

Rule	Tracking	Draft	Proposal Type	Effective Date	Proponent	Status
GR 801.0	210-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Matty O'Rourke	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: Helmet Fit						
GR 1102.5	343-17	2	Standard	4/1/2018	Bill Moroney	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: Horse Recordings						
GR 1302.0	041-17	2	Standard	12/1/2018	Steve Sarafin	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: Entry Requirements - Safe Sport						
GR 1316.4	211-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Matty O'Rourke	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: Helmets in Rider Fall						
AR 106.3	046-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Catherine West	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: shoe bands						
AR 115.1	045-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Catherine West	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: intimidation						
AR 116.4	047-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Catherine West	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: stretching						
DR 121.0	355-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Andrea Kaplan	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
EV 115.0	044-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Mary P Hunter	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: neck straps						
HU 111.4	031-17	1	Standard	12/1/2018	Daphne Boogaard	Disapproved (1/20/2018)
Description: Junior Hunter Cross Entry						

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	8/31/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

GR801 Dress [CHAPTER 8-A ATTIRE AND EQUIPMENT]

2. It is compulsory for all persons at Federation licensed hunter, jumper or hunter/jumper competitions when mounted anywhere on the competition grounds, to wear properly fastened protective headgear which meets or exceeds ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials)/SEI (Safety Equipment Institute) standards for equestrian use and carries the SEI tag. It must be properly fitted with harness secured **and tight enough so it cannot be pulled over the chin or allowing the helmet to come off without unfastening the harness**. Exception: In Hunter or Jumper classes, adults may be allowed to remove their headgear while accepting prizes and during the playing of the National Anthem only; they must refasten their headgear prior to the lap of honor. It is compulsory for riders in Paso Fino classes, both open and breed restricted including Hunter Hack, where jumping is required and when jumping anywhere on the competition grounds to wear properly fastened protective headgear which meets or exceeds ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials)/SEI (Safety Equipment Institute) standards for equestrian use and carries the SEI tag. It must be properly fitted with harness secured **and tight enough so it cannot be pulled over the chin or allowing the helmet to come off without unfastening the harness**. A Show Committee must bar riders without **properly fitted** protective headgear **or hair not conforming to the rules** from entering the ring for classes in which protective headgear is required and may bar any entry or person from entering the ring if not suitably presented to appear before an audience.

3. Except as may otherwise be mandated by local law, all sub-junior exhibitors in the Paso Fino division, while riding or driving or while in the driving cart anywhere on the competition grounds, must wear properly fitting protective headgear which meets or exceeds ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials)/SEI (Safety Equipment Institute) standards for equestrian use and carries the SEI tag. Harness must be secured and properly fitted **and tight enough so it cannot be pulled over the chin or allowing the helmet to come off without unfastening the harness**. Any rider violating this rule at any time must immediately be prohibited from further riding until such headgear is properly in place. For all exhibitors competing in the hunter, jumper, or hunter seat equitation section, if a rider's chin strap becomes unfastened, the rider may stop, re-fasten the chin strap and continue his/her round without penalty or elimination. A judge may, but is not required to stop a rider and ask them to refasten a chin strap which has become unfastened, again without penalty to the rider. Members of the Armed Services or the Police may wear the Service Dress Uniform.

8. The Federation makes no representation or warranty, express or implied, about any protective headgear, and cautions riders that death or serious injury may result despite wearing such headgear as all equestrian sports involve inherent dangerous risk and as no helmet can protect against all foreseeable injuries **but a properly fitted and current helmet is required**.

9. **Helmets may not be more than 4 years old, verified by the manufacturer date in the helmet.**

Proponent Details	Contact Information
-------------------	---------------------

Matty O'Rourke

Matty O'Rourke

p.1@mac.com

Rule Change Intent

Wearing hair up and in a helmet limits the effectiveness of the helmet and can lead to greater injury than a helmet properly fitted. In no other sport or profession where a helmet is worn, do people wear their hair up in their helmet. Not in any form of motor racing, bicycle racing, snow sports, ice hockey, football, lacrosse, extreme sports, amateur boxing, fighter pilots, Armed Forces, Police or Fire Fighters. Hair is worn in a bun below the helmet as in Dressage, the Armed Forces and Police. In sports where there is danger of fire, hair is worn loose or in a ponytail under the balaclava and under the uniform.

This can be a mandate that is phased in, similar to when harnesses became required on helmets. All juniors must comply, amateurs and professionals by a certain date to be determined.

Though there is backlash against jumper riders with loose, unkempt hair, there can be a middle ground with the traditional hunters and equitation choosing a bun or a neatly braided pony tail with no adornments other than a suitable hairnet as seen in dressage.

Helmets are routinely worn with chin straps too loose which defeat the purpose of wearing the helmet. Judges, stewards and all officials should be empowered to check the strap and require the rider to make an adjustment.

The Federal Government also requires that in states that require helmets for Motorcyclists to be no more than 5 years old, verified by the DOT sticker on the helmet. Helmets can appear fine on the outside but sweat, hair products, extreme temperatures, all serve to continually compromise a helmet over time and is not considered effective after 5 years of normal wear. In a sport where some riders and trainers can wear a helmet for 12 hours a day, that amount of wear is well beyond "normal." Instituting a helmet date check is similar to checking the length of a dressage whip, horse boots, blood rule or jog for soundness. A helmet check for fit and/or date of manufacture can be done concurrently with a jog for soundness, model class, boot check, etc. In motor racing a car finishing on the podium gets a quick check to make sure the car was legal; top three competitors can be required to show their helmet or get eliminated from class and points and money lost if the helmet or hair is non compliant.

