



**Minutes of  
The US Rowing Association  
Referee Commission Meeting**

**December 1-3 2005  
Towson, MD**

In attendance: Bob Appleyard, Larry Tolle, Amanda Watlington, Lyn Wylder, Tom Mannle, Tom Lotz, Bill Collins, John Walker, Rachel LeMieux

USRowing Staff: Jody Pope, Glenn Merry

Others present at times: Kathleen Crowe, Matt Fortino, Gene Barnes, Leah Penik, Laura Kunkemueller, Jim Kelly, Ken Kelleher, Ray Duff, Ryz Obuchowicz, Roxanne Everetts, Kirsten Meisner, Bruce Strigh, Richard Lewis, Kris Grudt, John Brownell, Jenny Simon, Ted Kakas. Lloyd McDonald, Win Rumsey, Robert Kidd, Bob Walton, Mike Bergen, Martha Ferguson, Paul Phillips, Sandy Killen, Don Langford, Gary Caldwell

**1. CALL TO ORDER.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bob Appleyard at 6:20 PM, Thursday December 1, 2005.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES  
(JULY, 2005 MEETING)**

Minutes were approved per the procedures in the IOP

**3. TREASURER'S REPORT AND  
COMMISSION BUDGET**

- a. reiteration of regional allocation amounts and procedures, relative to decisions reached in March 2005
- b. expenditures to date
- c. regional budget reports
- d. year end position

Collins reviewed the actual expenses against the 2005 budget; the potential is that the budget will be under-run for 2005.

Collins then presented a proposed budget for 2006; he recommends a proposed budget of \$25,000. More and higher quality training materials need to be developed, and for that reason the Commission should not propose a reduced budget request to USRowing.

Lotz asked about the potential for USRowing to approve a budget total of \$25K when actual expenditures were significantly lower than that in 2005. Kunkemueller observed that the Board is sympathetic to educational and training objectives

Appleyard asked members to provide updated expenses to Collins immediately, and to propose budget line items for 2006, for continued discussion at this meeting.

Discussion ensued about the budget support for travel and expenses to have appropriate personnel (Meisner, Everetts, et al) provide regional demonstrations on the database/data call system.

Tolle asked if there were any restrictions imposed by USRowing on certain elements of expense; Collins replied no, but the Commission does approve the overall purposes for the expenditure of budget allocations.

Appleyard asked if any member of the Commission would object to LeMieux spending her unspent regional budget in 2005, for travel and expenses in 2006; Collins objected based on Commission action taken in March.

*Collins moved to restrict the expenditures of regional budgets to the elements of expense approved by the commission in March, 2005; Tolle second  
Failed 2-4-2*

*Lotz moved that the Commission provide additional funds of \$400 for travel expenses to provide training on the database/data call system*

Approved 5-1-2

#### 4. COMMISSION GOVERNANCE

- a. Re-alignment of terms (all start on March 1 of each year) (Lotz). Lotz presented proposed IOP language to align terms of the Commission with a common ending date, the first Monday in March. Mannle observed that the “first Monday in March” language precludes conduct of an effective meeting on the first weekend in March, if the calendar falls that way.

*Lotz moved to approve the IOP language presented, Collins second.*

Approved 9-0-0

- b. Term limits (Lotz). Lotz asked for a Commission vote on the desirability of term limits.

*Lotz moved that the Referee Commission not adopt term limits for its members; LeMieux second.*

Collins asked for a roll-call vote.

Yes: Lotz, LeMieux, Mannle, Appleyard

No: Walker, Wylder, Collins, Watlington, Tolle

Abstain: None

Failed: 4-5-0 Lotz to develop proposal for implementing term limits in IOP NLT March 2006 meeting

- c. Election of at-large representative. Joe Carlson is the only nominee for the at-large position

*Mannle moved to approve the election of Joe Carlson as the at-large representative; Walker second.*

Approved 9-0-0

- d. Select the date and location for the spring meeting. Appleyard reported that Rumsey and Carlson are flexible in regard to schedule. Le Mieux noted that the Board would be meeting the first weekend in March in Tempe, AZ.

