## 2022 The 85th Annual Beagle Advisory Committee Meeting

The teleconference meeting was called to order at 10:00AM on Thursday June 16, 2022.

Jim Odle called role. All members were present.

Jim then introduced the AKC staff in attendance. The staff included Robert Oliver, Mel Stewart, Caroline Murphy, Susan Foote, Lisa King and Dawn Salpeck Performance Events Operations Staff and Doug Ljungren, E.V.P. of Sports & Events.

Jim Odle and Doug Ljungren welcomed and thanked the committee members.

The committee discussed trends within the sport.

Jim Odle: Let's start with the first item on the agenda:

Agenda Item #1 (Vote to be on 2023 Agenda)

Beagle Field Trial Awards

Change the award NBQ (which gets no points) to fifth place and award it one fifth of a point for each entry.

**Jim Odle:** This was brought up by Mr. Jim Campbell, Jim would you like to comment on this agenda item?

**Jim Campbell:** That is the request from the beaglers that their hounds are recognized in every other capacity besides getting a point and if they could get one point a 5<sup>th</sup> of a point for 5<sup>th</sup> place hound and do away with NBQ. Does that make sense?

**Jim Odle:** Yes, I understand the proposal. Let's canvas the group for comments, we are open for comments.

**Wayne Heckley:** We have voted this proposal down in previous meetings because it only serves to lower the standards for finishing a hound. I don't think any rule change that lowers the quality of our field champions is a good solution to any problem.

**Russ Arend:** The checking that I have done with several other people is that our people are not in favor of it, and it will cause a lot of confusion, and it's not necessary. We would say no, we would not go for that.

**Raye Ann Cole:** I do run both SPO and Gun Dog Brace and from an SPO standpoint I can see the point of this but from a Gun Dog Brace it does put issues in the current rule book in the way things are written because right now the NBQ hound can be named and that would no longer be applicable because 4<sup>th</sup> would have to run against 5<sup>th</sup> in this situation you are going to award points and I would think upon how the rule book is currently written so I think under Gun Dog Brace rules or under Brace rules it poses issues in under sections where the rule needs to be addressed unless I am missing something as well as in the situation that you bring back a defeated hound and you can only bring six dogs back and if your

high dog has been defeated by another dog you are going to have to flip your high brace on a loss in order to give the other dog a chance to move up. You would probably have to bring back eight dogs any time you brought back a defeated hound.

**Tim Beck:** I spoke to three federations each morning before the start of a trial. The people that were in the room are against it. Like Russ said it would present a lot of issues for the Brace beagler.

**Mark Malloy:** I polled a little over 200 people on a Facebook page dedicated to our region and it was roughly 5 to 1 in favor that is primarily SPO, but they were in favor 5 to 1.

**John Edwards:** Raye Ann brought up the point that I was thinking and the Brace venue it would defeat hounds it could complicate things so most of my folks representing the Mid Dixie were against this proposal.

**Doug Ljungren:** Should this be put on the agenda for next year for a final vote?

**Jim Odle:** We are going to vote on this item now to put on the agenda for next year, are you in favor or not in favor of putting on the agenda for 2023.

Jim Odle: The vote was 6 to 6, it was a tie. We will leave it on the agenda to be voted on in 2023.

(2023 Agenda Item)

**SECTION 5.** Awarding Championship Points. Field Championship points for Beagles shall be awarded only to hounds placing in licensed or member trials in Open Classes in which there were six or more starters. The championship points shall be awarded on the following basis: 1 point to the winner of first place for each starter; 1/2 point to the winner of second place for each starter; 1/3 point to the winner of third place for each starter; 1/4 point to the winner of fourth place for each starter. 1/5 point to the winner of fifth place for each starter.

## Procedure 4. Judging

4-B In all classes the Judges shall award places as follows: 1st, 2nd, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4th, and 5<sup>th</sup>, and after these places have been awarded the Judges shall designate the next best qualified hound as "N.B.Q." N.B.Q. is not a place and in case of disqualification of a placed hound at a licensed or member trial, the N.B.Q. hound shall not be moved up. However, the judges while still in the field have the authority to move up the hound they have selected as N.B.Q. if one of the hounds they are considering for a placement commits an action so faulty as to not warrant a placement.

**CHAPTER 4 RIBBONS, MONEY PRIZES, AND SPECIAL PRIZES SECTION 1.** A club holding a licensed or member field trial shall offer prize ribbons or rosettes of the following colors in the four regular classes: First prize—Blue. Second prize—Red. Third prize—Yellow. Fourth prize—White. N.B.Q. Fifth Place—Dark Green

For additional non-regular classes, a club holding a licensed or member trial shall offer ribbons or rosettes of the following colors: First prize—Rose. Second prize—Brown. Third prize—Light Green. Fourth prize—Gray. N.B.Q. Fifth Place—Orange.

