

CFA ANNUAL AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS
JUNE 18-21, 2020

Index to Minutes

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

(1)	MEETING CALLED TO ORDER.....	2
(2)	ADDITIONS/CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES; RATIFICATION OF ON- LINE AND TELECONFERENCE MOTIONS	11
(3)	CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATIONS.....	19
(4)	DATA PROTECTION COMMITTEE.....	31
(5)	IT COMMITTEE.....	33
(6)	TREASURER'S REPORT.....	35
(7)	FINANCE COMMITTEE.....	39
(8)	HISTORICAL DATA SCANNING.....	42
(9)	AMBASSADOR PROGRAM.....	49
(10)	MARKETING.....	51
(11)	REGIONAL INCORPORATION/CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.....	56
(12)	SHOW CANCELLATION ISSUE.....	58
(13)	CFA FOUNDATION.....	74
(14)	MENTORING COMMITTEE.....	75
(15)	CFA LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE.....	76
(16)	WINN FELINE FOUNDATION.....	85
(17)	AWARDS COMMITTEE.....	90
(18)	BUDGET COMMITTEE.....	92
(19)	OTHER COMMITTEES.....	106
(20)	JUDGING PROGRAM.....	107
(21)	GDPR RECOMMENDATIONS.....	111
(22)	INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.....	112
(23)	JUDGING PROGRAM RELICENSING HEARING.....	113
(24)	NEW BUSINESS.....	114
(25)	CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND ELECTION RESULTS.....	116
(26)	CALL MEETING TO ORDER.....	123
(27)	APPOINTMENT OF CFA ATTORNEY AND PARLIAMENTARIAN.....	124
(28)	APPOINT ID REPRESENTATIVE AND ANY OTHER NECESSARY APPOINTMENTS.....	130
(29)	TAKING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' OATH.....	132
(30)	COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.....	136
(31)	UNFINISHED BUSINESS.....	146
(32)	NEW BUSINESS.....	149
(33)	OLD BUSINESS.....	154
(34)	UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS.....	159
(35)	DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.....	167

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Thursday, June 18, 2020, via Zoom teleconference. **President Mark Hannon** called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. EDT with the following members found to be present following a roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger**:

Mr. Mark Hannon (President)
Mr. Richard Mastin (Vice President)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Ms. Kathy Black (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Howard Webster (SWR Director)
Ms. Mary Auth (MWR Director)
Mr. Kenny Currie (SOR Director)
Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)
Mr. Michael-Hans Schleissner (Europe Regional Director)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

John M. Randolph, Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director
James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst
Shino Wiley, Japanese Interpreter

Absent:

None.

Secretary's Note: For the ease of the reader, some items were discussed at different times but were included with their particular agenda.

(1) MEETING CALLED TO ORDER.

Hannon: It looks like 11:00 so let's get started. I want to welcome everybody from around the world that is watching.

Board Member Service Awards

10 Years

Sharon Roy

Credentials Committee Service Awards

10 Years

Norman Auspitz

P. Moser: Mark, my hand is up. **Hannon:** Wonder why I can't see that. Let me try something here. OK Pam. **P. Moser:** I have a point of order. **Hannon:** Yes ma'am. **P. Moser:** I object to the closed session agenda items that were not approved by 2/3 vote that is required by the Board Members' Guidebook. **Hannon:** Would you specify which those are? **P. Moser:** Yes, GDPR and Budget. **Hannon:** Does somebody want to address why GDPR was put into closed session? James or Allene? **Eigenhauser:** I would suggest that since it's a legal matter, we should discuss it in closed session and publish the results in the minutes, but legal matters and GDPR should be discussed in private. **Hannon:** Pam, why don't you make a motion for GDPR to be in open session and see what happens? **P. Moser:** OK, I make a motion that GDPR is in open session. No, wait a minute. Yes, that's true. **Auth:** Mary seconds. **Hannon:** Any discussion? **Newkirk:** I think what the objection is, is procedural. Our Guidebook requires that anything that goes into closed session must have 2/3 vote of the board of directors. It's not each issue. The procedure is what's not being followed, and that is what we need to discuss. **Hannon:** My understanding though, Darrell, is that it does specify some things that should be in closed session, like Judging Program discussions. What Pam's concern is, I believe, that there are some things that are not spelled out that should be in closed session, such as GDPR, and she would like to have that in open session. Alright, so is there any other discussion on Pam's motion. All those in favor of Pam's motion to have GDPR in open session. [**Hannon** calls the motion.] Since it requires 2/3 –

Eigenhauser: Wait, wait. I don't think it does require 2/3 because the Guidebook says legal matters are closed session unless we say otherwise. It says – I would like to read it: *The CFA Board may conduct closed session proceedings with respect to the following matters: (a) Litigation, threatened litigation, contract negotiations or other legal matters.* I think this falls under "other legal matters." **Calhoun:** The question is, we are speaking from something that is a guideline. I mean, this is not in Robert's Rules, this is a guideline for our discretion. Is that not correct? **Newkirk:** That is not correct. **Calhoun:** Why is that not correct? **Hannon:** When I looked up "guideline" it said "rule." It didn't say it was at our discretion. **Newkirk:** I agree with Mark. It's a policy. These are board policies that have accumulated over the years and this is our book of rules, basically, that we need to follow. This would be any kind of standing rule or anything like that, and if you go back and read the email I sent out, there's a lot of issues that are listed in this Guidebook that drastically need to be updated. The last time that was updated was in 2014. I want to comment also on Mark. There is five listings of things that should be discussed in closed meetings, and George is correct in his assumption about that, but the only thing, the 2/3 is if you want to make something into closed session. George is saying that we meet the qualification of it being a legal matter and so that fits the Guideline so it wouldn't require 2/3. **Randolph:** I agree with Darrell and George. It's clear it's a legal matter. It's a sensitive legal matter and it fits clearly within the Guidelines. I advise that, as to the issues surrounding GDPR, that you try to retain the discussions in confidence.

Anger: I am wondering, we just took a vote and now we are having discussion after the vote? I'm a little confused on what's going on. I don't know what the results are. **Eigenhauser:** Part of it is procedural – whether the vote takes 2/3 or whether it's a simple majority. **Anger:** We don't know what the votes are yet, though. **Hannon:** We still need to know before we count whether or not we need 50% for it to pass or 2/3 for it to pass. **Anger:** So, the discussion should be about that and we're talking about – **Hannon:** That is the discussion. That's why we're having the discussion. **Anger:** I have no opposition to that, I just wanted to keep track of where we are. **Hannon:** Alright, so John, are you telling us that we do not need 2/3 to move it from closed session to open session, we just need a simple majority? **Randolph:** Yes, that is correct, in accordance with those Guidelines.

Hannon: OK, so again, all those who voted – the minority was what, no? Alright, let's vote again. All those in favor of moving it from closed session to open session, GDPR.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** B. Moser, P. Moser, Auth and Newkirk voting yes.

Newkirk: Mark, if I can make a suggestion. Maybe everybody just raise your hand. That will be easier. **Hannon:** Online raise your hand or in the picture raise your hand? **Newkirk:** Well, when you're in the Participants, if you raise it there like you have a question, your hand will show up on your picture. **Hannon:** Your hand is up, Darrell. Are you voting as a yes? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** OK, so you want GDPR in open session. **Newkirk:** Yeah. **Hannon:** Pam, Mary, Brian. **Anger:** That confirms what I have. [reads vote] **Hannon:** Alright, so the motion failed, so it will be in closed session.

Hannon: Pam, you have another motion, I assume. **P. Moser:** Well yes. To have the budget in open session. **Newkirk:** I'll second. This clearly violates our board guidelines. If we need 2/3 vote to put it back into closed session, so we're sort of looking at it in the box, looking outside the box, or outside the box looking in. This is not either (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e), so (f) applies. [**Secretary's Note:** (f) All other matters deemed appropriate by 2/3 of the Board.] To put that in closed session you need 2/3 vote to put that back into closed session. **Calhoun:** I have a question. Are we referring to today's discussion? Are we including the letter and are we including the comments to the letter in open session? **Hannon:** Pam, it's your motion. Do you want to answer the question? **P. Moser:** That is correct. All of it in open session. **Calhoun:** So, we would publish the letter and we would publish the thread that was associated with the letter when it was sent to the board? **P. Moser:** That is correct. None of that should be hidden. According to the Guidebook, that is not anything that should be in closed session. It's about the budget. Our constituents should know what's going on with that. If somebody is asking for something – asking for a raise or asking for a bonus – our constituents should know about that.

*From: "Kathy Calhoun calhounkathy38@gmail.com [CFAboardmembers]"
<CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com>*

Reply-To: "CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com" <CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com>

Date: Saturday, June 13, 2020 at 10:46 AM

To: "CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com" <CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com>, Allene Tartaglia <atartaglia@cfa.org>

Subject: [CFAboardmembers] 2020 - 2021 CFA Preliminary Budget [2 Attachments]

****EXECUTIVE SESSION MATERIAL - Not for dissemination outside of this list.****

Attached please find the 2020-2021 Preliminary Budget. Adjustments have been made to the Mentoring, the Ambassador Cats and the Asia West Africa/Central South America committee budgets. A letter from the CFA Officers, providing the rationale regarding the officers' compensation budget request, has also been attached to this email. This email, the preliminary budget and the Officer Compensation 6/11/20 document are considered confidential.

Kathy Calhoun

CFA Officer Compensation Adjustment Rationale

The four CFA officer responsibilities and work load to CFA's business needs has evolved to requiring each officer to invest greater time commitments and be agreeable, available and accessible to chairing and or being involved in many appointed committees and day to day business practices and needs on a regular basis.

All the officers time spent on the many different needs have changed to require each of them to increase their available time to CFA by at least double the amount than what has been done and expected in the past. For the past two years the CFA officers have been receptive, responsible, reliable, and agreeable to taking on additional tasks and responsibilities for the benefit of CFA and CFA central office leadership team and staff. The additional time spent by each of the officers has greatly increased, far more than what was originally thought to be required.

President and Vice President have been involved and required to participate in additional committees/teams, monthly meetings and be available to address and advise on business related needs and questions at all hours of the day seven days a week.

Treasurer has taken on chairing the China Core Committee, Coronavirus Team and additional daily oversight, guidance on accounting practices, QuickBooks expertise supporting data driven decisions and needs.

Secretary has increased time commitment due to the increase in the number of transcripts of meetings, online voting results and now including all discussions on the online voting, in addition to participating and sitting on more committees.

The following is a list of tasks and committees the four officers are tasked with:

	<i>Mark Hannon</i>	<i>Rich Mastin</i>	<i>Rachel Anger</i>	<i>Kathy Calhoun</i>
<i>Ambassador Cat Liaison</i>		<i>1</i>		
<i>Annual Financial Optimization</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Annual Meeting and Awards</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Audit Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Awards</i>	<i>1</i>			
<i>Bi-weekly Payroll and Benefits Expense Review</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Board Meeting Transcripts</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Board-mandated summary of all motions</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Bottom Line Communication</i>				<i>1</i>
<i>Budget Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Budgeting Process</i>				<i>1</i>
<i>Central Office/ED Guidance</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>CFA Community Outreach/Education Liaison</i>			<i>1</i>	

<i>CFA News Updates</i>	<i>1</i>			
<i>China Core Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>China Core Committee Minutes</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Color and Pattern Consultation by Registration Staff</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Constitutional and Regional Incorporation Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Contract and Annual Insurance Review/Liaison</i>		<i>1</i>		
<i>Coronavirus Response Team</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Coronavirus Response Team Minutes</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Daily review of cats registered</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Executive Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Finance Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>GDPR Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Historical Data Liaison</i>		<i>1</i>		
<i>Hotel and Travel Program</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>International Show Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>IT Committee</i>		<i>1</i>		
<i>IT Team Consultation for Genetics Registry</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Marketing Oversight</i>	<i>1</i>			
<i>Monthly Financial Review Team</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>Personnel Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>QuickBooks and Financial Coordinator Oversight</i>				<i>1</i>
<i>Registration Consultation by Registration Staff</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Sponsorship Committee</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		
<i>Strategic Meeting Oversight</i>		<i>1</i>		
<i>Transcript of Strategic Planning Session</i>			<i>1</i>	
<i>Weekly Bank and Investment Account Balance Review</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>
<i>World Cat Congress</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>	
<i>Youth Feline Education Program Liaison</i>		<i>1</i>		
<i>Total</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>19</i>

Proposed to the CFA Board of Directors is to compensate each of the four officers in the following manner for their past two years work and their increased time spent to assist and guide CFA on the many different levels required:

- .1. President: \$6,000 one-time payment for past work and \$18,000 annual stipend (\$1,500 paid monthly)*
- .2. Vice President & Finance Chair: \$6,000 one-time payment for past work and \$18,000 annual stipend (\$1,500 paid monthly)*
- .3. Treasurer: \$6,000 one-time payment for past work and \$13,500 annual stipend (\$1,125 paid monthly)*

- .4. Secretary: \$6,000 one-time payment for the past work and \$13,500 annual stipend (\$1,125 paid monthly)

The proposed compensation adjustments are reasonable, affordable and in line with what has been done in the past for individuals who have gone above and beyond and invested more time than expected. The officers of CFA are required to be: professional, reliable, productive, focused on the business needs and direction at all times, able to go above and beyond, create a team like atmosphere, positive and have a caring attitude at all times. All four officers possess and practice these traits on a regular basis. The total cost for the one-time compensation adjustment for the additional work and time required is \$24,000 and the annual increase in the total stipends is \$21,000. The annual stipends should be looked at on an annual basis and adjusted as necessary based on the work load and time commitments needed. The board is asked to approve the one-time compensation adjustment and increase the annual stipends.

*Respectfully submitted,
CFA Officers*

* * * * *

*From: Darrell Newkirk a.darrell.newkirk@gmail.com [CFAboardmembers]
<CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com>
To: CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com <CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com>
Sent: Sat, Jun 13, 2020 3:02 pm
Subject: Re: [CFAboardmembers] 2020 - 2021 CFA Preliminary Budget*

Kathy,

I want to make a statement, and please understand me, Does the Budget Committee members need a hearing test? Did you not hear what the Board told you last Tuesday night? This is not directed at Rachel, as she is not a member of the Budget, nor the Finance, committee.

When we reviewed the Budge items last Tuesday night, I noticed that the % increase in officers compensation was blank. Was this an over sight of an example of duplicity?

*I guess I have not drank the koolaid, but surely, I thought, you would come back with a small increase. You can keep this info in closed session for the present, but it will have to be shared with the masses at some point, I assume during your presentation of the budge at the upcoming meeting. If you think the masses with slap you on the back and say job well done, news flash heading your way. In my not so humble opinion, this organization is in the f***ded up mess right now. And, you have the nerve to ask for a doubling of your stipend/salary, plus a bonus for past work? I am not opposed to giving people WHO DO A GOOD JOB a bonus, that is what a bonus is designed to recognize. You may not like my assessment of this observation, but again in my not so humble opinion, the CMCC was a complete and utter disaster. I sent several emails trying to advise the committee/task force that Mark appointed. But again, I guess you didn't hear me. You believed and took the advice of one person something that Mark told Brian and me on the Sunday morning meeting last June, "we aren't putting all our eggs in one basket." Really?*

Our attorney gets a pittance for what he does, so why didn't you increase that line item?. He has taken on twice the work load he had before the China NGO laws were put into place. Why no increase?

This just absolutely just takes the damned cake!!!

To say that I am disappointed in the budget committee review of the feedback provided by the CFA Board is an understatement.

I am not mad, I am just sharing with you my frustration.

Darrell Newkirk

* * * * *

*From: Pamela Moser bp.moser@comcast.net [CFAboardmembers]
<CFAboardmembers@yahoo.com>
To: CFAboardmembers@yahoo.com; Allene Tartaglia <atartaglia@cfa.org>
Sent: Sat, Jun 13, 2020 4:29 pm
Subject: Re: [CFAboardmembers] 2020 - 2021 CFA Preliminary Budget*

Really?

Budget material should be in open session (except personnel) - after all the delegation gets it presented to them at the annual meeting. Could this be because the Officer Compensation is embarrassing to those that are requesting it?

The Officers seem to think they are the only ones that do any kind of work on the this board. I can name others that get nothing, who put in endless hours doing what they were appointed to. Melanie Morgan puts in 70 to 80 hours a week on the judging program, Kathy Black has put in numerous hours on Marketing, and others put in numerous hours and they get NOTHING – because they do it for the benefit of CFA and their love for the cat fancy.

This is a VOLUNTEER organization and for us to be giving “bonuses” to a few anointed ones is beyond the pale to me. When you run for the board it doesn't say that you get money for the position you run for. If you only got on the board to get paid for it then you need to resign or not run again. What don't you understand about being a volunteer? If you don't want to do the work for free, then you shouldn't volunteer for committees.

At a time when we could be losing 60% of our revenue you want us to grant you more money, maybe your time would be better spent on finding ways the this organization can function by cutting the budget by 60%.

Pam

* * * * *

*From: Mark Hannon markh_@yahoo.com [CFAboardmembers]
<CFAboardmembers@yahoo.com>
To: CFAboardmembers@yahoo.com
Sent: Sat, Jun 13, 2020 3:56 pm
Subject: Re: [CFAboardmembers] 2020 - 2021 CFA Preliminary Budget*

Darrell,

I realize you were not on the board when we approved the 2019-2020 fiscal year budget in April 2019. Last year we provided our attorney a bonus equal to his annual stipend. That was due to all the extra work he did the previous year due to the China issues. This past year John's work was not as extensive as the previous year. However, the work undertaken by the four Officers was dramatically increased.

Regarding the CCMC, Peter recommended that a committee be formed to deal with the China issues rather than have the entire board dealing with it. I appointed Kathy as the chair of the CMCC and Kathy appointed the members. She explained to the board why each member was

appointed. I did not appoint the members. I have been very consistent since my initial election as President in 2014. I appoint the chair and the chair appoints their committee members. That was a change from previous presidents. I felt the chair knew what skills the committee needed and with whom they could work effectively.

We will discuss the Officers' compensation when we discuss the budget next week.

Mark

* * * * *

*From: Kathy Calhoun calhounkathy38@gmail.com [CFAboardmembers]
<CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com>
To: Darrell Newkirk <a.darrell.newkirk@gmail.com>; CFAboardmembers@yahoogroups.com
Sent: Sat, Jun 13, 2020 4:45 pm
Subject: Re: [CFAboardmembers] 2020 - 2021 CFA Preliminary Budget*

Darrell

I have no intention of engaging in a conversation that begins in this manner. There is little or no opportunity for productive dialogue. This will be reviewed with the entire Board next week.

Kathy

* * * * *

Eigenhauser: I actually support this motion. In the Guidebook we talk about personnel matters because we don't want to air our employees' dirty laundry in public, so personnel matters are normally closed session. Elected officials are not personnel. They are not employees of CFA, and I think the electorate has the right to know. I think that's really the issue here – is discussing executive stipends – and I think that's because that's a political matter, it does not fall within closed session. It should be in open session.

Anger: I do want to say that, as the person who prepares the agenda, I'm the one that put it in closed session. It's there because that's where I scheduled it, and the reason I scheduled where it is – I hate this phrase but I have to use it – that is how we've always done it. The actual board meeting minutes where we discuss the proposed agenda before it's presented for a vote have never been made public, except one year and that was 2016. Why I did it then I'm not sure, but just pointing out that it's this way because that has been our past procedure. It's being questioned now and I perfectly accept debate on it. I just want clear instruction where it should be put in the future, but that's why it's there now. I just want everyone to know, there was no attempt to make anything secret, it's just the way it has always been done. Thank you. **Newkirk:** Rachel, thank you so much for sharing that information. This is actually not to criticize anyone, it's just that – as I told Mark, I said *mia culpa*. I didn't even know that handbook was there until I think it was George made reference to it, and so I went and downloaded it and saw that there are some things that need to be updated. I also want to add one more thing to this. In the New York not-for-profit law, Section 515 – and I can share that with the board if you want to see it, but it covers any kind of payment that is made to any of the directors. It is legal to do that, OK, but those people that are affected aren't even supposed to be on the call when it's being discussed. Now, if you want, I took a screen shot of it. I can send that screen shot or I can send it to Allene and she can share it on screen if anyone is interested. **Anger:** I can't access email while I have

the Zoom meeting going, so if we do that it's got to be on the screen. As to the Guidebook, again, I don't want to sound defensive, but I believe the candidates that are not already on the board for this round of voting will vouch for me that I have already sent them an information email telling them I will be sending them the Board Members Guidebook. This is something that I do every year when we have elections and new people come on the board or come back on the board. So Darrell, if you did not get that email for some reason, I apologize, when you came back on the board but it's again something I do as a matter of course. It's on our document website, along with everything else that's public to the board. Thank you.

Black: I just want to say that I fully support the motion and I would like clarification again. Will this require 50% or 75% to move it into open session? **Hannon:** Darrell, isn't it 2/3? **Newkirk:** You might want to ask John Randolph. It's 2/3 to put something into closed session. **Hannon:** John Randolph, what do we require for this motion? **Eigenhauser:** Can I read from the Guidebook? **Hannon:** Go ahead. **Eigenhauser:** *All or part of any other closed session matter may be made public on the affirmative vote of a majority of the CFA Board present and voting.* So, to move something from closed session to open session is a majority vote. **Randolph:** I concur with George. **Hannon:** 2/3? **Eigenhauser:** Majority. **Hannon:** Majority, OK. **Eigenhauser:** II, subparagraph 2, paragraph c. **Hannon:** I don't see any more hands. Is there any more discussion? Are you ready to vote? Alright, let's do the voting with the blue hands. All those in favor of the motion of putting it in open session.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Roy, Colilla, Koizumi and Morgan voting no. Anger, Calhoun and Mastin abstained.

Hannon: Do you agree, Darrell, that passed? **Newkirk:** Yes. Those people that are affected by that budget really should abstain in my opinion, but you should ask John to confirm that. He's your parliamentarian. **Hannon:** The motion carried, so we'll put the budget as the last thing in open session. Pam, you're through with your motions, right? **P. Moser:** Yes. **Hannon:** OK, thank you.

(2) **ADDITIONS/CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES; RATIFICATION OF ON-LINE AND TELECONFERENCE MOTIONS**

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
1.	Anger Auth 04.01.2020	South Korea will receive 5 DW awards in all categories for the 2019-20 show season.	Motion Carried. Schleissner did not vote.
Mastin: Assuming CO can verify Dick's claim on the number of rings is eight, imo this is a reasonable request and I am glad Dick was able to catch this prior to the announcement of any awards. I will support the motion once eight rings are confirmed by CO.			
2.	P. Moser Anger 04.01.2020	Due to the COVID-19 virus pandemic, judges under contract with shows already licensed may cancel their contract up to six weeks prior to the opening day of the show and may exhibit at a show that weekend.	Motion Carried. Calhoun, Morgan, Mastin and Eigenhauser voting no. Anger abstained.
<p>Anger: I would like to have the motion read "effective immediately" and have an end date, which can be extended. Morgan: Shouldn't we also allow them to judge another, closer show as well as exhibit? Mastin: Can we consider adding a date period and extend if necessary? Example - ... "judges under contract with shows already licensed through August 31, 2020/September 30, 2020/October 31, 2020 may cancel ...". Will we also allow Clubs to cancel licensed shows through x-date (October 31, 2020) and receive full credit for show license and insurance? If we are allowing judges to cancel shows due to the virus, we should allow Clubs to cancel shows imo until the end of October 2020 since we cancelled CIS. Roy: we need to allow them to accept a local assignment if they cancel a fly show. Yes clubs should be able to cancel or apply their license fee to another show. Every area may have different regulations. P. Moser: I was just trying to do a simple motion so judges could get out of their contracts. I provided a starting point, if all of you want to add additional comments to the motion go ahead, I'm done with it. Eigenhauser: I strongly support the concept. The safety of our people has to be a priority. No judge should be forced to judge a show if they feel unsafe. But the vote is premature. The motion needs a start date, an end date, and some other details before it will be ready. It is still not clear whether judges may take other assignments if they cancel. We would have been better served to continue discussion and include some of the suggested changes.</p>			
3.	Anger Morgan 05.06.2020	Approve entering into an Event Cooperation Agreement between Cute Edelweiss Concept Promotion Center and The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc., as presented.	Motion Carried.
No discussion.			
4.	Auth Anger 05.11.2020	Effective May 1, 2020 all Clubs hosting current and future CFA licensed shows after June 1, 2020 are required to conduct due diligence and must follow all government regulations in place due to the COVID-19 virus pandemic. CFA will not be financially responsible if the club suffers a loss as a result of holding the show or cancelation of the show.	Motion Carried. Morgan and Calhoun did not vote.
<p>Black: Can Rich weigh in on what our insurance will cover. If someone gets the virus and sues the club and CFA does our insurance cover this liability? Auth: I will add to this – where is the COVID committee on coming up with a way to score the shows? Mastin: CFA does not have such coverage. When I last spoke with Whitaker and Meyers they weren't exactly sure what coverages would be available. And, I believe Federal Government has some issues with such claims on businesses and individuals. One of the major concerns is proof of where virus was transmitted and by whom. Please keep in mind many essential businesses are and have been open and I am sure many employees of such businesses are carriers of COVID 19 and other transmittable illnesses that are passed along on a regular basis. The major concern is all Clubs hosting CFA shows must follow local, state and federal mandates and restrictions or they could be liable for breaking laws and rules. George has touched on this in the past (possibly last</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p>week). Maybe John R can touch on CFA's and Clubs exposure to liabilities when individuals willfully do not follow mandates and restrictions. I will ask Whitaker and Meyers again on available insurance coverage(s). Calhoun: A decision plan was discussed with the full Board during the Wednesday, April 29 conference call. The Coronavirus Response Team would develop a survey so that we could get the opinions of the exhibitors. In addition the Board agreed to a follow up meeting in two weeks (May 13) to review the findings. Rachel sent the transcription to the Board List on May 1. Since that time Cathy Dunham, Nancy Peterson, Melanie Morgan, Kathy Durdick, Allene Tartaglia, Sharon Roy and I conducted two conference calls on the following dates - Friday, May 1 and Monday May 3. In addition there have been numerous email messages as we developed the survey. The Coronavirus will review the draft tonight. The final version will be available to the Board tomorrow assuming there are no major changes. That being said Cathy Durdick has done a great job formatting the survey and getting it ready for publication.</p> <p>Randolph: What is CFA's liability if someone claims to have contracted COVID-19 while participating in a CFA sponsored event or a CFA club's cat show? Liability is always dependent on the specific facts of any case and the burden of proof that the other party was negligent is on the person making the claim.</p> <p>In most cases, it will be difficult for an infected person to prove where he or she was exposed to the coronavirus. But even if the person can show the virus was contracted while attending a CFA sponsored event or participating in a CFA club cat show, that does not mean that CFA or the club is responsible. The injured person will still need to prove that CFA or the club was negligent and such negligence resulted in the injured person contracting the disease. In the case of cat shows, the injured party will have to establish that the club was negligent in not following governmental orders and observing recommended precautions such as social distancing in conducting the shows. CFA should not have liability for how a show is conducted, but could have liability for licensing shows and permitting them to be conducted contrary to governmental orders.</p> <p>A defense to any action brought by an injured party would be the assumption of risk by the injured party. That defense is based on the party electing to participate in an event or show with full knowledge that attending a group gathering could expose one to infection. The defense of assumption of risk is what is behind all of those fine print disclaimers you see on ski lift tickets, sports admissions and rental car agreements.</p> <p>While there is no absolute immunity from liability available to CFA or its member clubs, if CFA and the clubs can show that reasonable steps have been taken to keep people safe, it seems unlikely that CFA or a club would be found negligent if a person contracts COVID-19 at the event or show. An appropriate disclaimer of liability and an assumption of risk statement on admission tickets, cat entry confirmations tickets and show promotional materials might also lessen the risk.</p> <p>Black: John, would you recommend the club have a disclaimer releasing the club of responsibility each exhibitor would be required to sign? With ski lifts and other activities of risk you are required to waive rights before participating. Randolph: Kathy, that is what I was referring to. It could help to obtain one in advance from each exhibitor and each visitor to the show.</p>			
5.	Auth Anger 05.14.2020	That the October 10, 2020 weekend date be offered first to Cleveland Persian Society and Midland Cat Fanciers (since they were the two displaced clubs for the second week in October). Each club will be given until July 15 <u>ten days from notification</u> to respond. If either or both clubs decline the offer to host a show that weekend, then the weekend is opened up for request by other clubs. The new requesting club(s) must satisfy the distance between locations required by their appropriate Regional Director. This applies only to the October 2020 date.	Motion Carried. Auth and Roy abstained.
<p>Mastin: I am in favor of this motion, however, do both Clubs really need until July 15th to decide? I believe 10 days to two weeks is adequate time for the Clubs to respond so that the date can be available for other Clubs to make plans. Roy: I agree. Anger: Would you accept this: Each club will be given until July 15 <u>10 days from notification</u> to respond. Auth: Yes. Mastin: Rachel, I think your recommendation works and is reasonable. Thank you. Anger: OK, great. Since Mary made the original motion and I seconded it, and we both accept the amended</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
motion, then here is what we are voting on. [see motion above] Let's vote.			
6.	Anger Auth 05.19.2020	Due to the pre-notice not appearing on the CFA website and in a CFA-News announcement according to the internal deadline dates of the CFA Judging Program, allow the application of Dan Beaudry to be pre-noticed immediately, the deadline for comments extended to June 4 <u>10</u> , and the application to be heard at the June board meeting.	Motion Carried.
<p>Curre: I have no problem with the motion except this would not give the applicant the opportunity to comment on any negative letters that may arrive late. Hannon: In addition to Kenny's comment, the date of the Thursday board meeting is the 18th. Melanie is going to ask that the date in the motion be revised. Morgan: I was just reminded that the meeting is the 18th (for some reason I thought it was the next week), can we change the deadline for letters to 10th? The failure to pre-notice this application falls entirely on the Judging Program. It is not the fault of the applicant. He fulfilled all the requirements in good faith and I would hate to see consideration of his application delayed because of something he had no control over. We can get the notices out as soon as possible and there should be time for people to provide feedback if we give them until the 10th of June. My apologies for the oversight (and thanks to Pam for pointing it out). I truly hope you all can support this motion. Roy: I could be wrong but I do not expect any major negative letters. We need to apologize to Dan and shorten the time for letters. P. Moser: I just want to make sure that it is posted that any letters have to be in ASAP due to the oversight.</p>			
7.	P. Moser Auth 06.03.2020	That virtual shows be allowed to happen at the discretion of the hosting club.	Motion Carried. Eigenhauser voting no. Anger and Calhoun abstained.
<p>Eigenhauser: I support the concept of being more open but I'd like to see guidelines, similar to our in-conjunction guidelines, before we open it up. Newkirk: George, this event seems to be well planned and orchestrated to fit the needs of CFA breeders and exhibitors. Why would we want to stop it? I think Pam's motion is generic. Since the motion is generic, I feel I can vote yes and support the motion. I brought this to the boards attention 3-4 weeks ago and nothing was done because Mary and Kathy felt it should be up to the regions to put them up. No one agreed or disagreed at the time. Eigenhauser: Hi Darrell, I'm confused. You speak of "this event" but as you say Pam's motion is generic. Her motion is to approve, in advance, any virtual show any club may propose under any format without limitation. Newkirk: George, the announcement of the ID show prompted the current discussion and motion. "This event" would be covered by Pam's generic motion. My point is if the motion was to approve the show that has been scheduled, and I am listed as one of the judges, I would abstain on a vote, but that is not the motion, so I would cast a vote on a generic motion. Hope that clears up my thoughts. Auth: Just to be sure – I never said it should be up to the regions – I might have suggested it was a way for the regions to raise money. These virtual shows can include cats registered in other organizations – or not registered at all. Newkirk: Mary, I read your response as it should be the regions putting together the virtual shows? Was I incorrect? Auth: Darrell, Incorrect – I don't think it SHOULD be. Webster: I think we need to get shows back on and not worry about virtual anything. P. Moser: Mark, I made a motion and it has been seconded. I don't see where you have asked for discussion, why is that? Hannon: Board members started discussing before I called for discussion. I did not believe my involvement was needed. If anyone was politely waiting for me ... is there any further discussion? My hope is that the motion fails so we can look at a few requirements rather than allowing a free for all in the name of fun. If a virtual show is going to mention CFA, we should have a few requirements that are not burdensome. Someone mentioned that the board has already required all CFA virtual shows to obtain Executive Committee approval. Rachel... is that true? That's a start. For some reason some in the ID have advertised a CFA virtual show, knowing such approval is required, yet have started taking entries without such approval. Newkirk: Mark, in the email Andy sent, he said they asked and waited a week without a response from the exec committee. P. Moser: I do not recall that we passed a rule that a virtual show needs to get approval. Would Rachel please post where and when that was done. Also you are stating we need to put a few requirements out there for these fun shows. The requirements that I have seen, are not a few, they are almost a page long. Why are we trying to make something that is suppose too be fun and keep the fancy engaged in these challenging times so difficult. There should be no problem with CLUBS wanting to put on</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
		<p>virtual fun shows without going through a page long rule abiding document. There are no points involved, we are judging pictures for God sakes. Please help me understand what is going on here, you are strangling clubs with rules that are not necessary. Hannon: The proposed rules Rachel forwarded to us are hardly going to strangle clubs. They are fairly basic such as a requirement to indicate when entities will be accepted, fees, format (photos, video, Zoom, etc.), where the money goes, and so on. Exhibitors will need much of the information listed in the proposed requirements.</p> <p>Morgan: I actually was waiting for discussion to officially be opened, now that it is I will happily weigh in... There are two issues at play here: 1 – the ID virtual show that prompted this motion; 2 – Virtual shows as a general concept. Unfortunately the two issues are intertwined and difficult to separate.</p> <p>These virtual “shows” are photo contests. Pure and simple. Clubs, regions, groups etc want to do something fun. These events provide an opportunity for just that AND fund raising. They are also a way to get our name out there and give people who are sitting home looking for ways to entertain themselves something to do. They are not cat shows and as such do not necessarily fall under CFA show rules. We will not be judging cats, we will not be scoring these fun events, however if the CFA name is utilized we certainly want there to be a certain level of quality control. That said, it is a mistake to micromanage them. It is a mistake to make them so cumbersome and complicated that we lose the opportunity to have the CFA name out there and we frustrate, and possibly lose loyal CFA supporters.</p> <p>Do I think some basic guidelines would be a good idea? Absolutely, but not at the expense of bogging this down in minutia and running the risk of driving Loyal CFA supporters to go rogue. That is counter-productive. We should be GRATEFUL that there are people out there ready and willing to put hundreds of hours and many resources to work to promote the CFA name and keep us relevant. We should be providing support and guidance, not barriers.. All this does not mean that we cannot approve the proposed ID show (which has been approved by the ID Chairs) AND implement the Regional event concept proposed by Lorna. The two are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they could easily benefit each other. It would be a good idea to have a few dry runs/beta testers get out there to work out the kinks before rolling out the entire program proposed by Lorna. Having a few shows under our belt before jumping into the deep end with a huge event actually makes a lot of sense.</p> <p>I would like to see two things done: 1 -Approve the proposed ID show - The group involved has provided an outline of their proposed show. They plan on using the funds as a fund raiser to help off set costs of additional awards approved by the Board. The ID chairs are confident that they will represent CFA at the highest level; 2 - Develop a general set of guidelines to be applied to future virtual shows that carry the CFA logo.</p> <p>I think that this current motion can do that. If it passes, we can put together a general set of guidelines fashioned after the one we have for the in-conjunction shows and then make a motion to pass them. When I say general I mean basic – I.e. Must use CFA judges, must have CFA logo... must receive approval from Regional Director (or whoever we decide should approve these events). I personally would like it to say that any non-accepted breeds or colors should be judged in HHP, but basically we should not be putting up barriers to this endeavor. The guidelines should be designed to give the interested groups resources to implement the concept of a virtual show.</p> <p>I am truly bewildered that we are making this so complicated. This should not be so difficult.</p> <p>Currle: As a reminder, we passed a motion at the May 20 board meeting allowing any CFA club to participate in a virtual show. The only requirement at that the time was to check with CFA prior to the event. Are we adding to this motion? Eigenhauser: The motion as written “at the discretion of the hosting club” does not allow for the CFA to create any rules for virtual shows. This motion needs to be voted down so we can discuss the guidance proposal.</p> <p>Mastin: I believe we can approve Pam’s motion as is and hopefully have a motion soon to approve simple guidelines to be followed by specific entities wishing to host CFA Virtual Shows.</p>	
8.	Anger Colilla 06.06.2020	With the exception of the guest judge issue, adopt the Virtual Show Guidelines as presented and amended.	Motion Failed. Mastin, Anger, Calhoun, Colilla, Webster, Koizumi, Eigenhauser and Morgan voting yes.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p>P. Moser: The issue I have with the whole idea behind guidelines is they are not binding. You can put out the guidelines but no one has to follow them. Unless you make it a show rule, we are just putting all this effort into something that doesn't even matter. Hannon: CFA virtual shows require the approval of the Executive Committee. That committee can enforce whatever guidelines the board approves. P. Moser: Well according to my motion you didn't need any approval from anybody to have a virtual show and there were no guidelines. As I recall that passed. Eigenhauser: For in conjunction shows we make approval contingent upon following the in-conjunction guidelines. We can do the same here. Auth: In conjunction shows are scored – virtual shows are not scored – it's a picture, fun show. There is no comparison – why don't we just say you cannot have fun. Eigenhauser: I was responding to your comment about guideline not being binding. I was not debating the substance of the motion. Roy: Personally, I do not think this motion is, at this time necessary. I had been trying to plan a "virtual" show for Region 1 as a fun fundraiser. I contacted Lorna, before she was appointed chair of this committee for some guidance. I sent an email to the executive board with basic plans but heard nothing back. Lorna emailed me that she was working on some different plans and that we would have virtual qualifiers and then a virtual International. I put everything on hold. [Roy quotes two different private emails] I think we have made this too complicated. The longer it goes on, it is too little too late. Just my opinion. Mastin: Please note, in the attached is one red comment on regarding entry fees; I don't think it is of our concern who benefits from entry fees as we do not require such information for in-person normal CFA shows. The more I think about it I see no reason why we should care or micro-manage where fees are going. I believe it is necessary to have simplified guidelines to help guide people on what to do and what steps to take to be consistent on the very basic levels and use of CFA's approved logo(s). We do not need to over-manage or over-restrict these types of shows, but we should have some guidelines. Eigenhauser: I agree. We don't need to spell that out for virtual shows. The CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 2, makes clubs subject to discipline for: "d) Distribution of club funds in a manner inconsistent with the objects of the Association." That is the limitation on clubs using their money for improper purposes. We don't need to treat virtual show funds any differently than in person show money or any other club funds. Krzanowski: Personally, I feel it is both advisable and acceptable to provide some general guidelines for virtual shows. This shortened version is basic and reasonable. I do not believe the guidelines are too complicated or cumbersome at all. I also believe we need to offer clubs, regions and ID areas some guidelines so that any virtual shows conducted in connection with CFA's name and/or logo are consistent and of the quality folks expect from this association. I agree we do not need to be informed of how or where the funds will be utilized. I am fully supportive of these guidelines with the removal of beneficiary information.</p>			
11.	Anger Eigenhauser 06.11.2020	With the exception of the guest judge issue, adopt the Virtual Show Guidelines as re-presented and amended.	Motion Carried. P. Moser, Black, Auth, Currle, Schleissner, B. Moser and Newkirk voting no. Roy abstained.
<p>Eigenhauser: Since the current motion is a one sentence change in the motion we already discussed, and this possible change was included in that discussion, I have nothing to add and hope we call the vote soon. P. Moser: Mark, that is correct it is almost identical so I guess what you are saying is we will just keep bringing it up until you get the outcome your looking for. This is BS. Hannon: The previous motion lost by one vote. Carol wrote that she felt we needed some guidelines but she objected to the inclusion of the statement about where the proceeds go with virtual shows when we do not spell that out for in-person shows. George felt the Constitution covers proceeds. If the latest version of the motion resolves Carol's concern, it seems fair to remove the one objection to which she expressed concern. You have been on the board with me long enough to know that I do not normally keep bringing up motions until I get the result I want. Your accusation is unfair and you know better. Newkirk: This is a quintessential example of why this Board should be operating by RRO. Mark, you should have suggested to George or Carol to make an amendment to strike out the line that they objected to. That amendment would have passed and the amended motion could have been debated and would have passed. Since that was not done, now we are faced with another, needless waste of time, bringing back a motion that could have been handled correctly and passed. JMHO. Pam is correct that motions are improper when they present practically the same question as a motion previously decided AT THE SAME SESSION. I all capped the last clause, as it is the crux of why we can make a motion similar to the motion that failed. We are making and passing motions all the time online. As George has</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
stated, this is not a meeting, and RRO do not apply, but we are conducting the affairs of a Not-For-Profit Business, so there has to be some sort of order there too. Again, JMHO.			
9.	Executive Committee 06.03.2020	Approve a virtual fundraiser show to be hosted by the ID-Other, open to ID-Other and ID-China exhibitors. Entry will kickoff June 1 and the final presented June 20. The show is a fun show and will not be licensed or scored.	Motion Carried.
10.	Executive Committee 06.04.2020	Approve a virtual fundraiser show to be hosted by the Southern Region, using the CFA logo. Entries will open June 8-30, judging takes place July 1-5, results will be posted July 7. The show is a fun show and will not be licensed or scored.	Motion Carried.
12.	Newkirk Anger 06.16.2020	That the 06.03.2020 minutes of the China Associate Judging Program be considered as open session (with names and identifying comments removed).	Motion Carried. Morgan and Calhoun voting no. Anger abstained. Koizumi did not vote.
Eigenhauser: The Associate Judging Program change has to be public so people understand it and we can work to improve it. Most of it is already out there but including the Board discussion in open session minutes gives context. I'm assuming that personal discussion of individuals will be scrubbed like they normally are for judging.			

RATIFICATION OF TELECONFERENCE MOTIONS

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
• From April 29, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference •			
	Auth Eigenhauser	Effective June 1, 2020, current CFA licensed shows and shows licensed in the future can be conducted. The hosting club should conduct due diligence and must follow government regulations in place due to the COVID-19 virus pandemic. CFA will not be financially responsible if the club suffers a loss as a result of holding the show or cancellation of the show.	Motion Carried.
	Auth Newkirk	Reconsider the above motion. [No replacement motion having been made, the effect of the original vote is suspended, and no action may be taken to implement it.]	Motion Carried. Calhoun, Morgan, Roy abstained.
	Black Newkirk	That CFA print the awards booklet, mail the trophy and the rosette to the winners, and then we'll come up with some way to recognize them at the 2021 annual.	Motion Carried.
	Mastin Roy	That the 2020 International Show be cancelled.	Motion Carried. Black voting no. Newkirk, Roy, Morgan, B. Moser, Calhoun, Anger and Currle

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
			abstained.
	P. Moser Mastin	That the judges for the 2020 International Show are rolled over to the 2021 International Show.	Motion Carried. Newkirk, Roy, Morgan, B. Moser, Calhoun, Anger and Currle abstained.
• From May 20, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference •			
	Eigenhauser Calhoun	That CFA cancel all in-person cat shows through the end of October 2020. This motion may be revisited, extended, or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions as the Board may determine appropriate.	Tabled.
	P. Moser Auth	That we score regional wins only this year (2020-2021).	Motion Carried. Eigenhauser, Anger, Calhoun, Roy, Mastin, Black, Colilla, Schleissner and Currle abstained.
	Eigenhauser Calhoun	That CFA cancel all in-person cat shows through the end of October 2020. This motion may be revisited, extended, or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions as the Board may determine appropriate.	Following a tie-breaker vote by President Hannon, Motion Carried. Currle, Auth, Webster, Black, B. Moser, P. Moser, Newkirk and Schleissner voting no.
	Eigenhauser Mastin	That CFA impose a moratorium on issuing show licenses for any in-person show, regardless of show date or location, until further action by the CFA Board. This motion may be revisited, extended, or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions as the Board may determine appropriate.	Motion Carried. Schleissner, Auth, Newkirk, Webster, Currle, Black, B. Moser and P. Moser abstained.
	Mastin Eigenhauser	That no sponsorship is approved during the moratorium on licensing shows.	Motion Carried.
	Schleissner Currle	That CFA participate in the unscored virtual show being held on June 20/21 by Edelweiss Cat Club in Russia; that any club or region may participate in unscored virtual shows, with Executive Committee approval.	Motion Carried.

