

AERC Board of Directors Conference Call Meeting Minutes December 10, 2018

President Paul Latiolais called the meeting to order at 6:10 pm. Executive Director, Kathleen Henkel called roll, other Board members present were Monica Chapman, Connie Caudill, Mollie Krumlaw-Smith, Michael Campbell, Angie Mikkelson, Jan Stevens, Tonya Stroud-Oaks, Mary Howell, Nick Kohut DVM, Steph Teeter, Lisa Schneider, Susan Kasemeyer, Vance Stine, Troy Eckard, Marcia Hefker-Miles, Shawn Bowling, Andrew Gerhard, Olin Balch DVM, Terry Woolley-Howe, Bob Marshall DVM, Mike Maul, Heather Reynolds, Paul Sidio, Christoph Schork. Also present were Jay Mero DVM, Melissa Ribley DVM, and Holly Corcoran.

Paul Latiolais gave an opening statement before the meeting got underway; AERC is facing two major crises. First the lack of ridership this year and also the implementation of the Safe Sport Act. He went on to say that we obsess on things that are not in our power to change and seem to lack the courage to change the things we can. He stated that it is false that USEF has not brought our concerns to FEI. He said it is true that there is a conflict between AERC and USEF bylaws but he felt there were ways to solve that issue. He said we need to identify other problems one at a time and not give up. The Safe Sport Act is federal law passed by congress and AERC is obligated to follow that law or risk serious financial risk to the organization. He does not know if we are covered with our insurance or if Ride managers are covered but even if we are he said we won't be for long if we don't immediately implement safe sport protocol.

Paul Latiolais asked Monica Chapman to look into the insurance program and to research what ride managers need to know in order to limit their risk. Monica Chapman agreed she would but wanted to clarify that according to the American Horse Council and the Safe Sport Center that the deadline for implementation has been pushed back until summer. Paul Latiolais said that from what he has read Safe Sport training is much more than just taking a course. He felt a Junior rider may not be alone during a ride with a person other than their parent and wanted people to think how that would affect sponsors for the Juniors.

Paul Latiolais said he would not tolerate bullying behavior in trying to keep board members from expressing their opinions using the conflict of interest argument and any bullying of a minor would now fall under the safe sport act. We are all volunteers and we need to be courteous to our colleagues and want to encourage ideas and not squash them. He went on to say the biggest problem of AERC is the decline of rides, ride entries and rider fees but not in membership. We need to consider who are actually going to rides, putting on rides and providing horses for others to ride and who will be doing these things in the future. Over the past few years ride entries have been declining 2- 3%. However, in 2016-2017 the decline was 10% and these can't all be described as weather issues. He would like the board to work with him to fix the problem and not make it worse and also stated that ridership was up by 6% in the Southeast and wanted the Board to think about what that might imply. He stated that the affiliate agreement before us is a lose-lose proposition. Any position we take will anger a portion of our membership and potentially hurt the organization in many other ways including financially. We will need to be cognizant of the full impact of our vote. Over the past month he has talked with over half of the Board and almost all have expressed that they are tired of discussing the affiliation agreement and they just want it over. Paul Latiolais agreed and stated he is losing sleep over it but that is not a reason to neglect due diligence. We are obligated to vote on the USEF affiliation issue based on facts and not emotions. He went on to say that he unaware of how little power the President of AERC had but felt he has some tools according to the bylaws. He will be showing leadership at this time on two fronts -first he would make sure that the Board knows as much as he knows about the affiliation, so on the agenda the Board will see committee reports and the Board is encouraged to ask questions from these reporters, there will be more reports next month including the legal report. Secondly, he has convened a new negotiating team to work with USEF on the affiliation agreement. The previous team worked hard but he realizes we need a professional negotiator that is experience and has worked with the USEF predecessor. The team will be John Parke, Jan Stevens, Holly Corcoran and Stagg Newman. He asked Monica Chapman to talk with AQHA to ask if and how

they can help us with the issue that this type of dis affiliation will cause. Lastly Paul Latiolais stated that he's introducing a new motion that will deal with the USEF affiliation issues. He will be e-mailing that motion to the board momentarily. Paul Latiolais announced that the Board would not be voting on the affiliation agreement in this meeting. He stated that Michael Campbell has set a precedent of motions going to all relevant committees and stated that we have not heard from all of them. Paul Latiolais said John Parke had explained to him that by not voting on the motion today will strengthen AERC's bargaining position.

