



The American Driving Society, Inc.

9.1.2020 ADS Member Comments on 2021 ADS RCPs

RCP#1

Article: GR 2.7

Submitted by: Hardy Zantke

Current wording:

GR 2.7 Junior and adult competition participants, e.g., anyone who rides on a vehicle at any time at an event, are defined as follows:

- a. The “competition age” of an individual will be the age reached during the current calendar year.
- b. “Junior A” – competition age: 10 and below. Junior A drivers must be accompanied by a knowledgeable adult horseman at all times.
- c. “Junior B” – competition age 11, 12, 13. Junior B drivers must be accompanied by a knowledgeable adult horseman at all times.

EXCEPTION: Junior “B” drivers competing with a single Very Small Equine (VSE) turnout in a securely enclosed arena need not be accompanied by a knowledgeable adult horseman unless required by the organizer.

- d. “Junior C” – competition age 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. Junior C drivers competing with a single horse/pony turnout at their discretion need not carry a groom/passenger unless required by the competition.
- e. “Junior” – Unless otherwise defined: Competition age under 19.
- f. “Adult” – Competition age 19 and over.

Suggested wording:

Add new:

g: The knowledgeable adult horseman, as requested under item b & c above, may be the groom, when one is required, or may be an additional person - in which case that person is subject to similar requirements and penalties as a groom.

Reason for change:

In Combined Driving Events no additional person is normally allowed on the carriage besides the driver and the proper number of groom(s). At times Junior drivers do want to have a knowledgeable adult horse person with them on the carriage next to them, but also want to have a groom on the back step, both in the interest of safety. The LOC agreed and issued a directive accordingly in their winter edition of their newsletter to all licensed officials. This, however, not yet supported by our rules.

Note: The last sentence in this proposal is important to deal with normal groom down penalties etc., which then need to be applied to all, the groom(s) as well as the knowledgeable adult horse persons. Otherwise the groom might stay on the carriage and have the knowledgeable adult horse person step down and fix that trace down for example.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #1 Comments:

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560

I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436

SUPPORT. Would be valuable for disabled drivers also.

Name: Janet Oliver ADS# 9355930

I don't think that a 3rd person on a carriage is safe. Most carriages are not built to accommodate a 3rd person.

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335

ok as proposed

Name: Hillary Miskoe ADS# 9717

no

I do not feel this is a good idea - three people on a carriage can be too many in a difficult situation (unbalanced) and if the idea is that a junior driver needs assistance, then don't complicate the situation by having too many people on the carriage. The person who can best offer assistance should be the one with the Jr. driver. If they need TWO people, should they be driving?

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621

I am in favor as this clarification will help ensure an honest and level playing field.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947

OK

Name: Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258

Agree

Name: Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580

Proposed change is acceptable

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096

Agree

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

Yes



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Leslie Granger
Agreed

ADS # 12039070

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston
I agree

ADS# 3797240

Gale Pellegrino

ADS # 11029

No Three people on a carriage should not be passed. The best person to assist the junior driver should accompany them in the carriage ONLY. If the parent is not trained in order to do so, then they should not be on the carriage to assist.

Ann McClure

ADS #1190

Keyword is knowledgeable. Agree

Cheryl Pratt Rivers
Support

ADS #032720

Tracey Turner

ADS # 2181656

I think this rule makes good sense and support it.

Price Story
OK

ADS# 9181

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

Agree. Sounds like this option would allow a junior driver to have knowledgeable support next to them (on the boxseat) and also have a groom for vehicle balance (on the backstep). If this is already an accommodation, as Hardy indicates, then it should be codified in the rules.

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.
I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572
Support



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #2

Article: Appendix GR-A

Submitted by: Jeff Morse

Current wording:

Appendix GR-A. Officials Requirement Summary

Organizers of ADS-approved events must secure the services of at least one ADS-licensed official.

Suggested wording

Appendix GR-A. Officials Requirement Summary

Organizers of ADS-approved events must secure the services of at least one ADS-licensed official. **Exception: Sleigh Rallies.**

Reason for change:

Sleigh rallies are more informal competitions usually on tight budgets and held on short notice due to the vagaries of local weather conditions. To keep the costs within reason, local knowledgeable horse persons are usually capable of adequately officiating and are acceptable.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #2 Comments:

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560
I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436
SUPPORT

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
ok as proposed, our current pandemic situation points out that we operate with a severe shortage of licensed officials. I'm sure you are all aware of this and understand that as people age the shortage will become more acute. I don't have a solution but hope that consideration is being given to making the process of becoming an official less onerous and expensive - good luck - I fear it will be far from easy.

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am in favor.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
Instead of "sleigh rallies" I'd rather see the exception made for "informal competitions held on short notice".

Name: Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258
Agree

Name: Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580
Proposed change is acceptable

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096
Agree

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200
Yes

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070
Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240
I agree



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Ann McClure ADS #1190

Agree, Rebecca Burkhearts suggestion would be preferred.

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

Support enthusiastically. This will likely make it easier for these events to be held and to be affiliated with ADS

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

I think this makes sense too and will allow sleigh rallies to be rescheduled on short notice when the weather is appropriate for sleighing which is increasingly less frequent. I support this change.

Price Story ADS# 9181

OK

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

Okay

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Support, but how are sleigh rallies different than other informal competitions on a tight budget and held on short notice. If a change is adopted, then it should also apply to other informal events on a tight budget and held on short noti



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #3

Article: Appendix GR-B

Submitted by: Jeff Morse

Current wording:

ADS Ponies are 120cm to 148cm; with or without shoes; 149cm with shoes.

- 1.1 ADS Small Ponies are 99cm to less than 120cm; with or without shoes.
- 1.2 ADS VSEs are less than 99cm; with or without shoes.
- 1.3 Animals will be measured prior to their first competition of each year until reaching the competition age of 8 years, after which they are eligible for a Permanent Card.
- 1.4 ADS Measurement Cards are for the exclusive use of ADS competitions.

Suggested wording:

Add new:

1.5 The height of animals with a current, valid ADS Measurement Card cannot be protested.

1.6 The measurer must not measure animals owned or trained by a member of the measurer's immediate family, a person living under the same roof, nor a person with whom the measurer (exception: veterinarians) has a financial relationship, including a lease.

Reason for change:

The height of animals over 8 years should not be protestable. They have a permanent card at age 8 and should not grow. Younger competitive animals are measured annually and because of development and conditioning are going to change height. Sure, there will be some on the borderline but the increase in size in a few months to a year should not be enough to significantly affect results and it would only affect class status until they are re-measured for the next year. Making height non-protestable would avoid hearing processes and fees and the retroactive changing of results. It would keep scheduling from being disrupted by having to move entries to different classes at the last minute at an event. It would allow on site officials to concentrate on their jobs without having to stop.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #3 Comments:

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560
I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436
SUPPORT

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
ok as proposed

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am in favor as the official measurement card should supersede any protests.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
OK

Name: Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258
Agree

Name: Claudia DeLorme ADS #: 4353
This clarification ties current ADS acceptance of USEF cards (using the conversion chart created specifically for this purpose) to the rule change regarding protests - and further supports the many viable reasons for the original change in terms of efficiency at shows for officials.

The USEF permanent measurement cards should also to be accepted (and that a height conversion chart created for ease of use) that they be included in 1.5 in that sentence as such for all the same reasons listed for creating the new rule:

1.5 The height of animals with a current, valid ADS Measurement Card or a *valid permanent USEF measurement card* cannot be protested.

Name: Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580
Proposed change is acceptable

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096
Agree



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

Yes

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070

Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240

I agree

Ann McClure ADS #1190

Agree

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

Support

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

Great addition to the rules. I support this change

Price Story ADS# 9181

OK

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

Yes and no. I support 1.5 (that heights may not be contested). But I think the last clause of 1.6 could prove to be awkward. What if the farrier/chiropractor/dentist (or the lawn mower guy for that matter) also happens to measure horses? What if you pay someone a fee to measure? Is the intent that only an ADS official or a veterinarian can measure?

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Support



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #4

Article: Pleasure Driving section

Submitted by: ADS Pleasure Driving Committee

Suggested Wording:

Delete all English measurements in the Pleasure Driving Section and leave all Metric measurements.

Art 238.4 Leave conversion chart except remove conversions for Pounds and Kilograms.

Reason for Change:

This is an effort to streamline the Rulebook. This also would make all of ADS competitions conducted using the Metric system. Most carriage measuring tools now are in metric units. Even the English are using the Metric system!



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #4 Member Comments:

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560
I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436
SUPPORT, for consistency through rulebook

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
ok as proposed

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am in favor for the purpose of streamlining and for continuity between CD and PD divisions.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
OK

Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258
Agree

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580
Proposed change is acceptable About time we get away from non-metric measurements.

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096
Agree

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200
Yes

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070
Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240
I disagree. All measurements have already been figured out as both inches/feet and meters. Leave it as is. This is the American Driving Society, and inches & feet are the measurements most utilized in most instances in this country. It's already there...leave it.

Ann McClure ADS #1190



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Agree

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720
Support

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656
Makes sense. Agree using a single system of measurement will bring consistency to measurement standards across all competitions. I support this change.

Price Story ADS# 9181
OK

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990
Okay

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.
I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572
Support



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #5

Article: PD 231

Submitted By: ADS Pleasure Driving Committee

Current Wording:

Article 231 Carriage Dog Class

a: The dog should be standing, lying down or seated on the vehicle or should run behind, beside or at the axle of the vehicle.

Proposed Wording:

a: The dog should be standing, lying down or seated on the vehicle ~~or should run behind, beside or at the axle of the vehicle.~~

Reason for Change:

The dog is no longer allowed off the vehicle. There is a distinction between a companion dog and a working dog (Coach dog). When a dog leaves the vehicle in a ring full of turnouts, it becomes a safety issue.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #5 Member Comments:

Name: Michelle Harn ADS# 1130751

The stated reason is safety when a dog is loose. Having a dog on the vehicle in no way assures the dog will stay there. I have seen many dogs jump out of a vehicle, some even run over, and off into the crowd. A well trained dog can and should be allowed to accompany the vehicle from the ground. This is a very traditional way for a Carriage Dog to accompany a vehicle. Further this rule change could preclude larger dogs from participation if their owner and vehicle are too small to safely accommodate the large dog (wolfhound and VSE as an example). I am against this rule change.

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560

I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436

SUPPORT

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335

ok as proposed, a bit sad as those who go to the extraordinary effort to turn out a proper, well behaved working/coaching dog will not be recognized. The class becomes one judged on cuteness rather than skill and ability - however, it is much safer and perhaps those who have coaching dogs can find another venue in which to display their accomplishments.

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621

I am in favor for the purpose of safety and as stated, the difference between companion dog and coach dog is significant.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947

OK

Name: Gail Thomas ADS# 14350

I was very disappointed when I saw this proposed change. I have shown in the carriage dog class many times, with a dog in the carriage. This past year, I participated in the class with a dog running alongside the turnout. We practiced many times before going into the show ring to be sure that our dog would respond appropriately in the arena. She performed beautifully and demonstrated what a carriage dog could be, not just a cute dog in a carriage. The dog and horse worked together as a team and provided a real show for the audience. It does require training as any of our classes should. A well trained dog running alongside a carriage is a sight to behold. Please consider keeping the carriage dog class rule as is and allow trained dogs to run alongside as an option.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580

Proposed change is acceptable

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096

Agree

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

No comment

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070

Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240

I agree

Ann McClure ADS #1190

Agree

Susie Weiss ADS#4704

Agree to the change. No matter how well trained a dog it is, it is still an animal that can cause a safety issue. I believe that if you are concentrated on your horse and other turnouts, you don't have the time or concentration to worry about a dog running on the ground.

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

Oppose. I think it will be a shame to eliminate carriage dogs off the carriage. I have seen some amazing performances over the years. I am not aware of any accidents caused by a carriage dog on the ground. If there are significant issues perhaps an alternative solution could be devised.(Precertification of some sort)

Janet Crumpton ADS # 12036410

My initial interest in the sport of carriage driving came from watching Janey Randlett and her mini Barry and Dalmatian Sugar compete and win at the Carriage Dog Class at Grand Oaks in 2012 or 2013. As a Dalmatian owner, I was pleased to find a sport that allowed our breed to participate in doing something they were bred to do – coach alongside a carriage.

I oppose rule change # 5 if the intent is to disallow working/coach dogs, from participating in the carriage dog class by running beside or at the axle of the vehicle. The reason for the change provided by the ADS Pleasure Driving Committee indicates



The American Driving Society, Inc.

“there is a distinction between a companion dog and a working (Coach) dog.” And that “when a dog leaves the vehicle in ring full of turnouts, it becomes a safety issue.” However, the proposed rule change does not indicate and/or clarify if this rule change will apply to working/coaching dogs or not; therefore, I oppose this change.

I agree that the common companion dog should not be allowed to run alongside the carriage. However, a true working coach dog like the Dalmatian is trained to stay with the carriage and the horse, not run around a ring full of turnouts disobediently. There is nothing more beautiful in a carriage dog pleasure class than a properly trained and working coach dog. If the concern is that the Coach dog is not properly trained and, therefore, could create a safety issue to the other class participants, then, in the specific case of Dalmatians, the ADS can make it a requirement that the Dalmatian has achieved the Dalmatian Club of America Road Dog title and must present proof of same (title certificate from DCA) with class entry forms. In order to achieve the Road Dog title, a Dalmatian must participate in a number of obedience exercises while the handler is either on horseback or in a horse-drawn carriage with the dog working off leash. The Road Dog title is one of the most prestigious titles a Dalmatian can earn and it demonstrates the dog is truly working at the job it was bred for. For more information please visit <https://www.thedca.org/roadtrial.html>. I recognize that there are other breeds that coach but I am not familiar with whether or not those breed clubs offer any type of testing for coaching ability. But in the case of other breeds (including Dalmatians), an American Kennel Club obedience title certificate could be required to prove the dog is properly trained in obedience in order to compete alongside the carriage. If the safety concern for the participants is because some horses spook when dogs are around them, then perhaps a better compromise would be to have 2 divisions of the carriage dog class – 1) a companion division where the dogs are judged on cuteness of turnout and 2) a coaching division where the dogs are judged on skill and ability to work with the horse and carriage. I think it is unfair and one sided to allow the companion dogs to continue to participate while penalizing true coaching dogs and their handlers who spend a lot of time and effort to train their dogs for this sport.

Should the ADS decide it does not want to mandate obedience titles for coaching dogs showing in the carriage dog class, then I have another suggestion on how to handle this class. Start by splitting it into 2 divisions as suggested above - one for companion dogs and one for working coaching dogs. For those participating in the coaching division, have a precursor to the class earlier in the day, similar to the jog of horses at championships, where the handler and dog must perform a series of off leash obedience moves on a pass/fail basis to be eligible to show in the carriage dog coaching class division. Dogs that pass the obedience exercises would be accepted for competition just like horses are accepted at the jog. This would provide additional entertainment for the spectators as well as prove the ability of the working coaching dog.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

As much as this is moving away from the tradition of carriage dogs, it does make sense from a increased safety perspective. I support this change.