• From June 3, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference •			
	Anger Mastin	Accept the China Associate Judge Proposal, as presented, pending the ID Co-Chairs' approval of Mr. Newkirk's suggestion to add to the list.	Motion Carried. Currle voting no.
	Calhoun Eigenhauser	Approve Maloney + Novotny to conduct the 2019/2020 Audit with a new lead auditor and to authorize the Chair of the Audit Committee to represent the Board's alignment by agreeing to the "Statement Acknowledging of Financial Statements and Closings".	Motion Carried. Hannon abstained. Webster did not vote.
• From June 8, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference •			
		No motions.	

Hannon: The first order of business, Rachel. You have some minutes and some ratification of online motions? **Anger:** I do. They should be on the screen but I'm getting the welcome screen. **Hannon:** We see it. **Anger:** Now I do, too. Very good, and there's the agenda, as well. Wonderful. So, we have these motions that were conducted online, as well as from the last couple of teleconferences. I would like to move that they be ratified. **Krzanowski:** Carol will second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Hannon: Next, Rachel? **Anger:** Next is Central Office. **Hannon:** Did you do all your online motions? **Anger:** I rolled them all into one. **Hannon:** OK, alright.

(3) CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATIONS.

Committee Chair: Allene Tartaglia

Annual Meeting Site Selection: proposals for the 2025 Annual in the Southern Region have been received and site visits were scheduled for Jacksonville, Orlando and Tampa this past March, however, travel was cancelled due to COVID-19. It appears we will not be able to do in-person site visits until at least this fall. Pat Zollman from Helms Briscoe recommended we wait until things calm down a bit more with COVID and also with the civil unrest occurring in so many cities. Every effort will be made to contract for the 2025 Annual Meeting location as soon as possible.

Hannon: Allene? **Tartaglia:** The first item is Annual Meeting Site Selection. It's basically just for information. We are delayed on being able to do site visits because of COVID. Then there are the protests that are occurring, so we're postponing [inaudible] and we will get to locations as soon as we can. Hopefully we'll have more information no later than the October board meeting, if not a little bit sooner.

Cattery of Distinction – Merging Catteries: the criteria to merge cattery names to apply for the Cattery of Distinction title is: 1) the same person is working with both catteries, and 2) all co-owners of these catteries agree to merge for said award. Sometimes, acquiring the agreement of all co-owners for older and inactive catteries isn't possible.

There is a request pending to merge two catteries (cattery A and cattery B) where the older cattery (A) was co-owned by husband and wife who subsequently divorced. The husband dropped out of the cat fancy after the divorce, however, he is still on record as co-owner of cattery A. There has been no activity on cattery A since the divorce.

The newer cattery (B) is co-owned by the ex-wife and another individual. The ex-wife wants to merge the two catteries (A & B) so she can claim the CoD on cattery B. No one has heard from or been able to reach the ex-husband from cattery A since the divorce. I'm requesting an exception to the rule requiring agreement of all co-owners of each cattery to merge the catteries for the CoD title and process the pending application.

Tartaglia: The next item is Cattery of Distinction related and about merging catteries. I normally wouldn't read my report but I'll paraphrase it for the purposes of the audience. Although they can see it, still I'll go through it a bit. There's criteria to merge cattery names for the title of Cattery of Distinction, and it's two. One is, the same person needs to be working with both catteries and all co-owners of the two catteries agree to merge for said award. What we're finding is that sometimes acquiring the agreement of all the co-owners for older and inactive catteries is not possible, especially when they're 20-25 years old, people drop out of the cat fancy and we just can't get in touch with them. So, we have a current request to merge two catteries. The older cattery was co-owned by a husband and wife who subsequently divorced. The husband dropped out of the cat fancy after the divorce. Nobody has heard from him, they can't get in touch with him. However, [inaudible] is co-owner of cattery A. That's not uncommon. There has not been any activity with that cattery since the divorce, so what we're asking is that the owner

who was involved in both catteries be permitted to merge both of the catteries for the purposes of Cattery of Distinction without the permission of the older cattery that's inactive and for which nobody can get in touch with the co-owner of that cattery, the ex-husband. **Hannon:** The wife tells us she hasn't been in touch with him since the divorce 25 years ago, she has no idea where he is or if he's even alive, so there's no way we can contact that person. **Tartaglia:** Are there any questions? **Black:** Allene, if you need somebody to make the motion, I'll make the motion. **Currle:** I'll second the motion. **Hannon:** Thank you Kenny. Is there any more discussion?

Action Item:

Motion to require permission of only one co-owner from the inactive cattery for the pending application to merge catteries for the purpose of claiming a Cattery of Distinction title.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Clubs Suspended & Unpaid Entry Surcharges: *There were eight clubs with unpaid show entry surcharges, as required by show rule 13.09k, from shows in 2018/2019 (all from China). The clubs received a letter in January 2020 stating the club is suspended until the debt is paid and that if the debt remains unpaid as of June 1, 2020, the club would be dropped from membership.*

Five of the clubs did not pay 2020 club membership fees and/or did not submit a membership list for 2020 and were automatically dropped as of June 1. The remaining three clubs paid the 2020 club fees and submitted a CFA membership list, however, did not pay the outstanding entry surcharge. Most likely, they received the suspension notice after they paid the fees and submitted a membership list. The three clubs are:

*Oriental Fashion International Cat Club - \$2,625.75 - three shows unpaid from 2018
Tianjin Feiming Cat Club - \$1,031.25 - one show unpaid from 2018
China Tao Yuan Fanciers Club - \$1,031.25 - one show unpaid from 2018*

I've been informed that at least one of these clubs is working with another cat registry in China. Since the dues for 2020 were paid and a membership list for 2020 was filed, can these clubs be automatically dropped effective June 1? The clubs have met the requirements in Article III, Section 5 – Dues and List of Members of CFA's Constitution which states: "A member club that has failed to pay its dues and submit the list of its members and officers by the first day of January of any year will cease to be a member in good standing and will so continue until the delinquent dues are paid and the list of members and officers is filed with the Central Office. However, a member that remains delinquent in payment of dues and/or fails to file a list of its members and officers past the first day of June shall be automatically dropped from membership."

However, the clubs are in violation of a show rule. Article XV, Section 2 – Conduct of Members Subject to Board Discipline states in part: "The Board may reprimand, suspend, expel and/or fine any member club upon a finding of guilty for: c) The violation of any Show Rule."

Hannon: Do you have something else, Allene? **Tartaglia:** I do. **Hannon:** Let's hear it. **Tartaglia:** We have three clubs with unpaid entry surcharges from quite some time ago. They've received notice that they owe these fees, that they would be suspended if they were not paid

within a certain time and that, further, if the debt wasn't paid by June 1, 2020, the club would be dropped from membership. Some of the clubs that have these unpaid show entries dropped off from club membership because they didn't pay club fees for 2020 or they didn't submit a membership list. However, three of them did. They paid their dues, they submitted their membership lists. They have not paid the outstanding entry surcharge. What I'm asking, there are the three clubs that are listed. They're all from China. These show entry surcharges are from 2018. So, what I'm asking is, should these clubs be dropped from membership? They are in violation of a show rule, but they did pay their dues and they submitted a membership list. So, we just need a ruling on what should happen with these clubs. **Hannon:** Does somebody want to make a motion? **Anger:** I'll make the motion with the right to vote no, that we drop these three clubs for non-payment of their show surcharge fees. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion?

Newkirk: Allene, can you tell me how much of a – differentiate what the actual penalty fees versus the add-on fine? A penalty I guess is what that would be called. **Tartaglia:** Yes. The fine is \$300 per show. It used to be \$500 but it was reduced to \$300. **Newkirk:** OK, so let's take Oriental Fashion International Cat Club. They had three shows, so their actual penalty, their fine would have been \$900. Anything above \$900 is accumulated fees for not paying the \$900. Is that how I'm reading that? **Tartaglia:** Right within a certain time frame, correct. \$300 is the highest fee, I think it's after 90 days. **Hannon:** Any more discussion? **Anger:** I would like to know if the ID Co-Chairs have been given the opportunity to reach out to these clubs. The fact that they paid their 2020 dues makes me think that even though they have been communicated with about this, there is a lack of information there or a misunderstanding. Perhaps personnel has changed. Can we table this until we give the ID Co-Chairs an opportunity to personally reach out to these clubs and resolve these issues? I would hate to drop three clubs. **Tartaglia:** I can address that. The clubs receive the notice of suspension in January. They all paid their dues and submitted their membership lists in December prior to receiving this notice. The ID Chairs have been included all along with correspondence about this since January. In fact, I reached out to the ID Chairs as I was putting this board report together, to get input from them. Regarding one of the clubs, I received that information from one of the ID Chairs that one of the clubs above is working with another cat registry in China, but I didn't receive information from the others. We have attempted to get in touch with the clubs a couple of times, as well. **Mastin:** We had a similar incident happen last year that caused Darrell and I to work on the penalty price list changes for the new year. Under the rules on the price list, if you are 90 days past due on funds owed to CFA, you are suspended of all services. As I recall, we had one or two clubs last year go through the exact same thing, and I believe those clubs were suspended of all services, even though they submitted their membership list and their annual fee. So, at this point in time, they are suspended of all services. Now, whether or not we want to continue carrying them on as a member club, that's our choice, but they have no services until they pay what is owed. **Newkirk:** The first club listed on here – I'm not going to say who it is, but this club is super, super, super active on FaceBook promoting CFA. Now, I know that doesn't excuse non-payment that they owe, but they have worked their backsides off for CFA when nobody else is doing much in China for us right now. If you want to know who it is I will send you a chat privately, but they are all over shopping malls with the CFA logo shown. They are promoting CFA, and that provides a valuable service for us. The other two clubs, and I don't know which club below that they are talking about, but a lot of these clubs – Allene, do you know how many China clubs were dropped as of June 2nd? **Tartaglia:** I don't. We'll find out. I think it was about 15 or so.

Club #	Region	Club Name	2020 Dues	2020 Membership
1317	3	CAJUN COWBOY CAT CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
15	4	AMERICAN TABBY AND TORTIE	Not Paid	Not Received
603	4	BUTLER CAT FANCIERS	Not Paid	Not Received
1670	4	CLUB MEOW-WOW	Not Paid	Not Received
1178	8	CATS EYE FANCIERS	No Paid	Not Received
1397	8	JAPAN NORWEGIAN FOREST CAT BC	Paid	Not Received
1443	ID Indonesia	CAT FANCIERS' SOC OF INDONESIA	Not Paid	Not Received
1513	ID Brazil	CAT FANCIER'S OF BRAZIL	Paid	Not Received
1520	ID China	BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CAT CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1538	ID Hong Kong	PASSION FELINE FANCIERS	Not Paid	Not Received
1545	ID China	CHINA INTERNATIONAL PEDIGREE CAT FANCIERS' CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1555	ID China	TIANJIN CAT FANCIERS	Not Paid	Not Received
1568	ID China	FELINE ASIA EXOTIC CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1577	ID China	NORTHEAST CAT FANCIERS CL OF CHINA	Not Paid	Not Received
1580	ID Hong Kong	FELIDAE BEYOND INFINITY	Not Paid	Not Received
1582	ID Malaysia	JOHOR BAHRU CAT CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1585	ID China	LEFFAIR INTERNATIONAL CF CLUB	Paid	Not Received
1593	ID China	CHINA CAT PARTY CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1613	ID China	FENGtian CAT FANCIERS CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1635	ID China	CHINA SUPERSTAR CAT FANCIERS	Not Paid	Not Received
1651	ID China	NEI MENG MAO WANG CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1662	ID China	CROWN ROYAL CHINA CAT FANCIERS	Not Paid	Not Received
1664	ID Hong Kong	HONG KONG CAT FANCIERS	Not Paid	Not Received
1665	ID Taiwan	TAINAN MEOW LOVER CAT CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1666	ID China	UNIVERSAL CAT FANCIERS ALLIANCE	Not Paid	Not Received
1667	ID China	ABYSSINIAN ALLIANCE	Not Paid	Not Received
1668	ID Malaysia	ASIAN ABYSSINIAN CAT CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1681	ID China	JUST WE CAT CLUB	Paid	Not Received
1697	ID China	CHINA MING MAO FANG	Not Paid	Not Received
1698	ID Bahrain	CAT BAHRAIN CLUB	Not Paid	Not Received
1701	ID Philippines	MANILA CAT FANCIERS SOCIETY	Not Paid	Not Received

Newkirk: If any of you are on WeChat or if you follow on FaceBook, I've got a listing of all the UCA shows scheduled. Today I just got a list of all the ICE shows that are scheduled

through I think February of next year. Those competitive organizations are show, show after show and here we've got one club that is promoting CFA and really, really doing it in full notch fashion. So, I wish there was a way that we could one time forgive or whatever you want to do, but I really hate to see a club dropped. **Anger:** These guys, even though we have our ID Co-Chairs, they are unrepresented with a China Representative. I would like to take every opportunity we have and give these guys every chance we can. Dropping them today or dropping them at our August teleconference isn't going to make any difference. I know Central Office has done all the due diligence and more. Can we give one more chance, charge the CFA Secretary or someone like Clubs with reaching out to them and giving them one more chance to come forward, resolve the issues and go forward. The fact that they paid their dues makes me want to fight for everything I can for these guys. **Morgan:** I spoke to one of the ID Chairs. They confirm that Allene has contacted them multiple times and I guess they've been in contact, as well. They are in support of dropping them. **Hannon:** They what? **Morgan:** They support dropping the clubs. In their opinion, they have been given multiple opportunities to comply and they are delinquent.

Mastin: I'm not suggesting we necessarily need to drop this club at this point in time. I do like Rachel's recommendation that we do everything we can to try to save them. However, I just want to caution the board, at this point in time, based on the policy that is written, that we all agreed to and put in place, these three clubs do not have services until they pay their outstanding debts. I understand what Darrell is explaining about the one-time forgiveness. If we do a one-time forgiveness for one club, the policy that is in place does not hold much water when we allow clubs not to pay their past debts in order to retain services. So, be very, very careful when you approve or disapprove what we're doing with the written policy on the price list sheet. **Calhoun:** My question is, does anybody have any feedback as to what the obstacle is for these clubs not paying. Do they feel that they dollars are owed, that there's something unfair? It doesn't sound like it's a lack of communication, so I just wondered if any of the folks that had a closer proximity to what's going on have any background as to why. **Krzanowski:** I just wanted to respond to Darrell's question about how many clubs in China were dropped on June 2nd, and that was 15. That list does not include these three, of course. That being said, I do agree with Rachel that we could possibly table this until the August teleconference. I'm also wondering, have either of the ID Reps been involved with trying to communicate with these clubs about their outstanding fees, other than the ID Chairs? Have the ID Reps been informed? **Hannon:** Since we're having an election right now and there will be a new China Rep as of Sunday, can we perhaps charge the new Chinese Rep with contacting these three clubs? **Eigenhauser:** I favor tabling this, as well. If they are currently under suspension, which is our policy, they're not getting any CFA services anyway. They're not going to do anything between now and August that would do any harm to CFA, but on the other hand, if waiting until August gives us a chance to find out why this one club is busy promoting CFA but not paying, I think it's worth asking the question. So, I don't see any harm in waiting until August. I do see a potential harm in taking a vote now, so I think August is the better choice.

Newkirk: I want to clarify, because Rich brought up about the one-time forgiveness. I'm not saying forgiving the complete debt. What I'm saying is, forgive the penalty. Three shows would be \$900, one show would be \$300 for the second two clubs. Then, we would make sure after that, anybody that fails to pay their dues, the board will take a hard stand and not going to relicense a club that fails to pay their owed show sponsorship fees to CFA. I'm just trying to

come up with a compromise so that we don't lose these clubs. I understand completely why the ID Reps [sic, Co-Chairs] would say drop this club, because there's a political issue there that the board probably doesn't understand, but I have been told about it. There are teams over there and those teams fight with one another, and that club is not part of a team of the ID Reps [sic, Co-Chairs]. **B. Moser:** I agree with Rachel. I think we should table this and also maybe give them one more chance. I don't see forgiveness at all. I feel sorry for the club that's really pushing CFA, but we're going to set a precedent if we don't take action down the road. That's my thought. **Mastin:** I would be willing to work out a compromise. Darrell, thank you for clarifying what you are referring to on forgiveness. I would be willing to work on a compromise in order to retain the clubs, but I don't think the compromise would be a large amount. That sets a bad precedent going forward. **Morgan:** I actually can support tabling this until August. I cannot support forgiveness for penalties or fees, because I think it sets a precedent. We have the rules in place, we need to enforce them. But, I understand and would support a motion that asks for the decision to delay this until August, where we would give the new ID Rep a chance to contact them, as well as possibly an official piece of correspondence from our CFA Secretary.

Action Item:

Consider dropping the three clubs from CFA membership effective June 1, 2020.

Anger: May I withdraw my motion or move to table, whichever is preferred? **Hannon:** It's up to you. Why don't you just table? **Anger:** Tabled. **Hannon:** Alright. Tell me, John, do I need to have a second and vote on that? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. **Hannon:** So, we need to vote on tabling? All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion [to table]. **Motion Carried.**

***Yearbook/Online Almanac/Cat Talk:** the first CFA Yearbook was published in 1958, a soft cover, spiral bound, 6 ½"x9" book with 130 pages. By 1973 it had grown to a hard cover, 9"x12" book with 440 pages. It continued to grow and by 1997 there were 720 pages. Around the late 80's/early 90's, approximately 6,000 Yearbooks were being printed and sold each year. Ad space in the Yearbook always sold out. This was the only method showcasing the breeds and catteries of CFA. Breeders anxiously awaited the new Yearbook to study the ads and photos and help determine the 'look' they wanted to achieve for their breeding program.*

Enter the internet and websites in the early 90's. By 2004 the Yearbook had downsized to an 8 ½"x11" book with only 320 pages. The Yearbook moved to a soft cover in 2005 and upsized to 616 pages. By 2012 it again shrunk in size to 320 pages and a hard cover was reintroduced. The 2019 Yearbook increased to 520 pages with the thought that more pages with more info would increase sales. Unfortunately, this did not happen. The Yearbook has certainly had its ups and downs.

We have continually reduced the number of Yearbooks printed each year to avoid a large inventory of old Yearbooks and to try and keep expenses in line. In 2019 we printed 400 Yearbooks and sold 224 (68 complimentary copies were sent to advertisers and 108 remain in inventory). For the 2020 Yearbook, the print run was reduced to 325, 135 were actually sold and there are currently 131 in stock. Sales slow down dramatically a few months after the release in

late January and we don't expect to sell many more of the 2020 Yearbooks. The trend for low print runs and reduced book sales has been happening for at least 15+ years. Clearly, cat fanciers no longer rely on the Yearbook for information and pictures as they once did. Websites, Google searches and social media have taken over.

Printed publications of all types and in all industries have been diminishing for years and finally cease publication entirely. The CFA Almanac was introduced as a monthly, color, printed magazine in May 1984, moved to bi-monthly in 2004. The final print version was the October/November 2007 edition and the Online Almanac (OLA) started.

Sadly, the time has come to make the difficult decision about ceasing publication of the CFA Yearbook. If the Board agrees with this direction, I'll work with Shelly Borawski and Teresa Keiger to develop a detailed plan for consideration at the August 2020 board meeting. The proposal will include beefing up Cat Talk, a bi-monthly magazine bundled with the OLA, to include more photos and possibly reducing the number of issues from six to three or four with each issue highlighting an event such as award winners, the Annual Meeting, breed popularity stats or the CFA International Cat Show.

The bundled version of Cat Talk and OLA has approximately 600 subscribers. Other than Points, most of what is in the OLA is suitable for the CFA website and will be unbundled from Cat Talk.ePoints and Cat Talk would be available as stand-alone subscriptions and the OLA would be phased out.

The electronic, monthly CFA Newsletter is popular with approximately 4,000 subscribers and there are no major changes planned for it.

Hannon: Allene, it's back to you. **Tartaglia:** The last item on my report has to do with publications. We have the Yearbook, we have the Online Almanac and we have Cat Talk. Just a brief bit of history about the Yearbook. It was started being published in 1958, soft cover, spiral bound. It was smaller in every way. By 1973 it had grown to a hard cover, 9x12 book with 440 pages. Around the late 80's or early 90's, the book was even larger, and we were printing and selling approximately 6,000 Yearbooks. Of course, at that time, everything was very different. It was really the only method people had of seeing pictures, planning their breeding program, deciding who they wanted to work with, what they wanted their cats to look like. Everything changed when the internet came about, and websites followed. Many people chose to have cattery websites. By 2004, the Yearbook had downsized to an 8-1/2 x 11 book with 320 pages. It went to a soft cover but increased in the number of pages. But again it shrunk to 320 pages in 2012 and a hard cover was re-introduced. It has been a roller coaster – size, pages, number that we print. At one point in 2019 we thought by increasing the size of the Yearbook to 520 pages with more information that it would increase sales but unfortunately that didn't happen. We continue to reduce the number of Yearbooks printed each year to avoid a large inventory. In 2019 we printed 400 Yearbooks and we sold 224. We still have 180 inventory. For the 2020 Yearbook, the print run was reduced to 325. 135 have actually been sold and there are currently 130 in stock. We find that sales slow down dramatically a few months after the release in late January and we really don't expect to sell many more of the 2020 Yearbooks. We have been seeing that trend for reduced book sales for at least 15 years. It's just unfortunately people no longer rely on

the Yearbook for that information. As you know, printed publications everywhere have declined and just gone away.

Tartaglia: A little bit of history about the Almanac. It was a print publication monthly in 1984. Eventually it went to bi-monthly and then ultimately we did away with it and made it the Online Almanac. I think it's time that we really look at ceasing publication of the CFA Yearbook. I know that's a big deal for a lot of people. It just doesn't support itself at this point. I have a few motions, but basically the plan would be if the board accepts to not publish the Yearbook any longer is, we would beef up Cat Talk, which is a bi-monthly magazine, to include more photos, more pages, focus on perhaps award winners for one issue, the annual meeting for another, breed popularity stats, that sort of thing. So, we would be taking some of the information that we put in the Yearbook, putting it into Cat Talk, and we wouldn't be competing with ourselves as much as we currently do. We would seek to get ads, because the idea would be that circulation would increase. It would be an electronic version, as it is now, on Kindle. We think we may have a good opportunity to sell ad space in the expanded Cat Talk. For the Online Almanac, mostly what is in the Online Almanac that I think people want is ePoints and Scoreboard. Most of the other information in the Online Almanac is on the website. We could easily review everything and, as appropriate, put a little bit more information on the website and put some more information in Cat Talk. The monthly CFA Newsletter is very popular. We have about 4,000 subscribers. There are no major changes. Of course that's a free subscription, but still there is definitely interest there.

Tartaglia: Are there any questions with any of the information I have provided?

Hannon: First, I want to clarify about when we would cease publication of the Yearbook. We are in the midst of working on a Yearbook that would come out next January or February. We would continue to do that. That would be the final Yearbook, not the one from last January and February. That's correct, right Allene? **Tartaglia:** Yes, and that's part of the action items.

Eigenhauser: My comment is about the bundling of Cat Talk and the Online Almanac. Part of the reason we did that way back when is because ePoints has always been a driving force for our subscriptions. A lot of people want ePoints, a lot of people want Scoreboards. Combining them helped expand the subscriber base for Cat Talk, and I would hate it if we got rid of the Online Almanac, not to continue some option for bundling ePoints and Cat Talk in order to help Cat Talk get more subscribers. **Hannon:** George, as I've explained before, the issue there is, we aren't having shows, therefore we don't have any ePoints. **Eigenhauser:** I understand today, but I'm just talking about if we're going to do this long term, if we're going to have a policy, I think there should still be some sort of, if we want to drive subscriptions to Cat Talk when ePoints become relevant again, bundling it with ePoints will help Cat Talk subscriptions. Otherwise, I think we may find that Cat Talk is going to struggle to survive. **Black:** I was just going to make a couple of comments. First, I would hate to see the Yearbook go completely away. If we can incorporate some of that information that people use, like the summation of the board meeting minutes, the number of grands, the offspring – those kinds of things, then maybe that would be a good place in Cat Talk or some other form in the Online Almanac, to have that information readily available to people, to do that kind of line chasing and that kind of historical information. Again, I have a question for Allene. Would you find another role for Shelly to be incorporated with Teresa on the Cat Talk? **Tartaglia:** Yes, absolutely. We would not lose Shelly. **Black:** She's a very valuable asset. **Tartaglia:** Far too valuable, and I have talked with Shelly and assured her. We have already talked about other areas that she would be very helpful with, and part of that

would be Cat Talk. **Black:** OK perfect. Thank you. **Newkirk:** Allene, I don't know what kind of microphone you're using but it's really static-y on my end. I don't know if you have another option for a microphone. Some of the webinars that Winn put on, the speaker had to go to like three mikes before we could hear. Other than that, I think that we really need to get in line with a modern-day approach. Books are on the way out. There's all kinds of eReaders and everything else. It's a huge expense to publish the Yearbooks, where we get just a few sales of that Yearbook. If we can make it electronic and maybe have one issue of Cat Talk expanded to pretty much showcase our national winners, I think that's a good alternative. Kathy says she would hate to see the Yearbook go away, but if we can produce the Yearbook in an electronic format and we can sell it at a reduced cost, we would probably get more people buying it. That's just my opinion on that.

Auth: My thoughts are – and I vacillate back and forth about this a lot – is that the Yearbook is a legacy document of CFA. I hate to see it go away, but I also, there's a reality that the world doesn't work that way anymore. One of the problems I think that has been with the Yearbook is because – and Kathy Black did it last year and I sort of was doing it this year, though there wasn't much of a sort of an official designation – but I don't know that it has been actively or aggressively marketed. We just put it out on the website and if we build it they will come – well that doesn't work that way in terms of the Yearbook. I've kind of put some things together, and Shelly and I have talked about it, but I think if it was more aggressively marketed both for advertisers and to purchase, we might have a little bit more success with it. But, I understand. People don't pay to advertise in it if they can do it much less cheaper on the internet. My comments relative to the magazine is, you put yourself out there and you're competing then with other consumer-based publications. If you're not going to compete with the consumer-based publications, then what you're doing is, your audience is very narrow and I think it's going to fail, too. So, those are my thoughts. I personally don't want to see a Cat Talk publication because I don't think it's been well thought out who the subscribers would be and I don't think it would be hard to convince advertisers to give you much money for it, because it's not reaching the audience that they want. They want the consumer audience. And then the Yearbook, as I said, I hate to see it go away as it is a legacy document. My four cents' worth. **Morgan:** First I would like to echo the sentiments on Shelly. Certainly, we value everything she does. I know that, certainly from a Judging Program standpoint, we've already been talking with Allene about some things that we could really use, in terms of working on some of our breed workshops, etc., so I think that certainly there is a place for her if there is any reorganization. But, kind of dovetailing on what Mary just said, I think first of all, in terms of looking at Cat Talk, that we need to identify who our real target audience is there, because right now I think we're targeting multiple audiences. By definition, we're destined to fail with that, so there is a real place for Cat Talk but we need to clean up that target. So, I support unbundling the Online Almanac from Cat Talk, and reinventing Cat Talk into a more targeted vehicle. I understand there's a rationale for stopping production of the CFA Yearbook. On paper it has always been a loss leader. Financially it makes sense to call the time of death and move on. I get it. I know that we need to be fiscally responsible, but sometimes sense and logic should not reign supreme. Sometimes we have to look beyond the dollars and cents and even circulation and demand, and as Mary said, think about our legacy. The CFA yearbook represents a hard copy piece of our history. It documents where we have been and history has shown us that knowing where we came from is the best way to get where we are going. I really hate to think of us not having a hard copy somewhere, somehow. Yes, we move into this new age of electronic stuff. It does last forever but it's not

accessible forever. I think my heart is speaking here but I cannot support any motion that includes the loss of that legacy.

Schleissner: I have a question for Allene on Cat Talk. How many examples of the Cat Talk do you sell to Europe? Do you have an idea about the numbers? **Tartaglia:** I don't have an exact number, but I believe it's pretty low because of the cost of postage to ship. **Hannon:** And also the time lag. It takes so long to get to them. Michael, we came up with an online version for people in Europe, in hopes that they would subscribe to it using Kindle or whatever. That hasn't been overly successful, either. So, what is your point? You want us to – **Schleissner:** I just want to know how many subscribers we have. I also was interested in to know how many people from Chinese or from other Asia have subscribed to this Almanac. Being honest, I have not subscribed. I had two magazines in the past. I looked in the magazines and there was not really much interesting things for Europeans. I think it's also for an Asian one or for a Chinese one, so I think there should be a little bit more for Europe or China or Asia. They should be more involved in this magazine and then you maybe can raise the numbers with the subscribers.

Anger: I agree on the one hand that the Yearbook is an important legacy document, but apparently, it's only important to 135 people. What is the price tag on that? What is our budget loss that we have on that? Isn't it enormous? \$40,000 or something? If that's the price tag to keep a legacy document and you all agree with that, then we should continue producing the Yearbook. I love the book. I don't get it every year. I didn't get it this year yet, but I usually do. I would hate to see it go, but I also hate to see us spending that much money to have one sitting on the shelf in the Museum that may or may not be looked at. **Calhoun:** Just to answer Rachel's question, this year the net income on the Yearbook was, we lost \$45,000. Now, this was a bit of an anomaly because we wrote off \$19,000 worth of Yearbooks, so we had the expense come over on the P&L, but in May 2018-April 2019 it was \$17,900. We're losing about at least \$20,000 a year.

Hannon: There's a motion on the floor. Do you want to restate it for us? Do you have it, Rachel? **Tartaglia:** Can I just make a couple comments? **Hannon:** Sure. **Tartaglia:** To address the Yearbook, as I said, I know it's a difficult thing. I think if we continue to print it, we should look at making some pretty dramatic changes in hopes of selling more. Doing all this work for 135 to sell just seems an awful lot, so if you choose to not cease publication, then we will be coming back with some dramatic changes. For instance, I believe it's not attractive to open the Yearbook – we're looking to publish to an outside audience and for more people to purchase it. They are looking at pictures of people that they have no clue who they are. It's like, who wants to look at somebody's yearbook from high school unless it's that person? There's just no interest, and I think that's part of the hard sell for the Yearbook, especially if we're trying to promote it to people from outside the cat fancy. We're trying to get people involved, so just so you are aware of that, we will probably be looking at changing the format quite a bit in order to better market it, so that we do have more people purchasing it. I'm not committing that we do that, but I'm just saying, it's something to consider. **Hannon:** Is that the end of your comments? **Tartaglia:** I guess, yes. [transcript goes to vote on Motion #1]

Hannon: Allene, do you have anything else for the Central Office Report? **Tartaglia:** There's two other action items if you would like to consider them. One would be to unbundle the Cat Talk and Online Almanac, and extend the Online Almanac subscriptions – which are ePoints – through December 2020. That is mostly because we haven't had any shows. People have paid

for their subscription and they're really not getting anything. There's two things in there. There's extending the Online Almanac, which is part of Cat Talk. I think it was mentioned during this conversation that a lot of people purchase Cat Talk because they have to, because they want ePoints. I don't know that we should be forcing people to take one over the other or with another, and then perhaps by unbundling them, people who want ePoints can pay for ePoints – maybe \$25 for the year. People who want Cat Talk may be more encouraged to subscribe to Cat Talk because it's not so expensive. It might be \$25 for the year instead of, I believe right now it's \$59. **Hannon:** That happened I think while you were gone. What we did was, we used to charge \$49 for an annual subscription to the magazine and we added another \$10 for ePoints and upped the subscription to \$59 for a combination of ePoints and the magazine. That's in North America. We did not do that worldwide, we just did that in North America. **Tartaglia:** So, is that what we want to continue to do? **Hannon:** The problem is, if we extend the Online Almanac, which is ePoints, extend the subscription because we're not providing them anything in the way of ePoints – we have no shows to report – that would also, unless we unbundle it, mean they get an extension on the magazine. So, they would continue to get free issues of the magazine. If you unbundle it, then we can continue to charge for the magazine. [The motion is made and seconded, see #2 below]

Hannon: Alright, I see some raised hands. **Auth:** So, the motion is to bundle? Is that what we're doing? I need clarification on that. **Hannon:** Rich made the motion. What's your motion, Rich? **Mastin:** The motion is to *Unbundle Cat Talk and the Online Almanac, which currently include ePoints, and extend OLA subscriptions through December 2020.* **Auth:** Thank you. **Black:** I would like to see some more detail regarding this. I would like to see several options. I'm having a hard time just saying, let's unbundle it and extend the ePoints, because we're not having shows. I agree we should extend the ePoints. Most airlines and other organizations are extending your membership without you having to renew it because you're not able to fly or something like that, so I understand extending the ePoints because there's not shows going on, but just to say we're going to unbundle it and we're not saying what we're charging for each portion of it, I have a hard time voting on this. So, I would like to see more detail and have several options for people to choose. Maybe people do want to continue getting Cat Talk and their ePoints, and I may not want that unbundled. I just think we need more clarification as to what the options are. I'm not against unbundling, but I don't think that should be the only option. I think that we need to have a breakdown as to what the charges are with each kind of situation, so people have a choice. **Tartaglia:** Kathy, I should have mentioned that these motions were to proceed with a plan, and my plan was that if the board was in favor of these ideas, that I would come back in August with a more fleshed-out plan; specifically, regarding Cat Talk and the Online Almanac, what we would include in Cat Talk, what would be the cost to subscribe and that sort of thing. So absolutely there need to be more details. Maybe the motion is stated incorrectly, but I will bring back more detail in August. **Anger:** I agree with Kathy and I want to take it a step further. My question was the other end of that motion. I support extending the online subscriptions through December 2020. The beginning of it I'm not sure on. I'm with Kathy, I want to see a little more detail, but what I would like to vote on is extending the Online Almanac subscriptions and ePoints. I don't know if we can separate that out because there is a motion on the floor. Perhaps if that fails, we can re-present it as two different pieces. **Hannon:** You understand, Rachel, that if you extend the Almanac to the end of December and don't unbundle it, you're also extending the magazine subscription to the end of December. **Anger:** Correct. I think what I just heard Allene say is that this is a proposal for her to get feedback on,

so it wouldn't be done today. Is that correct? **Hannon:** Yes, that would be correct. Could we have Rich withdraw the motion and then we discuss it in August at the board meeting with detail? Would that be a better approach, Rich? **Mastin:** Do you want me to withdraw it or table it? **Hannon:** I think you ought to withdraw it, because we don't know when she comes back with the detail, we may want a different motion. **Mastin:** OK, I'm willing to withdraw it. **Hannon:** Rachel, does that satisfy you? **Anger:** I am satisfied, thank you. **Hannon:** Kathy Black, does that satisfy you? **Black:** Yes, thank you. **Hannon:** OK, so we'll talk about that in August.

Action Item:

Motion to proceed with plans to:

1. *Stop producing the Yearbook after publication of the 2021 Yearbook.*

Hannon: Rachel, can you repeat the motion for us? **Anger:** I have written down that Kathy Black made the motion. Is that correct? **Black:** If I didn't, I will. **Anger:** I have no one written down as second, so I will second that motion, to stop producing the Yearbook after publication of the 2021 Yearbook. **Hannon:** All those in favor of ceasing production of the Yearbook after next January.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Morgan and Auth voting no.

2. *Unbundle Cat Talk and the Online Almanac, which currently include ePoints, and extend OLA subscriptions through December 2020.*

Hannon: Does somebody want to make the motion? **Mastin:** Rich will make the motion. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds.

Withdrawn.

3. *Transition to an expanded Cat Talk, phase out the Online Almanac and offer a separate subscription to ePoints.*

Hannon: Allene, you have one more? **Tartaglia:** That's it. #3 would fall into that same category as part of that detail. **Hannon:** So, you're through with the Central Office Report? **Tartaglia:** I am done, yes. **Hannon:** I see Mary's hand is waiving. **Auth:** I would like to make one comment, relative to the Yearbook. In the budget now, I think it's in the neighborhood of [amount omitted] that's attributed to Shelly's time. As the treasurer goes to formulate the budget for subsequent years or even – I guess for the Yearbook that's going to happen now – that that is going to possibly raise the expenses then of the Almanac – or Cat Talk, rather. So, not only we're going to lose money on – we reduce expenses on the Yearbook but we'll have to raise those expenses somewhere else, since Shelly is going to be maintained on staff. Just a point. **Hannon:** Mary, I think you mentioned a particular dollar figure. Can we scrub that from the minutes?

*Respectfully Submitted,
Allene Tartaglia*

(4) DATA PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

Committee Chair: Rich Mastin
List of Committee Members: Tim Schreck, James Simbro, Allene Tartaglia

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

GDPR audit was completed, and a review of the findings was discussed on April 16th between Tim Schreck, James Simbro, and Jeremy Diller of Scenario77 (Company who performed the audit).

Current Happenings of Committee:

Planning and moving forward with GDPR compliance recommendations.

Future Projections for Committee:

Implement policies and changes as a result of the GDPR audit. Continue to monitor International and Domestic data privacy laws, and notify the board of any changes to CFA's policies to remain in compliance with such laws.

Board Action Items:

N/A

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

GDPR progress

*Respectfully Submitted,
James Simbro, Data Protection Officer and Systems Administrator*

Hannon: Can we turn to someone else in the same room? James, do you want to talk about data protection? James, why can't we see your face? **Tartaglia:** Why don't you come sit here? You can just sit here. We'll just swap seats. **Simbro:** The problem is, we have feedback issues. **Hannon:** Well, it's nice to see you, James. **Simbro:** Hello. I can't see myself so hopefully I look alright. I don't have anything to add to that report. If anyone has any questions, there's a lot of cross-over between it and GDPR as far as what we're going to be doing in the future, but if there's any questions. **Hannon:** Well, that was fast. Thank you James. **Simbro:** I will just say that we have not had anybody contact us, so we've not had anybody want to be removed or question our policies, so everything is good in that respect. **Hannon:** Thank you.

Anger: James, I wonder if, for the benefit of those participants who are not as familiar as we are with the whole GDPR [European General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679] and data protection thing, if you can give CliffsNotes, the GDPR for Dummies, so they know generally speaking what we're talking about. It's a little complicated. We Americans, we're just not very well educated about it – except, of course, this board because we have been hearing about it for a

couple of years. **Simbro:** Sure. As far as data protection, that has more to do with how CFA treats our data and controls it and secures it. That kind of does cross over into GDPR. GDPR is European rules about how we maintain our data, what we use our data for. It's very specific to Europe, but we are seeing more cross-over to various states with rules, such as California. It's just a matter of time before a lot of these GDPR privacy data rules roll over to the United States. It's kind of a separate thing right now, but we're seeing it be combined. Hopefully that explains it. **Anger:** And we're doing everything we can here to be prepared for that. **Simbro:** Correct. We had the audit, which identified some key things. Overall, we're doing things very well. The things that we have to address or fix are pretty minor. We're moving forward. **Black:** I think I'm going to hold my question. Since we moved the GDPR recommendation out of closed session into open session, I'll ask my question during that time. **Hannon:** We didn't do that. **Black:** Yeah, I thought we did. **Anger:** That motion failed. **Black:** Oh, that failed? I'll still ask it during the closed session.

(5) **IT COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: Tim Schreck
Liaison to Board: John Colilla
Committee Members: Steve Merritt, Dick Kallmeyer, Sheryl Zink and Seth Baugh

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Since the last report we have had 6 new tickets (programming corrections) with 4 still open.

Automated posting of ePoints/Scoreboard Project and CCW with Mobile friendly screens will be completed this month

Tier Champs setup completed by May 1st

Breed Council project has also been completed

Additional yearend changes added time to year end processing.

Changes to Entry Clerk program completed to simplify Breed/Division and color class changes from year to year

Current Happenings of Committee:

Genealogy/Color project is moving forward. Testing and reworking initial color questions to better aide users in color selection.

GDPR audit completed results to be discussed with Board.

Working with the Marketing department to provide contact data for marketing purposes while complying with GDPR.

Future Projections for Committee:

Progress of Genetics project and continuation of moving remaining applications from HP to the new system.

There really is light at the end of this tunnel.

Begin GDPR compliance changes to processes at Central Office.

Board Action Items:

None

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Progress of moving of all applications from HP to the new system. GDPR progress

*Respectfully Submitted,
Tim Schreck, Chair*

Hannon: James, I ask you not to go away, because the next session is IT. The board liaison for that is John Colilla. John, do you have anything you want to say about the IT on behalf of the Committee Chair Tim Schreck? **Colilla:** I really do not have anything, other than what's listed on that list. **Hannon:** Are there any action items? **Colilla:** He hasn't told me any action items or not, so basically what I have is what you guys are looking at. **Hannon:** It says none. Does anybody have any IT questions for either John or James? OK, moving on then. Thank you, James. You can go back to where you came from.

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

Treasurer Kathy Calhoun gave the following report:

Key Financial Indicators

Balance Sheet Previous Year Comparison as of April 30, 2020

As compared to prior year, the Wells Fargo investment account increased 3.0% while total cash assets decreased 6.6%.

Profit and Loss Analysis

Total registration, which includes litter registration and individual registration, delivered \$1,177,700.00 to the bottom line. This represents a 1.1% increase compared to the same period last year.

Category	May '19 - Apr 20	May '18 - Apr 19	\$ Change	% Change
Litter Registrations	\$391,300.00	\$389,094.50	\$2,205.50	0.57%
Individual Registrations	\$786,400.00	\$775,772.00	\$10,628.00	1.37%
Total Registrations	\$1,177,700.00	\$1,164,866.50	\$12,833.50	1.10%

Hannon: Next we have the Treasurer's Report, Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** Everyone has the Treasurer's Report. I'm going to hit upon a couple of highlights. Registration is pretty much flat to last year. A slight 1.1% increase, so considering the circumstances and the challenges, that's really good news.

Other key indicators:

Additional key performance indicators are captured in the following summary.

Category	May '19 - Apr 20	May '18 - Apr 19	\$ Change	% Change
HHP / CCW	\$4,968.00	\$7,163.00	(\$2,195.00)	-30.64%
Championship Confirmation	\$52,980.00	\$71,850.00	(\$18,870.00)	-26.26%
Judging School Income	\$3,250.00	\$10,680.00	(\$7,430.00)	-69.57%
Show License Fees	\$36,525.00	\$47,025.00	(\$10,500.00)	-22.33%
Show Entry Surcharge	\$62,553.38	\$81,612.25	(\$19,058.87)	-23.35%

Total Ordinary Income delivered \$ 2,275,705.61 to the bottom line compared to \$ 2,344,404.18 the prior year. This represents a 2.93% reduction in income.

Calhoun: I pointed out some of the other items where there's negative changes, so I won't read the report on that.

Publications

Almanac (Cat Talk, Newsletters, and the White Pages)

Income: Almanac income is 4.1% lower than year ago. The income reduction is largely driven by a \$3,430.66 reduction in Cat Talk subscriptions.

Expense: Almanac expense is 8.95% lower than year ago. This is largely due to how production expenses were posted.

