



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**RCS # Article # Subject**

**1 522.4 Collectives**

- I agree with this one. However, it will change the total number of points available and will therefore change to overall scoring. I assume this will be handled with the new dressage test for 2020. Hopefully this has been considered with Dressage awards also. Price Story #9181
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- I agree. As currently judged, impulsion, gaits and submission are already judged at each element of the test, as is the driver's ability to use voice and whip to achieve the expected pattern and gaits. Why are these then judged again? A score for the horse's condition and the overall presentation makes sense and would be a reasonable approach. Judy Chamberlain, #14010A
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- If it is approved, then similar changes should be made in the yellow pages under Art. 955 to the ADS modifications in italics in there. All old existing ADS dressage tests would need to be changed accordingly.  
If it is not approved, and old tests are still being used, then Art. 522.4 should get a note as discussed by e-mail from me on Jan 9th to Allyn & Tracey: "we should put a note under Article 523 as well as 955.1 where it says:  
"There are five boxes at the end of the Judges Score Sheet for marks on General Impression observed by the judges throughout the whole test" to just add in brackets: (or two for FEI - or new? - Tests). (reading RCP #21 it looks like the ADS Dressage Committee might continue with our current system of 5 collective remarks for the time being so will probably not approve this anyhow.)  
Further, I do see no reason why we need the suggested change to the language in Art 522.5.- Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- No. The collectives per ADS are still apropos. If at some point we do decide to change to be in line with FEI, we'll need to have a plan in place to update all our dressage score forms, and I'll have further comments about including instructions for size-adjusted arenas at the bottoms of the pages.-Merridy Hance #10826

**2 GR1.5 Superseding Gen Regs**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I disagree. The current language is correct - as we do currently (and I think always will) have situations where rules for specific classes or competition can be exceptions and then will and do supersede the General Rules. Here are just 3 examples: Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Art 7. allows "Either the one- or two-handed method of driving is acceptable." and "Drivers should not be penalized or rewarded for using one style over another." This General Rule is superseded in Dressage when one-handed movements are required in some tests. I am not an expert in Pleasure Driving, but believe a judge may ask there also in a reinsmanship class or test for one-handed driving?

Art. 11.1 states "Drivers and passengers should be dressed conservatively according to the style of the present day." This is superseded in every Costume Class incl. many Musical Kur classes.

Art. 15.1 states "Tails are not braided". This is superseded by Art.263.3 which allows braiding of tails in Draft classes where breed specific.

I am sure, there are more examples, and I believe the practice is the same in the FEI as well as USEF Gen. Regs. So, the current language should stand that specific classes or competition rules will supersede the Gen. Regs. and the Gen. Regs are not "wrong" in any of these cases, they are just the "general" ideas, which apply, except in exceptions. - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- No. Discipline rules should supersede Gen Regs. If there are Gen Regs in error, we should amend them where they are. Merridy Hance #10826

### 3- Not Recommended

#### 4 GR-A VSE Heights

- I would like to support the rule Change proposal regarding VSE height. I used to compete in to the intermediate level with a VSE but have moved on to a large pony (intermediate/FEI 1\*) 38” at the last mane hairs is the maximum height for an AMHR miniature. When the VSE division was created they arbitrarily set the height at 39” to account for the fact that those same horses would now be measured at the highest point of the withers. This proposal is just addressing the fact that 1” is not enough in a decently withered mini. Breed ring cards should absolutely not be accepted as proof for CDEs. A true 41” at the withers would still look like a mini to anyone’s eye. The proposal comes from a good place and from someone who always shows solo in her division and actively promotes the sport to her students to try and change that. The breed ring has lots of people who would love to go to CDEs given the opportunity.  
Michelle Courtemanche, DVM- 5835480
- No. Do not change the VSE height. Just because mini folks measure differently than the rest of the world, if they are small ponies, they are small ponies. Small ponies can not be discriminated against like VSE are and not invited to certain events. If they really want to compete, they should be happy they will be small ponies and not left out. If you make 40-41” ponies to be VSE, you have even more issues with the time being too slow for VSE. My 41” Shetland had to walk to make the time at small pony times and would



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

have been miserable at VSE times. Friends have bought small ponies, 40-41" just so they can show in this area where most of the shows do not allow VSE. This would cut them out again .- Price Story #9181

- While I agree with Carolyn that there are many B/Over miniatures/ponies who would measure over 39" if measured at the withers, I think it is a major mistake if ADS takes the breed show (AMHA/AMHR) measurement and registry standard instead of working to make their own measurement standard for this division. Miniature breed horses can receive a permanent measuring card as early as 3 years old, well before they're done growing, and I believe this is unfair to take a measurement when a horse is so young and allow that to be indicative of its measurement for the rest of its life for an entirely different organization, especially when it isn't even measured at the withers. AMHR is also in the midst of major issues with stewards giving incorrect measurements, so I think with all of the current events within that organization, it would be even more egregious to accept measurements from them going forward. AMHR and AMHA have continuously fought against using terms and rules from ADS for their Carriage Divisions because they acknowledge these are two different organizations and I think that we should also be aware that these are two different organizations and should work to create our own measurement system instead of blindly accepting other organization measurement cards, especially when they differ from the way every other breed of horse is measured. If ADS does decide to allow this RCP to go forward, I think it is in their best interest to institute an Under and Over VSE Division. If small and large ponies are split and we understand there's a distinct advantage to being a larger animal, we should also acknowledge that even in the VSE, small increments can make a huge difference, both within CDEs and in the pleasure driving ring. Without this acknowledgement, this should not go forward. I would not support this RCP as is if ADS accepts a breed show measurement and it would deter me and others from entering ADS shows with my VSEs if they suddenly have to show against ponies that have a height difference of potentially 8 inches or more. VSE stands for "VERY SMALL" and I think that is something we need to remember. There's a reason that Shetlands and miniature horses show separately and raising the



