

Winter 2010 Virtual Meeting – Discussion Notes – as Submitted via email

James Cornforth: Since this item deals with the State Meet, I would prefer someone else to make a motion. SVY would be in favor of PSSA being the organization behind the State Meet. I think it would be appropriate to have a Sanction (bid) fee of \$500.00 for a team to host the meet and then take on all financial and administrative duties.

SVY does not agree that there should be a fee for PSSA dual meets. The host team should be fully responsible.

FYI--- I reviewed the Fall, 2009 meeting minutes and found an error in my "fees" section of our Rules of Competition. According to our minutes, the hosts for Fall Fest and A/B are to receive 50% of the surcharge, not 25% as I have *mis*-listed. I will re-look at the results reports and see if there are any adjustments that need to be made for the hosting teams. Sorry for the confusion. I sometimes get over enthusiastic about making money for the PSSA Treasury

Tim Web: ITEM NO. 1: I disagree that a committee needs to be appointed for a change in meet structure.

A & B Championships has been a part of the league since at least the mid-1970s. It has been in existence and is a formative part of our heritage. It would be a shame to let such a heritage go by the wayside because of an opinion that it looks 'logical' on paper. We just made changes to the entire meet structure last year. I think that we should see those changes through. We just spent more than \$1,000 (Jim could quote the exact amount) for all new awards last year, which was reduced to \$293.10 this year because of inventory left from last year.

Currently, the A & B Championships meet is not a drain, but a contributor to the treasury. A & B Champs South had more than 100 swimmers in attendance this year, comparable to Fall Festival South, with the North meet yet to come. The meet currently highlights individual and relay team achievements, as there are no team awards, only individual and relay place awards. Many swimmers in our league strive to meet those A time standards, as a stepping stone to Y Regionals. B swimmers are also awarded for their achievements at their own level, including meet that standard at the meet. I am confident that there would be B swimmers who would still not get awards if the meet structure changes.

FYI, All 8 & unders receive A Champs awards. Their events are B events because there are no qualifying times.

ITEM NO. 2: With the economy in its current state, I believe the league meet fees are adequate, as indicated by the Treasurer's report. Any increase will eliminate many families' ability to keep their children active in our league. I would support a 33% team rebate for Fall Festival, as the treasury is growing rapidly.

The PSSA's mission has been to develop amateur swimmers within the Pacific Northwest. If the PSSA starts charging swimmers meet fees at every level, then parents will choose other sports for their children and we will price ourselves out of competition with those sports. I move that this item be tabled for discussion at the Spring Meeting.

ITEM NO. 3: So far, a team in our league has hosted this event. I think that the league should recognize the meet in our by-laws. I move that this item be tabled for discussion at the Spring Meeting.

ITEM NO. 4: From an official's and PSSA rep. perspective, this year's South meet was very successful and positive. The swimmers and parents were high energy, events seemed to go smoothly, AND LYAC won the Sportsmanship Award! I see need for only one change, mentioned for discussion below.

This may be considered a new item, but it is related. There was some confusion over whether or not the meet requirement applied to both A and B swimmers, or just B swimmers. This might be something to clarify?

Just to clarify; there is no meet requirement for B Championships. B swimmers cannot have an A time and compete in a B event (this means it is also not allowed to enter a swimmer as NT so that he or she can swim the event). B swimmers also cannot compete in relays, as those are A events.

Spring Meeting Date: April 18 works fine for me.

New Business: Discussion item; No motion until Spring Meeting I request that the following item be added to the Spring Meeting Agenda for Rules of Competition, Article 8-A: A & B Championships host teams shall be allowed to combine events as entries necessitate and score A & B swimmers separately within the event. This is something that the Yakima YMCA did successfully for many years at their June Kiwanis Invitational. I believe this would help Host teams streamline the A & B Championship event.

Action Item: I move that we reinstate awards for the Top Ten swimmers. In the past we have given swim caps or patches to the top ten swimmers in each age and gender group for each league event, including relays. Swimmers earned one cap when they achieved any position on the list. The league found it hard to follow through without accurate results from host teams, and because of limited treasury the last two years. Now that the treasury is back up to a reasonable amount, I feel that we should continue past practice of investing in the swimmers who make our league happen. There would be no league without them. We may still have the patches and could distribute to teams at the end of the season, or we could order caps or small medals if the motion carries.