Almanac	May '19 - Apr 20	May '18 - Apr 19	\$ Change
Income	\$62,743.56	\$65,452.27	(\$2,708.71)
Expense	\$61,368.76	\$67,403.41	(\$6,034.65)
Net Income	\$1,374.80	(\$1,951.14)	\$3,325.94

Yearbook

Income: Yearbook income YTD is down 10.13% compared to prior year. This is primarily driven by a reduction in 2019 Yearbook sales.

Expense: Yearbook expenses are 45.39% higher than prior year. This is primarily driven by a yearend write off inventory prior to 2016 and moving those costs from the balance sheet to the profit and loss statement.

Yearbook	May '19 - Apr 20	May '18 - Apr 19	\$ Change
Income	\$31,115.50	\$34,621.95	(\$3,506.45)
Expense	\$76,424.32	\$52,564.10	\$23,860.22
Net Income	(\$45,308.82)	(\$17,942.15)	(\$27,366.67)

Calhoun: We've kind of already talked a bit about Publications and the news there, so I think everybody is well informed on that.

Marketing

Income: YTD is down 73.55% compared to prior year.

Expense: YTD has increased 31.74% compared to prior year.

Black: I wanted to make a comment. Under the Marketing section, you had a note that year-to-date income was down 73%. I did some digging into why that's such a huge number and we had made the decision to move the DNA testing out of Marketing and under a different set of

income category, and so that was like \$15,000 or something. That's the reason why our income was down such a huge amount. So, I just wanted to make that comment because that looks really bad that we were down 73% and our expenses were up. **Calhoun:** I agree, Kathy. The expense of the DNA program was moved, as well. I would be the first one to echo that Marketing work and the expense behind Marketing benefits many categories. It benefits many categories from the income perspective. It's difficult to assign those percentages in different areas, but Marketing – again, I've stated this in prior reports and said that Marketing, although there is an expense associated with it, the benefit and the income side of it expands in many, many ways for CFA. **Black:** If I could just make a few more comments, please. So, going back to the DNA, just to give everybody kind of an update, we reached out to Roger [Brown, DVM] to try to figure out where we are in that process. I think the company that we're associated with is losing out, due to competition that's offering a broader panel for the same or less amount of money, and so I think that he is hopefully going to continue the talks with some different companies. I'm afraid that even the income that you're projecting on the budget, Kathy, is not going to come true because of the competition that's out there, so I think we need to look into different places like that. So, that's all I wanted to make a comment about, was why that percentage looked so huge and just kind of give some background to the numbers behind it. **Hannon:** OK, thank you.

Central Office

Total Central Office expense for this review period was \$1,266,429.45 which is a 3.71% reduction compared to the prior year.

Computer Expense

Total Computer expense for this review period was \$144,482.54 which is a 13.39% reduction compared to the prior year.

CFA Programs

Total CFA Program expense for this review period was \$401,018.92 which represents an 8.09% increase compared to the prior year.

Corporate Expense

Total Corporate expense is \$181,490.38 which represents a 7.90% increase in spending.

Legislative Expense came in \$4,230.99 lower than year ago.

Events

Annual - Syracuse

<i>Annual - Syracuse</i>	<i>May '19 - Apr 20</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>\$ Over Budget</i>
<i>Total Income</i>	\$83,599.80	\$68,949.00	\$14,650.80
<i>Total Expense</i>	\$139,306.89	\$180,585.00	(\$41,278.11)

<i>Net Income</i>	<i>(\$55,707.09)</i>	<i>(\$111,636.00)</i>	<i>\$55,928.91</i>
-------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

Calhoun: We've got some of the final numbers on some of the major events on the last page. The Syracuse annual cost us about \$56,000. Just keep in mind, for the board members and our audience, that the annual is a celebration of the year. Although you would just love for your income and expense to match, it does not. So, it was \$55,000 or \$56,000 and is never categorized as a loss. It's the cost of the event. Then

International Show – Cleveland

<i>International Show</i>	<i>May '19 - Apr 20</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>\$ Over Budget</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$238,913.13</i>	<i>\$214,860.00</i>	<i>\$24,053.13</i>
<i>Total Expense</i>	<i>\$223,168.86</i>	<i>\$227,315.00</i>	<i>(\$4,146.14)</i>
<i>Net Income</i>	<i>\$15,744.27</i>	<i>(\$12,455.00)</i>	<i>\$28,199.27</i>

Calhoun: Then, with the International Show in Cleveland, we had a profit of \$15,744.

The Bottom Line – May through April 2020 CFA realized a profit of \$37,196.52!

Calhoun: So, given the challenges of the year, we still came in on the profit side of \$37,196.52. In addition, the detailed reports have been uploaded to File Vista for board access. There is a file that is called Finance and that's where you will be able to find that report, if you would like to look into greater detail.

Calhoun: Are there any questions? **Hannon:** I just want to comment that the budget that we approved a year ago showed a significant loss. The fact that we actually came out with a surplus at the end of the year speaks well for us. Are you through with the Treasurer's Report then? **Calhoun:** I am, unless there's further questions. **Hannon:** I don't see any hands up, so we'll move on.

Respectfully Submitted
Kathy Calhoun, CFA Treasurer

(7) **FINANCE COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: *Rich Mastin*
List of Committee Members: *Kathy Calhoun and Teresa Sweeney*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Review monthly financial profit & loss statements and balance sheets to previous year's performance and budget.

Review and discuss contractual agreements as presented.

Work with Budget Committee on 2020-2021 Annual Budget.

Meeting with Whitaker & Myers (insurance company) team and Allene Tartaglia to review upcoming year's coverages, premiums and discuss options for possible needs and adjustments.

Separate confidential insurance report provided by Whitaker and Myers was submitted to Rachel Anger (CFA Secretary) and is available to the CFA Board of Directors, Executive Director and Legal Counsel.

Review of report and questions during the CFA Board meeting on June 18, 2020 are welcome.

Wells Fargo investment performance review by Joe Crispino (WF financial advisor) as of May 31, 2020

Current Balance: \$1,382,614.13

Year to Date Return: -1.55%

Average Return Since Inception: 4.79%

Current Portfolio Allocation: 35% Stocks / 65% Bonds

Summary:

Year to date, the Dow Jones index is currently down -10.78% after rebounding 25% from its low point of roughly -35% back in March. The most recent changes to the portfolio earlier in the year reduced the stock position adding more bonds/fixed income.

The mutual funds within the portfolio remain of the highest quality. As the markets continue to gain ground, so will the investments within the Cat Fanciers' account. The volatility that the mutual funds experience are part of the equation. From time to time there will be setbacks, however, the quality of the mutual funds and the diversification in the portfolio is what makes it possible to move forward to higher levels over time.

It is all about “time spent in the market” and not “timing of the market” that creates value. At this time, I would continue to recommend staying the course, if your investment objective has not changed. If this current mix is a comfortable one for the Association, then stay with it. But if you feel you want more growth then this would be a good time to convert a percentage of the bonds to stocks.

Coordinated opening of second Wells Fargo account for future long-term investments.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Accessible to: Central Office Executive Director, Director of Development, Treasurer (also Budget and Audit Committee Chair), Marketing Director & Chair, IT Director (also GDPR Officer), IT Committee Chair and Legal Counsel.

Review weekly bank account balances and bi-weekly payroll reports.

Finalize Whitaker & Myers insurance coverages and premiums for the upcoming year.

Reinvesting a maturing Huntington Bank CD fund with a total value \$456,486.46 as of June 5, 2020 into a new/second long-term Wells Fargo account set at a 50% Stocks and 50% Bonds blend.

Current long-term Wells Fargo account blend is set at 35% Stocks and 65% Bonds with a total of \$1,395,096.00 as of June 5, 2020.

The new/second long term Wells Fargo account will receive the Huntington CD value (\$456,486.46) plus \$143,500.00 from the Huntington Business Checking account for a combined total of \$600,000.

Current combined all account balances (including long term investments):

As of June 5, 2020, is \$2,609,712.51.

As of June 17, 2020, is \$2,640,478.11.

Current long-term investment balances as of June 5, 2020:

Huntington CD is \$456,486.46

Synchrony CD is \$329,523.95

Wells Fargo is \$1,395,096.00

Combined long-term investments is \$2,181,106.40

Wells Fargo report by Joe Crispino (Wells Fargo Investment Advisor):

Time Frame:

Projects, reviews, meetings, and accessibility is ongoing.

Finalize insurance coverage updates/changes and annual premiums by the end of June 2020.

New Bond and Stock investments should be completed by the end of June 2020.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Committee's progress and updates

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rich Mastin, Chair*

Hannon: We'll move on to Rich with the Finance Committee. **Mastin:** Yes, thank you. It's been a busy past few months with some of the different finances we've been working on. Currently, one of the new projects that we've been tasked with, and Kenny brought it to our attention last week when he asked us to look into our credit card fees, so we began that process, as well. I'm working directly with our contact at Huntington Bank on evaluating where we are currently and what our options are to reduce it. I don't have any action items. If anybody has any questions after I report June 17th's bank balances, feel free to give me your questions. As of June 17, our combined total bank balances are \$2,640,478.11. Rachel, were you able to get all that? **Hannon:** She is nodding yes. **Mastin:** OK good. Does anybody have any questions?

Currle: I will say something, but I can't get my hand up. **Hannon:** Alright Kenny, go ahead. **Currle:** This is a lot of work that Rich and his committee really puts in on this. I've been in CFA since '73 and we are in a strong financial position. One of the things that I know Rich and this group has done in the past few years is to diversify our portfolio. I'm very, very pleased, so I would just like to thank him on behalf of CFA. I'm sure everybody joins with me as far as work relative to these committee members. That's it. **Hannon:** Rich, do you have anything else? **Mastin:** Kenny, thank you for the kind words. I do not have anything else.

(8) **HISTORICAL DATA SCANNING.**

Project Manager: Karen Lawrence
Liaison to the Board: Rich Mastin

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Scanning of CFA's historical registration index card records is completed.

Current Happenings:

When we purchased the Kodak scanner for this project, it came with the reputation of being a workhorse. Two years into this project, I can attest to that fact. Well over 200,000 index cards have been run through that scanner since April 2018!

I'm delighted to report that this scanning project was completed in mid-March, ahead of schedule, and the files were turned over to CFA in mid-March. A copy remains with the CFA Foundation for historical research purposes.

During the early months of 2020, I concentrated on completing the scanning of the breeder cards, containing owner and registration data. A total of 91,530 breeder cards have been scanned. These cards are saved in files as per the alphabetical filing system used in the file cabinets, plus all files for each letter have been combined into a single file for that letter. Through scanning these cards, I've also discovered that CFA is a repository of death certificates, separation agreements, divorce decrees, and wills.

The final total of scanned items is:

***784 folders of individual cat registration cards** – each containing numerous files in 200-card increments. All are listed by color prefix number, breed, color, and sex. A sample of the directory folder listing 0100 (Persian) through 0941 (Cornish Rex) ...*

Contained within each of these folders are any microfiche files that we scanned, plus the series of files in 200 card increments depending upon how many cats of a particular color are registered. This is the numerical system used to store the cards in the file cabinets. Each of these PDF files are searchable in Adobe Acrobat. For example, copper-eyed white Persian males:

The individual card file, when viewed in a 2-up display in Adobe Acrobat, gives you the registration information from the front of the card and a listing of any winners ribbons and/or grand points from the back of the card. For example:

NEUTER		
16 Copper		Grand Points
nia Persuader	114-0900 V97	2-14-70 Chesapeake CC 20
Chat	103-0493 V95	4-25-70 CF Washington 24
Katherine Godfrey		11-7-70 Capital CF 4
TAM, Tammy Powstenko 13603 Kushner		1-23-71 Old Dominion 16
Silver Spring, Md. 20904		2-13-71 Chesapeake 6
		10-23-71 Virginia CF 14
		11-5-71 Capital CF 16 11-9-71

(b) No progeny cards, 0057-0058 series, totaling 3,926 cards

(c) Progeny cards, 0057-0058 series, totaling 2,200 cards

(d) Studbook (SB) and Foundation Record (FR) cards, totaling 28,315 cards

(e) Cattery name registration cards, 24 folders, totaling 1,280 cards

(f) Breeder cards, with owner and registration data, totaling 91,530 cards

Future Projections:

This project has ended.

Board Action Items:

None

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Not applicable.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Lawrence*

Hannon: The next order of business is you again, Rich. Historical Data Scanning.
Mastin: Karen is done with what we set out to do, with the exception of the foreign pedigrees. We talked about that back in February and I reviewed what our options are with Allene. It sounds as though our best option is going to be to purchase six fireproof cabinets – they’re not new. They’re used and refurbished – and maintain the documents onsite. Occasionally, we need access to them so offsite storage is not a reasonable option and the cost is not where we want to be, especially if we have to send staff offsite to access these. So, our recommendation is to keep them onsite and store them in these fire-safe cabinets. Anybody have any questions?
Eigenhauser: Isn’t there a large, walk-in fireproof safe in the Museum? **Mastin:** There is a large, walk-in fireproof safe in the Museum that is currently being used for a display.
Eigenhauser: Is there any way we could sublet it from them and just put it there? **Mastin:** If the board chooses to go in that direction, I would be happy to ask Karen and Don [Williams].
Hannon: What we did several years ago was, we gave up space at the top of the stairs there in exchange for our ability to hold board meetings in the Museum. We no longer hold board

meetings in the Museum. We've been holding them in Cleveland, so perhaps we could trade the room at the top of the stairs that used to be ours for the safe. So, I'll come back to the board. If the board prefers that we use the Museum space and relocate the existing cabinets into the safe, I'm happy to go back to Karen and ask, or we can purchase the fireproof cabinets. **Hannon:** At this point we have not purchased those cabinets? Allene? **Tartaglia:** No, we have not. **Hannon:** OK, thank you. So, does somebody want to make a motion? **Eigenhauser:** Sure. I move that we approach the Museum about using the fireproof safe to store the pedigrees. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Hannon:** Just for clarification for people that are listening in, when we refer to Karen, we're talking about Karen Lawrence. Rich's next report also deals with another Karen.

Krzanowski: I would be interested to know what the cost of those fireproof cabinets actually is. It might be a better approach to just get the cabinets. **Hannon:** Allene, do you want to tell us what the cost was? **Tartaglia:** Yes. They are \$675 each. They are used. They normally retail for about \$1,400. These are just not file cabinets, they're heavy duty fireproof.

Krzanowski: That doesn't seem like an exorbitant expense. My concern is that currently the fireproof safe that we're talking about in the Foundation is a large, walk-in vault. Currently it is used for a display in the Museum and is a space that we [the Foundation] would like to take advantage of. The problem with the room at the top of the stairs, that room is inaccessible to anyone with disabilities. There's no elevator that goes up to that level. If anything would be placed upstairs [inaudible unidentified speaker]. If someone is speaking, I wasn't finished.

Hannon: Allene, do you think that those cabinets would fit in the walk-in safe? We wouldn't need it, right? **Tartaglia:** I think the file cabinets – there's some feedback from somewhere. I'm not sure where that's coming from. **Anger:** It's coming from the people who aren't muted, so we're getting some reverb. **Hannon:** If we use the walk-in safe that's on the first floor of the Museum, we would not need the file cabinets. We could use the existing file cabinets. My question is, would they fit in that space? **Tartaglia:** Yes, they should fit. **Hannon:** OK.

Tartaglia: One of the concerns is that we would have more foot traffic from the office in and out of the Museum. If the Museum isn't open, it requires having a key to open it up – not that that's a big concern, but that is something we'll have to deal with. **Black:** I was going to make some of the same comments that Carol made. If we're going to put things upstairs, that could be problematic because, like she said, there's no elevator to that level. I just also wanted to really say thank you to Karen Lawrence. This project has been two years with hundreds of thousands of records, and we appreciate all the work she did on that. I think using the space, I don't know what that looks like. I think that should be more Allene and the Historical Committee to make that decision, whether or not they think that safe would be suitable. I just don't know if that's something the board needs to decide for them or not. **Tartaglia:** One more comment about the safe is, we will have to then start closing the door and we will probably have to modify it a bit to avoid anybody being locked in by mistake. Right now the door stands open all the time, which is not something we would want to do if we remove what's in there now and we put in cabinets.

Eigenhauser: I just want to point out that there really is no such thing as fireproof, it's fire resistant. Just like there's not bulletproof, there's ballistic resistant. It's always shades of gray. With so many wildfires out here in California, I can tell you that some of these fireproof storage boxes of various kinds they market are fire rated for one hour, two hours, three hours, because after a certain period of time, if the fire continues to burn around it, it may not burn through the safe but it will cook the contents and reduce them to ashes. So, that big built-in safe is necessarily going to be more secure than any small safe roll-up file cabinet is going to be.

Mastin: As a landlord and a tenant on many different aspects of my own business and with CFA, my recommendation is not to use the Foundation's safe for liability reasons. Allene brought up a good point. We would have to send staff down through the Museum to obtain access to those documents. Anything could happen from that point, once that individual is in the Museum. They could knock something over, they could accidentally put something in their pocket. There becomes liability and I don't know that we want to expose CFA or the Foundation or staff for that risk. So, I much prefer having the access directly within CFA's space, not within somebody else's space. Now, at some point in time, should the Foundation fall directly under CFA, I may think differently but at this point in time they are two separate entities with a lease agreement. I would caution everybody that we probably should not go in that direction.

Anger: I have two things. Can you tell me again how much these used safes are each? **Tartaglia:** \$675 each. **Anger:** And how many are required? **Tartaglia:** Four-drawer file cabinets, we would get six. Because he has six available, we would purchase all six. Most of them would be used for the pedigrees, and then we would put some other records such as financial records that we need to maintain, original incorporation papers and items like that in the other one or two safes. **Anger:** So, we are talking \$4,050 for the safes. Is that right? **Tartaglia:** Yes. **Anger:** I'm watching the scroll of the report because I wanted to capture when this pedigree information was from. These are records that have not already been scanned in. They are the pedigrees, is that correct? **Tartaglia:** Yes, that's correct. Pedigrees that have been used for registrations from many years ago. **Anger:** Many years ago, OK. So, our investment is a little over \$4,000 for pedigrees that I just am curious what the value is going to be. From "many years ago," is this like the 70's before we had any sort of electronic presence? **Tartaglia:** Yes, that's correct. **Anger:** I would like to know from our constituents if that has a value to them of at least \$4,050. I acknowledge that I know it does to some people, but again, how many? Then there is going to be the continued storage of it that will cost us something. **Hannon:** Rachel, we've already heard though that there is an issue with staff having to access those files, which tells me that we currently still use them. **Anger:** From the 70's, OK. **Hannon:** I don't know how back they actually have to use them, but whatever they have stored in the basement currently, Allene is telling us staff has to go down there and access those records on a regular basis. **Tartaglia:** That is correct. Just to clarify, we started going electronic probably around 2012-2013, so some of them are rather recent pedigrees, but they go back many years, as well. So, we do access them on a fairly regular basis. **Anger:** So, if there is a need and the recommendation is that this \$4,050 expenditure is well founded, then I can support that. **B. Moser:** I think maybe the safes that they want to buy is probably the right way to go. If Karen has a display there in the Museum and that's part of the display and there's no other place for it other than going up the stairs, I agree that this shouldn't go up the stairs. It should be accessible to everybody, so my vote would be to buy the safes. **Black:** I was just going to make a comment. I registered a cat that was from another association not that long back and I had to do it by pedigree, so these pedigrees could be more recent than the 70's. So, I just wanted to clarify that. **Morgan:** Speaking to the pedigrees themselves and back to my legacy comments, CFA is all about registrations, and registrations are all about pedigrees. I would hope that our constituents would support anything that is more than reasonable that we would have to do to preserve our history and our legacy in those pedigrees. In terms of a liability issue, etc., I would support giving Central Office access to them and not combining them and putting them into the Museum.

Newkirk: I've got a couple of questions here. Are these files uploaded in the cloud somewhere? **Tartaglia:** No. **Newkirk:** Does CFA have a drop box account? **Tartaglia:** Yes, we do have a drop box account. It's the scanning of the pedigrees which is problematic. It's extremely time consuming, but yes, we do have a drop box account. **Newkirk:** OK, can you tell me how many bytes – if all these files were uploaded into – these have already been scanned, is that correct? **Tartaglia:** Some of them have been, not many. **Hannon:** That's why we're going to this expense, is because we have not scanned them and Karen has told us it would take years and she is just not interested in spending years scanning these things. **Mastin:** I can speak on this if you call on me. **Hannon:** After Darrell is finished, you're the next one. Darrell, are you finished? **Newkirk:** Yes, I'm done. **Hannon:** Rich? **Mastin:** Allene indicated some of these have been scanned. Karen did scan a batch of them. She determined it would take her 11-13 years to scan these if she works on them X number of hours per month. The problem is how they are all stapled and being able to pull the staples apart without damaging the documents and then putting them back together. The documents are probably important because of the business CFA does, so I recommend, since scanning could be a very expensive option and a delicate option, I recommend that we invest – and I want to clarify the cost that's being invested on these fireproof cabinets. It's my understanding we are only going to use four of these fireproof cabinets at \$675 each, which comes out to about \$2,700. The other two cabinets for \$1,350 will be used for other CFA important documents, so when we're looking at this expense, this is one of the least expensive options for us to protect these from some sort of fire, keeping in mind we have a brick and granite building. I understand everything can burn or anything can burn to some extent. The chances of it happening are slim. We do have a sprinkler system where they are currently kept. The important thing is, we don't want to lose these documents in the condition they are in unless we can scan them. If scanning is not an option, we should proceed with protecting these every day they are at risk. **Auth:** My comment is, I'm dumbfounded that we haven't had any kind of secure storage of important CFA documents before now. Originally, when I came on the board, it was either suggested that we have some sort of storage or permanent location for our records because that's what we are – we are a registering body and we better have some sort of security for that. So, what I'm hearing is that we do not have any kind of secure place for other important legal documents within the building? **Hannon:** Allene, do you have an answer? **Tartaglia:** Well yes. The documents are stored in their safe. They are not in a hermetically sealed room or they're not in a fireproof room or anything like that. That's certainly nothing new. It was the same way in New Jersey – any office we have been in. I think they're in a really good spot now, but fire could be an issue. **Hannon:** They're in the basement, right? **Tartaglia:** Yeah, they're in the basement. **Hannon:** So, flooding could be an issue, too. **Tartaglia:** That's right. Flooding could be an issue, so the file cabinets that we are proposed we get – the fireproofed – we would raise them, they would be fireproof, they would be flood proof, and I think that even if in the future we should decide to expend the money to scan the pedigrees, they still need to be kept safe in the meantime. We're just trying to safeguard the pedigrees that we have, along with other documents that are important. **Newkirk:** We're beating a dead horse here. We all agree that those documents need to be protected, so the option is, put them in the safe or buy these filing cabinets. Rich has made a good point of why we need to buy them. I don't think it's that much of an expenditure to buy these, so let's all get on board, let's buy these cabinets and let's move on to the next agenda item.

Hannon: Rich, did you make the motion we're discussing? **Mastin:** No. **Eigenhauser:** I'll withdraw the motion. **Hannon:** So we need somebody to make a motion to buy the cabinets.

Curle: I make the motion. **Hannon:** Kenny made the motion. Who wants to second it?
Newkirk: I'll second it. **Hannon:** Having beaten this dead horse, I'm not going to ask for more discussion. All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Hannon: Are we through with that committee, Rich? **Mastin:** We are.

(9) **AMBASSADOR PROGRAM.**

Committee Chair: Karen Lane
Liaison to Board: Rich Mastin
List of Committee Members: Joel Chaney, Jim Flanik and Marianne Toth

Current Happenings of Committee:

Pet Me Signs:

Teresa Keiger has finished creative design and ready to go to print to be laminated.

Needs to be part of CFA's inventory for use by the A-Cats, and other CFA sponsored events like Pet Fairs and the International Show.

Calendars for 2021:

Requesting CFA Central Office send out notice to all Clubs hosting shows between November 1, 2020 and January 31, 2021 on how many calendars they would like for their show in order to obtain an estimated preliminary total count needed.

Proof should be available to the Board for review prior to the upcoming June 18, 2020 board meeting

Colorful World of Pedigreed Cats Coloring Book:

Will have a final edit and be submitted before October 1st.

A Kitty for Me Activity Book:

Has been temporarily halted until a date in the near future.

Annual Budget:

Submitted to CFA Treasurer for review and approval.

Future Projections for Committee:

Completion of all current happenings.

Time Frame:

All projects to be completed in the 2020-2021 season.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Committees progress and updates

*Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Lane, Chair*

Hannon: Are we ready for the Ambassador Cat Program? I believe that's you, Rich.
Mastin: Yes. Does anybody have any questions? **Hannon:** With the understanding we're talking about a different Karen. **Mastin:** Yes, we're talking about Karen Lane. This is Karen Lane's committee. **Hannon:** Thank you. No questions, so we're through with you then, Rich? **Mastin:** Yes.

(10) **MARKETING.**

Committee Chair: *Desiree Bobby*
Liaison to Board: *Kathy Black*
List of Committee Members: *Mike Altschul, Wendy Carson, Jennie Batten, Alene Shafnisky, Nicole Turk, Ariel Bartelmes*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

SOCIAL MEDIA

Facebook following: 61k

Instagram following: Hit 10K goal. Having 10K followers opens up new features for promotions. We also changed strategy for growth and following/follower ratio.

Hannon: Next is Marketing, Kathy Black. **Black:** OK, we have been very busy in the Marketing Department, even though there haven't been shows going on. I just wanted to highlight a couple of things that are in the report. **Anger:** Kathy, pardon me for interrupting, but before you give your presentation, so that we can all hear you, can everybody mute? Thank you. **Black:** OK, thank you. We've been very active on social media. Desiree is very excited that we've reached 10,000 followers on Instagram. Once you hit 10,000 you kind of go into the next level, so she's very excited about that.

CCW

Sonit have reported all errors are now fixed. We expect to start promoting again heavy in July.

Cards for past HHP members will be able to be ordering by July 1, 2020 via the CFA website. We will be sending an email out to all HHPs so they can order them.

Communication and partnership plan with CCW regional rescue partners underway. All but one regional identified the rescue of choice to obtain our annual donations.

Regional Winners cats to be added to the CCW website. Jenny Wickle is still trying to get photos of all from 2017 to present. You may see emails from her about this and it will be helpful if you can provide her with a resource to get her all the RW HHP photos from 2017-present.

PARTNERSHIP

Partnered with The Community Cats Podcast to sponsor their episodes and The 2020 Kitten Conference. They are a great group up people who focus on the welfare of all cats and are very welcoming to have us along with them. We are in discussions about what we can do in the future to support more of their efforts.

Current Happenings of Committee:

BRAND GUIDE

Refining refresh of vision, mission and logos. Working closely with Allene to get everything reviewed and edited prior to presenting to board for approval of draft version

BREEDER LISTING WEB SITE

Marketing designed the new site for this. We have given it to Kathy Durdick to install on the CFA web server. She is currently working on that and once it is live there, we will send link to board members to review before going live.

BLOG

Cats 101 Brand/Style is being developed and this will be the name of our informational articles/blog. The technology behind this is up and running now thanks to Kathy Durdick and we are working on developing SEO strategy, content calendar and agreement with authors.

Black: Mike Altschul is still posting his quarantine in place cat comics. It's about 14 different FaceBook pages that have been very popular. A lot of people share those and he gets a lot of comments on that. We've got the Cats 101. We're going to be using that as a teaching tool on the CFA website. Mary Tan is going to be writing articles for that. She is with the Cat Writers' Association. She is a public strategist and she is going to be doing those Cat 101 articles that we're going to be posting on the CFA website.

PHOTO CONTESTS

Partnered with Evanger's to provide great prizes from both of their brands.

Engagement is increasing with each contest.

MEOWY HOUR

Putting plans in place for a weekly FB Webinar/Live Event to begin July 1st. Arden Moore will be hosting. Meowy Hour will feature guests, paid sponsors, trivia and topics of interest.

Black: We're going to be hosting something called Meowy Hour that's going to be every Wednesday night at 6:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time. It's a FaceBook live with Arden Moore. If you guys are not familiar with Arden, she is recommended by Oprah. She has written numerous books – like 26 books on cats and dogs. She has one called a *Kids' Guide to Cats* which is really cute. She is a behavior coach, a professional speaker and she does a radio podcast that has a lot of followers and is very popular. So, Arden is going to be doing the Meowy Hour on the CFA FaceBook page, 6:00 every Wednesday night live and she's going to be interviewing different people. She is planning on interviewing whoever wins the presidential election.

Future Projections for Committee:

Go live with

Breeder Listings

Blog

Meowy Hours

Brand Guide draft review

Board Action Items:

None at this time.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Status on all above and review of new marketing initiatives.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Desiree Bobby, Chair*

Black: Those are just a couple things. We may have some use for the breed poster. I kind of inherited the breed poster four years ago, never have really got that kicked off the ground anywhere but we may have a possible use for that. So, we're investigating that currently. With that, I'll open it up for questions if anybody has any questions. **Auth:** Kathy, I'm going to reference back to the strategic planning sessions that we had. One of the questions that we addressed during that process is, who is our audience? George, if I recall, thought our biggest audience were breeders, and then we also talked about exhibitors and owners, and so the CCW takes care of the Household Pet thing. How are you addressing some of those other audiences like the breeders and like the rank and file audience; and then, I see an awful lot of social media. What other media are you engaging with to reach beyond those people that are over 50 that aren't on social media? **Black:** I'll address first addressing the breeders. I really kind of latched onto a presentation I saw. It was for the AKC and they were calling their pedigreed dogs "purposefully bred," and I really thought that that really struck home as to what we should be calling ourselves to kind of fight against the "adopt don't shop." So, I had Teresa create some advertisements using all the different breeds. She is working her way through those. It says, "I'm purposefully bred" and it talks about the uniqueness of the breeds, and also calling our breeders "preservation breeders." We are preserving these breeds that, under any regular description, could be labeled as on the extinction list. So, we're working that way. We're also coming up with some Café Press items that have mugs and t-shirts and things like that featuring our pedigreed breeds. We kind of kicked around the idea of making like a baseball card or something like that that people can hand out. We kind of tabled that for now, but we're trying to address the pedigreed part of our audience. As for people over 50, most of those are on FaceBook. We are very active on our CFA FaceBook page. You would have to ask Desiree how she may be targeting outside of that social media. I can't really answer that. I'll have to talk to her about that. She says she's available if I want to get her on the call. What was the third part of your question? I'm

sorry, I forget. **Auth:** Addressing the breeders. Oh, you did that, never mind. **Black:** Yes, OK.

Auth: I would just like to make one more comment while I'm here. Kathy, I think you have done a fabulous job. I applaud you for how much time you've had to put into it and all the thought that has gone into it. As a marketing professional myself, I'm pretty impressed. **Black:** Thank you. I appreciate that. **Hannon:** Is that the end of your report, Kathy? **Black:** It is unless there's more questions. I see a few more hands.

Anger: I agree with Mary, Kathy. You and Dez have done a great job. My question is, is there currently an international marketing initiative, or is that something that you're looking to do in the future? Not that this isn't big enough, but I want to increase your workload as much as I can by suggesting we have a larger international marketing initiative. **Black:** I do agree that that is a huge area to expand to, both with CCW and with the pedigreed cats. I spoke to some of the international representatives at the Annual last year. They were very much asking for us to help them. It's just a whole different ballgame, especially in China because of the way they market themselves and their clubs. I can honestly say nothing has been done to help them, mostly because of our show situation that's going on over there, but I also think that we are missing a huge opportunity with Europe and even in Japan. So, that would be a whole 'nother aspect that Marketing could reach out to, but we really have not gone there at this time. When we created CCW and it took a year to get that baby born, I always said I felt like I was carrying around a baby elephant and it took a year to birth that thing. But, I really envision CCW expanding into like Brazil, India where they have mostly non-pedigreed cats at their shows. Also with China, with the huge pet market that they have there. I really wanted to really expand on that and due to all of the problems that we've been having with the CCW program, those initiatives have not been followed up with, but hopefully they are on the agenda and they will be done in the future. **Anger:** I would like to see Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand – all these areas, in your spare time, right? **Black:** Exactly. **Anger:** When you have that next baby.

Morgan: First, I want to echo, thank you Kathy for all the work. I know that Marketing is unusually important to our success and our growth moving forward. Rachel, you touched a little bit on one of the things I wanted to talk about, which is our Marketing endeavors in other areas of the world. We are a global organization. Something that I think that we should certainly look into is capitalizing on the expertise we have in those other areas, and perhaps name people to the committee that would be in charge of endeavors in those areas. So, that was one of the three things I wanted to talk about. The other question I had Kathy was, in the past certainly we had agreements where we were licensing products. I think that's a huge opportunity to get our name out there. Do we have any plans in the works? Are there any options out there for getting CFA's name on products and licensing? My last thing is, as we are increasing our FaceBook presence, does that give us any leverage, using product reviews, etc., so that we can again become that "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" type of situation? That's all. **Black:** Yes, I agree. I would love to see more product advancement. I don't think that's something we have been working on currently. I could ask Desiree. She has always got at least 30 different balls in the air she is juggling, so I could ask her what she's doing with that. She has really been working hard to find sponsors for the events that we are hosting. We have Neon Litter, we have several others that are actually giving money and prizes to the different virtual cat shows and things like that that are going on. Some of the contacts that she has made with Arden and with some of the other people, I think that Allene can maybe discuss this. I don't know if she was going to bring it up today or not, but they are talking about taking our whole approach to promote ourselves. Kind

of what Jo Ann put together when she was doing her work, to come up with a brochure that talks about all our different programs. We've got someone working to take that a whole 'nother step further, truly be a PR piece that we can use to go to people, and then get our name on products and get our name with either organization, so that's definitely in the works. So, Allene may want to address that a little bit further. I don't know if she wants to do that at this time or not, but we are definitely working on those kinds of steps to be able to promote ourselves as an organization that truly is worldwide and can bring a lot of different people to the table for these companies to want to partner with us.

Hannon: Anything else for Kathy before we move on to the next item? **Black:** Thank you for your questions. I appreciate them.

(11) **REGIONAL INCORPORATION/CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: *Mary Auth*
List of Committee Members: *George Eigenhauser, Pam Moser, Kathy Calhoun, John Randolph, Barbara Schreck, Rachel Anger, Mark Hannon, Rich Mastin*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

1. *Abbreviated committee has reviewed Regional Affiliation Agreement. Regional Directors were asked for their opinion. Entire committee needs to be meet and provide recommendations moving forward to final document.*
2. *Constitution moved to the back burner until we are further along on incorporation and because the annual meeting was cancelled. The latest version of changes was received with Anita comments.*

Current Happenings of Committee:

Mary is preparing a clean document for the committee to review.

Future Projections for Committee:

Membership needs to approve updated Articles of Incorporation

Board Action Items:

None at this time

Time Frame:

Ongoing with no particular deadline at this time.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Final incorporation of regions documents.

More refined constitution/bylaws for discussion by entire board.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Auth, Chair*

Hannon: Next we have Incorporation and the Constitution, Mary Auth. **Auth:** Alright. The full committee met on Monday night. I had hoped to post a finalized part to it, but that didn't happen so we still have some more work to do on the incorporation of the regions. We did at least decide that Ohio would be the state we would probably incorporate in. John Randolph is preparing a more simpler agreement that might be more palatable to the Regional Directors. We had a fair amount of discussion on the agreement itself and whether it should be renewed every

time there's a new regional director or every time that there's a regional director election. So, that's being worked out in the simplified document. So, that will come back at some point in the future. Then, the constitution effort is back with the Michigan [sic, New York] attorney right now to incorporate the last changes that the committee had give her a couple weeks ago, so it's still pending. **Hannon:** Mary, you said "Michigan attorney." Did you mean New York? **Auth:** I'm sorry, I did mean New York attorney, yes. Any questions? **Hannon:** I don't see any hands u. Is that the end of that report then, Mary? **Auth:** Yes, it is.

(12) **SHOW CANCELLATION ISSUE.**

Auth moves to rescind the motion of May 20 (see below)

Hannon: *I don't see any other hands, so let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor of the motion, "That CFA cancel all in-person cat shows through the end of October 2020. This motion may be revisited, extended, or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions as the Board may determine appropriate."*

Hannon called the motion. Following a tie-breaker vote by **President Hannon**, **Motion Carried.** Currie, Auth, Webster, Black, B. Moser, P. Moser, Newkirk and Schleissner voting no.

Hannon: The next item is also you, Show Cancellation Issue. **Auth:** Yes. I need to get a copy of that in front of me. Oh, there it goes. OK, so, considering the amount of states that are opening up at a fairly regular speed, and because we are an international organization where we're contemplating shows in China – because there are shows in China that are going on – there are shows in Russia that are starting to be held, and so I would like to revisit or make the motion to rescind the motion of May 20th where we chose to, *CFA cancel all in-person cat shows through the end of October 2020.* **Anger:** Rachel seconds.

Hannon: Discussion? I need to see some hands. **Morgan:** I can support this. I feel that whether or not the clubs have shows should be a decision made by each individual club. I fully suspect that even if we lift that moratorium on producing shows that many of the clubs will opt to not put on shows in the near future, but that should be their choice. I believe that the role of CFA is to provide resources and support to our clubs in the form of options for formats, contract review, advice etc. Certainly, I understand that the health and wellbeing of our exhibitors should be a priority, but we need to stay relevant globally. Cat shows in varying formats are starting up around the world. We should stand ready and willing to help our clubs and our exhibitors should they choose to participate. They should have that option. **Webster:** I agree with Melanie and with Mary. There are many places that could open up and do it safely and use the parameters set by the local authorities; but, then again, China may open up, Korea has already had a show in TICA. We should not blanket everybody. What it's doing is forcing people who do want to show or need to show kittens and stuff to move to organizations that already are opening up. So, I am in favor of this motion to rescind. **Black:** I just want to echo, I agree also. When we took the vote, most of the Regional Directors voted against stopping the shows. I think it's because we kind of have maybe our ear to the ground more of what our constituents are telling us. I think that the clubs, if they feel that they can do it safely and they can meet all the guidelines of their area, I think they should be able to hold a show. I think that should be their decision and not our decision to force them into not having a show. So, I would be in favor of rescinding the motion. **B. Moser:** I think we should give the power back to the clubs to make their own decision about having the shows or not. They do their homework to see what kind of entries they may get. They [inaudible] state and county regulations. Most of these people have put on a lot of shows for a number of years, and I sort of trust them to do it right and do it safely. So, that's what I say. **Schleissner:** I just want to say, we are a global working organization and we're having clubs in different corners of the world. My main focus is on Europe. You know there is many different countries, many different regulations, but inside the countries there is also different regulations.

For example, in Germany you've got 16 states and they all act different. So, I think I have to support Mary for 100% to open up. That's all.

Currle: I too support this motion. Rachel, correct me; didn't we also put a moratorium on show licensing that needs to be addressed? **Anger:** [affirms] **Currle:** If this motion passes, would not we also have to address the show licensing issue? We did put a moratorium on that. **Hannon:** If this passes, we would have to have a follow-up motion to allow licensing. **Auth:** Kenny, that's my plan. **Currle:** OK. **Anger:** We also have the Best Practices that were brought up at a recent teleconference. If we adopt this and then Mary's second motion, I would also like to move that we approve those, if that's appropriate at this time. **Auth:** Mine is just to make sure that I'm able to make the second motion, to start opening up licensing. **Hannon:** OK. Seeing no more discussion, I'll call for the vote. All those in favor of the motion to rescind the cancellation issue.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser voting no.

Hannon: Mary, you have a follow-up? **Anger:** Can I interrupt? We have rescinded that motion, so do we need a new motion to go forward with shows? **Hannon:** I don't think so. If we have no prohibition on licensing shows, I don't see why we would need to have a motion to say that shows can go on. We just need to license them. **Currle:** We're back in business. **Anger:** OK, just so we're all clear on that issue. **P. Moser:** I just want an explanation. I may be wrong here, but I thought what Rachel was trying to say is, if we rescinded the motion, that was just to rescind it. Then, don't we have to vote again to have it? Or not? Am I wrong? I'm just trying to get some clarification. **Newkirk:** No further motion is needed. **Hannon:** I agree. I don't think there is a motion needed. We no longer have a cancellation, which means without that cancellation anybody can hold a show. They can't license it yet, but Mary is taking care of that. **P. Moser:** OK.

Hannon: They can hold shows but at this point they can't license them. So Mary, I assume you're making a motion to allow licensing? **Auth:** Yes. I move that we allow Central Office to begin licensing shows immediately. **Newkirk:** Second. **Black:** I was just going to say, the previous motion before that one was that we were going to stop all the shows from March through May, so if we rescind the one like we just did, then that means that we don't have to have a new motion. Shows can start – we're obviously in June now, but that goes back in my mind to the previous motion, which was ending shows through May. I'm very much in favor of Central Office starting to license shows and that we would remove any fees if someone is able to get a show within 30 days, that we would forego the penalty for having a quick turn-around on the license. **Hannon:** Mary, would you amend your motion to say, no penalties? **Auth:** Yes, I would amend the motion to include what Kathy Black just said. **Newkirk:** Kathy's comment about our prior motion was that the expiration date was in May. That has expired, so that's why there is no need to make a motion to start doing shows. Mary's motion is correct. We need to direct Central Office to start licensing shows. **Hannon:** Thank you, Darrell. **Mastin:** If Mary adds to her motion about no penalties for licensing a show with less than 30 days, do you want to put a date on licensing shows with less than 30 days, so this doesn't go on all year? **Auth:** Yes. I will amend the motion again so that the 30 day penalty is not included past November 1st.

Tartaglia: The shows that we cancelled, are we going back and re-instating those shows as of July 1st, or what are we doing with all those shows we already have on the schedule?

Hannon: You mean already licensed? **Tartaglia:** Yes. **Hannon:** I assume they can hold their shows. Mary, would you agree? **Auth:** I would agree, and I say that specifically because I asked a club in my region if they had yet cancelled their venue and they had not, and so I asked them would they be open to holding their show. Their answer was, they would take it back to the membership and ask if they could accept a decrease that may come with holding their show relative to limitations on spectators, in particular. So, I would say yes, unless you've got a specific email from someone saying the show is cancelled, that all licensed shows scheduled be reinstated. **Tartaglia:** Effective immediately, so shows that were – OK. Alright, we haven't sent show supplies, so we will have to take a look at that. I would ask that if a club wants to continue with a show, that they contact us just to be sure. **Hannon:** Why don't you take the initiative, Allene, and have the Central Office contact those clubs that are currently licensed? **Tartaglia:** We'll contact all those clubs and see if they plan on continuing. **Hannon:** And then if they do, then you can discuss with them supplies. **Tartaglia:** OK, that works.

Black: That's what I was going to say. I don't think we should automatically reinstate all the licensed shows, because many of those clubs have already cancelled venues and they may not be able to find another venue again. I would rather you reach out to each of the ones that were licensed and let them know of the board's decision in case they are not following this meeting, and then ask them. I wouldn't just automatically, because I know in my region several have cancelled their venues, and they may or may not be able to get it back at this point in time. So, instead of going through the process of making them all live again and then finding out no, they're not happening, I think it would be better to reach out to them and ask them first.

Hannon: Allene has said she will do that. **Black:** Yeah, but that's not what Mary's motion was. Mary's motion was for all of them to be reinstated immediately. **Auth:** No, my motion was that we allow licensing immediately, not that they necessarily be reinstated. I think that was part of the discussion. **Hannon:** If there's a club that wants to hold a show and it has not been licensed, Central Office is authorized to license it. It doesn't impact those that were already licensed. She will, as you suggested, have Central Office reach out to clubs that are licensed to ascertain their interest in whether or not they are planning to hold a show. **Morgan:** Kathy covered most of it. I just want to confirm that, for those shows that were licensed, we're going to give the clubs a choice of whether or not they want to – **Hannon:** Yeah, we're going to reach out to them. We're not going to assume that they're putting on a show. We're going to reach out and find out what their preference is. **Morgan:** If they do not, then we're still going to give them the option that we did before, which is rolling over their license fees, etc. Is that correct? **Hannon:** Right, right.