**Doug Ljungren:** We do not implement a tie so next year we have to have a majority in 2023.

Jim Odle: Let's discuss agenda item number 2.

**Agenda Item 2:** (Vote to be on 2023 Agenda)

Outlining areas: IA, KS, OK, and TX – Should we allow clubs to have three field trials per year? The reason for that is because they are on the out fringes and not accessible to some people. We will have comments on the second agenda item.

In 2021 –
Iowa – 1 trial
Kansas – 1 trial
Oklahoma – 2 trials
Texas – 6 trials

**Doug Ljungren:** So, if you are beagler in this area and you get one trial you may not even choose to try the sport because you're not going to get the job done. The idea is to give them a couple more opportunities to run their dogs.

**Jim Odle:** Any comments from the committee?

**Tim Beck:** Could we just let that area of the country have three trials because where I represent the International Federation, which is large, they are negative towards that proposal, but I can see the need for that area of the country to have three trials.

**Doug Ljungren:** Yes, we go state by state if this were to pass.

James Coburn: It appears to me that Iowa and Kansas are not even using their two trials that they are allowed to have now. Is their only one club in Oklahoma that held three trials? It seems we are voting to allow them to have two trials which they are not even taking advantage of now.

**Jim Odle:** Not many comments, lets vote now on whether or not this item will be placed on the agenda for next year. 7 no and 5 yes. This will not be considered in 2023 and not placed on the agenda.

Jim Odle: Lets discuss the next item on the agenda:

**Agenda Item 3:** (*Vote to add/not add to Rules*) PROCEDURE 3. MEASURING. 3-D (to be added)

The contact bar shall be loosely placed across the shoulder blades at the highest point, the hound standing in a naturally alert position with the head up but not stretched upward and with its feet well under it and forelegs vertical on a flat, level board with a non-slip surface including wood, concrete or tile, placed at floor or ground level.

The reason we are putting that in there is a lot of areas club houses, they have a concrete pad or a porch it seems absurd to have judges go get the board to measure these hounds on a good surface ground level so that would eliminate the board for those surfaces the board will still be required for the dirt measuring. Any comments:

**Wayne Heckley:** I don't understand why it's necessary if the rules already say it's a non-slip surface do, we really need to list what a non-slip surface is?

**Jim Odle:** It's assumed by the judges, measuring committees and large pack arena they use the board even on a level surface and this would be clarifying that to allow them to use wood, concrete or tile.

Wayne Heckley: It just doesn't seem necessary to me if you say non-slip then that's what it means.

John Edwards: There is nowhere in here it says anything about a board, I am not seeing the issue.

James Coburn: I can agree I don't see the issue, but I have not been to a 2CP pack or Gun Dog Brace trial in the last ten years where they didn't lay a piece of board on top of level concrete. There is definitely a communication issue and the standards I see everywhere I go to is that you use the board even on a flat surface so I feel like maybe it does need to be clarified that it's not needed.

**Jessica Anderson:** Is it possible that people are trying to eliminate grass or driveway, maybe somebody would not consider that non-slip it certainly wouldn't make for great measuring.

Jim Odle: Well, it's still going to be required for unlevel surfaces including all dirt measuring.

**Jessica Anderson:** Right, so I was just wondering if we are just trying to eliminate that someone new to a trial would think that grass or concrete driveway are non-slip and equate that to be ok to measure on.

**Russ Arend:** I go to about 18 to 20 trials a year and I have seen no problem there has always been a board there. In our case this is not a problem.

**Jim Campbell**: I agree with Russ, and I don't see a problem with the board. Most of the time when we find at the beagle clubs the concrete slabs, they are not level. Most of us that have attended them know that. I recommend we continue using the board for the measurement of the hound.

**Jim Odle:** It reads it has to be flat, level, non-slip.

**Rick McDonald:** I am agreeing with Jim Campbell on this and that is if it ain't broke let's not fix it. Everybody knows what we are supposed to do and I think we continue to do what we are doing because we are not having problems with it.

Raye Ann Cole: Now I am confused. The rule book is written that if I have a level concrete pad on our porch and I measure dogs on it and the way the rule book is written now technically you could not document us for that, is that a correct statement? Even though we have historically used the board because that has been precedent the way the rule book is written currently do I have to use a board if it's level?