Mica ITEM NO 1 I would second a motion to appoint a group to reexamine the structure of AB Champs and I would like to be a part of that group. When we were originally discussing the new format there was a question of whether or not we should even continue. Two important points were brought up. 1) This is something that we do as a league. State includes Spokane and possibly other teams from the eastern half of Washington, Regionals obviously includes teams from all over the Northwest, but we had AB Champs as a league meet. 2) This is an opportunity for kids that don't normally win races to get their chance to get their first or second place at a big meet. I feel like neither of these really apply anymore. It isn't something that we come together as a league for, it's broken into north and south. In the south for the past two years there have been A heats and B heats, but I'm pretty sure that when we first changed the format the plan was to combine heats and use the A and B groups for scoring purposes only. Getting a first place ribbon when you didn't even touch the wall first in your heat isn't nearly as exciting as touching the wall first and then having the first place ribbon to prove it. Separating the scoring into two groups when the heats are run together seems like an empty and almost condescending gesture and I think the kids see through that. They know when they didn't win. When the heats are run separately, some events have

two or three swimmers. Again, it's not as satisfying to get that first place ribbon when you beat one other kid. I don't think that the structure should be changed in such a way that would prohibit the A/B format should we hold it in a facility that allows for the use of two pools, but since KCAC is now used for the state meet I think we are unlikely to be in that situation again. Ideally, I would like to see the state meet take on a two-pool A/B format rather than a boy/girl pool format, but that's a whole different discussion.

ITEM NO 2 I agree with Tim that there should not be fees for participating in dual meets, have no problem with changing the language of the fee rule as outlined by Jim, and will second a motion to table this until spring.

ITEM NO 3 I will second a motion to table this until spring.

ITEM NO 4 My team has no problem with the AB being held in December, though I would suggest that we continue with a 2-meet requirement instead of a 3-meet requirement if it continues to be scheduled so early. Had we kept it at three, my team would have sent about 10 fewer swimmers to the meet. This may be considered a new item, but it is related. There was some confusion over whether or not the meet requirement applied to both A and B swimmers, or just B swimmers. This might be something to clarify?

TIM'S NEW BUSINESS I would second the motion to reinstate the Top 10. I definitely like the idea of caps rather than medals as the prize for making the list.

SPRING MEETING DATE April 18 in Everett is fine.

James Cornforth: Here are motions to be considered at the Spring meeting. I move that all swimmers in the A/B Champs must have the 2 meet requirement in order to swim in the meet & that the relays be available to all swimmers from a team.. *This should clarify the issue and allow B swimmers more rights.*

And to further clarify-- I move that no swimmer will be allowed to compete without a listed time. *NT's will not be accepted.* These motions will need to be deferred to the Spring meeting.

Dave Anthony: I thought I would use this discussion item as an opportunity to comment on Tim's interpretation (because I had to consider this rule in a situation recently presented to me) and to also present a Commissioner's Report.

ITEM NO 4 I agree with Tim's interpretation of the rule, with the possible of exception of the last sentence, which states "B swimmers also cannot compete in relays, as those are A events." My comments on this are as follows:

1. Is this really how everyone views it? I've seen teams with up to 4 relays at A Champs in some of the younger age groups. I have a hard time believing that every swimmer was an A swimmer.
 2. There are no qualifying times for relays in A Champs, so it would seem that a relay full of B swimmers would be permissible if they all satisfy the minimum meet requirement. And, by analogy, swimmers who don't have qualifying times for Regionals in individual events can still swim in relays (State also?).
 3. 8&Us swim in B Champs for individual events yet quite often swim in the 10&U (or older) relays in A Champs. I doubt that we check to see whether they all otherwise meet the A standards for the older age groups.
 4. All of relay events are "&U", which means younger swimmers can swim in the older age relays. Again, I doubt that we check to see whether they all otherwise meet the A standards for the older age groups. And, if we say a 10 yr old A swimmer can swim in a 14&U relay, but that a 14 yr old B swimmer with a faster time cannot swim in that relay, well, that doesn't seem correct.
- I didn't intend to pig pile on Tim (sorry, bud). Based on my personal observations, it doesn't seem that we apply the rule as he described or, at a minimum, its not been followed by everyone. I would think we would wish to allow B swimmers to participate in relays assuming they meet the 2 meet requirement. It would also really help the smaller teams fill out relays. My suspicion is that is how we have really been doing it anyway. The important thing is that we all agree on the same thing.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

I received two requests for the exemptions from the 2 meet requirement for this year's A Champs. The first request is one of which I think most of you are aware and the second is a recent request that has not previously been publicized.

1. OYST requested an exemption for Saralynn Campbell. Saralynn was unable to satisfy the 2 meet requirement due to injury. Additionally, she is a long time member of OYST and has a history of participation in PSSA dual meets and AB Champs. Based on these facts, I grant the exemption. In my view, this is the classic hardship case where an exemption should be granted.
2. Northshore requested an exemption for a new swimmer (whose name I did not receive) who joined the team in November and was only able to participate in one dual meet. This swimmer is 15 years old and joined Northshore after completion of the girl's high school season. I denied this exemption request. In my view, this was plainly a failure to meet the requirements and there was no hardship involved (just bad timing). I was also asked whether it might be possible for her to swim exhibition. I told them that we do not permit exhibition swims at AB Champs because it is considered a championship meet. To swim in a championship meet, you must meet the eligibility requirements (absent a showing of hardship). Note that in this case she cannot swim in B Champs because she is 15 and there is no B Champs for 15&0.