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

VSE height even more does not make it fair for VSEs of ALL sizes. I sincerely hope that we can keep the rule book as is in this regard. Elisa Forsysinski; #12045320

- Why change something that makes sense? The AMHR (American Miniature Horse Registry) uses the last hairs of the mane to get as many registered horses as possible. With the ADS they will just compete in a different size group. And notice that another rule change proposal states the speeds are too slow. Well, if someone is driving a borderline small pony as a VSE then the speeds should be too slow. They should compete in small pony. Please keep under 39" and under 99 cm at the top of the withers as the ADS official rule. And enforce it! Janice Ventresca #7973
- The rationale for doing so is to give a 3" height allowance to breed show miniature horses who are measured at the last hair of the mane. Thus a 38" registered miniature horse with higher withers will still pass as a VSE for ADS events. The writer suggests that this might make it easier for breed show drivers to make the transition to ADS shows. I disagree with this proposed change. It would mean that 39-41" ponies now competing in the Small Pony Division would have to compete as VSEs and would therefore be unable to compete at events that do not have a VSE division. In addition, the Section A VSEs (like mine, who is 30" both at the last hair and at the withers), who already compete in timed events against VSEs up to 9 inches taller, would now have to compete against horses up to 11 inches taller. I compete regularly and successfully in CTs, CDEs, ADTs and Derbies but recognize that larger VSEs have an advantage, especially on the marathon and on a spread-out cones course. Why should the smaller VSEs and the Small Ponies already active in the driving world be penalized in order to MAYBE increase the number of breed show drivers at ADS competitions? Judy Chamberlain, ADS#14010A
- likely to increase the number of American Shetland and American Shetland cross bred entries. These animals have a significant proportion of Hackney Pony blood and are much more refined and athletic than the prototypical American Miniature Horse, particularly those of 34 inches and under. I am concerned that this proposed change will discourage drivers with small Minis, and they may be lost from Combined Driving. I note there is a proposal to increase the speeds in VSE classes, which will also discourage the 'fuzz butt' VSE entries. Roger Cleverly #: 37720



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- No, I Disagree-Delight Craddock- #20191936
- This rule should not be considered, I would rather see the vse category stay 39 and under and the 39 to 41-inch vse stay in small pony. Many smaller vse are driven say under 34 inches and under and for them to compete with a horse so much large i. e 41 inches is not fair to the smaller vse.... they move entirely different.  
Bobbi Hoenigman-# 10168730
- I am a VSE competitor and I do not support this change. Judi Tintera #6951670
- I think the Vse measurement should stay the same at 39 cm but the VSE equines should be measured at the withers and not the last hair of the mane  
I feel that if the measurement is changed, the small ponies that then fit into that division will have a bigger advantage and also might not have as many shoes to go to as some organizers don't want to run a VSE division. Muffy Seaton #4611
- I strongly oppose increasing the allowed height of VSE's to 41", this would be so unfair to those of us who show the smaller minis as well as "opening a can of worms" in regards to measuring the horses. Joan McMahon # 3791920
- I feel all equines should be measured at the top of the withers. Measuring at the last hair for miniature horses is a breed show rule for AMHR and AMHA. As a miniature horse owner my horse measurement card, as they measured her at the first show of the year (required), is 36.5" at the last hair and at the top of the withers as measured at the same time as a reference for the AMHR she measures 39.25" . Most measure two inches taller than at the last hair. Also people leave extra hair so that at that last hair they will measure smaller to insure the division they want to be in.  
Patricia Fulkerson# 2447040



