

Minutes of the midyear meeting, 8/15/15

Meeting was called to order by President Michael Campbell at 8:02 a.m. MT.

In attendance were Michael Campbell, Lisa Schneider, Susan Garlinghouse, Mollie Krumlaw-Smith, Monica Chapman, Connie Caudill, Sue Keith, Kevin Waters, Christoph Schork, Nick Kohut, Paul Latiolais, Olin Balch, Steph Teeter, Forrest Tancer, Andrew Gerhard, John Parke, Terry Woolley-Howe, Julia Elias-Lynne, Roger Stanton, Duane Barnett, Susan Kasemeyer and Mike Maul.

Excusals - Skip Kemerer, Peter Himmertzein and Randy Eiland due to emergency family issues; Tom Bache due to a previously planned family event. Connie made a motion to excuse, Susan Kasemeyer seconded, motion passed.

Susan Garlinghouse made a motion to accept the minutes from BoD conference call of July 12, 2015. Lisa Schneider seconded, motion passed.

Statistical Report - Kathleen Henkel

Membership Report August, 2015

Membership as of 8/12/14 - 4781

Membership as of 8/7/15 - 5048

Rider fees as of 8/7/14 - \$43,821

Rider fees as of 8/7/15 - \$58,828

Sanction fees as of 8/7/14 - \$17,378

Sanction fees as of 8/7/15 - \$15,270

New members as of 8/12/14 - 556

New members as of 8/7/15 - 638

Business before the Board:

Candace Fitzgerald made a presentation updating the Board on marketing activities, including articles in non-endurance-specific publications introducing, supporting endurance riding and AERC and in regards to positive articles highlighting individuals (an example was John Parke's recent rescue of several exhausted ultra-marathon runners with the assistance of his Hall of Fame Icelandic Remington). Plans for future projects were discussed.

Approval of Kevin Water's recommendation of replacement Director for Mountain Region, Tennessee Lane. Connie Caudill made a motion to approve, Paul Latiolais seconded, motion passed.

Mollie Krumlaw-Smith reviewed the current working budget, noting that this is not yet finalized.

Motions before the Board:

1) Increase in board member expense reimbursement for attendance at mid-year meeting. Steph Teeter made a motion to approve, Susan Kasemeyer seconded. Motion passed.

2) AERC-I Young Rider stipend for first FEI ride. Connie made a motion to approve. Forwarded by International Committee, this motion does not require a second. Motion passed.

3) AERC-I dues increase request re AERC-I membership. AERC-I dues are currently \$10, motion increases dues to \$15. Sue Keith made a motion to approve. Forwarded by International Committee, this motion does not require a second. Motion passed.

4) AERC-I reimbursement for team golf carts at NAJYRC competition. Terry Woolley-Howe made a motion to approve. Forwarded by International Committee, this motion does not require a second. Motion passed.

5) Assessing a rider fee to generate income for funding of AERC research. There was signification discussion regarding this motion, including concerns forwarded by the Rider Managers Committee

on the difficulties in collecting, recording and forwarding additional monies at endurance rides. It was also commented that while ongoing research is beneficial to the sport, alternate methods of fund-raising should be explored. The benefit of considering funds for specific research projects was also discussed. Michael Campbell called for a vote on the motion, four ayes, 18 nays. Motion failed.

6) AERC Resolution to oppose the transfer or sale of federal public lands managed by the United States Department of the Interior and Agriculture. Roger Taylor made a motion to approve, Duane Barnett seconded. Motion passed.

7) AERC Youth Representative policy. There was discussion as to the merit of providing the opportunity for a young rider to present their perspective to AERC leadership. This is a opportunity for interested AERC members under the age of 21 years, as nominated by the Junior Committee, although no specific individual has yet been identified. The youth representative will not be accorded voting privileges on the Board. Steph Teeter made a motion to approve, Olin Balch seconded. Motion passed.

