

Hunting Retriever Club, Inc.

2018 BOD Meeting Minutes

June 9, 2018

Opening

The annual meeting of the Hunting Retriever Club, Inc. was called to order at 8:23 am on June 9, 2018 in St. Louis, MO by Glenn Dye, HRC President. Prayer led by Marcus Bice, President of Old South HRC.

Present

The Executive Committee, Glenn Dye, President; Tommy Harp, Vice President; Sarah Krause, Treasurer; and Andrea Barlow, National Secretary were present as well as Joy Freeland, Parliamentarian, with Freeland & Irminger, LLC.

Roll Call – Andrea Barlow, National Secretary. 100 HRC clubs were represented and a quorum was satisfied.

Approval of 2017 Minutes

A motion to accept the 2017 Minutes was made by Glenn Dye, HRC President, and seconded by Dean Roy, Lake Ontario HRC. The minutes were approved.

Audit Committee

Stephanie Bullen, Committee Chair along with Rita Johnson and Elaine Mitchell.

The Audit Chair reported that the committee reviewed income and expense transactions, statements, cancelled checks for the fiscal year ending 5/31/2018 and found that all entries, accounts and other documentation to be correct for HRC Inc., HRC Foundation Inc., and the Grand account. A motion to accept the Audit Committee's report was made by Glenn Dye, HRC President, and seconded by Tom Weeks, West Mississippi HRC. The report was accepted.

*see attached Committee report

HRC Inc. Financial Report – Sarah Krause, HRC Treasurer

Sarah reported the findings of the fiscal year June 1, 2017, to May 31, 2018, for HRC Inc. to have 447,144.36 in Checking and CD's between JP Morgan Chase and Bancorp South. A motion to accept the HRC Treasurers report was made by Glenn Dye, HRC President, and seconded by Joe Alexander, Lake Charles HRC. The report was accepted.

*see attached Financial

Grand Committee Report – Tracy Stubbs, Grand Hunt Chairman

Tracy recognized the current Grand Committee members, Grand Site coordinators, and Grand Hunt Secretary. He thanked them for their dedication to the program and their continued support. He also acknowledged and thanked Mike Botts, Local Hunt Chairman of Mississippi Valley HRC, Fall 2017 hosting club and Glen Scarborough, Local Hunt Chairman of Four States HRC, Spring 2018 hosting club. He continued to report that there were 450 entries in the 2017 Fall Grand with 113 grand passes, 14 new GRHRCH's and 12 still short of points and 509 entries in the 2018 Spring Grand with 112 grand passes, 18 new GRHRCH's and 11 still short of points as well as 78 single dog amateur handler entries in Fall Grand and 168 single dog amateur handler entries in Spring Grand.

Tracy also stated the upcoming Grand dates:

Fall 2018 Grand hosted by Cajun HRC October 6 -10, 2018 in Opelousas, LA.

Spring 2019 Grand hosted by HRC Region 4 April 8 -12, 2019, in Cheraw, SC.

Meeting was called for a short adjournment at 8:45 a.m. by Glenn Dye, HRC President.

Meeting resumed at 9:01 a.m.

Grand Financial report: Glenn Dye – Grand Treasurer

Glenn explained how the proceeds of the Grand are distributed with the first payout of \$2500.00 to the local host club, the next payout of \$10,000.00 to HRC Inc., and then a 50/50 split on remaining proceeds. He reported Colorado River Retriever Club received \$16,088.57 and HRC Inc. received \$23,588.56 from the proceeds of the 2016 Spring Grand. Mississippi Valley HRC received \$21,174.34 and HRC Inc. received \$24307.25 from the proceeds of the 2017 Fall Grand. Four States HRC received \$24,273.57 and HRC Inc. received 36,418.57 from the proceeds of the 2018 Spring Grand. Glenn thanked the Grand Committee, the hosting clubs, and all the volunteers. A motion to accept the Grand Committee's report was made Elaine Mitchell, Coastal Empire HRC, and seconded by Ray Caito, Central Florida HRC. The report was accepted.

Field Representative Report: Dean Roy - National Field Representative

Dean reported a successful and productive Field Rep meeting on Friday with a few highlights from the meeting to focus on for the 2018-2019 year

1. 2019 Judges Test
2. Season Testing– Five separate tests - Ensure adequate separation between elements. Each portion of the test should not influence any other part of the testing.
3. Started Test – Should be a purpose to each mark with challenge consistent with the philosophy of HRC and the language in the rulebook
4. Objectives of the Test – Ensure that judges provide “test briefings” that clarify mechanics and objectives.

Motion to accept the National Field Representatives report was made by Don White, Midlands HRC and seconded by Elroy Olson, The report was accepted.

Sponsor Committee: Michael Bullen-Sponsor Chair

Mike Botts, present at meeting, was recognized and thanked by Michael for Nestle Purina PetCare’s continued support of HRC as a Legacy Sponsor. Rahan Nanna, present at the meeting, was also recognized and thanked by Michael for Garmin’s continued support of HRC as a Legacy Sponsor. The GRHRCH sponsors are Avery Sport Dog/ Banded. The HRCH sponsors are Priefert Ranch and Rodeo and, Retrieval -R -Trainer. HR sponsors are Kuranda Dog Beds. SHR sponsors are MarshMutt, Ugly Dog Hunting, and Macomo Kennels. A motion to accept the Sponsor Committee’s report was made by Marcus Bice, Sowega HRC and seconded by Robert Archer, Old South HRC. The report was accepted.

Public Relations Committee – Kyle Krause, Committee Chair

Kyle welcomed and recognized the PR positions. He also encourage the BOD to join the Regional FB pages to see what is happening in the regions. He closed his report with gratitude to all the PR Reps for their hard work and dedication. A motion to accept the Public Relation Committee report was made by Marty Sweet, Prado Basin HRC and seconded by Joe Alexander, Lake Charles HRC. The report was accepted.

Running Rules Committee – Todd Tharp, Committee Chair

Todd reported that of the nine (9) rule proposals that were sent out to the local clubs for vote, one proposal was retracted by the author and will resubmit the next time.

Eight (8) rule proposals were voted on and four (4) met the requirement to be approved or defeated by a two thirds majority vote received from the clubs. Those proposals are as follows:

Proposal #1: Individual clubs have the option of allowing a handler to enter a dog in multiple stakes within a regular licensed hunt. **Failed**

Proposal #3: Seasoned – Maximum distance will not exceed 40 yards on blind retrieve for land or water. **Failed**

Proposal #7: Seasoned - Remove the diversionary bird from the seasoned test all together. **Failed**

Proposal #8: A diversionary bird can be thrown after the walk-up, blind or last retrieve of a double mark. If a seasoned hunting retriever switches to the diversionary bird it will be failed. **Failed**

The four (4) rule proposals that did not meet the requirements from the Local Club vote and voted on by the BOD are as follows:

Proposal #2: Seasoned – The Seasoned hunting retriever can be cast from the retrieving line a maximum of two (2) times *per bird*.

After discussions from the floor was made and closed, the ballots were distributed and the votes were accounted for by the Audit Committee. The proposal **Passed** with 74 in favor and 31 opposed.

Proposal #4: Grand – Unlimited entries

After discussions from the floor was made and closed, the ballots were distributed and the votes were accounted for by the Audit Committee. The proposal **Passed** with 61 in favor and 44 opposed.

Proposal #5: Attire, UKC/HRC Rules and Procedures, page 8 Clothing

After discussions from the floor was made and closed, the ballots were distributed and the votes were accounted for by the Audit Committee. The proposal **Failed** 17 in favor and 88 opposed.

Proposal #6: Started – Clarification, Page 38 Started Test Rule. Started retriever is required to be steady at the retrieving line.

After discussions from the floor was made and closed, the ballots were distributed and the votes were accounted for by the Audit Committee. The proposal **Passed** 82 in favor and 23 opposed.

