



## **Senior Development Committee Meeting Agenda Minutes**

January 20, 2022  
11:00am Mountain

**USA Swimming Mission:** USA Swimming is the National Governing Body for the sport of swimming. We administer competitive swimming in accordance with the Olympic & Amateur Sports Act. We provide programs and services for our members, supporters, affiliates, and the interested public. We value these members of the swimming community, and the staff and volunteers who serve them. We are committed to excellence and the improvement of our sport. We are committed to providing a safe and positive environment for all members.

**Committee Mission:** To evaluate programs, advise and make recommendations within the scope of the committee focusing on issues that affect senior level athletes and coaches.

### **USA Swimming Priority Results:**

1. USA Swimmers achieve sustained competitive success at the Olympic Games and other high-level international competitions.
2. Members have and use resources for sustainable success.
3. There is growth in swimming participation and interest.
4. USA Swimming is recognized as the “Best in Class” National Governing Body.

**Type of Meeting:** Standard Committee Business – 2022 Kick-off

**Meeting Facilitator:** Allison Beebe (Chair)

**Minutes:** MJ Truex (Staff Lead)

**I. Call to order:** Allison calls meeting to order at 11:02am Mountain

### **II. Roll call**

*Present:* Allison Beebe, Jaime Lewis, Todd Capen, Lydia Jacoby (athlete), Beth Winkowski, John Morse, Amanda Weir (athlete), Chris Natoli, Kevin Zacher, Kate Lundsten, Paul Silver (Ex-officio Club Development)

*Staff:* MJ Truex, Joel Shinofield, Patrick Murphy

*Not Present:* Aiden Pflieger (athlete), Revere Schmidt (athlete)

### **III. Approval of minutes from last meeting**

***Minutes approved as presented.***

### **IV. Introductions**



Given this is the first meeting of 2022 with new members, the committee introduced themselves with the following information: name, where you reside, club and LSC you are affiliated with.

## V. Committee Guidelines (Allison)

- Wear USA Swimming hat
- Important to make quorum: answer Doodle polls and show up
- Don't share documents from the meeting; what is discussed stays confidential. Staff will communicate official information/documents

## VI. Working Groups

### a) Sectionals (Beth)

Meeting this Friday to review draft of Manual. Contact Allison for Zoom link to attend. The manual is in a good place. Hope to wrap up end of January/beginning of February.

### b) Time Standards: Winter Juniors (Todd/Patrick)

Screen is shared with standards and background is provided:

Subcommittee (Kevin Zacher, Paul Silver, Todd Capen, and Patrick Murphy) met a couple of weeks ago. Going through a reset for standards. We had gotten in a position that we had accelerated standards quickly in 2018, then Covid hit, and we've been trying to recover ever since. The subcommittee came to a solid consensus on Winter Junior Time standards. There are subtle adjustments from last year's standards. Trying to standardize consistently how time standards are developed. Moving away from a one-off event having a different process to determine the standard.

- Winter Juniors is a percent or two slower than Summer Juniors. Traditionally we have always used Futures for bonus standards for Winter Juniors. Like how we use Winter Juniors as the bonus standards for Summer Juniors. With adding a 5<sup>th</sup> site for Futures and those time standards not progressing it's becoming very clear that the bonus time standards are so much slower than the qualifying standards. This may or may not be an issue but wanted to bring this to the attention of the committee.
- Came up with 3 options for bonus standards. This would be a deviation from tradition given we always used the next level meet down as the bonus standards:
  1. Futures,
  2. 2% slower (consistent with other meets),
  3. 3% slower (subcommittee felt most comfortable with this).

Todd: 2% was first model and the jump was extensive particularly on the men's side (e.g., 100 back at 1.5 seconds faster), so that raised some concern to change to that extreme which is why we looked at 3% and that was more reasonable yet was not slower than the actual Futures cuts, so it was going to be 3% slower or the Futures cut whichever was the faster standard.



Comment: No 2022 Winter Juniors Standards are slower than last year even if the formula indicates that it should be. This is consistent with the committee’s belief that we should not decelerate time standards.

Comment: No timelines were excessively long, and he is in favor of keeping the bonus cuts at Futures cuts. Just makes it simpler to remember. Bonus standards don’t affect number of athletes in the meet, only the timeline, so there is not a question of stressing the facility in terms of number of bodies. Also mentioned that A cuts for relays were made harder and supported this change.

Comment: If we made the relay standards way faster, do we need to have the discussion of RO swimmers before we approve the relay standards that are way faster?

Comment: Wouldn’t necessarily say they were way faster. There were 32 relays in every event that made the standard prior to entry and 32 that made it after finishing. The cuts were not significantly faster but there were cuts.

Comment: Believes the subcommittee felt that RO was okay assuming we are moving the relay standards faster.

