

**AERC Board of Directors Midyear Meeting
August 20, 2016 - Grapevine, Texas**

The meeting was called to order by President Michael Campbell at 8 a.m. CST

In attendance were Michael Campbell, Lisa Schneider, Susan Garlinghouse, Mollie Krumlaw-Smith, Monica Chapman, Connie Caudill, Sue Keith, Carla Richardson, Jan Stevens, Janet Tipton, Nick Kohut, Olin Balch, Paul Latiolais, Steph Teeter, John Parke, Andrew Gerhard, Roger Taylor, Barbara Reinke, Duane Barnett, Susan Kasemeyer, Tom Bache, Mike Maul and Terry Woolley-Howe. Also present as guest was Nicole Duarte, JD, chair of the Protest & Grievance Committee.

Due to local severe weather and flight cancellations, Mary Howell and Jody Wyatt were unable to attend and requested excusal. Jody Wyatt was able to attend via Skype subject to sporadic Wifi connection, but did not vote.

Christoph Schork had previously requested excusal due to international travel to South Africa. Sue Kasemeyer made a motion to approve excusals, seconded by Sue Keith. Motion passed.

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

Membership Report - Kathleen Henkel

Membership as of 8/7/2015	5047
Membership as 8/12/16	4991
Rider fees as of 8/7/15	\$58,867.50
Rider fees as of 8/12/16	\$53,725.00
Sanction fees as of 8/7/15	\$15,370.00
Sanction fees as of 8/15/16	\$15,910.00
New members as of 8/7/15	637
New members as of 8/15/16	572

Business before the Board

Consideration of Protest appeals:

- 1) *Sue Summers vs. Pete Davies*
- 2) *Dennis Summers vs. Jodie Dukerich*
- 3) *John Simpson vs. Dennis Summers*

John Parke, as AERC Legal Counsel, described how the Board should consider protest appeals under Rule 14. As previously discussed during the July 2016 conference call, there are various approaches by which appeals may be decided. In this case, the AERC Board will decide the relevant appeals as a *de novo* hearing under Rule 14, meaning the Board considers the same evidence considered by the Protest and Grievance Committee and makes its own decision based on the evidence. The Board is not merely reviewing any purported mistakes of procedure or rules made in the prior rulings. The decisions and any resulting penalties may either uphold or deny the rulings by the Protest & Grievance (P&G) Committee, or may establish a different ruling or penalty, if any. Each protest appeal will be considered separately

with this approach. Relevant background information common to all three protests will be considered and discussed simultaneously.

John Parke commented that under Rule 14 board members may not utilize their own personal knowledge of the protested circumstances in order to reach their conclusions, and may only consider the evidence presented to the P&G Committee.

Nicole Duarte was introduced as chair of the P&G Committee in order to answer questions about the committee's deliberations, as provided by Rule 14.

Several questions were asked of Nicole Duarte by Board members in regard to the process and interaction amongst committee members. Ms. Duarte explained in detail, and remained available for further questions throughout the morning session.

In regard to *Sue Summers vs. Pete Davies* protest appeal to the Board:

There was an extensive and detailed review and discussion of facts not in dispute as to the overall events, as well as those points still in dispute between parties. Also covered was how AERC rules regarding reasonable versus unreasonable safety and sportsmanship may be interpreted. There was discussion of the variations of normal and accepted rider conduct within AERC rules between regions.

There was significant discussion as to the extent of cause and effect between the actions of several horses traveling and passing at speed. The complexity of differentiating breach of trail etiquette versus a breach of rules was discussed, as well as whether there was consensus and agreement between riders prior to the events under question.

The Board then examined whether the accepted standards for unreasonably endangering the safety of others, unsportsmanlike conduct, or conduct prejudicial to the sport was breached sufficiently to violate Rule 12.1.

Terry Woolley-Howe made a motion to deny the protest. There was some discussion as to recusals by several directors with potential or perceived conflicts of interest, and as to whether such recusals were appropriate. Ms. Howe withdrew her motion.

Stephanie Teeter made a motion for a roll call vote. Paul Latiolais seconded. There was some discussion as to the conditions under which a roll call vote is appropriate. Three votes Yes, seventeen No, two abstained. Motion failed.

Monica Chapman made the motion to deny the appeal in *Sue Summers vs. Pete Davies*. Sue Keith seconded. Fourteen votes Yes, three votes No. Four directors (Terry Woolley-Howe, Barbara Reinke, John Parke and Susan Garlinghouse) recused themselves, one director abstained. The motion passed.

