

**UNITED STATES SKI AND SNOWBOARD ASSOCIATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**

**Olympia Park Hotel -- Grand Ballroom I-II
Park City, UT**

**Friday, September 11, 1998
1:00 p.m. - 5:20 p.m.**

MEETING MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

USSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

Chairman: Jim McCarthy
Vice-Chairman: Stew Turley, absent
Secretary-Treasurer: Bill Bindley, absent

FIS/USOC

FIS Ranking Representative: Hank Tauber, absent
USOC Ranking Representative: Serge Lussi

USSTF

Nick Badami
William T. Esrey
Vinton Sommerville
Thom Weisel, absent

SPORTS REPRESENTATIVES

Alpine Discipline Representative: Bill Slattery
Snowboard Discipline Representative: Gary Taylor
Freestyle Discipline Representative: Jeff Lange
Cross Country Discipline Representative: Lee Todd
Jumping/Nordic Combined Discipline Representative: Alan Johnson
Disabled Discipline Representative: Jack Benedick

ATHLETES

Alpine Athlete: Edith Thys, absent
Snowboard Athlete: Rick Bower
Freestyle Athlete: Craig Rodman
Cross Country Athlete: John Aalberg
Jumping/Nordic Combined Athlete: Greg Boester, absent
Disabled Athlete: Cathy Gentile-Patty
USOC Athlete: Joe Walsh

EX-OFFICIO/NON VOTING

USOC Athletes' Advisory Council Representative: Joe Walsh
NSAA President/Chair: Michael Berry, absent
SIA President/Chair: David Ingemie

HONORARY

Dr. Bud Little, absent
Dr. Leland Sosman

Staff

President & CEO: Bill Marolt
Executive Vice President: Bill Gorton
CFO: Mark Lampe
Vice President Athletics: Alan Ashley
Vice President PR & Member Services: Tom Kelly

Legal Counsel

Todd Wakefield
Gordon Strachan, absent

1.0 Chairman's Welcome: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: I'd like to welcome all of you to the U. S. Ski and Snowboard Association Congress. Thank you for coming. For those who have been here since Wednesday, in my personal judgment, this is probably the best, most exciting, and positive series of meetings for USSA that I have been in for quite some time. It was fun to be here, and I would like to thank Bill and his staff for their efforts and ideas in putting it together, particularly the keynote address on Wednesday and the awards dinner last night. They were very professional and very enjoyable. Thank you guys. Now is the time to end the enjoyment and the fun and attend to the work of the USSA Board. Serge, do you want to second that?

Lussi: Very quickly Jim. Last night, Bill Marolt's idea was probably the best thing that I have seen here in a long time. For those of you who were there, you know what I am talking about, and for those who weren't there, it was a recognition of retiring athletes and it was done very, very well and is something we should do. Bill, you're credited for that one. It was terrific. Thank you very much, Bill.

Marolt: Serge, I appreciate that. In order for an organization to have depth and breadth, you have to have history and tradition, and clearly if we are going to have that history and tradition, we need to recognize the primary players. And the primary players are the athletes. I'm glad to have done that, and we will push it on and make it even better.

McCarthy: What it epitomizes is that we have regained our focus on athletes and athletics. We are back on track, hopefully in time to do extremely well in 2002 and beyond. I'd like to go around the table and have the board members just indicate their names for the record. We're doing all this on tape and it would help Suzette greatly if the board members would indicate their names. I will start on my left with John Aalberg.

(The board members state their names and titles.)

McCarthy: Again, thanks to everybody for coming. I appreciate your time and your involvement, and, hopefully, these meetings will be as productive as the first part of this Congress has been. Tom Kelly has a video for us that I'm sure will be of interest to everybody. Do you want to put on the video now?

Kelly: Yes, it needs little introduction. Most of you have seen it, but we can't see this enough, because this is what our organization is all about. (Video)

McCarthy: Thanks, Tom. That does a great job of setting the mood for these meetings and again focusing our attention on the athletes and athletics as the basis that we should reference in all our decisions. So, with that said, why don't we get started.

2.0 USSA Agenda Approval: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: I would entertain a motion to approve the agenda, which is in your book on page 59.

Motion #1: To approve the agenda as submitted.

M/S/C M/Bill Slattery, S/Jack Benedick, Carried

3.0 USSA Meeting Minutes Approval June, 1998: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: Item #3 is approval of the minutes of our June 1998 meeting. The minutes are included in your book. Hopefully everyone has had a chance to review them; they're fairly voluminous. Jack.

Benedick: I have a correction. On page 107 when I was talking, it's typed out as the FIS wouldn't accept disabled skiing in the '94 Congress. It is just the opposite, they did accept disabled skiing in the 1994 Congress.

McCarthy: So it should be would. OK. Any other corrections, deletions, additions? If not, with the correction made by Jack, I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes of the June meeting.

