

Pygora Breeders Association
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes 09/23/2006
Called to order 09/23/2006 7:05 PM

Board Members present: A Esterline- presiding, S PrechtI, F Bishop
C Utterback, J Mann, T Naumann

Members present: 15

Officer Reports

President: No report
Vice President: No report
Secretary: No report
Treasurer: See attached budget report

Committee & Appointed Position Reports

Advertising Committee: K Blackett, see attached report

The committee is searching for advertising venues on the national level so as to benefit all members. There is discussion about a focus on the 3 major fiber festivals in the country, to include advertising and participation. More details to follow.

Breed Standard Committee: No report

Breeders Book Editor: No report

By-Laws Committee: No report

Fiber Committee: No report, chair is currently open, those interested contact Aaron Esterline

Education Fund Committee: calling for active committee members, interested contact Louellen Kelly

Judges Training Committee: reminder of the 9 AM 09/24/2006 judges training clinic

Merchandise Committee: No report, chair is currently open, those interested contact Aaron Esterline

There was some discussion of the practicality of keeping an inventory of merchandise available. A member would volunteer to store the merchandise and accept responsibility for shipments. There would also be an initial cash investment to have the merchandise printed ahead of time. This issue will be on an agenda for a future meeting.

Newsletter Editor: No report, position currently open, those interested contact Aaron Esterline

There was discussion of the job description for the newsletter editor. A suggestion was made to make this a compensated position, accepting qualifications and a bid from those interested, advertising in the newsletter to ensure the entire membership is aware of the opportunity. At this time the position will remain as a volunteer position. This issue will be included on the next board meeting agenda.

During recess, Melissa MacDougall volunteered to take on the position of newsletter editor after providing her qualifications to Aaron. This currently remains as a volunteer position and Melissa will produce the 4th quarter 2006 edition of our newsletter. Should the decision be made to make this a compensated position Melissa will be expected to submit her qualifications and a bid as would any other interested member.

Registrar: F Bishop

Motion #06-05 Motion made by C Utterback Seconded by J Mann

PBA will charge \$10 Rush fee per goat, in addition to standard registration fees. The Rush fee does not include costs for postage.

**In favor: F Bishop, J Mann, C Utterback, S Prechtl, T Naumann
Abstention: A Esterline**

Motion #06-05 Passed on 09/23/2006

Show Secretary: K Brookhart

Ordered 16 ribbons to replenish stock on hand at a cost of \$105.10, K Brookhart to follow-up with A Esterline on costs of ribbons, will work together to determine if we need to change suppliers to cut costs, general consensus was to leave the ribbon colors as is at this time, item to be included on future meeting agenda as needed.

Discussion of an increase in sanction fees, we are currently at the low end of the range for the industry, this item will included on a future meeting agenda.

All members are encouraged to enter their goats, especially State Fair and OFFF, there is a minimum requirement for a sanctioned show, low entry and last minute drops can prevent a sanctioned show.

Webmaster:

pba-pygora.com is the official web address for the Pygora Breeders Association to be used on any official documentation, all other web address in use will link to this one

Discussion of allowing banner ads on the web site for a fee to outside vendors, J Mann to research fee, item tabled until after OFFF and meeting resumes via email

Youth Committee: K Brookhart, any suggestions for youth involvement is appreciated,

General consensus is in favor of the annual coloring contest, many fun youth ideas were discussed, K Brookhart to follow-up with individuals.

New Business

National Animal Identification System: presented by M MacDougall, handout attached

M MacDougall was asked to be our resource regarding NAIS, keeping up on the changes and info posted by USDA, Melissa accepted this responsibility and will keep the board up to date on developments.

Operating Manual: A Esterline, item tabled until meeting is continued after OFFF via email

Fiber Testing: C Utterback

C Utterback is working with Yocum-McColl to arrange another fiber test. Under consideration: test open to all members in good standing for any registered Pygora fiber at a reduced rate, the actual type of test to be done and the timing of the test are still to be determined, process for a general call for samples to be sent to C Utterback, and whether all data on all samples submitted will be made available to PBA and be recorded into PBA archives.

Pygora Trademark: C Utterback

After discussion with a trademark attorney, it has been determined that PBA has a legal right to the word "Pygora." No further action is necessary on the part of the PBA in order to enforce trademark law for "Pygora" because the word has been clearly defined in the Breed Standard and used by PBA.

