MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA (v.2.0 - Final)
Thursday, August 8, 2019 – 1:30pm – 5:00pm.
Friday, August 9, 2019 – 8:00am – 10:00am
Holiday Inn, Saratoga Springs, NY, USA

(All Meeting Materials can be accessed online at http://www.arcimodelrules.online)

1. Call to Order – Tom Sage, designated by Denny Lee, Esq., Committee Chair and Chair, Nebraska Racing Commission.

2. Minutes from Previous Meeting. (Action Item)

3. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES regarding two-tiered races. (Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)

4. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-030 EQUIPMENT (A) Sulkies to include the use of wheel discs, mud fenders and mud aprons. (Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)

5. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES, D (Recall Rules) by adding additional subsections in regard to starting violations. (Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)

6. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-022-030 Drivers - adding new subsection to require medical clearance for a driver involved in an incident requiring medical attention, whether on or off the track. (Possible Action Item, Language Modification Recommended by Standardbred Committee)

7. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-021-020 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (G) DISTANCE MARKERS (4) with regard to the fair start pole. (Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)

8. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-019-010 Terms by adding new subsection to define the term "extended break." (Possible Action Item)

9. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(1) and (13) Conduct of the Race with regard to driving violations. (Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee – alternate language to be proposed)

10. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J) Conduct of the Race with regard to the substitution of drivers. (Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee – alternate language to be proposed)
11. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-035 RACING RULES by adding new subsection Disorderly Conduct. *(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)*

12. Proposed Amendment: ARCi-024-036 RACING RULES by adding new subsection to include “charging the gate” as a violation. *(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)*

13. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(18) Conduct of the Race in regard to a horse breaking from its gait. *(Possible Action Item)*

14. Proposed Changes to ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (K) Use of the Whip – both USTA Proposal and Standardbred Canada Rule to be considered. *(Discussion and Possible Action Item)*

15. Proposed Amendment: ARCI-022-010 General Provisions (H)(g) in regard to blood alcohol level and testing devices which provide immediate results. *(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)*

16. Question to Modify the Penalty Classification System contained in ARCI-011-020 Medications and Prohibited Substances, Section B (6) – penalty categories. *(Referral by Drug Testing Standards and Practices Committee - Discussion)*

17. Reconsideration of Proposed Amendment to ARCI 006-015 I(1)(3), Stewards’ Records and Reports and J(1) Stewards’ List. *(Discussion – Possible Action Item)*


19. CARRY FORWARD AND DEFERRED TO IFHA/MR HARMONIZATION MEETING: Question to Amend ARCI-010-035 Running of the Race E. (2-4) Interference and Placing to conform with IFHA rule. *(Discussion)*


*(THIS AGENDA HAS BEEN MODIFIED TO REARRANGE THE ORDER OF ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED. The Chair reserves the right to modify this agenda as well as the order in which items will be considered).*
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 2

Minutes from Previous Meeting.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, April 4, 2019 – 2:00pm – 4:30pm.
Embassy Suites, Arcadia, California, USA

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call** – Chairman Lee called the meeting to order at 2:48PM PDT. Roll was called at the following committee members were present: Dennis Lee, Nebraska (Chair); Dan Hartman, Colorado; Tom DiPasquale, Minnesota; Marc Guilfoil, Kentucky; Kelly Cathey, Oklahoma; Tom Sage, Nebraska; Duncan Patterson, Delaware; Charles Gardiner, Louisiana; Mike Hopkins, Maryland; Doug Moore, Washington; David Lermond, Virginia; John Wayne, Delaware; Ed Martin, ARCI President (ex-officio). Also in attendance and participating in the meeting were: Cathy O’Meara, ROAP and The Jockey Club; David Basler, National HBPA; Eric Hammelback, National HBPA; Dr. Dionne Benson, RMTC; Dr. Clara Fenger, NAARV; Dr. Lynn Hovda, Minnesota Racing Commission; Dr. Mary Scollay, Kentucky Horse Racing Commission; Alan Foreman, TRA; Dr. Scott Palmer, NY State Gaming Commission; Mike Tanner, USTA; John Campbell, USTA; and Eric Smith, ARCI.

2. **Minutes from Previous Meeting** – A motion to approve the minutes of the December 2, 2018 committee meeting in Tucson, Arizona as presented was made by Mr. Cathey; second by Mr. Hartman. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Proposed Amendments to Chapter 6** – Flat Racing Officials as proposed by the Racing Officials Accreditation Program and the joint ARCI/ROAP Stewards Advisory Committee. Cathy O’Meara presented the proposals to the committee.

   A) **Amendment to ARCI 006-015 Stewards, Section D Disciplinary Action** – Ms. O’Meara asked that the two proposals in this subsection be addressed separately. The first proposal was to amend ARCI 006-015 D(7) to include the words “written” and “or warning” and to authorize
Stewards to assess Multiple Medication Violation points. Motion to approve by Mr. Patterson; second by Mr. Guilfoil. The motion was approved unanimously. The second proposal in this subsection was to amend ARCI 006-015 D(8) to increase the maximum fine and suspension length that may be imposed by the Stewards. Several members commented that the proposal conflicted with statutory limitations in their states. Mr. Martin reminded the committee that the Model Rules serve as “best practices,” not law, and changes such as these might be useful in attempts to change statutes. Dave Basler commented that the proposed changes vest excessive authority in the Stewards and this is a source for concern because some Stewards have less experience than others. Motion to approve as presented by Mr. Patterson; second by Mr. Guilfoil. The motion was approved 6 to 3, with Mr. Moore, Mr. DiPasquale, and Mr. Cathey voting nay.

B) Amendment to ARCI 006-015 I(1)(3), Stewards’ Records and Reports and J(1) Stewards’ List – Records and Reports; the proposal for subsection I recommended that certain additional information be included in the daily Stewards’ reports and increased the timeframe for such reports to be made publicly available. Mr. Sage questioned the changing of the word “shall” to “should” in the proposed amendment. Stewards’ List; The proposal for subsection J recommended changing the word “entered” to “start” with regards to the eligibility of horses on the Stewards’ List. Mr. Cathey expressed concerns about permitting a horse on a list to be entered. Ms. O’Meara responded that the recommendation was in response to the entry window being significantly longer before the race date than in the past. Mr. Hopkins agreed that it was beneficial to the horsemen and the track to allow additional time to resolve whatever issue caused the horse to be listed as long as the entry did not exclude another horse. Mr. DiPasquale moved that the amendment to I(1) be approved with the amended language of “shall” instead of “should;” second by Mr. Wayne; the motion was approved 8-2 with Mr. Patterson and Mr. Moore voting Nay. Motion to approve the amendment to I(3) by Mr. Hopkins, second by Mr. Sage; the motion was approved unanimously. Chairman Lee proposed that the amendment be studied further before the committee acted. The proposed amendment to 006-015 J(1) died for lack of a motion to adopt.

C) Amendment to ARCI 006-030 – Paddock Judge – clarification of responsibility for saddling a horse; Mr. Patterson spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment citing the number of tracks in some regions
that are running simultaneously which would make the amendment impractical; Mr. Hopkins agreed. The proposal died for lack of a motion to adopt.

D) **Amendment to ARCI 006-050 – Starter** – affects reporting requirement, Starters List, gate card requirement, and assistant starter actions. Motion to adopt the proposed changes to 006-050 A(2)(5)(7) and to create (8) by Mr. Hopkins, second by Mr. Moore; the motion was approved unanimously. Motion to adopt the proposed amendment to 006-050 B by adding a clause (3) and striking the word “gloved” from the proposal, by Mr. Moore, second by Mr. Gardiner; the motion was approved unanimously. Mr. Hopkins moved to table the proposed amendment to 006-050 C “Starter’s List;” there was no objection to the tabling motion. The proposal was tabled.

E) **Amendment to ARCI 006-065 – Placing Judge** – to clarify aspects of calling a “Dead Heat”. Chairman Lee recommended that the proposed changes to 006-065 C(2) be set aside until the summer meeting to provide time for the language to be more clearly constructed. Regarding the proposal to amend 006-065 A, Mr. Hopkins suggested striking the word “passes” and inserting the word “reaches;” Mr. Gardiner moved to approve the proposal with the change suggested by Mr. Hopkins; second by Mr. Moore. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. **Proposed Amendments to ARCI-001-010 Terms and ARCI-008-020 Trainers** proposed by the Racing Medication and Testing Consortium pertaining to access to veterinary records by regulatory veterinarians for the fourteen days prior to a ship ins. Dr Benson presented the proposal for RMTC and stated that the purpose of the proposal was to provide on-site regulatory veterinarians with a comparable degree of oversight for ship-in horses as they have for horses that are stabled at the racing venue. Mr. Basler stated that the proposal is overly broad because it does not define “procedure,” and will lead to less diagnostic work being done. Dr. Fenger voiced concern that this rule would make more medial records available to the public. Dr. Hovda stated that this rule would provide the regulatory veterinarians with the appropriate information to do their jobs. Mr. Hopkins noted that the Mid-Atlantic region adopted this proposal in February. Mr. Moore noted that because the rule does not require the regulatory authority to keep these records, they do not become public records. Motion to approve proposed amendment to 001-010 by Mr. Sage, second by Mr. Hopkins; the motion was
approved unanimously. Regarding the proposed amendment to 008-020, Dr. Benson noted that this is “essentially the action portion” of the definition that was adopted in the previous motion and would give the regulatory veterinarians the authority to request the 14-day records. Ms. O’Meara questioned whether the proposal provided for specific penalty for refusal to provide the 14-day record. Dr. Benson responded that the penalty would be a refusal of entry or a recommendation to scratch. Mr. Hopkins suggested changing the word “shall” to “may” with regards to the possibility of disciplinary action. Mr. Hopkins moved to approve the proposal with the change of “shall” to “may,” second by (UM). The motion was approved unanimously.