In regard to *Dennis Summers vs. Jodie Dukerich* and *John Simpson vs. Dennis Summers* protest appeal to the Board:

John Parke stated that, as this matter and *John Simpson vs. Dennis Summers* share the same relevant background and history, both will be discussed together, but voted upon separately.

There was extensive discussion as to the facts both in dispute, and not in dispute. It was also discussed whether the unsportsmanlike conduct exhibited met and exceeded the threshold by which a violation of Rule 12.1 could be determined.

Nicole Duarte was consulted as to the process by which the Protest & Grievance Committee reached their ruling of June 9, 2016.

In regard to *Dennis Summers vs Jodie Dukerich*, Roger Taylor made a motion to deny the appeal and uphold the previous ruling determined by the Protest & Grievance Committee in which Dennis Summers' protest was denied. Terry Woolley-Howe seconded. Sixteen votes Yes, one vote No. The same four directors recused themselves, one member abstained. The motion passed.

In regard to *John Simpson vs. Dennis Summers* protest appeal to the Board:

There was further discussion in regard to evidence specific to this matter, and relevant rules.

The board went into executive session at 9:50 a.m. CST. Executive session ended at 10:03 a.m. CST.

P&G Chair Nicole Duarte explained the considerations made by the committee in determining the previously published ruling of June 9, 2016.

There was a protracted discussion of options for an appropriate penalty assessment, given all relevant information provided to the Protest & Grievance Committee and Board of Directors.

After extensive discussion, Lisa Schneider made the following motion: The previous ruling determined by the Protest & Grievance Committee, in which John Simpson's protest against Dennis Summers was upheld, is confirmed subject to the Board's modification of the penalties assessed against Dennis Summers. Dennis Summers' appeal to the Board is denied. The decision by ride management to disqualify Respondent from the 2016 Bumblebee ride is confirmed. The Respondent is suspended from competition (riding only) for a one-year period from June 9, 2016 through June 8, 2017, but may attend rides sites to drive, crew or otherwise assist other riders or ride management. Upon submission of certificate of completion of a ten-hour anger management course online or in person, as approved by the Chair of the Protest & Grievance Committee, the suspension period is shortened to end on November 30, 2016. There is no retroactive forfeiture of rides during the period between January 24, 2016 and June 8, 2016.

Roger Taylor seconded the motion.

Monica Chapman made a motion to amend the above motion to reflect the one-year period of suspension to start August 20, 2016 - August 19, 2017, with the period shortened to six months with completion of the anger management course. The motion was seconded.

Further discussion of this amendment commenced prior to the vote. Seven votes Yes, ten votes No. The same four directors listed above recused themselves, one director abstained. The motion to amend failed.

Steph Teeter made a motion to amend the above motion to no suspension, and the Board to issue a letter of reprimand. Carla Richardson seconded.

Further discussion of the effect of this amendment on the relevant regions and organization ensued prior to the vote. Four votes Yes, fourteen votes No. The same four directors listed above recused themselves. The motion failed.

A vote was taken on the motion as presented above by Lisa Schneider. Fifteen votes Yes, two votes No. The same four directors listed above recused themselves, one abstention. The motion passed."

Candace Fitzgerald contract - Consideration of extending the contract for marketing representation with Candace Fitzgerald. There was discussion as to expectations, current and past projects, increased ability of AERC office to accomplish many of current goals. A suggestion was made to suspend current contract, but keep Candace available for future projects as needed. This was generally agreed upon by the Board without a formal motion or vote.

The meeting was recessed for lunch at 11:58 a.m. CST.

Michael Campbell called the afternoon session to order at 1:02 p.m. CST.

Finance Report - Mollie Krumlaw-Smith reviewed the proposed 2017 budget, including requested changes in various line items.

International Committee - Jan Stevens reported on rule changes being proposed by FEI. These rule changes include clarification in terminology and penalties in regards to injury, catastrophic death/injury, failure to present horse to veterinarians, minimum age for horses competing and novice qualification requirements, and changes in championship format to make events more spectator-friendly. There was discussion about the effect of FEI required rest periods on horses competing in AERC-sanctioned multiway rides. Ms. Stevens commented it has been suggested that the FEI rest period would apply only to the total ride mileage completed by multi-day horses. Example, a horse competing for three consecutive, fifty mile days would be required to rest for the period prescribed by FEI for 150 miles. There are also changes in rules which makes it easier for ride veterinarians to increase pulse and vetting criteria to further protect horse welfare if environmental conditions warrant.

Regional reports

Central Region - The regional convention was held in January, with Susan Garlinghouse DVM as keynote speaker and a ride manager's meeting held; TERA had a ride manager's clinic this summer, will be offering a new rider clinic this fall. TERA is also organizing a parade group based on Rose Parade AERC group. Current projects include geomapping ride sites to provide better location services for emergency services; working on video promoting Texas rides; OCER organized and presented multiple rider clinics; participated in parades; and several trail work days.