Lisa Schneider commented that she felt Paul Latiolais is acting like this is a done deal in the postponement of the vote on the affiliate motion and does not agree with his reasoning. He replied that he has the power over the agenda and would not allow a vote today. Monica Chapman injected that the Board has to approve the agenda. Paul Latiolais replied- we do not and then asked where the bylaws say we have to approve the agenda. Monica Chapman stated the Roberts Rules of Order. Marcia Hefker-Miles, AERC's parliamentarian, called for a point of order. She said Roberts Rules of Order state that we follow a posted agenda. Paul Latiolais stated that this motion has not been vetted and precedent has been set in the past that the motions need to be vetted before voting. Marcia Hefker-Miles stated the president was out of order and if he had wanted to change the agenda he could have posted it before the meeting so that there could have been feedback from committees and Board members. She stated that he started the meeting by bringing up a motion that is not on the agenda. Paul Latiolais replied that he was not asking the Board to consider this motion but just informing the Board that this motion now exists. Marcia Hefker-Miles said that it should have been on the agenda and the Board should be dealing with it as an agenda item and if we are done with the roll call and housekeeping that we should be moving on down the agenda. Connie Caudill made a motion to accept the agenda, Jan Stevens second. Motion passed

After the vote there was no response from Paul Latiolais. Connie Caudill stated that if the president was not available on the call that Vice President Monica Chapman could run the meeting in his absence. Troy Eckard made a motion to have Monica Chapman conduct the meeting while Paul Latiolais was away. Tonya Stroud-Oaks 2nd the motion. Then Kathleen Henkel responded that Paul Latiolais wants everyone muted and to end the call. Paul Latiolais then came on the call and said he had been knocked. Lisa Schneider stated that there was a motion on the floor but Paul Latiolais said as long as he was President he was in charge of the meeting and that motion was out of order. He asked Kathleen to mute everyone which she did. Since muting had never been experienced in previous Board meetings, she explained during the silence, that with everyone being muted that no one can speak not even the president only she can as the host. After a minute she unmuted the call. Marcia Hefker-Miles asked if Paul Latiolais was on the call? Kathleen Henkel said no that he was not but he was calling her cell phone. Marcia Hefker-Miles stated that the protocol is to have the vice president conduct the meeting when the president is not available. At this time Paul Latiolais said he was back on the call. Steph Teeter asked if we could just go through the agenda. He said apparently not since there is an attempt to usurp my presidency. Marcia Hefker-Miles stated that was not the case but if the president was not on the call the vice president would conduct the meeting and it was unsure if he was actively not participating or if it was a technical problem. Paul Latiolais stated that he was back so the motion for the vice president to run the meeting is now a moot point. Jan Stevens made the motion to approve the minutes, Troy Eckard 2nd. Motion passed

Kathleen Henkel gave the statistical report;

Membership 12/5/17: 1946; 12/5/18: 1790

The number of renewals for the 2019 season rises by the hour.

Sanction fees as of 12/05/17: \$21,757; sanction fees as of 12/05/18: \$14,925

Rider fees as of 12/05/17: \$85,384; as of 12/05/18: \$74,088

The office is waiting payment on \$1,025 in rider fees for recently entered rides plus there are 5 additional rides currently in the input stage.

New members as of 12/5/17: 63; as of 12/5/18: 43

Connie Caudill made a motion from the National Championship Committee for approval of a date change for the AERC National Championship ride to 10/31 - 11/2/2019. The AERC Directors in the area felt this date would work well. The Melissa and Robert Ribley contacted nearby ride managers to ask if they would approve this one-time ride interference. All were agreeable. Melissa Ribley added that she appreciated working with the Sanctioning Directors from the PS and SW regions in helping with the date. Motion passed.

