grand. To process two fees or the additional fee as charging for the GC
confirmation would require would be more costly than just charging the $10 at the time of
championship confirmation. The $10 one time Championship confirmation fee would be the
most cost effective. What we were trying to do here was to match revenue with expense. This fee
would really spread out the cost to more people rather than just a few people. The bottom line is
this is more broad based and would work out better. DelaBar reminded that we used to pay a fee
when one of our cats achieved a DM. This fee no longer exists and perhaps it should be re-
instituted. Dent – There are around 100 DMs confirmed in a year. In order to take in any
significant amount of money for this confirmation we would have to charge an incredible fee.
What would happen then would be that the number of people claiming DMs would quickly
diminish. It seems that many people feel the DM program is very expensive when frankly, it is
easy and not of significant cost. Kalmeyer questioned what amount of revenue would be
brought in as a result of this $10 charge for the championship confirmation. Dent – At the
present time, there is $59,000 coming in yearly from confirmation fees. Based on the fact that it
would not be instituted until January 1 which is 2/3 of the way through our fiscal year, and also
there might be some drop off in the number of championship confirmations claimed, we
estimated it will go up to about $70,000 for the coming fiscal year with a potential of $90,000 to
$100,000 for a full fiscal year. The confirmation fee for a championship has been $5 since 1991.
Motion Carried. Berg, Trevathan, White, Barnaby, Williams, Lindsley, DelaBar voting No.

Another suggestion that came out of the Budget Committee is a proposal to try to
increase the number of kittens registered in each litter. Mrs. Tracy Petty is working up this
proposal which we will be distributing to you for review.

I would still like to consider reinstating the surcharge – either on a “per entry” or a “per
exhibitor” basis. Such a fee fluctuates in direct relation to show activity so it would not be
imposing unfair distribution of charges among clubs. This was pre-noticed in February and not
passed; I would like to request that the Board reconsider this and authorize a surcharge of at
least $.25 per exhibitor.
INTERNATIONAL SHOW TREASURY

The final result on the 1997 CFA International Show in Atlanta was a loss of $20,092. As we discussed in February, there were a number of factors that contributed to this including one of the lowest gates (in dollars) of any of the CFA International Shows in spite of a large expenditure on public relations and media. It may be time for us to consider if this event is to be viewed as a fund-raising event or as a promotional event to be funded for the positive exposure it provides CFA.

On a positive note, we were able to collect on almost all of the outstanding vendor bad checks (from Chicago and Anaheim) and all but one of the new vendor bad checks. All exhibitor checks were collected by the opening day of the show.

I worked with the 1998 show committee to develop a budget for the Kansas City show. At this point, we are projecting a loss of over $9000, but this is with very conservative assumptions such as “no corporate sponsors,” minimal gate, etc. By the October meeting, we should know if there will be sponsorship, etc. and we may be able to revise the budget at that time.

I want to comment on a table that appeared in the minutes as published in the April 1998 Almanac. The table at the top of the center column of page 112 appears to be a part of my treasurer’s report, but it was actually part of Mrs. Berg’s report. Since some of the attendance numbers and admission charges in that table do not agree to the data in my financial records, I feel it should be made clear that this is NOT part of the treasurer’s report.

REGIONAL TREASURY & CLUB ACCOUNTING

I’ve continued my work with the regional treasurers on standardizing all regional treasury reporting using a common computer software package. Most regions are now up and running with this system and are cooperating with our efforts to consolidate all CFA regional finances. The reports as of April 30, 1998 have already been received from a majority of the regions, so I have hopes that CFA will be able to comply with IRS consolidated reporting for this year.

CLUB ACCOUNTING MATTERS

I continue to receive occasional requests from clubs for the Quicken-based Club/Show accounting system that facilitates easy accounting for club activities with particular emphasis on show accounting. I will be updating this package to Quicken 98 soon, but will continue to make it available in older versions for those clubs who have older software and do not wish to change.

There is increased interest by clubs wishing to file for nonprofit status. I have helped several clubs with the filing process and will continue to provide such guidance to any club who calls.

Fuller asked for direction or policy concerning committee and board member requests for equipment. Of concern was how these items were to be funded. What equipment is provided to board members for their use by the association and what must board members provide for themselves? There have been things like FAX machines and typewriters and filing cabinets and
some board members submit requests for that to be paid for by the association and others don’t. It seems important that with so many new people coming on the board we should have a guideline to say what is allowable. “When I came on the board, I had no idea what things I could actually have provided and what I had to buy. I provided all my own equipment but I don’t know if I needed to or not. I assumed that computer equipment had been provided for the secretary.” 

**Hawke** responded, “No, I provided my own computer equipment. However, I believe the policy has been that any requests for equipment are to be submitted to the treasurer with the individual’s budget request in April. The requests can then be approved or denied by the budget committee.”

**DelaBar** noted that different committees have different needs. **President Rothermel** agreed that some jobs require additional equipment where others do not. The judging panel will require some things that other committees will not need. It would be difficult to make a blanket policy to say this is what we will give you. **Fuller** – The following Proposed Registration Fee schedule is submitted as food for thought and should be considered for possible action at the October meeting.

**Proposal 1**

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

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

**Proposal 2**

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

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

II. **Kittens Pre-registered without a Name:** All information except a name must be provided for pre-registered kittens. Pre-registered kittens will be assigned a registration number and cattery prefix (if applicable). Only the breeder may be the owner of pre-registered kittens. The breeder may subsequently register a name for a pre-registered kitten without additional charge in one of two ways:
1. Return the registration slip with a name designated for the kitten. Owner information may not be changed; if the owner is different than the breeder, the $7 transfer/change fee will apply.

2. Enter the kitten/cat in a show. Pursuant to Show Rules 4.06 and 20.07, all entries in a show must have a name. If a kitten/cat has been pre-registered and no name has been registered for the cat, the name used in its first show will become its registered name. If the owner of the entry has changed, the name will be registered (without cattery suffix, if applicable,) but the new owner information will not be applied until ownership is transferred via an official registration slip and a $7 transfer/change fee is paid.

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

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

(3) CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

President Rothermel read the following list of people to serve with the Credentials & Tellers Committee as submitted by George Summerville, Chairman 1998 Credentials & Tellers Committee. Nancy Sullivan and Leon Samuels (1); Sheila Kirkwood and Dorothea Brocksom (2); Paula Watson (3); Eve Russell (4); Jessica Everhart (5); Doug Von Aswege and Nancy Petersen (6); Hilary Helmrich and Jim Kinkaid (7). Alternates and Standbys included Yvonne Griffin; Pat Lichtenberg; and Nancy Krakow. Everett Moved to accept the committee. Discussion: Williams wanted an explanation of why three people who had served on this committee for 15 years had been removed. He addressed the possible perception that by removing these people from the committee it may make them appear not trustworthy. President Rothermel replied, “The explanation I can give you, Don, is that when I appoint a chairman of a committee I allow them to choose the people they work with. George expressed that he wanted to remove these three people for reasons that he knows and while these folks have served for a long time, there is no ordained right of anyone to be on any committee and if the chairman chooses to remove some of these people and replace them, it can be noted that we don’t have only 12 honest people in CFA and we may want to see new and other people on this committee. I don’t have any problem with any one of them that are listed there. My statement is that he wanted to choose some new people and he did it. I can’t see that this action should cast any aspersions on any of these people. It is simply that George chose to have some new people.” Williams said that he had no objections to the people on the new committee but wanted to see the three other people back on the committee. Motion Carried. Trevathan, Berg, White, Barnaby, Williams, DelaBar, Thompson voting No.

Barnaby Moved – Those board members not running for re-election this year be present at counting of ballots. Discussion: President Rothermel expressed amazement that this Credentials Committee, which has operated the same way for so many years, is now under
attack. He said that he had been accused of looking at the ballots and in truth had never seen a ballot. He noted his disgust with those individuals on the Internet who busily spread incorrect information and out and out lies challenging the integrity of this committee. Whether or not they are still on this committee, every member who has ever served on this committee has done an extraordinary job. It is wrong when persons who don’t have the facts choose to promote non-facts and try to create animosity within this organization. It is time this activity is stopped. If you don’t know the facts, stay off the Internet. Motion Failed. Barnaby, Williams voting Yes.

4) CLUB MEMBERSHIP APPLICATIONS (Domestic).

President Rothermel next called on Mrs. Laina Aitken to present the applications from clubs within the United States and Canada seeking membership in CFA. Aitken – No negative letters have been received, within the allotted time frame for consideration, regarding any of the club applications. The gossip on the Internet continues to provide questionable information regarding some of the applicant clubs.

At this board meeting we will be considering one application held over from our last board meeting and seven new applicants. I have received two applications that will be ready for consideration in October. I would like to thank the regional directors that have helped me over the past four years with information about the applicants and to recognize the importance of their work with our clubs on an ongoing basis. The strength of our CFA clubs is vital to the strength of our organization. I also want to thank Linda Siniscal, administrative assistant at Central Office, for her professional and efficient handling of club matters.

At this year’s annual meeting we will be asking the delegates to approve a constitutional amendment to raise club dues. I support that action, but I also believe we should cut costs by eliminating some of our mailings. We are sending reminders to clubs, often to both the secretary and president, that are costly. Our deadlines are published in every issue of the Almanac, and I believe the clubs must take the responsibility for meeting those deadlines.

Secretary’s Note: From a procedural standpoint, Aitken reminded the board that she would automatically Move the Acceptance of each application, reserving the right to vote against it, based on its merit. She also noted that she would attempt to provide the board with whatever information she had regarding each application and would call upon each involved regional director for comments.

MINK TONKINESE FANCIERS
Region 4

At the February 1998 board meeting we voted to delay consideration of the NATIONAL MINK TONKINESE FANCIERS until our June meeting. At that meeting board members were concerned about the national nature of the club and conflict with the existing national breed club, Tonkinese Breed Association. Craig Rothermel also voiced objection to the president and secretary being in the same household, since these are the two officers that sign ballots and other CFA documents.

Since our February meeting this club has changed their name, taking out the NATIONAL. The club plans to center their activities in the Great Lakes Region, where most of the members
are located. The club’s objectives of promoting the mink Tonkinese remain the same. The club has also changed the club president in response to Craig’s objection. I have not received any new objections to this club and I believe if this club is voted into membership it will be an active club in CFA and Region 4.

Aitken – This club was held over from last time. Discussion: Lindsley noted that he had spoken against the club last time and was still concerned about some of the same things. For example, the impact the acceptance of this Tonkinese Breed Club might have on other existing Tonkinese breed clubs. Also, he took exception with the structure of the officers in the club, the secretary and vice president living in the same household. He indicated that this was very similar to the ASH club which was never accepted. Hawke – One big difference between this club and the American Shorthair situation is that this club has now become regional in scope where the ASH group refused to become anything other than a national breed club. Aitken agreed that they had decided to become a regional club and while they welcomed out of the region members, they were confining their area of activity to Region 4. Motion Carried. Lindsley voting No.

DIXIELAND SILVER AND GOLDEN FANCIERS
Region 7

This club has organized as a regional club to promote the Silver and Golden Persians. They do not plan to hold a show for several years, but hope to sponsor rings at Southern Region shows.

Trevathan spoke in favor of this club.

Discussion: DelaBar raised some concern about one of the members listed on the application. Lindsley noted lack of information included on the actual completion of the application. He felt it was deficient. Motion Carried. Lindsley, DelaBar, Kallmeyer, Thompson, Fuller, Rothermel, Miller voting No.

EUROPEAN BURMESE CAT CLUB
Region 1

In response to the CFA Board’s preference that a national breed club’s president and secretary not be of the same household, this club has held a special election and Wayne Trevathan is now president. I received an updated membership list effective April 15, 1998. The club is currently publishing a fine newsletter and has all of their paperwork in order. They are not considering holding a show in the near future and understand the difficulties in show scheduling.

Aitken noted the change of officers. Motion Carried.

NEW MILLENNIUM CAT CLUB
Region 5

On February 14 I sent the club secretary a letter asking for a clarification in their constitution. I asked for a response by March 15. When I did not receive an answer I telephoned the club secretary. She agreed that the club needed to change their constitution, but seemed very
unconcerned about the failure to meet my deadline. I asked at that time for her to respond in two weeks. On May 18, the new constitution finally arrived in Central Office, postmarked 5/13. The letter with the constitution also stated the club had voted to change their name to NEW MILLENIUM CAT CLUB from CALIFORNIA COASTAL CAT CLUB. I am really confused since the application was made by NEW MILLENNIUM CAT FANCIERS. At the time of the club’s application, the directors had not been elected. The most recent update supplied the name of a new treasurer and three directors. The application, constitution and by-laws of this club are now complete.

Aitken expressed some concern about the non-responsiveness of the club. Lindsley, SWR Director, spoke in favor of this club. Motion Carried.

NOVA SCOTIA CAT FANCIERS
Region 1

I am very pleased to see CFA activity again in Nova Scotia. This club is incorporated as a non-profit organization and is hoping to hold a CFA show in the summer of 1999. The club has sixteen members and includes breeders and premiership exhibitors.

Aitken spoke in favor of this club. Motion Carried.

PREMIER POWER
Region 7

The purpose of this club is to promote and recognize showing in premiership and provide service to other CFA clubs. The application states the club will never hold a show. All of the club members belong to at least one other CFA club and some belong to four or more. Most of the members hold an office in another CFA club and all are enthusiastic CFA supporters. I believe their goals are sincere, but can be accomplished without the addition of a new club.

Trevathan spoke in favor of this club. Aitken expressed some concerns about the club. Motion Carried. Aitken voting No.

SPACE COAST CAT CLUB
Region 7

This is a new Florida club. The application states that none of the members belong to other CFA clubs and that other clubs are located too far away. The club hopes to hold one show each year.

Trevathan spoke in favor of this club. Motion Carried. Lindsley voting No.

SPHYNX BREED CLUB
Region 4

This club has already taken an active role in encouraging the members to exhibit their cats at CFA shows. The club seems well organized and ready to promote the Sphynx breed in CFA. Motion Carried.
I have enjoyed my duties as chairman of CFA Domestic Membership and I will be happy to help the next chairman in any way I can.

Sincerely,
Laina Aitken

Aitken noted that she already had two applications for consideration in October. She also reminded that the deadline for October applications is July 15.

Lindsley thanked Laina for her fine work as CFA Domestic Membership Chairman. President Rothermel concurred and commented that Laina had done an outstanding job. Applause, Applause.

[Secretary’s Note: Becky Jones and Diana Doernberg arrived at this point in the meeting; i.e., 10:15 a.m.]

(5) INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

President Rothermel, International Division Board Liaison, gave the following report for Edna Field, International Division Chairperson.

There are four new club applications in the International Division. The North Adriatic Cat Club based in Trieste, Italy, the Hong Kong Cat Lovers Society and the Cat Fanciers of Slovenia were held over from the January board meeting. The fourth application comes from Cats ‘R Us club based in Austria.

I am requesting the acceptance of these clubs and would like the board to know that all four clubs are ready, willing and able to sponsor shows right away!

There has been considerable confusion regarding the awarding of Winners ribbons in the Novice class in addition to those awarded in the Open class. It was suggested at the June 1997 meeting of International representatives with the board, that this would be a way of increasing interest in shows overseas. The International Committee members would like to request that this be considered again.

I will have a more detailed report to present at the Annual Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Edna M. Field

New Club Applications

CATS ‘R US CLUB, Austria. Everett Moved to Accept. Motion Carried.

CAT FANCIERS OF SLOVENIA. Everett Moved to Accept. Discussion: In response to a question about sending all club information to the club president, President Rothermel replied that all information must, by Slovenia law, be sent to the president of the club. We may also provide the information to the club secretary. Motion Carried.
HONG KONG CAT LOVERS SOCIETY. Everett Moved to Accept. Motion Carried.

NORTH ADRIATIC CAT CLUB, Italy. Everett Moved to Accept. Discussion: There was some discussion about two members of the same household holding the positions of president and secretary. It was suggested that if the board is going to enforce this unwritten rule, at the time of application, we should at least make a policy statement to that effect. At this time there is nothing in writing to make applicant clubs aware of this board’s attitude. Regardless of the board’s action during the application process, once the club is accepted we no longer have any control over their subsequent actions regarding their membership. Motion Carried.

Action Items

[Secretary’s Note: Some years ago the CFA Board created the Novice Class for listed cats shown in the International Division. This was done to insure that only registered cats would receive winners ribbons. This has worked and more and more cats in the International Division are being shown as champions and more cats are attaining grand championship status. The downside to this is that when exhibitors of cats in the novice class learn they cannot earn titles, they only show their cats once and go home and are never seen at another CFA show. In order to prevent this, during the 1997 Naples, Florida, Annual meeting, the International representatives asked the CFA Board to create a reserve winners (RW) ribbon to be awarded to those cats in the novice class. Then if the owner decides to register his cat with CFA these RWs would count as a winners ribbon toward championship. The chance to attain a title would encourage the owner to register their cats in CFA, subsequently increasing the number of qualified entries available for International Division CFA shows.]

Jones Moved that in the International Division shows, judges will award RW ribbons in the novice class in addition to those Winners Ribbons awarded in the open class. It will become effective May 1, 1998 (retroactive). Discussion: Williams – The problem with retroactive would be that we would not be able to determine at this time which one of those cats would get the winners ribbon. President Rothermel – Actually, the problem would be in knowing if the judge intended to hang a winners ribbon on any of the entries. Winners ribbons are not just automatic. Just because a judge hangs a blue ribbon, he doesn’t have to hang a winners ribbon. Hawke – The blue ribbon cat in the novice class would be the only cat that is eligible for the RW ribbon. Everett commented that we are making these concessions for the International Division just as we did in the past for Japan and Hawaii back when they were getting started. We need to make special provisions until they really get their feet on the ground and are able to grow. The idea is to see this International Division succeed. This will be a step forward. Motion Carried.

(6) CFA PROCESS IMPROVEMENT TEAM.

President Rothermel next called on Willa Hawke, Committee Chairperson, who gave the following report dated 6/17/98: We have held no formal meetings since February 1998 but have continued to work on the goals and objectives that resulted from the board’s October 1997 Strategic Planning Session. Among our accomplishments in the past year:
1. **National/Regional Scoring Task Force**

   President Rothermel asked Pat Jacobberger as an individual to facilitate a Task Force to study and recommend changes to the National/Regional Scoring System. Pat asked the Process Improvement Team to help her and together we developed a Scoring Survey for CFA Exhibitors. The survey process was conducted by sending it to show secretaries for distribution during March and April shows. It was also placed on the CFA Web Site. The number of responses was gratifying and the data received was used to help the Scoring Task Force which met yesterday. The meeting produced some excellent ideas and Pat will present our results to the delegation on Friday.

2. **Mentoring Program**

   Debbie Ritter is the new committee chair for this project. She was recently appointed and more recently told me that she is busily planning the implementation of the program and hopes to have it up and running very soon. I am confident that the Mentoring Program which so many people have professed to want will flourish under Debbie’s enthusiastic guidance.

3. **Youth Development Program**

   Debbi Stevenson, Chairperson, reported to me that the committee will be meeting on Thursday, June 18th, for the entire day and by the close of that meeting, she hopes to have a working model that can be implemented in January. She promised a further report for the Sunday board meeting.

**Other Items:**

**Registration**

   The Team earlier discussed barriers and issues related to the registration of pedigreed cats.

   We asked: Why there are fewer kitten and cat registrations? Why are there fewer pedigreed cats registered as a whole? Why are new breeds not fostered and facilitated by CFA? Why don’t we ride the coat-tails of the unregistered breeds that are getting publicity?

   We Suggested: That Central Office develop a CFA process where the breeder has the option and the incentive to register all of the individual kittens in a litter as a unit. Plans:

   1. Facilitate another strategic planning session for the CFA Board in October 1998.

   2. Conduct a second CFA Opinion Survey to compare to the survey that was done in 1996. It is our goal to continue to ask our constituency how they think the organization is doing.

   3. Continue to remain available to assist any group within CFA to work through their issues. We encourage their requests for our help.
4. Facilitate the next phase of National/Regional Scoring System Task Force in November.

   Just a Thought: “We need to Measure, Not Count. Financial accounting; balance sheets; profit and loss statements; allocation of costs; etc. are like an X-ray of an organization’s skeleton. But just as the diseases we most commonly die from; e.g. heart disease, cancer, or Parkinson’s – do not show up in a skeletal X-ray, loss of market standing or a failure to innovate does not register in the accountant’s figures until the damage has been done.”

Respectfully submitted,
Willa K. Hawke, Chairperson

(7) PUBLIC RELATIONS.

President Rothermel next recognized Michael Brim, CFA Public Relations Director to give his report.

   The CFA Public Relations Department has joined with all other CFA departments and committees to hold down expenses and at the same time reach the goals of the association. Outreach programs – centered around the CFA booth at veterinarian and humane society conferences and lead shows – are being adjusted. The ways our advertising dollars are being spent are under review. Other segments of the publicity program are under scrutiny as we move towards the new millennium.

   I’m keeping this report short as a more detailed one will be given to the delegation on Friday.

   CATS! Wild to Mild: The next stop in the five year run of the CATS! Wild to Mild exhibit will be in Washington DC on June 6 at Explorers Hall/National Geographic Society and will run until September 7. The exhibit produced by the National History Museum of Los Angeles County first opened on March 16, 1997 in Los Angeles and will continue to tour until April 28, 2002. The exhibit closed on May 3 at the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley CA. From all indications CFA continues to receive a great deal of exposure from our display case and the printed informational pamphlet we provide the exhibit for distribution.

   CFA Logo: At the February meeting I was charged to investigate adding the full name of the association to our existing logo. With the assistance of Carol Krzanowski, I’ll have several versions of the logo for your consideration at the meeting.

   CFA Show of the Year: This new program was to have started with the 1998-1999 show season, but has been delayed until the 1999-2000 show season. Many items of the program were not completed and some still need to be developed so the launch was delayed. Funding for the program to cover year-end awards, postage and printing are included in this year’s PR budget request.

   The CFA Store: After the February meeting a Request for Proposals for a marketing plan was issued. The call first went to both the CFA-List and the Fanciers-List on the Internet and then to several marketing companies. I received one reply and it didn’t address the
association’s needs. I will be meeting with a sales rep from a company that offers several different promotional programs that might meet our needs during the annual meeting in Philadelphia. After reviewing their proposal fully I’ll report back to you. In the meantime, I’m still exploring the marketing study. FYI: CFA discussed having a marketing study done back in 1991-1992, but the study was not undertaken because of the price tag, which ranged from a high of $46,000 to a low of $8,500.00 for a bare bones one.

**Media Exposure:** Film crews have arranged to shoot footage for upcoming shows featuring cats: National Geographic had a crew at the Crab & Mallet Cat Show March 14-15 in Baltimore. The Paula Poundstone Show shot footage at the Rainbow International Show held in conjunction with the America’s Family Pet Show April 17-19 in Pomona CA for her new show, which is in the final stages of development. CFA is featured in My Pet Television Network’s Veterinary Waiting Room Program, which reaches thousands of veterinarian offices each day. We are currently working with Disney Productions on several segments of a new Disney program that will air on the Animal Planet Network, the all animal all the time cable network.

The CFA/Friskies San Francisco Revelers Cat Show will premiere on the Animal Planet television network on Saturday, June 13 at 9 p.m. ET. The show entitled Reigning Cats in San Francisco will air seven additional times during June (all times are ET): Sunday, June 14 - 12 a.m., 1:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.; Tuesday, June 16 - 6:00 p.m.; Friday, June 19 - 7:00 p.m.; Sunday, June 21 - 3:00 p.m. and Tuesday, June 23 - 6 p.m. The show is sponsored by Friskies under the CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program.

**CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program:** The selection of Lead Shows for 1999 is almost complete. Shows are again being selected based on markets selected by Friskies’ marketing department. We hope to have the final list by the annual meeting. The list includes previous show locations and some new locations other than those comprising the 1998 list.

**Public Service Announcements:** Finding a celebrity who owns a CFA registered cat has been difficult. Many breeders have indicated they have sold a cat to a celebrity, but getting additional information like a telephone number or address is not so easy. So, I have contacted Actors and Others for Animals, asking for their assistance in getting the “type” of celebrity we need to take part in the production of a PSA for television. I hope to have additional information by the meeting.

**CFA International Cat Show:** Commercial sponsorship packages have gone out to 75 possible sponsors. Additional ones are going out every day and the list keeps growing. Interest in regular vendor booth space is strong, with many vendors from Atlanta planning on making the trip to KC MO.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please don’t hesitate to contact me in advance of the meeting.

Respectfully,
Michael W Brim
CFA Public Relations Director
Michael Brim presented seven different versions of the CFA logo. Choosing a logo will become an action item in October. There is a pin sale in progress. One red pin (1998) may be purchased for $4 and, if purchased at the same time, a green pin (1997) may be purchased for $3. If they are purchased separately, they will be $4 each.

(8) **INTERNATIONAL SHOW.**

President Rothermel called on Linda Berg, International Show Chairperson, and she gave the following report:

_The 1998 International Show to be held in Kansas City, Missouri is moving along on schedule._

_The International Show Budget Committee has met and are putting together the final numbers for the 1998 show._

_In my latest conversation with Pamela Keene she is still gathering publicity from last year’s International by doing another interview with last year’s winners, the Martins. The show has been announced to the media and she is doing an update to the media list of the KC area. She plans on generating interest by advertising the International Show and all the upcoming shows within a 200 mile radius of KC. She will be attending the Mo-Kan KC show in August to meet with local media personnel._

_We have had difficulty finding a place to have the International in 1999 and KC has the dates open so we are considering signing the contract for a second year. By having the International in the same place for two years it will somewhat answer the question that has plagued us about whether we would get better gate if we stayed in one place like the Westminster show. Granted, two years is not a long run but it should give us some insight. Anaheim will have completed their renovations by 2000 so we are contacting them for that year._

_We have been tossing questions out to the CFA-List about the International to see what kind of feedback we would get. The first question was judging without titles. Needless to say we received MANY responses which made us aware of many more problems than we had originally thought of. The exhibitors are not willing to give up winners ribbons or points and our way of dealing with that brought even more response, so we have tabled it for a year to give us more time to work out the bugs – if possible._

_We have also been asked to make exceptions for judges that are judging but would like to be exhibiting. We were asked to allow them to have the cat agented at the show they were judging at, x’ing out of their ring, or to be allowed to have the cat agented at another qualifier of their choosing. The overall feeling of the committee was not to make this allowance at this time. In my last report to the board I spoke of the small number of clubs that vote and the overall feeling of unfairness from the judges. This has promoted a change in how the judges will be chosen for the International Show. So as to allow new judges to judge the International, effective with the 1999 show we will be removing the three judges who have judged the most International Shows. That will allow three new judges to come on board. The following year we will remove the next three judges with the most longevity etc., etc. The three judges will have their names_
removed for one show and will start from year one when they return to the ballots. We hope this will be acceptable to all.

