

National Contest PICTURE JUDGING 2008

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 2007 issue of *Seedstock EDGE* and on the NSR Web site with entries due Feb. 1. Here are this year's official reasons and results.

Class 1 Hampshire Boars

Official Placing: 1-4-2-3

Cuts: 5-2-4

We easily started with 1. With his big, raw-made skeleton on the most correct and balanced structure, he is the growthiest boar. He demonstrates a more powerful forearm and wider blade tied to a thicker topline. His plant, cushion and bone size to his rear leg provide a truer, more flexible structure. 4 is a similarly designed boar with a bit more extension to his front end, but he is a frailer-designed, lighter-muscled boar.

In a middle pair of contrastingly designed boars, we place 4 over 2. He is a larger-statured, more flexible boar that appears to be later maturing. He shows more depth and softness to his rib with more set and give to his front end. 2 excels 4 in genetic leanness, shape of muscle, levelness of top and style, but his straightness to his front end and shallowness of body hold him in third.

Balance and eye appeal placed 2 over 3. 2 is a more up-fronted, leveler-lined boar that appears stronger behind his shoulder and smoother at his ham-loin junction. 3 is more powerful in his body cavity and thickness. This is a disadvantage, as we found him to be the lowest-fronted, shortest-necked boar that appears to be the most disjointed in his topline.

Class 2 Duroc Boars

Official Placing: 3-1-2-4

Cuts: 2-4-6

This class separated into a top pair, a third and a fourth. We opted for the added power and dimension found in 3 over 1. 3

was the stoutest-featured, most ruggedly-designed boar. He has the most natural thickness, while being bigger scaled and more extended. Granted, 1 is the more eye-appealing boar. He is level down his top and through his hip, while being cleaner fronted, leaner and more muscular. He was second as he was smaller scaled, frailer featured, and gave up the overall mass found in 3.

In the middle pair, 1 is the more correctly balanced boar. He tied together stronger behind his shoulder, while being leveler through his hip. He was also bolder in his center rib and more muscular in his look. We do admit that 2 is longer sided and taller fronted, however, we liked him in third as he was less collected in his topline, tighter in his flank and plainer in his shape.

The structural advantages, composition and shape in the 2 boar allowed him to sort into third. 2 is a longer-bodied, more expressively muscled boar that read leaner both visually and on paper. He, too, was leveler through his hip and more correct in the set to his hock. The 4 boar is heavy structured and deep sided. But, he is the plainest in his shape, the lightest muscled and the poorest on paper of the four.

Class 3 Yorkshire Boars

Official Placing: 4-2-1-3

Cuts: 4-2-3

We started with 1, as he excels in rib, dimension and growth. He shows more natural depth of side and flank. He also projects more shape down his top and from behind. 2 does show more elevation to his front end with a slightly leaner appearance. But, his lack of depth and the prominence of his ham-loin junction kept him in second.

In a close middle pair, we placed 2 over 1. 2 shows more support from his performance records and appears to be a bigger-statured, more-extended boar. He demonstrates more length of side, hip and front end combined with excellence in leanness and growth EPDs. 1 shows more shape down his top and is a thicker-made

boar. But, he is also the shortest-bodied, shortest-hipped boar in the class.

Extra power and stoutness compelled us to place 1 over 3. 1 is a wider-bladed, bolder-chested boar that packs more meat down his topline and from behind. He is more uniform in his depth and stronger topped. 3 shows an advantage in growth EPD and extension of skeleton, but his lack of genetic performance, natural body and dimension placed him last in the class.

Class 4 Landrace Boars

Official Placing: 2-1-3-4

Cuts: 5-2-6

2 is a relatively easy place to start. This is clearly the correctly designed, muscular, heavy-structured boar of the class that is big in his kind and correct about the angles to his skeleton. From a flexibility and genetic growth standpoint, 1 most closely resembles our class winner. However, he simply needs to be bigger skeletoned and cleaner in his composition.

We still used 1's added body and correctness of structure in a more controversial middle decision. The heavier-structured boar was more correct in the set to his knee and hock. 3 is a longer-bodied and leaner-designed boar.

Despite these faults, we felt that he still needed to beat 4 in the bottom, as there is just more to him. Not only is he stouter about his rib and hip, but is more correct in the set and cushion to his rear pastern. 4 didn't fit the group from a soundness, width and muscularity standpoint.

Class 5 Hampshire Gilts

Official Placing: 4-3-2-1

Cuts: 4-2-7

Among a very challenging initial trio of females, we chose to land on the added body and functional design of 4. She is the fault-free gilt that reads with the most width at her foundation and excels in muscle. From a side profile, 3 presents the most attractive look while being bigger

footed and longer bodied. However, she reads a bit closed-up underneath and needs more depth and shape to her rib.

We preferred her extra look and design over the body and muscle of 3. We believe that she is particularly more desirable in the angle to her shoulder and set to her hock, and she is more correct in her hip. Some may prefer the extra mass and power of 2. However, she's off in her hip and straight in her shoulder, and just reads the least functional of the initial three.