Midwest Region - 40 rides were sanctioned and held, including four 75 milers, four 100s and two pioneer rides. The regional ride managers report that ride entries remain steady. The regions includes several active clubs that organized five endurance clinics.

Mountain Region - 397 members, 36 new members. There were fifteen sanctioned events, 1169 starts this season with an 89% completion rate. The region will be hosting the National Championship 50/100 September 8-10 at Antelope Island. A recent fire burned half the island, but has not adversely affected the trail being traveled during daylight/visible hours, and did not impact base camp. Several educational clinics were held in different areas of the region.

Northeast Region - Several new rides were held this year, with another new ride coming up. The region is working on obtaining a portable scale to have available at rides. Per the regional ride managers, entries have been steady; several clinics were held in the Ohio area, as well as presence at several equine expos. There is ongoing trail work. An AERC grant for trail improvement opened a new section of trail, resulting in local media exposure. A new donor wants to donate funds to AERC in order to complete the trail project.

Northwest - There is an active group of 'green beans' in the region, with 177 new members this year. There were three 100-mile rides held in the region in the past, a previous 100-miler Santiam is being reinstated after a ten year lapse. The Mt. Adams ride had approximately thirty riders in the 100, and Sunriver 100 had 12 entries.

Pacific Southwest Region - Three rider clinics were held in the region. The number of rides available remains stable, which is an increasing challenge with encroaching development. There is a current challenge from mountain bikers wanting to put an Olympic training center in the middle of State park trail system. The parade group remains active. There is a very active Facebook page with lots of /green bean/ involvement. A Trail Master class is scheduled for next spring, with the goal of reviving the Malibu ride.

Southeast Region - Twenty-nine days of rides to date, with many more scheduled throughout the end of the ride season; two endurance clinics were offered; 14 rides have been re-sanctioned for 2017; Duane Barnett, DVM attended American Horse Association meetings in Washington, DC representing AERC; Sue Kasemeyer commented that there is a very active ride schedule between SE and NE regions, with average entries around 80 riders combined. between all offered distances. There is a strong regional organization providing support, blood analysis machine, scales, etc. which contributes to the SE region's strong presence within the organization.

Southwest Region - the region is adding another 100 mile event this year. The Indian Springs rides are doing well, have added FEI events to the upcoming schedule, and sanctioning lots of rides there for 2017. The region has a good relationship with BLM. There is an ongoing need for Trail Masters classes because of continued funding for Eco Servants being hired to work on trails projects, both for maintenance and new trails laid out by Trail Masters. Near Santa Fe, representatives are working with forestry services to maintain and improve trail and base camp areas. At the new Wickenburg ride, regional directors, with help from the AERC national office, were able to mediate a potential protest.

West - A new Facebook page was initiated last year. There are several small regional groups. Twenty-two rides have reported to date, with 21 left on the schedule. Five rides were cancelled due to fires. One of these fires almost interfered with Tevis. There are more sanctioning requests being received competing for the same dates. The Sutter Butte ride was cancelled because land owners withdrew access to key trails. There is a new 100 scheduled for next year. Tevis had 165 starters. Throughout the region, half of the entries are typically entered in LD distances. Cache Creek had a fire in the area, but damages may have been mitigated due to fire prevention measures initiated through an AERC trail project. The Cooley Ranch ride included a research study investigating fluid losses in participating horses.

Supporting organization - John Parke discussed the initiation of a foundation to be termed AERC Legacy Foundation (ALF) to develop and administer bequests for the benefit of AERC. The foundation board shall consist of seven directors, typically consisting of individuals with significant expertise in finances. It was discussed that the initial board will be chosen by the AERC board of directors. In future, the foundation board will choose their directors, with the approval of the AERC board. It was further discussed that two of the initial foundation directors should also be members of the AERC board to facilitate cross communication.

Staff salaries - The board went into executive session at 3:10 p.m. CST to discuss and approve salaries and wages for AERC national office staff. Executive session ended at 3:28 p.m. CST.

Motion - Trails grant - Introduced with background by Connie Caudill. The regional trails were damaged by rains, but with the governor's interest and support, are in the process of being repaired and restored. Last year, there was a proposal to close this creek crossing to horses and only have it available

to pedestrians and cyclists. The local equestrian groups became involved and proposal was abandoned. This will be a long-term project, as there are over 100 miles of trails in this system, but plans are to start this current project in September with completion in October 2016. Coming from committee, the motion does not require a second. Motion passed.

