GA SWIMMING BOD MINUTES March 8th, 2017 BOD Conference Call Meeting

Conference Call Meeting began at 8:30 pm. Time was allowed for members to arrive.

1) Roll Call Attendance:

In attendance:	Absent:
Ceci Christy	Jonathan Foggin
(Safe Sport Coordinator)	(Technical Planning Committee Chair
Jessica Cooper	Hanna Lee
(Executive Director)	(Senior Athlete Representative)
Kate Dunne	Steve Potter
(Safety Chair)	(Administrative Vice President)
Lucas Ferreira	Rob Schreer
(Age Group Committee Chair)	(Officials Chair)
Stu Hixon	Harrison Wayner
(General Chair)	(Junior Athlete Representative)
John Pepper	Nate Wright – joined the call at 9:35 pm
(Coaches Committee Chair)	(Senior Athlete Representative)
Sydney Pepper	
(Visitor)	
Kim Seaman	
(Secretary)	
Gary Theisen	
(Treasurer)	
Beth Winkowski	
(Senior Committee Chair)	

Meeting called to order at 8:36 by Stu Hixon, General Chair.

2) Approve February BOD Minutes:

(Presented by Stu Hixon)

Motion to approve by Gary.

Second by John.

No Discussion. All passed. Motion to pass notes is carried unanimously.

3) Current Financials:

(Presented by Gary)

1) GENERAL FINANCE UPDATE:

Gary shares that February financials are completed, and he submitted the balance sheet. He

adds that we're right down the middle for all the major expenses, and we're looking exceptionally well. The fines are coming in from missing time standards / requirements (even though they were late going out for the AG meet). Rob got them out. It generates a lot of revenue so we need to continue doing that.

Gary adds that Jessica is going through the session reports, and she already has a report to get out which Gary says is incredible since the meet was just last month. Jessica comments that she had to go through it twice, because the 13/14 year olds were not in there at first. So she is going to get it into Excel and then give it to Gary. She plans on getting that out early next week. She noticed that there was a swimmer let into the meet who wasn't registered USA Swimming since 2016 but was still in the meet. Also, some swimmers were let in without the specific cuts. She is not sure if that is something for the Age Group and/or Senior Chair and/or host teams to look into.

Beth and Kim bring up the issue about the original meet event file error that was discovered regarding the 200 IM cut specifically (noting that it was not well advertised once fixed later than many teams had already uploaded the original entry file) – There was an issue with the file that was not advertised and was not discovered until the week of the meet so a number of swimmers had planned to attend the meet for that race already by that point. There may be some question about what should be allowed for that. Stu summarizes that there may be something that comes out of this in the future, and we can be aware as it comes up.

There was another comment point regarding a disabled athlete at the meet, but it was taken care of by the Meet Referee who took him out ahead of time appropriately.

In summary, Gary wraps up by saying that the report is coming out soon, which is wonderful. Jessica concludes by stating that she hopes to have all the letters together by early next week.

Stu asks if there is anything else for Gary on Financials? There are none so we can move on.

4) Executive Reports:

There are NO expected Executive Reports.

The BOD is reminded that if anyone has something for these calls, even though we try to keep them to an hour and we don't have lots of time, you need to submit them prior to the calls. Stu asks that people would do that in order to be quick.

Jessica comments that we officially submitted our LEAP 3 document, and Jane said we should hear back by the end of next week so hopefully we will hear something soon about whether or not we got that status or not.

It is asked if there is anything else? There is none so we move on.

5) COMMITTEE REPORTS:

a) Age Group Committee- Presented by Lucas

i) State Re-cap:

In general, the meet was a smaller meet than previous years, but there were 30 fewer

10 & unders with same cuts... And, there were some other cuts elsewhere that were a little faster so it was maybe affecting the qualifiers.

Saturday seemed to run way too fast for the 10 & Under session. As such, adjustments were made on Sunday which seemed to help a lot.

Lucas adds that Steve made a great survey for the meet, and 4.5 out of 5 for a general score of satisfaction at the meet so that was good. People were saying that they seemed to want the awards ceremony back though.

Gary then clarifies that Stu is asking that Lucas would type that update up and then all he (Lucas) would have to say is "AS SUBMITTED" so we can move on quickly. Lucas says he understands.

Lucas then reports on their AG State Committee Meeting – He says that they did not finish at the state meet so they met again last week on the phone. Originally, there was a split vote about the Zone decision but it then moved to support it.

Lucas had his minutes up on the website today so people can see them on there if they would like to. They have some suggestions on potential changes to the AG State meet, and he is hoping to get the voices of the LSC to be heard before they vote on it.

He asks if there are any questions? There were none so we moved on to the Age Group Camp suggestion idea.

ii) Age Group Elite Camp:

Lucas says he would submit that we add the Age Group Elite Camp to the budget. He thinks it will be self-sustainable, but he thinks it should be in the budget before they start.

His estimates are the following:

\$150 - 175 x 50 kids.