Todd proposed adding “Running Rule Definition” to the Running Rules Charter and appoint a Committee to apply the “Running Rule Definition” to current rule book to clarify what is a rule and what is a policy. The task of the committee will be completed by September 2018 before the new rulebook is printed. The committee will consist of Todd Tharp, Glenda Mitchell, Jimbo Earles, Glenn Scarborough, and Pat Johnson.

Running Rule Definition – “The mechanics and standards of evaluation retrievers during a hunt test”.

Tommy Harp, HRC Vice President, provided clarity that developing a definition to refer to for going through the rulebook to clarify policies and rules. Marcus Bice, Sowega HRC, reflected that we this definition. All policies and rules are voted on by BOD. Discussion was closed. Motion to accept the Running Rule definition, add the definition to the charter, and approve the committee appointment for the rule book was made by Dean Roy, Lake Ontario HRC and seconded by Ray Caito, Central Florida HRC. **Motion carried.**

Todd proposed adding edition period to Running Rules Charter - #5 on page 3, current #5 will change to #6, editing period verbiage – Region Running Rule Rep will contact the author of the proposal to discuss feedback from the Running Rules Committee for editing purposes to finalize wording of the proposal. The editing and final proposal is due back to the chairman by July 31st of odd years. Motion to accept the editing period was made by Lisa Neel, Tennessee River HRC and seconded by Joe Alexander, Lake Charles HRC. **Motion carried.**

Todd proposed changing “results” to “ballot” on page 1, #4 of the charter. Motion to accept the changes was made Elaine Mitchell, Coastal Empire HRC and seconded by Robert Archer, Old South HRC. **Motion carried.**

Todd proposed adding "or emailing" to #3 on page 3 of the charter. Motion to accept the addition was made by Steve Boykin, Eastern Carolina and seconded by Lisa Neel, Tennessee River HRC. **Motion carried.**

Todd proposed electronic voting for proposals next year. Motion to accept adopting electronic voting was made by Jenny Richards, NE Florida HRC and seconded by Robert Archer, Old South HRC. **Motion carried.**

Todd proposed cleaning up the time lines by just removing years to odd and even years. Motion to accept the time line changes in the charter was made by Ray Caito, Central Florida HRC and seconded by Jenny Richards, NE Florida HRC. **Motion carried.**

Motion to accept the Running Rule Chairs report was made by Lane Blanchett, Middle Georgia HRC and seconded by Vanessa Everett, Wisill HRC. Report was accepted.

HRC Foundation Inc. – Glenn Stelly, HRC Foundation Inc. President

Glenn announced that this year's research grant was awarded to LSU School of Veterinary Medicine for the effect of the fecal microbiota transplantation administered orally or via enema on the fecal microbiome and metabolome of healthy dogs after oral antibiotic administration.

There were 25 scholarship applications only 22 qualified. Of the 22 qualified, 19 scholarships were awarded and 1 grant.

The (9) 2018 Club funded Memorial Scholarship recipients are as follows:

Denise Johnson Memorial Scholarship: Sarah Pesch, Wisill HRC
Phillip Freeman Memorial Scholarship: Makayla Pesch, Wisill HRC
Carol Rombauer Memorial Scholarship: Haylie Shaw, Great Lakes HRC
John Pritchett Memorial Scholarship: Allison Little, North Louisiana HRC
Chris Hailey Memorial Scholarship: Melissa Richter, Midway HRC
John Wallace Memorial Scholarship: Shannon Kehoe, Badger State
Carol Ford Memorial Scholarship: Riley Kotyza, Wisill HRC
Ernie Istre Memorial Scholarship: Hannah Cooper, Lonestar HRC
Ernie Istre Memorial Scholarship: Mackenzie Hunnicutt, Club not provided at meeting

The (2) 2018 Club funded Honorary Scholarship recipients are as follows:

Omar Driskill Honorary Scholarship: Taylor Abernathy, Big Elkin HRC
Omar Driskill Honorary Scholarship: Triston Ihrke, Illinois River HRC

The 2018 HRC Foundation Inc. Scholarship recipients are as follows:

Matthew Birdsall, Amite River HRC
Kevin England, Badger State HRC
Sarah Gandy, North Louisiana HRC
A Trent Hall, Southern Flight HRC
Jacob Olean, Dakota HRC
Ashlyn Postma, Great Lakes HRC
Danielle Richter, Midway HRC
Tyler Wilson, Club not provided at meeting

A motion to accept the HRC Foundation Inc. report was made by Robert Archer, Old South HRC and seconded by Vanessa Everett, Wisill HRC. The report was accepted.

*See attached Financials

HRC Secretary Report – Andrea Barlow

Andrea shared with the BOD that there are 128 clubs with two pending applications (Arizona and Canada). This includes six new Clubs, West Louisiana HRC, Conowingo HRC, Etowah HRC, Middle Georgia HRC, Mississippi Headwaters HRC, and River City HRC. She also reported the calendar year 2017 entries per UKC were as follows: Started, 8,370; Seasoned 6,739; Finished, 13,508; Upland, 1,256; and Grand, 811. These numbers reflect an increase from 2016. She conveyed the efforts to continue to improve the functionality of the website and to continue to look for more communication concerning judges' status, seminar expirations, and judges test deadlines in 2018. She clarified the membership totals to be 8,980 current memberships including honorary memberships. She continued to address the BOD with the requirements for the Purina club support orders. Two phone numbers must be provided for the carrier in case there is an issue with delivery. The Purina orders must be received no later than the due date listed. Exceptions to the due date are no longer available. In closing, Andrea thanked the BOD for their continued support. A motion to accept the Secretary's report was made by Ray Caito, Central Florida HRC, and seconded by Elaine Mitchell, Coastal Empire HRC. The report was accepted.

HRC President Report – Glenn Dye

Glenn opened his report thanking everyone attending the BOD meeting and thanked everyone volunteering their time by serving locally and nationally. HRC continues to grow. Weekend events full with waiting lists. The youth events have increased. The Grand hosted by Four States HRC saw the largest number of entries. The growth is exciting as long as we continue to provide a program to develop the hunting retriever in its intended purpose in life – a valued partner in the field. He charged the BOD to continue to show good sportsmanship at HRC events, continue to enjoy the fellowship with the HRC family. A motion to accept the Presidents report was made by Tom Weeks, West Mississippi HRC, and seconded by Mike Botts, Mississippi Valley HRC. The report was accepted.

HRC Vice President – Tommy Harp

Tommy greeted the BOD and offered thanks to the past and current EC. He showed appreciation to Tracy Stubbs for involving him as well as Todd Kellam. He was grateful to the BOD for their faith and support and he would continue the path of the BOD that they set forth. He spoke on the opportunities that he has had this past year to judge and run his dog and how thankful he was to be able to part of club's hunts and be a part of the HRC family. He reported the honorary membership list had been cleaned up. He thanked the Field Reps on what a great job they were doing and thanked Dean Roy for accepting the National Field Representative position. He reflected on preserving the history of HRC. Every one of us is our future. Tommy closed his report reminding everyone that we (HRC) promote ourselves as a family, we are all volunteers and we should be kind and respectful of each other and their efforts. A motion to accept the Vice President's report was made by Kevin Kennedy, Gateway Retrievers HRC, and seconded by Don White, Midlands HRC. The report was accepted.

UKC, Inc. – Todd Kellam

Todd reported the number of dogs registered with UKC is stable. UKC will go live next week for online single registration and the online points check, and litter registration is going well. He announced that Joyce Little retired and Sara Bohnomme will fill her position. The Breed standings in the registry per UKC are as follows: Labrador Retrievers moved up to #3, Golden Retrievers remained #13, Boykins moved down to #23, Chesapeake's moved down to #38. New

titles issued were GRHRCH 58, HRCH 742, HR 978, and SHR 960, Upland 387. A motion to accept the UKC report was made by Marcus Bice, Sowega HRC, and seconded by Bob Brundrette, Colorado River HRC. The report was accepted.

