

THE INTERNATIONAL CAT ASSOCIATION
MINUTES - 1987 ANNUAL MEETING
September 2-6, 1987
Saratoga Springs, New York

Wednesday, September 2, 1987:

The annual meeting of The International Cat Association Board of Directors was called to order at 9:05 AM by the President, Georgia Morgan. Roll call showed the following members to be present:

President, Georgia Morgan
Canadian Regional Director, Yvonne Patrick
North Central Regional Director, Dewane Barnes
Northeast Regional Director, Mark Coleman
Northwest Regional Director, Alice Rhea
South Central Regional Director, Sue Pannell
Southeast Regional Director, Pat Smith
Southwest Regional Director, Brenda Kinnunen

The Vice-President, Jim Becknell, was expected to arrive at noon.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Patrick to accept the minutes from the Semi-Annual, 1987, in Austin, Texas as corrected. Motion carried unanimously.

Georgia asked at this time that the Board identify themselves verbally if the vote was not unanimous.

The President stated that the decision had been made at the Semi-Annual that the Genetics Committee members would be informed that a resume should be sent to the Executive Office for inclusion in the Agenda of the 1987 Annual Board Meeting. The motion had read: "The current members of the Genetics Committee be requested to write a resume of their professional qualifications in the field of genetics together with their university degrees and any current experience they have in genetics, to be received by the Board of Directors no later than 30 days prior to the next Board meeting for inclusion on the agenda for the 1987 Annual." (See page 22, Minutes, Semi-Annual 1987.) Mark had asked Leslie to send out a form for the members of the Genetics Committee to fill out together with a letter advising that the Board had requested this form be filled out. As this had not been the instructions of the Board, the letter was not mailed to the Genetics Committee members.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Coleman that this Board not accept anything that violates the motion that anything discussed at this Board meeting be received 30 days prior to the meeting.

Alice felt that this was a valid motion but that this Board would not want to be put into the position of not being able to accept something because it was received after the 30-day limit. She indicated that Robert's Rules stated that the Board may suspend the rules.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Barnes to amend the motion that it must be postmarked not later than 60 days prior to the Board meeting. It was noted, however, that the TREND had clarified for this meeting: "The deadline for submission of proposals for the Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors to the Executive Office is July 31, 1987. Any proposals received after that date will be referred to the Semi-Annual Meeting in 1988." (See TREND, Volume 8, No. 3, page 2.)

Dewane stated that he was concerned about coming to meetings and having a host of things which had not been previously seen by the Board. He believed that in these cases they did not have the time to look over, reflect on, or contact other Board members about the material. He felt that perhaps in the past, the Board had acted precipitously on matters that should not have been addressed.

Georgia explained that this motion would only concern the Board Agenda, not the Judging Administrator's agenda, as Gloria had given a different deadline to the judges/applicant/trainees.

Sue and Alice reiterated that under Robert's Rules an emergency situation may be handled, and that the Board already had a rule that documents must be received before the deadline and that Robert's Rules provide that the Board may suspend those rules. Alice also stated other vehicles to prevent precipitous action would be: objecting to the question; or not seconding the motion; or just voting **NO** on the question.

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Barnes to appoint Solveig Pflueger and Gloria Stephens to the Genetics Committee.

Motion was made by Rhea to divide the question. Motion to appoint the individuals was discussed separately.

Brenda preferred that Solveig not be the chair of the committee as she felt that it was impossible to obtain anything in writing from Solveig. Leslie and Georgia both remarked that when contacted Solveig was always available for decisions and/or resolutions of problems. Mark stated that he had spoken with her on a weekly basis, and also had no problems obtaining information from her. It was stated that the President is an exofficio member of all committees.

Alice was under the impression that it had been impossible to obtain a complete list of colors from Solveig. Both Mark and Georgia stated that this was not entirely the fault of the Genetics Chairperson, as she had tried several times to determine exactly what the Board had decided in Austin. Sue stated that, in all fairness to Solveig, the Board had discussed the Greensboro package at the Austin Semi-Annual, 1984, and had made changes without involving her. Afterward no one on the Board had been able to tell her the exact changes they had made. Therefore, it had been impossible for her to make a complete color list. She had spent her own money and time on a special trip to the Abilene Semi-Annual, 1985, where the Board did not really have the time to give her the information she needed to complete the color list. Mark stated that Solveig has the list on the computer and that she can do the work. Georgia stated that Solveig had worked with both she and Sue on two different occasions recently, and that she had agreed to come here to make a presentation to the Board.

Motion to appoint Solveig Pflueger to chair the Genetics Committee carried with Kinnunen abstaining.

Mark stated that Gloria was a self-taught geneticist, and that she had a limited education, but also that she had been a member of the committee, had studied genetics, had provided genetics instruction to the members, and that had submitted her qualifications to the Board.

Motion to appoint Gloria Stephens to the Genetics Committee carried unanimously.

Nicole Ledoux and Larry Levy had written a letter concerning the Sphynx Breed Committee which was received too late for the Austin Semi-Annual, 1987. The letter stated that they objected to the members on the committee who had not met the requirements, specifically Barry Goldstein. ARTICLE FOURTEEN, Section 2, Ballot 06/29/85 states: "Persons may seek and hold office without being a member for 2 years immediately preceding the election if no member in the region or no member in the breed section has been a member for the 2 years immediately preceding the election." It was noted that Aline and Phillippe had never expressed a desire to be on the Sphynx Breed Committee.

A lengthy discussion ensued on the requirement of five members on each breed committee, when some breed sections only represent 12 members. Brenda suggested arbitrarily changing the number of committee members on the Sphynx Breed Committee and letting the breed section decide which two members to delete. Georgia felt that this would add to the time that the sections would be without a committee. All agreed. The By-Laws, ARTICLE FIVE, Section 4, state: "...The number of Breed Committee members shall be determined by the Board of Directors and may be increased or decreased based on the number of Breed Section members and the needs of the Breed Section."

The following individuals were elected Sphynx Breed Committee: Carol Richards, Chair, Peter and Vicky Markstein, Lisa Bressler, and Barry Goldstein. Carol Richards had bred and shown Sphynx, Peter and Vicky had owned and shown a Sphynx, and Lisa Bressler has now owned and bred Sphynx. Barry Goldstein had never owned or shown a Sphynx.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Pannell that Carol Richards, Peter and Vicky Markstein, and Lisa Bressler be appointed to the Sphynx Breed Committee. Dewane accepted an editorial change to delete Vicky Markstein.

Edited motion to read: Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Pannell that Carol Richards, Peter Markstein, and Lisa Bressler be appointed to the Sphynx Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the Oriental Longhair, Ragdoll, Turkisk Angora, American Wirehair, Singapura, and Sphynx Breed Committees be reduced to three members. Brenda accepted an editorial change that each individual breed committee would be voted on as they came up. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Barnes that the Sphynx Breed Committee consist of three members. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the Korat Committee consist of three members.

Sue contended that since the Abel's had been elected they could not be taken off the committee. It was decided that the number of people in the breed section should be the criteria by which it was determined to reduce the committee to three members.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes to reconsider the motion to effect a change to three members on the Korat Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes that based on the number of separate addresses of the Korat Breed Section, the number of committee members be maintained at five. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Smith, and seconded by Coleman to appoint Sharryn and Raymond Gaddis to the Korat Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Mark delivered information regarding the Singapura test mating program from Tommy Meadows. This information had been furnished by Tommy Meadows. Georgia stated this material had been distributed by Tommy Meadows since 1982.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the packet of information from Tommy Meadows was not relevant discussion for this Board. Motion carried unanimously.

Georgia requested that all **no** votes be verbal so that there would be a record of who had voted no on the tape.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to appoint Jo Cobery to the Singapura Breed Committee.

Sue asserted that according to precedent just set, this committee should only consist of three persons. Brenda suggests 10 addresses may be enough for a committee of five. There were four members of the Singapura Breed Committee elected. Alice and Sue both felt that someone who wanted to serve on the committee should have filed and paid their money.

Motion carried with Rhea abstaining.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes to appoint either John or Dian Burch, Debra Rexelle, David MacPherson and either John or Linda Dolan to the Chartreux Breed Committee. Brenda accepted an editorial change to remove John Dolan as he was not a member.

Yvonne stated that John and Dian had bred Chartreux in the past and that John had been working with the MacPherson's and had bred his cat. Other than a 2 year lapse, they have both been active with the Chartreux Breed. Brenda stated that her motion was a courtesy appointment as they had not been eligible. Dewane made a motion to accept John Burch subject to his breeding a litter. Motion was withdrawn. Dewane amended Brenda's motion to accept John Burch subject to registration of a litter within 90 days. Brenda accepts this as an editorial change. Sue felt that if it was a courtesy appointment, then both John and Dian should be accepted because both had been elected. She felt that if one was appointed, both should be appointed. Alice noted that John and Dian were two of the few people willing to work on the standards. Mark stated that they were voted on by the breed section because it had been understood that they were eligible, therefore, they had been on the ballot through

an administrative error. Dewane withdrew his editorial amendment. Motion was made by Rhea to divide the question.

Motion to appoint John Burch to the Chartreux Breed Committee carried unanimously.

Motion to appoint Dian Burch to the Chartreux Breed Committee carried with Smith opposed.

Motion to appoint Debra Rexelle to the Chartreux Breed Committee carried unanimously.

Motion to appoint Alexis MacPherson to the Chartreux Breed Committee carried unanimously.

Motion to appoint David MacPherson to the Chartreux Breed Committee carried unanimously.

Motion to appoint Linda Dolan to the Chartreux Breed Committee was denied with Smith in favor because she felt someone who was eligible should not be turned down in favor of someone who was not eligible, and Coleman voted against because there were already five members on the committee.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the Turkish Van Committee consist of three members. Motion carried unanimously.

Leslie stated that the Rears are active but the Executive Office had never received anything from them unless they were contacted by certified mail.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman to appoint Beth Holden, Barbara, and Jack Reark as members of the Turkish Van Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the Ragdoll Breed Committee consist of three members.

Dewane expressed concern over a committee of only three for a large breed section. He felt it was inconsistent. Rita Sievern had never answered inquiries from the Executive Office, and Karen Hague had a Ragdoll alter but had never bred a Ragdoll.

Brenda amended her motion to appoint three members to the Ragdoll Breed Committee for a period of 1 year. If at that time anyone is interested in serving on the committee then the committee may be upgraded to fill out the other two spaces on the committee. She suggested making this a retroactive motion to all the previous committees. Alice stated that it should not be made retroactive to those motions already acted upon. Georgia and Mark felt that there should be immediate action taken on the breed committees. Brenda withdrew her amendment.

Motion that the Ragdoll Committee consist of three members carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen that Dorothy Metcalf, Sirje Kuhl, and Patricia Rados be appointed to the Ragdoll Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Patrick to accept as the entire Oriental Longhair Breed Committee those elected: Bev Eitner, Robin A. Radlein, and Bob Smith. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea to table the Somali Breed Committee until the regional directors had a chance to contact their regions for more information.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman to untable the Somali Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell to appoint Bert Goldberg to complete the Somali Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Kinnunen that the Turkish Angora Breed Committee consist of three members. Motion carried unanimously.

Leslie stated that John and Debbie Dudley had not been members of TICA until 10/9/86, so could not have been elected. They had also just renewed current their memberships 8/10/87. Mark recounted that Dolores was quite active in another association, and he felt that there would be a conflict of interest as she was going into their Judging Program.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to appoint Patricia Joyce, Dolores Reiff, and John Dudley to the Turkish Angora Breed Committee, with Debbie Dudley as an alternate. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes that the Japanese Bobtail Breed Committee consist of three members. Motion carried unanimously.