Motion #2: To approve the minutes from June, 1998 as corrected.

M/S/C M/Jack Benedick, S/Gary Taylor, Carried.

4.0 Chairman's Report: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: Probably the biggest involvement that I've had (with Bill Gorton, Bill Marolt and Serge Lussi), since the June meetings was the amendments to the Amateur Sports Act. I'll go into those in more detail subsequently, but it came up very quickly after our June meetings and rather unexpectedly was being pushed into the Senate for approval by Senator Stevens. There were a number of sections that affected skiing and our programs directly. We prioritized those in relation to our own internal agenda and attempted to get some changes made. I'm sorry to report that, for the most part, we have not been successful thus far, although we still hold out some hope for the changes. Again, under Serge's report, I will go into those in more detail.

Other than that, most of the staff time this summer has been devoted to planning and getting us to the point where we are 18 to 24 months ahead in our planning. The books that you have received reflect their efforts. Again, it's voluminous, it is reasonably detailed, and we now have a plan in front of us that will take us, and I always have to make sure I have the right year, it's 2000 that we're now through in our planning. I personally think that's fantastic. I was, as many of you know, quite concerned at our meeting in Jackson that we had not done the planning. We had put

our goals up but we hadn't filled in how we were going to get there. I would again like to congratulate Alan, Bill and Bill, and the entire staff for the tremendous effort they put in this summer to get us 18 months to 24 months ahead in planning. I am quite confident it is going to make a big difference internally in terms of pursuit of our goals and also in the way the organization is viewed by our affiliated organizations, the USOC, FIS, what have you. That's a tremendous step forward and one that is going to make a great difference.

Those are probably the two highlights of the summer. I will tell you one thing I did not get done this summer, and this is my responsibility, I had asked the Discipline Committee people to work through me and Todd Wakefield on their operating procedures for the Discipline Committees. That fell by the wayside, but it is still on the agenda, and we'll pick it up again after this meeting so that we can get that finalized and get everybody in a situation where they have acceptable working operating procedures. Unless there are any questions, that completes my report and I'll turn it over to Bill Marolt.

5.0 Chief Executive Officer's Report: Bill Marolt

Marolt: Thank you all for being here and, as Jim suggests, these series of meetings have been positive and productive, and we're beginning to set a tone and movement as we move forward into the competitive season and as we look down the road to 2002. We have had a busy summer, with most of it dedicated to the planning process. Again, as Jim has mentioned, we are now planned out to the 1999-2000 season in terms of our athletic program, and now the other departments are building their plans behind athletics. So we have accomplished what we need to in terms of athletics driving the company, and I feel good about that.

The planning process has been such that each of our programs, each of our athletes, each of our coaches has specific goals to accomplish over next year and as we look down the road to 2002. Our athletic programs have moved forward and aggressively. In a post-Olympic year, we have not suffered the same sort of fall-off that we have in post-Olympic years in the past. As a matter of fact, our coaches and athletes have increased their focus and increased their intensity, and I sense that our summer training programs are going well. Alan will talk a little more in depth about that.

We've continued to develop the company as a successful business enterprise, finding greater revenue and translating that revenue into the bottom line, which ultimately goes to the athletes. Now that I've been here roughly two years, I'm starting to feel the staff, the athletes, and the volunteers coming together and forming a team and forming the family that I talked about in my keynote address. I'm starting to feel us move down the road. That's exciting, because when you have a group of people motivated and focused, there isn't anything we can't accomplish. As I go into some specifics of my report today, what I'm going to talk a little bit about is our mission and vision, our goals, give you a financial update, some department updates, and a brief look at athletics. Alan will talk about the Athletic Department and the details there.

Vision and Mission--It's important that every time we get together we look at our vision and we look at our mission. Ultimately, to be totally successful, we need buy-in on the part of our entire constituent group, and we are moving in that direction. The vision of USSA is simply to make the United States of America the best in the world at skiing and snowboarding, and I believe that, with the direction we're moving, that will happen. The mission of USSA is to make the vision a reality by fielding

teams of world-class ski and snowboard athletes. Again, very basic and simple statements that deliver the message of who we are, where we're going, and how we're going to get there.

Organizational Goals--These are goals that our staff sat down about 18 months ago in December of 1996, and we discussed what we wanted to do, what was important, and what our core business is. As we look at the four goals, *athletic excellence*, that's what we're all about. Our core business is kids; our core business is providing opportunity for coaches and athletes to work together to get better. Again, it's one of those things that you have to stay clearly focused on.

As you sit in the meetings of this Congress, there are a lot of great ideas that are put on the table and talked about. You have to be careful to sift through those things and make sure that when we're developing ideas, that the ideas and the decisions are athletically focused. If we are going to have the athletic success that we want, we have to be a *financially sound organization*. We have to manage our resources well, we have to control expenses, and maximize revenue. If we're going to provide consistent leadership and a consistent program to athletes, then we've got to be financially successful.