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- I have been competing in the Small Pony Division for several years now and was happy that my 41" Equine measured out of the VSE division. The pace was so slow, and VSEs are not welcome at many CDES!  
There are quite a few of us who have gone to driving 41-46" Equine's to be able to be compete under the Small Pony rules at most CDEs. Even better...when numbers warrant, some shows have offered a Small Pony Division.  
I feel that the Small Pony classification is appropriate for that size of equine!!  
Mary Baillie# 12024620
- The rationale for doing so is to give a 3" height allowance to breed show miniature horses who are measured at the last hair of the mane. Thus a 38" registered miniature horse with higher withers will still pass as a VSE. The writer suggest that this might make it easier for breed show drivers to make the transition to ADS shows.  
Unfortunately, this proposed change simultaneously imposes an unfair penalty upon the 39-41" ponies now competing in the Small Pony Division. I, along with many others, specifically purchased and trained a 41" pair of ponies who could then compete with full marathons and at venues not open to VSE's (Southern Pines, Katydid). Are we now to forfeit those benefits we sought to gain in favor of breed show drivers who may have an interest in ADS competitions? Linda Willis #8731
- Most of the VSEs currently competing are well under the 39 " height. Many of the ponies that measure from 39" to 41 " are big moving Shetlands or hackney crosses and move with a longer, bigger stride than the smaller VSEs. Allowing a larger VSE (39 "- 41 ") will certainly put the smaller VSEs at a disadvantage when competing and may result in the loss of entry of the smaller VSEs. I propose no change to the height allowed for VSEs. Elizabeth Pannill # 12033110
- Having been a VSE driver for almost 25 years competing in ADS events, I am infuriated that we would change a rule that has been in place for two decades. The small pony division was set up for the oversized VSEs after a struggle to find a place that is fair for the big VSEs. The small pony division is quite popular and is perfect for the >39" minis. I, myself, recently purchased an oversized VSE to be able to "move up" from the



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

restrictive VSE division and compete in the small pony division. Small ponies can compete at bigger venues and compete in Advanced which is currently not possible for VSEs. You can't just throw people back to the VSE division after preparing to compete in Small Pony at larger shows and higher levels. Small pony is a step up for us to compete with the bigger ponies. As a VSE driver, I have struggled to get CDEs to offer me even an Intermediate level opportunity. A number of competitions don't even offer a VSE division which is quite frustrating when the venue is convenient to me and offer a challenging venue. Did I mention the difficulty showing a 32" VSE against ponies that are now 10" taller? I have found it challenging showing against 38" VSEs. Please do not change the height rule. This will probably cause quite a few small ponies to quit showing if they have to go back to VSE and will certainly frustrate the smaller VSE competitors.  
Elizabeth Rieselman #8538

- Disagree Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Not in favor. Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- No. Heights for VSEs were carefully dictated in via the VSE task force a decade ago. It is acknowledged that breeds do not necessarily measure the same way the ADS does (we'll get into the reasons for that some other day). We've also studied the variances in height measurements between Pleasure and Combined Driving. Because of the roots of their disciplines in our multi-discipline rulebook, the height definitions must remain as they are. Merridy Hance #10826

**5 GR-B Judges @ competition**

- I agree - Price Story #9181
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- I reluctantly agree for cost containment reasons. The judge and TD serve totally different functions and it is not clear that one individual can do both jobs appropriately.



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

At the same time it is clear that the organizers want this and it will promote "conversion" to ADS recognition and that will offset the loss somewhat.  
- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916

- Not in favor. TD's have a specific role - among others to be the mediator between competitors, organizers, and the jury. Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Okay. IF the judge for the competition receives the training mentioned in this RCP. Merridy Hance #10826

**6 GR-C Measuring**

- This has lots and lots of issues. First, every show could be someone's first show of the year. That would mean every TD and every show would have to be ready to measure. Every TD would need an approved stick with a level and every show would need a concrete pad to measure on. That is pretty unrealistic. That could cut out small facilities that don't have the pad and decrease the number of shows when we are already losing places to show. I like the idea but do not see it as possible.  
Price Story #9181
- I do not agree that a separate BREED organization measurement should be acceptable, especially AMHR/AMHA for those equines that are in VSE or pony divisions. AMHR and AMHA breed horses can receive a permanent measuring card as early as 3 years old, well before they're done growing, and I believe this is unfair to take a measurement when a horse is so young and allow that to be indicative of its measurement for the rest of its life for an entirely different organization, especially when it isn't even measured at the withers, but at the last mane hair. AMHR is also in the midst of major issues with stewards giving incorrect measurements, so I think with all of the current events within that organization, it would be even more egregious to accept measurements from them going forward. Measurement of the last mane hair is a political move made by Breed Show organizations that should not be considered when it comes to the fairness of our members and safety of our equines.



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

I would much rather see ADS implement their own measurement program where equines are measured by ADS officials and given a card without accepting Breed Organization measurement Elisa Forsyinski; #12045320

- Yay! What a great idea! Sorry it will create more work for the organizers, but it's so needed. Please approve this proposal! Janice Ventresca #7973
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- I have thought there should be a measurement card for quite some time for all horses issued at the first show they attend of the year.... However, one part of this rule I am TOTALLY against is the sentence. **A measurement card from another recognized organization will be accepted.** Are you aware the American Miniature Horse Assoc. and the American Miniature Horse Registry do not measure at the wither but at the last mane hair? in other words, those horses from these registries will look and measure taller at the withers.....I would be against this being passed unless all horses need to be measured at the first ads show they attend at the beginning of each year. If you attend an AMHA or AMHR show you will find the measuring looking like it is almost the middle of the back. Why not keep vse 39" and under and the 39-41 stay in small pony.....there needs to be some consistency in the game. AMHR sec A is 34 and under, and Sec b is 34 up to 38, would you want to change ADS to be 38" and under. AMHA IS 34 INCHES AND UNDER. - Bobbi Hoenigman-# 10168730
- Strongly agree- Sharon Baum #12031610
- Agree with everything purposed except I feel you should not use the AMHR or AMHA Horse Registry Permanent Measurement Card as they measure from the last hair and not the top of the withers. This is a Breed show rule and not a true reading. Some people adjust the measurement by leaving more hair when clipping and they measure from there and not the real mane hair. Most Miniature horses or I should say an average are two inches taller at the top of the withers vs the last hair.