**Jim Odle:** Yes, it says board in the rule book, all we would be doing is eliminating the board on a flat level surface regardless of what it was.

**Raye Ann Cole:** OK so this rule would propose taking the word board out.

Jim Odle: Yes.

**Wayne Heckley:** Really what we are doing is changing the word board for surface? I don't think there is a need define what a flat level surface is. I would replace boards with surface.

**Tim Beck:** I measure hundreds of hounds that have always been on a board, I think if you take away the board and measure on non-slip surface and someone measures a couple of hounds don't you think some of those owners you might open a can of worms for complaints on the measuring. You might cause future problems especially if you measure a hound out.

**Jim Odle:** If a hound measured out on a flat level surface, he measures out it would be the board or the floor.

**Dale Pliscott:** We have always used the board, what is the problem with getting the board? We have a cement block, but we put a board on it. It saves the judges from getting the board, how big of a deal is it for a judge to get the board? Why do we have to change it now?

**Jim Odle:** We are going to vote now.

Jim Odle: The vote was 2 in favor and 10 not in favor. We will leave it alone.

Jim Odle: Next item on the agenda to discuss.

**Agenda Item 4**: (*Vote to add/not add to Rules*)

The premium list and event advertising must also state that judges may be mounted on horseback if the club plans to use horses.

PROCEDURE 4. JUDGING. 4-D (new, current drops own) <u>The premium list and event advertising must also state that judges may be mounted on horseback if the club plans to use horses.</u>

CHAPTER 3 MAKING APPLICATION TO HOLD A FIELD TRIAL, SECTION 4. Advertising. Clubs may only advertise corresponding dates, locations and stakes, plus club contact information, prior to an event receiving AKC approval. Clubs may not advertise and event prior to AKC approval if the dates or location differ from the previous year's corresponding event. Premium lists cannot be made available nor can entries be accepted until the event and judges panel have been approved by the AKC. The premium list and event advertising must also state that judges may be mounted on horseback if the club plans to use horses.

**Jim Odle:** That is to let the public know that some people, their dogs might be afraid of horses. A lot of clubs now are using horses, and all this is saying is that if they are going to use horses put it on the premium and it would be approved by the American Kennel Club.

**Wayne Heckley:** I have no problem with the proposal except I don't think I would put it under judging I would put it under the management where you talk about the advertising.

**Tim Beck:** I think parts of the sport that uses horses, the divisions I think they should be the ones that vote on this because brace beagling we have no need for horses. I think the representatives on this call if they uses horses or SPO, Gun Dog Brace that they should decide this.

**Doug Ljungren:** That makes sense.

**Dale Pliscott:** I don't see any need for Brace beaglers to have a horse, all of us are 90 years old and they would have to get somebody to help them up on a horse. I would not want to see that in our brace trials.

**Jessica Anderson:** Most of our judging does take place at the National Beagle Club on horseback but we do a special triple challenge and we let the people know that horses will be present. I think it's a great idea. If you have a hound that has not been around horses or cattle I have seen them, get spooked. I think it is important you tell people for the sake of the hound.

**Jim Campbell:** I think it's important people be told and I don't want to misconstrue that the clubs are responsible for horses for judges.

**Jim Odle:** No, that is not what we are talking about. We are talking about if the judges are going to use horses, then they would note in their premium and any advertising they would mention that the judges might be on horseback.

Raye Ann Cole: I have one question. Let's say that a club when it publishes its original premium list, does not plan on allowing horseback maybe they cannot allow horseback where they were going to run. Then something happens from the time they file their premium list to the time they actually hold an event, and they have to relocate and based on that relocation they now have the ability to use horses and maybe they want to use horses at that point and it's like two weeks before trial and they are having to use social media to advertise to post that the trial is being moved to a new location. Will that club be penalized, or will they not be allowed to use horses if something like that happens?

**Jessica Anderson:** If you're not sure you are going to use horses why not advertise anyway that there might be horses to cover it either way.

**Raye Ann Cole:** I would agree that is what I would do. I am just filling out the scenario like what happens to a club if they get into that situation?

**Doug Ljungren:** You have to announce it before the closing of entries that the judges will be mounted on horseback that will give people the chance to pull their hounds in case they don't want to run.

**Jim Odle:** We are going to vote on this now and excuse our brace friends because they are not concerned with it. We will let the SPO, Gun Dog Brace, Large Pack and 2CP pack people vote on this.

