

## **CGA Annual Rules & Judges Meeting**

July 28, 2007

Bolado Park, Hollister, CA

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 pm by President Ron Butts.

### **I. Opening Comments – President Ron Butts**

President Ron Butts welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded all in attendance that only carded judges are allowed to vote on action items. Parliamentarian Darlene Sandefur read aloud the CGA meeting rules of conduct, reminding all members that everyone has a right to speak and be respected during the meeting. Members should state their name and keep their comments to only three minutes. In addition members should speak one at a time and only when recognized, eliminating all personal comments and side conversations.

### **II. Opening Comments – Rules Chairman, Sheri Herchkorn**

Rules Chairman, Sheri Herchkorn stated many items had been discussed by the MAC, some with complete agreement among MAC members and others that resulted in disagreement. Those items that the MAC could not definitively agree upon were items Sheri would present in the meeting agenda items.

### **III. Agenda Items**

#### **Item III. A: Schooling/Circling an Obstacle More than Once While on Course**

Sheri Herchkorn explained this was on item the MAC was in complete agreement on and felt in necessary to share how they interpret the rule. No where in the CGA Rule Book does it state that a rider can or can not circle an obstacle more than once while on course. The Rule Book does say a rider can not circle or school prior to beginning their course, but there is not rule prohibiting the practice while the rider is on course. Sheri also reminded everyone that a district can not make/pass a district rule that counteracts any CGA rule; essentially a district can not pass a rule to prohibit riders from schooling or circling an obstacle more than once while on course. The MAC was in complete agreement that a rider may school or circle while on course as long as the rider correctly finishes their course for a good ride.

#### **Item III. B: Horse/Rider Breaking the Timing Beam Following Course Completion**

Sheri Herchkorn stated the MAC was not in complete agreement with the issue of a horse/rider breaking the timing beam following course completion. Some members of the MAC felt the rider should be disqualified while others felt this was not a problem and should be considered a good ride. Because of the MAC's disagreement, Sheri asked to open the floor to discussion and reminded everyone the goal was to find consistency in how the rule should be interpreted.

Margaret Whitelaw-Haynie felt the practice should be discouraged, but not called as a 'No Time.' Ron Butts explained that a horse/rider breaking the timing beam following course completion only really becomes an issue for those districts that can not recall times on their timers and some districts do not have timers that can recall times. Both Dianna Merrick and Shannon Rahn felt if this is a chronic problem with a rider then it should be addressed with that

rider individually, but otherwise it really shouldn't make a difference because it rarely happens. Lea deMontigny felt the benefit should always go to the rider and this case was no different, making a special rule or reading into a rule too far would only complicate things or lead to further rules. Some of the Master Judges present made the following comments: Conrad Fimbres and Randy Young felt the benefit should go to the rider and as long as it is not an issue to recall the time then crossing the timing line after completing the course was really a non-issue. Bob Perry suggested wording or a process be implemented for when a time can not be recovered.

**MOTION** by Rebekah Crill that all districts be required to have timing equipment that can recall prior times. **Seconded** by Margaret Whitelaw-Haynie. **Discussion Followed**

Darlene Sandefur explained the Rule Book already outlines necessary timing equipment and perhaps we just need to add or change some wording to the current rule. The current rule just states what equipment a district must have. Much discussion occurred regarding what type of timing equipment can recall times. The consensus seemed to be that all Farm Tech 200 or above times could recall times. Bob Perry asked how many districts did not have this timing equipment or the equivalent of the Farm Tech 200 and also asked if the CGA would help these districts get the proper equipment. Phyllis Odom explained the State Office would buy timers for any district and allow them to make payments (\$50 per month). Darlene Sandefur suggested making a change to the requirements to become a CGA district, adding the specific timing equipment or equivalent. In the Information Manual there is a statement of what the requirements are for a state run show. Darlene suggested making specific timing equipment a requirement in the Rule Book.

**Original MOTION Amended** by Rebekah Crill to add to Article 7.1 (of the Rules Book) "All districts must have the equivalent of Farm Tech 200 or better timing equipment with recall functions." **Seconded** by Margaret Whitelaw-Haynie.

The above **MOTION Carries** to the **General Meeting**

### **Item III. C: District 18 Arena Dimensions**

Sheri Herckorn discussed that District 18 is currently riding with questionable arena dimensions. The district has been given permission to ride all events with the exception of Barrels until a decision is reached regarding the matter. Joanne Galbraith explained the arena does not measure exactly 120ft wide in some areas, but does in others and this can affect some of their courses. Joanne explained they can not simply move the fence because it is a city/county owned park that would like to eliminate the horse arena all together. The arena dimensions were measured years ago and Joanne felt the arena should be deemed legal.