The letter from the attorney regarding the trademark use of "Pygora" and the letter from Katherine Jorgensen (attached) regarding her definition of "Pygora" when she founded PBA will be recorded into PBA archives.

Elections Procedures: A Esterline, item to be included on future board meeting agenda

C Utterback requested that a “members only” area on the web site be added for discussion on the next board meeting agenda.

Motion to recess: C Utterback

Seconded: J Mann

Pygora Breeders Association
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes 09/23/2006
Continued via email after recess on 10/10/2006

Board Members present: A Esterline- presiding, S PrechtI, F Bishop
C Utterback, J Mann, T Naumann

Members present: 18 via email CC list

New Business, continued

Banner ads on PBA web site:

Discussion of appropriate fees for banner ads. At this time fees will be set at \$20 per month, or \$200 per year, with annual review.

Motion # 06-06

I, Fran Bishop, make a motion to allow paid advertisements on the PBA website. The fee will be determined per the usual and customary rate to be researched and determined by the Board of Directors yearly. The Advertising Committee will review the ads prior to publication. PBA reserves the right to refuse any ad it deems inappropriate.

I, Jill Mann, second the motion.

A Esterline - Yes 10/20
S PrechtI - YES 10-20-06
F Bishop-Yes10/20
J Mann -Yes
C Utterback - Yes 10/20/06
T Naumann - Abstain 10/20/06

10/20/2006 Motion # 06-06 Passed

**In Favor: 5 - Esterline, PrechtI, Bishop, Mann, Utterback
Opposed: 0
Abstention: 1 - Naumann**

Operating Manual:

Discussion about draft of Operating Manual. Reminder that this draft is meant to meet only the minimum requirements of our By-Laws. This is a work in progress and will be open for discussion and growth at future board meetings.

Motion #06-07

I, Aaron Esterline, move that PBA adopt the Operating Manual as amended and published on [_http://www.pba-pygora.com/operatingmanual/_](http://www.pba-pygora.com/operatingmanual/) (<http://www.pba-pygora.com/operatingmanual/>) .

I, Chris Utterback, second the motion on the floor

Call for a vote on the above motion:

A Esterline YES 10/27/2006
C Utterback Yes 10/27/06
S Prechtl YES 10-27-06
F Bishop-YES 10/27/06
J Mann -Yes
T Naumann - Yes 10/28/06

Motion #06-07 Passed 10/28/2006

In favor: 6 - Esterline, Utterback, Prechtl, Bishop, Mann, Naumann
Opposed: None
Abstain: None

I, Terri Naumann, now recommend that the final agenda item - the fiber study - be tabled for a future board meeting and move that this board meeting be adjourned.

I, Chris Utterback, second the motion.

Call for vote to adjourn the board meeting.

Esterline: agree 10/29/06
Prechtl: agree 10-30-06
Bishop: agree 10/29/06
Mann: agree 10-30-06
Utterback: agree 10/29/06
Naumann: agree 10/29/06

With that, this meeting is adjourned: 10/30/2006 3:51:05 P.M. Pacific Standard Time