Price Story ADS# 9181

OK

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

Oppose. *The Carriage Dog class has devolved into a tiny class of one or two entries with “cute” dogs vs “carriage” dogs. There is indeed a difference between a companion dog and a working dog and each are appropriate. I am not aware of incidents involving working dogs alongside, maybe we can just leave this rule alone (if it ain’t broke...). Or the rule could be “if the dog is on the carriage, it must stay on the carriage.” Or require advance special provision for a dog alongside, similar to asking if a navigator can go twice around. Let’s not curtail enthusiasm any more than necessary.*

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Oppose



RCP #6 *8.7.20 Edits

Article: PD 306

Submitted by: Bill Venditta

Current Wording:

306.1 Drivers negotiate a course of paired markers set at the widest track width plus 20 inches. The course should be posted at least two hours in advance and is driven from memory.

306.2 At the end of the course, the driver halts the team with his front hub on a line between a pair of designated markers. A measurement is taken of the distance of the hub from the line. Five faults are assessed for each foot or part thereof the center of the hub is from the line.

306.3 Two or more horses cantering at the same time will be considered a break in gait. Failure to correct a break in gait within 5 seconds will incur 10 faults for each commenced period of 5 seconds. Faults are assessed as follows:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| • Distance from halt marker | 5 faults/foot or part of ft. |
| • Break of gait to canter or gallop exceeding 5 sec. | 5 faults/each comm. 5 sec. |
| • Knocking down or dislodging obstacle or course marker | 10 faults |
| • Groom down (first 2 times) | 20 faults/occurrence |
| • Groom down 3rd time | Elimination |
| • Off course | Elimination |

Timed Obstacles To be judged over a course in the ring consisting of paired markers set 20 inches wider than the widest wheel track of each vehicle. The course is to be posted in advance and must be driven from memory, at a trot. Breaks of pace will be penalized as will displaced markers. Breaks of gait consist of the entire team walking or cantering for longer than 5 seconds. Faults are assessed as follows:

- Displaced 10 seconds
- Break of gait 10 sec. each commenced 5 seconds

Suggested Wording:

Section C. OBSTACLE DRIVING

Article 306 Obstacles

306.1 FAULT OBSTACLES

a. Drivers negotiate a course of paired markers set at the widest **wheel** track width of the driver's vehicle, plus 20 inches. The

course should be posted at least two hours in advance and is to be driven from memory.

b. To test the accuracy of the halt, the driver halts the team, at the end of the course, with the vehicle's his front hub in line between a pair of designated markers. A measurement is then taken and five faults

are assessed for each foot, or any part thereof that the hub is off the line in either direction.

c. Two or more horses cantering **or galloping** at the same time **for 4 or more strides** will be considered a break in gait.

A prolonged canter or gallop is 6 or more full strides by two or more horses.

d. Faults are assessed as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| • Distance from halt marker | 5 faults/foot or part of ft. |
| • Break of gait to canter or gallop: | |



- o 1st Break to canter or gallop 10 Faults
- o 2nd Break to a canter or gallop 10 faults
- o 3rd break to a canter or gallop 10 faults
- o 4th break to a canter or gallop Elimination
- o Prolonged canter or gallop Elimination
- Knocking down or dislodging obstacle or course marker 10 faults
- Groom down (first 2 times) 20 faults/occurrence
- Groom down 3rd time Elimination
- Off course Elimination

306.2 TIMED OBSTACLES

a. To be judged over a course in the ring consisting of paired markers, set 20 inches wider than the widest

wheel track of each driver's vehicle. The course is to be posted in advance and must be driven from memory, at a trot.

b. Two or more horses cantering **or galloping** at the same time **for 4 or more strides** will be considered a break in gait.

A prolonged canter or gallop is 6 or more full strides by two or more horses.

c. **Penalties** are assessed as follows:

- Knocking down or dislodging obstacle or course marker10 seconds
- Break of gait **to canter or gallop:**
 - o 1st Break to canter or gallop 10 Seconds
 - o 2nd Break to a canter or gallop 10 Seconds
 - o 3rd break to a canter or gallop 10 Seconds
 - o 4th break to a canter or gallop Elimination
 - o Prolonged canter or gallop Elimination
- Groom down (first 2 times) 20 faults seconds/occurrence
- Groom down 3rd time Elimination
- Off course Elimination

Reason for Change:

To clarify that there are two different types of obstacle classes, to make penalties consistent, to make judging breaks of gait consistent with other Pleasure obstacle classes.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #6 Member Comments:

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560
I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
ok as proposed

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am in favor for the purpose of continuity.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
OK

Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258
Agree

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580
Proposed change is acceptable

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096
Agree

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200
Yes

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070
Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240
I agree

Ann McClure ADS #1190
*- *8.7.20 Edits - Agree*

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720
Support



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656
I support this change.

Price Story ADS# 9181
OK

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990
Okay, I suppose. Do we really need to define 4 breaks of pace?

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.
I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572
Support



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #7

Article: CD 937.3

Submitted by: Marc Johnson

Current wording:

Chart. No groom required for single Dressage carriages.

Suggested wording:

Chart. Groom required on all horse and pony Dressage carriages. No groom required for single small pony and single VSE.

Reason for Change:

Horse and pony single turnouts need a groom for safety. The United States is the only country not requiring grooms for single turnouts. We have had incidents involving single turnouts where the driver had no assistance available when needed. Advanced drivers are required to have a groom on board, where we allow single drivers to compete without.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #7 Member Comments:

Name: Linda Evans ADS# 4369

I strongly oppose proposed rule change #7, Chart. Groom required on all horse and pony Dressage carriages. No groom required for single small pony and single VSE. Many times I go to shows alone and only have my navigator come the day of the marathon. This rule change would create a hardship for me. I can always grab someone at the barn to head my horse while hitching but finding someone willing to dress in proper grooms clothing and ride on my carriage is another matter. The rule change would not only be a problem finding a willing body, it would cause a financial burden as well by either having to provide a groom with the necessary attire and/or I would probably have to pay someone to do the job. My husband, my marathon navigator absolutely would never be willing to ride as a groom on my carriage for dressage. This rule change makes it more difficult to compete and we are trying to encourage more participation not deter it. Also, I don't understand the use of the word "Chart." at the start of the existing or the proposed rule. What does that mean? I strongly urge you to dismiss this rule change.

Name: Katie Whaley ADS#4440

It is time for this rule to go forward. It has never made sense that the advanced drivers are required to have a person on the back of their carriage at all times and not the lower levels. Also, many people at the lower level use marathon carriages that ARE NOT MADE to have no one on the back. We have all seen accidents when the back end comes off the ground because no one is on the back. This is a huge safety issue.

Name: Hardy Zantke ADS# 1187

"Suggested wording: Chart. Groom required on all horse and pony Dressage carriages." I oppose this RCP. It would be inconsistent with Art 943.2.14 as well as 943.2.16

If the intent is to also change Art 943 accordingly - for which I do not see any RCP (yet?), then I would be opposed to that too.

It has often been discussed over many years, and contrary to the FEI we at the ADS have always allowed single horse and pony turnouts in dressage & cones without grooms on the carriage (By now: Unless the organizer wants to require grooms there and states so in the Omnibus). I see no good reason to change that now, just to go along perhaps with the FEI? As usually argued by the proponents of wanting to go along with the FEI, we always thought it was not a safety concern, as usually there are enough knowledgeable persons around ringside both in dressage & cones, should somebody be needed to assist, as we also do for VSE's and Small Ponies.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Name: Paul Van Sickle ADS# 12037350

This will not only put an additional burden on the singles driver to source a groom it would also create another expense. So, I gotta ask why this is being considered? Makes no sense, VSE's & small ponies don't have equipment or behavioral issues? Has there been a rash of problems with horses & ponies that I missed? This proposal will cause more folks to walk away from the sport.

Name: Marcy and Mark Eades ADS# 14025/14025A

We strongly oppose this proposed change. To require single horse and pony ADS competitors at all levels to have a groom on the carriage during the Dressage places undue burden on competitors.

No rationale for change is given; I am assuming this was for safety concern as required groom to be available to assist the competitor. If safety concern is the case, then requiring a person to be present might be better option. Then you could have person at hand but without the requirement that your assistant has size, dollars and inclination to dress up for dressage as groom on carriage. Also there would be increased burden on judges as they have approve that groom can stand on any carriage that does not have a safe groom seat. .

Name: Deborah North ADS# 20161038

I strongly disagree with the requirement for a groom to ride along with dressage competitors in horse and pony divisions. I feel that it would be a hindrance to anyone like myself who attends shows by themselves (I have a non-horsey husband). I do not have any one person who can personally ride along with me. I train with a professional who has multiple clients at events and many of us are in the same division. It would require that additional person to hop from cart to cart as a groom if he/she wasn't competing.

Name: Michelle Harn ADS# 1130751

I fail to understand how having another person on the vehicle will make the overall event safer. Those drivers who do have concerns about their ability or that of their equine can choose to have an additional body on the vehicle. In the unlikely accident during dressage or cones my experience is that it is volunteers and officials ringside that are assisting when an incident occurs. Especially for CT's which are increasingly held in conjunction with Pleasure shows, I feel this creates an unnecessary burden that would quite likely lead to decreased number of entries. I am against this rule change.

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560

I disagree with this change. I do not believe that a single dressage carriage requires a groom because a single driver can handle a single horse. In the event of an accident, there would be two people in jeopardy, rather than just the one. And, in the rare,



The American Driving Society, Inc.

problematic event that a horse needs to be headed in the ring, there are sufficient volunteers and competitor coaches on hand to assist. It would make more sense to require that a single driver have a designated ringside attendant than to require an on-vehicle groom. It is also hard to find someone willing/able to dress the part of a groom.

Name: Ruth Graves ADS# 9969

I do not support the requirement for a groom in dressage for a single horse /pony turn out. This would place an unnecessary burden on a competitor who would now have to find someone who was available on show day, dress them, feed them, and who would very likely have to get "used" to driving with said groom, when they have been schooling sans groom at home.

The safety aspect has long been a topic, but I would have to see some documented proof that it is a widespread problem in the dressage ring to agree with this rule change.

Name: Laurel Pyatt ADS# 10082

Good Morning All, I wanted to let you know that I do not think your idea's of having a groom on the carriage for dressage and cones, ...is good for our sport

As for having grooms on for dressage and cones in the lower levels, forget it. Most of us find it hard enough to compete, without the added expense of a groom/helper for 3 days. I have rolled over in cones, and seen an advanced roll over in cones. That groom got squished by a heavier driver, broke her arm. Both in two wheel vehicles. I was perfectly fine, grabbed the pony, righted the cart, and all was good. TWO WHEELERS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED FOR ANY CONES COMPETITION. How about doing that as a rule change.

You know, as well as I, that our sport is mostly older drivers. Find ways to help, not hinder the sport. I will never compete in Europe, doubt if I will ever compete FEI either. For those that aspire to greater things, more power to them, for those of us that drive for the fun and love of it, having to purchase another carriage, having to find help for 3 days, will kill the sport for many.

Name: Linda Holman Eagerton ADS# 4609480

I am opposed to the change. Leave wording as is.

Name: Jamie H Leier ADS# 12036330

I strongly oppose this proposed rule change. As an amateur competitor, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in ADS shows. I can see no need to have a groom on the carriage or cart in Single Horse Dressage, below the FEI level. If safety is the concern, then helmets and vests are the obvious adjustment to be made. While no-one is penalized for wearing a helmet in Dressage, it is an individual choice, made by an adult who has taken responsibility for his or her own welfare. The choice to be accompanied by a groom should be the same.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Finally, it is very much a hardship for those of us who train at home, usually alone. The added weight and shift in balance is certainly not fair to the horse only when it is being asked to perform in competition.

Thank you for your attention, and for the work that all the ADS committees do.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436

DO NOT SUPPORT AT THIS TIME.

Name: Mary Mott ADS# 5674

Grooms for everyone in dressage and cones. Not necessary. There is currently a rule, is there not, that everyone needs to have someone available to “render assistance” at all times when you are in a carriage at a show. If this is a safety issue, it is easier and faster for that person to get to the head of a horse from the sideline then from trying to get out of some of these presentation carriages, (I for one use a two wheel road cart), especially when something is going all to hell and the horse is acting up, rearing, etc.

Secondly, having an additional person in the carriage will, if things are going THAT BAD, only add an additional potential patient to deal with if there is an accident. Remember most shows for dressage and cones only have a single EMT available, not a whole ambulance and crew...which may not both be EMTs. (Legally an ambulance crew can be one EMT and one Driver who has CPR training....) So if something goes so bad in dressage and cones and someone needs assistance....isn't it safer and faster for people from the sideline to assist, then to have TWO people in a carriage who can both end up injured and needing assistance?

Better safety issue would be to make cones more like it used to be. Right now, with the complicated elements and how tight judges are measuring courses, you have to drive faster then you should, to basically complete what has, imho, become one big marathon obstacle, in double clear time....often in a “presentation/dressage” carriage which is NOT DESIGNED for those speeds and turns. So slow down the speed again, or measure the courses in a realistic, safe manner.

And keep in mind....COVID 19 Is not going away any time soon....so why do you want to force someone else to be in a carriage with someone!!! Even with a mask. (And also then you are forcing people to wear masks when now, if the person is alone in the carriage for dressage/cones they don't need a mask.)

Name: Diane Kastama ADS# 7713

While I like the idea of a groom on the carriage for everyone. I don't think during a pandemic is when we should start requiring a groom. As many people would have to recruit someone to ride on the carriage with them. This means they would be putting



The American Driving Society, Inc.

themselves and that person at risk, even with masks on. As current ADS policy's state you can't share grooms back and forth, this would severely limit participation.

Name: Leigh Semilof ADS# 9296

This would require all levels of driver to have a groom on board for dressage and cones. This is a hardship for those drives like myself who do not have help available for almost any show I attend. It would force me to pay for a professional groom and significantly increase the cost of attending any show. Secondly I drive a two wheel roadcart. Putting a second person in the cart changes my perspective and makes driving cones much more difficult since I drive from the center of the vehicle this second person actually becomes a huge disadvantage. A second person is not able to exit the vehicle any quicker then then one and may actually contribute to an accident.

Name: Kate Cabot ADS# 20161026

I do not approve this rule. I have a cart which I will use for both dressage and cones. The cart has a wedge seat in the center for that purpose. If I move the wedge seat off to the right, I can only carry a small person next to me but not my regular groom since then it would make it too tight a fit for two. There is no supporting commentary about why this rule needed to be changed, but assuming that the issue is one of safety, with my situation at the very least, it will make it more dangerous for the groom to get out of the cart in case of an emergency than it would be with him standing nearby and ready to come to my aid from the ground. I hope that this rule is not approved.

Name: Laurie Neely ADS# 7303

As the driver of a single, 127cm pony, I am strongly opposed to this suggested rule change. The overall effect of this change would be to slow the times for those of us driving two-wheeled vehicles, especially in pony divisions, and discourage new drivers, and those of limited means.

1) *Far from providing a greater degree of safety in cones, carrying another person in my vintage meadowbrook would pose a danger to that person as I turn through a gate and make quick corrections. This is a fact to which my husband will attest, having been nearly unseated on more than one occasion while out on practice runs. :-) I am certain that others would have the same concerns. No one driving a two wheeled vehicle needs to be looking out for a white knuckled passenger gripping the seat beside them.*

2) *Requiring a groom in the dressage arena would be both distracting to a driver and useless. A person on the ground would be in a far better position to respond to a problem than one who must figure out how to get out of the vehicle and then chase it down to assist. As a frequent ring volunteer I have had a number of occasions to jump over the rail or chain and head off a problem before a groom was even aware of it: a broken bit in one case comes to mind, and another when a driver dropped a rein.*



The American Driving Society, Inc.