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

This year they measured both last hair and top of the withers and my Mini is carded at 36.5" last hair and 39.25 at top of withers. Therefore, I feel ADS should have their own Measurement Card or at least require it at top of withers. Patricia Fulkerson# 2447040

- Totally unnecessary. There is seldom any issue with pony or VSE heights. Requiring a measurement card simply adds to the paper work and multiplies the administrative burden on both organizer and competitor and the office. Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Since the miniature and Shetland breed organizations both utilize the last hair of the mane as their standard this alternate avenue will be of no value to VSE/small pony owners. While a formal measurement process may level the playing field somewhat it will undoubtedly place an undue administrative burden on show officials. Linda Willis #8731
- I have no problem with measuring except you can't allow measurement cards from miniature horse/Shetland breed organizations because they measure from the last hair and not the withers. Elizabeth Rieselman #8538
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- This new pony measurement article is proposed as an appendix to the General Rules. As such, it would apply to all ADS events including pleasure shows, draft shows and recreational drives even though it is proposed by combined driving. If the intent is to require measurement for all disciplines, this is appropriate for a General Rule. If it is only intended for combined driving, it would be more appropriate as an appendix to the combined driving rules.  
I am aware that there have been some challenges to the height of ponies/VSEs at pleasure shows, but it doesn't seem necessary to add a whole new requirement to address this.  
I don't oppose a measurement card for show disciplines, but it certainly isn't necessary across the board. -Michael Ridge ADS # 3126



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- Definitely yes. For fairness in competition, measurements and records are very much needed. It's particularly notable as over height Small Ponies may try to go without a required navigator. Many's the time we competitors have noted over height VSEs or SPs competing in the wrong classes, and we've had no recourse but to grumble. Many of the TDs have already received training in measuring, and the record keeping for ADS should not be onerous. Merridy Hance #10826
- I whole heartedly agree there are so many 12 hand ponies fudging to be a small pony. I hope this rule is added to make it a formal measurement procedure. I agree with using a measurement card from a breed organization, except in the VSE division where they are measured by the last mane hair and not the withers. Hilda Wilkins #488910

**7      208.1   Leaving the Arena**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Disagree. The idea is right but the RCp as written does not do this. "May" does not specify a penalty. Needs to be "MUST" for me to agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I have no opinion. Sounds like some "issue" must have prompted this.  
Merridy Hance #10826

**8      209.6   Grooms standing**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree -Sharon Baum #12031610
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- I'd better not express an opinion on this Pleasure RCP. I think it should stay in the rules, but I don't know all the issues for Pleasure stuff. Merridy Hance #10826

**9 522.7 Horse's Head Transitions**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I guess this is okay, and I appreciate that this would be consistent with 954.16. Have we checked all over the place to see if "nose" appears anywhere else where it would be in conflict if we approved this one? I've just been enjoying reading the ADS Handbook for Driven Dressage again. Nice coverage of this in Chapter 4 under "Figures."  
Merridy Hance #10826

**10 DR-C Correction of math**

- YES!! Fix the math. Judy Chamberlain, #14010A
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- YES! - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Well, well, punctuation strikes again. Dan's analysis of the math agrees with Art. 958.2.1. The order in which these operations are performed is not so critical as ADDING penalties rather than SUBTRACTING them. Not sure if we need an actual mathematical formula as better than text, but changing the - to a + is needed in DR-C.  
Good catch, Dan. Merridy Hance #10826



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**11 Not Recommended**

- I no longer participate in CDEs at Training level because of the protective vest expense. It is difficult to find a navigator and find one who owns a protective vest. I cannot afford to purchase vest in various sizes. I understand making it a requirement at upper levels but for those who participate at lower level this is a big expense.  
Denise Marino #7522380
- I agree with the proponent - we are losing competitors as well as competitions due to our safety vest requirements. - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187

**12 937.3 Confirm table**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Wording is unclear. Grooms are optional for VSEs and small ponies as well, they just have the option to not use them, while single ponies and horses must have a groom on marathon. Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Disagree. Who has the option? Driver? Organizer? Judge? Not required is clear. Optional is not- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Okay. Intent is the same, but perhaps this proposed wording is stronger.  
Merridy Hance #10826

**13 937.3.1 Same carriage**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- ADS has no need to consider FEI CAI designations. If this rule is to be changed, do it for all ADS competitions and remove the CAI



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

designation. As stated in the reason, most people do not change anyway.  
Penny R. Nicely # 4259

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I disagree. The FEI rule ONLY requires the same carriage in Dressage and Cones for CAI 2\* and above. Most of our ADS competitions do not reach that stage. Allowing competitors to drive Cones with their marathon vehicles improves safety in the cones and usually requires fewer cones setting changes, as almost all marathon vehicles have the same width of 125 cm regardless of turnout (except VSE's). So, I believe marathon vehicles in Cones is safer and easier. - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Yes, please! Merridy Hance #10826