8) Motion to raise the drug testing fee (outside of California). There was significant discussion regarding the history and status of the current and recently- revised AERC drug testing program, the advisability of increasing and/or maintaining the current rate of drug testing at rides, and the probability of lab fees increasing and thus difficulty of maintaining even current rates of drug testing. Concerns were raised by the Ride Manager's Committee and ride managers on the Board in the logistical difficulties of collecting, recording and forwarding additional funds generated through increased ride entry fees to AERC. It was noted that the Veterinary Committee currently has reserves in their budget of approximately \$118,000, although this amount has been held in trust in the event of any future drug-testing litigation which may arise. It was determined to defer this motion back to the Veterinary Committee with the suggestion that reserve funds be utilized this coming year to determine the benefits and results of increasing drug-testing, and that the advisability of increasing rider fees in future be considered based on those results. The motion was deferred.

9) Motion to designate reserve drug testing fees for litigation specific needs only. This motion was also recommended for a deferment back to the Veterinary Committee as it relates to the above motion to raise rider fees to allow for increased drug testing at rides. The motion was deferred.

10) Extension of contract for Marketing Director. The board has previously approved a contract with Candace FitzGerald of Dobbin Group for marketing consultation and services, with said contract to be reviewed after initial six months. Lisa Schneider made a motion to extend the present contract for an additional six months. Susan Garlinghouse seconded, motion passed.

The Board went into executive session to discuss and approve salaries and wages for AERC staff.

Michael Campbell adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:06 p.m. MT, and brought the meeting back to order at 1:07 p.m. MT

John Parke gave a detailed update on the status of the Strategic Plan, including progress reports and updates from each of the SP areas (Governance, Membership, Finance, Trails, Education/Welfare). While still in process and development, there is good progress being made by each of the relevant "champions" and groups involved.

Following the Strategic Plan update, John led a discussion on strategies to increase Board communication.

The next Board conference call will be held September 14, 2015. Susan Garlinghouse made a motion to adjourn, Mollie Krumlaw-Smith seconded. Motion passed.

Michael Campbell adjourned the meeting at 6:13 p.m. MT

MOTIONS:

AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name **AERC I Dues increase request re AERC International membership**

Proposing Committee **AERC International**

Date of Motion July 7, 2015

Classification of Motion Request

Proposed Motion The AERC International Committee voted to recommend to the AERC Board increasing the individual AERC-I membership fee from \$10 to \$15 per year and adding a family AERC-I membership at a cost of \$40 per year, for the AERC board of directors to consider at their next meeting in order to take action in time for the 2016 membership year.

Background, analysis and benefit AERC-I believes a small dues increase is warranted and will allow the committee to develop more programs in the future.

Budget effect/impact No effect

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization no impact on general AERC members

Impact on AERC Office minimal

Committees consulted and/or affected AERC international

Implementation plan

Supporting materials

Supporting approvals AERC I meeting minutes to follow.

AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name **AERC I young rider stipend re first FEI ride**

Proposing Committee **AERC International**

Date of Motion July 7, 2015

Classification of Motion Request New

Proposed Motion The AERC International Committee voted to provide \$50 towards the young rider's first FEI ride and \$25 each for up to two subsequent rides, to be capped at \$100 per rider and \$1,000 for the overall program for the 2015 calendar year.

Background, analysis and benefit AERC-I believes this support will encourage young rider participation.

Budget effect/impact No effect; will come out of AERC-I budget

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization see above

Impact on AERC Office minimal

Committees consulted and/or affected AERC international

Implementation plan

Supporting materials

Supporting approvals AERC I meeting minutes to follow.

**AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL**

Motion Name AERC I Reimbursement for team golf carts at NAJYRC competition

Proposing Committee AERC International

Date of Motion July 7, 2015

Classification of Motion Request

Proposed Motion The AERC International Committee voted to reimburse team golf cart expenses of up to \$500 per zone for the July 13-18 NAJYRC competition, not to exceed \$1,500. The motion was approved unanimously; Ms. Howell will relay this decision to the chefs for the three participating AERC-I Zones: Central, Northeast and Southeast.