Shannon Rahn stated District 18 has been in existence and at the same location for 30 years, but this is an issue that extends beyond one district. Other districts have measurement faults and are also in question. Dianna Merrick cautioned naming a specific district and felt the issue should be universal to all arenas. Perhaps CGA should have a six (6) inch tolerance for all arena dimensions. Many members spoke in favor of this suggestion. Several members spoke about the possibility of simply grandfathering in District 18, while others were concerned the smaller arena

would not allow for a barrel course to be legal because the obstacles would not be 15ft off the fence. Sheri Herckorn cautioned everyone that a six (6) inch arena dimension variance could make some courses illegal throughout the state due to the 15 ft off the fence rule. Phyllis Odom pointed out that as soon as a legal arena is split into two smaller arenas, there are no longer exact dimensions of an arena as stated in the Rule Book.

Stan Janssen suggested one possible solution the problem at District 18. The arena is legal to run all courses aside from barrels, but there is on area where barrels can be specifically set up and the course would be correct. But this would also mean the course would have to be set up in a very specific place each time. Meghan Abatti cautioned that CGA make only one consistent ruling for all districts and if there is one exception then there are undoubtedly likely to be more arguments for exceptions in the future. Ellen Carr stated, perhaps if a district does not have a large enough arena to run the course, then they simply do not run the event, or move to another arena to run the event. Darlene Sandefur highlighted in the rules if an arena is not large enough to run an event then they should/must run the course in a legal arena as all districts are required to run all thirteen (13) events. Much discussion carried on regarding a legal course and how exactly the barrels course is illegal at District 18.

Teressa Barosso **MOTIONED** to grandfather in District 18's arena dimensions.  
**Seconded** by Belinda Harms. **Discussion followed.**

Cammie Dickerson suggested an amendment to the original motion to put in specifically District 18's arena name. Dianna Merrick cautioned grandfathering in an arena and felt that we should not make exceptions for one because then all districts would expect exceptions. Dianna strongly encouraged not grandfathering in a specific arena, but looking at changing/making a rule universal to all districts.

**Original MOTION Amended** by Teressa Barosso to grandfather in District 18's arena dimensions at Sam Lynn Ballpark Arena. **Seconded** by Belinda Harms.

The above **MOTION Carries** to the **General Meeting** on a standing vote.

### **Item III. D: Six (6) Inch Rule**

Sheri Herckorn discussed there is no current rule in the CGA Rule Book allowing for a course to measure six (6) inches off and still be considered legal. Some judges feel this 'rule' inherently exists, while others believe it does not because there is no mention of it the Rule Book. While Sheri had no strong opinion of the six (6) inch 'rule,' she would like to see something regarding this in the Rule Book if the majority feels it is appropriate. Darlene Sandefur explained there is no formal rule regarding this item but upon research discovered this was a 'rule' commonly used by Master Judges only when a record had been broke and a course was measured to make sure it was a legal course.

**MOTION** by Randy Young that any dot for an obstacle can be off a maximum of six (6) inches total and still be considered legal. **Seconded** by Shannon Rahn.  
**Discussion Followed.**

MAC Chairman, Sheri Herchkorn, cautioned this motion meant a course could be off several inches due to the cumulative effects of each obstacle. Conrad Fimbres suggested the motion be amended to state a course can be off a maximum of six (6) inches total and still be considered legal, thus removing the variance at each obstacle and making it only six (6) inches for the whole course.

***Original MOTION Amended*** by Randy Young that any course can be off a maximum of six (6) inches total and still be considered a legal course. ***Seconded*** Shannon Rahn.  
***Discussion Followed.***

This item generated much discussion and controversy among the members and judges present. Patrick Hoffman pointed out any event that has been properly triangulated should not be off by 6 inches, leaving no reason for such a rule. Several members questioned the issue of consistency among districts and the fairness to riders as well as the possibility of districts intentionally setting courses short to improve times. Meghan Abatti highlighted that at the end of the day a course is likely never to measure perfect due to knocking over obstacles and dot movement. Having a course measure perfectly every time seems very unrealistic and the intent of such a rule would not be for a district to cheat, but to know if a course is legal if re-measurement was required. Margo Abatti explained the only time there was ever a six (6) inch rule was when a State record was broke and the course was measured for legality. Other than that, Margo felt there was no six (6) inch 'rule.'

***Call for the question*** by David Bachman and ***Seconded*** by Rebekah Crill. ***Passed.***

The above ***MOTION DEFEATED*** on a standing vote.

Conrad Fimbres expressed his concerns about any State Show record being broke and the possibility of the course being off one (1) inch (or even less) and the course would not be considered legal and the record not given to the rider. Conrad felt this would be very unfair and stated he would like to see a rule addressing this issue. Cheryl Braswell suggested making the six (6) inch 'rule' only a State Show rule.