5. **Proposed amendment to ARCI-010-030 Horses Ineligible restricting entry by horses treated with bisphosphonate drugs prior to age 4** – Mr. Martin informed the Chair that this proposal was before the committee for discussion purposes rather than action at this time. Mr. Hopkins commented that he believed that, at a minimum, the committee should approve a formal position regarding the proposal. Mr. Patterson agreed. Mr. DiPasquale noted that he believed it would be premature to work on rule language, but he supported the committee adopting a unified position on the issue. Chairman Lee recommended that the committee go “on record” to the ARCI Board in supporting a rule change in this regard as soon as the summer 2019 meetings in Saratoga, and made a motion to that effect. Mr Hopkins suggested an amendment to the motion that the Board be encouraged to adopt a public position to confirm support of the position being taken by the Model Rules Committee. The Chair amended his motion and the motion was seconded by Mr. Hopkins. Dr. Benson commented that while the RMTC is concerned with the use of bisphosphonates in younger horses, she believes this approach is problematic because there are many unknown limitations on the ability to detect such usage and that adopting a rule prohibiting this usage could potentially punish people who had nothing to do with the administration of the substance (through sales). Dr. Scollay expressed concerns that the rule created ineligibility for certain horses without a remedy and this would lead to more unwanted horses; therefore, she believes a ban on the substances is preferable to creating another category of ineligible horses. Mr. Foreman suggested that ARCI adopt the same position as other industry groups such as TRA (a ban on the substances). He also noted that bisphosphonates are already prohibited under current model rules. The Chair called the question on the motion; the motion passed unanimously.
6. Proposed addition to **ARCI-022-015-New Section (G)** affecting standardbred owners’ licenses. Mike Tanner presented the proposal to provide penalties for individuals who are using “beard” trainers (program trainers) on behalf of the USTA. Mr. Martin advised that the ARCI Standardbred Committee supported the proposal and recommended changing certain verbiage to conform to current Model Rules format. Mr. DiPasquale questioned the rationale for the “possible exception” clause in the proposal. John Campbell responded that in some cases, the exception was intended to protect the health coverage of innocent parties. Chairman Lee made a motion to amend the proposal by striking all verbiage after the words “60 days; seconded by Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Tanner said that was agreeable provided the issue could be revisited in the future if problems arise. Mr. Moore moved to adopt as amended; second by Mr. Cathey. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. **Proposed clarification of testosterone threshold contained in ARCI-011-020 I. 3(c)** – Mr. Moore spoke on the proposal noting that it appeared the use of “not less than” was incorrect and should be “not greater than.” Dr. Benson agreed that it appeared to be in error. Motion to amend by Mr. Moore; second by Mr. Lermond. The proposal was approved unanimously.

8. **Proposed amendments to unspecified sections of Chapters 22-24 of the Model Rules affecting Standardbred racing as proposed by the United States Trotting Association** – Mr. Martin advised the committee that these proposals still needed to be reviewed by the ARCI Standardbred Committee and could be brought back to Model Rules at the summer meeting in Saratoga. No committee action was necessary at this time.

   A) Proposed Modifications to the Controlled Therapeutic Schedule affecting Standardbred racing as proposed by the Harness Racing Medication Collaborative. This matter was referred by several Standardbred regulatory agencies and is under review by the ARCI Scientific Advisory Group, Drug Testing Standards and Practices Committee, and Standardbred Racing Committee.

   B) Proposed amendments to unspecified sections of Chapters 22-24 of the Model Rules affecting Standardbred racing as proposed by the United States Trotting Association in an effort to achieve consistency between USTA rulebook and the ARCI Model Harness Rules
9. Next Meeting dates and Adjournment: August 8-9, 2019 – Holiday Inn, Saratoga Springs, New York, USA -- Chairman Lee advised everyone of the next scheduled Model Rules Committee meeting; Mr. Guilfoil made a motion to adjourn; second by (UM); the meeting was adjourned at 4:38PM PDT.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 3

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES regarding two-tiered races. (Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)
RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING RULE

Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:
Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue
Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES regarding two-tiered races.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem
The current rule, when there is more than one trailer, allows drivers in the second tier to choose any post position so long as they do not interfere with another horse or deprive another trailer of a drawn position. This potentially gives a disadvantage to drivers/horses in races with more than one trailer and can cause confusion in choosing a position.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact
Assigning post positions in the second tier is more consistent with international rules of racing and leaves no question as to where a driver/horse will score from the second tier.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

**Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES as follows:**

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES

F. Two-Tiered Races

1. In the event there are two tiers of horses, the withdrawing of a horse that has drawn or earned a position in the front tier shall not affect the positions of horses that have drawn or entered positions in the second tier.

2. Whenever a horse is drawn from any tier, horses on the outside move in to fill the vacancy. Where a horse has drawn a post position in the second tier, the driver of such horse may elect to score out behind any horse in the front tier so long as it does not interfere with another trailing horse or deprive another trailing horse of a drawn position.

3. When there is only one trailer, it may start from any position in the second tier. When there is more than one trailer, they must start from inside any horse with a higher post position.

4. In a race with multiple trailers, the driver of the first horse in the second tier may elect to score out behind the first or second horse in the first tier. The horse drawing the second post in the second tier shall score behind the third or fourth horse in the first tier. The horse drawing the third post in the second tier shall score behind the fifth or sixth horse. Any horse drawing a post position outside those already referenced shall be placed in a consistent manner behind the appropriate horses from the first tier. If there are more trailers than designated post positions in the second tier as described above, the judges shall determine proper starting positions for the second tier horses.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

No.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 4

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-030 EQUIPMENT (A) Sulkies to include the use of wheel discs, mud fenders and mud aprons.

(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)
Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue
   Amend ARCI-024-030 EQUIPMENT (A) Sulkies to include the use of wheel discs, mud fenders and mud aprons.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem
   Currently there is no model rule that addresses wheel discs, mud fenders or mud aprons, the two latter of which ensure the safety of drivers and horses in less than optimal racing conditions.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact
   Amending the current rule will require the use of standardized wheel discs and allow for the use of mud fenders and mud aprons at the discretion of the presiding judge.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

**Amend ARCI-024-030 EQUIPMENT (A) Sulkies as follows:**

ARCI-024-030 EQUIPMENT

A. Sulkies

(1) All racing sulkies must meet the standards as approved by the United States Trotting Association prior to being used in any sanctioned races.

(2) **It shall be the responsibility of the owner, trainer or driver to provide every sulky used in a race with solid one-color or colorless wheel discs on the inside and outside of the wheel. In his or her discretion the presiding judge may order the use properly affixed mud fenders and mud aprons.**

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

**Yes, in regard to wheel discs and mud fenders, see below.**

**New York:**

§ 4116.10. Special equipment.

... A driver shall not drive a sulky not equipped with special equipment as so ordered. Mud fenders must be available and must be used whenever ordered by the presiding judge. Every sulky shall be equipped with wheel discs of a type approved by the commission, which shall be of a solid color or transparent; no stripes or designs upon wheel discs shall be permitted.

**Pennsylvania:**

§ 183.299. Wheel discs and guards.

It shall be the responsibility of the owner and trainer to provide every sulky used in a race with unicolored or colorless wheel discs on the inside and outside of each wheel of a type approved by the Commission. In his discretion, the Presiding Judge may order the use of mud guards.

**New Jersey:**

§ 13:71-29.1 Standardbred sulky standards

(c) Wheel discs shall be either unicolored or colorless.

(i) The mud fenders shall be easily attached to the sulky in such a manner as to make them totally secure to the sulky.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

**None.**
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 5

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES, D (Recall Rules) by adding additional subsections in regard to starting violations.

(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)
Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners  
International 1510 Newtown Pike,  
Suite 210  
Lexington, KY  
40511 Phone:  
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue  
Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES, D (Recall Rules) by adding additional subsections in regard to starting violations.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem  
No model rule currently exists to address a driver keeping one line in each hand after the start or basing a fine or suspension of the current Recall Rules on advertised purse amount.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact  
Adding these modifications will allow the starter and/or judges to fine a driver for failure to keep one line in each hand after the start and to increase the fine amount or days of suspension based on advertised purse amount (i.e. an increased fine or suspension for higher purses may deter violations).
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

**Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.**

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

*Add new section to ARCI-024-035 RACING RULES:*

**ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES**

**D. Recall Rules**

(8) A fine and/or suspension may be applied to any driver by the starter and/or judges for:

- (a) delaying the start;
- (b) failure to obey the starter's instructions;
- (c) rushing ahead of the inside or outside wing of the gate;
- (d) coming to the starting gate out of position;
- (e) crossing over before reaching the starting point;
- (f) interference with another horse or driver during the start; or
- (g) failure to come up into position and remain in position.

(h) **after coming to the gate, failure to keep one line in each hand until the word “go,” except for the purpose of adjusting equipment.**

(i) A hearing must be granted or waived before any penalty is imposed. A fine or suspension as a result of any of the above may be increased based upon the advertised purse amount, or if the violation is deemed to have been committed in order to aid another horse with common ownership or a common trainer.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

No.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

---

**FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.**
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 6

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-022-030 Drivers - adding new subsection to require medical clearance for a driver involved in an incident requiring medical attention, whether on or off the track.

