

## **Curtis Jacobson, MAC**

### **MT Swimming Proposals**

#### **Proposal 1 (MT Swimming Proposal 1)**

I would like to propose that all MT Swimming LSC Swim clubs be required to put Montana Swimming Corporate Sponsors ads in their programs. This would be a full page black and white ad in each swim meet or event program that is conducted. If the MT Swimming Corporate Sponsor wants a color ad they must have it printed and supplied to the club so the club can insert it in their programs. If the corporate sponsor provides the ad to the swim team they actually get two full page ads if they want because they can print on both sides of the page that they provide to the swim club. A Corporate Sponsor is defined as a sponsor that donates to Montana Swimming \$5000.00 or more in Cash, Services, or in kind donations.

This will hopefully help MT Swimming sell more sponsorship. This really doesn't cost the clubs much to provide which will help all of MT Swimming LSC members.

#### **Proposal 2 (MT Swimming Proposal 2)**

We said that the clubs get 20% of the corporate Sponsors Sponsorship donation. I want to amend that and to the club still get 20% of any cash that is paid to MT Swimming, but in the case of services or in-kind donations, it is up to the executive board to decide the percentage that the club will receive. .

MT Swimming can't afford to payout cash when cash is not donated. But some services or in kind donations may be worthwhile enough for MT swimming to compensate the club in some manner, but this needs to be a MT swimming decision.

#### **Proposal 3 (MT Swimming Proposal 3)**

I would like to reimburse Officials if they have officiated at 5 or more meets in one year. The time frame would be from September through August. Officials or Clubs that pay for their officials need to apply for reimbursement by 8/31 for the time frame from the previous September 1 to August 31. The meets that would count are any meets that are not in the official's home town and any swim meet that your child or children don't participate in. This includes both the non-athlete registration fee and background check fees.

#### **Proposal 4 (MT Swimming Proposal 4)**

I would like to change the meet fees paid to Montana Swimming to the following formula.

\$4.00 per swimmer for swimmers 1 – 99.

\$8.00 per swimmer for swimmers 100 – 199.

\$12.00 per any swimmer 200 and above.

This will lessen the burden for the smaller swim meets and the larger meets will contribute more to Montana Swimming.

### **End of Curt Jacobson Proposals**

**Deidre Loyda, WRSC**

**Proposal 1 (MT Swimming Proposal 5)**

Add a line item in the Zone Code of Conduct that reads, “No deck changing.”

Rationale: Swimmers are willing to risk unwelcome exposure to non-consenting individuals.

**Proposal 2 (MT Swimming Proposal 6)**

MT Swimming adopt the Zone Code of Conduct for all MT sponsored events.

Rationale: This will establish a consistent behavioral standard for all MT sponsored events.

**Proposal 3 (MT Swimming Proposal 7)**

MT Swimming Code of Conduct is in effect 120 days prior to event and the maintained throughout the duration of the event.

Rationale: MT Swimming sponsored events are a privilege to attend, not a right. MT Swimming members desire management of unwanted behavior while providing supervision at MT Swimming sponsored events. Furthermore, this policy will enhance the expectation of swimmers to maintain consistent behavioral standard while representing MT Swimming.

**Proposal 4 (MT Swimming Proposal 8)**

In the second sentence, strike the words” first weekend in May” from language.

*Current Language: Change the Montana All-Star Team criteria to 13 & Over swimmers who achieve a “AAA” in their respective age group based on their current age. A training camp the first weekend in May will be awarded to the qualified swimmers. Coaches with qualified swimmers are eligible to coach. Other coaches are welcomed to attend. If a swimmer ages up in the time between Short Course State and the training camp and does not qualify for the older age group, the swimmer is still eligible to participate. The Coaches Representative is in charge of the logistics of the training camp.*

Rationale: In the past seven years , 5 camps have been hosted and none of them have been hosted on the first weekend in May. In fact, the camp has typically been hosted on Memorial Day weekend. This would allow MT Swimming to have flexibility to place the camp where it has the most positive impact for the swimmers.

**End of Deidre Loyda Proposals**

## **Kirk Ermels, HLST**

### **Proposal 1 (MT Swimming Proposal 9)**

Combine the 15-16 and 17-21 Age-groups at the Long Course and Short Course State Meets. Offer A and B finals for this Age-group and score to 16 places.

