

GA SWIMMING BOD MINUTES
April 16th, 2016
LSC Meeting BOD Meeting

Meeting called to order at 6:13 pm by Stu Hixon, General Chair.

1) Attendance:

In attendance:	Absent:
Ceci Christy (Safe Sport Coordinator)	Scot Davis (Age Group Committee Chair)
Jessica Cooper (Executive Director)	Jonathan Foggin (Technical Planning Committee Chair)
Lucus Ferreira (Visitor)	Nyasha Pace (Safety Chair)
Stu Hixon (General Chair)	Ethan Young (Senior Athlete Representative – At Large)
Hanna Lee (Co-Junior Athlete Representative)	
John Pepper (Coaches Committee Chair)	
Steve Potter (Administrative Vice President)	
Kim Seaman (Secretary)	
Rob Schreer (Officials Chair)	
Andrew Tang (Senior Athlete Representative)	
Gary Theisen (Treasurer)	
Beth Winkowski (Senior Committee Chair)	
Nate Wright (Co-Junior Athlete Representative)	

2) Consent Agenda:

(presented by Stu Hixon)

Stu explained that LSC meetings moving forward will be presented with a “consent agenda” where topical updates / reports are listed and provided prior to the actual meeting. At the time of the meeting, anyone who has issues, concerns, or questions can pull specific topics for later discussion within the meeting. This step was taken in effort to decrease the meetings’ duration as well as to provide ample time for consideration of each topic (rather than requiring immediate thought and decision at the time of the meeting).

Following this explanation, Stu asked if anyone would like to pull a topic from the provided

agenda list for later discussion.

Below are the listed Consent Agenda items listed and available to pull for discussion:

- A) February BOD Minutes
- B) Current Financials
- C) Registration Report
- D) Administrative Report
- E) Executive Report
- F) Senior Report
- G) Age Group Report
- H) Safe Sport Report
- I) Athlete Report
- J) Safety Report

With Stu's request for anyone's desire to pull an item for discussion from the consent agenda list, Lucas requested to pull the following item for further discussion: [Current Financials](#)

Outcome:

Motion to approve all items on the Consent Agenda except for the "Current Financials" (by Rob).

Second (by Beth).

All passed. Motion carried unanimously.

We then added "Current Financials" to be included under the "New Business" section for further discussion later in the meeting.

3) Committee Updates:

A) Officials Committee
(presented by Rob Schreer)

April Update:

1) New Committee Member: Doug Kinz is joining the Officials Committee as the Officials Committee Coordinator (a position previously done by Pete Junkins).

2) Current Numbers / Status: Numbers of Officials are remaining relatively constant and close to historical trends. We currently have 279 certified officials (Rob offers a list of these if needed).

3) Future Update to expect: The Officials Committee has made some editorial modifications to the Rules / Regulations and Policies / Procedures that are to include documentation of procedures for obtaining reimbursements when an official is selected to officiate at high level meets (like Olympic Trials). These changes are subject to updates at future meetings.

B) Coaches Committee:

(presented by John Pepper)

April Update:

1) New Committee Chair: John Pepper was elected to become the new Coaches Committee Chair at the LSC Meeting during the Coaches' Committee Meeting on the same day as this BOD meeting. As such, he did not have any further reports to share.

C) Technical Planning Committee:

(presented by Jessica Cooper in place of Jonathan Foggin who was giving his PhD dissertation)

April Update:

1) SC Season Meet Schedule Approval: Jessica explains that the main update / need for Technical Planning is to approve the Short Course Meet Schedule. From there a motion is made for approval:

Motion to approve SC Meet Schedule (by Steve).

Second (by Andrew).

Discussion followed:

Beth mentioned that we need to circle back to those teams who are hosting meets the same weekend as Nationals to see if they will have enough officials for their meets.

Stu replied that we are not likely to lose a lot of GA officials to the Nationals meet based on history. Discussion followed:

Gary said they ran 2 pools at Senior Nationals (requiring more officials) which could change the situation.

Stu replied that not many GA officials who apply are selected for Nationals, because officials from all of the country's LSCs are bidding for the same meet – so a lot of competition to get the opportunity results in few Georgia Officials being chosen to go. That means our meets scheduled for that weekend will likely not be affected negatively.

Stu asked if there was any other discussion? There was none.

Outcome:

We approve the SC Meet Schedule as proposed by the Tech Planning Committee – motion carried unanimously.