Paul Latiolais made a motion from the Sanctioning Committee for approval of the NW Region, Autumn Sun Pioneer ride, with Jessica Huber as ride manager, Oct 11-13, 2019. Motion passed

The approval of the AERC-I proposed members to the Sport Committee was withdrawn due to concern from USEF that the voting process was too rushed by the committee so was unable to accept all nominations. They will present this at a future date.

Jay Mero DVM summarized the Vet Committee report in response to the USEF affiliation issue with respect to drug testing stating that it needs to be divided in two parts. The analysis is the easy part, plenty of labs are available the big issue is that no other independent organization is available for the collection of the samples at competitive events. We would have two issues if we were to lose USEF's drug testing program. The first would be if our own vets are willing to pull the sample and would this present a conflict of interest since the ride vets know most of the riders? The second issue is- liability. She stated if AERC should lose USEF drug testing that it would be an immediate disaster. Can we come back from it? The answer would be – not as well. We will never receive as high of a level of integrity. It will cost AERC more money and will be a lot of work. We have had some high-end legal issues when dealing with drug testing. A high number of vets will refuse to test. Many vets are not licensed and don't carry much in a liability malpractice insurance. She believes it would take a couple of years to recreate the program. Troy Eckard commented that it may be difficult but not impossible and mentioned an e-mail from another vet on the committee that had a different opinion in cost and setting up of a new program. Jay Mero DVM, disagreed and said getting the accredited lab is not the problem but collection is the issue. She also said that when a problem arises that she can call Dr. Schumacher at USEF to get things corrected the next time. Jay Mero DVM spoke to the US Polo Association who took on this onerous task, well over a year ago, after they had a previous USEF administered program. They have many more paid employees working on this issue than AERC, not to mention far deeper financial pockets. They are still working on getting their new program set up, and by all accounts it's been a nightmare. She said that you can't compare endurance rides to horse shows with drug testing. USEF arranges for an 8-10 hour shift for endurance rides which is much different than any other sport. We want to test for as many drugs as possible. She stated that we won't find a great program on our own like we have with USEF. Troy Eckard stated he only sees the testers at rides for about 3-4 hours at the most. Jay Mero DVM, replied the testers should show up between 9- 10 am to test some of the LD riders and will need to wait until the last 50-mile rider is complete. They will test from anywhere from the 1st to the last riders. Jay Mero DVM said they try to also test 2-3 hundred-mile rides. The bulk of the ride entries are 25-50 mile rides so that is where they put their emphasis. Steph Teeter said they always seem to come and test her very small ride, they stay all day long and she does not feel this is the best use of the funds but Jay Mero DVM stated the plan is to test all types of rides from large profile to very small rides. The point is deterrence. Monica Chapman asked how long testers stay at the California rides and do they have different rules? Jay Mero DVM replied that they can test anytime during the ride. They can collect urine at any time and are in the process of changing their protocol to pulling more blood samples at any time. Shawn Bowling said when testers come to his ride they stay for 5-6 hours each time. Jay Mero DVM said that she sits on the committee for the California drug testers and knows that in order to pull blood the testers must be a veterinarian but not to collect urine. Christoph Schork, commented that she had mentioned the most important thing about drug testing is deterrence so is more testing better but do we really need 300 substances tested for deterrence? He felt if we tested less substances but did more tests it would that be better. He also questioned if USEF is really the only group available? Jay Mero DVM, said some testing needs to be done but always more is wanted. She said that the deterrent is anyone can be tested at any time. More is better but we have to be practical as far as the substances, USEF does more but at some time we will have to revamp the program to do what is practical as well as pragmatic. She does not feel it

is appropriate for her to talk about the affiliation agreement but she knows that many of the other USEF affiliates are going through similar issues as AERC and she would like to see compromise in trying to work with USEF. She appreciates both sides and can understand how AERC does not like feeling backed in a corner over drug testing. Jan Stevens asked if testing would continue in the state of California? Jay Mero DVM replied, testing would continue there.

