

## **Some notes on the 2003 FRA AGM OPEN DISCUSSION**

[Please note that these are not, strictly speaking, minutes of the meeting – and they will never be formally approved – they are my take on what went on, and I reproduce them to remind us, as a committee, of what was said. If you think that I've got something wrong, or omitted something (as if!!) please let me have your version, and I'll happily circulate it to the other committee members. – *Alan Brentnall*]

### **Long Fell Races.**

This year we lost the Ennerdale and the Royal Dockray Helvellyn - in part due to poor attendance and clashes with other events.

It was suggested that, in selecting English Championship races, the FRA should aim to target the poorly supported races (Ennerdale, Wasdale, Duddon) rather than the ones which always attract good numbers (Borrowdale, Langdale, 3 Peaks), and that the FRA should avoid clashes between English Championships and these races (e.g. avoid situations such as 2003 Pen-y-ghent vs Ennerdale).

This subject was in fact raised at the July 2003 FRA Committee Meeting where it was agreed that we would strive to avoid such clashes. This is not, however, always easy under the present system, and there was a suggestion that Championship races could be pre-published so that race organisers themselves could themselves take evasive action. Is this practicable?

Promotions: There was also a suggestion that the FRA could (occasionally) pay for all entries to a particular race as a promotion.

The Lakeland Classics Championship was discussed as one attempt to revitalise some of the less well-attended Longs. There was also a mention of the possibility of publishing a ranking of fell-runners (in these races) as an attempt to prompt runners to enter these races, and improve their performance.

### **Championship Races - Toilet Situation etc**

Despite the recommendation in the standard written advice given to Championship race organisers to provide adequate toilet facilities, two 2003 (British & English) Championship races (Holme Moss and Slieve Bearnagh) had no facilities whatsoever.

Although race organisers who don't, for whatever reason, provide toilets now state this in the Calendar entry, it was felt that the element of choice, which a runner might exercise, is not always as free when it comes to a Championship race.

It was suggested that the Championships Subcommittee should not be selecting races which stated that there were no toilet facilities.

It was also suggested that the FRA should attempt to broker a deal with a supplier of portaloos to provide a discounted service for organisers.

There were also suggestions that other facilities which became inadequate due to the sheer numbers involved in a Championship race (parking, stiles etc) should be addressed - even if this alters the course of the race.

### **Responsibilities**

Race organisers are legally responsible for the safety of the runners who take part in their races, and yet we all seem to be in agreement that, as runners, we should be responsible for ourselves.

This dilemma frequently provokes discussion – what can we really do about the situation?

The possibility of using tick boxes on entry forms was suggested - to specifically remind runners of their own responsibilities.