3) and perhaps most importantly, requiring a groom on a single turnout would pose a logistical, and financial burden to those, who like me, are happy competing a single *because* I don't need a groom on board and have limited funds to put toward competitions. I am not a small woman and I drive a pony. My husband, great guy and helper on the ground that he is, is not going to put on a suit coat, tie and apron to sit next to me in dressage and cones. Trust me on this. So, where will I find these appropriate grooms? Will I have to pay them? They have to be familiar with driving and ADS rules etc. in order to be even minimally helpful. Will I have to have an extra apron with me and pay for their hats and/or helmets in order to maintain the appearance of my turnout in dressage? Surely no two rent-a-grooms will have the same size heads or jackets, either one in my colors, making it impossible for me to just have a spare turnout on hand.

RCP#7 will slow times in dressage and cones, offer no benefit, and will discourage horse/pony owners with limited incomes who are interested in driving, from even considering entering the sport. We need to attract and retain drivers far more than we need to please judges in the UK. This rule change is a bad idea.

Name: Donene McGrath ADS# 7649520

Original Post:

I completely disagree that a groom is needed on a single dressage turnout for an equine of any size. Dressage is the area where most drivers spend the majority of their time practicing, and for the majority of us, that practice is done alone. To have to add an additional person on the carriage at competitions would change the dynamics of the test for many. It's just not needed.

Edited to add this after reason for change added to Rule Proposal:

I do not think requiring the lower levels to add a groom for dressage will increase safety. Most drivers will end up picking up whoever is available to sit on their carriage and happens to either fit the grooms' attire that they can provide or who has their own. In some cases this might be someone with horse experience but most likely will not be someone with driving or carriage driving experience. Frankly, I feel safer knowing that my support person/people are on the sidelines for dressage and can be in the ring in a heartbeat if needed. Having someone in my grooms' seat who fulfills the requirement but wouldn't know what to do in an emergency - after probably struggling to exit the carriage - does not provide any measure of safety. This is an ill-advised change and will do nothing to increase safety during single entry dressage tests.

Name: Virginia Miner ADS# 3611

First, I am a bit confused by the wording. "groom required for single Dressage carriages". This implies that if I use a marathon carriage for dressage (and cones), I don't need a groom. Correct?

It could also be interpreted to mean all single entries in dressage, in which case, it does not apply to cones.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Perhaps this could be re-worded before we all weigh in on it? Because at this point, I honestly don't know what the proposed rule means.

Aside from this confusion, I don't think this is a good idea. Why complicate the process with additional requirements? It is hard enough to recruit a groom for marathon. Asking that friend to give up 3 days to help out, not just 1, will be difficult for many, if not prohibitive. I'm a believer in the KISS principle: Keep It Simple, Sweetheart I could guess that the purpose is for safety, having a helper readily available. But, when doing dressage (and cones), there is always a sizable crowd of spectators in the immediate area who can (and do) help if needed. And if the reason for this is just to be the same as everyone else, I think that's a lousy reason. Please vote NO!

Name: Carl Zimmerman ADS# 9904

I am strongly opposed to RCP 7 and RCP 8. In both cases, the likely result will be to reduce overall participation in ADS events. It would certainly reduce or even eliminate my participation as I do not have a groom reliably available to assist at competitions nor would I be willing to purchase a new competition carriage.

Name: Janet Oliver ADS# 9355930

If safety is the priority, please have a person truly capable of rendering assistance at the warmup ring and competition ring. I could have my husband be my attendant. He is neither horse savvy or capable of paying attention. If a horse goes down and someone needs to sit on it's head to keep it from getting up, I don't think that I would be capable of providing that assistance. There are a number of experienced drivers who would be capable of alerting if assistance is needed, but not have the speed or strength to be effective. I don't have the budget to bring a truly capable person with me to a competition and have them available every time that I drive. Require helmets be worn if safety is truly a concern.

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335

I understand the pros and cons but end on the side that the requirement for a groom is an unnecessary burden on the competitor.

Name: Ardeth Obenauf ADS# 13813

I am opposed to the change.

Requiring a groom on single carriages at the lower levels will add a burden to those wishing to compete, many early on in their CDE experience. The expense and extra effort involved in bringing another person to be dressed, housed, fed and sometimes compensated is unnecessary and may discourage some from competing at all. It is hard enough to have a competent navigator for the marathon arranged for every event, and while some may be able to use that person as their groom, for most that will not be the case.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

I understand there are safety concerns, but I have been competing in CDEs for almost 20 years (mostly at the lower levels) and I've never seen anything approaching an accident in the dressage ring or in cones. If there was an issue, people on the ground would likely be as effective or more at offering assistance. As for cones, if the carriage is not stable enough to be driven without a person on the back, that can be addressed with weights on the back.

Name: Hillary Miskoe ADS# 9717

no.

Please do not make those of us without a staff need an extra body on the carriage for dressage/cones/at all times. The rule change rationale lists accidents in general but no actual stats to back up the claim. I have been competing for 6 years and have not seen a cones or dressage accident at all, (nor have I heard of any through the grapevine) nevermind one that might have been prevented by a person on the carriage. HOW MANY and WHAT KIND of accidents have there been in dressage and cones that an extra person on board would have prevented?

An extra person on the carriage is more weight for the pony and not necessarily safer. if you don't have a competent person. If having an extra person on board is a requirement it means competing as a single person might become impossible. It is hard enough to find a navigator for one phase, but to need someone all day?

Name: Gina Handy ADS# 10401

I am against RCP 7. Although the chart referenced is for FEI competitions, I fear that this requirement will spill down to ADS-sanctioned competitions, where it will very likely drive people away from the sport. If one is competing at a high enough level, they are likely going to have a presentation vehicle and possibly a paid groom or two, and will have someone with them anyway. People at the lower levels, at lower-level events, may not have a presentation vehicle to accommodate a groom behind, may not have room for a groom comfortably beside them, and will have to invest in livery of some kind (and find someone to fit in it, if they don't have a reliable, regular partner). Furthermore, if a groom is sitting beside the whip (for instance, in a road cart) and must render assistance in an emergency, it will be very difficult for the groom to get out of the vehicle quickly and easily to take care of the matter.

I think that a more reasonable compromise would be for the competitor to have a ground person at the dressage ring and the cones ring who is capable of rendering assistance should the need arise. I've logged a lot of hours as a volunteer and a competitor, and I can't recall a time when I've witnessed a situation when a whip really needed a groom with them on the carriage unless the type of vehicle or class required one. I've seen a lot more whips need people on the ground to adjust a piece of harness, wipe down a horse, or stand at the horse's head while the whip took care of something. I'm not denying that there could be times when a groom on the vehicle could be helpful, but I just haven't witnessed it. I see no reason to change the rule/chart as it stands.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Name: Susan Gregorio ADS# 11768

I disagree with mandating a groom to accompany drivers in all but small pony and VSE dressage classes. My reasons are as follows:

- 1. I don't believe that safety is compromised by allowing the driver to drive alone in the dressage phase. I have been driving and competing for almost 20 years and have never witnessed an incident that would have benefitted by having a groom aboard. By the time the groom steps down from the carriage, outside assistance has usually been rendered. The one and only time I personally witnessed a situation that required assistance during the dressage class was when a very unruly pony was rearing and bolting forward at X, could not be controlled by the driver, the groom could not safely leave the 2 wheeled vehicle, and assistance was rendered by a volunteer who came in from the sidelines and got the situation under control.*
- 2. From a personal standpoint, I sit in the center of my 2 wheeled vehicle. Adding a groom would be a hinderance.*
- 3. And speaking of grooms; finding a suitable, knowledgeable person is not easy. And with Covid19 lurking, I would be hard pressed to find someone other than a family or household member that I would be comfortable with. Social distancing would be impossible to maintain with 2 people sitting on one seat. This does not take into account the added expense of paying for lodging, etc for this extra person for another day of competition.*
- 4. And quite frankly, I do not give a hoot what "they" are doing in Europe. As my mother would say: "if everyone else jumped off the Brooklyn Bridge would you do it too?"*

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621

I am opposed as this change is unnecessary and burdensome to many single drivers at ADS (as opposed to FEI) level.

Name: Kate Bushman ADS#10895

VOTE NO because:

- 1. While I appreciate we've deviated from FEI/European rules here, that alone isn't sufficient reason, as we've deviated on many other things.*
- 2. While I can see the value-add of someone to assist in the event of an emergency, I think any value of them being on the carriage versus being ringside is outweighed by the fact they may be inexperienced in helping or already physically hurt by whatever is "bad" thing is going on.*
- 3. A good percentage of people are competing with just one carriage, so they are driving a marathon type vehicle for dressage and cones. While I agree a marathon carriage is more stable with the a navigator STANDING on the backstep, since the groom must be seated and stationary, they must pick one side or the other to sit on.*



The American Driving Society, Inc.

This puts a marathon carriage pretty badly out of balance for dressage and about 50% of your turns in cones.

Personally, I compete a single horse, and my husband is always at ringside. I realize you're not asking for this, but suggest the requirement be that you either have groom onboard or ringside.

And I'll add my own, embarrassing story to illustrate. I was participating in a Developing Driving clinic in FL in 2016. Driving a single horse with the only carriage I had there, a marathon carriage. Cones day we were told we must have groom on carriage. My husband ("ringside" as usual) agreed to sit on carriage. We talked about how many turns were to left and to right, and which side was the better bet to sit on. He's about 250lbs. He picked a side. I drove too fast – my very bad judgement. We rolled the carriage to the side he'd picked to sit on. We were both thrown out. He got a concussion, and thus was no help in extracting the horse from wreck. The rest of the people ringside were VERY helpful. Glad to report no one, including horse, were badly hurt, but it's left me with a strong opinion about this rule.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947

I do not support this change.

As with most farms, family members and friends cover feeding and chores for each other. We can't all be gone all weekend. Given the distances we travel for most events, it would not be possible for me to have a groom for both days. This change appears to be an unnecessary complication and could prevent me from attending future competitions.

Name: Gail Thomas ADS# 14350

This proposal is not necessary. The driver should make the decision whether to carry a groom in Dressage. If having a groom is a safety enhancement, then why wouldn't the proposal apply to Pleasure driving as well?

Name: Lynda Mowers ADS# 7659

I have been a member for 22 years and actively engaged in showing both in CDE's and pleasure for that whole time. I am absolutely against rules 7 & 8. I have shown without a groom throughout my career and have never had or seen a situation where a groom on the carriage was needed. If needed in dressage then it would also be needed in cones with the groom seated. On a marathon which many of us use a seated groom can cause a turnover on turns since they are not allowed to move. We are losing drivers and especially now rules that make it harder to compete are very detrimental to our sport. This same argument goes for rule 8, let's not discourage people from entering or staying in this sport by making it any harder or more expensive than we have to.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Name: Lynn Parker ADS# 20161133.

As a driver of a 12h pony (just over the small pony designation) I feel that this change will put me at a disadvantage in the dressage ring and cones course. The extra weight will effect his performance in both. It also will add to the cost of participating in an ADS show. I generally pay someone to navigate for me in marathon and would have to add on the charge of two additional events. Dressage and cones are both in confined areas where there are ring stewards and spectators that could assist if there was an issue in the ring. It would take a groom longer to get out of the jump-seat than it would for the ring steward to walk in to head a horse. I can understand the need on a marathon course where there would be no one close by to help with tack or equipment issues. So far, I have not found a single person in my region that is in agreement with this revision.

Name: Joan Adler ADS# 12045000
not everyone has a groom

Name: Marjean Mcintire ADS# 5394

I wanted to voice my objection to the RCP proposed by Mark Johnson to require a groom in dressage for all levels. The case that this is a change based on safety is just a false narrative. I have been a member of ADS for more than 25 years. I was an organizer for 5 years. I am not aware of anyone having an accident during dressage. I am aware of a couple in warm up but none while actually in the ring. I am not going to say there hasn't been one, I'm just not aware of one. At a time that I feel it is so critical to be as supportive and welcoming to new competitors as possible this will do nothing but eliminate many from being able to compete as they may not have someone available, they may not have appropriate clothing for them, they may not be able to afford to pay for someone's expenses to come with them. It's just BAD on so many levels.

Laurie Renda ADS# 4252670

I do CT's because I do not have a navigator or groom. I am against this change and the person that proposed the rule didn't even give the reason they think it should be changed. If a marathon carriage is designed for proper safety to have a person on then that should apply to that style of carriage only. Not a presentation carriage.

Wilson Groves ADS#13149-A

Reasons not to change at preliminary level and below

--

1) lack of knowledgeable groom's that could be of assistance An unknnowledgal groom is worst then no groom A person available on the ground is of greater assistance. 2) not all carriages are able to carry a groom.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Jillian Stroh ADS # 11226

please keep the rule as is, I do not support the change. Requiring grooms for all divisions will definitely become an issue for many of us with limited help and funds. I realize, in theory, we could have a few people dressed as grooms ready to hop on carriages at shows, but how is that not an increased liability? I don't want to pay a stranger to sit on my carriage. What happens when someone begs a friend or family member who is not horse savvy and cannot actually help in an emergency?

Helen Heinzer, #4240

*I support the current rule. No groom required for single dressage carriages.
As a single driver, I find it hard to find a Groom. Its challenging to get a steady navigator for Marathon.
So I often focus on the Dressage/Cones or Pleasure Shows*

Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258

*opposed
ADS does not have a history of accidents due with Single Drivers without grooms. More accidents occur when hitching/unhitching which would be a time to require an assistant.*

Deborah Bevan. Member 4712

*I strongly disagree with making training and prelim carry grooms for dressage and cones.
— from my experience, a person on the ground has been able to assist drivers faster than someone who has been riding on the carriage and has to get off to assist.
An impatient horse needs a ground person at their head and will not likely wait for the driver to halt and groom get off the carriage. Grooms leaping off the carriage to assist will likely provide opportunity for human injury as well as add more commotion.
— many marathon vehicles used at training and prelim do not have safe accommodations for a person to sit while doing these phases as required by the rules
— ADS US shows are supported by these lower level entries who often have limited help and this rule would but a burden on them to have a help who could ride on the carriage. After all we are an aging population of drivers and sitting as a groom on a carriage my be a problem for many.*

GladysAnn Wells ADS #:102560

I believe this change, while well intentioned, would keep many of us now active to stop competing. It is too hard to find experienced help for those of us from non horse families for the



The American Driving Society, Inc.

marathon (although my husband has done an amazing job, as a non horse person). Please don't make things harder.

Paige Horine ADS#9308

I am strongly opposed to PRC#7 the requirement to have a groom present on all horse and pony carriages except for small ponies.

This rule change will create additional unnecessary challenges and burdens for competitors. There will be the financial burden of funding and hiring a properly attired groom. It is hard enough often to find a navigator. Grooms will be limited and will create a scheduling obstacle for the organizers of an event among competitors sharing grooms

On a personal note, I drive a two wheel vehicle which I love and do not like having someone in the cart sitting next to me, especially when I am trying to concentrate on a dressage test. Others may feel the same and may go so far as to warrant the purchase of another carriage. I do not want to have to purchase another carriage. I much rather put those funds to participating in ADS events.