(Possible Action Item, Language Modification Recommended by Standardbred Committee)
RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING RULE

Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:
Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

Name: TC Lane
Organization: USTA
Address: 6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081
Phone(s): 614.224.2291
Fax #: 844.229.1338
E-mail Address: Tc.lane@ustrotting.com

A. Brief Description of the Issue
Amend ARCI-022-030 Drivers by adding new subsection to require medical clearance for a driver involved in an incident requiring medical attention, whether on or off the track.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem
The safety of all drivers and horses is of utmost concern. Therefore, should a driver be involved in any type of incident that requires medical attention, whether is it be on or off the track, medical clearance from a medical professional should be required to confirm that he/she may resume his/her duties as a driver.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact
The solution is to require medical clearance to ensure the driver is capable of driving.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Add new subsection to ARCI-022-030 DRIVERS:

ARCI-022-030 DRIVERS
(9) In the event a driver is involved in an incident on or off the track that requires medical attention, the driver must provide medical clearance from a medical professional or an on-track emergency medical technician (EMT) stating that he/she can resume his/her duties.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.
No.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

The ARCI model rule below currently exists; the USTA proposed language would be in addition:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race
(21) If, during the preliminary scores or during a race a driver is unseated in such a manner that he or she falls to the ground, the judges may direct the driver to report to the infirmary or to the emergency department of the nearest hospital for examination and receive written clearance to continue with driving assignments on that day of racing.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 7

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-021-020 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (G) DISTANCE MARKERS (4) with regard to the fair start pole.

(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee)
Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue
   Amend ARCI-021-020 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (G) DISTANCE MARKERS (4) in regard to the fair start pole.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem
   The current model rule states that fair start pole shall be located 320 feet before the starting point, which does not agree with current individual Racing Commission rules.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact
   By changing the verbiage of the model rule, judges/racing commissions may decide individually where the fair start pole should be located, based on specific track size, ability to see the pole and other extenuating circumstances.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Amend ARCI-021-020 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (G) DISTANCE MARKERS (4) as follows:

(4) The fair start pole shall be located 320 feet before the starting point erected at a point before the start that is clearly identifiable. If a horse has not reached the fair start pole when the horses are released at the starting point by the starter, the judges shall cause the inquiry sign to be displayed immediately and shall request the horse be refunded.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

Yes, see below.

Indiana:
71 IAC 7-2-3.5 Fair start pole Authority: IC 4-31-3-9 Affected: IC 4-31 Sec. 3.5.
   (a) There shall be a pole erected two hundred eighty (280) feet in front of the starting pole.
   (b) The pole must:
      (1) have written on it "FAIR START POLE"; and
      (2) be approved by the executive director or judges.
   (c) If a horse does not reach the fair start pole before the field is released at the start, the judges shall display the “inquiry” sign immediately.
   (d) Any horse not reaching the fair start pole before the starter releases the horses at the starting pole shall be declared a nonstarter for wagering purposes. All monies wagered on that horse shall be refunded.
   (e) All drivers must make a reasonable effort to reach the fair start pole.
   (f) Any horse which fails to reach the fair start pole more than one (1) time in a calendar year may be placed on the qualifying list.

New York:
§ 4115.5 (j)
(j) At a point on the track designated by the commission a post shall be erected (“recall post”).

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 8

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-019-010 Terms by adding new subsection to define the term “extended break.”

(Possible Action Item)
RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING RULE

Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue

*A mend ARCI-019-010 Terms by adding new subsection to define the term “extended break.”*

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

*Continually, the distance a horse travels while on a break is questioned. This proposal provides a guide for both racing officials and the betting public to define “extended break.” No current ARCI model rule currently addresses an “extended break.”*

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

*As no current model rule addresses an “extended break,” adding this definition will add uniformity in charted results.*
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Add new subsection to ARCI-019-010 Terms:

Extended Break — An extended break shall be defined as a horse that is not on its proper gait for 25 consecutive strides or more.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.
   No.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.
   None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 9

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(1) and (13) Conduct of the Race with regard to driving violations.

(Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee – alternate language to be proposed at Model Rules meeting.)
A. Brief Description of the Issue

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(1) and (13) Conduct of the Race in regard to driving violations.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

The current rule is outdated and does not cover certain driving violations such as kicking and removing a foot from the stirrup or foot support to not only pull ear plugs, but also to adjust equipment. In addition, the current rule does not address suspensions from driving that may carry over to another race meet (i.e. with the current rule, driving suspensions may be taken while the specific racetrack is not racing).

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

Amending the current rule to add more specific and updated violations will allow racing officials to better enforce rules and will allow driving suspensions to be served, if applicable, during an actual race meet at the same racetrack.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(1) and (13) Conduct of the Race as follows:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race

(1) A leading horse is not to be more than four feet from the inside rail/pylons except after selecting his position in the home stretch. Neither the driver of the first horse nor any other a driver in the race shall not commit any of the following acts which are considered violations of driving rules:

a. Change course or position, or swerve in or out, or bear in or out during any part of the race in such a manner as to compel a horse to shorten its stride or cause another driver to change course, take his or her horse back, or pull his/her horse out of its stride.

b. Impede the progress of another horse or cause it to break from its gait.

c. Cross over too-sharply in front of another horse or in front of the a field of horses in a reckless manner endangering other drivers.

d. Crowd another horse or driver by 'putting a wheel under it.'

e. Allow another horse to pass needlessly on the inside or otherwise commit any other act that helps another horse to improve its position in the race by opening up a hole without then promptly pulling to re-pass the horse, unless the failure to re-pass is necessitated by safety reasons.

f. Carry another horse out.

g. Take up or slow up abruptly in front of other horses so as to cause confusion or interference among the trailing horses.

h. Maintain an outside position without making the necessary effort to improve his/her overall position.

i. Jostle, strike or hook wheels, or physically interfere with another sulky horse or driver, or otherwise drive in a careless manner or fail to maintain reasonable control of the horse at all times during the race. For any violation that results in contact with another horse, driver or bike, the driver shall receive a minimum driving suspension of three days.

j. Lay off a normal pace and leave a hole when it is well within the horse's capacity to keep the hole closed.

k. Drive in a careless or reckless manner.

l. Swerve in and out or pull up quickly, unless such action is taken for the safety or welfare of the horse or driver.

m. Change course after selecting a position in the home stretch or swerve in and out or bear in and out in such a manner as to interfere with another horse or cause him to change course or take back.

n. Kicking shall be defined as a blow or thrust with the foot against any part of the horse’s body or to impel by striking with the foot at any time on the racetrack, including before, during or after the race. Removal of a foot from the stirrups or any foot supports in and of itself shall
not constitute the offense of kicking. The penalty for kicking as defined herein shall not be less than nine days suspension.

(o) Cross the inside limits of the course.

(p) Turn the horse abruptly after the finish line of the race in order to return to the paddock or barn area.

(q) Fail to set, maintain or properly contest a pace comparable to the class in which the driver is racing considering the horse's ability, track conditions, weather and circumstances confronted in the race.

(r) If any violation of the above occurs during a meeting and results in a suspension from driving, the suspension must be served by the driver during that meeting unless the appeal process carries beyond the end of the meeting, in which event the suspension must be served during the same time of year that a subsequent meeting is being conducted at that race track.

(13) Drivers shall keep both feet in the stirrups during the post parade and from the time the horses are brought to the starting gate until the race has been completed. Drivers shall be permitted to remove a foot from the stirrups or any foot supports temporarily during the course of the race solely for the purpose of pulling ear plugs or to adjust equipment and once same have been pulled the foot must be placed back into the stirrup. Drivers who violate this rule may be subject to disciplinary action.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

Yes, all Racing Commissions have driving violation rules in place – the amendment of the current model rule would, in theory, would create more uniformity across commissions.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 10

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J) Conduct of the Race with regard to the substitution of drivers.

(Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee – alternate language to be proposed)
A. Brief Description of the Issue

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J) Conduct of the Race in regard to the substitution of drivers.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

Currently, drivers may be substituted in a race if in the opinion of the judges he/she is unfit to drive or if his/her behavior is reckless or he/she endangers the safety of other horses or drivers in the race. However, the rule does not state the skill level of driver that shall be used as the substitute, therefore possibly affecting multi-race wagers when a less experienced driver is used as the substitute.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

Simply adding “comparable” to the rule will attempt to replace an unfit driver with similar skill set for multi-race wagers.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J) as follows:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race
(10) If, in the opinion of the judges, a driver is for any reason unfit or incompetent to drive, or is reckless in his/her conduct and endangers the safety of horses or other drivers in a race, he/she shall be removed and another comparable driver substituted at any time after the positions have been assigned in a race, and the offending driver may be subject to disciplinary action. The substitute driver shall be properly compensated.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

No.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(1) and (13) Conduct of the Race as follows:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race
(1) A leading horse is not to be more than four feet from the inside rail/pylons except after selecting his position in the home stretch. Neither the driver of the first horse nor any other a-driver in the race shall not commit any of the following acts which are considered violations of driving rules:

* * *

(n) Kicking shall be defined as a blow or thrust with the foot against any part of the horse’s body or to impel by striking with the foot at any time on the racetrack, including before, during or after the race. Kicking shall include positioning the foot in a manner in which it is allowed to come into contact with the horse. Removal of a foot from the stirrups or any foot supports in and of itself shall not constitute the offense of kicking. The penalty for kicking as defined herein shall not be less than nine days suspension.

* * *

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J) as follows:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race
(10) If, in the opinion of the judges, a driver is for any reason unfit or incompetent to drive, or is reckless in his/her conduct and endangers the safety of horses or other drivers in a race, he/she shall be removed and the judges shall endeavor to substitute another comparable driver substituted at any time after the positions have been assigned in a race, and the offending driver may be subject to disciplinary action. The substitute driver shall be properly compensated.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 11

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-035 RACING RULES by adding new subsection Disorderly Conduct.

(Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee.)
RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING RULE

Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:
Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue
Amend ARCI-024-035 RACING RULES by adding new subsection Disorderly Conduct.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem
No model rule currently exists to address Disorderly Conduct by a driver or trainer.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact
Adding this rule will allow judges to fine, suspend or revoke a license of a driver or trainer for behavior that is not in favor of the integrity of racing.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Add new section to ARCI-024-035 RACING RULES:

ARCI-024-035 RACING RULES
Disorderly Conduct
The following shall constitute disorderly conduct and be reason for a fine, suspension or revocation of a driver’s or trainer’s license:

(1) Failure to obey judge’s orders that are expressly authorized by the rules
(2) Failure to drive when programmed unless excused by the judges
(3) Appearing in the paddock in an unfit condition to drive
(4) Fighting
(5) Assaults
(6) Offensive and profane language
(7) Smoking on the racetrack in driving colors during actual racing hours
(8) Warming up a horse prior to a race without driving colors
(9) Disturbing the peace
(10) Refusal to take a breath analyzer test and/or any recognized test relative that shall produce immediate results or upon probable cause submit a body fluid sample when directed by the presiding judge
(11) Failure to participate in the post parade at the prescribed time unless excused by the judges

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

Yes – Pennsylvania, see below.

§ 183.255. Suspension or revocation of drivers’, trainers’ or grooms’ license.
The license of any driver, trainer or groom may be suspended, revoked or a money fine may be imposed, at any time for:
(1) Failure to obey the instructions of a racing official.
(2) Failure to drive in a race when programmed, unless excused by the presiding judge.
(3) Consumption of intoxicating beverages within 4 hours of the first post time of the program on which he is carded to drive.
(4) Appearing in the paddock in an unfit condition to perform his duties.
(5) Fighting.
(6) Assault upon any other person.
(7) Offensive or profane language.
(8) Smoking while on the race track in silks and during actual racing hours.
(9) Warming up a horse without silks at any time after the admission gates are open.
(10) Disturbing the peace.
(11) Refusal to take a breath analyzer test.
(12) Refusal, when requested by the Commission to submit evidence of physical and mental ability or to submit to a physical examination, or both.
(13) Failure to participate in post parade, unless specifically excused by presiding judge.
(14) Any other act or conduct detrimental to the sport.
(15) Violation of any rule of the Commission.
(16) Falsifying or misrepresenting answers on the application for license.
(17) Failure to name a driver at the properly prescribed time of the race meet.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 12

Proposed Amendment: ARCi-024-036 RACING RULES by adding new subsection to include “charging the gate” as a violation.

(Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee.)
Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES by adding new subsection to include “charging the gate” as a violation.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

At times, drivers will intentionally lay off the starting gate only to “charge” it near the start to attempt to gain an advantage. “Charging the gate” gives an unfair advantage to a horse by giving it more momentum at the start of the race. There is currently no repercussion for this violation.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

By allowing the judges to determine if a horse/driver gained an unfair advantage by charging the gate, they may fine or suspend (or both) a driver to discourage future instances.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Add new subsection to ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
C. Starting
(7) Subject to the age, experience and post position of the horse and the condition of the racetrack, each horse in the first tier shall approach the starting gate reasonably in concert with the other horses in the field and shall be on the gate at the start. If the judges deem that a driver has intentionally laid off the gate and then charged it near the start in order to gain an advantage at the start, the driver shall be fined or suspended or both.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

No.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 13

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(18) Conduct of the Race in regard to a horse breaking from its gait.

(Possible Action Item referred by Standardbred Committee.)
RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE

PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING RULE

Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(18) Conduct of the Race in regard to a horse breaking from its gait.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

The current rule only addresses allowing a driver to take a horse to the inside, if necessary, while on a break; it does not allow for the fact that taking a horse to the inside may be a safer option. In addition, the rule does not include a violation for an extended break or failure to continuously lose ground while on a break. Furthermore, the current rule does not give adequate direction to racing officials regarding placing/not placing a horse due to interference caused by a lapped-on break.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

Amending the current rule will provide racing officials with a better guideline on placings due to horses breaking from their specific gait or while on an extended break.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (J)(18) Conduct of the Race as follows:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race
(18) When a horse breaks from its gait, it shall be considered a violation on the part of the driver for:
(a) Failure to take the horse to the inside or outside of other horses when clearance exists.
(b) Failure to properly attempt to pull the horse to its gait.
(c) Failure to continuously lose ground while on a break.
(d) Committing an extended break, in which the horse may be placed last.
(e) If there has been no violation of (a), (b), (c), or (d) above, the horse shall not be set back unless a contending horse on its gait is lapped on the hind quarter of the breaking horse at the finish. However, notwithstanding the foregoing, if interference caused by another driver or horse has caused the horse to be on a break at the finish, the judges may, in their discretion, determine not to set the horse back even if a contending horse on its gait is lapped on the hind quarter of the breaking horse at the finish. The judges may set any horse back one or more places if, in their judgment, any of the above violations has been committed and the driver may be subject to a fine or suspension or both.
(d) If no violation has been committed, the horse shall not be set back unless a contending horse on his/her gait is lapped on the hindquarter of the breaking horse at the finish. The judges may set any horse back one or more places if, in their judgment, any of the above violations have been committed, and the driver may be penalized.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

Yes, all Racing Commissions have rules in place in regard to breaking violations, however the amendment of the current model rule would provide for more uniformity across commissions.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARantee YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
J. Conduct of the Race
(18) When a horse breaks from its gait, it shall be considered a violation on the part of the driver for:
(a) Failure to take the horse to the inside or outside of other horses when clearance exists.

PROPOSE TO CHANGE To

Failure to take the horse to the outside of other horses when clearance exists.
However, if there is no clearance on the outside, then a driver may take to the inside when clearance exists.

Reason: Inside, means inside the pylons.
Inside the pylons is off the track.
The horse won’t be going the whole mile then.
It should be a last resort, for safety reasons, to go inside.

Also kicking needs to be defined to include more,
and a range of penalties for initial and repeat offenders needs to be discussed.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 14

Proposed Changes to ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (K) Use of the Whip – various versions to be considered.

(Discussion and Possible Action Item)
Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners
International 1510 Newtown Pike,
Suite 210
Lexington, KY
40511 Phone:
859/224-7070

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue
   Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (K) Use of the Whip to address whip color and the use of a snapper.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem
   The current model rule does not designate that a certain color whip may or may not be used. In addition, the rule states that a snapper is prohibited, which is not consistent with both USTA and various Racing Commission rules.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact
   Black whips, in comparison to white or lighter colored whips, draw less attention to whatever urging is being done through the stretch by the driver. In addition, some horses may “shy away” from white or lighter colored whips causing safety issues if a horse would go offstride. Adding the permission of a snapper no longer than 6 inches conforms to USTA and Racing Commission rules (see F below).
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Amend ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES (K) as follows:

ARCI-024-036 RACING RULES
K. Use of the Whip
   (1) In any/all Standardbred races, drivers will be allowed only black whips not to exceed four (4) feet in total length, plus a snapper not longer than (6) inches.
   (2) A snapper (popper) of any kind is prohibited.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

Yes, in regards to the use of a snapper, see below.

Pennsylvania:
§ 183.288. Whips.
Drivers will be allowed whips not to exceed 4 feet, 8 inches, plus a snapper not longer than 8 inches.

New York:
§ 4117.8. Whips, goads and head poles. (a) Drivers may carry a whip that shall not exceed three feet nine inches in length plus a snapper no longer than six inches.

New Jersey:
§ 13:71-20.14 Whips
Drivers will be allowed whips not to exceed four feet, eight inches, plus a snapper not longer than eight inches.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
Last Sunday afternoon the Quebec Jockey Club hosted opening day for the harness racing season in Quebec at the Hippodrome 3R racetrack. Mother Nature cooperated with beautiful sunny skies, dry and warming temperatures.

Despite some last-minute fudging, the new whipping rules were adhered to without a hitch. In fact, driver Stephane Gendron seemed to make fun of the new rule as he drove five winners during the afternoon program and barely lifted his whip in all five victories.

Designed by management at the Quebec Jockey Club (QJC) and agreed with by the local horsepeople, the new whipping rules call for drivers to keep both hands in the handholds at all times. Drivers must limit the use of the whip at all times while on the racetrack.

Drivers can never reach back to whip a horse. All whipping movement must be done from the wrist. The forearm must remain must be parallel to the track when the whip is used.

These rules were presented to the Quebec Racing Commission, who oversees the judges that work at the track. They came back and said they could not administer them and that the QJC could not, on their own, come up with and administer penalties on horsepeople.

“We were so excited about having the new rules in place,” said Murielle Thomassin, the general manager of racing at Hippodrome 3R. “We wanted everything in place for opening day and now this problem. Luckily, we were able to circumvent the situation and have the new rules in place and also be in compliance with the Quebec Racing Commission.”

The QJC saw that the Quebec Government rules towards animal abuse fell in line with the new whipping rules they had designed and that they could still have the new rules put in place and not supersede the Quebec Racing Commission’s jurisdiction.

“It took quite a bit of work,” Thomassin explained. “Including getting every single driver competing in the races last Sunday to sign off on a document that they totally understood and would abide by the new whipping conditions. Every driver signed off on them. “The Quebec Government rules for animal abuse are much more severe than that of the Quebec Racing Commission,” Thomassin added. “Now, if a race fan or a racetrack manager wishes to file an animal abuse charge against one of the drivers for improper use of the whip, the government in Quebec will launch an investigation and if found guilty, that horseman will
face a criminal charge and the fines that go with it, not just a fine or suspension from the judges.”