Beginning Balance 1/1/2006 \$6,947.56

INCOME & EXPENSE STATEMENT

INCOME	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
Dues	\$168.29	\$177.51	\$378.63	\$268.29	\$203.46	\$241.94	\$145.63	\$182.42					\$1,766.17
Herd Name	\$25.00	\$10.00	\$20.00	\$35.00	\$25.00	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$15.00					\$145.00
Regs & Trs	\$98.00	\$46.00	\$63.00	\$327.00	\$266.00	\$367.00	\$546.00	\$369.00					\$2,082.00
Breeder's Dir Ad	\$100.63	\$255.85	\$197.40	\$96.50									\$650.38
Newsletter Ad	\$145.77	\$15.00		\$15.00									\$175.77
Newsletter Subscription													
Show Sanction					\$30.00		\$65.00	\$25.00					\$120.00
Judges Test				\$70.00		\$35.00	\$105.00						\$210.00
Rush Fees						\$14.00	\$31.00	\$28.00					\$73.00
Rush Postage						\$14.40		\$28.80					\$43.20
Credit Cert Issued	\$25.00	\$10.00	\$13.00	\$75.00	\$38.00	\$45.00	\$62.00	\$9.00					\$277.00
Credit Cert Redeemed	(\$31.00)	(\$16.00)	(\$10.00)	(\$8.00)	(\$63.00)	(\$27.00)	(\$14.00)	(\$5.00)					(\$174.00)
Reg Corrections&Dups	\$3.00	\$3.00		\$15.00		\$6.00	\$3.00	\$9.00					\$39.00
TOTAL	\$534.69	\$501.36	\$662.03	\$893.79	\$499.46	\$706.34	\$948.63	\$661.22					\$5,407.52
EXPENSE													
Registrar Stipend	(\$164.00)			(\$100.00)			(\$418.00)						(\$682.00)
Postage	(\$77.49)			(\$90.40)			(\$30.27)						(\$198.16)
Phone	(\$3.35)			(\$12.70)			(\$6.12)						(\$22.17)
Copies&Supplies	(\$131.09)			(\$12.87)				(\$88.35)					(\$232.31)
PR			(\$62.00)	(\$106.00)		(\$106.00)		(\$233.00)					(\$507.00)
Webmaster	(\$150.00)			(\$150.00)		(\$150.00)							(\$450.00)
WebHosting/Domain													
Newsletter-Printing			(\$245.39)			(\$122.51)							(\$367.90)
Postage			(\$142.99)			(\$107.10)		(\$165.29)					(\$415.38)
Materials						(\$18.32)							(\$18.32)
Breeder's Dir-Printing				(\$639.74)									(\$639.74)
Postage			(\$217.35)										(\$217.35)
Judge's Trng Manual						(\$67.26)							(\$67.26)
Postage						(\$69.55)							(\$69.55)
Show Sec-Postage													
Copies&Supplies													
Show Ribbons													
Secretary-Postage													
Copies&Supplies													
President Post&Exp													
Education Grant													
Misc Exp				(\$2.79)									(\$2.79)
Ballot Printing													
TOTAL	(\$525.93)		(\$667.73)	(\$1,114.50)		(\$640.74)	(\$454.39)	(\$486.64)					(\$3,889.93)
GRAND TOTAL													\$8,465.15

CD

\$2,187.17 \$5.11 \$4.48 \$4.97 \$4.89 \$5.07 \$5.11 \$5.30 \$5.31 \$2,227.41

2006 ADVERTISING COMMITTEE REPORT AS OF 9/1/06

From 1/1/06 through 9/1/06, we have spent or contracted for \$753 of our \$1000 budget for 2006. This includes the following ads:

Spin-Off Magazine, 4 issues (one year).....	\$436.00
Countryside Magazine Breed Association Listing (one year).....	60.00
Hobby Farms Magazine 7 issues (14 months) Classified & Online.....	180.00
The Dairy Goat Journal 6 issues (one year) Classified Listing.....	.53.00
The Goat Magazine 6 issues (one year) Classified Listing.....	24.00

All of the above advertising is on a national level, equally benefiting all members of PBA.

We are also happy to report that our satellite web page through the New York Fiber Festival web site has been up and running since May. Because of the initial delay, we have been given another year of free advertising on this site, which will extend through July 1, 2007.

We continue to search for free links to the PBA website *and add* these as we find them.

So far we have found 12 websites that have us a free link,

In the final quarter of 2006, we will be searching for new advertising venues for the remaining funds in the budget.

Report submitted by:
Advertising Committee Chair
Kathy Blackett
Committee Members
Jill Gallagher, Lou Kelly & Jill Mam

September 12, 2006

Dear Chris,

Here is how the word "Pygora" came into being:

In 1980 I began to experiment with cross-breeding Pygmy goats and Angora goats. I purchased an Angora doe that was registered by the American Angora Goat Breeders Association and bred it to one of my registered (NPGA) Pygmy Goat bucks. The word Pygora takes "pyg" from the Pygmy goat and "ora" from the Angora. The resulting cross-breeding produced animals with the general characteristics of the Angora goats, only more hardy. Further breeding of previous cross-breeds eventually produced what we now call type B and C fleece, where the grey Pygmy undercoat grows out longer and is of cashmere fiber diameter.

The Pygora Breeders Association (PBA) emerged in the late 1980's in Oregon and Washington, and then gradually became a national organization as interest in this new goat grew. The word Pygora has taken on a very specific meaning since the PBA breed standard was formalized in 1989, and the herd book was closed to any goats not meeting the breed standard.

