

2015 The 78th Annual Beagle Advisory Committee Meeting

The teleconference meeting was called to order at 10:00am on Wednesday, June 3rd.

Mel Stewart called role. All members were present except Max Huett and Jim Campbell

Mel then introduced the AKC staff in attendance. They included Jim Odle and Robert Oliver, AKF Field staff, Karen Reuter, and Dawn Salpeck Performance Events Operations Staff and Doug Ljungren, V.P. of Sports & Events.

Mel Stewart and Doug Ljungren welcomed and thanked the committee members.

The sport trends were reviewed.

Format	2013 Trials	2013 Entries	2014 Trials	2014 Entries	Change in Trials	Change in Entries
Brace	298	14,068	281	13,003	-17	-1065
Gun Dog Brace	65	6,291	68	6,682	+3	+391
Large Pack	67	5,588	67	5,442	0	-146
Small Pack	17	460	11	373	-6	-87
Small Pack Option	290	24,770	285	24,840	-5	+70
Two Couple Pack	58	4,324	64	5,076	+6	+752
Total	795	55,501	776	55,416	-19	-85

Mel: We have a few items to be voted on this year. The first one is a proposal that John Edwards made last year, moving the requirement for the second advanced seminar to the end of 2018 instead of the end of 2016.

John Edwards: I would like to amend the proposal to making it an option of a club.

Russ Arend: I would second John's proposal.

Mel: Just to clarify what the proposal is and to make sure what we are all voting on: In regards to second advanced seminar, make it an option of a club and not making it mandatory.

John Edwards: Do away with the second seminar.

Mel: You still have to take one seminar, but John you are talking about from the second one on correct?

John Cable: If we vote on this that means there is no more advanced seminar ever, unless somebody comes along and says we have to do it again.

Wayne Heckley: Not that I am not in favor of it, but we are basically gutting the advanced seminar, the whole idea was that it was going to be a refresher right? So our veteran judges were going to get this refresher and bring up any new topics and with our experience we are saying its not needed anymore, which I don't think it has been that fruitful so I kind of agree.

Russ Arend: I still need clarification, lets say somebody takes the basic seminar for the first time this month? Will they still be required to take the first advanced seminar sometime in the next five years? What would happen with that?

Mel: Yes, they would because everybody is required to take one advanced seminar. The easiest way is to remember every judge is required to have a basic seminar and one advanced, and then from the second one on, we are not requiring that unless a club requests it.

If there is no more discussion lets vote on it, yes means you are voting for doing away with the second advanced no means you want to keep it:

Jessica Anderson	Yes
Bob Kimber	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
John Edwards	Yes
Russ Arend	Yes
Wayne Heckley	Yes
John Stuckwisch	Yes
John Cable	Yes
Bryan Bush	No
Ray Ann Cole	Yes
Rick McDonald	Yes

Yes 10, No 1

Mel: Ok this vote will be reflected in the book. Moving on to the second item to be voted on. Let me give you some background. We have a lot of people that are serving as a field trial secretary or chairman of the committee that really do not understand the rule as far as it pertains to misconduct. We would like your input on either requiring a field trial secretary or chairman of the committee, one of those two at least, have a record of attending a basic clinic where we cover everything. Any comment on this? (There were no comments)

Let's go down the list and vote on that:

Yes means that you are in favor of either a field trial secretary or the chairman of the committee to successfully attend and pass the basic rules seminar.

Jessica Anderson	No
Bob Kimber	Yes
Robert Miller	No
John Edwards	No
Russ Arend	Yes
Wayne Heckley	Yes
John Stuckwisch	Yes
John Cable	No
Bryan Bush	Yes
Ray Ann Cole	Yes
Rick McDonald	Yes
Yes 7, No 4	

That has passed.

Mel: Max Huett and Jim Campbell have now joined the meeting

Mel: The third item to be voted on brings us to something that has been talked about for many years, the Grand Field Champion title. Mel read the following statement. Two years ago the BAC voted in favor of creating a GFC title. The title would be awarded by accumulating points earned in new classes restricted to FCs only. There is concern that participation in these FC only classes at local trials would not be large enough to justify their creation. An alternative way for a hound to earn a GFC title would be to accumulate points in the existing Open stakes. A dog would be awarded the GFC title if it earned enough points/placements to be a “double FC.” It is becoming more common for FC dogs to be run in the existing local trials. Clubs may, at their option, restrict their Open stakes to FCs only.

As you know, Purina has changed their top dog calculation to use the same system that AKC does in creating a field champion. A lot of field champions are now running, chasing those awards, so that would be a good way to figure the Grand Field Champion.