Linked Rules	Comments
--------------	----------

Web: Helmet Fit

Committee Actions

Andalusian/Lusitano

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/02/2017

Draft 1: Helmets last longer than four years when taken care of properly and have not been damaged. It would be difficult for competition stewards to check each exhibitor helmet especially at larger licensed competitions.

Arabian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/15/2017

Draft 1: This rule change would be difficult to enforce. Who would enforce the rule at the competition? What if the tag is no longer in the helmet?

Breeds/Disciplines

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Dressage

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/04/2017

Draft 1: Would be difficult to enforce. Many helmets can be used over four years per manufacturer based on amount of uses, etc.

Driving

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/20/2017

Draft 1: Strongly oppose these changes for many reasons: cannot be enforced, puts potential legal obligation on Officials & the Federation, not clear to "who" is responsible in these situations, should be left for the Organizer's to handle (not the Federation), cannot clearly define 'properly fitted' in a general sense across disciplines.

Endurance

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Eventing

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017

Draft 1: The Eventing Sport Committee does not recommend approval as there are concerns about the administration of the rule.

Hackney

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/20/2017

Draft 1: This would be too difficult to monitor and enforce

Licensed Officials

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/27/2017

Draft 1: This rule is unenforceable by competition management and would be extremely difficult to monitor.

Morgan

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017

Draft 1: This rule change would be difficult to enforce. There is not enough time for Stewards/TDs to check each helmet and the manufacturer date is not indicative of the helmets condition

National Hunter Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/06/2017

Draft 1: This rule is unenforceable.

National Show Horse

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/13/2017

Draft 1: This rule would be difficult to enforce and too many factors come into play regarding proper fit and age of helmets.

Paso Fino

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/30/2017

Draft 1: It would be difficult to verify helmet age and would burden competition management to enforce this rule.

Roadster

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017

Draft 1: Too difficult to monitor and enforce.

Saddle Seat Eq

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/20/2017

Draft 1: Helmets can be used longer than the noted 4 years and who will monitor if the helmet fits properly. This rule would be too difficult to enforce.

American Saddlebred

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/27/2017

Draft 1: Difficult to enforce

Shetland

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/01/2017

Draft 1: This rule change would be difficult to enforce and verify helmet age. At competitions, who will check each helmet? This could cause hardship to competition management especially at competitions with a high number of exhibitors.

Vaulting

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Connemara

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017

Draft 1: There are currently no rules about hair being in a helmet as referred to in this proposal. While this may be a well meant idea, it is not really enforceable.

Western Committee

Draft 1: No Action 11/21/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Safety

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017

Draft 1: While the committee is in support of a rule enforcing the proper fit of helmets, it cannot approve this rule as written with the restriction of helmets over 4 years old and mandate on wearing hair outside of the helmet. There is research that has found helmets are effective for years with proper care. Additionally, there is ongoing debate and research regarding the best way to wear hair with a helmet.

Reining

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Friesian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/14/2017

Draft 1: It should be up to parents, trainers and individuals to ensure helmets are up to standard. Too much work for competition management and stewards.

Jumper

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/28/2017

Draft 1: JSC feels we should focus on better education regarding concussions and helmet safety.

USHJA

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/14/2017

Draft 1: Proper helmet fit is already addressed within the current rule and the responsibility for ensuring proper fit rests with the individual, not the Federation.

Carriage Pleasure Driving

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/09/2017

Draft 1: Committee feels this rule change is unenforceable.

Steward-Technical Delegate Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/29/2017

Draft 1: This rule is unenforceable by competition management and would be extremely difficult to monitor.

English Pleasure

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Welsh

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017

Draft 1: This rule is a great concept, but we feel it will be rather difficult to enforce. Who will enforce this rule at each competition - i.e. check each individual helmet & fit? This will potentially cause a hardship on those who may not ride often to have to purchase a helmet every four years, as well as the fact that the helmet may already be a year old when it is shipped to a store. The manufacture date does not indicate the intensity of how a helmet has or has not been used.

Western Dressage

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017

Draft 1: The committee is okay with the language regarding the chinstrap but feels verifying the helmets age would be difficult to enforce. Who will check the fit and verify the age of the helmet?

Council - Admin & Finance

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 01/08/2018

Draft 1: Goes against current standards for replacing helmets. Would be difficult to enforce.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 01/04/2018

Draft 1: No Comments

Council - Intl Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017

Draft 1: Too difficult to enforce. It is not the purpose of the USEF to dictate and police the correct fit of helmets.

Governance

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

GR1102.5 Tracking #343-17 Draft #2 Disapproved

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	4/1/2018	12/1/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

GR1102 Horse Recordings [CHAPTER Subchapter 11-A Horse Identification and Recordings]

5. Horse recording applications are available from the Federation office or online at www.usef.org. A recording may also be activated on an annual **or lifetime** basis, using each horse's Unique Horse ID number. The recording fee is discounted for the life of a horse if applied for from birth to December 31st of year foaled. **Exception:** Horses must be recorded for life **annual or life recorded** to be eligible to receive FEI or National Passports. To qualify for the age discount, registration papers and/or other proof of age must be provided. The fees can be found on the horse recording application at www.usef.org.

Proponent Details	Contact Information
<p>Bill Moroney</p>	<p>Bill Moroney bmoroney@usef.org</p>

Rule Change Intent

To change the recording requirement for eligibility to receive an FEI or National passport to allow for either life or annual recording.

