

Committee Name:	Rules Committee	Session #:	Teleconference #4
Committee Chair:	Charles Cockrell	Vice Chairs:	Mollie Grover/Claire Letendre
Minutes recorded by:	Christina Fox	Date/time of meeting:	Tuesday 7/9/19 8pm EDT

Motions Passed:

1. MSA to recommend R-2 as amended to the HOD.
2. MSA to recommend R-4 to the HOD.

Number of committee members present: 13	Absent: 1	Number of other guests present: 0
Committee members present (list all, including chair and vice chair): Charles Cockrell, Mollie Grover, Carolyn Boak, Kathy Casey, Julie Dussliere, Marilyn Fink, Christina Fox, Judy Gillies, Karen Harris, Barb Protzman, Jessica Seaton, Rand Vaillancourt, Jason Weis		
Ex Officio and EC present: Bill Brenner, Richard Garza, Peter Guadagni		
Committee Members absent: Claire Letendre		
Ex Officio and EC absent: Steve Hall, Clark Hammond, Teri White		

Minutes

The teleconference was called to order at 8:00 pm EST.

The following topics were covered during the teleconference:

1. Charles opened the meeting by entertaining a motion to accept the minutes from 25 June conference call. Mollie noted one correction. MSA (Rand/Kathy) to accept minutes from 25 June conference call as updated.
2. Proposed Rules Changes for 2019
 - a. R-1 – 102.9 Relays
 - i. Charles provided the background for the relay proposals R-1, R2 and U-2: R-1 is proposal submitted by Indiana to address penalties for failure to comply with rules regarding relay entries; previous sense of the committee was to have an alternative to consider and R-2 was drafted. U-2 is a USA Swimming proposal that is pending which clarifies that a relay team must be composed of four eligible members for lead off split to count.
 - ii. MS (Mollie/Rand) to recommend R-1 to the HOD.
 - iii. Discussion: Kathy expressed concerns with R-1 (and R-2) because some of the ineligible swimmer issues are not discovered/clarified until after the event is complete and results are being prepared or an issue is reported and is not in favor of this change. Charles provided additional context/perspective noting that there are various ways to discover issues after the fact and the challenge is how to handle these "after the fact" issues in a fair and equitable and non-targeted manner and encourages having process to check for potential errors prior to the event.
 - iv. Charles and Kathy clarified that, if R-1 is adopted, it would be more lenient than the current rule. Under the current rule, if an error is discovered after the fact, the relay is disqualified; under R-1, the relay would not be disqualified (would keep position, points, awards etc.) but the times (relay and led off split) would not be eligible for Top Ten or records.
 - v. Carolyn and Rand agreed with Kathy and do not support this change.
 - vi. There was some discussion/clarification on allowable changes. Carolyn noted that the present rule allows for changes to swimmer names as long as it does not change the age group. Charles clarified that the no age group

change is a Nationals requirement only.