*LeMieux moved to meet March 3-5, 2006, in Tempe, AZ; Wylder second*  
Approved 8-0-1

#### 5. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS; AND PRIORITIES THROUGH DECEMBER 2005

- a. Grievance/Appeals (Tolle/Wylder). Tolle reported that there were no grievances or appealed filed with the Commission
- b. Ethics and Performance (Mannle). No report; Mannle observed that the procedure for bringing performance improvement needs to the Commission’s attention is not well understood, he indicated he’d be working with Lotz to have the procedures included as an Appendix to the IOP.
- c. Publications and Recognition (Watlington). Watlington discussed revisions to the Referee Training Manual; she has received comments and feedback from Lotz and LeMieux. Watlington would like to have a revised version completed in early 2006.

Mannle asked if a soft copy was available, Everetts indicated that it was; Everetts also indicated that Clyde Voightlander the original editor had a file of comments based on original publication date

Appleyard suggested that the focus of any revision be on the changes to the Rules and corrections, rather than a wholesale re-write.

Lotz asked about distribution, higher print runs mean more cost.

Appleyard talked about the Referee Tips, and how to get more participation from clinicians or other interested officials. The purpose of the Tips is to provide information for communication between Referees and non-referees



- Watlington will assign chapters for revision to members; Mannle will synthesize revisions into a whole
- d. Rules and Safety (Collins). Collins reviewed a summary list of changes to the Rules recommended by the Referee Commission at the December meeting
- e. Curriculum, Training, Evaluation (Walker). Walker reported that the Assistant exam is done, the Referee exam will be done by January 1. He will be compiling the existing training materials beginning in January.

Tolle inquired about the clinic theme for 2006; the members discussed the four-year rotation of clinic themes (Protest and the Jury, Body of the Race, Start, and Finish); several other topics were suggested (Control and Marshalling, and Head Races)

Appleyard asked what current training needs are, for focus during the clinic season. Responses focused on correct situational application of the Rules, and mechanics; Crowe suggested emphasis on Start, based on her experience at Nationals; Appleyard mentioned boat positioning

Appleyard asked if LeMieux had anything further on including Rules and referee roles included into coaching education.

Appleyard agreed to send LeMieux's proposed letter to USRowing

*Tolle moved to make Start the clinic theme for 2006; Mannle second*

Watlington asked that the materials focus on the mechanics; Collins asked for some emphasis on consistency

Approved 6-2-1. Walker to compile a Start presentation for distribution to clinicians; Collins to prepare materials on consistency and forward to Walker. Walker to have the materials prepared NLT January 1, 2006

- f. Policy and Procedures [IOP discussion] (Lotz, LeMieux). Lotz reported that he would be taking over the IOP from Collins, and he would be doing a complete edit.

## 6. COMMISSION LIAISON REPORTS

- a. Insurance and Liability (Appleyard). Status quo, no additional information available; McDonald will obtain the latest copy of the NASO policy and provide any comments to the Commission. Lotz asked if the masters insurance policy requires licensed officials; McDonald responded no.

A number of questions were raised about liability in registered and non-registered regatta situations; a vigorous discussion ensued about the Commission's responsibilities when the number of referees required by the Rules are not available.

LeMieux will research the issues and report to the Commission in March 2006

- b. Masters. (Tolle). Proposal for static refereeing demonstration. Tolle introduced Ted Kakas, of the Masters committee. Static refereeing is being conducted by FISA regattas, and is being experienced by more and more US masters rowers. Kakas proposed a demonstration of static referring, to be able to reduce centers and add more events at the USRowing masters nationals, in August 2006.

Walker reported on his experiences in Scotland, and his current less than favorable opinion of static umpiring as a result. Le Mieux commented on her experiences, and her concerns about the entire question of static refereeing from a safety standpoint.

