Committee Name:	Records & Tabulation	**Session #:**	**Report #:**
Committee Chair:	Chris Stevenson	**Vice Chair:**	Greg Danner
Minutes recorded by:	Greg Danner	**Date/time of meeting:**	Sunday, July 29 2012 / 8pm EST

Motions Passed:

1. Minutes from previous meeting (5-27-12) approved unanimously.
2. Motion to approve update on previously approved rule change proposal 105.1.7E. ***105.1.7 Pool Measurement E*** *Where a moveable bulkhead is used and the initial pool length certification for all lanes is on file, the measurement rules and policies of FINA shall be the standard for events sanctioned by a FINA Masters member federation other than USMS.* Motion approved unanimously.
3. Motion to rephrase rationale for 105.1.7E to include: *No measurement to confirm bulkhead placement would be necessary to submit for USMS Top 10, but a measurement would be required for a USMS Record, since those are the current USA-S requirements.* Rationale will exclude references to upsetting members and expense. Motion approved unanimously.
4. The Rules Committee is proposing a Rules change so that USA-S "on file" measurements will not be automatically accepted as valid without supporting documentation. A motion for Records and Tabulation to support this proposed rule change was approved by a majority, with one against**.**
5. Adopt the following policy: *Top 10 recorders usually upload meet results from USA-S meets in response to requests from one or more swimmers in their LMSC. If in the process of uploading those results into the Event Results Database the TTR notices swims from other USMS members, it is recommended that the uploader contact the TTRs of the LMSC from those swimmers in order to determine whether to submit those swims for Top 10 consideration. That TTR would be responsible for securing permission from the swimmer to submit the times into the ERDB; if the swimmer consents, the original uploader would mark the swimmer as a "member" and submit the times as part of his Top 10 report*. Motion approved unanimously.

Number of committee members present: 9 **Absent: 2** **Number of other delegates present: 0**

Committee members present: Chris Stevenson (Chair), Greg Danner (Vice Chair), Donna Hooe, Emmett Hines, Ginger Pierson, Jeanne Seidler, Mary Beth Windrath, Mary Sweat, Laszlo Eger

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 8:00pm

1. Motion to approve meeting minutes from 5-27-12. Motion passes unanimously.
2. **Feedback on Rule proposal edits/questions**.

Chris sought feedback from Kathy Casey on the committee's rule proposal. Feedback was provided and the new proposal is as follows:

105.1.7 Pool Measurement
E *Where a moveable bulkhead is used and the initial pool length certification for all lanes is on file, the measurement rules and policies of FINA shall be the standard for events sanctioned by a FINA Masters member federation other than USMS.*

The committee approves of the updated wording as well as adding the following rationale statement:

No measurement to confirm bulkhead placement would be necessary to submit for USMS Top 10, but a measurement would be required for a USMS Record, since those are the current USA-S requirements.

The committee agrees to exclude the segment related to "upsetting members, sometimes at considerable expense."

The next part of the discussion revolves around the contact from Anthony Thompson, chair of the Governance Committee. He asked whether the committee considered proposing FINA rule changes with the goal of raising their standards, instead of proposing a change to the USMS rules. The committee agrees we could propose related items in parallel. It could take many years to get it approved through FINA, so we would not want to limit ourselves to FINA rule proposals. Since FINA is less stringent in many respects, it is also unlikely we would quickly change all the issues where USMS differs.

The Rules Committee is considering a modification to Article 105.1.6A, removing the USA-S list of certified pools. Mary Beth explained the reasoning behind this: some of the pool certifications happened very long ago. USA-S doesn't necessarily have the measurements (or note if there is a bulkhead). Therefore, there are questions surrounding the legitimacy of some of the pools on the USA-S list. However, there are many accurate pool measurements on the list as well. Committee members note that USA-S will not provide USMS copies of completed measurement forms. Committee members debate both sides and decide to vote on whether to support the proposed change. The majority is in favor and Jeanne is noted as being against.

3. **List of measured pools - USMS vs. LMSC records.**

Chris pointed out that we have conflicting messages in our GTO: TTR's are asked to send pool measurements into Walt and that it is also acceptable to just keep them on file at the LMSC level. The committee agrees that we want to modernize our list. TTR's should be encouraged to send in the lists of all their measured pools. One committee member suggests more transparency with the public. The general public might want to know if they are attending a meet where the pool is not in the national database. It is also suggested that during the online sanctioning process, we could allow meet hosts to upload their pool measurements.

The committee agrees that every pool should be on file with the LMSC at the least. However, the sooner we recommend they are all sent in to Walt, the better. One committee member inquires about the number of yards pools that are unmeasured. Mary Beth indicates it might be a couple dozen. Chris will talk to Ed and Walt to determine if the committee can push more action by TTR's for submitting the measurements. The committee is currently unaware of any plans that the E2EEM Task Force might have in relation to this.

4. **Policy for submitting USA-S meets for Top Ten recognition**.

The committee discusses what a TTR should do if they are submitting a USA-S meet and they notice a USMS member from another LMSC. It is more work for the submitting TTR to contact other LMSC TTR's. Additionally, the competing member may not want their time published or they might not respond. Is it appropriate to mark a USMS member as a non-member, when we know they are a registered member? One aspect of this is the question of whether it is appropriate to upload the result of a USMS member from a USA-S meet without his/her knowledge or consent; it was decided that such consent was needed.

Committee members question various scenarios and ultimately proposed the following policy, which recommends (but does not require) a course of action on the part of the TTR uploading the meet.

Top 10 recorders usually upload meet results from USA-S meets in response to requests from one or more swimmers in their LMSC. If in the process of uploading those results into the Event Results Database the TTR notices swims from other USMS members, it is recommended that the uploader contact the TTRs of the LMSC from those swimmers in order to determine whether to submit those swims for Top 10 consideration. That TTR would be responsible for securing permission from the swimmer to submit the times into the ERDB; the original uploader would then mark the swimmer as a "member" and submit the times as part of his Top 10 report.

The motion was approved unanimously.

5. **IT Projects Prioritization**.

Chris requests committee members review the projects list and suggest changes as well as prioritize the items. Chris wants to make sure Jim has an impression of what is important for the committee, with the understanding that he has his own priorities. Issue is tabled for the convention, but continued discussions in the forums are encouraged.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:14pm