Unfortunately, an explanation was not given for the proposed rule change. The change was proposed by Marc Johnson, a well respected and seasoned official with many years of experience. I would very much welcome an explanation as to the reason for the change to help me better understand how this will benefit the sport.

As for now, I respectfully urge you to not pass PRC #7. Thank you for your consideration and thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.

Muffy Seaton ADS# 4611

I feel strongly that the ADS should NOT require grooms on single carriages at Training and Prelim levels. It will discourage competitors to have to pay for another person for the whole weekend. So many entry level drivers do not have the funds to afford to do this. I'm fine with a " knowledgeable person" being required to be on hand

Kathleen Schmitt ADS#12297

Please, let's just leave this alone.

The lack of a groom on the carriage for single horses and ponies has not proven to be a safety issue.

It is difficult enough for some of us to find a navigator, many of whom do not attend the entire competition and would not be available to fill the dressage grooms position. The added expenses of housing, travel, food and entertainment, as well as reimbursing for time off work for an additional person to basically fulfill an unnecessary requirement for less than 10 minutes of a competition, is not insignificant.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Also, many of us are using a marathon vehicle for dressage. Having a groom sitting on one side or the other can put a significant added weight on one wheel/ side of the carriage. Depending on footing, I can only imagine that this affects balance and performance of the entire turnout. If it isn't broken, it does not need fixed. Changing our rules to align with those in countries thousands of miles away, which the vast majority of us will unlikely ever travel to with our animals for a competition, just does not make sense.

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580

Absolutely no. There is no safety reason a groom is needed on the back of a single turnout for dressage and cones. It is hard enough for many drivers to find someone to navigate during marathon, and pay for hotels and meals for that day, without adding dressage and cones to the requirement. This will also further limit drivers from sharing duties, or sharing a navigator.

Bonnie Fahrner ADS# 10775

I have been a single driver , horses and ponies, since 2004. I have shown every year and have always struggled with obtaining a gator. for the marathon. I know that finding someone for 3-5 days will be impossible for me.

I can neither afford the daily expense of having an additional person thru out a show nor have access to a friend that can be away from family, or business obligations for 3 -5 days and in addition be physically capable of being a gator/groom. My retired friends often meet the first requirement but not the second.

If this rule is passed the effect will be reduce the # of single drivers at shows and in particular the single drivers with limited funds. And it may have a negative effect on ADS membership. I know if I can not show in CDEs or HDTs I will forgo my membership

Gail Aumiller ADS # 782190

I am opposed to this change! I drive a single hitch, because I do not need a groom. Would like to know the reasoning behind this proposed rule. Does Marc plan to propose a change to require a groom for cones???

Requiring a groom for my single hitch Dressage drives would eliminate my entering those classes, because I do not have a person to ride along with me. If entering, I would have to scramble at an event to find someone, which means a new variable added to my test without training and practice. As a 70yo amateur whip, I need to be over prepared to drive a test, not adding a new variable just before I compete.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

If this becomes a rule, I will have to rethink my plans to winter in FL in 2022 to compete in ADS driven dressage events. I certainly don't need another hurdle to overcome to get into the show ring.

Katy Rhinehart ADS #14170

I oppose the changes in carrying a groom and in standard width

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096

Do not agree

Elizabeth Goldmann ADS #: 2020670

I am not in favor of requiring a groom on the carriage during Dressage and Cones. Having a groom should be the decision of the whip. I am among those drivers who enjoy CDEs with a small group of friends who assist each other and always ride as navigators during marathon, but we do not have the luxury of dedicated grooms at our beck and call for Dressage and Cones times. Also, having a groom during these events is not necessary. These events occur in contained areas with other contestants, their friends, staff, and spectators who could lend assistance in extremis (with appropriate penalties for outside assistance.) I have been competing for 10 years and have had only one 'emergency' when in the middle of my dressage test a horse outside the arena ran away towards the barns. My judge blew her whistle to stop me, got down from her platform and came to stand at my horse's head until the runaway was dealt with far in the distance behind us. The judge said because she was in charge of the ring and I was in it, I was her responsibility and came to my immediate aide. My horse was nonplussed by the event, only wondering why we had halted in the middle of our lengthened trot. Once there was no more threat the judge told me to go back to the previous movement and pick up my test again with no penalty.

From my anecdotal experience I believe there is plenty of help available as necessary without requiring a groom, who would also cause issues of balance during Cones.

Thanks for reading my comments. I urge you to vote NO on this proposal.

Donna Rose ADS # 12029070

I feel a groom in Dressage should be optional. I am an ADS member and do training level dressage. If forced to have a groom I would not compete

Cathy Thomas ADS # 9238

I am against this change. This puts an undue burden of lower level competitors. Having to have a groom at training and preliminary would in many cases require extra cost to the competitor. Getting a groom to the event, feeding, and housing a groom all cost money. In places in our country where competitors often have to travel 8+ hours to



The American Driving Society, Inc.

compete it is not an easy task to find a groom willing to travel on their own dime. The defense that this is done in Europe should not be accepted. Our sport in the US is so different because of the distances involved. As a safety issue, this requirement cannot guarantee that the groom has the training or physical ability to in fact be of help in an emergency, things go wrong fast!

Gayle Heiring. ADS # 7278

Completely opposed to requiring groom on all horse and pony carriages. This is just adding expense of having to find, bring, outfit and house an additional person. There should be no safety concern in dressage. If someone does not appear safe in warmup the steward should address. Showing is already very expensive and adding more unnecessary expense will result in fewer people being able to show. Finding and sharing navigators is already difficult but at least that effort is related to safety. A groom for a single in dressage is expensive nonsense.

Elflada Powell ADS #2926400

Dressage stresses obedience. If an equine is not schooled well enough to perform in the dressage ring, then it should be practicing at home in the training ring. I cannot see where a second person on a cart or carriage can be a guarantee to save the day if something goes wrong. A groom on the back of a marathon carriage must sit on one side which changes the balance and adds weight. In a cart, a groom impedes the driver from free movement and surely cannot exit quickly or safely to assist.

Julie Kirchhoff ADS #: 20181543

I am strongly opposed to RCP 7 and RCP 8. I believe the likely result in both cases will be to reduce overall participation in ADS events especially at the training level and preliminary levels. The cost for equipment and grooms would increase the cost of competing at these competitions substantially. It would certainly reduce or even eliminate my participation as I do not have a groom reliably available to assist at all competitions.

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

No

Roger Cleverly ADS # 37720

Reason for change? No reason has been stated by the proposer. Without a clearly stated reason, I am very much against this proposal. Whilst Presentation Vehicles have the facility for a bolt on dickie seat, Marathon Carriages are not designed for grooms to



The American Driving Society, Inc.

be seated, so it seems rather unnecessary for single horses and ponies. The proposal also adds another level of expense for competitors.

Susan Van Huis ADS #12040440

I am opposed to RCP#7. If this is truly being proposed in the name of safety, wouldn't it make more sense to address the issue of protective headgear first? If this rule goes forward, there would be two heads at risk in the event of an accident. Even at its most expensive, a helmet is cheaper, more easily acquired protection than a groom who might or might not be a driver or even a horse person. All of us can have a ground person nearby and we can share that person, but in this time of virus, we can no longer share our on-carriage grooms and navigators. If the ADS is truly worried about safety, a helmet mandate is more within everyone's reach. Our sport is not any more dangerous than the other equine disciplines, most of which wear helmets and none of which are being required to carry an extra person for safety's sake.

Gloria Ripperton ADS#12020050

This rule change would really add to the expense of competing with a single horse. I have a navigator, but buying presentation clothes for her in addition to other expenses would limit going to CDE's.

Safety can't really be the reason for this, because with the speeds required for cones, having a person sitting on one side of a marathon carriage seems to totally mess up the balance on turns. And, if I have to find a person (small and well dressed) at the show, they probably would know very little about my horse or turn out.

Kathleen Carey, ADS #10474

Disagree. Requirement would create additional expense and may reduce participation. If safety is the concern then reduce the speeds.

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070

- Disagree - Single carriages should not require a groom for dressage or cones.

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240

I disagree. I believe the rule on "no groom required for single dressage carriages" should be left unchanged. Allow the athlete the option or the organizer may require a groom, per the individual event rules. However, I do not feel that a groom should be mandated on horse and pony dressage carriages.

We have a lot of club members who come to our events by themselves, with no helpers or family. They already have to arrange for a gator for the obstacles. In addition, some 2-wheel dressage carriages are not necessarily safer, with a groom on board.

Marcia Geil ADS # 314480



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Opposed - adding the necessity of a groom to Dressage arena only is not going to enhance safety in the warm up area, nor in the tacking and untacking area - plus will make it much harder for people to compete. I prefer to have an assistant available to hitch and unhitch, but am driving horses that are not completely developed in their muscling and asking them to pull the additional weight will not be productive for them. I have a marathon carriage, and having someone "sitting" on the side will produce an unbalanced carriage thru turns. This is not clear if it is meant to apply to all carriages being driven for a Dressage test, or only presentation vehicles with additional seating.

Lindy Hild ADS#2752270

I DO NOT WISH or APPROVE this change

I am retired on a fixed income. I cannot afford to sponsor a groom with all the attendant expenses to competitions. I also am not in a position to purchase new vehicles with different axle widths. I would not be able to change over my existing vehicles. Should the new width requirements be adopted, I would not be able to compete in or otherwise support ADS Driving Events.

Please! this sport that I love is in enough difficulty NOW being supported by the small number of us (compared with H-J, etc) . Changing the rules would seriously damage most of our competitors' ability to compete at all.

As it is, I have not been able to compete at an ADS event in over 2 years, which breaks my heart.

Gale Pellegrino ADS # 11029

No Requiring an extra person on a carriage or on the ground at all times for a single driver is not feasible for most people that are showing. This is in no way a safety feature seeing most people will find a "body" to fill that role and that body would not be effective to help in a required situation. I have been showing for many years and dressage/cones is not where the accidents occur. Granted the FEI rules requires this but it would take many people out of the sport at the ADS level.

Ann McClure ADS #1190

- I strongly oppose. This is the United States and we have different traditions than Europe. If a European Judge will not abide by our rules hire a different judge. I've never understood how riding in a Dickey seat is safe. I see nothing wrong with the addition of encouraging a groom if applicable. Results I see is another decline in competitors or ADS recognized Shows

Deborah Bridges ADS #466330

Vote: NO on this proposal

Against the change forcing entries to carry a groom in Dressage. This change will increase the cost for competitors who will now have to have an extra person at competitions. There is no supporting evidence provided why this change needs to be



The American Driving Society, Inc.

made. The current rules allow for those competitors wishing to have a groom on their carriage to do so, making all horse and pony competitors to have a groom will only increase costs and put further downward pressure on entries.

Carole Grimsley ADS# 167100

This change will be a detriment to the lower level competitors. It is sufficient that the current rules specify a support person/team on the ground to assist in Dressage and Cones.

Bill and Kim Allen ADS #13146

We are opposed to this change. This is unnecessary and only serves to increase the cost of competing. This will reduce the number of shows we are able to enter.

Susie Weiss ADS#4704

Oppose of this change in ruling. A groom may not notice that there is a problem until it is too late. A groom also may not be able to get out of the carriage fast enough to help. A ground person can see the problem a lot quicker and react faster.

It also imposes a financial burden on the driver, finding a capable person and paying their expenses to help.

We all have seen accidents happen at anytime with a horse, but if you have a problem with the horse in the Dressage Arena, maybe they are not ready to do the other phases of a CDE.

Cindy Baehr ADS#: 12025280

This change has the possibility to require that a competitor replace their carriage. Some two wheel carriages do not have a large enough bench to accommodate two persons comfortably. The rule would only be in effect for classes above training, but some of us spend a lot of time training our horses to advance to higher levels of competition. This change might require some to buy a new carriage.

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

- I would like to associate myself with the comments of Dana Bright. I am a trainer and am often competing young horses for their early competitions. I am safety conscious. I much prefer to have a knowledgeable person on the ground capable of rendering assistance. Often young horses are still building strength and any extra weight as we strive for lightness and correctness in dressage is a handicap and a concern. By the time we reach the advanced level the horse is better able to handle the extra weight. But before that, I think a groom on the carriage is a detriment for the smaller horses and ponies. If safety, and not some desire to emulate Europe, is the motivation, require helmets for every person on a vehicle during an event at all times. I have never seen a safety issue at an event caused by not having a groom in dressage, and that is over the course of about 40 years. This will discourage participation. The only way that this could



The American Driving Society, Inc.

be justified in my view is if there was well documented objective data to demonstrate it as a serious safety issue. There is no such data. Please reconsider this as we will lose drivers who do not have the means to comply with it. It The proposal will be a detriment to the development of young horses. They need time to develop strength. This will ask too much, too soon for many of them.

Janet Crumpton ADS # 12036410

*I strongly oppose proposed rule change #7, **Groom required on all horse and pony Dressage carriages. No groom required for single small pony and single VSE.** Many single drivers go to shows alone and only have their navigator come the day of the marathon. This rule change would create a hardship for many single drivers. While a driver can always find someone on the show grounds to head their horse while hitching, finding someone willing to dress in proper grooms clothing and ride on the carriage is another matter. The rule change would not only create a problem of finding a willing body, it would cause a financial burden by requiring yet another expense added to the already hefty entry and stabling fees to pay someone to do the job. Just like there is a shortage of volunteers at shows, there is also a shortage of available grooms. This rule change makes it more difficult for a single pony/horse driver to compete. As the ADS, we are trying to encourage more participation by drivers, not deter it. If the concern is over the safety of a young/green horse showing, then make this a requirement at training level only. This would put a 3 show limit on the requirement; not a permanent one. As one progresses up the levels, their pony/horse should be solid enough to be driven as a single without a groom. Many single drivers spend hours in practice and pleasure driving without a groom on the carriage. If the single driver feels safe enough to participate in a show without a groom, then they should be allowed to do so at their option not mandated by the organizers. All drivers are required to sign a release of liability so, therefore, they are responsible for their own actions and results thereof.*

In my opinion the committee should not approve one rule change to make it easier for the organizers and volunteers (RCP # 8 regarding standard carriage widths) while at the same time approving a change that makes showing more burdensome on the drivers (this RCP #7) who are paying the entry fees to attend a show. The more burdensome we make the rules on the drivers, the more we are limiting the future of the sport. Furthermore, trying to implement this rule at this time, given the restrictions of the ADS COVID-19 Action plan updated 7/27/2020 will make it almost impossible for singles to show at the few shows we will have in the 2020-2021 season. The July 27, 2020 COVID 19 Action Plan specifically disallows sharing of personnel at any time, including Marathon. So implementing this rule, in conjunction with the COVID 19 action plan means that each single driver will have to provide their own groom/navigator as we can no longer share personnel. This creates additional burden since as mentioned above there is already a shortage of grooms/navigators on show days.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

I believe this proposed change would make it more difficult for people to compete if they are unable to bring an extra person to every show. It is increasingly difficult to get all the help and sharing people for CDEs it already difficult and in some cases sharing is not allowed or can't be accommodated when both people are competing. I think this change would make competing more difficult for many people. Additionally, I don't think it is necessary for added safety because speed is not an issue in dressage. Perhaps at training level, it may be more warranted, but again, if a person has had the training necessary to compete and attests to that fact in the safety form, an additional person should not be needed.