Mannle commented on the requirements for a successful demonstration. Kunkemeuller noted that Masters nationals had issues of



novice ability and fitness, and were unlike FISA events with much higher caliber racing. Crowe reported on her own experiences, and her strong preference against static refereeing.

Everetts noted that insurance costs have risen, as reported by Glenn Merry and Don Langford, and adoption of this practice could also affect insurance.

Appleyard noted that for every anecdote favoring static umpiring, referees and other interested parties could provide anecdotes against the practice. He also asked whether FISA “all-final” racing should be adopted for Masters Nationals; Kakas indicated that progressions needed to be maintained

Kakas indicated that the demonstration could be done to whatever specifications desired by the Commission; Mannle reiterated that the purpose of the demonstration should be to demonstrate something, possibly that static refereeing is at least as or potentially more effective in ensuring safety and fairness as the provisions of Rule 2-207(b), and that the demonstration should be designed to collect the evidence to support or refute this hypothesis.

A vigorous discussion ensued.

*LeMieux moved to recommend to the Board that there be no use of static refereeing at the 2006 Masters nationals, either on a demonstration basis or otherwise,*

*Watlington second*

Approved: 7-0-2

- c. Junior – Youth (Lotz) See Youth Nationals report
- d. Safety (Le Mieux) USRowing received the Coast Guard grant for developing safety awareness materials. An oar is no longer

considered a flotation device. Tolle asked if safety videos (on DVD) could be provided to each clinician

- e. Adaptive Rowing (Lotz). No report
- f. High Performance committee (Appleyard). No report
- g. Technology (Watlington). Demonstration of the data base/data call system constitutes the report.

## 7. REGATTAS AND EVENTS

- a. Standards for serving on national championships juries (Appleyard). Appleyard commented on the standards for performance at National championship regattas, and whether referees were meeting the standards expected in all cases
- b. Process for selecting regional members of national championships juries (Mannle). Mannle described the process for establishing a regional order of merit for use in selecting national championship juries, and other purposes.

A discussion ensued; Mannle responded to a number of clarifying questions and members discussed the appropriate timeline and schedule for the 2006 evaluation process.

*Appleyard moved to retain the process used in the prior year, with Mannle to receive lists of regional evaluators by December 9th, evaluation sheets to be provided to evaluators and Regional Representatives by December 15th, a deadline of January 15th for responses and summary evaluations returned to Regional Representatives by February 1st; Watlington second.*

Approved 9-0-0

- c. Staffing for the national championships (Appleyard / Wylder). Duff commented on the “no-show” rate for regional selectees, and how this affected the opportunity for the schedule and the numbers of officials available to provide a break, given the



duration of the event and the heat. He observed that by the end of the regatta fatigue was setting in. Based on these factors, he recommended four regional selectees, vice three, to be augmented and supplemented by local officials on a full or part-time basis. He also commented on the non-championship nature of the USRowing Nationals.

Kunkemeuller observed that the overall quality of the jury goes down when officials have to be solicited at the last minute.

Collins commented on the possibility of proportional representation from regions, rather than a fixed number.

Appleyard reviewed the history of having representatives from each region on the juries for national championships.

Watlington observed on the long hours needed to staff a regatta, and how this might be affecting the corps of referees.

Appleyard asked if there were sentiment on the Commission for re-thinking the distribution of officials. Mannle asked how to prevent the situation that occurred in the past, where the Commission voted to approve 4 per region, but this was reduced to 3 because of budget pressures. Appleyard observed that the budget issues are not going away, but that the numbers needed to be agreed upon, and then decisions could be made about distribution.

Kunkemeuller said that the no-show problem was probably uncontrollable, based on absence due to professional or personal reasons

Appleyard asked about the number of referees needed for each regatta; Carlson reported 26 for Masters; Kunkemeuller

reported that 23 was minimum for Indianapolis.

An extensive discussion ensued about how to approach determining the “right” number of referees for national championship regattas.