Newkirk: What about show sponsorships? Will those be reinstated, Rich? **Mastin:** Yes. That was going to be my next motion. **Newkirk:** OK, alright. **Roy:** I think if we're going to reopen them, we need to tell our constituents how we're going to score the season – if it's just going to be regular scoring or no scoring or what it is, because that may make a difference to clubs, whether they think their show will be successful. **Hannon:** Alright, so we can make a motion on that if this passes.

Black: I was just going to make an additional comment. As for traditional show dates, some of these clubs may or may not be able to get their traditional date, so I think that if you want me to make a motion regarding that, we can if this passes. I just wanted to bring that up. To

Sharon's point, we made a ruling that all the points for this season would only be regional, not national, so I think that would still hold. If we wanted to readdress that we can, but I think for now that's what we're basing our show season on. **Anger:** I have a couple of motions that I have here to make, and scoring will be one of them. So, can we get back to voting on the license issue? **Hannon:** Yep. **B. Moser:** The other thing we did with the clubs, we had their show license to the next year. So, the clubs that cancelled their shows because we cancelled their season, basically, for that show season, that show part – are we going to just let them go ahead and roll it anyway, if they decide not to have the show? **Hannon:** Yes. **B. Moser:** That's good. **Hannon:** I see no more questions. I'm going to call for the vote on Mary's motion, which was to allow licensing of shows.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Hannon: Mary, do you have another motion? **Auth:** I think perhaps maybe Rachel will cover the ones – I hadn't thought about this snowballing into something more, so Rachel, would your motions cover some of the ancillary discussion? **Hannon:** She is nodding yes. **Auth:** Alright, I defer to Rachel. **Anger:** OK. Let's start with the easy one. I move that we adopt the Best Practices document that was presented at the May 19th teleconference. **Newkirk:** I'll second that.

CFA'S SUGGESTED BEST PRACTICES FOR THE WELL-BEING OF CLUBS AND PARTICIPANTS AT CFA EVENTS

This document reflects the fact that different regions, states and countries have had widely disparate responses to the pandemic, from complete lockdown to business as usual. As a result, the document does not mandate any specific containment methods, such as mask wearing, and stresses that clubs follow "state, local and facility guidelines."

CFA supports each club's informed decision to reschedule, postpone or cancel their respective events, as well as supporting clubs ready to hold events in locations that are open and permit gatherings. As events resume across the country, people need to feel safe while enjoying their cat fancy activities. CFA urges clubs to take appropriate precautions for the benefit of their participants. Events need to be held in a manner that emphasizes the safety of participants and event officials over efficiency.

The following is a list of suggested best practices that may be helpful when planning or attending a cat show. Show locations, facilities and dates will differ. With a situation that is continually evolving, it is up to the clubs to determine the guidelines that best fit their event. In order to inform participants, specific guidelines established by the club or region should be published in the show flyer, club website and/or advertising, and posted on signage at their event.

General Practices

- 1. Clubs, officials and participants are required to follow state, local and facility guidelines that apply to the area and site where the event is held.*
- 2. Practice social distancing consistent with guidelines in effect at the time of the event. Avoid congregating to the extent possible.*
- 3. Consider wearing masks when in close proximity to others. Clubs should provide masks if desired for officials, judges and volunteers.*

4. *Consider wearing disposable or washable gloves.*
5. *Wash hands as frequently as possible. Have disinfecting spray at bathroom facilities for people to spray door handles (or anything else they touch). Consider hiring bathroom attendants to maintain maximum cleanliness.*
6. *Avoid shaking hands, hugging, or other physical contact.*
7. *Avoid touching cats that are not your responsibility.*
8. *Avoid sharing pens, pencils and cat toys – bring your own.*
9. *Disinfect surfaces in common use areas as often as possible (tables, chairs, doorknobs, etc.). Clubs and facilities may consider not providing chairs, and encourage exhibitors to bring their own portable chair.*
10. *Meals - Avoid or stagger group lunches/dinners if possible. Hospitality areas should avoid community items such as salt and pepper shakers, condiments, creamers, etc. Participants should consider bringing their own lunch/drinks.*
11. *Vendors should follow retail guidelines for the area.*
12. *Parking – Park with sufficient distance between vehicles if possible. If there is a parking fee, ask exhibitors to bring exact change.*
13. *Clubs should work with facilities to have as many entrance/exit points open as possible. Hand sanitizer should be available at every entrance to the site and at multiple locations within the site.*

Event Practices

1. **Show Set-Up.** *The size and layout of a show hall will determine the opportunities available to clubs.*
 - *Separate the rings if possible; otherwise, set-up buffers along adjoining sides to provide separation.*
 - *Avoid placing stewards and rosette racks next to those in neighboring rings.*
 - *Consider traffic patterns in the rings – one direction for cats entering and one for cats exiting.*
 - *Consider setting up cages with doors in the front and back (if available), and have cats placed in cages from the back of the ring.*
 - *Clerks and stewards should sanitize their hands frequently and consider wearing a face mask and gloves.*
 - *Clubs should consider not providing chairs. Private chairs should not be placed in higher traffic areas*
2. **Scheduling.** *With the efforts to make shows safer, the event may take longer. Modified scheduling may assist with congestion and provide a better experience for exhibitors. Work with the show scheduler to create a schedule that assists with the situation.*

- *If possible, schedule each group (Kittens, Championship, Premiership, Household Pet) to be judged at the same time of day (morning, noon, afternoon), and allow exhibitors the option to leave for the day when judging of their exhibit(s) is completed.*
- *As always, clubs may consider implementing entry limits.*

3. **Exhibitors.**

- *Prepare to be self-sufficient: bring sanitizer, personal use masks and gloves, food and beverages if allowed by the facility.*
- *Know your cat's number and exact ring before going to the ring.*
- *Do not congregate at the ring.*
- *While showing your cat, maintain social distances with other exhibitors.*

4. **Benching.** *Design the layout of benching areas and spaces to comply with the social distancing guidelines in place at the time. Marking off individual benching spaces is encouraged.*

5. **Judging.** *Judging is where the ability to socially distance becomes challenging. Taking care to protect the parties will require a concerted effort between the judge, clerk, steward and exhibitors.*

- *Judges should consider wearing face masks if otherwise not required.*
- *All classes should be called in catalog order to provide order and efficiency.*
- *Judges must practice ring awareness, be conscious of spacing, and take appropriate measures to avoid crowding of exhibitors.*
- *Judges should sanitize hands after examining each entry. Re-examining of cats should be minimized.*
- *Judges are encouraged to personally pull ribbons and rosettes for placements. Coupled with frequent hand sanitizing, this will help mitigate contact exposure.*
- *Equipment used to evaluate cats (table, pole, toys) must be sanitized after each use.*

Participants are expected to follow country, state, local government, facility and event guidelines. Clubs should be prepared to enforce the guidelines that apply to their event. Show management should assist as always in an advisory capacity.

These Suggested Best Practices may be periodically updated. Please check CFA website for the most up-to-date version.

CDC - How to Protect Yourself and Others: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>

For questions or additional suggestions, please contact Central Office.

Hannon: Anyone want to raise their hand to discuss it? All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Hannon: Rachel, do you have another one? **Anger:** Yes. I'm going to start at the top and move that we reinstate our normal scoring procedures, effective immediately. **Calhoun:** I'll second. **Newkirk:** Does this include regional and national? Because we passed a motion to exclude national wins this year. **Anger:** Yes, and this would replace that then, or be a new motion, whichever way you want to look at it. **Hannon:** So, she is saying yes, there will be national scoring if this passes. **P. Moser:** I don't agree that we should have national scoring. There's all different parts of the world that cannot open at the same time, because states [inaudible]. Some people can't go into one state but they can go into another state. I don't think we should have [inaudible]. **Black:** I think it's going to open up a whole lot of different [inaudible] from our constituents. I appreciated the poll that Kathy and her team put together, but one of the questions to make everything like it would normally be was not an option, and so maybe it's time to poll again leaving that as an option and kind of see what our constituents think. Like Pam said, it's going to be difficult for people to travel in certain areas. We have three areas of scoring, with China, ID, and Regions 1-9. All of those could end up being in different scenarios. I just think that we need to kind of hear from people as to what they're thinking, more than just making a blanket decision on this. I don't feel comfortable making a decision to open it up as normal at this point in time. **Auth:** My thoughts are, while shows are able to have their shows, there is still going to be some push-back from people who are uncomfortable with going, and I think we don't have a level playing field relative to shows globally, and that just regional points and grand points and those. I can't support national points. **Krzanowski:** I agree with the statements made before. I just don't believe it would be fair to reinstate national awards for this season. There's going to be too many inequities and too many uncertainties. In Europe, I think some countries have opened. Other countries are still not open. In the U.S. some states are open, some others are not and some others are seeing a resurgence and possible lock-downs again. In the International Division, we have the same situation. I just don't think it would be fair to all of our constituents to have national wins this year, but I do support regional and divisional wins, grands, etc. **Calhoun:** I just first wanted to state, would everybody mute? That seems to have been done. I think that we should eliminate national at this point in time because we may have regions that may float in and out of being open as the year progresses. The playing field definitely could be choppy, although I do think that we should score regionally in championship and divisional wins and those sorts of things.

P. Moser: Just to Kathy Black's position on maybe we should do another poll, I just want to say that I did do a second pool. The majority of the people came back and said no national wins, just regional wins at this time. **Newkirk:** Rachel, would you accept an amendment to strike national awards from your motion? Because no one seems to support it. The easiest way to handle this is with an amendment just to strike that portion of your motion. **Anger:** It's cleaner to just withdraw it. **Newkirk:** No. You'll have to re-introduce it. **Hannon:** She has withdrawn it. Darrell, do you want to make a new motion? **Newkirk:** No. **Hannon:** Rachel, your hand is up. **Anger:** Yes, I have – **Black:** Mark, Howard is desperately trying to get your attention. **Hannon:** Oh. Hi Howard. Do you want to speak? **Webster:** Yes. Like with California, it doesn't look like we're going to have any shows in California, at least not until well after the first of the year. It doesn't even look like Del Mar is going to make it because of the restrictions on how many

people can go in, and of course that is a very expensive venue. Unless thousands of people walk through there, they can't afford it. So, for my region, we're left with just maybe 3 or 4 shows, if that. So, I would say only regional points, not national. **Hannon:** Alright, but right now we don't have a motion on the floor, so we're talking about something without a motion. I need somebody to make a motion if you want to continue the discussion, or we'll move on.

Webster: I make a motion that we only do regional awards for this year. **Newkirk:** So, no grand points? Nothing else? **Webster:** Regional points, plus your grand points and all of that, but there's no national points. **Newkirk:** Mark, that is why Rachel's motion was good, except nobody wants to include national wins. That's why I asked her to accept an amendment. Then, we don't have to argue here for 5 minutes on what the new motion is going to be. **Hannon:** She wouldn't amend it. **Newkirk:** Well, I understand that. That's why Robert's Rules, it helps you conduct business in an efficient manner, and this policy that we have had for years of withdrawing a motion and then re-introducing the exact same motion minus one or two words can be handled by a motion to amend, and then we just move on and vote for it. We're all in favor of what Rachel proposed, except national wins. If she would have just struck that portion from the motion, we would be on the next item. **Anger:** May I please speak? **Hannon:** Yes ma'am. **Anger:** I withdrew the motion because it would default to the existing motion that we have, which is what everyone seems to want, where we have regional points, grands of distinction, grand points, etc., just no national scoring. That's what we have right now, so if I withdraw my motion, we're back to what we had originally, is that correct? So, I have no reason to make another motion or amend it. **Newkirk:** That's Mark's decision.

[Secretary's Note: The motion currently in effect from the May 20, 2020 teleconference is: *Award titles using all points and rings earned regardless of owner's region of residence - this is the current scoring system. Titles being awarded include Regional Winner (RW), Champion (CH), Premier (PR), Grand Champion (GRC), Grand Premier (GRP), Grand Household Pet (GH), Grand of Distinction, Regional Breed Winner, Distinguished Merit (DM) and Champion/Premier tiered titles. National Winner (NW) and National Breed Winner (BW) titles would not be awarded.*]

Hannon: George? John? Advice. **Eigenhauser:** I can't really speak to it, because I don't have access to the minutes and I don't know what our status quo is, if we roll it back without the motion. So, I'm just going to rely on that, Rachel. If that is the state of affairs, then she is correct. **Hannon:** John? **Randolph:** You might be better with a motion, because you'll have it stated and it will be approved, where if we've got a problem – I would ordinarily defer to Rachel, but if we've got a problem, we don't resolve it unless we have a new motion. **Anger:** May I make that same motion from the teleconference then, that we score regional wins, grand points, champion qualifying rings at all the various levels, grands of distinction – everything but national awards. **Hannon:** National awards includes national breed wins. We established that in the past. Alright, Rachel has got a motion. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second.

Hannon: Alright, let me go back to the raised hands. **Morgan:** I appreciate that change, but I have concerns about that. I think there are still many areas in Europe and various areas globally, as well as here in the United States, that aren't going to be able to put on shows, which makes it an unlevel playing field. I would much prefer to see us approving something where we allow shows, but the only scoring that is done would be for grands, grands of distinction, etc.,

and the various levels of champion. We don't have regional or national wins. **Black:** I was going to kind of comment what Rachel said before. The motion that we passed before was to score everything as usual, except for national wins and national breed wins. That's what we had in place before the motion that Rachel had and then withdrew. So, if John Randolph thinks that we need to vote on this again, I guess we can vote on it again. Maybe people have changed their minds. We also had that discussion when we voted on this before that you would still have to attend a show in your region to qualify, so maybe that might want to be discussed. People like Howard are saying they may not have any opportunities to attend a show in California, but they might be able to go to a show in Utah or maybe come to the Gulf Shore Region and get points. Maybe we might want to withdraw that stipulation that we discussed before, that you have to attend at least one show in your region to get a regional win. But, I'm in full support of not doing national at this point in time – either national breed wins or national wins. Who knows what the year is going to look like? Who knows what's going to happen, so maybe removing the requirement that you have to attend a show in your own region might be something to add onto this motion. **Anger:** I will accept that amendment.

[Secretary's Note: The amended motion will read: *Award titles using all points and rings earned regardless of owner's region of residence - this is the current scoring system. Titles being awarded include Regional Winner (RW), Champion (CH), Premier (PR), Grand Champion (GRC), Grand Premier (GRP), Grand Household Pet (GH), Grand of Distinction, Regional Breed Winner, Distinguished Merit (DM) and Champion/ Premier tiered titles. National Winner (NW) and National Breed Winner (BW) titles would not be awarded. Article XXXVI, National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program – Scoring, fourth paragraph regarding exhibiting in the region of final assignment shall be waived.***]**

Newkirk: I will vote for this under one condition. We get ourselves in trouble when we don't have an old motion and present it to us, and then ask to basically update it and reintroduce it. And so, we have gotten ourselves in trouble in the past when we do that. I just want to make sure that what we voted on is what is being presented, about what is scored and what is not scored. Now, Rachel said that she included the old motion and added in the national wins [sic, the motion was to return to normal scoring], and she withdrew the motion because there's not enough support to support adding national wins in. So, I just want to be perfectly clear that what our motion is that Rachel has re-introduced is the exact wording of the motion that we passed, that is the current policy. If the wording has not changed – and now we have added an amendment to this motion that Rachel has accepted – so now we have to vote on this, but I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page and what we voted on, and then include the amendment that strikes out or adds to, whatever it does, so that we don't violated procedure.

P. Moser: I kind of like what Melanie has suggested. I hadn't thought of that before, but with the regional points, if we can't have regional points, then we're going to have to have another discussion on what those points are going to be, what the minimums, all of that, and with all the different regions not putting on the same amount of shows. I really don't want to be giving out regional wins for cats that have 25 points or whatever. There's no substance to that, so by taking out the regional points and just going with Melanie's suggestion, I kind of like that idea. **Calhoun:** Somehow I have been elevated to the host and I cannot raise my hand. **Hannon:** You're kind of in the same boat with Howard. **Calhoun:** But Howard's not a host. It's a different problem. The only thing that I'm hearing is that we're not saying anything about Grand

Household Pets. I just wanted to make sure. I've heard everything about every other title, but there was nothing about Household Pet grands. **Roy:** I actually – Pam just said everything I was going to say. I do agree with Melanie and Pam. We just don't know. Just different types of grands is really all we should score for. **Hannon:** And champions. And champions? **Roy:** Right. **Currle:** I disagree. I think we should score regional points.

Newkirk: Howard, you need to mute your microphone. **Webster:** Oh shit. **Newkirk:** Yeah, shit, OK. I want to make another comment. Anybody can listen in on this conversation right now, but when we go into closed session, if someone is in your home that's not a board member or not entitled to hear closed session information, that person needs to leave. Does everybody understand that? Someone was in the background of a board member a few minutes ago and that person has mammary glands. That person's partner does not have mammary glands that large. **Webster:** We're not in closed session right now. **Newkirk:** I understand. I'm telling you that when we go into closed session – I didn't see the person's face, but they need to leave the meeting at that point in time. Is that understood by everybody?

Eigenhauser: Building on what Howard said earlier, different parts of the country are going to open up at different rates. There are some parts of the country that barely shut down at all, and there are some parts of the country that I expect will be shut down into the beginning of next year. If we allow regional points, what we're going to wind up doing is giving people with the biggest checkbooks regional wins. If people in California can't have cat shows in California, they will fly someplace where they can and that just increases the risk of spreading disease. I think it's irresponsible for people to be crossing state lines right now, so until all of the regions are ready to go, I think it's premature to score for regional points. **Currle:** I disagree with George. I think that we should be scoring regional points and give them the option. I think that to take away regional points, you're really going to restrict the clubs' entries in a lot of cases. I think that if you're really concerned about this, I think we should do a poll of our clubs. They are, after all, the ones that are going to have to put their money on the line. I understand the concern about this virus, but again, I don't think any of us sitting on this board has a crystal ball. So, I would fully support keeping it open for regional point scoring. **Newkirk:** I think that the regional points are essential, because I think if we eliminate those, you'll get a few cats coming out to shows to get some grand points and maybe a color win or something like that, but I think if we – I understand taking the national wins away and I support that. I'm not in favor of taking the regional awards away from people because it's going to vary by when shows come up, and that's basically local government and state governments that are imposing those restrictions, so I really want to see the opportunity for people to accumulate their regional points and, next year, get those awards. Has anybody thought about if we don't do national wins this year, awarding the awards that we would be doing Saturday night at next year's annual? That's an option. We can have an awards show but have it one year late, since we won't be giving any national awards for this current show season. I think that's an option that we might want to talk about. **P. Moser:** Again, if we're having regional points, I'm OK with this if each region can set their own points, because, you know, in Region 4 they could be having a lot more shows possibly because they have more shows anyway, so their regional points could be a minimum of maybe 500-600 points, but then again in Region 2 where we are going to have problems even having any shows, I would think that we should be able to, as a region, set our own minimum points if that's the case. **Krzanowski:** I honestly believe that we should keep regional wins. I agree with some of the comments earlier, that clubs will have a hard time getting entries for any shows they try to

produce if we are not doing regional wins. There are a limited number of people who would want to go for grands or grands of distinction in all categories, or maybe show a kitten for experience, but I do believe it would be much better for the clubs to have the regional wins. **B. Moser:** I think we should do the regional wins, too. If we just do the grands and once they grand they're going to go home and not come back. Maybe some of those grands maybe decide to just go for regional wins, so I think for the clubs' sake, we should do regional wins. **Black:** I agree that we should keep regional wins. As to Darrell's point, if I am the Regional Director for next year, the annual in Houston is going to face lots of different challenges, so we've already talked about rewarding those cats that would have been normally recognized this weekend in Spokane. Drawing people to an annual when there are no national wins is going to be a challenge, so the annual is already going to be a different annual, but I am very much in favor, like everyone else has said, of keeping our regional wins. I think that will help the clubs and those people who do want to show, to be able to show their cats and just going for grand points or qualifying rings only, I think that's going to limit the clubs too much. **Schleissner:** I'm definitely for scoring regional wins and I want to bring to your attention that we have a special situation for Europe. We can only have our regional points in the region. We cannot go outside. Other regions do not count for Europe, so this is why I support regional win counting. **Colilla:** OK. My only concern, if we just score getting cats granded, I'm going to have a problem. My problem is, I'm about to sign a contract for my regional awards show. If we're going to do that, I'm not going to sign the contract because there's no sense spending all that money. I will get stuck with all the down payments and then if you guys change your mind later, I'm going to have no place. So, I'm going to go for scoring regional points.

Krzanowski: I just wanted to comment one thing further regarding a possible survey. We already did a survey in which we addressed the idea of regional awards and various other scoring options. The option for keeping standard scoring with regional awards but without national was the one that was overwhelmingly favored by our constituents. **Hannon:** I see hands up. I don't know if they just forgot to take them down. OK, I don't see any hands now. Are we ready to vote on this? My understanding is, the motion is everything but national. Is that correct?

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser, Morgan and Roy voting no.

Tartaglia: Mark, could you repeat that motion for me? I'm sorry, I want to be clear on what's – **Hannon:** I think it's everything but national. **Tartaglia:** Everything but national, OK. **Hannon:** Nod your head Rachel. Is that right? **Anger:** I'll send it to you, and of course I'll have it in the minutes. **Tartaglia:** Thank you.

Hannon: Alright, are there any other necessary motions related to holding shows? **Eigenhauser:** I thought Rachel was going to make a motion regarding the guidelines. **Black:** She already did. **Hannon:** Yes, she did. Did we vote on that, Rachel? **Anger:** Yes. **Hannon:** Alright. Rich, did you want to make one about sponsorships? **Mastin:** Yes, that the board agrees to begin show sponsorships. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? I see some hands up. **Morgan:** I had my hand up for something else, but then the motion got in. I just want to make a really quick point for anyone who is listening out there in clubs. With those provisions that we put out there, there are options for different show formats that may hopefully address the concerns regarding the fact that we can't have spectators in the immediate future and will give clubs some ideas on how to move forward, using

something other than our traditional show formats. Sorry to jump in, it's just I had my hand up. **Hannon:** OK, thank you. Is there any discussion on Rich's motion about providing sponsorship?

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Hannon: Are there any other motions related to holding shows? **Auth:** Mark, I have a question. **Hannon:** Yes ma'am. **Auth:** The motion that we just passed, how much is that going to influence the budget? I think the budget that the Budget Committee prepared, it factored that there weren't going to be any shows, so. **Hannon:** Correct. **Auth:** OK. **Tartaglia:** Mark, I have a question, a clarification. With the scoring motion, with regional points, do people have to show at least once in region, or are we doing away with that? **Hannon:** There was no motion to do away with it, so unless there is, we still have that policy in place. [**Secretary's Note:** See amended motion above.]

P. Moser: I want to know about minimum points for regional wins. Is that going to be by what the Regional Directors say? Is this going to be overall throughout the cat fancy? How is that going to work? I think that's something that we need to figure out, because people are going to want to know. **Hannon:** Do you want to make a motion? **P. Moser:** Well, I would like to make the motion that Regional Directors are able to put their point minimums for their own region. **Hannon:** So, the Regional Director would determine the minimums within their region for regional awards. **P. Moser:** Yes, yes. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Hannon:** OK. I see a bunch of hands up. Are they discussing this motion?

Newkirk: Well actually, I wanted to go back to something, because we're going to be scoring these regional wins and this may be a factor or not a factor, but we always have split season kittens, and those kittens are not taken into consideration. Like I said, it may not be an issue because we don't know when we'll start shows up. As far as Pam's motion right now, I do want to address one thing on that; and that is, this past season what we did is, we went in and adjusted those points based on the number of weeks out of the year where there were shows held. We don't know if a second wave of COVID-19 hits, we may not be having any shows in the Fall, so I think that, I mean, we could pass this motion if people support it, but I think you're getting into tricky territory here, allowing a Regional Director to say how many points they are going to allow, to provide a national win, because there's no lower limit and so the director for – I'll just use Sharon as an example – she might say, "you only need 100 points and you can get 25th Best Cat or Kitten" or whatever. I think that's very tricky, so there needs to be some limit, in my opinion, on that.

Black: I want to address what Pam's motion is. I'm wracking my brain. I was trying to remember if we have a minimum point for regional wins. I know that we set the minimums for the breed wins and the color wins. The Regional Directors have that ability every year now, but I don't think we have minimum points for regional wins. **Tartaglia:** There are none. **Black:** There are none, right. So, she is saying that we should have a motion that the Regional Director can set the minimum. We don't have that minimum for regional wins. We have minimums for breed wins, and we're asked every year by Central Office to weigh in on that and give them any changes that we may want to make. I know like in John's region, he has zero for his breed wins. Other regions have 50 or 25 or some other number, so we already have the ability to set that, so I'm confused as to why we need Pam's motion, because there is no minimum for regional wins. I

would rather talk about whether or not they have to attend a show in region or not. **Hannon:** Pam, do you want to respond? **P. Moser:** I would like a suggestion then. I guess what I'm trying to get at is that I don't feel comfortable if a person attends one show and gets 20 points and I'm giving out regional wins. **Hannon:** What is your policy now, Pam? **P. Moser:** For regional wins? We do give them now, but I just think even now I think it's crazy when we give 25th best whatever premier with 60 points. I think that's ridiculous. I know that some people in my region think that that's just going too low with the points. **Hannon:** If I understand what Kathy was saying, you currently have the ability to change that. **P. Moser:** If we do, then I'm great then. I'll just withdraw the motion. If that's the case, then I'll withdraw the motion. And you agree with that Kathy? We have the right to do it now, right? **Black:** Well, you can have Allene weigh in. I want to make sure Allene agrees, but that has been my understanding. **Hannon:** Allene? **Tartaglia:** My understanding for regional win is, we send out 25 top cats, kittens, premierships, and there is a factor for Household Pet to change that. It's only the breed and color wins that have minimum points. Currently, that's what we have. In the show rules, I believe that's what it says. There is no minimum for the top cats that get the RW title. **Hannon:** We're going to take a break soon. Why doesn't somebody during the break – Carol, as the Show Rules liaison, could you check during the break what the rules are regarding minimums, if there are any, for regional wins? **Krzanowski:** OK. I will look into the Show Rules while we're on a break. **Colilla:** I have my hand raised. OK, I want to make a correction. We do have a 50 point minimum for breed wins. I'm suggesting, why don't we match the breed wins for the top 25 to be 50? You have to have 50 points to get a regional win – I mean, a breed win anyway, so in order to get a top 25, you have to have a minimum of 50 points for my region. **Hannon:** You can do that for your region. It doesn't mean that everybody else has to do it, currently. **Colilla:** The majority of regions it's a 50 point minimum except one region if I'm not mistaken. **Hannon:** Carol is going to check and we'll discuss it when we come back after the break. **Colilla:** Thank you.

Newkirk: What I want to say is, I downloaded those point minimums. It's on the CFA webpage and I was shocked to find that there were no minimums for a regional win. I think I even did a calculation and put it in a chart and sent that out to the Regional Directors. I don't think I sent it to the board at large, but I sent that out to the Regional Directors. We're beating a moot point here. Unless you want to change what's on that sheet, then that kind of motion would be in order. Now, if John wants to say it needs to be a minimum of 50 points, it should be across the board everywhere, not one region. I don't think it's right for one region to give somebody who has 10 points a regional win and in John's region, if you don't have 50 points you don't get it. That's not fair to the people. People need to understand what the points are. The alternative method would be if the regions want to set their minimum levels, then it should be published on that sheet like everything else is. The people who exhibit and show, they need to know what the limits are. Right now, there is no lower limit. If we're going to change that, it needs to be published so people understand and see what the limit is.

Hannon: We'll discuss this after the break. We're almost an hour beyond when we were supposed to break. We're going to take a 15 minute break, OK? See you guys in 15 minutes.

BREAK.

Hannon: We're back to issues related to opening up the shows again. Does somebody want to say something? **Krzanowski:** Yes. During the break I check the Show Rules in regard to

point minimums for regional awards. There are no point minimums for regional awards noted in the Show Rules, except for Best-10th Best Household Pet, and for those there is a minimum of 100 points. **Hannon:** Does it say anything about breed wins in the Show Rules? **Krzanowski:** There is nothing, no minimums noted for regional awards or regional breed wins at all, except for as I said, Best-10th Best Household Pet. They must have a minimum of 100 points. **Hannon:** Darrell had said something different. Darrell? **Newkirk:** There is a point minimum sheet on the website, and that lists by area what the breed and color win minimum points by region are. There's also the point minimums for national wins. Allene can point you in the correct spot. **Hannon:** I don't know which is correct, whether it's the website or the Show Rules, but from what Carol tell us, they're in conflict. So, after this meeting we need to have somebody determine which is correct and make them match. We want the website and the Show Rules to be in sync.

Hannon: What do we want to do about grand points? Somebody brought up the issue of, with fewer cats attending the shows and fewer shows, do we still want to keep the grand points at that level or do we want to reduce it somewhat like we did for some of the restricted areas of the world that require fewer points? **P. Moser:** I think I still have the motion on the floor. **Hannon:** Which is? **P. Moser:** Which was that the Regional Director can set the minimum points. After I discussed offline and it seems to me that we already have that ability, I think – because I know that when I get an email from Allene or from James, it says, “are you going to keep your point minimums the same,” but that's usually in reference to breed wins and color, it's not in reference to top 25, so if it's already there and it doesn't make a difference, I'll go ahead and withdraw my motion. **Hannon:** Thank you.

Hannon: Does somebody want to make a motion in regard to what we want to do about grand points? Melanie, your hand is up? **Morgan:** For something other than grand points, but we can talk about that later. **Hannon:** Melanie, we're having a hard time hearing you. **Morgan:** Alright, can you hear me any better? **Hannon:** Not much. **Morgan:** Sorry. Actually, I have my hand up because I have a concern about our regional requirement, when we have areas where people may not be able to fulfill that requirement because their area is not open. For example, in Europe where maybe none country might not be open, but they can get to – they couldn't show there, but they could get to other shows. So, I think we need to put that into the mix, as well. While I'm certainly willing to consider an adjustment to grand points, I'm not sure that it's mandatory for us to actually resolve that tonight, because as long as people know they are allowed to grand their cats, we can take some time to let our Awards Committee come up with a recommendation. **Roy:** I was going to pretty much say what Melanie said. I would like to task our Awards Committee to come up with some minimum grand points, or minimum points needed for grand, and then we'll all be on the same page, rather than make a split decision right now. **Hannon:** OK, but the Awards Committee may change on Sunday. **Eigenhauser:** My concern is that, in the past when we have created zones with different grand points, it's because of geographical or political boundaries, and those are permanent. The number of cats attending shows may vary throughout the course of the year. The first few shows in the Fall may have 50, 60, 70 cats. By the end of the year, we may be on to full-size regular CFA shows. If we change the grand point minimums for the whole year based on a guess, we may be grossly over-estimating the number of points that could be earned early while the COVID restrictions are still in place, and then grossly under-estimating how shows get back to normal by the end of the show

season. I think this is something that we should put on hold for now, see how the shows actually work in real life before we start guestimating how much of an adjustment we need to make.

Black: I wanted to bring up the idea whether or not to have the show in region or now, so if we need to entertain that after your discussion about grand points, I just wanted to get that in. **Hannon:** Nobody has made a motion on grand points, so go ahead. **Black:** OK. I would like to make a motion that for this show season you are not required to attend a show in your region to earn a regional win. **Krzanowski:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion? Darrell, your hand is up. Is it about this motion? **Newkirk:** Well, it is, but I also wanted to let everybody know, I just sent you an email with the PDF of the point minimums that's on the CFA website. I failed to send it to Allene, so I sent her a separate copy if she wants to put this up as a screen share. My other thing about this motion is, I'm not sure I can go along with not requiring to show in your region. We have sort of a pocket out here in the Southwest. I saw on the map this morning where there are increases in COVID-19 spread, so yeah, it may be that Region 5 is going to be affected more severely than the others, but it looks like Region 2, Region 3, Region 6, parts of Region 4 will be able to have shows. I'm not sure that we should not require somebody to get all your points outside of your own region. I think that's a bit of a stretch. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with Darrell. I think that, as regions open, we may have some regions that don't open at all, so people are traveling to other regions. Again, it favors the people who can afford to travel. If we don't require at least one show – that's all that's currently required is one show in your own region – that's a minimum. If you can't find one show in your own region, then we need to go back and really re-think what we're doing in terms of regional awards for that region. They shouldn't all be points earned out of region. There ought to be some contact with the home region, even if it's just at a minimum level. **Anger:** Part of my motion as I wrote it down, in the motion that I made about scoring, there was an amendment that I accepted, that the requirement to show in-region would be an exclusion. That appears to be what we are discussing now, but I just wanted to make that clear because when it comes out in the minutes, that will be [internet connection unstable]. **Hannon:** What she is saying is, we've already passed this. **Black:** Well, it wasn't clear that we included my amendment when we passed the motion. **Anger:** If you think it was unclear, let's go forward and discuss it and vote on it so that we're all clear. **Black:** If we already passed it, I will withdraw my motion, but I wasn't sure it was included when we did the previous motion, and I'm not sure everybody else thought that, either. Mark, what do you suggest? **Hannon:** Just to get clear, why don't you make your motion and we'll vote on it. What's your motion? **Black:** My motion was that the requirement to attend at least one show in-region would be removed for this current show season. I think someone seconded it already. To address George's comment, there could be one or two shows that end up, let's say in California in March or April, but you may not still be showing your cat, but you were able to get to shows in other regions. That cat maybe needed to be bred or it may be a kitten that aged out or it could be a lot of different circumstances that would prevent you from making that one requirement, because with kitten wins, they are separate from championship wins, from premiership wins. Each one of those, you have to attend one show, so to get a regional kitten win you have to attend at least one show in-region with a kitten. If you take that kitten, even though it was shown out of region, to a show as an adult in-region, those kitten points do not count for your home region. So, I'm just saying, like you said, we don't have a crystal ball. We have no idea what the future is going to look like. We have no idea how things are going to be opening up in different parts of the world, and rather than put restrictions on people that maybe earned enough points for a kitten regional win, that they never made it to an in-region show because there were none, I don't think that's fair for

them. So, that's why I'm just saying, for this one season only, removing the requirement.

Hannon: I don't see any other hands up, so there's no other discussion. I'm going to go ahead and call the vote. All those in favor of removing the requirement to attend one show in-region in order to get a regional win.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser, P. Moser, B. Moser and Newkirk voting no. Schleissner abstained.

Hannon: Are there any other motions we need to deal with regarding scoring issues?

Tartaglia: I'm sorry, I have a question. So, what about the point minimums? Are there any?

How are we handling that? **Hannon:** I'm going to have whoever the new president is get the Show Rules and the website in alignment. **Tartaglia:** OK. The Show Rules say no point

requirements except for Household Pet. **Hannon:** But the website says different. It doesn't

matter which is right, make them the same. **Tartaglia:** It's been tradition that there has been

breed and color point minimums. I don't think anybody realized they never made it to the Show Rules. OK.

(13) **CFA FOUNDATION.**

Committee Chair: *Donald J. Williams*
Liaison to Board: *Carol Krzanowski*
List of Committee Members: *Don Williams, Carol Krzanowski, Liz Watson, Kathy Calhoun, Karen Lawrence, Pam DelaBar, Desiree Bobby, Lorraine Shelton, John Smithson*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Feline Historical Museum is managed by the CFA Foundation, and continues to rotate displays on a regular basis, which attracts visitors to the Alliance area.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The Feline Historical Museum has been closed since March 14th due to the mandated closures by the State of Ohio. The ban on museums being open is expected to be lifted sometime in June.

Karen has been working at home in Canada for the past three months and expects to return to Ohio on July 3rd to prepare the museum for opening. For the past month she has been working on requirements necessary to reopen the museum, and raising funds to cover the extra expense that will be incurred. She has also been busy creating historical flipbooks, promoting the foundation on social media, and preparing new presentations for when the museum reopens.

Future Projections for Committee:

We will continue to prepare to reopen the Feline Historical Museum.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

We will keep the CFA Board of Directors informed of CFA Foundation activities.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Lawrence*

Hannon: CFA Foundation, Carol. **Krzanowski:** You have the report. It's basically pretty standard. The Museum has not been able to be open, due to Ohio law. I am unsure as to whether museums are allowed to open as yet. Karen has been in Canada and working on other projects – Karen Lawrence, who is the Museum Director. She was hoping to come back to re-open the Museum the beginning of July, but she informed me recently that the Canada border closing has been extended to July 23rd, so now it's unsure exactly when she will be able to return, but we'll try to keep the board posted on what's happening with that.

(14) **MENTORING COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: Kathleen R. Hoos
Liaison to Board: Carol Krzanowski

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

With the show season a victim of Covid-19, our show mentors have been on hiatus.

Current Happenings of Committee:

We are trying to keep hold of those new people interesting in showing and breeding. New people are referred to New Bees as well as sent videos of shows and OTRA from various regions.

Future Projections for Committee:

Web site updates are waiting a bit to see how we may have to move forward in light of social distancing and limits in show halls.

Board Action Items:

None

Time Frame:

Dependent on Board direction at reopening shows.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Hopefully updates to the Website and a plan to help new people get started.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathleen Hoos, Chair*

Hannon: Next would be Mentoring, which is you again, Carol. **Krzanowski:** Again, it's just the basic report. There's not much to say since there have not been shows, but Kathi Hoos and her committee have been working hard to try to keep new people interested and try to mentor people with their breeding programs as much as they can from a distance. They're using some videos and things like that to try to maintain interest. **Hannon:** Thank you.

(15) CFA LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE.

Legislation Committee Chair George Eigenhauser gave the following report:

Committee Chair:	George Eigenhauser
List of Committee Members:	Joan Miller, Phil Lindsley
CFA Legislative Group:	George Eigenhauser, Sharon Coleman, Kelly Crouch

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The COVID-19 pandemic has had its impact on lawmakers as well as fanciers. Some state legislative sessions adjourned earlier than planned while other state and local governments adjusted their schedules and possibly narrowed the focus of their activities. Open meeting laws and citizen access to their elected officials have become problematic. Some communities still found time to consider changes to animal ordinances while others postponed implementing changes already enacted.

The CFALegislativeNews Facebook page is our broad spectrum news outlet for legislative happenings, giving fanciers a quick check news source for news that may impact them. Posts on the Facebook page reflect news from a wide variety of sources. Despite the disruptive force of the coronavirus, the page likes and followers have increased since the last report. Page likes increased to 580 and followers have increased to 607. Since January 2020, the articles generating the most interest were the highly restrictive breeding ordinance of Palm Springs, CA followed by the Evanston, IL ordinance proposal that would allow only federally licensed breeders and shelters to sell cats, dogs and rabbits.

In the January report, we discussed how the Hilliard, OH post about criminalizing the feeding of community cats drew divisive commentary from people outside the cat fancy. As Facebook pages, unlike Facebook groups, are not really meant to provide a forum of discussion, the tools available to page administrators are limited. Continued divisive activity would require that all commenting ability be turned off. This was not the preferred approach and an alternative approach to the issue was taken. As community cats are important to our target audience but not crucial to engaging in the hobby of pedigreed cats, we held off posting articles relating to community cat ordinances for a short period of time. We have started including such articles in the Facebook feed again and will monitor the situation. So far there has not been a repeat performance from outside elements.

The CFA Legislative Group blog is the second piece of the Legislative Group's social media presence in our communication strategies that provides a more comprehensive look at certain targeted topics. With the blog we have a platform we can manage ourselves with public links to our materials. The monthly What's Hot articles are posted here after they have been published in the e-newsletter. Some of the Cat talk articles will also be posted here six months after their original publication date. And this will also be the vehicle for certain articles that are not published elsewhere. Readers may "Follow" the blog to receive notices

when a new post is published. We can also announce new posts or added resources on the CFALegislativeNews Facebook page and elsewhere to expand our reach.

The CFALegislativeNews Facebook page may be found at <https://www.facebook.com/CFALegislativeNews/> and the CFA Legislative Group blog may be found at <https://cfalegislativegroup.wordpress.com/>

Current Happenings of Committee:

Highlights of a few selected issues: (Not by any means complete - just a few examples.)

Federal

On May 13, 2020, APHIS published a Final Rule streamlining licensing requirements and eliminating renewals to promote compliance and strengthen safeguards against individuals with a history of noncompliance. Comments were solicited on the proposed rule in March 2019. The proposed rule was discussed in the April 2019 What's Hot. In February 2020, APHIS announced it was restoring certain Animal Welfare Act records to its website pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2020. The Act requires APHIS restore the contents that were available on January 30, 2017 and content generated since that date. These records were originally removed due to potential privacy concerns.

State Issues

The California legislature reconvened from its emergency recess in May, but the Assembly reconvened a week earlier than the Senate so that each house revised its legislative calendar (including procedural deadlines) with the Senate one week behind the Assembly. Due to fiscal changes during the COVID-19 emergency and into the future, the Governor's Budget and the legislature's budgets have needed intensive review and revision in order to meet the Constitutional deadline of adopting the annual state budget by June 15. This, combined with much COVID-19 and related legislative issues, bills not related to these topics or otherwise urgent were not to proceed this year, the second of California's current 2-year session. For animal bills, this shelved some bills that would have re-worked previously failed bills and others that would have introduced completely novel topics. One of the latter would have added restrictions and requirements to be administered by the state veterinary medical board for a "for-profit corporation that owns more than 60 veterinary premises in the state," i.e. VCA. Another would have allowed a criminal court, upon its own motion or upon request of a party or counsel for a party, to appoint an advocate to represent the interests of the animal, without regard to whether the animal is alive or deceased at any stage of the proceedings during or after arraignment.

On its new procedural calendars, the houses of origin have still been working through the remaining small number of bills being heard that have passed policy committees and have or are facing the Appropriations committees that use their "suspense" files to sideline bills with projected costs that can be either removed by amendment so the bills can be passed or used to "hold" bills, usually killing them, especially in the second year of the session. There are

two bills of interest currently at this phase. One is Assembly Bill 2152 that would amend the law enacted by 2017 AB 485 to allow retail pet stores to only acquire dogs, cats or rabbits from “humane” sources including private rescue organizations, not resellers. AB 2152 has sought to amend the definition of rescue to prevent the use of rescues to funnel “cute puppies from breeders” to pet stores for resale. This practice has been ongoing and the subject of litigation, not entirely successful to stop it. The pet stores that provide “showcase” space for rescues (and animal control and humane societies) objected to the criminal classification of the offenses for violating the terms of the proposed new rescue definition, but the bill advanced easily from the Assembly Business and Professions Committee to Appropriations. There it took a one day in and next day out through the compressed time frame of suspense and was passed as amended, deleting the criminal classifications and stating, “(f) It is the intent of the Legislature to authorize a civil penalty for a violation of this section.” Given the fiscal climate, the stakeholders will probably make do if this can be enacted. However, we have seen a similar situation in Chicago with amendments pending and, so far, one local ordinance that enacted the same type of restrictions within a rescue definition. So far, the California amended definition would only apply within this pet store provision and not elsewhere in the other California codes where definitions of rescue came along with enactment of the 1998 “Hayden” bill meant to require shelters to release animals to rescue. We do not want to see widespread use of rescue definitions designed to restrict pet stores used indiscriminately in other areas of law.

Colorado SB 164: “Colorado Socially Conscious Sheltering Act” establishes standards of care for shelters and rescues. Postponed indefinitely by the House.

Florida HB 509: Prohibits animal shelters from euthanizing animals under certain conditions; and requires animal shelters to release animals to rescue organizations. Died in Business and Professions Subcommittee. Similar bill SB 1044 died in the Rules committee.

Florida [R] HB 621: “Allie’s Law.” An animal cruelty bill that requires veterinarians to report suspected animal cruelty in certain circumstances; requires certain persons to report suspected animal cruelty to veterinarian; provides immunity; prohibits alteration or destruction of certain records; specifies that failure of veterinarian to report suspected animal cruelty is grounds for discipline. Died in Business and Professions Subcommittee.