Rationale: We did this out of necessity at the Montana Short Course Championships this past year and we had some fabulous races that we would not have had otherwise. This made the meet more fun and exciting for the kids. Not only do the fastest swimmers race the fastest swimmers, there is an added level of accomplishment/competition for kids on the border of the A or B Final, and swimmers in the B final will have the opportunity to race kids who are similar in speed. There are a number of different ways we can do this to ensure that we don't take opportunities away from any swimmers and I am open to anything that makes this work. We are a small enough LSC that we need to make sure we are giving kids the opportunity to race the best they can.

**End of Kirk Ermels, HLST**

## **Kirk Ermels, Proposals from Technical Planning Committee**

### **Proposal 1 (MT Swimming Proposal 10)**

Specify that the requirement that distances of 400 or longer be swum fastest to slowest only applies to individual events.

Rationale: Make all relays congruent and conform to the intent of the rule.

Submitted by: Kirk Ermels, Technical Planning Chair

### **Proposal 2 (MT Swimming Proposal 11)**

At the Short Course and Long Course State Meets, hold the fastest 1 heat of boys and fastest 1 heat of girls (regardless of age) of any individual event 400 or longer during the finals session.

Rationale: This is similar to what is done at other large meets and would give swimmers in those events an opportunity to swim in front of a larger audience.

Submitted by: Kirk Ermels, Technical Planning Chair

**End of Technical Planning Committee**

## **Susan Huckleby**

2011 MT Swimming Proposals

### **Proposal 1 (MT Swimming Proposal 12)**

Montana Swimming Athlete of the Year award:

- Selection of the Female and Male Montana Swimming Athlete of the Year will be on a score basis, not a vote of the House of Delegates.
- Athletes will be nominated, scores submitted, and athletes of the year determined at the Montana Swimming Spring House of Delegates meeting. Scores must accompany any nomination.
- In April of each year the Montana Swimming General Chair will announce to the LSC that nominations for the MT Swimming Athletes of the Year are being accepted. The announcement and the application worksheet shall be sent to each team, each member of the Montana Swimming Board of Directors, placed on the Montana Swimming website, and announced in any other manner deemed appropriate at that time.
- Athlete nominations may be submitted to the General Chair prior to the Spring Montana Swimming House of Delegates meeting or may be submitted during the Spring House of Delegates meeting.
- To qualify, athletes must be age 21 or younger when the power points were achieved.
- To qualify, the athlete must be an active member of Montana Swimming when the power point scores were achieved and must have competed in at least two Montana Swimming swim meets during this time period. Power point scores achieved while the athlete is a member of another LSC do not qualify for this award.
- Swimmers from college varsity swim teams and professional swimmers are ineligible for this award.
- The qualifying time period is from April 1 of the previous year through March 31 of the current award year.
- Montana Swimming will award a plaque to the Male and Female Athletes of the Year at the Montana Swimming Long Course State Championship meet.
- In the case of a tie, a joint award will be presented.
- If no nominations are submitted, no award will be given that year.
- The award shall be based on the top five Hy-Tek Power Point scores for the athlete in the qualifying time period. Multiple power point scores for the same event or for the same event in different courses will not be accepted. (For example the athlete may submit a score from the 100 yard freestyle, but may not submit a score from the 100 LCM freestyle or 100 SCM freestyle.)
- The power point scores may only be used from times in the USA Swimming SWIMS data base and shown on the USA Swimming website Times database.
- Nominations must be accompanied by the application worksheet and a print out of the scores from the USA Swimming SWIMS Times database.
- To print the power point scores from the USA Swimming Times database go to the USA Swimming website at [www.usaswimming.org](http://www.usaswimming.org). Click on the 'Times' tab, click on the 'Times Search' tab, and click on the 'Individual Time Search' tab. Under the Individual Times Search tab, enter the athlete's first and last name, the date range (April 1 of the previous year to March 31 of the current year), and under 'Sort By', use the down arrow and click on 'Power Points'. The search may also be narrowed by using the age range feature and clicking on "Show only fastest time by event". Click 'Search'. Print a copy of the results and circle the top five (5) power point scores. Submit this paperwork with the application worksheet.
- The application worksheet will be used to tally the scores.

#### Rationale:

Last year we passed a new athlete of the year policy. This proposal is basically last year's legislation just written hopefully more clearly. The section on the power point scores was re-written to explain how to find and submit the power point scores. The application worksheet has not been changed. There are two small changes to the proposal from last year. 1. The manner in which the general chair announces that nominations will be accepted has been changed slightly. Last year the General Chair was to send the announcement to the coaches and teams. In this draft, the general chair notifies the teams, the MT Swimming Board of Directors, places the announcement on the website, and can announce in any other manner deemed acceptable. Any other manner could include Facebook or Twitter or a phone call or a personal e-mail. Ten years ago Facebook wasn't the phenomenon it is today and this option allows for future technology to be used for announcements. 2. The qualifying period was changed to April 1 of the previous year to March 31 of the current year to include a full long course season and a full short course season. The wording from last year was from May 1 of the previous year to April 30 of the current year.