Every driver that now competes at the Hippodrome 3R must sign the agreement in order to drive.

“The important issue here is being in compliance with both the Quebec Government rules and the Quebec Racing Commission,” said Thomassin. “We had thousands of race fans come out last Sunday for opening day, they watched and wagered on our ten races and enjoyed a great return of live racing in Quebec. There were no issues with excessive use of the whip by our drivers. Our horsemen agreed to the new rules and we should be fine moving forward.”

(Quebec Jockey Club)
May 30, 2019


Preamble

WHEREAS after meeting with industry stakeholders and responding to requests to consider revising the current rules and Directives with respect to urging and specifically that use of the whip be limited to wrist action only;

AND WHEREAS this rule will enhance the health and safety of horses and participants, and the integrity of racing;

AND WHEREAS enforcement of the revisions will commence at Woodbine Mohawk Park, the revisions will be phased in across all Standardbred racetracks in Ontario at dates to be determined;

TAKE NOTICE that the Registrar rescinds Policy Directive No. 5-2009: Penalty Guidelines for Inappropriate Urging of a Horse in Standardbred Racing and hereby orders the Rules of Standardbred Racing be amended commencing June 3, 2019:

Chapter 22
Racing Rules

22.23.03 At any time while on the grounds of an Association, it is a violation of the Rules for a driver, or the person in control of the horse, to use the whip to hit or make contact with the horse as follows:
(a) To raise their hand(s) above their head;
(b) To cause the whip to move back beyond a 90-degree angle relative to the track use more than acceptable wrist action;
(c) To cause any portion of the whip to be outside the confines of the wheels of the race bike;
(d) To strike the shaft of the race bike, or the horse below the level of the shaft of the race bike;
(e) To cut or severely welt a horse.
**PENALTY GUIDELINES RULE 22.23**

Any violation of Rule 22.23, to include subsections 22.23.01, 22.23.02, 22.23.03 and 22.23.04 is a violation and covered by this penalty structure.

**VIOLATION – Inappropriate urging of the horse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Mandatory meeting with the Judges for the purposes of providing training on the Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd violation within one year of the 1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Mandatory meeting with the Judges for the purposes of providing training on the Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd violation within one year of the 1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Mandatory meeting with the Judges for the purposes of providing training on the Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th violation within one year of the 1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>Immediate Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Referral to the Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIOLATION – Cutting or Welting the horse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Mandatory meeting with the Judges for the purposes of providing training on the Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd violation within one year of the 1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Mandatory meeting with the Judges for the purposes of providing training on the Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd violation within one year of the 1st violation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Driving Suspension</td>
<td>Immediate suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Penalty</td>
<td>Referral to the Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Races with a purse of $100,000 and over

For any violation that takes place in a race where the purse is $100,000 or more, the penalty shall be a minimum fine of 20% of the driver's earnings for placings 1st through 5th and shall be a minimum fine equivalent to 20% of the driver's earnings for 5th place for placings 6th and on. If in the opinion of the Judges, the violation was egregious, a driving suspension may be issued. While discretion is available to the Judges, the driving suspension should be calculated at 1 day driving suspension for each $200,000 of total purse money for the race.
For a violation where a driver has driven with both lines in one hand and struck the horse with the whip, the Judges shall place the horse last.

Placing of a horse may be considered by the Judges where the misuse of the whip caused interference with another horse or, in the opinion of the Judges, there has been a flagrant disregard for these rules.

Application of the Guidelines will take into consideration the following:

1. This penalty structure provides guidance to Judges as to minimum penalties for inappropriate urging of the horse, and for the cutting and wetting of a horse.
2. The penalty for any subsequent violation cannot be less than the previous violation, regardless of whether the violation is for inappropriate urging of the horse or for cutting and wetting of a horse.
3. Any cut or wet violation shall be counted and considered by the Judges as the next violation for inappropriate urging on a cumulative basis.
4. The penalty structure is progressive in nature, irrespective of which of the encompassed rules are violated.
5. In determining whether a violation of the Rules has occurred or in assessing penalty, Judges may consider mitigating factors in exceptional circumstances. An example of conduct that may be viewed as a mitigating consideration would be striking a horse to prevent inevitable harm to another driver, horse, participant or patron.
6. In assessing penalty, Judges may also consider aggravating factors, such as the licensee's history of violations pertaining to inappropriate urging of the horse (which violation/s occurred more than a year before the subject violation).
7. If the violation is sufficiently egregious, the Judges may depart from the penalty structure and impose higher penalties than those enumerated in the chart above.

DESCRIPTION OF TERMS

This Policy was established to provide more description of what constitutes a violation under the Rules regarding inappropriate urging of the horse in Ontario racing:

Indiscriminate action means unrestrained or careless activity without regard for safety or care.

For the purposes of Rule 22.23.01 (a), the following are examples of indiscriminate action but do not constitute an exhaustive list:
   a. Use of the whip in any manner between the hind legs of the horse
   b. Loose lining or driving the horse so as to not have control of the horse
   c. Kicking the horse
   d. Striking the horse with the butt end of the whip;
   e. Punching the horse; or
   f. Any use other than acceptable wrist action.
Excessive action means unreasonable quantity or degree. For the purposes of Rule 22.23.01 (b), the following are examples of excessive action with respect to inappropriate urging of the horse but does not constitute an exhaustive list:

a. Use of the whip when a horse is not in contention in a race;
b. Use of the whip without giving the horse time to respond to a previous application of the use of the whip;
c. Use of the whip on the horse anywhere below the level of the shaft of the race bike.

Aggressive action means inhumane, severe or brutal activity. For the purposes of Rule 22.23.01 (c), the following are examples of aggressive action but do not constitute an exhaustive list:

a. Use of the whip on the head or in the area surrounding the head of the horse.
b. Use of any object or stimulating device and/or application; or

c. Leaving any cuts, abrasions or severe welts on the horse caused by the whip;

Loose lining means the indiscriminate action of carelessly lengthening the lines while driving so as to allow the loopy shaking of the lines (i.e. butterfly action).

Meaningful Position (22.23.02) means the horse has a reasonable opportunity to finish in an advantageous position. Examples of meaningful include, but are not limited to, maintaining qualifying times, receiving points towards future races or earning purse monies.

Confines of the wheels (22.23.03c) means that any part of the whip cannot move outside of a line which runs parallel to the horse from a point prescribed by the outside of the race bike wheel.

BACKGROUND

Under a process established by the Executive Director in the fall of 2008 to gather industry input on the appropriate use of the whip in horse racing, it was recognized that the use of the whip is a necessary tool in racing.

The following principles were agreed to and serve as a guide for all decision making on rule development:

1. **Ensure the welfare of the horse**
   The welfare of the horse is paramount and guides decision making in all matters

2. **Promote safety for racing participants (including the horse)**
   Where the safety of racing participants has been compromised, appropriate action shall be taken

3. **Create simple, clear and consistent rules (and enforcement)**
   To be adhered to or enforced correctly, rules must be written and communicated in a straightforward manner.

4. **Address customer/public perception and education**
   Shifting public sensitivity on the use of the whip in horseracing must be recognized by all industry participants, who must also do their part in educating new fans about the sport.

5. **Support growth of the customer base**
Racetrack management has identified use of the whip as a barrier to increased customer growth. Participants must be involved, as our industry builds to creating a more desirable product.

The outcome of the industry discussion has led to the formation of rules regarding the appropriate methods for urging a horse in racing and changes to driving styles to require a hand in each line for the entire race.

**Loose lining:** It was stressed by the participants that this change to driving style should not lead to the practice of "loose lining", which means the indiscriminate action of carelessly lengthening the lines while driving so as to allow the loopy shaking of the lines (butterfly action). It was agreed that these would be the type of actions counter to the intent of the rule changes and would present an undesirable product to the wagering public.

**BY ORDER OF THE REGISTRAR**

Jean Major
Registrar
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 15

Proposed Amendment: ARCI-022-010 General Provisions (H)(g) in regard to blood alcohol level and testing devices which provide immediate results.

(Possible Action Item Recommended by Standardbred Committee - subsequent comments received from NY.)
# RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
## PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING RULE

Please submit this petition via email to rules@arci.com. Submissions received within 45 days of the next committee meeting will only be considered at that meeting at the discretion of the President or Chair of the Model Rules Committee. Printed petitions should be sent to:

Racing Commissioners  
International 1510 Newtown Pike,  
Suite 210  
Lexington, KY  
40511  
Phone: 859/224-7070

### Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>TC Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>USTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>6130 South Sunbury Rd, Westerville, Ohio 43081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s)</td>
<td>614.224.2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #</td>
<td>844.229.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tc.lane@ustrotting.com">Tc.lane@ustrotting.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Brief Description of the Issue

*Amend ARCI-022-010 General Provisions (H)(g) in regard to blood alcohol level and testing devices which provide immediate results.*

### B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

*The current model rule calls for a breath analyzer to test the blood alcohol level, however the industry has now moved to include other testing devices that produce immediate results. In addition, we suggest that the level of alcohol be no more than .00%.*

### C. Possible Solutions and Impact

*Safety is the main focus of this recommendation; the industry would like to see zero tolerance for alcohol or any drug as shown by a testing procedure that produces immediate results.*
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

Supported by the USTA Board of Directors, comprised of 60 individuals actively involved in the harness racing industry. No known opposition.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

Amend ARCI-024-035 GENERAL PROVISION (H)(g) as follows:

ARCI-024-035 General Provisions
H. Substance Abuse/Addiction
The personal use of any illegal drug, any medication that may detrimentally impact performance, or any unapproved stimulant, depressant, narcotic, or hypnotic is prohibited.