Linda M. Berg

Discussion: Doernberg asked about the publicity for the International Show. She reminded us that we had discussed this at length during the February meeting and whether or not it was money well spent to hire an outside publicity firm. Berg noted that she had not seen this year’s budget but in previous years prior to 1997 when we had a very large budget for advertising and publicity, our budget had been about $20,000. Pamela Keene has agreed to do the advertising for this year’s show and will work within our prescribed budget and will be able to do a very good job. Lindsley Moved to allow $20,000 for full publicity and advertising expense for the 1998 International Show. Motion Carried. Fuller and Jones voting No. Everett asked that we determine exactly what we want this International Show to become. Do we want just a big fat cat show or do we want it to evolve into a CFA Westminster type show? Doernberg also felt we should discuss our purpose for this show. What are we really trying to do here? One of the points Craig made in February was that the show had a great deal of merit, not necessarily as a giant media event but something we wanted to continue even if we didn’t garner a giant media. She then inquired if our new budget was based on budgets from prior years before 1997. (The answer was yes.) This board needs to tell this committee exactly what we want them to do. Brim explained that the amount of publicity we received last year was phenomenal. There would have been no way that we could have purchased that type of publicity and it was received as a result of Pamela Keene’s work. White agreed “we need to decide what we want this show to be.” We should not keep talking about whether it should be a big cat show or should it be a publicity effort. We are supposed to be promoting pedigreed cats and this show is an excellent vehicle to do that. We need to make up our minds that we are going to do it. Everett – The CFA show in New York is the show that garners the most publicity. It is an annual event held in Madison Square Garden. It is all over the networks and it is not the CFA International Show. That management group (INCATS) knows how to stage big events. Lindsley reminded us that we had tremendous gate at the 1996 CFA International Show in Anaheim. When we get this show properly developed and our learning curve comes up, we are not only going to increase our public awareness but we also will be making money from the gate from this show. If you want something to grow, if you have a product you want to sell, you have to advertise it. Miller commented on that New York show, what it does and how it compares to our show. First of all its being in New York is the big thing and the major reason that it gets the coverage it does. When INCATS held one of their shows in San Francisco, it was not successful and that group will never hold one of their shows in San Francisco again. So you see, it is not what they do, or their expertise, or their PR, it is New York. New York, however, is not good for CFA because as you all know that the hotels are prohibitively expensive, and everything else is very expensive; it is just not good for our overall purposes. We have to have this show, not one or the other, a promotional thing for pedigree cats or a big show for the cat fancy, we have to have both. What we need to build for this show is momentum. We need to have this show in one place and it will take about six years to get it to the point where every year people and the media are waiting for the cat show. You now have all your contacts. As soon as we get set in one place, we will have both, a big show for the cat fancy and a major media event as well. Brim – We could move the International Show to New York and yes, we would have a major media event. The Garden is not a good place for the type of show that the CFA International is because it doesn’t have the
floor space and even if it would work, the arena is $50,000 per day. **Barnaby** agreed with Joan except that he felt the show has to be in New York. I think that no matter the expense for the facility it has to be there. **Williams** – We must not eliminate New York, that is where the media is even if we have to bus our exhibitors to the show hall. We can always bus them from some place (hotel) in New Jersey if need be. **Lindsley** took exception with the perception that the only media center in the United States is New York. We have actually had our most successful International in Anaheim. The person mentioned earlier who stages the Garden show also thinks Anaheim is a really good place and that is why they also put on a really big show there. We need to be planning on getting back there. Much of the big media in this country is out of Los Angeles. **Aitken** stated that a club in New Jersey had hired the same media person used in NYC to do their show and the whole effort fell flat. There is something special about the media coverage of events in New York. However, the exhibitors hate the show in Madison Square Garden and don’t go. The show usually consists of 230 cats and most of them are HHPs. **President Rothermel** questioned whether or not the board should be getting involved in this committee’s actions. **Everett** felt it would be a good move to begin rotating some of the judges. This would help eliminate some of the apathy among the clubs and their voting. The number of clubs who actually vote is truly minimal. The clubs seem to have the peculiar idea that their votes don’t count and just don’t bother to vote. We need to see that behavior change. **Everett Moved** to accept Berg’s report and remove from the ballots the names of those three judges who have judged the most Invitational/International Shows beginning with the first Purina Invitational Show, through the CFA International Shows. These three would be ineligible for one year. This process would continue yearly. The judges dropped would be placed on the ballot the following year and their eligibility would begin anew. **Motion Carried.**

(9) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

**President Rothermel** recognized **Kim Everett**, Judging Program Chairman, who gave the following report:

**JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT**

*Thank you letters to the board were received from the following judges on their advancements in February 1998:, Holly Ayers, Norm Auspitz, Connie Chindlund, Kayoko Koizumi, Edward Maeda, Wakako Nagayama, Darrell Newkirk, Aki Tamura and Debbie Ritter.*

*Betty O’Brien has requested a one year medical leave of absence commencing May 1, 1998 to May 1, 1999.*

*Erika Graf-Webster requested an indefinite medical leave commencing June 1, 1998.*

*Werner Kachel requested an indefinite medical leave commencing June 1, 1998. Werner is progressing with his therapy but he feels it best that he ask for this leave at this time until he feels ready to resume judging.*

*Our deepest sympathies are sent to the families of Jim Thompson whose brother passed away and to Vicki Nye and her mother Barbara Farrell on the loss of Vicki’s father.*
Hazel Lindstrand suffered a severe break to her leg at a show but finished the show and then went to the hospital in an ambulance. She underwent surgery to pin her leg and she is already back judging!

George Summerville has had a rough time of it and suffered an infection which he is fighting but he is home and very determined to be able to get back to judging.

Muriel Slodden’s husband suffered two heart attacks and our get well wishes are sent to him.

Longtime CFA-approved Longhair Judge in Japan, Mrs. Haruko Mori, passed away in May. Our sincere sympathies are sent to her family and to the Japanese cat fancy.

Suzi Yamazaki underwent surgery and was quite ill but is doing fine now and back judging.

Bess Higuchi was involved in a severe car accident and looking at the photos of the car it was a miracle that she was not killed. She did suffer severe injuries to her right arm, however, and is now undergoing therapy. She is doing better all the time and beginning to get strength back in her hand but it will take time. She hopes it will not take too much longer as she would like to resume judging.

CFA Guest Judging Assignments granted:


Edna Field – November 7-8, 1998, Warsaw, Poland.

Kim Everett – June 5-6, 1999, World Cat Federation, Minsk, Belarus.
Discussion: This Bavarian Cat Fanciers Association’s questionable activities were first brought to the board’s attention during the June 1997 International Representatives meeting in Naples, Florida. President Rothermel reminded the board that the International Division had expressed serious objections to this group that has been bordering on promoting themselves as CFA by using the CFA acronym and previously using the CFA logo. In response to the International Division complaints, he and his wife had refused to judge their show scheduled for April 9-10 (just approved for the Williams to guest judge).


CFA clubs requesting permission, which was granted, to invite international guest judges which was granted:

Cat Fanciers of Brazil – April 11-12, 1998 - FIFe allbreed judges: Beat Rettenmund and Jorge Fletcher.

Cat Lovers of Russia – April 10, 1998 - WCF allbreed judge, Galina Dubrovskaya.

Cat Friends of Germany – October 17-18, 1998, Independent SH specialty judge Yvonne Kleyn and April, 1999 TBA date, George Cherrie, LH/SH.


CFA Open Judging School held in Tokyo, Japan, March 23, 1998, conducted by Kim Everett and Bob Bradshaw on American Shorthairs and Maine Coons. Japan has held several’ judging schools over the years which attract both judges and exhibitors to study the various breeds as well as handling techniques.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Everett

Judging Program Rule Changes. Everett next addressed the proposed Judging Program rule changes and commented that we had voted to pass part of these changes in February but because some of the board members had not been prepared to discuss and decide on the rest, it had been continued for further discussion at this meeting. Lindsley objected to the format and felt that the way the changes were written did not clarify what was being changed. Jones reminded us that we had just put a Judging Program Committee (JPC) into place and
suggested that these changes be turned over to that group to make recommendations. **Miller** agreed that some significant and important items were included in these changes. She too felt that this should be turned over to the new committee for their thoughts and ideas. **Jones Moved** to turn this over to the new committee for their review. They will then make their suggestions and send it back to the board for approval. **Discussion: Everett** noted that this proposal had been done by a committee of several judges who met for many hours and worked very hard to address all of the items affected. “However, I think it is a good idea to move it on to the JPC and I will welcome being relieved of the task.” **Doernberg** clarified that part of the proposal had been passed but nothing had been implemented. Now we are addressing two different things. We are addressing things that have been passed and things that have not been passed. Don’t we need to do this in two different ways? **Lindsley** said that procedurally we need to table the things we have not voted on but the things we have voted on, we should bring up with a motion to review and deal with those as a block. **Jones Moved** to withdraw her motion. **Lindsley Moved** to renew the issues that were voted on in this report at the February board meeting and then to refer them to the JPC for further consideration. Also to table this report to the JPC at the same time. **Motion Carried.**

**New Applicants to the program are as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gardea</td>
<td>Shorthair Specialty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Petty</td>
<td>Shorthair Specialty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Stevens</td>
<td>Shorthair specialty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant files should be reviewed in the Tuesday evening reading room. There is still ample time for much correspondence. I’ve enclosed copies of the application materials and a listing of the letters received to date. Full files will be available in the reading room.

**There are four Trainees to be considered for advancement:**

- Rachel Anger to Longhair Apprentice
- Rhett Bockman to Longhair Apprentice
- *Gloria Hoover to Shorthair Apprentice*
- Paul Patton to Shorthair Apprentice

As usual I have noticed to you the show listings and judges report forms. I will not bring the actual color class work to the board meeting unless requested to do so

*Gloria Hoover has completed her second solo session and has the final session scheduled the first week of June. I will forward these reports under separate cover as soon as available. She struggled initially, but with the help of additional study and unofficial color classes she seems to have progressed well.

A safe trip to one and all.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Thompson
JUDGING PROGRAM PROPOSAL TRANSITION COMMITTEE REPORT.

Having effectively completed its charge following the adoption of the previous report at the February meeting of the CFA Board of Directors, the Judging Program Proposal Transition Committee witnessed the election by CFA’s judges of four of their members to the new Judging Program Committee. Term length for this first election was based on the number of votes received, as stated in the program.

The problem of a vacancy occurring can be addressed by naming an “alternate” from the most current election to fill the position which is first due to expire. The terms of remaining members whose terms were due to expire prior to that of the departing member would be extended one year. This seems to be the simplest, most logical, and least costly approach to this eventuality, although another election is a further possibility. The board of directors needs to determine this issue.

Besides the possibility of a vacancy occurring, this election brought two other matters to the fore. Should declared candidates have their names on the ballot, and can a retiring committee member run again when his/her term expires?

Elected to this committee in April were: Jo Ann Cummings – 4-year term; Jeanie McPhee – 3-year term; Annette Wilson – 2-year term; Wayne Trevathan – 1-year term.

The new committee plans to meet at the CFA Annual Meeting in Philadelphia in June. The exhibitor member named to this committee by those judges elected is Toni Woolard.

Respectfully submitted,
Stan Barnaby, Tom Dent, Kim Everett, Donna Jean Thompson, Betty White

White – The JPC election brought three questions to the fore that need to be addressed: What do we do in the event of a vacancy? I do want to apologize if I offended any member of this board by suggesting an alternate solution. I discussed it with Tom, a member of the Transition Committee, and since it was the simplest, most efficient, quickest, and least expensive to CFA – not to mention the fact that it clearly represented the wishes of the CFA judges – I made a quite innocent leap of faith. The second question has to do with AB judges who are candidates for office while the third deals with retiring members of the JPC. Accordingly, I should like to make three motions, the first being: Moved that this board adopt the policy of declaring the runner-up in the annual election for the JPC as the alternate for that year should one of the elected members be unable to serve. As stated in our report, this alternate would fulfill the term of the member first scheduled to retire, which means a term of no more than one year.

Discussion: President Rothermel – Since the board had set up this committee it was the board’s decision as to how they would approach the vacancy situation. I had no problems with an alternate as the result, however, it is the board’s duty to make that decision. Everett had a problem with the alternate. First of all this is not the International Show nor is it the qualifier. We also have board members that would not be eligible but when they are not on the board any more, they would have an option to run. When this plan was first presented, it was very sketchy. People read things into it that were not there, they didn’t know which direction it was going. It was in the baby stage and several judges said they didn’t want to run for it initially but now that
they see it starting to take form they say they would like to run for that next time. The cost of an additional election for such a small group would be minimal. DelaBar noted that with four judges on the committee it would not be a problem if one spot was to become vacant for some reason that it couldn’t just remain vacant until the next regular election. Four or five members are sufficient for a viable committee. Motion Carried. Miller, Everett, Fuller, DelaBar and Rothermel voting No.

Moved: That declared candidates for the CFA Executive Board be ineligible to appear on the next JPC’s regular ballot. Motion Carried.

White Moved: That a current elected member of the JPC is not eligible for reelection until his/her term has expired. This means a period of at least one year between terms. Discussion: Hawke – I don’t think this is a very good idea. If the committee has a program in place and everything is working well, it would be better for the committee to be kept intact rather than perhaps forcing a key member to drop off for a year. I would rather see term limits than this. At least with term limits, the continuity of the committee could always take advantage of program planning based on a given number of years. What you are suggesting will be akin to rotating like the International Show judges. Motion Carried. Hawke Voting No.

Secretary’s Note: Jo Ann Cummings had written a letter to President Rothermel addressing the need for clarification of one article of the JPC regulations. “It was our original understanding that the Judging Trainee Administrator would be one of the five people who were elected to the JPC. It has now been brought to our attention that the Judging Trainee Administrator can be a person who is not part of this committee and in addition can be a member of the CFA Board of Directors.” White – Stan and I were appointed to this committee following our election to the board last June. We studied the minutes of the meeting where all of you discussed this proposal in order to get a sense of the board’s wishes. I particularly recall that one of you [Phil Lindsley] stated that he usually felt that he had enough information to vote intelligently on those applying to the Judging Program, but felt less secure with the information he had on those moving through the Program. Quite frankly, this echoed my own observation that anecdotal information and written information on licensed judges was contradictory – sometimes in the extreme. The new Program broadens and opens the whole process, while it allows for some procedures, whether it be the training process, schools, workshops – whatever – to remain the same IF THE COMMITTEE SO CHOOSES. I would like to emphasize this: IF THE COMMITTEE SO CHOOSES. The intent and the language is clear. I would also like to stress that it would be a grave mistake to view this program in the context of what exists at present, which has perhaps led to this misconception. The JPC has authority over the entire Judging Program. As such, it appoints the Trainee Administrator. It can hardly exercise the authority unless the person holding that position is outside the committee. There is nothing in the language of the proposal adopted that states anything else. The proposal is also quite clear as to ultimate authority. Since the board has appellate powers, members of the JPC – those five individuals only – cannot be members of the CFA Board of Directors. The new JPC is free to retain the services of any of those individuals now serving in any capacity, or it may clean house. Everett – When I made the motion to proceed with the committee I was well aware that that provision was in there that if they wanted to enlist the services of someone outside the committee, they could. They now have a very strong panel of five, one of those members, Jeanie McPhee, was a prior Judging Program Chairman. There is not a single person on that committee
not capable of handling applicants and trainees. The JPC should make their own assignments. Donna Jean and myself are already wrapping up our work. I am handling the approval pending judges but have already sent a transition of the apprentice files. Donna Jean is finishing all of her trainees who are in process now, I am finishing the Japanese trainees who will come up in October. Everyone who moves to apprentice will go to the JPC for handling. The JPC does have the option to ask for the services of someone outside of the committee. Fuller expressed concern about additional cost if another person is included from outside the committee; i.e., attending meetings, conference calls, etc. She didn’t see that what was approved for a budget would encompass anybody outside the five that were approved in the proposal. Williams – For the sake of continuity it would be best for the program administrator to stay on for the first year then the committee could do what they want. Barnaby – I received a call and was told who was elected to the committee. I next received a call from Jo Ann and she asked what our intent was when we wrote the original proposal. I told her that our intent was that the committee oversees all of the activities but they have the right to retain Donna Jean to work with the trainees. Jo Ann said, “Oh good, we will need her to show us how it is all done.” I took it from the conversation that she meant for a period of time. Then Jo Ann called me back and said that she had talked with Kim and was told completely differently from what I had told her. Everett said that her response to Jo Ann had not been different but had just informed her that she had an option to do it either way. Barnaby then asked why Jo Ann had written the letter. Everett reiterated that Jo Ann was asking for a clarification as to whether or not it was an option or was it mandatory. Barnaby seemed to take exception that all of the correspondence was coming from Jo Ann and asked why her other three committee members weren’t being consulted. President Rothermel noted that Jo Ann had come to the right place, the CFA Board of Directors, to get the needed clarification. The board should tell the committee what is meant and expected. Delabar – When I voted in favor of this I thought all of the functions that two people were doing were going to go to five, including trainees, etc. Now if these five people must pass some of these duties outside their committee then we have a lot of money being spent that hardly seems necessary. We also have a budget for the transition phase that will see the committee through the learning curve. At the time the transition is finished this is their baby for the committee to work with. Jones indicated that in this case, Donna Jean would not be a part of the committee but would be more of an employee of the committee. Fuller noted that the budget for this committee only included the stipends and nothing for expenses. Budget requests are due to the treasurer in April. Hawke – I believe that we should maintain the integrity of this committee as we understood it to be and that is five members, none of which will be on the board of directors. However, for the sake of continuity and to get this committee moving, I suggest that they be given the option to “employ” the services of the Trainee Administrator for a period not to exceed one year. Miller asked to hear from Donna Jean. Thompson indicated that she was the only person that had not been consulted in all of this. She then went on to say “I will assure this board that there is no way under the sun that I will ever turn my back on our judges, on our CFA, on our breeders, or on our exhibitors. I will do everything in my power to see that this judging program is maintained in its viability and in its world presence and that it will succeed either with or without me.” Fuller moved if they wish to keep Donna Jean Thompson as Trainee Administrator, they may do so for one year. After that transition time, all functions of the Judging Program will be administered by the elected members of the JPC. This would include the duties of the Trainee Administrator. Motion Carried. Doernberg, Jones, White, Barnaby, Lindsley voting No.
Secretary’s Note: The following judging items were actually discussed at other times during the board meeting, however, for the sake of reader’s ease in reading they are reported here.

(11) CFA JUDGING ADVANCEMENTS & APPLICANTS.

During Executive Session the following actions were taken and subsequently announced during open session:

Advanced to Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH Ayers, Holly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advanced to Approval Pending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB Beedy, Suzy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes, 1 No (Fuller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB Newkirk, Darrell</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advanced to Apprentice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH Anger, Rachel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Bockman, Rhett</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Hoover, Gloria</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes 1 No (Barnaby)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Maeda, Edward</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Patton, Paul</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepted as Trainee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH Gardea, Steve</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes, 1 Abstain (Fuller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Petty, Tracey</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes 1 No (Barnaby)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH Sada, Y.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Stevens, Jan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reinstitution Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH/SH Mare, David L.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*David Mare will be completing a refresher course between now and the October board meeting. At the October board meeting, subject to the JPC’s report on his progress and the
outcome of this refresher course, the board will decide the appropriate category level for David to begin accepting assignments.

Secretary’s Note: At this time, (1:00 p.m.) the board took a 30-minute lunch break and then reconvened into Executive Session to conduct seven hearings, and to hear some sensitive judging items and Protest Committee matters. One additional hearing was conducted in open session. The results of the protests and hearings are reported at the end of these minutes under the “Disciplinary Hearings & Protests” section.

(12) PROTEST COMMITTEE.

[During executive session following the Protest Committee Report] For the minutes – Phil Lindsley made the following statement: “I would like to thank all of the people who have served on the Protest Committee for the last number of years: Chuck Reich, Betsy Arnold, Tom Dent, Nancy Dodds, in a limited capacity, Loretta Baugh. Everybody who has contributed to this effort and particularly Chuck and Tom have been in there for the whole four years. They have all contributed an awful lot of work and a great amount of time.” Miller went on record as saying we started this protest procedure in increments four years ago with the express intent of eventually getting this off the board. Now that four years have gone by we need to start thinking of the next step. A constitutional amendment may be in order. President Rothermel thanked Phil for all his hard work on the Protest Committee.

(13) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

President Rothermel next called on Tom Dent to present the CO Report.

The surveys of clubs and judges pertaining to the automation of show records have been conducted and the results will be discussed at the Automation Roundtable scheduled for Saturday afternoon. My thanks to those who responded and it should be noted that the judges, as a group, did especially well with an 83% response rate.

The show rule requiring the automation of show records (not including award information) takes effect May 1, 2000 and the Central Office will be working with software vendors and our clubs to insure the reality of the requirement. Our current policy is to remit $15 to each club that now provides automated records and it should be understood that once the rule takes effect, the $15 payment would cease.

We are continuing our study of the “on-site” (i.e. at the show itself) automation of awards records and are contacting other organizations and gathering information on different equipment and methods of achieving this. I have recently reviewed a product which utilizes a special pen which while writing on ordinary paper transmits signals to an electronic tablet positioned under the paper. The signals relay to the tablet the movement of the pen and the tablet later transfers the digitized data to a PC. The need to have a Pentium powered PC at the show hall is the drawback of this approach but every day brings the release of new products, so it seems feasible that within the next year or two at least some of our judges will be producing automated records right in the show ring.
I have received a request from a member club that we deny a show license for a second show within the same year (not known if year refers to calendar year or show year) to another member club. The writer states that a “second” show, scheduled in close proximity to the date of their own show, would hurt the gate for all shows and, also, would draw the ire of animal activists. The Show Rules specifically state that “no show license shall be denied because the same date has been scheduled by one or more other clubs...” (12.03) and it would seem that a denial of a show license on the basis of a close proximity” of dates violates the spirit if not the letter of the rule. I plan no action on the request but to advise those requesting the denial of the provisions of 12.03; however, I am prepared to discuss the specifics of the situation if the board so desires.

Two matters involving the International Division and scoring/awards arose this past season which indicate a need for examination, discussion and either change or affirmation of our procedures/policies. The first matter addresses the inclusion of “listed” cats in the official show count. It has been our practice throughout the existence of the International Division to include listed cats in the count. The Show Rules suggest that this is proper, however, there is no specific wording which addresses this point. In October 1989 I suggested to the board that listed cats should not be included but that a policy should be developed and adopted. Apparently, this never happened, our scorer proceeded to count listed cats and that became our “de facto” policy. I believe this issue should be reviewed by both the Show Rules and International Committees and a recommendation brought to the board in October. Moreover, in the absence of board action on this subject at this meeting, I suggest that the practice of including listed cats in the count be continued throughout the remainder of the current season.

The second matter pertains to the issue of which cats are eligible to receive a “National” award. Specifically, is a cat which resides, competes, and receives points in the International Division eligible? We have followed the practice of giving national awards to the cats which received the highest number of points in accordance with our scoring rules regardless of where the cat is housed and where it competes. This practice was developed on the basis of discussion and board action at the February 1992 Board Meeting. The minutes covering the discussion follow:

“[Mr. Dent stated] “A policy was adopted at the June 1991 board meeting which disallowed international division points from being used towards non-international division awards. As a multinational corporation, our policy should allow points earned at a CFA show held anywhere in the world by someone living anywhere to accrue towards our highest awards. Therefore, two changes should be considered: 1) amend the rule passed in June 1991 and 2) rename the “National Awards” to indicate multinational competition and achievement – e.g. the ‘World Awards” or remove the limiting word “National” we now use and simply have the CFA Annual Awards. #1 CARRIED, #2 to be considered at a later date. Another change is the renaming of the International Division as most people consider the word “International” to be more important than “National”. NOT CONSIDERED at this time.”
Unfortunately, we have never added wording to the rules which clearly states our policy in this area and I am suggesting that this matter be sent to the Show Rules Committee that they may develop the wording which would be based on the board’s action.

**Action Items:**

1. **Out of Region Show(s)**

   a) Tonkinese Breed Association - Region 5  
      Show Date: April 29-30, 2000  
      Proposed Show Location: Baltimore MD area - Region 7

   **Discussion:** Several people spoke to possible negative impact on existing shows within region and neighboring region. **Motion Failed.**

2. **Show Format Changes**

   a) Salt City Cat Club - September 26-27, 1998  
      Current: 5AB, 1 Specialty  
      Proposed: 8AB

   b) Tails ‘N No Tails - January 2-3, 1999  
      Current 5AB, 1 Specialty  
      Proposed: 6AB, 2 Specialty

   c) Empire Cat Club - May 8-9, 1999  
      Current: CH-4AB, 2 Specialty; K/P-6AB  
      Proposed: K/C/P-4AB, 2 Specialty

   d.1) Mid-Michigan Cat Fanciers - October 3-4, 1998  
        Current 4AB, 2 Specialty  
        Proposed: 6AB, 2 Specialty

   d.2) Mid-Michigan Cat Fanciers - April 17-18, 1999  
        Current 6AB, 2 Specialty  
        Proposed: CH-6AB 2 Specialty; K/P-8AB

   e) Rocky Mountain Cat Fanciers - October 24-25, 1998  
      Current 4AB, 4 Specialty  
      Proposed: CH 8 Specialty; 8K/P-8AB

   f) Whisker Woods Feline Fanciers - October 3-4, 1998  
      Current: 4AB, 2 Specialty  
      Proposed: 5AB, 2 Specialty

   **Garrison Moved** to empower Central Office to take action on show format changes without waiting for a board meeting. **Motion Carried.**
3. We have recently received a breeder ad for placement in the Almanac which contains quotes from different judges speaking on the quality of the cat. To the best of our recollection, we are unaware that this (quotes of judges) has ever appeared in an ad in either of our publications. Our concern is that doing this could result in claims and counterclaims arising from misquotes and there is also the possibility that a quote may never have actually occurred. If the board shares our concerns, we are requesting the passage of a motion which would disallow quoting a judge(s) in ads placed in either the Almanac or Yearbook. Passage of this motion would not disallow the quoting of judges in articles.

DelaBar Moved to disallow quoting Judge(s) in ads placed in either the Almanac of Yearbook. Motion Carried.

4. Hierarchy of Awards – While scoring shows we sometimes are confronted with conflicts in awards for which there is no established resolution procedure. Typically, the situation arises when a champion which is not a Best or 2nd Best Champion in show receives a finals award higher than either the Best or 2nd Best Champion. Should the “Champion” award be voided or the Top Ten award? Because situations of this nature could potentially affect National/Regional awards, we request that action be taken to establish policy that deals with these situations. One approach would be to adopt the policy that in all cases of conflict between the awards of Best/2nd Best AB Champion (Prem.), Best/2nd Best LH Champion (Prem.), Best/2nd Best SH Champion (Prem.) AND the awards of Best through 10th Best Cat, the award of Best through 10th Best Cat shall stand and the conflicting “Champion” award be voided.

Discussion: Barnaby – When a judge names a best or second best champion in an AB and then comes up with another cat in their top ten I would be inclined to void the top ten win because it is obviously a mechanical error and possibly at the breed level. Garrison – Stan said basically what I was going to say. It is a mechanical error and the higher award would automatically be voided. Lindsley agreed with Stan and Jody, always breed judging would determine eligibility for finals. Fuller – Obviously it is a mechanical error. If you void the top 10 win, it could impact other top 10 cats and their national points. Whereas if you void the best champion win, it is less likely to affect other cats. Meantime what happens is that the judge didn’t realize that some other cat which was much better was a champion. The transfer had come in wrong or the transfer had not come in or something else. We should not be messing around with the top 10 to not void the lower wins. DelaBar – I don’t believe we should throw that cat out of the top 10 win, regardless of its title. If a SH champion is named in the top 10 and it is a champion it will be the best champion in show. Then the best SH champion becomes your second best SH champion. Whoever had second best shorthair champion is out of luck. Doernberg – If I make a mechanical error in my final and I put as my third best cat a champion but it is not named as my best champion or my second best champion, what would happen is that my second best champion would be dropped, best champion becomes my second best champion and my third best cat now becomes my best champion. Then all of the mechanics are correct. Hawke – What happens if this third best cat had been defeated in its breed or division for best champion in division and that best division champion is not best or second best cat? If, however, this is not the case, I would then agree that the highest award would stand. Barnaby – If this third best cat had been defeated at breed or division level it would not be eligible for third best
cat or best champion. **Aitken Moved** that the highest award would stand. **Motion Carried.** Barnaby, Hawke voting No.