The current breed standard defines a Pygora as: "The Pygora goat is a cross breed, created by crossing an Angora goat with a Pygmy goat for at least 2 generations. The parent stock must be registered with their respective breed registry, either the American Angora Goat Breeders Association or the National Pygmy Goat Association, to be acceptable by the Pygora Breeders Association. The ratio of Pygmy to Angora is not to exceed 75% of either parent breed. All Pygora goats must have fleece as described in the breed standard of the Pygora Breeders Association."

It is alarming to hear that there are some breeders calling their goats "pygoras", or some derivative word such as "piegora", when they are not animals conforming to the PBA breed standard. Use of the word Pygora is clearly misrepresentation when referring to an animal that is not the result of a cross-breed of registered AAGBA Angora and NPGA Pygmy goat stock. Any persons wanting to start their own goat breed are welcome to, but they are not welcome to use the term Pygora to refer to goats that do not meet the PBA breed standard.

Sincerely,

Katharine Jorgensen
PBA Founder

NAIS

THE NATIONAL ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

JUST THE FACTS, FOLKS

(AND THINGS TO THINK ABOUT)

Oregon Flock & Fiber Festival, September 23, 2006

Presenter, Melissa A. MacDougall, Gobhar Gnob Pygoras, mmacdougall@centurytel.net

Consultant, PBA Board Secretary Terri Naumann, Happy Hollow Homestead,
Happyhollowgoats@aol.com

I. Definition of the NAIS “National Animal Identification System”

- a. Initiated 2004 by USDA, designed as a partnership between State and Federal governments and livestock industry
- b. Includes all livestock, even horses
- c. Three components of NAIS:
 1. Premises identification

2. Animal identification
3. Animal tracking
- d. Defines premises as farm, clinic, including vet clinics, markets, shows, slaughter houses...

II. Goals of NAIS

Disease tracking: Health officials have access to a national database for diseases tracking, databases owned by private companies. Nothing in NAIS provides a plan for disease prevention, only tracking after the fact to notify public within 48 hours of outbreak, i.e., possible terrorist attack of deliberate disease attack on US livestock/food supply

III. Benefits According to USDA

National system to track disease, provide health officials with database to locate premises, type of premise, type of livestock, provide animal owners with info to improve disease control, improve production and add value to animals, "safety of national herd"

IV. Dates/Laws of implementation/Costs

- a. Currently, voluntary, although Wisconsin has already passed laws making portions of the NAIS a law for WI citizens
- b. Expected date of compliance 2008, although no enforcement or implementation rules are in place now
- c. States/Tribes will be responsible for administering and maintaining laws for premises; All premises and all animals, even one horse, will get a unique id number. Individual animal owners will pay for animal tags and 'reading' devices for each herd. Each animal permitted to have the most appropriate tag: for instances, horses not required to have ear tags, nor are LaMancha goats
- d. If animal never leaves premises, no need to id: however, this is misleading, because 'vets' are considered to be premises, so if you need to take an animal to the vet, you would need presumably to have that animal identified. Vets potentially, could refuse to allow a non-id animal on premises. Could impact those owners who so small scale that they cannot afford id system, don't have a traveling vet to come to their premises, only want to show one horse
- e. Costs: Government has invested \$18.8 million already, President requested \$33 million more. Expected that industry and the federal and state governments will share costs

V. Miscellaneous

- a. 2001 made the SCRAPIE program mandatory for sheep and goats according to the NAIS site: plans for SCRAPIE program to work with NAIS so those animals registered under one can be pulled in for the other system
- b. In July 2006, the USDA and the Pork Industry partnered together at the World Pork Expo to have livestock owners of pigs register premises and animals. Good response from Pork industry

Link: <http://animalid.aphis.usda.gov/nais/index.shtml>

Other sites: www.nonais.org, www.stopanimalid.com, <http://www.survivalblog.com/nais.html>

Contact Federal/State Legislators: <http://www.vote-smart.org/index.htm>

USDA – National Animal Identification System
Guidance for Non-Commercial Producers
The National Animal Identification System:
A Guide for Small-Scale or Non-Commercial Producers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, June 2, 2006

INTRODUCTION

The National Animal Identification System (NAIS) is a cooperative State-Federal-industry partnership to standardize animal identification programs and practices of all livestock species

and poultry. NAIS is a voluntary program where producers and stakeholders are invited to participate in the program to test the system and offer feedback to help ensure that a practical, cost-effective, and reliable program is developed. Premise registration, animal identification and the reporting of animal movements are essential for the rapid tracing of animals during a disease outbreak.