***MOTION*** by Cheryl Braswell that a course can be off a total of six (6) inch rule only at State Show and a course still be considered a legal course. ***Seconded*** by Dianna Merrick. ***Discussion Followed.***

Andy Krogh suggested the above motion be amended to state when a Master Judge re-checks a course for a State breaking record a course may be off a total of six (6) inches from its' prescribed dimensions. Andy felt this would give more clarity to the rule and would address Conrad's concerns. Cheryl Braswell felt this was a good suggestion and amended her motion to read:

by Cheryl Braswell that when a Master Judge re-checks a course for a State breaking record a course may be off a total of six (6) inches from its' prescribed dimensions.  
***Seconded*** by Dianna Merrick. ***Discussion Followed.***

Some members felt the amended motion did not address the instances when a riders requests re-measurement of an event at State Show. If a course was to measure slightly off, all riders would have to re-ride the course. Much discussion followed regarding natural course variance and the undoubted presence of natural variance in measuring a course. Meghan Abatti discussed that perhaps a rule allowing for tolerance in measurement was necessary; the question was only what an appropriate tolerance of measurement should be. One member pointed out this motion only addresses State Show and no other CGA show.

*Call for the question* by Andy Krogh and *Seconded* by Patrick Hoffman. *Passed.*

The above *MOTION DEFEATED* on a standing vote.

*MOTION* by Andy Krogh that any course may be off by a total of six (6) inches from its' prescribed dimensions and still be considered a legal course when re-checked.

*Seconded* by Patrick Hoffman. *No Discussion Followed.*

The above *MOTION Carries* to the *General Meeting.*

### **Item III. E: Half Belts** – Joanne Galbraith

Joanne Galbraith explained many riders get their belt caught on the horn and a half belt would solve this safety issue for many riders.

Joanne Galbraith *MOTIONS* that a half belt be considered a legal belt. *Seconded* by Dianna Merrick. *Discussion followed.*

One member asked for clarification of a half belt. Joanne explained a half belt goes around the waist and buckles on each side of the pants, eliminated the belt across the front of the waist. Amanda Martin stated if this motion were to pass, exact clarification of what a half-belt constitutes would be necessary. Shannon Rahn discussed the CGA dress code is implemented to make our riders look nice/presentable and we need to decide how lenient we will become with our dress code.

*Call for the question* by Rebekah Crill and *Seconded* by Andy Krogh. *Passed.*

Joanne Galbraith asked for a last minute amendment to her original motion to give further clarification to the requirements of a half belt.

*Original MOTION Amended* by Joanne Galbraith that a half belt, which comes to the belt loops on either side of the zipper, be considered a legal belt.

*Seconded* by Dianna Merrick.

The above *MOTION DEFEATED* on a standing vote.

### **Item III. F: Keyhole Wings**

MAC Chairman, Sheri Herckorn explained there are currently no prescribed measurements for the wings of the Keyhole. It seems all districts are measuring them differently and there needs to be a standard measurement.

*MOTION* by Sheri Herckorn that the ‘wings’ placed on the Keyhole measure six (6) inches. *Seconded* by Andy Krogh. *Discussion followed.*

Dianna Merrick asked if the Keyhole ‘wings’ are in the rule book and considered part of the course. Sheri responded they are in fact part of the course diagram and considered a part of the course, if a rider steps on them it should be considered a ‘no time.’ Discussion followed among the members about when a ride is considered a ‘good time’ or a ‘no time’ in relation to where the line is stepped on by the rider.

*Call for the question* by Skip Hoffman and *Seconded* by Shannon Rahn. *Passed.*

The above *MOTION Carries* to the *General Meeting*

### **Item III. G: Hurry Scurry Poles and Center Supports**

Lea deMontigny spoke about the Hurry Scurry poles, explaining if the poles measure three (3) inches they easily fall out of the new center supports, but if they measure five (5) inches they fit securely.

*MOTION* by Lea deMontigny that the Hurry Scurry poles fit tightly into the center supports. *Seconded* by Joanne Galbraith. *Discussion followed.*

Much discussion followed regarding the inconsistency of Hurry Scurry jumps among districts and those districts with the smaller poles, the jumps fall easily. The members present felt there should be consistency among the districts providing the same course for riders throughout the state. One member pointed out the above motion did not specifically state how to solve the problem. Shannon Rahn pointed out that as the rule reads currently the jumps are legal and if the membership wants to implement a change, this is the meeting to start the change. Patrick Hoffman stated the center support was only meant to support the poles and as the rule currently stands, the center support is doing its’ function irregardless of the pole size.

*Call for the question* by Bob Perry and *Seconded* by Darlene Sandefur. *Passed.*

The above *MOTION Carries* to the *General Meeting.*

Seeing the passing of the above motion, a solution was now needed to solve the problem.

*MOTION* by Andy Krogh that the foam size be increased to make the pole four (4) inches in diameter. *Motion Withdrawn.*

Andy Krogh withdrew his motion with Stan Janssen’s suggestion that the MAC work on a recommendation and bring it to the General Meeting.

Stan Janssen *MOTIONED* that Lea de Montigny work with the MAC to come up with a recommendation to make the Hurry Scurry poles fit tightly and present it at the General Meeting. *Seconded* by Andy Krogh.

The above *MOTION Carries*.

## **VII. Agenda Items – Adjournment**

*MOTION* to adjourn the meeting by Andy Krogh and *Seconded* by Randy Young.  
*MOTION CARRIES.*

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Meghan Abatti  
CGA Secretary