

# 2006 National Contest

## PICTURE JUDGING

### Reasons

Sponsored by:



Each year the National Swine Registry sponsors the National Picture Judging Contest. It is open to youth and adult participants and includes divisions for 4-H, FFA and collegiate teams. The contest ran in the November/December 2005 issue of *Seedstock EDGE* and on the NSR Web site with entries due by Feb. 1. Here are this year's official reasons and results.

#### Class 1 Hampshire Boars

Official Placing: 2-1-3-4

Cuts: 5-3-5

We placed this class of Hampshire boars 2-1-3-4, feeling that we found a boar that best combines muscle, balance and structure into a fault-free package.

The 2 boar is a big-volume, thick-made boar that is heavy structured and the boar that shows more set to his hocks. 2, also being the powerful hog in class, will be most likely to sire blue-butt showpigs that will rise to the top in the show ring.

Structure and flexibility sorts the middle pair 1 over 3. 1 is the sounder-appearing hog that stands on more substance of bone. Yes, he is steeper-hipped, but he has body and muscle to go along with his structure. I realize 3 is a longer-fronted, more attractive-profiling boar. He simply is too straight in his structure and weaker in his EPDs.

In the final pair of boars, we chose the depth of rib, muscle shape and base width found in 3 over 4. Yes, 4 is the longest-bodied hog in class that is the longest, cleanest fronted, but he is a tight-ribbed, light-muscled boar.

#### Class 2 Duroc Boars

Official Placing: 3-2-4-1

Cuts: 3-5-2

In this class of Duroc boars, we found the 3 boar easily on top. He's a wide-based, big-boned, heavy-muscled boar that

comes across as sound-structured. Yes, we would like to see him stronger on his front pasterns, but his power sorts him to the top. 2 is similar to the class winner. However, he is courser fronted and steeper hiped.

In the middle pair, the strength of EPDs and depth of body sorts 2 over 4. 2 is a bolder-ribbed, stouter-made boar that is longer bodied. We like the eye appeal that 4 shows us; however, he is smaller-made, shorter bodied and tighter structured.

In our final pair, we chose the longer-fronted, better-profiling hog that will most likely sire barrows with the show-ring look. We admit 1 is a rugged, stout-made hog, but we would like to see him leveler designed and more expressive in his muscle.

#### Class 3 Yorkshire Boars

Official Placing: 1-4-2-3

Cuts: 6-3-3

In this Yorkshire boar class, we find the 1 boar quite simply dominates from a power standpoint. He is the most-complete, nicest-balanced boar both visually and on paper. He separates himself from the rest of the class due to his extreme power from blade to hip. He's pulled apart from end to end and appears to be flawless in his structural integrity. We realize the 4 boar is a skeletally extended, big-outlined boar; however, he simply lacks the overall muscle and base width to compete with our class winner.

In our middle pair of contrasting types, we like 4 over 2. He is bigger outlined and has the data advantage by utilizing his days on feed more efficiently. He, too, appears to be a longer, leveler-hipped boar that is more extended through his front one third. 2 is a notch heavier muscled, but simply doesn't balance up as well as his contemporaries.

Data sorts 2 and 3 into the bottom pair. 2 is a wider-based, heavier-muscled hog that excels in both MLI and NBA. He appears

to be a longer-bodied boar that is heavier boned and stouter featured. 3 is functionally designed, but goes fourth, as he is the least acceptable in his data and appears to be the frailest-featured boar in the class.

#### Class 4 Landrace Boars

Official Placing: 4-1-2-3

Cuts: 5-3-2

This class was one of the toughest of the day. 4 is the most-complete, nicest-balanced boar in the class. His data, coupled with his phenotypic design, makes him the easy class winner. 1 falls logically into second place. He is a notch frailer boned and lighter muscled, but he does have the statistical advantages over the bottom two.

In our middle pair, 1 easily sorts himself over 2. He is a leveler-designed, more-structurally correct boar. He has a distinct advantage being the leaner-designed, faster-growing boar that has a better set to his hind legs. 2 appears to have a larger hip, but is the more-structurally challenged boar.

