

Minutes of the Carolina PBGV Club, 11/19/11, Old Stone Vino Restaurant, Kannapolis, NC.

Meeting called to order at 7 pm.

In attendance:

Mary Fluke

Paul Urban

Zack & Heather Helmer 328 Cherry Lane, Queenstown, MD 21658
zhelmer@atlanticbb.net (guests)

Lynn Rowell

Jenni Easter (guest)

Shirley Van Camp

Bobbe Jackson

Wendy Murphy

Ginger Russell

Diann Shannon

Ralph Hattox

Susan Hattox

Minutes from the last meeting were read and accepted with 2 corrections:

Hunt Report—dates of upcoming hunt are February 24-26, 2012

Health Clinics—profit per dog for echo clinic is set at \$15 per dog.

President's Report:

Ginger re-introduced herself to the club. She reminded us of all the great accomplishments of the last 6 years: matches/AKC licensure/hunts/health clinics/...and (oh yeah) the National/Regional Specialties. She considers the role of the president to be to preside over meetings but that the actual running of the club is done by the board which represents the membership. For good function, the club needs structure and good communication. This past year has been a bit of a "break" for various reasons (burn out after the National effort, physical and mental absence of various people from club activities). Ginger anticipates a fresh start for us, with better communication and structure. We need to identify a new direction, to learn from the past but look to the future with a goal of figuring out how to meet the needs of the members, both those who come to meetings, and those who don't. Ginger pledges to do all that she can to make that happen.

Treasurer's Report

Wendy reported the club balance at \$4800. This includes a profit of about \$1000 from the last hunt. Mary asked if this balance included the preliminary deposits made for the health clinic. Wendy explained that the balance reported did not include anything from November as she generates treasurer's reports monthly—the most recent report is the same as what was included with the recently distributed October minutes.

Wendy reported that BB&T requires us to keep \$1500 as a minimum balance in order to continue to receive free checking but that this should represent no particular problem given our recent pattern of income and expense. The consensus was that the

advantages of using a bank that was accessible to multiple members (for purposes of making deposits) was enough to make up for the inconvenience of the minimum balance requirement.

Membership Report

In Ruth's absence, Wendy gave second readings for the following membership applications: Jim Lemons (Concord, NC), Nancy and Andy Metzger (Blowing Rock, NC), Karina and Russell Corey (Raleigh, NC), and Tim and Vickie Willmann (Marion, IN). Mary asked if the membership applications were for full or associate membership but this could not be determined from the available information. All four applications were voted on and accepted. We welcome our new 4 member households.

Wendy read a new application from Robert and Virginia Morris (Asheville, NC), members of PBGVCA, PBGV owners since 2001, 2 PBGVs, strong interest in hunting, sponsored by Ralph Hattox and Mary Fluke. The Morrises attended our last hunt weekend and participated in the NLE.

The group observed that the membership application form should be revised so that the applicant can more clearly indicate which type of membership is desired (full voting vs. associate).

Hunt Report:

Mary thanked everyone who helped at the last hunt and expressed the feeling that it was a very successful hunt. The lower number of rabbits was a difference from our previous experience but it made for a better hunt, better test of the dogs. Fewer dogs qualified, but those that did really earned it. We had AKC reps present (in response to the PBGVCA request for Parent Club Performance Title Recognition) who gave us good feedback.

Paul made an observation about the difficulty of judging so many runs and the need for more judges (in particular at our events, and in general in our hunt program).

Mary acknowledged that hospitality was a weak point at this hunt (mostly because she ended up doing the hospitality on the field)—it would be great if someone could come forward to take this job on with a goal of “middle of the road” approach, meaning somewhere between the minimalism of this hunt and the “full out cooking on the field” approach of the last couple of hunts.

We had to respond to a concern raised by a member of the NJ club about how a particular issue was handled at this hunt. Mary wrote a detailed report of the hunt in general which was forwarded to the chair of the PBGVCA hunt committee and the PBGVCA board (since they were copied on the original complaint). The report is attached as an addendum to these minutes. Mary observed that the silver lining to this episode was the realization that the decision making process of the hunt needed to be shared within the hunt committee in a more formal manner, not just on the field but also in the preparations and planning prior to the weekend.