**14 Not Recommended**

**15 937.3.3 Carriage measurement**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes, please! Merridy Hance #10826

**16 Not Recommended**

**17 938.2 Spares**

- No. This is not needed. Price Story #9181
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- Disagree. I don't see what this adds other than work for the organizer/judge. Many marathon vehicles don't have room for spares like this any longer (four halters and four lead ropes??)- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I disagree. I have not seen a problem in my almost 40 years in the sport (23 of those judging) for a lack of a halter & lead rope. This RCP only adds to the burden of the safety check person and to the rule book. - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- No. Though most of us do carry full spares, and certainly halters and leads, it may be more safe and efficient out there in the wilds to use another piece of equipment to lead a horse. Besides that, I'm a little chuffed that per reports, the author (she is a TD) of this RCP actually eliminated competitors at a recent CDE if they did not carry halters and leads. That was not her decision to make, and not covered by the rules. If an organizer were going to dictate this requirement, it should have been declared in advance in the event omnibus. - Merridy Hance #10826

**18 Not Recommended**

**19 943.2.14 Grooms – Omnibus**

- The rule as written is absolutely clear that “a groom is OPTIONAL for all single turnouts at all times at the event location, except for turnouts with an equine 120 cm. or taller competing on the Marathon course”. Thus, a groom is NOT optional on marathon for an equine over 120 cm and is therefore required.- Judy Chamberlain, #14010
- I am not in favor of allowing Organizers to impose the carrying of a groom on a >120 cm small pony on marathon. A simple mathematical calculation shows that a 4 wheeled carriage, such as my WSS Batmobile M-100 [270 lbs.], plus driver [180 lbs.] and a teenage groom [100 lbs.], (if allowed by SafeSport), comes to a total of 550 lbs., about 20 lbs. more than the weight of my Welsh Section A gelding. I was under the impression that it was unwise to ask an equine to pull more than its own weight cross country. Instituting 2020 RCP #19 will, effectively, allow organizers to impose a requirement that goes against animal welfare considerations. If this change is passed, I will not enter



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

events that demand that my pony is pushed to his limits. [Yet another potential lost entry].- Roger Cleverly #: 37720

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- The new wording makes it optional for turnouts larger than 120 cm - even on marathon - as it limits the exception to those smaller than 120 cm. I don't think this was the intent???? -Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- YES! - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- (Here I go being chuffed again. I'm not worried at this time about being in line with USEF, so I'm discounting that part of the author's reasoning.) I do agree that if an organizer dictates that a groom is required at his events, it must be published in the Omnibus. I would not think that an ADS organizer would require this, but it is an organizer's right to be more rule-restrictive in his event rather than less restrictive. - Merridy Hance #10826

**20 945.3 Groom down penalty**

- No, I Disagree-Delight Craddock- #20191936
- This change is dangerous as it forbids assistance to those who ADS has said do not need to carry grooms. This has been no problem, why make it one???- Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Disagree. the liability issue can be managed by adding that the "capable person" may NOT get on the carriage.- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I disagree: This rule clarified how to treat the need for a groom should it arise for a driver without a groom on the carriage - and is mainly geared towards dressage and cones - but also VSE's and small ponies on the marathon. Deleting this would throw us



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

back to where we were before = into the unknown - where at times of need sometimes people from the outside did assist during dressage and cones - and no penalty was given (even by very experienced judges!). Citing a liability concern can kill almost any issue in our sport - and an outsider hardly needs a helmet and a safety vest to for example re-attach a trace down, nor are those required for grooms in dressage and cones. Or how would the proponent want to address such a situation - like a trace down in dressage (or cones) by a single driver without a groom? - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187

- I find this change badly worded. It seems to say: A groom is optional except for an equine 120 cm or SMALLER on the marathon. I believe the writer's intent was to say 120 cm and smaller equines DO NOT require a groom on the marathon.  
Jaye Ventresca - #7973
- Well, this is a Hardy rule, and he was trying to help out the small turnouts that did not have navigators on board. He battled with the wording at the time, but it's still a dicey rule for exactly the reasons the author of this RCP has given. Do we have any reports as to whether anybody has ever used "capable person" assistance in the heat of competition? - Merridy Hance #10826

**21    951    FEI 1\***

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- No. Let's see the new tests before we ditch the #1 tests. We've been waiting a long time for new Dressage tests, and we can't afford to doff any until we actually see new ones. - Merridy Hance #10826

**22    960.2.7c    5 Obst. – Intermediate**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936



American Driving Society  
 RCP Member Comments  
 As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. As land for events disappears before our eyes, organizers are doing the best they can with what they have. -Merridy Hance #10826

**23 960.2.8 VSE Marathon Speeds**

- The VSE Training speed at 9 kph was originally based upon empirical data obtained by timing an extensive sample of miniature horses representing the full spectrum of size (28-39”) and fitness on a level course. A driver who knows his/her VSE and who is driving a fit VSE should be able to rate the speed with which the course is driven. Pushing everyone to “race” is not the answer. Many advanced drivers with larger horses and multiples can be seen walking on parts Section B, especially after a fast obstacle. This is not considered a need to “eat up time”, and no one is proposing increasing the speeds for these competitors. At Training Level, the marathon is a test of the driver’s ability to remember the course, follow the times allowed, and learn to rate the horse’s speed appropriately. Racing and wanting to go fast on course and in obstacles are not suitable goals at that level.
- If the speeds are now to be increased, I would propose a slight increase for Section A Training level; keeping VSE speeds equal in Preliminary, as they are for the other equines; and increasing by one KPH for Section A in Intermediate and advanced, as follows:

SPEED( KPH)	TRAINING			PRELIMINARY			INTERMEDIATE			ADVANCED		
	VSE	<del>9</del> 9.5	-	9	10	-	<del>9.5</del> 10	<del>10</del> 11	-	10	10	-

Judy Chamberlain, #14010

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- I am a VSE competitor and I do agree with this change. Judi Tintera #6951670



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- agree only if the window is expanded from 3 minutes to 4 or 5 minutes at training level only. I have no issue with prelim due to cantering being allowed.  
Sharon Baum, #12031610.
- I am against this proposed change. The speed for VSEs should remain as it has been with no increase. Although many VSEs can compete at a faster rate the terrain greatly affects speed - very sandy or hilly terrain would be harder to make time if kph is increased.  
Elizabeth Pannill # 12033110
- I have long been a proponent of leaving the VSE Training speed at 9 kph. This number was originally based upon empirical data obtained by timing an extensive sample of miniature horses representing the full spectrum of size (28-39") and fitness on a level course. I view the need to "eat up time" as a direct result of lack of training of both horse and driver. New drivers tend to see the marathon as a race rather than a beginning step in the physical and mental development of the animal. Racing off the blocks and wanting to go fast in obstacles are not suitable goals at that level. If, however, the speeds are now to be increased I believe it should be done commensurate with other larger animals. Horses, ponies and small ponies all have the same Section B speeds for preliminary and intermediate levels. The same should be true for VSE's. I would alternately propose: Training – 9.5kph, Preliminary – 10kph and Intermediate – 10kph as a more reasonable and graduated alternative. Linda Willis #8731
- I have been against this especially raising training level which is a level for beginners who are learning the sport and tend to either go too fast or too slow. The original guidelines were developed to cover VSEs from 28" to 39" on a variety of terrains and weather conditions. As a volunteer when not competing, I have seen a number of VSE competitors excessively whipping their ponies to make current speeds that can be difficult in hot muggy weather or deep footing. We need to think of the horses' welfare and not the driver's inability to rate their horse.- Elizabeth Rieselman # 8538
- No opinion.- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. We've studied this for some time, and comparative speeds for VSEs and larger equines are not equivalent efforts. I understand that being able to walk on course is



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

helpful to “waste” time, but that strategy is not helpful to the overall scheduling of the event. This has been a bone of contention for at least a decade now, and I understand that newer and smaller equines may like the slower speeds as they are introduced to the sport. We don’t do that for other sizes of equines, and I think it contributes to the perception of the smaller, newer equines as unfit for the sport. - Merridy Hance #10826

- I agree with adding 1 KPH to the VSE time as I too have had to walk portions of a marathon because my pony was too fast. VSE are perfectly capable of doing small pony times if properly conditioned. 1 KPH is a good start. Hilda Wilkins #488910

**24 960.2.8 Add Transfer distance**

- Agree but delete reference to USEF- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- YES- Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187

**25 960.2.8 Advanced**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- YES- Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Yes. I’d like to see whether ADS will develop its own Advanced division, and this is where it would start. We’re not ready yet, but this is setting the stage. (Boy, have we had hot spirits over the years about Advanced and who owns it!)  
Merridy Hance #10826

**26 960.2.8.1 2-Section A speeds**

- Yes-- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- Yes. Good adjustment to promote this mode of event. The CDE at NCDC is a rather painful case in point, and this change is helpful. - Merridy Hance #10826

**27      960.6.3          Transfer**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yep. (Interesting that this turned out only to be an issue in one version of last year's rulebook.) -Merridy Hance #10826

**28      961.3.1          Dry gates for Training**

- No. There will be new folks who do not come if they think they will have to do water. Any organizer can just not have Training do the water if they can't figure out a dry route. Leave this one alone.- Price Story #9181
- Yet another proposal that may well have the effect of discouraging Training level competitors from entering Combined Driving. Not everyone has the facility of a water hazard where they can train their equine. In my experience, water training needs to be taken very slowly, step by step, from hand walking to ground driving to hitched with a header, before an animal is ready to step out, solo. I feel this proposal has far greater impact on the novice driver, often with a novice equine than officials adjudicating welfare. I fear this change could significantly reduce the Training level entries at events where there is no 'dry line' for those classes. When I started Eventing, in the UK, in the 1980s, there was always a long option, over minimum level fences, where the optimum route called for a high level of skill and experience. I see no reason why, for one hazard, this cannot be achieved, if the course designer has the necessary vision. Definitely not in favor of this proposal. - Roger Cleverly #: 37720
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Leave this alone. There is no problem with giving Training level an alternate dry route. It can be easily done, and they



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

are to required to take it. Making them go through water can cause more problems than currently exist. Remember you are making rules for the entire country, not just those areas where water is readily available for schooling.- Penny R. Nicely # 4259

