

## April 11, 2016 Conference Call Minutes

The meeting was called to order by President Michael Campbell at 6:02 p.m. PST.

In attendance were Michael Campbell, Lisa Schneider, Susan Garlinghouse, Mollie Krumlaw-Smith, Connie Caudill, Sue Keith, Carla Richardson, Jan Stevens, Janet Tipton, Mary Howell, Nick Kohut, Olin Balch, Paul Latiolais, Steph Teeter, John Parke, Andrew Gerhard, Forrest Tancer, Roger Taylor, Barbara Reinke, Duane Barnett, Susan Kasemeyer, Tom Bache, Mike Maul, Christoph Schork, Terry Woolley-Howe, and Sarah Holloway (youth representative). Also in attendance was Dr. Jerry Gillespie.

Monica Chapman requested excusal for a veterinary emergency. John Parke made a motion to approve excusals, seconded by Lisa Schneider. Motion passed.

Connie Caudill made a motion to accept the minutes from the March 14, 2016 conference call. John Parke seconded, motion passed.

Roger Taylor made a motion to accept the agenda. Sue Keith seconded. Motion passed.

### Statistical report – Kathleen Henkel

Membership as of 4/1/15: 4310

Membership as of 4/1/16: 4233

Sanction fees as of 4/1/15: \$12,110

Sanction fees as of 4/1/16: \$13,095

Rider fees as of 4/1/15: \$15,076

Rider fees as of 4/1/16: \$15,081

New members as of 4/1/15: 418

New members as of 4/1/16: 340

### Business before the Board:

Motion - Research Proposal - Dr. Jerry Gillespie introduced and described the proposed study, including that this is relatively uncharted territory in collecting data on hydration parameters beginning with horse weights at home prior to traveling to base camp. The Research Committee has approximately \$49,000 in available funds, this motion requests approval by the Board to use research funds for this project, no outside funds have been requested. A number of questions were asked by Board members as to the parameters of data being collected (speed during competition, arrival time, time to reach criteria, CRI, fecal loss during transport), and a discussion of accepted methodology for measuring hydration in endurance horses. There was a brief discussion as to gathering input from the general membership. Several Board members commented that while no formal poll or survey had taken place, informal communication via social media had all been extremely positive. John Parke made a motion that the Board approve funding from the Research budget for the purposes of studying hydration changes in endurance horses as detailed in the research motion and description. Roger seconded. The motion passed with one abstention.

Dr. Gillespie furnished his research committee evaluation and it is below. The final proposal is lengthy and appears in the AERC Minute binder held in the AERC Office.

### Research Committee Evaluation

Truman W. Prevatt, PhD

**Introduction:** The Research Committee was presented a proposal for funding entitled: “Tracking Body Fluid Losses and Gains in Competing Horses During an Endurance Competition Period.” The principal investigator is Jerry R. Gillespie, DVM, PhD with Susan Garlinghouse, DVM as the co-principal investigator. This proposal is included in this package.

Whereas Dr. Gillespie is the Chairman of the Research Committee, he would have been in conflict of interest to serve in the normal roll of establishing an evaluation team and managing the evaluation of said proposal and making a recommendation to the AERC Board of Directors concerning funding of said proposal. An alternate was appointed by the AERC Chairman to select a committee from the Research Committee to evaluate this proposal.

The criteria I used for establishing this team was people with either extensive scientific research experience and those with direct experience with the subject matter, or experienced ride veterinarians. There were five people from the Research Committee and one experienced AERC ride veterinarian from outside the Research Committee on the team. In this report, the findings of the team and recommendation to the AERC Board of Directors are documented.

**Overview of the Proposal:** In laymen’s terms the goal of this proposal is to investigate loss of body weight during the period of an endurance event to include traveling to the ride and the activities in base camp relate to their performance in the ride and their susceptibility to dehydration-related ailments. The abstract of the paper reads:

*Abstract: Previous studies have shown that horses competing in endurance rides loose body weight (BW) associated with their loss of body fluid and electrolytes, and these losses average nearly 5% of pre-ride body weight, and may be as large as 10% or more in some horses. The BW losses are deduced to be losses in body water through sweating, although there are also losses in feces and urine during these long distance competitions. It has been shown that horses also loose BW during transportation. There are greater losses in BW (i.e., body water) that occur during transport or competition at higher ambient temperatures. It has been noted by investigators and control veterinarians at endurance rides, that the percentage of body weight loss from start to end of the ride does not relate well to the onset of dehydration-related ailments. This poor relationship may be because all horses do not start at the same hydration level, i.e., there may be a large variation in the hydration level of horses at the start of the race relative to their homeostatic hydration level. If one assumes that most horses are in a homeostatic hydration level at their home stable, then their BW at rest at home could be used as a baseline for fluid loss/gain during transportation to the ride and during the ride. Variation from the homeostatic BW would represent the absolute hydration level during and following the ride. We hypothesize that the absolute hydration level of endurance horses during an endurance ride would likely relate to their performance in the ride and their subsequence susceptibility to dehydration-related ailments. We will test this hypothesis by weighing horses at (or near) their home stable prior to departure by commercial van to an endurance ride. We will determine the variance from this homeostatic weight periodically throughout and after the competition. We will correlate these findings to performance and health measures for each horse during the ride.*

The proposal goes into detail on the protocol and experimental methodology developed to accomplish their goals. I refer the read to the enclosed proposal for details.

The evaluation team evaluated the proposal based on multiple factors but the most important were quality of the research and the value to the AERC and their members.

**Background:** There is anecdotal evidence that weight loss is an indicator of the status of an endurance horse. In human ultra distance foot races the correlation between weight loss/gain to performance and the health of the runner is strong to the point that is weight loss/gain is used as a criteria for a runner being allowed to proceed at many ultra-marathons. This is not at all ultra-marathon races but it is true of the ones I am familiar with in Florida.

In 2000, the South East Endurance Riders Association procured a livestock scales and made it available at rides for the use of the riders since that point. It was primarily for the use and education of the riders. However, the numbers that resulted from the use of this scale provide an interesting backdrop. On the average a horse will lose 2.5 to 3.5 percent of their body weight on the first loop. After that point in the horses that do well - the weight loss stabilizes and in fact some is often gained back.

When a ride veterinarian is questioned by a concerned rider along the lines of “my horse lost 40 pounds, is he all right or should I stop,” the ride veterinarian has not context in which to answer that question. In the SE we also saw horses gain a small amount of weight over the course of a 50 mile ride, tie for first and walk away with the BC. We also saw horses that lost 60 to 70 pounds on the first loop and get pulled at the first check. Without context - there are few defensible conclusions one can draw. The team feels that a study of the type proposed is timely and needed.

**Proposal Evaluation:** The proposal was determined to be timely and of value to both our members and the long term welfare of endurance horses. However, there was concern from multiple sources concerning the experiment design. The one area of concern for the evaluation team was the “control aspects” of the experiment. The study identifies 3 groups of horses to be studied. The Controlled-Transport Group is the most rigorously managed of the 3 groups and involves 10 to 15 horses transported by commercial van from Los Angeles, Auburn, or Reno.

The following observation was made by one evaluator. *“The experimental protocol would be substantially improved if each of the experimental horses were accompanied by a control horse of a similar temperament and ride experience coming from the same or similar location – making for a classic case-control study. The control horse would be matched to an experimental horse and would accompany the experimental (to be ridden) horse on the van and to the ride-site and be housed adjacent to the experimental horse. The two horses would be treated as identically as possible by being weighed simultaneously, fed, and watered as depicted for the schedule for the experimental horse. The control horse simply would not be ridden at the ride-site or on the course but rather stay at the trailer while the experimental horse was on the course.*

*Nevertheless, in the absence of other controls, it is not clear to me how one separates the effects of vanning and ride-site residence versus the true effect of the ride experience on hydration status.”*

Another evaluator gave the following observation: *“If the horses that are chosen for the study are all good, stable mid-level endurance horses does that call into question whether the results would then translate to upper level athletes? There have been numerous studies done on performance issues using available research horses that were later criticized because the results might be suspect if the study population was upper level athletes.”*

**Recommendations:** It was concluded that this was a worthwhile study to pursue and that the study should proceed. It is, however, recommended that the investigators consider modifications of the control and protocol. As pointed out by multiple reviewers who are experienced ride veterinarians, the effects of trailering and travel and the stresses of ride-camp need to be separated from that of the ride. This study will not address this question directly. It is suggested that the investigators consider how the address issue raised above about control

group of horses that go through the same travel protocol as the Controlled-Transport Group but do not participate in the ride can be addressed in this study. It is recognized that creating or enlarging a control group would impact the cost of the study. It is also recognized that the logistics associated with this study already present a challenge. However, it is felt that a more control-based experimental design would be would enhance the applicability of the study. An alternative to modifying this study would be to address as part of this study how the results of this study could be used to define a more targeted experiment that can address the issues raised by the evaluators and other questions that might arise as a result of this study to define a potential follow on study.