Data makes it a close bottom pair. 2 holds a significant advantage in his LWT EPD. He, too, is a heavier-boned, more-powerfully muscled boar. 3 does give us an advantage in his days to 250; however, this is the poorest-quality boar of the drive.

#### Class 5 Hampshire Gilts

Official Placing: 2-4-1-3

Cuts: 6-2-4

We found this Hampshire gilt class to have a logical top and easy bottom, as we placed the class 2-4-1-3.

2 is a higher-quality female that, while attractive on the profile, is also bigger ribbed, heavier muscled, sounder and heavier structured. We admit 4 is a thick-made, long-bodied, big-framed gilt that still maintains depth of body. But, she is too straight fronted to place higher in class.

4 places over 1 in the middle pair, as she is a bigger-bodied gilt that shows more depth to her flank, more shape and expression of muscle through her forearm and hip, and appears to be bigger in her kind. We like that 1 is leveler out of her hip and stouter in her bone work; however, she's tighter-flanked, shallower-bodied and gives up the overall body found in the top pair.

We like the levelness of design found in 1 over 3, as we think 1 is a heavier-structured, longer-sided gilt that will most likely produce barrows with show-ring appeal. We realize 3 is a deeper-bodied, big-topped gilt; however, we would like to see her leveler hip and stouter made.

### **Class 6 Duroc Gilts**

Official Placing: 4-1-3-2

Cuts: 2-6-3

We, as a committee, felt the 4 and 1 gilts rose to the top as a competitive and close pair of Duroc gilts. The 4 gilt was a taller-fronted, longer-sided gilt that was longer and more feminine fronted. She also had a slight advantage in heaviness of structure and foot size. Granted, 1 has an advantage in depth of rib and flank, but we opted to put her second in a close pair, as she is a lower-set gilt that lacks the elevation and show-ring look of 4.

In the middle decision, we felt the 1 gilt easily handles 3. 1 is a more-productive, stouter gilt that is bolder fronted, bigger ribbed and naturally wider. She also has a leveler, more-correct set to her hip and hind leg. Yes, 3 has added shape and dimension, but we liked her third, as she is a straighter-hocked, rounder-hipped gilt that lacks the mass and correct structure of our top pair.

In a closer final pair, we opted for the added extension and size in 3 over 2. 3 is more extended throughout her skeleton, and more elevated and attractive through her front end. We realize 2 has a more-correct set to her front legs and is stouter boned, but we like her fourth as she is a lowest-set, shortest-sided gilt that is too round and quick in her makeup.

### **Class 7 Yorkshire Gilts**

Official Placing: 1-2-4-3

Cuts: 6-2-4

In this class of Yorkshire gilts, 1 finds her way to the top very easily. She is the most-complete, nicest-balanced gilt of the class. She most uniquely and effectively combines levelness of design, structural integrity and base width, while being more than acceptable in her data. She excels the class in terms of muscle and power, while still maintaining a feminine head and neck, and a prominent underline. 2 does possess

a higher LWT EPD, but still holds no phenotypic advantages over the class winner.

Our middle pair becomes close when we choose 2 over 4. 2 is a notch longer bodied and appears to be more-structurally stable on her front two pasterns. She, too, appears to be longer and more extended through her front one third. 4 does hold the MLI and NBA advantages, but she doesn't show the length and extension of the top two.

In our bottom pair of contrasting types, it is 4 over 3. 4 is a nicer-balanced gilt that is more-structurally correct out of her hip and hind leg. She shows us more power and muscle expression. 3 is a big-outlined, more-skeletally extended gilt; however, she simply lacks the overall structural soundness and base width to compete any higher.

### **Class 8 Landrace Gilts**

Official Placing: 4-2-3-1

Cuts: 4-6-2

We started with 4 as we felt she overpowered this class. She is the wide-chested, big-centered gilt that has the most muscle and width throughout. She is also the stoutest, heaviest-structured gilt that possessed the most-balanced genetic profile. Yes, 2 has more cushion up front, but she gives up mass and balance to our winner.