Linked Rules	Comments
	Web: Horse Recordings

Committee Actions

Arabian	
<p>Draft 1: Recommends Approval 11/15/2017</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments</p>
Breeds/Disciplines	
<p>Draft 1: No Action</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments</p>
Dressage	
<p>Draft 1: No Action Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/04/2017</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments Draft 2: It will cause confusion to have a horse with a valid horse passport but not a valid horse recording. Would also recommend expanding discounts past the birth to Dec 31st parameter.</p>
Driving	
<p>Draft 1: No Action Draft 2: Recommends Approval 12/20/2017</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments Draft 2: DSC supports this change. It is common in driving to temporarily lease/borrow horses from foreign owners (that already have a passport through their NF) for a World Championship or WEG on the US team. Allowing for annual recordings rather than requiring life recordings is a better option in these temporary cases, especially when multiple horses are involved.</p>
Endurance	
<p>Draft 1: No Action Draft 2: No Action</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments Draft 2: No Comments</p>
Eventing	
<p>Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017 Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/09/2017</p>	<p>Draft 1: The Eventing Sport Committee recommends disapproval with the reasoning that it is unfavorable to have to have a horse which has a valid passport but not a valid horse recording. Draft 2: The Eventing Sport Committee recommends disapproval with the reasoning that it is unfavorable to have to have a horse which has a valid passport but not a valid horse recording.</p>
Hackney	
<p>Draft 1: No Action 11/20/2017</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments</p>
Roadster	
<p>Draft 1: No Action 11/21/2017</p>	<p>Draft 1: No Comments</p>

Saddle Seat Eq

Draft 1: No Action 11/20/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

American Saddlebred

Draft 1: No Action 11/27/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Vaulting

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Draft 2: No Comments

Connemara

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017

Draft 1: There is no argument with the passport language change. We feel, however, that it is important to keep the discount for younger horses in this language, as breeders do not always record foals. This provides an incentive for member that may have horses between the ages of 1-3 to go ahead and get their horse recorded.

Western Committee

Draft 1: No Action 11/21/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Reining

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Draft 2: No Comments

Jumper

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/28/2017

Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 11/28/2017

Draft 1: Horses competing in FEI competitions must be recorded (members) of their NF. Also, this proposal includes language that is already removed from the Rulebook regarding discounted Life recordings.

Draft 2: Horses competing in FEI competitions must be recorded (members) of their NF and annual recordings will inevitably leave a gap in their recording/membership.

USHJA

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 2: Recommends Approval 12/14/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Draft 2: No Comments

English Pleasure

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Welsh

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017

Draft 1: We do not oppose of the changes to the FEI requirements, but as breeders would like to be sure the discounts for recording young horses still stand to encourage people to have their ponies recorded.

Council - Admin & Finance

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 01/08/2018

Draft 1: No Comments

Draft 2: May be confusing; the recordings may not be in sync.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Council - Intl Discipline

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Draft 2: Unfavorable to have a FEI horse passport but not a USEF horse recording.

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	12/14/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

GR1302 Duties [CHAPTER 13-A Responsibilities]

GR1302 Duties

1. Every exhibitor, rider, driver, handler and trainer or his/her agent(s) must sign an entry blank (see GR404 and GR908.2). In the case of a rider, driver or handler under 18, his/her parent or guardian, or if not available, the trainer, must sign an entry blank on the minor's behalf.

2. In order to participate in any Federation Licensed Competition, any person who is a Professional or acts as a Trainer or Coach as defined by the Federation rules, shall comply with the Federation Safe Sport Policy, including successfully completing a criminal background check and Federation-approved Safe Sport training, in accordance with such Policy. Parents or legal guardians who are not Professionals under the Federation rules but act as Trainer or Coach on behalf of their Junior, as well as Amateurs who act as Trainer or Coach for themselves, are exempt from this rule.

Proponent Details	Contact Information
Steve Sarafin	Steve Sarafin ssarafin@bellsouth.net

Rule Change Intent

In an effort to further educate the Federation's coaches and trainers, this rule is being proposed to require professionals, acting as coaches and trainers, to successfully complete several important Federation components. This rule proposal will require that all professionals complete a criminal background check and Safe Sport training.

Linked Rules	Comments
	Web: Entry Requirements - Safe Sport

Committee Actions

Andalusian/Lusitano	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/02/2017 Draft 2: No Action	Draft 1: This rule change would discourage competitors from competing at licensed competitions and would severely limit participation of amateurs. Draft 2: No Comments
Arabian	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/15/2017 Draft 2: No Action	Draft 1: The committee feels this idea is good, but would be difficult to enforce and more time is need to determine how it would be enforceable. This rule change would also limit participation from amateurs. Draft 2: No Comments
Athletes Advisory	
Draft 1: No Action Draft 2: No Action	Draft 1: No Comments Draft 2: No Comments
Breeds/Disciplines	
Draft 1: No Action Draft 2: No Action	Draft 1: No Comments Draft 2: No Comments
Dressage	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/04/2017 Draft 2: No Action	Draft 1: We support the philosophy behind this rule change proposal. However, as written, this would be impractical and impossible to comply with at a competition. Additionally, as written, this would apply to foreign competitors who are competing as well. Draft 2: No Comments

Driving

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/20/2017

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: The Driving Sport Committee strongly disagrees with this rule as a REQUIREMENT, but instead suggests that the Safe Sport Policy be offered as a member BENEFIT. i.e. Trainers may opt to take the training & the background check, and upon doing so would earn a "star" or certification for their membership. Therefore, other members could benefit from knowing their Trainer is certified under the Safe Sport Policy. Making this a requirement would be ENTIRELY too difficult to enforce & would also be a hardship on many trainers who don't operate as a professional business & simply have a few clients. DSC suggests to offer the Safe Sport Policy as a benefit rather than requirement.