HRC/UKC National Ambassador – Omar Driskill – Tommy Harp presented report

Omar expressed how proud he was of our organization. He discussed how thankful he was for UKC for registering the dogs and allowing the BOD to write the rules and for the BOD giving up their time to come to the national meeting to vote. Omar wanted to remind the BOD of realism and to keep the hunt in the hunt test and keep the hunting in the hunting retriever. A motion to accept the National Ambassador's report was made by Elaine Mitchell, Coastal Empire HRC, and seconded by Ray Caito, Central Florida HRC. The report was accepted.

New Business:

Glenn Dye, HRC President, opened discussion for the interim policy implemented by the EC on 3/23/2018 and turned the floor over to Tommy Harp, Vice President, to answer questions concerning the policy. Motion to accept reading was made by Robert Archer, Old South HRC and seconded by John Burkett, Pin Oak HRC. After discussion was made from the floor and called to vote, the motion **carried** to add policy.

Glenn Dye, HRC President, addressed the BOD with discontinuing DNT's services for the forum on the website. Annually, the cost is \$2000.00 for their services and currently the forum is not being used. He made a motion to discontinue the DNT services. Mark Evans, Amite River HRC seconded the motion. Called to vote. The motion **carried** to discontinue DNT's services for the forum.

Adjournment

Dean Roy, Lake Ontario HRC, made a motion to adjourn and Don White, Midlands HRC seconded. The meeting adjourned @ 2:05 pm.

Minutes reported by: Andrea Barlow, HRC National Secretary

Minutes of the BOD Annual Meeting are summarized and not transcribed per the guidance of the Parliamentarian.

2018 Board of Directors Annual Meeting

St. Louis, MO

The 2018 BOD Annual Meeting Audit Committee was comprised of Elaine Mitchell, Rita Johnson and Stephanie Bullen, Audit Committee chair.

The committee has reviewed income and expenses for the HRC Inc., The HRC Foundation, Inc., and the HRC International Grand Inc. Our findings were that all financial information was organized and accurate. There was proper documentation backing up all disbursements. All entries and accounts were correct as stated.

Elaine Mitchell
Rita Johnson
Stephanie A Bullen
4/9/2018.

Hunting Retriever Club, Inc.
Balance Sheet
As of May 31, 2018

	May 31, 18
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	
Bancorpsouth-Grand	30,000.00
JP Morgan Chase	279,398.56
Total Checking/Savings	<u>309,398.56</u>
Other Current Assets	
Bancorp South-CD	107,745.80
Certificate of Deposit	30,000.00
Total Other Current Assets	<u>137,745.80</u>
Total Current Assets	<u>447,144.36</u>
Fixed Assets	
Accumulated Depreciation	-10,414.00
Office equipment	19,975.94
Seminar equipment	3,319.73
Total Fixed Assets	<u>12,881.67</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	<u><u>460,026.03</u></u>
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Liabilities	
Current Liabilities	
Other Current Liabilities	
Payroll Liabilities	797.92
Total Other Current Liabilities	<u>797.92</u>
Total Current Liabilities	<u>797.92</u>
Total Liabilities	797.92
Equity	
Opening Balance Equity	135,459.99
Unrestricted Net Assets	305,613.02
Net Income	18,155.10
Total Equity	<u>459,228.11</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	<u><u>460,026.03</u></u>

The Grand
Profit & Loss
 March through May 2016

	<u>Mar - May 16</u>
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
banquet ticket sales	445.00
Entry fees	82,920.00
plaques	975.00
Raffle	3,390.00
Total Income	<u>87,730.00</u>
Expense	
Bird exp	218.38
Bird techs	3,950.00
car rental	1,967.95
Chukars	1,685.00
Clothing	4,357.74
Committee travel	2,253.13
Ducks	5,966.25
entry fee refund	5,880.00
Field exp	527.31
GC Dinner	110.82
GC Welcome bags	650.11
Grand plaques	867.24
Grand ribbons	400.86
hunt test fees	1,925.00
Judges airfare	78.18
Judges auto transportation	1,106.72
Luggage expense	990.00
Meals	539.46
Meet & Greet	2,340.51
Misc. expense	3,800.00
Office supplies	580.74
Operations	
Postage, Mailing Service	54.93
Total Operations	<u>54.93</u>
Per Diem	3,800.00
Permits	147.00
Program printing	1,025.20
Refrig trailer	1,579.63
Rental car	575.79
Trans. expense	675.00
Total Expense	<u>48,052.87</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>39,677.13</u>
Net Income	<u><u>39,677.13</u></u>

SPLIT

CCRC - \$16,088.57

6/6/16

- CK# 1214

HRC, Inc. \$23,588.56

- CK# 1215

6/6/16

1:25 PM
12/13/17
Accrual Basis

The Grand
Profit & Loss
July through November 2017

	<u>Jul - Nov 17</u>
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Entry fees	128,576.75
Raffle	4,260.00
Total Income	<u>132,836.75</u>
Expense	
banquet hall deposit	500.00
Banquet meal	2,655.01
Bird exp	357.13
Bird techs	4,000.00
car rental	1,750.71
check expense	15.00
Chukars	1,370.00
Clothing	7,570.25
Committee airfare	3,887.07
Committee travel	1,962.32
Ducks	8,300.00
entry fee refund	10,925.00
Field exp	533.47
Field lunches	1,086.85
hotel room	12,065.90
hunt test fees	2,472.00
Judges airfare	2,243.60
Judges auto transportation	1,444.34
Land use	1,058.70
Luggage expense	1,100.00
Lunches	333.54
Meal allowance	1,800.00
Meals	400.00
Meet & Greet	267.42
Misc. expense	4,407.38
Office supplies	1,477.02
Operations	0.00
Per Diem	1,800.00
Poppers	1,172.50
Porta potty	750.00
Ribbons	4,871.82
Trash disposal	411.05
Total Expense	<u>82,988.08</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>49,848.67</u>
Net Income	<u><u>49,848.67</u></u>

MVHRC

\$ 21,174 ³⁴

CK# 1488 x

12/3

HRC

\$ 24,307.25

CK# 1489 x

12/13/17

9:00 AM
 06/05/18
 Accrual Basis

The Grand
 Profit & Loss
 February 1 through June 5, 2018

	Feb 1 - Jun 5, 18
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Entry fees	146,479.25
Other Types of Income	
Miscellaneous Revenue	2,219.10
Total Other Types of Income	2,219.10
Raffle	6,330.00
Total Income	155,028.35
Expense	
Banquet meal	4,214.84
Bird techs	3,000.00
car rental	2,126.76
check expense	136.86
Chukars	2,200.00
Clothing	6,150.00
Committee airfare	2,357.90
Committee travel	5,338.35
Ducks	8,065.00
entry fee refund	6,050.00
Field exp	1,988.14
Grand tlr.	2,400.00
hotel room	13,644.86
hunt test fees	2,946.00
Judges airfare	2,102.00
Judges auto transportation	2,656.47
Land use	1,750.00
Lodging	342.77
Luggage expense	990.00
Lunches	2,332.46
Meal allowance	400.00
Meals	170.95
Meet & Greet	500.00
Misc. expense	5,200.00
Office supplies	711.72
Operations	
Postage, Mailing Service	160.11
Total Operations	160.11
Per Diem	5,300.00
Poppers	1,154.65
Ribbons	4,555.17
Snacks	731.20
wire transfer	15.00
Total Expense	89,691.21
Net Ordinary Income	65,337.14
Net Income	<u>65,337.14</u>

H States
\$24,273.57

HRC
 \$36,418.57



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
Conceived by Hunters for Hunters"

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

#1

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

Date: 3/10/17

SUBMITTED BY: Daniel Johnson

Long Island Retriever Field Trial Club Region: 2

(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)*¹

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2017 RULEBOOK.

PAGE 7, PARAGRAPH 6

CURRENT RULE WORDING: "Each dog is limited to one (1) entry per licensed hunt."