USDA encourages all producers to participate in NAIS. However, USDA is sensitive to the challenges faced by small-scale or non-commercial producers. In recognition of these challenges, USDA has developed this document to better explain what this program is and is not. USDA continues to seek and receive feedback and recommendations from all producers as we determine, along with States and industry, how we will proceed with the system. We encourage stakeholders to make suggestions about NAIS by contacting the working group(s) for the species of animal(s) they raise. The working group information is on the left side of the NAIS Web page (www.usda.gov/nais); under “Browse by Audience” click the “Select a Working Group” dropdown button. Stakeholders can also submit comments to a particular working group via e-mail at animalidcomments@aphis.usda.gov. Please include the species name and the term “working group” in the subject line of your e-mail.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

- The purpose of the NAIS is to protect U.S. agriculture by enhancing our emergency response capabilities. The system will enable us to address urgent animal health concerns as quickly and effectively as possible.
- Participation in the NAIS is voluntary. First and foremost, USDA wants to build a cooperative system that is valuable to all producers and that producers want to be a part of. There are no enforcement mechanisms or penalties related to the NAIS.
- Household pets (e.g., cats and dogs) are not covered by the NAIS.
- The NAIS covers only cattle and bison, cervids (e.g., deer and elk); goats; horses; camelids (e.g., llamas and alpacas); poultry; sheep; and swine.
- The focus of NAIS is animal health, primarily within the commercial animal production sector in which animals move from their birthplace to a subsequent location(s) over the animal’s life cycle. USDA’s NAIS efforts will largely focus on commercial operations and animals at such locations due to their higher risk of spreading diseases among multiple locations and for greater distances.

Premises:

- USDA encourages all owners of animals covered by the NAIS to register their premises.
- In all States, premises registration is currently free.

Animal identification and tracking:

- If your animals never leave the farm of birth or are only moved for custom slaughter for personal consumption, you will not be asked to identify them or report their movement.
- Animal owners who choose to participate in the animal identification and tracking components of the NAIS, are not expected to report all animal movements. For instance, taking your animal on a trail ride with a neighbor or moving livestock from pasture to pasture within your operation pose a low risk of spreading disease, and therefore, are not reportable.
- Reportable movements are those that involve a high risk of spreading disease, such as moving livestock from a farm to an event where a large numbers of animals are brought together from many sources.
- USDA will not track animals in real-time. USDA has no interest in knowing where animals are all of the time. Data concerning animal movements and locations will be held in multiple, secure databases managed by private organizations and state animal health authorities.
- USDA will only request animal identification data to respond to an animal disease outbreak or other emerging animal health concern.
- USDA fully recognizes that NAIS must be practical and affordable for all sectors of

agriculture.

- For producers who choose to obtain official identification numbers/devices for their animals, the costs would vary depending on the number of animals and type of identification used. Some livestock are already identified as part of ongoing disease control programs, and USDA is working to incorporate those existing ID systems into the NAIS to minimize or eliminate any further costs to producers.
- Animal tracking databases will be privately held; we anticipate that producers who voluntarily choose to participate in the animal tracking component of NAIS will have various options and that competition between databases will help keep costs down.
- USDA is not mandating what technique or device should be used to identify animals. Appropriate means of identifying animals vary by species. What works for one species may not work for another. This is a decision best left to the producers themselves.
- Group/Lot ID is an option for animals that move as a group through the production chain (i.e., groups of pigs or chickens). USDA recognizes that tagging every individual animal is not always practical.
- The primary purpose of the NAIS is to enable rapid animal tracing and disease containment in the case of an animal disease outbreak or other emerging animal health concern among U.S. livestock and poultry. USDA will only request data and combine information from the databases when animal health officials need information to respond to such a disease outbreak or emerging animal health concern.

GUIDANCE FOR NON-COMMERCIAL PRODUCER PARTICIPANTS

The NAIS participation guidelines for small, non-commercial producers is based on how they manage (move, market, etc.) animals and the associated risk of disease exposure and spread.

Definition of Non-Commercial Producer

Under the NAIS, the following criteria describe non-commercial producers:

1. Individuals whose animals are not moved to auction barns or from their location to those of commercial producers.
2. Individuals whose animal movements are limited to those moved directly to custom slaughter; movement within a single producer's premises; local fairs and local 4-H events.

Guidance for Non-Commercial Producers

Premises Registration:

USDA encourages, but does not require, all livestock and poultry owners to register their premises with the animal health authority in their State, regardless of the size of their operations or the number of animals present at the facility.

