

HIO Teleconference Summary

August 8, 2006

Present via Teleconference: Don Bell (NWA), Donna Benefield (HPC), Keith Dane (FOSH), and Niels Holch (HOA & WI), Lonnie Messick (NHSC), Mack Motes (SSHBEA), and Kenny Smith (KWA)

Not Present: Craig Evans (TWHBEA), and Bob Nagle (MFTHBA)

USDA: Not Present; Facilitator: Robin Lohnes

Review of June 13-14, 2006, Meeting Summary:

The June 13-14, 2006, meeting summary was reviewed and approved as amended. Additionally, it was noted that regarding prohibition periods, both FOSH and HPC would want the prohibition period to apply to all sanctioning organizations in addition to the HIOs because the board members that serve on sanctioning organizations have influence over the HIOs. The industry is currently talking about how to address soring and it needs more than window dressing to address the problem. FOSH and HPC requested that the HIO representatives go back to their respective sanctioning organizations and ask if the sanctioning organization is willing to institute a prohibition period to whomever has authority to appoint board members. Mack will go back to the Trainers, and Lonnie will go back to WHOA.

Review of July 11, 2006, Teleconference Summary:

The July 11, 2006, teleconference summary was reviewed and approved as amended.

USDA Monthly Report (Dr. Behre)

- No Report

OP Discussion:

- **Prohibition Period:** Niels summarized the original prohibition period proposal and restated his clients' counterproposal. In addition, HPC, FOSH and NWA all believe that whatever the final language is that it should apply to all partner organizations and anyone who has the authority to appoint members of that organization. Mack and Lonnie have agreed to go back to WHTA and WHOA. Niels will take it back to TWHBEA. Don Bell, on behalf of NWA, added that NWA would be willing to agree with the counterproposal if and only if the penalty for unilateral violations was the same as the penalty for bilateral violations. Mack Motes added that with regard to pressure shoeing violations he thinks that perhaps SSHBEA would consider life suspensions and thought that it would carry over to the SSHEABA board. Don Bell stated that this industry is different in that it never throws the book at violators. Mack responded that he wants to stop soring, but how to you do it? In his opinion, penalties in and of themselves do not stop soring and Don responded that the industry needs to eliminate soring, not regulate it. Mack concluded by saying that he did not know of any crime that has been eliminated altogether by enforcing penalties.
- **Plastic Wrap:** Regarding the proposal to eliminate plastic wrap on the show grounds, Mack noted that plastic wrap in and of itself will not hurt a horse but acknowledged the perception it portrays and is willing to keep it on the table for further discussion. Lonnie Messick is looking into this also and agrees that it need to stay on the table for further discussion.
- **Scar Rule-Definition of "loss of function":** Discussion was tabled to the September teleconference.
- **Prohibition of all scars on horses two years old and younger as of January 1, 2007:** Niels will obtain input from HOA and WI. Kenny Smith stated that KWA would not accept this proposal. Mack Motes would like to keep this proposal on the table and discuss it in person at the next HIO meeting. Kenny added that while KWA wants to eliminate soring and that in no way does he condone soring, the problem is that no one has confidence in leading a horse through inspection. He also noted that for horses with scars that change ownership the new owner should not be held responsible. Niels added that the Department has changed its interpretation of the scar rule and it varies from VMO to VMO. He noted that the regulation is

not a “no tissue change.” Keith Dane pointed out that the Department has only 5 VMOs versus the industry’s 100+ DQPs but Kenny said that it was the same 5 vets (VMOs) that have changed their minds as to scar rule interpretation. Lonnie added that at each show this past weekend at which the Department was present the VMOs had a different interpretation of the scar rule than they had at the beginning of the year and enforcement has not been consistent. Niels said he would be filing a complaint with the Department, and pointed out that his clients had not received any correspondence from the Department as to any subsequent changes in the scar rule interpretation.

Miscellaneous

Celebration Protocol: Lonnie will clarify proposed changes in the press release the Commission issued regarding the protocols for the 2006 Celebration and will send electronic copies to the HIO representatives. The Commission plans to have a ground steward (DQP) and a veterinarian to walk the show grounds. He is working on how to finance the additional personnel but that is the plan. He added that there would be at least 2 DQPs in the inspection area at all times and they would have the right to examine tack boxes.

Outstanding Issues

The following issues are still outstanding:

- Owner liability
- Penalties: To include NWA’s proposal to increase all 8 month penalties to one year and to treat unilateral violations as the same as bilateral violations; FOSH’s proposal to distinguish between pre and post-show violations, increase the penalty for foreign substances, and to evaluate the structure for all penalties.
- Suspensions
- Address different appeals’ processes among HIOs

Determine September 12, 2006, HIO Teleconference Agenda

- Tentative Agenda:
 - Review of August 8, 2006, HIO teleconference summary
 - USDA Monthly Report
 - Continued discussion re prohibition periods, plastic wrap, “loss of function” terminology, prohibition of scars two years old and younger
 - Owner Liability
 - Enhanced Penalties
 - Suspensions
 - Appeals Process

September HIO Meeting

- HIO Representatives suggested to continue with the September 12, 2006, teleconference in addition to the October 2-3, 2006, HIO meeting to be held in Nashville, TN.