(g) Presently has drugs (controlled substances) or alcohol in his or her body. With regard to alcohol, every track shall be equipped with a breath analyzer device and/or any recognized test relative that shall produce immediate results. If the results of a breathalyzer such test showing a reading of more than .05 .00% percent of alcohol in the blood, that shall be the criterion for a finding of alcohol present in the body. With regard to other controlled substances, presence of the drug in any quantity measured by the testing instrument establishes the presence of the drug for purposes of this paragraph.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

Yes, all racing commissions require the alcohol/drug testing prior to participation in racing.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

None.

FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.
(g) Presently has drugs (controlled substances) or alcohol in his or her body. With regard to alcohol, every track shall be equipped with a breath analyzer device and/or any recognized test relative that shall produce immediate results. If the results of such test show a reading of more that .00% of alcohol in the blood, that shall be the criterion for a finding of alcohol present in the body. With regard to other controlled substances, presence of the drug in any quantity measured by the testing instrument establishes the presence of the drug for purposes of this paragraph.

Ed, the new proposal is a good start, but I would leave it at .05, with the following addition, if there is a measurement of less than .05%, but greater than .00% of alcohol in the blood, then the Presiding Judge shall order further testing of the racing participant and then decide if the participant should continue or be scratched and penalized.

Reason: Mouthwash or cold medicine can blow numbers.
When working as a judge I saw it.
A group of drivers ate at the same restaurant as the judges did before the races, different, nearby tables.
None of horsemen or officials were drinking.
The driver said he used a mouthwash after eating.
He answered questions and gave a statement, and the investigator said he was fine.
After a half an hour he took the breath analyzer test again, and this time passed.
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 16

Question to Modify the Penalty Classification System contained in ARCI-011-020 Medications and Prohibited Substances, Section B (6) – penalty categories.

(Referral by Drug Testing Standards and Practices Committee - Public Discussion Item)
TO: ARCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
FROM: Ed Martin, ARCI President
DATE: JULY 17, 2019
RE: Project to Restructure the ARCI Penalty Guidelines

**Background:**

In August, 2017, the RCI Board tasked the DTSP Committee with performing a review of the current penalty guidelines and structure with an eye toward differentiating between violations that could clearly be called “doping” or “equine endangerment” from those that were overages of therapeutic medications with less of an impact on performance by virtual of being classified as a Class 4 or 5 drug.

Following that meeting an online survey was conducted of DTSP Committee members and a similar survey was conducted of interested industry contacts. A conference call was held to discuss the project and a smaller group provided subsequent input.

Recognizing that the task was a potentially enormous undertaking, Committee Chair Patterson asked Dan Hartman to lead a Task Force to flesh out what a new penalty guideline system might look like. The Task Force was deliberately formed with individuals not burdened by other industry projects associated with the RCI or other organizations, but who possessed the level expertise necessary to do the legwork necessary to bring a concept forward.

The following individuals were appointed to the Working Group and literally spent countless hours discussing almost every substance contained on the RCI Classification Document. The expertise was balanced to ensure veterinary participation, horseman participation, track operator experience, and regulatory enforcement experience.

The ARCI is especially grateful for the volunteer efforts of:

- Dr. Kathy Anderson, DVM - past AAEP President;
- Dr. Charles Vail, DVM - past AAEP President, former Colorado Racing Commissioner;
- Mr. John Ward - former regulator and lifelong horseman;
- Rick Baedeker - former track operator and current regulator;
- Mike Hopkins - former horseman and lifelong regulator, and;
- Dan Hartman - regulator and workgroup coordinator.

In early 2018, the project could not proceed without guidance from the RCI Board as the members of the DTSP committee were split on a significant question affecting the outcome. Should the ARCI keep the present penalty guideline structure and adjust the recommended...
penalties within it, or create a bifurcated structure, separating “Doping and Equine Endangerment” Violations from “Treatment Misapplication & Mismanagement” violations as had been originally discussed.

The Board voted unanimously for the later.

**Current Status:**

The ARCI Drug Testing Standards and Practices Committee voted to issue this proposal for public input at its meeting on April 4, 2019. The committee reserved action pending comments from the industry and public.

On April 20, 2019, a press release was issued seeking comment from the public and industry organizations.

The DTSP committee will meet via conference call prior to the Model Rules Committee meeting. Any recommendations will be presented at the Model Rules Committee meeting and public input is anticipated.

**Workgroup Proposal:**

The Workgroup has generated a DRAFT for a new Classification document indicating the recommended penalties for each type of violation: “Doping and Equine Endangerment” and the existing violations which would be termed. The working draft can be downloaded here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rtaiT7YmgMhV7xkDlfZfKSyAMDBzkzgF/view?usp=sharing

Please note that it is the recommendation of the WorkGroup that a drug finding not be elevated into the Equine Endangerment category for a penalty without a recommendation to do so from the Regulatory Veterinarian or Equine Medical Director. The workgroup did not feel that a Steward or other non-veterinary personnel would be qualified to assess whether the substance found or the amount found would pose a potential threat to the health and well being of the horse.

The Workgroup recommends keeping the existing penalty guidelines in place for the less harmful overages of therapeutic medications that do not rise to a level to be considered “Doping”. As such they have not recommended penalty changes to the existing penalty document.

The Workgroup recommends more stringent penalties than now exist for violations that can be considered doping by virtue of the substance itself, or equine endangerment by virtue of the substance or the amount and potential health risk to the horse. This proposed maitrix can be accessed here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RnoaRh8DqUSsyQfzoiehAbSYPQfJuhEF/view?usp=sharing
A SUMMARY SUSPENSION SHOULD BE IMPOSED FOR ALL CATEGORIES WHERE A DOPING OR ENDANGERMENT VIOLATION IS CHARGED. The following are recommended penalties for Doping or Equine Endangerment Violations carrying a Category “A” penalty and for violations of ARCI-011-015: Prohibited Practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSED TRAINER:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st offense</strong></td>
<td>2nd LIFETIME offense in any jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Minimum <strong>two-year</strong> suspension absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of a <strong>five-year</strong> suspension. AND ◦ Revocation of license with no reapplication permitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of <strong>$50,000</strong> plus share of purse absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of <strong>$100,000</strong> and share of purse. AND ◦ Minimum fine of <strong>$100,000</strong> plus share of purse. AND ◦ May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSED OWNER:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st offense</strong></td>
<td><strong>2nd LIFETIME offense in owner’s stable in any jurisdiction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Disqualification and loss of purse. AND ◦ Disqualification and loss of purse plus <strong>$25,000</strong> fine absent mitigating circumstances. Aggravating factors could be used to impose suspension. AND ◦ Disqualification and loss of purse. Minimum <strong>thirty-day suspension</strong> and <strong>$50,000</strong> fine absent mitigating. Aggravating factors c/b used to impose a maximum of <strong>one-year suspension</strong> and <strong>$100,000</strong> fine. AND ◦ Horse shall be placed on the veterinarian’s list for 180 days and must pass a commission-approved examination before becoming eligible to be entered. ◦ Horse shall be placed on the veterinarian’s list for 180 days and must pass a commission-approved examination before becoming eligible to be entered. AND ◦ Horse shall be placed on the veterinarian’s list for 180 days and must pass a commission-approved examination before becoming eligible to be entered. ◦ May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission. AND ◦ May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A SUMMARY SUSPENSION SHOULD BE IMPOSED FOR ALL CATEGORIES WHERE A DOPING OR ENDANGERMENT VIOLATION IS CHARGED.
The following are recommended penalties for Doping or Equine Endangerment Violation Category “B” penalty. (DEE Category B would be for many of the substances currently calling for a Class A penalty, essentially your Category 1 substances and some 2’s.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSED TRAINER:</th>
<th>2nd offense in any jurisdiction during any 365-day period.</th>
<th>3rd offense in any jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st offense</td>
<td>Minimum 180-day suspension. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum two-year suspension. AND</td>
<td>Minimum three-year suspension absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of a five-year suspension. AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Minimum one-year suspension absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of a three-year suspension. AND</td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $100,000 and loss of purse absent mitigating circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $25,000 and loss of share of purse absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of $50,000. AND</td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $25,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $50,000 and loss of share of purse absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of $100,000. AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission. AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSED OWNER:</td>
<td>2nd offense in any jurisdiction during any 365-day period.</td>
<td>3rd offense in any jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st offense</td>
<td>Disqualification and loss of purse. AND</td>
<td>Disqualification and loss of purse. Minimum fine $10,000 in the absence of mitigating circumstances. Aggravating factors could be used to impose fine of $25,000. AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Horse must pass a commission-approved examination before becoming eligible to be entered.</td>
<td>Horse on Vet’s List for 180 Days. May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission. AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horse on Vet’s List for 180 Days. May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission. AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND
A SUMMARY SUSPENSION SHOULD BE IMPOSED FOR ALL CATEGORIES WHERE A DOPING OR ENDANGERMENT VIOLATION IS CHARGED.