Motion - Special Sanction request - Introduced by Connie Caudill. Seconded by Michael Campbell, motion passed.

Motion - Young Rider division. Introduced by Steph Teeter. There was some discussion as to a division to help retain interest in competing in riders that have aged out of the junior division, but may not yet have the experience to compete successfully in senior divisions. John Parke commented that there may be riders eligible for the Young Rider division that would prefer be competing in adult/senior divisions, and should have an opt-out phrase. There was some discussion of the complications in changing computer system. There was also discussion as to whether riders competing in this division would count as adults towards the ride's available Overall Points. Jan Stevens suggested amending the motion to reflect riders in this division would count towards Overall Points. Steph Teeter tabled the motion until meeting pending more input.

Motion - Equine Longevity Program - Introduced by Terry Woolley-Howe. This program is still in the developmental stage. There was discussion in regards to design of the proposed pins. Coming from committee, this motion does not require a second. Motion passed.

Motion - Update to appendices of Rule 13. Submitted by Veterinary Committee in regards to adding three pharmaceutical drugs to the list of prohibited substances. Eighteen votes Yes, one vote No, two abstained. One director briefly left the room and did not vote. Motion passed.

Motion - Update to appendices of Rule 13. Submitted by Veterinary Committee in regards to adding kinesiology tape to list of prohibited therapies. Twelve votes Yes, nine votes No. One director briefly left the room and did not vote. Motion passed.

Ride Structure Committee - An update on activities was presented by Susan Garlinghouse. An online survey to collect member input on a variety of proposed ride structure ideas has been developed and was released on August 5, 2016. To date, approximately 1300 responses had been collected. The survey will remain open into mid-September to allow adequate opportunity for member participation. Trends based on the current responses were presented and discussed, as well as the possible need to re-test one question to better clarify member response. Following closure of the survey, the results will be finalized, and distributed to applicable committees for further development, if warranted. Results will also be presented to the membership in an article in *Endurance News*.

The afternoon session recessed for dinner at 6:05 p.m. CST.

The evening session was called to order at 7:02 p.m. CST.

Online Protest Records - Mike Maul discussed the possibility of providing past protests online via searchable records as a reference tool for reference and educational purposes. There was extensive discussion as to the feasibility and advisability of doing so, including opinions of the Executive Director and relevant rules in regards to publishing and retaining protest documents. John Parke commented that retention of protests is not a specific rule, and that the board has the ability to direct the office staff to make past protests available via a protected password or other methodology. Mike Maul made a motion to develop such a protected document retention. Carla Richardson seconded. John Parke said that he would like time to draft a specific proposal and motion. Mike tables the motion until this time.

Strategic Plan - John Parke suggested that in the interest of time management, review of current progress on the Strategic Plan be deferred until a later date. The Board agreed with this suggestion.

Password-protected repository - Olin Balch introduced a suggestion for maintaining applicable documents available to authorized individuals via a password protected repository. Mike Maul and Paul Latiolais discussed feasibility of doing so, including such online tools as Dropbox, Google Docs, Yahoo Groups files and methods utilized by other organizations.

Young Rider Exchange Program - Connie Caudill discussed the recent program in which a group of US junior riders between 14-17 years of age from varying backgrounds carried out fundraisers to travel to Australia to compete in an endurance event. Ms. Caudill discussed in detail the relative similarities and differences between US and Australian events, the activities in which the US group participated, and explained how Australian sponsors matched up the junior riders with suitable horses. The strong suggestion was made to continue this exchange program, including hosting a group of Australian junior riders to participate in a US endurance ride. There will be an article describing the project in next month's *Endurance News*.

Motion - Policy Guidelines for Enforcing AERC Rules - Paul Latiolais introduced an initiative with the purpose of developing guidelines for actions to enforce AERC rules. There was discussion as to the advisability and positive effects of periodically reviewing policies. John Parke provided an amendment to be added under Proposed Motion as follows: "Resolved, that the Board of Directors directs the Rules Committee to develop clear and complete policy guidelines and possible rule changes describing the scope of responsibility, objectives, and constraints for AERC officers, employees and committees." Andrew Gerhard requested an amendment to the wording to reflect "...employees, committees *and ride managers*." Amendments to the motion were accepted by the makers of the motion. Motion passed.

There being no further business before the Board, Terry Woolley-Howe made a motion to adjourn. Susan Garlinghouse seconded. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned by Michael Campbell at 8:14 p.m. CST.