Voluntary registration of premises does not obligate producers to identify their animals or to report the premises-to-premises movement of their animals.

Animal diseases can affect producers of all sizes. Swift moving, highly contagious diseases such as highly pathogenic avian influenza and exotic Newcastle disease can harm small-scale producers as much as large-scale producers. Diseases can spread through a variety of sources — human contact, tainted food or water supplies, insects, airborne viruses, or migratory birds — and the number of animals, their source(s), the location of the event, and the health status and certification of animals all influence the potential for disease spread.

Animal Identification and Reporting Animal Movements:

Scenarios that would not call for animals to be identified and/or movements reported in the NAIS include:

- animals that never leave the farm/location of birth;
- animals moved from their birth premises directly to custom slaughter for personal use of the animal's owner;
- livestock moved from pasture-to-pasture within one's operation;
- participation in local fairs and parades;
- the local trading of birds among private individuals; and
- animals that "get out" and cross over into the neighbor's land.

Also, animals used for recreational purposes do not need to be identified if they are permanently cared for at their birth premises. Taking your animal on a trail ride with a neighbor would not be a reportable movement.

Comprehensive recommendations for identifying animals and reporting movements are in development in cooperation with the species-specific working groups and State-Federal animal health authorities.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR NON-COMMERCIAL PRODUCERS

1. Why should the small-scale producer care about NAIS? Isn't the only benefit to large-scale commercial producers and exporters?

Animal diseases can affect producers of all sizes. Swift moving, highly contagious diseases such as highly pathogenic avian influenza and exotic Newcastle disease can harm small-scale producers as much as large-scale producers. Based on these facts, we believe that all producers can benefit from a national animal identification system.

NAIS will allow animal health officials to quickly access information that is accurate and necessary to respond to disease situations. With the ability to know rapidly where animals are and which animals have moved recently, animal health officials can take the best actions possible to stop a disease's spread and alert producers — small and large — of what they can do to protect their animals.

Although APHIS' NAIS focus is on commercial operations, all producers are encouraged to register their premises.

2. If I raise animals for my own use (i.e., consumption), will I need to participate in NAIS?

If your animals never leave the farm of birth or are only moved for custom slaughter for personal consumption, you would not be asked under the Federal guidelines to identify them or report their movement. USDA encourages all owners of animals covered by NAIS to register their premises, regardless of the number of animals present, because many animal diseases (such as avian influenza, foot-and-mouth disease, and vesicular stomatitis) can be spread whether an animal leaves its home premises or not.

3. Will cats and dogs need to be included in the NAIS?

No. Household pets (e.g., cats and dogs) are not reportable to the NAIS.

4. Why should horses be included in NAIS?

NAIS is intended for use in responding to any highly contagious animal health concern among U.S. livestock and poultry. Horses can be infected with and transmit diseases of interest such as streptococcus equi (strangeles), equine infectious anemia (swamp fever), rhinopneumonitis (Herpes II), salmonellosis, and vesicular stomatitis, among many other diseases. NAIS could allow USDA to quickly contain and eradicate a disease before it spreads outside a given area.

5. Will NAIS require that all animal movements be reported? Will I have to record all trail rides and which properties I cross?

No. Recording all animal movements would not be practical, nor is that the intention with NAIS. Reportable movements under the NAIS would include movements with a high potential for spreading disease (i.e., movements where animals commingle with other animals). By recording the movement of animals as they come in contact with other animals, animal health officials will be able to quickly identify exposed animals and stop the spread of disease.

There are a number of factors that can influence whether an animal movement activity may pose a disease risk. Certainly, some events pose greater risk of disease transmission than others. The number of animals, their source(s), the location of the event, and the health status and certification of the animals, for example, all influence the degree of disease risk in a given situation.

For example, taking your animal on a trail ride with a neighbor or moving livestock from

pasture to pasture within your operation would pose a relatively low risk of spreading disease. It would be unnecessary from a disease standpoint to report all movements in such “low-risk” situations. If additional risk factors come into play, it would then be necessary to consider recording the animal movement. For example, if livestock are moved from a farm to a state or national exhibition—or other events with large numbers of animals from many sources—the possibility of spreading disease becomes a factor. These types of “high-risk” movements will be the priority to report.

State and Federal animal health officials are working with the NAIS working groups to develop recommendations for the specific types of movement that may pose a disease risk for each species and should be reported.