- vii. Motion to recommend R-1 to HOD failed by unanimous vote (0-12).
- b. R-2 – 102.9 and 104.5.4
 - i. MS (Mollie/Rand) to recommend R-2 to the HOD.
 - ii. Discussion: Rand asked for clarification on requirements for name of club (full or abbreviation) in 102.9.5 and Charles indicated that abbreviation acceptable. There was further discussion on intent and clarity of language.
 - iii. MS (Kathy/Rand) to amend R-2 (102.9.5) to "...club, each swimmers full name". Further amendments proposed (Peter and Richard) and accepted as friendly amendment by Kathy. Article 102.9.6 reviewed for consistency and no change needed (Charles, Carolyn, Kathy)
 - iv. Discussion on amendment: none. Motion passed.
 - v. Discussion on R-2 as amended: Carolyn asked for clarification on language of "entries shall be removed" versus "shall be disqualified". Charles indicated the according to the rules on disqualifications, a disqualification should be done by the officials at the meet and so "after the fact" errors should go back to the admin referee to be called a disqualification. This is not always possible/practical and current practice (per Charles and Kathy) is to remove the relay from the event and results.
 - vi. Carolyn proposed amending to ..."removed from event results". Charles and Kathy agreed.
 - vii. Kathy indicated that she is reluctant to make meet referee responsible and noted that there is already a provision in the rules for a process/check (instruction to head and lane timers). Charles agreed that provision for a process/check is in place and noted that this may act as a reminder to officials to instruct timers in this requirement and allow for a more equitable process.
 - viii. Charles noted that this does not address issues discovered in processing Top Ten and records which may be a long time "after the fact" and that these instances would require an interpretation.
 - ix. Mollie noted that the language in 104.5.4 is similar the language just amended and suggested language should be consistent. MS (Mollie/Rand) to amend 104.5.4 language to match amended 102.9.5.
 - x. Discussion on amendment of 104.5.4: none. Motion passed.
 - xi. Discussion on R-2 (as amended) as a whole: none.
 - xii. Motion to recommend R-2 as amended to HOD passed.
- c. U-2 – 103.18.1 Official Time (and 105.2.2 for consistency)
 - i. MS (Mollie/Rand) to recommend U-2 to the HOD.
 - ii. Discussion: Carolyn indicated support for this proposal. Kathy, Rand, Marilyn and Judy indicated they did not support this proposal. Kathy noted that in individual events where swimmer is looking for splits going out, in a longer event, that the event must be completed without disqualification and should be the same for relays. Marilyn did not consider it fair that the lead-off swimmer could get a time but relay does not. Judy noted that any disqualification should nullify the lead-off time.
 - iii. Charles clarify the intent of the is change: for a split to count, the requirements are that 1) the relay is swum by 4 eligible swimmers and 2) the lead-off swimmers completes the initial distance without being disqualified.
 - iv. Mollie asked if the results database can handle this change if this proposal passes. Charles indicated that this was discussed and it would need to be done manually.
 - v. Mollie asked for clarification on whether this referred to any disqualification (e.g. relay take-off) or just a stroke infraction. Charles clarified that this referred to any disqualification except for an administrative disqualification.
 - vi. Mollie asked for clarification on whether the USA Swimming rule for individual events was the same as USMS. Charles confirmed that this is the same.
 - vii. Motion to recommend U-2 to HOD failed by roll call vote (11-1). Charles will prepare rationale for not recommending.
- d. R-3 – 102.12.1 Swimwear for Pool Competition
 - i. This proposal from San Diego-Imperial LMSC adds some of the FINA guideline language and reorganizes this section to clarify major criteria for determining if a swimsuit is FINA approved. Charles noted that the only systemic issue that arises is a lack of understanding on tie back suits and so committee could consider

- clarification of language to address this (R-4).
- ii. MS (Mollie/Rand) to recommend R-3 to the HOD.
 - iii. Discussion: Charles indicated that he is hesitant to duplicate the FINA guidelines in the rule book as they are only guidelines and FINA language is not currently included by USA Swimming or USMS. Current language is subjective but is consistent with USA Swimming
 - iv. Marilyn reviewed the changes in the proposal and indicated that some language was added and the section reorganized to clarify requirements and for readability.
 - v. Kathy noted that she likes the addition of "waste ties are permitted". There was further discussion on allowable ties and scenarios (Charles and Kathy).
 - vi. Mollie noted concerns with the FINA language of "good moral taste" and thought that the USMS language was less loaded.
 - vii. Motion to recommend R-3 to the HOD failed.
- e. R-4 – 102.12.1 Swimwear for Pool Competition
- i. This proposal is to address systemic issue of lack of understanding on FINA guidelines on tie back suits
 - ii. MS (Mollie/Rand) to recommend R-4 to the HOD.
 - iii. Discussion: there was discussion/clarification on concern regarding waist ties on 2 piece suits for women and functional versus non-functional ties (Mollie, Kathy, Charles and others) and potential language amendments (Carolyn, Rand, others).
 - iv. Charles indicated that waist ties are permitted for 2 piece suits for women per the interpretation and Kathy noted that she thought adding the "waist ties are permitted" language would cover this issue.
 - v. Charles proposed amended to add "ties" to list of prohibited items. Committee agreed.
 - vi. Marilyn noted that this modifies the section that was the starting point for the San Diego-Imperial proposal and felt that it is still not clear as to what all the FINA requirements are which are included in different sections. Charles acknowledged this and also indicated that this is the major issue that arises and this change should clarify this.
 - vii. Motion to recommend R-4 to the HOD passed.
- f. Next meeting will be Tuesday July 23rd at 8pm EDT. Agenda will be review of the following policies: championship; decision making; swimwear exemption

The teleconference was adjourned at 9:35 pm EDT.