4) Old Business:

A) LC Senior State Meet -

(presented by Beth Winkowski)

Review of Situation:

Beth explained that upon Columbus' bid / selection as the host for the LC Senior State Meet, she had a meeting with Columbus and a gentleman named Jeff to verify that there would be no issues or problems caused for the meet by weather (lightening / thunder). She was told all was good and that there would be no stopping due to weather.

Then, in March 2016, a meet was stopped due to weather at the facility. Beth followed up with Jeff again at that time. Jeff had either not fully understood or had been given inaccurate information when he first reassured us that there would be issues due to weather, because this time (in March) he said that it turns out they WILL close down due to weather even though the facility is grounded.

Because of this new information, Beth and the Senior Committee came up with a few alternative options. Those alternatives that were presented included:

- 1) Stay at Columbus with the potential weather threat
- 2) Move meet to GA Tech hosted by SCAT but with a date change (Sunday – Tuesday meet)
- 3) A Brand new option: Move meet to the Cumming Aquatic Center with Gold hosting the meet on original dates with caveats:
 - 1) They ask to be allowed to offer a separate Meet in between Prelims and Finals to off set costs if needed.

Discussion about these caveats followed, primarily regarding the separate meet in between Prelims and Finals. The main discussion points included:

1) Age of the swimmers allowed in the Separate Meet:

There was uncertainty about what ages would be allowed to swim in the meet, but the hope is that it would be "Open" status. Beth had mentioned

that to Pat.

2) Vote for the Senior Meet:

Beth mentions that the status and specifics of this separate meet should not affect our vote for the Senior State Meet decision, and it may not even happen.

3) Concerns about the potential affect on the Championship Meet timeline (especially for Finals sessions):

Rob comments that the separate meet may throw off the timeline of the Championship meet though. Steve clarifies that there has to be a 30 minutes of break between prelims and the start of Time Trials. This means that if we have a lot of time trials, it could definitely cause issues to the timeline for the separate meet and then for the Championship Meet Finals. John asks if we can limit the number of events or the number of swimmers in the separate meet? The answer was yes, we believe we can do that.

But, the final verdict was that: we need to get an assurance from Pat on this meet specifically not causing issues for the State meet timeline.

From there, the vote sent to the BOD via email is closed due to the new additional 3rd option of moving to Cumming (which was not an option when that email was sent out).

From there, Stu entertains a motion from someone to have us vote for 1 of the 3 options.

Lucus (who is just visiting at the BOD meeting tonight) – comments that it sounds like the 3rd option is the best (but, he can not motion since he is not a part of the BOD, but he is just commenting.)

Beth then comments that the Senior Committee did not have a quorum at the Senior Committee Meeting, and this 3rd option came up in Technical Planning after the Senior Committee Meeting. Beth mentions that she tries to keep her opinion out of the decision-making, but, since we don't have great options, she wants us to think about what is going to harm our athletes the least.

Beth seems to think that Cumming is the best option (even though details are not worked out) – but that gets us to a pool on the dates we want and is less disruptive overall.

Outcome:

Motion made to move meet to Cumming – Option 3 (by Andrew).

Second (by Hanna).

Discussion followed:

Steve asks how many lanes are at the Cumming pool? Answer is: 8 lanes. It is basically the same pool set up as Columbus (4 lane warm down pool), etc.

Gary asks how long does the middle session at AG State meet (10 and under session) usually run? Answer is about 2 ½ hours. With that answer, the plan is suggested to make sure that Pat

limits that separate meet in between Prelims and Finals to 2 ½ hours or less.

At that suggestion, we take a 5 minute break so that he can call Pat.

Stu confirmed with Pat that he is not going to plan on a 3 – 4 hour session in between Prelims and Finals and that he is not even sure that they are going to offer the meet at all. Stu trusts Pat at his word on that. He also verified the \$10.00 surcharge (which was determined in Technical Planning).

Motion is reviewed: The motion is to have the 2016 Senior LCM State Meet on the same dates as planned but to move the venue from Columbus and have Gold host it at the Cumming Aquatic Center pool (with the potential of a mid-day meet – just agreeing to allow them to hold something in between sessions).

Steve offers a friendly amendment: That the non-qualifying mid-day meet in between prelims and finals must be finished at least 1 hour before the warm ups.

Discussion followed:

Lucus asks: Isn't 1 hour a bit excessive?

Rob says that it wont change anything for the swimmers in Senior State.

Beth is most worried about the Mile event on Sunday – With how long that usually runs, we probably could only do Friday and Saturday with this separate mid-day meet.

Lucus expresses his strong interest in bringing kids to the non-qualifying mid-day meet, and feels strongly that requiring that meet to finish a full 1 hour before warm ups is a little excessive.