I do not support this proposed change.

Price Story ADS# 9181

No. Although I compete a small pony and this doesn't affect me now, there is no reason to require Single horses or ponies to have a navigator in Dressage and Cones. Many of the carriages were not meant to carry a seated gator. If there is a problem, like hood is that someone on the ground can get there to help before the gator can get out anyway. Just because it is required in Europe, doesn't mean we need to. It will increase the cost for those who have to bring gators because now they will be needed for up to 3 days instead of one.

Diane Kern ADS #3620

I am against the rule change #7.

Finding a groom and getting them suitably dressed for dressage just adds another layer of complication for a solo competitor to an already complex undertaking.

Katie Twohy ADS# 624800

I strongly oppose this rule change proposal for the many reasons that have been well presented by other members.

Pamela Miller ADS # 8007

Opposed. This will not make the sport more accessible for many people. Only a little safer. Many people pick up a navigator for the marathon. Drivers have to supply the lucky volunteer with a vest and helmet. Now they also need a selection of Groom clothes. In an emergency the volunteer Groom may not be any more agile and brave than a willing bystander. Here in the west the drive to a CDE is 5-10 hr. No friend will just pop by to groom or navigate. Drivers will have to house and feed a groom/navigator for two days if not three.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

How about an extra point for a well turned out groom on your cart ? Don't put another obstacle in the way of competing by making the groom mandatory.

Teresa Jump ADS #: 12026210

As an organizer and driver this rule would put unnecessary strain on our volunteer list, as we are now taking volunteers from other areas to ride on the back of the carriage. Most single drivers do not bring a lot of help during dressage and cones days. This would mean that a groom would have to be on the grounds for the 2 or 3 days of the competition, adding expense to an already expensive sport, i.e., hotel, food, etc. If grooms are required for single horse or pony, why not for small pony or VSE? As an organizer, over the years, small pony and VSE can do as much damage as a big horse. We want to encourage people to enjoy this sport. This proposed rule change would make it more difficult, if not impossible for drivers new to the sport to participate; we do not all have "staff" to ride on the back of our carriages!

Wanda Chancellor ADS # 8147

No grooms necessary.

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

OPPOSE. *There is no value in adding a groom to dressage (and cones??) for horses and (large) ponies. Surely, we can manage to complete a dressage test without a catastrophe, and if there is a fear of a roll-over in cones, then stop increasing the speeds and tightening the courses; that issue is of our own making. USEF/FEI and Advanced drivers compete under different rules, as is appropriate; all competitors to not have to aspire to that level to enjoy the sport. This rule will shrink ADS even further by making it more complicated, more expensive, and more elitist to compete. I certainly will not be able to compete and will not renew my ADS membership if this rule is approved. (Side note: this rule is so poorly written, it actually isn't clear what the change would be.)*

Gail C. Williamson ADS# 9265

I am Strongly Opposed to RCP # 7 I'm a singles driver; I'm 68 and have been driving for 20 years. Much of my training is driving my horse, BY Myself., along roads and tracks . I know of many other drivers who train their horses in similar circumstances. Yet This Proposed Rule Change DISALLOWS ME to drive my horse by myself during a 5-10 minute dressage test in a competitive situation w/ spectators at hand and groom on the side lines Because It Is Now Dangerous simply because Grooms are Required In Europe & Britain.

This Reasoning is extremely Poor .- this for a vague and nebulous " we have had incidents.." This is Not Necessary,. It strips the driver of their own assessment of the horse's suitability to compete , and the driver's knowledge of their Own Ability to Control



The American Driving Society, Inc.

the horse properly AND It will cause hardship to those with existing presentation carriages that can seat only the Driver Comfortably.

Alice Simpson: ADS #11510

NO. There are several reasons why this rule change is a very bad idea. First and foremost, if this rule change is adopted, it will reduce participation in a sport that is already on the decline. The ADS should be trying to grow the sport at the grassroots level, not kill it off. I for one may have to give up competing in combined driving if RCP #7 is adopted. It is already very difficult to find a navigator for the marathon phase, for those of us not married or otherwise related to one, and requiring someone to be at the competition for an extra day plus possess and be willing to wear the appropriate attire, will raise the bar so high I will not be likely to meet it. I already had to skip an HDT this year because I could not find a navigator, and this proposed rule change will just add to the challenge.

Second, it is unnecessary for a single carriage to have a groom on board during dressage. In the 16 years that I have been competing, I have never seen or even heard of an incident during a dressage test requiring the assistance of a groom. In the unlikely event of a wreck, the presence of a groom on board would not prevent the wreck and would just mean there could be two persons injured and not just one. If the purpose of this rule change was safety, it will have the opposite effect, especially if the groom is seated beside the driver instead of on the back of a vehicle. If outside assistance were needed, there are usually other competitors or spectators on the sidelines who would be in a better position to help out than someone on the carriage. Nor is it necessary to have weight on the back step of a marathon vehicle for dressage given one is hopefully not making tight turns at speed.

Third, suddenly asking a horse to lug around more weight that it is accustomed to during schooling at home, where I for one must drive alone because I have no one to ride along, is unfair to the horse which is disadvantaged by the sudden change in balance.

Fourth, just as a rider should be seated in the center of the saddle on a straight line, a driver should be seated in the center of the carriage. If the only place for a groom to sit is beside the driver, this displaces the driver to the side, which may be OK for pleasure driving but is not appropriate for dressage.

Last but not least, driven dressage is already an oxymoron, because having to push into a collar is biomechanically antithetical to one of the main goals of dressage, which is collection and self-carriage. A horse cannot "carry itself," namely elevate the forehand, transfer weight to the hindquarters, and shorten its base of support, and push into a



The American Driving Society, Inc.

collar at the same time. Picture a draft horse pulling a stone boat (entire weight on the forehand) vs. a Lipizzan in a levade (entire weight on the hindquarters) and you can see the problem. So a compromise has to be made. Adding additional weight to the vehicle by piling on a groom just adds to the problem. Ideally, a vehicle for dressage should be as light as possible, preferably a two-wheeled cart, not a heavy presentation carriage with a groom on the back. There is a reason fine harness horses are shown in lightweight viceroys, not big heavy carriages.

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I strongly disagree with these rule change proposals. Many other members have indicated the same opinion as my self. I agree with all their comments. Also as stated in my introduction, be mindful of the economic impact to your drivers. Without drivers, there is no sport.

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Oppose

It's to the benefit of the horse to pull less weight in dressage. In my experience, it's the POJ from Europe that has required a groom for dressage, since it is a requirement in Europe. Perhaps an organizer can find out from a POJ whether they are going to require it in dressage and, if so, note it in the Omnibus. Additionally, this rule change proposal doesn't address cones, which is a different issue than dressage. Does the proposal require a groom in cones as well? The wording of the proposal needs to be reworked and resubmitted at a later date.

Sheri Haviza ADS #13248

The requirement of grooms on the vehicle will be a difficult requirement. Some of us have a hard enough time to find a groom for marathon. This will make it even harder to share navigators. Not all vehicles have a safe and comfortable spot for a navigator to sit. This sport is dwindling and this requirement will make it more difficult for drivers, not encouraging more drivers. There is usually someone always near by that can assist.

Barbara Estey ADS #10461

I am expressing strong disapproval to both RCP #7 and RCP #8. Each of these changes makes it very difficult for new and casual competitors to compete. None of my current vehicles are compliant with RCP #8 and I would be excluded from ADS sanctioned events. I acquired these vehicles from other drivers who were upgrading or retiring. Competing at ADS competitions is complicated enough, without these rules. Needless to say, if I am no longer able to compete at ADS events, I will no longer maintain my ADS membership.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

I feel that the ADS has betrayed competitors like me. Not so long ago, ADS split from USEF in part because USEF ignored low level competitors like me. Now it seems that ADS has become decidedly unfriendly to those same drivers. If these two rules are approved, I suspect you will loose casual competitors/drivers and smaller local events.

Norma Katz ADS#9273

Not all carriages can accommodate a groom - not all carriages are regulation width. I believe that if competitors are forced to buy different carriages - it will negatively affect entries. I also believe that events will withdraw from ads sanctioning and if enough events do that, ads will suffer and ads membership will suffer.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #8

Article: CD 937.3b

Submitted by: Marc Johnson

Current wording:

At ADS-Recognized events, there are no required track widths...

Suggested wording:

At ADS-recognized events, with the exception of Small Pony and VSE entries, Advanced and Intermediate Dressage carriages will be required to comply with the carriage widths specified in the above chart effective January 1, 2022. Preliminary Dressage carriages will be required to comply with the specified carriage width effective January 1, 2023.

Reason for change:

The result of measuring carriages and setting cones at different width has resulted in frequent inaccuracies, including at our North American Championships. We require too many volunteer hours setting cones for an unreasonable amount of time, making it physically difficult for some and making it difficult to run the cones arena on schedule. In England, the drivers were given two years to comply. It got done quite easily. By having a staggered effective date, it will be easier to implement, and drivers will have time to organize modifications to existing carriages. Training division Dressage carriages will be exempt from this change and may still use the Training Standardized Settings in article 973.1.9. The Intermediate and Preliminary Standardized Settings will be phased out accordingly.



RCP #8 Member Comments

Name: Katie Whaley ADS#4440

Another good change, everyone complained when this happened at the Advanced level but in the end people made it work. This also helps the shows as volunteers are harder and harder to get

Name: Diane Kastama ADS# 7713

I disagree with this proposal. I suggest we do what the Dutch do. They have the 2 standard widths. see chart below. This would allow people to use their current marathon vehicle. No measuring needed except for VSE's and possibly training level. Less room for error. as you have only two possible measurements for the class. and actually for everything but pair horse and horse 4.. Page 19 of Dutch rule book link here.

<https://www.knhs.nl/media/17901/wedstrijdreglement-mennen-2020.pdf>

*division wheels min width standard setting for marathon type vehicle
standard width for presentation type vehicle*

single pony 2 of 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 140

cm + cm for class

Pair pony 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 140

cm + cm cm for class

Tandem pony 2 of 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 140

cm + cm cm for class

Pony 4 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 140

cm + cm for class

single Horse 2 of 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 140

cm + cm for class

Pair Horse 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 150

cm + cm cm for class

Tandem Horse 2 of 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 140

cm + cm cm for class

Horse 4 4 125 cm 128 cm + cm for class 160

cm + cm for class

Name: Donene McGrath ADS# 7649520

My response to this is: Really? We're concerned about the dwindling number of drivers in our sport and now we're going to make them buy new carriages? While I'm sure it worked easily in England, I'm not convinced that instituting it here will have the same effect. My understanding of the ADS is that it's about encouraging driving and making it accessible to all. Most of us devote our time and energy to spending time with our



The American Driving Society, Inc.

equines...not making modifications to our carriages. This proposed rule change is more suited to FEI competition - which your rank and file membership does not aspire to.

Name: Hardy Zantke ADS# 1187

I am opposed to the RCP and the plan to phase out our current system of not requiring FEI dressage carriage width. Many of our competitors do not have FEI widths dressage carriages, and many compete with marathon carriages. They all would have to get modified axles for those (or new carriages). Yes, it can be done, but is costly. Yes, they did it in England, but there the sport has many more drivers than we do, and losing a few there who then decided not to compete at recognized events anymore was not that harmful to the sport there. We have fewer drivers in our sport here and are spread out so much more over our large country. I believe we cannot afford to lose any of our competitors here. I also believe our current system of using "standard cones settings" per Art 973.1 & 974.1 works sufficiently.

If we really want to eliminate the cones setting work, rather than requiring FEI width dressage vehicles, or extendable axles, we should allow people again to switch carriages between dressage & cones, and then go to just using marathon carriages for cones. They are ALL (except VSE) the same width = basically 125 (+ 1 or 2 cm) regardless of horse or pony, single, pair or team, and on top of that, they are much safer for fast cones rounds too. So that would be the way to go in my opinion.

Name: Deborah North ADS# 20161038

I strongly disagree with the requirement of required carriage widths. Carriage driving is already an expensive sport. Asking competitors to spend money retro fitting existing vehicles or expecting them to have the means to afford new, compliant vehicles is only going to further diminish the number of participants. Honestly, not all of us are trust fund babies or have careers that pay comfortable salaries. Some of us sew our own aprons, get our jackets from thrift stores, and scrimp and save to have safe vehicles, afford training, and enter events. There will also be a reduced market for the vehicles that people will sell in order to be compliant.

Name: Marcy and Mark Eades ADS# 14025/14025A

I oppose the proposed change.

We agree that trying to simplify the process of cones setting would have the advantage of decreasing volunteer time demands and improved accuracy. But especially in today's economic crisis, the proposal grossly underestimates the burden of compliance even when phased in over a two year period.

1. Respectfully, the geographic distances over which you have to obtain and transport used vehicles are orders of magnitude higher in US than in



The American Driving Society, Inc.

England. "United Kingdom is approximately 243,610 sq km, while United States is approximately 9,833,517 sq km, making United States 3,937% larger than United Kingdom."

2. As many new carriages are produced in Europe and imported into US, the shipping distances, time and costs are also proportionately larger., longer and higher.

3. In the current and foreseeable future, the movement of people across long distances is particularly challenging.

4. Owners of vehicles smaller than required track widths will be unable to compete and will have difficulty selling their carriages to anyone else who might want the option to compete in future.

Name: Michelle Harn ADS# 1130751

This change refers to the chart in 037.3 that designates a MINIMUM vehicle width. In theory (and indeed in practice much of the time) presentation vehicles are manufactured at this minimum width thus making the volunteer job easier. But this specific width is not necessitated by this chart as written. I believe there is a great risk to the number of entries if this change is implemented. My experience is that many lower level drivers use only their marathon vehicle for all phases and would be forced to increase the axle width by 10-13 cm. I personally have a high level of concern for the safety of these modified vehicles especially once they are used in the marathon. Drivers are unlikely to purchase a second vehicle due to the expense and difficulty of transporting two vehicles to an event. I am against this rule change.

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560

I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436

DO NOT SUPPORT AT THIS TIME. We need to do a survey of membership asking what their current track widths of vehicles used NOW is. Let's get some solid facts before we craft a RCS.

Name: Mary Mott ADS #5674

If you really want to reduce the "errors" or hassle of moving cones, then have two standard widths. One based on Presentation carriages, and one based on marathon carriages. Then group the people together when driving cones so you only have to move the cones once between the two groupings. But most "modern" carriages are built on the standard 140 cm for 'presentation" and 120 (I think) for marathon carriages so except for the unusual antique carriage, (which IMHO should not be driven in a "modern" cones course) people should fit in one of those two groups already with what they already own. And also this way you don't have to drag two carriages to a show if you don't want to, nor will you force



The American Driving Society, Inc.

people to buy new carriages, and you still accomplish your goal of reducing how often you have to “move” cones or how the measurement is determined.

Name: Leigh Semilof ADS# 9296

The wording states that wheel measurements for preliminary must conform to the standard wheel widths by 2023 at all ADS dressage events. That may be fine for combined driving, but what about pleasure shows that may have additional dressage and cones. My antique trap which may be the only vehicle I plan on bringing may not fit the designated wheel width . Does that mean I cannot enter dressage at a pleasure show? This rule is designed for the convenience of the measuring committee. At a pleasure show we should be allowed to use whatever cart, or carriage we are planning on showing with that weekend. Some of us do not have 48 foot trailers and staff to get multiple carriages ready . This is a bad rule.