Endurance

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: No Comments

Eventing

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The Eventing Sport Committee agrees with the sentiment of this rule but feels that the rule, as written, presents potential issues with its administration and believes clarification regarding the administration of this rule is required, e.g. if 30 competitors arrive at a show and their entries have not specified a trainer, will the secretary be required to check a database at that time? This could be a major nightmare for the show secretary at a very busy and confusing time. If a trainer signs a form at the show office and is found not to be in compliance will the competitor be permitted to compete? Is this creating a situation where more and more trainers will refuse to sign the entries, leaving the competitors (or their parents) to sign as trainer?
Draft 2: No Comments

Hackney

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/20/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Agrees with concept but this rule would be difficult to enforce. Committee believes this would discourage competitors from competing at licensed competitions
Draft 2: No Comments

Morgan

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Would be difficult for show staff to verify and limit participation from amateurs.
Draft 2: No Comments

National Hunter Committee

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 01/03/2018

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: The committee is concerned with the enforcement of this rule as well as the validity of the current Safe Sport training in the horse show industry. We feel the horse show industry is so vastly different from other sports and warrants it's own training module.

National Show Horse

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/13/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Good concept, but it would be hard to enforce and difficult for competitions to verify. Completing the background check places another financial impact on competitors. Who determines if you pass or fail the background check?
Draft 2: No Comments

Paso Fino

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/30/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The idea is good, but would be difficult to enforce at licensed competitions. In the Paso Fino division, this change would require competitors in amateur trained classes and competitors without trainers to meet these requirements not just trainers and coaches.
Draft 2: No Comments

Roadster

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Too difficult to monitor and enforce. Committee felt that this rule's requirements would negatively affect membership.
Draft 2: No Comments

Saddle Seat Eq

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/20/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Concern about helmet requirement being only 4 years to be eligible to be used and who was responsible to insure the helmet fit properly. The rule as written would be very difficult to monitor.
Draft 2: No Comments

American Saddlebred

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/27/2017
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017

Draft 1: Difficult to enforce and would require certification or licensing. Would be difficult for show staff to check and would discourage shows from becoming licensed with USEF.
Draft 2: The committee still believes it will be difficult to enforce and would require certification or licensing.

Shetland

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/01/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The intent is good, but feel it would be difficult to verify and enforce at licensed competitions.
Draft 2: No Comments

Competition Management

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/04/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The committee feels this is an opportunity to have the affiliates develop these programs.
Draft 2: No Comments

Vaulting

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: No Comments

Connemara

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The Connemara group does not have as many "professional" trainers as many of the larger groups, and this rule could prove to be a burden on smaller trainers. There needs to be clearer language for an amateur signing the entry blank for him/herself.
Draft 2: No Comments

Western Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Difficult to monitor and enforce unless Trainers were licensed or certified.
Draft 2: No Comments

Safety

Draft 1: Recommends Approval 11/21/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The Committee recommends approval of this rule but notes that a system of implementation will be needed to educate the membership.
Draft 2: No Comments

Reining

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: No Comments

Friesian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/14/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: It is a good idea, but complicates paperwork, is difficult to verify and would but a finical burden on shows and competitors. This needs to be required for everyone, including parents, or none. Believes this would led to lots of parents signing vs. trainers.
Draft 2: No Comments

Jumper

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/28/2017
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/18/2017

Draft 1: JSC would prefer to work on language from the USHJA proposed rule of GR 1302.2 (tracking 266-17).
Draft 2: The JSC agrees in principle but prefers to support the USHJA's version.

USHJA

Draft 1: Referred 12/14/2017
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 01/02/2018

Draft 1: Referred to January USHJA Board Meeting
Draft 2: Prefer language in 266-17

Carriage Pleasure Driving

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/09/2017
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/18/2017

Draft 1: Agrees with the concept but feels this is an opportunity work with the affiliate to develop these programs. Committee is okay with professionals completing these requirements but the current language would severely affect amateurs.
Draft 2: Committee Agrees with the concept but feels this would be difficult to monitor and enforce.

English Pleasure

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: No Comments

Welsh

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: The intent of this rule is good, but not practical for the Welsh group. We do not have many professional trainers as compared to larger groups, and this may cause a financial hardship on those who sign the entry blank as such.
Draft 2: No Comments

Western Dressage

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: Too difficult to enforce.
Draft 2: No Comments

Council - Admin & Finance

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 01/08/2018

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: Council feels that this is unenforceable in the current competition environment.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 01/04/2018

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: This rule would be difficult to enforce because there is not a plan in place to penalize or encourage those non-compliant

Council - Intl Discipline

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: Too difficult to enforce and creates complications for competition management.