Holly Corcoran reported from the AERC-I committee and some of the reasons that they believe it would be in the best interest of AERC to remain affiliated. Reasons stated are: Drug testing through USEF which is the best the Vet Committee felt was available, Safe Sport Training already in place with USEF, AERC will have less of a voice with horse welfare, ride managers will be directly affected, another affiliated organization will be in direct competition with AERC, if there is no co-sanctioning there will be a loss of International members, AERC will have no input or influence with the FEI temporary committee, AERC-I members fulfill a strong mentor role and could eliminate many of the 75 mile distances that are in place for FEI members, Holly Corcoran said since the Board was concerned with the reciprocity of USEF's disciplinary sanctioning that their committee felt that USEF members could sign a waiver that stated they would accept the disciplinary actions from USEF and waive their due process that they would have with AERC. She felt while listening on this call there are still many more questions that have not been answered. Mike Maul asked if AERC-I could take over the role that AERC has now. She does not have an answer but said Bill Moroney has mentioned the Endurance Sport Committee would be in that position for a while. It was asked if there would be co-sanctioning, she did not have the answer but thought Bill Moroney had stated that they would not. The Endurance Sport Committee would have to create all their own rides but she is not sure how that process would be brought along. Mike Maul said that it seems like if the rides were held at the same venue but as separate rides and with different rules that it would be a solution to be able to work together if both organizations were willing. Holly Corcoran did not have answers since USEF would have the say. She felt the issue would be if USEF would allow the events to be held at the same time and said there would be a lot to work on moving forward but felt there was not enough information at this time concerning affiliations vs disaffiliation. Troy Eckard said that he would like to volunteer to be the AERC representative on the negotiating team concerning the affiliate agreement since it seems to be heavily weighted by FEI people. He feels we need to take a tougher stand with the negotiations with USEF. Paul Latiolais thanked Holly Corcoran for her participation in the call.

Paul Latiolais then asked Mary Howell if she had anything to add on her membership committee report but she did not respond.

Paul Latiolais asked Mollie Krumlaw-Smith to discuss the financial situation with disaffiliation. She stated that we need to consider membership dues and loss of members with either direction that we choose. We will also lose sanctioning fees and rider fees. She has issues with raising our drug testing fees at this time since we won't have a drug testing program in place if we disaffiliate. With AERC-I, we currently collect the \$15.00 dues for the program. Some members have paid their 2019 dues and we would need to decide where those funds would go if we decide to sever that relationship. We have cash balance in the AERC-I funds that were specifically requested to go to the AERC-I funds. Anytime funds are given to a specific program it must go to that purpose. From an IRS standpoint AERC is obligated to spend the AERC-I funds for what they were designated. Any of those funds would have to be used for those purposes. This purpose is not talking about individuals wanting to ride in a foreign country. She believes AERC would have to donate those funds to that cause or a similar cause. Also, AERC-I holds their conference and continuing education for the officials at the Convention which if we disaffiliate would have a financial impact on convention attendance. Which is normally about 50 attendees. Steph Teeter asked if AERC no longer has an affiliation with USEF then how can they pursue international riding? Steph feels we can still have an international relationship and members could still pursue international riding and could still spend their funds. Mollie does not know if those members will remain AERC members. Christoph Schork asked if International can be other things besides FEI? Was it designated to only be FEI International events? Mollie Krumlaw-Smith stated it would be interpretation but that she had received calls that said the funds were for US teams competing against other countries. Connie Caudill asked if the affiliation payment can be paid without consent of the Board? Paul Latiolais answered that Kathleen Henkel has not paid the dues but that he had instructed her to pay them because