Submitted by Susan Garlinghouse, Secretary

American Endurance Ride Conference Trail Grant Program Application Form

Proposed Project Name:

Phase 1: Restoration in Clark State Forest in the Dry Fork creek crossing

Location of Proposed Project: Clark State Forest, Henryville, IN

Physical Address: 1217 Deam Lake Rd. Borden, IN 47106

City, State & County: Between Borden and Henryville, IN

Requesting Organization: Daniel Boone Distance Riders

Description and purpose of Requesting Organization:

DBDR is a local/regional endurance riding club that exist to host endurance rides in and around the state of Kentucky and to work on maintaining trails in the same area.

List of contacts for requesting organization1:

Name: Sue Keith/Connie Caudill

Address : PO Box 334

City, State, Zip: Henryville, IN 47126

Phone: 812-967-5973

Email: conniecaudill@yahoo.com

Estimated total cost of project: \$11,578

Funds requested: \$5,066

or

Matching Funds requested: \$6,272

List of Matching share provided by requesting organization2:

Private donations of labor, equipment, materials:

27 ton 53's dense grade rock Donated by Clark State Forest	\$408
25 ton rip rap rock donated by Clark State Forest	\$364
I ton truck and operator donated CSF 20 hours@ 12.00/hr	\$240
1 Skid loader- donated by McAfee Trucking \$350/day x 10 days	\$3,500
2 ATV's- donated by McAfee Trucking \$100/day x's 2 x 10 d	\$2,000
 TOTAL from other funds	 \$6,512

IN-KIND SERVICES

23 volunteers

15 people to shovel dirt, rock, tree pruning, place rip rap: 112 hours

6 people layout and install geotextile: 12 hours each (70 hours)

2 Loader operators 40 hours each (80 hours)

2 ATV rock transporters 24 hours each (48 hours)

Total man hours for the entire project= 310 man hours

Project Description:

Our entire project is threefold with a total of 3 creek crossing repairs but at this stage we are only seeking funding on the first phase which is focused on the orange trail creek crossing of the Dry Fork trail system. The second stage will be on the Green trail and third stage is on the yellow trail of this same system.

Phase 1 of 3:

Restoration on orange trail of the hills leading in and out of the first creek crossing of the Dry Fork Loop as well as the actual creek crossing in Deam Lake Recreational Area of the Clark State Forest near Borden, IN.

The need is to repair soil erosion on hills leading in and out of the creek crossing of the orange trail loop as well as hardening the crossing.

The project will repair erosion on the hills with removing berm and making rolling grade dips to direct water off of the trail leading down into the crossing, stabilize areas on hills with Geotextile fabric and gravel. Harden and stabilize the creek crossing with Geotextile fabric, fill rock and rip rap.

The results will be erosion control on the hills. The harden creek crossing will be sustainable which will reduce future maintenance costs and a safe crossing for the horses.

Five equine organizations that would be involved in the project are:

America Endurance Ride Conference

Daniel Boone Distance Riders

Indiana Trail Riders Association

Hoosier Back Country

Pekin Saddle Club

Detailed Description of project:

1. Getting the Rock and materials down to the erosion areas will be the first issue. We will use a skid loader (bobcat) and we have an experience trail builder as our skid loader operator that will need to work the trail as it goes down the hill making it possible to move the materials to the project crossing.
Action: Several deep eroded areas going down the hill will need to be smoothed out and removal of the berm of the eroded trail and also adding rolling grade dips which will slow the water on the trail lessening future erosion. Will use geotextile fabric to stabilize footing where needed.
2. Moving rock and materials to the project site after trail is stabilized.
Action: With the use of 2 ATV's, a tractor and the use of another skid loader, materials will be transported down to site.
3. Repair a hazardous steep creek crossing that has a deep, boggy mud and flowing water.
Action: Grade and stabilize new crossing with geotextile, rip rap and cap with a hardening dense rock.
4. Work on eroded hill on far side of creek crossing.
Action: Several steep and deeply eroded areas going up the hills will need to be smoothed out and removal of the berm of the eroded trail and also adding rolling grade dips which will slow and direct water off of the steeper sections of the trail lessening future erosion. Will use geotextile fabric to stabilize footing where needed.

X Yes, there is an AERC Trail Master involved with this project!

Name of Trail Masters: Mike Caudill, MaryLynn Stockdale and Greg Jones

How many hours has your organization been involved with trail maintenance in the past year?

Please describe. 40 hours, mostly clearing trees with chainsaws and clearing brush.

Is there currently an endurance ride being held at these trails? Please name the ride and length of time in existence.