In our intermediate pair, we felt the more-opened-up, bigger-ribbed 2 female beat 3. The 2 gilt is bolder in her blade and has more depth and spring of rib. She also appears to be the more-durably constructed gilt that has more width, muscle and structure. Sure, 3 is longer bodied, but the gilt with a pin nipple is the shallowest-bodied, frailest-made gilt of the drive.

Nevertheless, 3 still beats 1 in our final pair. She is a taller-fronted, longer-sided, more-extended gilt that has a leveler hip and a more-correct set to her pastern. Yes, 4 has the more-desirable underline, and is fuller through her rib and flank, but we like her fourth as she is the shortest-bodied, shortest-hipped gilt that has excess set to her pastern.

### **Class 9 Yorkshire Market Hogs**

Official Placing: 1-3-2-4

Cuts: 3-2-4

In a challenging class of Yorkshire market hogs, the committee placed it 1-3-2-4.

In a top pair of bigger, more-compositionally correct barrows, we felt 1 best combines muscle, lean shape, size and width, along with structural correctness. He also is longer, leveler hip and appears to have a more-fluid and correct hind leg structure. Yes, 3 has the most flare and dimension to his muscle pattern, but we liked him second as he is shorter and rounder through his hip and rump.

In the middle pair it became a situation of give and take. We liked the shape, muscle and look of 3 over 2. 3 is the rawer-made barrow that works more shape and dimension down his top and through his hip and rump. I'd expect him to measure leaner at the 10th rib resulting in a higher percentage of muscle. Sure, 2 appears to be a bigger-rumped barrow that is looser structured, but we felt he was third, as he is a lower-statured barrow that has more condition through his lower body.

In the final pair, we like the more production-oriented, easier-growing barrow 2 over 4. 2 has the advantage in width, rib and mass. He also spreads more muscle from blade to hip, and is heavier boned and structured. We realize 4 is taller-fronted, but we put the barrow that toed out up front fourth as he is simply the narrowest-made and lightest-muscl'd of the drive.

### **Class 10 Duroc Market Hogs**

Official Placing: 1-2-3-4

Cuts: 6-2-2

The Duroc barrows offered many differences in size and structure. The barrow that puts the most together from a balance standpoint is 1. He is stout in his muscling from his forearm back to his hip. He shows plenty of rib and bone, and is good in his structure, in terms of set to his hind legs and flex to his pasterns. We realize that 2 is longer bodied and has plenty of muscling to his top. He just gives up balance and design.

The middle pair becomes much more challenging, as we have hogs that contrast in their types. We find the added value in apparent performance in the 2 hog over 3. He is not only bigger in his kind, longer patterned and more expressive in his hip, but he also has the visual advantage in weight. This should give him a higher value when it comes to market.

Yes, 3 is better in his structure and design. This little barrow has a ton of show-ring appeal and looks fresh. He is level in his hip and still lean in his makeup. However, he simply gives up the total weight to run with the top pair.

Quality sorts the final pair 3 over 4. 3 is clearly better in his rump structure and appears to be cleaner though his lower one third. 3 is leaner through his elbow pocket and lower body. We admit that 4 is the bigger-outlined, pounds-heavy barrow that appears to be thick enough. But, this barrow is also the poorest-balanced, highest-condition and finds his way to the bottom.

**Special thanks to this year's officials: Craig Spray, Jim Kilmer, and Brandon Ogle.**

# 2006 National Contest PICTURE JUDGING

## Results



### FFA Team Division (67 teams) 2,000 points possible

**1st Place Total Score: 1,824**  
**Holcomb FFA, Holcomb, Kan.**  
Kristin Becker, Troy Krehbiel, Darris Hawks, Stefane Prieto

**2nd Place Total Score: 1,820**  
**Hooker FFA #2, Hooker, Okla.**  
Aaron Wayman, Bryce Burden, Jaycee Cron, Marcus Romero