Leslie explained that Solveig had volunteered to serve on the Japanese Bobtail, Manx, or Sphynx Breed Committees as a last choice.

Hazel Swadberg had been the only qualified member elected. Several other members were discussed.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Patrick to appoint Solveig Pflueger as the second member of the Japanese Bobtail Breed Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to discuss Board Ballot BB87-10. The subject of this Board Ballot had been to "allow the Exotic Shorthair Breed Committee elected in the 1986 General Election to be comprised of seven members provided Lynn and Joe Hager receive enough votes in the recount of the ballots as described in Board Ballot BB87-07 dated June 23, 1987 to be elected to the Exotic Shorthair Breed Committee." Brenda felt that the concept of having seven people on the breed committee was so that the larger breeds would proportionately get better representation. The Exotic Breed Section had only shown 99 cats in the last year, and was not what she believed was one of the larger breed sections. There had been 626 Persians shown, 405 Maine Coons, and 945 Household Pets. She felt strongly that those were the only breeds that qualified for a higher number on the committee.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea that in lieu of BB87-10 to the Board vote on the issue of expanding the Exotic Breed Committee to seven at this time. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Smith to: "Allow the Exotic Shorthair Breed Committee elected in the 1986 General Election to be comprised of seven members provided Lynn and Joe Hager receive enough votes in the recount of the ballots as described in Board Ballot BB87-07 dated June 23, 1987 to be elected to the Exotic Shorthair Breed Committee." Motion carried with Kinnunen opposed.

The results of the Egyptian Mau Committee had been given to the Board before the meeting.

Georgia announced the Members of the Year:

- Canada-Karen Matz
- North Central-Lynne Sherer
- Northwest-Robin Williams
- South Central-Glenda Stephens
- Southeast-Doreen Spencer
- Southwest-Vicky Shields
- Northeast-Bernie Hayduck/Martie Fellman

At this time, Georgia mentioned that the Report from Legal Counsel had stated: "Most persons do not mistrust Mary Haffner or Mary Schweiger. However, many expressed an opinion they did not wish to vote when any person in the Cat Fancy counted the votes. They prefer all ballots going to a CPA who can certify the results to Georgia. I would recommend you employ the CPA who currently does our financial statements."

Discussion focused on comments to several directors that conformed with this statement. The Executive Office was directed to investigate costs for the CPA in Harlingen. Mark stated that he would also check with a CPA he and Marilyne were familiar with, who had offered to do the job for \$100. Georgia cautioned that this was not to be related to anyone else, until a decision was made and the current CPA's were formally advised by the Board. Brenda asked if all ballots would be removed from the ballot judge, i.e., Judge-of-the-year and Member-of-the-Year? Yvonne felt that Alice Rhea's system of honoring their Member of the Year at the regional banquet was excellent. Everyone agreed that it was a regional honor and should be awarded at the regional banquet.

Motion was made by Patrick, and seconded by Coleman that the ballot for Regional Member of the Year originate from the regional director and that the votes be returned to the regional director. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea that an outside CPA be used to count all ballots to include Judge-of-the-Year.

Mark suggested making the decision for an outside CPA to determine who after research on costs, etc.

Motion was amended by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman to be effective May 1, 1988. Motion carried unanimously.

shown in Europe that was very different in type from what we know here, and that it was very different in the colors that were recognized. She continued that the people who were breeding them in Europe were interested in showing them in this country. Dewane stated that a breeder in his region had discussed this proposal at great length with him. He contended that they were adamant about being accepted as the Foreign Burmese. She had told him that if it was to be a choice between being accepted as Foreign Burmese or not being accepted then they would rather not be accepted. Solveig stated that if the Burmese people want to allow it then, the Board could make an exception, however, these were different in conformation, so they had no right to the name. She explained that either they were the same and they bring them in as Burmese, or they were different and they bring them in as a New Breed and they had no right to the name. Yvonne stated that they had been planning to use the European standard, and that was why they wanted to retain the name. Dr. Pflueger replied that in Europe they do not call them the Foreign Burmese.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman that the General Manager write to Bill Vermaas stating that the Board had rejected the proposal based on Article III, Section 4, Rule 1 of the Registration Rules. Further, that they may register the cats as a new breed without Burmese in the name, or as Burmese conforming to the existing Burmese standard. Motion carried unanimously.

A discussion ensued on Scoring a Multiple Breed Congress: A Balinese/Oriental Shorthair/Siamese congress is judged as a specialty ring. Some felt that since it was mixed breeds, it should be judged as an allbreed ring. It was noted that a specialty license fee is paid. Pat read from the TREND, Volume 4, No. 3, Mar/Apr 1983: "...Breed Specialties and multiple Breed Specialties. Effective May 1, the following will apply: Specialty ring points will be awarded; there must be 25 entries in the catalogue, 25 must be present for top 10 awards, 20 present for top five awards; if 25 cats are present excluding those in breed or multi-breed specialty, the club may choose to have a different judge to do the breed specialty, have the same judge do breed specialty separately and rejudge cats participating in specialty with the rest of the entries or have the same judge do breed specialty and do remaining cats as a separate specialty; if 25 entries are not present excluding those in the breed specialty, the club must choose one of the first two options."

There were several opinions for both allbreed and specialty points, however, no decision was made.

Later, in the open meeting, Sue Servies stated that breed congresses were specialties by definition, and that they were called breed specialties or breed congresses. Georgia stated that several of the clubs do pay for them, and that she felt it should be up to the club.

Georgia stated that the CPA felt that it wasn't necessary to have a separate account for the computer fund, therefore, she recommended that May 1, 1988 be the cutoff date for computer fund fees. She stated that any new computer equipment could be purchased out of the existing fund and the general account. Everyone wanted newer technology to be available. Georgia stated that the separate account would be maintained as long as there were funds available to it. She also felt that there would be a savings in money spent now to count the cats for the billing of clubs for the computer fees and maintaining the reports, etc. Dewane stated that this fee also generated the most complaints from the clubs.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman to discontinue assessing the Computer Fund Fees effective May 1, 1988. Motion carried unanimously.

The Vice-President arrived at this time, and was welcomed by the President.

Georgia asked if everyone had read the recommendations of the legal advisor. She also informed the Board that Gloria would be unable to attend the meeting because of the forest fires near her home.

There were no questions about the Financial Report. Dewane questioned the increase in Professional Fees on the Budget. The amount included preparation of financial statements and depreciation schedules, preparation of Franchise Tax Reports, and processing of a request for non-profit status through the Internal Revenue Service.

There was a general discussion of advertising. It was noted that Cats Magazine and Cat World are breeder oriented publications, whereas Cat Fancy is more oriented toward the general cat owner. Everyone felt this was where TICA needed to could attract more attention. Mark called Cat Fancy for more information on rates. He subsequently reported that Cat Fancy had suggested a 1-inch by 1-inch column in front of the magazine that ran every month or possibly an insertion of the same size ad or a 1/10th page ad. She had suggested a one-time directory ad. Twelve insertions of a one column by 1-inch ad are \$2,040. Six insertions of the same ad are \$1071. One-tenth page ad is \$500 per insertion for twelve insertions or \$530 per insertion for every other month. All have a 15 percent discount for camera ready copy. She maintained a quarter page ad would not give any return at all, but she liked the idea of the classified ad. Classified ads are \$.60 per word per insertion with a \$12 minimum.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Rhea that the advertising in Cats Magazine and Cat World be as presented, and in Cat Fancy at 1/10 page insertion every other issue and a classified ad every month not to exceed \$300/year. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Barnes to table the advertising to the Open Meeting for input from Fenton and Judy Kovic. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes at the Open Meeting, and seconded by Rhea to untable the advertising issue. Motion carried unanimously.

During the open meeting Mark explained that currently, the advertising consisted of 1/4 page display every issue in Cats and Cat World. The revised advertising recommendation would consist of 1/2 page in Cats alternating with a full page in Cat World instead of duplicating in each issue. Fenton stated that the show calendar is in one issue and the advertising is in the other. Mark further explained that the Board had discussed a 1/10 page display ad in Cat Fancy on odd numbered months, and a classified ad on even numbered months. He went on to state that based on a readership survey by Cat Fancy, the Board had determined that the Household Pet owner would be the targeted audience for that advertising. The ad rates would be \$530 each, less 15 percent for camera-ready copy for display ads, with a flat rate for classified at \$.60 per word per insertion, with a \$12 minimum per insertion, the maximum budget for the classified ad to be \$300.

Mark stated that these were suggestions only, and that the Board had been well-pleased with the excellent job that Judy and Fenton had done with the advertising for TICA.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to approve the advertising budget at \$8600.

Mark stated that this did not include the Annual Awards figures. Georgia reiterated that she had stated the Annual Awards advertising was not separate, however, she did not have the figures for the Board at this time.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Rhea to accept the wage schedule as presented.

Brenda questioned the increase in the Business Manager's salary, as her notes stated to raise her salary to \$18,000. It was stated that her salary had been raised to that figure in 1986. At the Semi-Annual: "Motion was been made and seconded that the Board will entertain a 10 percent across-the-Board increase in salary of the staff in reviewing the Budget at the Annual. (See page 9, Minutes, Semi-Annual, 1987.) Georgia stated that these salary increases were not an overall 10 percent. The raises included on the Wage Schedule had been determined based on attitude, initiative, performance, efficiency, and ability. Georgia related that the raise for the Business Manager was more than 10 percent and that the Business Manager had not requested it.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to adopt the budget proposal as presented with the exception of advertising. Motion carried unanimously.

Brenda proposed a change to the requirements that three members be required to renew a club charter. She stated that it is required that three or more TICA members are required to charter a club, however, there is no requirement for TICA members to renew a club charter.

Sue mentioned that this proposal had not been submitted 30 days prior to the meeting.

Brenda stated that she would be happy to refer to the Open Meeting as she would like to know if there is any opposition to this proposal and if so what it is. There was no motion.

//////////////////////////////////UNFINISHED BUSINESS//////////////////////////////////

There were no questions on the membership report.

Mark stated that he had several people who had not been receiving their TREND. Alice felt that several of the people complaining the loudest in her region about not receiving the TREND were those who had move eight times, or who had not turned in a change of address. It was also stated that the TREND's had been handed out at shows rather than mailed. Everyone felt that the TREND should be mailed. Nancy had stated in a letter to Georgia that she would continue with the TREND but that it might be wise for the Board to look for a new TREND Editor in the event one was needed. The Kovic's were discussed as new TREND Editors as they had approached Georgia at one time, they had had previous experience with church bulletins, and they were very deadline oriented.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Becknell to table the discussion on the TREND until after speaking with the Kovic's privately. Motion carried unanimously.

Later, Georgia stated that she had been told indirectly that the TICA TREND Editor may not be able to function in that capacity. Nancy Nolen had approached Nancy Turner to take over the functions of the TREND. Georgia had not been able to contact Nancy Nolen, but she felt that the Board should be ready in the event that Nancy could not continue to publish the TREND, i.e., she felt someone should be selected. Dewane asked if the Kovic's would take the position if they were offered it. Georgia felt that they would.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea that if it becomes necessary to replace the TREND Editor, that Judy and Fenton Kovic be appointed as the new TREND Editors. Motion carried unanimously.