Does BAC support this approach or are there any conditions you would like to add?

Wayne Heckley: If I had my preference I would leave things the way they are, but if we are going to do a GFC, I agree it should be something extra. However the idea of a field champion finishing twice and calling it a grand field champion, my federation is not really in favor of it. To me the acknowledgment should be in line with the accomplishment. If somebody finishes field champion twice we should acknowledge them as a double field champion and if they finish three times it’s a triple field champion, they just did the same thing over again. This title GFC should be as this thing is stated, something addition, but I don’t believe it will be practical so my preference would be to leave it as it is.

Doug Ljungren: We could do field champion two or three.

Mel: Yes it’s just the terminology of it, as Doug just said we could put that on the certificate.

Russ Arend: In talking to a lot of the brace beaglers about this, there is really not much interest. I think some that are interested are concerned that to be a grand field champion you have to have two wins

and so many points. A lot of our field champion trials are very small, there is only seven total at this time, and the guys who have field champions that I have talked to have expressed no interest. Also, we discourage through pressure people not to run their field champions in regular trials and that has been that way for years because they think it takes away from other people that are competing for a field champion by losing those points. So I just passed that on, I am not opposed to it because it would be optional but do you have any thought in mind in terms of number of points and wins it would take to become a grand field champion, have you outlined any of the basics yet?

Mel: Originally in 2013 the figures mentioned was two wins and 90 points to become a grand field champion. The points could be whatever the committee thinks is appropriate in that regard. I think if you did have a chance to bring some of these field champions out it would actually it would help some entries.

Wayne Heckley: Does that mean we would have to license field champion trials?

Mel: In the regular open classes at licensed trials, if you run a field champion and you accumulate enough points/wins, you would be awarded a GFC. You could make that a field champion only trial if you wanted to restrict it just to field champions. So both would count towards becoming the grand field champion.

Russ Arend: In our six federations we have these six championship trials. I think the question was would those trials have to be licensed to participate in the program?

Mel: Yes

Russ Arend: So the question would be that in addition to the entry fee they would have to increase it up enough to pay for \$3.50 per dog?

Mel: Yes that is correct, it's strictly an option if the mid-west federation did not want to license their field champion trial they would not have to. So it's strictly an option

Bryan Busch: Sometimes we have a guy that will make field champion in March and to try to win the mid-west high hound, they keep running that dog all year long. Now at the same time other guys might have a female maybe to breed her and they don't keep running that dog. If they took the same points to make a field champion that dog would have made grand or double if they had a title like that. If you want to be the best you have to be the best.

Rick McDonald: If the UBGF decided to hold a field champion trial that would have to be licensed to give points towards a grand field champion is that correct?

Mel: Yes, that is correct.

Rick McDonald: Would that be limited to just field champions or could anybody enter?

Mel: That is up to the club.

Max Huett – We run a field champion class not licensed. We run in spring and fall at licensed trials in addition to licensed classes and everybody enjoys it. They all bring their field champions, we auction them off and handlers and owners and people get to bid and win a few dollars and its has been a good event for us.

Robert Miller: I think the grand field champion is a good idea if it's done right. First of all I think any club should be allowed to hold a trial for champions not just those club that are aligned with the federation trial. Secondly I believe that the title should be attainable but not a giveaway, and third I would ask that points be awarded the same as licensed trials for example one point for first, ½ a point for second etc. I think two first places and 25 points would be fair requirement and I also think there should be a minimum of six entries same as a licensed trial now. I think 90 points is too much to require if you want to allow these dogs a chance to get this title.

Mel: The range that we have is from 25-120. I think 25 is way too low but all good comments.

Bryan Busch: If you were going to call it a double field champion, do it the same way that you attain the points for a field champion.

Mel: That would be the easiest way under the current system of tallying these scores and keeping up with it would be same way as field champion.

John Edwards: Would a secretary have to make an application for that to get a number to run these events?

Mel: If your federation decided they wanted a licensed their field champion trial they would have to obtain a number. It does not have to be a federation, it could be any club. We are giving an option to local clubs as well as the federations. If your local beagle club wants to have a field champion only trial at a licensed event toward a GFC title, then you can do that.

Doug Ljungren: Max, were you talking about having an Open Stake at your trial and in addition at the same trial having a field champion stake?

Max Heutt: Yes, we run it on a day before or the day after our regular classes.

Doug Ljungren: So if that is what a club wanted to do, they can do that, but they would use up one of their two trials with a field champion only.

