

Registry Committee Meeting Minutes  
April 28, 2005  
Burlington, Vermont

**Attendance:**

**Registry Committee:** Georgie Green, Chair, Sherry Cole, Mike Goebig, Tony Lee, Kathy Newcomb

**Staff:** Tyler Atwood, Registrar, Fred Braden, Exec. Director, Erica Richard, Director of Membership Services; Registry Staff: Marlene Duell, Catherine Labarre, Carol Peters, Janet Rotax.

**Directors:** Toodie Connor, Ed Creighton, Marjorie Hazelwood, Barbara Hewitt, Eileen Hunter, Judy Kjellander, Robert Painter, Joyce Quigley, Harry Sebring, Linnea Sidi, Mary Jean Vasiloff, Ling Fu Wylie.

**Guests:** John Green, Sam Stanley, Polly Quinn, Ginny Coutts, Laura Smith, Anna Smith, Kim Likakis, Catherine McCauley-Libert, Carol Martinelli, Jay Rappaport.

-----

The meeting was called to order by Registry Chairperson, Georgie Green. Mr. Atwood called the roll. The entire committee was present.

**Motion #1**

A motion was made by Mike Goebig and seconded by Kathy Newcomb to accept the minutes of the February 2005 meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Sherry Cole asked that the Registrar follow up on an article that appeared in another equine publication that addressed the collection of breeding fees in an attempt to obtain permission to have the article reprinted in THE MORGAN HORSE.

**Registry Chairperson's Report**

Mrs. Green asked the committee to consider adopting a policy that would require anyone wishing to have a topic discussed or reviewed by the Registry Committee to have all their material to the office or a Registry Committee member a minimum of three weeks prior to the meeting. The Committee was unanimous in their support of this policy. The policy will take effect immediately.

Mrs. Green appointed a sub-committee to review the Rules for Hearings and Appeals. Two items the committee was asked to consider was the possibility of using Director Emeritus and past members of the Registry Committee as possible Hearing Panel members and to consider adding a provision for placing a person on probation. The Sub-committee appointed is: Sherry Cole, Chair, Ling Fu Wylie and Tyler Atwood as staff liaison.

Mrs. Green explained that the day after the February 2005 Registry Meeting she received communication from Ms. Diana Kline that included a letter from Ms. Kline's attorney. Much of the communication related to the Half Morgan Registry which no longer pertains since the Board voted not to pursue a half Morgan Registry. The letter also addressed technology that Ms Kline believed to be new technology. The letter from the attorney suggested that the AMHA had to use this technology to exam all records and make necessary changes. The letter suggested that the Jockey Club had used this technology and had made pedigree changes based on the technology. Mrs. Green reported that Tyler Atwood had contacted the Jockey Club about this. A letter from the Executive Director of the Jockey Club was read which clearly states that they have not been using mtDNA technology to determine parentage and they have not and will not make pedigree changes using this technology. Mrs. Green reminded everyone that it is the Registry's position that the AMHA will not use mitochondrial DNA as it does not prove parentage. Mrs. Green will follow up with Ms. Kline.

Mr. Atwood requested a moment to clarify a statement he had made at a previous Registry Meeting. The statement he wished to clarify was, "the Registry keeps records on registered horses and when a horse is denied registration, the registration application is returned to the applicant – it is not retained in the Registry and current rules and rates apply upon resubmission." Mr. Atwood explained that technically that statement was accurate since the original applications are returned however, starting in the late 1990's the Registry staff has been retaining copies of the applications. Mr. Atwood explained that these copies are very helpful in maintaining the integrity of the Registry.

### **Registry Statistics**

Registration and Transfer Statistics were reviewed. Copies attached.

Mr. Atwood reported that in the first quarter of 2005, 916 registrations had been completed compared to 969 in the same time period in 2004 and 911 in 2003. In the first quarter of 2005, 1,919 transfers have been completed compared to 1,969 in 2004 and 1,543 in 2003.

Parentage Verification Kits sent – 810 kits have been sent in the first quarter compared to 839 in 2004 and 760 in 2003.

Parentage Verification Program Results - Since the February 2005 meeting, 13 new parentage exclusions were found. Ten of these have been resolved. In

addition, seven existing exclusion were also resolved for a total of 17 resolutions. Currently a total of eight exclusions are still open and being worked.