The following are recommended penalties for **Doping or Equine Endangerment Violation Category “C” penalty**, (DEE Category C would be for many of the substances following the penalty progression in Category A and B moving from current to DEE Category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSED TRAINER:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st offense</strong></td>
<td><strong>2nd offense in any jurisdiction during any 365-day period.</strong></td>
<td><strong>3rd offense in any jurisdiction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 90-day suspension. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum one-year suspension.</td>
<td>Minimum 180-day suspension absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of a two-year suspension.</td>
<td>Minimum one-year suspension absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of a three-year suspension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $5,000 and loss of share of purse absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of $25,000.</td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $10,000 and loss of share of purse absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of $50,000.</td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
<td>May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
<td>◦ May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSED OWNER:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st offense</strong></td>
<td><strong>2nd offense in any jurisdiction during any 365-day period.</strong></td>
<td><strong>3rd offense in any jurisdiction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Disqualification and loss of purse.</td>
<td>◦ Disqualification and loss of purse. Minimum fine $5,000 in the absence of mitigating circumstances. Aggravating factors could be used to impose fine of $10,000.</td>
<td>◦ Disqualification and loss of purse. Minimum fine $10,000 in the absence of mitigating circumstances. Aggravating factors could be used to impose fine of $25,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Horse must pass a commission-approved examination before becoming eligible to be entered.</td>
<td>Horse on Vet’s List for 180 Days. May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
<td>Horse on Vet’s List for 180 Days. May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAILURE TO MAINTAIN OR PROVIDE REQUIRED TREATMENT RECORDS.

The following are recommended penalties for trainers failure to keep or report required treatment records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSED TRAINER:</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; offense in any jurisdiction during any 365-day period.</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; offense in any jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; offense</td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $500 absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of $2,500.</td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $2,500 absent mitigating circumstances. The presence of aggravating factors could be used to impose a maximum of $5,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Minimum fine of $5,000 absent mitigating circumstances.</td>
<td>◦ May be referred to the Commission for any further action deemed necessary by the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS RECEIVED AS OF 7/31/2019 ON PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE PENALTY GUIDELINES.

From: Eric Hamelback <ehamelback@hbpa.org>
Date: July 29, 2019 at 11:36:07 AM EDT
To: Non formalized Comments

As you hopefully know, serious punishment for true cheaters is something the NHBPA and Affiliates advocate for and will support. I have a few comments but I have not formally posted them. For one, I want to confirm that on these proposed Category A and B penalties the commission will be acting on is solely based on Limit of Detection. That is not clear to me, but possibly because that is a commission responsibility. Regardless, absent screening limits to account for incidental transfer positives I think these recommended penalties are very steep. I am not saying I agree or disagree, but I admit to being concerned.

Mainly my concern is based around being allowed to offer mitigating circumstances (we know the absolute insurer rule is in place in some jurisdictions), and the very high legal fees often associated with a mounted defense. I feel this may be a time to truly discuss and possibly apply the Administrative Orders and Procedures Act (AOPA). Something we have discussed at our conventions with attorney Peter Sacopulos.

As you are likely aware once an administrative complaint is filed, the licensee is required to exhaust all administrative remedies before being entitled to a hearing before a state court of law. Thus the licensee must navigate the administrative gauntlet and climb the financial administration mountain before he or she will be heard in a state court. The result, in the case of most licensees, is that they simply cannot afford to litigate and/or the cost/benefit analysis results in the alternative position of “just take the deal.” Interestingly, the AOPA specifically provides for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), specifically for mediation.

Is this the proper time to discuss something such as ADR? This would play very well into my proposed Stewards Advisory and Review Committee. Why would a state racing commission not want to utilize the mediation process? After all, I am told most state courts mandate, by local rule, that all civil cases be mediated prior to trial.

Let me know your thoughts, thank you.

Eric J. Hamelback
CEO, The National HBPA
The philosophy behind the proposed revisions is sound. Enhanced penalties for intent and willingness to put horses’ health/safety at risk, and mitigated penalties when unintended and indirect exposure (to human substances of abuse or substances legitimately prescribed for human consumption) occurs beyond the control of the trainer.

However, the list of substances is truncated and does not address other substances whose presence in an equine sample could fit one of the above situations. When one of those substances appears in a post-race sample, as an example, it would be preferable, rather than reclassifying specific substances, to have a penalty provision that gives the Stewards/Judges the latitude to assess an augmented or mitigated penalty based on the facts of the case.

Considered alone, the detected concentration of a substance cannot indicate presence or absence of intent, time or route of administration/exposure, or dose. A concentration of a substance at a low picogram concentration is NOT unequivocal evidence for unintended, indirect exposure. The concentration of a substance is based on dose, route of administration, and time of administration/exposure. A lower dose administered closer to sampling can result in the same concentration as a larger dose administered further removed from the time of sampling. So the determination of intent, or absence thereof, must be made by the Stewards/Judges in consideration of all information presented at a hearing.

It is my recommendation that the penalty to the horse and the penalty to the trainer be separated and addressed individually. The penalty to the horse is intended to remedy the integrity of that particular race. The horse carried a prohibited substance in its body during the running of the race and as such must be disqualified (Class A, B, and C substances). However, in consideration of the facts of the case, the trainer may be held blameless, partially accountable, fully accountable, or having willfully attempted to impact the outcome of the race or put a horse’s health/safety at risk.

The current structure of not disqualifying for a first offense but disqualifying for a second offense does not appropriately address the integrity of the competition. The horse that finishes second to a first-offense trainer has a different outcome than the horse that finishes second to a second-time offender. How does this remedy the integrity question? Same medication/drug, same concentration even—and yet the outcome is substantially different for all the other horses that participated in each race. The intent of disqualification is not to punish the owner of the affected horse, but rather to address the loss of integrity in that race. To the extent that punitive action needs to be taken, it would be directed at the trainer—in consideration of the facts of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Scollay, DVM
From: Sandbulte, AL
Subject: New Proposed penalties
Date: May 21, 2019 at 12:10 PM
To: rules@arci.com
The rules are stiff enough your new proposals are completely ridiculous, especially on an owner, its hard enough to get new owners the way it is now, you are going too far.
Sincerely, AL Sandbulte

From: Victoria Keith
Subject: Proposed rules comment
Date: May 21, 2019 at 8:43 AM
To: rules@arci.com
Where are the sanctions against the veterinarians?

JAMES HAYS
JUNE 11, 2019 AT 1:18 PM EDIT
REPLY
I am a retired person who decided to make Indiana harness racing my retirement hobby. I am a licensed owner in both Indiana and Ohio. I own two horses currently racing, and two more who may race this summer. My horses race at both Hoosier Park and at Indiana county fairs.
I am concerned about the proposed penalties for owners. Perhaps I have neglected this aspect of horse ownership, but I have very little if any control over what trainers racing my horses do where illicit administration of medications are concerned. Same thing with drivers, and their conduct during the race, by the way. The proposed fines for owners would eliminate my participation in racing, and I suspect would also remove many if not all “mom and pop” operations from Indiana harness racing.
Is there a way that I could indemnify myself against misconduct by my trainer? Is there a boilerplate written contract that your organization would propose that owners could use with trainers to protect ourselves from a $25,000 fine? Are these penalties for the “second offense” with that trainer and that horse? If so, could an owner protect himself by immediately removing his horses from that trainer on the occasion of a first offense? If that’s true, then one of the purposes here seems to be to drive a first offense trainer out of business; is that true? I am not saying that I think that’s a bad idea, but perhaps there’s a better way to accomplish that goal than put owners in the middle of these issues.
We’re racing at Hoosier Park tomorrow night and I intend to try to find some folks up there who know way more about this than I do and ask some questions. We were drawn into racing, in part, by the fractional ownership program that Hoosier Park has to try to encourage more people to become race horse owners. During that program, I know we talked about the level of trust that must exist between owners and trainers, and I have experienced first hand how difficult it is to achieve that. From looking at this material, it sounds like I have a lot more homework to do.

FROM: TOM POOLE
It happens world wide and at every level. Even Triple Crown trainers have had violations before. Record setting trainer in Australia, topping off horses, was finally exposed and banned. It's all about Who, What, When and Where. There's a million stories about how horse racing is the Sport of Kings, in the hands of peasants. Rules are like that border wall in Texas. Hopefully they do some good and stop some of the violations.
August 1, 2019

Dear ARCI Model Rules Committee:

In response to the industry request for feedback on the proposed modifications to the ARCI Penalty Guidelines restructure, the ROAP regional steward groups met July 23 – July 29 to discuss the possible penalty restructure. Then on July 30, the ROAP Stewards’ Advisory committee reviewed the comments of the regional groups and compiled the below comments for your consideration.

Questions:
- If a drug appears on the Controlled Therapeutic Substances list, can it be considered in the Doping or Equine Endangerment penalty scheme? If so, what is the criteria for selecting the penalty scheme?
- How are the Multiple Medication Violation Points affected by the enhanced penalty scheme?

Concerns/Comments:
- Applying a summary suspension should be at the discretion of the stewards and not mandatory
- The owner penalties may be too harsh. The bigger problem seen is the effects of program training.
- Strict definitions of doping and treatment misuse needs to be available to promote consistency.
- Mitigating and aggravating circumstances are already available to stewards in the current penalty scheme.

The ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee would like to continue conversations with ARCI regarding the proposed penalty scheme and welcomes any questions from the committee.

Sincerely,

Frank Lamb
ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee Chairman

Cathy O’Meara
ROAP Manager
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 17

Reconsideration of Proposed Amendment to ARCI 006-015 I(1)(3), Stewards’ Records and Reports and J(1) Stewards’ List.

(Discussion – Possible Action Item)
August 1, 2019

Dear ARCI Model Rules Committee:

Following discussions during the ARCI Model Rules meeting in April 2019 in Arcadia, CA, the ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee has revisited the eligibility of horses being able to enter while on a list and has prepared the below items for consideration.