PROPOSED CHANGE: Individual clubs have the option of allowing a handler to enter a dog in multiple stakes within a regular licensed hunt; ie. a dog may be entered in both started and seasoned or seasoned and finished within a regular licensed hunt, as per the preference of the club holding the event. The premium shall state if an event allows a dog to be double staked.

JUSTIFICATION: This change would allow clubs the chance to increase the number of entries in a licensed hunt, if they so choose to allow double staked entries. Many smaller clubs that rarely, if ever, reach the designated maximum entries per flight would benefit by the additional entry fees to offset the cost of running a hunt test (judges transportation and hotel fees, bird fees, etc.). The change would also allow handlers and dogs the opportunity to earn points and titles at a faster rate. For example, if a dog has three (3) started passes during the previous year, but is now running at a seasoned level, that dog may be entered in started to finish that title while also having the opportunity to run at their skill level in seasoned within the same test.

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
"Conceived by Hunters for Hunters"

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC. #2

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

Date: 3/10/17

SUBMITTED BY: Jo Ann Reynolds, Yankee Waterfowler's Hunting Retriever Club

Region: 2

(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)*¹

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2017 RULEBOOK.

PAGE 44, TEST RULES, VIII

CURRENT RULE WORDING: The Seasoned hunting retriever can be cast from the retrieving line a maximum of two (2) times. If a Seasoned hunting retriever is unproductive after a second attempt, the judge will instruct the handler to pick up their hunting retriever and that test is failed.

PROPOSED CHANGE: The Seasoned hunting retriever can be cast from the retrieving line a maximum of two (2) times *per bird*. If a Seasoned hunting retriever is unproductive after a second attempt, the judge will instruct the handler to pick up their hunting retriever and that test is failed.

JUSTIFICATION: Clarifies wording to match instructions in the judges' seminar manual. Clarifies that it is two casts per bird. Many judges at a recent judges' seminar were unaware that it is two casts per bird.

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
Conceived by Hunters for Hunters[®]

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL #3 FORM

Date: 3-23-17

SUBMITTED BY: MARK EVANS - Amite River HRC
TOMMY HARP - North LA HRC Region: 10
(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)^{*1}

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2013-14 RULEBOOK.

Page 7 Paragraph 6

CURRENT RULE WORDING: There is a collective limit of twelve (12) dogs per handler, per hunt. Each club has the option of lowering this limit. The limit must be published on the premium.

PROPOSED CHANGE: There is a collective limit of twelve (12) dogs per handler per licensed regular hunt and upland hunt. Each club has the option of lowering this limit. The limit must be published on the premium.

See page 53 of this rule book for the number of dogs a handler can run in a Grand hunt

JUSTIFICATION: This change is strictly for clarity as a second proposal is being submitted to increase the number of dogs a handler can run in a Grand hunt.

(If additional space is needed, please attach, following the same format as above.)

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
Conceived by Hunters for Hunters[®]

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

#4

Date: 3-23-17

SUBMITTED BY: MARK EVANS - Avite River HRC
Tommy Harp - North LA HRC Region: 10
(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)^{*1}

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2013-14 RULEBOOK.
Page 53 Paragraphs 1-5

CURRENT RULE WORDING: There is no mention here of the number of dogs allowed for each handler at a Grand Hunt.

PROPOSED CHANGE: Add: For Grand Hunts ONLY, handlers are allowed to run an unlimited number of dogs

JUSTIFICATION: With the addition of the Hall of Fame, more owners will want to run dogs in the Grand that are already Grand Champions.

(If additional space is needed, please attach, following the same format as above.)

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
Conceived by Hunters for Hunters®

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

#5

SUBMITTED BY: Michael Cato

Date: 3/28/17

Region: Cowtown Hunting Retriever Club - Fort Worth, Texas

*(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)*¹*

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2017 RULEBOOK.

UKC®/HRC Rules & Procedures Page 8

CURRENT RULE WORDING:

CLOTHING Judges, Hunt Marshals, Gunners, Bird Boys and Handlers must wear hunting clothes. Hunting clothes worn must be harmonious with the hunting environment, such as camo in waterfowl and dove hunting, white clothing if snow goose hunting. Gallery and spectators should not be in white or light colored attire that might interfere with the dog's performance.

PROPOSED CHANGE:

CLOTHING Judges, Hunt Marshals, Gunners, Bird Boys and Handlers must wear hunting clothes. Hunting clothes worn must be harmonious with the hunting environment, such as camo in waterfowl and dove hunting, white clothing if snow goose hunting. Gallery and spectators should not be in white or light colored attire that might interfere with the dog's performance. Dark colored denim jeans or solid color dark pants or slacks are acceptable as appropriate pants or bottoms.

JUSTIFICATION:

There are several reasons we are proposing this change. The first and main reason is the fact that the rules say appropriate hunting attire and the majority of our hunting group, friends, family, etc. wear jeans and camouflage shirts and jackets for all seasons of hunting (pheasant, duck, dove, etc.). The second reason would be that during duck season many waders come in plain dark brown or green and not all are camouflage and we hunt in these as well which are also not required to be camouflage and these are real life hunting situations which the hunt test is supposed to represent. The third reason is that women who are pregnant but still participating in the hunt trials have difficulty finding attire that is camouflage and made for their size and shape even though they are still in good enough health to run dogs. The current rule is interpreted differently by everyone so one judge says jeans are okay and another can say we have to be head to toe camouflage which leads to too much inconsistency in the rules and you never know how you should dress for a hunt test. So even if our new wording is not adopted the rule itself still needs to be further clarified. If head to toe camouflage is the intent I also think a clause should be included to excuse first time participants from disqualification so they can still run their dog in the test.

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
"Conceived by Hunters for Hunters"

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

#16

Date: 4/4/2017

SUBMITTED BY: Joe Olson of Platte Valley HRC

Region: 13, Platte Valley HRC¹

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2017-18 RULEBOOK.

PAGE 38, ITEM III UNDER STARTED TEST RULES

CURRENT RULE WORDING: The hunting retriever is not required to be steady at the retrieving line. The hunting retriever may be hand held at the retrieving line. If the hunting retriever is hand held, the handler will not handle the shotgun. The handler may request the gunner to move a distance away to avoid scaring an inexperienced dog.

PROPOSED CHANGE: The hunting retriever is **not** required to be steady at the retrieving line. The hunting retriever may be hand held at the retrieving line **to achieve steadiness**. If the hunting retriever is hand held, the handler will not handle the shotgun. The handler may request the gunner to move a distance away to avoid scaring an inexperienced dog.

JUSTIFICATION: This section of the Started rules is confusing as written. As taught at the Judge's and Handler's seminar, Started dogs are, in fact, required to be steady, yet the rulebook says they are not required to be steady. Clearly, the intent of the rulebook is to say that they don't have to be steady without restraint, but as written it says they don't need to be steady at all. Removing "not" from the first sentence would confirm that they are required to be steady and then adding that they can be held to achieve steadiness in the second sentence clarifies the intent. This would bring the language in the rulebook in accord with the seminar manual which states on page 24:

"While the Started retriever is not expected to be steady on its own, it is still required to be steady! It may have a collar, leash or line around its neck, or may be hand-held to assist in achieving steadiness."

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
"Conceived by Hunters for Hunters"

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL #7 FORM

Date: 3-28-17

SUBMITTED BY: Shawn Shannon Cowtown HRC

Region: _____

*(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)*¹*

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2017 RULEBOOK.

Page 44 Section VII

CURRENT RULE WORDING: A diversionary bird can be thrown after the walk-up, blind, or last retrieve of a double mark. If a Seasoned hunting retriever switches to the diversionary bird, it will not fail but will be scored lower by the judge. The hunting retriever shall retrieve the diversionary bird.

PROPOSED CHANGE: Remove the diversionary bird from the seasoned test all together.

JUSTIFICATION: There's a great potential for either creating a gun safety violation because a seasoned handler tries to rush to load a popper, shoulder the gun, fire and safely handle the gun while watching a seasoned dog and trying to get that dog to deliver to hand. Many times the diversion is thrown in such a manner that a young dog can't help but switch. We are creating more problems for the handler and his retriever than we are evaluating that dog to see if it is doing seasoned work. We already have a walk up/walk out, a blind retrieve, a double retrieve, and have to put the dog on lead to move to each element of the test, all happening with a short distance in most cases.