Stu says that Prelims usually takes 3 ½ hours on the mile day finishing up at 12:30 pm. Then, Finals warm ups start at 5. Take all of that into consideration for the mid-day meet on the day of the mile.

Steve says that we do not tend to see a lot of time trials in the LSC Championships – Beth says well Seniors and Nationals and Trials are still open for qualifiers so we might.

Another comment is made that at other meets, Time Trials have been inserted as an exhibition swimmer into open lanes during heats in the actual Championship meet which helps with time. However, it was unknown if that is actually allowable within USA Swimming or if the times would count in USA Swimming afterwards.

Friendly Amendment review: The friendly amendment still stands for requiring the in-between mid-day meet to end at least an hour before the Warm Up Time for the Championship Meet Finals session.

Further Discussion followed:

Andrew asks: does it have to be an hour?

Steve says we want to have enough time for the chloramines to get off the pool deck and for officials, timers, and volunteers to take a break.

Stu doesn't think requiring an hour is going to be an issue, because Pat doesn't even seem like the meet itself is going to happen necessarily.

Outcome:

As such, Gary accepts the Friendly Amendment to the motion.

1 is opposed to the motion (Rob).

Motion passes.

Stu will inform Pat of the final decision. The meet will need to be announced at HOD tomorrow (Even though the Columbus meet was voted upon in the Fall by the HOD, the bylaws are silent on whether or not there needs to be an HOD vote when you have to make a venue change. Someone comments that the Fall vote had the stipulation regarding any potential facility changes / issues. So, we are not going against that vote anyways. We will announce the decision to move to Cumming, and, unless there is a request for discussion, it is set.

6) New Business:

A) Proposed GA Swimming Investment Plan Statement (IPS)

(Presented by Stu Hixon)

April Review:

Everyone was sent the investment policy statement via email so we are going to decide on that now.

Motion to accept the Proposal (by Gary).

Second (by Rob).

Discussion followed:

Lucas asks why there is item 10.

Gary says they haven't decided if we are going to stay with Wells Fargo or if we are going to move to First Western – in the quick review we did, these 2 banks are pretty similar in terms of fees.

Steve clarifies that there is no difference based on the info he heard. He is in banking, and the 2 banks offer the same fee structure.

Gary says that what this would do is make us considerably more conservative in what our investments are. And with a majority of our money in investments, we should want to strive to make them work for us.

Stu says that on investments we are at: 80% equity and 20% debt. Compare that to USA Swimming who is at: 55% equity and 45% debt. So, we have not had anything moved. It's pretty aggressive so this just codifies an investment policy for GA Swimming.

Asked if there was any more discussion? Answer was “no”.

Outcome: Motion passes unanimously.

B) Proposed 2017 – 2020 Quad Business Plan

(Presented by Stu Hixon)

April Review / Update:

Congrats to Jessica for getting GA Swimming to pass LEAP 2 (Great job! There is a monetary value to that of accomplishment as well: Ga Swimming will get \$2500.00. Jessica will get to accept one of those big checks in September for it.)

Stu goes on to explain that LEAP level 1 was required by all LSCS and levels 2 and 3 are additional items (LEAP 3 has a \$5000 prize – and in order to get to that we have to have a Quad Business Plan for GA Swimming... Similar to how we will see USA Swimming’s business Quad Business plan this year at Convention. So, Gary has put together a Quad Business plan for us.)

Outcome:

Stu next entertains a motion to approve the Quad Business Plan.

Move to approve (by Beth)

Second (by Andrew)

Discussion Followed:

Gary clarifies that this is a Business Plan – NOT a budget. So, each year, we will still put together actual numbers and present a specific budget to the HOD as we always have.

This is a plan for what we expect and will hope to plan for in the future. We will discuss things as they come up down the road (for example, if the Banquet goes away, then we would have a change to the plan as it is written now). Business plans do change from year to year so this is Quad Plan is not a hard and fast plan for the next 4 years. There is flexibility to change the numbers in the business plan as you go.

Stu explains further that it is like trying to use a little bit of a crystal ball and a little bit of knowledge. Stu adds that Gary did a great job putting it together, and it at least allows us to keep an eye on the ball for future years. Jessica says it will also help with strategic planning too.

Asks if there is any other discussion?

Lucus wants to clarify about: The cash investments between 2016 – 2017 seem to be quite different. Gary says that is a good eye. That is just us moving the money we have in one spot that is making very little return right now, and it will just switch to current assets. Cash investments right now we are just sitting on in operating.