If, ultimately, we're going to have the success, we have to figure out a way to *grow our organization*. We have to figure out a way to grow at the grass roots level, but we don't want to grow just for growth's sake. We want to grow through quality athletic programming so that the athletes who come up through our development pipeline have the ability to compete with the world's best.

Finally, we want to establish a *clear corporate image*. We want the public, we want our donors, we want our corporate sponsors, we want everybody to think of the United States Ski and Snowboard Association, the United States Ski Team, the United States Snowboard Team, we want them to think that this is a world-class sports organization. To that end, we have work to do to develop a new logo, which will ultimately translate into a whole family of logos, and we have retained a public relations firm. Through all of those areas I believe that we do have, and will continue to develop, our image as a world-class sports organization.

Finance--As we look at our financial situation, this year we ended with a \$145,000 surplus. You will see this in our audited financial statements, and those are available today, you should have them in front of you. I feel very good about this, because this is the third straight year of a surplus, and it shows we're moving in the right direction because we have managed at year-end to be in a strong financial position. Through our detailed and rigorous planning and through a conservative estimate of revenue potential and focusing on athletic goals, we've been able to do all that we want and still, at the end of the year, provide a surplus; and as you look back over the last three years, we have been in that position.

As we project ahead to next year, we're looking at being in another surplus position. I've put up on the screen for you to look at a budget for FY 98/99. I have compared that with FY 97/98 so that you can see that we have projected growth of about \$2 million. What that projected growth translates into is record funding for our athletic programs.

On the revenue side, we have strong confidence that we will end up with a little bit more than \$17 million. Again, on the expense side, athletics projects to be about a \$7.7 million budget, which is significant growth over last year. As you look down through the expenses, the events expense has gone down, because we are not doing the Gold Cup in Lake Placid this year. In the sales, general, and

administrative, we have actually seen an increase; but one of the reasons you are seeing that is because we have invested in additional staffing in marketing, additional staffing in Foundation. With this financial report you're starting to see the growth in the programs to get us to the point where we want to be.

The investment in resources, the investment in staff and so forth has paid off. As you compare what we were doing in FY 95/96, we basically have a 51% increase in our athletic budget and a 28% increase from last year to this year starting with \$5.1 million in FY 95/96 and again, in round numbers, \$7.7 million for FY 98/99. I feel very good about what we're doing with our financial management. All of our managers understand that they need to take care and spend their resources carefully. We have good discipline. Mark does a good job in preparing the information for us, and we do a regular review of where we are. As we go forward, we will be where we need to be.

Events--In looking at our Events Department, Annette Royal has done a wonderful job in putting together a calendar of events and in staging world-class events. We've done well in our World Cup competitions and our Grand Prix and with our National Championships. As I've sat through board meetings throughout the years, we've always talked about how can we do a better job with our domestic programs and how can we do a better job in developing high-level domestic competition. We have looked at updating the Nor-Am, and as part of the Nor-Am series, which is a cooperative effort between the Canadians and the Americans, we're going to take the American part of the Nor-Am and develop what we're going to call an Alpine Super Series. This is important for our young developing athletes to be able to compete in a high-quality series of events.

Basically, what we're going to do is take the World Cup venues, and after each World Cup race, we're going to host one of our Nor-Ams or one of our Alpine Super Series events. Over a period of time, we'll build this out and create and develop it to such a level that when our athletes are either in Europe or at home, they are going to be essentially skiing at the same sort of level and in the same sort of competitive event.

We're going to work hard to get some additional promotion with this event. Jalbert, as part of his *Quest Series*, is going to devote about 30 minutes of television time to it. Through our partnership with *Resort Sports Network*, we will have a report on the Alpine Super Series on the *Fox Sports Network*. It's a 13-week show, and each week we'll get an update on where we are with our Alpine Super Series.

We're doing the same thing with the Snowboard Grand Prix. We've actually added the National Championships to the Grand Prix, and we're calling that the Snowboard Super Prix. Again, it's to enhance our high-level domestic programs and create the best possible competition venue with the best possible athletes participating and competing. At the end, with both series, we're going to try to create the situation where there is a big prize, whether it's an automobile from Chevy Truck or a cash prize, we want to provide an incentive to the athletes to ski in all of these events and make it a big deal at the end.

During this summer we organized the first event organizers' meeting where we invited all of our World Cup and National Championship organizers to Park City. We had a very good two-day seminar where we shared ideas, compared programs, compared budgets, did a lot of good team building. It will make for a better Events Department, and it will help us organize first-class World Cup events. I should say, though, that in the long history of US skiing and hosting World Cup events, our event organizers and ski areas do a first class job. Across the board, these are wonderful

events. Sometimes when you're in Europe, the events are not as good as ours, so we should feel good about that.