Breeding Activity in 2004 - As of April 2005 the Registry has received 1,339 reports listing 4,692 mares. Mr. Atwood reminded everyone that this number would continue to grow. Mr. Atwood pointed out that as of April of 2005 the Registry had received 1,483 reports listing 4,841 mares that were bred in 2003 but twelve months earlier, in April of 2004, the 2003 totals were 1,325 stallions breeding 4,454 mares

### **REGISTRY RUSH SERVICE**

Mr. Atwood explained that the current rush service program causes a person's registry work to be moved to the front of the line so that it is processed the same day it is received. When the certificate prints the following day, the certificate is mailed via overnight delivery service. (This all assumes that the work is complete and accurate when submitted) Due to overnight delivery charges that range from \$22 for delivery within Vermont to \$26 for delivery in Florida, Texas and on the west coast, the current fee of \$25 is not covering our costs. Requests for this service are increasing. A review of other Breed Registry's Rush Services ranged from \$45 to \$65. (One Registry provides rush service for \$20 but this only guarantees that your work will be processed within the next ten days and then mailed standard first class mail.) Mr. Atwood asked the committee to consider a flat fee of \$50 for rush service. After discussing various options, the following motion was made.

### **Motion #2**

A motion was made by Sherry Cole and seconded by Mike Goebig to charge \$50 for Registry rush service effective June 1, 2005. Motion passed unanimously.

### **SHOW LETTERS**

Mr. Atwood explained that current procedures, as set by the Registry Committee, calls for a \$10 fee to be charged when an owner requests a letter to be sent to a show secretary verifying ownership of a Morgan. Mr. Atwood outlined several scenarios under which a person would request a show letter and what steps would have to be taken in each case.

### **Motion #3**

A motion was made by Sherry Cole and seconded by Mike Goebig to increase the fee charged for letters issued by the Registry that are sent to horse show management to verify information contained in the Register to \$25. The increase is to be effective immediately. Motion passed unanimously.

### **STALLION OWNER'S SIGNATURE**

Current wording on the certificate of service portion of the registration application and on the stallion service report requires stallion owner's to certify

information they don't have knowledge of. Georgie Green asked staff to develop wording to replace the outdated wording and to report back to the Committee.

### **FROZEN EMBRYO REPORT**

Linnea Sidi reported on behalf of the Frozen Embryo Sub-Committee, which is made up of Linnea, Loretta Brown and Mike Goebig. Linnea reported that the sub-committee met during the February Convention and developed an outline of a possible program. Ms. Sidi outlined the program to the committee. The Committee felt that the concept presented was the correct approach and asked the staff to develop the wording and forms for the committee to review at the August Meeting.

### **RECIPROCITY**

Mrs. Green explained that mis-understandings in the conversation at the last meeting gave the appearance that the committee was considering revoking Reciprocity from Canada and Great Britain. She did not believe it was the intention of the committee to rescind reciprocity with Canada or England.

Mr. Atwood reported good progress in obtaining information from other Registries. Canada and Australia are ready to transmit their information as soon as we are able to determine what format we want it in. Staff will be contacting Great Britain, New Zealand and Sweden to request the same information from them in the near future.

At the February meeting, the committee asked staff to determine what would be an appropriate fee to charge when a Morgan is imported into the states and one or more of its family tree are registered only with the foreign registry. (Before the horse being imported into the USA can be registered, its family tree must be entered in our system if it isn't already there). Staff recommended a fee of \$30 per unregistered ancestor, the same as the cost for the horse being imported. Mr. Atwood asked that the committee consider offering a moratorium for the re-registration of Canadian or British registered horses that were registered in accordance with Rule 1 Section 2. Current cost to re-register a Canadian or British registered horse is \$30. Mr. Atwood asked the committee to consider reducing this fee to \$15 for a six month period.

### **Motion #4**

A motion was made by Mike Goebig and seconded by Tony Lee that when a Morgan horse that is registered in Canada or Great Britain is applying for AMHA registration under the reciprocity agreement and the horse has ancestors that are not part of the AMHA Registry, a fee of \$30 per ancestor be assessed before entering them into the Register. Motion to take affect January 1, 2006. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Motion #5**

A motion was made by Tony Lee and seconded by Kathy Newcomb that the AMHA Registry offer a moratorium on the re-registration of Morgan Horses that are currently registered with the Canadian Morgan Horse Registry or the British Morgan Horse Society only. The moratorium is to run from January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006. For that period, the re-registration fee will be reduced to \$15. All other requirements for re-registration must be met. Motion passed unanimously.

Mrs. Green surveyed the Committee to clarify the committee's position regarding reciprocity. The Committee was unanimously in favor of retaining the reciprocity agreements that AMHA currently has with the Canadian and British Morgan Horse Registries.