Governance

Draft 1: No Action
Draft 2: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments
Draft 2: No Comments

GR1316.4 Tracking #211-17 Draft #1 Disapproved

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	8/31/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

GR1316 Accidents Involving Competitors [CHAPTER SUBCHAPTER 13-E RETURN TO COMPETITION GR1316 Accidents Involving Competitors]

GR 1316

4. Unconsciousness/Concussion. If qualified medical personnel determines that a competitor has sustained unconsciousness or a concussion, he/she must be precluded from competing until cleared to compete under paragraph 6 below **and the helmet will be retained by the horse show organizers.**

6. Return to Competition. In the event that a competitor is determined ineligible to compete under one of the preceding paragraphs, the competitor shall submit to the Federation, a signed release, which includes criteria established by the Federation from time to time, completed by a licensed physician in order to be eligible to once again compete in Federation-Licensed or endorsed competitions **and show proof that a new helmet has been purchased.**

7. For all competitors evaluated pursuant to this rule, the Steward or Technical Delegate shall submit a properly completed Accident/Injury Form, **helmet and any available video** and, if applicable, any corresponding signed release to the Federation Director of Competitions by 6:00 p.m. on the day following the last day of the competition.

Proponent Details	Contact Information
Matty O'Rourke	Matty O'Rourke p.1@mac.com

Rule Change Intent

If a rider has had a fall and the helmet is visibly damaged, it is no longer safe to wear for any reason, in competition or out of competition and should be confiscated. If a rider has a loss of consciousness, the helmet must be confiscated regardless of appearance because the integrity of the helmet has obviously been compromised.

Too many riders continue to ride in helmets they take falls in "because it looks ok" and any fall thereafter is exponentially more dangerous.

This practice will continue to happen but can be mitigated by retaining helmets from falls in competitions. Seemingly innocuous falls can become life threatening if a helmet is compromised by previous damage.

Not all helmets will be confiscated, if the judge saw no contact with the head, or the rider lands on their feet, etc.

Video of rounds can be used to verify if a helmet was kicked by a horse or if riders head came in contact with jumps, equipment, or the ground.

Linked Rules	Comments
	Web: Helmets in Rider Fall

Committee Actions

Andalusian/Lusitano	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/02/2017	Draft 1: This would be difficult to enforce at competitions and not all competitions have vendors where a new helmet could be purchased.
Arabian	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/15/2017	Draft 1: This rule change would be difficult to enforce.
Athletes Advisory	
Draft 1: No Action	Draft 1: No Comments
Breeds/Disciplines	
Draft 1: No Action	Draft 1: No Comments
Dressage	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/04/2017	Draft 1: Would be difficult to enforce and impractical. Many helmets can be used over four years per manufacturer based on amount of uses, etc.; would also be a liability for shows and TDs. TD's cannot steal someone's helmet.

Driving

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/20/2017

Draft 1: The DSC believes this change may be difficult to enforce. 1316.6 is not applicable to all disciplines either (i.e. Driven Dressage phase in Combined Driving does not require a helmet, therefore should proof of a new helmet still be required if an accident occurs in this phase?). The DSC believes photographs and proper paperwork of the incident would be sufficient evidence for the Organizers. If a helmet is retained, who should be responsible for keeping it? What if it is lost? Who is responsible for obtaining proof of a new helmet being purchased? What if another helmet can be borrowed? This rule is not realistically enforceable as written.

Endurance

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Eventing

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017

Draft 1: The Eventing Sport Committee recommends disapproval as the administration of the rule is burdensome and it is not within the purview of the Federation to seize personal property.

Hackney

Draft 1: No Action 11/20/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Hearing Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/22/2017

Draft 1: The rule places too much responsibility on show management or Licensed Officials to send items to the Federation in a short time frame. The Committee had concerns about the legal repercussions for mandating the surrender of personal property. It is also leaves open a wide range of situations that are not easily discernible, such as whether a judge can determine whether a rider's helmet actually hit the ground. Helmet companies might offer a replacement option that allows riders to receive a new helmet following an accident.

Licensed Officials

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/27/2017

Draft 1: This rule is unenforceable by competition management and would be extremely difficult to monitor.

Morgan

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017

Draft 1: Would be difficult to enforce and would cause a burden to show management and stewards/TDs.

National Hunter Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/06/2017

Draft 1: This rule is unenforceable.

National Show Horse

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/13/2017

Draft 1: This would be difficult to enforce. What if there are no vendors or tack shops available to purchase another helmet?

Paso Fino

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/30/2017

Draft 1: This rule change will be difficult to enforce at licensed competitions.

Roadster

Draft 1: No Action 11/21/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Saddle Seat Eq

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/20/2017

Draft 1: Rule would be difficult to enforce and monitor.

American Saddlebred

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/27/2017

Draft 1: Difficult to enforce

Shetland

Draft 1: Recommends Approval 11/01/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Competition Management

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/04/2017

Draft 1: The committee does not support this, competitions and licensed officials should not be involved in personal property seizure.

Vaulting

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Connemara

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017

Draft 1: This does not seem enforceable. Who will collect the damaged helmets, as this is a violation of private property? These should be more of recommendations not rules.

Western Committee

Draft 1: No Action 11/21/2017

Draft 1: No Comments

Safety

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/21/2017

Draft 1: This rule is not practical. Competitions and Licensed Officials should not seize personal property from individuals. Additionally, some helmet manufacturers offer discounts on new helmets if a helmet is returned after a fall.

Reining

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Friesian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/14/2017

Draft 1: Like the intent but would like to see language regarding the ability to borrow a helmet. What if there are no vendors or if the vendor does not have your size?

Jumper

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/28/2017

Draft 1: JSC feels we should focus on better education regarding concussions and helmet safety.

USHJA

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/14/2017

Draft 1: This rule change proposal is beyond the scope of the Federation's responsibility, and there are legal ramifications for mandating surrender of personal property.