During the summer we developed a new event property. As a staff, we felt there were opportunities during the summer months to take advantage of the Winter Sports Park, the freestyle facility there, so we developed what we call the *Ultimate Airwave*. It was sponsored by *Sprint*, and it was an awesome event. When you walked in, it took your breath. Our staff put together a classy presentation. We had a lot of people. It was made for television--it's already run on ESPN 2 and will run again on ESPN later this month. It just showed that with some imagination and some motivated people, we can do great made-for-TV events. It was profitable, so it made sense for everybody. It was a win/win.

We announced earlier this week that the Alpine and Freestyle National Championships will be conducted this winter at the Olympic venues in Deer Valley, here in Park City, at the Sports Park, and also at Snow Basin. We're excited about that, and we feel good about where we're going with those venues, because, ultimately, leading up to the Olympics, they are going to be wonderful. But as important, and part of our event plan, is to make sure that we do everything possible to negotiate access to those venues after 2002. I realize that when we're in the Olympic year of 2002, this is going to be the winter sports capital of the world. There won't be another place like it where you have these awesome venues and facilities all within 30 minutes of a major international airport. As an association, we have to make sure that we maximize our opportunities as we go down the road, because as good as it's going to be going to the Olympics, it can be even better as we go past the Olympics.

Marketing and Sales--I feel very good about our marketing and sales program and very good about our marketing and sales staff. Todd Burnette has been with us about the same length of time I have, about two years. He has moved his effort forward, getting better and better as we go along, and now, especially over this year, we're going to start to see significant movement with our marketing and sales program. We added an additional staff member in New York City, a young man named Ted Morris. He's in New York every day banging on doors, and that's going to bring some significant additional opportunity to us.

As part of our sales program and part of our corporate presentation, we have secured and we can now offer our corporate sponsors network television, and we will create two freestyle and two snowboard World Cup network television programs. It's important to our corporate sponsors, and to us, to promote the sports to ultimately find the revenue that we need for the bottom line.

As we look forward with our sponsorship agreements, we have just renewed our *VISA* agreement through 2003. We're finalizing an additional *Chevy* S-10 sponsorship of our Snowboard Grand Prix. *Charles Schwab* has renewed and they have signed an agreement through 2002. We have continued to work hard in a variety of other sponsorship areas. One of my greatest frustrations is that we have a difficult time finding sponsorship in the soft drink category, but we're starting to get some movement. Hopefully by the time we get to our next meeting, we will have an agreement with a soft drink company. Currently we are talking with *Coke*, we're talking with *Pepsi*, and we're also having discussions with *Dr. Pepper*. One of those, hopefully, is going to come to the table.

The second area that's also very frustrating is the malt beverage category. We have approached literally every brewery, and I'm optimistic now that we're finally going to be in a position where we are going to bring *Budweiser* to the table. It's good,

because Bud is a USOC sponsor, and any time that we can find joint sponsorship arrangements with the USOC, it makes it a lot easier for us to do business.

Finally, we are working hard with the USOC, with *Texaco*. We have a good proposal in front of *Home Depot*, and we are very close to finalizing a deal with *NationsBank*. Again, this would be a good arrangement for us, because they are a USOC as well as a SLOC sponsor. As we go forward and you look at the \$9 million net projection in our budget, we can make that \$9 million, and I'm going to be very optimistic and hope that we even go a little bit beyond that.

Member Services--This is an area where we want to try to provide the right kind of service and the necessary service for our members. Tom Kelly and his staff have done a good job in re-designing the program and streamlining it. We now have reduced the processing time. (By that I mean from the time we receive a membership in the office until the time we get it back out the door.) Two years ago we were up to 14 days, and right now, our goal was to be at seven days, but realistically we are turning them around in anywhere from one to three days. If somebody sends their check, within a short period of time they are going to get a confirmation and their membership cards and packages. That's good. It creates more confidence in what we are doing.

At this time we have about 36% of our total membership processed. That's a little ahead of where we were at this time last year. Our goal is to have 65% of our membership processed by the middle of October. From now on, as we have established these deadlines, there will be a real crunch, but by October 15 we'll have about 65% of our processing complete.

We're very happy about the accomplishment of having our comp guides printed and on the table, and they will be in the mail this week. That's a real step forward. There were times in the past when these things went out at the end of February, so this is a major step forward. They're actually a usable document now.

Public Relations--As I mentioned before, we have started to create a new look. We have created a new logo, and Tom has produced an image and logo standards manual for any of our clubs and corporate sponsors who want to use logos. We have guidelines, and it's a useful piece of information in that it helps us protect the logo and the image. TK has done a terrific job of that, and he has also produced an event media standards manual. With our big events, our large World Cup organizers can run a good press headquarters. A lot of our smaller venues and, those areas that are just coming on board, don't have a good understanding of what it takes to have a good press headquarters, so Tom has put this in place to help and support our press and PR efforts at our big events.