Background, analysis and benefit AERC-I has traditionally helped the young riders at the NAJYRC in this way and would like to continue.

Budget effect/impact No effect; will come out of AERC-I budget

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization see above

Impact on AERC Office minimal

Committees consulted and/or affected AERC international

Implementation plan

Supporting materials

Supporting approvals AERC I meeting minutes to follow

AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name – Motion to Designate Reserve Drug Testing Fees for Litigation Specific Needs Only

Proposing Committee – Veterinary, Finance

Date of Motion – Mid Year BOD Meeting August 2015

Classification of Motion Request - policy

Proposed Motion Motion to designate all \$118,000 that are currently in the reserve drug testing fund for litigation needs only. These monies should be held in trust, and potentially increased in the future if further need is assessed to defend potential legal cases arising from positive drug tests.

Background, analysis and benefit – AERC has in the past had to defend itself while pursuing positive drug tests. Like all litigation procedures these situations were costly to AERC, even more so for its generous volunteers who defended our organization and donated massive amounts of man power and labor to protect AERC. While AERC has not been sued in recent years over a positive drug test, given the litigious nature of society we are likely to experience these scenarios again. It would be prudent to have monies held in reserve, particularly to allow us to hire external legal aid skilled and experienced in working with these particular type of situations, such as what USEF does – if the need does arise. While some positive drug cases can likely be resolved internally with AERC’s own legal counsel – it would be wise to have monies designated to enlist any and all experts that might be needed to defend AERC in the case of a particularly combative or caustic case.

Budget effect/impact none

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization no impact, benefit in being protected by having monies available for appropriate legal defense if needed

Impact on AERC Office none

Committees consulted and/or affected – Veterinary, Legal, Finance

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial)

Supporting materials (List of any other documents and/or spreadsheets)

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees)

AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name Increase in board member expenses for attendance at the midyear meeting

Proposing Committee – proposed by the office - Kathleen

Date of Motion (Date to be presented to BOD) 8/15/15 (Midyear meeting)

Classification of Motion Request (new, change, add, delete, by-law, rule, policy) Change

Proposed Motion (use exact wording) Increase current allotment of \$500 per board member for reimbursement of airfare and hotel accommodations to a maximum of \$800

Background, analysis and benefit (describe the problem this motion is solving) Airfares have risen over the years and many board members are spending over and above the current allowance of \$500. A raise to a maximum of \$800 is more in line with the amounts currently being spent to attend the meeting.

Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate) A raise of approximately \$6000 to the budget – not every board member will use the additional \$300 and some board members do not use any of the allotted expense.

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization There is a chance this will stimulate other individuals to nominate.

Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget) None

Committees consulted and/or affected – The AERC Treasurer was consulted

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial) Effective immediately

Supporting materials (List of any other documents and/or spreadsheets) None

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees)

**AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL**

Motion Name – Motion to Raise the Drug Testing Fee (outside of CA)

Proposing Committee – Veterinary Committee, and Research Committee

Date of Motion – August 1, 2015

Classification of Motion Request – New - Policy change, per rider fee increase (outside of CA)

Proposed Motion – Motion to raise the current drug testing fee per ride entry from \$3 to \$5 – outside of CA

Background, analysis and benefit –

In 2013 the AERC Veterinary and Legal Committees completed an extensive overhaul of the AERC Drug Testing Program. This resulted in improved testing protocols and a better interface with the United States Equestrian Federation (USEF), the agency that carries out the actual testing at AERC rides. This improved testing may have been a factor in the subsequent identification of

three positive drug tests during the 2014 season amongst only 114 horses sampled. At this time, AERC only tests one ride per region, plus the two days of the National Championships, with one additional ride chosen at random from all regions. AERC contracts with USEF for approximately 120 samples per year at a cost of \$315 per sample, a total budget of approximately \$37,200. Riders are charged \$3 drug fee per entry, for rides outside of California. There is approximately \$118,000 held in the drug testing reserves for any potential legal action which may arise.