Top of the Rock 25/50 mile 2 day ride– manager Lois McAfee/Bill Wilson 20 years in existence

Spook Run 25/50 mile 2 day ride- manager Lois McAfee/Bill Wilson 20 years in existence

The trails every week will have 20-30 endurance riders on them conditioning

Estimated start date of your project:

Phase 1- September 15, 2016

Signature: Date: Connie Caudill 7/29/2016

Title: DBDR Treasurer

AERC # 6264

**AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL**

Motion Name: Young Rider Award Division

Proposing Committee: Junior/Young Rider committee

Date of Motion: February 18

Classification of Motion Request: New Awards, Rules Modification

Proposed Motion:

Expand the Regional Senior Endurance Awards to include a Young Rider division.

The Young Rider division would include AERC members who are between 16 and 21 years of age as of the first day of the AERC ride season (December 1). It would also include any Juniors (under 16 years of age) who have been granted permission to ride unsponsored per Rule 10.3 .

The Young Rider Division points standings would be calculated in the same manner as the existing Senior weight division awards (Feather, Light, Middle, Heavy).

Young Riders would earn points per mile and bonus points based upon the Appendix A 'Points Per Mile, Senior Division' charts, in the same manner as the other Senior Divisions.

The number of year-end award recipients would be determined by the number of Young Riders in each Region. (In the same manner that the weight division award recipients are determined).

Background, analysis and benefit:

The median age of AERC members is over 52, and steadily increasing. Our future lies in recruiting new members and creating a desire and commitment in our youth to continue the sport as they age, or return to it when able.

Recognition and awards are important, especially to AERC's youth. They create a playful sense of competition among peers, and a sense of pride and accomplishment resulting from their participation. They also help create a bond with the horse, and respect and gratitude for the partner that helped them achieve, or just try for, the award. An award helps the individual set a goal and discover the real life lessons learned in its pursuit.

Under the current Regional Awards system, AERC's youth are eligible for a Junior award as long as they are under 16 and ride with a sponsor. As soon as the youth is no longer eligible to compete in the Junior Division, they must compete within the Senior Division. It is very difficult for a child that is still dependent on a parent or guardian for finances, transportation and opportunity to place in the Senior awards division. They are usually limited to competing during school breaks, which greatly reduces their opportunity to earn points towards awards.

Most youth fall out of the standings as soon as they leave the Junior Division. Many lose interest in the sport when they no longer have attainable goals. The longer we can keep these kids interested in riding AERC the greater the likelihood that they will continue on into adulthood or return to the sport when life permits. Additionally, it is fair that youth compete against other youth for recognition and awards, rather than against adults.

Most other National equine sport organizations recognize Young Riders as a division, in addition to

Junior and Senior divisions. This age group is an important demographic – representing those old enough and skilled enough to reach high levels of performance, yet still disadvantaged from senior competitors due to lack of independent finances, dependence upon parents or guardians, school commitments, etc.

Budget effect/impact: Cost Estimate to add Young Rider Awards

Award Jackets estimated @ \$35/jacket

In 2015 there were 227 members under the age of 16. Top 3 in each region (9) are eligible for awards. 39 Juniors received jackets.

There were 254 members between 16 and 21 years, the proposed age range for a Young Rider division.

Impact on AERC Office:

Creation of an additional (weight) . Approximately \$500 for programming. Purchase of additional jackets, estimation: \$35/jacket to be awarded to 40 Young Riders, \$1400.

Committees consulted and/or affected:

Rules, Junior/Young Rider, Technical, Ride Manager

Implementation plan: Present to the board February 18, solicit comments, print in Endurance News. Present for final approval at midyear BoD meeting. Delayed for presentation at the October 10 conference call.

New Division to begin December 1, 2017 for the 2017 ride season

AERC Board of Directors MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name **Longevity Recognition Program**

Proposing Committee **Competition**

Date of Motion (Date to be presented to BOD) August 20, 2016

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

Proposed Motion (use exact wording)

A horse that completes at least 50 miles each year (in endurance or limited distance rides – does not have to be consecutive years) would get recognition at 5 year increments, starting at the 10 year plateau. The horse's owner would receive a pin, their names listed in an issue of Endurance News, and recognition at the annual convention.

In order for a horse to qualify for this Longevity Recognition Program, the horse must be registered in the AERC horse mileage program and the rider/owner must be a current AERC member.

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

At the suggestion of one of our members and in keeping with this organization's emphasis on competition longevity of our horses, this motion would put a program in place that would acknowledge all horses that compete year after year at any sanctioned distance of 25 miles or greater.

The technical committee will write a program that will produce an annual report listing those horses in

the horse mileage program, which in that year, reached the plateau of 10, 15, 20 or 25 years of completing at least 50 miles a year (in LD or endurance).

Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate)

\$300 or less to write the program, the cost of the pin and postage to rider (A donor would be sought to underwrite the cost of the pins and the postage (already obtained for the first 6 years).

