

All:

Thanks for all of the questions/comments/concerns. I appreciate the emails of support as well as those that are upset/confused/disagree. I'll try to consolidate as many of the emails / questions as I can below.

Why did you start the AWDC? There's an assertion that being president of USCA is not enough and this is USCA's attempt to "control" more.

Some of the thoughts/accusations floating around are really funny – this is the most amusing and incorrect. The truth is actually much more boring. I do not want to be president of two organizations and in fact, as many of the USCA members know, I have been doing less and less over the past year with more delegation within USCA.

AWDC was formed for a few reasons *but with a singular mission* – ensure that all competitors could compete in a fair, safe, and professionally run event. Feedback from many competitors (as well as spectators, vendors, event staff, etc.) over the last decade has been that we have too many big events condensed into a small window and we should consider consolidation. Secondly, over the past five or six years, I've felt (and received hundreds of similar phone calls/emails) that the AWDF championship was in decline without any real urgency to ensure that it gets better. While there are occasional bright spots, the end grade has not been favorable. I felt that my attempts to convince the leadership of AWDF (and that is not a criticism of any single individual – this has been an issue for years) that we should improve the quality of the AWDF or combine it with USCA's WDC were futile and not well received – issues such as crafting the flight schedule post draw, disrespectful treatment of judges and staff, and lime-covered tracking fields were the tipping points this year.

I felt that I'd exhausted my options so I formed the AWDC.

This was an action independent of USCA for two reasons . . . (1) I was advised by the FCI that it would be better, should the invite to the FCI Championships change in the future, it should be to an all-breed organization, not to a specific breed club and (2) I am well aware of the perception of USCA – some historically factual, some not (both the good and the bad). I did this independently without USCA support to ensure that negative reaction could be blamed on me – not on USCA.

As far as the "control" aspect – seems like such a bad word but it is, in some regard, the truth. I wanted to make sure that there was "control" to ensure an exceptional competitor experience. There was every intention from the beginning to work cooperatively with other clubs so that judges/helper/tracklayers/staff/group were all acceptable and as good as we could get.

Did you want AWDC to end all AWDF activities?

Not at all – whatever other benefits the clubs of AWDF derive should and would remain. I had no intent of negatively impacting those.

This was only about hosting a combined championship. I had every hope and belief that the FCI would move the championship invitation from AWDF to AWDC. While I was aware that this would be initially upsetting to some, I believed in the greater result. I believed that those most upset would not be competitors and that following the first event people would see this to be good for the dogs and competitors. The initial idea was that this would be at no/low cost to the member clubs.

Why did you start negotiating with AWDF then?

AWDF called me and asked me about AWDC. I told them the same as above. We then started negotiating as a compromise that could meet everyone's needs. I was open to that, as previously stated, all I cared about was a singular world-class event for competitors. At that point, AWDC activity stopped and we proceeded to negotiate.

Why did you not do it with USCA member input/support? Where is the transparency?

Over the past 5 years of being president, I've done my best to ensure that the members are kept in the loop of all USCA business. I can't think of any USCA business that the EB, the office, or me knows and doesn't share with the membership. Again – I don't make organizational decisions – the bylaws prevent that.

On this AWDC issue – this was me acting independently of USCA. I felt that over the years that I've had plenty of competitor / member feedback about the quality of the AWDF event and that I understood their frustrations and needs. I believed that there would be great support for the singular trial vision based on that input. Of course, there was every chance (as did happen to some degree) that when the board was informed of my individual actions, they would not approve or ratify. I had expected that once AWDC received a formal go ahead from the FCI that I would be able to convince all member clubs of the benefit as well.

Is USCA reverting to the era where a very few control the organization?

USCA is a democracy. I do not make any decisions independent of the USCA Executive Board (20 strong independent thinkers that do not always vote the way I would like) or the General Board (all clubs are eligible to vote at the annual general board meeting and overturn anything the EB does) nor do I derive any income or a salary. Even the committees that I appoint often have contrarian thought to mine and yet, we always go with the majority . . . we do the best for the most even if that means individuals are occasionally upset or don't get exactly what they want (me included).

Jim Alloway