Based on 13-15,000 annual starts (excluding California), AERC is providing a testing presence of approximately 4%. By comparison, the state of California's Equine Medications and Monitory Program (EMMP), the program responsible for maintaining the integrity of CA's equine events, targets testing approximately 25% of all rider entries, and charges \$5 per entry. In 2016, the CA EMMP will raise that drug testing fee per entry to \$8 in response to increased lab fees and to maintain an adequate testing presence in the state. Also in comparison, USEF currently charges \$8 per ride entry, and FEI \$25 per ride entry. All other breed organizations and equestrian disciplines charge from \$8-\$25 per entry for drug testing, and do not waive the additional drug testing fee that a state such as California imposes, hence all other disciplines double charge their members in states such as California.

Starting with the 2016 ride season, a modest increase in the AERC drug testing fee from \$3 to \$5 per entry is recommended. This amount is still well below those drug fees charged by other equestrian disciplines, but will allow AERC to nearly double its testing presence from one to two rides per region, while providing some insulation against the certainty of increasing testing fees imposed by USEF as lab costs continue to escalate. Without this modest increase, but still faced with increasing costs, AERC will be unable to maintain an adequate drug testing presence at rides.

Budget effect/impact - Based upon an estimated 14,000 annual ride entries, \$5 per entry will generate \$70,000. This will allow an increase in drug testing from the current level of 120 samples to 222 samples in 2016. Each additional 1000 ride entries would generate an additional \$5000 and enable sixteen further samples per ride season.

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization - This small fee increase will have a significant beneficial effect on the AERC Drug Testing Program by allowing us to nearly double our testing ability and presence in the first year. It has been thought in the past that AERC endurance is a clean sport, with minimal or non-existent prevalence of prohibited performance-enhancing drugs during competition. However, with the recently improved testing methodology, and three positive results identified from a relatively small sample population, this thinking may have been overly optimistic, indicating the prudence of providing deterrence through an adequate testing program. The increased presence of nearly doubling our sampling rate supports our stance of integrity within our sport by providing a significant and visible disincentive to those who might be tempted to gain an unfair advantage through the use of performance-enhancing drugs. An increased drug testing program will contribute towards providing a more level playing field amongst all competitors, whether they be front runners or 'turtles'. Most importantly, an increased and consistent testing presence, and thus an increased deterrent factor, helps to protect the welfare of the horses under our care which might otherwise be put at increased risk of significant harm through the use of illegal substances during competition.

Impact on AERC Office - None

Committees consulted and/or affected - Research, Welfare of the Horse, Ride Managers, Veterinary

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial) – Request fee increase to start with the

2016 ride year

Supporting materials (List of any other documents and/or spreadsheets)

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees)

AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name Youth Representative policy

Proposing Committee (none) – proposed by Steph Teeter

Date of Motion (Date to be presented to BOD) August 15

Classification of Motion Request (new, change, add, delete, by-law, rule, policy) New policy

Proposed Motion (use exact wording)

Whereas, the growth and sustainability of AERC membership is important to the future of AERC, and:

the median age of AERC members is increasing, and the participation of juniors and young riders in AERC is to be encouraged and supported, and juniors and young riders have a unique perspective of AERC due to their age and experience level, and this policy would encourage greater commitment, participation and interest in AERC by juniors and young riders, and the Board of Directors would benefit from a stronger relationship with juniors and young riders,

Therefore, be it resolved that a Youth Representative shall be permitted to participate in all official AERC Board Meetings, including telephone conference calls, but **excluding** Executive Session and General Assembly,

Be it further resolved that:

This Youth Representative shall have speaking privileges at the discretion of the President, and shall **not** have voting privileges, and shall be a member of AERC, 21 years of age or under, and this Youth Representative and an alternate shall be appointed by the Junior committee (and other interested directors) and approved by the Board of Directors, and shall not receive reimbursement for travel expenses from the AERC, and

shall not be included in the BoD email distribution list but may submit posts, notifications, concerns to the email list via the Executive Director,

Be it further resolved that following Board approval, this Youth Representative Policy shall be published in Endurance News in order to inform the membership and solicit interested individuals

for consideration, and

This policy shall take effect on December 1, 2015 to coincide with the new ride season.