Yvonne asked if the National Show put on by INCATS was an exclusive show, meaning that no other shows could be scheduled on that weekend. Vicky Markstein appeared to be under the impression that it was an exclusive show date, and had told a new club in Canada that they may not have that date after Yvonne had approved the date. Alice mentioned that it had been clarified in San Francisco: "Motion was made and seconded...The Regional Director is given the authority to deny a show date only in those instances where there is a conflict within the region, within the Association. They may recommend, if there's a conflict outside the region, but they may only deny the date if it is within the region within the Association. Motion carried unanimously." (See page 14, Minutes, Annual, 1986.) Further research of the Minutes, Semi-Annual, 1985, did not reveal any mention of an exclusive weekend for the Garden Cat Club.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell that no show, other than the Annual, be given the exclusive rights to host a show on a particular weekend. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Becknell that when the Executive Office receives a request for show license from a club that is not current with their charter renewal fees, that the charter renewal fees must be paid before a show license is granted. Motion carried unanimously.

Georgia queried the Board on their views on a club who had sent out a show flyer, (the Executive Office would not necessarily have knowledge of this) had accepted entries, and 3 weeks before the show, no show supplies may go out because there had been no renewal and no membership list. It was concluded that perhaps the regional directors could look at their lists and ask pertinent questions when the show was scheduled.

There was a lengthy discussion concerning a bad debt incurred by Andrew Stefaniuk for entry fee at the La Rosa She Blooms Show. Yvonne read Andy's letter which stated that he had entered Byron's show but that the show he had entered was not the one that was finally put on. The show he had entered was 2 days/8 rings each day with 16 different judges. Byron had assured him that the format had not changed. Andy had informed him that unless he was providing the show advertised, he would not be attending. The final conversation with Byron had been 4 days prior to the show when Byron had stated that Andy was already in the show catalog. Andy had not believed that he was putting on the show as originally planned, and therefore, did not believe he should be held accountable for the debt. Yvonne stated that the

show location had been changed to further south, that the judges that Andy had wanted had been dropped, and that he had provided copies of phone bills demonstrating when he had told Byron that he would not attend. Yvonne felt that it was Byron's word against Andy's. The letter from the Executive Office had gone to Andy in April. He had called Yvonne, and she had told him to take care of the matter immediately, but she really did not feel that he understood what that meant, until he had sent work in and it had not been returned.

Alice stated that she would hate to lose Andy as an exhibitor, however, her last experience had been that he had called in an early bird entry, and had been told him to send a check. He had shown up at the door with the early bird fees in Canadian funds. She had tried at that point to explain how it should have been handled, but in the end had let it slide. Yvonne stated that he had owed money to Regina which he had paid. She asked what could be done if a person is put on the bad debt list, and it was not their fault. Sue asked a hypothetical question: if the show were not put on Byron would there be any question about the bad debt? Brenda and Jim felt there were two identical incidents on this list: Chambers and Stefaniuk. Alice asked if the board was prepared to dismiss or uphold the billing of this bad debt, and if it was board business. Brenda felt that any bad debt to a club was board business. Sue felt it was only Board business in that the Board may rule whether the By-Laws are upheld. It's one person's word against another's. It was generally felt it would set a precedent that the board might not want to live with. Andy had contacted both Leslie and Georgia, and he had been told to get it straightened out. Instead he had brought a letter to Georgia in late July. Yvonne had talked to Larry and his advice had been to discuss it. Dewane asked what Andy wanted from the Board. Yvonne stated that he wanted absolution although he had not asked for it.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to refer the question on Andrew Stefaniuk to the legal advisor for an opinion. Motion was denied with Yvonne in favor. The Board wanted everyone to know they did not feel Byron was right but did not feel they had the right to act on this particular situation.

Sue stated that she did not feel that the Chambers fit into the same category as Andy Stefaniuk. She felt that it was immaterial whether Byron had called her or she had called him. Georgann could have said no, she had not, therefore, she owed the money. She had mentioned twice that the check was in the mail. Georgia had checked the number of registrations from the Ragnarok cattery registered since July 1, 1979. There were approximately 500 Ragdolls, and 39 Ragnarok cats only five of which had ever been registered to the Chambers'.

Georgia asked that the Bob Mullen letter be discussed. The letter had implored Georgia to waive the mandate of the membership and remove the embargo placed on the Chambers' to prevent them from showing or registering their cats with TICA. The Legal Advisor had recommended that she **not** reply to the letter. Two days after the date of the letter from Bob Mullen, Georgann had been unceremoniously removed from the office of Recorder of UCF. There had been several letters from various parties. Georgia asked if she had the power to waive the bad debt on the Chambers. The unanimous answer was **NO!**

Upchurch Report: Nellie had recommended that the Board offer Sue Servies one of the free tickets. Georgia had replied that the tickets were for people who were required to be at the meeting. Gloria had used one ticket for the Austin Semi-Annual; Leslie had ridden with Georgia to the Semi-Annual, and Leslie had used one of the tickets to this Annual. Jim had

agreed that only those people required to attend the meetings should be able to use the free tickets. Sue thought that perhaps the tickets should be used to send Leslie to some shows where the club could not afford to pay her way. Georgia clarified that in San Francisco, motion had been made, seconded, and carried: "that the General Manager/Executive Secretary be allowed, upon request of a club and at club expense, to travel to each region once a year, to include 2 days travel time, without any deduction from leave time." (See page 36, Minutes, Annual, 1986.) Alice felt that the tickets should be kept for emergencies. It was pointed out at that time that the tickets were dated.

Later in the Open Meeting Jim LeCroy reported that the tickets must be used within 1 year. He stated that the Board may use the coupons for anything they wish, to include a raffle for various regions, a fund raiser, etc. He also stated that the total revenue generated by TICA as of the month of July was \$9365. At this time Delta had been disinclined to renew their contract as the Delta portion of the revenue had only been \$338, as opposed to American's portion of \$6255. American had just renewed their contract.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman not to renew Delta's contract. Motion carried unanimously.

Jim LeCroy stated that he would like to see more clubs with accounts with Upchurch, and advised the Regional Directors to let their clubs know that an account could be opened easily. He also stated that he could negotiate with Delta if there was going to be more traffic generated in the future.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea to reconsider the motion to renew Delta's contract. Motion carried unanimously.

Leslie delivered a report on Past Due Club Debts Report. She stated that the only club who had replied to her letter had been Los Conquistadores who had agreed to make an effort to repay the debt when they had cleared other debts. She asked if the motion to **NOT** issue show licenses to these clubs was to be upheld. The Board had been emphatic about this. Pat stated that Frances Yow had told her that it had all been straightened out.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea that the Wisconsin/Illinois Cat Fanciers be granted a show license for their next show although they were still indebted for their last show. Motion carried unanimously.

Mark stated that the Feline Club of Queens is now in Rannie Vernon's hands, and that he had been told that they would be paying off the debts. The Executive Office had no knowledge of this.

Brenda stated that Los Conquistadores had just sent out letters of indebtedness over 1 year after the Annual in San Francisco.

Sue, Alice, and Brenda felt that if these clubs did not pay their debts, they should not be licensed, and if they were not licensed, then there would be no sanctioning of the show, and therefore, no confirmations and/or points would be available.

Computer fed judge's books fillers were discussed. It was decided that tractor-fed final sheets were not needed, and that both kinds of judges books would not be required as the tractor-fed forms would also fit in a standard typewriter.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Kinnunen that the Executive Office contact three suppliers, and take the best offer. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Barnes to consider Vicky Markstein in three separate packages:

1. Injury of an animal.
2. Suggesting that a non-purebred animal be used in a closed breed program.
3. Humiliating exhibitors.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Barnes to dismiss the first charge. There had been no evidence to support the charge. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Pannell to dismiss the charge of humiliating exhibitors.

Several complaints had been received from the DiPesa's, Ann Sandner, Ann Ulbright, etc., about remarks made by Vicky to exhibitors that had been demeaning.

Alice prefaced her remarks with a contention that those in a position of authority, whether real or perceived, have the moral obligation to treat those under their power as gently as possible with the utmost courtesy, because those people are in a lesser position. She believed that Vicky had violated this tenet. Alice had spoken with several judges who had failed to final Ann's cats and none of them had ever seen her argue in a ring. She contended that this was not the first time that complaints of this nature had been received about Vicky, and she charged the Board with enforcing its rules.

Jim felt that enforcing the rules with Vicky would also force the Board to enforce the rule which states that an exhibitor may not speak to a judge. It was pointed out that Show Rule 338 states: "Judges shall not permit exhibitors to talk to them during judging." However, Jim felt that Vicky had tried to stop the talking. He repeated that he was not necessarily standing up for her, but he did not feel that this was something that the Board should handle. He felt it would set a precedent that would have complaints on several judges being handled at every Board meeting because an exhibitor had overheard something, or had taken something out of context, and written a letter of complaint. He felt this particular protest had been completely blown out of proportion, and that the exhibitors had several means of stopping Vicky, i.e., not putting their cats in her ring, not inviting her to judge, etc. He reiterated that he did not feel the Board had anything that they should act on.

Dewane felt that it was the responsibility of the Board to see that TICA judges act in a professional manner. "Policing judges" had been one of their primary responsibilities as a Board. He agreed with Mark that Vicky was not here to defend herself, however, he maintained that for as long as he had been on the Board, Vicky had been brought up, discussed, and tapped on the wrist for infractions of this type. He did not feel it should be

dismissed, because it would set a bad precedent. In fact, he asserted that if this matter was not considered, then the judges would be given carte blanche to do anything they wanted during judging. He felt that Vicky should be given "due process" and her side should be heard.

Georgia stated that the thing that bothered her the most was that this had been bandied around to every person in the cat fancy not just in TICA, but in the entire fancy. She felt that it should have been handled in a proper manner where only the Judging Administrator and the Board were aware of it. Instead, it had been common knowledge, everyone had known about it, and if it had happened to her, she would have come out fighting.

Sue stated that Vicky had written an apologize for any misunderstanding that might have occurred. She had further related that she (Vicky) felt that her comments were in keeping with her duties as a TICA judge, and that they reflected values and policies that she and this association had continually sought to further. Sue believed that Vicky's manner was and is abrasive. She also thought that if a club did not relish that, then they should not invite her to judge. Sue stated: "That is the way she is and you can't change her." She went on to remark that she also did not feel it had been handled properly, and that the Judging Administrator had found Vicky guilty before hearing her side of the story.

Jim reiterated that Vicky had gone on to say that it had not been her purpose or intention to offend these individuals, and he felt that she had not purposely done so. He also wanted in on record: "that he did not feel that judges could be told how to handle their rings, or you would have them walking out left and right."

Alice quoted the Judging Administrator's letter to Vicky: "I am enclosing copies of letters concerning your judging. Please answer these letters immediately, sending copies of each reply to the Board." Alice felt that was a proper request from the Judging Administrator. Brenda agreed. She did **not** feel that the letter from Gloria had been accusatory. Yvonne stated that Gloria had been very upset by the fact that Vicky felt that way, and by the Goldstein attack.

Alice maintained that Gloria did not accuse, and that Vicky did not reply to the letters except under extreme duress very much later. Vicky had never sent copies of correspondence to the Board. Alice related an incident in which she was involved: She had bred and groomed the cat for the ring. The owners came to her in tears stating that the judge had told them that the cat was ill. Their letter states: "that Mrs. Markstein called for the owner, and in front the audience and the other owners told me she could not give the cat the first which she said he deserved because he was in such poor condition, that I had no business showing him. I received a lecture on how to take care of him, I was told that his poor coat was a sign of ill health."

Jim stated that this had been the judge's opinion.

Sue stated that Vicky had contended that that was not what she had said. Sue asked if Gloria had called anyone to confirm these letters as she had in the past to exonerate other judges. Alice stated that most of the letters had supporting letters. Pat remarked that when she had read the letter, she had felt that it was telling Vicky to defend herself. She thought that if the letter had been to herself, she would have taken it as if she was told she was guilty.

