

2020 U.S. Masters Swimming Annual Meeting — Virtual

Committee Name:	Rules Committee	Session #:	2
Committee Chair:	Charles Cockrell	Co-Vice Chairs:	Mollie Grover & Claire Letendre
Minutes recorded by:	Julie Dusliere	Date/time of meeting:	Tuesday 15-Sept-2020 / 8 pm ET

Actions Requiring Approval by the HOD:

1.

Motions Passed:

1.

Number of committee members present: 13

Absent: 1

Number of other delegates present: 97

Committee members present (list all, including chair and vice chair): Charles Cockrell (Chair), Mollie Grover (Vice Chair), Claire Letendre (Vice Chair), Carolyn Boak, Kathrine Casey, Julie Dusliere, Marilyn Fink, Christina Fox, Judy Gillies, Mark Marshfield, Barbara Protzman, Jessica Seaton, Jason Weis

Committee Members Absent: Ian King

Ex-officio: Bill Brenner (USMS National Office), Chris Colburn (VP Administration), Richard Garza (Legislation Committee), Steve Hall (USMS National Office), Terri White (Officials Chair)

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 pm ET.

Jessica Reilly (USMS National Office) briefly explained meeting protocols and Zoom logistics for the meeting/webinar.

Charles thanked the USMS national office for this year's convention preparation, particularly considering the unique situation this year. Charles also publicly thanked the committee for their work throughout the year.

Charles provided a brief overview of Rules Committee jurisdiction (part 1) of the rulebook, the FINA rules cycle, and rules from USA Swimming. Charles also shared the details of the annual USMS rules change process.

Review of Rules Amendments for HOD:

R1, R4, R9, R11

Comments/Questions:

- Bob Anderson – Pacific – question regarding “meet announcement” and publishing via Club Assistant (technology).

R5

Comments/Questions:

- Leo Letendre – New England – please clarify “made available to all eligible swimmers”.

R8

Comments/Questions:

NONE

R7

Comments/Questions:

- Nadine Day – Indiana – meet committee in 102.14 regarding protests, are all sections being submitted as one item?

R3

Comments/Questions:

- Jeff Strahota – Potomac Valley – believe the proposal benefits anyone who competes in our organization and that relay setups are arbitrary. Advocating on behalf on the proposal.

- Carolyn Boak – Rules Committee – argument can be made both ways over benefits (or lack thereof) to specific age groups and toward various team sizes.
- Meegan Wilson – Florida – member of History & Archives and pointed out that the organization has a lot of historical information that is important to maintain.

U1

Comments/Questions:

- Bill Tingley – Kentucky – statement for consideration that anytime multiple venues are used there is a need to consider timing system regulations and pool measurement requirements (administrative regulations).
- Heather Stevenson – Virginia – noted that the language states that each part of the meet must be sanctioned by respective LMSC and is very much in favor of this idea.
- Bob Anderson – Pacific – may need time between first event and last event (i.e. number of days) to be consistent. Queried timing of COVID guidelines from USMS Board of Directors sub-committee.
- Anthony Thompson – Missouri Valley – clarify rule reference number and asked if there was already (in existence) any policy/rule/guidance from USMS regarding virtual meets.
- Steve Peterson – Pacific Northwest – does the 10-day span apply to open water/long distance also?

Other Questions/Comments on any of the proposals:

- Bill Tingley – Kentucky – in regard to R6, believe it is in direct conflict with 104.5.6 B1, impact on workout groups at National Championships.
- Bill Sive – Southern Pacific – regarding R1, elaborate on how the committee got to the proposed language regarding gender and noted three recognized biological genders.
- Paige Buehler – Inland Northwest – regarding R6, club affiliation, is unattached covered by this rule and what proof is necessary when declaring unattached at any time (i.e. on deck).
- Ginger Pierson – Oregon – regarding R6, query about entry name statement and impact on foreign athletes.

L22

Charles shared information and perspective on behalf of the Rules Committee regarding the L-22 proposal, an indivisible package from Rules, Long Distance and Legislation.

Comments/Questions on L-22:

- Don Livoni – Montana – noted that Long Distance committee is supportive of this amendment and noted the work done to present this omnibus-type legislation.
- Bill Tingley – Kentucky – logistical question on L22, regarding task force and BoD involvement.
- Meg Smath – Kentucky – noted that Legislation committee vote was unanimous against L-22 and feels strongly that sanctioning is an administrative function. To make rulebook a better experience, we should consider a complete re-write.
- Nadine Day – Indiana – make a point that everyone should review the rulebook, 2020 is online and available to all. Noted that it makes sense that all pool info be in one section and all open water info in one section to benefit the members.
- Richard Garza – Legislation Committee – shared Legislation’s rationale for not recommending.
- Bob Anderson – Pacific – sanctioning a meet is not simply checking boxes, think about swimmer first not the committees, thought the omnibus was very thoughtfully done and probably doesn’t need further review.
- Alana Aubin – New England – sanctioning for open water and the safety plan go hand in hand, noted representation from all three committees on sub-committee.
- Doug Sayles – New England – can the majority of the HOD understand the proposal without a workshop/breakdown in order to make an informed decision.

Charles recognized and thanked the ex-officio members of the committee and thanked the delegates for participating in the meeting.

Tasks for the Upcoming Year

1. None at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 pm ET.