Mica : ITEM NO 4 The question of whether B swimmers can participate in relays didn't even occur to me, but I did run into a couple of other problems with this rule that may stem from my lack of understanding.

1. I have several swimmers who qualify with an A time for one events and a B time for others. If they don't meet the two/three-meet requirement, does this mean that they can only swim in the B events (as a coach I would have a hard time keeping track of which

events every individual on the team can or can't participate in based on their time and previous meet participation)? Or would they be barred from participating in the meet altogether because they happen to excel at one particular stroke, whereas if they were equally lousy in all strokes they would be able to compete? I guess the question here is does having one A time make the swimmer an A swimmer across the board?

2. I also had the situation that Dave mentioned with the high school swimmer. I'm not sure if "unfair" would be the appropriate word to use, but it seems a little odd that younger swimmers who have B times can participate without the requisite number of dual meets, but older swimmers cannot simply because of the structure of the meet.

I would wholeheartedly agree that we should apply the dual meet requirement to all swimmers, and that NT entries are not allowed.



Tim: Sorry Dave, I should further clarify the B swimmers and relays comment. Those swimmers who have not met the 2 meet requirement (3 meets when not altered by the board) are only able to swim B events with B times. Those same swimmers who have not met the meet requirement cannot swim in relays. It is not the caliber of the athlete, just that the athlete has competed in dual meets and Fall Festival to qualify. Thanks for calling me on that one.



Katy, BEST Item 1: I would very much like to be on a committee to review the A/B format as it has clearly changed with the addition of the State meet.

Item 2: To Jim : BEST deducted 50% for the North Fall Festival, not 25%, so we are okay with that portion.

Item 4: Two meet requirement worked fine for BEST, including our high school swimmers. Three would have been a challenge for several of our swimmers.

However, we would like to propose that we hold tri-meets instead of dual meets, given the pool situation (and huge cost here in the North end). Would it be possible to add to the list as a new item? Sometimes the meet attendance is very low and really makes the cost of the pool unwarranted (I realize fees are not charged, but we like to think we are getting good utilization for the money spent!). Or perhaps a combination of dual and tri meets depending on who is hosting?



Cyndi: Item No. 1: This being my first year, I am not familiar with the two pool format. The way the meet will be run January makes sense from a pool and time stand point. I agree with Jim and Mica to make the two meet rule apply to all swimmers.

Item No. 4: The two dual meet rule has also worked well for us this year with the exception of the high school swimmer we had who joined late



Trish, WSY Item 1 - WSY cannot attend an a/b meet in December - there are too many other PNS championship meets during December that our swimmers attend. We also believe that with the new state champs the A/B meet has become less important and too costly to continue.

Item 4 - two or tri meets work fine. We, however, have one of the few pools that can host meets.

April 18th does not work for us for a meeting as we are hosting a two day PNS meet then.



Becky I really have nothing to add except I like the idea of tri-meets, as that is what we as a new team have participated in all season. I do appreciate all the discussion, as a newbie to the league, I feel like I am understanding more of the sentiment and philosophy behind different guidelines. April 18 works fine for us.



Ashley Item No. 1 Yes; Item No. 2 No; Item No. 3 I move to table this until the meeting.; Item No. 4 Yes



Kandace – Whatcom: Item 1: Yes; Item 2: I move to table this until the meeting; Item 4: Yes, the two meet requirement was just fine for us. ;April 18th, 2010 will work just fine for WCYD.



Ballot:

Please have one person from each team send their vote on the following 6 items:

Item 1: AB Committee Proposal

There is a lot of mixed discussion on this item. Tim wants to see the history of this and how it supports amateur swimming preserved. The league has recently spent money on awards, and has a lot of awards on hand. Continuing a league or December AB champs will not work for a West Seattle at all. Several teams were in favor of simply appointing a committee, with little discussion at this point. Both 'sides' agree that the State meet affects things. Mica would like to be on the committee, Katy (BEST) would like to be on the committee.

Motion to appoint a committee to re-reexamine AB Champs (timing? Make 2 meet requirement permanent? Re-name? Re-adjust schedule? Etc.): Mica Second: Mel

Item 2: Fee Updates

Some confusion here – this item was about fee amounts coming back to the league from League events: AB and Fall Fest. There was some discussion of adding fees at dual meets. Morgan would like to have the ability for host teams to have a fee. SVY and Tim, our VP, spoke up against fees. We can tackle both items in the spring.

