

# USMS Convention — Anaheim (Garden Grove), California 2013

<b>Committee Name:</b>	Records & Tabulation	<b>Session #:</b>	1	<b>Report #:</b>	10
<b>Committee Chair:</b>	Chris Stevenson	<b>Vice Chair:</b>	Greg Danner		
<b>Minutes recorded by:</b>	Greg Danner	<b>Date/time of meeting:</b>	9/13/13 7:45 am		

---

## Actions Requiring Approval by the HOD:

- 1.

---

## Motions Passed:

1. MSA for minutes from previous meeting (5-19-13). Motion approved unanimously.
2. MSA to amend L 21 202.1.1 A (3) (a) as follows: “The length of the non-bulkhead competition course..”. Motion approved unanimously.

---

<b>Number of committee members present:</b> 8	<b>Absent:</b> 1	<b>Number of other delegates present:</b> 18
<b>Committee members present (list all, including chair and vice chair):</b> Chris Stevenson, Greg Danner, Mary Beth Windrath, Walt Reid, Hans Van Meeteren, Ginger Pierson, Barbara Dunbar, Jeanne Seidler		

---

## Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:48am

1. MSA to approve minutes of May 19<sup>th</sup>. Unanimously approved.
2. Issues that arose during the course of the year were briefly summarized for the committee and the audience.
  - a. The Committee discussed a few items related to splits:
    - i. The first 50 split of the 1500 at LC Nationals.
    - ii. If a TTR has local meet results and wants all relay leadoffs added to the event rankings, they can contact Jim Matysek for inclusion.
    - iii. A blanket split request is possible for the entirety of a meet.
    - iv. The USMS split notification form is not mandatory; a swimmer can submit a piece of paper asking for a split.
  - b. TTRs are asked to submit all pool measurements to USMS as meets are run. Walt indicated that there are approximately 500 pool measurements now on file, so TTRs have been doing a good job of submitting the measurements.
  - c. Chris updated the Committee on an issue regarding pools where only one or some lanes are short, but other lanes are long enough. Per Kathy Casey, all swims in short lanes cannot be submitted for Top Ten, but the remaining lanes can be submitted. Committee members seek further clarification on situations when only three lanes are measured. If one lane is short, does another “third” lane need to be measured?
  - d. The Committee previously discussed motivational time standards and Chris brought up the fact that the Committee recommended against it at the time. Committee member Mike Abegg (not present) had said he may implement them in his LMSC and report back to the Committee on progress.
  - e. The committee formalized a policy for alteration of Top 10 lists after official publication.
    - i. There is a thread in the Records & Tabulation (private) forums to track non-trivial changes to the Top Ten lists after official publication. There is only one entry so far, and Chris hopes that this thread will continue to be utilized so we have history of changes following publication. Members sometimes inquire about how they thought they were in the Top Ten at one time, but could not determine why they were no longer included. This type of history may answer those questions.
3. Discussion of proposed legislation.

- a. L 21 – 202.1.1 A (3) – modification and renumbering of this statement to require additional meet information with regarding to the pool measurement. The committee discussed the various statements and thought that meet directors may simply choose the first option (option a) without realizing that a bulkhead facility does not apply.
  - b. Motion to amend L 21- 202.1.1 Section A (3) (a) as follows: “the length of the non-bulkhead competition course...”
4. The Committee fielded questions from the audience.
- a. What are the differences between USA-S and USMS pool measurement requirements? Committee members discussed varying measurement requirements and stated that USMS holds stricter standards. Chris reminded the meeting attendees that swimmers are now Top Ten eligible without bulkhead measurements. The pool length certification measurements must still be on file with USMS.
  - b. Chris asked Mary Beth Windrath about the usage of the web tools by Top 10 Recorders. Mary Beth stated that approximately 99% of Top 10 recorders are using web tools for submission. What percentage of sanctioned meets is uploaded to meet results database? This is unknown. Anna Lea Matysek will contact Top 10 Recorders to point out when sanctioned meets do not have uploaded results. Swimmers will inquire if meet results are not uploaded in a timely manner. Best practices indicate that meets should be uploaded within 2-4 weeks. LMSCs should have policies and procedures that require meet directors and Top 10 Recorders to follow through. Also, results should still be uploaded for meets where the pool has not been measured or does not meet the standard. The results database is not just for Top Ten and Top 10 Recorders need to be educated about that. Jim Matysek indicated that some type of visual highlighting will be in effect for times in the ERDB that do not meet standards for Top Ten inclusion.
  - c. An LMSC that sanctioned a dual sanctioned meet is responsible for measurements and items necessary for Top 10 submission. As a precaution, competing USMS swimmer(s) should assume oversight responsibility, even though it is not required. The TTR can't keep track of all possible USA-S competitions that people are planning on attending, but they should be aware of dual sanctioned events.
  - d. Can Meet Directors submit results directly to National? There are questions about bypassing a LMSC Top 10 Recorder. There can be delays, but Top 10 Recorders need to be the ones doing the uploading since there is almost always auditing taking place with meet results. LMSC officers must work through issues with their Top 10 Recorder and allow for reasonable processing times (2-4 weeks). Should there be a disclaimer indicating there will be a minimum number of days prior to uploading? The Committee does not think this is a good idea.
  - e. There is a request to utilize the National database to determine LMSC records. Although that functionality is not possible, it is in the list of projects submitted to IT. Currently, reporting is available to list Top Ten swimmers in the LMSC each year. This can be used to supplement research on LMSC records.
  - f. “Report an issue” button in web tools – Jim asked that Top 10 Recorders use this button if there are any glitches/errors noticed; an email to this effect went out to all recorders. With regard to the file type of the upload, a HY3 file is preferred, unless the meet director is using workout groups and the alternate club field, in which case a CLT file type should be used. Otherwise, swimmers can be duplicated within the database.
  - g. For TTRs that thought a meet was measured and had initially marked it as such, there is an option within the web tools to uncheck that the pool has been measured.
  - h. Suggestions for TTR web tools? Nancy Rideout indicated that relay results are often missing names of swimmers who were relay only athletes. This creates a burden because adding swimmers to the relays via the web tools is a time consuming process. She asked if there was an easier method for adding swimmers to relays. Jim and Anna Lea Matysek point out that the burden should fall on the meet directors to clean up this information.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 am

---