Jim quoted a letter from Peter where Peter stated that when Vicky's letter to her accusers did not appease them, the Judging Administrator wrote to Vicky again. This time threatening a hearing before the TICA Board unless Vicky sent all complainants letters in which Vicky was to acknowledge that her behavior was "reprehensible". Jim felt that the suggestion of appeasing these bullies had been reprehensible.

Alice quoted a letter from the Judging Administrator to Vicky dated 8/30/84: "Dear Vicky, The Board of Directors has instructed me to inform you of the following: You are certainly entitled to your own opinion concerning the breeds. It would be advisable to be more discreet and keep your opinions to yourself....". 4/3/85: "...it is certainly advisable to keep one's mouth shut while judging. Vicky, I will do my best..." 8/26/86: "Dear Vicky, The TICA Board of Directors has asked me to write you concerning your judging and comments while judging. You must emphasize the positive...they were concerned about your attitude. You were coming across to exhibitors that you 'know everything there is to know' and that you are superior to them as well as to others at the show. That you may not be aware or conscious of the fact that there is a public display of arrogance while judging...that you should be honored by being asked to judge not that you are honoring the club by judging them. Be very careful on health matters as you are not a veterinarian and should not behave as one." She then asked how long the Board was going to discuss Vicky Markstein's behavior in Board Meetings.

Sue reiterated that no one was declaring that Vicky was the easiest person, or that she did not have an abrasive personality. Sue stated: "We are not defending her personality, we are defending her rights." Brenda and Alice both took issue with the members of the Board who were insinuating that Gloria was not backing up her judges, and perhaps was prosecuting this judge. They felt it was unfounded. Alice stated that Gloria had been on the phone with her constantly, asking what could be done, how it could be settled, etc. Georgia stated that perhaps Gloria had been pressured by Alice. Gloria had told her that "reprehensible" had been Alice's word, and that Gloria had asked Alice how to spell it. Alice stated that it was indeed "one of her words" and that she felt that Vicky Markstein had thumbed her nose at the office of the Judging Administrator, at the Board of Directors, and that she had said, "I don't have to answer you and she hadn't". Jim felt that he would not have answered the letters either, or if he had, it would have been a scathing reply. He would have felt tried before he'd had a chance to defend himself. Brenda could not find anything accusing in the letters.

Jim read from the opinion statement of legal counsel: "In the Markstein matter the allegations have been blown so out of proportion it would probably be wise to end the matter and either express yourselves privately to Mrs. Markstein or give her notice that she will be reviewed again at the Semi-Annual regarding the charges of rudeness to others."

Yvonne stated that Gloria did not write the best letters, and that perhaps anything that Gloria puts out to the judges should go through legal counsel.

Georgia remarked that she personally did not feel comfortable sitting in the Board Room and making decisions about anything without legal counsel present in the room. Alice had requested Larry's presence, but he had not been available. Yvonne also felt that counsel should be present at the meetings.

Sue read a letter of personal reference for Vicky from Richard Negus. Jim read a letter from someone planning to enter the judge program. They had felt that the Markstein case had been blown completely out of proportion. She lauded Vicky's comments, and stated that she felt that judges should be able to voice their opinions and that TICA should support them in so doing.

Jim then stated that if TICA took issue with this, he would cease to be a talking judge. Georgia agreed with his last statement, and Sue felt that she would not be able to be honest when an exhibitor asked about their cat. Brenda felt that they were blowing it out of proportion. Jim felt that it had already been blown out of proportion, and Georgia felt that it had not been blown out of proportion by them. Dewane asked if the Board did not have the right to expect that a judge would observe proper decorum. Sue stated that the judges were all different personalities and that they should all be accepted that way, and that if they couldn't be accepted that way then it would cease to be worth the effort to be a judge. Alice asserted that if someone had written a letter about a comment from Jim, Jim could write and simply say: "I'm sorry you overheard that. I did not intend that to be a public broadcast." Vicky did not have the right to publicly broadcast a cat's faults... Sue reiterated: according to Vicky, she didn't publicly broadcast any of this, and she did not deliberately embarrass anyone or attempt to embarrass anyone.

Alice read a portion of a letter from Betty Gilbert who had not been involved in this, but had heard: "Vicky then announced to the spectators that she was withholding ribbons from this cat, and disqualifying it because it was being starved and undernourished."

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Patrick that after there has been time to talk to Vicky the Board may then act on the issue. Jim would not accept this as an editorial. Dewane and Georgia did not feel that the matter should be continued, as it would be to the detriment of all.

Pat remarked how guilty Vicky **had** looked on the issue of injuring an animal. And there had been proof that she was innocent. She went on to state that with the letters received, Vicky looked guilty. When Alice asserted that it didn't have any bearing on the matter at hand, Sue contended that it did, as Alice had already quoted past reprimands. Georgia wanted it on the record that: "it had not been Gloria's fault that the request to Vicky to be present for the Board meeting had been late."

Motion carried with Kinnunen, Rhea, Coleman, and Patrick opposed. The President broke a tie vote to carry the motion.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Rhea to dismiss the charges of suggesting that a non-purebred animal be used in a closed breeding program.

Alice read a letter of complaint from a individual who felt that a judge should not have encouraged use of household pet in a breeding program, etc. It was noted that the letter did not request action. Brenda stated that as a judge, Vicky should know when to say things and when not to, and she should not be encouraging use of an unregistered cat in a closed registry in the show ring.

Motion carried with Patrick abstaining, and Rhea, Kinnunen, and Coleman voting against.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Barnes that legal counsel write a letter of reprimand to Vicky concerning her remarks and her conduct in the show ring.

Alice and Yvonne both felt there would be no point to such a letter. Brenda asked when the Board would begin acting on judges who were doing the same things over and over. Sue felt that the clubs had the ultimate weapon--they would not continue to invite her to judge.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Patrick that in view of the fact that there are matters needing legal advice, legal counsel be present in the meetings. Alice added and Sue accepted the editorial: require legal counsel be present for matters of a delicate nature.

It was noted that if Larry had attended this meeting, he would have had to pay his own way, as there had been no authorization for payment of his expenses.

Motion was denied.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Patrick that legal counsel be present at meetings of the Board of Directors. Motion carried unanimously.

Jim Becknell presented to the Board a proposal for Compadres Cat Club to host the 1990 Annual in El Paso, Texas. He stated that the show hotel was 1,100 yards from the airport; there would be 8,000 square feet for exhibitors with an additional 4,200 square feet for vendors in the foyer; with rooms for both open and closed board meetings. The club is planning a banquet held in the true western fashion, at a dude ranch with a gunfight and western band, etc.

It was mentioned that City Kitty Cat Club also had a proposal for the 1990 Annual. Sue remarked that City Kitty had contacted her 6 months prior to the meeting although their proposal had not been received in the Executive Office 30 days prior to the meeting, and she felt they should have first choice.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Barnes to open discussion on the microfilming of registrations in the Executive Office and review the proposals received. Motion was withdrawn.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Rhea to accept the proposals on the microfilming and storing of the microfilm registrations in the Executive Office.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to split the question. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to microfilm the registrations in the office carried unanimously.

Motion to store microfilm was discussed: It was noted that each microfilm must be duplicated because reading of the film destroyed it, therefore there should always be an original and a working copy.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea that the Executive Office explore storage costs and choose whatever option is lowest. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion ensued on whether the Board should expect reports from the clubs sponsoring the Annuals and Semi-Annuals. Most Board members felt that they could legislate when it became necessary. Sue pointed out that, in that case, the individual club may feel that it was being persecuted. The general consensus was that the clubs usually kept their regional directors informed, and that the regional director could keep the Board informed.

There had been a Show Protest from the Northwest concerning Dan Castro showing a kitten less than 4 months old and falsifying his paperwork on the kitten. Alice read a letter from Dan Castro and Scott Sobjack: "I realize I was wrong in falsifying my Cornish Rex kittens' date of birth. I apologize for any inconvenience and I will abide by all TICA show rules from now on. Sincerely, DJ Castro and JF Sobjack."

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman that based on the admission of guilt the Board assess a penalty.

The By-Laws, ARTICLE TWENTY-TWO, Section 3(b), state: "...or if the Club declines to act in the matter, the charges, any evidence and filing fee shall be submitted to the Board of Directors and the procedure set forth in Section 2 of this Article shall be followed."

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Patrick that through evidence, plus admission of guilt, the Board assess a penalty of a suspension of all rights in TICA for a period of 1 year, to be submitted to legal counsel, effective from this Annual to the next Annual, wins to be void from 5/1/87.

The general discussion centered around the fact that Dan is flamboyant and can be very hard to deal with. Yvonne stated that he was pathological liar and schizo. She believed that he had been instrumental in the death of several cats, and although there had been no proof, she felt that he had shown these kittens at less than 3 months of age and he had complete disregard for TICA Show Rules. Alice did not feel that Dan should be made a scapegoat of an infraction of rules that several people may be breaking. She wanted to see the Board land on Dan for this infraction, bar him from showing for 3 months, and have an end to it. Yvonne stated that her club had banned him from exhibiting at their shows.

Mark added an editorial to the motion: retroactive to 5/1/87 through 5/1/89, all wins to be voided for a period of 2 years. Editorial was not accepted.

Motion denied with Pannell, Barnes, and Becknell in favor. Coleman voted no as he felt that the suspension was not long enough.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Smith that the period of suspension be 5/1/87 through 5/1/88. Motion denied with Kinnunen and Smith in favor.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Patrick to void all wins from 5/1/87 and suspend services beginning now through 4/30/89 to include membership and litter registrations. Motion denied with Coleman and Patrick in favor.

Alice felt that all the penalties had been too stern.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to suspend services for 1 year, and revoke wins 5/1/87 through 5/1/88, pending reference to legal counsel. Motion carried with Alice opposed as she felt the penalty was too stiff.

Coleman stated for the record: definition of all services included anything that TICA might offer the individual.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Mark had completely revised all the By-Laws and Show Rules and submitted them to the Board. He stated that these contained all the change to-date. Georgia had expressed her appreciation to Mark on the work he had done on the By-Laws and Show Rules earlier in the meeting. He wanted a vertical bar in the right hand margin covering the entire length of the revision to identify the revisions rather than parenthesis with the date with a note in the table of contents stating: **Revisions are identified by a vertical bar in this issue.** Alice requested a revision date in the lower right hand corner. Georgia reminded him that a copy must be furnished to Arthel. He stated that they would be printed magazine style with saddle stitch on the perforation. Georgia contended that the original intent had been to be able to insert changes. Alice did not want them bound.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to accept the Show Rules as reformatted, loose leaf style, one article per sheet, with no more than one article to be contained on one sheet of paper pending acceptance of the Technical Terminology Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes to accept the By-Laws as reformatted, loose leaf style, one article per sheet and no more than one article to be contained on one sheet of paper with the exception of ARTICLES I and II pending acceptance of the Technical Terminology Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Sue stated that BB87-09 had been a duplication as Page 4, Minutes, Semi-Annual, 1987 states: "The Scottish Fold Breed Section had been polled as to acceptance of the Longhair. The Breed Section had accepted the Longhair and had agreed that it would be called the Scottish Fold Longhair rather than the Scottish Shag."

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Becknell that when the By-Laws and Show Rules are reprinted they be dated.

ARTICLE NINETEEN, Section 5 states: "All publications except the Annual Edition shall be dated and have pages numbered."

