



## Referee Committee

Minutes of Meeting  
September 29, 2014  
Phone Conference Call

### Attendance:

#### Referee Committee:

Tom Fuller – Chair  
Chris Lang – Vice Chair  
Ruth Macnamara - Secretary  
Lloyd McDonald – Regional Coordinator  
Marcus McElhenney – Athlete Representative

#### Regional Coordinators:

John Musial, MA  
Jorge Salas, SE  
Howard Meisner, NE  
Lloyd McDonald, SW – Regional Coordinator to Committee

#### USRowing:

John Wik – Director of Referee Programs

#### Absent:

Roger Frederick, MW  
Dee McComb, NW

1. Tom Fuller called the meeting to order at 8:00 PM EDT
2. Overview of what will be covered tonight – Tom Fuller
  - a. Need nominations from Regional Coordinators and Committee Members of referees they recommend to be included in the review of the final Rules Reorganization Documents later in October.
  - b. John Musial's Comments on the HPC Trials Rewrite
  - c. Rule Changes\_26Sept2014\_Color.pdf
  - d. LOCguidance\_Draft\_26Sept2014.pdf
  - e. RefereeProceduresManual\_Draft\_26Sept2014.pdf
  - f. Continue review of the RulesChanges\_29AugColor; beginning with Rule 5-102

### 3. John Musial's Comments on HPC Trials Submission

#### a. John's submitted comments:

I have concerns about moving to FISA rules for trails; namely the fairness of trials. We will be asking non FISA referees to enforce FISA rules. The concern being the trials pool of 75 referees (or so) mostly are not versed in the FISA rules. While referees are asked to enforce other LOC rules from time to time; the FISA rules, while similar, have a different philosophical outlook. I would point out 2 of those, the starters role (starter is subservient to the umpire in FISA) and more importantly the enforcement of interference. FISA uses exclusion and re-rows as remedies. While we have those penalties the philosophy is different. There are other differences as well.

I have concern over asking referees to enforce rules they are not versed in. OF course we can give them training and such but does that really impart the wisdom needed to make the right decisions under FISA rules. I think it cannot.

I also have concerns as a chief referee. I've been chief numerous times, including Olympic trials and 2 events in 2014. I am not sure I would (I won't speak for other chiefs) be comfortable with a jury of people not well versed in the rules (FISA rules if used). I can very clearly see an incorrect decision being made. Our referees today are trained and drilled in the USRowing rules of rowing, why would we want to use something else for such an important event.

Additionally it's easy to say we will use FISA rules.....but where does that end? We will need the bylaws etc. also. No doubt some sharp coach will find the loop holes in the FISA rules we aren't enforcing and take advantage or call others on those things.

My suggestion would be if we (USRowing HPC etc.) decide they wish to use FISA rules, we flag the rules we wish to enforce and pull them verbatim into the USRowing trials rules.

These are just my thoughts on this topic. I'm always happy to discuss further.

Tom indicated that the HPC Trials rules changes will be treated as a separate Rule Change from the larger reorganization document. The HPC Trials changes will be considered when we discuss the general membership rule change submissions. We will be leaving the Trials section as presented. During the October meetings with Howard, Kirsten, Laura and Gary, we will talk about Rules Changes and we will discuss and incorporate all or a portion of the recommendations the Coordinators' and Committees' suggestions. At that point, the Committee will make a recommendation to the Board. This group will get plenty of chances to talk about proposed changes before a recommendation is made to the Board.

The 3 documents dated 9/26 will be posted on the USRowing website on 10/1 for the comment period by the general public. These documents reflect the most current thinking by this group of Committee Members and Regional Coordinators and Ron Chen, Bob Appleyard, the working group and selected others.

Discussion here about how we can distinguish changes that have been made from the original submission on 8/29 to the most current document dated 9/26. Howard suggested that all changes made have been indicated on the feedback form; it states what action was

taken from individual suggestions. The 9/26 version reflects all changes agreed to through the 9/22 telephone conference meeting.

4. Review of September\_26Sept2014 Documents (All) Tom Fuller
  - a. RuleChanges\_26Sept2014\_Color.pdf
  - b. LOCguidance\_DRAFT\_26Sept2014.pdf
  - c. RefereeProceduresManual\_DRAFT\_26Sept2014.pdf

Tom took a poll of what documents each member has been able to read of those circulated Friday 9/26.

RM - RoR, Ref Manual and not completed LOC Doc

CL - RoR, Ref Manual and not completed LOC Doc

MM - went through all 3 documents, all looks good

LM - none of the documents

JS - RoR, Ref Manual and not LOC Doc

JM - RoR, most of Ref Manual and not LOC Doc

JW - all 3; fine with all

GC - RoR, Ref Manual and 1/3 of LOC Doc; so far good

TF - all 3 documents; no comments on Rules; a couple of questions on LOC; and a couple of minor questions on Ref Manual. Tom stated he has no major issues on any of the documents.