Mrs. Green explained that currently there is a motion in the May 2003 Registry Minutes that says that the AMHA will not grant reciprocity to any more Registries. Mrs. Green asked how that committee felt about this. After a brief discussion, the following motion was made:

### **Motion #6**

A motion was made by Mike Goebig and seconded by Tony Lee to rescind Motion Number Four of the May 2003 Registry Committee Meeting where the Registry Committee voted to accept the report of the Reciprocity Sub-Committee which recommended that the AMHA not accept any more requests for reciprocity. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Transfer of Semen Transport Permit**

Mr. Atwood explained that currently the staff will transfer an existing semen transport permit to the new owner when a stallion is sold, if application is made to the Registry and payment of a \$25 transfer fee is submitted in addition to the transfer of ownership.

### **Motion #7**

A motion was made by Kathy Newcomb and seconded by Mike Goebig that the Registry Committee approve continuing the policy of transferring an existing semen transport permit to the new owner/lessee for a fee of \$50. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Appeal of Registrar's Decision**

Mr. Atwood read a letter from the owner of a stallion who has had numerous medical problems that prevented him from caring for his horses. During that time he believed that his senior stallion was locked in large box stall. A year later a foal was born. Under the circumstances, the owner is asking that the late fee be waived .

The committee was sympathetic to this owner's medical problems but felt that we have Rules and Policies in place that must be followed.

### **Prefixes**

Several meetings ago the Committee asked the staff to identify and contact breeders that are repeatedly using an unregistered prefix. Mr. Atwood explained that the staff has not been able to identify these breeders using the computer. Instead, letters are being sent to breeders that the staff identify during the registration process. To date, eighteen letters have been sent – of the eighteen breeders that have been notified, one has responded by registering a prefix. This was followed by a discussion of how this letter should be mailed - first class, certified mail, some other method. Ms. Libert explained that in her opinion as an attorney, the process the AMHA is using would be deemed legally tendered under case law. Kathy Newcomb suggested that sending the letter via certified letter would cause undue concern for the recipient when we are only doing this as customer service.

Jay Rappaport asked if he was allowed to use any registered horse's name simply by placing his prefix in front of it. Mrs. Green suggested using the name Sharpshooter as an example. Mr. Rappaport asked if he registered "Jay" as his prefix, would he be allowed to name a horse "Jay's Sharpshooter". Mr. Atwood explained that the rules allow him to use some discretion in such cases. He went on to explain that if someone used their prefix in front of the name of a horse that lived in the mid 1800's and had no registered offspring, it would be allowed. However if someone tried using a prefix in front of Courage of Equinox or UVM Promise, Mr. Atwood indicated that he would probably deny the request and give the applicant the opportunity to appeal the decision to the Registry Committee. Mr. Rappaport stated that he would be filing a formal protest before the next meeting over two horses he believed were improperly named. Mrs. Green asked if they were his horses. Mr. Rappaport refused to answer, stating that she would see in the letter.

### **Coat Colors**

Mrs. Green reported that a group of breeders have requested that the coat colors recognized by the AMHA Registry be expanded. Mrs. Green appointed a sub-committee to review this matter of Kathy Newcomb, Linnea Sidi and Loretta Brown with Tyler Atwood as staff liason. Kathy Newcomb to serve as chair.

### **Other Business**

Anna Smith expressed her concern that older Morgans are going to die without DNA on file and renewed her offer to coordinate an effort to contact owners of Morgans that don't have DNA. Mrs. Green asked the staff to attempt to identify a population that could be used as a pilot program. If a population can be

identified then Ms. Smith would have to outline and present further plans for the program.

Ginny Coutts indicated that she had requested a copy of her horse's DNA type at the time it was registered and that she has received the registration certificate but not the DNA type. Staff indicated that they would look into the matter that night and get back to her the next day.\*

Ed Creighton felt that with the publication of the Rules of the Registry in the membership directory that members have to be held accountable for their actions and that it is not right for members to blame the Association for the consequences of their ignorance of the rules. Mrs. Green thanked him for his comments.

Marjorie Hazelwood asked to present a letter from a member concerning deceased horses. Mrs. Green asked if the author was the same person that brought this concern to the Registry several years ago. Ms. Hazelwood confirmed that it was. Mrs. Green explained that the CyberQuilt program had been explained to this member who thought it was a wonderful idea and offered financial support of the program. Mrs. Hazelwood claimed that this had just been brought to her attention because she wasn't a director at that time and that she felt it was her duty to bring forward a concern from a member. Mrs. Green thanked her and asked for a copy of the letter so that the staff and the committee could look into this matter before the August meeting.

Mrs. Green called for any other business. There being none, she declared the meeting adjourned.

\* Chairman's Note: Staff looked into this matter overnight. The request for the DNA report did not come in with the registration application – instead it was noted on the certification card that is completed when the hair sample is taken. The request in this unusual manner combined with the fact that the required payment was not submitted, caused the request to be over looked. Payment was collected the next day and Ms. Coutts was provided with a copy of the report.