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Coleman to deviate from the published agenda and move to the Byron Tassler issue. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to suspend or revoke club charters for 1 year or to revoke all show licenses for 1 year.

Brenda remarked that some people in the Southwest felt that Byron was not an asset. The Southwest Region felt that Byron was lowering the average of cats shown. She stated that his shows had not been what the Southwest was used to in organization, conduct, and in facilities offered to the judges. She also stated that there was a distinct demarcation line between judges on the Board which Byron had been careful not to offend or upset, and the rest of the gang about which he really didn't care. She felt that basically the membership did not favor him as a whole. Sue stated that 3 months before, she would have been against Byron, however, in view of the surplus of documents recently released by others in the Southwest, she now perceived it as an internal struggle, and would not want to take action against one without taking action against the other. When queried as to what action would be taken against Haffner, Sue replied that Mary had opened up the entire topic by name calling, and delineating and violating privacy, and sending out notes that were never meant to be released, which Sue felt had been essentially what had released everything. She stated that since it was a complete mess, and she didn't know who to believe, she had decided not to believe anybody.

Jim stated that everyone had a multitude of copies of various documents, some claiming that Show Rules and By-Laws had been broken, but none that provided dates and places and followed the Show Rules and By-Laws. He felt it must be done properly or the Board could not move on it. Alice also felt that proper procedures must be followed.

Mark stated that the letter from East of Eden had asked the Board to "consider the good of our association before allowing one individual to further erode our image in the central and southern California areas." Brenda stated that he does many innovative things, one of which was his latest attempt to have a show with rabbits, mice, crafts, flowers, etc. She warned that if there were any repercussions, the original suggestion for this had been hers.

Motion denied unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Pannell to table the matter to the Semi-Annual. Motion denied with Barnes and Pannell in favor.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Patrick to table until the following morning. Motion carried unanimously.

Thursday, September 3, 1987:

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell to untable the Byron Tassler matter. Motion carried unanimously.

Letters Byron's defense from Vicky Shields, Jean Mills, Fran Briganti, and Nicki Callahan were read.

Brenda stated that of the five shows he had put on, she had only attended one. Alice noted that the only violation she had found was that he had not furnished rosettes at one show. No protest had been filed. There have been accusations about cats put in the catalog at the last minute. No protest had been filed. Jim recounted incidents he had had at Byron's shows. Yvonne and Georgia both described instances where Mary Haffner had expounded Byron's faults to them.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Coleman that the Board send Byron and Mary letters of concern about all matters and about the constant deluge of literature/correspondence. It was determined that it would be a cooperative Board effort: that Dewane would write a draft to Byron to include a phrase admonishing him to abide by the spirit of the Show Rules more than pushing them to the limit, concern over the fact that he doesn't break the rules, he just bends them until they crack, and an advisory that he must follow our guidelines if he's going to put shows on under our auspices. Alice would write a draft to Mary to include counsel about the smear campaign and the literature, suggestions that she and Byron coexist for the betterment of TICA and the Southwest Region, and if they can't get along, then to stay away from each other.

Membership Committee: Mark stated that membership had gone up. The benefits had been financial gain in new registrations, letters, etc., continued growth, and interest in the judging and clerking programs, new club, etc. Jim mentioned that there had been a few judges talking up membership. Mark agreed that the judges could really aid in this area because the people like to be talked to and they really were interested.

Mark described a TICA Pamphlet that would be an information packet about TICA that would be mailed to anyone who asked for information. It would have photographs, text, information, etc. He stated that it would be a color brochure, with graphics, etc. He felt that anything that promoted our organization would be a business development tool.

Georgia appointed Mark, Brenda and Jim to the Publications Committee with Mark as the Chairperson.

Georgia asked how many of the Board members received cat oriented junk mail. Several did. She would like to know how the membership would feel about our mailing list being sold. She felt that if our mailing list was being sold, TICA should be profiting from it.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen that the Executive Office explore and prepare a proposal, for the Semi-Annual, on what it would take to develop mailing lists for sale to include hiring an employee.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to table this to the Open Meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

////////////////////UNFINISHED BUSINESS////////////////////////////////////

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Kinnunen to suspend the order of business to discuss the TREND. Motion carried unanimously.

Everyone seemed dissatisfied with the TREND. Leslie stated that Family members should not get the TREND, but Regular Members should, even if both husband and wife were Regular Members. Alice felt that the problem was that it had not been published on time, and that the mailing labels were incorrect. Alternate postage rates were discussed. Leslie was dispatched to obtain information on second and third class rates. Mark felt that TICA should be pushing themselves as the AKC of the cat fancy. Registrations would increase the revenue, and an increase in registrations would offset the increase in mailing the TREND out at second or third class.

Dewane felt that the letter to the Chairperson of the Egyptian Mau Breed Committee should spell out that our registration rules would not prevent Mrs. Mill from registering cats with unknown parentage. Dr. Pflueger reiterated that the Egyptian Mau is a Category I Breed. Requirements for Championship Exhibition are: "There can be no outcross to other breeds except within a breed group within the three generation pedigree. No unknown or unregistered cats may appear within the three generation pedigree." (See Article VII, Section 2, Paragraph 2, Registration Rules.)

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell that the Board deviate from the agenda and discuss the Norwegian Forest Standard. Motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Pflueger stated that the Norwegian Forest Breed had been accepted on the basis that one of the distinctions from a Maine Coon was their double coat. It had been an important distinction, and she felt if it was to be eliminated there would be no need for this to be a separate breed.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell that the words "double coat" may not be deleted from the Norwegian Forest Standard. Motion carried unanimously.

The General Manager was instructed to write to Mary Buckmaster to inform her that the Genetics Committee suggested that the words "which, when pressed down with the fingertips, will leave a momentary impression" may be deleted but that they may not delete "double coat". ARTICLE 18, Section 2 of the By-Laws was quoted.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen not to accept the Norwegian Forest standard with any Maine Coon or Persian type. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Barnes appoint Jun Negami as Regional Director, Japan per the By-Laws, ARTICLE FIVE, Section 3(a). "The Regional Directors shall be elected by the members of the Region where the Director resides to serve a term of 3 years or **until a successor is duly elected.**" Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Patrick that the point structure for Japan Championship be changed from 150 to 100 points. An editorial for a time limit of 1 year by Kinnunen was not accepted. Motion was denied with Becknell in favor.

Brenda remarked that TICA was now requiring a final for championship, and that the lowest final at Top 5 Specialty would take 110 points.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that Mrs. Ohira be contacted and asked if she understood what was required for a Championship, and if she did not understand, then the Japanese Region be reverted to 75 points and no finals as an isolated area be referred to the membership on the upcoming ballot. Motion carried with Barnes against and Pannell abstaining.

At the Semi-Annual Meeting, 1987, motion was made and seconded that the scorer notify the Regional Director if she had not received a catalog from a club in that region. This motion had never been acted upon.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to table until the Scorer was present. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was subsequently made by Becknell, and seconded by Rhea to untable. Motion carried unanimously.

Sue Servies stated that she did try to notify Regional Directors when catalogs were overdue.

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to deviate from the agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

CLARIFICATION: What is really meant by \$.20 per mile not to exceed the most economical rate?

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to clarify that effective immediately the most economical rate would be a 30-day super saver arriving the day prior to judging and leaving the day following judging.

CLARIFICATION: Disqualify: does this mean to remove the cat from the individual judge's ring or from the entire show? An individual judge may only disqualify the cat from his ring. He may call the show committee if the cat is ill, but a judge may not go to another judge's ring and advise them to disqualify the cat.

CLARIFICATION: Withhold all awards: what is insufficient merit? This is a judgement call by the judge and is up to the individual judge's discretion.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman that the Regional Director will notify applicants/trainees/judges of any Board decisions affecting them. Denied unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Kinnunen that official notification of applicants/trainees/judges of any Board decisions affecting them shall come from the Judging Administrator, effective immediately. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman that the Board place no restrictions on any member's or officer's right to advertise any way they please. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to table to the discussion of Judging Program. Motion carried unanimously. See Revised Judging Program dated 9/03/87.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to give the Judging Administrator authority to serve the judges notice, in writing, of their missing requirements, and give them 2 months in which to meet the requirements. If the requirements have not been met by that time the Judging Administrator has the authority to suspend. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Barnes to table clarification of schools/seminars to the discussion of Judging Program. It was noted that Gloria was referring to the 1986-87 Judge's Record Form. Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea that the Board authorize the Judging Administrator to act on their behalf, and that these Trainees/Judges would be given a month's notice in which to send the Refresher to the Judging Administrator. If not received by that time, they would be suspended until the form was received by the Judging Administrator. Motion carried with Coleman, Barnes, and Rhea opposed.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell that the Refresher Test not be sent to all Board Members. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea that the Refresher Test not be sent to anyone for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen that the date that the next Refresher Test be sent out be 11/1/87. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to discontinue use of the club evaluation and exhibitors comment sheets. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Kinnunen that clubs no longer be required to send marked catalogs to judges, but only final sheets.

Sue didn't want the finals sheets. Georgia stated that this was Show Rule #608. She had her clerks only mark one catalog in the interests of accuracy, and she stated that the Board had just made a change where the catalog had only to be copied on one side.

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell that the Judging Administrator send in her next newsletter, a small informal ballot at the bottom to be returned to the Judging Administrator to contain the following questions: Do they need a marked catalog? Do they want finals only? Do they need a blank catalog? Do they really need a catalog at the end of the show? This could then be determined at the Semi-Annual. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Barnes that photographs, tape recordings, and video tape recordings will not be used as evidence against or for any applicant/trainee/judge.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea that motion: "that photographs, tape recordings, and video tape recordings will not be used as evidence against or for any applicant/trainee/judge" be referred to legal counsel. Motion carried unanimously.

Original motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Barnes to notify the Judging Administrator to contact the Breed Committees for input to the Standards Committee Chairperson, and that the Standards Committee Chairperson (Alice) notify the Breed Committees for the Sphynx, Ocicat, and Turkish Van breeds that their standards need work as soon as possible, by return receipt post. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea that this question be tabled to the discussion of the Standards. Motion died for lack of a second.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell that all information to the Judging Administrator concerning applicants, trainees, and judges must be in writing and signed; telephone conversations or any other verbal form of communication is **not** acceptable. If a request is made by the Judging Administrator for more information concerning a possible problem about a person in the Judging Program, the letter is to reference **ONLY** information pertaining to the situation and the specific person and may not give reference to any other matter or person. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman that these letters shall be sent to the judge, and Judging Administrator, with copies to all involved Regional Directors, and Allbreed Sponsor (if applicable). Copies shall not be sent to any other party without written permission of the Judging Administrator. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the Executive Office furnish the Judging Administrator with copies of the results of any Board Ballots which result in changes to judges or standards. Motion carried unanimously.

CLARIFICATION: The Board defined Household Pet as 8 months of age or older.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that the exhibitor entry clerk, and the judge, in that order, are responsible for determining if the Household Pet has been altered. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to discuss having to inform a judge of a demotion. Motion carried unanimously.

Sue stated that it was covered in the new Judging Program. Consensus was that the Judging Administrator should have the authority to send out a letter advising judges of the Board's impending discussion.

The legal advisor had stated: "Is a judge who is demoted or denied a promotion entitled to a hearing as a matter of rights? No. However, you may advise anyone in these circumstances they are entitled to file any material they wish with the Board. Judges are entitled to a hearing when revocation of their judge's license or the denial of a new one is the issue."