**Jim Odle:** 8 voted yes, so this passed and we will implement that right away.

**Jim Odle:** I want to bring up something else that has been brought to our attention. Right now, 30 days is required between field trials for a club. It's been brought up with the cost of gas to get a lot of people

there the club would be exempt from the 30 day and have two trials back-to-back. We are asking for you comment regarding two trials in four days if they wanted to. Please provide feedback in regard to eliminating the 30-day waiting period.

**Ray Anne Cole:** I would be for it. There are a lot of clubs trying to do special promotions and in certain areas this would be beneficial.

**Mark Malloy:** In our area I would be totally against it. We have so many trials and if a club holds one trial this week it would take away from the other trials in the area the support would not get spread around. I am against it.

Jim Odle: A club could have two field trials in four days, the same club on the same grounds.

Jim Campbell: Then we would get on somebody else's date. You're not going to get the support for that. We have problems now in the deep south finding dates to run a trial and to do that it would compound some problems, I can see. We talk about watering down field champions or dogs and then we keep compounding trials like this where are we going with this? We are not getting the participation in the trials.

**Jim Odle:** Our thinking was that they would get more participation, especially clubs isolated, if they could get more people their to run their dogs two times.

**Tim Beck:** In my area there are only five clubs using four classes, everybody has gone to the combined field trial, and I can see where a lot of clubs would run a combined trial on Saturday and a combined trial on Sunday back-to-back and have no problem with it, I cannot see anything wrong with that, waiving a 30 day rule.

Ray Ann Cole: I want to throw a scenario out there from the Gun Dog world to you that is that the point that some of these remote areas I know in the state of Wisconsin right now there is a club that was waived in because they had their trial dates, they have a limited trial schedule to begin with because of their conditions in Wisconsin and they have three or four clubs that have joined together and are running a weeklong event and it's drawing dogs out of state they wouldn't normally get. From that standpoint that is where I am coming from, from the fact that I'm not saying jump on somebody else's date because you are r still going to have the rule that you can't be within so many miles. There are situations up there where clubs can join together or a single club can do something where they are trying to promote one weekend where you are only trying to get a kitchen crew for a weekend type event seems to be a lot of excitement of what they are trying to do in Wisconsin. That is one of the reasons why I am in favor of it.

James Coburn: It really doesn't affect the 2CP much, but I can tell you we have been trying to encourage clubs to combine with other clubs and have 2 2CP the same weekend and lot of it is due to the expense of hotel, driving and everything else. I can tell you that with our entries a weekend where you have two 2CP contests on same weekends our entries are 40% higher than they are if I were to drive to SC for a trial.

Mark Malloy: For outlining areas like Wisconsin even Texas and Oklahoma I think in those areas it makes sense but to Jim's point if we implement this rule like in the deep south you are really compounding a real problem and entries are suffering because if you have a club that will have two trials back to back these guys bounce around in support of other clubs, if we implement this rule it would devastate the rest of the deep south, the state of Pennsylvania. I think this thing needs to be amended and almost to

the point like to the outlining areas, the places where they don't have opportunity but if you do it in the beagling hot beds it will hurt the club themselves.

**Jim Odle:** Remember Mark this will be optional.

**John Edwards:** It is optional, and it depends on what that club can do and what that club can support. I think making it optional is a good thing.

**Wayne Heckley:** Will this be going on the agenda? If we are voting on it now, I would not have the feedback.

**Jim Odle:** We would be voting whether to put this on the agenda for next year. You will have a year to get feedback.

Jim Odle: 11 to 1, it will be on the agenda in 2023.

(2023 Agenda Item)

CHAPTER 3 MAKING APPLICATION TO HOLD A FIELD TRIAL. SECTION 3. A licensed or member club may hold up to two licensed field trials in a calendar year. provided the second trial is at least 30 days from the last day of the first trial.

**Jim Odle:** Do any of you have any suggestions for the agenda for 2023 meeting? Any issues or items you want to discuss?

**Jessica Anderson:** I am finishing my 10<sup>th</sup> year as President; it appears that Joan Barrett will take my place next year. This will be my last meeting. I look forward to welcoming Joan. Joan will take over in November.

Doug Ljungren: Thank you Jessica for your time on the BAC.

**Wayne Heckley:** Regarding multiple format titles, I received feedback about people who have finished their dog in large pack and want to finish in small pack and the rules are clear how you get that first title, but the algorithm used to determine that is not stated and that causes questions and confusion. What I am asking is not to change a rule but for AKC to be more forthcoming as to what does it take to get that second title. It could be done several ways. It needs to be documented better.

Jim Odle: Thank you everyone for participating on this call.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00AM.