We then looked at the specifics listed:

We approved this year's budget with a loss of \$40000 ish due to travel to Olympic Trials.

\$0 – \$27,000 projected coming in is a big range – The reason is that we expect to make \$5000 per Championship meet + \$6000 for webcasting + LEAP 3 potentially coming in too.

But because this year took a while to get sponsors for summer Championship meets, we now have a much longer time to get a lot higher sponsorship for all 4 meets at \$5000 per meet that we did not get for all 4 meets this year. We also want to get sponsorships for the web casting of the meets. Jessica has a plan for all of that, but the time that it requires is more than she had since coming on as Executive Director to today. But, with more time going forward now, she has the plan and the time to follow it.

Lucus has 1 more question –

He points out that the Business Plan shows National Travel staying the same in 2020 as in the 3 years before it.

He asks: Do we think we should up the National Travel projections from this year's Olympic year to be the same in 2020's Olympic year.

The response is that this is a valid point to have that same number at the end of the quad. If we did not change it, the loss projected there will not be accurate (we are going to be in more of a loss if we don't change that).

Gary says he will go ahead and change that 2020 number to be the same \$130,000 we have listed for this 2016 Olympic year instead now.

Steve asked if the motion now that we accept this Quad Plan with the 1 change?

Motion made clarified (by Beth) to accept the Quad plan with the amendment to change the 2020 number to \$130,000.

Further Discussion followed:

John asks what has changed in the disability financials from this year from last year.

The answer provided is that we have a number of disability swimmers who are going to the CanAm's and are going to the Paratrials. And, this year, they are claiming their travel reimbursements.

We have had that option in the past, but the parolympians were not quite as aware that it was available to them. They are now coming aware of it as we have strived to include them and increase diversity opportunities. With that, they are more aware of the information regarding their ability to file for reimbursements for CanAms and Paralympic Trials.

Final clarification point regarded the: Open Water Zone Meet - \$84,000 - \$90,000 which was an increase in National Travel for Open Water Zone Team.

No other discussion.

Asked for all in favor of approving the 2017 – 2020 quad business plan with the 1 adjustments to National Travel for 2020. None opposed.

Outcome: Passes unanimously.

C) Mission / Vision Statement Review

(Presented by Jessica Cooper)

April Review / Update:

We proposed the new mission and vision statements to bring to the BOD based on the Strategic Planning meeting with USA Swimming from February. Jessica pulled up the current Mission and Vision statements and the new Proposed Mission and Vision statements.

Motion to accept (by Rob).

Second (by Beth).

Discussion followed:

A lot of conversation regarding the specific wording chosen followed (questions primarily came from Kim and Ceci with responses primarily from Steve and Jessica – They help explain that there was a lot of discussion in order to come to the decision on using these specific words with the hope to get people excited about them).

Motion to approve the mission and vision as stated (by Rob)

Second (by Steve now).

Outcome: Motion passes unanimously.

D) Fall LSC Meeting Weekend

(Presented by Jessica Cooper)

Update:

We had already determined the likely best option of the available options prior to the BOD meeting was:

August 27th

Outcome:

Motion made for August 27th LSC meeting date (by Rob).

Second (by John).

Any other discussion? None.

Outcome: Motion passes unanimously.

E) Vote on Fall Governance / LEAP 3 follow-up session:

(Presented by Jessica Cooper)

April Update / Review:

We have to determine a date for Jane from USA Swimming to come back to help with a LEAP 3 follow-up session. The dates she has available included:

- i) August 27 – 28 – Which we now will have our LSC meeting
- ii) September 17 – 18 – Jane prefers this one because she will already be in town for the convention
- iii) October 15 – 16
- iv) October 22 – 23 – She no longer has this available

Discussion followed: We note that, the later we get into the season, the fewer number of people can attend.

The question is asked: would it be too much to put it in the same weekend as our LSC meeting which is just the 1 day (August 27th) / so we could do this meeting with Jane on August 28th?

Stu's opinion is leaning towards doing that option (meeting with Jane on August 28th). And comment is made that maybe she can be a part of the 27th LSC meetings as it would be good for her to see how the LSC meeting run, etc.

Motion made for Jane to come on August 28th (by Steve).

Second (by Rob).

Discussion? None.

Outcome: Motion passed unanimously.

F) Review of Bylaws Article 607.1 Divisional Organization and Jurisdictions Standing Committees and Coordinators

(Presented by Jessica Cooper)

April Update / Review:

Jessica wants to go over what the bylaws actually say and determine if they need to be adjusted.