About \$9000 revenue and \$9000 expenses

He comments that \$1500 is already on the budget for the camps, but it never gets used. So he would add that amount to the budget leaving it now at \$10,500.

Within that budget, he would also like to get a coach from outside of the LSC to stay here for a week during the camp. He thinks it would be good for the kids to have exposure to coaches outside of the LSC.

Stu asks if there are questions?

Gary says that it has to be a revenue neutral issue. Stu says that what he is hearing is that we already have \$1500 for Camp budget. So if we take the amount paid by the 50 kids and the \$1500 budget, we would have \$9000 - \$10,500 to work with for the camp.

Lucas adds that they looked at Emory (for hosting the camp and swimmers), and those prices were relatively cheap and would get everything taken care of.

Stu asks Ceci if we would need to plan for Chaperones. Ceci says that, in her opinion,

you would need a couple chaperones because you're going to have kids staying in college dorms without chaperones other than coaches. So, she would recommend that there be chaperones.

Stu asks Lucas that, if we are doing this as a Zone Select Camp, does he know if they generally have chaperones. Beth says that when you are on a Zones Select Camp or National Select Camp you are bound by the code of conduct but it is only the coaches.

Gary says to Lucas that he will need to figure parking into the budget as well if you're going to be there during the week. Lucas says it's more on the weekend – Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Gary says then that he will still need to figure in parking for Friday (\$5.00 per vehicle). Gary says that if you're in there before 4:30, they'll charge you for it. Lucas says that he will keep that in mind.

Stu says that this is well planned out and that he thinks we should put it in the budget. He adds, however, that he wants Lucas to determine if it is definitely more like \$150 or \$175. How much it would take specifically since it has to be budget neutral.

Stu then entertains a motion to approve the Age Group Zone Select Camp:

GARY made the motion.

JOHN seconded it.

All in favor – none opposed. The motion carries.

Lucas says he will nail down those numbers and get them ready. We will have the first camp in 2018.

6) OLD BUSINESS:

a) Proposed "Option B" Zone Team Policies - Presented by Stu Hixon

See document.

Stu says he met with Lucas, Sydney, and John at the state meet to talk about this. At the last meeting, we approved the new agreement for the Zones team, and we also approved an agreement if needing an exception to be requested to not stay with the team.

Stu says that we did not have the implementation (we didn't do that on purpose so that they could come up with ideas). Implementation includes terms such as: how many chaperones we should have (2 or 4) – how to pick the chaperones – who decides whether an exception is made – head coach? Not likely the BOD – more likely people associated with the Zone, etc.

So, what was sent out with the agenda for this BOD meeting was something that addresses the chaperones and the implementation of the "Option B Opt Out" but Stu likes calling it an "Exception".

That all was sent out – and is coming up because it is the nuts and bolts on how to implement this new plan. He says that he knows there are some job descriptions in the contracts

themselves – but this document has come forth for help more like a policy manual.

So, with that background, we can discuss. Lucas, John, and Sydney are here too for us too.

Discussion:

Beth wants to know why we would ever not grant an exception request. Lucas says that was brought up earlier and that, once the option is out there, we could get in a lot of trouble if we grant the exception to some and not to others. Lucas still thinks there should be a process for asking for the exception though.

But, Beth adds that she feels like any parent who asks for this is asking against what their child wants so they're going to have a good reason for it if they're willing to make their child miserable.

Lucas says he agrees but that there still needs to be a process in place for asking. The parent needs to at least explain their reasons in his opinion.

Gary says that, from a financial standpoint, if the parent wants to keep the kid and pay the same amount, that should be fine. They might not get the same experience that the other kids get from the trip, but things are different now in these times. Because of the situation last year and the general ways of the world / times these days, we don't have much of an option now. It's become a monster, but it's going that direction anyways.

Stu summarizes that Beth seems to be saying that it is just an option. Beth says that we don't necessarily have to advertise it. But, if it is requested, we should honor it.

Ceci says that you don't need to put it out there as an option, then the head coach and the team can have that conversation with the family. You may have more people choosing not to if it is advertised so taking it on a case by case basis as it comes up might be best.

Stu says that he likes the idea not to advertise it but he reminds us that the exception is ONLY about where they lay their head at night. They're going to ride the bus to and from the pool and go to all the team meetings. We're trying to preserve the team atmosphere in this.

Ceci said that she agrees with Stu that it is just to be in regards to them not sleeping with the team, but they will be required to participate in all other ways. And, we aren't here to make life difficult and, at the same time, we can't have it all done differently. They can stay in the parents' room but we will want to add what the rules are behind this option. Such as: If you're not at the same hotel, they have to be back at the team's hotel for any time the bus is leaving.

The BOD is reminded that this new plan is basically for Tupelo, and we'll see how it goes and take it from there.

Stu asks if everyone is good with just saying that this is how it is going to be and not putting it in writing. Does anyone have a problem if we don't put it in writing?

No one has a problem. So that part is covered. So we have that separate agreement -

in all frankness there is probably just 1 parent that may ask for this at the upcoming meet, and this may not be an option that they want to take because they have to pay the same price.