Florida SB 1048: Provided for the appointment of an advocate for the interests of an animal in certain court proceedings, at the discretion of the court. Died in Judiciary.

Florida SB 1698/HB 1237: These bills would give pet store access to legal sources of animals to purchase for resale without running afoul of local prohibitions. It also included restrictive hobby breeder definitions. These bills died in committee.

Georgia HB 886: Require veterinarians or veterinary technicians that provide treatment to animals to scan such animals' microchips and to report ownership information under certain circumstances. Sent to Senate Assignments Committee.

Illinois HB 4928: Animal abuser registry. Sent to House Rules Committee.

Illinois HB 5448: Amends the Animal Welfare Act with regards to requirements for high volume breeders. A High volume breeder is a facility maintaining 6 or more female dogs used for producing offspring that meets one or more other requirements. Sent to House Agriculture & Conservation Committee.

Illinois HB 5530: Provides that in a prosecution of a case involving the injury, health, or safety of a cat or dog, the court may, on its own motion or motion of any party, appoint a special advocate to assist the court. Sent to House Judiciary - Criminal Committee.

Illinois SB 3078: Amends the Animal Welfare Act. Provides that a pet shop operator may offer for sale a dog or cat only if the dog or cat is obtained from an animal control facility or animal shelter. Sent to Senate Assignments Committee.

Iowa HB 2376: Rescue, sanctuary, shelter, pound and research facility registration and regulation. Sent to House Agriculture Committee.

Kansas SB 224: Kansas retail pet shop act would have restricted sources of dogs for resale to certain shelters, dog brokers, qualified breeders, and hobby breeders. Died in committee.

Kentucky SB 21: Requires that a veterinarian report suspected animal abuse to an animal control officer and allows immunity for good faith reports. Sign by Governor.

Kentucky SB 179: Defines "animal shelter," "breeder," "broker," and "retail pet shop". Prohibits retail pet shops from selling dogs, cats, and rabbits; but allows retail pet shops to collaborate with animal shelters to showcase dogs, cats, or rabbits. KY is adjourned.

Massachusetts HB 2592: Restricts the source of cats, dog, and rabbits for resale in pet stores. Sent to Senate Ways and Means.

Maine SB 1311: Prohibits the sale of certain animals by pet shops unless the pet shop is grandfathered. Showcasing rescue or shelter animals is allowed but it cannot charge a fee for the space. Became law with signature.

Maryland HB 992/ SB 992: Increases maximum compensatory damages to pet owners for certain tortious injury or death of a pet from \$10,000 to \$25,000. MD is adjourned.

Massachusetts SB 169: Prohibits declawing of cats. Sent to Senate Ways and Means Committee.

Minnesota HF 3369/ SF 3307: Prohibit the sale of cats and dogs by retail pet shops. Sent to House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee.

Minnesota SF 3481: Transfer the licensing, enforcement, and inspection of companion animal kennels, dealers, and commercial breeders from the Board of Animal Health (BAH) to the newly created Companion Animal Board (CAB) if enacted. Sent to Senate Agriculture, Rural Development, and Housing Policy Committee. Similar to House File 3584 pending in the House Agriculture and Food Finance & Policy Committee.

New Hampshire HB 1630-FN: This bill would increase the threshold for cat and dog breeder licensing from the lower threshold passed in the 2019 budget bill. It was amended in the House to include an exception that the license provisions shall not apply to breeders of dogs that do not meet the definition of pet vendor. It has passed the House.

New Hampshire HB 1387: Prohibit declawing of cats. Inexpedient to legislate.

New Hampshire HB 1602: Establish a registry for persons convicted of animal cruelty. Inexpedient to legislate.

Local

Palm Springs, California City Council at its February 27, 2020 meeting passed the proposed breeding permit ordinance that was set for final passage on the consent calendar of the March 19 meeting when city staff requested it be pulled from this first council meeting held by teleconference pursuant to the Governor's order for the public health state of emergency. Council meetings are still being held by teleconference, and this item has not yet returned for final passage.

Evanston, IL: In March 2020, Evanston started considering an ordinance that provided only breeders that were federally licensed could sell cats, dogs, and rabbits. At the April 13, 2020 meeting, discussion of the ordinance was tabled until a later date.

Litigation

The CFA Board has allowed CFA to join with the Animal Health Institute (AHI) coalition on amicus curiae (friend of the court) briefs opposing non-economic damages (i.e. "pain and suffering") for injuries to animals. In April 2020 CFA joined an amicus brief in Anne Arundel County, Maryland v. Michael H. Reeves. A county police officer shot and killed Reeves' dog "Luke" thinking he was under attack. A jury found for the owner and awarded \$1.26 million in damages which included \$750,000.00 in non-economic damages. The Court of Special Appeals reduced the damages to \$200,000 under a state law which limits awards against local governments. The jury also found the officer violated the constitutional rights of Plaintiff but awarded him zero dollars for this claim.

The defendant County petitioned the Maryland Court of Appeals to overturn the award. The Maryland Veterinary Medical Association, American Kennel Club, Cat Fanciers' Association, Animal Health Institute, American Veterinary Medical Association, National Animal Interest Alliance, American Pet Products Association, American Animal Hospital Association, and the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council filed a joint amicus curiae brief in support petitioners. The brief explains that Maryland law does not allow for non-economic damages in pet cases. Many rulings around the country that have denied such claims and the brief explains the downside such claims would have on pet care, among other things. We will continue to advise the Board of any new details as they become available.

Publications

The CFA e-Newsletter provides space for a "What's Hot" legislative column used to provide information on new and urgent matters of interest to the cat fancy. In general, Cat Talk Almanac articles are written for less time sensitive matters with a focus on guidance on lobbying in general. The CFA Legislative Facebook page provides more real-time discussion of legislative topics. Articles published in the CFA e-Newsletter and the Cat Talk Almanac since the February 2020 CFA Board meeting:

- * CFA e-Newsletter, February 2020, **“Florida pet store bans, preemption, and hobby breeders; New Hampshire’s Pet Vendor Definition in the News Again”** by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison. Pet stores in Florida seeking legislation to gain access to legal sources of animals to purchase for resale without running afoul of local prohibitions created definitions, perhaps inadvertently, of hobby breeders that fanciers could violate with a single litter. In addition to limiting the number of intact males and females, the definition would also limit sales to four cats or kittens per calendar year. Dog breeders faced the same restrictions. Representative Howard Pearl of New Hampshire sought to undo some of the work accomplished in the 2019 budget bill that decreased the threshold of pet vendor licensing for cat (and dog) breeders to 25 transfers between July 1 and June 30. Representative Pearl’s bill would have increased the threshold for licensing to yearly transfers of 35 or more dogs and 50 or more cats.*
- * CFA e-Newsletter, March 2020, **“Georgia Surety Bill, Minnesota Companion Animal Board Bill, and Palm Springs, CA Proposed Restrictive Breeder Permit Ordinance”** by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison. Lawmakers in Georgia sought legislation requiring licensed pet animal breeders to pay a surety bond of \$7500 - \$500,000 in addition to the license fee for a pet dealer license. Although the bill language would have increased the statutory threshold for licensing from selling 20 to selling 30 cats or dogs, under the statutory authority granted to the Department of Agriculture Commissioner to change that threshold, the Commissioner has historically required anyone whose cat, dog, or other covered animal, has more than one litter in a twelve-month period to be licensed. This one litter rule would still be in effect if Senate Bill 338 were enacted. Minnesota Senate File 3481 would transfer the licensing, enforcement and inspection of companion animal kennels, dealers, and commercial breeders from the Board of Animal Health (BAH) to the newly created Companion Animal Board (CAB) if enacted. In Palm Springs, CA Mayor Pro Tem Christy Holstege has again proposed an ordinance that would make it nearly impossible for small in-home breeders to pursue their hobby in a meaningful way within the city.*
- * CFA e-Newsletter, April 2020, **“Responding to the COVID-19 Pandemic”** by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison and Sharon Coleman,*

CFA Legislative Legal Analyst. COVID-19 creates challenges in every aspect of our lives including how lawmaking bodies adapt legislative practices to the pandemic, how governmentally mandated breeder licensing programs are affected, to how obtaining pet food, veterinary care and otherwise caring for our animals will be managed during this time. How these things are dealt with will evolve over time as necessitated by the virus.

- * *CFA e-Newsletter, May 2020, “**Legislative Hearings and Government ‘Lockdown’ Orders**” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison and Sharon Coleman, CFA Legislative Legal Analyst. One of the challenges facing governments during the pandemic is preserving government transparency, vital for a representative government, as near as possible to the level provided before the government lockdowns. Solutions are evolving and will be varied among the jurisdictions but governments need to adapt methods so the public can be fully engaged and ensure that people and the press are able to perform their watchdog functions. Fanciers are involved with pedigreed cat rescue, it is important those fanciers thoroughly review the proposed rules.*

*Cat Talk Almanac, April 2020, “**State Breeder Laws Every Resident Fancier Should Know!**” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison and Sharon A. Coleman, Legislative Legal Analyst. This article is part 2 in a series designed to help fanciers with an overview of their state’s pet law and breeder regulation. This installment covered the states of Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and Tennessee in the Gulf Shore Region. Laws regulating cat breeders and pet sales vary significantly from state to state. Fanciers should be aware of laws affecting them in their home state but also anywhere they may consider relocating. Of course, no overview can be completely comprehensive. Breeders may also need to consider laws of jurisdictions into which they sell cats, as well as any federal, city, or county laws affecting them. Even homeowner associations may have rules which may affect cat ownership or breeding.*

Meetings and Conferences:

CANCELLED: HSUS Humane Care Expo, April 15-18, 2019, New Orleans, LA. George Eigenhauser had planned to attend on behalf of CFA. This event was cancelled by the host.

Future Projections for Committee and Legislative Group:

Upcoming conferences related to legislation –committed or pending:

PROBABLY CANCELLED: Pet Night on Capitol Hill - Wednesday, September 9, 2020 in Washington, DC. Created by the Animal Health Institute (AHI) more than 22 years ago, the event is hosted by the Human Animal Bond Research Institute (HABRI) and the Pet Leadership Council (PLC). Last year George Eigenhauser was unable to attend so Ritch Tindall and Michael Piziali took charge of the CFA booth, assisted by Tracy Petty. While we

have not received formal notice this event has been cancelled for 2020, due to COVID-19 concerns CFA will not be sponsoring this year.

STILL SCHEDULED: Association for Animal Welfare Advancement (AAWA) Annual Conference, Houston, TX, on November 15-17, 2020, New Orleans, LA and the National Council on Pet Population Research Symposium (November 18-21, 2021). AAWA members are leading animal control professions and members of the sheltering community with a pragmatic animal welfare (rather than animal rights) perspective. AAWA partners with the National Council on Pet Population to present a research day symposium in conjunction with the AAWA Conference. CFA was one of the founding members of the National Council. The AAWA Annual Conference provides CFA with networking opportunities with leaders in the animal control community. We've worked for years to build respect for CFA and our views within this group. Groups like HABRI are helping educate the public and legislators on the value of pets and the significance of the human/animal bond. Membership is by invitation only. George Eigenhauser is a member and plans to attend this year on behalf of CFA.

Ongoing goals -

Networking with the sheltering community, aligned organizations, veterinarians and lawmakers so we better understand the problems and trends that cause homeless animals to be in shelters and develop ways to address the issues that motivate legislation detrimental to our interests.

Continuing to find new methods for presenting perspective on the cat fancy views to those in animal related fields and government.

Working with national and local cat fancy teams to defeat legislation/regulation detrimental to pedigreed cats, feral/unowned cats, CFA's mission and cat ownership.

Enlisting professional help with strategic public relations and communication to build greater public awareness and gain more support for our opposition to mandated sterilization laws across the country.

Increasing efforts to raise funds for the Sy Howard Legislative Fund and to help clubs present projects suitable for funding.

Action Items: *None at this time.*

Time Frame: *Ongoing.*

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates and pending legislative matters.

*Respectfully Submitted,
George J. Eigenhauser, Jr., Chair*

Hannon: Legislative Committee, George. **Eigenhauser:** I have nothing really to add to the report, but I just want to say one thing; that is, a lot of local governments are still open, even though there's the COVID-19 problem. They're using slightly different procedures to try to social distance, to be responsible, whatever. This means that there's a good chance that we might overlook things, particularly at the local level, because they're using different procedures or meeting in different ways, so I'm asking all of the fanciers out there to stay on alert for things happening at the local level, especially in this era of virtual meetings, where you don't have the usual city council watchers that used to be the trip wire for finding out when things were coming up, so stay plugged into your local government.

(16) WINN FELINE FOUNDATION.

Winn Feline Foundation Liaison George Eigenhauser presented the following report:



<i>President:</i>	<i>Dr. Drew Weigner</i>
<i>Immediate Past President:</i>	<i>Dr. Glenn Olah</i>
<i>President Elect:</i>	<i>'open'</i>
<i>Secretary:</i>	<i>Janet Wolf</i>
<i>Treasurer:</i>	<i>Vickie Fisher (TICA President)</i>
<i>Liaison to CFA Board:</i>	<i>George Eigenhauser</i>
<i>Board Members:</i>	<i>Kelly Bishoff, Steve Dale, Dr. Brian Holub, Dr. Glenn Olah, Dr. Vicki Thayer, Dr. Dean Vicksman, Janet Wolf, Anthony Hutcherson (TICA Board Member)</i>
<i>Executive Director:</i>	<i>Julie Legred, RVT</i>
<i>Winn Staff:</i>	<i>Alisa Salvaggio, Virginia Rud, RVT</i>
<i>Veterinary Consultant:</i>	<i>Dr. Philip Kass (UC Davis, College of Vet Med)</i>
<i>Veterinary Advisor:</i>	<i>Dr. Melissa Kennedy (U. of Tenn., College of Vet Med)</i>
<i>Scientific Advisors:</i>	<i>Karen Greenwood (Vice President of Project Management, Kindred Biosciences, Inc., Burlingame, California)</i>
	<i>Dr. Tracey Williams (Senior Principal Scientist, Global Therapeutics Research, Zoetis, Kalamazoo, Michigan)</i>
	<i>Dr. Kari Mundschenk (Professional Service Veterinarian, IDEXX Laboratories, Inc., Westbrook, Maine)</i>
	<i>Dr. Heidi Anderson (Senior Research and Development Manager, Wisdom Health, Helsinki, Finland)</i>

Grant Review Program

Winn recently added four new grant reviewers with specific areas of expertise:

Chris Kaelin, Senior Scientist, HudsonAlpha Institute for Biotechnology, Geneticist focusing on the genetics and biology of hair color and coat patterns in mammals.

Dr. Claudia Kirk, Professor of Medicine and Nutrition and Head of the Department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences at the University of Tennessee College of Veterinary Medicine in Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. Bonnie Beaver, Noted Behaviorist and Professor, Small Animal Clinical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Texas A&M University

Winn held its annual grant review on March 20, 2020, and awarded a total of \$304,477.09 in general and stipulated funds (see below.)

Winn will be conducting an independent \$830,000 grant review over two years to investigate the relationship of dietary Calcium and Phosphorous to the development of Feline Kidney Disease. Called the Cap-K Project and sponsored by both Nestle Purina and Mars, Inc., it's the first time these two premier pet food manufacturers will work together for the benefit of feline health.

To date, Winn has funded over \$7.3 million in feline health research at more than 30 partner institutions worldwide. CFA has good reason to be proud of their foresight and impact on the practice of feline medicine.

Education

The Winn FIP Webinar, “PURRsuing FIP and WINning: What We Know Today” was held on April 30, 2020 with sponsorship from CFA, TICA, and Dr. Elseys. Moderated by Winn board member Anthony Hutcherson and presented by Drs. Glenn Olah, Vicki Thayer, and Drew Weigner, this presentation was attended by over 500 individuals from around the world, and is available for viewing on our website.

The Winn Genetics Webinar, “From Health and Morphology to Complex Genetic Traits” was held on June 11, 2020 with sponsorship from Dr. Elseys and was presented by pioneering feline geneticist Leslie Lyons, PhD, and moderated by Anthony Hutcherson. This webinar can also be viewed on our website.

Winn's Education Committee has published a Summary Document from the FIP Symposium held November 16 and 17, 2019 at the University of California, Davis, CA for publication and dissemination to the veterinary and fancier communities as well as the general public. Hard copies are available, and it can also be viewed on our website.

Winn has partnered with the American Association of Feline Practitioners to develop and publish Guidelines for diagnosis and treatment of FIP. These guidelines set standards of care in feline medicine.

Winn is currently planning our next webinar and is actively seeking sponsorship for production of six educational webinars in 2020. These webinars will offer RACE continuing education credits and will be appropriate for judges' continuing education requirements.

Donor Programs

Dr. Elseys donated \$3500 in CFA and TICA's names to sponsor the FIP Webinar.

Estate bequests for the 2020 calendar year to date equals \$344937.82

Corporate donations for the 2020 calendar year to date exceed \$63,000 not including \$415,000 for the Cap-K Project.

Infrastructure, Organization Structure, Systems, Operations

Pursuant to the Strategic Planning midterm update held June 2019, Winn has embarked on a rebranding strategy to revitalize and reinvigorate the brand to appeal to existing and prospective donors. As part of this endeavor, we will be changing our name to EveryCat Health Foundation, dba Winn Feline Foundation. This change is vital to our continued growth and influence and will enable us to appeal to a wider audience. It is also consistent with Robert H. Winn's futuristic vision to benefit feline medicine for generations to come.

Winn has embarked on an executive search for a Development Director to assist in fundraising and outreach to our donors.

Upcoming Events

Monthly continuing educational webinars

October 2020 Board Meeting

Miller Trust Review

Cap-K Project Review

Recent Grant Awards

W20-002 *Mechanism of action of doxycycline in inhibiting feline infectious peritonitis virus.*

PI: Gary R. Whittaker, PhD; Cornell University; \$25,000.00 (Bria Fund)

W20-003 *Developing a safe and effective anticoronaviral therapy for client-owned cats with FIP (continuation study). PIs: Dr. Brian Murphy, Niels C. Pedersen; University of California, Davis; \$21,500.00 (Bria Fund)*

W20-005 – *Determining the clinical efficacy of mefloquine for treatment of naturally occurring feline infectious peritonitis, stage 1. PIs: Jacqueline Norris, Merran Govendir, Dr. Benjamin Kimble; University of Sydney; \$20,500.00 (Bria Fund)*

W20-007 *Transcriptomic analysis of CRISPR-Cas9 edited iPSC-CMs to identify and therapeutically target key biological pathways in hypertrophic cardiomyopathy caused by the Ragdoll R820W mutation. PIs: David J Connolly, Dr. Luke Dutton; The Royal Veterinary College; \$11,542.09 (Ricky and General Fund)*

W20-009 *Investigating cell molecular biological influence of PTC-209, a novel anti-cancer stem cell drug, in cats with oral squamous cell carcinomas lines. PI: Hiroto Yoshikawa; North Carolina State University; \$25,000.00 (Oncology and General Fund)*

W20-016 *Evaluation of oxidative stress in nonazotemic cats with increased symmetric dimethylarginine concentrations. PIs: William Whitehouse, DVM, DACVIM (SAIM), Nicolette Cassel, BSc, BVSc, MMedVet, DECVDI; Kansas State University; \$19,426.00 (Feline Kidney Fund, in honor of Vicki Thayer, DVM, DABVP – Feline)*

W20-019 *Phase 1 clinical trial investigating burst wave lithotripsy for treatment of obstructing ureteroliths in cats. PIs: Eva Furrow, Jody Lulich; University of Minnesota; \$23,405.00 (Feline Urinary Fund, Feline Kidney Fund in honor of Vicki Thayer, DVM, DACVP - Feline)*

W20-020 *In Vitro Characterization of Small Molecule Inhibitors of Pancreatic Amyloidosis for Diabetic Cats. PI: Jessica Fortin; Michigan State University; \$24,365.00 (General Fund)*

W20-021 *The effect of feeding frequency on feline energy metabolism and body composition – a long term study. PIs: Adronie Verbrugghe, Anna Kate Shoveller; Ontario Veterinary College, University of Guelph; \$24,946.00 (General Fund)*

W20-029 *Probing Modulation of FeLV Integration Sites into the Cat Genome Using Epigenetic Modulators. PIs: Dr. Cheryl Swenson Kruger, Dr. Vilma Yuzbasiyan-Gurkan; Michigan State University; \$25,000.00 (Infectious Disease and General Fund)*

W20-031 *Identification of Microsporium canis virulence factors. PI: Sue VandeWoude; Colorado State University; \$21,366.00 (General Fund)*

W20-032 *Development of a Rapid Diagnostic Test for Microsporium canis. PI: Sue VandeWoude; Colorado State University; \$14,062.00 (General Fund)*

W20-039 *Effects of general anaesthesia and surgery on renal biomarkers in cats. PI: Dr. Kavitha Kongara, BVSc (Cert. ECFVG-AVMA), MVSc, PhD; Massey University; \$20,700.00 (Feline Kidney Fund in honor of Vicki Thayer, DVM, DACVP - Feline)*

W20-040 *The effect of an intravenous injection of branched chain amino acids on body temperature of cats undergoing general anesthesia. PI: Stuart Clark-Price; Auburn University; \$7,665.00 (General Fund)*

W20-044 *Development and Initial Validation of a Frailty Scale for domestic cats.*

Pls: Tony Buffington, Melissa J. Bain; University of California, Davis; \$20,000.00 (General Fund)

*Respectfully submitted,
Drew Weigner, DVM
Winn Feline Foundation, President
<http://www.winnfelinefoundation.org>*

Hannon: Winn Foundation, George. **Eigenhauser:** I want to start off, there was a little bit of a problem with one of our recent webinars. The Leslie Lyons webinar was thrown together so quickly they didn't have time to ask CFA if CFA wanted to be named as a sponsor. Mark brought this to my attention of the powers that be in Winn. Anthony was still putting on the webinar when the message got to him. He did a thank you to CFA for our support and our sponsorship at the end, but we weren't included in the paperwork. So, the Winn board met yesterday and basically decided that for now on CFA will just get put on the webinars by default. It won't be, ask us if we want to be sponsors. I believe we have six webinars planned over the next few months through this year, and so CFA will just by default be named as a sponsor. I want to thank Mark for bringing that to our attention. **Hannon:** Thank you.

(17) **AWARDS COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: Mary Kolencik
Liaison to Board: Mark Hannon
List of Committee Members: Linda Peterson, David Raynor

Current Happenings of Committee:

[**Secretary's Note:** The Star Award nominees were considered in Executive Session.]

Action Items:

Vote on nominations for the 2020 Star Award.

Announce the recipients now and mail the stars. This is preferable to holding the names until the next annual because sometimes things get forgotten.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Kolencik, Chair*

Hannon: The Awards Committee is dealing exclusively this time with the Star Awards, so we're going to discuss the actual nominations for Star Award recipients in closed session, but in open session I do want to bring up, when do we want to present these? Do we want to hold off until the next Annual, do we want to make some big announcement? When do you want to announce the winners of the Star Awards for this year? **Anger:** I just want to make sure I have audio. Do I have audio now? **Hannon:** Yes. **Currle:** I've got two on the list. They live overseas, so we're going to have to do some other accommodations if the board decides to. I'll hold off until we talk about it during the vote. **Roy:** I think we should announce it as soon as we vote on them, maybe put out a special edition of the CFA News, because you know what? Those people deserve it and we don't know if any or all of them will go to an annual anyway. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with Sharon. Waiting until next year is just impractical. We've given up on the idea of having some sort of a mini thing at the International because we cancelled the International, so there's no really good place to give them the awards before next year. The best thing to do is just announce it as soon as possible with as much fanfare and hoopla as we can manage, but let's do it now. **Hannon:** Does somebody want to make a motion? **Currle:** I'll make a motion to announce, once they are approved, all Star Awards that are awarded by CFA. **Calhoun:** Kathy seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? I don't see any hands up other than Kenny's. OK, Kenny's hand is down. All those in favor of announcing it as soon as possible.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

The Cat Fanciers' Association

News Announcements

June 18, 2020

CFA Service Stars Awarded

Each year, CFA recognizes those people who have performed some service for CFA with a Star Award. This award is a simple token to show appreciation for a job well done. Unfortunately, this year we are not able to applaud these volunteers at our banquet, but I hope that you all will join me in thanking them for their service to CFA. Congratulations to:

Rachel Anger, Region 4, World Cat Congress representative, third star
Nagla Elmsary, Egypt, CFA International Division support, first star
Jan Beardsley-Blanco, Region 1, Animal Welfare, first star
Lucy Drury, Region 6, Cat Talk, first star
Beth Field, Region 3, Ambassador of CFA, first star
Kit Fung, Hong Kong, Assistance to CFA during the COVID-19 pandemic, first star
Wain Harding, Region 2, CFA International Division support, second star
Kathi Hoos, Region 4, CFA Mentor program and CFA hotline support, first star
Julie Keyer, Region 1, Animal Welfare, second star
Rich Nolte, Region 7, CFA Promotion, first star
Linda Peterson, Region 7, 2019 Annual, second star
Nick Pun, Hong Kong, BAOS support, first star
Alan Raymond, Thailand, CFA International Division support, first star
Ann Strople, Region 7, Cat Talk, first star

Thank you all for your support of CFA!
Mary Kolencik
Awards Committee Chair

(18) **BUDGET COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: *Kathy Calhoun*
List of Committee Members: *Mark Hannon, Rich Mastin, Mathew Wong, Teresa Sweeney, Alene Tartaglia*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

A modified team met via Zoom meeting on Tuesday, May 26, Wednesday, May 27 and Friday, May 29, 2020 to develop the 2020-2021 budget.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The CFA Treasurer loaded the preliminary budget into QuickBooks to generate reports to support the CFA Board Review on June 8, 2020.

Future Projections for Committee:

Continue to monitor income and expenses driving posting accuracy and forecast attainment.

Board Action Items:

Approve the 2020-2021 CFA Budget.

Time Frame:

Thursday, June 18, 2020

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

CFA Preliminary Budget

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, Chair*

Hannon: Budget. Rich, you have a motion? **Calhoun:** Everybody has gotten the Budget Committee Report. I'm going to drop right down to the action item, which is to approve the 2020-2021 CFA Budget. My question is, does anybody have any line items that they would like to pull out of the preliminary budget I sent out on Saturday, June 13th? **Hannon:** This is in line with what we normally do with Protests. We take something out if we want to discuss it, and then we pass the rest of it. **Mastin:** I would like to pull out line item 500801, the Officer Compensation, from this motion and approve the rest of the budget and pull that line item out so we can address that separately. **Newkirk:** I agree with Rich. I think that is the only line item that the board is having an issue with. I'm happy with everything else that's in the budget. I think passing everything except that one line item is in order and I would support that motion. **Currle:** I too support Rich's motion. **Hannon:** Rachel, I see your hand is up. **Anger:** I just got booted off, so I missed Rich's motion. **Hannon:** His motion was to approve everything except the line

item dealing with the officers' compensation. **Anger:** That assumes that the current stipends stay in place, is that correct? **Hannon:** No, it takes it out of the budget. We would do it like we do with Protests. We would approve the entire budget with the exception of that one line item, then we will bring back a motion if this passes for that one line item. **Anger:** Thank you, OK.

Auth: So, my question would be to Kathy Calhoun, since we have made some decisions relative that are going to affect the budget, how will we deal with those? Mostly for the Almanac and the Yearbook, and now that the shows are coming back on, you are going to have some more income that you didn't have, and you're going to have some more expenses relative to that, and Rich is going to have his \$500 sponsorship that's going to come back on, so how will you make your adjustments in the budget to address those changes? **Calhoun:** We will have to continue – and this is kind of an ongoing thing, because we always have programs and these sorts of things that we bring on as the year goes on. At this point, the preliminary budget was before all these decisions were made. We may have to make some adjustments, but that won't be unusual. We wouldn't have to re-approve the budget; we would just have to present those adjustments back to the board. Quite frankly, some of the things like new shows, we don't know how many shows are going to come back in play at this point in time. We did make some considerations to be conservative around like the Yearbook. The Yearbook really won't hit us until next year's budget, because we still intend to have a Yearbook this year. **Auth:** Thank you. **Hannon:** I don't see any other hands up. Are we ready to vote on the motion?

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser abstained.

Hannon: Rich? **Mastin:** I'm not sure if we had a second on that last motion. If it wasn't seconded, I'll second it. I asked to pull it out. **Black:** I thought that Darrell seconded it. **Currle:** He did. **Newkirk:** I did, Rich. I seconded your motion. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. **Hannon:** Alright, we're dealing with the line item with the officers' compensation. Rich, do you want to make a motion? **Mastin:** My motion is to continue with the stipends that have been in place with the four officers. In addition, I would like to separately address each of the officers' compensation adjustment for the work that has been done, and then going forward increase their compensation by 50%, based on the current and past work requirements that are needed. Each of these can be discussed separately. I will abstain on myself. I will not speak in favor of myself or against myself, but I would like to speak in favor of the other three officers and the work that they have done. So, that is my motion; to address each officer separately, continue their stipends as is, give them a compensation adjustment for the work that has been done for \$6,000 each person, and increase their stipend by 50%. **Hannon:** Why don't you make a motion then for one of them. **Mastin:** Alright, Rachel. **Hannon:** So, you make a motion for Secretary. **Mastin:** Yes. **Calhoun:** I second. **Hannon:** Discussion?

Newkirk: I sent Allene a copy of New York not-for-profit law 515. I don't know if she can put that up on the screen or not, but these discussions – it delineates in there who can be present during this discussion. So Allene, can you find that and put it up? **Tartaglia:** Yes, I'm working on that right now. I should have it up shortly. **Morgan:** Can you hear me? **Hannon:** Yes. **Morgan:** I know there is some opposition here from many of the board members here to this proposal, but I would like to give you guys just a little bit of a different take on it. I do not disagree that originally maybe it was perhaps presented in the wrong way. I know that myself, like many of you, my first reaction when I saw the line item for officer compensation increases

was kind of outrage. Quite candidly, my original response was to think of me, myself and my own contribution which are anywhere from 40-to 80 hours a week, and that certainly goes well beyond what could reasonably be expected as a volunteer for an elected position. But then my second thought was that we are facing unprecedented challenges that will undoubtedly impact on our bottom line, but then I told myself to take my own personal issues out of it and I took a step back to look at what this really represented. I would say to you that if you look at this from a slightly different point of view, you may very well have a completely different take when you're done thinking about it. Quite frankly, we are getting a pretty amazing deal. When we run for office there is a reasonable expectation that there is a time and resource commitment. We're all willing to do that. None of us begrudge it, we signed up for it and we are glad to do anything we can for CFA. However, recently the scope of what many are expected to cover has changed dramatically. If you will indulge me I will give you a few examples. Let's start with our Secretary. Not so long ago she was expected to transcribe minutes for four in-person meetings. Then we added the teleconferences and her workload doubled. This year we have added transcriptions for core committees and extra board meetings to the point that she is often transcribing minutes on a weekly basis. That goes well beyond what one can reasonably expect one individual volunteer – volunteer – to handle. We had one meeting where she could not attend. This is just a really good way to make this real to you with numbers. Kathy had that meeting transcribed by the service. The cost for a meeting that went a little over an hour was over a \$1,000. If we were to compensate our Secretary for the extra work at the going rate the amount we would owe would be astronomical. What they're asking for is a drop in the bucket, but it does not stop there – let's look at our Treasurer. Some time ago our accountant walked out without notice. She was paid over \$40,000 a year and that does not count any of the benefits and all that other stuff. Rather than replace her, we asked our Treasurer to pick up some of the slack, not to mention line item audits that go well beyond what an elected official should be expected to do. Again, what is proposed in the budget is a pittance compared to what it would cost if we had a paid accountant to cover the work that our Treasurer and our Vice President are now covering. And speaking of Vice President, let's look at the contract work that he does. If we were paying an attorney, we would be paying hundreds of dollars an hour and I am not even going to start on the multitude of extras covered by our President who is available 24/7. They have taken on the work of paid employees and are asking for a small token of appreciation that does not even come close to the market value of the work they perform. I will say it again, given what the market value is on the work that's involved, I think we really are getting a bargain with this proposal. In my opinion, we cannot afford to be penny wise and pound foolish. I really hope you will put aside your preconceptions and that first initial knee-jerk reaction, and prejudices you might have, and look at this from a different perspective. I think that if you do that you will realize that we do not want to have to cover the costs of all the extra work currently being carried by our officers. They deserve our thanks and they deserve our appreciation. I support each of the individuals' proposals as they will be presented. Sorry that I went so long.

Hannon: Rich, one more time. Which office are we talking about? **Mastin:** The CFA Treasurer [sic, Secretary] Rachel. **Hannon:** OK. **Newkirk:** Can I get a turn in? **Hannon:** Yes. **Newkirk:** This thing that's on the screen right now, this was sent to me in a line. When Allene put it up, I just see the education law is section 216(a) and I think that this may apply to education corporations and not our corporation. Maybe John or George can weigh in on that. **Hannon:** John, do you want to weigh in on that? **Randolph:** I'm still reviewing the section here, as it appears on the screen. **Newkirk:** The thing that was specific was item c, the second

sentence, if Allene can put it back up. What I need for you to tell us is, does that apply to just – that not-for-profit law has a whole lot of individual laws that apply specifically to different kinds of corporations. OK, so this is not-for-profit. **Hannon:** Darrell, I'm uncomfortable having to rule on this on the fly like this. I think if you want to bring this up where we can do some thinking about it, some research about it, but to ask John to look at one sentence in a law without looking at the whole thing and giving some time to give it thought, I think it's a little unfair for us to move on that right now. **Newkirk:** OK, I don't object to that.

Hannon: OK, so we're talking about the Treasurer's [sic, Secretary] position. Pam, I see your hand is up. Can we limit it to the discussion of the Treasurer [sic, Secretary]? **P. Moser:** Mine is for all four. It doesn't make any difference – Treasurer, President, whatever. It's a blanket for all. I am very disappointed that when we started the discussion on these bonuses, that there were many objections to them and we were told you would go back and revisit the numbers. I had assumed that you would have come back with lower amounts, but to my surprise, not only were they not lower, Kathy and Rachel's amounts were \$1,500 more each. The first time you asked, it was all in bonuses as a one-time only situation. When you came back with the new work-around you gave – which is what you're asking this tie – lower bonuses as a one-time, but you then raised your stipend on a yearly basis, which will increase the budget annually by \$21,000. When our revenue is going to take a hit, a downturn due to the COVID, I can't find justification. I do believe that people do a bunch of work on the board, but that is not limited to just the officers. If you read the job descriptions of the officers, most of the committees that they are currently on relate to what is stated in their job descriptions. The other committees they sit on are voluntary. No one has forced them to sit on these committees. I would have no objection for anyone on this board to get a stipend if it was voted on by the delegation. After all, they are the ones that voted us in, but for us as board members giving our fellow board members bonuses, I feel it's unethical. **Black:** I agree a lot with what Pam said. I have no problem with the officers getting a stipend. When it comes to all the work on the different committees, that's what we have directors-at-large for, and directors-at-large should be shouldering this work, not all the four officers, so I think that the work should be spread out amongst those people who were elected to take on those committee chairs and do that work. I could go along maybe with a small increase but I have a problem with the \$6,000 bonus and doubling the stipend. Like Pam said, we have no idea what this year is going to look like. Our income is already projected to be 75% down [sic]. I think it will potentially be much more than that. We have a very modest profit showing on our budget now with the 75% [sic] decrease in our income, and if our income was lower than that we would not see any profit at all. So, I appreciate the work but I don't think this is the timing to double stipends and give out bonuses.

[**Treasurer's Note:** CFA's income is not projected to be 75% down. Total Income is budgeted/projected to be down 17% compared to 2019-2020 actuals. But this alone is only part of the equation. Total Expense is budgeted/projected to be 21% lower compared to 2019 - 2020 actuals. This means that income is lower, but our expenses are lower as well. The bottom line is that we are projecting a \$142,281 profit.]

Mastin: Just for clarification purposes, there is no request to double the stipends. That is not accurate. The request is to increase the stipends by 50%. A few board members – and I think it was maybe four board members – asked the Budget Committee to go back and adjust the – as you refer to it – a bonus amount to a lower amount. It was reviewed and discussed, and it was

lowered from the original amount, which was equal to the current then-stipends, down to half or slightly above half for the Treasurer's position and the Secretary's position. So, I just want clarification purposes there so the information is accurate. Particular for Rachel, we have addressed these in the past some years ago when we determined Rachel has done extraordinary work or additional work, and we have addressed it with a bonus. I believe the last time we did this 2-3 years ago, it was my recommendation that we not only change from that format to just giving Rachel a bonus, that we also increase her compensation because of the added work she was doing, and the board at that time agreed to that. Last year, we had a situation with the CFA Legal. I had the discussions with our legal counsel and there was a request, based on the amount of time that was spent, that we had to look at something in terms of increasing the stipend for the work that was done for that year in question. That was brought to the board. We presented it to the entire board and the board approved it. These are all what we have done in the past, whether CFA or, to the best of my knowledge – I've been CFA's Finance Chair for 10 years now – and I believe most all of those 10 years CFA has been profitable. There may have been one year where we were slightly below profit, but is there ever a good time to justify increases, or is it just a phrase to use that "there is no good time" to justify increases? The point is, Rachel – and going back specific to Rachel's work – she has doubled and in some cases more than doubled the required amount of time she expected to spend going into this and we are expecting her to produce minutes from committees that have likely never been done before up until this year. We are also asking her to publish all the discussions that go into the online voting. To the best of my knowledge, that was not done before. This all takes time. This is time that is taken away from Rachel and other officers – personal time, family time, work-related time – that is given to CFA. This is a very small request. It's not unreasonable at all, and I believe we need to do something to show appreciation for these officers and allow them to continue to do the work. I don't know who the next President is going to be. Darrell, you may not appreciate me speaking up on this now. You are going to put in 40, 60, 80 hours a week in being the CFA President. The stipend that is presented right now that the President receives is very, very small. In order to get your attention and to get you to do the work and do a good job, you need to be compensated at some level.

Auth: I have four points I would like to make. The first one is, first of all, this is relative to all four, but Rich, your motion is to maintain the current stipend that is to be paid to Rachel, is that correct? **Mastin:** That is correct. **Auth:** OK, and that's public knowledge. It's \$9,000. **Mastin:** That is correct. **Auth:** OK, so that's public knowledge. So then, this has to do with Melanie's comments and to some extent Rich's comments. When you're mixing employees with volunteers, now, by the very discussion that you're talking about the value of volunteers in terms of what employees would make, would make the IRS jump through hoops. That's because you are equating volunteers' value with that of employees, and if that's the case then the IRS would then claim that they are not volunteers, that they are employees. I think that's going to be a legal problem that could be problematic down the road. So, I think that we need to be careful if we're going to have this discussion that we can't equate volunteers' time with that of the value of an employee, because by golly I think the IRS would really have a problem with that. So then, let's talk about the bottom line. The bottom line was, and it was – this is the thing that really set me off yesterday and it mirrors what Pam had said – that we had anticipated you coming back with some lowerage, and you did but it became smoke and mirrors because the bottom line was a dollar amount, and yet but the new budget that's being proposed actually got increased, so you would think that the board members would be upset about compensation and the dollar amount.

To come back and increase the amounts by that much is a slap in the face for those people who spoke up against these changes in the meeting that we had last week. Now, in terms of Rich's comment – this is my fourth point. In terms of Rich's comment relative to timing, that no timing is good, while it is right that we do have a higher income than we've had in the past, I might want to point out to a number of people that three people got laid off with no intentions of them coming back, and that one person was furloughed. So, if volunteers are taking time away from paid employees, and those paid employees lost their jobs, I think the timing really sucks because what you're doing is you're paying – compensating volunteers when there are people who actually lost their jobs. That's all I have for this time. **Newkirk:** When we had the budget meeting, I made the comment that if you had come to us with a 10-15% bump in the stipend, I probably could have gone along with that, but that wasn't the case. You-all doubled it. Now it's been altered and it's a 50% increase, but actually when you add the bonuses on to what next year's budgeted items are, the total line item for the expense has not changed and I think it even went up a little bit, if I'm not mistaken, OK? As to Rich's comment about if I get elected President, I did not run to seek the President of CFA to make money. It never even entered my mind, and I didn't even know what the stipends were. I think there's a lot of charities really struggling, if I even take the stipend. My initial feeling is to donate it to like Winn and BAP and some really needed charities that need some donations. But if you figure – now don't get me wrong, I'm not saying that an officer of the organization is anywhere near being compared to somebody who flips burgers, OK, at McDonald's but if you figure a person that gets paid \$10 an hour at 40 hours in a week, 52 weeks in a year, that person would make \$20,800. Now, that's a really, really low figure and I understand that's below the poverty level. Now, all of us – I mean, I'm retired but I planned ahead so I'm financially secure, so I don't need the income. Now, that doesn't take away from the work that the four officers of this organization do, alright? I sincerely thank you guys from the bottom of my heart for all the hours you put in. I think that you go above and beyond, and I understand. I think there's a little bit of conflict here that three of these officers are on the Budget Committee and are proposing this increase. It's sort of like Congress just voting in their raise anytime they want to. So, I've got a little bit of problem with that but I don't know a solution how to correct that. So, I think Rachel – and I have told her this privately many times – she works her ass off for this organization. If anybody deserves a bonus in this organization, it's Rachel, because not only does she have to attend the meetings, after the meeting is over, she spends hours transcribing all of that. The other three people on the board that are getting a bonus here don't spend those after-the-meeting hours putting that time in. I think \$6,000 is a little bit too much, but personally I think Rachel deserves a bonus. She has measurable work after the meeting that we all see, OK? Now, maybe the people in the planning part put hours in before the meeting, so that's something we don't see. Everybody that sits on this board, you're a resource person for every person. When you walk in a show hall, I always get all kinds of questions asked, and so I get paid because I go and judge, but I give a lot of my judging fee back to the clubs, because like I said, I don't do this for the money. I do it because I take pride in representing this organization. That's where I stand on this. I can't support \$6,000. If you want to lower it, I can support it for Rachel because I see measurable output for Rachel and she really, really – she goes far and beyond anybody I've ever seen. So, in my eyes, Rachel is a hero for CFA.

Calhoun: The only thing that I was going to mention, because it was kind of a little bit mixed in the beginning about whether we were talking about the Treasurer or the Secretary. I agree that Rachel does a yeoman's job and that she is – if you just take simple math and let's say

she is transcribing one additional meeting a week, if we had to have some sort of transcript service to do that, that would be \$4,000 a month and at least \$48,000 a year. This bonus or this compensation for work done and increased stipend is not nearly to that magnitude. I think she does a phenomenal job. I think the other thing, a lot of this is behind the scenes and folks don't see the work done, but I think in Rich's case, we have gotten not only the contract work that both Rich and Mark do. None of us see this work. None of us have to participate in that. It's ongoing. There are multiple contracts that have to be reviewed. If we had a financial advisor that was watching our funds and making advisory projections on how we should distribute things; for instance, like the Wells Fargo, that advisor would be taking a percentage every month. It would be far more than what we're getting for the advice from Rich. So, you know, I know that the initial doubling of what was called a bonus, I think the proper term is really compensation for work done in the past. If folks really and truly deserve it, I think we certainly – again, if we had to farm it out, we would be at least at a minimum of \$100,000 as opposed to what we are. Just the only other thing that I wanted to mention is that, from Mary's perspective, she made a good point about employees being either let go or furloughed. The skill set – I'm not trying to dismiss any of that, at all. Please don't get me wrong, because that's a human being and it's tough, but the skill sets were different. It wasn't a person who could do what Rachel is doing that got laid off. It wasn't a person that could do what Rich and Mark are doing that got laid off. And while I certainly do feel this is tough – I have people, neighbors. I live in Chicago and it hits you on the head. I'm not trying to be non-sympathetic, it was just a different skill set. That's all I have to say.