Appleyard also proposed 14 officials for the Youth national championships. He also agreed as a matter of policy referees should not work extended shifts over a long duration.

Mannle proposed an allocation for both Nationals and Masters Nationals of 24 drawn from regions, 6-8 from the region hosting the event and/or selections by the Chief, and a Chief and deputy selected by the Commission., total 32-34.

Discussion ensued; Collins proposed a slightly modified method with some drawn from a National pool. Kelly observed that competence involves showing up when you say you are going to.

Everetts observed that the message may be a bit garbled in the field, because the only officials wanted at Nationals are those fully-funded and/or selected through the Commission process. Kelly observed that full funding should not be available for officials wanting to only work 1-2 days. Meisner proposed to add questions to the data call about preference for working if funding were less than full.

*Mannle moved to set the jury size of the USRowing Nationals and Masters Nationals at 32 fully-funded positions, plus a deputy and Chief, and 14 fully-funded positions for the USRowing Youth Nationals, plus a deputy and Chief;*  
*LeMieux second*  
Approved 9-0-0

*Collins moved to make the following allocation: 3 selectees from each region, 6 drawn from a national pool, 6-8 drawn from the host region and/or Chief selections, plus a deputy and a Chief.*  
Failed for want of a second

- d. Staffing for FISA masters 2006 (K. Grudt). Grudt provided a report on the planning involved for the 2006 FISA Masters Regatta, to be held at Mercer County September 7-10, 2006. There is a need for approximately 40 USRowing officials to provide support the FISA Jury, drawn nationally (or locally if necessary). Appleyard asked about support provided for USRowing officials; only meals will be provided, transportation and housing will be the responsibility of the officials. Grudt indicated that blocks of hotels are available, and will consider identifying an available block for the USRowing officials. Individual reservations can be made on the FISA Masters event web-site [www.fisamasters2006.com](http://www.fisamasters2006.com) Interested individuals should contact Kris directly, at [Kgrudt@aol.com](mailto:Kgrudt@aol.com).

## 8. RULES OF ROWING

- a. Starting command (2-306) (Appleyard). Appleyard reviewed his proposal to include a variable pause in the starting command. *Appleyard moved to approve his proposal, Walker second*  
Approved 9-0-0
- b. Obstacle instructions (2-408) (Mannle). Mannle reviewed his proposal to include use of the white flag in 2-408, similar to employment in 2-407. *Mannle moved to approve his proposal; Collins second.* Appleyard suggested that a review of the Rules for consistency and extensive editing may be appropriate in the near future  
Approved 7-1-1

- c. Masters age handicap (5-310 (b) and (h)) (Tolle). Tolle reviewed his proposal for changing the language on Masters handicaps, eliminating use of handicaps at the Masters nationals, providing for medals in the case of limiting entries, and moving table of handicaps to the Classification by Age.

*Tolle moved to approve his proposal; Watlington second*  
Approved 9-0-0

- d. Youth championships (5-302 and Article V organization) (Collins). Lotz reviewed the status of proposed rules for governing the Youth National championships. He provided proposed language for use in the 2006 Rules, with an intent to revise Article V, Part C completely in the near future.

Mannle asked a clarifying question about eligibility by age; Lotz will review with the Youth committee before a vote is taken. Allen Eubanks of the Youth committee provided additional information.

*Lotz moved to approve the proposal by the Youth Committee, less item 513 (g) (age eligibility); age eligibility will be addressed in the Regatta packet; Tolle second*  
Approved 9-0-0

- e. New business – recent proposals
- 1) New FISA progression rules (USRowing rule 5-210) (Walker). Walker discussed the new FISA progression system, which is different than the FISA progression systems described in the Rules. The issue is whether the FISA progressions in the Rule book need to be removed, replaced or relabeled based on the change to FISA progressions. *LeMieux moved to re-label the description of “FISA progressions” in the Rules of Rowing with “alternate” or other specific language; Walker second.*  
Approved 9-0-0

Rules and Safety (Collins) to provide revised language by December 15, 2006.