- Disagree. The land route option works. - Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Not in favor. I think the dry route works fine. - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Yes, for the reasons given.- Merridy Hance #10826

**29 962.3 Course inspection**

- No. This is unfair to multi-use facilities. They can lose money by not having their facility open for schooling for other disciplines (like Eventer who also pay to school the water obstacle which isn't possible when it is a water obstacle). 24 hours is fine, 48 is too long. As a competitor, sure it would be nice but we can't cause a loss of income to our facilities unnecessarily. Price Story #9181
- It is often impossible to comply with the current 24 hour rule let alone 48. At a 2-day, the Jury often doesn't arrive until Friday so they cannot review and accept the course before late Friday afternoon. Leave it alone and realize that it's a loose requirement even as it stands. ADS does not have to comply with FEI or USEF in these matters. Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Disagree, Impractical. We voted this down last year. - Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I disagree: The CDC tried to do this change already last year - and it was strongly and correctly opposed by many members & organizers & voted down by the BoD. Our current system of having the marathon course ready 24 hrs. in advance works well. Changing that requirement to 48 hrs. would add substantial additional cost to each event as then the officials would need to be at the competition 24 hrs. earlier than currently = be paid for one extra day! (At FEI competition there is no extra expense as



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

they need to be there that early anyhow for the vet check - which we don't usually have at ADS events. That's one reason why running an FEI event is so expensive and why we have so few of them in this country) Further, having the marathon course ready another day earlier adds substantial burden also to many organizers who can't get an extra day out of the landowners - or might have to pay for it. (Landowners still running cattle or other farming operations on the land.)- Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187

- Yes. This one was rejected last year at the last minute for a misunderstood reason. Merridy Hance #10826

**30 Not Recommended**

**31 962.3.6 30-day rule**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I agree with the proponent - we should make this clearer - where to find it. - Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- No. I understand the financial ramifications of taking a venue offline for 30 days, but I've also seen competitors taking their horses through obstacles up to just a few days before an event. This would open the door to drivers schooling their horses in obstacles up to ... well... any time before an event. If this one does go through, I'd suggest adding an Omnibus question as to whether taking a horse in an obstacle would be allowed in the 30 days before an event. - Merridy Hance #10826

**32 962.3.8 30-day rule – Champs**



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

- No. I think the obstacles should be closed the month before an event.-Price Story #9181
- I understand that many venues hold multiple events, but I am concerned that doing away with this rule gives unfair advantage to a competitor who lives at or near an event venue. Even though the actual obstacle course is not set, there is an advantage to schooling through obstacles that a competitor who is traveling a distance to an event would not have. While there is no way to completely do away with this “home field advantage”, it makes sense to try to keep the playing field as level as possible. Perhaps decrease the time to 2 weeks or let all competitors know when they can school on the obstacles?- Judy Chamberlain, #14010A
- Ok, if this passes people can come and school the course the week before the event, or take lessons on the obstacles the weekend before. Talk about removing the fair and level playing field - this one takes the prize.- Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- No. Reasons as above. -Merridy Hance #10826

**33      963.2.6      Change to Transfer**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. -Merridy Hance #10826

**34      963.2.6      change max time**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- I prefer the version in RCP #33. -Merridy Hance #10826



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**35 Not Recommended**

**36 Not Recommended**

- 36 has the wrong reason stated why it didn't make it forward to an RCP.  
Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187

**37 967.1.2 Delete Organizer instructions**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. Good one.- Merridy Hance #10826

**38 967.2.2 Delete Organizer instructions**

- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. And we need to update forms annually as we do the rulebook.  
Merridy Hance #10826

**39 Not Recommended**

- I made this suggestion and feel strongly that VSE should have the same clearance between cones as all other equines. I was told because the length of the turnout with VSE is not as long so that is why they have VSE 5cm less. This makes no sense to me. They small pony and even pony are not near as long as the larger breeds and they get the same clearance. Vehicles range in all lengths. When traveling fast that extra 5cm is important. As I have said before it is all relative and all that matters is the



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

distance between the wheels and cones and all should have the same advantage.  
Patricia Fulkerson# 2447040

- I hope we gave the proponent more details why her suggestion - rightfully - was turned down. - Merridy Hance #10826

**40      973.4.6      Cones - bridges for Training**

- Yes. I agree with this change- Price Story #9181
- This proposes allowing an obstacle such as a bridge on a cones course for training level. I agree that this is a reasonable change but would add wording such as *“for Training Level equines an alternate gate must be supplied”*. This way the driver can choose to go over a bridge or other obstacle but does not have to at training level.  
Judy Chamberlain, ADS#14010A
- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Sharon Baum #12031610
- Remember the reasons for the levels. Training is not supposed to have to negotiate obstacles like bridges and water in Cones. School at home and when you're ready to do these move up to Prelim.  
Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Disagree. Modify to require a no bridge option??- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. If we're going to let Training do water on marathon, we should let them do a bridge in cones. - Merridy Hance #10826