Health Clinic:

Mary thanked everyone who helped put on the health clinics:

- Echo Clinic: Susan Thomas, Shirley Van Camp, Bobbe Jackson

- Health Clinic: Susan Thomas, Shirley Van Camp, Ralph Hattox, Paul Urban, Lynn Rowell, Jenni Easter, Ginger Russell, and Wendy Murphy

Preliminary figures show a profit of \$470 from the echo clinic and just under \$600 from the general health clinic for a total of about \$1000.

Mary asked to be relieved of the responsibility of co-ordinating the health clinics in future.

New Business:

Wendy has been working on an idea for partnering with the Epilepsy Foundation and other dog clubs for a “Dog Olympics” as a fund raiser to benefit the Epilepsy Foundation. A similar event has been held in Raleigh to benefit the vet school. Bobbe said that the GMKC and the Jack Russell Terrier Club have expressed interest in being involved. Wendy suggested October 2012 as a projected date. Bobbe said that 18-24 months might be more realistic for planning such an event. Wendy asked whether the club was interested in going forward with this project. Susan proposed that the club ask Wendy to continue to gather information to bring to the board so that a proposal could be developed to bring to the membership for consideration—consensus was to accept Susan’s suggestion.

Old Business:

Mary asked to open discussion on the proposal made at the last meeting to establish an annual donation of a minimum of 50% of the profit from the annual health clinics to PBGVCA Health and Rescue Foundation. Bobbe said that we shouldn’t make a commitment to this since we couldn’t always count on being as well funded as we are right now. Lynn noted that we will need to put on a specialty at some point in order to meet our requirements and that this would be expensive so we needed to build up funds. Wendy referenced a previous decision that we decide each year how much money if any to give to Health and Rescue and proposed that we give \$2000 out of current funds, half to Health, half to Rescue. Susan observed that we needed to be careful about how we decided to allocate money (who, where, when). Paul moved that we table the discussion and ask the board to consider the issue and develop a proposal to bring to the membership for review. The group accepted Paul’s recommendation.

Election:

The Nominating Committee reviewed the proposed slate of officers and board members: Ginger Russell (president), Ralph Hattox (vice president), Wendy Murphy (treasurer), Ruth Hoffman (secretary), Bobbe Jackson (board member).

(Bobbe replaces Lynn Rowell who finishes her term this year. Beverly Childs will continue on the board through 2012 and Mary Fluke will continue through 2013.)

The slate was approved as read by the membership.

Meeting adjourned at 8 pm.

Minutes submitted by Mary Fluke, DVM.

Addendum
October 2011 Hunt Test Report, Carolina PBGV Club

Saturday, 10/22/11

Dogs entered: 38

Dogs run: 38

HIT (8), Pack Stake (27), Brace Stake (2), Solo Stake (1)

Number of runs: 11 (2 HIT, 1 Brace, 1 Solo, 7 Pack)

The Chair and Secretary elected to allow some extra runs beyond the stated entry limit in order to make it possible to accommodate all entries and allow people to participate that would otherwise have been turned away. (We did this for the PBGVCA hunt in March 2011 and it all worked out so we risked it again this time.) It did create extra pressure to get all the runs in before the end of the day—good co-operation between the handlers, judges, marshals, and field officials made this work. It helped that the weather was excellent.

During the process of trying to figure out how to accommodate all the entries and still minimize the number of runs, some of the individual entry dogs were assigned to pre-arranged packs (with permission from the handlers of those packs). This plan was scrapped when it became apparent that it would not cut the number of runs. One of the individually entered dogs was inadvertently left in a pre-arranged pack and not included in the random draw for the 2 individual entry packs. This lapse was not noticed until after the draw on Saturday so the dog ran with that pack. The dog was put into one of the two individual entry packs on Sunday (based on a coin flip).