up until now it has been a standard function but she had refused to pay them. Someone asked for him to elaborate on the reasoning of the payment of the dues. He replied that since AERC need to be affiliated in order to recommend the candidates for USEF's Endurance Sport Committee and the payment was due on December 1st so technically we are not affiliated and there is a legal question if we can approve the list of candidates if we haven't paid our dues. But as it turns out, AERC-I was unable to complete their voting so we won't be able to vote on it in this meeting. It was asked of Paul Latiolais if he will instruct Kathleen Henkel to pay the dues again after this meeting without Board approval? He replied, no he will not because Kathleen Henkel won't do it. Kathleen Henkel said she was not being defiant of the president but she felt it was not in the best interest of AERC to pay the dues since the Board has been in discussion of this issue and it should be a Board decision. She said it is not her decision to make. Paul Latiolais said he understands that. Several people stated their support of Kathleen Henkel's action. Monica Chapman said that everyone knew there was a potential vote on this tonight and asking her to pay the dues before this meeting was out of line. Paul Latiolais said in his defense that he wanted the vote for the Sports Committee to be valid and the Board could vote to disaffiliate at a later time. He also said the AERC membership can blame him but Monica Chapman said the Board would be blamed not just one person. Paul Latiolais said he was willing to take the hit and the Board can blame him for this and said he is comfortable with this. Tonya Stroud-Oaks asked if we are going to pay the dues or not until this is resolved. Paul Latiolais said it is his understanding that the dues will not be paid until this gets resolved. Vance Stine asked if we don't pay the dues would we be ineligible to nominate members to the Endurance Sport Committee? Paul Latiolais did not know but he is guessing maybe not as the Board would be pushing the deadline.

Joe Mattingley was approved by USEF to be on the call to give the USEF Endurance Sport Committee report was unable to attend due to a family health issue. He was prepared to give answers to the questions that Bill Moroney referred to the committee from the Board. They have been sent this to the Board but Paul Latiolais will send copies to anyone that has not seen it.

Paul Latiolais stated- that is all that is on his agenda and then asked to have a motion to adjourn? When no one answered, he asked again for a motion to adjourn? Marcia Hefker-Miles stated for a point of order that there is a motion on the agenda to suspend the USEF affiliate agreement. He again asked if he has a motion to adjourn and a reply came from her that he does not. She once again said point of order that he was out of order. He asked again for a motion to adjourn and several people replied no. Marcia Hefker-Miles then said, Mr. President point of order, that he was out of order. For the fifth time Paul Latiolais asked if anyone was willing to make a motion to adjourn? With there being no answer, he then told Kathleen Henkel the meeting is over and told everyone good night. Monica Chapman stated that we could continue the meeting without the president. Troy Eckard made a motion that the Board remove Paul Latiolais from office. Kathleen Henkel then muted everyone for the third time during the meeting stating she was doing what was requested by the president and he wanted to end the call. She then unmuted the call. Someone requested Monica Chapman continue the meeting since it was assumed Paul Latiolais had hung up. Paul Latiolais then answered that he was on the call and had never left. He asked what the vote was about. Troy Eckard stated that he made a motion to remove him from office under article 8.3 of the AERC bylaws. Marcia Hefker-Miles 2nd the motion. Paul Latiolais stated that he was willing to conduct that vote and discussion on the motion. Steph Teeter is embarrassed for our Board of Directors to be doing something like this and felt this was ridiculous. Marcia Hefker-Miles said she finds it unprofessional that our president is not addressing the rules of the order of the organization in running the meeting and items of the meeting with his own regard without input from other members of this Board. Paul Latiolais replied that precedent has been set in the past that motions need to go through the proper committees and we have not heard back from all of them. She stated that he had set the agenda. She also said it was unprofessional for him to go on and off the call. Olin Balch DVM agrees with Marcia Hefker-Miles that this is incredible that Paul Latiolais is avoiding the motion by not allowing the Board to consider what is on the agenda, he added that we can vote to postpone the motion but not to be allowed to consider it is an extraordinary act. Michael Campbell said the precedent that he set was not anything like this. Christoph Schork agreed that Michael Campbell never had anything like this and 100% agreed with Marcia Hefker-Miles that the president was out of line.

Lisa Schneider called the question to end discussion, Olin Balch DVM, 2nd the motion.