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**41 973.7 Grooms walking cones**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Sharon Baum #12031610
- Suggest making the course available to everyone and not list those who can walk it. Grooms often accompany their drivers anyway.  
Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- Agree in principle but need to clarify that grooms cannot use a wheel. They are not included in the list of those who may not. - Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- While I fully agree with the intent of this - and made a similar Rule Change suggestion, which now is listed as RCS # 42 and is not followed and listed as a duplicate to this one. Please look carefully, and note, if you go with RCP # 41, grooms would be allowed to use a measuring wheel when inspecting the course, as they would not be included in the group of people who are NOT allowed to use a measuring wheel = Athletes, Chef's d'Equipe and Trainers, so I think you must include the grooms in that group as well, and should rather use RCS # 42 instead of RCP # 41.- Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Sure, makes the walking crowded, though. And we're adding golf carts for our Para Drivers, so walking the Cones course gets pretty busy - Merridy Hance #10826

**42 Not Recommended**

**43 CD-B 1.10 Grooms – housekeeping**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. Housekeeping. - Merridy Hance #10826



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

**44 CD-C 8.3 Bi-directional bridge**

- Yes, I Agree -Delight Craddock #20191936
- Agree- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Yes. Good one! - Merridy Hance #10826

**45 CD-H Remove TD required**

- See 5- Daniel M. Rosenthal #11916
- Not in favor - same reason as at RCP # 5- Hardy Zantke ADS # 1187
- Okay. Assuming the judge knows the TD stuff. Will there be a way for us out here in organizer-land to know whether the judge knows the TD stuff? - Merridy Hance #10826
- I do not think that the vehicle should be measured a second time unless there was a question about moving the axels on adjustable axel vehicles. - Hilda Wilkins #488910

**46 LO6.2 TD Conflicts**

- Not a rule. This is LOC policy and should have been brought to the BOD as a policy/housekeeping change. - Penny R. Nicely # 4259
- I don't know Merridy Hance #10826

**47 AC 2.6, 2.7 Medical personnel**

- I strongly disagree with RCP # 47 and I hope this will not be adopted by the ADS Board. The required Safety protocol for each type of event is properly stated in the rules for the specific event. This rule does not need to be restated in the General Regulations. Part of the RCP is copied here:



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Any event, trial or show that includes a marathon (of any type) pr (or) activities outside of a supervised area must provide qualified medical personnel on site from the start of the marathon until the last horse completes the course.

Thus, Recreational Drives would require EMT on site.

Pleasure Drives would require EMT on site.

Sleigh Rallies would require EMT on site.

Continuous Drive would require EMT on site.

Other competitions may also require EMT on site - Ted Campbell # 13011

- I have no problem with moving the current rule from the competition section to the general rules. However, the following new wording does extend the requirements to ADS activities such as pleasure shows and recreational drives Any event, trial or show that includes a marathon (of any type) or activities outside of a supervised area must provide qualified medical personnel on site from the start of the marathon until the last horse completes the course.

For example, the organizer of a pleasure show usually offers a pleasure drive judged on turnout that leaves the show grounds to travel to a local park. That is clearly an activity that is outside a supervised area. Is the organizer required to have on site medical personnel on each day that such a drive is offered? No marathon is offered so the organizer can reason that they have an EMT on site from the start to the end of the marathon even when the EMT is just on call. Another organizer in the same situation might decide that the 'intent of the rule' is to have an EMT on site whenever the pleasure drive is scheduled. Another, very scrupulous, organizer will have the EMT on site for each day that the drive is offered.

It is unfair to make the organizer guess what they should do. Use the current wording if the intention is to cover competitions with a marathon of any type or clean up this changed wording to explain to the organizer what is actually required.

If it really is intended to cover only combined driving events, then this should not be in the general rules. If safety concerns lead to applying it to all types of ADS events, then the extent of the on-site requirement should not be tied to a 'marathon' which doesn't exist in most types of ADS events.



American Driving Society  
RCP Member Comments  
As of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

I received a note from Jeff Morse that reminded me that pleasure driving shows do not have marathons and so my concern had already been addressed when the word 'marathon' was defined.

My reply clarified that the new phrase added to the rule as it currently exists in the approval of competitions may have inadvertently extended the rule to much more than just 'marathons', but my problem is actually with the addition of the phrase "or activities outside of a supervised area". A pleasure drive that leaves the show grounds is outside a supervised area. Many pleasure shows do include a pleasure drive, a picnic class that leaves the immediate grounds or a sporting day of traditional driving with its country drive. When these are part of the pleasure show, what is the organizer to do about hiring medical personnel to be on the site?

If it really is intended to cover only combined driving events, then this should not be in the general rules. If safety concerns lead to applying it to all types of ADS events, then the extent of the onsite requirement should not be tied to a 'marathon' which doesn't exist in most types of ADS events. - Michael Ridge # 3126

- I have the same concern about the vagueness of the phrase "activities outside of a supervised area". What constitutes a "supervised area"? What constitutes "an activity"?

This added sentence is poorly written and would cause more confusion for organizers and officials.

*"Any event, trial or show that includes a marathon (of any type) pr activities outside of a supervised area must provide qualified medical personnel on site from the start of the marathon until the last horse completes the course."*

The PD Com believes the current wording and placement in the AC section is adequate. - Jeff Morse | Chairman, ADS Pleasure Driving Committee #6717

- No. I like it where it is. Merridy Hance #10826