(If additional space is needed, please attach, following the same format as above.)

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.



AFFILIATED WITH
UNITED KENNEL CLUB, INC.
Conceived by Hunters for Hunters"

HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.

RUNNING RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

#8

Date: 3-28-17

SUBMITTED BY: Shawn Shannon Cowtown HRC

Region: _____

*(Submitted and Sponsored by - Please include Club or Homeclub if individual)*1*

CURRENT RULE - REFERENCE - PAGE AND PARAGRAPH NUMBER IN THE 2017 RULEBOOK.

Page 44 Section VII

CURRENT RULE WORDING: A diversionary bird can be thrown after the walk-up, blind, or last retrieve of a double mark. If a Seasoned hunting retriever switches to the diversionary bird, it will not fail but will be scored lower by the judge. The hunting retriever shall retrieve the diversionary bird.

PROPOSED CHANGE: A diversionary bird can be thrown after the walk-up, blind or last retrieve of a double mark. If a seasoned hunting retriever switches to the diversionary bird it will be failed.

JUSTIFICATION: There's a great potential for either creating a gun safety violation because a seasoned handler tries to rush to load a popper, shoulder the gun, fire and safely handle the gun while watching a seasoned dog and trying to get that dog to deliver to hand. Many times the diversion is thrown in such a manner that a young dog can't help but switch. We are creating more problems for the handler and his retriever than we are evaluating that dog to see if it is doing seasoned work. We already have a walk up/walk out, a blind retrieve, a double retrieve, and have to put the dog on lead to move to each element of the test, all happening with a short distance in most cases.

(If additional space is needed, please attach, following the same format as above.)

¹ Running Rules proposals may be sponsored and submitted by: an HRC Club, U.K.C., Inc., Executive Committee Members, HRC/UKC Field Representatives and HRC Members in good standing.

HRC RUNNING RULES COMMITTEE • CHARTER

MEMBERSHIP:

The HRC Running Rules Committee shall be composed of one representative from each region of the HRC, and the President of the HRC. Regional representatives shall be elected by majority consent of the Presidents of each of the member Clubs within the region. Under the direction of the HRC Vice President, the Regional UKC Field Representative shall coordinate the election of the region's Rule Committee Representative. In the event that any region does not elect a representative, the National HRC President shall appoint a knowledgeable member from within that region. Each member shall serve a two-year term, coinciding with the years that Running Rules voting occurs. Members may be re-elected as many times as may be dictated by regional consensus. The term of Office shall be from October 15th to October 15th of every other even year. The HRC President shall select one of the elected members as Chairman.

QUALIFICATIONS OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Effective July 1, 2004 1) individuals shall be a member in good standing with HRC, UKC, and a HRC club; and 2) the individual be a licensed AA Finished level Judge.

OBJECTIVE:

To coordinate effective and appropriate Running Rules -- Rule Book -- changes as may be required based on Running Rules Committee members direction, and by proposals submitted and sponsored by member Clubs, the UKC, the National Executive Committee, Regional UKC Field Representatives, and any members in good standing.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS DUTIES:

1. Provide appropriate Running Rules Proposal Forms and procedural information to Clubs within his/her Region and to receive and forward to the Committee Chairman, Running Rules change proposals as may be properly submitted.
2. Upon request of the HRC Executive Committee and/or UKC, review all Running Rules disputes and make recommendations, clarifications and/or interpretations of the Running Rules as may be required to effect appropriate resolutions.
3. As proposal activity warrants, attend a meeting of the Committee on the Friday prior to the National Meeting on odd numbered years, to coordinate all proposals for presentation by the Chairman to the Board of Directors on Saturday during the Annual Meeting.
4. Per the Procedure stated herein, the Committee Member shall receive the results of voting of the Clubs within his/her region and shall forward such results to the Committee Chairman
5. Attend (by meeting, mail, or phone) any special meetings as may be called by the Chairman.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHAIRMAN:

1. Provide appropriate Running Rules proposal forms to the Committee Members and Clubs as necessary and oversee the activities of the Committee Members to insure that each Region is properly represented.
2. Coordinate, review, prepare and submit proposals received from each region or as provided for herein, to the Committee Members for review at the Committee Meeting on the Friday prior to the Board of Directors Meeting on odd numbered years. The Committee does not have the authority to revise any proposal without the permission of the Club/Individual submitting the Proposal other than grammatical, which in no case could alter the intent of the Proposal. The Committee Chairman will present the proposals to the Board of Directors for discussion during the Annual Meeting.
3. Oversee the mailing of the proposals submitted to the Board of Directors and a ballot form, to all Clubs by November 1st following the National Meeting.

4. Receive and correlate the votes from the Committee Members on each proposal and provide a report of the results to the Executive Committee, in confidence. Such report shall include all proposals and the voting results. Proposals passing/failing require a 2/3-majority vote of ballots returned.
5. Attend the Board of Directors meeting on even numbered year, and report to the Board the results of the voting and oversee voting on any proposal not passing/failing by 2/3 majority of ballots returned.

PROCEDURE FOR ELECTION OF RUNNING RULES REPRESENTATIVES:

(This is a two year process starting in even # years with the election of Rules Committee Members immediately following the June, Board of Directors Meeting and ending in the even # years that voting occurs.)

1. The Vice President will correspond by letter, to the Field Representatives on or before July 1, in even numbered years, announcing that an election of Rules Representatives is required for the Regions. The Vice President will obtain a list of the current Presidents and their addresses and provide such to each Field Representative for the Clubs within their specific region.
2. On or before July 15, the Field Representatives will correspond by letter to each of the Club's Presidents within their region, requesting nominations for a Running Rules Representative. Nominations must be received by the Field Representative on or before August 15. A ballot listing the nominees will be sent to the Clubs on or before September 1, for voting by the Clubs. Running Rules Representatives are elected by a simple majority vote." The Clubs must return their vote results to the Field Representative on or before October 1. The Field Representative will notify the Vice President of the results of the election on or before October 15. If no nominations are received for a Region, the HRC President shall appoint a Running Rules Committee member for that Region.
3. The HRC President shall appoint the Running Rules Committee Chairman.

RUNNING RULES REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION TIME LINE

(TERM OF OFFICE IS FOR 2 YEARS STARTING ON OCTOBER 15 – EVEN YEARS)

- Seek Nominations for Running Rules Representatives July 1, 1998 (2000)
(Responsibility: Vice President to Field Representatives)
- Notification to Clubs to seek Nominations July 15, 1998 (2000)
(Responsibility – Field Representative to Club Presidents)
- Nominations Returned August 15, 1998 (2000)
(Responsibility – Club President to Field Representative)
- Ballots to Clubs for Voting September 1, 1998 (2000)
(Responsibility – Field Representative to Club Presidents)
- Voted Ballots Returned October 1, 1998 (2000)
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to Field Representative)
- Notification of Results of Voting October 15, 1998 (2000)
(Responsibility – Field Representatives to Vice President & person elected)
(New Committee Members officially assume Office)
- Determination of a Running Rules Chairman by President October 15, 1998 (2000)

PROCEDURES FOR RUNNING RULES COMMITTEE:

1. Committee Members will provide Proposal Forms for new change proposals to the Clubs within their Region by November 1, in even years. All Running Rules Proposals will be returned by the Clubs to the Running Rules Committee Representative or the Running Rules Chairman in the absence of a Regional Representative on or before April. The Committee Members will forward their Regions Proposals to the Committee Chairman by April 20.