Steph Teeter asked if Paul Latiolais would be willing to go forward with the USEF suspension motion and that he could ask to table it during discussion to avoid the current vote of his removal from office. Paul Latiolais said he would be willing to take the vote to table the motion to disaffiliate but he would only do that if we vote on tabling the motion first before the vote on the motion to remove him from office.

Marcia Hefker-Miles clarified that the motion before us is whether we want to vote on removal of the president from office. She said the motion to call the question is on the floor. If the vote on calling the question fails, then we continue the discussion of his removal from office. She stated that we need to discuss only the motion that is on the table. If there are other points of business after we vote on the call the question motion and the removal of the president, we can discuss them. We have two motions on the table- Call the question and removal of the president. Then we come back to the agenda and the next motion would be the USEF affiliation. Motion to end discussion passed

Motion on removal of Paul Latiolais from office passed with 18 yes and 5 no. Paul Latiolais thanked everyone and stated that he is quite pleased that he does not have to take responsibility for what the Board is about to do. It was stated that he will remain on the Board as the NW director.

Acting President Monica Chapman continued with the meeting by stating that the next item on the agenda is the suspension of the USEF affiliation agreement. She noted that on November 14, Paul Latiolais sent the motion to Competition, Education, Finance, International, Young Riders, Membership, Veterinarian, and Welfare of the horse Committees asking for feedback by this meeting. Reports were sent to the Board by the Finance, International, Membership, Veterinarian and Welfare of the Horse Committees. She assumes that committees that did not respond had no feedback on the motion. Mollie Krumlaw-Smith said the only question that Ride Managers Committee had was the question if co sanctioning was not allowed and would be detrimental to the rides that were already sanctioned for 2019 with FEI. Terry Woolley-Howe missed the request from Paul Latiolais so did not put it to the Competitions Committee but based on feedback from many members she did not think it would be a problem to suspend the affiliation with USEF. Marcia Hefker-Miles stated that with the Education Committee that it was purely speculative since they did not have any facts in place to form an opinion. Steph Teeter said the Junior Young Riders did not have any comment. Paul Latiolais said that the Legal Committee has not had time to get a report to the Board but that he had spoken to Lisanne Dorion recently and her concerns were how the Board would strategically comply with ADA and the Safe Sport Act moving forward. Monica Chapman asked the members of the Ad Hoc Committee that had been working on the affiliate agreement, what legal issues came up in those discussions. Connie Caudill responded that the main issues were concerning AERC's ability to follow USEF's rules, bylaws and suspensions while still following AERC's procedures. She stated that even though some board members felt the Ad Hoc Committee was not playing hardball in the negotiations, that after a year and a half and 100's of hours of working on it, that the committee didn't agree with USEF so wasn't able to bring it to the Board for review. The committee received some feedback from USEF's legal but have been unable to come to any solid consensus. Monica Chapman said if we stay with USEF and take their Safe Sport training that our members would have to become a USEF fun member for \$25 in order to get the training for free or they can take the training directly through the Center of Safe Sport for \$20.00. She has spoken with Julie Broadway, President of the American Horse Council, who has offered the possibility of bringing together many Equine organizations and has spoken to the Safe Sport Center about receiving a group discount. Monica Chapman has also spoken with Billy Smith, Executive Director of the Paint Horse Association. They are working with lawyers from the Baylor football team sex scandal in working on the possibility of making their own safe sport video. They have invited us to participate and help pay for the video. She spoke with the AQHA, Craig Huffman and they still haven't decided how they are going to handle the Safe Sport law in their organization. Monica Chapman said that AERC still needs to figure out who needs to take the training and what the cost will be before we would know the best avenue for AERC. She stated that we aren't the only affiliations that has issues with the USEF affiliation agreement. She had discovered that a few years ago USEF had suspended someone in the Morgan Horse Association but the Morgan Horse Association did not feel they could suspend one of their members without due process. She did not know the particulars but knew they had affiliation disagreements. Also, the Driving Horse Association had issues with

negotiating the USEF affiliate agreement. And when speaking with the AQHA President, Monica Chapman discovered that FEI had not contacted AQHA to tell them they being disaffiliated from FEI, they only found out in the press release. Monica Chapman asked if anyone wanted to go around the room for discussion on the suspension of affiliate agreement motion. Paul Latiolais made a motion to table to motion for a later vote, Susan Kasemeyer 2nd. Olin Balch DVM would like to continue to discuss the motion not table it since it is premature to discuss tabling. Susan Kasemeyer replied that was because it is not 11 pm at his house.