5. **At the February 1998 Board Meeting, the board directed that the Havana Brown Breed Council be re-poll on the issue of allowing outcrossing. On May 1, 1998 a revised ballot was sent to the 18 individuals who were current breed council members; 16 ballots were returned. The ballot and results are included as Attachment 5. It is now requested that the board act on the policies presented in the three questions.**

**Discussion: Doernberg** gave a short synopsis of what happened in February and referred us to attached Havana Breed Council Poll dated May 1, 1998. 16 of the 18 ballots mailed were returned: Item 1 passed 16 to 0. Item 2 passed 14 to 2. Item 3 passed 16 to 0. **Doernberg Moved** to accept with an effective date of now. **Motion Carried.**

6. **The Show Rules contain a misprint pertaining to the year when Orientals will be disallowed from competing as Colorpoint Shorthairs. The actual date is 5/1/99 but was printed as 5/1/2000. We have advised breed council members of the error and are prepared to correct the date in existing copies of the rules. The Oriental Breed Council Secretary has proposed an alternate suggestion, that the incorrect date be allowed to stand. His letter is enclosed as Attachment 6.**

**Doernberg Moved** to take no action on request contained in the OSH BC Secretary’s letter. **Discussion: Doernberg** referred to Attachment 6. OSH BC Secretary’s letter. She said that while it was unfortunate that this clerical error in the show rules had occurred, she did not see that disseminating the correcting information was a problem. A change to a policy set in February because of a clerical error would only serve to make the transition more difficult, with more damage to breeder relations. We should make every effort to disseminate the correction to the affected breeds; i.e., CPSH and OSH breeders and move forward. **Motion Carried.**

**Dent** asked for a policy that would cover when an outgoing officer hands over the reins to the incoming officer. **Discussion:** There are a couple of different items involved here, there are the social functions that are attached and then there are the official duties of the board members. This action may require a constitutional amendment and Tom agreed to prepare one before the October meeting to propose to the board at that time. He then asked for a policy about the social functions of outgoing directors and officers. **Hawke Moved** that CFA Board policy be that outgoing officers’ terms end at midnight on Saturday night of the Annual meeting. **Motion Carried.**

**Doernberg** referred to the International Division and scoring/awards. She asked if this was going to be addressed in October as a possible show rule change. **Dent** said he would present this to both Show Rules and International Committees and what they do at that point is up to them.
CFA Club Statistics as of June 1, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Int’l</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of clubs</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Delinquent Clubs dropped*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of clubs pend approval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CFA Clubs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delinquent Clubs Dropped 6/1/98

Region 1
Improper Bostonians (The)

Region 2
Bay Area Rex Breeders
Golden West Cat Club
Witches Int.

Region 3
Old Spanish Trail Cat Fanciers

Region 6
Dubuque Feline Fanciers
Stray Cats
Water Tower Siamese

Region 7
Cape Fear Valley Cat Fanciers’
Southern Paws ‘n Tails

International
Cat Fanciers of Moscow
Club Des Amis Du Chat
Northern Brittania Cat Fanciers

**Total may change due to board action on new club applications at June Meeting.

(14) CFA CAT BOOK.

At the June 1997 Annual Meeting, President Rothermel announced CFA would be investigating the possibility of producing a CFA Cat Book (similar to the AKC Dog Book). Inquiries to publishers established the feasibility and interest in this type of project.

I’m pleased to announce Mordecai Siegal has agreed to be the editor of the book. As many of you know, Mr. Siegal brings with him a solid and respected reputation in the publishing industry. It is this reputation and Mr. Siegal’s extensive business contacts which have made this project a reality. Additionally, Mr. Siegal has edited several other books of this type, e.g. the highly successful Cornell Book of the Cat, U of C Davis Book of Dogs and U of C Davis Book of...
For the purposes of this book, CFA and Mordecai Siegal have entered into a partnership. This partnership is being represented by the William Morris Agency, a highly respected and powerful agency in the publishing world. Contract negotiations with the publisher are taking place now and I hope to be able to report to you at the board meeting that the contract has been finalized.

I will be working very closely with Mr. Siegal. One of my main functions is to interface with the cat fancy in gathering the information and articles to be included in the book. Following is a first draft, table of contents which will provide you with a “feel” for the book. The contents of the book are far from final at this point and there may be additions and/or deletions to this list. While reviewing the contents, please keep in mind we are targeting several audiences: the general cat-owning public, the novice cat fancier and the more experienced cat fancier. I welcome your comments and/or suggestions in this area.

Each breed section will contain one color photo of the breed. I believe the selection of these photos will become a hot issue and will be asking you to endorse a policy, at the October board meeting, regarding the photo selection. We plan on selecting photos from Richard Katris’ (Chanah Photography) extensive library. Currently, Richard has approximately 12,000 pictures catalogued on CD-ROM with even more uncatalogued pictures to choose from. I would appreciate hearing your ideas.

In closing, I’d like to thank the entire board for the confidence you’ve shown in me by endorsing my appointment by President Rothermel to chair this exciting project

CFA CAT BOOK
First Draft Table of Contents

Introduction

1. What is a pedigreed cat?
   - Why choose a pedigreed cat as a companion as opposed to a non-pedigreed cat?
   - What makes a cat pedigreed? Why we don’t use the word “purebred?”
   - Address issue of overpopulation? Explain pedigreed cats account for only about 5% of the entire cat population. Many breeders have waiting lists.

2. Selecting a cat
   - Large cat or small cat.
   - Long or short hair.
   - Activity level of cat.
   - Allergies.
• What do you expect from a cat - a playmate? a companion? a source of affection?
• One cat or two for company?
• Are there children, dogs, or other cats in household?
• Be aware of local legislative issues - limit laws, licensing requirements, lemon laws, restraints on activities.

3. Where to get a cat

• A pet shop?
• A breeder. Emphasize RESPONSIBLE breeders.
• What to expect from a breeder, neuter/spay, adoptable age-4 months, etc. (provide a sample sales contract), require to keep cat indoors, health guarantees.
• The application for registration.
• What to look for when selecting a cat - clear eyes, good condition, friendly. Although it’s a good idea to see the cattery, explain why some breeders are hesitant to have people in their cattery because of animal control issues, etc.
• Explain CFA Cattery Environment program.
• Outline questions a breeder might ask. It’s similar to placing an adopted child in a home.

4. Living with your cat

• Bringing the cat home.
• Always transport a cat in an enclosed, secured carrier (they’re inexpensive). Be sure to cover the carrier during cold weather.
• Litter box - selecting type (hooded vs open, etc.), location in house.
• Food, toys, place to sleep, food, etc.
• Introducing a cat to other cats.
• Introducing a cat to dogs.
• Cats and children.
• Cats safer indoors.
• Traveling with your cat.
• Cat furniture.
• About declawing (cats in CFA shows may not be declawed). Explain other alternatives to declawing.
• Neuter & Spay.
• Animal Disaster Preparedness - How to provide for your cat(s) in case of a fire, hurricane, etc.

• Safety issues - string, aluminum foil, plastic bags, medicine bottles, open trash cans (dental floss, etc.), open toilet seats, etc.

• Grooming.

5. Behavior

• The tail tells all. How a cat communicates through its tail.

• Litter box problems.

• Clawing furniture, drapes, etc.

• Cats on countertops.

• Biting (often associated with declawed cats).

• The aggressive cat - cat to cat, cat to human (attacking feet).

• Cat using a human as a climbing post.

• Why cats purr and knead and what it means.

6. Nutrition/Feeding

• Free feeding vs. controlled feeding

• Special feeding needs for a sick cat

• Feeding the right type of food (kitten, active adult, low activity, etc.)

• Type of bowl (no deep bowls for Persians/Exotics)

• How to deal with cats eating dog’s food and vice versa.

• How to cope with a finicky cat and get him to eat.

7. Health/Wellness Care & Illness

• Annual check-up, dental care, vaccinations.

• How do I know when my cat is sick?

• Your cat and the vet.

• How to choose a vet for your cat.

• When to go to the vet: common feline illnesses, major feline illnesses.

• Health Insurance.

• Poisonous plants.
• Aging cats - special care, diseases common to older cats (hyperthyroidism, kidney failure). Grief support for owners when cat dies. Answer questions such as “Should I get another cat right away to keep surviving cat company?”

• Winn Feline Foundation.

8. Twenty most frequently asked questions about cats

• Is a male calico rare and worth a lot of money?
• Ditto for polydactyl cats.

9. Twenty most common mistakes owners make with cats OR Twenty most common misconceptions about cats

• Expect a cat to behave like a dog.
• Cats aren’t affectionate.
• Cats are aloof
• Cats don’t require much care.
• OK to leave cats alone for extended periods of time.
• It’s OK for a cat to fall from high places because they always land on their feet.
• Cats should drink milk.
• Pregnant women should not handle cats (toxoplasmosis).

10. Breeding & Reproduction

• Should I breed my cat?
• Emphasize it’s not important that a female cat have “just one litter.”
• Emphasize the responsibility of breeding cats, breeding to the standard.
• Cattery Management, cattery standard, tax info.
• Genetics.
• Breeding techniques.
• Delivering kittens.
• Post-natal care.

About Pedigreed Cats

Standards, History, Breed Personalities and More

• Anatomy.
• Personality.
• Official standards.
• Differences between shaded and smoke, chinchilla vs silver (amount of tipping), etc.
• Illustrations showing the variety of accepted coat patterns, shaded, smoke, tabby, spotted tabby, ticked tabby, classic tabby, mackerel tabby, van, pointed, etc.
• Illustrations and photographs of items unique to a breed such as the curl of the American Curl’s ear, the fold of the Scottish Fold’s ear, the break on a Persian’s face, the tail of the Japanese Bobtail, etc.

A color portrait to accompany each breed entry.

11. Cat Shows

• Overview.
• How to find and enter a show.
• Judging.
• Basic info about how someone becomes a judge.
• How judges choose between all those lovely cats.

12. CFA & Registration

• Lease info.
• Samples of forms (blue slip, registration certificate, etc.).
• The registration process - parents CFA registered, then litter is registered, then individual cats.
• Cattery names.

13. Feral/unowned cats

• What can I do about stray cats in my neighborhood?

CFA Cat Book Addendum

I’m pleased to report the contract for the CFA Cat Book has been finalized and signed. A complete manuscript must be in the publisher’s hands, Harper-Collins, no later than January 1, 2000. Although that date may sound far off, it is only 18 months away. There is a tremendous amount of work to be accomplished in this short, very short, time frame.

As I mentioned in my previous memo, please provide me with any relevant input as soon as possible. Mordecai Siegal and I will begin work immediately on the book upon my return from the annual.

I will be available at Wednesday’s board meeting to answer any questions you might have.
Respectfully submitted,
Allene Tartaglia

(15)  **WINN FELINE FOUNDATION REPORT.**

The Winn Feline Foundation Board of Directors will meet on Wednesday June 17, 1998. Our June board meeting concentrates on general business and election of officers for the next term.

With the resignation and subsequent death of our attorney, Sy Howard, we have appointed a new attorney, Fred Jacobberger. Fred will be with us for his first meeting on June 17.

The Winn Feline Foundation Symposium will be held on Thursday evening, June 18, 1998. Joan Miller has organized this event. Two talks are planned: the first is Feline Vaccinology by Julie Levy (from University of Florida). The second is presented by Joan Miller and Diane Eigner entitled The Veterinarian and Pedigreed Cat Breeder Relationship. Dr. Eigner comes from Philadelphia and writes a veterinary column for the CFA Almanac. Both subjects are of interest to our attendees and we look forward to an interesting and informative evening.

The Foundation is very excited to be a part of the First International Feline Genetic Disease Conference at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, June 25-29, 1998. The conference is co-sponsored by Ralston Purina and Winn Feline Foundation. Thursday night, June 25, the Conference opens with a reception. Then Friday and Saturday, scientists from around the world will meet to discuss current research on feline genetic disease, feline gene mapping, and related topics. Sunday, June 29, there will be an all-day program for breeders and their veterinarians which will recap the scientific conference and add some discussions of interest to breeders. We are looking forward to hearing the latest information on Polycystic Kidney Disease (PKD), blood typing, heritable cardiomyopathy, etc.

The host of this conference, Dr. Urs Giger, has been active with feline genetic disease for 15 years, including his research work in feline neonatal isoerythrolysis and feline blood typing as well as patella luxation and hip dysplasia in the cat. Over the years the Winn Foundation has provided grants for several of his groundbreaking projects. We know that this conference is a dream come true for Dr. Giger. He has planned this program for several years, and he has made it happen in 1998. Our congratulations to Dr. Urs Giger, University of Pennsylvania.

The Winn Foundation will have a booth at the Conference, and will have participation in both the scientific and the breeder portions of the weekend. A copy of the program is attached for your information.

Thanks to Karen Lawrence, Carol Krzanowski, and John August, the Winn Foundation Internet Website <http://www.winnfelinehealth.org> is up and running. We can run it online or as a demonstration off-line. We will have a demonstration of the website at the CFA International Show in November, as well as at the International Feline Genetics Conference in Philadelphia.

The work of The Winn Feline Foundation benefits cats, both in the United States and around the world. Late last fall, our secretary received a letter and package from Argentina. The
writer had experienced the tragedy of Feline Infectious Peritonitis and eventually found the volume of Feline Practice devoted to the First International FECV/FIP conference co-sponsored by the Winn Foundation and the Center for Companion Animal Health at the University of California, Davis. She has donated a paid Spanish translation of this issue to the Winn Foundation and we have received permission from the publisher to make this available at our cost.

1998 marks the 30th anniversary of The Winn Feline Foundation. Thanks to the vision of Robert Winn, CFA’s attorney, the board members who have worked tirelessly, and the clubs, companies, and individuals who have donated their time and their money, the Foundation has grown substantially from its modest beginnings in 1968. The Foundation endowment totals $400,000. (The endowment is perpetual with only the interest income available each year to fund projects.) Currently we can fund two worthy projects annually from the endowment fund. In addition, annual donations of approximately $85,000 are used for health-related studies.

As we reflect on the accomplishments of the Foundation over the past 30 years, we are reminded that the relationship between the Cat Fanciers’ Association and the Winn Foundation has been a strong one and we look forward to continuing the relationship in future years.

Respectfully submitted,
Hilary Helmrich
President

HEALTH COMMITTEE REPORT.

Guidelines for Requesting Outcrossing

Following the adoption of the report of the Breed Definition Committee (WIAB) at the February 1998 meeting of the CFA Board of Directors, the Health Committee commenced working on guidelines for requesting outcrossing by any of our recognized breeds. I notified all breed council secretaries of our undertaking by mail on February 25, requesting thoughts and suggestions from their breeders to aid in our deliberations. Tentative guidelines were established in late April and all breed council secretaries were apprised of the proposed protocol in a letter from me on May 5.

These working guidelines are:

Documentation of any of the following:

1. Reduced litter size and/or increasing kitten mortality
2. Increased incidence of a specific disease/disorder within the breed.
3. Increasing susceptibility to a variety of illnesses.
4. Dangerous reduction in available genetic variability.
Documentation to be in the form of registration records, detailed breeders’ medical records that must include necropsy, veterinarian and lab reports, and/or any studies that may have been made. It may be that the Health Committee will require additional documentation as such tools become available, e.g. gene mapping.

In addition, the committee is working on reference material to be made available to all CFA breeders, information to assist them in identifying genetic defects (including a genetic defects database). Further, we will offer standard protocols to enable breeders to document a breed’s overall genetic health. It is our goal to have final guidelines and all other educational data completed for review and approval by the board of directors at the February 1999 board meeting.

PKD (Polycystic Kidney Disease) Sub-Committee

A sub-committee was formed in late April to spearhead a concerted attack on this known genetic disease of Persian and Exotic cats and those other domestic breeds related to them. The committee will also serve as a clearinghouse for information of all kinds concerning PKD. Joining me on this sub-committee are Debi Faryna, Sue Helmke, Hilary Helmrich, Susan Little, Colleen Power, and Anna Sadler. Dr. David Biller, the recognized authority on this disease, is our consultant. The committee will meet at the Annual in Philadelphia on Thursday and make an initial report at a general meeting on the subject to be held on Saturday afternoon, June 20.

Vaccine-associated Feline Sarcoma

Breeders will be heartened to know that the Vaccine-Associated Feline Sarcoma Task Force, a group formed by the American Veterinary Medical Association, awarded a number of research grants to study this problem. They were announced in the January issue of their Journal and supported by the American Animal Hospital Association Foundation, Fort Dodge Animal Health, American Association of Feline Practitioners, Cornell Feline Health Center, Intervet, Inc., Veterinary Cancer Society, and Synbiotics Corporation. The Morris Animal Foundation also announced a similar study funded by the Kirkpatrick Foundation.

Feline Diabetes

A valuable, long-lasting insulin that enables many cats to be maintained on a single dose per day is once again to be made available. Called PZI (protamine zinc), this insulin ceased to be manufactured a few years ago. Anthony Products has received FDA approval to produce it, making it available soon through regular veterinary suppliers.

Flea Control

According to a clinical report published in the January issue of the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, it is suggested that flea populations within a home may be controlled by carefully timed on-host treatments with potent long-acting insecticides such as imidacloprid. A comparison treatment with lufenuron, an insect development inhibitor, indicated that this suspension was not effective.
CFA Health Committee Website FAQ (frequently asked questions)

Continuing our mission to inform our breeders and the general public of health concerns, the Health Committee utilizes our website faithfully to further this effort. We have added more new topics to the website and wish to call these to your attention:


http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-petownership.html (Susan Little DVM) - pet ownership for those who are immunocompromised

http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-vaccination-guidelines.html (Diane R. Eigner DVM) – vaccination guidelines approved by the American Association of Feline Practitioners

http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-flea-products.html (Jill A. Richardson, DVM) - an examination of flea control products

Website Pamphlets

The first of our website pamphlets (reproductions of our website articles) to be made available to clubs and individuals deals with Polycystic Kidney Disease. One of the prime topics of the PKD Sub-Committee at the Annual will be how best to use these pamphlets.

Almanac Article

Please be on the lookout for an article on estrus prevention in cats by Jean Ryan Gullahorn, DVM, soon to be published in the CFA Almanac, [July 1998].

AVMA Conference

I plan to attend the 1998 AVMA Conference in Baltimore this July with Michael Brim and the CFA booth. Please expect a report of proceedings of keen interest to our breeders and CFA in October.

Respectfully submitted,
Betty White, Chair
CFA Health Committee

(17) LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT.

CFA Legislative Group:

The legislative year has been extremely busy for the CFA Legislative Group. We have had many stunning successes in preventing detrimental laws, thanks to excellent help from the cat fanciers; but we have had some discouraging defeats as well. Our grass roots mobilization is greatly improved; however, in some areas apathy continues to hamper our abilities to be effective.
Anna Sadler, Sharon Coleman and I have learned a great deal over the past year and feel we have established a sound basis for our legislative procedures — reporting, coordinating, tracking, analyzing of legislation, understanding and working with the many people involved, using the power of the Internet and coping with its drawbacks. We have also established good contacts with other animal interest groups and attended several important national conferences and meetings. Our system is still evolving but is working well. We start by analyzing each proposal, deciding strategy and timing with a core team of local fanciers, preparing an Alert flyer and letter writing guide with clear points, preparing a list of all legislators’ fax, phone and email and then mobilizing all cat fanciers to write strong but polite letters. Testimony by local cat fanciers at hearings with books containing facts and data has impressed the legislators. Often letters have been prepared at shows or at club meetings and in many areas we have only a few fanciers taking the lead but many more willing to telephone and fax. Everyone’s effort is important to have the strong impact we need. We especially appreciate the enormous amount of time given to this by relatively few individuals. Some of their achievements will make the difference in the future survival of the cat fancy.

Several months ago we were monitoring or involved in over 80 state bills alone, in addition to local and county ordinances. Now, as some of the state legislative sessions are starting to end, we are watching or actively dealing with 56 state bills and several local situations. As one crisis ends and another begins we have found that there is little time for many of the communication objectives we set last year. We have revised some materials in the Central Office and are working on other binders, sample letters and good backup data.

The following is a brief summary of some of the current hot spots and activity. We will have more information available at the board meeting:

**USDA/DDAL Petition** – Per my attached report the next step will be an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR), which will take several months before announcement.

**Alabama** – Cat licensing has been proposed in Jefferson County, and we are lucky to have the strength and knowledge of the Birmingham Feline Fanciers who are working to stop this proposal. We are providing information and materials that have worked in other parts of the country.

**California** – The Southwest Region legislative team was proud to achieve one of the most outstanding recent successes. The “cat tax” (cat licensing) was soundly defeated in the City of Los Angeles. With a 15 to 0 City Council vote the mayor’s budget was stripped of funds for his pet proposal. An onerous neuter/spay ordinance with intact animal fees is now being pushed in LA; however, cats have been removed. Nevertheless, we will fight this along with the dog fanciers to prevent precedent being set.

Both Berkeley and Oakland have been considering mandatory neuter and spay legislation. Oakland may propose an “unaltered animal certificate” with an annual fee and a battle is expected to start in a few weeks.

Assembly Bill 1856, which would have required sterilization of every dog and cat sold in the state, was soundly defeated in committee, thanks to a huge outpouring of letters from cat and
dog fanciers. Assemblyman Edward Vincent later revised the bill to require sterilization of shelter animals only. This legislation has now moved to the Senate after Assembly passage yesterday and may be further revised.

Even though Senate Bill 2102 concerns only dogs we were disturbed that it passed the Senate yesterday and moves to the Assembly. It would extend the existing Pet Breeder Warranty Act to include anyone who sells a litter within a 36 month period. Groups that would like the public to believe all purebred animals are genetically flawed and have poor temperaments, thereby requiring rigid consumer protection, heavily support this bill. We will continue to aid the dog fancy in their opposition.

**Connecticut** – HB 5495 was another example of a bill requiring anyone who breeds more than one litter of dogs (cats not included) to obtain a kennel license, including inspections. Cat fancy opposition was stronger than that of the dog fancy, but the bill passed this month to the Governor’s desk.

**Delaware** – Another serious Pet Warranty Law proposal for dogs and cats is in the drafting stages. We have submitted strong rationale for its defeat, or modification if necessary, and have a cat club representative on the State Pet Legislation Working Group which meets this week.

**Florida** – We supported the State Veterinary Association in passing this law to provide exemption from public records the requirement for rabies vaccination certificate information. It is on the Governor’s desk.

Dade County, Florida, has now amended its County Code to include regulation of dog and cat breeders and pet stores. This proposal was defeated by the cat fancy in Florida two years ago after a hard battle. It suddenly came up again with no notice and passed. In spite of our last minute aggressive effort to get the mayor’s veto, it was too late. The law will require registration, licensing and of breeders owning five or more cats.

**Missouri** – With the passage of the Animal Care Facilities Act of 1994 hobby/show breeders with ten or fewer intact female cats and dogs were exempted. Senate Bill 810 would have removed this exemption and group together all breeders who have four or more intact female cats, dogs, or birds or any combination thereof. License fee would be from $100 to $500 per year with penalties ranging up to $1,000 for violation. We have strong CFA representation on the Missouri Federation of Animal Owners and this organization managed to kill this bill in committee.

**New York** – Several cruelty to animals laws with strict penalties have been dormant for a while and are now starting to move through committees needing closer monitoring. We are also concerned with AB 6724, which requires cat licensing, and AB 9743, prohibiting unaltered cats-at-large.

**Tennessee** – Thanks to excellent cooperation between our CFA cat fanciers and the dog fanciers HB3102/SB2540, which was basically a state shelter sterilization bill but had some detrimental elements, died in the house and in the Senate committee just before the session was adjourned.
Texas – We aggressively objected to a new interpretation of the State Health and Safety Code regarding rabies and the regulation of animal shelters as proposed by the Department of Health, Director of Zoonosis Control. The language would have been detrimental to rescue group activity and disaster relief activities in the state. Based primarily on the points made by Sharon, Anna and Pam DelaBar the objectionable wording was deleted.

Upcoming Conferences:

The 4th annual No-Kills Shelter Conference – September 10-13, 1998, Concord Hilton, Concord, CA. (HYPERLINK mail to <FORODTFA@Ix.netcom.corn>

The American Humane Association- Anaheim, October 4-7, 1998, Disneyland Hotel, CA <http://www.amerhumane.org>


The CFA Legislative Fund – Board Action:

All of the legislative activity has raised awareness of many cat fanciers of the importance of our work to preserve the cat fancy and pedigreed cat breeding. Thanks to several cat fanciers who have started raffles for the Legislative Fund, posted numerous messages on the Internet and stimulated club and individual donations, we are beginning to see excellent contributions coming in to the CFA Matching Fund and also to some of the state or regional treasuries. Contributions to the CFA Fund are matched by a CFA allocation, which was established around 1994 for this purpose. Based on the Budget Committee’s report at the board meeting, I would like the board to consider adding to the allocation balance. When the CFA Legislative Committee meets next we plan to review the available funds and the kinds of projects which would be appropriate and are most needed to fight legislation, provide data or support programs that assist our legislative efforts.

Respectfully submitted,
Joan Miller

USDA update on DDAL Petition — May 12, 1998:

An announcement concerning the Doris Day Animal League (DDAL) petition, which would amend the Animal Welfare Act definition of “retail pet store” (would add more breeders) and require that breeders of hunting, security and breeding dogs be licensed under the AWA, was made at the USDA/APHIS Animal Care public meeting, May 12, 1998.

Ron DeHaven, Acting Deputy Administrator for USDA/APHIS Animal Care, said there will be an “Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking” (ANPR) which will announce APHIS’s intention to consider amending its regulations. This would start a process that invites public comment on specific questions that will be included in the ANPR. An ANPR is not a commitment to engage in rulemaking. If APHIS decides, on the basis of responses to the ANPR, to amend its regulations, the proposed amendment will then be published as a “Proposed Rule”, which will also be subject to public comment before a Final Rule is adopted. DeHaven did mention that if
changes are made to the regulations they may be “based on the number of breeding females.”
He said they would have to estimate the numbers of dealers that would be involved in licensing
should such changes be made.

Now, what does this mean for us? As explained to me by Jim Holt, AKC’s Federal
Legislative Liaison in Washington, D.C., it is likely to take two or three months or longer before
the ANPR is published. We would then have several months to answer the specific APHIS posed
questions and then if a Proposed Rule is prepared, several more months of a public comment
period similar to what we went through in 1997 on the DDAL petition. The process promises to
be long and drawn out. Meanwhile we will utilize the time to prepare. Attorneys for AKC and for
the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC) in Washington had worked for several months
to achieve this ANPR decision, as this was preferable to an anticipated announcement of new
regulation proposals based on those presented by DDAL and the other seven petitioners. Our
position is still to firmly oppose any change in the Animal Welfare Act Regulations concerning
the addition of non-wholesale breeders selling their dogs and cats directly to the public at retail.
We continue to insist that USDA improve its ability to enforce the existing regulations and
wholesale dealer licensing compliance and believe that expansion of regulation is not
warranted.

I represented CFA at an organization follow up meeting in Washington on May 13th to
discuss strategy. Groups present were AKC, CFA, PIJAC, NABR (National Assoc. of Biomedical
Research), the American Horse Council, Air Transport Assoc. of America, United Airlines and
the Chair of the International Air Transport Association (IATA). Along with the other groups, I
sent a letter on behalf of CFA to the Chair of the House Committee on Appropriations. We
requested that, during the upcoming USDA/APHIS budget review, consideration be given to
several concerns. My letter stated that we encourage adequate funding of existing APHIS
activities to assure that the Animal Welfare Act goals are met but that we ask that funds not be
allocated for any new programs or expansion of the USDA scope of enforcement. At the May
12th Public Meeting and the follow up meeting there was considerable criticism for APHIS’s
ability to regulate and evidence that they have not adequately addressed existing deficiencies
that impair current enforcement. We believe if the final approved budget does not allow
expansion, then any consideration of adding dog and cat breeders (selling direct to the public) to
the wholesale dealers already licensed will be less likely. Lobbying efforts in Washington will
continue and we will keep the cat fancy posted when the ANPR is published.