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Coleman that if a judge is to be considered for disciplinary action at a Board meeting this judge shall be put on notice automatically by the Judging Administrator using the previously designed form, 60 days prior to that Board meeting for review at the Board meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Kinnunen that judge's record forms and refresher tests be sent to Judging Administrator by Return Receipt Requested post. Motion denied unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Barnes that the judge's record forms and refresher tests not be sent to the Regional Directors. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Pannell that all applications for acceptance into the Judging Program, and applications for advancement must be mailed to the Judging Administrator, and the complete TICA Board of Directors and must be postmarked 65 days before the next Board meeting. Any application postmarked after that date will be presented at the following Board Meeting effective immediately. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was subsequently made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to reconsider the 65 day requirement. Motion carried unanimously.

The Board felt that part of the problem was that they had not been consistent.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes to make it 60 days instead of 65 days. Motion carried unanimously.

The Judging Administrator was instructed that the legal advisor was available for her use.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Kinnunen that requirements for belonging to clubs be tabled to the discussion of the new Judging Program. (See Judging Program, 9/3/87.)

CLARIFICATION: The Board clarified that an application was not automatically submitted at the next Board Meeting after an advancement has been denied. Applicants must write to the Judging Administrator for a new advancement form, and then they must comply with the rules.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Coleman to deny that an application is automatically submitted at the next Board Meeting, and to reaffirm that it must be resubmitted in writing on a new advancement form in order to be considered at the next Board Meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Pannell to deny the Judging Administrator's request to review Frances Yow at this meeting. Motion was withdrawn.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman that if the Board demotes a judge, the judge is required to submit an application for reinstatement to his previous capacity. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman that a person is considered as participating in the Judging Program when application has been accepted by the Board and approval to take the Applicant's Examination is granted. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Rhea that it be published in the next TREND: Prospective applicants to the Judging Program are not eligible to attend a judge's conference until their application has been approved by the Board. Motion carried unanimously.

Yvonne stated that Irma Castle had been told by Gloria in her presence that Gloria did not feel that Irma had any basis to ask for advancement back to Allbreed as she had not trained.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that a Return Receipt Requested letter be sent from the Judging Administrator, giving Don Ardoin 1 month to become current, or he would be placed on suspension until such time as his requirements are current. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that a Return Receipt Requested letter be sent from the Judging Administrator, giving Stanley Bass 1 month to become current, or he would be placed on suspension until such time as his requirements are current. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea that the Board defer Joe Edwards until a report is received from Gloria. If he has not met the requirements, then he be given 1 month or he would be placed on suspension until his requirements are met. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Coleman that a Return Receipt Requested letter be sent from the Judging Administrator, giving Linda Green 1 month to become current, or she would be placed on suspension until such time as her requirements are current. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Coleman to waive the requirements for Beth Hicks. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea that a Return Receipt Requested letter be sent from the Judging Administrator giving Prissie LaJaunie 1 month to become current, or she would be placed on suspension until such time as his requirements are current. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen that Vicky Markstein be sent a Return Receipt Requested letter by the Judging Administrator giving her 1 month to get her conference in or she would be placed on suspension until such time as requirements are met. Motion carried unanimously.

Sue read a note from Peter Markstein dated 8/24/87 stating that he had attended a judge's conference in El Paso and that he would be attending the judging school in California 09/25/87. He stated that both he and Vicky would be attending.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that Solveig Pflueger be sent a Return Receipt Requested letter by the Judging Administrator giving her 1 month to get her refresher and record form in or she would be placed on suspension until such time as requirements are met. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that a Return Receipt Requested letter be sent from the Judging Administrator giving Duffy West 1 month to return refresher test or he would be placed on suspension until such time as his requirements are current. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman that a Return Receipt Requested letter be sent from the Judging Administrator giving Elaine Zear 1 month to return refresher test or she would be placed on suspension until such time as her requirements are current. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell that the following individuals: Don Ardoin, Nancy Nolen, Vicky Markstein, Linda Green, identified for examinations not received, be required to reapply for advancement.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea to table until the previous motion had been found in the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Leslie stated later that page 15, Minutes, Semi-Annual, 1987 states: "Motion was made and seconded that all extensions be granted with a limit of the next Board meeting. It was stated that the new Judging Program would be available and in final format for the meeting and would be effective May 1, 1988. There would be no grandfather clauses. Motion carried unanimously."

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Pannell to untable the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Original motion carried unanimously.

A lengthy discussion concerning Trudy Vermaas followed: Alice related two separate incidents where Trudy had been belligerent, discourteous, rude, and very hostile. Trudy apparently felt the Board had no right to impose requirements and guidelines and had not fulfilled these requirements. She had also refused to answer questions on the test, and Gloria had returned it to her for the answers.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to suspend Trudy Vermaas for 6 months from training in the Judging Program, and she must reapply, and although she does not have to take the test again, she must submit a letter stating that she would abide by the spirit and the letter of the Judging Program, and that she would conduct herself in a civilized manner.

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to suspend Trudy Vermaas for 6 months from training in the Judging Program, her conduct to be observed closely for 6 months at shows by her Regional Director, and her sponsor; she is to comply with Judging Program requirements to own, live with, house, show, breed an opposite type, and she is to apply for reinstatement at least 60 days prior to the Semi-Annual.

It was stated that the reasons for this motion were: conduct unbecoming a future judge in this association, failure to comply with opposite type requirement as ordered by the board, challenging the decision of the board, and failure to complete the test without being told.

Sue felt she that had violated a direct mandate of the Board.

Motion carried with Patrick abstaining.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to reconsider the action on Trudy Vermaas, due to the fact that there could possibly be some repercussions rather further reaching than anticipated. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Patrick, and seconded by Rhea that until Trudy Vermaas obtains a foreign type longhair, she may not train again. The cat must be shown at least three times at three different shows. Motion included a letter of reprimand regarding her attitude as far as questioning everything the board has asked her to do and her unwillingness to follow instructions. Motion carried unanimously.

Jim honestly felt that her attitude left a lot to be desired, and that that kind of attitude was not needed in the Judging Program. He also felt that the board had made some exceptions and some good decisions, however, that they needed to be well aware of the fact that this could taken as a weakness on the Board's part. He felt that it should be made clear and plain to Gloria what the requirements are. It should also be plain that the Board would be coming down hard on any transgressor.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Patrick that Michael DiPesa, since he had not trained in over 3 years, be informed that he must reapply as a new applicant.

Yvonne stated that she had directed him to get a proper application from Gloria to detail what previous requirements had been met. He had not contacted his Allbreed Sponsor, Georgia Morgan.

Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Barnes to table the motion on Marie Rezem. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was subsequently made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to remove Marie from the table. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to not accept Marie Rezem for advancement to Household Pet Judge.

Mark stated that Marie had not complied with the criteria set for her advancement, and no one had received her request for advancement. He had not seen her active in his region at shows. Her Allbreed Sponsor had requested that she join as many clubs as possible in the region.

Motion carried with Kinnunen opposed because the Board had denied her for discrepancies regarding unfit cats in the show hall, etc. Everyone stated that they had denied her because she had not reapplied.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman to consider the application from Laura McIntyre at the Semi-Annual as it had not been received 30 days prior to the Annual.

Motion was withdrawn because her sponsor had been responsible for the lateness of the packet, and because Gloria had received it 7/30/87.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Becknell to accept Laura McIntyre into the Shorthair Judging Program. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea to accept Bev Eitner into the Longhair/Shorthair Judging Program with a recommendation that she lease a semi-mature Persian for 6 months and show it at least three times before she applied for advancement. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman move to accept Carol Hovick into the Longhair/Shorthair Judging Program. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Patrick, and seconded by Barnes to accept Lynn Judge into the Longhair/Shorthair Judging Program with the recommendation that she lease a semi-mature Persian for 6 months and show it at least three times before she applied for advancement. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to table the application of Frank Percesepe to the Semi-Annual due to the fact that the application and supporting documentation was not received by the deadline. Motion carried with Smith opposed.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Barnes that Mary Schweiger be accepted into the Longhair Shorthair Judging Program with the recommendation that she lease a semi-mature Persian for 6 months and show it at least three times before she applied for advancement.

Brenda stated that she had gone along with the others because their longhair experience as a whole had not been any different from their shorthair experience.

Motion carried with Kinnunen, Rhea, and Patrick opposed.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to accept Vickie Shields into the Longhair/Shorthair Judging Program with a recommendation that she lease a semi-mature Siamese/Oriental Shorthair for 6 months and show it at least three times before she applies for advancement. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Barnes to accept D'Ann Kovic into the Longhair/Shorthair Judging Program. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to postpone the application of Pamela Barrett as her application was received late.

Alice stated that Gloria had informed her that she had received it in plenty of time.

Motion was withdrawn.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Becknell that Pamela Barrett be advanced to Probationary Specialty Judge. Motion carried unanimously.

Alice felt Pam had completely turned herself around, and that she was wonderful.

Motion was made by Patrick, and seconded by Becknell to accept Daryl Pewtress as a Longhair/Shorthair Probationary Specialty Judge. Motion carried unanimously.

Mark thought Daryl was great, Sue said charming, Jim felt he would present TICA in the proper way.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Becknell to advance Lynne Sherer to an Approved Specialty Judge. Motion carried unanimously.

Dewane praised Lynne aid to his region, her hard work, and her judging. She had also been elected member of the year in his region.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Coleman to advance Nancy Turner to Approved Specialty Judge. Motion not acted upon.

Sue had had numerous complaints that she didn't know her cats, about political judging, and rough handling. Mark and Yvonne had had the same complaints. Mark stated that in viewing the catalogs, her judging was not consistent with other judges.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Coleman that Nancy Turner be deferred for advancement until the Semi-Annual in order to give her the opportunity to gain more experience. Motion carried with Becknell opposed.

Motion was made by Patrick, and seconded by Coleman to defer advancement of Bill Vermaas to Approved Specialty Judge until the Semi-Annual. Motion carried unanimously.

Alice had been concerned with the fact that he had a cat living with him that was registered to another owner. Gloria had had some reservations. Yvonne stated that Bill did an adequate job in the ring, however, he raced to be finished first, and then went around the show hall justifying his decisions in a loud voice. Alice classified him as a loud braggart. He had accosted Georgia at the Prowse's. She had had to leave the room to get away from him.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Patrick to approve Robert Thompson as Allbreed Judge.

No one had received an application. Jim stated that his letter had instructed him that he may reapply for advancement. Jim read his letter to Thompson: "I apologize for the tardiness of this letter. I thought it had gone out to you immediately after the semi-annual and until just this last weekend in Seattle thought you had received an official statement on your request for advancement to Allbreed. You were not favorably considered for advancement to Allbreed at this time. You may re-apply for advancement to Allbreed status at the next semi-annual, if you so desire.

The Board was extremely concerned about some reports that we received about you. These reports concerned talking to a judge about another judge's decision in a ring during judging and causing disturbances and dissention in the show hall. Among others, reports were received, in writing and signed, by Pat Harding and Carol Brown, who gave permission to have their names divulged. Robert, if you decide to continue your judging career in TICA the Board of Directors suggests that you refrain from any activity that could bring discredit upon yourself or TICA.

If, at any time you wish to discuss this or anything with me one-on-one I will be available and will be most pleased to do so."

Pat remarked that the letter to Robert stated he could reapply at the Semi-Annual. Georgia had explained to him in Edmonton that he must reapply.

Brenda stated that Robert's attitude had changed radically and that his manner in the show hall had been very professional. Alice commented that he had handled cats for which several other judges had requested handlers. Brenda asked, as his Regional Director, for an exception in the matter of reapplication, and for very serious consideration to her request, with Yvonne and Alice concurring in this request.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to ask for an exception to advance Robert Thompson at **this** meeting. Motion was denied: Coleman-NO, Smith-NO, Pannell-NO, Barnes-NO, because he did not reapply, Becknell-NO, he did not reapply.