Christoph Schork asked if we table it would Monica Chapman assure us that the affiliation fees would not be paid until the board approves it. She agreed. Vance Stine said the phone meetings was hard to decide something like this and would like us to consider having the meeting at the March convention. Connie Caudill stated it was late to begin this discussion and with all that has taken place tonight and with it being 11:15pm already, that she agrees that the motion needs to be tabled even though she would have liked to have taken the vote tonight. Christoph Schork commented that if we are tabling the motion and not paying the affiliate dues that would mean that our current affiliation agreement is suspended until we come to a vote in January. Kathleen Henkel said even though we haven't paid the dues or signed the agreement that last year she didn't send it in until January 10 and there was no mention of any sort of suspension by USEF. Paul Sidio asked about moving the vote on this to the following week when the Board has a scheduled meeting on an appeal of a protest. Steph Teeter said the Board has not been informed of this meeting, but others stated that they were informed when they received the appeal packet from the AERC office. Paul Latiolais noted that Steph Teeter had not been informed or sent an appeal packet since he was planning on calling her tomorrow to ask her to recuse herself but stated that is no longer his job it is now Monica Chapmans. Steph Teeter could not believe the appeal would be in a week as she was not informed. Monica Chapman asked if there were any other comments on tabling the motion so that we can move on. Terry Woolley-Howe said she is opposed to tabling the motion she does not think there is anything new that would change things, she would like to vote. Mike Maul wants to vote on this later stating that all are tired and emotionally stressed but would like to vote on it next week. Marcia Hefker-Miles noted that the motion would be tabled until the Executive Committee brings it back for a vote. Motion to table the USEF affiliation motion passed with 14 yes, 9 no and one recusal.

Monica Chapman asked the Board to allow her a couple of days to get her act together. She doesn't see the Executive Committee putting the motion off for very long. Terry Woolley-Howe wanted to make sure that this is on the January agenda. Olin Balch DVM asked if everyone could give an opinion to see how they feel about the situation with USEF and any solutions and he would like to also discuss conflict of interest. Monica Chapman wanted some time to talk to the Legal Committee in depth concerning the conflict of interest.

Connie Caudill made a motion to adjourn, Marcia Hefker-Miles 2nd the motion. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 11:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Connie Caudill, AERC Secretary

MOTION PROPOSAL

--

Motion Name : Limited Distance rule modification

Proposing Committee: Rules

Date of Motion : November 12 teleconference call

Classification of Motion Request : rule change

Proposed Motion :

Whereas existing LD finish/completion rules often result in confusion and rushing to meet time and veterinary/pulse criteria,
Resolved to change the following rules: (deletions to current rule book are noted with cross-out line, additions with bold, italic)

1) Rule L3:

L3. The ride must provide a specific amount of time (total competition time) which will include all stops and holds, and within which competitors must complete the ride to qualify for placing or completion.

L3.1 There may be no minimum time limit for completion.

L3.2 Course completion time, which is the maximum time competitors are allowed to complete the specified course from start to finish, will be according to the Limited Distance chart in Appendix A.

L3.3 Riding time is the time used by competitors to complete the course and reach criteria, excluding all hold times. This is the time used for AERC ride results.