Finally, this is a result of having our athletic staff in town and doing a lot of planning, our athletic staff was able to spend time with each of the vice-presidents and to explain what the coaches and the athletes needed in support from each of the vice-presidents. Tom also sat with the coaches, and they developed a specific PR plan for each of the programs, a program that works for the individuals whom we want to use in appearances and at events, etc. This is a major step forward, because now the athletes can put that on their calendar, and they can plan for where they have to be and when they have to be there. So this is another major step forward.

Foundation--Tricia Skalicky and her staff continue to do a wonderful job. Tricia is exactly like all of our vice-presidents, they're young, they're aggressive, and you see them improve literally by the day and by the week.

We have created an opportunity for our foundation members to be part of the 2002 Olympics in a program that we call *Champions Club*. We have 30 of these packages, and Tricia and her staff have already found 20 of the 30 spots. What's terrific about this program is that this is a major commitment on the part of those individuals who want to be involved, and the monies that come from this program are dedicated to our development program. We have been able to step up funding to athletics. If you look at the number budgeted in athletics, the *Champions Club* represents a good part of that.

Gold Pass Program--is moving along very well. We have 306 sold to date. Only 44 are left, and what's good about this program is that we are using fewer of the Gold Passes for fulfillment. That means that we're not including as many in corporate packages and that sort of thing. You're reducing on the expense side and increasing on the revenue side in this area, so this is an ideal program. It's one of our truly great fund raising efforts, and one that's been stable through the years and has been hugely helpful.

Scholarship and Internship Program--We haven't reported in any great detail on this in the past, but our trustees, through the scholarship program, this year granted 15 athletes educational assistance, help to go to school, and those scholarships ranged anywhere from \$500 to \$1,500. Another exciting program is our internship program with *Charles Schwab*. Twelve of our athletes are now involved in that, and it gives the older athletes an opportunity to work in the business world, in the business environment, and to perhaps create a future for themselves after they stop competing. As an example, Matt Grosjean worked in this program a year ago, and since he's retired, he has now gone to work for Montgomery Securities in San Francisco. So, those are good stories, stories we want to tell.

Direct Mail Program--This is the one area where we're not performing at expectation. We're actually lagging behind, and at this time we're taking a very close look at our consultant and marketing firm. We will likely move in the direction of hiring a new direct marketing firm and consultant. With the exception of that, the foundation is performing very well.

Athletic Department--In terms of our Athletic Department, Alan will do a thorough job of this, and you will enjoy hearing what he has to say and the work that has gone into our 24-month plan. You have received the FY 99/00 plan. It should be put in your three ring binder, and as we go forward each year, we will provide you with the subsequent season so that you always have 24 months in your binder, and then remember that we add another year beyond. So now we're looking at FY 02/03, so that when we ultimately get to 2002, we're five years beyond that.

Podium 2002--One of the exciting possibilities for additional support is the Podium 2002 program that the USOC has developed and approved for Sydney and for Salt Lake. It was \$26 million, with \$18 million of that being dedicated to Podium 2002 or to the Salt Lake Olympics. They have come back to the NGBs and asked us for our plans of how we would spend our portion of that \$18 million. It's exciting that the USOC has done that, but what's even better is that we have a plan that we can show them of how we would spend incremental dollars that would come to us.

In our planning, we have created initiatives, everything the coaches would want in terms of initiatives. We fund those initiatives to the level that we can, and when we can't fund further, we push off the initiatives until the next year. Well, when Jim Page from the USOC sits down and says, 'I've got as much as maybe \$1.7 to \$2 million a year,' we can say, 'Jim, here is our plan as we go forward. This is where we would spend those incremental dollars.' I believe this is going to happen, and it will make a

huge difference in what we are going to do in literally every program. It's an exciting initiative on the part of the USOC, and it's money that's going to be spent in the right place, in our athletic programs.

As we have looked at our plan and prioritized, because the USOC asked us to prioritize where we think we have the greatest opportunity of winning medals, what we're going to focus on is alpine, freestyle, snowboard and nordic combined. We think that is where our greatest possibilities lie, and that's where we're going to find the success to win the 10 medals that we put up on the board in terms of our goals for 2002. We don't know what those numbers are going to be. The USOC Board meets in Phoenix in early October, so hopefully sometime from the middle to the end of October we'll have an idea of the dollars that could flow to us from this Podium 2002 initiative. It would add the frosting on the cake and give a giant push to all of our programs, so we're delighted with that.