Stu then goes back to the chaperones, 4 adults (2 male and 2 female) – but he thinks that these chaperones were talked about in the team agreement and the chaperones are kind of like the parents that we were just talking about. That they have duties once they're at the hotel. The coaches would be on duty at the meet and on the bus, but that's it.

Beth adds that it is her suggestion that you will want multiple adults positioned in multiple zones of the bus - to make sure that all bases are covered.

Sydney says that we wont have enough room on the 55 passenger bus so some athletes will have to ride in a rental car, because not all athletes will be able to ride on the bus and have chaperones. Gary comments that perhaps we could get a bigger bus – that 55 passenger buses are typical size but maybe there is a bigger bus now a days to see if you can get a bigger bus.

Sydney asks Beth if she has ever seen a bigger bus – Gary says we should just find out if we can get a bigger one now. Gary says that the bus business owner asked him how many we wanted, and there were a few options to look into.

Lucas says that to have more than a 55 bus you're looking at a double decker so the price might change but Gary says she has money to utilize.

Jessica brings up the chaperone issue again and asks if they are riding in place of a coach? Jessica says that she feels like the coaches would be on the bus there too.

Beth says she thinks everyone is overthinking this – we need to have flexibility with the extra van, but we need to have everyone be where is needed at the right time.

Lucas said that it sounds like we should just leave the specifics out of the agreement in terms of who and how many are riding on the bus. Keep it simple on in writing.

Stu says that he did not remember us saying that the chaperones would not get a per diem. Discussion occurs that it does not seem reasonable to have the chaperones up all night and then at all the team gatherings too. There is not likely a lot of people who would volunteer to do that. Gary says that he is in favor of getting money incentives involved if it at least gets this off the ground. We can always reevaluate moving forward.

Comparisons are discussed about the way Dynamo does things. Lucas is concerned that he did not feel like there was a per diem included in the original proposal. A stipend is discussed but Gary does not like that term for financial reasons.

Stu asks if coaches have to take vacation days when they go on this Zone trip. Discussion occurs that a lot of coaches are taking vacation when this trip happens so they're using their vacation to help with this trip – the coaches are choosing to be on the trip instead of vacation with family or friends.

And, then, Stu asks are the chaperones also doing that? Answer is that it depends on the parent of course. So there are some stay at home parents who would have kids on the trip already and therefore would like to go anyways.

Stu entertains a motion that we accept the Chaperone portion of this as written / submitted (by John, Sydney, & Lucas) – no per diem for the chaperones as written – but we will STRIKE OFF ITEM 6 (No specifications on who rides where – but will decided by the head coach in the moment as needed) –

GARY makes the motion.

SECOND by JOHN.

No other discussion. None opposed. Motion Carries.

In summary, we are LEAVING THE "B" section out of this and handle it like we said.

There is no other old business.

7) NEW BUSINESS:

<u>a) Replacing inactive committee members / committee member requirements – presented by Lucas</u>

Lucas says that he has 1 committee member who has not been able to participate in the AG Committee meetings. He mentions that he does not know if there is a procedure to take someone off of the committee, but he also does not know if we have a process or quideline on what committees should look like.

He also realized that he only has members from certain areas and are mainly from big clubs. He was wondering if we should have something in place for how committee members may be removed and what needs to happen. Because right now, the chair can just change things as they desire from what he can tell.

Stu says that USA Swimming definitely has some very clear things about committee members etc. Gary says that we do too. Stu / Gary say that there are some in our by-laws - Gary asks if Lucas has looked at the by laws.

Jessica doesn't think that we have some hard and fast clear statements about inactive members. Gary finds something in the by laws to read about how they can be removed. He says it's not a big deal to do it if they're not participating.

Jessica brings up that the Athlete Representatives are not working – some of the swimmers are no longer swimming and some are no longer in Georgia. She asks how we can tighten up some of the requirements for it. Stu says that he is open to

suggestions, and Jessica says that we can put it on the agenda for another time.

Stu says he can't find anything specific on how to remove someone from a committee – So, the issue is summarized that Lucas can pick his own committee. Lucas says that he doesn't even feel comfortable doing that. Stu says that if you would like more structure on how your committee is formed, you can but you just have to get the person to volunteer and do the job.

As far as the athletes go: we have to have 20% athlete representation – we do a very very poor job of getting athletes involved. We're not the only LSC having this problem –

Jessica wants to table this to have time to talk about it in detail at the in person meeting in April.

Stu agrees. Let's talk about this at our next meeting.

Our next meeting is April 22nd at the LSC Spring Meeting at the Marist School – an agenda and timeline will be sent within the next couple of weeks. We will have all of the meetings on Saturday.

We will be doing a consent agenda for the HOD meeting – so please get your reports in. It is asked if there is anything else to discuss. There is nothing.

Accept a motion to adjourn.

JOHN makes the motion.

Second by GARY.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting is Adjourned at 10:01 pm.

Minutes submitted for approval by GA LSC Secretary, Kim Seaman.