## EVALUATION OF COURSES BY THE COURSE DESIGNER (Sally Ike)

Name of Event: Fair Hill International, October 11-15, 2017
F.E.I Divisions offered, in the order they were run, and if they were run on different days:

CCI2*, CCI3*, run in that order - Jumping for both divisions run on Sunday, October 15, 2017
In the case of CIC's, was the show jumping held before the cross-country or after: $N A$
Size of arena in feet: 300 'x 250 '
Grass or all weather: All weather
Any Gradient: Flat
Were there any permanent, or semi-permanent, items in the arena, like cross-country jumps, trees, etc.: Nothing permanent in the arena

Is there any other information about the arena layout that I may need to know of? No
What were the weather conditions on the day (i.e. rain/windy/hot)? Cloudy, mid 60 's
Do you think this had any effect on the results? No
Either mark the distances, in feet, of all the lines up to 10 strides, on the plan, or list them here:
See attached CCI2* diagram. The lines in the $3^{*}$ track ran in the opposite direction from the $2^{*} ;$ I didn't change any of the distances between the divisions.

Were there any other circumstances that affected the day (i.e. lack of help, insufficient material, etc.)? No, super help on the day, including footing maintenance before and during the event - the best by far of any year I've been to Fair Hill!

Was the Time Allowed changed for any of the Divisions, and if so by how much:
No. An interesting point, though, especially in light of all the time faults in the $3^{*}-$ At totally different times Kathy White and I each measured each course. Without telling her my lengths, we were 10 m different in the $2^{*}$, only $4 m$ different in the $3^{*}$.

Give a brief description of any changes you would make if you had to build the same track again:
In the 3*, I didn't like the U turn after \#2 to \#3. I would have angled \#3 so they had smoother turn from \#2, and a more interesting line to \#4. This line was ridden in the other direction in the $2 * /$ would have worked better there, too, I think. With more time for the build on Saturday night, I think I would have caught this improvement and been able to implement it for Sunday's jumping.

Are there any other comments that you would like to offer about your courses:
Building the Course - Fair Hill isn't an easy 'build' because XC goes through the arena and we can't start until $X C$ has finished. Those helping are all volunteers; we don't finish until well after dark. It's important, therefore, to be considerate of their time and be as efficient as possible. The volunteers worked very, very hard.

In addition, mention must be made of the help provided by Kathy White, who designs many of the Jumping courses in Area II. She's helped with the build for the past several years; I can't thank her enough for her help and feedback.

Material and Decoration - LJ Enterprises has supplied the jumps for Fair Hill for a number of years. They sent some different material this year. Plants and flowers were brought in from XC, and great care was taken by those in charge to provide beautiful decorating for each jump. I thought the course looked super!
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There were two sponsor jumps:

- Dutta Corporation (title sponsor) - The last line for each course finished in front of the VIP tent and spectators. I was able to use the Dutta material as an oxer (\#10 in the $2^{*}, \# 12$ in the $3^{*}$ ) and was thanked for its positioning by the photographers.
- Devoucoux - This material was a vertical. I used it by itself in both courses (\#5 in the $2 *$, \#7 in the $3^{*}$ ) on the side of the arena that was at right angles to the VIP tent - also the side from which many spectators watched, so also good visibility for this sponsor.

The Tracks - It is important to me that different tracks are provided for each level and that each reflects the appropriate level of difficulty for the division. Because the jump crew are all volunteers, I try to do as little shifting as possible between divisions. This year's tracks were different in that the $3^{*}$ lines were ridden in the other direction and in a different order from the $2 *$.

How the lines rode in each division was very interesting, e.g.

- CCI2*:
- A few rode the line from 2-3-4 in a very steady 8 followed by a very steady 6, but most did a slightly forward 7, i.e. not waiting, to a slightly forward 5 ( $75^{\prime}$ ), similarly, not long, but not waiting. I suggest that those who 'added' were thinking of the turn to \#5 (which I measured as if I were riding a nice, not tight turn.).
- Even more interesting was the variety of horses - some with very long strides who 'walked' the 7 to 5, and some with short strides, for whom the 7-5 rode rather long.
- Similarly, $2 *$ riders rode the $75^{\prime}$ line from the combination ( $6 a b c$ ) to \#7-an oxer in the $2 *$ - in 5 strides quite easily.
- CCI3*
- The line with the combination was ridden in the other direction as \#5, \#6a/b/c in the $3 *$ and began with a triple bar - most put a curve in and did 6 strides to the vertical at ' $a$ ' of the combination.
- The 2-3-4 line from the $2 *$ was ridden in the other direction in the $3 *$ as \#'s 8-9-10. All did 5 strides $/ 7$ strides, i.e. no 'adding up' as was done by a few in the $2 *$.

The Results - While I might have liked a better 'flow' in the early part of the 3* (see note above), overall I had to be pleased with the statistics:

CCI2* - 53 starters, every fence came down at least once except for \#1,

- 21 clear, 13 with four faults, 1 with four plus time, 7 with eight, 2 with eight plus time, 5 with 12, plus one each with 16, 16 plus time, and 28.

CCI3* - 26 starters, 5 jumps of the 15 efforts had no penalty (\#'s 1, 2, 5, 10, and 11 b )

- 8 clear, 6 clear with time, 1 with four, 3 with four plus time, 4 with eight plus time, 3 with twelve, and 1 with sixteen.
- $50 \%$ had time faults; 7 of the 13 with just one.

I've asked myself why so many of the $3 *$ riders had time faults ( $1 / 2$ the field). Kathy White and I were only 4 meters different in the lengths we came up with - and neither of us saw where the other walked. Perhaps it was due to a lack of understanding of the difference between riding at 375 mpm and 350 ? All turns were measured so they could be ridden at 375 .