Currle: Hello everybody. **Hannon:** Hi Kenny. **Currle:** I own a business and this is a business. We're also a promotional event with our cat shows, our judges and everybody, particularly our exhibitors and our cat clubs. We need to have competent people running with this type of income. Fifteen years ago, we didn't have these challenges. We are now and have become a global organization which does require a tremendous amount of more time, so it's going to take more management. Somebody said something earlier about, if we want to become a completely volunteer organization, then why aren't we getting the at-large members involved? In my mind, that certain is a good point, but I know that they're on committees as well – certainly unpaid, but the crux of all of this falls on our elected officers – our President, Vice-President, Treasurer and Secretary – and in my mind they are already compensated. In my mind they are under-compensated. I'm not saying let's give them what they want, but let's step back and take a look at what has been accomplished and what they're responsible for. Rather than take each and every one individually, I think as a collective group would be a lot easier for us to address.

B. Moser: I just looked this up and first of all before I say what I want to say, I want to thank all of you for doing the job you do. I know you do hard work. I know Rachel – I don't know how many times I've told people how hard and how good I think Rachel is, how hard she works and how good she does her job. But, I just looked this up and I'm having a problem with the 50% raise, OK? So, that's basically what we're doing, is giving her a 50% raise. The average raise in 2019 out of thousands of companies was 3.1%, so my problem is, compensation is really high, people, as far as when you want to give a raise. When I was in the work field, I never saw anyone get a 50% raise unless they got a promotion. So, that's where I am. I could never vote on the 50% raise. That's it. **Morgan:** I think someone just mentioned 10-15%. Brian just mentioned 3.1% in terms of increases. What I want to say is, we're facing things as a board that no other

board has ever had to face. Things have escalated to the point of an unprecedented level and their workloads haven't gone up by 3.2%. They haven't gone up by 10-15%. It hasn't even gone up by 50%. It has tripled. So, again, we're looking at a mere pittance. If you're looking at a 3% raise on a recent salary, that's fine, but we're not talking salaries or employees here, we're talking their minimum stipends. So, I don't think the increase is unreasonable. In fact, again, I would reiterate, I think we're getting a deal. I want to go back to the motion I think we have on hand, which is, we're considering Rachel. If we're not going to give her – **Hannon:** That's not the motion at hand, it's Treasurer. **Morgan:** I thought it was. **Hannon:** Rich, what was your motion? **Mastin:** I'm sorry, it was for Rachel. That was my mistake earlier. It was for Rachel. **Hannon:** OK, go ahead Melanie. **Morgan:** If we're not going to give her just what they're asking for, I see no reason why – I mean, her job description doesn't say she has to give word-for-word transcripts. We should just give all that up, give up our history, give up all those things and she can go back to just doing basic minutes. She has every right. We should be falling to our knees and kissing the ground she walks on, for the work that woman is doing for us. CFA is very, very lucky to have her and I don't think what they're asking for is unreasonable.

Hannon: OK, I'm going to interject my own comments here in regard to Secretary. I don't know if any of you remember, but when she ran the first time, I ran against her. She obviously won. If I were the Secretary today, I don't have the ability to do transcriptions. We would be contracting that out. It is not a part of the Secretary's job to do transcriptions. The minutes we had before Jerry became President and asked for transcriptions were far less detailed, and that's what I ran for when I ran for Secretary, and if Rachel for some reason decides she doesn't want to be Secretary any longer and we get a new Secretary, that new Secretary may not have the ability to do transcriptions. We're going to have to pay thousands of dollars to have that contracted out. **Currle:** I never knew you ran for Secretary. **Hannon:** Yes. Rachel will remember it. **Currle:** I'm done. **Hannon:** I did get an email. Somebody suggested every time I have to say, "you're on mute," I take a drink.

Roy: I was going to first address something that Darrell said, but now I've forgotten it's been so long. It's a small price to pay for all of you, when you consider how much your work has doubled or tripled in the last year. That's the first thing. The second thing, what Brian said, when people get a 3% raise or a 2.1% raise, they haven't doubled their workload. They are still doing the same job, it just compensates for cost of living. That's all. **Hannon:** Is that it?

Anger: My internet connection is very unstable. Every time it boots me off it says that I'm unstable. I'm going to give it a try here. First, I want to thank everybody for the really kind words that you have said, and I want to share those same words about my fellow officers. I see these guys [internet connection unstable] neither expect nor am asking for the kind of compensation that someone in my job like a court reporter would get in the regular workplace. This really is a labor of love. I love the Secretary part. I tell people that all the time and they just shake their head and think I'm crazy, but it's just something that I love to do. I think Mark Hannon loves to be President. He likes to have meetings, likes to pull all the pieces together, and he has done a great job with that this past year. It's a job very few of us want. I don't know why Darrell wants it, don't know why Mark wants it, don't know why Pam DelaBar wanted to do it in the past, and all the other great Presidents. That's just a job not everybody wants to do. As far as the delegates voting on this issue, that is an interesting concept. I have to say that I am feeling a little awkward right now – not because of the amount being discussed or people's views on it,

it's just that I feel awkward because I'm looking at comments that people listening are feeling awkward about having to listen to it. Would the delegates want to do it? I don't know, but so far in the over 100 year history of this association, as far as I know the delegate have not done it, and that's why they're not considering it this year. If that's something we want to do in the future, great, but then they're going to inherit that awkwardness. As far as Mary bringing it up earlier, that had quite a bit of detail about why it's awkward. When I speak to my employer about my annual compensation, it's behind closed doors [internet connection unstable].

Hannon: Rachel, you are breaking up. I guess your internet connection is not good right now. I'm going to move on to George. **Eigenhauser:** I just want to say that I agree with the people that say, we shouldn't be talking about this like a 3% or 5% cost of living increase. This isn't a situation where the person has been doing the same job for 20 years and we're just doing little incremental increases. The amount of work Rachel has to do has increased dramatically. We've gone from just having minutes of the meetings to having full transcripts of the meetings to having special meetings that we've called several times this year that she has to do transcriptions of, and then we started asking her to do transcriptions of some of the major board committees, like the China committee and the COVID committee. So, her work has increased radically over the last couple of years and particularly over the last six months, so I don't look at this in terms of an incremental cost or pay raise, I think this is pay for work received. She puts in a hell of a lot of time and does a hell of a good job, and I don't begrudge a penny of this.

Hannon: Darrell, your hand is up. **Newkirk:** This really has brought to light, do we need verbatim transcriptions of our board meetings? I think the answer to that is no. When Rachel transcribes a meeting, she sends it to the committee for their approval. There's no reason that Rachel can't just take minutes – quote/unquote. Why do they have to be verbatim? We hear every um, ah, oh, ooh, and every door slam she puts in the minutes. That's just ridiculous, and there's no reason for that. It would cut her workload down probably by half if we just said, "here, tell us what happened, give us the minutes. You hear it, you translate it into what you think would be concise so that everybody understands the point." Then you send that to the committee report, OK, to the committee chair. The committee chair says, "yeah, that was the gist of it," you send it back and you put it in the file, and then that gets in. That would cut her work down a lot. Now, that's not what we're talking about, because we're talking about awarding Rachel a bonus. I think Rachel deserves every penny of \$6,000, but I think that for me personally I'll raise my hand for a \$3,000 but I can't support \$6,000 right now.

Krzanowski: Many of the thoughts that I had have already been expressed by other speakers, but I do want to say that during my time working in CFA and through my time serving on the Board of Directors, the scope of the work that the entire board has faced has increased dramatically. Years ago, we had hardly any issues to consider. We were looking at judges' advancements, show rule changes, some breed changes. Now we're dealing as an international organization with so many issues all the time. The point I want to make is that, as we're looking and dealing with those issues and trying to address them, our leaders – our four officers – they are leading us as we try to address all these things. I really believe that they work extremely hard for the benefit of CFA. They put through a lot of extra effort to try to help us address the issues at hand. I do believe that they deserve the compensation.

Roy: This goes back to something that Darrell just recommended. Didn't the delegates pass a few years ago that they wanted verbatim minutes of everything that was said, not just a summary? **Hannon:** That's not my recollection. When Jerry was elected President, he determined we were going to do verbatim, because he was of the impression that we weren't being transparent with our constituents, that the minutes were being deliberately skewed to keep information from our constituents, so he wanted verbatim. Now, when we went to verbatim, Rachel did tell me that actually turned out to be easier than the minutes she had done, because the minutes she was doing before, she was trying to make the board members sound more intelligent than they actually did in the transcripts. **Roy:** OK. **Hannon:** I don't see any other hands. **Eigenhauser:** George has a hand. We just got a note from Mary K that says that she does recall that it was the delegation that made the request that we get full transcripts, and that she was the person that made the motion. That's why she remembers. **Hannon:** I'm going to call the vote. **Mastin:** I just wanted to point out that earlier there was some discussion on the concern on the 50% increase. A couple people had mentioned a 50% increase compared to cost of living or a 3% increase. This is not equitable, but keeping in mind, if Rachel is only working 40 hours a week at the current pay – and I'm not saying she's only working 40 – that's \$4.33 per hour. I don't know where you are going to get the quality of work that Rachel is doing for \$4.33 per hour, and if we increase that by the 50% that I just made the motion on, that brings her to \$6.49 on a 40 hour work week, just doing this. If she's spending 50 hours or 60, it even lowers it further, so keep that mind. When we're talking about percentage increases, we're not looking at an apple to an apple when we're comparing it to the standard annual increase. Thank you. **Auth:** Before we vote, can we have the motion restated, so we know exactly what we're voting on. **Mastin:** Sure. The motion is to increase the current stipend by 50% and compensate Rachel \$6,000 for the past work that she has completed, or she has done. **Hannon:** OK, you're satisfied, Mary? **Auth:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Rich, repeat it one more time please. **Mastin:** The motion is to increase Rachel's stipend by 50%, so that goes from \$9,000 to \$13,500, and she receives \$6,000 for the past work completed. **Hannon:** All those in favor of the motion.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Newkirk, Auth, B. Moser and P. Moser voting no. Anger abstained.

Hannon: Rich, you have another motion? **Mastin:** Yes. My next motion is to provide our Treasurer, Kathy Calhoun, a 50% increase in stipend and a \$6,000 compensation adjustment for work that has already been done. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to say that, once again, we're not talking about a cost of living increase here, we're talking about when things started hitting the fan earlier this year with the pandemic, the problem in China and everything else, Kathy has had to keep her hand on the pulse of our finances through one of the biggest crisis this organization has ever faced. In addition to her Treasurer duties, she's a real workhorse. She has been lead on things like Coronavirus, been lead on China, been lead on a lot of other things, so in the face of just a massive amount of additional work – and even this year going forward, I would expect that it's going to continue to be a busy job. As little by little the world opens up, we're going to be revisiting and re-tuning and re-tweaking our budget over and over again throughout the course of the year. I think this is a fair amount for the work that has been done and is being done. **Morgan:** I'm not going to pretend to understand all the numbers that Kathy has to work with, but I do know that she has picked up untold amounts of extra work, not only with all the emergencies that we've had, but also with the turn-over that we've had in Central Office, etc., and I kind of echo what I've already said when I was addressing some of the issues with Rachel. Again, as George

just mentioned, this isn't a cost of living increase, this is payment for services rendered – just a little bit, not even as a token for services rendered. **Mastin:** I just want to remind the board that I still do not have a second on my motion. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** My own comment was, we lost our bookkeeper and the decision was made not to replace her. In regard to the comments on the people that got laid off, they don't have that skill set. They could not take over for Cristal. Kathy has done a lot of extra work in order to avoid spending \$40,000+ to hire another bookkeeper. **Mastin:** I just want everybody to know, in my 10 years as Finance Chair, I've had the opportunity to work with three Treasurers. All three of the Treasurers have been wonderful to work with, including Kathy. Anytime I have an email or a phone call regarding CFA finances or any concerns that stand out, Kathy is right there all hours of the day, seven days a week, getting back to me as quickly as possible. She is very deserving of my request and I hope the rest of the board sees that, as well. Thank you. **Hannon:** Any other comments before we vote? All those in favor of the motion regarding the Treasurer.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Newkirk, Auth, B. Moser and P. Moser voting no. Calhoun abstained.

Hannon: Rich, do you have another motion or do you want to defer to somebody else? **Mastin:** No, I will continue with my motions. This will be my last one. My motion is to provide a 50% increase for the CFA President. Current stipend is \$12,000. My proposal is to increase it to \$18,000 and also provide a \$6,000 compensation adjustment for work done in the past. **Hannon:** Is there a second to the motion? **Calhoun:** Kathy seconds. **Newkirk:** I will abstain on this one. **Mastin:** Anybody who has had the opportunity to work with me knows that I can be extremely demanding in many different aspects, in terms of running a business. I had the opportunity to work for four years with the President before Mark and there was a fair amount of time dedicated by the President. Going forward these past six years with Mark as President, Mark has done an amazing job with all the hours and the time that he has put on this. Now, I'm one who does work all hours of the day. Many of you have seen my emails come in early, early in the morning or late in the evening. Well, Mark at most times was able to keep up with me, and to be able to reach out to the CFA President at 1:00, 2:00 in the morning or 10:00 p.m. or first thing in the morning and get some direction or questions answered is very important. Now, I don't suspect he does that with everybody, but to be able to have that relationship with the CFA President tells me he extremely cares about CFA and he wants to move things in the right direction, and I believe he is very worthy of this adjustment to compensation and his hours spent. **Calhoun:** I have been Treasurer on two rotations and I would have to say that I have seen a number of Presidents in action. I would not say that I have seen anybody more impressive than Mark Hannon. He is always available. If I think that I have a lot of work to do, he is on triple the calls and business issues and items that come up at 9:00 at night, Saturdays, Sundays. Mark is always on top of it, but not only that, Mark has been a great leader, he has been motivational. When I call him on a Saturday or a Sunday or 9:00 in the morning, he is there with information, good advice. I am very, very impressed with Mark. The stipend that he is currently receiving and compensation for work done in the past is minimal to what he has delivered. In some instances, it's hard to see because all the folks that are on this call are not on all those calls, are not on the crack of dawn or late night calls, but Mark is. I think he completely deserves this and I will support it. **Morgan:** We talk about the time commitment that some of us put in, and really an easy week is 40 hours. They go up to 60, 70, 80. We talk about all the work that each one of us does individually. What we don't look at is what Mark deals with, and what Mark deals with is

that he is part of all of this. He is involved with each and every one of us. He's there for all of us, but it transcends that because he has picked up every bit of extra work that could possibly be thrown at him and never once shirked it. Not only that, he has continued to do what he was elected to do, which is lead this organization in a way that has garnered, I think, the respect of all. And yes, again, this is a pittance towards what he's done. He is involved in each and every committee that we have. I'm a member of a couple of them, and he gives us attention whenever asked. I'm in 100% support. **Currle:** I support this. Can we go ahead and vote on it now?

Hannon: I don't see any other hands up. Alright, we're going to vote on the motion. All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Auth, P. Moser and B. Moser voting no. Newkirk abstained. [**Secretary's Note:** The President only votes in the case of a tie.]

Hannon: Kathy, do you want to make a motion with regard to the Vice President?

Calhoun: Yes. I would like to make a motion in regard to the Vice President and Financial Chair to grant a \$6,000 one-time payment for past work and an \$18,000 annual stipend for 2020-2021.

Hannon: Is there a second? **Currle:** I'll second it. Two years on the board, I always knew Rich was brilliant, but seeing how brilliant he is in person is even more impressive. In looking at the numbers and what he has done to diversify the portfolio that we have, it's just been amazing. To have him, there is no price you can put on it. He knows business, he knows how to make the best out of the money and this \$47,000+ we had just in interest from his diversification of this portfolio is only the beginning. So, thank you Rich for that work and I fully support this.

Eigenhauser: Rich is one of the hardest working people I have ever met, on or off the CFA board. It is amazing how much work he takes on himself, and he's just got impressive follow through. If you ask Rich something, he will find the answer and it will be right. I don't know how he devotes as much time as he does to CFA, managing his businesses, but it is just incredible the amount of time and work he does for CFA. My only objection is, this is not enough. **Newkirk:** The first time Rich ran for office, I sent an email – I lived in Region 6 at the time – to every club telling them that this is one sharp dude. We need this guy on the board of directors, and luckily they voted him in. I think Rich – I've told many people Rich is the most important board member we have. I can say that with all honesty. I don't mean that as an insult to anybody else that serves on this board, but I always call Rich "EF Hutton" because when EF Hutton speaks, everybody listens, if you all remember that old ad, because what Rich does is, he sits there and he takes everything in and then he processes it and then he brings out what he thinks, always in a very logical way. I know he works his ass off. There's no denying that. What I object to is the whole concept, so Rich, I will vote no but please understand that you have my 100%, maybe 150% respect and it's just the process. It's not a vote against you, so I want you to please understand that. **Calhoun:** If we tried, we could not afford Rich Mastin, by any stretch of the imagination. It's amazing the amount of work that he puts in for CFA, on top of a very demanding business that has also been going through a very challenging time; yet, he is there, he is adding things to his workload for CFA, he is volunteering to look at contracts for clubs. It's amazing the amount of work that he can do. Let's set all that aside. Let's just take the one thing. Let's take the portfolio for the Wells Fargo account. His recommendation saved CFA a tremendous amount of money. His work in changing the portfolio and the balance between stocks and bonds made a tremendous difference. He has that insight and he takes the time to make sure CFA benefits from it, as well. That alone – that alone – is far worth the small amount that we can afford to give him. There is just no question in my mind that I support this for Rich

100%, and not only that – not only that, and then I'll be done – not only that, Rich is the kind of person that [inaudible] like Mark. You call him on Saturday night. I always wonder what the whole family is thinking. You call him on Sunday. You may be having like, "I need an answer now, I need an opinion now," he gives it, he's balanced, he's calm, he's rational and we are very, very fortunate to have him. So, of course, I support this. **Morgan:** Kathy just said it. We are incredibly fortunate. One of the things I count myself lucky is, having been on the board has given me the opportunity to have been able to work with someone like Rich. I don't think that people who haven't had that opportunity have any idea how incredibly fortunate we are to have that kind of business mind working hard around the clock – again, 24/7 – for CFA. I stand in awe. I go with George, the only problem is it's not enough. **Hannon:** OK, I'm going to call for a vote. All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Newkirk, Auth, B. Moser and P. Moser voting no. Mastin abstained.

Hannon: I guess that's the end of our open session. I do want to say before – **Roy:** Mark, wait a minute. **Hannon:** Melanie, you were going to say something? **Calhoun:** I think Sharon had her hand up. **Roy:** Yeah, I did. While we're discussing all this, I think there is one more person that we really need to consider a one-time bonus for, not a line item. It's very common knowledge that a lot of the Judging Program issues have skyrocketed, especially with everything that happened in China, taking on the new China program, as well as other committees. I would like to recommend a one-time bonus for Melanie Morgan, because I know she's putting in hundreds of hours a week. **Calhoun:** Kathy seconds. **Hannon:** Do you want to put a dollar figure in there, or do you want to pass this and then discuss the dollar figure? **Roy:** I'm in favor of giving her the same amount of money that we've given all four officers, but I'm open to any other suggestions. **Hannon:** She said \$6,000. Kathy, I believe you seconded it. Do you accept that? **Calhoun:** I do. I accept that. **Hannon:** Alright. **Black:** Well, I put my hand up because I wanted to do some other business, but I'm in favor of this one-time bonus for Melanie. **Calhoun:** This is another example of a person who consistently goes above and beyond, to work with the Judging Program, which is a challenge as it is, but she has also picked up the International liaison and has done an amazing job taking the lead role in so many occasions. You know, when you work with folks from halfway around the world, you're taking calls in the middle of the night, all day long. You're working with language barriers. It's just amazing. Every time Melanie is asked to do something, she does it quickly, she does it the quality of work is without question, she is very balanced. I mean, she's just amazing. She has taken on so much and it is such a challenging time. I think she well deserves this and I completely support compensation for work done for Melanie. **Newkirk:** There's no question Melanie has worked her backside off for the Judging Program. Since we know how this is going to go, can we please just call the question so we can finish up our business and move on? I support this because – this was not pre-noticed but I still support it. Can we just call the question so we can give Melanie her \$6,000 and we can move on? Let's not waste more time. **Hannon:** George, do you want to say something or can we just go ahead and vote? **Eigenhauser:** I just want to say that this is another situation where we're not looking at the normal Judging Program Committee Chair job, we're looking at someone who has had an amazing number of things dumped on her, from the visa problems in China to other problems in China to COVID to everything else, and I fully support this and I'll shut up.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Auth and P. Moser voting no. Currle, Morgan and B. Moser abstained.

Hannon: This brings us close to the end of our open session. I do want to say in open session, even though we're still going to go on in closed session, this is the last board meeting for Kayoko Koizumi. She is the Regional Director in Japan. She opted not to run for re-election. I want to thank Kayoko for all of her work on behalf of CFA and on behalf of the Japan Region, and wish her well. I also understand that this is Shino Wiley's last meeting. She is the translator and has been for a number of Japanese Regional Directors. Shino, how many Regional Directors have you worked for? **Wiley:** I have been working for three, from Yayoi Satoh, Edward Maeda and then Kayoko Koizumi. It's been about 11-12 years. **Hannon:** And this is your last meeting with us, is that right Shino? **Wiley:** Yes, that's my understanding. **Hannon:** We're certainly very grateful for all that you have done for us in those 11 years. We thank you very much and wish you well.

Hannon: Alright, I'm going to adjourn the open session. The closed session, does somebody have a recommendation for how long? It was an hour on the agenda but we're way past the time that we were supposed to have done that. **Currle:** Why don't we start at 5?

Hannon: OK, 5:00. We'll come back at 5:00. Thank you to our audience. **Auth:** Wait a minute. [Transcript goes to Judging Program Report]

Hannon: Was there anything else in open session? **Calhoun:** Mark, I just have a question. **Hannon:** Let's see if I have an answer. **Calhoun:** It's 3:47 p.m. now, right, Eastern Time. What time are we – how much break? We had 45 minutes. We're not taking 45 minutes, right? **Currle:** If we start at 5, it will be an hour and 15 minutes. **Calhoun:** Why are we starting at 5? I'm confused. **Hannon:** Somebody suggested it. Do I have a counter-offer? **Colilla:** 4:30. **Calhoun:** Do we need more than 15 minutes? Do people have to get dinner, or what do they have to do? **Eigenhauser:** It's lunchtime for me. **Hannon:** Is 45 minutes OK with everybody? <no> **Newkirk:** Let's take a 15-30 minute break. Why are we delaying this? **Hannon:** Are we OK with 4:15 Eastern Time? <yes> **Currle:** Whenever you guys want to start again. **Black:** I was going to bring up a new idea, but I don't know if we want to do any additional business right now. I can make it online. **Hannon:** Are you agreeable with getting back together at 4:15 Eastern Time, which is less than half an hour? <yes> OK, 4:15 Eastern Time.

[**Secretary's Note:** See New Business for additional Budget action items.]

Meeting adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

(19) **OTHER COMMITTEES.**

None.

(20) JUDGING PROGRAM.

Committee Chair: *Melanie Morgan*
List of Committee Members: *Larry Adkison* – General oversight and quality control
Claire Dubit - –Applications Administrator
Pat Jacobberger –Chair, Judges’ Education subcommittee
(Breed Awareness and Orientation School)
Barbara Jaeger
Ann Mathis
Tracy Petty
Becky Orlando – File Administrator; Mentor Program Administrator
Sharon Roy – Ombudsman, General Communications Representative
Jan Stevens – File Administrator; Member, Recruitment & Development subcommittee
Annette Wilson – Chair, Guest Judge subcommittee; Guest judge paperwork review
Education and Recruitment Subcommittee, Melanie Morgan Chair
Laurie Coughlan
Pat Jacobberger
Jan Stevens

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Committee members met by teleconference on June 4, 2020, to discuss the upcoming application and other items for this Board meeting.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Service Awards:

5 Years

Nicholas Pun

10 Years

Etsuko Hamayasu
Doreann Nasin

20 Years

Vicki Abelson
Ellyn Honey
Jeff Janzen
Jan Rogers

25 Years

Karen Lawrence
Laura McIntyre
Becky Orlando
Gary Powell
Robert Zenda

30 Years

Pam Delabar
Brian Pearson

35 Years

*Kenny Currle
Donna Fuller
Elizabeth Watson*

40 Years

*Larry Adkison
Nancy Dodds
Yayoi Satoh*

45 Years

*Diana Doernberg
Carolyn Owen*

Retirements/Resignations:

CFA Allbreed Judge Gary Powell has submitted a retirement notice effective June 1, 2020.

Action item: *Accept with regret the retirement of Gary Powell effective June 1, 2020.*

Morgan: I have some open items on the Judging Program. **Hannon:** OK, go ahead. **Morgan:** I have an action item. It's my only item in open session on the Judging Program and it's a very sad one. I would like to move to accept with regret the retirement of Gary Powell, effective June 1, 2020. **Anger:** I will second that motion. **Hannon:** I don't think we need to belabor it with discussion. The motion was to accept Gary Powell's retirement from the Judging Program.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

[**Secretary's Note:** See New Business for additional Judging Program action items.]

Guest Judging Report:

(Note: Guest Judge approvals granted for shows subsequently cancelled may not be included)

CFA Judges to Judge International Assignments:

Judge	Assn	Club Sponsor	City/Country	Date
<i>DelaBar, Pam</i>	<i>FIFe</i>	<i>Keski-Suomen</i>	<i>Laukaa, Finland</i>	<i>9/26/2020</i>
<i>DelaBar, Pam</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Association Felina Greece</i>	<i>Athens, Greece</i>	<i>12/12/2020</i>
<i>Rivard, Lorraine</i>	<i>QFA (WCF)</i>	<i>EKKA Royal National Assn.</i>	<i>Brisbane, Australia</i>	<i>8/7/2021</i>

Non-CFA Judges requesting permission to guest judge CFA shows:

NONE, as CFA Shows are Cancelled through October, 2020

Education and Recruitment update:

2020 Judge's Workshop – Spokane, WA

This year's Judge's Workshop which was scheduled to be held in conjunction with the CFA Annual Meeting in Spokane, WA, USA, has been cancelled. The Singapura, Bengal and Ragdoll

were to be presented. To provide our judges with timely continuing education, Anne Mathis and Pat Jacobberger are working together with those breed council secretaries so that presentations of their breeds can be done using the ZOOM platform. Currently, they are scheduled as follows:

June 27 – Singapura

July 25 - Bengal

August 22 – Ragdoll

A thank you to Darrell Newkirk for our “just-in-time” training in the use of ZOOM.

Breed Awareness and Orientation Schools 2019-2020:

A BAOS was scheduled to be held in Orange, France on April 9, 10 and 12, 2020 in conjunction with a CFA show held by the Cat-H-Art Cat Club. It was cancelled on March 11, 2020 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Breed Awareness and Orientation Schools 2020-2021:

Barbara Jaeger and Pat Jacobberger will be working together over the next several months to pull together the first online BAOS. They will reformat the program to three days in length and hope to have the first school in place by October 2020. They are currently planning on using the ZOOM platform for the school. The first school will be limited to 10 students and the Judge's Workshops will act as the prototype.

Judge's Open Book Examination 2020

The bi-annual Judge's Open Book Examination is in the process of being conducted and the due date has been moved to June 29, 2020 due to slow mail delivery in all parts of the world. It is an on-line exam, with a written copy sent to each judge by USPS and email. The examination went live online on May 11, 2020. The examination cover changes to the CFA Show Rules and Show Standards for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 show seasons. There are 25 questions on the examination with a possible 25 points. 85% is the minimum passing score. Beta testing was done by Rachel Anger, Teresa Signore and Peter Vanwonderghem. The online beta testing was done by Melanie Morgan, Sharon Roy and Annette Wilson. Thank you to Kathy Durdick and Allene Tartaglia for their help and support and willingness to address all questions and issues during the online testing process.

Continuing Education Compliance

All CFA Judges are in compliance with the Judging Program Continuing Education requirements. We approved several online continuing education presentations for our judges which included:

Abyssinian Breed Confirmation by Darrell Newkirk

2019 WINN FF FIP Symposium

"Feline Coronavirus and FIP Diagnosis and Prevention" by Dr. Dianne Addie

“Spotstripe Plus” by Chris Kaelin, PhD of HudsonAlpha Institute and Stanford University.

“Cats, COVID-19, and Cornell” by Cornell Feline Health Center

Transition of the Work of the Education Subcommittee

Pat Jacobberger and Anne Mathis worked on the Judge’s Examination online and over the telephone meeting once a week. Beginning in June, Pat Jacobberger will work weekly with Barbara Jaeger as we begin to pull together the materials for this year’s BAOS.

1st Specialty Applicants:

Dan Beaudry – 1st Specialty LH

Tabled

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

None at this time.

Emeritus Recommendation: *The following individual is presented to the Board for elevation to Emeritus status:*

Gary Powell

[Vote sealed]

*Respectfully Submitted,
Melanie Morgan, Chair*

(21) **GDPR RECOMMENDATIONS.**

[Executive Session]

(22) **INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.**

[Executive Session]

(23) **JUDGING PROGRAM RELICENSING HEARING.**

[Executive Session]

(24) NEW BUSINESS.

Hannon: Kathy, I know you have New Business. Is it open session? **Black:** Yes, it's open session. **Hannon:** Before we do that, is there anything else for closed session? OK now, while we're discussing it and Zoom is lined up for executive session, this is actually open session so it will be in the minutes. Go ahead, Kathy. **Black:** I got some clarification from Rich. I had the idea that because there are so many TICA shows that are already licensed to be taking place from July through October, that there may be opportunities where a CFA club could work with a TICA club to go in and have an in-conjunction show, because it's going to be difficult for a lot of our clubs to find a venue again, because a lot of us have cancelled our contracts, and our venues that we had we counted on a lot of gate to be able to afford that venue. So, I had some people approach me with the idea that they thought that maybe they could work together with a TICA club that's already licensed to put on a show, and maybe we can do an in-conjunction show. So, my idea was to – I didn't know the number of in-conjunction shows that CFA would approve of. I thought it was still three, but Rich answered an email and he said he can confirm. If I'm reading it right, I think it's up to 11. Is that right, Rich? **Mastin:** I believe last year we approved 11 in-conjunction shows and it's one of those sponsorships that I don't believe we had to come back for an increase because we were right on the border. I think we ended up with 8 or 9 per year. **Black:** And it's \$1,000? **Mastin:** Yes. **Black:** I had it in my head it was only 3 and I didn't want to have the clubs fight for those three spots. I think 11 is a good number, so I would just like to entertain the idea of maybe increasing that sponsorship, because we're not going to have as many shows as we normally would, so we're not going to be giving out the \$1,000 for all the clubs that would have normally been going on outside of COVID and maybe we could give these clubs an opportunity to be able to successfully put on a show without spectators, in an in-conjunction show along with TICA. **Hannon:** What's the amount you had in mind, Kathy? **Black:** It's currently \$1,000, right? **Mastin:** Correct. **Black:** OK, \$2,000. **Hannon:** Make a motion. **Black:** I make a motion that, for this show season, we increase the in-conjunction show sponsorship to \$2,000. **Hannon:** Looking for a second. **Schleissner:** Michael seconds. **Hannon:** Thank you Michael. Discussion?

Eigenhauser: I just wanted to know, are we sticking with the 11 limit? We can always pick a higher number at a later meeting, but for now are we sticking with the 11 limit? **Black:** Yes, I was thinking with the 11 limit, or is it 13? No, it's 11. I don't think we're going to have 11, so I think 11 is sufficient. **Mastin:** My recommendation to the board, I think it might be best if you allow me a little bit of time analyzing all of last year's sponsorships and looking at going forward, what the direction is and what I think we should be approving. However, we could just approve what we had set up last year. The problem is, we have already gone through May, most of June and possibly part of July with no shows, so we may not need that number. I'm a little indifferent on it. We could approve what Kathy's asking, but I want to make sure what [inaudible] these shows we're approving for. At this point in time we don't have a number. **Hannon:** Rich, in the budget we just passed, we had a figure in there for sponsorship. Didn't we cut it in half, thinking we're not going to have shows until the end of October? **Mastin:** That's correct. **Calhoun:** \$3,500 in there for in-conjunction. **Hannon:** \$3,500? **Calhoun:** I think so. I'm looking right now. **Hannon:** How can you get \$3,500 when there was \$1,000 per show? **Calhoun:** It was going to be a short year, I don't know. **Hannon:** Kathy, why don't you make a motion and we'll find the money. **Calhoun:** We spent \$7,000, and last year we cut it in half. That's where we got the \$3,500. **Hannon:** Kathy Black, do you want to make a motion? **Black:** I

made a motion that we leave the number at 11 for in-conjunction shows and we raise the sponsorship to \$2,000 per show. **Hannon:** And it was seconded. Is there any more discussion? I'm going to call for the vote, to provide \$2,000 for up to 11 in-conjunction shows. That's correct, Kathy? **Black:** Yes. **Hannon:** All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Morgan voting no. P. Moser abstained.

Hannon: Kathy do you have another motion you want to bring up? New business?

Black: That was it. **Hannon:** Anybody else have anything else they want to bring up before we adjourn and find out who won the elections? [transcript goes to end of Judging Program Report]

Hannon: Is there anything else before we adjourn? **Eigenhauser:** Yes. I would ask Rich, on top of all the other work he does, to come back with a proposal to maybe give clubs a little more money this year in terms of sponsorship – not just in-conjunction shows, there are a lot of shows that are going to be hurting by having to cancel show halls, by having to put on shows where they can't get gate or where they have to social distance between exhibitors. I would like to rethink our sponsorship and maybe give them a little more this year. I'm not ready to make a motion, I don't have a plan in mind, but I would just like maybe Rich to crunch some numbers and come back in August with it. **Hannon:** OK Rich? **Mastin:** George, do you have any initial thoughts on a recommendation? **Eigenhauser:** No. **Mastin:** OK, I'll work with Kathy and we'll put our heads together and try and figure something out. We'll hopefully come back with something on Sunday. If not, it will be sometime next week.

* * * * *

Hannon: Anything else before we adjourn? Thank you everybody. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

(25) CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND ELECTION RESULTS.

Introduction:

Before we began to address the agenda items for the Credentials Committee this year a few things came to mind about our clubs. As you may know, the Club Secretary is the one person authorized to submit membership and officer lists to CFA as well as changes to that list. The Club Secretary is the main contact between CFA and the Club. CFA uses these lists to record the email addresses for the Club Secretary and President.

This is the 3rd year for on-line balloting. The Club Secretary of record is the only person authorized to vote on behalf of the club. Once a ballot is complete the ballot is released, and the appropriate confirmations are automatically sent. The confirmation of how the club voted is sent back to the Secretary, to the President and to the Central Office person in charge of the Clubs and ballots. Each year we hear that something must be wrong with the system because Presidents have told us they are not receiving the confirmations of voting. I discussed this with CFA staff. We determined that there are 3 very obvious reasons why:

- 1. The Club President has changed his/her e-mail address and has not advised the Club Secretary to update CFA.*
- 2. The confirmation arrives but gets routed to the "Spam folder" and then deleted because the Club President does not recognize the sender ID of the confirmation.*
- 3. The Club Secretary has not updated the list of members and officers for several years and instead sends yearly payment of dues to CFA along with a list of members and officers that is outdated.*

The Credentials Committee reminds Clubs to take control of the information in their membership and Officer lists and provide correct information through their Secretary to CFA so that the voting system can work as it is designed to do.

This year we were advised that "some clubs" reported that their Secretary didn't vote according to the club's instructions. They wanted to re-vote. Re-voting is not allowed with on line balloting. The Credentials Committee recommends that clubs choose their secretary wisely because it is the Secretary who has the authority to act on behalf of the club. If necessary, elect a new Secretary.

During this past year the Credentials Committee was twice called upon to render opinions because of challenges brought about with club memberships and Officers. The challenges required us to review all the information we could access about the clubs involved. We asked CFA for clubs' By-Laws in each case so we could review actions that had been challenged. We found that decisions and actions that had been made were in conflict with the clubs' own By-Laws. We made and published honest but difficult decisions. The Credentials Committee would also like to remind clubs to revisit their By-Laws on a regular basis and modify them when needed. When Clubs apply for Membership they submit to CFA their Constitution and By-Laws. CFA has records of every Club's Constitution and By-Laws. If your club is unable to locate your club's records CFA can locate them and send a copy back to you.

And now we will proceed to the report of the Credentials Committee for 2020:

Minutes:

The CFA Board of Directors has canceled our annual meeting scheduled for June 17-22, 2020 in Spokane, Washington. In addition, there would not be a traditional meeting of the Credentials Committee.

The Committee members were notified and selected for 2020. They are the same members as those chosen in 2019 with the exception of Yvonne Griffin who has retired from the Committee. Nancy Dodds remains the Chairperson and Hilary Helmrich has been identified as the Secretary.

It was determined that the voting for Regional Directors and ID Representatives as well as the Officers of CFA would proceed. Ballots and instructions were sent to clubs electronically.

When ballots were returned to Central Office, Amber Goodright printed out the ballots, updated the list of voting clubs and filed the ballots in order by Region.

Because there was concern regarding health and safety of employees and committee members, the Board voted to implement the following plan for the counting of votes. Two members of the Credentials Committee (Hilary Helmrich and Nancy Dodds) signed the Oath of Inspectors along with three members from Central Office (James Simbro, Allene Tartaglia and Amber Goodright). Two outside people from an accounting firm near the Central office (Michael B Guban and Matthew J Banjo) signed the Oath of Inspectors on the day that the votes were removed from lock and key and made ready for the counting (June 15, 2020). All activities were conducted in a locked area of the building and there were no additional personnel allowed into the area during the time that ballots were available to the people counting the votes.

Batch sheets were prepared and counted in two teams of two people: one from Central Office and one from the accounting firm. Once the batch sheets were completed and signed, they were sent electronically to Hilary and Nancy in Arizona where the votes were reviewed and the totals entered into the excel file used by the Credentials Committee. Results were tallied and reported to the CFA Board of Directors and posted by Central office on Thursday, June 18.

<i>All Clubs in good standing as of June 2, 2020</i>	<i>594</i>
<i>Clubs added after 30 June2019:</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Clubs dropped as of 1 June2020</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Clubs suspended for non-payment of surcharges</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Oriental Fashion International CC</i>	
<i>Tianjin Feiming Cat Club</i>	
<i>China Tao Yuan Fanciers Club</i>	

CFA Clubs added between June 3, 2019 and June 1, 2020:

Club #	Clubs Added by Name	Region
1712	AL ANDALUS CAT CLUB	9
1713	ALL CATS ARE BEAUTIFUL (A.C.A.B.)	ID
1717	AMERICAN SHORTHAIR LOVERS OF EUROPE	I9
1698	CAT BAHRAIN CLUB	ID
1718	CAT FANCIERS CLUB OF TURKEY "ANGORA"	ID
1699	CHINA FELINE FANCIERS ALLIANCE	ID
1706	CHINA PEACE & LOVE CLUB	ID
1705	CHINA SCENERY CAT FANCIERS' CLUB	ID
1700	DEAR MEOW	ID
1716	FCC (FLUFFY CAT CLUB)	ID
1719	GERMAN PHOENIX - CAT FRIENDS EUROPE	9
1710	HONG KONG PIRATES MEOW CLUB	ID
1720	HONG KONG SHORTHAIR CAT CLUB	ID
1724	INDIAN CAT CLUB	ID
1704	KHAO MANEE CAT CLUB	9
1723	KNIGHT'S OF CATS	ID
1707	LAND OF THE SKY CAT FANCIERS	7
1721	MALAYSIA CAT FANCIERS CLUB	ID
1711	MAN MIAO CLUB	ID
1701	MANILA CAT FANCIERS SOCIETY	ID
1722	NEBRASKA FINE WHISKERS SOCIETY	6
1709	NEW ERA FELINE ALLIANCE	ID
1725	ORANGE CAT CLUB	9
1714	PALATINA BLUE CAT CLUB	9
1702	PHARAONIC CAT FANCIERS	ID
1708	REGAL CAT FANCIERS ISRAEL - RCFal	ID
1715	SHERWOOD MANX CLUB	9
1726	STARRY SKY CAT FANCIERS' CLUB	ID
1727	VIETNAM CAT CLUB	ID

CFA Clubs Dropped after June 1, 2020 Deadline: 31 Clubs

Requirements outlined in Article III, Section 5, of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. Constitution

Club No	Club Name	ST	R#	ML	REASON DROPPED
1317	CAJUN COWBOY CAT CLUB	XX	3	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
15	AMERICAN TABBY AND TORTIE	XX	4	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
603	BUTLER CAT FANCIERS	XX	4	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1670	CLUB MEOW-WOW	XX	4	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1178	CATS EYE FANCIERS	XX	8	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1397	JAPAN NORWEGIAN FOREST CAT BC	DU	8	19	NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1443	CAT FANCIERS' SOC OF INDONESIA	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1513	CAT FANCIER'S OF BRAZIL	DU	D	19	NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1520	BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CAT CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1538	PASSION FELINE FANCIERS	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1545	CHINA INTERNATIONAL PEDIGREE CAT FANCIERS' CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1555	TIANJIN CAT FANCIERS	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1568	FELINE ASIA EXOTIC CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1577	NORTHEAST CAT FANCIERS CL OF CHINA	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1580	FELIDAE BEYOND INFINITY	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1582	JOHOR BAHRU CAT CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1585	LEFFAIR INTERNATIONAL CF CLUB	DU	D	19	NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1593	CHINA CAT PARTY CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1613	FENGtian CAT FANCIERS CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1635	CHINA SUPERSTAR CAT FANCIERS	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1651	NEI MENG MAO WANG CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1662	CROWN ROYAL CHINA CAT FANCIERS	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1664	HONG KONG CAT FANCIERS	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1665	TAINAN MEOW LOVER CAT CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1666	UNIVERSAL CAT FANCIERS ALLIANCE	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1667	ABYSSINIAN ALLIANCE	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1668	ASIAN ABYSSINIAN CAT CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1681	JUST WE CAT CLUB	DU	D	19	NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1697	CHINA MING MAO FANG	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1698	CAT BAHRAIN CLUB	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST
1701	MANILA CAT FANCIERS SOCIETY	XX	D	19	DUES NOT PAID/NO MEMBERSHIP LIST

As of 06/02/2020 DU=Dues pd; XX=Dues not pd; ML is year of list submitted

The ballots were counted by Central Office Personnel and the Outside Consultants on Monday June 15. The tally sheets were sent by email to Arizona where N Dodds and H Helmrich processed them on June 15. As soon as the ballot counting was complete in Ohio, the actual tally sheets and the actual ballots were boxed and sent to Arizona via overnight mail. They were received by N. Dodds on Tuesday June 16.

N Dodds and H Helmrich met on Wednesday June 17, and verified the ballots and the tally sheets and created the final tallies.