Summary--I will conclude my remarks and say that this has been an interesting two years. I have the opportunity with all of your support, with our volunteers, our parents, our athletes, our Board, our corporate sponsors and donors, to reach out and to grab the brass ring. In a very short period of time, again because of all the support, we have put the U. S. Ski and Snowboard Association back on track and on path. If we're willing to pay the price and to stay the course, which we are, we will be where we want to be in 2002. The guy who is going to do that and get us there is our vice president of athletics, Alan Ashley. You need to know that there are people in the world who have a tremendous capacity to work with a positive attitude, and Jim will confirm this, he saw him in Nagano. There aren't many guys who can understand all the moving parts of this organization. He understands them, makes all the parts mesh, and provides good leadership to our coaches and our athletes.

6.0 Athletics Sports Specific Plans: Alan Ashley

Ashley: First of all, I'd like to start my presentation by giving a heartfelt thanks to the staff in Athletics. The job that I have is absolutely impossible without a strong staff that works day to day. I tell you, there are a lot of things that get thrown to each of us, and I have a great partnership with the people I work with. First of all, I'm going to start by saying thank you to them, and I'm looking forward to continuing the awesome work that we are taking on to help our athletes achieve great success.

Goals--The goal of *athletic excellence*, of our corporate goals, is the goal that relates obviously directly to the Athletic Department, so I'll start off with that. Now our question is, how do we help our athletes win ten medals in 2002? That's a huge focus for us right now. Obviously it's a huge opportunity, and it's a great catalyst for many of the things we can do together. But we're also starting to ask the question that, as a benchmark in our organization's life, there is a greater vision, and that vision is to be the best in the world in snowboarding and skiing. So when do we reach that vision? As we are building towards the success in 2002, we are also building towards a long-term success, which is the convergence of the athletic sports of our organization towards being the best in the world. That's a huge focus; that is the one that continues to bring us together as an athletic department. In order to do that, we need to have strong leadership. We're becoming very focused as an organization, and it's clear where we want to go, it's clear why we're here, and how we're going to spend our resources and our time. It's now incredibly important to put a system in place so that we can achieve goals at all levels.

One of the things that I have found as the Athletic Director is I can't be everywhere and lead from the standpoint of being a person in each sport. What I can do is help the staff to create systems so that our athletes have clear pathways in training and in

competition to understand and see a vision of how they, individually, can set their goals and achieve their ultimate success as athletes. That system is a key component for how we organize ourselves for the future.

The other part that is underestimated is education. If our athletes are the best-educated athletes from the standpoint of their sports as they go to the start, then we, as an organization, as staff and as coaches, have done a great job of giving them the best tools to be prepared for success. We're not there with them in the start. We're not there, and they ultimately have to have 100% of the responsibility for their performance. But what we have to do is give them an environment where they get the tools so that we catalyze that whole process, and for an athlete who's going to win, that's what we can provide for them.

Planning--Our focus and priorities this summer, and currently, are planning, planning of the system. Planning establishes our priorities; it builds out where we need to go next with each sport. Second is the stabilization of our sports science and medicine programs, which I addressed earlier, and we are making good headway there. We're further refining the athletic systems. This is not only the goal setting process for the lead athletes and for the focus of the elite programs, but also, how does that translate into each and every club and each and every division and region within our organization? How does the whole system contribute towards satisfaction for athletes and coaches and the identification of the next generation of winners and the proper environment for them to attain their highest goals? Again, that's a big focus. In order to put that system in place, I'm starting to focus now on competencies. Alpine skiing has a good set of competencies. It's a road map that is a communication tool for athletes and coaches and parents and administrators at all levels. It's imperative that we implement competencies in all the other areas.

We're going to make sure that we deliver on the goals that are spelled out in FY 98/99. We're going to work on the long-term development of the vision of how to become the best in the world so the planning of the five-year plan point us in the direction towards the convergence of when we achieve the vision. That is our mission, to achieve that vision. What the priorities will come to now is, we have a FY 99/00 plan, how do we balance out the priorities as a company? That's the step that we have to go for now. The preliminary plan that you have in your books was based upon this five-year, long-term plan. The expectation is that we will modify that based upon how we perform against our FY 98/99 plan. As we go forward, we will do our final FY 99/00 plan, and any modifications we need to make based upon the evaluation will be done this spring, and then we'll do FY 00/01 next summer. We've got a successful system in place, and we're moving it forward.

Sport Science--One of the key elements of providing good service to the athletes is a good sports science and medicine program. Science, along with great coaches and great athletes, is how we achieve at the highest level as an organization and how we give the real resources we need to our athletes. We have applied science, we have medical services, we have information and education on nutritional supplements and we have research. Those are all the components with which we have to deal.