Carriage Pleasure Driving

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/09/2017

Draft 1: Feels this is unenforceable. If there are no vendors at the show can you borrow a helmet?

Steward-Technical Delegate Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/29/2017

Draft 1: This rule is unenforceable by competition management and would be extremely difficult to monitor.

English Pleasure

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Welsh

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 10/25/2017

Draft 1: How will this data be tracked from one competition to another? Who will verify that the "new" or different helmet is safe to use? There is also the issue of taking someone's personal property when the competition retains the helmet, and often times a manufacturer will provide a discount towards the purchase of a new helmet when the damaged one is returned.

Western Dressage

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017

Draft 1: This rule would be difficult to enforce. What if you trade in your helmet vs. purchase a new one?

Council - Admin & Finance

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 01/08/2018

Draft 1: Difficult to enforce. Not in line with industry standards.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 01/04/2018

Draft 1: No Comments

Council - Intl Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017

Draft 1: It is not the responsibility of the USEF to retain a helmet and decide if it is unfit for use.

Governance

Draft 1: No Action

Draft 1: No Comments

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	6/6/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

AR106 Shoeing Regulations, Arti cial Markings and Appliances [CHAPTER SUBCHAPTER AR-1 GENERAL SECTION]

AR106 Shoeing Regulations, Arti cial Markings and Appliances

1. Any machine made shoe (keg), or handmade shoe made of magnetic steel, mild steel, aluminum, rubber or other non-metallic shoe is allowed. Shoes made of tungsten carbide are prohibited.

a. No part of the shoe may exceed the dimensions of 3/8 inch thick by 1 1/8 inches wide (nail heads and/or toe clips are not considered when measuring the shoe). Aluminum, rubber or other non-metallic shoes are exempt from the dimension requirements.

b. In the case of a bar shoe, there may be only one bar, which must be either a straight bar, or an egg bar.

1. A straight bar can be located anywhere within the circumference of the shoe.

2. The egg bar is de ned as an uninterrupted, oval shaped shoe.

3. A bar is part of the shoe and must not exceed the dimensions of 3/8" thick by 1 1/8" wide at any point on the shoe, nor may the bar extend below the ground surface of the shoe.

c. ~~If a shoe band is used, it may be attached to either the shoe, or the pad if present.~~ **Shoe bands are disallowed.**

Proponent Details

Catherine West

Contact Information

Catherine West

Thearabiancoalition@gmail.com

Rule Change Intent

Hoof health and maintenance is a primary equine welfare concern. A common adage in horsemanship is "No hoof, no horse!" Hoof bands are solely used to ensure a shoe/shoeing package remains attached to a hoof otherwise without the strength to hold a nailed on shoe. some report the use of a hoof band is to prevent the hoof wall from tearing away from the internal structure. This further illuminates unhealthy connective tissues and the weakened tubules conforming the hoof wall. This explanation alone demonstrates the understanding that hoof bands are, indeed, utilized to force an unhealthy hoof to hold a shoe. This is, without fail, a hoof health issue such the hoof wall is so compromised and unhealthy the wall's inherent weakness cannot withstand the stress of a nailed on shoe/show package. As it's the primary goal of competition for horses to compete sound and healthy, hoof bands are contraindicative to supporting this equine welfare goal. Horses with a lack of hoof health to hold a shoe/shoeing package, as intended, without further aid should be in hoof rehab to rebuild hoof health, and should not be in the completion ring until healthy enough to do so without aids socially, and physically, masking a lack of needed care.

Linked Rules

Comments

Web: shoe bands

Committee Actions

Arabian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 08/01/2017

Draft 1: Shoe bands were discussed at length during the AHA shoeing study and it was determined there are benefits to shoe bands. Shoe bands help secure normal shoes to the hoof of those with various hoof wall issues. Additionally, it was noted that shoes bands are sometimes necessary to secure a shoe to a hoof that has sustained damage from throwing a shoe. It is important to note that bands are only tightened when horses are worked and have no impact on the horses well-being.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/05/2017

Draft 1: The Council noted that AHA had done studies to investigate shoeing and found that bands are helpful. The Council therefore supports the recommendation to disapprove from the technical committee

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	6/6/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

AR115 Penalties/Eliminations [CHAPTER AR SUBCHAPTER AR-2 PUREBRED ARABIAN BREEDING/GELDING IN-HAND SECTION]

AR115 Penalties/Eliminations

1. There can be no contact of the whip to the horse, any contact shall result in elimination from judging consideration by the Judge. "Intimidation": A horse that appears to be intimidated by its handler will be penalized. This may include but is not limited to, *the horse's tension level leading to the whites of their eyes showing*, crouching, cowering, quivering, withdrawing and buckling their knees. **"Withdrawing": During the period of judging, any point at which the horse moves away from the handler in an intimidated manner. Moving away from the handler in any manner, including leaning backwards, such that one front leg and one back leg are no longer perpendicular to the ground, is withdrawing. "Hard Standup": The hard standup is any overtly tense position in which intimidation, as defined, occurs in part or in whole.** Judge(s) may excuse any entry deemed in violation of any of these restrictions.