USDA Animal Care Public Meeting – May 12, 1998:

The all-day meeting was held at the APHIS building in Riverdale, Maryland. CFA
participants were Joan Miller, Debi Faryna, Ellyn Honey and Pam Huggins. In the morning
general topics were presented and in the afternoon there were several break away sessions.
Attendance was over 300 and included commercial animal dealers, pet industry representatives,
biomedical researchers, veterinarians, zoo representatives and other exhibitors, animal rights
and animal welfare organizations, transportation entities and various animal fancy
representatives. Ron DeHaven and Michael Dunn, USDA Assistant Secretary of Programs,
presented the Strategic Direction Plan. It was clearly stated that the goal of the USDA is to “get
off the backs of those who comply, work with those who want to comply and to put out of
business those who refuse to comply.
In addition to the AWA regulations ANPR announcement, APHIS speakers talked about their high tech developments and other efforts to improve the effectiveness of their inspection and animal care programs. Much of this is positive; however, cat fanciers present couldn’t help being amused to hear that APHIS now plans to accept public comment on federal regulation directly through email communication (they have no idea what this will mean once the DDAL matter starts again!). Summary reports of animal dealer and research facility inspections are now available to the general public on-line. There was considerable objection to this by some of the animal facilities present. Inspectors are now scanning dogs routinely for microchips. So far over 300 have been checked and no microchips have been found. They want microchip identification in order to verify veterinary treatment records and other information needed for enforcement.

A major change is that inspections are now “risk based” as of February 1998. If a facility is consistently in compliance it will be inspected every three years unless there is a complaint. Others will be inspected as often as six months or one year. Inspection reports have been redesigned to be more easily understood and performance indicators have been established to measure effectiveness. Punishment fines now are partially directed to facility improvements rather than to the federal government. Partnerships and sharing of information with other government agencies, such as State Departments of Agriculture, will leverage APHIS resources. They also plan to tie into well-documented standards of care, such as the AVMA euthanasia standard, which are industry based and come from a strong background of knowledge. This will avoid conflict between federal and other standards and these will be updated regularly by industry. The APHIS Safe Pet Travel Campaign was discussed along with the new regulations for temperature and humidity during transport. (CFA provided input helping to avoid a maximum temperature level requirement for travel.) There is now an automated service to provide information on the proper handling of cats and dogs during transport (800-545-USDA) giving the requirements for temperature, documents, cage sizes, etc.

Policy guidance will be more affected by increased yearly public regional meetings and public forums than in the past. A newly established “USDA Animal Well-being Task Force” will issue reports and APHIS has an Animal Care quarterly newsletter. Many of us have great concern for the shift from more formal regulation change procedures to the directions announced at this meeting. There is now increased potential for organizations with political agendas, and the ability to influence, to have a much greater role in policy development. Ron DeHaven answered questions by saying that policy is an “interpretive rule” and that the courts have given broad leeway to the interpretation of the regulations by the USDA. This means CFA and AKC must have closer contact with the USDA, attend public meetings, provide speakers and participate in the process if we expect our interests to be protected.

There were several short presentations. Cathy Liss, Animal Welfare Institute, spoke about medical record documentation and also asked for more regulation of the supply of dogs and cats for research; Cindy Carroccio, the Austin Zoo, discussed the problems of zoos filling up with dangerous wild animals sold to the public as pets. Barbara Rich, National Association for Biomedical Research, spoke in favor of APHIS efforts to assure that animals in research facilities are not lost pets and said Class B Dealers were now in compliance with the AWA. Sumner Matthes, Sarasota In Defense of Animals, asked for additional funds for the USDA budget and advocated more laws for protection of wild and exotic animals. He believed there
was pretty good compliance with the AWA for dogs and cats but called for a blue-ribbon committee of animal protectionists and humane organizations, hunters, etc. to get federal and state laws changed to better protect wild/exotic animals. He asked for government funded wild animal sanctuaries to enable the closing of roadside zoos.

During the Dealer/Auction/Actions breakaway session I attended I had the opportunity to speak with Dan Jones, DVM, Supervisor of the APHIS Central Region inspection, who was a speaker. During his many years as a field inspector he went to “the worst of the worst” facilities. He said there are few if any commercial operations consisting solely of cats. Wholesale facilities will breed dogs and sometimes have cats as an adjunct. He introduced me to several large brokers and “bunchers” from Midwestern states with many commercial facilities who also told me that when there are cats raised they tend to be exceptionally well housed and cared for. (30 USDA licensed facilities in Missouri include cats and all are excellent.) Usually there are no more than three or four breeds and 20 cats that are totally healthy. It is not commercially viable to breed or sell sick or weak cats. I believe we should discontinue use of the term, “kitten-mill,” as it reflects poorly on cat breeding in general and is most likely inaccurate.

Marshall Meyers, PIJAC, discussed the pet industry perspective on AWA regulation. He emphasized that long term housing requirements are not appropriate for short term pet store housing and stressed that compliance could be enhanced with better educational tools. APHIS needs to broaden the range of fines and penalties, to include lesser through heavy sanctions, and he suggested that their press releases should reveal the problems of animal abuse more clearly. He said that overall the AWA regulations are working. Sue Pressman, consultant to the New York ASPCA, formerly with HSUS, presented the ASPCA Puppy Breeding Study of Lancaster County, PA. She described commercial dog breeding farms with as many as 40 different breeds where the animals were treated as a primary “crop” and where “careless management is a lifestyle”.

This public forum was an eye opener for me but considered relatively uneventful and repetitive to many individuals who were present and had been to other USDA meetings.

(18) ANIMAL WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT.

My main report will be given to the delegation on Friday. I provided a proposed CFA Breeder Code of Ethics to each member of the board at the February meeting and asked for input. To date, I have received no input. Therefore, I will present the attached Code of Ethics to the delegation during my report. This Code of Ethics is meant to be general and can be further supplemented by breed clubs, etc., as long as their supplements meet the spirit and the constitution of this organization, and current policies and procedures.

Disaster Relief Training will be presented on Thursday, again by Shirley Minshew. We are fortunate to have Monique Verronneau, director of the Canadian Cat Association, in attendance at this class. We are hoping, at the time of this report, to have the Code 3 Associates disaster unit on site for true hands-on training. If we can accomplish this task of finding room for our 75 foot unit, the board of directors is invited to tour it. I think you’ll be impressed. This unit was also on display at the Miami Cat Fanciers - Friskies Lead Show in May and received many
favorable comments. Exhibitors loved the Zodiac boat that CFA donated to the disaster unit last year.

I completed one level of the National Animal Cruelty Investigation Course conducted by the University of Missouri School of Law, Law Enforcement Training Institute. I’m pleased to report that I earned a 93 percent on the overall examination (class average was 88.12%) and 100 percent on Oleoresin Capsicum Aerosol Training (OCAT) (class average was 94.80%) and have received national certification in the use of Oleoresin Capsicum Aerosols. I am scheduled to attend the other two levels of the National Animal Cruelty Investigation Course later this year. In addition, I received a FULL scholarship to attend the Equine Investigations Academy also conducted by the University of Missouri School of Law. Though this week-long course does not directly affect cats, we have found in the past that livestock is often abused along with dogs and cats in the puppy and kitten mill scenario.

**CFA BREEDER CODE OF ETHICS**

As a breeder registered with the world’s largest registry of pedigreed cats, I understand I have certain responsibilities to pedigreed cats and to the Cat Fanciers’ Association.

As a CFA breeder, I am aware that I am representative of CFA breeders in my community. I will breed my cats with the intent of improving the breed and to produce healthy, happy kittens. I will deal honestly with the purchasers of my kittens and cats and will not sell any kitten/cat that is sick or has been exposed to a contagious disease, within the best of my knowledge. I will not sell or place kittens prior to their attaining a proper level of immunity against common infectious diseases.

I will strive to house my cats in a manner meeting or exceeding the CFA Cattery Standard. I will ensure my cats are kept in a healthy environment and I will ensure they receive the proper veterinary care as needed.

I will maintain appropriate cattery records and will correctly register litters and cats.

I will work honestly with my fellow breeders and provide timely and correct litter registration information to those who use my cats for breeding.

I will mentor new breeders to ensure they have a solid information foundation.

Respectfully submitted.
Pam DelaBar, Animal Welfare Chairperson

(19) **CFA WEB SITE STATUS REPORT.**

The CFA web site continues to be a valuable resource for visitors who are searching for information on cats and their care. In order to keep the interest of people and ensure their frequent return to our site, we make every effort to see that it always offers something new to visitors. In the What’s New section, we now have a Site Map which aids people in finding the information they seek.
As an added resource for those who are looking for more detailed information about our various breeds, we are currently in the process of adding breed articles from past Almanacs which are linked to the breed profile pages. The Korat and Turkish Angora articles are already completed and actively linked. Photos accompanying these articles will be file photos of national top cats as well as breed and color winners that we have accumulated since the site was launched in 1995. Many other new pages are now available including a list of non-toxic plants (courtesy of Dr. Jill Richardson at the National Animal Poison Control Center), the complete schedule for the airing of “Reigning Cats in San Francisco” on the Animal Planet television network (taped at the San Francisco Revelers Cat Show, March 1998), and feline health topics such as vaccination guidelines, cats and flea products, polycystic kidney disease (PKD), declawing, and chronic gingivitis to name a few. The PKD article has generated requests for reprint permission from publications based in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Australia.

While the majority of the CFA site is geared toward the general public, in the Exhibitor’s Corner we post news and other items of interest to the serious CFA breeder and exhibitor. This area of the site includes such things as a list of declared candidates, current information on the Annual Meeting and the International Show, a chart of mailing dates for the Almanac, updates and alerts on legislative issues, and CFA forms. A more comprehensive overview of our site can be found in the June 1998 Almanac article entitled “An Update on CFA’s Presence on the Internet,” written by Karen Lawrence, CFA’s webmaster.

Our statistics show that the number of successful hits (requests for pages) on the CFA site continues to rise steadily. The following figures indicate the amount of activity on our site for the past four months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Hits</th>
<th>Average Hits per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>184,269</td>
<td>6,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>229,767</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>200,767</td>
<td>6,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>212,263</td>
<td>6,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volume of e-mail questions generated by these hits is a large part of maintaining the CFA site. Most general inquiries are handled by Karen Lawrence, while others are referred to the appropriate person or department. We currently have a routing system for questions pertaining to registration, legislation, disaster relief, public relations, and the Almanac.

We have granted permission for our web site breed profiles to be reprinted in the America Online publication for veterinarians and the general public who subscribe to the Pet Care Forum. “The Mewsletter ... PCF Cat Forum News and Updates” is an online newsletter which is published monthly by the Pet Care Forum, a division of the Veterinary Information Network, Inc. In return for this reprint permission, the Mewsletter provides appropriate credit to CFA and a link to our home page.
On the subject of breed profiles, please note that the photos on CFA’s web site pages are updated annually to include the most recent national best of breed winners. Changes are normally made during the summer months and completed by the fall of each year at the latest. This year we are considering the inclusion of second and third best of breed winners on the breed profile pages for two reasons. First, additional photos would be interesting to the general public and second, including these winners would be a way of providing more recognition at the breed level.

We are requesting that each region and the International Division fax a copy of their qualifier show flyer to Central Office as soon as they are available. The CFA site includes a page for each qualifier show that will need updating within the next few months.

Regional Web Sites

Six of CFA’s regions have developed web sites where specific regional information is posted. Since these sites provide links to the CFA site, there has been some question as to why the CFA site does not reciprocate. For the most part, the regional sites are maintained and hosted by volunteers within each region and access is through the URLs (Internet addresses) of private catteries. Posting private cattery addresses on the CFA site is something we wish to avoid since it could be construed by the public as an endorsement of individual catteries. Another problem concerns the likelihood that the regional site address will change as a new person takes over the maintenance and hosting of the site.

As a step in resolving the link issue and to create a more professional appearance, we are recommending that each region register an official domain name for their regional web site using the uniform format of CFA in all capital letters plus the region name in lower case letters. Once this is accomplished, we can proceed with linking to the regional sites.

The Great Lakes Region has taken the initiative by registering their domain name as CFAgreatlakes.org, and we hope that the other regions follow suit. Domain names can be registered at the interNIC web site <http://www.internic.net> for a fee of $70 for the first two years and a $35 renewal fee each year thereafter. Karen Lawrence and I will be happy to assist the regions by answering questions they may have about the registration process.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Krzanowski

Secretary’s Note: The board adjourned Wednesday’s meeting at 6:30 p.m.
1998 CFA ANNUAL MEETING

Friday, June 19, 1998

ANNUAL MEETING OPENING: President Rothermel called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Fellow Board Members, Delegates, Honored Guests and fellow cat fanciers, welcome to the 1998 CFA Annual Meeting here in beautiful Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the City of Brotherly Love. I’m sure this will be a memorable meeting for many of us.

Last year was not a particularly good financial year for CFA. There were many distractions during this year and that created an atmosphere of discontent. We, CFA, have again been threatened with yet another lawsuit, exhibitors are threatening to leave the association and we have too many people pushing personal agendas. I feel that it is time we try to solve these problems without threats to our association. One of the major problems is the erroneous information on the Internet. One such error had me flying to Colorado Springs in my own airplane 10 years before I had my pilot’s certificate. Another example is that I was going to bring WIAB up at the next board of directors meeting when what was said was that WIAB would be brought up at the breed council secretaries meeting. These, and many other erroneous postings, create an atmosphere of discontent and confusion and I’m asking you to verify any information that you may post as it can be very disruptive to this organization. The posting of this erroneous information can severely damage the very organization that you are trying to promote.

Now, let’s shift to more positive events and what the future holds for this organization. First, last year was not a good year financially for CFA; however, making a few assumptions that hopefully will happen here at the annual meeting, the future looks much brighter. You will hear this from our treasurer in her report in a few minutes. Also on the horizon is the fact that CFA will soon be publishing a new book on cats and two things about this make it a great event. First of all, over the next two years, this will bring $45,000 into the organization and secondly, we have editorial rights on the entire publication so it will be CFA’s slant on the cat world, not someone else’s. We feel that this book will become THE definitive book on cats.

Registrations are always a challenge and to help both you and CFA a discount program is being developed to give you a break on your registrations while encouraging you to register whole litters. Hopefully, we will all come out winners when this program is implemented.

Legislation still plagues us with new unwanted laws at every turn. However, our Legislative Committee is doing a wonderful job on identifying this unwanted legislation and taking action against it. This is a project that affects all of us and this committee needs all of our help. There is nothing that will bring people closer together than working together. Our Welfare Committee continues to provide a positive public image while helping cats in times of need. This is a committee of which we can all be proud.

We have two new committees that will bring a bright spot to the future of CFA. They are the Junior Handling and the Mentoring Committees chaired by Debbi Stevenson and Debbie
Ritter respectively. Here is your chance to participate and I ask you to contact these two ladies and offer your assistance in furthering CFA’s future.

Finally, whenever election results are announced there are moments of exhilaration and also of frustration, joy and sadness, hope and despair. I ask that whatever the results, leave those emotions here in this room and let us all go forward with the desire to keep CFA the premier cat organization that it is today; and with your help it will always remain that way. Thank you!

President Rothermel next recognized Mr. George Summerville and asked him to give the invocation.

(20) **CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE.**

The first order of business was to declare a quorum present to conduct the business of the association and then to ask for the approval of the 1998 Credentials Committee: George Summerville, Chairman, Nancy Sullivan & Leon Samuels (1); Sheila Kirkwood & Dorothea Brocksom (2); Paula Watson (3); Eve Russell (4); Jessica Everhart (5); Doug Von Aswege & Nancy Petersen (6); Hilary Helmrich & Jim Kinkaid (7). Alternates and Standbys included Yvonne Griffin; Pat Lichtenberg; and Nancy Krakow.

(21) **CORRECTION AND APPROVAL OF 1997 MINUTES.**

President Rothermel next asked for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the 1997 Annual Meeting. Motion Carried.

(22) **SPECIAL RULES OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE.**

Fred Jacobberger, CFA Attorney and Parliamentarian for the 1998 CFA Annual Meeting advised the delegation of the special rules of parliamentary procedure they would be asked to adopt for this meeting:

1. The agenda for this meeting will be the agenda as proposed by the chairperson and distributed to all of the delegates. 2. Motions to (a) table or (b) to move the previous question or (c) to postpone indefinitely shall not be permitted. 3. Motions to substitute will be treated as are other amendments. 4. The seconding of motions shall not be required. 5. The sponsor of a debatable motion will be permitted a closing statement after closing debate. 6. Recommendations from member clubs may be discussed even though no motion is pending. 7. An affirmative vote of no less than 100 votes is required to compel a roll-call vote. 8. When not inconsistent with the foregoing general rules, the constitution of the CFA, Inc., its charter, by-laws, and applicable rules of law, Roberts Rules of Order, newly revised, shall govern the proceedings of this meeting. Motion to Approve. Motion Carried.

(23) **TREASURER’S REPORT.**

President Rothermel next introduced Donna Fuller, Treasurer, to bring her annual report to the delegation.
CFA FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Copies of the audited Financial Statements of CFA as of April 30, 1998 are available here today for distribution. Although I had hoped to develop some interim financial reports for distribution to the entire CFA population, the timing obstacles proved too great. By the time the books are closed and a report prepared, and factoring in the two-month lead-time for publication in the Almanac, any interim information would be four to five months old before it reached you. The utility of such data does not justify the cost to provide it. Any CFA member may contact me and I will try to answer specific inquiries about CFA interim financial information.

Once again, CFA’s balance sheet reflects a healthy position with sufficient working capital for normal operations and no long-term debt. Unfortunately, the bottom line this year is very disappointing with a loss of over $73,000 as compared to a profit of $105,000 last year. There were a number of factors contributing to this performance which I will discuss below, but the most important point now is to enlist the help of everyone in CFA to plan for the future – to increase revenues, cut expenses, and bring CFA back to a healthy financial position.

Registration revenues continued their decline again this year. We believe that an increase in the registration fees at this time will result in fewer registrations so are not recommending it. These basic revenues previously funded not only the operation of CFA’s basic functions, but also covered many of our other programs such as scoring and awards. As the profit from registration shrinks, we will need to either find new ways to fund our programs or reduce these programs.

Other income items that declined substantially from last year included: funding from corporate sponsors ($53,000 decline); and International Show profit/loss ($51,000 decline). Also of note, was the need to provide a $10,476 reserve for the loan to the 1993 International Show; no payment has been made on this debt in almost three years so the auditors consider the collection doubtful.

The CFA Yearbook also experienced a disappointing year. For the first time in many years, the advertising space was not sold out. Sales of the 1997 Yearbook were disappointing, resulting in a large inventory of unsold 1997 Yearbooks. For the 1998 Yearbook, we reduced the number of books produced in an effort to avoid the large inventory problem, but that results in a smaller number of books over which to spread the fixed costs, resulting in a smaller margin. Almanac revenues and expenses were close to budget and comparable to last year; since previously announced rate increases were too late in the year to produce a noticeable positive impact.

Our Central Office had a very good year with expenses coming in substantially under budget and less than the prior year. I believe we should thank Mr. Dent and his entire staff for providing us with a bright spot in what otherwise was a dismal year.

CFA Programs expense was again negatively impacted by costs of defending ourselves in litigation brought by a Southwest Region club. This matter is resolved now and should not affect future years. Several of the other programs and committees also had notable increases in costs. This was the first year in which the amount charged to the income statement for national awards...
and related costs was based on a predetermined accrual. Hopefully the actual costs of the awards to be given tomorrow will be within the accrued amount, so it won’t be necessary to make up a shortfall in the current year funding.

The budget that will be presented to the board on Sunday morning will project net income for next year, but this was possible ONLY by cutting nearly $100,000 from amounts requested for various programs and functions. The Budget Committee struggled hard to avoid presenting a “loss budget” for the second year in a row and I may be stoned by my fellow board members when they see the allocations we are recommending. But even with the drastic reduction in program expenses, the “balanced” budget will not be possible without the help of this delegation and the entire population of CFA. We need to increase revenues in a number of ways, and some of these are subject to vote later in this meeting. I ask for your support of the constitutional amendment increasing club dues to $100 and for your understanding and acceptance of the increases imposed by the board in other areas. However, increasing club dues and certain other fees will not solve the big problem. We need to find ways to restore slipping registration levels, to find new sources of revenue, and avoid instituting new program expenses without first finding funding for them.

BOARD FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

In January, the Budget Committee prepared cost analyses to support proposed increases in show license fees and club dues for discussion at the February 1998 board meeting. Unfortunately, I failed to properly communicate to the secretary that this analysis should be published with the minutes, so it was not. Because this data may influence some decisions we will make later in this meeting impacting the financial health of CFA, I am incorporating portions of it into this report.

The first issue before the Budget Committee was to identify those costs that should be considered club costs as opposed to being costs of other programs. It was determined that club costs should be identified as falling within four different areas: show licensing costs, club costs – direct, scoring costs, and awards costs.

Show Licensing. Show licensing costs include the show package ($44), media kit ($5), shipping these two items ($10), and administrative costs of show licensing ($10) for a total of $69. In June 1997, this board raised the show-licensing fee to $60 effective with show dates after May 1, 1998, and in February 1998 raised it to $100 with the same effective date. The reason for the second increase so soon was simply that the first one didn’t even cover the “hard” costs of show licensing and it was felt that each show should bear at least part of the cost of scoring the show.

Scoring includes the processing of show records for championships/grand championships and national/regional points, and the publication of the show results (Scoreboard). Also included is the printing and mailing of grand certificates, DM certificates and the publication of the grand listings in the Almanac and Yearbook. The above functions cost approximately $68,000 per year. If the entire scoring cost was allocated to show licensing costs, it would increase the show license fee by $170 per show. The increase in the show license to $100 only covers about $30 of this cost.
Club Costs – Direct. It is estimated that the cost of servicing CFA’s member clubs averages $39 per member club (using 1997 data) for labor, phone calls, maintaining dues and membership records, annual meeting items (ballots, delegate forms), posting of related fees, and postage and supplies for mailings. In addition, the cost of printing and distributing the minutes of board and annual meetings in the Almanac, the expense of the annual directly related to the meeting of the delegates, and the expense of the board to consider club matters at regular board meetings adds approximately $38 per member club to this expense area for a total of $77 per member club. These costs alone justify an increase in club dues to at least $80. As shown below, the requested increase to $100 will only make a small contribution to scoring and awards costs.

Scoring and Awards. The Budget Committee looked at three ways to spread these costs: 1) allocation to show license fees; 2) allocation to club dues; and 3) reinstatement of a per entry surcharge on all show entries. Clearly none of these methods would be acceptable alone, and even trying to cover all scoring and awards costs just from these three sources would necessitate unacceptably high increases in all areas. However, showing these numbers is the clearest way to demonstrate the magnitude of the funding problem. We (the board) are asking only small increases in club dues and show licenses to partially offset the costs of these programs.

As discussed above, total scoring costs are approximately $68,000 per year, which is $170 per show. If this cost were allocated to clubs, it would increase club dues by $103 per year per club. If it were allocated to exhibitors on a per entry basis, it would result in a surcharge of $0.75 per entry.

Awards expense includes trophies, rosettes, plaques, paid advertising, postage, awards booklet and miscellaneous administration. Even without an allocation for the cost of space in the Almanac and Yearbook to publicize the awards, this expense for fiscal year ‘97-98 was $47,000. If all of this cost were allocated to clubs, it would increase club dues by $72 per year. If it were allocated to show licensing costs, it would increase the show license fee by $119 per show. If it were allocated to exhibitors on a per entry basis, it would result in a surcharge of $0.53 per entry.

In summary, if all of the scoring and awards costs were to be borne by our existing clubs, annual club dues of $250 would be required to fund these programs. If all of these costs were to be borne by our show-producing clubs, a show-licensing fee of $349 per show would be required. If all of these costs were to be borne by our exhibitors, a surcharge of $1.28 per entry would be required.

We are asking that club dues be raised to $100, which would cover actual club costs and contribute about $20 per club toward funding scoring and awards.

INTERNATIONAL SHOW TREASURY

The final result on the 1997 International Show in Atlanta was a loss of $20,092. There were a number of factors that contributed to this including one of the lowest gates (in dollars) of any of the International Shows in spite of a large expenditure on public relations and media. It may be time for us to consider if this event is to be viewed as a fund-raising event or a promotional event to be funded for the positive exposure it provides CFA.
On a positive note, we were able to collect on almost all of the outstanding vendor bad checks (from Chicago and Anaheim) and all but one of the new vendor bad checks. All exhibitor checks were collected by the opening day of the show.

REGIONAL TREASURY & CLUB ACCOUNTING

This year, I continued my work with the regional treasurers toward standardizing all regional treasury reporting using a common computer software package. I am happy to report that most regions are now up and running with this system and are cooperating with our efforts to consolidate all CFA regional finances. I have hopes that CFA will be able to comply with IRS consolidated reporting for this year.

CLUB ACCOUNTING MATTERS

I continue to receive occasional requests from clubs for the Quicken-based club/show accounting system that facilitates easy accounting for club activities with particular emphasis on show accounting. I will be updating this package to Quicken 98 soon but will continue to make it available in older versions for those clubs who have older software and do not wish to change.

There is increased interest by clubs wishing to file for nonprofit status. I have helped several clubs with the filing process and will continue to provide such guidance to any club who calls.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna Fuller

(24) PROCESS IMPROVEMENT TEAM.

President Rothermel next introduced Willa K. Hawke, Process Improvement Team Leader, who gave the following presentation:

Good Morning Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Cat Fanciers’ Association is an organization with a rich history. Much of our annual meeting is a celebration of our traditions. Most of the business we conduct each year at this gathering is a reaction to our collective memories. We elect officials based on the records of the incumbents and the experience of the challengers. We vote on resolutions and amendments that primarily seek to correct or avoid events that have already transpired. And we recognize the achievements of those who share our love of the pedigreed cat.

As chair of the CFA Process Improvement Team (perhaps better known as the Planning Committee), I too want to share with you some of the past achievements of this group, but I want to emphasize the need to look into the future, to see where CFA is heading, and to prepare the path to get there. Our group includes members of the board, Central Office staff, allbreed judges, breeder/exhibitors, and professional strategic planners who have donated their time to CFA’s planning effort. Dick Kallmeyer, Allene Tartaglia, Tom VanSistine, Jeanie McPhee, Billy Wheeler, Patty Jacobberger and I make up this team. And we have been assisted in our endeavors by a host of volunteers from our multi-talented fancy. I thank every one of you.
This past year the Planning Committee began by holding a one-day strategic planning session in conjunction with the October board meeting. Following proven methodology, we developed areas of critical interest to our community and a comprehensive set of goals and objectives. At this meeting you will hear a presentation from one of these projects that is a product of the CFA planning process. These projects will help prepare CFA for the next millennium.

The attitude survey presented at last year’s annual told us that half of you have been in the fancy for more than 10 years and 80 percent of you are over the age of 40. “Well, it may be true that old dogs can’t be taught new tricks but I am not sure that applies to cat fanciers.” In recognition of the “Graying of CFA” and as a response to data gathered by the team, we have established the Youth Handling Program. Debbi Stevenson is chairing that group and hopes to have the program up and running later this show season.

Our survey results also told us that you felt that the fancy did a very poor job of mentoring new exhibitors and breeders. In response, CFA has established the CFA Mentoring Program. Erica Graf Webster prepared the model and Debbie Ritter has agreed to chair the project. You will be hearing more about this very soon.

The CFA Process Improvement Team has operated on three premises:

1. **We listen to you, the members of CFA.**
2. **We get the information needed to make a decision.**
3. **We facilitate the decision making process so that the board and our member clubs can take action.**

In a survey conducted just this past spring, you told us what you thought about our current system of scoring for regional and national awards. In a few seconds, Pat Jacobberger will share the results of that survey and will tell you about the work of the National and Regional Scoring Task Force.

The Planning Group thanks you for the opportunity to serve and will continue to work on the issues you care about.

Now, I Thank You for listening to me – And I ask you to please welcome Patty Jacobberger. Applause, Applause.