2 dominates 1 in terms of muscle, body and design. We admit that 1 may be leveler hipped and more extended from her blade forward, but is simply the narrowest-designed, tightest-ribbed and poorest-performing gilt of the drive.

Class 6 Duroc Gilt

Official Placing: 3-2-1-4
Cuts: 4-2-7

We started with 3 as she shows the bigness and rawness of skeleton in a high-volumed, stylish design. She excelled 2 in levelness of hip and extension of front end in a bigger-outlined package. 2 shows an advantage in depth and curvature to her rib and more natural thickness. The roundness off her rump and coarseness of her front end places her second.

In a tight middle pair, stoutness and dimension places 2 over 1. 2 excels in natural muscle shape and width of skeleton. She exhibits a taller front end on a longer cannon bone. 1 is a more flexible-appearing, softer-made gilt that excels in rump design. Her lack of muscle dimension and elevation leaves her third.

An easy bottom pair places 1 over 4 for extra rib, stoutness and base width. She is naturally more three dimensional in her skeleton with a bigger foot and forearm, and more set and give to her pastern. 4 is clean fronted and bigger framed, but she is the narrowest-gauged, shallowest-bodied, poorest-performing gilt in the class.

Class 7 Yorkshire Gilt

Official Placing: 2-4-3-1
Cuts: 4-2-3

The gilt that comes to the top is 2. She has the most to offer in balance and body volume, and appears to be correct in her design while still heavy in her structure. She also has the highest MLI. The 4 gilt ends up in second with her extra body mass and muscle shape. She also has the best EPDs for Days. This gilt gets shorter and steeper in her hip. She does not balance up as well as our class winner.

The middle pair is 4 over 3. 4 appears to have more body, rib and flank. She has

more muscle expression to her top and is more correct in her front knee structure.

The 3 gilt is longer patterned, leveler hipped and has a very level design.

The final pair is 3 over 1. 3 is a gilt that looks better in her rear hock, cleaner in her rear joints and better in her hip.

1 is full of muscle from front to rear, and from her flank forward she is level and muscular. We would like to change her hip structure, rear hock and ham-loin junction.

Class 8 Landrace Gilt

Official Placing: 2-4-3-1
Cuts: 3-2-2

This class was challenging, but we still thought that 2 sorted her way to the top. 2 appears to have the widest and most correct skeleton, while still maintaining the most shape to her rib and natural dimension throughout. 4 is the taller-fronted and larger-outlined gilt, and she does have the higher LWT EPD. However, we liked her second, as she gave up the power and brood-sow potential found in 2.

In the middle pair of gilts, we opted for the advantages in design and structural correctness in 4 over 3. 4, when viewed from the side, is the longer-bodied, taller-fronted gilt that is leveler out of her hip and more correct in the set and angle to her hock. She is also leaner designed and more expressive in her shape. 3 is deep sided and bold centered with an advantage in her Days and NBA EPDs. We kept her in third as she was steeper out of her hip, slightly over-set in her hock and lower fronted.

The 3 gilt's added body and functional look keeps her in third. We saw the 3 gilt as the deeper-sided, bolder-centered gilt that is stronger in her ham-loin junction and more desirable in her growth figure.

1 is a bigger-scaled, longer-bodied gilt, but she is also the shallowest-ribbed, harshest-appearing gilt that could potentially be the hardest maintaining of the four.

Class 9 Crossbred Market Hogs

Official Placing: 1-3-2-4
Cuts: 4-5-2

We saw this class breaking into a top pair of higher-quality market hogs, and 1 sorted his way to the top. 1 is the most correct in his skeleton, being the most level down his top and through his hip, and maintaining a correct angle up front and set to his hock. He also appears to have the most natural muscle dimension and width of skeleton. 3 has more lean shape down his top, however, we liked him third as he is frailer boned, lower fronted and straighter in his hock.

3's combination of muscularity and a more balanced, correct look allowed

him to stay in second. 3 is more correctly balanced. He is more correct in the angle to his shoulder, which allows him to be more relaxed in his spine and leveler out of his hip. He, too, has a leaner, more muscular shape through his top and hip. 2 shows more power through his center and lower ham, yet he is third, as he is straighter in his shoulder, tighter in his top and plainer in his look.

We opted for the added product potential found in 2 over 4. We saw 2 being a bigger-scaled, longer-bodied barrow that is more muscular in his look. 4 is leveler designed and structurally more correct, but within the class, he is the smallest scaled and shortest bodied who is the plainest in his shape and offers the least product of the four.

Class 10 Hampshire Market Hogs

Official Placing: 2-4-1-3
Cuts: 3-2-5

2 is not the biggest-ribbed barrow of the drive, however, he excels the class in his combination of muscularity, correctness of design and heaviness of structure. He is an extremely tall-fronted and attractive barrow with a great deal of muscle shape, and he reads the most desirable from a structural standpoint. The stout-hipped and big-ribbed barrow is 4. He is more opened up through his forerib and has more muscle shape down low. He is plain in his shape, frail structured and straight in his shoulder, so we decided to leave him second.