Comment: Asked to clarify if the question being asked was to allow RO or if we were allowing RO swimmers to Time Trial? Response: To allow RO.

Comment: Timeline not an issue. It was number of bodies. We continuously overcrowd the meet and the conditions aren’t ideal for performance. Our focus should be how to eliminate bodies. Three ways:

1. Tighten the A time standard,
2. Bonus cuts: but not really an issue because timelines not long and
3. RO swimmers: eliminate

Report is pulled:

| Meet Size Report               |            |           |                     |      |       |                     |      |       |                |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|------|-------|---------------------|------|-------|----------------|
| Meet Name                      | City       | Date      | Individual Athletes |      |       | Relay Only Athletes |      |       | Total Athletes |
|                                |            |           | Female              | Male | Total | Female              | Male | Total |                |
| 2021 East Speedo Winter Junior | Greensboro | 12/8/2021 | 355                 | 403  | 758   | 29                  | 29   | 58    | 816            |
| 2021 West Speedo Winter Junior | Austin     | 12/8/2021 | 409                 | 469  | 878   | 43                  | 51   | 94    | 972            |

1/20/2022 11:19:29 AM

Determined that this would be roughly an additional 80 bodies for each East and West sites with RO swimmers. This would impact facility availability to host the meet, air quality, warm-up/cool-down space, etc.

Comment: We’ve jumped into the RO discussion. Do we want to go back and finalize the A standards?

Comment: Okay with that as long there is not a huge impact on the relays. If we are making the relay cuts faster and saying no RO swimmers, is that a double whammy?



Comment: Relay standards should be difficult but attainable enough for teams that are just making that move from having 1 or 2 athletes at the meet to having relays so they feel like they can build on their success. Feels the time trial thing is a different question entirely. Can you set parameters around the time trials for the RO athletes?

Comment: Interesting that we took away RO only time trials and we still had 94 RO swimmers come to Austin. It didn't seem to impact the decision to come.

Comment: In looking at the faster relay standards, we will probably still have 4 heats of relays if we allow relay only swimmers. Allowing time trials for RO is probably not a good idea since it could drive numbers up.

Comment: Reiterates that we have too many bodies in the meet so we need to address that. RO group makes the most sense to eliminate, taking 80+ bodies out of the building. Remove those people from the meet and let the people at the meet swim the relays and make it a legitimate meet.

Comment: Example: 6:49 for 800 F.R. Time standard per athlete is 4.5 seconds slower than the individual cut. If we are going with that, that seems too slow. You can have one person who is 1:37 and everyone else on the relay could be a 1:44-1:45. That doesn't seem like a legitimate relay. You can have 4 kids that aren't even close to a Junior National time standard and make a relay.

Comment: There is a lot at the meet that aren't legitimate.

Comment: That's why we are proposing to get rid of the RO swimmers.

Comment: : How do take out RO swimmers completely? There has to be some sliding scale; maybe per number of individual qualifiers you have? Not sure.

Comment: Why do we need RO swimmers?

Comment: That relay cut is so slow then compared to the individual cut. If you're going to go 1:38 x 4, that's a lot faster than 6:49 relay cut. How many relays would actually meet that?

Comment: Is there a way to find out where our RO swimmers are coming from? Making time standards faster helps in a sense for larger clubs that are bringing A and B relays where often times the B relays are filled by RO swimmers and with these faster standards there won't be many clubs that have A and B relays.

Comment: How many RO swimmers are on the B relays? Does it have to be just yes or no to RO swimmers? Maybe you can't enter a B relay with RO people.

Comment: That would be hard to administrate.

Comment: That brings us back to if the club owns the time, you can use times from swimmers who graduated or aren't on the team anymore and bring 4 RO swimmers.



Comment: That is a separate issue and is there a way to solve that?

Comment: At NC State Championships, in order to have an A relay you have to have one person with the standard and in order to have a B relay you have to have at least 5 so at least one person would have to be on that B relay so you're not filling it with RO kids. For M.R. it's in the meet. If you're bringing 5 males to the meet, you'd be able to have an A and B as long as you can make the A and B qualifying time. This is the same in Minnesota so can we do something like this for Juniors?

Comment: Or can you make it so that all entry times are aggregate so when you're doing meet entries, you're only entering people who are part of your club?

Comment: So, you have 2 options if you want to preserve that RO opportunity but limit the numbers. There is still the assumption that you have to still make the cut.

Comment: Likes the aggregate idea but still thinks to eliminate RO swimmers. We could do both and have a pretty good meet.

A motion for both, there is a second for both.

**Discussion:** Athletes are asked specifically.

Comment: Doesn't feel best person to speak on this since never been on a relay except with Team USA

Comment: Curious is relay only athletes stay the whole time. Hard to say that it would eliminate bodies unless you cut them out completely.