Name: Laurel Pyatt ADS# 10082

I don't think this is a good idea. Why not lump all carriages that are similar width in one group, those that are narrower will be happy, those that are wider, not so happy. However it would certainly help with finding cones setters, if that is an issue for the show committee. If everyone knows before hand that is how cones will be, you can decide if you want to compete or not.

Name: Carl Zimmerman ADS# 9904

I am strongly opposed to RCP 7 and RCP 8. In both cases, the likely result will be to reduce overall participation in ADS events. It would certainly reduce or even eliminate my participation as I do not have a groom reliably available to assist at competitions nor would I be willing to purchase a new competition carriage.

Name: Janet Oliver ADS# 9355930

Again - money. I just bought a new marathon carriage. I'm not going to buy another. I'll give up competing before I do that. The sport is already suffering. This would do us in. I think the argument that it saves time might not be valid. Don't the widths need to be checked before each driver anyway? So that if a cone has been dislodged with or without the ball dropping it can be reset before the next driver.

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335

I don't know enough about this topic to know whether this rule change would eventually require many competitors to change their carriages or not - but if it did then I would vote no. Most folks simply cannot afford to purchase new or modify existing vehicles. While it is true that cones setting requires many volunteers I don't believe that carriage width is the limiting factor in keeping cones courses running accurately and on schedule.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Name: Marjean McIntire ADS# 5394

I am adamantly opposed to this rule change. I mean seriously, are these people just trying to kill the sport? Not everyone can just go out and spend the money to buy a new vehicle to comply or to buy and transport two carriages.

We went down this road several years ago and it was resoundingly negative response. We really have to do this again?

Name: Hillary Miskoe ADS# 9717

No

If this is passed many people will be forced to either not compete or buy a new carriage that meets the guidelines. I don't have another suggestion but I don't like this proposal.

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621

I am strongly opposed to this change. While I understand the difficulties in setting courses and getting enough volunteers, this rule change would place a tremendous financial burden on the base of the ADS competitors. Implementing this rule change would prevent many competitors from moving up from Training to Preliminary because of the financial burden in an already expensive sport.

Name: Susan Gregorio ADS# 11768

Another, if it ain't broke don't fix it item.

1. I venture to guess that the majority of competitors are participating in the Preliminary division; have a job that they are required to be at on a daily basis; their vacation time is used for competitions; do not have the room to transport or funds available to purchase a second carriage for competitions.

I have volunteered many times and have been a "cones pusher" . I find the task to be pleasant and the camaraderie enjoyable. Many folks I have met are horse enthusiasts but have never competed at a driving event, but love the spectacle.

I think we would be throwing the baby out with the bath water if wheel widths were to be standardized. Why not group competitors by wheel widths? Order of go in dressage would set the stage and like sized width carriages could be grouped together.

I am sorry that there was a measurement mistake in the North American Championship, but I am sure that standardizing wheel widths will not eliminate all errors. To penalize many, because of the few, does not seem fair.

And, if this means I need to purchase another carriage, you can count me out in 2 years for sure! I just purchased a new carriage...if I am forced to sell it to comply with the new rules who is going to buy it?

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947

I do not support this change This change would require replacing my new carriage \$10k, and my new trailer (\$60k) and would likely require a new truck as well. If this change is adopted, it will push me out of the sport.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Name: Gail Thomas ADS# 14350

This proposal will make it difficult for competitors to start in our sport. Carriage driving is one of the most expensive sports in the world and this proposal makes it worse. New carriages are expensive. Let's make an effort to help drivers afford the sport.

Name: Lynda Mowers ADS# 7659

I have been a member for 22 years and actively engaged in showing both in CDE's and pleasure for that whole time. I am absolutely against rules 7 & 8. We are losing drivers and especially now rules that make it harder to compete are very detrimental to our sport. This same argument goes for rule 8, let's not discourage people from entering or staying in this sport by making it any harder or more expensive than we have to.

Sheila Goodman ADS# 12021730

Emphatic NO!

I do not understand expecting drivers to sell their old, now diminished value carriages and buy new, demand priced, expensive carriages just to save the number of volunteers at an event. This is a sure way to lose ADS entries and see non-sanctioned events increase in numbers.

Wilson Groves ADS# 13149-A

Reason not change. 1) Drivers at Preliminary and Training level are not willing financially able to change carriages to meet this rule Remember we are dealing with a dying sport

Jillian Stroh ADS # 11226

Please keep the rule as is, I do not support the change. Requiring carriages to be all one width will most definitely hinder turnout numbers. The ADS is seeing a decrease in attendance anyway because of costs- now you want to require us to spend more money? Drivers will have to buy a new carriages or have their current carriages modified- all which costs money and isnt obtainable for many even if given a few years to comply. I understand from a show managers perspective why this rule change would be helpful, but I fear the result would be less shows from less people can come because they cannot comply with the new rules.

Helen Heinzer, #4240

I spent a lot of time reading this proposal and re-reading the ADS rule book.

While I empathize with the time and number of volunteers it takes to measure carriages and set cones,

I can not change my standard size Kutzman marathon carriage at 125cm to meet the new standard size of min 138cm.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

I am also not in a position to bring two carriages to a CDE to comply with this proposal.

~ Many of us at the lower levels use our truck beds to transport carriages, 125cm works, 138 and higher gets tough.

And there is no clarity that I can find where the NEW standard size cones would be set at for all the competing levels.

This proposal would definitely effect my ability to compete at CDE's. Leaving me no option but to go Pleasure.

Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258

oppose Volunteer cones setters will still have to be present to reset cones and balls hit by Drivers. The extra time to set cones has not been a limiting factor for Organizers in accepting entries.

Deborah Bevan. Member 4712

I strongly disagree with requiring standard width carriages for training and prelim competitors — these are the divisions that support our US shows with their entries. Many people at this level only do a few shows a year and this rule would put a financial burden on them to purchase another carriage. There are many safe older carriages out there that people use which do not have the required axel width.

— yes sometimes measuring errors occur as we rely on willing volunteers in our sport but I do not see this as being a big enough problem to require a rule change that mostly like would bump several competitors out of the sport.

— Does ADS really want to make it harder for people to enter shows? Our base are training and prelim people. As organizers we often encourage new people to enter our sport with what ever they have.

— if the ADS sees measuring errors as a problem, then at Championship classes make it a requirement to have a set wheel width but don't make this a unilateral rule

GladysAnn Wells ADS #:102560

Please, this change would disqualify too many drivers and our sport can't afford to make driving competitions harder or more expensive.

Muffy Seaton ADS# 4611

Making it mandatory to have two carriages at Training and Prelim levels will severely limit the number of competitors at those levels. I feel training and prelim to be "entry level" levels, and to require them to have two carriages will cause so much more expense to the competitor, from buying a new carriage, to getting a new trailer to carry it, to getting a new truck to haul the new



The American Driving Society, Inc.

trailer. We already have “standardized measurements” that are close enough to have everyone competitive. Leave it the way it reads now.

Kathleen Schmitt ADS#12297

It is no secret that the driving sports are having difficulty attracting “new blood” and retaining current members. It is an expensive sport. Why would we make it more of a financial burden? If this rule change is implemented, many competitors who use the same carriage for all 3 phases would be faced with either finding a way to convert their current marathon carriage to an extendable axel (not an easy feat if it can be done at all depending on the vehicle) or purchasing a presentation vehicle which fulfills the requirements. I can only speak for myself but I do know several other competitors who have voiced the same concerns I have. Like most of the people competing in combined driving, I currently compete at the Training/Preliminary level. I may or may not eventually move up to Intermediate. Advanced is distant goal but I will cross that bridge if and when I get there.

I do not want to invest in another very expensive piece of equipment. If I purchase a presentation carriage, I will likely need a presentation harness as well. If I purchase and need to transport an additional carriage, I will need a larger trailer. If I purchase a larger trailer, I will likely need a new truck. Sorry, as much as I enjoy competitions, I just can't justify the additional expense for a hobby. I would most likely just stop competing in CDEs and find something else to do with my ponies.

If I did need to eventually sell my current carriage to help finance the purchase of an FEI compliant carriage, I can only imagine it would be a hard sell. Suddenly there will be many non compliant used carriages on the market and few buyers. All the buyers will be scrambling to find carriages with extendable that can fulfill the FEI requirements.

We do not need to align ourselves with the FEI. The vast, vast majority of ADS members will never compete in Europe. We are not Europe. Our access to competitions and driving resources are much more limited than they are in Europe. This rule change does nothing to improve safety or promote carriage competition in the US.

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580

Absolutely no. If needed, a competition can easily group turnouts using standardized measurements for cones per our existing rules. Most drivers only have transport for a single carriage and most marathon carriages are not “dressage width”. This would further make the sport financially inaccessible

Bonnie Fahrner ADS# 10775

This rule will require two carriages for a Preliminary Driver —a 125 cm and a 138 cm. Many Prelim drivers use the marathon carriage for all phases. Requiring a second carriage goes far beyond a single purchase. Usually it requires a larger trailer which in turn requires a larger



The American Driving Society, Inc.

truck, often it requires a second harness , and on and on. Between Rule 7 and Rule 8 — I am afraid Preliminary will be decimated. it will particularly adversely effect those with limited funds.

Katy Rhinehart ADS #14170

I oppose the changes in carrying a groom and in standard width

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096

Do not agree

Penny R Nicely ADS#: 4259

The use of the standard measurement for cones has been an option for several years. There are some organizers who do not choose to use it and their competitors prefer to be measured. Since the option is available, it doesn't seem necessary to try to force everyone to do something that they simply don't see the need to do. I have worked quite a number of events since this became an option, and have only seen it used once - for an Int II class. Lets not become too dictatorial with rules that really don't affect the competition, have no bearing on safety and certainly should be left to the discretion of the individual organizers. If I had a vote(not that I do) I would not vote to approve this RCP. Its totally unnecessary.

Elizabeth Goldman ADS #: 12020670

Nope. I use a marathon vehicle for all phases at our CDEs. I am not in a position to buy another, and those who twiddle with adjusting a currently engineered carriage are asking amateur drivers to mess with true engineering. If some modern carriage have adjustable axles that is nice, but do not disallow those of us with one cherished vehicle to compete. Please do not pass this proposed change. If I ever get up to FEI level (not likely) I'll buy a lottery ticket and a new buggy. Until then, let us who contentedly enjoy this sport at the lower levels do so without penalty. Thank you.

Gayle Heiring. ADS # 7278

I'm going to comment on this rule being effective for Preliminary level. Training and preliminary should be welcoming divisions that allow someone to be in the sport on a budget. Passing this rule for prelim is just burdening the entry levels of the sport with unnecessary expense. I can understand this rule for more advanced divisions but drivers should be able to participate in training and preliminary in the carriages they have already purchased unless it is a safety issue. This is not a safety issue. Encourage people at the entry levels!



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Virginia W. Miner ADS# 3611

In order to understand this, I opened my 2020 rule book to look at “the above chart”. The chart immediately above 937.3b (the quoted current wording) specifies “no minimum weight or width”. This doesn’t make sense, as it would not constitute a change. I’m guessing the RCP meant to refer instead to the FEI chart above that, but rules are interpreted exactly as written, no guessing.

Aside from unclear wording, and assuming this is intended to require minimum track width, I do not support this change. At the lower levels, most competitors own just one carriage, a marathon carriage with track width of ~125 cm, which would no longer be legal for dressage and cones. So this would require purchase of a second carriage. And most of those folks do not own a trailer big enough to transport 2 carriages. Consider for a moment the cost of a carriage AND new trailer. Events are already struggling to attract enough competitors to cover costs. The last thing we should be doing is putting competitions out of reach for more members.

I do understand that the idea is to make cones simpler, and require fewer volunteers, which would be an advantage. If Training level is exempted, this change would not reduce the number of required volunteers, and so the primary advantage of the change will not be realized.

It comes down to weighing the cost to competitors vs. simplifying the running of the cones competition. I do not think the advantage comes even close to outweighing the disadvantage.

Please vote NO.

Julie Kirchhoff ADS #: 20181543

I am strongly opposed to RCP 7 and RCP 8. I believe the likely result in both cases will be to reduce overall participation in ADS events especially at the training level and preliminary levels. The cost for equipment and grooms would increase the cost of competing at these competitions substantially. It would certainly reduce or even eliminate my participation as I do not have a groom reliably available to assist at all competitions.

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

No

Roger Cleverly ADS # 37720



The American Driving Society, Inc.

The RCP, as drafted, refers to dressage carriages, presumably as defined in Chapter 7, Article 936 where reference is made, under the Dressage category, to Dressage Carriages and Marathon Carriages.

In Chapter 13, Article 973.1.9 vehicles are referred to as Presentation Vehicles and Marathon Vehicles.

May we have a clear definition of a 'Dressage carriage'? I doubt that most ADS members could make that definition.

Do I detect a move to disallow marathon carriages for the dressage and cones phases? This needs to be made clear to the membership. Most amateur competitors, such as my clients, compete in two or three ADS recognized CDEs in a calendar year and would find it hard to justify the expense of not only the 'dressage carriage' but also a serious upgrade to their transport to move two vehicles.

If the long-term aim is to set one, standard width, cones course for each Division, then I fear it will foreshadow the end of Combined Driving in the USA. If standardized width courses are the aim, then consideration must be given to a new Class for those using just one marathon carriage for all three phases, or entries will melt away.

To make it quite clear, I OPPOSE RCP #8.

Gloria Ripperton ADS#12020050

Some of us show ADS only because it is more affordable and we do not have aspirations of international competition. If you require 2 carriages for everybody at Preliminary and above, it will certainly limit entries. Everyone has a marathon carriage at that level, and with the speeds required, we could drive cones in that carriage with a standard distance between cones. For 2 day shows, you would just need to tell the secretary that you needed to switch carriages. You would not need to switch clothes.

Kathleen Carey, ADS #10474

Disagree. Requirement would create additional expense and may reduce participation.

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070

Disagree - requiring standard widths puts too much financial burden on competitors to get a new vehicle.

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240

I disagree. I believe that at ADS events, there should be no required wheel track widths.

The grass roots of the ADS organization are not the elite few, with unlimited finances. The grass roots of ADS are everyday families, who love driving and want to be able to afford competing in the sport.

From what we have experienced here in Arizona, most lower level drivers are not going to spend the money to retro-fit or go purchase new vehicles, in order to comply. The majority of drivers in Arizona are frugal, working folk, who love the sport, and want an



The American Driving Society, Inc.

economical way to enjoy combined driving. Most look toward purchasing used vehicles (probably not compliant with the new proposed ruling). With so few ADS events on the West coast, we have to travel over 16 hours to compete at the nearest ADS CDE or HDT.

If this rule is implemented, I imagine you will see more organizers dropping their ADS sanctioned events, not wanting to sacrifice losing their existing competitors with non-complying carriages.