Alice asked the Board's indulgence in this matter as she believed that the Board had seriously violated Robert Thompson's right to a fair hearing at the Semi-Annual. She felt that if they did not rescind that action or in some manner rectify the situation, he would have grounds to sue. We failed to advance him, and then we informed him that the reason he had not been advanced was because he had been wrong and he was not given an opportunity to defend himself on those charges.

Mark reminded her of the legal advisor's previously quoted remark that a judge who was demoted or denied a promotion was not entitled to a hearing as a matter of rights. He then quoted the Minutes, Semi-Annual, 1987, page 21: "Motion was edited to state: that Bob Thompson be denied advancement to Allbreed at this time. He would remain an Approved Specialty with a strong letter of reprimand from Gloria stating that the Board is highly displeased with his ethics, and that this must be revised and that he may reapply for Allbreed status contingent upon his performance through the year. Motion carried. Mark suggested that the letter of reprimand be reviewed by the legal committee before it was mailed and that permission must be granted by the writers of the letters for them to be named."

Jim stated that the legal advisor had read the letter before it was mailed.

Brenda felt it was very unlike this Board to get so uptight when a few members felt very strongly about something, and questioned if there were undercurrents. Dewane stated that he had "no bone of contention", he had not been at the Semi-Annual, and he had voted "no" only because he did not reapply.

Brenda wanted it read into the minutes: "that she felt it was pretty poor attitude on this Board's part to flatly deny, on a point of order, a feeling on a subject upon which three members of this Board feel so strongly."

Jim stated that five members of the Board felt just as strongly as the other three.

Brenda reiterated that she was dealing with Robert Thompson's career, his professional advancement, and that she was applying on his part. He had thought that because she was going to apply for him, it would not be necessary for him to also apply.

Alice also wanted to be on record: "that she was disappointed in this Board for not showing more support and courtesy for a Board member and director who knew more about the case."

Later, motion was made by Kinnunen to reopen the question on Robert Thompson based on three of his recent judgments. Dewane stated that the only those on the prevailing side may motion to reconsider.

Motion was made by Smith, and seconded by Pannell to reopen the Robert Thompson issue. Motion was tied with Becknell, Barnes, Coleman, and Pannell opposed. Georgia broke the tie to carry the motion.

Yvonne stated that Robert had been under the impression that Brenda would be bringing this action up and that he did not need to reapply. Sue remarked that Beth Hicks had a dying child and Joan Ray's husband had just died, that she did not see that either of those circumstances applied to Robert Thompson, and that no other exceptions had been made. Alice stated that he had been advised not to reapply but to have his Regional Director present him. She simply felt that this Board had not been treating Robert fairly based on some insignificant points. Jim pointed out that the complaint on Robert Thompson had been in writing, and three different judges, Nancy Turner, and Bill and Trudy Vermaas had been refused with only verbal concerns.

Brenda asked permission to inquire of the Judging Administrator if she had instructed him not to reapply. Georgia reminded her that she had specifically told him on 7/18/87 that he must reapply.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Kinnunen to table the motion. Motion was tied with Becknell, Barnes, Coleman, Pannell opposed. Georgia broke the tie to carry the motion.

Motion was made the next morning by Becknell, and seconded by Smith to untable Robert Thompson. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to advance Robert Thompson based on the fact that his application had been postmarked to the Judging Administrator 7/27/87, as related to Brenda by Gloria at 7 AM, 9/4/87.

Jim stated that Gloria had told them that she had indicated to Robert that she would be forwarding his packet to the Board. Alice was not in favor of penalizing an applicant for following the advice of the Judging Administrator. Dewane stated that as a paid employee, he would be expected to abide by the rules, even if he had been told differently. Sue felt that there had been extenuating circumstances in this case. Dewane's concern had been the "bending" of the rules for what he considered less than extenuating circumstances. He had no problems with tragic illness. Georgia and Sue pointed out that Gloria's Newsletters could be very ambiguous, in that one newsletter may state one thing, and the next may state the opposite. Georgia reiterated that the dates had been changed repeatedly, and there had not been a comprehensive Judging Program to turn to.

Motion carried with Coleman and Barnes opposed.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to advance Joan Ray to Allbreed Judge.

Mark read the motion from the previous meeting: "Motion was made and seconded to accept Joan Ray as a TICA Approved Specialty Judge contingent upon passing the applicant's exam. She had been a UCF Allbreed Judge. Brenda did not feel that she had sufficient experience in TICA shows to be a TICA Allbreed Judge. Motion carried." (See Minutes, Semi-Annual, 1987, page 19.)

Georgia stated that she had been impressed with her knowledge, and did not feel there would be any problems.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Patrick to table the motion on Joan Ray until Brenda's return. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was subsequently made by Rhea, and seconded by Patrick to untable Joan Ray. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Patrick to accept Joan Ray as an Allbreed Judge. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Patrick, and seconded by Rhea to deny reinstatement of Irma Castle as an Allbreed Judge due to the fact that she did not reapply, she had done no training sessions, and had not attended any shows. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Coleman to deny acceptance of Stan Bass as a Ring Instructor. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Smith, and seconded by Barnes to accept Frances Yow as a Ring Instructor. Motion denied unanimously because she had failed to apply.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell to accept Marilyne Coleman as Ring Instructor.

Sue, Alice, and Jim had not received an application. Alice stated that in view of previous actions she would be unwilling to make an exception unless it was a case of hardship, death, or illness. Yvonne stated that if Gloria received it in time, she had no qualms about it. Mark pointed out that Gloria's comment read: "All requirements met. I recommend that Marilyne should be accepted as a Ring Instructor."

Motion denied with Patrick, Smith, and Coleman in favor.

Motion was subsequently made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to reconsider the motion to accept Marilyne Coleman as Ring Instructor. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes that based on the fact that the application from Marilyne had been received in the Judging Administrator's office well in advance of the deadline, that Marilyne Coleman be accepted as Ring Instructor. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea that pursuant to a telephone discussion with Dr. Pflueger, she had recommended that he move to use the words Persian type longhair and Persian type shorthair, and Siamese type longhair and Siamese type shorthair for the packet as described earlier in the meeting.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea to table this motion until morning. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Pannell to recess until morning. Motion carried unanimously.

|||||TABLED|||||

Friday, September 4, 1987:

Dewane felt that Gloria should be instructed that she was **not** to inform anyone that she would send their material to the Board.

Georgia addressed the Board advising them that once decisions had been made in the Board Room, she felt it was important that, as a Board they presented a group effort. She appreciated the fact that this Board had had its differences, which she felt was important in a working group, but that after a decision was made, they were in accord, i.e., the decision had been made by the entire Board. She felt that it was important to support each other as a working group whose decisions were also supported by the entire group.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Kinnunen that the Board express a vote of confidence to the Judging Administrator.

Alice stated that Gloria was under the impression that somehow it had come across that she had been "on the other side of the fence" in the Markstein case. She had been uncategorically on Vicky's side. Sue stated that evidence in writing did not support that, but Vicky had told Sue on the phone that Gloria had been supportive. Dewane stated that Gloria's style of writing was the problem. Jim agreed. He felt that Gloria's letters were taken as a personal affront, and as general non-support, however, he believed that with the access to counsel, the letters might go out with a better tone. Mark also felt that the tone was the problem. Sue reiterated that in the Markstein affair she had not been consistent in the things she had done in other incidences where judges had been accused, i.e., in trying to amass more information prior to sending out a letter to the judge. Regardless, Sue would not, in any way, want to reprimand Gloria. Brenda suggested that if there was another Vicky Markstein incident, it be taken out of the Judging Administrator's hands and put into the hands of a three-member committee. Sue was curious to know if Gloria would be happy with a proposal of this nature, and if so, would like it proposed at the Semi-Annual.

Motion was restated by Rhea, and seconded by Coleman that the Board express a vote of confidence to the Judging Administrator, and ask for her ideas on handling of licensed judges accused of misconduct. Motion carried with Becknell opposed as he felt that the Board had proved its vote of confidence in this meeting.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to discuss late Judge's Books with a comparison of the Semi-Annual report. Motion carried unanimously.

Brenda stated that the second offenders were: Ardoin, Bass, Costello, Dyer, LaJaunie, Meyers, Patrick, and Zear.

Motion was made by Becknell, and seconded by Pannell that a \$5 fine for each offense for everyone on the late judge's book list be assessed by the Executive Office. Brenda added an editorial of \$5 for the first offenders, and \$10 for second offenders.

Motion was restated: that the Executive Office assess a \$5 fine per offense for first offenders and a \$10 fine per offense for second offenders, with a letter stating that if you're on the list for a third time at the Semi-Annual, you will be automatically be suspended for 1 month from that meeting, plus a \$25 fine per offense, effective immediately. Motion carried with Coleman and Barnes opposed because they felt the penalties were not severe enough.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Barnes that Beth Hicks be written a letter of concern about the maintenance of her judge's books, and asking her to make an effort to get them in on time. Motion carried unanimously.

It was stated that clubs should get permission every time they use a Foreign Judge.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Patrick to approve Morgan, Markstein, and Meyers to judge in France. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Coleman for blanket approval for up to four foreign judges for Vicky Markstein and Yvonne Patrick. Motion carried unanimously.

OPEN MEETING:

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to discussion the Regional Realignment Proposal. Motion carried unanimously.

Mark felt that there were several reasons for this proposal: it would provide TICA with a Mid-Atlantic Region which could help in the growth of the organization; there were some very large regions which contained a significant proportion of the population which might be better served as TICA continued to grow; the distance between the regions sometimes made it difficult to communicate with individuals in specific geographic areas. The revised proposal demonstrated a new region which would contain the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Ohio, West Virginia, and Virginia as the Mid-Atlantic Region. Sue remarked that at the South Central Regional Meeting, it had been suggested that two new regions should be created in any realignment proposal to retain the balance on the Board. Mark replied that that had been given consideration with another new region called the Plain States consisting of the states of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, and Kansas to be formed for potential growth and to maintain the balance on the Board with the same breakdown of clubs and members affected. Pat advised that six clubs and 60 members would be affected with the revised Mid-Atlantic Region, with a loss of about six shows to her region. Mark advised that the Northeast Region would lose about seven clubs and six shows. Brenda did not care for the way it had been split, and Alice would be in favor of working toward getting TICA in a position where a director could be put in the area, because of the distances. She stated that at the time, TICA had one member in Wyoming, and three members in Montana. However, she was in favor of working toward a time when a Regional Director would be meaningful and beneficial. Georgia mentioned that

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to change the By-Laws, ARTICLE THREE, Section 3(a) to read: DUES. (a) Membership dues shall be established by the Board of Directors and shall be due and payable on the 1st of January of each year for the ensuing year.

Most directors felt that changing this date from May 1 to January 1 would only be more confusing.

Motion denied with Coleman voting in favor only to support the motion from his region.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell to change the By-Laws, ARTICLE TWENTY-ONE, Section 2 to read: CLUB CHARTER RENEWAL. All clubs shall pay an annual charter renewal fee by January 1st and submit to the Executive Office and the Regional Director an annual club report in conformity with the Association guidelines.

The rationale had been to get everything to calendar year instead of show year.

Motion denied unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell to withdraw all Northeast Regional proposals regarding TICA Registration Rules as they had been resolved at a previous time in this board meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to add Show Rule 242: All show halls/show rooms shall have operational climate control systems active during the entire show.