2. The Committee Members will meet on the Friday prior to the Board of Directors Meeting in odd numbered years (2007, 2009, etc.) to correlate, review and coordinate the new Proposals which will be presented by the Committee Chairman to the Board of Directors for discussion during the Annual Meeting the following day.
3. By November 1, following the National Meeting, the Chairman will effect the mailing of the proposals submitted to the Board of Directors and a ballot form, to all Clubs to be voted upon and returned to the Running Rules Representatives by March 1st in even years.
4. The Committee members will receive and correlate the votes from their Region's Clubs on each proposal. Such votes must be postmarked on or before March 1 of the even numbered year. The members will forward the votes & results to the Committee Chairman on or before April 20. The Chairman will provide a report of the vote results to the Executive Committee on or before National Meeting. Such report shall include all proposals and the voting results (2/3 majority of votes received from the Clubs are needed to pass/fail).
5. The Chairman will attend the next Board of Directors meeting, report to the Board the results of the voting and oversee voting on any proposal not passing/failing by the 2/3 majority.

RUNNING RULES PROPOSAL AND VOTING TIME LINES:

- New Proposal Forms to Clubs August 1, 2006
(Responsibility – Chairman to Club Presidents, RR Reps, Field Reps & Exec. Cmte)
Last Official Act
- Clubs Submit New Proposal Forms April 1, 2007
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to New Running Rules Reps)
FIRST OFFICIAL ACT
- Running Rules Reps Submit New Proposals to Chairman April 20, 2007
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to New Running Rules Reps)
- Running Rules Reps Review & Present New Proposals 2007 National Meeting
(Responsibility – Running Rules Reps to Board of Directors)
- Proposals and Voting Ballots to Clubs November 1, 2007
(Responsibility – Chairman to Club Presidents, RR Reps, Field Reps & Exec Cmte.)
- Clubs Return Voted Ballots March 1, 2008
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to Running Rules Reps)
- Voted Ballots Forwarded to Running Rules Chairman April 1, 2008
(Responsibility – Running Rules Reps to Chairman)
- Report to Executive Committee National Meeting, 2008
(Responsibility – Running Rules Chairman to Executive Committee)

VOTING TABULATION:

Each Club and each member of the Executive Committee has 1 vote per proposal. If a rule does not pass or fail by a 2/3 majority of the votes returned at the Club level, the proposal will be brought before the Board of Directors. A simple majority vote will determine the outcome of Running Rules proposals voted on at the National meeting.

AUTHORITY:

The Chairman and Running Rules Committee members derive authority from and are accountable to the National Executive Committee, and the Board of Directors.

EXPENSES:

Appropriate expenses will be reimbursed to Running Rules Committee Members. Expense report forms, which are available from the Committee Chairman or HRC Secretary, shall be properly completed, include appropriate documentation and submitted to the HRC Treasurer.

RUNNING RULES REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION TIME LINE

(TERM OF OFFICE IS FOR 2 YEARS STARTING ON OCTOBER 15 – EVEN YEARS)

- Seek Nominations for Running Rules Representatives July 1
(Responsibility: Vice President to Field Representatives)
- Notification to Clubs to seek Nominations July 15
(Responsibility – Field Representative to Club Presidents)
- Nominations Returned August 15
(Responsibility – Club President to Field Representative)
- Ballots to Clubs for Voting September 1
(Responsibility – Field Representative to Club Presidents)
- Voted Ballots Returned October 1
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to Field Representative)
- Notification of Results of Voting October 15
(Responsibility – Field Representatives to Vice President & person elected)
(New Committee Members officially assume Office)
- Determination of a Running Rules Chairman by President October 15

RUNNING RULES PROPOSAL AND VOTING TIME LINES:

- New Proposal Forms to Clubs
August 1, even years
(Responsibility – Chairman to Club Presidents, RR Reps, Field Reps & Exec. Cmte)
- Clubs Submit New Proposal Forms
April 1, odd years
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to New Running Rules Reps)
- FIRST OFFICIAL ACT(incoming chairman)/ Last Official Act(out going Chairman)
- Running Rules Reps Submit New Proposals to Chairman
April 20, odd years
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to New Running Rules Reps)
- Running Rules Reps Review & Present New Proposals
Odd Years National Meeting
(Responsibility – Running Rules Reps to Board of Directors)
- Proposals and Voting Ballots to Clubs
November 1, odd years
(Responsibility – Chairman to Club Presidents, RR Reps, Field Reps & Exec Cmte.)
- Clubs Return Voted Ballots
March 1, even years
(Responsibility – Club Presidents to Running Rules Reps)
- Voted Ballots Forwarded to Running Rules Chairman
April 1, even years
(Responsibility – Running Rules Reps to Chairman)
- Report to Executive Committee
National Meeting, even years
(Responsibility – Running Rules Chairman to Executive Committee)

Hunting Retriever Club Foundation
Profit & Loss
June 2017 through May 2018

	Jun '17 - May 18
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Investments	
Interest-Savings, Short-term CD	6,013.15
Total Investments	6,013.15
Memorials	
Carol Ford	7,584.00
Carol Rombauer	2,275.00
Chris Hailey	1,500.00
Ernie Istre	10,750.00
John Pritchett	1,025.00
John Wallace	4,000.00
Memorials	9,909.20
Omar Driscoll - Honorary	10,000.00
Phillip Freeman	1,632.00
Wayne Gay - Honorary	1,500.00
Total Memorials	50,175.20
Sponsor	
Garmin/Tri-Tronics	5,000.00
Gunners Up	2,000.00
Kuranda USA	500.00
Nestle' Purina	32,000.00
Priefert	3,000.00
The Ugly Dog Hunting Company	500.00
Total Sponsor	43,000.00
Total Income	99,188.35
Expense	
Awards and Grants	1,500.00
Business Expenses	10.00
Scholarship	
Carol Rombauer	1,500.00
Chris Hailey	1,500.00
Denise Johnson	1,500.00
Ernie Istre	3,000.00
HRC Foundation	6,000.00
J.P. Pritchett	1,500.00
Phillip Freeman	1,500.00
Total Scholarship	16,500.00
Total Expense	18,010.00
Net Ordinary Income	81,178.35
Net Income	81,178.35

Hunting Retriever Club Foundation
Balance Sheet
As of May 31, 2018

	May 31, 18
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	
HRC Foundation Inc.	246,150.11
Total Checking/Savings	246,150.11
Total Current Assets	246,150.11
Other Assets	
Other Assets	
Interest-Long term CD	4,989.05
Long Term Asset	
CD 02587DQ35	50,000.00
CD 795450ZZ1	50,000.00
CD 949763GM2	50,000.00
CD 949763GN0	50,000.00
CD 949763GQ3	50,000.00
CD29883	100,000.00
Total Long Term Asset	350,000.00
Total Other Assets	354,989.05
Total Other Assets	354,989.05
TOTAL ASSETS	601,139.16
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Equity	
Opening Balance Equity	149,830.87
Unrestricted Net Assets	413,852.58
Net Income	37,455.71
Total Equity	601,139.16
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	601,139.16

**2018
HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB NATIONAL MEETING
ENTRY REPORTS**

YEAR	STARTED	SEASONED	FINISHED	UPLAND	TOTAL
2007	6,166	5,050	11,219	1,828	24,263
2008	6,332	5,096	11,141	1,581	24,150
2009	6,443	5,208	11,721	1,784	25,156
2010	6,447	5,136	12,118	1,950	25,651
2011	5,337	4,589	10,766	1,433	22,125
2012	6,714	5,437	10,736	1,202	24,089
2013	6,311	5,276	11,084	1,496	24,167
2014	5,883	5,193	10,640	1,113	22,829
2015	6,857	5,698	11,343	1,208	25,106
2016	7,138	5,996	11,191	1,241	25,566
2017	8,370 ↕	6,739 ↕	13,508 ↕	1,256 ↕	29,873 ↕

GRAND ENTRIES

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
631	629	696	772	634	744	770	780	623	642	811

NEW HRC MEMBERS

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
1199	1172	1266	1134	970	1135	1041	1085	1096	1268	1287

Current (5/10/18) Total Members: 35,893

CLUBS DISSOLVED

JUNE 2017 to MAY 2018

Backwater HRC

May 21, 2018

NEW CLUBS

JUNE 2017 to MAY 2018

(continued)

Etowah RC

Region 04

Formed 02/06/18

NEW CLUBS

JUNE 2017 to MAY 2018

Middle Georgia HRC

Region 04

Formed 5/20/17

West Louisiana

Region 10

Formed 6/7/17

Mississippi Headwaters HRC

Region 08B

5/21/18

Conowingo HRC

Region 02

Formed 1/31/18

Pending: River City HRC, Virginia

2 Club Apps mailed out: Arizona and Canada

Both Region 14A

Important Purina Order Information

Please note that orders for Purina support for hunt tests need to be received no later than the due date listed on the chart below. **Exceptions to the due date are no longer available.**

Your hunt test application and fees must be received by UKC by these dates as well, in order for the order to be placed with Purina.