**Motion - Special sanctioning of 2019 Best of the Best ride.** This motion has been approved by the Sanctioning Committee. There was some discussion as to sanctioning required for a ride with special qualifications, and whether competitors would receive completion points only, or regional and national points as well. Connie Caudill pointed out that this current motion only needs to provide initial approval so that ride management may raise funds for further development, and that award points could be further discussed and decided at a later time. Having been presented by the Sanctioning Committee, no second is required. The motion passed unanimously.

AERC Board of Directors

## MOTION PROPOSAL

The AERC Bylaws require that Robert’s Rules (RR) “shall govern the meetings of ... the Board”. This Motion complies with RR guidance. Thus, the “Proposed Motion” specifies the actions to be taken should the Motion be adopted. These actions are specified in the “Resolved” clauses. The “Whereas” clauses provide context to aid comprehension of the “Resolved” clauses. These are needed because the Motion should be able to stand alone. The other material in this Motion Proposal is required by our internal policy for Motions. It adds other important background and context information, but it has no force (i.e., it does not commit AERC to anything).

**Motion Name: AERC Social Media Moderator Policy**

**Proposing Committee** Motion proposed by BOD member Tom Bache

**Date of Motion (Date to be presented to BOD)** April 11, 2016

**Classification of Motion Request** New Policy

**Proposed Motion**

*Whereas*, The AERC Board of Directors (BOD) may establish or otherwise control various social media sites that are provided to allow free discussion of AERC issues by the membership and sometimes non-members as well; and

*Whereas*, The BOD Policy for managing such sites may recommend appointment of Moderators to police these sites to delete posts deemed to be inappropriate

***Whereas;* That site users and Moderators need clear guidance on what is and is not permitted in posts to the site; and**

***Whereas;* That the Policy needs to have the flexibility to evolve as technology and circumstances evolve; therefore, be it**

***Resolved,* That the AERC President shall propose a Social Media Moderator Policy [“Policy”] for moderating content on social media sites that it controls plus guidance for how this Policy is to be implemented and submit this Policy for approval by a majority vote of the BOD; and**

***Resolved,* That subsequent modifications to the Policy may be developed at the discretion of the AERC President and implemented unless two or more BOD members object; and**

***Resolved,* That implementation of a revised Policy will require a Motion passed by majority vote when there is objection to this revision by two or more members, and**

***Resolved,* That the current Policy be stated clearly on all moderated sites; and**

***Resolved,* That to the extent that is practical, authors of deleted Posts should be informed that their post has been deleted and the penalty for further transactions against the stated policy.**

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

**This Motion assumes that (1) AERC may choose to continue to provide social media outlets for our members and perhaps other interested people; (2) AERC may choose to assign people (“moderators”) to monitor these sites to keep the content civil and constructive. This is consistent with common practices for sites similar to ours.**

**This Motion requires that AERC upgrade its social media policies to be consistent with those of others who monitor content on social media sites. This Social Media Policy is to include the process for its implementation.**

**This Motion does not directly constrain how the Policy is to be implemented. But the recommended approach is for the BOD to focus on the Policy and the Executive Director to be made responsible for its implementation.**

**The Motion does not specify the exact wording of the Moderator Policy because this would fix those words and (to comply with RR) require another Motion for changes now and in the future. Instead, passage of this Motion starts specifies a process for developing, implementing, and modifying the Moderator Policy over time. The specified process will probably unfold in a simple and straightforward way, but there is some complexity to manage controversy should it arise now or in the future.**

**The following is an initial draft of the Policy to provide an indication of what such things usually include. The President could offer this to the Board for approval or offer something else he develops by any method he thinks appropriate.**

**Suggested Moderator Policy**

**AERC welcomes comments about all subjects related to Endurance Riding including AERC policies and management. By posting on this site, you agree not to make unlawful, abusive, defamatory, vulgar, or obscene comments. You also agree to refrain from promoting or advertising goods and services, political comments, illegal activity, infringing on the proprietary rights of any party, or impersonating another person or entity. AERC reserves the right to remove any posts and/or block users that violate these agreements.**