6. How could someone’s backyard animals be a “risk” to others?

Even animals that never leave the farm or have contact with other animals are at risk for catching and transmitting disease. Having a small number of animals can put you at risk of being impacted by a disease outbreak. Recent situations such as the 2002-2003 outbreak of exotic Newcastle disease in U.S. poultry show that backyard animals can serve as reservoirs for disease and contribute to disease spread. Thus, premises registration would help to reduce the risk of disease in backyard flocks.

7. What does the government plan to do with NAIS information? Who will use or have access to the NAIS data?

First, USDA will not be “tracking” animals in real-time. USDA has no interest in where all animals are all of the time. In fact, NAIS is designed in a way that ensures this will not happen. The information concerning animal movement and location data will be held in multiple, secure databases managed by private organizations and state animal health authorities. USDA will only request data and combine information from the databases when animal health officials need information to respond to an animal disease outbreak or other emerging animal health concern. This limitation will be explicitly outlined in the cooperative agreements with private database owners.

8. As a small-scale producer, what’s this going to cost me?

For all producers, the costs associated with NAIS will vary and are somewhat connected to their involvement with each of NAIS’ three parts: premises identification, animal identification, and the animal tracking databases.

In all States, premises registration is currently free. Many small producers may choose to participate only in the premises identification component. If so, NAIS would result in minimal to no expense for them. Other costs associated with NAIS only arise when a producer voluntarily chooses to identify individual animals or groups of animals.

For producers who choose to apply official identification numbers/devices to their animals, the costs would vary with the number and type of animal identification used. Some livestock already require identification for disease control purposes, and USDA is working to incorporate existing ID systems into NAIS. Animals identified under such existing systems may not bring additional costs for some producers.

Because the animal tracking database infrastructure is still being developed, and it is to be privately held, it is difficult to discuss costs for this part of NAIS with any accuracy. But, because these will be privately held databases, we anticipate that producers will have various options and that competition among databases will help keep costs down. Again, these costs would only apply to those producers who voluntarily choose to participate in an animal tracking database.

9. How is participation with the NAIS being enforced?

Participation in the NAIS is voluntary. First and foremost, USDA wants to build a cooperative system that is valuable to all producers and that producers want to be a part of. There are no enforcement mechanisms or penalties related to the NAIS.

10. USDA has stated that, if regulations become necessary to increase participation in the

NAIS, it would follow “normal rulemaking procedures” and “provide an opportunity for public comment.” What does this mean?

Rulemaking is simply the process for making regulations. Most importantly, this process provides ample opportunity for the public to comment. During this period, the public has an opportunity to participate in the development of regulations by submitting comments on a proposed rule. These comments are submitted directly to USDA and help ensure that our process benefits from a variety of perspectives on a given issue before we make any final decisions.

11. Will NAIS require that all livestock animals be microchipped?

No. The rumor that USDA will require all animals — ranging from livestock to chicks — to have microchips is false.

With regard to the question of how an animal could be identified (i.e., ear tag, tattoo, microchip, leg-banding), USDA has remained neutral. On this point, we respect the needs of different producers and different species groups. We recognize that such questions should not be answered for producers; instead, such questions would best be resolved by producers themselves.

For more information about providing input to the NAIS species-specific working groups, see the introduction at the top of this document.

12. Will NAIS require that all animals to be tagged individually?

No. USDA realizes that tagging each and every animal individually would be unrealistic and impractical. Group/lot ID is an option for both large- and small-scale producers, depending on the circumstances, such as animals that move as a group through the production chain (e.g., groups of pigs or chickens). If a producer chooses to participate in the voluntary animal identification system for a group of animals and utilizes the group/lot identification method and later removes an animal from the group, that animal should then be identified individually. However, this would be the case with animals from any size farming operation, large or small.

13. Will NAIS put many small-scale producers out of business?

No. USDA believes strongly that small farms have an integral role in our country’s system of agriculture. USDA fully recognizes that NAIS must be practical and affordable for all sectors of agriculture. This continues to be a priority for USDA as we work with State officials and producers to develop the system in greater detail.

14. What does USDA mean when they say “national herd?”

USDA uses this term to refer to all agricultural animals in the United States. Being included in the “national herd” does not imply government ownership or control.

15. Why would global positioning satellite (GPS) coordinates be used to describe my premises? Could the government use NAIS to track me via satellite?