Proponent Details Contact Information

Catherine West

Catherine West

Thearabiancoalition@gmail.com

Rule Change Intent

The intent of this rule change is to further define intimidation to include aspects of the the hard standup and to eradicate the hard standup in the Arabian horse Halter Division. In 2016, the USEF Hearing Committee spoke to the intimidation and abuses in halter being possibly linked to the hard stand up. Since that April 2016 ruling, highly regarded judges such as Cindy Reich have come forth in the Arabian horse publication, the Arabian Horse World, speaking out against the hard standup. Trainers such as internationally acclaimed, Michael Byatt has commented, in Arabian Horse World publications, on the harshness required to accomplish the hard stand up as being detrimental to horses, as well as the exclusion of many amateurs and breeders due to what's required to train this standup. Over all, the consensus amongst many of our horsemen is the hard standup is a problem for our horses, spectators, and amateurs. Speaking to the USEF Sportsmanship Charter, amateurs are the equine competition's lifeblood and should be a focus in all we do. The lack of ability for an amateur to compete fairly in our halter division bc of the extraordinary skill set it requires to teach a hard standup without abuse is one of our most important corrective goals. The hard standup is rarely, if ever achieved in training or showing without intimidation, now defined by USEF as abusive. Teaching amateurs to become abusive to be considered competitive is contraindicative of all of the goals, mission and vision statements of our organizations.

Linked Rules Comments

Web: intimidation

Committee Actions

Arabian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 08/01/2017

Draft 1: The language addressed is repetitive, the rule already covers 'withdrawing' and moving away from the handler. While the whites of the eye is not a favorable breed characteristic many horses naturally show the whites of the eye, making the rule difficult to enforce. It was also noted that this topic is discussed and addressed at judges clinics and schools.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/05/2017

Draft 1: The additional language being proposed is repetitive

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	6/6/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

AR116 Procedure [CHAPTER SUBCHAPTER AR-2 PUREBRED ARABIAN BREEDING/GELDING IN-HAND SECTION]

AR116 Procedure

- The following procedures shall be followed in all Breeding/In-Hand classes. Exception: Sport Horse In-Hand Classes see AR176
- A horse must be handled and shown throughout an entire class by only one and the same person, except that a substitute handler may be used if, during a class, the original handler becomes ill or is injured. Time allowed for the change of handler shall be in accordance with AR108 Time Out Rules No handler may show more than one horse per class.
- Handlers are expected to keep a reasonable clearance between horses and judges should modify the alignment of horses to achieve that clearance. Further judging will not commence until the Call Judge approves the placement and spacing of all horses.
- Breeding/In-Hand horses are not to be stretched. A horse is considered not stretched if all four feet are at on the ground and at least one front and one rear cannon bone is perpendicular to the ground, **as well, the horse's muzzle should not rise equal to or above the horse's eye during the standup.**
- All class entrants must be in a "controlled paddock" outside the ring until entering the ring individually in the designated order of go. A "controlled paddock" is an area designated by show management outside the competition ring for Breeding/Gelding In-Hand classes. The USEF steward and/or the Show Commission shall supervise this area. Only one specified person appointed by the show committee shall be in the controlled paddock to assist with the entrance(s) into the arena.
- Competition management shall have the option of choosing a or b of the following class procedures: a. In the Ring Class Procedure.
 - Judging begins when the first horse enters the ring. From the moment the horse enters the ring its movement

Proponent Details	Contact Information
-------------------	---------------------

Catherine West

Catherine West

Thearabiancoalition@gmail.com

Rule Change Intent

The intent of this rule change is to further define "stretched out" to include aspects of the the hard standup and to eradicate the hard standup in the Arabian horse Halter Division. In 2016, the USEF Hearing Committee spoke to the intimidation and abuses in halter being possibly linked to the hard stand up. Since that April 2016 ruling, highly regarded judges such as Cindy Reich have come forth in the Arabian horse publication, the Arabian Horse World, speaking out against the hard standup. Trainers such as internationally acclaimed, Michael Byatt has commented, in Arabian Horse World publications, on the harshness required to accomplish the hard stand up as being detrimental to horses, as well as the exclusion of many amateurs and breeders due to what's required to train this standup. Over all, the consensus amongst many of our horsemen is the hard standup is a problem for our horses, spectators, and amateurs. Speaking to the USEF Sportsmanship Charter, amateurs are the equine competition's lifeblood and should be a focus in all we do. The lack of ability for an amateur to compete fairly in our halter division bc of the extraordinary skill set it requires to teach a hard standup without abuse is one of our most important corrective goals. The hard standup is rarely, if ever achieved in training or showing without intimidation, now defined by USEF as abusive. Teaching amateurs to become abusive to be considered competitive is contraindicative of all of the goals, mission and vision statements of our organizations.

Linked Rules	Comments
--------------	----------

Web: stretching

Committee Actions

Arabian

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 08/01/2017

Draft 1: The current rule clearly addresses horses are not to be stretched. The additional language is not necessary and would be difficult to enforce due to horses being expressive and naturally raising head to a certain point.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/05/2017

Draft 1: The additional language is not enforceable as horses may raise or lower that head at any time

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	10/3/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

Cornell Collar Approval [CHAPTER DR121]

Throat support devices such as Cornell Collars are allowed; provided a written statement from a veterinarian certifying that the Horse requires such a device for welfare reasons is received by the USEF prior to the competition. A copy of the statement must be retained at all times for inspection during the competition.