Wayne Heckley: I think that is a deal breaker.

Mel: It's still required to hold one a year with AKC they have an option for a second one if you ran all field champion stake that would be one of your two trials that you are allowed in a year. The only requirement is, is that you have to have one licensed trial a year.

Mel: The first vote would be do we want to have the Grand Field Champion at all? Yes means we agree there should be a grand field champion title and we still have to work out the details and no means we don't want a grand field champion:

Jessica Anderson	Yes
Max Huett	Yes
Bob Kimber	No
Jim Campbell	Yes
Robert Miller	No
John Edwards	No
Russ Arend	No
Wayne Heckley	No
John Stuckwisch	Yes
John Cable	No
Rick McDonald	No
Bryan Bush	Yes
Ray Ann Cole	Yes

6 Yes to 7 It did not pass

Mel: We will drop the Grand Field Champion idea at this point. Anything anybody wants to bring up?

John Stuckwisch: At the present time in two couple pack trials, if the classes are divided into two divisions, it is possible since a hound may run in two different packs that they could run in two divisions. The rules states that the running order cannot be changed under any circumstances once the packs have been drawn except when a pack contains the same hound must be run at the same time in both divisions. A pack that cannot be run in order without causing delay in the trial now it says is dropped to the end of that division. I would like to change that to read may either be dropped to the end of the running order in that division or it may be moved down to the earliest position in that running order of that division. This gives clubs an option and then also the procedure would be followed once announced at the beginning of the trial.

Mel: He is speaking about a 2 couple pack. I do not see a problem with that, if the local club wants to handle it that way.

So your proposal is if they run it at the same time in different divisions then you either drop them to end or works them in as soon as possible.

John Stuckwisch: That is correct

Mel: Any more discussion on that? Do you want to make that into a proposal? I will entertain a second.

John Stuckwisch: Yes I would like to propose this.

Jim Campbell: I second the proposal.

Mel: Let's vote: Yes means ok to do and no means to keep it like it is:

Jessica Anderson	Yes
Max Huett	Yes

Bob Kimber	Yes
Jim Campbell	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
John Edwards	Yes
Russ Arend	Yes
Wayne Heckley	Yes
John Stuckwisch	Yes
John Cable	Yes
Rick McDonald	Yes
Bryan Bush	Yes
Ray Ann Cole	Yes

Yes 13 - 0 No

Mel: Ok that will be changed in the next printing of the book. Anything else someone wants to bring up?

Bob Kimber: One of the federations that I represent is the International Beagle Federation. That federation is made up of 17 associations that compromise of 130 beagle clubs. Less than a month ago they held their annual meeting and the delegates voted unanimously to support changes that would enable the futurity and derby trials at brace federations to become AKC licensed trials. Stan Peterson has written a letter to Mel Stewart and Doug Ljungren. We believe being able to obtain licensed trial points at federation derby and futurity championships would really helped turn the entries around. We believe the beagling public would gladly pay an increased entry fee at the events to cover the AKC fees for the opportunity to earn licensed trial points. We hope this concept can be worked out because it could be the shot in the arm that brace beaglers need and I know Mel Stewart and Stan Peterson worked out some changes for the AKC National Gundog Brace Championship and now that trial is a tremendous success. We hope this can be achieved for the Brace Federation as well. Thank you for the opportunity to bring this up.

Mel: Thank you. I did get the letter.

Doug Ljungren: I have a question, what are the qualifications for the futurity?

Bob Kimber: Both the futurity and derby are certain age eligibility. There are no nominations; it's strictly by when you are born. A futurity is one year older then the derby. There is 12 month time period that a dog is derby, for the following 12 months that is when that dog is a futurity. We think because we are at the federation level that is reasonable and worthwhile to expect the licensed trial point. This would be for derbies held at a major federation.

Wayne Heckley: So the large pack international beagle futurity is a big trial. It's a very celebrated event. That the dog is a futurity if he turns 2 on that calendar year. I am not sure if there would be any interest in turning that into a licensed trial, maybe, that would be it would be a big change.

Bob Kimber: That is why I brought it up for the Brace Federation because I know we have different definitions with derby's and futurities then some of the other ones.

Mel: For the sake of fairness, this option would need to be available for all formats and there would need to be a common definition for derby/futurity. We will need to look at it across the board because all formats run derbies/futurities. If you are going after the same title it's hard to let one group do something and let another group not do it. In all cases your individual federations would have an option whether you wanted to make it a licensed event or not.