If you suggest that drivers can “modify” carriages, you are not taking into consideration that not every driver has ready access to the equipment needed, or a nearby company available to safely make such modifications in existing carriages. If using an out of state company, you would have to bear the costs of shipping your carriage to and from the carriage repair company & lose use of the carriage for a lengthy period of time. Would these modifications be safe, in the long run? An “after market” modified axle will inherently be compromised, regardless of the quality of workmanship. If you have ever had car repairs done (after a wreck) you understand that dilemma. It is never as strong as the original part. What happens if modified carriages begin suffering catastrophic failures, because ADS required changes in wheel widths?

Did you consider that those drivers having non-complying carriages will no longer have the ability to easily to sell their non-complying carriages. That means if you did purchase a new compliant carriage, you might not be able to sell your older “non-compliant” carriage, or would have to sell it at a significantly reduced price.

As for volunteers, you still have to have them to reset and recheck cones widths. Organizers generally group similar wheel width carriages here, and we have never had a problem working through competitors.

I feel that this is an unnecessary rule, which will not benefit competitors and works to the detriment of the sport. Why introduce another expensive and unnecessary rule, to push people away from ADS.

Marcia Geil ADS # 314480

Opposed. Right now, I'm driving training - and looking at Preliminary. I do not have a "FEI width" carriage - nor the ability to upgrade to be able to compete with one. I drive a Frey marathon carriage - asking drivers to spend another 8K to 15K is not reasonable with the economic hits that the entire world has had due to COVID-19. We have standardized settings available now in order to not require the cones course to be reset for each drive

Lindy Hild ADS#2752270

I DO NOT WISH or APPROVE this change

I am retired on a fixed income. I cannot afford to sponsor a groom with all the attendant expenses to competitions. I also am not in a position to purchase new vehicles with different axle widths. I would not be able to change over my existing vehicles. Should



The American Driving Society, Inc.

the new width requirements be adopted, I would not be able to compete in or otherwise support ADS Driving Events.

Please! this sport that I love is in enough difficulty NOW being supported by the small number of us (compared with H-J, etc) . Changing the rules would seriously damage most of our competitors' ability to compete at all.

As it is, I have not been able to compete at an ADS event in over 2 years, which breaks my heart.

Gale Pellegrino ADS # 11029

No, Although my carriages do meet these requirements. I feel you would be limiting several people from competing as this would endure a large expense to buy a new vehicle for this purpose. I can see where advanced requires this however the training to intermediate should not.

Ann McClure ADS #1190

I'm strongly opposed to both RCP#7 and RCP#8. I only see a decline in competitors or recognized events. Personally, a similar type rule resulted in me not participating in FEI events. As an Organizer having cones measured is always a problem. This problem might be better addressed by how we measure cones. Diane Kastama had a good suggestion. I fear requiring cones to be driven] with the marathon vehicle will results in other problem.

Deborah Bridges ADS #466330

Vote: NO – required wheel widths are a bad idea

Requiring common wheel widths is a bad idea – and I don't care what has been done in Europe. This requirement will increase the cost of competing at ADS events tremendously. It will make it more difficult to attract new entrants to the sport. Currently, used carriages are not holding their value and this will make the value of existing carriages decline (as what will the market be for these carriages if they can not be used at ADS competitions). For drivers wishing to pursue FEI competitions or compete overseas, they can purchase carriages with the necessary wheel widths. But please, don't make the general membership bear the costs associated with the few drivers that want to pursue more elite competitions.

Personally, I don't buy the argument that standard wheel widths are necessary to ensure accuracy of cone setting at competitions. Training for those involved would be a better option (and yes, I have volunteered at many events and some of the training provided was not very good). If there are that many problems with cone setting at select competition venues, then have those select venues be able to limit carriages to specific widths – again, please don't negatively impact the general membership for a select few. If the ADS is really interested in attracting new drivers, then steps should be taken to mitigate the cost of entering the sport and competing at ADS sanctioned events.

Requiring safety vests for all competitors increased costs, constant rule changes make



The American Driving Society, Inc.

it difficult to learn the sport, and requiring multiple officials at events makes it costly for organizers. Requiring expensive carriages just to be eligible to compete at a sanctioned event will not accomplish the goal of attracting new drivers.

Carole Grimsley ADS# 167100

There is a large body of competitors who are active but stay at the Training or Preliminary levels for their entire driving career. In order to move up to Intermediate and above, it has become understood that a competitor must have 2 carriages, a presentation and a marathon carriage, plus all the transportation issues which accompany the additional equipment. My input is to leave the Preliminary levels out of this rule change for carriage width requirements, to allow those levels to continue to compete with a wider range of vehicles that they already own.

Bill and Kim Allen ADS #13146

We are opposed to this change. This is unnecessary and only serves to increase the cost of competing. As long as the lower levels are still using variable-width carriages, organizers must provide staffing for that, which limits the potential to reduce the number of needed volunteers. With only a few exceptions, existing carriages cannot be modified to meet this change. This will reduce the number of shows we are able to enter.

Susie Weiss ADS#4704

I disagree! With the low number of CDE's that are available in our (Midwest) area it is not worth the cost of a new carriage. But I can see where if everyone had the same width carriage, you would not need as many volunteers to measure widths where needed. But if you arranged the entries where all the same width carriages run back to back and then change the cones for the next width carriages, it would save some time in measuring cones.

With our soft economy right now, it looks like carriage dealers are looking for ways to sell new vehicles!

Cindy Baehr ADS#: 12025280

This change has the possibility to require that a competitor replace their carriage. Some carriages have a non-conforming wheel widths. The rule would only be in effect for classes above training, but some of us spend a lot of time training our horses to advance to higher levels of competition. This change might require some to buy a new carriage.

For me, a new carriage would not be possible. I cannot afford to buy a carriage. I am only able to train and compete because of help from friends who have supplied me with a carriage. I love to compete, but I would not want to have to stay at training level



The American Driving Society, Inc.

because my perfectly safe and cared for carriage becomes obsolete. I cannot expect my friends to purchase a new carriage for me. They have their own expenses. As competitions become more expensive, I have had to reduce the number of times I can compete during the year. If I had to add the price of a new carriage, I would have to stop all together. If these rules go into effect, the ADS would be effectively be saying that I was no longer welcome, and I would have to discontinue my membership.

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

This is another proposal which will discourage participation. It is breathtakingly insensitive to the realities faced by many drivers. I am an organizer and I routinely an easily deal with multiple widths of carriages. The logistics of transporting multiple carriages to events is difficult. I have a four horse trailer, but I like it much better when I can go to an event with one carriage. Then there is room for the golf cart. When I take multiple carriages I either have to make multiple trips or incur the expense of renting a golf cart. Resources are a reality for most drivers. Please do not make this into a sport for only the wealthiest of competitors. Combined with proposal number 7, this is a sport killer.

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

While I think this too could potentially make competing more difficult and more costly for people without the means to purchase a new vehicle that is compliant with the new regulation, I understand that it will make running a show more efficient and able to run with fewer volunteers, I am concerned about the added cost of this for those who want to compete....as well as disposing of the carriages that don't comply....who would buy them? It would have to be someone with no intention of showing, thereby reducing the market for those non-compliant carriages.

The sport of carriage driving, specifically CDEs is already expensive. If we hope to attract more people to the sport and keep a vibrant competitive schedule of events, this change would negatively impact that goal.

I do not support this change.

Price Story ADS# 9181

No. It will require many buy new carriages and it is usually the beginners in the sport that have older hand-me-down carriage with won't meet the requirements. It is a sport killer. It doesn't change the requirement for cones pushers by much. Do not pass this.

Diane Kern ADS #3620

I am against the rule change #8.

Standardized widths would be great if we all had the money to upgrade our carriages. Adjustable axle carriages are probably beyond the means of most competitors and we want to encourage new drivers, not make an expensive sport even more costly.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Katie Twohy ADS# 624800

I strongly oppose this rule change proposal for the many reasons that have been well presented by other members.

Pamela Miller ADS # 8007

Opposed. This rule is a step toward ending the ADS. People will have to get a new cart and likely take two carts. Bigger trailer and bigger truck. This adds a lot of expense. We need to attract new members to the fun of competition.

Organizers that put on CDE need participants to make it profitable. There will be less sanctioned events and less people at the sanctioned events. Less sanctioned events less incentive to join the ADS.

Getting enough qualified cone setters is a problem. I think Hardy Zanky's idea of going back to letting people use a different cart for cones and dressage or combined with Diane Kasama's suggestion we use the Dutch 2 width rule would reduce the number of adjustments.

I would also point out the entire area of Europe could fit in just the Pacific Region. We are much less densely populated with Driving competitors. What works in England is not a model for what will work here. We are not the same as the FEI or USEF. They need us to provide entries level rules that are inviting to new members

Barbara Akers, ADS #3186

Strongly opposed. For the past 25+ years, we have run an event where we have 6 to 8 cones pushers at no cost, free! (And they come back every year) To retrofit an existing vehicle to the specified carriage widths or to buy a new one to meet the specs = \$\$\$\$\$. Not very cost effective and would most likely put most competitors out of the show ring.

Teresa Jump ADS #: 12026210

What is ADS thinking? This sport is already having a difficult time filling the events with enough competitors. Now, you want to change the requirements so all vehicles are the same widths. Who are we helping here? As an organizer and driver, it looks like the only person that will benefit from this rule change will be the volunteer organizer, requiring less volunteers to help set cones.

As an organizer, at Clay Station Horse Park, we consider our volunteers as very special people and treat them with the utmost respect and gratitude. Because this is also where the new and upcoming drivers will come from, so looking at it as an organizer, we do not want less volunteers, we want more. This is just one take on this rule change.

Now let's get to the economics of this. Training and Preliminary drivers make up a HUGE percentage of ADS members; NOT the advanced drivers. These drivers come



The American Driving Society, Inc.

into this sport on a smaller budget and maybe a carriage that is safe but does not meet the requirements of the ADS rule change. So, do we want to discourage them from becoming members and competing? I don't think that is a very good idea! ADS needs to stop looking toward the FEI, USEF and Europe as a guideline. Let's keep ADS as a uniquely American organization that works for us here!

Gail C. Williamson ADS# 9265 (Life Member)

I strongly oppose RCP#8 .

The strongest argument AGAINST has been stated by most of the other members. ie Financial Burden. The Standardized Track Width Change may have been easily implemented in Britain mainly due to the small size of the country, the Much Greater Number of drivers and the ready availability of parts from near-by Europe.

I would venture to say there are many more carriage dealers and workshops in Britain as well. As far as the actual Cone Setting Process, yes, there ARE probably inaccuracies but those are spread evenly through the entire competition and do not favor any driver in particular. Cone Setters Volunteer and are happy to do the job - one gets to watch every cones round and get a bit of exercise and socializing as well.

If ASKED if they Care/Mind 'inaccuracies' in cones setting- usually meaning a few >CENTIMETERS< in one direction or the other I think that Drivers are much more forgiving of The Process because the Volunteers who are there setting cones enable the drivers to Compete, no matter what the level of competition.

Moreover, If asked the Choice between having to buy a new vehicle with Required Standardized Track Width VS risking Slightly Inaccurate Cones Settings while being able to keep driving their existing vehicles, I'm Fairly Sure what most of the answers would be. The American Driving Society was formed to promote the sport of carriage driving in the US. and, as the Governing Body, MUST be Allowed to encourage and Help drivers participate safely and enjoy the sport with the resources they have readily available. For Most US drivers, Being in Lockstep with Europe/ FEI is simply unnecessary and irrelevant.

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

OPPOSE. *Sadly, ADS continues to find new ways to squeeze out the average “happy competitor”. Advanced and Intermediate drivers are competing for different reasons and probably should get equipment appropriate to those goals. I have no issue with a requirement for those levels, although I question whether it is necessary to mandate what they drive. But this rule will prevent Training level competitors from trying to move up to Preliminary. Does that mean Training level will get bloated with those who really should move up? And Preliminary will include only an elite class who can afford to buy a new vehicle when they think they are ready to move up. Again, this rule will further shrink the sport. (PS: again, what exactly is a “Dressage carriage” – I have searched the current Rulebook and don't find the term defined. Shouldn't an RCP outline what the revised rule will actually say?) (PPS: the “reasons” stated are insufficient. I was*



The American Driving Society, Inc.

volunteer organizer for a driving trial for several years and cones volunteer spots were a hot commodity with local 4H clubs. And driving in England & Europe is simply not like driving in the US on a number of levels, including number of active drivers, distance and frequency of events, and availability of affordable carriages.)

Alice Simpson: ADS #11510

NO. If the ADS is deliberately trying to deliver a coup de grâce to an already dying sport, this rule change will do it. If it passes, 2021 will be the last year I will be able to compete as I am now competing at the Intermediate level. Dropping back to Preliminary would only buy me one more year. I am a master of the art of carriage driving on a shoestring, because I am not made of money. I only have one carriage and it's a marathon carriage. I don't have a big enough trailer to haul the carriage, so I winch it into the bed of my 1995 Ford F250. It fits between the wheel wells with a quarter inch to spare on each side. The ability to extend the axles on my carriage is zero as far as I know, and there is zero chance I can afford to purchase a new marathon carriage with extendable axles any time soon, or a presentation carriage (and harness to go with it) plus a bigger trailer to haul it in, plus a bigger truck to tow the bigger trailer. I have no desire to compete at the Advanced Level and I will never be competing in national much less international competition. I am getting on in years and I just want to have a good time, and have something challenging to do with my horses when the day comes that I am no longer physically capable of dressage riding which is my main passion. If this rule change passes, when that day comes, you will deprive me of that opportunity. Pleasure driving does not interest me, and there are no pleasure shows left where I live anyway. And with the ADS on its current path of passing ever more rules and restrictions, there soon won't be any combined driving events either. We have already lost most venues and are down to only two in California, and the number of competitors keeps dropping. Keep this up, ADS, and you will succeed in killing off this sport entirely, at least in the West.

Nor is this rule change necessary. Cone setters are needed whether cones widths are changed or not, to recheck widths if a cone is hit, and I have never found cone setting to slow down a show. Nor does it require nearly as many volunteers as does the marathon phase. This Rule change is a solution in need of a problem.

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I strongly disagree with these rule change proposals. Many other members have indicated the same opinion as my self. I agree with all their comments. Also as stated in my introduction, be mindful of the economic impact to your drivers. Without drivers, there is no sport.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Oppose

Sheri Haviza ADS #13248

People do not have the finances to purchase new vehicles, nor may they have the ability to change the structure of their present vehicle to accomodate this rule. Once again, this will be a hardship for some drivers that will choose to quit the sport.

Barbara Estey ADS #10461

I am expressing strong disapproval to both RCP #7 and RCP #8. Each of these changes makes it very difficult for new and casual competitors to compete. None of my current vehicles are compliant with RCP #8 and I would be excluded from ADS sanctioned events. I acquired these vehicles from other drivers who were upgrading or retiring. Competing at ADS competitions is complicated enough, without these rules. Needless to say, if I am no longer able to compete at ADS events, I will no longer maintain my ADS membership.

I feel that the ADS has betrayed competitors like me. Not so long ago, ADS split from USEF in part because USEF ignored low level competitors like me. Now it seems that ADS has become decidedly unfriendly to those same drivers. If these two rules are approved, I suspect you will loose casual competitors/drivers and smaller local events.