**Secretary’s Note:** Patty Jacobberger gave a very informative presentation about National/Regional Scoring. She reported the results from last spring’s survey and the findings from the Tuesday National/Regional Scoring Task Force meeting. The task force members included Ann Pevey, Shana Ellzey, Mark Hannon, Kathy Young, Yaeko Takano, Phil Lindsley, Valerie Hedden, Dot Brocksom, and Christy Safron. Facilitators were Willa Hawke, Pat Jacobberger, Allene Tartaglia, and Billy Wheeler. Patty told the delegation that as a result of the Tuesday meeting, she would be bringing a resolution from the floor. It would address ring by ring scoring retroactively to 1998. (See Resolution #41) The International Show Committee has
accepted our pilot plan, the Championship and Premiership rings at the upcoming Kansas City show will be judged without titles. Applause. Applause.

President Rothermel remarked that the Process Improvement Team obviously takes your concerns very seriously and will attack them very seriously. Applause, Applause.

(25) PUBLIC RELATIONS DEPARTMENT.

President Rothermel next recognized Michael Brim, CFA Public Relations Director.

The new millennium is a term we’ll hear over and over again during the coming years as we reach the year 2001. How is your club looking ahead to the new millennium or your next show?

The CFA Public Relations Department has a number of aids available to help you promote and generate positive publicity for your show, be it in two weeks or in the next millennium.

Cat-ching Attention, a publicity guide for CFA cat shows, is a hands-on tool offering step-by-step advice on handling a publicity campaign, and it even gives you sample fill-in-the-blank press materials. So, you’ve already used the guide for a prior show, and it worked from the many letters, e-mails and telephone calls we received. Then, continue to use it and just dress it differently the next time. Different color and quality paper; nice letterhead; new photos, media folder (kit, jacket). It’s okay to go in a circle, just don’t get in a rut!

We have produced professional spots for both television and radio to promote your show. While, they aren’t free, they are responsibly priced.

And we continue to supply you with information on radio and television stations, daily and non-daily newspapers in your area to help you build a media contact list.

Don’t forget to check out the monthly PR column in the Almanac which covers various subjects dealing with publicity and offers a “CFA PR TIP OF THE MONTH” – some special little item that can make a big difference in your PR effort.

CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program Year IV – The fourth year of the CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program got underway in January. Three very successful years have been completed in this unique program that provides show supplies, spectator information, advertising and publicity tools for your CFA show. Each CFA show manager or show secretary must order these items for shows held in the United States at least eight weeks in advance of your show. Please respond to the mailings from Friskies – they will help you help your show. You may also stop by the Friskies booth for additional information.

The ultimate goal for the CFA/Friskies program has been to achieve 100% participation by CFA clubs in the U.S. While we continue working towards that goal, we hope that you will help us reach that level of support. It’s a great program in which we encourage you to participate.
Although the program administration is handled by Friskies and Manning, Selvage & Lee, please don’t hesitate to contact me for assistance as well.

Lead Shows – Since the CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program began in 1995 we’ve been able to chart the direct benefit to the Lead Shows, but we have not been able to track each and every show participating in the program.

**Recap of Attendance, Reach & Ad Dollar Value Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Totals</th>
<th>Number of Consumer Reach</th>
<th>Advertising Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994 74,239</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 122,805</td>
<td>176,474,396</td>
<td>$1,213,114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 103,200</td>
<td>178,346,230</td>
<td>$1,626,259.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 148,300</td>
<td>144,158,637</td>
<td>$1,258,176.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1999: Markets have been selected for the 1999 Lead Shows locations. The final approval process is underway at Friskies as we speak. The selected shows will be contacted shortly and contracts sent for their approval and signature. The complete list will be published in the Almanac.

The CFA/Friskies San Francisco Revelers Cat Show premiered on the Animal Planet television network on Saturday, June 13. The show entitled “Reigning Cats in San Francisco” will air seven additional times during June. The three remaining airs are on Friday, June 19 - 7 p.m. ET; Sunday, June 21 - 3:00 p.m. and Tuesday, June 23 - 6 p.m. Check your local cable listings for the time and station in your area. The show is sponsored by Friskies under the CFA/Friskies Cat Show Program.

**CATS! Wild to Mild:** The current stop in the five year road trip of the CATS! Wild to Mild exhibit is at Explorers Hall at the National Geographic Society in Washington DC and will run until September 7. The exhibit produced by the National History Museum of Los Angeles County first opened on March 16, 1997 in Los Angeles and will continue to tour until April 28, 2002. The exhibit closed on May 3 at the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley CA. From all indications CFA continues to receive a great deal of exposure from our display case and the printed informational pamphlet we provide the exhibit for distribution. The next stop after a break will be the Museum of Science in Boston, February 6 - May 2, 1999. Then on to the Nassau County Museum Sands Point Preserve in Port Washington NY, June 5 - September 6, 1999.

**CFA Show of the Year:** They say “the third time’s a charm.” There were the CFA Showman’s Club awards in the late sixties and the CFA Show of the Year Competition in the mid-eighties. Starting with the 1999-2000 show season, the CFA Show of the Year Competition returns. This new program was to have started with the 1998-1999 show season, but has been delayed until the 1999-2000 show season.
During the CFA Strategic Planning session held October 2-3, 1997 one of the proposals in the public relations section receiving a great deal of board support was the re-activation of the Show of the Year Competition. A timeline was established for this program, and the first step in meeting that timeline has been taken. Please see the January 1998 Almanac for the program announcement.

**Media Exposure:** Film crews have arranged to shoot footage for upcoming shows featuring cats: National Geographic had a crew at the Crab & Mallet Cat Show March 14-15 in Baltimore. “The Paula Poundstone Show” shot footage at the Rainbow International Show held in conjunction with the American’s Family Pet Show April 17-19 in Pomona, CA for her new show, which is in the final stages of development. CFA is featured in My Pet Television Network’s Veterinary Waiting Room Program, which reaches thousands of veterinarian offices each day. We are currently working with Disney Productions on several segments of a new Disney program that will air on the Animal Planet Network, the all animal all the time cable network.

**Public Service Announcements:** It seems that the NRA has their Moses in Charlton Heston. We in the cat fancy haven’t had an active celebrity since the late ‘60s and early ‘70s in the days of Celia Heriot’s involvement with Pet Pride and the Santa Monica Cat Club. Finding a celebrity who owns a CFA registered cat has been difficult. Many breeders have indicated they have sold a cat to a celebrity, but getting additional information like a telephone number or address is not so easy. I have contacted Actors and Others for Animals, asking for their assistance in getting the “type” of celebrity we need to take part in the production of a PSA for television.

The new CFA PSAs are being funded through the continued support of CFA programs by The IAMS Company. The objective of the IAMS support is to enhance the well-being of cats and forge a long-term working relationship between them and CFA. This outstanding support was first announced at the 1995 annual meeting and continues today.

The color CFA breed profiles are being continued by the financial sponsorship by IAMS and are currently being updated with the Best of Breed winners for 1998. They should be available in early October.

Respectfully,

Michael W. Brim
CFA Public Relations Director

(26)  **INTERNATIONAL SHOW REPORT.**

President Rothermel next introduced Linda Berg, International Show chairperson.

The 1998 International Show to be held in Kansas City, Missouri is moving along on schedule.

The International Show Budget Committee has met and are putting together the final numbers for the 1998 show.
In my latest conversation with Pamela Keene she is still gathering publicity from last year’s International Show by doing another interview with last year’s winners, the Martins. The show has been announced to the media and she is doing an update to the media list of the KC area. She plans on generating interest by advertising the International Show and all the upcoming shows within a 200 mile radius of KC. She will be attending the Mo-Kan KC show in August to meet with local media personnel.

We have had difficulty finding a place to have the International in 1999 and KC has the dates open so we are considering signing the contract for a second year. By having the International in the same place for two years it will somewhat answer the question that has plagued us about whether we would get better gate if we stayed in one place like the Westminster show. Granted, two years is not a long run but it should give us some insight. Anaheim will have completed their renovations by 2000 so we are contacting them for that year.

We have been tossing questions out to the CFA-List about the International to see what kind of feedback we would get. The first question was judging without titles. Needless to say we received MANY responses which made us aware of many more problems than we had originally thought of. The exhibitors are not willing to give up winners ribbons or points and our way of dealing with that brought even more response, so we have tabled it for a year to give us more time to work out the bugs – if possible.

We have also been asked to make exceptions for judges that are judging but would like to be exhibiting. We were asked to allow them to have the cat agented at the show they were judging at, x’ing out of their ring, or to be allowed to have the cat agented at another qualifier of their choosing. The overall feeling of the committee was not to make this allowance at this time.

In my last report to the board I spoke of the small number of clubs that vote and the overall feeling of unfairness from the judges. This has promoted a change in how the judges will be chosen for the International Show So as to allow new judges to judge the International, effective with the 1999 show we will be removing the three judges who have judged the most International Shows. That will allow three new judges to come on board. The following year we will remove the next three judges with the most longevity etc., etc. The three judges will have their names removed for one show and will start from year one when they return to the ballots. We hope this will be acceptable to all.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda M. Berg

(27) CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE REPORT.

President Rothermel noted that the tellers were back and called on George Summerville to give the committee report and to announce the results of the election for the four Executive Officers and the eight Regional Directors.

Summerville gave the following information:
Club Delegates Not Seated and reason:

**Lucky Cat (8)** – Missing signature on delegate form

**Rex Club of the West (5)** – Duplicate delegate form received (not appropriate and neither were accepted)

**Champagne Cat Club (4)** – Club dues not received by April 30, 1998 deadline

**Northumberland Cat Fanciers (1)** – Club dues not received by April 30, 1998 deadline

**German Show Cats (International Division)** – Not eligible because no CFA licensed show held between May 1, 1997-April 30, 1998

**Golden Gate Cat Club (2)** – Postmark on delegate form after May 1, 1998 deadline

**Tokyo A&A Cat Club (8)** – Postmark on Delegate form after May 1, 1998 deadline and also not correctly completed

CFA Officers/Regional Director Ballots: 545 Ballots received. 524 Ballots used:

**Cat Fanciers of Washington** – Duplicate ballots received.

*The ballots were counted this morning, there were 545 ballots returned but only 524 were valid. Problems included incomplete ballots, no signatures, late postmarks, duplicate ballots, the wrong number of candidates. Region 5 was the only region where all the ballots were counted. The results of the balloting were as follows:*

(28) **ELECTION RESULTS.**

*Election Results were as follows:*

**CFA OFFICERS:**

**Office of President:**

- Loretta Baugh 144
- Craig Rothermel 162
- Don Williams 213*
- Abstain 5

**Office of Vice President:**

- Suzanne Beedy 144
- Kim Everett 356*
- Abstain 24
Office of Secretary:
Kitty Angell 275*
Willa Hawke 242
Abstain 7

Office of Treasurer:
Donna Fuller 438*
Abstain 86

REGIONAL DIRECTORS:

North Atlantic (1):
Debbie Kusy 23
Sharon Roy 40*
Abstain 1

Northwest (2):
Jean Grimm 30
Lorna Malinen 49*
Abstain 2

Gulf Shore (3):
Lonnie Hoover 29*
Ann Pevey 27
Abstain 2

Great Lakes (4):
Becky Jones 28
Liz Watson 32*
Abstain 2

Southwest (5):
George Eigenhauser 48*
Abstain 5

Midwest (6):
Linda Berg 61*
Abstain 6
Southern (7):

Rhett Bockman 20
Robert Cooney 1
Jim DeBruhl 36*
Ande DeGeer 27
Toni Pironi 2
Abstain 1

Japan (8):

C. Bess Higuchi 22*
Teruko Arai 21
Abstain 4

* = Elected

(29) 1998 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CFA’s CONSTITUTION AND PRE-NOTICED RESOLUTIONS.

Eligible Voting Clubs-500. The required number for 2/3 majority vote-334 votes.

[Secretary’s Note: Constitutional Amendments (1-12) require a 2/3 majority vote to pass. Proposed Show Rule Resolutions (13-33) require a simple majority to pass and go to the board with a favorable recommendation. If, however, they pass by a 2/3 majority, they become automatic. Non-Show Rule Resolutions (34-40) require a simple majority to be recommended to the board favorably.] President Rothermel announced that Amendment 9 and Resolution 33 had been Withdrawn.

– 1 – CFA Board of Directors

RESOLVED: to amend Article III, Membership, Section 5, Dues and List of Members, by changing the amount of club dues in the first sentence from $50.00 to $100.00.

RATIONALE: The last increase in club dues was in 1980 when they were increased by $25 to the current amount of $50.00. A recent review of costs associated with the maintenance of the club records indicates that the Association spends approximately $77 per year per club. This amount includes printing, mailing and staff costs and does not include any expense related to shows. In addition to covering the shortfall of club associated expenses, a portion of the proposed increase (approximately $20) will be used to partially offset the cost of programs which themselves have no source of revenue. These include, but are not limited to, all committees, the awards program (scoring, printing, trophies, publication) and our legislative expenses. In the past, registration revenues provided adequate funds for these programs. However, due to the decline in registrations, other sources of revenue are needed to maintain The Cat Fanciers’ Association’s services and programs at their current levels. FAILED.
RESOLVED: to amend Article III, Membership, Section 5, Dues and List of Members, by changing the amount of club dues in the first sentence from $50.00 to $80.00.

RATIONALE: The rationale for proposed Amendment #1 applies to this proposal except that no provision is being made to partially offset the costs of The Cat Fanciers’ Association’s programs. If #1 passes, this proposal will be withdrawn. CARRIED.

RESOLVED: to amend Article VI, Officers and Directors, Section 1, Titles, paragraph two of the CFA Constitution to read as follows:

The Directors of this Association shall consist of Regional Directors, representing the geographical regions herein specified in Article VIII, provided that not more than one person resident in any one of the Regions specified shall be elected a Regional Director.

RATIONALE: This will reduce the number of directors from 19 to 12. Currently seven (7) of these directors have no direct constituents to report to, which makes for unaccountability in their actions. Smaller regions would make it easier for exhibitors to attend regional shows and awards banquets. Clubs would have more interactions with regional directors. Nineteen directors are too many for a small organization to support. The savings to the organization (telephone calls, postage, meeting attendance) would be considerable. This amendment does not specify the number of regional directors in order to allow changes in regions, if the membership so decides in the future.

If this amendment passes, per the Constitution, it would take effect in 1999 allowing the current directors-at-large to serve out their terms.

AND

RESOLVED: to amend Article VI – Officers and Directors, Section 2, Elections of the CFA Constitution to read as follows:

CURRENT: a. General. The President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and Regional Directors shall be elected in even numbered years. The Directors-at-Large shall be elected in odd numbered years.

CHANGE: a. General. The President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer shall be elected in even numbered years. The Regional Directors shall be elected in odd-numbered years.

RATIONALE: This would be a housekeeping amendment if directors-at-large are eliminated.

AND
RESOLVED: to amend Article VI – Officers and Directors, Section 2, Elections of the CFA Constitution as follows:

Delete italicized phrase from: c. Candidates. Except as provided in Section 3 of this Article, any member in good standing of any member club may run for any office or Director-at-Large, and may run for Regional Director from that region. No candidate may run for more than one office at a time.

RATIONALE: This would be a housekeeping amendment if the directors-at-large are eliminated.

AND

RESOLVED: to amend Article VII – Executive Board Section 1, Membership, first paragraph of the CFA Constitution to read as follows:

The government of the affairs of this association shall be in the hands of the Executive Board. The President, the Vice President, the Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Regional Directors of this Association shall be members of the Executive Board.

RATIONALE: This would be a housekeeping amendment if the directors-at-large are eliminated.

AND

RESOLVED: to amend Article VI – Officers and Directors, Section 2, Elections of the CFA Constitution to read as follows:

Delete the following phrase from e. Election Procedure: “Ballots in elections for Directors-at-Large selecting less than seven (7) candidates (or less than all declared candidates if fewer than seven) shall be considered incomplete.”

RATIONALE: This would be a housekeeping amendment if the directors-at-large are eliminated. FAILED.

– 4 – Oriental Shorthairs of America, Inc.; Buffalo Cat Fanciers

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Constitution, Article VI, Officers and Directors, Section 2, Elections, the first and second paragraph, and Section 5, Vacancies second paragraph as follows (additions in bold and bracketed):

Section 2 – Elections (first and second paragraph)

The President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer shall be elected by mail ballot in even numbered years and shall hold office for a term of two (2) years or until their successors are elected and qualify. No candidate may declare for more than one office which will be voted upon by <members of> clubs via mail ballot. Central Office shall, on or before April 25th, under the supervision of legal counsel, mail to all <individuals who are members of> clubs in good
standing as of February 1st of the applicable year, the ballot listing all candidates. **There shall be one and only one ballot mailed to an individual, regardless of how many clubs that individual is a member of.** Returned ballots must be received at Central Office by June 1st and shall remain sealed until the Annual Meeting, at which time the tellers will supervise the opening and counting of the ballots. Ballots that are illegible, incomplete, or those that have write in candidates shall be considered void. Results shall be announced at the Annual Meeting as soon as the ballots have been tabulated.

In odd numbered years, seven (7) Directors-at-Large shall be elected by mail ballot in the same manner as the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer for a term of two (2) years or until their successors are elected and qualify. In even numbered years, each of the Regional Directors shall be elected for a term of two (2) years by a mail vote of the **individuals who are members of** clubs in the appropriate region, provided that any **individual and/or** member club that is not a member in good standing on February first of the applicable year shall not be entitled to vote. The Executive Board of the Association shall supervise the election of each Regional Director, establishing means for obtaining declarations, the sending out, the return, and the counting of ballots, and shall promptly advise all the member clubs of the results of each election. These elections shall be held not later than June 1st of each applicable year. No Regional Director need be a delegate to the Annual Meeting of the Association.

**AND**

**Section 5 – Vacancies (second paragraph)**

Should a vacancy occur for any reason in the office of any of the various Regional Directors and nine (9) months or more remain in the term of that office, the Central Office shall immediately notify member clubs in the specific region of the vacancy and call for declarations from candidates to be submitted to the office within thirty (30) days of said notice. Within ten (10) days after the closing date for the acceptance of declarations, the CFA Central Office will mail ballots to the **members of** eligible clubs in the region for voting. Eligibility for voting will be limited to those **individuals who are members of** member clubs in good standing not less than fifty (50) days prior to the mailing of the ballots. The closing date for the return of the special election ballots to the Central Office will be sixty (60) days after the mailing from the Central Office – said date to be printed on the ballot. Dated postmark stamp (provided by a postal clerk) on either the ballot or on a separate paper enclosed in the mailing envelope will constitute PRIME FACIE evidence of the mailing date by the **voter**.

**RATIONALE:** Several years ago the voting procedures to elect the officers and board were changed from voting at the Annual Meeting to a mail ballot to allow for more equal representation for clubs that may be far from the location of a given annual meeting.

This amendment is also designed to increase equal representation for club members within our association. Depending on a wide variety of circumstances, including geographic location, it is possible for one person to be a member of one large and active club, while another may be a member of a number of smaller, less active clubs. These two individuals currently have very different representation in voting for our officers and board members.
This amendment does not change the basic club-based structure of CFA. Clubs still present resolutions and vote on them at the annual meeting, and only current members of clubs in good standing will be eligible to vote for the officers and board.

As Article VII – Executive Board states, “The government of the affairs of this Association shall be in the hands of the Executive Board.”

This government affects all the memberships of all clubs equally, and in a democratic organization, those club members should have equal representation in the election process. One person, one vote. FAILED.

– 5 – Rip City Cats

RESOLVED: to add to Article VI, Section 2, Elections, of the CFA Constitution the following section:

g. Inspectors.

There will be inspectors for counting ballots from each region and each inspector will serve a term of two years. Inspectors will be appointed by their Regional Director. Inspectors must be members in good standing of a member club in the region they represent and must also reside in the region.

RATIONALE: Inspectors have a very important position in the determination of valid ballots and the actual counting of ballots. The Constitution does not specify a method of appointment or what the requirements are for being an inspector. Because of the potential for scandal and impropriety, inspectors should have the same Constitutional boundaries and requirements as the executive board. FAILED.

– 6 – Rip City Cats

RESOLVED: to amend Article VI, Section 2, Elections, of the CFA Constitution to read as follows:

Remove the following sentences under e. Election Procedure: “Ballots shall remain under the control of the inspectors until a motion to destroy the ballots is passed at which time the ballots shall be destroyed under the supervision of the inspectors. No person other than a duly appointed inspector shall have access to the ballots until after they are destroyed.”

Replace with: “All ballots including those deemed void shall remain under the control of the inspectors until safely delivered to the official accounting firm used by this Association. The ballots shall be kept sealed and on file by the accounting firm for one (1) year pending any protest or call for recount by the accounting firm instead of the inspectors. Access to ballots is only available to the inspectors and no other officer of the organization may have access to them.”

RATIONALE: Currently, the Constitution does not allow for any protest or recount. In the past ballots have been destroyed immediately after the announcement of election results,
making it impossible for a candidate to call for a recount. Because of the potential for the appearance of impropriety, ballots should be available for recount. Recognizing the confidentiality of the ballot and the club’s right to a secret vote, access will be limited to inspectors only. Most organizations call for ballots to be kept on hand for this purpose. **FAILED.**

– 7 – Oregon Cat Fanciers; Portland Cat Club; Moorestown Cat Fanciers; Mount Laurel Cat Fanciers; Roses For Felines; Appalachian Area Cat Fancy; Muskogee Cat Club; Longhair Japanese Bobtail Breeders Club; Sunkat Feline Fanciers; Wild Blue Yonder Cat Fanciers; Somali Cat Family; All Cat Partners; Japan International Cat Fanciers; Osaka Allstar Fanciers; Toy Cat Club; Mt. Fuji Hokaido Cat Club; Ameridream Cat Club; The Japan Saga Cat Club; Sun Pacific Cat Club; Enchanted Cat Fanciers; Sun Kyoto Cat Club; MC Japan Cat Club; Persian Fairies Cat Club; Ganba Kobe Cat Club; Japan Liberty Cat Club, Osaka Philocat Society; Lucky Cat Club; Tokyo Feline Fanciers; Kii Cat Fanciers; Pocahontas Cat Club; Japan Aichi Cat Fanciers; Ancient Capital Cat Society; Friendly International; Eternity Tokai Cat Club; All Cat Fanciers Club; Art Noble Cat Club; Rose City Cat Fanciers; Fallen Timbers Shorthair Fanciers; McKenzie River Cat Club; Just Cat-In Around Cat Fanciers; Midwest Persian Tabby Fanciers; Thumbs Up Cat Fanciers; Kino Kat Klub

**RESOLVED:** to amend Article VII – Executive Board by changing the current Section 5 – Acceptance of New Breeds for Championship Competition to Section 6 and add a new Section 5 – Voting, to read as follows:

Section 5 – Voting

Every Board Member has the right to abstain, i.e. not vote, on a particular issue. For the purpose of tabulating votes only, a Board Member not voting for any reason will be considered absent from the meeting when calculating the total affirmative votes required for passing a particular proposal.

**RATIONALE:** This will remove the automatic no vote associated with an abstention. The wording in our Constitution and other governing documents is that passage must be by an affirmative vote of a majority or 2/3 of those present, not those voting. This change would allow an abstention to be a true non-vote instead of a no vote. **CARRIED.**

– 8 – Rip City Cats; Longhair Japanese Bobtail Breeders

**RESOLVED:** to add to Article VII, Executive Board, Section 5, Acceptance of New Breeds for Championship Competition, of the CFA Constitution the following additional paragraph:

Once a breed is accepted for championship status, it cannot have its registration status rescinded, placed back in A.O.V. status or moved to provisional status without 2/3 Breed Council approval.

**RATIONALE:** Breeders working with new breeds and breeds that are established over a period of time, who have met the criteria for registration and have been accepted by the board, currently have no say in the future of their breed regarding registration or showing. Current
status could be rescinded at the whim of the board if this amendment is not adopted. The amendment is for the protection all breeds and breed council members.

AND

RESOLVED: to add to Article XIII, Rules and Standards of the CFA Constitution the following additional paragraph:

Once a breed is accepted for championship status, it cannot have its registration status rescinded, placed back in A.O.V. status or moved to provisional status without 2/3 Breed Council approval.

RATIONALE: Breeders working with new breeds and breeds that are established over a period of time, who have met the criteria for registration and have been accepted by the board, currently have no say in the future of their breed regarding registration or showing. Current status could be rescinded at the whim of the board if this amendment is not adopted. The amendment is for the protection all breeds and breed council members. CARRIED.

– 9 – Rip City Cats

RESOLVED: to amend Article XI, Breed Council Procedure for Submission of Proposals, of the CFA Constitution to read as follows:

Members forward suggestions and opinions to the elected secretary of the specific breed council. The breed secretary will receive proposals or changes in breed standards and show rules from members of the particular breed/division section and submit for publication for their opinion. The Executive Board shall approve all “Breed Standards” and “Show Standards” that pertain to that breed at the executive board meeting in February when breed standards are considered and these “Breed Standards” and/or “Show Standards” have passed by a 2/3 majority of the returned ballots by the respective Breed Council members. Changes or proposals that impact other breeds must also have 2/3 majority of the Breed Council for the breeds involved.

RATIONALE: Each breed has the right to determine its own destiny as long as it does not infringe upon the right of other breeds to do the same. If a breed wants to add and/or change a standard, color, coat length, outcross for purposes of showing or health, it is that breed’s right as long as it is a majority (2/3) wish. The board should function only in an advisory position for Breed Standards. They should have no more say than the members of a breed council.

AND

RESOLVED: to add to Article XIII, Rules and Standards of the CFA Constitution the following additional paragraph:

The Executive Board shall approve “Breed Standards” at the Executive Board Meeting in February when breed standards are considered that are passed by a 2/3 majority of the returned ballots by the respective Breed Council members.
RATIONALE: If the amendment to Article XI – Breed Council passes, this would be a housekeeping amendment. WITHDRAWN.

– 10 – Rip City Cats; Longhair Japanese Bobtail Breeders

RESOLVED: to add to Article X, Central Office, of the CFA Constitution the following paragraph:

Central Office personnel may not act to change, add or delete any colors, registration prefixes, descriptions to breeds without Breed Council approval as outlined in Article XI.

RATIONALE: Last year the Central Office arbitrarily added a registration prefix to the Japanese Bobtail without consultation, notification, or approval of the breed council or the breed council secretary. Some of the cats had their prefixes changed without notification to the owner, causing problems and confusion with regional awards. When the breeders protested, Central Office refused to remove the prefix. This is not within their realm of responsibility. It is up to each individual breed to determine classifications of the colors of their breeds. In order to reverse this, the breed council had to vote on the new prefix in a negative manner. FAILED.

– 11 – Superstition Cat Fanciers, Inc.; Desert Cats Cat Club; Tonks West; Burmese Club of Southern California; Torrey Pines Cat Club; Queen City Cat Club; Orientals West; San Diego Cat Fanciers

RESOLVED: to amend Article XI, Breed Council of the CFA Constitution by changing the second to last paragraph to read as follows (addition underlined):

Notwithstanding the fact that the Council shall serve the Executive Board in an advisory capacity, the Executive Board shall not alter or amend any part of the standards for any breed, or add thereto, without first obtaining (within the prior 12 months) the approval of 60% of the members voting of the specific Breed Council(s) affected for the breed whose standards are being altered, amended or added to.

RATIONALE: Current language is ambiguous as to exactly which breed council’s approval must be obtained before a breed’s standards may be modified. This clarifies the intent of the existing rule to require the approval of the breed council whose standards are in fact being modified. FAILED.

– 12 – San Diego Cat Fanciers

RESOLVED: to amend the CFA Constitution, Article XVI, Amendments, to read as follows (additions underlined):

ARTICLE XVI – AMENDMENTS

This Constitution may be amended by an Annual or Special Meeting of members by two-thirds (2/3) of the votes entitled to be cast by the delegates present at the meeting in person or by proxy, provided that a quorum is present, and further provided that the proposed amendment, together with notice of time and place of the meeting, has been mailed by the Central Office of
this Association, or by a member club proposing the amendment, to each member club at least forty-five (45) days prior to the meeting.