Election Results were as follows:

Election Results for CFA Officers for the term June 2020-June 2022 were as follows:

CFA OFFICERS: (503 votes tallied)

Office of President:

Mark Hannon – Linden VA	215
Darrell Newkirk – Las Vegas NV	283*
Abstain	5

Office of Vice President:

Richard Mastin – Rochester NY	434*
Abstain	69

Office of Secretary:

Rachel Anger – Wayne MI	446*
Abstain	57

Office of Treasurer:

Kathy Calhoun – Chicago, IL	433*
Abstain	70

REGIONAL DIRECTORS:

North Atlantic (1): (total 57 ballots)

Sharon Roy – Manchester NH	54*
Abstain	3

Northwest (2): (total 50 ballots)

Pam Moser – Independence OR	46*
Abstain	4

Gulf Shore (3): (total 47 ballots)

Kathy Black – Duncan, OK	23
Steve McCullough – Caldwell, KS	24*
Abstain	0

Great Lakes (4): (total 59 ballots)

John Colilla – Columbus, OH	50*
Abstain	9

Southwest (5): (total 47 ballots)

Howard Webster – Phoenix AZ	38*
Abstain	9

Midwest (6): (total 46 ballots)

Mary Auth – Champaign, IL	18
Cathy Dunham – Jacksonville IL	28*
Abstain	0

Southern (7): (total 77 ballots)

Kenny Currle – Fairfax VA	54*
Tracy Petty – Fredericksburg VA	23
Abstain	0

Japan (8): (total 64 ballots)

Yukiko Hayata – Japan	62*
Abstain	2

Europe (9): (total 26 ballots)

<i>Pam DelaBar – Tampere, Finland</i>	<i>14*</i>
<i>Michael Hans Schleissner – Limburgerhof, Germany</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Abstain</i>	<i>0</i>

International Division – China Representative: (total 16 ballots)

<i>Eva Chen – Chongqing, China</i>	<i>7*</i>
<i>Abstain</i>	<i>9</i>

International Division - All Other Representative:

No declared candidates – to be appointed Sunday, June 21

Two regions (3 and 9) were close races. They were counted in Central Office, recounted in Central Office, and recounted in Arizona to verify the tallies.

Once the tallies were complete and verified by the Central Office (Allene Tartaglia and Amber Goodright) and the Credentials Committee members (Nancy Dodds and Hilary Helmrich), the minutes were completed and the final totals of votes were added.

The ballots and tally sheets were put under lock and key in Arizona and were kept until instructions from the CFA Board authorized destruction.

The minutes were completed and transmitted to Allene Tartaglia for publication and for the Board of Directors.

*Respectfully submitted:
Hilary Helmrich*

[Secretary's Note: See New Business for additional Credentials Committee action item.]

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Sunday, June 21, 2020

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Sunday, June 21, 2020, via Zoom teleconference. **President Darrell Newkirk** called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. EDT with the following members found to be present following a roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger**:

Mr. Darrell Newkirk (President)
Mr. Richard Mastin (Vice President)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Steve McCullough, D.C. (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Howard Webster (SWR Director)
Mrs. Cathy Dunham (MWR Director)
Mr. Kenny Currle (SOR Director)
Ms. Yukiko Hayata (Japan Regional Director)
Ms. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director
James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst

Present Following Ratification of Appointment:

Ms. Cyndy Byrd (Director-at-Large)
Shelly K. Perkins, Attorney at Law, CFA Legal Counsel

Absent:

None.

Secretary's Note: For the ease of the reader, some items were discussed at different times but were included with their particular agenda.

(26) **CALL MEETING TO ORDER.**

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD AGENDA		
All times are approximate – Eastern Daylight Time (EDT or ET)		
Sunday, June 21, 2020 • Board of Directors Meeting		
12:00 p.m.	Call Meeting to Order	Newkirk
12:05 p.m.	Appoint CFA Legal Counsel and Parliamentarian	Newkirk
12:07 p.m.	Appoint ID Representative & any other necessary appointments	Newkirk
12:10 p.m.	Taking of Board of Directors' Oath	Perkins
12:15 p.m.	Committee Appointments	Newkirk
12:30 p.m.	Unfinished Business	Newkirk
12:45 p.m.	New Business	Newkirk
	New Committee – Calhoun	
	New Committee – DelaBar	
	CFA Attorney Compensation	
1:00 p.m.	ADJOURN	

Newkirk: I am assuming that everyone got a copy of the agenda. If there's no objections, the agenda will become our orders of the day. If you have an objection to that, raise your hand. We do have a few additions under Unfinished Business. I got an email from the Credentials Committee – Nancy Dodds – and at that time we're going to entertain a motion to destroy the ballots from the elections if we have no objections or contestants against the elections. Under New Business, Madame Secretary, will you add that we will be recognizing Kathy Calhoun for a new committee and Pam DelaBar for a new committee. If there's no objection, then our pre-noticed agenda will become our orders of business for today. No one has raised their hand, so I will assume that that motion is approved.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Krzanowski: I was going to make a motion. **Newkirk:** I just did unanimous consent. Maybe everybody doesn't understand this, but I probably will be using unanimous consent quite a bit. It's just a parliamentary rule on voting. That's why I say, if you have an objection raise your hand. I will assume that everybody is in support of a motion, and so then I will announce that the motion was passed by unanimous consent. So, we don't have to do a lot of this voting when we have stuff that we know is going to be by unanimous consent.

(27) **APPOINTMENT OF CFA ATTORNEY AND PARLIAMENTARIAN.**



Newkirk: Our first order of business today is the appointment of the CFA [Attorney] and the Parliamentarian. I want to introduce everyone to Shelly Perkins. You can see I have highlighted several of Shelly's accomplishments. She owns her own law firm in Portland, Oregon. I met with Shelly yesterday, along with the Executive Committee. We didn't have a meeting. It was a chat, since I was not officially President at the time, and so I would entertain a motion to accept Shelly Perkins as the Attorney and Parliamentarian. **Eigenhauser:** So moved. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** Is there any discussion on Shelly's appointment. OK, there's no discussion. Is there any objection to Shelly's appointment?

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Newkirk: Hearing no objection, Shelly has been appointed as the CFA Attorney and Parliamentarian. So Allene, if you will bring Shelly into the meeting. **Calhoun:** I had one question before you bring Shelly into the meeting. I would like to discuss compensation. Would that be appropriate now or would that be appropriate later? **Newkirk:** We can do that under New Business. **Calhoun:** OK. **Newkirk:** So Rachel, will you add compensation for our attorney as a new line item in New Business? **Anger:** I have it, thank you. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much, Madame Secretary. By unanimous consent, I will tell you that Shelly is appointed and she can be brought in as a panelist from the attendees. **Currle:** Darrell, I didn't mean to interrupt but I'm getting some chats from people saying that they can't hear you for some reason. I'm not talking about board members, I'm talking specifically our audience. **Newkirk:** OK. I'll turn the volume up. Can somebody let me know if you can hear me? OK, Adrienne said she hears me fine. So Allene, have you brought Shelly into the panel? **Tartaglia:** Yes, I have. **Newkirk:** OK, we can go to the next slide.



Newkirk: We have some new board members joining us today. Steve McCullough is not new to the CFA board, so we want to welcome Steve back to serve a two-year term as the Gulf Shore Regional Director. So, welcome aboard Steve. **McCullough:** Thank you.



Newkirk: Our next new member, I think this is Cathy's first time serving on the CFA Board of Directors. I used to live in Region 3 [sic, 6], and so I've been friends with Cathy for many, many years. So, welcome aboard Cathy Dunham, the Region 6 Midwest Regional Director. **Dunham:** Thank you.



Newkirk: OK, from Japan, Yukiko Hayata-san. We welcome you to the CFA Board of Directors.



Newkirk: Pam DelaBar from Region 9, European Director. As many of you know, Pam has served on the board. She has also been a past President of CFA. Pam, we welcome you to the CFA Board of Directors. **DelaBar:** Thank you very much. It's nice to be back. **Newkirk:** We're glad to have you.



Newkirk: OK, that's the completion of our new members. We want to thank our outgoing members. Kathy Black from the Gulf Shore Region. Kathy has done a really, really good job serving as her regional director. This is not the last slide you'll ever see of Kathy Black, because when we get over to the committee appointments, you'll see that I've asked Kathy to continue a lot of work that she has been doing. Even though she won't be on the board, she will be continuing on in many of those tasks, so Kathy, thank you so much. All of CFA thanks you for your service to CFA.



Newkirk: Mary Auth, Midwest Regional Director. Thank you Mary. We really appreciate everything you've done. You and I have been friends for many, many years. I appreciate the work that you do for CFA and you have one committee appointment. We'll go over that when we go over committee appointments.



Newkirk: Kayoko Koizumi-san has served many years as Japan Regional director. Kayoko-san, お疲れ様でした。Otsukaresamadeshita. That's Japanese for, thank you for what you've done.



Newkirk: Michael Schleissner. I met Michael the first time I ever judged in Europe. We've been really good friends for many, many years. Michael has been regional director for Europe the last two years. Michael, thank you very much for everything you've done for CFA. We really, really appreciate it.



Newkirk: John Randolph has been the CFA Attorney, I think he said for four years. John, we really appreciate – we know you’ve done a lot of work, especially helping us get some legal issues resolved in China and we really appreciate everything you’ve done. My hat is off to you. Thank you so much.



Newkirk: And, I want to thank Mark Hannon. Mark Hannon has served 22 years on the CFA Board of Directors. He’s been a Region 7 Director, a Director-at-Large and Vice-President. He has been the President of CFA from 2014-2020. Mark, thank you. We all respect you very much and we wish you the best. Thank you so much.

(28) **APPOINT ID REPRESENTATIVE AND ANY OTHER NECESSARY APPOINTMENTS.**



Newkirk: As you know, when I became President, that left a vacancy in the DAL and I'm asking the board to approve Cyndy Byrd to fill the unexpired term of the DAL, which is for one more year. You can see Cyndy Byrd is very well qualified. I might add that in the last election, she lost being seated as a board member by one vote, and so I would like to have a motion to accept Cyndy Byrd to fill the vacancy for the DAL position. **Anger:** So moved.

Curle: Second. **Newkirk:** Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, is there any objection to the appointment? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent Cyndy Byrd will be appointed to the DAL position.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Newkirk: Welcome aboard Cyndy. Allene, can you elevate or move Cyndy? **Tartaglia:** Already done. She's on. **Newkirk:** Welcome aboard Cyndy. We're really happy to have you here.



Newkirk: Our next item, we had a vacancy – well, we didn't have a vacancy; no one filed for the ID Rep. Please mute your mike. Matt Wong was appointed last year. He served the term and we talked to Matt ahead of time. He is willing to continue on, and so I'm asking a motion for Matt to be appointed as the International Division Representative. **Krzanowski:** So moved. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you Rachel. Is there any discussion on the appointment of Matt Wong for a two-year term for International Division Rep? OK, hearing no discussion, is there any objection to the appointment of Matt. Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent, Matt is appointed to serve as the International Division Rep for a two-year term.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

(29) **TAKING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' OATH.**



The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. Board of Director Code of Ethics

Preamble

The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc., is a New York not-for-profit association formed to register pedigreed cats, sanction CFA clubs, shows, and events, protect the hobby of breeding and showing, and enhance the well-being of all cats. CFA's principle membership consists of CFA cat clubs. The business of the association is managed under the direction of the CFA Board of Directors. This code of ethics serves as a code of conduct for association volunteers and staff in their capacity as board members. Members of the board affirm their endorsement of the code and acknowledge their commitment to uphold its principles and obligations by accepting and retaining membership on the board.

Mission

CFA's mission is to preserve and promote the pedigreed breeds of cats and to enhance the well-being of all cats.

Board of Directors Code of Ethics

Members of the board shall at all times abide by and conform to the following code of conduct in their capacity as board members:

- 1. Abide in all respects by the rules and regulations of the association including but not limited to CFA's articles of incorporation, constitution, bylaws, and show rules.*
- 2. Conduct the business affairs of CFA in good faith and with honesty, integrity, due diligence, and reasonable competence.*

3. *Lead by example in serving the needs of CFA and its members and also in representing the interests and ideals of the cat fancy at large.*
4. *Uphold the strict confidentiality of all closed meetings and other confidential communications and not disclose any confidential information related to CFA affairs. Confidential Information does not include information that is publicly available, so long as the information was not made public by violation of this, or any other, Agreement or confidentiality obligation. Board Member shall not disclose to any others the following information or property of CFA:*
 - a. *Trade secrets, patents, or other proprietary information;*
 - b. *Customer or referral source lists;*
 - c. *Contractual agreements;*
 - d. *Customer and Employee personal information;*
 - e. *Judging program information and Judge personal information;*
 - f. *Protest, citation and other disciplinary information;*
 - g. *Animal welfare information;*
 - h. *Advertising or marketing strategies;*
 - i. *Product development practices; and*
 - j. *Computer programming and source code.*
5. *Perform assigned duties in a professional and timely manner pursuant to the board's direction and oversight.*
6. *Exercise proper authority and good judgment in dealings with CFA staff, judges, breeders, exhibitors, other board members, and the general public and respond to their needs in a responsible, respectful, and professional manner.*
7. *Handle conflicts of interest appropriately by identifying them to the board and removing themselves from all discussion and voting on that matter.*
8. *Act at all times in the best interest of CFA. Avoid placing (and the appearance of placing) one's own self-interest or any third party interest above that of CFA.*
9. *Not abuse board membership by improperly using board membership for personal or third-party gain or financial enrichment.*
10. *Not represent that their authority as a board member extends any further than that which it actually extends.*

11. *Not engage in any outside business, professional or other activities that would directly or indirectly materially adversely affect CFA.*
12. *Not engage in or facilitate any discriminatory or harassing behavior toward CFA staff, members, officers, exhibitors, breeders, or others in the context of activities relating to CFA.*
13. *Not solicit or accept gifts, gratuities, or any other item of value from any person or entity as a direct or indirect inducement to provide special treatment to such donor with respect to matters pertaining to CFA without fully disclosing such items to the board of directors.*
14. *Provide proper care for their cats and maintain them in an exemplary manner beyond CFA's Minimum Cattery standards.*

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned hereby agrees to be bound by and abide by the foregoing Board of Director's Code of Ethics.

Board Member:

Name [Printed]: _____

Signature: _____

Dated: _____

Newkirk: Our next item in the orders of the day is the taking of the Oath of Office. Shelly, I will turn it over to you. **Perkins:** I was not aware that I was administering the Oath of Office to everyone, but I can do that. Darrell, can you tell me the procedure? Do I have the Board Code of Ethics in front of me? **Newkirk:** It starts, *The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. Board of Director Code of Ethics*. **Perkins:** Yes. Do you want me to read that? **Newkirk:** I don't want you to read the preamble or the mission, OK? What I would like for you to do is, where it says *Board of Directors Code of Ethics*. It's the third highlighted paragraph down, if you will start there. **Perkins:** Thank you [reads]. **Newkirk:** Thank you Shelly. So, what I want to do, if you have not signed this agreement and returned it to Rachel – Rachel, can you let me know how many people have not returned their signed Code of Ethics? **Anger:** I have two people. **Newkirk:** OK, thanks. What we're going to do now, I'm going to have Rachel go through the roll call and have everyone affirm by voice that they will agree to the 14 line items in our Code of Ethics. I will start by saying that I will comply by voice and by signature, to comply to the 14 items listed in our Code of Ethics. **Anger:** So, when I say your name, if you comply will you respond in the affirmative by saying "aye" or "yes" or whatever language you would like. Rich Mastin. **Mastin:** Yes, I have agreed to comply with the Board of Directors Code of Ethics, and I have submitted it to Rachel. **Anger:** Thank you. Rachel Anger is an aye. Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** Aye. **Anger:** Sharon Roy. **Roy:** Yes. Rachel, I just sent it by text to your phone, so hopefully you've got it. **Anger:** I do, thank you. Pam Moser. **P. Moser:** Sure. **Anger:** Pam, are you on? **P. Moser:** Yes. I said "sure." **Anger:** OK, thank you. Steve McCullough. **McCullough:** Sure. **Anger:** John Colilla. **Colilla:** Yes. **Anger:** Thank you. Howard Webster. **Webster:** Yes. **Anger:** Cathy Dunham. **Dunham:** Yes. **Anger:** Kenny Currle. **Currle:** Yes. **Anger:** Yukiko Hayata. Hayata-san? We'll come back. Pam DelaBar. **DelaBar:** Yes. **Anger:** George

Eigenhauser. **Eigenhauser:** Yes. **Anger:** Carol Krzanowski. **Krzanowski:** Yes. **Anger:** Melanie Morgan. **Morgan:** Yes. **Anger:** Brian Moser. **B. Moser:** Yes. **Anger:** Cyndy Byrd. **Byrd:** Yes. **Anger:** Let's also get Shelly Perkins. **Perkins:** Yes. **Anger:** The only one we have not received a verbal response from is Hayata. **Hayata:** Yes. Can you hear me? **Anger:** Yes, thank you. Back to you, Mr. President. **Newkirk:** Do you have all signed copies now from everyone? **Anger:** I think I am still missing two. I will have to go to my email and see if they have arrived. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you Madame Secretary.

(30) **COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.**



Newkirk: Our next item is the committee appointments. **Tartaglia:** Darrell, do you want me to show the list? **Newkirk:** Yes, if you don't mind. It will be easier for people to see it on the screen. Then I can just briefly touch on these. Some of these committees are the same as they have been, because some of these people have been in those positions for a number of years. **Tartaglia:** It should be up on the screen. Does everybody see it? **Newkirk:** It's not on mine. **Tartaglia:** It's not? **Newkirk:** No. **Eigenhauser:** All I've got is a title page. **Krzanowski:** That's all I have, as well. **Tartaglia:** Wait a minute. **Anger:** While we're getting that on the screen, anyone who is not speaking could you please put yourself on mute? **Tartaglia:** Does everybody see that now? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Tartaglia:** OK. **Newkirk:** Allene, are the new committees highlighted in red, or is it all in black? **Tartaglia:** They are highlighted. **Newkirk:** OK, good. Fantastic, thank you very much. So, these are my committee appointments. I went over these. We made a few corrections in naming some of these, so we'll get started here.

Committee	Chair	Co/Vice Chair	Board Liaison	email
Appointment of CFA Standing Committee Chairs				
Agility	Jill Archibald		Sharon Roy	jellyb1083@aol.com

Newkirk: We're going to start off with the Agility Committee. The chair of that is Jill Archibald, and Sharon Roy will be the board liaison.

Ambassador Cats	Karen Lane	Joel Chaney	Rich Mastin	karenllane@comccast.net
------------------------	------------	-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Newkirk: Ambassador Cats is Karen Lane and Joel Chaney. Rich Mastin is the liaison.

Animal Welfare/ Breeder Assist/Food Pantry Breed Rescue	Charlene Campbell		Steve McCullough	jcampb4244@aol.com
--	----------------------	--	---------------------	--------------------

Newkirk: Animal Welfare, Breeder Assist, Food Pantry and the Breed Rescue is Charlene Campbell. Steve McCullough, I'm asking you to be the liaison, since you're part of the Breed Rescue group.

Awards	Cyndy Byrd			chelrose@earthlink.net
---------------	------------	--	--	------------------------

Newkirk: Award Committee is Cyndy Byrd.

Audit	Kathy Calhoun			calhounkathy38@gmail.com
--------------	------------------	--	--	--------------------------

Newkirk: The Audit Committee is Kathy Calhoun, our Treasurer and CFO.

Breeds/Standards	Jacqui Bennett	Teresa Keiger	Rachel Anger	jacquibennett864@gmail.com
-------------------------	-------------------	---------------	--------------	----------------------------

Newkirk: Breeds and Standards, Jacqui Bennett, and the vice-chair of that committee is Teresa Keiger. Rachel Anger, I'll ask you to be the board liaison.

Budget	Kathy Calhoun			calhounkathy38@gmail.com
---------------	------------------	--	--	--------------------------

Newkirk: Budget is Kathy Calhoun, our Treasurer and CFO.

CCW – Companion Cat World	Kathy Black		Kenny Currle	Kathy.black@yahoo.com
--------------------------------------	-------------	--	--------------	-----------------------

Newkirk: Companion Cat World. This is something that Kathy Black has taken on, and so I talked to her and Desiree. This was under the Marketing Committee. They wanted this segregated out, so we have done that now. Kathy Black will do that and Kenny Currle has agreed to be the liaison for the Companion Cat World committee.

CFA Board of Directors Policies and Procedures	Pam DelaBar	Cyndy Byrd Shelly Perkins		Satl1c1@aol.com
---	-------------	------------------------------	--	-----------------

Newkirk: The CFA Board of Directors Policies and Procedures, this is a guidebook that we call the Board Members' Guidelines. I talked to Pam because I think she was around when that initially got updated. It has not been updated since 2014, and so Pam has agreed to take that on. I'm asking Cyndy Byrd and Shelly Perkins, and I would like to be included on that myself.

CFA Club Bylaw Guidance	Bethany Colilla		Melanie Morgan	believerscattery@gmail.com
--------------------------------	-----------------	--	----------------	----------------------------

Newkirk: Next is the CFA Club Bylaw Guidance. This is a – all these committees that are in red are new committees. I’ve asked Bethany Colilla to take this on. This is basically just a point person when a club has a question about their bylaws. It has nothing to do with the Credentials certifying votes or anything that they normally do. This is just someone, “I’m not sure what’s going on with my Bylaws. Can you guide me on that?” Bethany has agreed to take that on and Melanie Morgan will be her liaison.

CFA Foundation	Don Williams		Carol Krzanowski	williamsdj2@aol.com
-----------------------	--------------	--	------------------	---------------------

Newkirk: The CFA Foundation, Don Williams is president and Carol Krzanowski will be our liaison.

Clerking Program	Dan Beaudry		Carol Krzanowski	carolk.cfa@gmail.com
-------------------------	-------------	--	------------------	----------------------

Newkirk: Our Clerking Program has been headed up by Dan Beaudry. He has done an absolutely fantastic job. The liaison is Carol Krzanowski.

CFA Club Show Sponsorship	Finance Committee			
----------------------------------	-------------------	--	--	--

Newkirk: CFA Club Show Sponsorship. This is just a name change. This is a committee that handles and Rich primarily presents this. This is the money that clubs get and can apply for.

Club Membership	Carol Krzanowski			carolk.cfa@gmail.com
------------------------	------------------	--	--	----------------------

Newkirk: Club Membership will remain with Carol Krzanowski.

CFA Community Outreach and Education	Joan Miller		Rachel Anger	camberwel@aol.com
---	-------------	--	--------------	-------------------

Newkirk: CFA Community Outreach and Education. Joan Miller, with Rachel Anger being the liaison.

Credentials	Nancy Dodds		Rachel Anger	fenwaynd@earthlink.net
--------------------	-------------	--	--------------	------------------------

Newkirk: The Credentials Committee, Nancy Dodds, who by the way was awarded the Judges’ Spotlight Award yesterday. So, congratulations Nancy for that great honor. You do a great job with Credentials and we look forward to your continued great work. Rachel Anger will be her liaison.

Executive	Officers + K. Currle			
------------------	----------------------	--	--	--

Newkirk: The Executive Committee is made up of the four officers and one other member of the board that the President picks, and I picked Kenny Currle. He has agreed to serve on the Executive Committee.

Experimental Formats	Sharon Roy			sharonroy@grolen.com
-----------------------------	------------	--	--	----------------------

Newkirk: Experimental Formats continues to stay with Sharon Roy.

Finance	Rich Mastin			rmastin1@rochester.rr.com
----------------	-------------	--	--	---------------------------

Newkirk: Finance Committee, Rich Mastin.

Hotel/Travel Program	Rachel Anger			camberwel@aol.com
-----------------------------	--------------	--	--	-------------------

Newkirk: The Hotel and Travel Program is Rachel Anger.

International Division				
China:	Russell Webb		Kenny Currle	whiteweb00@aol.com
Asia: (outside of China)	Robert Zenda		Kenny Currle	zendabob1@cs.com
AWA/CSA	Kenny Currle			kenny.curre2@gmail.com

Newkirk: International Division. We have the International Division divided up between China and AWA/CSA, and so for the Asian component of the International Division I am asking Russell Webb. He has agreed to take on the ID Chair for China. For Asia outside of China, Bob Zenda has agreed to be the chair for that. Kenny Currle will remain. Kenny will be the liaison for Russell and Bob Zenda.

International Show	Rich Mastin			rmastin@rochester.rr.com
---------------------------	-------------	--	--	--------------------------

Newkirk: The International Show continues to stay under the watch of Rich Mastin.

Judging program				
China Associate Judging Program	Anne Mathis		Rachel Anger	annekevinmathis@gmail.com
JPC/Applicants and Trainees	Ellyn Honey		Rachel Anger	ellynhoney@gmail.com
JPC/CFA Licensed	Vicki Nye		Rachel Anger	tvnye@jps.net

and Guest Judges				
JPC/Education and Mentoring	Loretta Baugh		Rachel Anger	kittrik@live.com
BAOS	Barbara Jaeger	Loretta Baugh	Rachel Anger	barbara.jaeger911@gmail.com
Judges Workshop/ Tests/Cont. Ed	Anne Mathis	Loretta Baugh	Rachel Anger	annekevinmathis@gmail.com

Newkirk: For the Judging Program, this is a huge change in the way we've done things in the past. Melanie has served I think for the last three years as Chair of the Program and she has worked herself to death. She has done a great job. Melanie, I appreciate all the work that you put in to make the CFA Judging Program the best it can be. So, I decided – I actually got this idea from Mark Hannon; that is, to split up the Judging Program into basically four different categories. It was three, but since we added the China Associate Judging Program, I'm going to appoint Anne Mathis as the Chair of that subsection of the Judging Program. Rachel Anger is going to be the liaison for all of these appointments. For our regular Judging Program Committee, the applicants and trainees Ellyn Honey will be the Chair. The Judging Program for CFA licensed and guest judges is Vicki Nye. For the Education and Mentoring Program will be Loretta Baugh. Loretta is oversight for Barb Jaeger, who heads up the BAOS. For the Judges' Workshop and Continuing Education, Anne Mathis will still head that up. She's doing it now. Barbara and Anne are currently doing those positions. Those are the two people that Patty Jacobberger had. I want to give a huge, huge thank you for all the work that Patty Jacobberger has done over the years. If you have ever attended a BAOS and seen the amount of work that goes into putting one of those on – just not the putting on, but preparing all the slides, the PowerPoint presentation, making sure those are on and then updating. Patty, thank you so much. Your work will be forever remembered in CFA. My hat is off to you. Thank you so much.

Tartaglia: Darrell, Pam's hand is up. Pam DelaBar. **Newkirk:** Do you mind waiting until we're all done here, and then you can ask questions? **DelaBar:** Not a problem, Darrell. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you.

Legal Advisory	Cyndy Byrd	G. Eigenhauser/ Ed Raymond/ Shelly Perkins		chelrose@earthlink.net shelly@perklegal.com
----------------	------------	--	--	--

Newkirk: The next committee is the Legal Advisory Committee. This is a committee – I talked to Shelly about this and asked Shelly to join in as our legal counsel for the CFA board, so I proceeded to get a little input back from her. She thought this was a good idea, so I'm asking Cyndy Byrd to head up this Committee, and George Eigenhauser and Shelly. So, we've got three active lawyers. When we met yesterday – I wanted a fourth person and I actually asked John Randolph to stay on this Committee, but he's got a lot of other work commitments and everything, and he was very gracious and declined the invitation. So, I had a suggestion from Rich Mastin that Ed Raymond and Jodell are slowly getting back into the cat fancy. I think Ed would consider serving as a legal advisor for CFA, and so Rich contacted him and shared his email. I got confirmation last night, so Rachel, if you will add Ed Raymond on under the co-chair

portion of this, between George and Shelly Perkins. **Anger:** That would be my pleasure to do. **Newkirk:** Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

Legislation and Group	George Eigenhauser			geigenhauser@allmail.net
------------------------------	--------------------	--	--	--------------------------

Newkirk: Our Legislation Group is still remaining with George Eigenhauser.

Marketing	Desiree Bobby			dbobby@cfaorg
------------------	---------------	--	--	---------------

Newkirk: Marketing – Kathy Black was the Chair of the Marketing Committee. Desiree Bobby has done a fabulous job. She sent me an email telling me her educational background. This lady is one sharp cookie. She is really, really on the ball with Marketing. She is actually going to become functional at all of our board meetings, sort of like Roeann used to be, and so Desiree, thank you for taking that on and supporting CFA in your role as the Marketing person.

Mentoring and NewBee Program	Kathy Black		Carol Krzanowski	kathy.black@yahoo.com
-------------------------------------	-------------	--	------------------	-----------------------

Newkirk: Our next committee is in green, and the reason I put that in green, this is actually a merge of two committees – the Mentoring Committee and the NewBee Program. Teresa was the NewBee Chair and Kathi Hoos was the Chair of Mentoring. Kathi actually had a conversation with me saying those two committees overlap quite a bit. When I had a phone conversation with Kathi, she agreed with me and so now I’ve combined those committees. I’ve asked Kathy Black to be the Chair of that combined committee and Carol Krzanowski as liaison.

Millennial Outreach	Lorna Friemoth		Rachel Anger	nudawnzcfa@hotmail.com
----------------------------	----------------	--	--------------	------------------------

Newkirk: Another new committee that I had on my campaign flyer was a Millennial Outreach Committee. I asked Lorna Friemoth and she has agreed to take that on. Once she gets her committee together, she can give us her committee members and we’ll make note of that. Thank you Rachel Anger for agreeing to be the liaison.

New Club Guidance	Mike Altschul		Cathy Dunham	twomikea@yahoo.com
--------------------------	---------------	--	--------------	--------------------

Newkirk: Our next committee appointment is another new committee called New Club Guidance. Mike Altschul has agreed to take that on. My idea for this – and I’ve talked to Mike about it – is that when Carol Krzanowski presents the club and there’s an affirmative vote of the board of directors to accept the new club, then I’m going to advise Carol to send that information on to Mike, so Mike can be the point person for new clubs. Once we accept these clubs, we need somebody to follow up to make sure they know what’s going on, and I’m asking Cathy Dunham to be the liaison to that new committee.

Ombudsman	Teresa Sweeney		G. Eigenhauser <u>Darrell</u> <u>Newkirk</u>	tsignore@att.net
------------------	----------------	--	---	------------------

Newkirk: Ombudsman is Teresa Sweeney. She has agreed to stay on in that role. Thank you Teresa.

[from end of Committee Appointments] **Newkirk:** That's the conclusion. Pam, I'll recognize you. **DelaBar:** I was going to make a recommendation that you separate Ombudsman to where Teresa would report directly to you. The Ombudsman, that position came about in 2004. Basically, it's to investigate those matters that are outside the pervue of the Protest Committee and try to resolve those, especially when it's a systemic thing. The Ombudsman usually responds to the Chair, which in this case is you. I would recommend that you separate Ombudsman from any relationship with Protests, and have Teresa report directly to you and not through George. **Newkirk:** Would you accept a compromise that I be included along with George? **DelaBar:** I don't think that's wise. That's my opinion. You can check into the history of Ombudsman, but that is my recommendation, especially if there happens to be a problem with Protests. **Newkirk:** Can you make that in the form of a motion so we can open it up for discussion? **DelaBar:** I move that the Ombudsman report directly to the Chair or the President of the organization. **McCullough:** Second. **Newkirk:** Steve, was that you? **McCullough:** Yes, sir. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you so much.

Newkirk: OK, so the floor is open for debate. Pam, you can have first option since this is your motion. **DelaBar:** I think I said it. **Mastin:** I think Pam makes a very valid point. There can be a conflict of interest with George being involved. However, I would like to hear George's opinion and possibly an opinion from Shelly on this. As far as who the Ombudsman reports to, I don't know how much time is involved in this, and maybe we can hear from George. You may want to reconsider who that reports to. You may want to include your Executive Committee to help out on this – or not, but I would be interested in knowing what George has to say. **Roy:** I did this for eight years. I very much agree in theory with Pam, and I did a lot with the CFA Attorney when I had questions, but I also asked George, so I think that even though he may be head of the Protest Committee, we still want to allow the Ombudsman to get some advice from either George or the CFA Attorney. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with Pam on this one. The whole idea of the Ombudsman is to, kind of outside the system, be able to resolve disputes that couldn't otherwise reach the board. I understand Sharon's position, but nothing about reporting to the President prohibits the Ombudsman to ask the Protest Chair about Protests or the Animal Welfare Chair about an Animal Welfare investigation, or whatever may be necessary, but who they report to I think should be either the President or the Executive Committee. **Newkirk:** Anyone else? I see no one else has raised their hand. **Mastin:** I think Shelly is raising her hand. Maybe she's having trouble. **Perkins:** Sorry, I can't find the raise hand on the program. It's not showing, so I was raising my visible hand. If you are going to have an informal procedure outside – it seems to be a pre-protest procedure – it makes sense to have that person report to Darrell directly, but then still be able to consult with George. So, I would agree with Pam's motion because just the sense of having – if she is reporting to George, then she's really just part of the Protest [Committee] itself, and it makes more sense to have her direct line, and she can consult with George anytime she wants. **Newkirk:** Pam, can I offer a suggestion to amend your – could you include to the President and the Legal Counsel of CFA, which would be Shelly? **DelaBar:** I have no problems

with that, but the Ombudsman is free to basically correspond with anyone, especially if it's a systemic issue. So, if that makes you feel better, then yes, I have no problems adding that.

Newkirk: I feel like we should have a legal point of view. **DelaBar:** An Ombudsman is trying to do things outside of Protests, outside of legal. Sometimes it's a he said/she said between breeders. Sharon can tell you some of the specific cases, as can Teresa. It's just, I wanted to separate the Protests from the Ombudsman, any appearance of that. If that makes you feel more secure, this is my recommendation. **Perkins:** I'm going to chime back in. I don't think that going straight to having the Ombudsman go to having it written that they go to the legal counsel is important. It may help that this is what the Ombudsman's discretion is. If they feel that they think this is heading to a formal protest, they will contact George. If they think they need legal, they would contact me. If they think this has something to do with Marketing, they're going to contact that person. So, I wouldn't want to necessarily write that down, because then it makes it seem like that's where they really need to go. I would prefer to see them go straight to you, Darrell, after they have consulted with whoever they want to go to. That's my second input.

Newkirk: Thank you for your input. That makes sense. **Anger:** I think we're all clear on the motion, but for clarity can Pam please restate the motion we will be voting on? **DelaBar:** My motion is to have the Ombudsman report to the Chair or the President of the organization, and anybody else they need to work with in trying to resolve issues. **Newkirk:** OK, everybody is clear on the motion? Any further discussion? OK, I'm going to call the motion. All those in favor.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Protests	G. Eigenhauser			geigenhauser@llmail.net
Scientific Advisory	Roger Brown	Noelle Giddings	G. Eigenhauser	DotsRNB@aol.com purrcasso@juno.com

Newkirk: Scientific Advisory Committee is Roger Brown, DVM. I have added a vice-chair for that committee. It's Noelle Giddings, and she is a vet from up in the Spokane area.

Show Rules	Monte Phillips		C. Krzanowski	jouvencebleu1@gmail.com
-------------------	----------------	--	---------------	-------------------------

Newkirk: The next committee is Show Rules. Monte is going to continue on, and Carol Krzanowski will be the liaison.

Statistical Analysis	Dick Kallmeyer		Steve McCullough	rhkallme@ix.netcom.com
-----------------------------	----------------	--	------------------	------------------------

Newkirk: The next is a new committee but it's not a new job. Dick Kallmeyer has been doing a lot of work with statistical analysis for CFA, and anybody that's sat on this board has seen all the charts that Dick puts together. My eyes cross sometimes, they are loaded with so much information, so I decided to create the committee and recognize Dick for his great work for CFA in that area. Steve McCullough, I'll ask you to be the liaison of Dick's committee.

Winn Feline Foundation			G. Eigenhauser	geigenhauser@allmail.net
-------------------------------	--	--	----------------	--------------------------

Newkirk: Winn Feline Foundation, the liaison is going to be George Eigenhauser.

World Cat Congress:				
Delegate	Darrell Newkirk			newkirk.darrell@gmail.com
Advisor	Rachel Anger			camberwel@aol.com

Newkirk: Next, we'll go to the World Cat Congress. I'll be the delegate and Rachel will be my advisor. That's the way the World Cat Congress works. We may see Rachel in a different position in the World Cat Congress.

CFA Yearbook	Mary Auth		Pam Moser	mary@maryauth.com
---------------------	-----------	--	-----------	-------------------

Newkirk: CFA Yearbook. Mary Auth has agreed to stay on, to complete the current issue of the CFA Yearbook, and Pam Moser is going to be the liaison for that committee.

Youth Feline Education Program	Rich Nolte		Cathy Dunham	rnolte2@hotmail.com
---------------------------------------	------------	--	--------------	---------------------

Newkirk: Youth Feline Education Program. I had originally asked Rich if he would do the Millennial Outreach. We were in a phone conversation and he said, "my heart is really in Youth Feline." He's got some kids, he's really active in a lot of pet fair competitions, he's really, really in tune with this and I think Rich will be a really good addition to this committee. Cathy, I know you served on that committee in the past, so I would ask you to be the liaison.

Appointment of CFA Special Committee Chairs				
Constitution/Bylaws/Regional Incorporation	Cyndy Byrd	G. Eigenhauser		geigenhauser@allmail.net
		Shelly Perkins		shelly@perklegal.com
		Kathy Calhoun		

Newkirk: I should not have said "appointment" because these are not standing committees. These are special committees and the board has not approved those in the past, so I'm telling you right now that the Constitution/Bylaws/Regional Incorporation will be composed of Cyndy Byrd, George Eigenhauser, Kathy Calhoun and Shelly Perkins.

Genetic	Darrell	G. Eigenhauser,		newkirk.darrell@gmail.com
----------------	---------	-----------------	--	---------------------------

Registrations	Newkirk	Melanie Morgan, Roger Brown, Allene Tartaglia		
----------------------	---------	---	--	--

Newkirk: Mark appointed me to a special committee having to do with when we have a registration – I'll give you an example of a red Abyssinian but in its genetic test. Instead of showing the cinnamon gene, the genetic test shows that it's a chocolate gene. We do not accept chocolate in the Abyssinian. The reason I haven't brought this any further is, I wanted to bring this up with the Breed Council Secretaries because I know that the Aby is not the only one that's having this issue, and so this is a head's up to the Breed Council Secretaries. I'll be getting in contact with you about the gene potential within your breed. I went through all the breeds and I've listed all the genetic codes that are available and which ones are not available in your breed. So, I'll be sharing that information with you. George and Melanie had been on that committee with me. It's not a dead committee, but we've not done anything.

* * * * *

Newkirk: Now we're back to the ratification of committee appointments. Can I get a motion to accept the committee appointments, as presented? **DelaBar:** So moved. **Krzanowski:** Second. **Newkirk:** So, Pam and Carol. Any discussion? Are there any objections to any of the appointments? OK, no one has objected to the appointments, so the appointments are confirmed by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

(31) UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

(a) Motion to Destroy the Ballots.

Newkirk: The next order of the day is unfinished old business. The first thing I would like to bring up is, I got an email from Nancy Dodds, the Chair of the Credentials Committee, this morning. We need a – she said that there have been no objections to any of the ballots that were submitted for our elections. As tradition, we need a motion to destroy those ballots.

Eigenhauser: I move we destroy the ballots. **DelaBar:** I second. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Alright, is there any discussion? Is there any objection to the destroying of the ballots? Since there's no objections, by unanimous consent, we hereby order the Chair of the Credentials Committee to destroy the ballots. I know Nancy is on, so she will know that this has been approved.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

(b) CFA Legal Counsel Compensation.

Newkirk: Is there any other old or unfinished business? Kathy, I think you had something you wanted to bring up on compensation. Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** I would like to offer a motion in regard to the CFA Legal Counsel compensation, that a \$1,500 per month stipend be awarded. The stipend would be effective July 1, 2020 through April 30, 2021.

Mastin: Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rich and Kathy.

Newkirk: Kathy, would you like to start off the debate? **Calhoun:** Certainly. I think that legal counsel is valuable to CFA. We have many, many opportunities – let's put it at opportunities – to reach out to our legal counsel. I think that this stipend is really quite reasonable. In fact, if we were to try and negotiate a stipend outside of this circumstance, we would certainly pay quite a bit more. So, I think this is fair and equitable. I certainly think that we will certainly have our CFA Attorney – we will keep her very busy. **P. Moser:** Could you please tell me, what was John Randolph getting? **Calhoun:** \$1,000 a month. Last year, Pam, we gave him a \$12,000 bonus. **P. Moser:** So he was getting \$24,000. **Calhoun:** He got \$24,000 last year. **P. Moser:** OK, thank you. **Newkirk:** Any further discussion? **Mastin:** I just want to clarify John Randolph's compensation. Kathy said for last year the compensation adjustment bonus that John Randolph received was for the work that was done in 2018-2019. For last year – 2019-2020 – he received his \$1,000 monthly stipend but we actually made the previous year's adjustment in last year, 2019-2020, once we approved the budget back in April of 2019. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rich. Any further discussion? **Calhoun:** I just wanted to clarify one thing if I could, Darrell. **Newkirk:** No problem. Go ahead, Kathy. **Calhoun:** This stipend is being stated as \$1,500 a month. It starts July 1st, so for this first year the total compensation package would be \$15,000 because we just appointed the Legal Counsel. The plan would be that next year, next season, that \$1,500 per month would be an \$18,000 compensation package. **Newkirk:** Thank you for the clarification, Kathy. Any further discussion? Any objections to the motion? No objections? OK, by unanimous consent, the motion is ratified.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

(c) **Judging Program.**

Newkirk: Is there any other unfinished business that we need to discuss? **Eigenhauser:** Not in open session. **Tartaglia:** Melanie has her hand up. **Newkirk:** OK, I just now saw it. Thank you, Melanie. Go ahead. **Morgan:** I have a few items on the Judging Program that have come up since Thursday.

Retirements/Resignations:

CFA Allbreed Judge Becky Orlando has submitted a retirement notice effective June ~~30~~ 21, 2020.

Action item: *Accept with regret the retirement of Becky Orlando effective June ~~30~~ 21, 2020.*

Morgan: My first action item, we actually need to adjust the date there. The date should be June 21, 2020, not June 30. CFA Allbreed Judge Becky Orlando has submitted her notice. My first action item is to accept [with regret] the retirement of Becky Orlando, effective June 21, 2020. **Newkirk:** Can we take each one separately? **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing no objection, the motion is passed by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

CFA Allbreed Judge Jan Stevens has submitted a retirement notice effective June 19, 2020

Action item: *Accept with regret the retirement of Jan Stevens effective June 19, 2020.*

Newkirk: Your next item, Melanie. **Morgan:** CFA Allbreed Judge Jan Stevens has submitted a retirement notice effective June 19, 2020. My action item is to accept with regret the retirement of Jan Stevens, effective June 19, 2020. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Is there a second? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you George. Anybody want to enter into debate on this action item? Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the motion is ratified.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Medical Leave of Absence:

Ayumi Ueda has requested a Medical Leave of Absence until April 30, 2021.

Action Item: *Approve Medical Leave of Absence for Ayumi Ueda until April 30, 2021*

Newkirk: Your net item, Melanie. **Morgan:** Medical Leave of Absence. Ayumi Ueda has requested a medical leave of absence until April 30, 2021. My motion on this action item is to approve the medical leave of absence of Ayumi Ueda until April 30, 2021. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Newkirk:** Thank you George for the second. Is there any debate on this motion? Is there

any objection to the motion? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent the medical leave is approved for Ayumi Ueda.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Newkirk: Your next item, Melanie. **Morgan:** The last thing is, I would just like to say something if you would indulge me. **Newkirk:** Sure. **Tartaglia:** Melanie, we can't hear you. **Morgan:** Can you hear me? **Tartaglia:** Now we can. **Morgan:** Alright. First of all, I want to thank all of you. It's really been an honor and a privilege to serve on and chair the Judging Program Committee. When I was asked to take this on, I didn't take that responsibility lightly, and I devoted myself both to managing the day-to-day requirements of the Committee, which are substantial, and addressing the directives I was tasked with when I became chair. I was really fortunate to have a phenomenal team, which is one of the reasons I wanted to say something right now. They were totally dedicated to CFA and the Judging Program. I am so proud of them, and their devotion to CFA is unparalleled. I want to thank each and every one of them from the bottom of my heart. You have no idea the countless hours they have given freely to CFA. I also want to say that none of what we accomplished would have been possible without the support of our outgoing President, Mark Hannon. His skillful management really enabled us to fly high without fear and go all out with new ideas and new programs, and we did that because he trusted and supported us. This is a leadership skill that is so rare and very, very precious. I want to thank him for his trust, his support, and his devotion to CFA. Just so you all know, with the exception of Sharon Roy and Pat Jacobberger, all my committee members resigned yesterday, so until a few minutes ago I stand alone on the JPC with Sharon and Pat. I did not resign, I have been replaced. I really wish the incoming Committee Chairs and their team all the best. I want to assure you that I will, of course, facilitate turnover to the best of my ability. I want what is best for CFA – that's what is really important – and a smooth transition is imperative. I look forward to serving CFA in other ways and thank you all for your support of the Judging Program. I want to thank you for giving me my moment. That's it. **Newkirk:** Thank you Melanie. There is no doubt that you've done a fabulous job and a lot of work. We appreciate everything, so thank you very much.