- 2) Rule 2-204 (Rowing Near the Course While a Race is in Progress) (Tolle). Tolle reviewed his proposal to remove the asterisk from the Rule, due to lack of enforcement. Watlington, Mannle and Lotz indicated that they strongly prefer retaining the asterisk

*Tolle moved to remove the asterisk from the Rule; Walker second*

Failed: 1-8-0

- 3) Article IX (Tolle). Tolle reviewed his proposal for removing Article IX (Open Water Racing) from the Rules of Rowing, and the history of the issue.

*Tolle moved to remove Article IX from the 2006 Rules of Rowing; LeMieux second*

Approved 5-4-0

- 4) Head race rules (Article VIII and Appendix) (Tolle). Appleyard reviewed the discussion that took place informally before the meeting. Tolle reviewed the history of Article VIII and the Appendix (Customary Head Rules). Tolle observed the difficulty in employing the Appendix on courses of varying configurations.

*Tolle moved to remove the Appendix from Article VIII.*

Failed for want of a second.

*Mannle moved to appoint an external body to develop revisions to Article VIII, including the Appendix, but without other restrictions on scope and content, but with specified objectives, and a deadline, and some management support for conducting their work; Lotz second*

Mannle accepted a friendly amendment to charge Rules and Safety subcommittee as the group. Appleyard indicated that he preferred keeping

discussions among the Commission for the time being; LeMieux indicated her willingness to research and compile previous work on this subject and report to the Commission on next steps at the March, 2006 meeting. Mannle indicated he would table his motion until March, to give LeMieux a chance to develop her report. LeMieux to develop a report as proposed for March, 2006

- 5) Electronic devices (Lotz and Wylder).

Lotz suggested special emphasis be applied to the electronic device rule, to prevent the use of cell phones, which have become ubiquitous; or to delete the Rule rather than not to enforce it. LeMieux noted that the Commission has already formally ruled on this issue this year

## 9. REFEREE EVALUATION

- a. Qualifications to take the Assistant Referee exam.(Lotz) Appleyard asked for these issues to be explained and clarified, without detailed debate at this time. Lotz is proposing to add a requirement for observing a head race, and/or to add head race questions to the Assistant exam Crowe observed that the requirement doesn't help keeping candidates for a longer haul, and doesn't make them effective for doing head races at all. Appleyard noted that there are no standard rules for head races, and that while the proposal is rational per se, it is impractical to do so at present.

*Lotz moved to require a separate observation of a head race for Assistant license, with discretion for the Regional Representative to waive the requirement for candidates in the pipeline; Watlington second.*

Failed 3-6-0

- b. Assistant Referee examination (Walker) Walker reviewed the questions and the revisions to the Assistant Exam



*LeMieux moved to approve the revision of the Assistant Referee exam as developed by Walker, as Version 5 December 2005;*

*Wylder second*

Approved: 9-0-0

- c. Referee examination (written portion) (Walker) Walker reviewed the new questions on the Referee exam. Mannle suggested that the Commission be more deliberate in its review of the proposed revision, because he felt that there had been insufficient time to do so. Members to provide comments on the exam to Walker NLT December 16, 2005.

## 10. TRAINING AND COMMUNICATION

- a. Rules content for coaching clinics (Le Mieux) Le Mieux presented information on inserting modules on the Rules of Rowing into Coaching education.
- b. Referee Training Manual – current status & plans (Watlington). See publications and recognition.
- c. Referee school (Appleyard). Appleyard provided a report on the Basic Referee course conducted in 2005, and proposed Chief Referee as the course for 2006, in keeping with the normal rotation.  
*Lotz moved to appoint Appleyard as the Director of the Julian Wolf Referee Training School; Tolle second.*  
Lotz accepted a friendly amendment to establish that the Commission define the terms and conditions of the appointment as required  
Approved 8-0-1
- d. Referee tips (Wylder). See publications and recognition.