RATIONALE: The Constitution currently requires a 2/3 vote of those eligible to cast votes to amend the Constitution. Persons absent from the meeting to attend excursions, go to the rest room, attend other meetings, or prepare for dinner are effectively counted as “no” votes. As a result, it becomes more difficult to conduct important CFA business as the day wears on, and more delegates leave the meeting for excursions, to prepare for dinner, or other personal business. Amendments to the CFA Constitution are important enough to be decided by the delegates who actually vote, not by those so disinterested that they leave the meeting. This amendment will permit the delegates to amend the Constitution by a 2/3 vote so long as a quorum remains present. FAILED.

(30) PROPOSED SHOW RULE RESOLUTIONS.

– 13 – Mo-Kan Cat Club, Inc.

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

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

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

– 14 – Garden State Cat Club

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article II, Eligibility for Entry, Section 2.12 to read as follows (additions underlined):

The show committee may permit cats or kittens, 4 months old or older, to be present for display, sale or other appropriate reason only if the exhibitor has sufficient cage space for such cats or kittens (see paragraph 2.13). No kitten under the age of 4 months shall be permitted in the show hall. Proof of age must be presented upon request of the show manager (see paragraph 15.12). Non-entered cats and kittens which are not intended for either display or sale may be in the show hall subject to such conditions as the show committee may require, but, in any event, cage space must be provided for all cats or kittens. (see Paragraphs 2.13 and 4.09)

No changes would be required to paragraph 2.13. No more than two kittens or one cat may be benched in a single cage whether entered for exhibition or competition or benched for sale ... Or to paragraph 6.08 … All cats or kittens for sale or lease must be benched in the benching area.
RATIONALE: Cats and kittens brought to a show hall, regardless of their purpose for being there, should be provided with cage space. It has been observed that kittens being sold in show halls are often housed for the entire two day period, either singly or in groups, in carriers placed below the benching cages covered by cage curtains. Such conditions are inhumane at best. These animals are being systematically deprived of space, fresh air, light, movement and, perhaps water, food, and litter facilities as well. Sales cages are available at all shows at a nominal price for the convenience of exhibitors who wish to sell cats or kittens at shows. Show management should also be aware that kittens are present should they wish to confirm kittens are indeed at least four months of age, in accordance with show rules. Under the current circumstances, show management may not even be aware that such animals are present in the show hall since they are, in effect hidden from view.

Other cats or kittens present in the show hall for appropriate reasons, such as pick-up by another breeder or pet purchaser, should have cage space available to them to avoid continuous housing in small carriers under the benching tables. If it is necessary for an exhibitor to remove a cat or kitten and place it in a carrier for a limited time for an appropriate reason, such as temporary incompatibility with another cat housed in a double cage or sudden illness, the cage space remains available for the cat or kitten should circumstances allow the exhibitor to return the cat or kitten to its cage. FAILED.

– 15 – Garden State Cat Club

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article III, Causes for Disqualification, Section 3.08 as follows:

Delete the following, “whole males that do not have 2 descended testicles”

AND

RESOLVED: to add to CFA Show Rules, Article VIII, Championships & Premierships, Section 8.07 to read as follows:

“Whole males competing for winners ribbons must have 2 descended testicles.”

RATIONALE: The purpose of the original rule was to ensure that the top breeding cats are physically complete. This proposal would not change the basic requirements as expressed in Show Rule 3.08 but would eliminate the need for judges to continually check whole males for testicles each time they were judged. Once at least 4 CFA judges have verified that the whole males have 2 testicles it should not be necessary to keep verifying this fact. Given the sensitive nature of this portion of the male anatomy, this change would be appreciated by many cats, their breeders and judges. FAILED.

– 16 – Mo-Kan Cat Club, Inc.

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article III – Causes for Disqualification, Section 3.03 to read as follows (words being deleted indicated by strikeout):
Any exhibitor, judge, clerk or show committee member suspecting any cat or kitten of having fungus, fleas, ear mites or any contagious or infectious illness shall report same to the show manager and it will be the duty of the show manager to remove such cat or kitten, along with all other exhibits belonging to the same exhibitor, being agented by the exhibitor or traveling with that exhibitor, to an area outside of the benching and judging rooms until a veterinarian can pass upon the health of the suspected cat or kitten. In the event that a veterinarian confirms and/or diagnoses fungus, fleas, ear mites or any contagious or infectious illness, that entry as well as all other exhibits belonging to the same exhibitor, being agented by that exhibitor or traveling with that exhibitor, shall be disqualified. If a veterinarian certifies the entry as free from fungus, fleas, ear mites, contagious or infectious illness, the entries shall be returned to the show room and …

RATIONALE: As previously written, only the questionable exhibit was required to be removed. While additional entries from the same exhibitor could reasonably be expected to be affected, it is somewhat doubtful that a feline only exposed to the questionable entry while being transported to the show would be contagious immediately after exposure. We believe this wording was included many years ago and was presumably deleted for the above reasons. FAILED.

– 17 – Mo-Kan Cat Club, Inc.

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article XI -Responsibilities of Exhibitors, Section 11.01.2 which currently reads “Any person offering a cat(s)/kitten(s) for sale, must ensure an enclosed, secured carrier is being used for the transport of the cat being sold” to read as follows:

It is strongly recommended that any person offering cats(s)/kitten(s) for sale advise purchaser(s) that an enclosed, secured carrier should be used for the transport of the cat(s)/kitten(s) being sold.

RATIONALE: In theory, this is a good show rule. However, short of giving away a carrier to the purchaser of every cat/kitten sold in a show hall, this can be very difficult to carry out. Unless there have been numerous actual problems, this can create difficulties in practice. If a purchaser borrows a carrier to transport the cat to their car, then the cat would presumably be loose in the car when the purchaser returns to their car, thereby creating a potentially worse scenario than carrying the feline to the car in their arms. Experience has taught us that people do not always return carriers loaned out. If an exhibitor were to take the feline to the purchaser’s car, ring calls can be missed. FAILED.

– 18 – Love Cats

RESOLVED: to add to the CFA Show Rules, Article XI, Responsibilities of Exhibitors, the following section:

11.31 Exhibitors must not solicit specific information from the entry clerk or show management regarding other exhibits or exhibitors prior to any given show.
RATIONALE: We believe all entries should be confidential and only general information should be available, i.e., final kitten, championship, premiership and household pet, counts. It is unethical to discuss specific entries and exhibitors. FAILED.

– 19 – Love Cats

RESOLVED: to add to the CFA Show Rules, Article XIII, Responsibilities of Show Management, and Article XVII, Responsibilities of Show Entry Clerk the following sections:

13.19 The show management may only give out general entry count, i.e., final kitten, championship, premiership and household pet counts.

AND

17.07 The show entry clerk may only give out general entry count, i.e., final kitten, championship, premiership and household pet counts.

RATIONALE: Exhibitors have been known to pressure entry clerks and show management about specific entries and exhibitors. We find it unethical to have to give out this information and we feel the only way to stop it is to have a show rule prohibiting such inquiries. WITHDRAWN.

– 20 – Rainbow Cat Club; Shorthair Japanese Bobtail Club; Cats of Wisconsin

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article XIII, Responsibilities of Show Management, Section 13.12 (a) to read as follows (addition underlined):

The show management shall determine the amount of the entry fee, which must be at least $1.00 per ring per exhibitor. A club shall not refuse an entry fee(s) paid in the “coin of the realm.”

RATIONALE: A club has recently been told by the CFA Board through a protest being filed, and a hearing to be held, that while the letter of this rule is $1.00 per ring (which equals $6 total per exhibitor for a 6-ring show) the spirit of the rule is $1.00 per entry per ring; therefore, it is never possible to give the exhibitor a break, with the rising costs of showing cats, by giving them a free entry with the payment of at least one. This change brings the letter of the show rule in line with the interpretation that will allow clubs to legally give their exhibitors a break, if they so desire, by offering a deal such as “enter 3, get one free”.

If this resolution passes, the following resolution (#21) is withdrawn. FAILED.

– 21 – Rainbow Cat Club; Shorthair Japanese Bobtail Club; Cats of Wisconsin

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article XIII, Responsibilities of Show Management, Section 13.12 (a) to read as follows (addition underlined):
The show management shall determine the amount of the entry fee, which must be at least $1.00 per entry per ring. A club shall not refuse an entry fee(s) paid in the “coin of the realm.”

RATIONALE: A club has recently been told by the CFA Board through a protest being filed, and a hearing to be held, that while the letter of this rule is $1.00 per ring (which equals $6 total per exhibitor for a 6-ring show) the spirit of the rule is $1.00 per entry per ring. (“Entry” is defined by Show Rule 1.05.) This change will bring the letter of the rule in line with the spirit. If the resolution is defeated, it will be clear that the letter of the rule governs. FAILED.

– 22 – Paumanok Cat Fanciers; Make Mine Mink

RESOLVED: that whenever feasible, in any facility which ordinarily allows smoking, specific smoking areas be set aside for smokers, separate from the benching and judging areas.

RATIONALE: Smoking is legal. Our show rules prohibit smoking in the benching and judging areas; however, the attempt to prohibit smoking in entire facilities was soundly defeated at the Seattle annual. Smokers have no desire to break show rules, but resent being forced outside in inclement weather when appropriate, separate areas have been declared “non-smoking” by the sponsoring club in facilities which normally do permit smoking. FAILED.

– 23 – Delaware River Cats Club, Inc.; National Norwegian Forest Cat Breed Club

RESOLVED: add to the CFA Show Rules, Article XV, Responsibilities of Show Manager, the following section:

15.08 r. No laser device (e.g. toy, pointer, light, etc.) will be permitted in the show hall.

RATIONALE: These devices all come with a mandated warning label, directions and hazardous-item logo, but all too often they are being used by people who do not understand the potential harm they can do to cats’ and peoples’ eyes. Both children and adults have been observed shining them around the show hall and into the judging ring in an irresponsible manner which is clearly hazardous to the cats’ welfare. FAILED.

– 24 – Saintly City Cat Club

RESOLVED: to amend CFA Show Rules, Article XV, Responsibilities of Show Manager, Section 15.08 a.) to read as follows (changes underlined):

The show manager must provide illumination (most closely simulating daylight as may be reasonably available) in each judging ring sufficient to allow thorough examination of each entry. The General Electric type F4OSPX50, or F40SXUSPX50 fluorescent lamp, Phillips F40/5000 U lamp, or equivalent, are suggested for this purpose.

RATIONALE: Inasmuch as Westinghouse was bought out by Phillips more than 10 years ago and that numbers on bulbs have changed and improved, we would like to see this updated in the show rules to make it easier for other clubs to purchase the correct bulbs with less
hassle. (This is mostly a housekeeping issue.) [2017 Secretary’s Note: no results were reported in the minutes.]

– 25 – Rip City Cats

RESOLVED: to add to CFA Show Rules, Article XX, Catalog the following section:

g. If applicable, a notice that the club is using permanent designations instead of fabric ribbons and fabric ribbons will be available to exhibitors entitled to them and who have requested them.

RATIONALE: This is a housekeeping amendment. The last paragraph in Article XXIII, Ribbons and Rosettes, states that this statement must be included in the introductory section of the show catalog. However, it is not mentioned in Article XX, Catalog, under 20.05 requirements for the introductory pages. Most clubs are currently in violation of this rule because it is not mentioned in Article XX. FAILED.

– 26 – Internet Cat Club

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

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

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

– 27 – Internet Cat Club

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

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

RATIONALE: This would be basically a “housekeeping” change. The majority of other ribbons are listed as optional for use as a permanent flat; the Winners Ribbon is not yet listed. The cost of fabric ribbons continues to rise. Many exhibitors do not take the fabric Winners Ribbons at present, so clubs could lower costs by using permanent flats for this award. However, as with other permanent flats, the option of a fabric ribbon would still be available for exhibitors upon request. CARRIED. 2/3 majority vote.
**RESOLVED:** to add to the CFA Show Rules, National/Regional Awards Program, Scoring, the following new paragraph after paragraph 3:

National Awards are based on all points earned. Regional Awards are based only on points earned in the region of final assignment.

**RATIONALE:** Every show year, cats/kittens are transferred/sold at the last minute to earn a regional award or higher regional award into regions who have lower scores. This is not fair to the exhibitors who stay within their region, work within their region, and support their region. A REGIONAL WINNER SHOULD BE A REGIONAL WINNER, not a transferred-in cat. This would not affect National Winners. **WITHDRAWN.**

**RESOLVED:** to amend CFA Show Rules, National/International/Hawaii/ Regional Awards Program as follows:

Change and add:

Best of Breed/Division**; Plaque
2nd Best of Breed/Division**; Plaque
3rd Best of Breed/Division**; Plaque
**The title of “National Breed Winner (BW)” is limited to cats receiving these awards.

**RATIONALE:** These changes are designed to place more emphasis on the best of each breed/division. Breeders remember their own breed placements and these winners should be honored. Cats who set the style and tone for each breed will get more recognition for their achievement in the breed. The current National Winners are usually the best of their breed and should not affect them! **WITHDRAWN.**

**RESOLVED:** to add to the CFA Show Rules, National/Regional Awards Program, Scoring Procedures/Policies & Awards, Awards, presented each year the following section:

National Awards:

After “The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving these awards” ADD The Title of National Breed Winner (NBW) is limited to cats receiving the Best and 2nd Best of Breed Awards.

**RATIONALE:** CFA has recently been emphasizing the importance of breed awards and has highlighted them at the last several international shows. Achieving the breed awards is an important achievement for a breeder and this proposal would provide additional recognition for both the cats and their breeders. Frequently the top award winning cats at both the national and
regional levels cover only a few of the many CFA breeds. This would extend important recognition to other breeds. **FAILED.**

---

**31 – Garden State Cat Club**

**RESOLVED:** to add to the CFA Show Rules, National/Regional Awards Program, Scoring Procedures/Policies & Awards, Awards, presented each year the following section:

Regional Awards:

After The Title of “Regional Winner (RW)” is limited to cats receiving top cat/kitten/cat in premiership awards” ADD The Title of Regional Breed Winner (RBW) is limited to the cats receiving the Best and 2nd Best of Breed Awards.

**RATIONALE:** CFA has recently been emphasizing the importance of breed awards and has highlighted them at the last several international shows. Achieving the breed awards is an important achievement for a breeder and this proposal would provide additional recognition for both the cats and their breeders. Frequently the top award winning cats at both the national and regional levels cover only a few of the many CFA breeds. This would extend important recognition to other breeds. **FAILED.**

---

**32 – Longhair Japanese Bobtail Club**

**RESOLVED:** to amend the CFA Show Rules, National/Regional Awards Program, Regional Assignment, by changing the last date a cat may be transferred to a new region or between co-owners to read as follows:

Remove the phrase “last show week-end of February” in every paragraph and replace with, “the third show weekend of January” in the “Co-owned cat/kitten:” section.

**RATIONALE:** Every show year, cats/kittens are transferred/sold at the last minute to earn a regional award or higher regional award into regions who have lower scores. This is not fair to the exhibitors who stay within their region, work within their region, and support their region. A REGIONAL WINNER SHOULD BE A REGIONAL WINNER, not a transferred-in cat. This change of date will require owners to make a decision while the “race” is still on. **FAILED.**

---

**33 – Longhair Japanese Bobtail Club**

**RESOLVED:** to add in bold to the CFA Show Rules, National/Regional Awards Program, Regional Assignment the following new paragraph before listing rules governing Regional Assignment:

A CAT/KITTEN may be transferred according to the following procedures, but only points earned in the region of final assignment will be counted for a regional win.

**RATIONALE:** Every show year, cats/kittens are transferred/sold at the last minute to earn a regional award or higher regional award into regions who have lower scores. This is not
fair to the exhibitors who stay within their region, work within their region, and support their region. A REGIONAL WINNER SHOULD BE A REGIONAL WINNER, not a transferred-in cat. This would not affect National Winners. WITHDRAWN.

(31) PROPOSED NON SHOW RULE RESOLUTIONS.

– 34 – Orientals West

RESOLVED: to add to the CFA Rules for Registration, Article II, Registration, Section 10, Registration Screening the following new paragraph:

Notwithstanding any other provision of these Registration Rules to the contrary, any kitten whose parents are registered cats of the same breed and which has a characteristic (e.g., color, pattern, coat length) not in the current show standard for that breed shall be eligible for unrestricted registration as an AOV (“Any Other Variety”) of that breed.

RATIONALE: This amendment to the Registration Rules reaffirms a 1966 CFA Executive Board decision creating an AOV registration policy, a change which was prompted by CFA’s refusal to register dilute color Burmese out of two registered sable Burmese. The current Registration Rules do not include any provisions for the registration of AOV’s; instead, there are rather vague “registration screening” rules, which have been and are now being used to deny registration to cats of certain colors and/or patterns; for example, ticked tabby American Shorthairs. Furthermore, it is clear from the minutes of the February 1998 CFA Executive Board meeting that a certain faction believes that, in addition to eliminating outcrosses for certain hybrid breeds, another way to “purify” all the breeds (and eliminate lookalikes) would be to stop the registration of AOV’s within a breed, including longhaired Exotics; pointed Orientals; seal, blue, chocolate and lilac point Colorpoint Shorthairs; shorthaired (variant) Balinese, Javanese, Somalis, etc. AOV’s have played an important role in the history of several breeds and for the health of these breeds we ask for your support of the above resolution.

From the 1967 CFA Yearbook, CFA Executive Board Meeting Minutes (abridged) September 9-10-11, 1966: “Mrs. Carnahan moved the AOV class be established for the offspring of any recognized color or breed, cat or kitten, which now appears in our show rules or those which we subsequently adopt and may apply to a cat which does not conform to the color standard for a specimen of that breed. Carried.” FAILED.

– 35 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

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

The CFA Board will approve guidelines for outcrossing for a breed when at least 60% of the voting breed council of that breed submits its outcrossing breeding plan. The breed council of each breed is responsible for determining the outcross breeding plan for its breed. The timetable for breed council submissions is to be established by the CFA Board.
RATIONALE: Only the breeders who have invested study, time, work and money in a breeding program of a specific breed truly understand the strengths and weaknesses of their breed. Their understanding of what their breed needs cannot be matched by cat fanciers in general, including judges and/or board members. Experienced breeders in a given breed have produced, registered and shown cats of their breed. They have qualified to become breed council members. Only breed council members are in a position to know what is best for their breed. Therefore, the consensus of the breed council members of a given breed should determine breeding practices of that breed. CARRIED.

– 36 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

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

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

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

– 37 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

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

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

– 38 – Altered States Cat Club; National Bombay Fanciers

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

RATIONALE: Breeders/exhibitors have spent a lot of money to produce litters, register them and put their cats in the show ring. With so much time, effort and financial investment the breeder/exhibitor gains a great deal of knowledge, including breed standards, and pays attention to what goes on in the judging ring. The frequent exhibitor does a lot of observing, sees many judges and can recognize when a cat is handled with skill. The hard fact is that exhibitors observe many judges in many situations more than other judges do. They understand what qualities are needed for a judge to have good rapport with cats, exhibitors, and spectators and can handle awkward and difficult situations with tact and kindness. Above all they are keenly aware of the desired behavior that shows respect to cats and people. Exhibitors need to be represented for they have an important contribution to give to this committee and without it the committee would be incomplete. CARRIED.
RESOLVED: that any time the CFA Board establishes a committee or panel it includes
on that committee or panel a person(s) who is a breeder or exhibitor but NOT a judge.

RATIONALE: The CFA Board is dominated by judges. In fact, most CFA activities are
controlled by judge members. There is very little representation of the exhibitor/breeder
viewpoint. Yet the main financial load is borne by breeders/exhibitors. It is time to give this
group more opportunity to voice their opinions. WITHDRAWN.

RESOLVED: effective with shows held after May 1, 1998, the CFA show processing
fee will be rolled back to $60.00 per show. Clubs which have already paid the excess fee will be
given a refund from CFA.

RATIONALE: CFA recently doubled the show insurance fee from $30.00 to $60.00 per
show. The show licensing fee is now scheduled to increase from $60.00 to $100.00 effective
May 1, 1998. The total cost to license a show is thus increased from $90.00 to $160.00 per show.
The increase was made retroactive for clubs which had previously licensed their shows. This
resolution will allow the insurance costs to be passed through to the clubs, but will reverse the
licensing fee increase. In recent years many show producing clubs have been faced with
increases in hotel, hall, and transportation costs. CFA judging fees are also scheduled to increase
effective May 1, 1998. As a result, some show producing clubs may be forced to curtail or cease
show production. Show producing clubs are the backbone of CFA, and too many burdens have
been placed on them in a too short period of time. FAILED.

[Secretary’s Note: #39 and 40 were actually not considered until Saturday but for
continuity and ease of reading, they are listed with the other pre-noticed resolutions.]

The Friday portion of the 1998 CFA Annual Meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

1998 CFA ANNUAL MEETING
Saturday June 20, 1998

President Rothermel called the Saturday session to order at 9:00 a.m. for the balance of
the reports and presentations and the continuation of the proposed resolutions.

(32) CFA YEARBOOK REPORT.

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Honored Guests, and friends:

They say “never use a cliché in your talk” and yet it’s inevitable that I mention “it seems
like only yesterday that we were here in Philadelphia.” It was 1991, and so many new things
have happened and yet so much has remained the same.

Years ago you could see us sitting quietly at a drawing board reading instructions and
laying out ads — creativity was a must and the yearbook reflected our concentrated efforts.
Today we have an entirely different picture — fax copies coming out of a machine in the corner from everywhere in the world — laser printouts coming out of the printer — where is that beep coming from? — more paper? What machine? and time to check your on-line mail to work on a feature that was emailed by the author.

We have become computer technicians, bookkeepers, machine and telephone operators and everything you can imagine in a day in the life of a yearbook editor. What remains the same is that we are still concentrating and working hard to give you what you want.

While the publication is essentially designed to include the year-end coverage of all the significant events of the show season, we are still determined to present it in a new, more original, and aesthetic manner. We are not just communicators; we are dealing with more critical and more knowledgeable readers. Editorial excellence demands more than language skills and a basic knowledge of cats. Attractive design just does not cut it because we have to convey a product that really says and teaches something about the feline.

We still try to develop a book that will in its final coverage strike a balance between the wants and needs of a limited few.

Our due dates are still created to ensure the on-time delivery of our publication. There are a specific number of pages allotted to advertising. We have a contract to adhere to with the printer and deadlines are not prepared as an obstacle course between the Yearbook office, the photographers, and the advertisers. The deadline for grands was June 6, and believe it or not, that section of the book is at the printers. The Yearbook advertising deadline is July 7 (or when the quota is filled), and yes, we did fill our quota last year. However, more pages were allotted to other features and business.

We all benefit by having our ads and photos in the CFA Yearbook. Remember, if you advertise in the Yearbook, it won’t crash, corrupt, erase or become obsolete. The Yearbook is a permanent and magnificent record for all posterity.

Patricia Decker and I are dedicated to helping you. Stop by at our table with any questions or problems. I am sure we can be of assistance. Make this your year to advertise.

The Yearbook remains for you – by you – and about you and your magnificent cats. To those of you who continue to advertise and support the Yearbook and purchase it year after year – we could never make a solitary boast without you. We are very proud of our publication and we sincerely express our gratitude and say thank you.

Respectfully submitted,
Mama Fogarty Editor

(33) LEGISLATION.

President Rothermel recognized Joan Miller, who along with Anna Sadler, spoke briefly to the delegation. Joan thanked her committee and introduced Anna to the delegation. Sharon Coleman was not able to attend the meeting but Joan thanked her for her wonderful
work. In lieu of a formal report, they presented a very enlightening visual production depicting some of the recent legislative activity where CFA has been involved.

(34) **ANIMAL WELFARE.**

President Rothermel welcomed Pam DelaBar, who spoke to the delegation:

> In the past I have reported on what the Animal Welfare Committee has done during the past year. This year I am going to tell you what we are supposed to be doing, per the job description for the committee, and what we actually did.

> Article II – Objects: “The Association shall be a not-for-profit organization. Its objects shall be as follows: the welfare of all cats.”

> The CFA Animal Welfare Committee promotes the welfare of all cats through the execution of the following programs:

1. **Investigate all reported alleged cases of animal abuse/neglect in CFA registered catteries and recommend disposition to the CFA Protest Committee and the CFA Board of Directors.**

   Of all the jobs we are tasked to do, this is the most time consuming and the most disheartening. We have turned over about ten cases this past year. There are four cases ongoing. To ensure that I do not put CFA in a tenuous position, I have completed one level of the National Animal Cruelty Investigation Course, conducted by the University of Missouri Law Enforcement Training Institute, and am scheduled to attend the remaining two levels. Besides obtaining certification, attendance at this course is reaping other benefits. I get to interact with animal control officers as a fellow student, a peer. And what I have found out is rather amazing: (a) If they know of CFA already, they think we’re great – if they don’t know of us, I tell them of all our programs. (b) I get to “feel” out what they think of laws and ordinances and have had them ask me about licensing of cats. I think I stopped a few during the week of my instruction.

2. **Provide the proper amount of resourcing, as requested, in supporting animal rescue and relief efforts during natural and manmade disasters.**

   We again have provided training for CFA personnel in disaster planning. We also experienced one of the most frustrating disasters this year: ice storms. I think both the committee and the fanciers that actually lived through this now know what to do and have an excellent familiarity with generators. When the Blue Bonnet Cat Sanctuary was wiped out by a mudslide in Laguna Beach, CA, CFA Disaster Relief and the local CFA clubs provided money, supplies, cat trees, etc., to help relocate the survivors. I would also like to introduce you to the Code 3 Associates Disaster Tractor-Trailer Unit, called Riders on the Storm. This is a mobile command center which allows us not only to function in a zero-resource disaster environment, but also to take training directly to agencies requesting help. This disaster response team carries a horse trailer and Ford Explorer 4x4, rescue boats and gear for water rescue, rappelling equipment, livestock corrals and cages. The unit comes equipped with a surgical theater and enough water and animal food to stay on station seven days without replenishment. The vehicle can sleep nine and has toilet and shower facilities, microwave, refrigerator and TV/VCR. Riders on the Storm is
on 24 hours call, seven days a week. The CFA emblem is currently at a graphic arts company and will be displayed on the trailer unit.

(3) Sit as a member of the Disaster Relief Fund and recommend expenditures of funds in support of disaster rescue to the board of the Disaster Relief Fund.

Well, basically I can honestly say that I have recommended some expenditures this past year, have approved a draft of the incorporation articles for the fund, but I cannot stand here and say that this fund has been incorporated and submitted for 501c3 status. I hope this will change in the next few weeks.

(4) Execute and monitor CFA’s mandatory and voluntary cattery inspection programs per the CFA Cattery Standard.

Every year we increase the number of catteries undergoing the voluntary cattery inspection. This year we had 124 breeders fall into the mandatory cattery inspection category. This number has stayed rather stable ever since we initiated this program. One item does concern me – about 20 of these breeders do not have a registered CFA Cattery Name. I will be submitting a proposal to the board to require registrations by these catteries in addition to the mandatory inspections.

(5) Coordinate activities with the CFA Protest Committee, the CFA Animal Health Committee, the CFA Legislative Committee, and the CFA Executive Committee, as needed.

This is done constantly, especially with the Legislative Committee.

I can often get a “feel” for potential hot spots and I pass this information on to Anna or Joan. However, I feel one of the greatest services I can provide to the other committees, and thus to CFA, is to strongly promote our programs to our breeders. We cannot expect to effectively fight restrictive legislation unless we have our own house in order. I prefer we police ourselves – not be policed by an outside agency. We were successful this year in changing wording proposed to the Texas Board of Health which would have wiped out any animal rescue by individuals, any TTVAR activities, and any disaster relief activities in the State of Texas.

(6) Provide information and education for proper cattery management.

We are developing a cattery management booklet and pamphlets and thank Margot Mellies for volunteering to spearhead this effort.

(7) Present education programs on CFA breeds and animal welfare programs to veterinary students and state/local humane and animal control officials.