Proponent Details

Andrea Kaplan

Contact Information

Andrea Waxler Kaplan
andrewaxler@comcast.net

Rule Change Intent

Dorsal Displacement of the Soft Palate (DDSP) causes the horse's soft palate to flip up and over their windpipe during exercise, cutting off breathing. A simple piece of tack, the Cornell Collar, lifts the larynx up and forward so the soft palate cannot obstruct the windpipe. This device has been deemed legal for horse racing in the US, Australia, South Africa, Canada to name a few. It is also approved for use in competition by the FEI:

http://inside.fei.org/sites/default/files/VRs%202017_Clean%20Version.pdf
Article 1035 page 56; #3

"3. Throat support devices such as Cornell collars are allowed; provided a written statement from a veterinary surgeon certifying that the Horse requires such a device for welfare reasons is received by the FEI Veterinary Department, at least 4 weeks before first use at an Event. A copy of the statement must be retained at all times for inspection during an Event."

Horse's with DDSP have a mechanical issue with their throat that is permanent but can be simply remedied. Without the Cornell Collar they experience extreme exercise intolerance. The collar is carefully adjusted so there is no tightness. See instructions for properly fitting the collar and the video here: <http://vet-aire.com/p/instructions>

Potential Impact

Allows horses diagnosed with dorsal displacement of the soft palate to compete

Linked Rules

Comments

Committee Actions

Dressage

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 05/16/2017

Draft 1: Cornell Collars are not permitted during FEI Dressage Events for horses during the Dressage test and in warmup, which would include training and lunging. Additionally, there are no peer-reviewed studies on the effects of the Cornell Collar with horses in a dressage headset. Allowing this device in warm-up and the competition ring could create horse welfare concerns due to the pressure and constriction it causes in the throat area. Several racing jurisdictions allow this device; however, those horses are performing with an extended poll angle, which is significantly different to the poll flexion and neck position required for Dressage. This Committee is strongly against allowing equipment or devices that influence the horse to open/close at the throatlatch or any other type of action that would affect flexion.

Council - Intl Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017

Draft 1: There are no peer-reviewed studies on the effects of the Cornell Collar with horses in a dressage headset. Allowing this device in warm-up and the competition ring could create horse welfare concerns due to the pressure and constriction in the throat area.

EV115 Tracking #044-17 Draft #1 Disapproved

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	6/1/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

EV115 Saddlery [CHAPTER EV1 General Rules for all Eventing Competitions]

EV115.1: Running martingales..., irish martingales, **neck straps**
 EV115.2.e. A breast plate **and neck strap** may be used.
 EV115.3.b. (second sentence inserted) **A neck strap is allowed.**

Proponent Details	Contact Information
Mary P Hunter	Mary P Hunter mphunter@bluewin.ch

Rule Change Intent

EVENTING RULES
 I recently was informed by a steward at an USEF recognized event that neck straps were allowed during the dressage test. If I read the rules EV115 the wording is confusing (especially if I read DR121.7 "Martingales, bit guards, any kind of gadgets (such as bearing, side, running, balancing reins, neck straps, nasal strips, tongue tied down, etc.),..." which seems to provide a further example of a "gadget". I use a neck strap and have observed that riders up through the top levels use neck straps. In Great Britain the rules allow for the neck strap, but I believe that the FEI forbids neck straps during Dressage. So confusing....

EV 115 is not clear with regards to the use of a simple neck strap. If the neck strap is considered a "gadget" then according to the rules riders may not use a neck strap from 3pm the day prior to the start of the competition through to the end of the competition.
 Can the rule be clarified to indicate specifically that a neck strap is allowed or not and when it is allowed or not (i.e. warm up, dressage, jumping, cross country).

Linked Rules	Comments
	Web: neck straps

Committee Actions	
Eventing	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/07/2017	Draft 1: The Eventing Sport Committee would be amendable to approving a second draft if the proposed change was limited to EV115.2 only (Dressage phase).
Council - Intl Discipline	
Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/21/2017	Draft 1: No Comments

HU111.4 Tracking #031-17 Draft #1 Disapproved

Rule Change Type	Effective Date	Draft Received	Board Action
Standard	12/1/2018	5/17/2017	Disapproved 1/20/2018

Proposed Change

HU111 Junior and Children's Hunters [CHAPTER HU 1 Definitions and Eligibility]

14. Junior Hunter 3'3". Open to junior riders. Riders may not cross enter into any class at 3'6" or higher in the hunter division (**exception, Junior Hunter 3'6"**), higher than 3'9" in the equitation division or higher than 1.20m in the jumper division at the same competition. Horses entered in the Junior Hunter 3'3" section may not cross enter into the Children's Hunter section at the same competition. Horses entered in Junior Hunter 3'3" sections may not cross enter into Junior Hunter 3'6" sections at the same competition. When the Junior Hunter 3'3" is offered as one section, no exhibitor may ride more than three (3) horses in the section.

Proponent Details	Contact Information
-------------------	---------------------

Daphne Boogaard

Daphne Boogaard

Tulippond@aol.com

Rule Change Intent

Let junior hunters show in both heights so it doesn't cause riders to be holding up jog, needing to find someone to jog #2 horse, or making a choice which horse to flat.

Some horses can do 3'6 and some need to be in 3'3. Riders should be able to complete division and can't if they have to only flat one horse.

Linked Rules	Comments
--------------	----------

Web: Junior Hunter Cross Entry

Committee Actions

National Hunter Committee

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 11/06/2017

Draft 1: This is not what the Junior Hunter task force wants for the Junior Hunter 3'3" section.

USHJA

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 12/14/2017

Draft 1: The height sections (3', 3'3" and 3'6") were purposefully structured with cross-entry restrictions to ensure a level playing field. The proponent's reason for changing is not sufficient.

Council - Natl Breed & Discipline

Draft 1: Recommends Disapproval 01/04/2018

Draft 1: No Comments