Submitted by Susan Huckleby

#### **Proposal 2 (MT Swimming Proposal 13)**

Addition of multi-age super final heats at Short Course State:

Add a multi-age super final heat for all multi-age group prelim-final events at the Montana Swimming Short Course State Championships beginning with the 2012 Short Course State Championship. The meet referee may at his/her discretion combine and swim subsequent finals heats of the same event should there be fewer than 8 swimmers in any remaining heat after the seeding of the multi-age super final; these combined heats will be still scored and awarded according to age group.

Rationale: The multi-age super final is an easy way to increase competition and allow the best of the best to race each other in one super heat.

The multi age super final is a special way to seed finals in a prelims/finals group event. Assuming an 8 lane pool and an event set up with the 11-12, 13-14, 15-16, and 17-21 age groups, the finals would have a top 8 heat of the fastest 8 swimmers in the event regardless of age plus a top heat of the 8 remaining 11-12 year olds, a top heat of the 8 remaining 13-14 year olds, a top heat of the 8 remaining 15-16 year olds, and a top heat of the 8 remaining 17-21 year olds. The super heat itself will always be only one final of the fastest swimmers (although if desired subsequent heats could be set for A, B, and even C finals). This set up is easily done in Meet Manager in the event set up screen. It is proposed only for the SC State meet as there are more athletes at SC State than any other state championship meet thus allowing for better competition.

Submitted by Susan Huckleby

### **Proposal 3 (MT Swimming Proposal 14)**

#### **New Short Course State meet format**

Montana Swimming will host three short course state championship meets each spring – ‘A’ State, ‘BB’ State and the Junior BC Championships. ‘A’ State will be held generally the week after MHSA High School State meet. (The date may fluctuate depending upon the date of Senior Sectionals.) ‘BB’ State will be held one week after ‘A’ State, and the Junior BC Championships will be held the week after ‘BB’ State or later. Time trials will be offered at both ‘A’ and ‘BB’ State.

This meet format change will not take place until the 2012-2013 season (state meets to be held the spring of 2013.) The delay in implementing the change is to allow for the evaluation of the 2011 MT Swimming Senior Championship meet and to allow teams time to bid for these new meets.

#### ‘BB’ State:

- No changes to the current Montana Swimming Short Course State meet policies, procedures, and rules except a de-qual time will be added.
- The de-qual time shall be: Any swimmer with an “AA” time or faster in any course in any event may not enter that event or the corresponding leg of a relay at the ‘BB’ Short Course State.
- Senior recognition will be held at ‘BB’ State for those athletes competing at the meet.
- The MT Swimming athlete representative meeting and elections will be held at BB State.
- The Spirit award and team awards will be awarded at BB State as per past practices.
- The Excellence in Officiating award will be presented at BB State.

#### A State:

- To qualify for ‘A’ Short Course State, swimmers must enter at least one event with an “A” time or faster in any course. The swimmer may then enter any other event with a “BB” time or faster in any course.
- There are no 8 and under events at this meet. Any 8 and under swimmer who has achieved the 10 and under qualifying standards may enter the meet.
- There are no 13 and over 50 yard/meter backstroke, breaststroke, or butterfly events at this meet.
- The oldest age group will be changed from 17-21 to 17 and over.
- Athletes may enter seven (7) individual events total with no more than 3 individual events per day. Athletes may enter three relays total with no more than 1 relay per day.