**3rd Place Total Score: 1,817**  
**Holcomb FFA, Holcomb, Kan.**  
Garrett Maddox, Nathan Maas, Matt Amos, Melissa Conway

**4th Place Total Score: 1,814**  
**Karval FFA Red Zone, Karval, Colo.**  
Darien Wezel, Bryanna Johnson, Joshua Savage, Manon Merewether

**5th Place Total Score: 1,813**  
**Hooker FFA #5, Hooker, Okla.**  
Aid Bahlmann, Weston Russell, Brent Herald, Vince Martinez

### 4-H Team Division (17 teams) 2,000 points possible

**1st Place Total Score: 1,776**  
**Karval 4-H Club, Karval, Colo.**  
John Thornton, Brett Stone, Lane Elliott, Devin Seymour

**2nd Place Total Score: 1,749**  
**Karval 4-H Club, Karval, Colo.**  
Abigail Clark, Cole James, Joni Marie James, Jeremy Burch

**3rd Place Total Score: 1,710**  
**Marion City, Ill., #3, Salem, Ill.**  
Kane Austin, Bradley Braddock, Caleb Brink, Jay Telford

**4th Place Total Score: 1,674**  
**Southern Tier Livestock #4, Wayland, NY**  
Jeff Kurtz, Andrew Schubmehl, Ryan Barber, Patrick Acomb

**5th Place Total Score: 1,673**  
**Christian City, Jr. Livestock Judging, Taylorville, Ill.**  
Taryn Adcock, Tamar Adcock, Amy Heberling, Kyle Yoder

### College Team Division (18 teams) 2,500 points possible

**1st Place Total Score: 2,367**  
**Iowa State University #3, Ames, Iowa**  
Jarrod Bakker, Cassie Johnson, Ben Isaacson, Andrew Bormann, Matt Rohrig

**2nd Place Total Score: 2,366**  
**Black Hawk East #3, Kewanee, Ill.**  
Taylor Schwartz, Samantha Sell, Ashley Schnoor, Jeremy Onken, Nathan Ray

**3rd Place Total Score: 2,347**  
**Black Hawk East #6, Kewanee, Ill.**  
J.P. Morris, Jacob Patterson, Tim Maxwell, Casseday Lohr, Kyle McCracken

**4th Place Total Score: 2,335**  
**Iowa State University #2, Ames, Iowa**  
Bryan Hoag, Anne Bjerum, Greg Hosch, Kyle Schulte, Shari Sell

**5th Place Total Score: 2,319**  
**Black Hawk East #4, Kewanee, Ill.**  
Doug Albright, Jamey Albrecht, Donald Sunday, Brian Bates, Hayley Wertemberger

### Senior Division (92 contestants) 500 points possible

**1st Place Total Score: 472**  
Brian Arnold, Liberty Center, Ind.

**2nd Place Total Score: 468**  
Kay Christian, Woodward, Iowa

**3rd Place Total Score: 462**  
Dale Hummel, Cabery, Ill.

**4th Place Total Score: 459**  
Charlie Leopold, Hallettsville, Texas

**5th Place Total Score: 458**  
Merle Nickelson, Guymon, Okla.

### College Division (127 contestants) 500 points possible

**1st Place Total Score: 484**  
Ben Isaacson, Ames, Iowa

**2nd Place Total Score: 480**  
Nathan Ray, Cameron, Ill.

**3rd Place Total Score: 480**  
J.D. Morris, Poneto, Ind.

**4th Place Total Score: 478**  
Katie Dillon, Martinsville, Ind.

**5th Place Total Score: 477**  
Jared Chester, Washington C.H., Ohio

### Junior Division (478 contestants) 500 points possible

**1st Place Total Score: 474**  
Lance Waugh, Guymon, Okla.

**2nd Place Total Score: 470**  
Colin Lowe, Chickasha, Okla.

**3rd Place Total Score: 468**  
Bryce Burden, Hooker, Okla.

**4th Place Total Score: 467**  
Brandon Bruner, Hooker, Okla.

**5th Place Total Score: 465**  
Darien Wezel, Karval, Colo.