Background, analysis and benefit (describe the problem this motion is solving)

(included in motion, per Roberts Rules of Order motion guidelines)

Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate) none

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization

(included in motion)

Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget) none

Committees consulted and/or affected

Rules Committee (pending), Junior Committee (in favor)

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial)

(included in motion)

Supporting materials (List of any other documents and/or spreadsheets)

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees)

Junior Committee (in favor)

Rules Committee (still in committee)

AERC Board of Directors MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name: AERC Resolution To Oppose The Transfer Or Sale Of Federal Public Lands
Managed By
The United States Departments of Interior And Agriculture

Proposing Committee: Trails and Land Management Committee

Date of Motion (Date to be presented to BOD) August 15, 2015

Classification of Motion Request (new, change, add, delete, by-law, rule, policy) New

Proposed Motion (use exact wording)

AERC Resolution To Oppose The Transfer Or Sale Of Federal Public Lands Managed By The United States Departments Of Interior And Agriculture

Whereas, a mission of the American Endurance Ride Conference (herein known as AERC) is to develop, use, preserve trails, and to work to ensure public lands remain open to recreational equestrian saddle use and

Whereas, the public lands of this nation managed by the United States Department of the Interior and Agriculture are a part of our national treasure and heritage and,

Whereas, these public lands are held in perpetuity to benefit future generations of Americans because of the renewable resources and recreational value, and

Whereas, we support the sustainable management of resources on federal lands in cooperation with other stakeholders, and

Whereas, the transfer or sale of these lands will remove large acreages from the national federal public lands system, fragmenting existing land areas, compromise public access, and set a precedent for privatization of all public land and,

Whereas, specifically the disposal of these federal lands will decrease the opportunity for all recreational use of these lands,

Whereas, no federal lands should be removed or transferred except for lands considered under the Federal Land Transaction Reconciliation Act (FLTRA, PL 106-248),

Therefore, be it resolved by the AERC to go on record in opposition to any plan, action or legislation for the disposal, sale, or transfer of public lands managed by the United States Department of the Interior and Agriculture (except under FLTRA) and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be made to the President of the United States of America, congressional delegations and elected officials from each state, and agency officials of the Department of the Interior and Agriculture.

Background, analysis and benefit (describe the problem this motion is solving) It has come to the AERC Trails Committee's attention that the United States Congress has become serious about selling federal lands to the western states. The Trails Committee feels the sale of public lands is detrimental in many ways. Some of the ways this is detrimental is the states could sell the land to private ownership foreign or domestic, the states or counties do not have \$3 billion used on annual fire fighting, trail maintenance would fall even farther behind. This resolution will add AERC's voice to the groups of organizations against the sale of public lands. See more information under Supporting Materials.

Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate) None

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization If federal lands are sold to the states the lands our members condition their horses or compete on could disappear.

Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget) Minimal. The office or marketing committee will need to publicize AERC passing the motion.

Committees consulted and/or affected None

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial) Write up a press release as soon as passed and send out to appropriate publications and media outlets.

Supporting materials (List of any other documents and/or spreadsheets)

Documentation provided to AERC by BCHA (Back Country Horsemen of America)

Public Access Ensured by Keeping Public Lands in Public Hands Summary: The desire of some states and local governments to own or control federal public lands carries significant repercussions for backcountry pack and saddle stock users. State-managed lands, for example, typically do not embrace the multiple-use mandate that guides federal land management agencies and includes promoting diverse opportunities for public outdoor recreation. There remains great uncertainty as to whether the type of access currently enjoyed by BCHA members to federal public lands would continue under either state or local control or management.

BCHA Mission includes to Perpetuate Heritage and Recreational Access BCHA's mission statement has not wavered in 41 years. It includes the following objectives and purposes:

1. To perpetuate the common sense use and enjoyment of horses in America's back country and Wilderness areas.
2. To work to ensure that public lands remain open to recreational stock use (emphasis added).