- All individual events for all age groups will be prelim-final events with the exception of the 500 yd/400 m freestyle, 400 yd/m IM, 1000 yd/800 m freestyle and the 1650 yd/1500 m freestyle. These distance events will be timed finals and will be swum in prelims.
- All relays will be swum during finals as the last events of the day.
- Only the top scoring relay team in each age group and sex from each team will be eligible for points.
- The qualifying time will be from January 1 of the previous year through the entry deadline.
- There will be a spirit award and team trophies awarded at 'A' State and selected and awarded in the same manner as at 'BB' State.
- In prelims individual events will be combined and swum (depending upon the event) in the following age groups: 12 and under (for events that may be swum by athletes ages 10&U and 11-12), 11&O (for the 200 backstroke, 200 breaststroke, 200 butterfly, 400 IM, 1000 freestyle, and 1650 freestyle only), 13&O, and Open for the 500 freestyle.
- Relay events will be swum, scored, and awarded as follows: 12 & Under, 13-14, and 15&O.
- Finals will be swum, scored, and awarded by age group as follows: 10&U, 11-12, 13-14, 15-16, and 17&O.
- The event list will remain the same as BB State with the exception of removing the 8 and under events and the 13&Over 50 backstroke, breaststroke, and butterfly events.
- Championship scratch procedures will be used at the meet.
- The meet format will remain the same – three day prelims/final meet.
- All relay swimmers must be entered into an individual event to compete at this meet. No relay only swimmers.
- No converted times will be accepted. No 'no time' or 'NT' entries will be allowed for any individual or relay entry. Seeding will be as per Montana Swimming and USA Swimming rules.
- Proof of time must be submitted for all individual entries. Times must be proven through the SWIMS database. Relays do not have to submit proof of time.
- No deck entries except for time trials.
- Scoring will be the same as for BB State.
- Senior recognition will be held at 'A' State for those athletes competing at the meet.
- The remaining policies and procedures for BB State would be in effect for this meet including entry limits, scoring, seeding, and awards.

Rationale: I am proposing this as a means to allow for more competitive opportunities for our Montana athletes.

Submitted by Susan Huckleby

#### **Proposal 4 (MT Swimming Proposal 15)**

An official's evaluator from outside Montana will be invited to come to the Montana Swimming Short Course State meet every other year beginning in 2013 to evaluate officials at the meet. Montana Swimming will pay for the evaluator's expenses.

In even years evaluators from Montana may be asked to evaluate the officials at either Long Course State or Short Course State.

Rationale:

Providing training and evaluation opportunities for officials will serve to make our officials better. Montana Swimming provides funding for training opportunities and clinics for coaches and it has been a positive experience for the coaches. This proposal will provide a similar opportunity for officials.

It should be noted that this proposal may not be needed. Merle Gunderson and I both recall that this proposal may have been passed already, but it has not been implemented.

In the past it was decided to have an evaluator at Short Course State rather than Long Course State for several reasons including: SC State is a larger meet, there are more athletes at SC State, there are more individual swims at SC State, and there are more officials at SC State. This discussion took place after the officials considered having an evaluator at LC State. Having more swims at a meet is important for an official being evaluated because it allows the official more opportunities to be evaluated and gives the evaluator more opportunities to observe more officials at the meet.

Submitted by Susan Huckleby

**End of Susan Huckleby Proposals**

**David Berkoff**

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Montana Swimming HOD  
From: David Berkoff  
Date: September 1, 2011  
Re: LSC Combination Proposal

---

Dear Members:

One of the first directives the new USAS Board of Directors received from the Executive Branch of USAS this past fall was to fix the LSC problem. I, and a few others on the Board, have been quietly discussing this issue. To back up a moment, it is important to know where LSCs originated.

USAS's LSCs are relics of the Amateur Athletic Union. When Congress passed the Amateur Sports Act in 1980, United States Swimming, now USAS, broke off of the AAU and took the LSC system as the template for creating regional swimming organizations. I am told that the AAU's last adjustment of its LSC boundaries was well before 1980. Thus, we currently have LSC boundaries that are more than 40 years old. While this might not seem like a problem, it is. When the LSC boundaries were first drawn upon ages ago, the demographics of the country were a lot different. Southern California was about a 10<sup>th</sup> of the size it is now and the Seattle area didn't have Starbucks or Microsoft. Things have changed,



but LSCs have not. Now, some LSCs are huge and others are barely hanging on. The level of competition and achievement are, not surprisingly, closely tied to the size of the LSC.

The USAS Executive Branch made it clear to the USAS Board that it wants all LSCs to have paid executive directors, wants LSCs to agree to have on-line registration, and wants LSCs to adopt 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies. While some very large LSCs such as Southern California and Illinois have no problem hiring staff or adopting to an on-line system for everything, smaller LSCs do not have the finances to do this. Again, what might have been appropriate boundaries 40 years ago in a “paper era” of technology is now not and we are way behind now.

A few of USAS’s Board members have been informally getting together to discuss the LSC structure and how to best fix a broken system. We understand that there is a lot of politics and “history” involved in LSCs and that making large changes to the current LSC system is going to be a tough sell. However, I think there are several small fixes that we might implement that could serve as a template for changes across the country and could really help Montana in the long run.