Purina orders may be submitted on line at:

<http://www.huntingretrieverclub.org/purinaorder.shtml>

MONTH OF HUNT TEST	DATE ORDER IS DUE
March	January 2
April	February 1
May	March 1
June	April 1
July	May 1
August	June 1
September	July 1
October	August 1
November	September 1
December	October 1
January 2019	November 1, 2018
February 2019	December 1, 2018

Policy for Training on Hunt Test Grounds

POLICY:

Training of retrievers will not be allowed on the Hunt Test Grounds of any HRC sanctioned event. The use of training aids such as, but not limited to, e-collar, cattle prod, heeling stick, quirt and metallic leads will not be allowed other than in designated areas. Hunt Test Grounds are considered the entire property unless otherwise designated by the host club.

JUSTIFICATION:

Irresponsible use of training aids on Hunt Test Grounds, whether public or private, jeopardize continued use of the property and are a poor reflection on HRC.

This policy will be in effect immediately, but on an interim basis. The intent is to protect local clubs and their property. Continuance of this policy will be at the discretion of the HRC Board of Directors at our next scheduled National Meeting.

Added 3/23/18 by Executive Committee:

Glenn Dye, President

Tommy Harp, Vice President

Andrea Barlow, Secretary

Sarah Krause, Treasurer

Field Representative Meeting
Friday June 8, 2018

Proceedings

Introductions

Rysty Wismer, Pat Johnson, Bob Brundrett, Danny Sanders, Tom Weeks, Willie Ratliff, Ken Reinert, Joe Heffley, Clayton Taylor, Marcus Bice, Wayne Sumner, Dean Roy, Mark Evans, Paul Bishop, Kim Olson, Glenda Mitchell, Elroy Olson

1.0 Distribution of Documents

1.1 Three documents were distributed by HRC National Field Rep Coordinator Dean Roy:

1.1.1 Judges Directory

1.1.1.1 Dean mentioned that "if there is a judge on the list is not judging anymore, send a note to Marcha Garn".

1.2 Exhibit C -- Judges Recourse Policy

1.3 Field Representative Job Description

2.0 Call for "Issues" Associated with Each Category

2.1 Started

2.1.1 Started testy lack sufficient challenge – "Some tests are like a puppy stake"

2.1.2 Enforcement of the delivery standard is inconsistent.

2.2 Seasoned

2.2.1 Elements of the test are not sufficiently "separated". "Some judges and getting lazy – they don't want to walk to get the separation expected."

2.2.2 There is some variance among judges on "back on lead – off lead- back on lead" as the dog and handler move from one element of the test to the next element. Based on the discussion that followed, rulebook language may not be sufficiently clear regarding "on lead – off lead". There was a general consensus among the FRs that it is permissible to "go from one element of the test to the next off lead if the distance between elements is relatively short (a few steps).

2.2.3 The use of an attention getting device on the second mark was presented. Even though attention getting devices are infrequently used, FRs were reminded that it is permissible to use an attention getting device.

2.2.4 In some tests, the marking element is too difficult because terrain and cover "make it too difficult" to see the thrown bird. The consensus of FRs was that seasoned marks should be in terrain and cover that is reasonable and judges ought to ensure that the seasoned dog is able to "see" the marks well enough to perceive the location of the area of the fall.

2.2.5 In some test and entry angle is "too sharp" and promotes "bank running". The consensus of the FRs was to continue the practice of water entries perpendicular to the water or "very little angle on entry.

2.2.6 Diversions are poorly placed or poorly timed. The consensus of FRs was to assure that the distance between the thrown diversion bird and the dog is adequate.

3.0 Finished Issues

- 3.1 Some judges do not give sufficient time for the dog to “show recovery”.
- 3.2 Non-realistic duck calling.
- 3.3 Some handlers do not use “true shooting form”. The consensus among FRs was to encourage judges to prompt handlers to use “true shooting form” and to issue “gun safety warnings” to handlers who repeatedly use poor form.

4.0 Electronic Rulebook

- 4.1 Dean recommended downloading the rule book to a cell phone and store in “documents”. This will allow quick search by ‘key word’ to clarify matters in the field.

5.0 Field Rep Reimbursement

- 5.1 Dean reminded the FRs that requests must be submitted within 30 days of a seminar or hunt test.
- 5.2 Dean indicated that, “in the future it is likely that we’ll move to Google Docs”. This move will allow for an electronic submission of reimbursement requests, hunt test evaluations, etc.
- 5.3 Wayne commented that a form needs to be revised to allow for the listing of the “third judge” in situations where a third judge is used.

6.0 Handler Changes

- 6.1 Tom cited a scenario wherein “the owner runs the dog in the morning but the Pro runs the dog in the afternoon”. The consensus of the FRs was that this is “not permissible” except in the case of emergencies.

8:55 AM Visit by President Dye and Secretary Barlow

President Dye and Secretary Barlow extended a greeting and expressed appreciation for the work done by FRs.

7.0 “Changed Test”

- 7.1 A scenario was cited wherein a test was changed after several dogs had run. There was a question regarding “which dogs should be re-run?”. Dean clarified that the preference of HRC is to not re-run dogs with passing scores. Discussion followed that included the notion that this matter ought to be addressed in the seminar, seminar manual and rulebook.

8.0 Suspended Handler

- 8.1 Mark inquired regarding the effect of suspension by UKC on the person’s involvement in local HRC club activities. Dean shared the perception that the UKC suspension would have no effect on participation in local club activities but the suspended club member could not run a dog in any UKC licensed event for the full duration of the suspension.

9.0 Region Report at General Membership Meeting

- 9.1 Willie contested the merit of the oral “Region Reports” provided as part of the General Membership Meeting as each national meeting. Willie contended that “the magazine (*Hunting Retriever*) is a very adequate outlet for information about activities in each region. There was no consensus among the FRs and no action was taken.

- 10.0 FR Job Description (distributed by Dean at the outset of the meeting)
- 10.1 Dean clarifies that Vice-president Harp was seeking FR input on revision to the FR job description and had discussed with Dean some language changes that seem in order
- 10.2 Dean clarified that the FRs are appointed by HRC and UKC and that their job is to represent both UKC and HRC and uphold the rules and policies of each organization.
- 10.3 Language Changes from the "old job description" (dated 12/29/2015)
- 10.3.1 2. Responsibility A)
- Old language -- Attend a minimum of **one Hunt of each Club within their Region at least once within a 18 month period** to observe the overall operation and quality of the hunts,
- New Language – Attend a minimum of 50% of each club’s hunts within their region at least once within a 12 month period to observe the overall operation and quality of the hunts
- 10.3.2 2 Responsibility A) b)
- Old language – Observe, evaluate and discuss each test with the judges during their official visits
- New Language – Observe, evaluate, and discuss each test with the judges during their official visits on set-up day.
- 10.3.3 2 Responsibility b) bullet 4
- Strike through bullet 4 – omit the following:
~~"The Field Representative will complete a formal written critiques of each test reviewed and give each judge a copy"~~
- 10.3.4 Discussion on "2 Responsibility b) bullet 6"
- Language -- Changes that the Field Representatives may require the judges to make are intended to help the judge avoid problems that may cause difficulties in evaluating their dogs. It is not our intent that the Field Representatives involve themselves in Judges’ judgmental decisions, only that they assist in setting up and conducting a quality test. Tom mentioned that "suggest" may be more appropriate than "may require". The consensus of the FRs was to leave the wording "may require".
- 10.3.5 Add Bullet 7 to 2 Responsibility b)
- Dean suggested and the FRs concurred that language ought to be added to clarify that FRs can view judges’ books and review score sheets.
- 10.3.6 B Recommendations for New Clubs
- 10.3.6.1 No changes to this section were mentioned.
- 10.3.7 C. Recommendations for Clubs Changing Hunt Dates
- 10.3.7.1 D) Change the number of seminars within the region from two annually to one each year.
- 10.3.7.2 F) Strike ~~"work with the New Club Coordinator in identifying potential new clubs, follow up with persons receiving New Club~~