I'm pleased to announce today that I have now hired a Sports Science Director. It's been a long search, and I've received a lot of good resumes and a lot of good feedback from individuals. I've settled on a man named Andrew Walsh. He is from Australia. He has a Ph.D. in applied bio-mechanics from Southern Cross University. He has worked within a highly sophisticated sports science program, so he'll bring us a lot of key knowledge. His background is in alpine, freestyle, and snowboarding. The thing I liked about him, aside from his good and solid qualifications, was his

absolute ability to work in a team environment and essentially work specifically hands on with coaches and athletes. That was the primary component that we had to have in this position. We're on board now. He starts on October 16, and I'm pleased that we've been able to make that move. His focus will be to design a sports science team.

When I went through this process, one of the things I found is that there is no magic person out there. There is no one guy who knows medicine, bio-mechanics, physiology, and every aspect of science. What you've got to look for is someone who is strong with athletes, strong with coaches, understands leadership, understands how to manage, and then have that person build out the team with them that can provide the service and the education to the coaches and athletes.

We're going to get him on board, get the team built, and then go through and determine what the focus and priorities are for sports science. I'm not going to throw Andy into the middle of the fray and have him start solving critical issues until we figure out what those critical issues are. We'll go sport by sport, and we're going to figure out where we can make the biggest impact in science, where we can make the biggest impact in medicine, and how we can round up the resources to get those things done.

I want him to maximize the relationship we have with IHC, which is Intermountain Health Care in Salt Lake. We have a good relationship there for our medical needs in terms of physical therapists. We have a good relationship starting to grow in terms of research and science, and I want to maximize that relationship and our USOC relationship, and ensure we have focused resources. I can't stress that enough, because we've been through this a couple of times where we get going down five or six different paths which aren't contributing to the end result.

The application of science to the athletes' training involves physiology, psychology, nutrition, testing programs, making sure that we're getting the maximum from our training and our performance and that we're doing the best job possible in providing feedback toward the peaking process when it comes to the big events.

Sports medicine will be the physical therapists' program in alpine, freestyle, and snowboarding as it currently exists. What that offers us is an opportunity for athletes to recover. When you're trying to perform at the highest level in training and in competition, we have to make sure that we have a system in place that allows them to recover. When we have athletes who are injured, we need to rehabilitate properly, and we need to track all the information about our athletes carefully. Then, we are able to provide good feedback and we're able to not have to re-create the wheel every time someone has an injury or problem.

Finally, the research component in science and medicine is critical. How do we answer the key issues in our sports? How do we go out and solicit the researchers to make sure that they come with great proposals about how they answered the most critical and pressing issues for our athletes? How do we apply time and money and effort where we'll make a difference? So that's the sports science program, and now we're taking the next step to start moving forward.

Education--In education, if everyone looks in their plan, one of the things I have done is compartmentalize the resource departments in athletics. These are competition services, sports science, and education. Those are resource departments for the sports. The idea is that we build those out so that the sports can utilize them to get their jobs done to create the best environment for athletics. With education we have broadened out from the standpoint that it's not just coaches'

education, it's parents education, administrators' education, it's education in all sports.

With that, we just hired a new staff member who will help implement the cross-country, freestyle, jumping, nordic combined, and snowboard initiatives, Chris Katzenberger. Tim went through a long process for that, and I'm excited that we're continuing to move forward in the service area. We need to focus on efficient development of education materials.

One of the things I have found is that, for a while, education was not only the delivery of materials that relate specifically to what we need to achieve at the athletics end, it was also responsible for the development the program. Now we're coordinating between competition services and education so that we're not duplicating programs and focusing education on providing materials.

We met with the divisional presidents yesterday morning, and one of the things they said is, 'We want to know what is going on at the top. We need to know more.' Our clubs need to know more. If you look at the entire leadership scheme we have, the whole idea is, help those clubs be better at what they do, give great opportunities to the athletes at whatever level, and identify the top athletes and help them get the skills they need to progress to the top. So the education aspect is critical. Tim's department is helping to facilitate with the competencies. Again, that's a key issue. If we ever want to have education, we had better have a road map laid out, and competencies represent that.

Competition Services--Rules, ranking, races, and there's that word again, competencies. The delivery of the competencies happens through our competition services program, whether it's the alpine-specific staff or the staff in the other sports, which have multiple responsibilities both for this aspect as well as for running the day-to-day operations. The whole idea of making sure the information about competencies is available --how do you become a great athlete-- is critical. We have developed a PC-based information system, which is our ranking system. There has been a ton of work done on this. It's not quite complete yet, but the sophistication, we're getting into the new age here, and the way that the information will be distributed to the membership, the way that we'll be able to track the progress of our athletes, has become much better through this process.