We had three guests present on Saturday, Doug Ljunggren (AKC Performance Committee), Judie Ljunggren, and Jim Odle (AKC Scent Hound Rep). They were there in response to the PBGVCA request for AKC Parent Club Title Recognition. They spent the day going out on runs to watch the dogs and the judging and asked lots of questions. They interacted with everyone there from field officials to handlers to judges. At the end of the day, we asked Doug for feedback and he said that he and Jim both were very impressed by what they saw. He said that our rules were fine and that the test was conducted in a business-like manner, not hit or miss with a lot of informal variation. We talked about the past history of the hunt test and the development of the program over the years and that it was here to stay, good longevity. He said that he and Jim would both be recommending that the PBGVCA Hunt test be accepted for Parent Club Title Recognition. He did go on to say that if our application was declined it would be due to the low number of titled dogs and the lengthy period of time for the AKC to recoup the upfront costs of programming their system to accept our titles. He indicated that the recognized titles would likely only include PCJH, PCSH, PCMH as it appeared that not that many people went for the Excellent titles. He asked if we thought it likely that AKC Parent Club Title Recognition would increase participation in the program and we said that that was likely.

Sunday, 10/23/11

Dogs entered: 38

Dogs run: 36

HIT (7), Pack Stake (29), Brace Stake (0), Solo Stake (0)

Number of runs: 10 (2 HIT, 8 Pack)

Two dogs were absent at roll call, 1 declared absent by the handler, 1 absent because the handler didn't get there in time. The dog that was declared absent was part of a pre-arranged pack. The handler had asked the day before if he could run the remaining two dogs as a brace if he pulled the third dog (for reasons relating to a health concern). (The initial concern was what constituted a reason to pull the dog and some consultation occurred with the judges regarding this as referred to in Procedure 2-E of the Hunt Test Rules and Standard Procedures. Upon reflection, the word "present" in that paragraph refers to present at roll call not present on the field so that conversation was moot.) The hunt chair and secretary consulted with a third member of the hunt committee (Mary Fluke, Ginger Russell, and Paul Urban, respectively) and the decision was that because the entries were in pack stake, the remaining two dogs would need to run as a pack with a third dog added. The handler did not indicate that he did not agree to this option. When he declared his dog absent on Sunday morning, this was the plan that was followed and the third dog was added with his apparent agreement. The added dog was not judged.

It should be noted that the rules do not state specifically what to do in this situation (dog in pre-arranged pack declared absent prior to the draw). Allowing a handler to change the entry status during the trial (other than move-ups from HIT to hunt test) creates the opportunity for a person to "game" the system and get a second crack at a brace or solo stake. There has to be a balance between being informal and accommodating participants, and setting a precedent that can be abused in the future. Fortunately, the rules allow for dealing with unprecedented situations like this under Procedure 1-A which authorizes the Hunt Test Committee (=Event Committee) "...to decide any matter, whether arising from an unseen emergency or not, which is not specifically provided for in these Rules and Procedures."

General observations:

There were fewer rabbits on the running grounds than is typical, but this actually made for a better test as the dogs had to work harder to find the rabbits and were less confounded by cross trails. Scores tended to be lower than at previous hunts, due in part to the conditions, and also to a little less "generous" judging than has occurred in past years. If this scoring trend continues, handlers may find it harder to earn titles in the future, but those titles will mean more and be a better reflection of the quality of the dog.

Entries for this hunt were atypical in that the majority of hunt test entries and even 1 HIT pack were entered as pre-arranged packs. Some of these packs were made up of experienced dogs who have run together before, some of less experienced dogs running

together for the first time. This will likely be the pattern in the future as people have figured out that dogs entered individually risk being packed with dogs which may not work together well. This may have an impact on the opportunity for less experienced handlers and dogs to get into tests in the future.

Six evaluations were received. Five of the six evaluation listed good and excellent ratings on all items. The sixth evaluator rated the field hospitality as poor because there was only hot water available rather than brewed coffee, rated the hunt committee as fair on communication and poor on following the rules (no specifics given), and said “some good, some bad” on judges following the rules. One of the positive evaluations suggested that we provide 2 potties in future. (I guess that person didn’t know about the outhouse around the corner!)

Addendum:

The day after the hunt tests ended, an e-mail was circulated which indicated that the handler who declared his dog absent was unwilling to allow the third dog to be added to his pack. We understood him to be willing to add the third dog (which was selected in consultation between the handler and a judge who was not on the event committee). No formal complaint was made to the event committee during the trial. (One committee member remembers the handler saying, after the draw and before his run, that he thought he should be allowed to run the dogs for a brace score.)

Submitted by Mary Fluke, DVM, CPBGVC Hunt Chair
11/1/11