Motion to table until spring meeting: Tim Second: Mel Clark

Item 3: State Meet Ownership

Jim had a great proposal, that we will need to review at the spring meeting, and is best qualified to speak to the appropriate amount that meet can give to the league.

Motion to table until spring meeting: Tim Second: Mel Clark

Item 4: 2 meet requirement

Favorable feed back. This also needs to be continued at the next meeting, as it is a rule change.

Motion to table to spring meeting: at large Second: Mel

Item 5: Spring Meeting Date

Apr 18th does not work for West Seattle. Note, it is a Sunday. SO: we are not quite ready to vote, I think. For this item, propose an alternate date IF YOU ARE WILLING TO HOST, and we will vote separately on the list I get, and go with the meeting with the best attendance.

Item 6: New Item, from Tim: Top 10 awards.

In the past we have given swim caps or patches to the top ten swimmers in each age and gender group for each league event, including relays. Swimmers earned one cap when they achieved any position on the list. The league found it hard to follow through without accurate results from host teams and because of limited treasury the last two years. Now that the treasury is back up to a reasonable amount, I feel that we should continue past practice of investing in the swimmers who make our league happen. There would be no league without them. We may still have the patches and could distribute to teams at the end of the season, or we could order caps or small medals if the motion carries.

I move that we reinstate awards for the Top Ten swimmers, Tim. Second, Mel

Voting Results

NSYS Cyndi

Yes to 1-4,6. 5: No preference for the meeting.

OYST's votes... --Mica

Item No 1: Olympia votes yes

Item No 2: Olympia votes yes

Item No 3: Olympia votes yes

Item No 4: Olympia votes yes

Item No 5: Olympia would be willing to host the spring meeting on Saturday April 10 or Saturday April 24. However, I'm guessing that several teams would prefer it be hosted a little more centrally instead of by the team that is the farthest south and the longest drive.

Item No 6: Olympia votes yes

SVY Vote: Jim Cornforth

1. Yes

2. Table, yes (our vote will be no in the spring meeting)

3. Table, yes

4. Table, yes

5. Have the President decide--SVY prefers a Saturday.

6. Yes.

BEST vote: Katy

1. Yes.

2,3,4,&5 are all N/A I think

6. Yes. further discussion in the Spring meeting.

GH20 Nicole

Item 1: AB Committee Proposal No

Item 2: Fee Updates Yes

Item 3: State Meet Ownership Yes

Item 4: 2 Meet requirement Yes

Item 5: Spring Meeting Date Okay for meet on April 18th.

Item 6: New Item, from Tim: Top 10 awards Yes

DTFY Becky

Agrees with all motions. We could host the Spring Meeting here, any Saturday March 13-27 or April 10 on. I would rather not have the meeting on a Sunday but would make it work if that is what works for everyone else as long as it is in the afternoon (between 1 - 5pm).

AYAS Kasey

Item 1: Yes

Item 2: Yes

Item 3: Yes

Item 4: Yes

Item 5:

Item 6: Yes, sounds great

Morgan Family YMCA: Andria

Item 1-Yes

Item 2-Yes

Item 3-Yes

Item 4-Yes

Item 5-

Item 6-Yes

VP Tim

Item 1: The league President appoints committees, so **this is a non-vote item**. Either Sarah does or does not... If she chooses to, then I would also like to be on the committee.

Item 2: Yes, in favor of tabling discussion

Item 3: Yes, in favor of tabling discussion

Item 4: Yes, in favor of tabling discussion

Item 5: I prefer Saturday, April 17, as I have church and would rather not miss out. I did not realize it was a Sunday until your note.

Thank you for pointing that out.

Item 6: Yes, in favor of getting awards (patches on hand) out this year

Final Tally

All the motions carried. I received votes from NSYS, OYST, Morgan, Auburn, DTY, GH20, BEST, and SVY.

The majority do want to see a committee re-examine the timing/structure/name/whatever of the AB champs meet.

All other items are tabled until spring.

The majority can meet on the original proposed date, but some cannot. So, we need to have one more vote on meeting dates, and let Sarah sort out the best for the majority from there.

Proposals:

Sarah, at Everett APR 18

Dale Turner Mar 13, or 27, 1:00

Olympia Apr 10 or Apr 24

Please pick your top 2 choices, and we will go with the majority....

If you have any agenda items for the spring meeting, please send them my way as I am starting to compile things, in addition to everything we tabled.

The votes for the meeting were tallied, and the Spring meeting will be Apr 24 in Olympia, 9-1, light breakfast and a lunch to be served.

Secretary,
Mel Clark