## 11. USROWING ISSUES DISCUSSION (G

Glenn Merry and Don Langford joined the Commission meeting. Glenn provided an update on the move to New Jersey (currently scheduled for end of January, 2006), with some staff changes as a result. Glenn summarized the objectives and goals for the move, and briefly

articulated elements of a future vision for the organization as a whole.

Several members asked about staff changes; Mannle asked if the Commission should take back some responsibilities that have been shifted to staff recently; discussions focused on Jody Pope's responsibilities and how to make an effective transition.,

Glenn asked about the status of the 2005 budget and the budget request for 2006. Collins provided an updated estimate for 2005. Appleyard reviewed the position of the Commission re: staffing for national championships

Appleyard reviewed several of the proposals for recommending Rules changes; Glenn asked support for changing 6-205(b) to increase the Trials entry fee to \$20.00, from \$15.00. Glenn ask the Commission to take note of the increase in insurance costs in 2006, based on an adverse loss history in 2005.

*Appleyard moved to change Rule 6-205(b) to raise the Trials entry fee to \$20.00 from \$15.00; Wylder second*

Approved 9-0-0

## 12. DATABASE DEMONSTRATION

Meisner, together with Everetts and Watlington, provided a systematic and comprehensive demonstration of the Referee Database/Data Call system. Multiple questions were asked by members of the Commission and the audience, and effective clarifications provided by members of the development team  
*Watlington moved to adopt the system for conducting the 2005 Data Call, in early 2006; LeMieux second*  
Approved 9-0-0

## 13. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Remarks by Gary Caldwell, ECAC . Gary Caldwell thanked the Commission and the



referee corps for their efforts in conducting ECAC championship races; hundreds of races without a single protest. He provided a proposed ECAC regatta schedule for 2006. He reported that the Big Ten has developed a set of guidelines for conduct of dual meets; they require an official. Increasingly, USRowing officials will be required for events that have previously done without.

ECAC is putting together a registration system that will create a database and survey for collegiate athletes to demonstrate knowledge needed to participate in ECAC regattas; the hope is have 95% of the student athletes “certified” to participate by April 1. Eventually this system might be applied to USRowing registered regattas.

Lotz asked about how to get referees from SE involved with ECAC regattas; Lotz will provide email addresses to Caldwell Watlington asked about working candidates and other educational objectives into the regatta schedule. Mannle observed that the pontoon boats in Worcester offer an opportunity for educational objectives for administrators, etc. He also inquired about the potential for ECAC to support a revision of the Referee Training Manual; the response was affirmative.

- b. Open Forum. Fortino emphasized the importance of consistency in training. Penik asked why referees don’t receive feedback on the annual evaluations conducted by clinicians, or on how they’re being evaluated generally. Watlington noted the difficulty in obtaining constructive feedback on a consistent routine feedback. Carlson noted that feedback is pro forma and cursory. Killen noted that the knowledge for how crews should maneuver, boat handle, and back into starting areas are not in the coaching

manual, and that the inability to do so effectively severely affects the ability of the referees to keep the regatta on schedule

#### 14. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- a. Regional reports—annual review of licenses for referees age 65 and older, and annual review of clinicians.
  - 1) NE: 4 new licenses were granted, and 2 promotions. Henry Petty died just recently. 2 officials are proposed as new clinicians, and 2 officials are proposed for removal from clinician status. All officials age 65 or over are proposed for retention. The NE will hold a winter retreat in Albany in February; it will be open to all in the region.
  - 2) MA: Mannle presented a strength trend for the MA, and demographic data. Mannle proposed to retain all officials age 65 or over. One clinician has retired, and 3 officials are proposed as new clinicians. 3 additional officials need to be contacted to ascertain their willingness to continue as or serve as new clinicians.
  - 3) SE: Lotz confirmed his understanding that an Emeritus referee could serve as a clinician; Commission members agreed. Lotz also provided a brief report on a head race that required withdrawal of referee support from a non-registered regatta, for safety reasons. 14 new licenses were granted; this result was based on a recruiting competition between 2 clinicians. 2 referees were reinstated, and 4 licenses were revoked for inactivity. 3 referees are retiring, 2 are recommended for Emeritus status All other referees age 65 or over are proposed for retention, with one exception. Lotz discussed the specific reasons for recommending this exception (detailed documents provided in support of this recommendation).