Newkirk: Any other unfinished business before we move into New Business?

(32) **NEW BUSINESS.**

(a) **Diversity and Inclusion Committee Proposal.**

Background: CFA has a number of ongoing efforts to expand the awareness of, and participation in, the Fancy in many parts of the world. These efforts have had varying degrees of success but we have not had a focus on the black and brown communities here in the United States. We are all aware of the recent domestic events that have, unfortunately, highlighted existing inequities. No matter what your personal takeaway may be, it is certainly apparent that we can do better.

Corporations large and small are stepping up in hopes of making a difference. Certainly, CFA can work to enhance its relationship with the black and brown communities. And although, CFA has representation from the LGBT communities, have we actually taken a public position?

Again, **WE CAN DO BETTER!**

To that effort I would like to propose the following:

Motion: CFA to establish a Diversity and Inclusion Committee focused on proactively embracing and increasing participation with the Black, Brown and LGBT Communities throughout the entire organization.

Thank you,
Kathy Calhoun

Committee	Chair	Co/Vice Chair	Board Liaison	email
Appointment of CFA Standing Committee Chairs				
Diversity and Inclusion	Kathy Calhoun			calhounkathy38@gmail.com

Newkirk: We'll move to the next order of the day, which is New Business. This is a committee proposal submitted by our Treasurer, Kathy. **Calhoun:** The proposal is to establish a Diversity and Inclusion Committee. I'll give you a bit of the background. I'm going to walk through this, primarily for folks that are [inaudible], so that they can get the perspective of this committee. From a background perspective, [reads]. Thank you. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **DelaBar:** Pam with a question. **Tartaglia:** Darrell, you're on mute. **Newkirk:** Sorry everybody. I left it open. I tried to turn my mouth to comply with the etiquette process. Kathy, do you have any further comments you would like to make? **Calhoun:** No, except the fact that this has been a turmoil time here, and really there has been global support. My focus in this is the United States. I think that we have some opportunities, not so much for growth from a financial standpoint, but growth from doing the right thing. We clearly don't have many minorities – black, brown or otherwise – that actively participate in CFA. I would like us to take a proactive position, and not

with just trying to get exhibitors and those sorts of things. This would be from Central Office and throughout the organization. I think that we have to be proactive, and this is an outreach. These things won't come and knock on our door. These opportunities won't. I think that we have to be proactive and we have to step up. I've seen many corporations that are already doing these sorts of things. It certainly has been highlighted as of yet. I would love to say that this committee could address this globally, and then we could get there. Perhaps we could get there, but today we have some efforts to expand CFA's presence in other parts of the world. Kenny is doing a yeoman's job on some of the developing countries, but we really have what may be opportunities here. I would like to see us do things in schools. I would like to see us participate in fairs that are focused on black, brown and LGBT communities. At some point in time, a global perspective may be achievable, but what I don't want to do is bite off more than we can chew. We have to start somewhere. Why not start here? **Newkirk:** Thank you. Now Kathy, I'm assuming that you are asking this to be a standing committee, not a special committee. **Calhoun:** This would be a standing committee, because yes, this is absolutely a standing committee. **Newkirk:** We're behind the times. **DelaBar:** Just for clarification, Kathy, it should read *LGBTQ*. **Calhoun:** Pam, I will tell you that I Googled and Googled and Googled this, because yes, and I will change that because I want to do the appropriate thing. The *Q* kind of troubled me a little bit. I didn't know what was appropriate, but thank you for the correction. **DelaBar:** I had one other thing. Considering the horrible reaction towards Asians in the U.S. over the COVID virus, I would add Asian into your groups of concern, as well. **Calhoun:** Can I speak? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Calhoun:** I think that's an excellent add. For example, in Chicago and my other urban cities, we have a significant Asian population, and there is discrimination. Also, we are very successful in Asia, outside of the United States. This is a group of people that may be very interested in our fancy that we have not marketed to specifically – specifically – so I would be happy to add that, Pam. **DelaBar:** Thank you. **Newkirk:** The Chair would entertain a motion to amend, to add *Q* to *LGBT* and then add *Q* and *Asian* as an amendment. Can you make that motion, Pam? **DelaBar:** I think it should be part of Kathy's motion. Kathy has got a motion on the floor. **Newkirk:** This is an amendment. We're going to amend her motion.

Eigenhauser: Before we make a motion, I have a comment. **Anger:** And so do I. **Newkirk:** Go ahead, George. **Eigenhauser:** I have been told *LGBTQ* is discriminatory because it reinforces the notion that there are only a limited number of choices, in terms of how we identify sex, how we identify gender, how we identify people's relationships. I have been told the correct term now is *LGBTQ+*. I would prefer that be in the motion. In addition, if we're going to add *Asian*, I would also say that we should also be looking at diversity in terms of religion and cultural background, as well. **Newkirk:** OK, before we get too deep in the weeds here, we've got a motion here. There's a slight amendment that can be made, and then if further changes or enhancements need to be made to the name of the committee, Kathy can deal with that. So again, I ask for someone to amend the motion to include *Q* and *Asian* between the communities and the LGBT. **Anger:** May I not speak? **Calhoun:** You want me to amend my motion? **Anger:** May I not speak? **Newkirk:** Yes please. **Anger:** I have in mind a more all-encompassing amendment. May I present it? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Anger:** To say at the end, *including any and all minorities unnamed in this motion*. **DelaBar:** Excellent. **Anger:** Thank you. **Newkirk:** OK. Alright, so we have an amendment on the floor. Is there a second to the amendment? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second the amendment. **Newkirk:** Thank you George. The motion is on the amendment, not on the motion that is presented here. It's on the amendment only. Everybody understand that? This is something that we have not done in the past. We're

going to have two votes here. One is on the amendment. Is there any debate on the amendment?

Perkins: I would just like someone to say specifically what the motion is going to say, with the amendment, so it's very clear. **Newkirk:** That's fine. Thank you, Shelly. Rachel, will you read the amended motion please? **Anger:** I will. *That CFA to establish a Diversity and Inclusion*

Committee focused on proactively embracing and increasing participation with the Black, Brown and LGBTQ+ Communities throughout the entire organization, including any and all minorities unnamed in this motion. **Newkirk:** Everybody clear on the motion? OK, so Rachel has read the amendment to the original motion. Is there any further discussion on the amendment? OK, no discussion. Is there any objection to the amended motion? Not the amended motion, the amendment. Hearing no objections, the amendment is hereby passed by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the amendment is adopted.

Newkirk: So, now the main motion. Will you read it again so we know what our main motion is, Rachel? **Anger:** I will. The original motion, *CFA to establish a Diversity and Inclusion Committee focused on proactively embracing and increasing participation with the*

Black, Brown and LGBTQ+ Communities throughout the entire organization. **Newkirk:** No, add your clause on that you added. Read the amended motion. **Anger:** OK. *organization, including any and all minorities unnamed in this motion.* We are also changing to *LGBTQ+*. **Newkirk:** So,

everybody understand what the main motion is that we're voting on now? **Eigenhauser:** I just want to say that we are way behind the curve on this. So is Winn, by the way, and on Wednesday Winn adopted a similar motion, that we're now going to have a diversity committee look into these kinds of things. How we present ourselves to the world isn't just a matter of marketing. I don't want people to think that that's what this is about. How we present ourselves to the world is about what kind of human beings we are and the kind of respect we show to our fellow human beings, so I think this is long overdue. **Newkirk:** Thank you George. Any further comments?

Are there any objections to the amended motion? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent, our amended motion on the Diversity and Inclusion Committee is passed.

There being no objection, the motion as amended is adopted.

Newkirk: Rachel, you will add that into the list of our standing Committee

Appointments? **Anger:** Yes, I will, and I just want to clarify that *Asian* would be assumed to be included in the *any and all unnamed minorities*. **Newkirk:** Yes.

[after next proposal] **Newkirk:** To go back to the last motion we passed – the Diversion Committee – I just assumed everybody understood that I was asking Kathy Calhoun to be the Chair of that Committee, and I didn't do that officially so Kathy, I am appointing you to be the Chair of the Diversity Committee. **Calhoun:** I am absolutely honored. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

(b) **Easy Mind System (EMS) Committee Proposal.**

CFA Special Committee Chairs				
Easy Mind System (EMS)	Pam DelaBar			Satlct1@aol.com

Newkirk: Next item of business? Hang on just a second. We've got one more new business item. Pam DelaBar, you have a special committee – not a standing committee but a special committee that you would like to recommend. **DelaBar:** I was volunteering to pick up something I brought up two years ago; that was, to investigate converting our registration system from the numeric one that we have right now over to the *Easy Mind System* known as EMS. As you know, the last portion of a registration number is unique to that individual cat. The first four digits before the dash describe the breed and the color. We have numerous numbers. The one I told Darrell, I said, “0108 describes the black Persian male” where “PERN” is a black Persian. It simplifies it. People do not have to memorize a whole bunch of different numbers in learning pedigrees, learning breeds and planning breedings. I think that the Easy Mind System (EMS) would make it a lot easier for us to explain breeding to new people and to get them more involved so they know what they're doing. EMS is used by the majority of the major associations in the world. Even GCCF in England, which is one of the more conservative organizations in the world, is going over to EMS if they haven't already. So, I would like to investigate and work this up and work with James and with all IT, and see how we are going to possibly be able to join the rest of the associations in making it easy to have a worldwide cat fancy, and to make CFA part of it. That's my proposal. **Newkirk:** Thank you Pam. Any other discussion? So Pam, this is a special committee. It doesn't need board approval, so you have authority from the President to go ahead and do your research and do your presentation to the board.

(c) **Scoring.**

Roy: I don't know if this is quite the right place to bring it up, but I know that on Thursday we discussed a committee to discuss how the points will be for regions, but one of the things that came up in my discussion with people from my region and others after this meeting, after Thursday's meeting, was a possibility that we may want to change our grand points for this year and one of the really good suggestions, and it did come from Mary K, because it wouldn't require any type of change to the computer system, was until we know how big shows are going to be, that grand points be scored as double. So, if you went to a small show and got 15 grand points, CFA would automatically score it as 30. So, I think it's something we can discuss online but I do want people to start thinking about it before shows start to come up. That's all.

Newkirk: Sharon, can I ask a favor of you? **Roy:** Sure. **Newkirk:** Would you mind getting with Mary K if she's not leaving CFA to come up with a proposal and bring it back to our next teleconference board meeting? **Roy:** Absolutely. **Newkirk:** I appreciate that. So Rachel, if you will make a note of that, to make sure we don't forget that in the agenda for the August meeting. **Anger:** Consider it done.

Newkirk: Any other New Business?

[from after Old Business] **Mastin:** Can we go back to the scoring thing real quick on the grands? Should we also get an opinion from [inaudible]. I know you asked for an opinion from Mary K, but can we also include an opinion from the new scoring chair? **Newkirk:** Yeah, that's fine. **Mastin:** Thank you.

(33) **OLD BUSINESS.**

Newkirk: We talked briefly during the Strategic Planning meeting of bringing to the board table, not in voting positions, but basically as consulting positions – a member from China and a member from the International Division. Rich, did you want to address that? **Mastin:** When we did our board meeting in February 2020, we had discussed adding two people to the board table; one from China and one from the ID. I walked away from that discussion, that it was recommended by a majority of the board that we move in that direction. I have no objections to have an appointed individual from each area present for the board meetings. I feel it's pretty important, as do others, that we are a global association and we do need to get the right representation and the understanding of what is going on in different parts of the world. I'm not exactly sure how we want to proceed with this, Darrell, but I think we do need to have a representative from the ID and a representative from China at the board meetings. **Newkirk:** OK, Rich. We've got some new board members and some continuing on board members. I would like to have some input on this, so the floor is open for debate before we [inaudible]. **Currle:** [inaudible]. We expanded so quickly, comparatively speaking, into these areas. They have become a very important part of our organization, particularly from a financial standpoint. I think we need boots on the ground representation. Since we're going to be limited in actual travel over there, that doesn't really give us the information that we need in order to make the proper decision. There's an old adage in business: You've got to spend money to make money. I think it's time to actually put the money where our mouth is. We're trying to do the same thing in India but I don't want to go in there until we're totally legal. So, we've got these problems we're faced with. Let's get it done right and let the people over there participate in these decisions that we need to make. That's it. **Anger:** Historically, this is something that we have done in the past. Before Region 9 was formally voted as a region in CFA, it had representation on the board for several terms. That facilitated their involvement into a region. I'm not proposing that any of these areas are ready to be a region in the next year or two, but they certainly should be looking to that in the future and this would be a first step toward that. We need to hear from them at the board, so I completely support having representatives from both areas. **Newkirk:** Thank you, Rachel. I want to make a clarification. These would be non-voting positions. Everybody understands that, right? **P. Moser:** I just want clarification from Rich. Are you talking about, you want a motion as of today that we're going to do this or are you just doing a discussion? **Mastin:** We're bringing it up as a discussion and I'm open to the idea. If we need to make a motion to proceed with this, I would be happy to make a motion but I would like to hear what the board as a whole thinks of this. We do have new board members on and this is new to them. Maybe they have some questions that we can answer. **P. Moser:** Yeah, because myself, I know that we a lot of times are kind of quick to jump into things without really thinking about it. I'm not saying that I don't think this is a good idea, but I would really like some time to step back and bring it up at our next board meeting or at a little bit later time so I can look at all the different options and do it that way. That's my opinion. **Eigenhauser:** I would point out that our next couple of meetings are going to be telephonic, so there won't be any major expenses involved in giving this a try. So, we could have them available by telepresence in August and September, as we kind of iron out the details for physical presence at future meetings. It doesn't have to be done all in one step. **DelaBar:** How would you decide who is going to be the rep? Would we be holding a special election in these areas? **Newkirk:** I think they would be board appointments. **DelaBar:** Would these be Matthew coming in to participate with the board? **Newkirk:** Yes. **DelaBar:** OK. **Mastin:** Just a couple comments. To further expand on what George just said, we will have

telephonic or Zoom board meetings right through December. The October in-person board meeting was cancelled, so that will likely be Zoom. I assume that's Darrell's direction. The December regularly scheduled telephonic meeting, that may also be Zoom, so from a financial investment standpoint, to have these two individuals involved is minimal. Getting back to what Pam just suggested, I would absolutely recommend that Matthew be one of the individuals invited to the board meetings. As for the other individual, I would be open to hearing what the options are so the board can discuss that.

Newkirk: If we're going to do names, then I want a motion on the floor. **Mastin:** Darrell, I'm not sure the board is ready for a motion on this. I could be ready. I don't know if the rest is, but if you want a motion for Matthew, I would make a motion that Matthew Wong be involved on the board, just so we can begin the discussion and get an approval or not. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** Hang on just a second. My other appointment that would come from me from China would be Gavin Cao. **Mastin:** Darrell, may I make a recommendation we do them separately? **Newkirk:** That's fine. **Mastin:** I don't have any objections to making both motions, but I would like to go with Matthew first. **Newkirk:** OK, that's first. The motion is on the floor for Matthew. Discussion?

Mastin: I've had the opportunity to work with Matthew on a couple different projects. He is enjoyable to work with. He's got an extensive business background and I feel very confident in his abilities to have a positive impact in what he has to offer for the board, so I would strongly recommend that we approve Matthew. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? **Calhoun:** I will have to echo what Rich has said. I have worked with Matthew on projects. We didn't really actively work with him on the budget last year, but he was on the Budget Committee. I would like to include him again on the Budget Committee moving forward for his input. I think that he is very strong and very fair. I do support Matthew. **DelaBar:** I've known Matthew for years. He has so much credibility, that I should think this is no question. I just want to make sure that Thailand and Malaysia and Indonesia and Singapore are also covered well, that Matthew would know that he has to interface with these, as well. That's it. **Newkirk:** Thank you. We can make sure that he understands the responsibilities of the position. Any further discussion? **P. Moser:** Like I said, I would have liked to – I mean, I really like Matthew. That wasn't the issue. Like I said, I like to have a little more time to think about it, so I will just abstain on the motion. **Newkirk:** Hearing no further comments, and I know Pam wishes to abstain, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** P. Moser abstained.

Newkirk: The motion is passed. Rachel, you will notify Matt that he will be a non-voting member of the board starting at our next board meeting. **Anger:** I will, and I'll include his scope of responsibilities. **Newkirk:** Great. Thank you so much. We should add him to our Yahooogroup. You'll take care of that, Rachel? **Anger:** Sure will. **Newkirk:** Thank you so much.

Mastin: My next motion is to have Gavin also sit on the board, representing his area. I do not have a lot of background on Gavin so I can't speak to that. The only perspective I have is from others. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **P. Moser:** Who is the China Rep now? **Newkirk:** Eva Chen. **P. Moser:** OK. My suggestion is, if she is the China Rep – I have nothing against Gavin. I think Gavin is really good, but if you have a China Rep I think that you should be

appointing the person that was voted in. **Newkirk:** I will make a clarification for you. The China Rep represents the clubs. We want someone who has the business dealings and sense of what goes on in China. I tell you, Gavin is much more qualified than Eva. I love Eva to death. She is a good friend of mine, but Gavin owns a business. He is a business person and I would recommend – I get your point, but Gavin is the best candidate for the position. **P. Moser:** My hand is still raised. So, my comment to that is, then why didn't Gavin run for that? **Newkirk:** He's not running to be the ID Rep. We're appointing him to serve the board in a financial and business sense, Pam. It's two different things. **P. Moser:** I have an objection to that. **Newkirk:** That's fine. The Secretary will note your objection in the minutes. **Colilla:** I basically second Pam Moser's objection to using Eva. **Anger:** Someone said they didn't know much about Gavin. What I know is that he was educated in North America, speaks beautiful English. I think he would be a good go-between, between the North American mindset and the Asian mindset, and would represent both sides well. Thank you. **DelaBar:** I have absolutely no problems with Gavin. What I do have a problem with is the procedure. Don't faint, Pam Moser. I am agreeing with you. I think that this goes a little bit beyond the scope of the election for the China Rep and we need to think about this before we go further. **Newkirk:** Is there any other debate? **Morgan:** I do know Gavin and I have the utmost respect for him. I think he has phenomenal qualifications and is a really, really talented individual, but I have to agree with the people about the selection. It concerns me. I understand what you're trying to do, Darrell, by bringing someone qualified on. I think there's no one better than Gavin to do that, but there is always a question about how we selected in fairness, etc., etc., and I too would like more time to think about this. **Newkirk:** Any further debate? **Mastin:** I want to thank everybody for their comments on this. It's now an interesting discussion. Not one individual had a negative comment about Gavin being chose to be the board representative for China. However, the issue of concern was around the appointment or should it go to the individual that was elected as the Rep? So, it becomes a little difficult. However, I think I'm more leaning towards the individuals who feel that Gavin is more than qualified to be the in between for the board, the ID Rep and the business in China. So, I'm torn a little bit. I can see both sides of it, but I think from a business perspective in using Gavin as the representative for the area, I think this is probably the best choice. Until somebody can say he's not, I'm going to keep my motion and I would like to see how this plays out. **P. Moser:** Again, I say that this other Eva was elected by the people in China. They elected her to be their rep. So, what kind of a message are you sending to the people over there, that they voted her in but we decided that she's not the best person to sit at the board. I think it sends a bad message. **DelaBar:** Pam Moser just stated what I was going to say. It's a procedural problem that I have right now. It's not with Gavin. I would have the same concerns about anybody else that was brought up. I think that this wouldn't hurt to wait to get feedback from China to get an idea, and it wouldn't hurt us to wait until August.

Perkins: I have a question. Is this an internal appointment that we are allowed to make in this board meeting? What is the basis for the decision for this appointment? I'm just wondering if this is an expansion of the board of directors or is it something that should have to be voted on by the assembly? I'm just curious if someone can explain to me that procedural part. **Newkirk:** Shelly, I think Rachel can explain that to you. We set a precedent when we voted Europe in. We had Olivier Grin come and sit at the table as a non-voting board member to catch him up to speed. This is a little bit different because each of these people is experienced around the world in the business dealings of China. That's where Gavin outshines Eva. We don't even know if Matt or Gavin will accept these appointments. These are invitations. Gavin and Eva are very

good friends. If Gavin thinks it's a slight to Eva, he will turn the assignment down. Rachel, would you like to explain Shelly's question? **Anger:** There is a precedent, that we had a non-board member representative sitting at the board table for I believe it was four years. The difference, if I recall correctly, and my memory is not 100%, is that Olivier was the representative and we didn't have a separate elected office. That's the only thing that's different. I would be happy to research that so we can have the exact precedent, but that's basically what has been done in the past.

Byrd: Cyndy has a question. Is there any reason why we can't have both Gavin and Eva? **Calhoun:** I had my hand up, Darrell. That was my suggestion, as well. We aren't going to have an in-person meeting where there are any costs associated with this until February. I agree and that would have been my suggestion with Cyndy. Is there any reason why we can't have both participate? **Newkirk:** Would you like to amend the motion? Make an amendment, Cyndy, to include both? **Byrd:** Yes, I would like to amend the motion to include both Gavin and Eva to be non-voting members at the table. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. Is there any discussion on the amendment? That's basically to add Eva. We've already been talking about Gavin. **Currle:** I'm going to support the amendment, as well. I too share both Pams' concerns about elected officials being left out of the loop. It does set a bad precedent, particularly for the people that supported her and for the fact that she ran for that position. She needs to stay involved, regardless of her qualifications. I know what your aim is, Darrell. I fully support it. I'm fully supportive of business expansion in the proper way, but I think to include all three of them. When push comes to shove, if we want them actually there we can talk about whether or not we want to foot the expense. **Mastin:** I like the amendment and thank you for bringing that up. I will support it, as well. **Newkirk:** Is there any further debate on the amendment? Is there any objection to the amendment?

There being no objection, the amendment is adopted.

Newkirk: Now we need to vote on the main amended motion, which is to appoint Gavin and Eva to the board set. Is there any further debate on the amended motion? **Currle:** Could we state the motion so everyone [inaudible]. **Newkirk:** Rich, with you restate your motion to include Eva in it? Kenny, your computer is acting up. Rich, can you restate your motion to include Eva? **Mastin:** Yes, the amended motion is to allow Gavin and Eva to be involved in all the board meetings with non-voting privileges. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Is there any further debate? Is there any objection to our now-amended motion? **Morgan:** Sorry Rich, I didn't hear. Is that just for telephonic, or is that in-person, as well? **Mastin:** That's a great question. I would assume that's for all board meetings. **Morgan:** We're looking at a significant – originally when we were talking about this, we were talking about the fact that we're not having an in-person meeting until February so there was no financial obligation here. [inaudible] **P. Moser:** I was under the understanding this was just for the telephonic. I was not under the understanding that this was in-person meetings. That's what your first motion was for, was just telephonic with Matthew, so why is it now changing to in-person also? **Mastin:** Darrell, if I could speak on that real quick. I know there's people ahead of me. My motion was not specific to attend telephonic meetings, my motion was specific that they would be part of the board regardless of the meeting. My point on the telephonic was a clarification that there were no in-person meetings scheduled until February. The telephonic meetings will continue until December because the October board meeting is cancelled. Nowhere in my motion does it say specific to telephonic meetings. I do

know there is a cost associated with this. I understand that, but I'm not restating my motion. I do not believe we can have people appointed to be a part of the board for only telephonic meetings, but they can't be in in-person meetings due to the cost. I have a problem with that. **Eigenhauser:** I don't think we need to deal with this today. I think we can say that they're on. The next time we are going to have a physical face-to-face meeting isn't going to be until February, so we have between now and February to either budget for the travel or decide if they're only going to have telepresence, in which case they can still attend our in-person meetings. They just don't have to physically be there. We've had board members attend by telepresence in other situations, so I think we can vote on this today and let Kathy and Rich and those people work out a budget for it later. **P. Moser:** Again, you know, because it was basically said that they wouldn't be at the board table because of the cost. It would just be over the phone. I was OK with that, but now if you're just going to go woosh, we're going to go ahead and have them come in into the in-person meetings, I cannot support the motion because I need to have more time for discussion on this. I don't want to just make that decision right now. **Morgan:** I don't disagree with you, Rich. I think having that representation at the board, both telephonically and in person, is important because we need to hear the perspective from those areas. However, my suggestion would be that for mainland China or ID China that we vote on this current motion as it is, with the understanding that they would come to an agreement between the two of them that only one would come over to represent for in-person meetings. **Newkirk:** That's a good idea. Thank you, Melanie.

Calhoun: OK, I just want to put a little bit of context around what this will cost. It will probably cost somewhere between \$2,000 and \$2,500 to bring a person over for a board meeting. The February board meeting is smack in the middle of Chinese New Year. There may be people who opt not to come because it's Chinese New Year. This part of the world is where we get 67% of our registrations. I don't think that, while I want to be a good shepherd of the dollars spent, I think we need to make sure that we are doing the right thing overall for CFA. I think this may resolve itself over time, but if it does not, I don't think that \$2,500 is that great of an obstacle. **Mastin:** Pam, thank you for bringing up your concern about the finance part of it. We could let these individuals know that we expect them to participate via teleconference or the in-person meetings. I just don't want to exclude them from this, specific to only board telephonic or Zoom meetings. The other thing we have to keep in mind is, we don't know for sure that these three individuals are going to even be able to fly into the States or to the February in-person board meeting. Things may change, so I don't want this specific to in-person or telephonic or Zoom meetings. They are a part of this. If we want to dictate, "we expect you to attend via teleconference," I'm fine with that. **Newkirk:** I don't see anyone else's hand up. Is everybody ready for me to call the question? All those in favor of the amended motion.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** P. Moser and McCullough voting no.

Newkirk: The motion is passed. Is there any other New Business that we need to bring up now?

(34) **UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS.**

- ❖ August 11 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ September 1 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ October 3-4, 2020 –Teleconference
- ❖ November 3 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ December 1 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ January 5 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ February 6/7, 2021– In Person, Cleveland Marriott or Teleconference
- ❖ March 2 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ April 6 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ May 4 at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time – Teleconference
- ❖ June 16-20, 2021 Westin Galleria, Houston, TX
- ❖ June 22-26, 2022 Galt House Hotel, Louisville, KY

Eigenhauser: Are we going to do the board meeting schedule? **Newkirk:** Yes. Allene, can you bring that up? **Newkirk:** OK, so the next thing, we're going to go to the board meeting schedule. If you will notice, there are two committees. We had a China Management Core Committee and a Coronavirus Task Force Committee. Those were special committees that Mr. Hannon had appointed. I am not reappointing those two committees because I'll expect the Executive Committee to handle any emergency situations that arise before us. If need be, then we will call a special board meeting, but I want to schedule and pre-notice a meeting every month. We have to decide which Tuesday it's going to be because there's a conflict with the second Tuesday. If there are no agenda items, these extra six meetings that now will be placed between our every other month meetings will be cancelled. So, what we need input from the board members is, we need the first Tuesday of the month or the third Tuesday of the month. I need input on that. **Anger:** Just for historical purposes, we had scheduled these originally on the first Tuesday but they have been moved to the second Tuesday for a number of years because of a conflict with a club meeting with two board members. So, those board members are no longer on the board. I'm the person that has a conflict the second Tuesday. If that's the day that works best for everyone else, I can work around it because this is my priority. That's the historical perspective and why Darrell is bringing it up as a possible alternative. Thank you. **Eigenhauser:** Looking at my calendar, I only have my calendar up to the end of the year in front of me at the moment. The first Tuesday works better for me than the third Tuesday. I have at least one conflict already on the third Tuesday of the month. **DelaBar:** I only have a problem with August. I have to reschedule a trip so if there was a board meeting on the 4th of August I would be calling you from Crete. **Krzanowski:** I also have a problem with August if it's moved, because I already

told some club applicants of the second Tuesday as the board meeting. If we move it up, I don't know if there is time for them to complete their requirements. **Newkirk:** We're meeting on a monthly basis. Would it harm them to wait one month? **Krzanowski:** I can advise them of that. That hopefully should not be a problem. **Anger:** I hate to see that happen. If I'm the only one that has a minor conflict on the second Tuesday, then I am fine with keeping it the second Tuesday. **Eigenhauser:** My conflict on the third Tuesday doesn't occur until later in the year, so in August, the first, second or third makes no difference to me. **Newkirk:** Does someone want to put it in the form of a motion? **Mastin:** Would we consider doing the August one on the second Tuesday of the month, and then after that go to the first Tuesday? That will accommodate Pam and Carol, and it will address Rachel's concern going forward. **DelaBar:** I would move for August that we have our telephonic meeting on the 11th of August. **Newkirk:** We need a motion to cover all the meetings. **DelaBar:** That was the only one that we were going to go to – **Newkirk:** We don't have a regular date scheduled, so the motion needs to include, "all meetings will be held on the first Tuesday of the month, excluding the August meeting, which will be held on the second Tuesday of the month." **DelaBar:** I move what you said. **Mastin:** I'll second.

Perkins: I really think your motion needs to say that all the meetings are on the second Tuesday of the month except August, and excepting the in-person meetings in October, February and June, because those aren't on a Tuesday. I think you should clarify that. **Newkirk:** Pam, would you like to clarify the motion? **DelaBar:** Yes, I will clarify that we will have all of our meetings on – I think it was the first Tuesday, wasn't it? – of each month. **Eigenhauser:** Yes. **DelaBar:** The first Tuesday of each month, with the exception of August and those meetings that – let me restate that. Hang on. That we have all our telephonic meetings on the first Tuesday of each month, with the exception of August which will be the second Tuesday in August, except for those that we deem by the constitution to have in person. **Mastin:** I'll continue my second. **Eigenhauser:** I don't think that fixes the problem. The date of the October meeting is set in the constitution, so if that motion passes as stated, we will be moving our October board meeting to Tuesday if it's telephonic. **DelaBar:** You're right. **Newkirk:** I was reviewing the constitution. This is because I was reviewing the Board Policy Guidelines and it stated those three meetings were mandated by the constitution, and that's not true. The Breed Council Secretaries – there is an extension of the February board meeting on proposals and there is no requirement for a February and an October board meeting. It's annual meetings and special meetings, so that needs to be worked out, Pam, when we go through the Policy Guidelines updates. **DelaBar:** OK. Let me restate it again. Rachel is going to go nuts. That for our telephonic monthly meetings, not including October and February board meetings, that we have it on the first Tuesday of each month, with the exception of August, which will be the second Tuesday of that month. **Mastin:** Second. **Newkirk:** Any debate on that motion? Is there any objection to Pam's motion.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Newkirk: Any other New Business we need to go over? **P. Moser:** I have a question on the upcoming board meetings. In October and February it states that the in-person board meeting is going to be at the Museum in Alliance. I wanted to know if that was meant to be that, because we had voted on having them in Cleveland, due to convenience to the airport. Or is that being changed back to Alliance? **Newkirk:** I think Rich made the comment earlier that that board meeting has been cancelled. It will be a teleconference meeting. **P. Moser:** February then. **Newkirk:** It will be in February when we will have our first in-person meeting. **Eigenhauser:**

Her question is, where? **P. Moser:** Yes. **Tartaglia:** We currently have a contract with the Marriott in Cleveland for the February 2021 board meeting. **P. Moser:** So, my question was that this was an error, that you should have put Cleveland, correct? **Newkirk:** We can update that. Rachel will do that, and then she will change October 3/4 to a teleconference, OK? Rachel, you can do that? **Anger:** I can do that. **Calhoun:** What times are the teleconference meetings scheduled for? **Newkirk:** We've been having them at 5:00 Pacific Time, which is 8:00 on the east coast. It would be 7:00 your time zone, Kathy. **Calhoun:** I'm fine with that. I just wanted to make sure that everyone knew that the times had not changed. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. Rachel, maybe after those you could put 8:00 Eastern Daylight Time, just as a reminder for everybody.

* * * * *

Newkirk: OK, we've got most of our business covered. Anything, Melanie Morgan?
Morgan: I have one executive session item. I didn't get a contact for calling back in for that.
Newkirk: Let Allene address that. It was my understanding we were going to set up a Zoom meeting with the board for that? **Tartaglia:** There is a separate link and I believe Rachel sent that out. It was either later yesterday or early this morning. Rachel, maybe you can send that out again. Does anybody else, other than Melanie, need it? **Eigenhauser:** It was in my in box this morning. **Roy:** I just need the number because for some reason my grolen email is completely down. I'm not getting anything in the in box. **Tartaglia:** It's not a phone number, it's an actual Zoom meeting with a link. **Roy:** The Zoom meeting number to get into that meeting? **Morgan:** If someone could resend that to me, I have nowhere to call. **Roy:** Yeah, that would be good. **Tartaglia:** Let me text that to you, Sharon. It's executive session. We don't want to publicize it. **Roy:** That would be great, thank you.

Newkirk: Before we adjourn, I want to get the board's opinion. We have 113 attendees right now, including 21 people on the panel. They would like to continue this open forum we're having so they can listen in on the board meetings. Is there any objection from the board about continuing to broadcast our meetings? Of course, we would have to have a special Zoom meeting like we're going to have today to cover any closed session items. This is really presenting the transparency to the people that support the organization. Is there any objections to that? **Anger:** No objection. I think it's a great idea. This is something we've all wanted for a very long time. I just want to remind everybody that, years ago for the Breeds and Standards portion of the February meetings, Scott Cowling would live broadcast that. That was very popular, so I hope that as more people come to know that we'll be having these publicly – if that's what we decide to do – that they will attend and not find them incredibly boring. Thank you. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with what Rachel said. Not only do I support having our open session Zoom meetings available to the public, but I would like to see us start webcasting our in-person meetings and our annual meeting, as well, but certainly getting people on board for the Zoom meetings is a start. **DelaBar:** Just to know that that's going to be effective only for the U.S. In Europe, I'm still getting up in the middle of the night to attend these meetings and I sincerely doubt you're going to have a big audience from Region 9 attending these, and probably Asia as well. **Currle:** Do we need a motion for this? We can always adjust our start time concerning these telephonic meetings, but I'll make a motion to continue to Zoom our open session board meetings to all of our constituents worldwide. **McCullough:** Second. **Newkirk:** OK, we have a motion and it has been seconded. Kenny, would you like to offer any more discussion? **Currle:** That would be your decision to ask for that. **Newkirk:** No, you made the motion. **Currle:** I certainly agree and I think most of the board members, if not all, agree that for them to become more and more involved with what we're faced on their behalf, it just creates better understanding and more unity throughout the entire cat fancy. That's basically my main premise to continue on with this sort of approach. **Newkirk:** Very good, thank you for the motion. Any further discussion? Any objections to Kenny's motion? I hear no one objecting, so by unanimous consent, Kenny's motion is approved.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Newkirk: Is there any other items we need to bring up before we adjourn? **Tartaglia:** What time does the executive session meeting start? **Newkirk:** What time is it now? **Tartaglia:** 2:03 Eastern Time. **Newkirk:** Does everybody want to take a 30 minute break? I think the

executive session is going to be pretty short. **Roy:** Can we just do it like right away rather than wait if it's only for one item? **Newkirk:** Sure. Is everybody agreeable to that? <yes> OK, alright.

Newkirk: Before I adjourn, I want to thank all the board members for your participation today. I think we got a lot done. Usually our Sunday meetings are very short. This one went a little bit longer than I thought it might, but I think we went only a couple hours and got quite a bit done. I thank you all for participating. We have a lot of people as attendees today watching their board in action. I thank you guys for taking the time to listen in. I didn't get to see all the chats that have been brought up, but I want to thank all of you guys for participating at the board level. Keep us informed of your issues and let's take CFA into the next generation and we'll move on.

Meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m. EDT.

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met in executive session on Sunday, June 21, 2020, via Zoom teleconference. **President Darrell Newkirk** called the meeting to order at 2:18 p.m. EDT with the following members found to be present following a roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger**:

Mr. Darrell Newkirk (President)
Mr. Richard Mastin (Vice President)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Steve McCullough, D.C. (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Howard Webster (SWR Director)
Mrs. Cathy Dunham (MWR Director)
Mr. Kenny Currle (SOR Director)
Ms. Yukiko Hayata (Japan Regional Director)
Ms. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
Ms. Cyndy Byrd (Director-at-Large)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

Shelly K. Perkins, Attorney at Law, CFA Legal Counsel
Ms. Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director

Absent:

None.

[**Secretary's Note:** Following an executive session item, the Chair then opened the meeting to additional miscellaneous items.]

Newkirk: George, I will recognize you for switching over to Groups IO. **Eigenhauser:** You heard my rationale earlier. I just think Yahoogroups keeps cutting their services, so I'm going to move that we move the board email list to io.groups. **McCullough:** I second. **Newkirk:** Is there discussion? **Anger:** I have no objection to that. I just want to let you know that we discussed this before. Mark said, "Rachel, you talk about it with James," which I did. I asked him for a good alternative and he recommended at the time – which was March or so – he recommended we just stick with Yahoogroups. So, that's the history of it. I'm happy to change to whatever the board wants, but I just wanted you to know we didn't drop the ball. **Newkirk:** I never, ever would have said you dropped the ball, Rachel. You're always on top of things. **Mastin:** I think it's important that we review this with James so he can clearly understand how much of an issue it is that we're having with Yahoogroups. There's got to be better alternatives

than going back to Yahoo. If Allene can get involved and share our concerns with James. I can also, if it's a help to James, I can run it through my IT department and ask for their recommendations if James needs it. **Tartaglia:** I'll contact him right away. We'll get on that. **Newkirk:** Almost all of our cat fancy friends have different groups on Yahoo. Almost every one of them have migrated over to Groups IO. It's really a good system. I agree with George, I think this would be a smart move for us to do. I would say we should do it pending talking with James. **Eigenhauser:** I was going to agree with what Darrell said. Most of us have experience with IO Groups because so much of the fancy has already moved over. I don't think this is rocket science that necessarily requires something signed in blood by our IT Department before we make the move, this is simply how the board chooses to communicate among ourselves. I think this is a decision we can make on our own. Unless James comes back with something toxic, I think we should go ahead and do it. **Newkirk:** I agree with you George. **McCullough:** I contacted Yahoo on Friday because I couldn't join the group. They informed me those were taken down in October and that's why I wasn't associated with any of my 17 groups, and that there would be no support because they don't exist except for on somebody else's server. So, for whatever it's worth, they're not there anymore. **Newkirk:** I think that answers the question then, doesn't it? Are there any other comments about migrating off of Yahoogroups onto Groups IO? Shelly, do you have any input you want to give us on that? It doesn't look like anybody is in opposition. Is anybody opposed? Let's do it right – is there any objection to George's motion? OK, no one has raised their hand to object, so we'll say by unanimous consent George's motion is approved.

There being no objection, the motion is adopted.

Newkirk: Who is going to take the lead on – Allene, will you take the lead on getting that migrated over? **Tartaglia:** Yes. It's called the IO Group? **Newkirk:** Groups.io. You can do a search on CFA and it will probably bring up 50 things. It's heavily populated. Most of the judges' list, all of the regional groups, everything is on IO Group now. It's really, really – it put Yahoogroups out of business. When Yahoo quit supporting their archive files and stuff, they thought, "what the hell, what's the point?" So anyway, OK.

Newkirk: Anything else we need to talk about before we adjourn? No? OK, good. Thank you guys very much. I appreciate everybody's input today. I think we had a good meeting. It's 11:28 and I will announce that the meeting is adjourned. **Mastin:** Darrell, Shelly's got her hand up. **Newkirk:** I'm sorry, go ahead Shelly. **Perkins:** Just briefly, I notice that there are times when people are speaking that they are not identifying themselves and the President didn't identify them. For people on the telephone, it's going to be difficult for them to know who is actually talking, so if Darrell doesn't recognize you in the order of events by Robert's Rules, then the person speaking needs to identify themselves, even when you are seconding motions, because we aren't in person so we can't see who that second person is and the people on the telephone don't know who that is. It's just something I noticed today. **Newkirk:** Great, thank you Shelly. That's really, really a good observation. I'll try to do better in the future to make sure that I announce the person. You made reference to Robert's Rules. The other day I had pre-paid for the 12th Edition which is going to be released on the 1st of September and I know Steve McCullough is a Robert's Rules junkie. **McCullough:** Thank you. **Newkirk:** Shelly, I know you're a rules person, too, so anyway, there's a few more things. There's not that much stuff we really don't follow in Robert's Rules and it's not a really terrible learning process. I made up a cheat sheet that I gave Rich, I think it was back in October or maybe it was February, and I will

share that sheet. It basically list the hierarchy of the motions in Robert's Rules. All these motions don't apply to us obviously. How to amend a motion, how to table something – all those things are really pretty important for us. I think everybody has learned about reconsider and rescind – the difference between those two motions. I'll try to put together a little cheat sheet just explaining a little bit about those. I'll run it by Shelly before I send it out to you guys, so we can get on the main page. As you noticed today in our meeting I used the unanimous consent to do votes. We had only a couple votes we really had to have everybody raise their hand on. That's the beauty of Robert's Rules. It makes your meeting run smooth and orderly and quickly. So, thanks you guys for participating. **Anger:** Since we're in open session, I did want to mention that many of us, we do know Robert's Rules – it's just that we are unsure how to apply them. They have been applied a little different, not at all, whatever, but I don't want our constituents to think that we're completely ignorant of what they are and how they operate. We just need to know exactly how they are going to be applied. I think we're catching onto that pretty quickly. As for the seconding of motions, I would like to think that I have an uncanny ability to recognize who is speaking, but what Shelly says is exactly true. When I second a motion – I know Rich does this, too – I always say, "Rachel seconds" or whatever. So that's a great suggestion that will help our minutes be even better, thank you. **Newkirk:** That's why I wanted to clarify, Rachel, that there's just a few things that we need to clear up. This participant list is really pretty good because when you raise your hand it elevates your name on mine towards the top so I can call people in order that they raise their hands, like I am going to call on Rich Mastin right now. **Mastin:** Darrell, I just want confirmation on your monthly telephonic meetings. Are we having one in July? **Newkirk:** No. I'm actually, on the first of July I'm going to fly into St. Louis. I haven't seen my mom since Christmas, and so I'm going to go spend two weeks with her. That would fall during that meeting time. I grew up in the sticks and when I told my mom she would have to constantly move her phone because of the reception so I can hear her, so no, there is no July meeting unless we have to have an emergency meeting if anything pops up. Any parting comments anyone? No? OK, thank you Melanie for bringing that motion up for Gary. Really appreciate it and I appreciate all the work you've done, OK? So, it is 11:34 my time. It would be 2:34 East Coast time and the meeting stands adjourned. Thank you everyone.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary*

(35) **DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.**

Disciplinary Hearings And Suspensions: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to the Board. The following case was heard, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the parties, and no appeal and/or appeal fee was filed. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None.

Board-Cited Hearing: The Board may consider any protest filed by any member of a member club or in any other manner brought to the attention of the Executive Board. The Board may delegate authority to one or more persons to review, investigate, and determine if probable cause exists for the filing of a formal protest. This case was heard on direct cite by the CFA Executive Board. Timely notice was given to the party, and the matter was heard in open session, at the request of the respondent.

None.

Appeals: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to and heard by the Board, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the party, an appeal and/or appeal fee was timely filed, and the appeal was heard by the Board of Directors. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None.