### **Suggested Implementation Policy**

**The Executive Director is responsible for implementation of the Policy. This includes selection of the Moderators and ensuring that the Policy is executed fairly and effectively. Within practical limits, Moderators should be neutral with respect to opinions on the thread they are moderating.**

**Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate): None**

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

**Social media is an important element of modern communication, so our members want to use it. But they also want it to be effective and efficient for them. This Motion contributes to that Member objective, and it also assures them that AERC manages these sites with consideration and integrity.**

**Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget)**

**Office staff (Troy Smith) is now one of the Moderators. She is an ideal example of the neutrality we should seek in selecting moderators. This has impact on the office work load, but this Motion would not increase that impact.**

**Committees consulted and/or affected: None**

**Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial)**

**This Motion simply requires an upgrade of ongoing actions. The only requirements for something new are to articulate our policy in writing, to enhance moderated sites to include the written policy, and, where it is practical, to implement a method for informing posters whose posts were deleted. These can all be doable within a few months and certainly prior to the mid-year meeting.**

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

**Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees): None needed**

**Motion - Social media moderation policy. Introduced by Tom Bache. There was considerable discussion and commentary amongst the Board members, primarily in whether micromangement of AERC social media requires Board-level decisions, or belongs within the purview and responsibility of the Executive Director. Steph Teeter seconded the motion. Two votes yes, 23 votes no. Motion fails.**

**&&& AERC Board of Directors  
MOTION PROPOSAL**

**Motion Name: Proposal to include car rental expenses for board member travel to midyear meeting**

**Proposing Committee: Proposed by Carla Richardson, DAL**

**Date of Motion: (Date to be presented to BOD) April 11, 2016**

**Classification of Motion Request: (new, change, add, delete, bylaw, rule, policy) Change**

**Proposed Motion (use exact wording): Include car rental expenses for board members, in addition to the current reimbursement for airfare and hotel accommodations, in the current allotment of \$800 per board member.**

**Background, analysis and benefit (describe the problem this motion is solving): Travel to midyear meetings can include driving or flying. Board members who need to drive or desire to drive should be reimbursed for their travel expenses, as are board members who are reimbursed for airfare.**

**Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate): Car rental fees can be significantly less for some members and could therefore save AERC money.**

**Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization: Some people are unable or unwilling to fly. Including car rental expenses would encourage those members who would prefer to drive to the midyear meeting to nominate to be on the board.**

**Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget): None**

**Committees consulted and/or affected: None**

**Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial): Effective immediately**

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

**Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees): No Motion - Reimbursement of Board member travel expenses. Introduced by Carla Richardson. There was some discussion as to the language provided in previous motions as to the expenses covered. As those documents were not immediately available, the motion is postponed to the May conference call.**

**New business - John Parke reviewed the rationale behind a recent decision handed down by the Protest & Grievance Committee in regards to a positive drug test. He corrected a misunderstanding by a Board member, stating that a below-threshold drug result is still a true positive results, is a clear violation of Rule 13, and does not constitute as a false positive finding.**

**There was some discussion as to the difficulties of extrapolating plasma levels to published thresholds determined with urine levels. Reference was made to the recommendations of the veterinary committee, included a board-certified veterinary pharmacologist. John Parke further commented that while it was difficult to recommend moving forward with a protest or not, it was decided by the Veterinary Committee and Legal Counsel that the responsibility to fully explore the**

issues and render a decision rests with the P&G Committee. Mr. Parke stated that he does not recommend any further action by the Board on this matter at this time. It was commented that concerns may exist in future in regards to extrapolating urine thresholds from plasma results, but that the Veterinary Committee sub-committee chair thought this would be extremely rare. It was discussed and recommended that an article in Endurance News would be appropriate in regards to clarifying the issues in regards to drug withdrawal time and thresholds.

Connie Caudill raised a question about review of press releases prior to being released. Jody Wyatt will continue to provide input in regards to FEI and Group 7 issues. Michael Campbell commented that he is working on private letters to Dr. Brian Sheehan and Manuel Bandeiros de Mello in regards to FEI issues.

There being no further business before the Board, John Parke made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Susan Garlinghouse seconded, motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned by Michael Campbell at 7:24 p.m. PST.