She has the bylaws posted up in the front of the room for reference. She notes that the word “divisions” is used which can get confusing since we have “divisions” within the LSC.

She also points out how the bylaws have the committees being in charge of much more than just the basics of time standards, etc. that we have them doing currently. There are a lot of things they are responsible for in the bylaws that they are not doing. We don't think that committees are aware of these roles.

So, Jessica asks if we think these needs listed in the bylaws are in the most appropriate place as far as who can get them taken care of effectively.

Beth says:

Committee would be a better word than Division.

Some of the things on the list are confusing and vague so revision does sound beneficial; however, we cannot do this right now as it will be time consuming, etc. Beth says she thinks the best option would be for the Executive Director to lead a task force to address it appropriately.

Stu agrees about setting up a task force – But, question comes up about: what type of people would be the most beneficial on this type of task force?

Answer is: Someone who has been here in GA Swimming “forever” – You would want 4 or 5 people including yourself, Jessica, and some people with some tenure that have been on the BOD a while – current or previous – to know how things have been done. We do not follow what is the bylaws which means a lot falls back on Jessica which is a lot – So, if we can get some people with some experience and who are not brand new to the board, etc. we should be in good shape.

Stu says he would want the task force to have solutions to present at the Fall LSC meeting.

Jane is coming back as we know, and she could help review it after we have put something together as a revision.

With that, we discuss the rules regarding Bylaw changes:

Any bylaw changes must be presented 60 days before the change to the BOD and then 30 days before to the LSC membership. This would all need to happen before the Fall LSC meeting. This means that it needs to be done by the end of June (before Trials) – Therefore, the task force needs to have a recommendation by June 30th.

Once we pass it, we will give it to USA Swimming and it will probably be addressed at the convention.

Clarification follows on how the bylaws are changed within USA Swimming. Then Discussion about how it has to be submitted follows, etc. We vote to change a bylaw / then it goes to USA swimming to be approved. It's not validated until USA Swimming approves them.

Beth asks / proposes: Can we just take out all of the specific roles listed from the bylaws and put the specifics into the rules and regulations or policies so we do not have to wait / require USA Swimming approval each time we change duties (due to the lengthy process)? She proposes that we remove the duties from each of the committees on the bylaws and determine those in documentation we can change more easily in the future if needed.

Steve says that he would propose that each of the committee chairs look at the list of duties in the bylaws and take out what is not needing to be in there – take things out that we don't do anymore – add things we are doing – clean it up within the committees – bring it back by the end of May (get a template of the USA Swimming version for each Committees roles) – and then put together a proposed new list.

Okay. What is the timeline for all of this: Who is going to what by when?

- 1) Each committee chair does their list by May.
- 2) We vote on it at the June conference call.

Jessica says she will email Lucinda to get USA Swimming's template recommendation and will email all the committee chairs that as well as our bylaws to go over the duties listed to come up with recommendations on cleaning it up.

The plan is to get it ready for the September meeting with plenty of time to get it all done.

G) Additional 2 items added to New Business:

1) No new questions on Financials from Lucus anymore.

2) Sanctions Chair Announcement –

Stu mentions that Kim's coaching friend from her ASCA Fellowship and who was a Head Coach in Hawaii (very involved there) and is moving here, Stuart Jeffries, might be a good person to get as a front person for the need of Sanctions Chair if he is agreeable to that.

Does anyone have a problem with that? Or does anyone have another recommendation?

Clarification is made on the role: It's not as bad as Pete made it out to be. It can get hectic. But, Rob will agree to continue with it until we have someone.

Outcome: Stu says he just wants the BOD's blessing to pass off the role if we are able to.

7) Adjournment: Next Meeting May 5th Conference Call

Jessica makes the suggestion to skip the May conference call and just plan the next one for June. We agree to forgo the May meeting. When discussing the summer schedule, we realize that June 2nd (1st Thursday of the month) may not work.

Outcome: The decision is made that Jessica will send out a Doodle Poll to everyone in order to determine the June meeting date and time.

Following the BOD meeting, Steve requested the below addition to the minutes to insure documentation of this note that:

He, Steve, did the 6-month financials review for GA Swimming today (April 16, 2016). He has that in the records for us.

9) Motion to Adjourn the Meeting @ 7:55 pm.

Motion to Adjourn the Meeting (by John).

Second (by Rob).

None Opposed.

Outcome: Meeting is closed at 7:55 pm

*Meeting Adjourned at 7:55 pm by Stu Hixon, General Chair
Submitted for approval by GA LSC Secretary, Kim Seaman*