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

This program would recognize the entire career of those horses that may start in LD, move up to endurance and then later in their career move back to the LD distances. Because the owners of these horses who reach plateaus must be current members, it may encourage members to retain their membership because as they age and go to LD rides, those miles will also count in this program.

Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget)

The office will be given the task of producing the report and producing the mailing labels for the annual recipients (Terry has agreed to do the mailing of the pins).

Committees consulted and/or affected

Competition Committee, Technical Committee, National Office.

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial)

Immediately.

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

See attachments regarding pin design, number of recipients and costs of pins and postage.

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees)

Competition Committee, Kathleen Henkel, Executive Director

**AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL**

Motion Name Update to AERC drug rule Appendix A, Prohibited Substances

Proposing Committee Veterinary Committee

Date of Motion August, 2016 AERC Board Meeting

Classification of Motion Request Rule update

Proposed Motion To update the appendices of Rule 13 with the following changes:

- 1) Add to Appendix A (Prohibited Substance): Nitrofurazone ointment
- 2) Add to Appendix A (Prohibited Substance): Tiludronate (Tildren®) and Clodronate (Osphos®)
- 3) Add to Appendix B (Categories of Prohibited Substances): Bisphosphonates

Background, analysis and benefit

The Veterinary Committee is tasked with periodically reviewing and recommending necessary updates to

the drug rule appendices as needed. As new substances or new knowledge about existing substances becomes available, these substances may be added to the Prohibited Substance Appendix.

1. Nitrofurazone is currently not specifically listed in Appendix A as prohibited, however it is prohibited as a class of substances (antibiotics/antimicrobials in Appendix B) so this is a drug rule clarification, not a change.

2. Tiludronate (Tildren®) and Clodronate (Osphos®) need to be added to Appendix A and bisphosphonates to Appendix B. Bisphosphonates are in a class of compound that act as effective bone resorption inhibitors. Tiludronate and clodronate approved in the US and Canada for the treatment of navicular syndrome in horses. These drugs inhibit enzymes used by pyrophosphate and bind to calcium ions, thereby accumulating in areas of high calcium deposition such as bone. Bisphosphonates are incorporated into the bone matrix and are gradually released over months to years. In human medicine, these drugs are used to treat bone reabsorptive diseases such as osteoporosis, osteitis deformans (Paget's Disease) and multiple myeloma. They are used by astronauts aboard long-duration space station missions. Bones undergo constant turnover, with osteoblasts forming bone and osteoclasts resorbing it. In diseased bone, the balance between formation and resorption is disrupted. Bisphosphonates inhibit bone resorption by encouraging osteoclasts to undergo cell death, leading to a decrease in the breakdown of bone. Bisphosphonates can cause gastrointestinal and renal toxicity. Higher blood plasma levels may increase the risk of toxicity. Because bisphosphonates are excreted by the kidneys, conditions that impair renal function may increase the blood plasma level and lead to more adverse reactions. It is not recommended to use bisphosphonates in horses with impaired renal function. Bisphosphonates can cause signs of colic in horses, usually shortly after the drug is given and may be due to altered intestinal motility. Bisphosphonates affect the blood plasma concentrations of some minerals and electrolytes, such as calcium, magnesium and potassium. The effects are immediate and can last up to several hours. They should be used with caution when administering to horses with conditions affecting mineral or electrolyte homeostasis (eg, hyperkalemic periodic paralysis or hypocalcemia). Bisphosphonates are not approved for use in breeding animals, especially pregnant or lactating mares. They cause abnormal fetal development in laboratory animals. The uptake of bisphosphonates into fetal bone may be greater than into maternal bone, creating a possible risk of skeletal or other abnormalities in the fetus. Bisphosphonates may be excreted in milk and absorbed by nursing foals. Increased bone fragility has been seen in horses given bisphosphonates at high doses or for long periods of time. Because bisphosphonates inhibit bone resorption and decrease bone turnover, the body may be unable to repair microdamage within a bone. At the present time the short, medium, and long term effect of bisphosphonates on the skeleton of endurance horses is undetermined.

Budget effect/impact

Little effect on the budget is expected

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

Nitrofurazone is currently prohibited by Appendix B. Adding this product specifically to Appendix A will provide a more direct reference for members.

Impact on AERC Office

Rule will need to be updated in print and on the website

Committees consulted and/or effected

Rules Committee, Welfare of the Horse Committee

Implementation plan

Implement immediately upon approval by the board of directors.