The ROAP SAC would like to withdraw the previous petition to modify sections ARCI-006-015, 006-050 and 006-030B, which would allow horses to be entered into a race but not allowed to race if the horse is on a steward, starter or paddock judge list. Furthermore, in order to maintain consistency, the ROAP SAC would make the following recommendation to modify section ARCI-011-030 relating to the Veterinarian’s List to make a horse ineligible to enter if currently on a Veterinarian’s List.

Additionally, the SAC felt strongly that if a horse has an off date listed in the InCompass system which is prior to the day of the race, then the horse would be eligible to enter. Please accept the subsequent language modifications in Proposal A and B to that affect.

“Horses may be allowed to enter if an off date has been indicated on the list which is prior to the race date.”

The ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee welcomes any comments or concerns.

Sincerely,

Frank Lamb
ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee Chairman

Cathy O’Meara
ROAP Manager
RCI MODEL RULES COMMITTEE
PETITION FOR NEW RULE OR CHANGE TO EXISTING

Your Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Cathy O’Meara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>821 Corporate Drive, Lexington, KY 40503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone(s):</td>
<td>859-224-2702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax #:</td>
<td>859-296-3033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:comeara@jockeyclub.com">comeara@jockeyclub.com</a> or <a href="mailto:contactus@horseracingofficials.com">contactus@horseracingofficials.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Brief Description of the Issue

The below rule proposals are carryover items which were not discussed or tabled during the 2019 ARCI Model Rules meeting in Arcadia this past April.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

The below rule proposals are mostly clean up with a few modifications to bring the rules more in line with actual practices and/or industry standards.

**Proposal A:** This section has been modified after discussions during the 2019 Spring Model Rules meeting in Arcadia
ARCI 006-15 Stewards J. Stewards’ List
- This proposal outlines addition language to the stewards’ list section to allow the entry of a horse if an off date is indicated on the stewards’ list.

**Proposal B:** This is new section to come in line after discussions during the 2019 Spring Model Rules meeting in Arcadia.
ARCI-010-030 Horses Ineligible (9); ARCI-011-030 Physical Inspection of Horses (B)
- Creating consistency with respects to management of lists

**Proposal C:** This section was tabled during the 2019 spring rules meeting in Arcadia
ARCI 006-030 Paddock Judge
- This proposal clarifies who is responsible for saddling a horse in the paddock and
updates the paddock judge list language

**Proposal D:** This section has been modified after discussions during the 2019 Spring Model Rules meeting in Arcadia
ARCI 006-050 Starter
- This proposal clarifies aspects of the gate card requirement and requirements for starting a horse.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

Most of the proposals are clarifications to the existing rules

D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

The proposed changes are supported by the majority of regional representatives on the ROAP Stewards’ Advisory Committee.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

See below

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules.

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal.

---

**FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.**
FLAT RACING OFFICIALS - CHAPTER 6

ARCI-006-015 Stewards

I. Stewards’ List

(1) The stewards shall maintain a Stewards' List of the horses which are ineligible to be entered in a race because of poor or inconsistent performance or behavior on the racetrack that endangers the health or safety of other participants in racing. Horses may be allowed to enter if an off date has been indicated on the list which is prior to the race date.

(2) The stewards may place a horse on the Stewards' List when there exists a question as to the exact identification or ownership of said horse.

(3) A horse which has been placed on the Stewards' List because of inconsistent performance or behavior, may be removed from the Stewards' List when, in the opinion of the stewards, the horse can satisfactorily perform competitively in a race without endangering the health or safety of other participants in racing.

(4) A horse which has been placed on the Stewards' List because of questions as to the exact identification or ownership of said horse, may be removed from the Stewards' List when, in the opinion of the stewards, proof of exact identification and/or ownership has been established.
ARCI-010-030 Horses Ineligible
A horse is ineligible to start in a race when:
(9) its name appears on the Starter's List, Stewards' List or Veterinarian's List except when an unforeseen administrative issue occurs in removing the horse from the Veterinarian's List of another racing jurisdiction. However, the horse is eligible to be entered only if an off date is indicated on the list which is prior to the race date and the horse does not exclude another horse while on the Veterinarian’s List subject to section ARCI 010-030(B) as long as no other horse is excluded from entering into the race;

ARCI-011-030 Physical Inspection of Horses
B. Veterinarian's List
(2) Horses so listed are ineligible to start enter in a race in any jurisdiction until released by an official veterinarian or racing veterinarian except when there is an unforeseen administrative issue in releasing the horse from the Veterinarian’s List of another racing jurisdiction. Horses may be allowed to enter if an off date has been indicated on the list which is prior to the race date.
ARCI-006-030 Paddock Judge

A. General Authority

The paddock judge shall:

(1) …

(5) ensure that the saddling of all horses is done by or under the direct supervision of the trainer listed in the daily racing program or the trainer’s licensed assistant trainer, unless prior approval has been granted by the stewards; and is orderly, open to public view, free from public interference, and that horses are mounted at the same time, and leave the paddock for the post in proper sequence;

(6) …

Adopted in Version 1.4 ARCI 8/27/02 NAPRA 10/2/02
Version 4.0 to 4.1: New rule language added
ARCI-006-050 Starter

C. Starter's List

No horse starting for the first-time shall be permitted to start in a race unless prior written approval (gate card) is given by the-an official starter certifying the proper schooling in and successful breaking from the starting gate. The starter shall maintain a Starter's List of all horses which are ineligible to be entered in any race because of poor or inconsistent behavior or performance in the starting gate. Such horse shall be refused entry until it has demonstrated to the starter that it has been satisfactorily schooled in the gate and can be removed from the Starter's List. Schooling shall be under the direct supervision of the starter.

D. Report Violations

The starter and assistant starter shall report all unauthorized activities to the stewards.

Adopted in Version 1.4 ARCI 8/27/02 NAPRA 10/2/02
Amended Version 4.8 to Version 4.9 ARCI Board 7/27/11 Notification of unfairness of start to Stewards
Proposed Amendment ARCI-011-010 Veterinary Practices

(Discussion – Possible Action Item)
A. Brief Description of the Issue

The ARCI Model Rules currently require the submission of all veterinary treatments to the Commission veterinarian or designee. Several commissions require this be done electronically and we seek to update the Model Rules to reflect current technology and the advantages associated with searchable electronic submissions.

B. Discussion of the Issue and Problem

This issue was discussed in 2014 and several issues were identified. Since that time some regulatory commissions have created their own treatment databases, utilizing in house programmers or an outside service provider.

The ARCI Model Rules require submission of all veterinary treatments but submissions in paper form are bulky and often difficult to review with limited manpower. This requirement would allow for the development of programs to highlight treatments and the reasons for them by also adding a requirement that a diagnosis be reported along with the other information contained in the existing rule.

C. Possible Solutions and Impact

*Provide possible recommendations to solve the problem. Include details on each proposed solution such as*

This should facilitate regulatory veterinarian review of submitted records.
D. Please identify any affected stakeholder groups that expressed support or opposition. (These stakeholders may include the racetracks, breed registries, owners, trainers, jockeys, veterinarians, or others.)

- The US Jockey Club has long supported this concept.
- The National HBPA has raised concerns in the past about securing access to this data and who would be responsible for submitting the records.

E. Attach the model rule language you are proposing. Please show new language with underlined text. If you are proposing that current model rule language be eliminated, please strikeout the language to be deleted.

**ARCI-011-010 Veterinary Practices**

D. Veterinarians' Reports

1. Every veterinarian who treats a racehorse at a facility under the jurisdiction of the Racing Authority shall electronically submit a Veterinarian’s Medication Report Form to the official veterinarian or other Regulatory Authority designee in a manner specified by the Regulatory Authority and in an approved format which includes:
   a) The name of the horse treated;
   b) Any medication, drug, substance, or procedure administered or prescribed and medical diagnosis;
   c) The name of the trainer of the horse;
   d) The date and time of treatment; and
   e) Any other information requested by the official veterinarian.

2. The Veterinarian’s Medication Report Form shall be signed by the practicing veterinarian, or, where reported electronically, shall be submitted by the practicing veterinarian.

3. The Veterinarian’s Medication Report Form must be filed by the treating veterinarian not later than the time designated by the Regulatory Authority on the next race date following administration or prescription of any medication, drug, substance, or procedure.

4. Any such report is confidential to the extent allowed by state law. Access to a report is limited to the regulatory veterinarians and its contents shall not be disclosed except in the course of an investigation of a catastrophic injury or possible violation of these rules or in a proceeding before the Stewards or the Regulatory Authority, or to the trainer or owner of record at the time of treatment.

5. A timely and accurate filing of a Veterinarian’s Medication Report Form that is consistent with the analytical results of a positive test may be used as a mitigating factor in determining the nature and extent, if any, of a rules violation.

F. Do any racing jurisdictions currently have a version of this rule in effect? If yes, please attach copies of those rules. n/a

G. Review the RCI Model Rules and identify any other Model Rules this change would affect and submit proposed amendments to those rules to comply with changes that would be made by this proposal. n/a

*FILING THIS REQUEST WITH RCI DOES NOT GUARANTEE YOUR PROPOSAL WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE MODEL RULES COMMITTEE. IF YOU HAVE OPPOSITION FROM AN INTERESTED PARTY, YOU ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO TRY TO REACH CONSSENSUS PRIOR TO FILING THIS FORM.*
MODEL RULES COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM # 19

CARRY FORWARD AND DEFERRED FOR DISCUSSION TO THE JOINT IFHA RULES HARMONIZATION/ RCI MODEL RULES MEETING.

Question to Amend ARCI-010-035 Running of the Race E. (2-4) Interference and Placing to conform with IFHA rule.

(Discussion will occur at the Friday meeting following the conclusion of the ARCI Model Rules Committee.)