~~Packages and assist as necessary in organizational meetings, preliminary hunts, etc.~~

- 10.3.7.3 J) Misspelling – corrected the spelling of “judging”.
- 10.3.8 3. Accountability – Paragraph 2 line 2
 - 10.3.8.1 The sentence should read “If unable to effectively resolve an issue they will request assistance from the HRC Vice-president or UKC.” The change is from HRC President to HRC Vice-president.
- 10.3.9 4. Pre-Requisites for Appointment
 - 10.3.9.1 No changes.
- 10.3.10 5. Selection
 - 10.3.10.1 No changes.
- 10.3.11 6. Restrictions
 - 10.3.11.1 There was some confusion on the matter of FRs serving as judges in events sanctioned by other associations. Vice-president Harp joined the meeting and sought the preference of the FRs on this matter. The preference of the FRs was to alter the job description language to reflect that FRs “can judge any other association event with the consent of the EC.” It was assumed that a request to judge other association events that would interfere with presence at an HRC event where the FR has responsibility would not be made by the FR or granted by the EC.
- 10.3.12 7 Funding
 - 10.3.12.1 No Change
- 10.3.13 Supplies
 - 10.3.13.1 No Change
- 11.0 Walking and Shooting
 - 11.1 Dean put forward clarification on the “walk-up”. The FRs were reminded that the walk-up is not considered a mark. A mark is defined as a bird thrown from the retrieving line wherein the dog can see the bird without interference of the act of walking.
- 12.0 Authorized Shotguns
 - 12.1 Willie sought clarification on the authorization of shotguns that may be used at the retrieving line other than the shotguns provided by the club. Willie cited the rulebook, *“Only authorized guns will be allowed in the test area. Authorized guns are those shotguns inspected and found to be in proper working order and approved for use at the test site(s) by a hunt official(s).”* Dean clarified that the Remington 870 is the official gun of HRC but handlers may use their own gun for legitimate reasons (e.g. stock length etc.). Prior to the test the judges or marshal should inspect the gun to assure that the gun is functional and safe. Dean indicated that judges may reject the request of a handler to use their own gun if the gun is unsafe or the rationale for the request is not legitimate.
 - 12.2 Pat Johnson reminded the FRs that no handler should hold a shotgun at the same time they have a dog on lead. Judges should be sure that when a handler comes to the line or leaves the line with their own gun they should not be holding their dog on lead.
- 13.0 Authority of Field Representative

- 13.1 Dean referred the FRs to a HRC Policy excerpt distributed earlier that included a paragraph with the heading "Field Representative/Authority Of". The text clarified that a FR's authority is not limited by regional boundaries. An FR can exercise authority in another region in the absence of the FR assigned to that region.
- 14.0 Judge Recourse Policy – Exhibit C
- 14.1 Dean reviewed the content of the document. Dean recommended that FRs provide a print copy of the Recourse Policy to the judge who is resistive to the requests of the FR to alter a test – "give the judge 10-15 to process the policy". The notion is that it gives time for the judge to effect alterations or for the FR to get a "new judge".
- 14.2 Tom sought clarification on the authority of an "Assistant Field Representative". Does an Assistant Field Representative have authority to "flag" a judge's file? Dean indicated that he would seek information to resolve the question.
- 15.0 FRs serving as Proxies
- 15.1 Wayne sought clarification on the utilization of the "Elected Board Form" and "the Designated Proxy Form". Dean provided clarification on the intended use of the forms. Vice President Harp added that the designation of proxies is cited in the by-laws. Wayne agreed to "take the lead" on submitting a by-law change regarding proxy carrying authority of the FRs.
- 16.0 Airedale Matter
- 16.1 Dean indicated that Airedales are not recognized by UKC as "gun dogs" so they are denied participation in UKC licensed hunt tests. Todd Kallam joined the conversation on Airedales and suggested to "grandfather" the current Airedales that are working toward a title. No "new Airedales" can be run in UKC/HRC hunt tests.
- 16.2 Tom sought clarification on running "silver labs" at HRC events. Todd Kallam requested that judges notify owners/handlers of silver labs at the line that they will be reported to UKC as a dog that does not meet the color standard.
- 17.0 Todd Kallam on Scheduling Dates
- 17.1 Todd clarified that Joyce Little has retired and that Sarah Bonnam is the person to contact regarding date changes. Todd also indicated that scheduling dates will be based on the numbered weekend process.
- 17.2 Dean reminded the FRs that they must "sign off" of a date change and need to be aware of how the date change is likely to affect other clubs when considering the requested date change.
- 18.0 Judges Talking to Handlers
- 18.1 Dean reminded FRs of the importance of judges speaking to handlers in a courteous manner. Courteous communication by judges with all persons associated with the hunt test is an expectation since these conversations often influence attitude and disposition.
- 18.2 Dean reminded FRs that courtesy is an imperative when informing handlers at the line that the test has been failed.
- 19.0 Three Things to Focus on for Next Calendar Year
- 19.1 Rusty provided a list of "three things to work on" from previous years.

- 19.2 The “list” prompted a comment about “dog fighting”. Dean clarified the dog fighting policy. The policy is intended to “get the aggressive dog out of the program”. It is important to “figure out” who the aggressive dog was in a dog fighting occurrence.
- 19.3 “Three Things” were put forward to focus on for 2018-2019:
- 19.3.1 Ensure adequate separation between elements of seasoned test.
 - 19.3.2 Ensure that judges provide “test briefings” that clarify mechanics and objectives. FRs were encouraged to prompt judges to prepare a briefing before the test using the test briefing templates located in the seminar manual.
 - 19.3.3 Ensure that started marks have challenge consistent with the philosophy of HRC and the language in the rulebook.
- 20.0 “Running Rule” Defined
- 20.1 Todd Tharp joined the meeting and explained that there are inconsistencies in the Rulebook. The “gray shaded” text in the rulebook is to be “rules” while the “unshaded text” is policy. In some cases, gray text is thought to be policy and there may be occurrences of unshaded text having the characteristics of a rule. According to Todd there is a need to create a definition of a “Running Rule” to provide a basis for resolving inconsistencies.
- 20.1.1 Dean proposed the following definition – “Deals with the mechanics of testing retrievers during a test”.
 - 20.1.2 Mark proposed “ ... the mechanics of evaluating retrievers during a test”.
- 20.2 Todd excused himself from the FR meeting but indicated that the matter of resolving inconsistencies would be put forward at the Board of Directors meeting on Saturday June 9.
- 21.0 Formal Complaint Form
- 21.1 Dean recommended that FRs keep multiple copies of the “complaint form” with them during a hunt test.
- 22.0 Test Construction
- 22.1 FRs created questions to be used for the upcoming “Judge’s Test.”
- 23.0 Seminar Dates
- 23.1 Dean requested that FRs send him the dates of the upcoming Judge/Handler Seminar for their regions.
- 24.0 Seminar Manual and Slide Presentation Update
- 24.1 An inquiry was made regarding plans for revising the seminar manual and/or the seminar slide presentation. Dean indicated that revisions/update would be contingent on input from Vice-president Harp.