Jim Campbell: If you go license a derby trial then you are going to get a lot of pressure that people with dogs of all ages are going to want to enter. That is going to be a headache. I think derby should be derby and licensed events all age hounds alone. Why would you want allow all age hounds to enter a derby trial? Then it's no longer a derby trial.

Mel: If you are going after the same title it's hard to let one group do something and let another group not do it.

This is a serious question across the board. It's a situation that needs to go back to the beaglers and let it come back next year. IF derby stakes are going to be licensed, they need to be across all formats and there would need to be an agreed upon age for a derby to be eligible. As far as AKC is concerned it would be an option if a club or a federation wanted license the stake.

Wayne Heckley: I do believe a lot of these things are very well intended as optional but the fact is that there will be tremendous pressure. We have very nice field champion only trials that are sanctioned events that are fun. There would be strong pressure to make them licensed trials. It's not as optional as it sounds.

Russ Arend: I have a comment. I understand that the other venues do not have the same kind of problems as the brace trials. But I can tell you in the next three years, if we can't make some adjustment; our federations are going to be over. These guys are not going to drive 1000 miles anymore to go to these federations if we don't license them. We have a serious, serious problem with our sport. I go to most of the federations and I get more people approaching me about that than any other subject. I would hate to see things voted out without time to think it through. The only thing we are saying is that we want some kind of a specialty event or something that allow certain things to happen. This is different for the brace people then it is for you guys. We need to do something.

Robert Miller: I would like to agree with what Russ said. I heard a lot of talk about this in the Northeast and I am in total agreement with his comments.

Mel: We are going to vote to put on the agenda next year and give all the beaglers time to do it and the only way at this time we can work it is if it's across the board because you cannot discriminate between them. The question is should derby stakes, at the club's option, be licensed by the AKC? Dogs could earn FC points at licensed derby stakes.

As I go down the list we are voting on whether to put this on the agenda to come back and vote on it next year as the beaglers discuss it: Yes means we will and no means we won't

Jessica Anderson	Yes
Max Huett	Yes
Bob Kimber	Yes
Jim Campbell	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
John Edwards	Yes
Russ Arend	Yes
Wayne Heckley	No
John Stuckwisch	Yes
John Cable	No
Rick McDonald	Yes
Bryan Bush	Yes
Ray Ann Cole	Yes

11 Yes - 2 No

So it will go on the agenda next year.

Jim Campbell: We talked about one time and it's been talked about several years about an NBQ Hound being awarded a point. Where are we on that?

Mel: That has come up a couple of times. If you change the NBQ there are about 8 rules in the book that has to be changed as it pertains to brace. One of the big ones being it says that all hounds that place have to run in the second series. Well in the brace world you cannot name NBQ after that and go on till you four placed hounds. . It's the only sport that has a 5th place or an NBQ. I think we should leave it like it is because it's not worth going through the rule book.

Jim Campbell: I understand what you are saying.

Mel: We tabled that last year to discuss this year. So if your proposal is to leave as is then need a second

Jim Campbell: I make the motion to leave it as is

Max Huett: I second the motion

Mel: Ok gentleman this is a vote to leave it like it is or go further and look into making 1/5 place a place. Yes means we going to leave it like it is a no means we are going to look at it further.

Jessica Anderson	Yes
Max Huett	Yes
Bob Kimber	Yes
Jim Campbell	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes

John Edwards	Yes
Russ Arend	Yes
Wayne Heckley	Yes
John Stuckwisch	Yes
John Cable	Yes
Rick McDonald	Yes
Bryan Bush	No
Ray Ann Cole	Yes

12 Yes – 1 No. We will leave it like it is

Anything else you want to bring up? The minutes will be published in the magazines and they are also posted on the AKC website

Wayne Heckley: At our federation we talk a lot about of the advertised judges not showing up for their scheduled judging assignments. I really have no proposal for that but it is a problem that its being handled way to casually by these judges. Is there anything the AKC can do to help us with that?

Mel: When someone cancels like that and it's not a legitimate excuse, Jim Odle writes a letter to each judge and they have to give us a response in writing.

Russ Arend: This brings up a good point when this happened many, many years ago when we were going through this back in the 70's, The AKC sent a letter to every field trial secretary to be read at the meetings and before the draw that laid out that if you agreed to judge a trial you were expected to be there. That turned things around.

Mel: That is a good idea.

Wayne Heckley: If that worked before I think that would be a good idea.

Mel: We can type up a letter and insert it in each packet that we send to the beagle trial secretary.

Russ Arend: Make sure it says it must be read before the drawings at your trials and every meeting.

Mel: Wayne let's try that. Great Idea Russ

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 am