The distinct advantages that 4 has from a body and muscle perspective are sufficient to use him over 1. Specifically, 4 is longer and leveler about his hip. However, we do appreciate the advantages 1 has through his front end. To us, the heavier-structured barrow is taller fronted and more correct in the angle to his shoulder, not to mention that he has a more descript edge to his loin. He is short and steep hipped and just doesn't read with the productive look of 4, so we left him a close third.

We felt he was still a logical choice to use over 3 in the bottom pair. The more eye-appealing 1 barrow is stouter and more rugged in his skeleton than 3. Likewise, we read him with a clear advantage in muscularity. 3 may be more extended in his skeleton and especially longer hipped, however, this doesn't make up for the fact that he is the lightest-muscled, narrowest-skeletoned, poorest-designed barrow of the four.

Special thanks to this year's officials: Dan Shike, Ill., Brian Hines, Mich., and Clint Schwab, Ind.

National Contest

PICTURE JUDGING

2008

Results

Sponsored by:



Ties were broken on classes with smaller total cuts.

FFA Team Division (126 teams) 2,000 points possible

1st Place Total Score: 1,797
Texhoma FFA Thunderbird,
Texhoma, Okla.
Matt Freeman, Amber Escalera, Kyle
Keylon, J.D. Pugh

2nd Place Total Score: 1,796
Holcomb FFA Blue, Holcomb, Kan.
Jarvis Jarnagin, Matthew Flores, Vanessa
Casanova, Nick Herrmann

3rd Place Total Score: 1,796
Holcomb FFA Pink, Holcomb, Kan.
Breanna Post, Brandon Miller, Brandon
Bailes, Charles Kenyon

4th Place Total Score: 1,792
Hooker FFA Green Team,
Hooker, Okla.
Alexis Wiebe, Brittney Bergner, Guerrero
Garcia, Taylor Gibson

5th Place Total Score: 1,781
Texhoma FFA Blue Streak,
Texhoma, Okla.
Chandler Henderson, Katelyn Blain,
Colter Grice, Braidyn Allard

4-H Team Division (36 teams) 2,000 points possible

1st Place Total Score: 1,738
Henry-Stark Team #2, Galva, Ill.
Jon Heaton, Jay Iliff, Ethan Ely,
Brandon Shultz

2nd Place Total Score: 1,737
Henry-Stark Team #1, Galva, Ill.
Ryan Giertz, Clay Zwilling, Jill Johnson,
Tonja Egan

3rd Place Total Score: 1,723
Hardesty C, Hardesty, Okla.
Francisco Morales, Eber Marquez, Ivan
Rivera, Zachary Fuentes

4th Place Total Score: 1,710
Henry-Stark Team #3, Galva, Ill.
Tyler Gradert, Jacob Steele, John Steele,
Jenna Loundenburg

5th Place Total Score: 1,704
Sherlock Strivers, Holcomb, Kan.
Jordan Jarnagin, Tanner Mongeau,
Stephanie Janda, Ashley Mongeau

College Team Division (13 teams) 2,500 points possible

1st Place Total Score: 2,302
Seward Co. Community College
#3, Liberal, Kan.
Jessica Swan, Sandi Cortez, Paul Fisher,
Anthony Adams, Sam Rucker

2nd Place Total Score: 2,293
Seward Co. Community College
#1, Liberal, Kan.
Ryan Imler, Luke Wempe, Jett Eder,
KayLonni Williams, Stephanie Jones

3rd Place Total Score: 2,288
Seward Co. Community College
#2, Liberal, Kan.
Travis Stovall, Sara McManus, Lance
Waugh, Alissa Imler, Blake Williams

4th Place Total Score: 2,233
Black Hawk East #4, Kewanee, Ill.
Kylee Willard, Jalene Alden, Jared Givens,
Alex Denny, Carmen Drummond

5th Place Total Score: 2,233
Black Hawk East #1, Kewanee, Ill.
Chris Cassidy, Zack Butler, Jared Boyert,
Brandon Freel, Emily Elliott

Senior Division (79 contestants) 500 points possible

1st Place Total Score: 461
Janet Truelock, Hooker, Okla.

2nd Place Total Score: 459
Brenda Sparks, Guymon, Okla.

3rd Place Total Score: 457
Merle Nickelson, Guymon, Okla.

4th Place Total Score: 457
Rowena Nickelson, Guymon, Okla.

5th Place Total Score: 456
Chad Mahler, Serena, Ill.

College Division (74 contestants) 500 points possible

1st Place Total Score: 469
Justin Stierwalt, Paragon, Ind.

2nd Place Total Score: 468
Jessica Swan, Johnson, Kan.

3rd Place Total Score: 467
Sandi Cortez, Thibodaux, La.

4th Place Total Score: 463
Sara McManus, Franktown, Colo.

5th Place Total Score: 462
Jett Eder, Sharon Springs, Kan.

Junior Division (776 contestants) 500 points possible

1st Place Total Score: 459
Charles Kinyon, Holcomb, Kan.

2nd Place Total Score: 457
Matt Freeman, Texhoma, Okla.

3rd Place Total Score: 455
Cody Huxman, Hooker, Okla.

3rd Place Total Score: 455
James Jacobs, Hooker, Okla.

5th Place Total Score: 455
Colter Grice, Texhoma, Okla.