Brenda stated that half the show halls in California would be prohibited by this rule. Jim felt that this might cancel a show, and create the necessity of returning fees, if an emergency were encountered with the climate control, and he also felt that he did not feel that the Board should be involved in something that seldom happens. Dewane added that with this rule, a club would be prohibited from using a hall when air conditioning was not needed.

Motion denied with Coleman in favor.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to add Show Rule 242: Clubs will identify on the show flyer whether or not the show hall was climate controlled.

Motion was made by Rhea, and seconded by Barnes to table this motion until the rule on Show Flyers was presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was subsequently made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to untable this proposal. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea to add Show Rule 243: Only one kitten or one cat may be benched in a single cage, whether entered for competition, exhibition or for sale. REASON: Have you ever seen two 7 month old Maine Coons in a single cage? This eliminates any overcrowding of cages.

Sue Servies reported that she had received 28 catalogs so far this show season. She furnished the directors with a list of those received. She requested a show schedule from the Executive Office.

Georgia outlined the destination for the different colors of pages in the judge's books. The white copy should be furnished to the Executive Office, the yellow copy to Sue Servies, the pink copy should be retained by the judge, and the goldenrod copy is now furnished to the regional scorer.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Rhea that a minimum number of points be established for computation of regional and international breed and/or color awards. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Pannell, and seconded by Rhea that the Board establish the minimum number of 25 points to be used in the calculation of regional and international color and/or breed awards. Motion carried unanimously.

Jim LeCroy delivered a presentation for City Kitty Cat Club relating to a commitment from the Hyatt at the Airport in Dallas for the show hall and meeting rooms for the 1990 Annual. He stated that everything would be free for the meetings, that the show hall had 40,000 square feet. Due to the proximity of the location, the costs would be low and the it would be exceptionally convenient. The room rate would be \$49 for single or double. Parking would be free to exhibitors.

At this time Jim Becknell again presented a proposal for Compadres Cat Club to host the 1990 Annual in El Paso, Texas.

It was stated that Dallas had already hosted an annual.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman that the 1990 annual be hosted in El Paso due to the fact that Dallas had hosted an annual in the past. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea that the proposal from City Kitty be considered for the 1991 Annual. Motion carried unanimously.

It was stated that the 1990 Annual would be held on August 28 - September 3 in El Paso, TX.

Sue Servies asked that the Board decide where co-owned cats from two different regions would be scored.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Rhea that the scorer will score all cats in whatever region is indicated in the catalog, and if it happens to be in two regions then they will be scored in both regions. Motion carried unanimously.

Brenda wanted it noted: "that she had stated that there would be some unhappy owners harassing their regional directors because their cats had been scored in two regions."

Sue Servies stated that occasionally an adult cat moved before January first and was never shown again. The cat would then be in the new region, and they would never have seen it. She suggested that if a cat or kitten completed its show career before January first, it be scored in the region where it completed that career.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Becknell that if a cat or kitten completed its show career before January first, it be scored in the region where it had accumulated the most points.

Brenda stated that the North Central Region was notorious for a person going out of region to show because of the shortage of shows in the North Central. Dewane stated that for the last 2 years, the Best Kitten of the Year had not been shown in his region.

Motion and second were withdrawn.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Coleman that if a cat or kitten completed its show career before January first, it be scored in the region where it completed that career. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea that in order for a cat/kitten to be eligible for a regional award, it must be shown at least once in that region. Motion carried unanimously.

The Vice-President left to catch his plane at this time.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to discuss the Show Calendar. Motion carried unanimously.

Fenton Kovic explained that the show calendar was on their computer, and edited daily. They had been begun furnishing it to both Cats Magazine and Cat Fancy every month, because several of the clubs do not send in their show dates. Judy added that once the regional director had informed them of the show date, they would be responsible for providing that information to the magazines.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen that Fenton and Judy Kovic do the show calendar publicity for Cats Magazine and Cat Fancy. Motion carried unanimously.

Georgia complimented Judy and Fenton for the admirable way they had accomplished their tasks in advertising and publicity for TICA.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Rhea to express the Board's appreciation to Judy and Fenton Kovic for the work they have accomplished in TICA's behalf. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Smith to discuss the Publicity Committee Report dated 4/16/87, as submitted, page 143, in the Agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

Mark explained that the intent of this report was to increase awareness of TICA in the cat fancy. Implementation would be to advertise in major cat fancy magazines; visual exposure of the TICA logo (banners at the entrance to showhalls, display of logo in all judging rings,

Alice reported that the Standards were in a colossal mess and that she would be working on them.

Motion on the fee feasibility study was withdrawn by Coleman .

Motion was made by Coleman, and seconded by Kinnunen to table to the Semi-Annual the discussion on specialty judges judging household pet rings. Motion carried unanimously.

* * * * *TABLED TO THE SEMI-ANNUAL* * * * *

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Coleman to accept the Judging Program as amended in its entirety contingent upon the corrections being made and the amended copy received by each Board Member. Motion carried unanimously. (See Judging Program, 9/3/87.)

Georgia asked the Board to delineate what type work should take priority in the Executive Office. The Board felt that the membership came first. It was pointed out that no Board Member had the right to use the Business Manager as their personal secretary. Georgia also pointed out that some members seem intent in harassing the Executive Office, i.e., Vickie Shields. The Board answered that any hassle from a member of their region should be referred to the Regional Director. Brenda specifically reiterated that she would handle Vickie Shields if she was apprised of any problems.

Motion was made by Smith, and seconded by Kinnunen to change the Show Rules to read: When a breed standard names disqualifying faults such as kinked tails and crossed eyes, the judge must disqualify for those faults (except in alters). REASON: This removes the judge's discretion in these cases. We need to strive to improve the quality of our cats. More and more cats are being shown today with faults which would have barred them from showing just a few seasons ago - and are winning in spite of those faults. If the breed committees felt the faults were important enough to name specifically in the standard as a disqualification, we ought to honor their wishes. Motion denied unanimously.

Motion was made by Smith, and seconded by Kinnunen to change the Show Rules to read: No judge may judge any cat more than once in one 3 day period (Friday, Saturday Sunday or Saturday, Sunday, Monday) at the same location with the exception of regular judging and a Breed Congress or Breed Specialty. A judge may only award one final win per judging. Exception made in cases of emergency - 72 hours or less notice. (This will eliminate back-to-back shows and shows where judges handle cats once and then do a specialty and an allbreed final from one judging.) REASON: The professionalism of TICA is at stake here. In our infancy, we needed back-to-back judging, due to a lack of judges, and clubs which were just starting out. We have come a long way since then, and should be putting on shows which are top quality in every way. We are pressing or have surpassed CFA in every area except this one and here we are sliding backward. Two "shows" in 1 day is very unrealistic, as is having one judging and doing two finals. Let's put the back-to-back issue to rest once and for all. Motion denied unanimously.

Motion was made by Smith, and seconded by Coleman to change the Show Rules to read: No judge may judge any cat more than once in 1 day with the exception of a regular judging and a Breed congress or Breed specialty. A judge may only award one final win per judging. No more than 1/3 of the judges may be repeated on subsequent days of a back-to-back show (For example: two judges in a 6 ring show, or 1 in a 4 or 5 ring show.) Exception made in

Sunday, September 6, 1987, 12:30 AM:

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Kinnunen to reopen the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Georgia stated that there may be a problem with the TREND Editor. (See previous discussion.)

The next item involved Mark Coleman. Georgia stated that she felt that the article about the purchase of the computer in his newsletter was in poor taste, and she felt that the rest of the Board would want to let him know how they felt about it.

Barnes: I would hope the one thing we learned from our difficulties 3 or 4 years ago was that if we had differences of opinion, we argue it out and accept the decision the board makes without going public with those differences.

Pannell: In the board meeting we talked about how we should support each other and remain solid outside the board room, and then you state in your newsletter that we could have bought it cheaper. And in affect cast doubt on all of us. I was really upset.

Rhea: There are two aspects of this: One is that it is not factual. I don't think that we could have gotten it cheaper in that there were things not in your proposal that would have to be purchased. The second thing is that the Vice-President and Northwest Regional Director both advised you in our own ways that it is a breach of decorum, that it is an improper way to treat your fellow board members and that the issue is closed. It was voted on, the equipment has been purchased, it is too late to do anything about it, so why put out anything like this in print.

Patrick: It really puts our credibility at stake. Like Dewane said, once it's voted on, there's lots of things we don't like but that's the end of it. I don't think we have to go into detail and explain why all the time.

Kinnunen: Just reiteration, I thought we were supposed to support each other and remain a solid board for the rest of the membership, and I believe that some of your facts are very sloppy in that from what I remember of that, that you admitted in letters that you had left out some cables, etc. and that you admitted that it is best to have someone on hand which Mr. Hart had built in to his estimate.

Smith: I feel like Dewane does, Lord knows, that we don't all agree but when the vote is over, it's a board decision and I don't think that any of us should put it out to the membership any differently.

Georgia stated that there were things that had been voted on that she had been vehemently opposed to, but when the Board voted on them, that had been it. She also wanted Mark to be aware that there had never been any guidelines established for the purchasing of supplies and materials other than Board approval. She had hoped that his letters had been the end, however, felt that if he continued to feel this way, rather than putting it in print, he should have brought it up in the Board Meeting.

Mark stated that he had not meant for it to be taken in any way other than that he had voted differently. He remarked that he had promised during his campaign that he would disclose his vote in any matter. He believed that he had been correct in writing the article.

Georgia asked if he meant that if the same thing happened in reverse, i.e., seconding every motion, he would still feel the same. He reiterated that so much time had been wasted in the meeting talking before a motion was seconded. Sue felt that the Board wasted a great deal of time on motions that should never have been seconded in the first place. Dewane felt that he could have communicated the way he voted to his region without making it appear that he was attacking the Board. Sue contended that it appeared to her that he had made an effort to justify what he had done by smearing everyone else. Dewane also felt he had gone overboard in what he considered justification. Alice stated that it sounded like the Executive Office and the rest of the Board were fools, and that they had spent too much money on something that was a sound business investment. Mark stated that he had felt it was a rushed decision. Alice reiterated that TICA had been working toward this for 4 years. Dewane also stated that he had called Leslie to express his concern about the wording on the ballot not being more specific, but hadn't rushed out to tell his constituents that the members of North Central had just voted on a ballot which in effect gave carte blanche to the Executive Office on purchasing a Computer. Mark stated that he had used the words "not good business" and was entitled to his opinion. Sue stated that he was not entitled to spread his opinion by stating that he was right because he disagreed with everyone on the Board. Alice agreed that the members of her region had a right to know how she voted, but she did not have a right to comment on how other Board members voted. Dewane felt that there was no point in continuing the discussion as they had all expressed their concern to Mark, in relating that they had no qualms about his expressing his point of view, but that the Board was asking him to use some discretion, and not make it appear when it was published as though it was an open attack on the Board.

Mark stated that if the question arose in the show hall, he would defend the statement in the sense that it would not make the Board look divided.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Pannell to move on to anything else that needed to be handled at this time. Motion carried unanimously.

Georgia stated that Nancy Nolen had gone back to teaching and that the Board should be thinking of who could replace her as Yearbook Editor if necessary. It was also noted that there had been no invoice for the yearbook forthcoming. Georgia remarked that she would be detailing the account for the Yearbook.

Motion was made by Kinnunen, and seconded by Rhea that the Semi-Annual start on Tuesday morning. Motion carried with Barnes, Coleman, and Rhea opposed.

Motion was made by Barnes, and seconded by Pannell to adjourn again. Motion carried unanimously.