Supporting materials

FEI Prohibited Substance List

Supporting approvals

Veterinary Committee

**AERC Board of Directors
MOTION PROPOSAL**

Motion Name Update to AERC drug rule Appendix F, Prohibited Treatments

Proposing Committee Veterinary Committee

Date of Motion August, 2016 AERC Board Meeting

Classification of Motion Request Rule update

Proposed Motion To update the appendices of Rule 13 with the following changes:

1) Add to Appendix F (Prohibited Treatments): Kinesiology tape

Background, analysis and benefit

The Veterinary Committee is tasked with periodically reviewing and recommending necessary updates to the drug rule appendices as needed. As new treatments or new knowledge about existing treatments becomes available, these treatments may be added to the Prohibited Treatments Appendix.

Kinesiology taping practices for the human athlete are used in injury rehabilitation and prevention, and training. There are now products being marketed for use in horses. There are no published scientific studies evaluating the effect of these tapes on equine performance, but manufacturer claims include:

- Decrease muscle spasms
- Reduce inflammation and associated pain
- Reduce swelling and edema
- Re-educate muscle memory
- Support ligaments, tendons and joints
- Prevent injury and speed recovery
- Help with injury rehabilitation
- Increase circulation and promote healing
- Increase equine athletic potential

Therefore their use contradicts the spirit of the AERC rules and kinesiology tape products should be added to Appendix F.

Budget effect/impact

Little effect on the budget is expected

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

Clarifies to members that such artificial aids are not permitted during endurance competition.

Impact on AERC Office

Rule will need to be updated in print and on the website

Committees consulted and/or effected

Rules Committee, Welfare of the Horse Committee

Implementation plan

Implement immediately upon approval by the board of directors.

Supporting approvals

Veterinary Committee

**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: Policy Guidelines for Enforcing AERC Rules

Proposing Committee Motion proposed by BOD members Tom Bache, Olin Balch, Paul Latiolais, Carla Richardson, Christoph Schork, Steph Teeter

Date of Motion (Date to be presented to BOD) August 20, 2016

Classification of Motion Request New Initiative

Proposed Motion

Whereas, AERC has no clear and complete guidelines for actions to enforce AERC rules; be it Resolved, That the AERC President shall direct that an AERC Committee (Rules Committee or special purpose Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the President) shall develop clear and complete "Policy Guidelines" describing the scope of responsibility, objectives, and constraints for all AERC officials with rule enforcement authority, and Resolved, That these Policy Guidelines are to be adopted after approval by the Board of Directors.

Resolved, that the Board of Directors directs the Rules Committee to develop clear and complete policy guidelines and possible rule changes describing the scope of responsibility, objectives, and constraints for AERC officers, employees, committees and ride managers.

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

This Motion is motivated by the fact that the AERC Rules describe prohibited actions and behavior and the process steps to be followed when a member makes an allegation (by official or unofficial complaint) of a rule transgression. There are many AERC officials with the power and authority to deal with such allegations (RM, Regional Directors, P&G Committee, Board), but the rules are incomplete in their provision of guidelines for their respective scope of responsibility, priorities, objectives, and constraints. This is appropriate, since such Guidelines are a Policy matter that should not be in the Rules. It is best addressed in a separate document that can be modified by the Board as experience recommends. The role of the P&G Committee is addressed in the Rules, but many questions about its composition and function remain open. These should be addressed in the new Policy Guidelines. They include but are not necessarily limited to:

- Should the P&G Cmte membership be expanded to ensure representation from all regions”
- Should the P&G Cmte be directed to give highest priority to issue resolution by Mediation, especially in member vs member protests?
- Should first-time offenders be treated more leniently than repeat offenders?
- Should the drug policy revise the published thresholds to reduce or eliminate the likelihood that we will tag as “drug violators” riders who had no intent to violate?
- Should the entire Board be advised when a protest is filed? Note that when a protest is filed, the entire Board will be responsible for the P&G Cmte ruling.
- Since the P&G Cmte is only an advisory body with rulings that are unofficial prior to Board approval, should the Board be required to ratify rulings?
- When does a protest and ruling become public domain information?
- Should the outcome of a protest ruling dictate whether the protester and/or respondent be anonymous in AERC publications and in the public domain?
- How should protest rulings (length of time, anonymity of protester and/or respondent, etc.) be archived in AERC-controlled websites and in the public domain?
- Are character references a legitimate part of the deliberation and subsequent record? Who may solicit them?

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

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

Members and AERC officials will benefit from the availability of clear Policy Guidelines for rule enforcement

Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget): Another document will need to be added to the website.

Committees consulted and/or affected: None.

Implementation plan (Schedule, resources, financial)

This Motion requires that a new task be assigned to the Rules Committee, or alternatively to a new Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the President.

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

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