- 4) MW: Tolle presented data for the MW, including both recruiting and retention. Projected losses for 2006 are 5-7, which will have to be made up by recruitment. Target for MW is 110-130 active officials, based on regatta needs. Tolle proposed to grant emeritus status to 1 official and to retire another, and to retain all others age 65 or over.
- 5) SW: Collins discussed the process for recruiting a successor, he is pleased that Win Rumsey has been nominated and will be elected as Regional Representative. No new licenses have been granted, but prospects are good for 2006. One problem with a venue, previously reported upon, has been addressed and progress is being made. All officials age 65 or over are proposed for retention. One official has retired as a clinician, and none have been added.
- 6) NW: Active strength is 29, 11 Assistants, 18 Referees, plus 1 Emeritus. 2 new licenses have been granted, 2 promotions, and 1 reinstatement to Assistant. One official age 65 or over is recommended for retention. The region has 5 clinicians and no new clinicians are proposed.

*Appleyard proposed to approve the personnel actions proposed by the regional representatives (with the exception of any action on the official proposed for retirement by Lotz); LeMieux second*  
Approved: 9-0-0

An extensive discussion ensued on the official proposed for retirement by Lotz. *Tolle moved to extend the license of the official proposed for retirement by Lotz; Walker second*  
Approved: 6-3-0

*LeMieux asked for a straw vote on whether to remove IOP 44, that revokes license at age 65 unless extended by the Commission*

For: 4

Against: 5

Nomination of chief referee and deputies for National Championship Regattas. Appleyard asked for nominations for the chief and deputy roles for these regattas. After nominations were received, the Commission made the following appointments:

- Nationals: Ray Duff, Chief; Laura Kunkemueller deputy
  - Masters Nationals: Chris Lang, Chief; Joel Beerman deputy
  - Youth Nationals: Nik Vajda, Chief (Stan Shawl as the alternate); Kathleen Crowe, deputy
- b. FISA jury nominations for 2006. Mandle convened executive session to discuss the panel recommendations for FISA juries prepared by Walker.  
*LeMieux moved to accept the recommendations proposed by Walker, Watlington second*  
LeMieux accepted a friendly amendment made by Collins to send to FISA only first choices, except for Masters Worlds  
Approved: 7-0-0
  - c. FISA umpire candidates. Appleyard received applications to take the exam from two candidates distributed them to the Commission members and all current FISA umpires; he summarized the comments from the latter group. Lotz asked if there a quota or limit to how many applicants may be put forward to USRowing; Appleyard responded that there wasn't.

A discussion ensued about the standards and criteria, versus recommended experience to justify a recommendation for taking the exam.

The Commission approved recommending one of the two candidates to take the FISA exam.

- 
- d. Trials. Mannle raised the issue of removing the preference for Trials from the Annual Data Call, because recent Trials juries have not been selected based on the pool thus identified

Collins raised the issue from the IOP and the Rules, about the appointment of Chief Trials Referee and certain other Trials officials by the Commission; the process is somewhat confused given the adoption of NSRs and Trials by USRowing. Collins asked about the best way to proceed.

- e. Appleyard reported the following Trials schedule for 2006
- NSR I 6-9 April
  - NSR II 28-30 April
  - NSR III 19-21 May
  - Trials 31 July-4 August

*Mannle moved to remove the ranked preference for working Trials from the Annual Data call, but to retain an ability to solicit interest; Watlington second*  
Approved: 9-0-0

## **15. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:47 PM, Saturday, December 3, 2005.