GPS coordinates are simply latitude and longitude and mark a location on a map. If there is no mailing address at your property, latitude and longitude can be used instead to describe your property location. This does not provide any GPS tracking capability of either animals or people living at your premises.

16. What about individuals’ religious freedoms?

As we make progress with developing NAIS, USDA is sensitive to individuals’ religious beliefs. On this topic, many individuals have provided comments to USDA and expressed concerns about the use of certain technologies, such as computers. USDA recognizes these concerns. We are respectful of these beliefs and are committed to ensuring that workable options are available to religious communities. Again, NAIS is a voluntary program; those who have objections to the program are not required to participate.

17. How is NAIS supposed to protect food safety? Isn’t testing rather than tracking of

livestock more effective in ensuring food safety?

The purpose of NAIS is not food safety. The United States already has a comprehensive system of food safety policies, testing, and inspection requirements in place to ensure the safety of our products. The primary purpose of the NAIS is to enable rapid animal tracing and disease containment in the case of an animal disease outbreak or other emerging animal health concern among U.S. livestock and poultry. The need for a uniform national animal identification system is warranted to enhance our animal disease programs and ensure that we have the response capabilities necessary to address urgent animal health concerns—as quickly and effectively as possible. Maintaining the health of the national herd supports consumer confidence that the food supply is safe.

18. USDA has said that many respondents are in favor of the NAIS. How were these comments received?

On May 6, 2005, USDA published a draft NAIS strategic plan and program standards in the Federal Register and requested public comments from all interested parties. These documents were developed over two years with extensive input from industry and others during USDA listening sessions held around the country. The drafts reflected a plan and offered a starting point for discussions on how to move forward with the implementation of NAIS. USDA received hundreds of comments and letters related to these postings. Many of the individuals who provided comments at the public meetings and in response to the published drafts expressed support for NAIS. USDA recognizes fully, however, that the system's development and success depends upon ongoing input from all U.S. producers.

* * *

Presenter's Note: The above document was obtained from the USDA's NAIS website. The contents of the document have not been altered, except to reformat type, paragraphs and headings. In the interest of space, page numbers and page headers were deleted.



Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

ANCHORAGE BELLEVUE LOS ANGELES NEW YORK PORTLAND SAN FRANCISCO SEATTLE SHANGHAI WASHINGTON, D.C.

CATHERINE MAXSON
DIRECT (206) 628-7720
CatherineMaxson@dwt.com

2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688

TEL (206) 622-3150
FAX (206) 628-7699
www.dwt.com

July 21, 2006

Ms. Peggy Tigner
Pygora/Colored Angora Goat Club and Registry
27861 Pine View Road
Brownsville, OR 97327

Dear Ms. Tigner:

I write on behalf of a group of breeders of Pygora goats (the “Pygora Breeders”) that are members of the Pygora Breeders Association (the “PBA”), an organization that was formed in 1987 and is dedicated to the advancement and well being of the Pygora goat. As the Pygora/Colored Angora Goat Club and Registry (the “PCA”) surely knows (given the specific references to the PBA and its breed standards on the PCA’s website), “Pygora” designates a very particular type of goat. The PBA has developed strict standards that goats must meet in order to be properly designated as belonging to the “Pygora” breed of goat.

It has come to the attention of the Pygora Breeders that the PCA is using the term “Pygora” to falsely and misleadingly describe the goats that are permitted on the PCA’s registry. Specifically, the PCA allows goats from the Colored Angora Goat Breeders Association (the “CAGBA”) to appear on the “Pygora/Colored Angora Goat” registry, even though goats from the CAGBA do not meet the standards of the Pygora breed. In other words, PCA is misleadingly and deceptively allowing goats with CAGBA goats in their pedigree to be labeled “Pygora” goats. Not only is your use of the term “Pygora” likely to confuse consumers as to the nature of the goats on the PCA’s registry, but it will also harm the ability of the term “Pygora” to designate a particular type of goat.

July 21, 2006

Page 2



The PCA's use of the term "Pygora" in association with goats that are not "Pygora" goats constitutes a violation of Section 43(a) of the federal Lanham Act, *see* 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), and the Pygora Breeders request that you immediately cease and desist from further usage of the term "Pygora" in connection with goats that do not meet the Pygora breed standards. Please provide written confirmation that the PCA has indeed ceased such use by August 2, 2006.

Sincerely,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Catherine Maxson".

Catherine Maxson

CM:djh