This has been a slow year for this function. We find that our presentations tend to be cyclical, slow this year, next year we’ll be busy with these presentations. I did present the cattery standard and our cattery inspection program to one group of animal control officers this year.
Promote and provide, as requested, trap, test, vaccinate, alter, release, and maintenance programs of managed “feral” cat colonies.

We had one request for assistance which we met and removed several cats from an environment where they were being tortured. These cats were able to go into adoptive homes. We have another request to assist a responsible pet owner association in TTVAR of a truly “feral” colony. We will respond as our budget permits.

It is never a dull moment in animal welfare. There is so much we want to do and a very limited budget to do it. Thanks to you, we have a healthy disaster relief fund. Thanks to you, CFA has set the standards for feline welfare. And, thanks to your own personal hard work and high standards, CFA can stand strong in the animal welfare arena and stand very strong against legislation and ordinances which threaten our existence. Please keep up your efforts and we will make a difference.

Respectfully submitted,
Pam DelaBar

(35) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

President Rothermel introduced Kim Everett, CFA Vice President to give her Judging Program report. Kim Everett said:

It has been a pleasure and an honor serving on the CFA Board for 16 years. For 12 of those years I have been Judging Program Chairman. CFA is moving ahead for the future with new innovative ideas, one of which is implementing a new JPC composed of members who are not on the board. I heartily support this new concept and feel we should all get behind it and our newly elected Judging Program panel and their selected exhibitor. Please join with me in congratulating our new committee: Jo Ann Cummings, Jeanie McPhee, Annette Wilson, Wayne Trevathan, and Toni Woolard and wishing them success in a very difficult and time consuming task. I also wish to thank the outgoing JPC, Donna Jean Thompson, Will Thompson, and Bob Zenda for all their help and to the Central Office Staff, all the judges and clubs. On a sad note, we lost two wonderful Allbreed judges who contributed many years to CFA – Marion Hall and Ann Kimball. Both of the ladies will be missed but always remembered.

Lastly and my favorite part of my report is sharing with you the judges and applicants who advanced at this June meeting. **Advanced to Approved:** (LH)—Holly Ayers (5). **Advanced To Approval Pending:** (AB) Suzy Beedy (2), (AB) Darrell Newkirk (6). **Advanced to Apprentice:** (LH) Rachel Anger (4); (SH) Rhett Bockman (7); (SH) Gloria Hoover (3); (SH) Edward Maeda (8) and (SH) Paul Patton (6). **Accepted as Trainee:** (SH) Steve Gardea (3); (SH) Tracy Petty (7); (LH) Yoshiko Sada (8); and (SH) Jan Stevens (7). **Reinstatement to the Program:** (LH-SH) David Mare (2). Dave will be doing some review and taking our judges refresher course.

CFA has the best judges in the world – please honor them today with your appreciation. They do a wonderful job.
It has been a long and rewarding run but the amount of work involved in administering the Judging Program is astronomical and it takes its toll. When I counted all of the judges in the program, I think I processed more judges during my administration than anyone else before me. As Rita Swenson said when she left the position, “It’s time to turn over the baton.” Good Luck to the new committee and now please join me in acknowledging every CFA Judge on our roster. Will all the judges please stand. THANKS TO ALL OF YOU!!!” Applause, Applause, Applause.

President Rothermel next recognized Donna Jean Thompson, Trainee Administrator:

Listening to Kim give her report, it would seem we were on the same wavelength – she worked with a few notes and said many of the same things I planned to say. I don’t care, I am going to say them again anyway, they are deserved.

Change is difficult but change represents growth and that growth is what we have before us. Wednesday at the board meeting I made a commitment to the board of directors that I would do all in my power to see this transition move forward successfully without any glitches. I am asking you, the breeders and exhibitors in CFA and my fellow judges, to join me in that commitment. There is no doubt in my mind that you do.

This past year, Erika Graf-Webster worked very hard to put together a Mentoring Program for new judges. It is excellent and ready for implementation. Erika could not be here, yet I publicly thank her so very much.

July will begin my 35th year in the CFA cat fancy. I have had so many successes, I have had so many opportunities. I have had goals and have surpassed each and every one of them. This organization has given me more than I can ever give it back. Fourteen years ago, Walt Friend bestowed upon me the honor of asking me to come aboard and take on the Judging Program Applicants and Trainees – a difficult task, yet it became the most rewarding of my CFA activities. I survived Walt, I survived Don Williams, I survived Craig Rothermel, and I even survived Kim Everett – Thank You, Kim! Kim and I may have disagreed on a path to follow but we never ever disagreed in our goal for this organization: The finest cats and the finest judges in the world. Thank you to the Central Office staff, particularly Tom, Allene, Carol, and Linda (who I am sure is chained to the copy machine). I want to thank our training judges and our senior judges who have given of their time and their ability in the ring – you may have had a late dinner but it was your investment in our future. You, as breeders and exhibitors, opened your catteries for visitations and in our show halls shared your cats, wisdom and expertise. I thank you and I hope I have not left anyone out.

I have been called a “mother hen” with her little chicks; well, there may be some truth to that – would my chicks of the past 14 years please rise. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is tremendous talent before you of which my part has been very small. It is the results of my time and energies – It is my gift to you. Applause, Applause, Applause.

President Rothermel called on Bob Zenda, Judging School Coordinator.

CFA JUDGING SCHOOL.
One thing we can say for the judges of CFA is WE HAVE THE FINEST IN THE WORLD! It has been my honor to have been a part of something that is very important to the future of CFA and that is the training and education program. We had a school in Atlanta last November and we had 35 students in attendance. We had five Allbreed Judges who put a considerable amount of work into that to make sure that the school was a success. Loretta Baugh, Judy Thomas, Donna Jean Thompson, Bob Molino, and Bob Bradshaw did an absolutely fantastic job. Last night at our Judges Workshop we had three breed presentations that were just superb. We had the secretaries from the Somali, Egyptian Mau, and Abyssinian Breed Councils who gave beautiful presentations as a part of our continuing education program. Next year, the Burmese, the Bombay, and the British Shorthair are scheduled for our study. The 35 students who attended the school in Atlanta represented every region and there was one person from Sweden. As I call your name will you please come forward for a group photograph – Tohru Aizawa; Donna Andrews, Art Anzalone; Linda Anzalone; Joan Ardrey; Steve Baylus; Vicki Baylus; Ollie Bishop; Lee Brown; Susan Edwards; Shana Ellzey; Gail Frew; Steve Gardea; Kim George; Gloria Hoover; Gerald Hollingsworth; Miki Ishimoto; Linda Jewell; Peg Johnson; Susan Johnson; Debbie Lloyd; Carolyn Lyons; Lynette May; Steve Oreolt; Jan Rogers; Wendy Rosfeld; Joachim Salen; Connie Schmidt; Eric Simpson; Pam Sogge; Jan Stevens; Karen Talbert; Tracey Tranen; Judy Watts; and Beverly Wood.

(37) **JUDGING PROGRAM TRANSITION COMMITTEE REPORT.**

Betty White and Stan Barnaby gave the following report.

Having effectively completed its charge following the adoption of the previous report at the February meeting of the CFA Board of Directors, the Judging Program Proposal Transition Committee witnessed the election by CFA’s judges of four of their members to the new Judging Program Committee. As previously mentioned, they are: Jo Ann Cummings, Jeanie McPhee, Wayne Trevathan, Annette Wilson.

The exhibitor member named to this committee by those judges elected is Toni Woolard.

The problem of a vacancy occurring can be addressed at Wednesday’s board meeting by naming an alternate from the most current election to fill the position which is first due to expire. The board felt this to be the simplest, most logical, and least costly approach to this eventuality.

It was further determined by the board that declared candidates for the CFA Executive Board be ineligible to appear on the Judging Program Committee annual ballot. In addition, a current member of the Judging Program Committee is not eligible for re-election until his/her term expires. This means a period of at least one year between terms.

Stan and I, along with fellow committee members Tom Dent, Kim Everett, and Donna Jean Thompson, join all of you in wishing the new Judging Program Committee well. They have a hard act to follow!

Respectfully submitted,
Betty White
Stan Barnaby
(38) **CLERKING PROGRAM.**

President Rothermel next welcomed Debbie Kusy, Clerking Program Chairman, to present her report to the delegation.

*Good Morning,*

*This is my first annual report on the Clerking Program and I have to say that it has been an interesting experience. This was the year that the clerking test would be taken. The test is out; some people have even already returned their tests. I had three people around the county take the test on a trial basis to see how they interpreted the questions and how they scored, also asking for their Comments. Two Master Clerk Instructors and one Certified Clerk took the test and all three scored very well. I would like to thank Pam Sogge, Karen Talbert and David Raynor for taking the time to add their comments and input. However, all three of them, along with myself and two others, missed a typo on one of the questions. Several have called about it and those, along with the ones who have returned the test, have assumed the correct missing item and are getting the right answer; so, it does not appear to be a problem.*

*Many clerking schools have been scheduled around the country, one in each of the following regions in the next few months – North Atlantic, Southern, Southwest – and several in Japan. Interest in the Clerking Program in Japan continues to be very high and I would again like to thank Edward Maeda for his invaluable assistance.*

*The clerking pins will soon be available as service awards – eligible clerks will be notified of their availability. Finally I would like to thank Shirley Michaud-Dent for her assistance in Central Office, she helps to keep things running smoothly. If anyone has any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. I enjoy talking to you all.*

Debbie Kusy  
Clerking Program

(39) **WINN FOUNDATION.**

President Rothermel introduced Hilary Helmrich, Winn Foundation President and she gave her report. The full report can be found on page 122 of Sept. 1998 Almanac and p.401 of this Yearbook.

(40) **HEALTH COMMITTEE.**

President Rothermel introduced Betty White, Health Committee Chairman.

*Beginning my tenure as Chair of the Health Committee rather routinely with no “hot health topics,” the committee and I have ended this year with a full measure of concerns.*

*Who are the members of the Health Committee? They are respected breeders Penny Copes, Gayle Hand, Karen Lawrence, Jennifer Reding, and four veterinarians whose names are very familiar to you all: Nikki Crandall-Seibert, Steven Hull (who grew up in CFA), Susan Little and Judy Zinn.*
PKD (Polycystic Kidney Disease) Sub-Committee

A sub-committee was formed in late April to spearhead a concerted attack on this known genetic disease of Persian and Exotic cats and those other domestic breeds related to them. The committee will also serve as a clearinghouse for information of all kinds concerning PKD. Joining me on this sub-committee are Debi Faryna, Sue Helmke, Hilary Helmrich, Susan Little, Colleen Power, and Anna Sadler. Dr. David Biller, the recognized authority on this disease, is our consultant. The committee met on Thursday and will make an initial report at a general meeting on the subject to be held on Saturday afternoon, June 20, at 2 p.m. in the Philadelphia South Ballroom.

Vaccine-Associated Feline Sarcoma

Breeders will be heartened to know that the Vaccine-Associated Feline Sarcoma Task Force, a group formed by the American Veterinary Medical Association, awarded a number of research grants to study this problem. They were announced in the January issue of their Journal and supported by the American Animal Hospital Association Foundation, Fort Dodge Animal Health, American Association of Feline Practitioners, Cornell Feline Health Center, Intervet, Inc., Veterinary Cancer Society, and Synbiotics Corporation. The Morris Animal Foundation also announced a similar study funded by the Kirkpatrick Foundation.

Feline Diabetes

A valuable, long-lasting insulin that enables many cats to be maintained on a single dose per day is once again to be made available. Called PZI, this insulin ceased to be manufactured a few years ago. Anthony Products has received FDA approval to produce it, making it available soon through regular veterinary suppliers.

Flea Control

According to a clinical report published in the January issue of the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, it is suggested that flea populations within a home may be controlled by carefully timed on-host treatments with potent long-acting insecticides.

CFA Health Committee Website FAQ (frequently asked questions)

Continuing our mission to inform our breeders and the general public of health concerns, the Health Committee utilizes our website faithfully to further this effort. We have added more new topics to the website since my February report and wish to call these to your attention:


- http://www.cfainc.org/articles/health-petownership.html (Susan Little DVM) - pet ownership for those who are immunocompromised
Website Pamphlets

The first of our website pamphlets (reproductions of our website articles) to be made available to clubs and individuals deals with Polycystic Kidney Disease. These pamphlets will be available at the PKD Seminar on Saturday afternoon.

Almanac Article

Please be on the lookout for an article on estrus prevention in cats by Jean Ryan Gullahorn, DVM, soon to be published in the CFA Almanac. [July 1998]

AVMA Conference

I plan to attend the 1998 AVMA Conference in Baltimore this July with Michael Brim and the CFA booth. Please expect a report of proceedings of keen interest to our breeders and CFA in October

Guidelines for Requesting Outcrossing

Following the adoption of the report of the Breed Definition Committee (WIAB) at the February 1998 meeting of the CFA Board of Directors, the Health Committee commenced working on guidelines for requesting outcrossing by any of our recognized breeds. I notified all breed council secretaries of our undertaking by mail on February 25, requesting thoughts and suggestions from their breeders to aid in our deliberations. Tentative guidelines were established in late April and all breed council secretaries were apprised of the proposed protocol in a letter from me on May 5.

In addition, the committee is working on reference material to be made available to all CFA breeders, information to assist them in identifying genetic defects (including a genetic defects database). Further, we will offer standard protocols to enable breeders to document a breed’s overall genetic health. It is our goal to have final guidelines and all other educational data completed for review and approval by the board of directors at the February 1999 board meeting.

You, as well as I, have been heartened by the report of Legislation and Animal Welfare at this meeting. We need to continue to demonstrate our responsibility as breeders for the health of our cats. We in CFA want to be regarded as the solution, not the problem.

Betty White, Chair
CFA Health Committee
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT.

President Rothermel next presented Edna Field, International Committee Chairman. Edna brought the following report.

The CFA International Division continues to extend its boundaries and attract new clubs around the world. At the Wednesday board meeting four new clubs were accepted – in Austria, Italy, Hong Kong, and now Slovenia. Unfortunately, clubs were dropped from membership in England, France and Russia. This now leaves us with 26 clubs in the International Division.

Club applications from France, the Ukraine and Siberia arrived too late to be presented at this board meeting, but will be considered for membership in October.

On the show scene, 24 successful shows were held and 21 cats became Grand Champions while six become Grand Premiers. This represents a big increase in numbers from last year. We also had yet another first this year – a Himalayan Persian achieved the title of Distinguished Merit!

While Persians are still the breed of majority in the International Division, a Turkish Van and an Oriental Shorthair were in the Top Ten Cats. Also, the Best Cat, Best Kitten and one of the top Premiership Cats were Exotics. The awards banquet was held in Italy in May, with rosettes and certificates awarded to the Top Ten Cats in Championship, Top Five Kittens and Top Five Cats in Premiership. Because of an increase in the number of entries in the Kitten classes, we will be awarding Top 10 Kittens next year.

The International Qualifier will be held in October in Austria, and a large entry is expected.

It has been my pleasure to serve as Chairman of the International Committee for the past several years. I’d like to extend my thanks to the CFA Board, the Yearbook staff and to the Central Office staff for their support. I greatly appreciate the assistance of my committee members both here and abroad, Larry Vaughn, Peter and Piergiorgio, who have kept me well informed and up-to-date. Special thanks to Karen Lawrence who has eased my communication with overseas clubs through the use of her email. I have decided that it’s time to hand over the chairmanship of this committee to a new appointee. I will be happy to continue as a committee member if I can help, and look forward to helping with the growth of CFA around the world.

Respectfully submitted,
Edna M. Field

CFA FOUNDATION.

President Rothermel next recognized Tom Dent who read Vaughn Bather’s report.

The CFA Foundation, Inc. is a not-for-profit corporation. Our goals are to collect and preserve the materials pertinent to CFA and the cat fancy. The Foundation has been recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as a charity under the provisions of the I.R.S. code section 501 (c)(3). Donations to the Foundation are tax deductible.
Cowboy Country Cat Fanciers, The Greater Baton Rouge Cat Club and Emerald Coast Cat Fanciers honored their judges by making contributions to the Foundation. Thank you.

Karen Lawrence and Carol and Melvin List made donations to the Foundation in memory of cats from Nekomo Cattery lost in a fire. Thank you.

On July 9, 1997, the CFA Foundation met at the Doubletree Hotel in Somerset, NJ. At this meeting it was decided to include a category of participants referred to as Friends of the Foundation. They are Wain Harding, Mark Hannon, Bobara Pendergrast, Joan Pocica, Scotty Griffey, Kim Everett, Debbie Ritter, Shirley Crawford and Marilyn Dipboye of Cat Collectors. Officers are President, Don Williams; Vice President, Michael Brim; Secretary Vaughn Barber; Treasurer, Thomas Dent. The Accessions Committee consists of Wain Harding and Bobara Pendergrast. The responsibility of the officers and friends is to “spread the word” – make appeals to individuals, clubs and other interested sources.

With storage space becoming scarce at Central Office, the Foundation is thinking of a capital campaign to help fund our dream of a library and cat museum, similar to the Dog Museum in St. Louis, MO. If there are any volunteers for this monumental task, please speak to any of the officers and friends.

Vaughn Barber has met with Mary Jo and Lee Pierce of Tulsa and their son Paul regarding Mary Jo’s collection of cat artifacts. Another meeting is scheduled in October. Bobara Pendergrast continues to work with a potential donor of a large estate. Sharon Melnyk of Berkeley, CA has donated two exceptional signed and numbered Garfield plates. The numbers are A5091 and A5092. If anyone has others to donate, the Foundation would be pleased to acquire the complete series.

In September of last year, Marilyn Dipboye forwarded several dozen photographs of a collection of rare Staffordshire cats owned by a collector in Italy. The collector wanted to sell the entire collection and was not interested in breaking it up. Unfortunately, our funds did not allow us to make a competitive bid, but this is one more reason we need your donations to the Foundation. The collection was well documented, museum quality and something that would enhance any cat collection.

Please keep us in mind when you are making your will or dispersing some of the profits from your show.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,
Vaughn Barber

(43) BOUNDARIES COMMITTEE.

President Rothermel introduced Jody Garrison, committee chairperson, and she recognized the members of the committee: Jan Wydro, Dennis Ganoe, Dan Petty, and Robert Belfatto. The members made an interesting presentation to the delegation displaying overheads depicting several possible boundary realignments. A straw poll was taken of the delegation and
they cast the most votes for the nine region configuration. Jan Wydro said that we could expect a constitutional amendment in 1999. He went on to point out that nothing is cast in stone at this time and they are encouraging everyone to come in with suggestions for alternatives.

The complete regional boundary report can be found on page 77 of the June 1998 Almanac.

1999 ANNUAL MEETING.

President Rothermel recognized Jean Grimm who reported on the 1999 Annual Meeting scheduled to be held in Sacramento, California. Jean and others on the committee held some fun raffle drawings and dispersed some nice prizes. Everyone is looking forward to gathering at the Hyatt Regency on June 23-27, 1999, in Sacramento, California for the 1999 CFA Annual Meeting.

2003 ANNUAL MEETING.

President Rothermel welcomed Linda Berg who along with Beth Cassely proposed the 2003 Annual Meeting site. The delegates accepted their recommendations and the 2003 CFA Annual Meeting in Region 6 will be held at the Adams Mark Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS FROM THE FLOOR.

President Rothermel then invited delegates to present their resolutions from the floor.

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

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

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

So that it reads:

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

Also amend:

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

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

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

Also add to CFA Show Rules, Article XVIII – Responsibilities of Clerks, Section 18/08, a new subsection to be labeled, “f. The chief ring clerk of each judging ring will provide the unofficial ring count for kittens, championship and premiership including champions and premiers prior to each final.”

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

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


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

– 43 – Presented by Lucy Pozzi. Sponsored by Altered States Cat Club. (This resolution was submitted in an effort to replace #38 which passed on Friday).

RESOLVED: In this initial year, the CFA Judging Program Committee to be adjusted to be composed of 4 AB judges and 3 exhibitors. Exhibitor qualifications and method of selection to be determined by the CFA Board. After the first year, the committee size may be modified so long as it retains at least two exhibitors. RESOLUTION FAILED.

– 44 – Presented by Bob Agresta. Sponsored by Ancient Capital CC; Northern California CF; Just Cat-In-Around; Michi Pet; Paws & Claws; Royal Canadian; Valley View Cat Fanciers; Cleveland Persian Society; Specifically Orientals; Oriental Shorthairs of America; Westchester CC; Coastal Cat Club; Sophisto Cat Club; Appalachian; Thumbs Up CF; Seneca CF; Golden Triangle CF; Buffalo Cat Fanciers; Ontario Cat Fanciers; Black Tie & Tails Cat Club; Salt City Cat Club; Grandview Cat Fanciers; International Bombay Society; Syndi Cats; Atlantic Himalayan Club; Copper City Cat Club; Himalayans of the West; Orientals West; Sunkat Feline Fanciers; Peace Bridge Aby Fanciers; Mohawk Trail Cat Club; Fantastic Felines of CNY.
RESOLVED: That the board take whatever steps are necessary to assure that the 16 pointed Oriental colors that have shown for 15 years have no lapse in their championship status:

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

RESOLUTION CARRIED.

– 45 – Presented by Wayne Newland. Sponsored by Freestate Feline Fanciers.

RESOLVED: Amend Article IV to add: 4.12 Exhibitors who are bringing their own security cages, so indicate on their entry forms. Amend Article XI to Add: 11.31 Exhibitors who are bringing ‘their own security cages so indicate on their entry forms.

RATIONALE: Safety – Finding a safe place to store extra cages Saturday morning, where they will be out of the way and people won’t be hurt tripping over them and cages being damaged in extra handling. RESOLUTION FAILED.

– 46 – Presented by Loretta Baugh. Sponsored by Mt. Fuji Tokyo Cat Club.

RESOLVED: All blue slips will be preprinted with the phrase “Not for Breeding.” Each slip will contain an area for the signature of the buyer to indicate their understanding of this designation. If the cat/kitten is being sold as a breeder or should the seller decide at a later date that the cat CAN be used for breeding, an attachment indicating this arrangement will be filed with the blue slip or the current registration will be amended by filing an affidavit with the Central Office.

RATIONALE: One of the ongoing concerns expressed repeatedly this week has been the continued decrease in registrations. The impetus for a kitten buyer to register a newly acquired kitten is highest in the first few weeks after purchase. They are excited and proud of their purebred cat and will often register as soon as a name is selected. Waiting to issue the blue slip until after the kitten is neutered or spayed may result in a failure for the owner to register their pet. This failure to register means a loss of revenue for CFA.

This change will allow the seller to issue the blue slip at the time of the sale. Currently, sellers must place a check mark in a box next to the phrase “Not for breeding” status on the blue slip. The attachment adds assurance that the wishes of the seller will be followed.

We have also been constantly reminded how our hobby is under attack by animal rights groups and coercive legislation. This procedure would provide one more positive indication that the pedigreed cat fancy takes their responsibility seriously in regard to the prevention of unplanned matings that result in unwanted kittens. RESOLUTION FAILED.
RESOLVED: That the name of the CFA Legislative Fund be changed to the Sy Howard Legislative Fund.

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


RESOLVED: To amend Article III championships and premierships Section 8.01. Delete words: the winning and change to ALL and add: if a cat meets their breed standards. There is no limit to how many winners ribbons may be awarded in color class judging in any one ring.

RATIONALE: Many times in majority breeds there are many of the same sex and color cats, whereas in minority breeds winners ribbons are virtually unchallenged by other sex and color cats. This makes the whole champion process somewhat unfair. After all, winners ribbons only represent the fact that the cat does meet its standard, and may continue to attain points to grand. The judge could withhold if the standard was not met. We believe many more cats would be entered into shows for winners ribbons if the standard was the judging standard criteria and not competition of the same color and sex of another cat, thus boosting entries and confirmation fees. Too many times it becomes a campaign to champion majority breeds (black Persians, etc.) and minority breeds seldom have competition and are awarded winners ribbons by simply meeting their own standard. RESOLUTION FAILED.

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

RESOLVED: To require clubs to submit to Central Office proposals for resolutions to amend constitution and show rules in the form of “red line/strike out” so that the section amended appears in its entirety with the parts to be deleted in strike out (line through print) and the parts to be added underlined.

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


RESOLVED: Amend Show Rule 28.13 (handling by judges). Amend the rule by inserting the following sentence as item “g” and moving the items “g” and “h” to “h” and “i”:
The judge should complete the handling of all exhibits before providing the clerk with a list of cats to be called for finals.

**RATIONALE**: It can be efficient to have the clerk pull cards for finals while the last few cats are being judged; this procedure is discouraging and demoralizing – it makes it appear that the last few exhibits are not receiving the same consideration for finals as those judged previously. **RESOLUTION FAILED**.

– 51 – **Presented by Bob Molino. Sponsored by New River Cat Fanciers.**

**RESOLVED**: Issues regarding acceptance of competition eligibility be resolved by the affected breed councils. Resolutions from the floor cannot be used to change the deliberative process of the breed councils. (No Rationale given). **RESOLUTION FAILED**.

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

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

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

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

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

1. That the word “affected” refers principally to the breed/or breeders whose standard(s) is/are changing.

2. That other breeds that have an interest in this change should be polled for their position, and their vote will provide valuable input on the proposal, but that their approval is not required for consideration of the issue by the board.

**RATIONALE**: The February 1998 board meeting’s expanded interpretation of the word “affected” was discussed at length during the presentation of proposal 11. Although a 2/3 vote was not achieved, discussion indicated a majority of the delegates did not agree with the most
recent broadened definition. Passage of this advisory proposal will advise the Board of the original intent of Article XI’s language. RESOLUTION CARRIED.


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

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

RATIONALE: Housekeeping, focusing on requirement. RESOLUTION CARRIED.

Adjournment

President Rothermel thanked all the outgoing officers for their years of service and welcomed the new officers. There being no further business, the 1998 CFA Annual Meeting was officially adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Secretary’s Note: The June 17, 1998 CFA Board Meeting, including the summary of the Disciplinary Hearings and Protests, and the June 19-20, 1998 CFA Annual Meeting portions of these minutes are –

Respectfully submitted by,
Willa Hawke, CFA Executive Secretary.

[A personal note from Willa Hawke, the outgoing CFA Secretary. To all CFA Clubs and Their Individual Members: As I leave the office of CFA Secretary I would be remiss if I did not thank all of you for giving me the opportunity to serve you and CFA for eight years. This thanks is extended to all of you who supported my re-election effort and to those of you who could not support it. The thread that unites us as cat fanciers is our love of cats and their welfare and while the road that leads us to that end may differ from time to time, I have never lost sight of the fact that we are all headed to the same destination. I take pride in the fact that my term as your secretary is the longest in current history. That certainly suggests that we did many things right.

I also take pride in my work as head of the Process Improvement Team and our accomplishments. We started by guiding the board of directors into strategic planning and process improvement methodology. We initiated the learning steps for the member clubs and individual breeders and exhibitors in understanding how process improvement can upgrade the services and support you receive from the CFA. More specifically we recommended the initiation of the CFA Web site; facilitated three strategic Planning Sessions with the CFA Board of Directors or members thereof. These sessions resulted in: A CFA Vision Statement; A CFA Mission Statement; A Mentoring Program; A Youth Program; Increase in information for you about existing CFA’s programs; i.e. Protest Committee; Improvements to the Judging Program; Identification of the need to improve the morale and attitude of the CFA exhibitor. We conducted surveys: Satisfaction-Attitude surveys and a Scoring survey. We facilitated the CFA National/
Regional Scoring Task Force. Yes, I am proud of my work with this committee and can only hope that our process will continue under the new administration. I, along with my committee, want to continue working toward our goal of leading this organization down a clear path into the 21st Century.

In closing, I look forward to seeing many of you as I continue to serve CFA in my judging capacity and I will always work to improve the lot of that which we both love so much – the pride of the international cat fancy – CFA and our pedigreed cats.