Norma Katz ADS#9273

Not all carriages can accommodate a groom - not all carriages are regulation width. I believe that if competitors are forced to buy different carriages - it will negatively affect entries. I also believe that events will withdraw from ads sanctioning and if enough events do that, ads will suffer and ads membership will suffer.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #9

Article: CD 939

Submitted by: Ted Campbell

Current wording:

Article 939 Tires

At ADS-recognized competitions for Training division only, pneumatic tires and/or wire wheels may be allowed at the discretion of the Organizing Committee. (See Appendix CD-E. Quick Reference Guide for CDEs.)

Suggested wording:

Article 939 Tires

At ADS-recognized competitions pneumatic tires may be used in Training, Preliminary and Intermediate divisions provided that the wheel on which they are mounted is engineered for use on a carriage. Tire tread type is optional. The use of wire spoke wheels is limited to use in the Training division, at the discretion of the Organizing Committee and approved as safe by the event TD and Ground Jury.

Reason for change:

Many or most carriage makers are selling vehicles with these modern design wheels. Many years of experience has shown these wheels to be safe. Therefore there is no longer a safety concern except with the vehicles that compete with the bicycle type tires. These need to be approved as safe by the ground jury and the TD.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #9 Member Comments:

Name: Marcy and Mark Eades ADS# 14025/14025A

We agree that safety rationale for excluding pneumatic tire is less clear than previously. However, we find the wording of the rule vague and difficult to enforce. What exactly is "engineered to be used on a carriage"?

A simpler wording such as " At ADS-recognized competition, for Training division only, wire wheels may be allowed at the discretion of the Organizing Committee and must be approved as safe by the event TD. At ADS-recognized competitions, pneumatic tires NOT on wire wheels may be used with no requirement that tires be smooth."

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560

I agree with the proposed change.

My reason is that I have found the sturdy pneumatic tires to be completely safe. For an ADS show in 2019, I had to use a presentation vehicle rather than my pneumatic-tired marathon carriage for dressage because the hard rubber tires I had on order since 2018 took two years to arrive, to the tune of

\$2000. This kind of unnecessary expense is the type of thing that prohibits many people from showing. Not every driver has \$2000 to "waste" on a second set of tires.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436

SUPPORT

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335

I don't know enough about this topic either - I can say from personal experience that it is certainly possible to damage one of the new, modern, pneumatic tired wheels beyond repair. I wish that I could endorse this rule change as it would make life easier and less expensive to have only one set of wheels but I don't have enough information to make that decision. I am hoping that when the decision is made it will be based on hard data and not conjecture, wild fancy or the science of facebook.

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621

I am in favor; newer carriage and wheel/tire design make this proposed change an excellent move.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947

OK

Name: Gail Thomas ADS# 14350

Please leave this rule as is.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Name: Susan Sellew ADS# 11503

I support this rule change.

Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258

Agree

Deborah Bevan. Member 4712

I agree with opening up the use of pneumatic tires for prelim.

— by giving organizers this option they could encourage entries in their region.

— this would be advantageous to the horse as in some areas where deep footing conditions make it more stressful on the horse.

Kathleen Schmitt ADS#12297

At first glance I was excited about this change but then I saw some holes in how it might be interpreted. I, on occasion, compete my VSE using a Hyperbike for at least marathon, if not all 3 phases. While my VSEs are quite capable of moving beyond training level competition, I am forced to stay at training because so many officials mistakingly assume my wheels are pneumatic. I have solid rubber tires on a polymer wheel rim. The wheel rims on a Hyperbike are not specifically engineered for carriage driving. They are adapted from BMX bicycle wheels. BMX bicycles take quite a pounding and are capable of handling quite a bit of pounding and torque. Extensive engineering has gone into the design of the Hyperbike. That engineering includes the use of these wheels. The Hyperbike is a durable, well balanced and safe vehicle. Because it is “different”, many officials seem reluctant to allow their use. Sadly, they seem to forget how different the modern marathon vehicles were when they were first introduced. Imagine where we would be if they had been shunned when first introduced.

If the wording remains as is, I can only imagine that those who wish to prevent the use of Hyperbikes would use “engineered for use on a carriage” as justification to disallow them at all levels.

It is too late for this year but perhaps a rule specifically allowing the use of Hyperbikes at all levels of VSE competition might be in order

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580

Proposed change is acceptable. This makes use of modern materials and construction techniques.

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096

Do not agree



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Gayle Heiring ADS # 7278

Allowing a type of pneumatic tires to preliminary and intermediate is again adding cost to the sport. Let people come into training in a welcoming and safe way. Once at preliminary keep the same standards we have today. Otherwise people will determine what tires are fastest on what terrain and to be competitive you'll need to purchase and change tires for different competitions. That will result in less safe conditions as mistakes will be made in changing tires. No one should need to spend more money in a sport that is already very expensive. Leave it be.

Suzy Stafford ADS #: 8907

I approve of this change

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

Yes

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070

Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240

I agree

Ann McClure ADS #1190

Agree

Carole Grimsley ADS# 167100

Don't muddy the waters. Everyone now understands the difference between pneumatic and hard wheels. This issue will create a hardship on event administration to determine if the pneumatic wheels are legal or not. Either leave the rule as is, or open it all up to any wheel.

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

Support. This will help increase participation as it gives more flexibility to competitors.

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

*I have not driven a carriage with pneumatic tires, but have considered getting one. If there is no discernable advantage or disadvantage to these versus hard wheels, I have no objection to this proposed change.
I support this change.*

Price Story ADS# 9181



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Yes. In Europe they drive through Intermediate with pneumatic tires and do it without problems. These wheels are made for the competition, not the old bike wheels. Please pass this so those of us that live on sand can stop having to change wheels.

Mary Baillie ADS# 12024620

*I train my small pony all winter in Aiken SC and have no end of trouble with deep sand in the area. I would LOVE to have pneumatics on my Carriage but have been unable to use them as I show Preliminary and cannot be changing my wheels for every show. They would make all the difference in the weight of my Tadpole carriage as it's narrow hard rubber wheels sink in and create too much drag in the sand. I can't wait to put Pneumatics on all my carriages!!!
Thanks for your consideration!!*

Pamela Miller ADS # 8007

Seems time to accept pneumatics. No hard statistics but we broke over 20 standardbreds for harness racing on jog carts with pneumatic tires. No collapsing wheels. They are lighter and easier to pull. I bet lots of you used them to train young horses. Good for smaller ponies. Good on sand and mud. It's getting harder to find venues with a surface perfect for dressage. This could be an equalizer especially for the smaller equines.

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

*Oppose. This RCP is too vague and leaves it to the Organizer/TD to interpret and enforce. First, does everyone mean "semi-pneumatic" when they say "pneumatic?" I was ringside when a pneumatic tire blew and it was a good thing it was a small class of experienced ponies and drivers. How shall we define "engineered for use on a carriage?" Or are we trying to address the *wheel* vs the *tire*? I think this proposal needs clarification.*

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Support, but the wording needs to be clarified as to what mounting is considered "engineered for use on a carriage," and who decides that it is.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #10

Article: CD 940.2.1

Suggested by: Ted Campbell

Current wording:

940.2 Bandages and Brushing Boots

2.1 Bandages and Brushing Boots are not permitted in Dressage. Failure to comply will result in 10 penalty points.

Suggested wording:

940.2 Leg, Hoof, Foot Apparatus

2.1 Bandages and Brushing Boots are not permitted to be used in Dressage.

Failure to comply will result in 10 penalty points. At ADS-Recognized Events, this also applies to overreach boots and hoof boots.

Reason for change:

To make it clear that that bandages, brushing boots, splint boots, bell boots, hoof boots or any apparatus applied to the leg, foot or hoof of the equine is not permitted in Dressage.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #10 Member Comment:

Name: Carol Ilacqua ADS# 12037560
I agree with the proposed change.

Name: Dana Bright ADS# 4436
SUPPORT

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
no. I agree that bandages and boots applied to the leg should not be allowed but today's modern hoof boots often allow barefoot horses to compete in unfavorable footing. Some may argue that hoof boots are apt to come off, twist etc but horse shoes also come off and twist. It is my opinion that hoof boots are analogous to horse shoes and if you ban one then you must ban the other. Hoof boots should be permitted

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am opposed to this change since many people are opting for hoof boots rather than traditional shoes. The existing wording is adequate for protection of horses while the proposed change defies advancements in hoof care.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
*I do not support this change.
Hoof boots are the same as steel shoes. If you allow nailed on shoes, you should allow hoof boots. If you are going to disallow hoof boots, you should also disallow all types of shoes. IN fact, in the reason for the change >>>"or any apparatus applied to the leg, foot or hoof of the equine is not permitted in Dressage" reads to include nailed, clipped or glued on shoes.
My horses have excellent feet and run barefoot. I have hoof boots to use when protection is needed. If hoof boots are prohibited, the association is prohibiting my ability to care for my mare when she needs hoof protection. This would reduce the number of events I could attend each year given the terrain at some local venues.*

Morgan Pevonka ADS# 12028030
I do not support this rule change proposal, specifically as it seeks to ban the use of any type of "hoof boots" in dressage. Hoof boot technology has come a long way in recent years. Lower profile, close-fitting rubber boots that are glued on are becoming increasingly popular in a variety of equine sports. I am familiar with two brands, Equine Fusion 24/7s and Scootboots "skins", but I'm sure there are others. They are reset every trim cycle, and function the same as shoes. Do they protect the sole of the hoof? Yes, that's the point. But, pads can be added to any nail-on shoe to do the same thing. Many horse owners are choosing not to use nail-on shoes,



The American Driving Society, Inc.

and hoof boots are providing a viable alternative. They are recommended by many vets and farriers. Whether there is a medical reason that a hoof cannot hold a nail-on shoe, or simply the owner's preference, I think they should be allowed.

Tracey Morgan ADS # 13258

opposed Hoof boots offer no competitive advantage over the equine being shod. If hoof boots are a better choice for equine or the owner they should be allowed to make that choice.

Theresa Leal ADS #: 1201060

I really object to no hoof boots. My horses are barefoot & depending on the footing in the arena, may need their boots.

Tamara Woodcock ADS# 017580

no. Considering the footing in some of the dressage courts and associated warm up areas I have competed in, hoof boots (easy boots, old macs, sneakers, etc) could very well be a horsemanship issue, allowing some to not end up with damaged feet from bad footing. Hoof boots function the same as nailed on shoes and should be allowed in all phases of competition.

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096

Do not agree. - current rule should stand. Hoof boots should be allowed and are currently allowed.

Elfleda Powell ADS #2926400

Modern hoof boots provide the same protection as do steel or glue-on shoes. My horse needs hoof boots and wears them whenever she is at work. When we want to compete, I must get nail on shoes for her. What is it about boots that makes them unacceptable when shoes are allowed? What is the rationale for prohibiting a hoof boot but allowing a shoe?

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200

No

Leslie Granger ADS # 12039070

Agreed

Kevin & Marcia Fetherston ADS# 3797240

I agree

Ann McClure ADS #1190



The American Driving Society, Inc.

I like that Ted tried to clarify the rule which I appreciate. Hoof boots should be allowed for the benefit of the horse.

Cheryl Pratt Rivers ADS #032720

Support

Tracey Turner ADS # 2181656

I support this rule change.

Price Story ADS# 9181

No. There are competitions that have really ugly gravel between the barns and the dressage ring. Those of us with unshod ponies or horses, need to be able to use hoof boots to get to dressage and there is no way to get them off before dressage if you have them on. I have only had that happen once but the judge accepted the position and allowed hoof boots. There needs to be that option in some cases.

Diane Kern ADS #3620

I am against rule change #10 as written.

If a competitor works their equine in hoof boots instead of metal shoes I feel they would be allowed to use the boots in dressage.

Katie Twohy ADS# 624800

I do not support this rule change proposal, specifically as it seeks to ban the use of any type of "hoof boots" in dressage. Whether there is a medical reason that a hoof cannot hold a nail-on shoe, or simply the owner's preference, I think they should be allowed.

Pamela Miller ADS # 8007

Opposed. There is a big contingent that go barefoot and only use the boots for hard ground. While most dressage arenas are well groomed people should have the choice to use hoof boots. They offer no advantage to the user. It is the same protection shoes and pads. Might be helpful on asphalt but not issue in dressage

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990

Oppose. Hoof boots provide no competitive advantage and protect the hoof with minimal covering of the leg, which should be visible for observation and examination.

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.

I agree



The American Driving Society, Inc.

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572

Oppose

Sheri Haviza ADS #13248

Not allowing boots may be a hardship for someone's particular situation. I think allowing the TD or ground jury to make exceptions should be allowed. I know of a driver who's mule had a healed crack in the navicular and was fine wearing hoof boots.

Hardy Zantke ADS# 1187

I agree with the RCP. It is good to explain this. I believe that our current rule against bandages and brushing boots also includes hoof boots, even though they are currently not spelled out. Also in ridden dressage clearly hoof boots are not allowed. I think, if the horse can go barefoot at home and in his stall all day long, 10 minutes in a decent dressage arena should not hurt his feet either. I have always read the current rule accordingly - and plan to do so also in the future - unless somebody convinces me differently or it is spelled out that hoof boots are allowed. If - however - the footing is not proper in the dressage arena (or also in the warm-up arena) I have always been willing to make an exception and allow hoof boots on such an occasions on requests and plan to do so also in the future. I appreciate and support this RCP.



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #11

Article: GR 5.11

Suggested by: Michele Harn

Current wording:

At all times while on a carriage, all Juniors must wear properly fastened headgear which met or exceeds current ASTM...

Suggested wording:

At all times while on a carriage **or riding an equine**, all Juniors must wear properly fastened headgear which met or exceeds current ASTM...

Reason for change:

Juniors should wear protective headgear while driving as well as riding as a matter of safety. This would specifically pertain to PD classes such as Drive and Ride, Combination Hunter, Sporting Tandem, and also when riding any equine while at an ADS-Recognized Event (e.g. hacking on the grounds for fun).



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #11 Member Comments:

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
ok as proposed

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am in favor of this change for the sake of safety and clarification.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
OK

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096
Agree

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200
Yes

Ann McClure ADS #1190
Agree

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990
Okay

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.
I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572
Support



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #12

Article: GR 8.1

Suggested by: Michele Harn

Current wording:

An appropriate whip should be carried in hand at all times while driving. The thong on the whip should be long enough to reach the shoulder of the farthest horse.

Suggested wording:

An appropriate whip should **must** be carried in hand at all times while driving. The thong on the whip should be long enough to reach the shoulder of the farthest horse.

Reason for change:

To be consistent with wording in 20722 and 928.4.1. See rules 2.9 and 2.10 for use of words "should" and "must".



The American Driving Society, Inc.

RCP #12 Member Comments:

Name: Carol Hunter ADS# 12335
ok as proposed

Name: Patricia Anselm ADS# 13621
I am in favor of this change for the purpose of clarity.

Name: Rebecca Burkheart ADS# 20191947
OK

Rochelle Temple ADS Life Member #5096
Do not agree, leave current wording.

Esther R Wright (Boots) Life member #5200
Yes

Ann McClure ADS #1190
Correction in wording makes sense but really has anyone ever seen the thong measured? I may have seen it done once in a Turnout class back in the eighties.

ERICA ROBB ADS# 6951990
Okay

Kasey Ashley ADS# 11536.
I agree

Tasha Wilkie ADS #8572
Support

Hardy Zantke ADS# 1187
I am opposed, leave as is - the RCP is inconsistent with Art. 964.1