Comment: Have the number of RO swimmers been consistent over the last few years? The answer is yes.

Comment: Back to the relay point, what's the point in having a 1:42.5 average on a relay when the cut is 1:38 to get to the meet. You're probably not going to have a lot of relays dip down that low if you eliminate the RO swimmers.

#### 1. Eliminate relay only

Passed: 2 opposed

Discussion: for aggregate times:

Question posed: Can we do this in OME? Someone says yes. Individual clarifies if we can force the aggregate in OME. Answer not determined at this time.

Comment: In the West, as an example, there were only 2 relays entered underneath the aggregate time of 1:38.99 and only 6 relays went under that. Someone points out that it wasn't the cut-off time. This is acknowledged. If you start thinking about the kids that make the meet and no RO swimmers, you're either going to have a 7:20 relay from teams that are 6:35 from teams that can put that together.

Comment: Maybe we hold off on making aggregate only since we've already pulled off RO swimmers. Wait and see the impact of that.



Comment: If the entire point was to eliminate bodies and we eliminated RO swimmers, aggregate won't change the number of bodies. The individual kids are still going to be there.

Comment: This is true but what it does is put the competitive relays with the other competitive relays. You often go to the meet and you see people that are operating off of a relay from a previous year and they may be in the top heat or next to the top heat and they're 25-30 yards behind because they don't have those bodies anymore. If you do the aggregate, you are actually going to have a competitive heat all across the heat.

Comment: So you're having to do the aggregate with those that are going to be on the entry but they wouldn't necessarily have to be the 4 that swam? I'm thinking this through from an OME side of things but also the other side.

Comment: But the aggregate doesn't force you to pick names off of who's on the entry. It forces names who are current on your roster.

Comment: Yes, that is where I was going, but I think when you're doing an aggregate, you have to put those people on your roster. (Unsure about this).

Comment: So what you're saying is you could have a person who is a 1:40 200 freestyler but doesn't make the meet. You can use their time to make the relay however then you throw on a 1:47 breaststroker.

Comment: I thought if you used him as an aggregate, I thought they had be on the roster as RO

Comment: It used to be like that but they changed it. It was like that. You'd have to pay for them and put them on the roster, but it was changed how ever many years ago.

Comment: The only force out is if you have an aggregate relay and only have 3 qualifiers in that gender or age group, it forces you to add a RO swimmer into the meet. It doesn't force it to be one of the four people on your aggregate.

## 2. Require aggregate times for Winter Juniors relay entries

Passed: 4 opposed

Summary: Motions that passed: Eliminates RO swimmers and requires aggregate relay times for Winter Juniors 2022.

Someone asks for clarification: the aggregate we just voted on, is it aggregate of athletes at the meet or an aggregate? Because those are not the same thing. OME currently allows any.

Comment: I think since we just passed that we have to do those who are in the meet are who's times we are going off of instead of old times from the year before.



Comment: Yes but you could have a kid who's on your team this year who is a 1:42 200 free who helps that relay makes the time standard but doesn't make the individual cut. You should be able to use that time.

Comment: I voted based on the people you intended on using to avoid those issues of putting on people who didn't belong; to avoid a 7:40 relay being in with a 7:00 relay.

Comment: I understood it as eliminating relay teams that were no longer the same.

Comment: From what I'm hearing it's as if we are trying to force coaches to do the right thing from an integrity standpoint and not sure we are able to do that.

Comment: Seems to me you are going to have very few relays in the meet if you're only allowed to use the ones who are at the meet.

Comment: Is this something we need to step away from and come back in a couple of weeks when people have had time to think this through? I'm not getting a sense that people are comfortable with what was just posed.

Comment: I get the sense that we are pretty split and maybe a little time thinking about it would help.

Comment: I think we voted on something and asked more questions and maybe people were unsure about what they were voting on based on the answers "What does aggregate mean?" after the fact.

Comment: The question is does aggregate mean aggregate at the meet or aggregate on your team?

Comment: How you define that would affect what happens with RO swimmers.

Comment: Doesn't have an issue with a team 25 yards behind. There is agreement with this. Even if I'd like to see RO in there I see John's point of removing the bodies.

\*Discussion moved to whether there was a quorum with enough athletes present on the call to make what was voted on official. The point in question is do 1/3 athletes have to be present to make a vote official? There were thoughts that all athletes do not need to be present at each meeting for the vote to count as long as the committee has 1/3 athletes in good standing and they are invited to every meeting, the committee can still vote if not all athletes show up. \*

Given we were over an hour, meeting wrapped up and all open issues would be pushed to either email vote or another in person if needed (also once the question about quorum was determined).

Last items discussed before adjourning:



- What do we do with Bonus standards? Most thought the way we were doing them before was fine (next level down meet)

**VII. Adjournment: 12:04pm Mountain**