Montana has less than 1,200 swimmers. Our closest LSC neighbors, Inland Empire and Snake River, have 1,400 and 1,100 swimmers respectively. Combined, we approach that magic 4,000 member number. Those LSCs that have been successful in hiring paid staff seem to have membership levels of 4,000 members or more. Such LSCs include: Southern California (15,000+); Illinois (15,000); Middle Atlantic (7,500); Potomac Valley (7,000+); Oregon (5,000); Pacific Northwest (5,000); Colorado (5,000+).

I have two proposals.

### **Proposal 1 (MT Swimming Proposal 16)**

First, I propose that we, Inland Empire, and Snake River look into the idea of having a tripartite LSC arrangement for the purpose of LSC management/ athlete registration and hire a joint executive director to manage all three LSCs. Obviously, the devil is in the detail and we would need to discuss this in more depth with Inland Empire and Snake River.

The positives are many: (1) all three LSCs are provided with a professional paid staff (instead of a volunteer “staff”); (2) we have more financial stability and power as an organization; (3) we will be better equipped to access and utilize many of the USAS programs that we either do not access or know about; (4) we add a new level of professionalism to the sport and our profession as coaches; and (5) we will have the opportunity to expand our programs through a larger combined LSC.

Another major benefit of combining management of LSCs instead of simply combining all three LSCs into one LSC is that we (1) keep our regional individuality and (2) retain our political power at the national level by maintaining the same number of delegates—something that would be lost if we combined as one LSC.

### **Proposal 2 (MT Swimming Proposal 17)**

My second proposal involves the issue I am frankly tired of talking about—lack of competition at our LSC championships. To be blunt, I think we have let politics and old thinking get in the way of what is best for swimming in Montana. Our job—our charge as a member organization of USAS—is to help produce the best and fastest swimmers we can. We are not doing that by having an LSC Championships with half of the lanes empty. It is also no surprise why our swimmers do so well when they compete at the Sectional and Zones meets every year—they finally get to race against equals.

In speaking with representatives of both Inland Empire and Snake River, they, not surprisingly, have the same problem—empty lanes and a lack of competition. I propose that we hold a Spring and Summer Tri-LSC Championship Meet with Inland Empire and Snake River to take the place of our current MT LSC Championship meet. Again, the devil is in the details, but my thought is that the meet could rotate between the three LSCs upon a bidding system. I propose that we start these meets in 2013 so that we have enough time to put them together. I have discussed this proposal in detail with several Montana, Inland Empire and Snake River coaches and officials and have had very good support.

The positives are obvious. We (1) have a much higher level of competition; (2) we get to see new faces; (3) we get to swim at least four times every three years in a new facility, many times at or near sea level. The obvious downside is that we have to travel further and lose the “old” LSC championship meet. To offset these downsides, I propose three things:

First, at the tri-LSC meet, we keep the local LSC scores and the overall score. That way a Montana champ, a Snake River champ, and an Inland Empire champ are crowned. We also would retain tri-LSC records and local LSC records just as we have in the past.

Second, the new tri-LSC proposal would be limited to 9-10 and higher age groups. This would cut down on the strain (and disincentive) that taking 8 and unders to a far-away meet might pose.

Third, to assure that those Montana kids who might not make the tri-LSC time standards have a place to swim, we would continue to run a winter and summer B/C meet. Doing so would actually expand this program and would boost participation.

I ask that you think about these proposals. Montana Swimming is at a grow or slowly die stage. I think these proposals can help us go in the right direction and will benefit all of us in the long run.

Dave Berkoff

MAC Head Coach

**End of David Berkoff Proposals**

### **(MT Swimming Proposal 18)**

**TeamUnify proposal.** I would like to increase the registration fee charged to each swimmer within the state of Montana by between \$5.00 - \$10.00 per year so MT Swimming can purchase TeamUnify for all clubs in the LSC. There are two teams that have it now and those two would

get a credit for part of what they have paid this year if this get put in place. TeamUnify gave us two different proposals to choose from.

1. One that gives us a higher cost up front but a chance to get some of those dollars back if we generate more money for TeamUnify in a revenue sharing arrangement.
2. The other gives us a lower price but requires each team to spend money which may cost less up front for MT Swimming but could cost each of our clubs more over the year.

I think this will help all our clubs better manage their teams in the MT LSC.

### **(MT Swimming Proposal 19)**

I want to make a motion to open up our State Championship Seniors meet to any qualified swimmer in our region that has the same qualifying times. This would take effect immediately and would govern the November meet.

This will allow our senior qualifying swimmers to swim with more athletes which will allow us to have a more comparative meet.

**End of All proposals**