These represent key tenets by which BCHA's Executive Committee analyzes the pros and cons of proposals that could affect use and enjoyment of public lands. BCHA's mission also includes promoting the sustained use of the back country "by horsemen and the general public commensurate with our heritage." The concept of heritage includes recognition of a unique national "birthright" enjoyed by all Americans—where every citizen enjoys partial ownership of an unparalleled system of national public lands, irrespective of an individual's wealth or socioeconomic status.

Federal Lands Never Controlled by States

As a condition of joining the Union, most former territories in the West renounced their claims to federal public lands in compacts with the federal government. Relevant sections of each western state's constitution, or enabling act, are shown in the sidebar on the following page.

Leaders of these f

to disavow all future claims to the public domain as a fundamental condition of statehood.

American Public Strongly Supports Continued Federal Ownership of Public Lands

According to a recent poll by The Colorado College,¹ more than two-thirds of Western voters (68%) view public lands as American places that belong to the country as a whole; only 24% say these lands belong more to the people of their respective state. The poll documented that a majority of voters in every state, including those that are

relatively conservative, believe that federal public lands belong to the country as a whole. A related study² demonstrates that a majority of Western voters oppose transfer of America's forests and public lands to state ownership. The majority polled assume full control of costs related to managing formerly federal landscapes.

Threat Associated with Transfer of Federal Lands Has Never Been Greater

Over the past century, many attempts have been made to shift control of the federal estate in order to benefit local governments and private corporations. The most recent and significant manifestation was the Sagebrush Rebellion of the 1970s and 1980s. In early 2015, congressional leaders in both the Senate and House of Representatives publicly renewed the effort to facilitate the transfer of federal lands to the states by taking the following actions:

¹ The Colorado College State of the Rockies Report: Conservation in the West Poll (2015), available online here ² Public Opinion Strategies, Sept. 2014, available here "disclaimer clause" in their

former territories agreed

believe that transfer of public lands would result in higher taxes, reduced access for recreation, increased resource extraction and a high risk that treasured public lands would be auctioned off to private

individuals or corporations were states to

Non-Binding Senate Budget Resolution

The U.S. Senate approved on March 26, 2015, a budget resolution that would establish a procedure for selling, exchanging or transferring to the states federal lands that are not national parks, monuments or reserves.

The amendment was sponsored by

Sen. Lisa Murkowski, Chairman of the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee.

Budget Request in the House of Representatives

Also in March 2015, the Chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources, Rep. Rob Bishop, requested \$50 million for the Fiscal Year 2016 federal budget in order to facilitate immediate transfer of public lands to states control.

Additional Downsides of Federal Land Transfer

There are numerous "downsides" to large-scale transfer to, or control of, federal public lands by the states. For example, states and local governments typically do not have the multiple use mandates by which federal agencies must abide (e.g., protection of watersheds, wildlife, fisheries, historic resources, promotion of recreation, commodity development, etc.). In contrast, states and counties typically take a myopic view of the benefits provided by public lands and are forced to maximize revenue, often to the detriment of other uses, including recreation. Were local governments to choose to maximize revenue through the enhancement of recreational opportunities, the result invariably would be higher fees for recreational access and amenities.

There also are issues associated with the lack of wildland fire- fighting resources/ capability by the states and the potential for states/counties to sell off formerly public lands to the highest bidder, including billionaires and global corporations. These are some of potential downsides of the transfer of federal lands—the least of which would be great uncertainty over the public's ability to continue to access public lands in a manner that American citizens have been accustomed for over 150 years.

Conclusion

BCHA views the potential for large-scale transfer of federal lands to the states with great skepticism and concern. While our members continue to take issue, sometimes significantly, with indiscriminate restrictions to recreational stock use, we would much rather contend with federal multiple-use management agencies than grapple with 50 different state bureaucracies in order to ensure our continued use and enjoyment of public lands.

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees) The AERC Trails and Land Management Committee unanimously approved the res