L3.4 At the finish, ride time of the competitor continues until a pre-set judging criteria of 60 heartbeats per minute or less is met. (Finishing time is recorded as the time at which the rider asks for and subsequently meets this preset criteria.) ~~There is no marked finish line on the course that is used to determine placing or completion time.~~

2) and change the Limited Distance chart in Appendix A to read:

Limited Distance Maximum Course Time Hours:Minutes

(time rider must be off the marked course, including all Holds and Checks)

and

3) Rule L4

~~L4. Completion requires meeting all of the criteria used for endurance rides with the following exception/additions:~~

L4. Completion requires meeting all of the criteria used for endurance rides with the exception of maximum pulse criteria upon completion of the course (see L4.1.2)

L4.1 All equines must stand a mandatory post-ride evaluation within ~~30 minutes~~ one hour of crossing the marked finish line. Riders may present their equines for the final examination at a time of their choosing during the ~~30-minute~~ one hour period. An equine that does not meet the established criteria within ~~30 minutes~~ one hour of arrival time shall be disqualified. Once a completed equine has passed the post-ride examination, it may not be removed from completion for veterinary reasons.

L4.1.2 The equine must meet a reasonable pulse recovery based on ambient conditions within 30 minutes of arrival at all control points. Maximum pulse criteria upon completion of the course is 60 beats per minute, and must be met within 30 minutes of arrival ~~upon completion of the course~~ at the finish line. Respiration should be evaluated on its own merit. Ambient temperature and humidity effects need to be recognized and their effects considered.

Implementation plan : Article in Endurance News, immediate notification of all members via email.

MOTION PROPOSAL

Motion Name: Request for Funding for AERC Research at the 2019 Tevis Ride (see attached protocol)

Proposing Committee: AERC Research Committee – Jerry R. Gillespie, Chair of Research Committee

Date of Motion: 15 October 2018

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

Proposed Motion (use exact wording): This is a request to reinstate funding that was approved for the 2018 Tevis Dehydration Study, which did not occur because of illness of one of the Principal Investigators. AERC was notified 11 May 2018 of the need to postpone the Tevis Research, and a request to refund the project for the 2019 Tevis Cup Competition. The funds requested herein are in the same amount as those requested for the 2018 Research.

It is moved that AERC provide funds in the amount of \$4,000 from the AERC Research Fund to continue our studies on dehydration of endurance horses traveling to the 2019 Tevis Ride and during the Ride. (see attached proposal) I am attaching a budget request in which I propose the AERC and the Tevis Foundation share in the cost of the proposed 2019 Tevis study; \$4,000 funded by AERC and \$2,450 funded by Tevis Foundation; TOTAL \$6,450.

Background, analysis and benefit (describe the problem this motion is solving): The proposed Tevis Research will be an extension of the AERC Research at the 2016 Cooley Ranch Ride and the 2017 Virginia City Ride. The results of these studies were report at the 2017 and 2018 AERC Conventions. (more background in the attached Research Proposal)

Budget effect/impact (Attach spreadsheet if appropriate): We anticipate no budgetary impact on AERC. The requested funds will come from the AERC Research Fund.

Benefit and/or Impact to Membership and/or the AERC Organization: Of great concern to the Membership and the AERC Organization is the welfare of the endurance horse. Like the earlier studies at Cooley Ranch and Virginia City Rides, the 2019 Tevis Study will focus on a very important ailment in endurance horses, dehydration. Our studies have shown that horses dehydrate (lose body water) during transport to rides if the journey requires more than 2 hours. The horses do not usually have time to rehydrate before the start of the rides and will continue to dehydrate during the ride in both 50 mile and 100 mile rides. It will be important to investigate the extent of dehydration in the Tevis horses during a 100 mile ride with ambient temperature around 100 degrees F. We expect to collect home-stable body weights and ride-arrival weights to assess the extent of dehydration do to transport to the Tevis venue.

Impact on AERC Office (Work load, budget): Minor

Committees consulted and/or affected: No Other Committees consulted. However the information from these studies should enrich presentations in the Education Committee, Inform members of the Veterinary Committee, and provide guidance to the Ride Managers Committee Supporting materials (List of any other documents and/or spreadsheets): Attached Research Proposal with budget and budget justification.

Supporting approvals (proposing committee, participating committees) AERC Research Committee