Tom - The Committee and Coordinators have looked at the documents to date - the September 26 documents reflect what has been accepted so far.

Discussion ensued on publishing the version of the three documents that contains the Committee's suggested changes. A couple of Committee members (LM and CL) expressed concern that it does not reflect what the authors intended it to. JW agreed that the documents should be published without comments as submitted by Laura, Howard and Kirsten. He stated there had been a magnitude of changes that are significant.

Discussion ensued for the need of a cover letter to accompany the three reorg documents when they are posted on the website for general membership comments.

In addition to the general reorganization documents of the Rules of Rowing, there will be a document that contains the General Membership's suggested Rule Changes, to include the HPC submission for Trials Rule changes for review by the Referee Committee, the Regional Coordinators and the working group (Laura Kunkemueller, Howard Meisner, Kirsten Meisner and Gary Caldwell).

Howard will take the lead to write a document to be used as a cover letter to accompany the three documents that relate to the General Rules Reorganization.

Lloyd asked the question: When we go through the rules with the feedback incorporated into the final conclusions; what are we voting on?

Tom answered: First, the Committee will vote on the proposed reorganization of the Rules of Rowing as they stand with the latest updates included in the three documents. Second, the Committee will vote individually on any Rule Change Proposals included in these three

documents. This will all take place the first two weeks of November, possibly beginning at the end of October. Howard, Laura, Kirsten and Gary will be consulted throughout this process.

Discussion ensued between: Laura, Tom, Howard, Lloyd and John Wik. Tom stated that each Rule Change will be voted on by itself, not a package vote. There was discussion that this might take a long time. Tom said we are prepared to give the time it is going to take to do this right. Suggestions of how to handle the magnitude of this were discussed and it was decided to address a process of weeding out the rule changes without any objections from those that will need to be discussed and debated. The process of how to address this expeditiously will be decided by those who know how to set up a process. It was emphasized that we need to explicitly address each change individually to be presented to the Board and public.

Laura stated: in large part this group has already done that. By the end of the process, she believes the group will have roughly 10 issues to discuss and come to a resolution.

Tom restated that we will come up with a process that is efficient and allows us to address each rule change individually.

Laura brought to the attention of the group that in the latest revision of the proposed reorganization of the Rules of Rowing, the asterisk (\*) has been reinserted. She reminded the group that some things that don't currently have an asterisk should be asterisked. She will keep a list of these items for the group to discuss in the future meetings. **The Asterisk is a Parking Lot Issue**, to be discussed in later meetings.

Howard brought up the mechanics of making changes and deletions; that if we don't approve a portion of a particular rule, it could muddy the water throughout the three documents. We need to be careful of the unintended consequences we might cause by bringing bits and pieces of language back into the Rules.

Lloyd stated that at this time, he does not see any major changes that would cause major movements of information.

Tom concurs with Lloyd; doesn't see anything in the Manuals that will have to go back into the Rules.

Lloyd stated that no one has the intent to undo the work that has been done.

5. Continue Review of the Rules of Rowing document we have been reviewing **ALL**
  - a. Rule 5-202
    - LM – objection to the removal of the first sentence. This changes the intent of the Rule. There is an unfair advantage if all entries are published early.
    - Leave as is.
  - b. Rule 5-203
    - Discussion ensued here about membership status.
    - Action: John Wik will verify with Susan Smith regarding membership numbers, expiration dates; will verify wording!

- Laura emphasized that the fact a competitor is required to have a membership number is not a rule and needs to be sorted out.
- Action: John Wik will get an official definition of Membership.
- **REVISIT**

Lengthy discussion ensued about reinserting the asterisk back into the Rules and how to indicate that appropriately on the version published for comment. Many opinions were expressed. Conclusion is to neutralize the wording in the “color key code” on page 7.

A vote was taken by the Committee Members to accept the proposed wording to indicate the reinsertion of the asterisk into the document. 3 yes; 1 abstention

- c. 5-204 – no issues
- d. 5-205 – no issues
- e. 5-206 – Discussion about who to report to and what is done with the information reported. Conclusion: If change the contact person to Director of Referee Programs, this needs to be stated explicitly in the front of the Rule Book with instructions to be clear how and where to send to DoRP.

**This is currently a Parking Lot Issue**

- f. 5-207 – no issues
- g. 5-208 – no issues

Next meeting – Discussion ensued about meeting at least weekly through the month of October. Need to change from Mondays. Next meeting: Wednesday, 10/08/2014.

Convention – John Wik will send out a detailed email with information regarding the Convention. Discussion ensued about inviting Clinicians to be a part of Clinicians Clinic. John Wik will try and answer specific questions and concerns off line.

Marcus made a motion to Adjourn.

Meeting was Adjourned at 10pm EDT.

Respectfully submitted, 9/30/14

Ruth Macnamara  
 Secretary  
 USRowing Referee Committee  
[carczar01@aol.com](mailto:carczar01@aol.com)  
 703-201-4547