Sincerely,
Willa K. Hawke

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
June 21, 1995

The Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. met on Sunday, June 21, 1998 for its post-annual meeting, organization and business session. President Don Williams called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM with the following members of the Board of Directors present:

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

Also present were Mr. Thomas Dent, CFA Executive Director; Mrs. Carol Krzanowski, Associate Director; Mr. Fred Jacobberger, CFA Legal Counsel; Ms. Allene Tartaglia, Director Special Projects; and Mr. Michael Brim, Public Relations Director. Mrs. Diana Doernberg, Director-at-Large, was absent due to a death in the family.

President Williams opened the meeting by welcoming the new board members Angell, Roy, Malinen, Hoover, Watson, Eigenhauser, DeBruhl, and Higuchi. He also thanked Craig Rothermel for staying on the board in the capacity of ex-officio.
As the first order of business President Williams appointed Fred Jacobberger as CFA Legal Counsel and Tom Dent as CFA Executive Director. The board approved unanimously.

Williams asked to appoint Jody Garrison to fill his vacant position of Director-at-Large. Rothermel, Everett and DelaBar spoke against the appointment citing cost factors and the present cutting of the budget. President Williams voiced concern that with Jody no longer on the board, her insurance coverage as co-chairman of the Animal Welfare and Disaster Relief Committee would be in jeopardy. Rothermel stated that it might be better for Jody to leave the committee as we looked at the overall aspect of the corporation. White spoke in favor of Garrison as she felt that Jody could lend her years of experience to a board with so many new members. Eigenhauser explained that he would have to go back to his region and explain the added cost. Kim Everett made the motion to add Garrison to replace Williams on the board. Motion failed. Barnaby, Hoover, White, Roy, Angell, Thompson, DeBruhl, Higuchi, Williams voting Yes.

Jacobberger suggested that he get together with Tom Dent to find out if it is feasible for non-board members that work on various committees to be insured.

(47) COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

President Williams announced his committee appointments for the coming year and asked that they be ratified as a group.

Animal Welfare and Disaster Relief ........Pam DelaBar and Jody Garrison
(Pending insurance coverage)
Archives and CFA Foundation ...............Vaughn Barber
Awards .............................................Jim DeBruhl
Breeds and Standards .......................Diana Doernberg, Chair; Geneticists, Heather Lorimer and Deborah Faryna
Breed Awareness .............................Kim Everett
Budget .............................................Donna Fuller, Jackie Taylor, Jim Barkley, Tom Dent
Clerking ..........................................Debbie Kusy, Lonnie Hoover (liaison)
Constitution ....................................Fred Jacobberger
Credentials ....................................George Summerville
Executive Committee .......................Don Williams, Kim Everett, Kitty Angell, Donna Fuller, Stan Barnaby
Health ..........................................Betty White
Honors and Social .............................Lorna Malinen
Insurance .......................................Jerry Woolard, Tom Dent
International Division .....................Stan Barnaby, Chair
Europe ..........................................Peter Vanwonerghem
South America ................................Liz Watson
Asia (Japan not included) ....................Yaeko Takano
International Show .........................Linda Berg
Job Description ..............................Lorna Malinen
Judging Program Liaison ....................Donna Jean Thompson
Committee: Jo Ann Cummings, Jeanie McPhee,
As a point of clarification Craig Rothermel said that he requested to not be placed on any committee.

Donna Fuller asked to be put on record as saying that she objected to the appointment of her entire committee, especially expanding it by one additional member. She reiterated that it was budgeted for the original committee.

Pam DelaBar asked for the definition of a Breed Awareness Committee and Kim Everett stated that she would be promoting the breeds wherever she went and whenever she had the opportunity to speak.

Craig Rothermel moved to approve all committee appointments with the exception of the Budget Committee, which he wished to be voted on separately.

Williams explained his reasons for adding the two new Budget Committee members. Jackie Taylor is in the accounting business and Jim Barkley is a CPA and has worked for the IRS.

Williams added that, according to Robert’s Rules, he would not vote except in the case of a tie. Rothermel objected to that statement, saying that a previous board (which included Mr. Williams) voted to have the president vote on every issue because our organization deserves to have the knowledge of how every board member including the president voted. Williams said that he had no problem stating his beliefs and would be happy to vote.

Rothermel then restated his motion to approve all committees except the Budget Committee. Motion carried.

Donna Fuller again stated that her first objection was having two people added to the committee. Previously she had been able to select whatever outside member she felt comfortable
working with. In this instance she was not given that option and she feels that her committee was
singled out.

Williams stated that he felt that the budget and the way we want to go in this
organization is to get the bottom line in the black. He also stated that Donna has done a good job.
One of the people he has appointed has articulated that they want to explore new ways of
generating funds that we need desperately.

Rothermel spoke against the number of the committee. George Eigenhauser wondered
why Williams chose the two people named.

Pam DelaBar said she believed the president should serve on the committee, as well as
Tom Dent, and that personalities should not be brought into the committee.

Rothermel reiterated that he was not talking about personalities, he has no problem with
the two people named. He has a problem with adding a person.

Stan Barnaby stated that he had been listening to the conversation and agreed that we
must keep the budget in mind. “It has been my experience in business and I have been involved
in executive decisions in business for many years,” Stan added. “And while I have objected to
auditors coming in, I have discovered that they have found ways to save us money. If we have
these two people on the committee and they find new ways of saving us money, don’t you think
they’ll more than pay for themselves?”

Williams said that this is one of Jackie Taylor’s jobs in the financial industry, going into
a company and finding ways of saving money.

Everett mentioned that the budget was coming up soon and she felt we could make more
cuts.

Dent told the board that both Taylor and Barkley have agreed to serve on the committee
at no cost to CFA. (Applause!)

Williams called for the motion to accept the Budget Committee members. Motion
carried. Fuller voting No.

Joan Miller then asked about the status of the Planning Committee. Williams countered
that it was not budgeted. Pam DelaBar asked that we consider some type of strategic planning.
Williams said that he would take it under advisement. He will look around for a group that will
set plans for where this organization wants to be in five to ten years. His feeling was that the
previous planning committee had accomplished its goals and was in the process of winding
down.

(48) CFA PROPOSED BUDGET.

Fuller presented the material that had been handed out to the board members. She stated
that her committee worked very hard to get this into the black. “If I had taken into consideration
everything that everyone wanted the bottom line would have been a $70,000.00 loss. In order to
come up with black ink we had to do some pretty drastic cuts. I think it is important that we do this. Last year we went into the budget in a negative position and I was very upset about it. Those of you on last year’s board know how upset I was. If you start off in a hole you end up farther in a hole and that is exactly what happened. We budgeted a loss of $23,000.00 and we ended up with a loss of $73,000.00. This year, by making the cuts that we did, by making a couple of new revenue sources, for instance, the $80.00 club dues and the $10.00 for championship confirmation, those are both factored into this.”

Rothermel mentioned that when this budget was drawn up they actually thought they would get the $80.00.

Donna continued, “On the revenue side we always try to estimate conservatively but as accurately as we can. On the expense side we try to be conservative by accommodating all of the expenses that we have to pay; and then cutting the discretionary any way we can. For those of you who are new on the board the format of this budget worksheet is essentially the same as the monthly financials that you will be receiving from Central Office. At this point I would entertain questions from anyone.”

Everett brought up the cut on the national awards. Fuller explained that $200.00 per award was budgeted this year. Jim DeBruhl asked for a clarification of a certain figure. Fuller then explained how those figures were determined.

Fuller asked if the board wanted to leave the $1,000.00 budgeted for the Planning Committee in the budget and Williams said that, for the time being, we would.

Eigenhauser questioned the cost of living adjustment for Central Office. “It says here that there was 2.3% geographic and labor specific adjustment; what was the national adjustment for that same period?”

Fuller answered that she didn’t know about the national but that she used the New York/New Jersey figures.

Eigenhauser then stated that he sat in on the budget discussion last year. His recollection was that, “We didn’t give Central Office less than a CPI adjustment but we made a determination that we are a national organization and we would use the national figure even though the national figure is somewhat lower than the regional figure from New Jersey. In this budget we are giving an extra 3/4 of a point on a pay raise making up for a short fall that wasn’t actually a shortfall, but a policy decision that we are a national organization and not a New Jersey organization.”

Fuller said that was not her recollection. She proposed 4% because the actual was 3.9% and Pam came up with something that was 2.2% and Fuller did not recall what that was based on. “What this is based on is the geographic location where the Central Office is located. Plus this is based on office and clerical workers as opposed to all wage earners. This is specifically the kind of operation that Central Office is. It still is not a large increase,” replied Fuller.

“Three percent of a 2/3 million dollar Central Office payroll is about $20,000.00,” said Eigenhauser.
At this point Fuller stated that the Central Office was the only major area that came in not only under budget but also under prior year’s budget.

Everett mentioned there had been some turnovers at Central Office. Pay raises would add incentive and it might help to keep them happy, as time is money.

DelaBar thinks that, “We need to look at our big expenditures and that is why we are taking a very close look. I don’t want to cut more people, I think we are about as streamlined as we can get that way. We need to make sure there are no little miscellaneous accounts running around that are causing expenditures.”

White voiced a concern about the media (Almanac and Yearbook), its income and expense. “What are we doing to address this problem? What can we do to help this problem?”

Fuller stated that at this point they did nothing to change this budget as far as changing either publication because there is quite a lead time. If we were to change the kind of publication it is or to change the kind of yearbook that we do, something like that would take a year or two lead time. Fuller thinks that what we need to do is have either this board or a committee of this board really look at these two publications to see if this is what we want to continue doing in the exact same way we’ve been doing it.

Rothermel said that one of the things talked about in Budget Committee meetings is that Dent has taken it upon himself to reduce the number of Yearbooks that he is going to order. The reason is we have found that 50% of sales from the Yearbook department is from pre-existing customers and the other 50% is from new people coming in and wanting data. This is directly tied to registration. Registrations are declining even though animals being shown is pretty much even. This tells us that new people are not coming into the fancy. Because we don’t have those new people, our Yearbook sales have steadily declined along with it. Tom has addressed one of the issues in trying to make it a more profitable operation. “There are some concerns I have had and I think it is time we look at the consolidation of some of our operations and cross-train some of our people to work together.”

DelaBar brought up board meeting expense. What she would like to see for board meeting expense is that a per diem concept is used. Board members will have so-many dollars for meals and so-many dollars to spend on their hotel. Some cities are more expensive than others are, of course.

Williams expressed concern with this per diem concept and Allene Tartaglia stated that the annual meetings would be more difficult to stay within a certain budget because the hotels are more expensive. She proposed that we stay in the same locations for all other board meetings, finding an inexpensive location and staying with it.

“All across the country,” DelaBar interjected, “So that we still offer people the opportunity to come to board meetings.”

Williams felt that Central Office was already doing this. But it takes a certain size hotel to provide room for a board meeting. Tartaglia added that it takes a certain size hotel to accommodate any board meeting.
Everett suggested board members “bunking up.” By sharing a room we could cut expenses that way.

White wondered about the feasibility of having the October and February board meetings in Las Vegas since the airfare and hotel rates were so inexpensive.

DelaBar felt that the board was criticized enough because of appearances and the appearance of meeting in Las Vegas would be bad.

White still felt that with proper understanding by the members of the organization, this concept could save a lot of money.

Fuller Moved that the budget be adopted as presented. Motion Carried.

White complimented Fuller for the all the hard work she has done on the board.

(49) MISCELLANEOUS.

President Williams brought up the Judging Committee. He talked to some of the people who wanted more exhibitors on the panel. It was his understanding that these people would agree to keep the five people appointed to the committee this year and when we select another person for next year, instead of a judge, we would drop the judge and elect an exhibitor. This would still make a five-person committee, only now it would be three judges and two exhibitors. Williams added that the board was not going to vote on this issue at this time.

“Since the committee is just getting started,” Williams said, “let it get off the ground. Let them get their feet wet and iron out some of the problems and then when we elect another person next year, that person would not be a judge, it would be an exhibitor.”

Eigenhauser commented that right now there are five judge representatives on the board. In spite of the fact that there is an exhibitor on the Judging Committee, judges selected her. And the person who appoints you is the person you represent. When we come back with a new system I would like the system to be such that the exhibitors have some say as to who is representing them on the Judging Committee.

DelaBar reminded Eigenhauser that “Judges are exhibitors too. I definitely want us to bring this up in October but I want the time between now and then to study why there is such fascination for an exhibitor to be on the committee. I don’t understand why we need exhibitors on the Judging Committee.”

Kitty Angell observed, “I have absolutely no problem with extra exhibitors, myself. I just think it is important that we establish some very definite criteria for the exhibitors that are going to serve on this panel. They should have some history, some background, some experience rather than showing in a number of shows and being a breeder for one or two years. We need a more well-rounded person with a lot of experience.”

Everett said that the delegates voted to go with the present panel this year, and while “I have no objection to exhibitors being on it, as far as Pam’s business about what the fascination
is, I think you’re going to find it’s not very fascinating. I’m not talking just exhibitors; there are judges that are going to find this is not a piece of cake. But I think we should address this and a little balance with exhibitors won’t hurt. We don’t want to create a wedge between the ‘them’ and the ‘us’. We’ve got to be very careful our playing field is there and our communications are open both ways.”

Rothermel addressed Angell’s consideration, by stating the committee has already established guidelines for this concern. He then suggested that they be published for all the membership to see.

Angell replied that she was referring to the proposal from the floor that did not include those guidelines and that she thought the Judging Committee guidelines already submitted were very good.

Rothermel then said it was an overwhelming victory to have this committee just as it is. “I think we can consider anything between now and then but I think the committee should not change at all.”

At this point President Williams stated, “My feeling within the cat fancy is that if we can only get the parties to sit down and talk and bring them somewhere close together we can solve all our problems. The problem is getting some sort of compromise.”

Pam DelaBar added that she thought that in the committee that was formed the duties were administrative, the decision on who is advancing and who is going to become a judge, protests, etc. still lies within the responsibility of this board.

Lorna Malinen recapitulated that she felt once she had the job responsibilities defined that we will have a better idea of what we are doing rather than what everybody perceives we are doing.

Fred Jacobberger spoke from the standpoint of procedure on protests. “In the past we have occasionally had some jurisdictional confusion between the Protest Committee which George Eigenhauser now runs and the judging part of the Protests. A year or two ago we got to the point where Kim went through the judging protests preliminarily but that then she would turn it over to Phil Lindsley who was heading protests. I am wondering just what is the reasoning of the board as to what the procedure is going to be with the judging program?”

Everett answered that no matter what you do you are criticized, and often unfairly. Your board of directors charges you with getting the information and even if you don’t want to do it, you have to.” The way I generally worked with the Judging Program, with the exception of one person who I was charged to get the whole thing on, was the personnel problems: rudeness to exhibitors, rough handling, that sort of thing. Neatness, etiquette that sort of thing all entered in. The breached show rule or constitutional amendment violation, I was instructed not to respond to it but to immediately hand it over to Phil in Protests. I am wondering just what is the reasoning of the board as to what the procedure is going to be with the judging program?”
does it fall. Now if it falls half way between show rule, constitutional and personnel then they should all be involved in the process. Quickness of response is very important.”

Dent added that what Kim was suggesting was that the ground rules stay the same. That a Judging Program matter stayed within the judging panel. If it is a show rule or constitutional issue it is the Protest Committee that handles it. There was a stipulation that when the Protest Committee was dealing with a protest involving a judge that there was a special judging panel liaison that joined the deliberation of the protest. Tom wondered if it is not the intent of the new committee that the exhibitor member be the liaison member to the Protest Committee.

George Eigenhauser felt that the liaison between the Judging Program and the Protest Committee needs to be a judge just because the judges will feel there is someone in touch with their aspect of it, with their way of doing things, with their point of view who is taking the matter over to the Protest Committee.

President Williams added that these would be some of the problems the committee would have to iron out. They’ll be confronted with these problems long before we have to discuss this and we hope they’ll come back to the board to discuss those problems.

Stan Barnaby mentioned that one of the things he and Betty wanted to point out was when they originally worked on Mark Hannon’s concept, they were concerned about the fact that larger numbers might affect the confidentiality of certain matters that has always been afforded to judges. “By confidentiality we mean letters that might come to us and say, ‘I didn’t like the color of Donna Jean’s dress.’ Responses have to be made to every letter. Our concern was that this confidentiality remains intact. With Donna Jean being appointed as liaison to the Judging Committee, this means that at least one of the two people who have achieved expertise in this business of handling the judges will be involved. Also, she will be able to assist those who are already on this committee with how to properly handle these delicate situations.”

Donna Jean Thompson said, “In the past, when we had judges’ protests, we had a judge that served on that committee and became involved with that committee whenever a problem involved judges. This past protest chairman named his own committee and for a while it did not include any judges, so a judge was named so that whenever a judging problem came to their hands they had judging input.”

Kim Everett emphasized that in the 12 years she had the Judging Program that confidentiality was never breached. She reiterated the fact that when letters came in on judges they were kept “in house.” Protection of the club, exhibitor and judge was of utmost importance. There were a few cases that could not be resolved and those cases came before the board. She hoped that in the future these cases would not be discussed over the Internet because these affairs were private and a person’s life could be ruined this way. She hopes the board will agree with her premise.

DelaBar added that she was sure the breeders that were involved in animal welfare cases appreciated the confidentiality that they were afforded.

Jacobberger offered a word on protest procedure in general stating that a protest should be sent to the Central Office not to himself, Don Williams or George Eigenhauser. CFA has a
staff person who tracks these matters to make sure they are assigned docket numbers, sees that no documents get lost and that they get to the appropriate people.

**Everett** addressed a matter that came up at the board meeting earlier in the weekend that no judge be allowed to judge for the Bavarian Cat Fanciers Association (they go by Bavarian CFA) in the future. It has caused some disturbance with our CFA clubs abroad. Don and Leta Williams had been given permission to judge for this organization earlier but now Kim would like for the Williams’ to be released from their contracts by order of the board.

**Williams** agreed with this measure saying that, because of the confusion, he didn’t believe we should jeopardize our people or our clubs by sending our judges over to judge their shows.

**Everett** made the motion that the Williams’ be withdrawn from this show, thus giving them the ability to accept another show on this date according to our rules. Kim then amended her motion to read that any club that has a conflict with our name (CFA) not be granted permission to have our judges guest judge at their shows.

**DelaBar** reminded the board that they still must address the issue that they had granted the Williams permission to judge the show.

Point of order from **Fred Jacobberger**: it is in order, it is an order to renew, it is not a motion to reconsider. Since it was not pre-noticed it requires a 2/3rd vote to pass. **Motion Carried.**

At this point **Kim Everett** said she felt we should vote this measure through for Europe. However, there is an Australian CFA club that is very old, and even though we have had no activity whatsoever with this club, she’d hate to see a conflict arise.

**Williams** said that if anyone has a problem of this type they should bring it to the board.

**WHAT IS A BREED? Discussion:**

**Kim Everett** started the discussion by saying that she presumed that the discussion about “What is a Breed?” that was passed and also about the Colorpoint Orientals that was passed would come up in the February meeting. **Williams** stated that was true because we would be conducting business as usual (Show Standards in October and Breeds in February).

**Eigenhauser** thought that it would be inappropriate to wait until February so he wanted to bring that subject up today. “I think it is important to consider the wishes of the breed councils when making breed decisions. There are examples other than breed standard decisions such as ‘allowing outcrosses’ for example that are not technically part of the standard but that directly affect the breed. I would like to have the breed council secretaries present at the February board meeting, both to answer direct questions from the board and, at the discretion of the chair, to make brief opening statements when a particular issue is introduced. The time for that brief statement could be determined on a case by case basis. ‘Brief’ would be the key word.”
President Williams felt that this would set a precedent, because we have never let the delegation or the audiences participate in the meeting.

Eigenhauser then said that he felt these breed councils were a constitutionally recognized body to advise the board.

At this point Betty White reminded the board that the chairman of Breeds and Standards (Diana Doernberg) was not present because of a death in the family. “I think there are times at the February board meeting that we would like to ask questions. I think that would be most appropriate. I’m not sure that setting a precedent for every breed council secretary addressing the board would be appropriate. I do think if this was an approach that we determined to take, this could be decided at the October board meeting in plenty of time.

Williams added that this was a compromise that we could consider.

Everett said, “What’s more important than our breeds? The only thing we have to clarify here is the budget. Obviously, CFA cannot foot the bill for these breed council secretaries to come to the board meeting. This needs to be made plain.”

Fuller clarified a point that CFA would allow the secretaries to come if they wish.

Eigenhauser mentioned that the breed council secretaries are now compiling questions to be put on their ballots. If they knew they were coming before the board they might compile more complex questions than if they knew in advance that they were not going to be invited. He felt for their planning purposes in terms of what is going to be put on their ballots (which are going to be due before the next board meeting), they ought to know whether or not they were going to be invited. He does not see any reason why they should wait for the board to give them an answer.

DelaBar said that she didn’t feel the BC secretaries should hold anything back if it concerns the health and welfare of their breed. “I think they would get a rather positive idea of how the board feels about them addressing certain issues pertaining to their breeds, but I still think the chairman of the Breeds and Standards Committee should be here. I think our final vote should be in October.”

Williams was concerned that the meeting might last too long. “Not that we don’t want to hear the input from the secretaries, but I don’t want it to take up the whole board meeting.”

DelaBar added, “A lot of words can be said in five minutes.”

Williams agreed, “If we can limit it to that.”

Fuller also stated that opening up the discussion too much could open the meeting to lobbying by certain secretaries. She felt the speaking time should be limited.

Williams added that the people have the right to know, they are not excluded from the meeting. It is speaking at the meeting that can be disruptive.
White once more verbalized the time limits on the meeting stating that it starts at 8:00 AM and often goes on past 8:00 PM. It is a very time-intensive thing.

DeBruhl made the point that not every breed council secretary will talk.

Rothermel spoke against Eigenhauser’s motion because he felt that we should have the input from our Breeds and Standards Chairman and he didn’t think the board should hurry its decision because if this decision is made in October, there is plenty of time to make arrangements before the February board meeting.

A Motion was made that the breed council secretaries be invited to the February board meeting to make an opening statement and to respond to questions, time limitations to be determined by the chair. Motion Failed. Everett, Williams, DeBruhl, Eigenhauser, Malinen, Roy, Miller, Higuchi, Watson voting Yes.

Stan Barnaby asked for the minutes to reflect that the reason some of us voted against the last motion was because it was our strong belief that Diana Doernberg, our Breeds and Standards Chairman, should be here for this motion.

Tom Dent said he was advised that there was another CFA judge contracted to judge the Bavarian CFA show: Walter Hutzler. DelaBar so moved that Walter Hutzler not be allowed to judge for the Bavarian CFA. Motion Carried.

Tom Dent brought up individual ring point scoring. He said that the resolution to have individual ring point scoring passed on the floor of the convention. That motion was to go back and re-score all the shows for the current season using the individual ring count method and to apply that method to the remaining shows of the show season.

President Williams stated that it was his feeling from the conversation that we would bring the matter up at the October board meeting rather than come up with a concrete scoring system and that it would be pre-noticed and it would go into effect next year.

Rothermel said that since it was a motion from the floor, it was as an advisory. “It would have to be pre-noticed. We have to entertain this in October. But I think the retroactive part is almost impossible. It would create a nightmare at Central Office.”

Williams said he felt the delegation wants a change; They would like it this year, but if we come up with a concrete proposal that is rational they will accept it to go into effect next show season.

Meeting adjourned.

Post Script: After the meeting Betty White reported that the Saturday afternoon PKD Seminar was very well attended. Dr. Leslie Lyons was there and she told breeders how they might get a study for this particular disorder and a fund was begun. Someone who attended has already given one large check. White urged all interested breeders to donate money to the Winn Foundation, earmarking it for the PKD study.
The North Atlantic Region was thanked for putting on a wonderful annual convention and the entire NAR committee was congratulated for a job well done.

Tom Dent also invited the eight new board members to visit the Central Office.

Respectfully submitted,
Kitty Angell

[Editor’s Note: The following portion of the minutes was provided by Willa K. Hawke.]

(50) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS & PROTESTS.

Secretary’s Note: Although printed as a separate section of the minutes, these reports are nonetheless a part of the official minutes of the proceedings of the CFA Executive Board during the period from June, 1998. When used in this section, the term “cited for a hearing” means only that the CFA Executive Board considered the Protest Committee’s recommendations and determined that sufficient cause existed to believe that the individual(s) or club(s) involved may have violated a show rule or a provision of the CFA Constitution. In such cases, the involved individual(s) or club(s) is “cited for a hearing,” meaning that the Executive Board has scheduled a fact finding hearing on the alleged violation, pursuant to the provisions of the CFA Constitution. The CFA Executive Board’s actions and considerations in disciplinary hearings and various matters previously submitted by the CFA Protest Committee resulted in the following actions:

[Secretary’s Note: The CFA Protest Committee had submitted a report which stated: At the February, 1998 Board meeting in Houston, Texas, there was one matter held over. Through the end of April, 1998, 48 new complaints have been received, for a total current caseload of 49. Of these 49, 36 were deemed contractual or personal, and one is being held over for further notification to respondents. The remaining 12 are submitted with recommendations for the dismissal of eight and citation for four. (During closed session, the protests that were on the agenda were considered and the board followed the CFA Protest Committee’s recommendations in all cases). One hearing was held in an open session setting.]

PROTESTS

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


98-005 CFA v. Geving, C. & Smith, S. – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec.4 (g) & CFA Show Rule 2.02.

98-024 CFA v. Stephens, K. – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b).

98-46 CFA v. Summers, C. and Evans, R. – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Secs. 4 (a) & (g).
HEARINGS

a. Case 97-103 CFA v. Collins – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (b) (Forgery). Ms. Julie Collins appeared in closed session to speak on her own behalf. Following Ms. Collins testimony, the board excused her from the room and subsequently voted and found her Guilty. Penalty – $200 fine. Letter of Reprimand (Suspension in effect until fine is paid).

b. Case 97-106 CFA v. Sartz, P. – Violation of CFA Show Rules 11.25, 11.26, & 28.08. (Challenging a judge’s decision). No representatives were present and following closed session deliberation the board found him Guilty. Penalty – $200 fine. Letter of Reprimand. (Suspension in effect until fine is paid).

c. Case 97-094 CFA v. Gorecki, P. – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) & (g) (Animal Cruelty). No representatives were present and following closed session deliberation the board found her Guilty. Penalty – Permanent Suspension.

d. Case 97-116 CFA v. Herrington, K. – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV, Sec. 4 (a) & (g) (Animal Cruelty). No representatives were present and following closed session deliberation, the board found her Guilty. Penalty – Permanent Suspension.

e. Case 97-107 CFA v Tobias, P. – Violation of Show Rule 2.12 (having an underage kitten in a show hall). No representatives were present and following closed session deliberation the board voted to take No Action.

f. Case 97-117 CFA v Southern Paws N Tails – Violation of Show Rule 25.14 (failure to give judges timely notification of show cancellation). No representatives were present and following closed session deliberation, the board found the club Guilty. (No further action was taken as the club has been dropped from membership).

g. Case 97-104 CFA v. Daigle, L. – Violation of CFA Constitution Article XV Sec. 4 (b). (Forgery). No representatives were present. Following closed session deliberation, the board voted to take No Action.

g. [sic] Case 97-129 CFA v Maggio, K. – violation of Article XV, Sec. 4 (b) of the CFA Constitution ( Forgery). No representatives were present. Following closed session deliberation, the board voted to take No Action.

h. Case 97-071 CFA v. Rainbow Cat Club (Held over from prior term) Violation of CFA Show Rules 13.12 (a) and 19.01 (h). (failing to charge at least $1 per ring entry, and by failing to adequately describe the climate control facilities of the show hall in the show flier). Ms. Christine Buck, Club President, Dr. Nikki Crandall-Siebert, Show Manager, and Miss Kathy Buck, Show Secretary appeared in open session on behalf of the club. Following their testimony, the board excused them and subsequently voted to find the club Guilty. Penalty-Letter of Reprimand and $100 fine (Suspension in effect until fine is paid).