Finally, competition services help facilitate domestic sport projects. When we've gone through and done our planning, you'll notice in the planning documents that there are team initiatives and there are domestic initiatives. The domestic initiatives are essentially initiated to try to help communication with the clubs, help spearhead leadership with officials, help with our judges programs, help with our officials' programs, and generally do a better job of making sure that we've got good communication. The Competition Services Department is responsible for facilitating and helping with that process in each of the sports.

Alpine Skiing--First of all, in alpine we're coordinating the alpine skiing movement right now. It's the biggest department obviously everyone knows that. It has the largest number of employees. What's critical is that we coordinate the top to the bottom of the pipeline. The coordination I've done is through an Alpine Management Team which includes the two head coaches, men's and women's, two team managers, competition services staff, and elite development director, Aldo Radamus. Our goal is to make sure we have clear communication and integration as athletes move through the pipeline.

The focus of elite programs is to establish what the goals are, establish a pathway towards those goals, and then work toward supplying the support and services toward achievement of those goals. We've gone through the system of goal setting, and in our plan you'll see that each program has goals. Those goals are now being generated in cooperation with the athletes' goals so we aren't throwing 10 medals on the wall and wondering where they're all going to come from.

We're starting to see which athletes have realistic goals that relate to those 10 medals and then determine how we provide the services that go in that direction. This has been a primary focus for us this year. The focus of implementation of competencies at all levels--we've got the written competencies out there, now we've got to follow them. We have to make sure we are following them all together, top to bottom. Finally, the development and implementation of the long-term plan through 2003. We came out of this summer looking at what we're going to do FY 99/00. What that ended up doing for all of us was saying we're going to develop a program through 2003. Let's get our goals past just this next year. Let's get them all the way out to the future.

Alpine Men's Program--Critical issues---quality conditioning effort. We bumped our conditioning effort. We came into the summer with a specific plan for conditioning, and halfway through the summer we were able to up the amount of effort we put in that area. That's not to say the athletes were doing a bad job. What it says is, we find that when athletes train together, they like it, and it becomes real efficient. So we created more opportunities where the athletes came together.

We focused on a consistent, high-quality program for our young athletes who will emerge in 2002. With the retirements in the men's program, we have some rebuilding to do. There's a lot of talent, there's a lot of energy, and there is a lot of focus. Right now, we have to make sure that we put that precisely in the right perspective and that we have the best opportunity for each of those athletes to achieve when we come into 2002.

Stability of staff--Bill Egan has a good staff lined up with the men's program. I feel confident that we should support that staff. It's got quality people in it. It's got organization, and, now it's a matter of just settling down and letting the process happen.

Finally, we had to address some equipment and technical issues. This summer I reported to the board we were going through this process; the equipment manufacturers have had to cut back on their support of the ski-racing program and of the national team. What that has meant is that we've hired all the service people. The bad side is it cost us quite a bit of money, the good side is that now they're part of the team.

Instead of having physiologists, coaches, conditioning coaches, and psychologists that were our employees and worked for us as part of the team and then having service outside, now everybody is in and everybody is coordinated, and that it is a very positive situation.

Alpine Women's Program--The critical issue there is the management of injured athletes. This isn't serious injuries, but about 50% of the team right now has some sort of injury. This is where the physical therapist is a key component of our staff. If we're going to manage these athletes properly, and make sure that we get them back to full strength, and able to continue to train properly, we need to manage that aspect carefully. We're doing ok there, but if you ask Marjan what his first initiative is, you look in the book, and the first initiative is physical therapists. We need more

attention in between training for the athletes to help them recover and help manage injuries.

Quality conditioning effort: Again, the women have been together more this summer than originally planned. The idea was to make sure that the quality of their conditioning effort as a team was as high as possible and that they got the leadership from the staff, and had the opportunity to be together.

Equipment and technical issues: same thing, we have had to consolidate.

Alpine Elite National Development Program--What's happened here is that we've got a lot of projects out there that Aldo's conducting for the alpine athletes who are below the national team. Our big challenge is to turn that into a program. We must connect all those projects into an ongoing program throughout the year so we identify athletes, who come into this organization at a new and higher level with a consistent program that helps them support their goals. A program to move as quickly as possible through to the national team and on to success. That requires access and coordination with national team projects. We've been working hard on that so there is a definitive, specific way for an athlete to move from the national development group, from the national league group to the national junior group, into a national team project.

We've established a preferred funding scenario. When I looked at this, I thought we could go right to the bottom line on this and say we're going to fund everything for our national elite group. But what I'd prefer to do is to fund up to a certain point, but beyond that, it's still going to be the responsibility of the athlete. If we have additional money within this program, we're going to put it into other areas.

Which goes right to the next item, which is a resident program in Utah. As we go forward, that is one of the most critical things we can do to help athletes who want to succeed in alpine skiing is get them together on a consistent basis. Set up an environment in Utah, using the Olympic venues, with the Olympic spirit here, so that athletes can come and day in and day out get leadership and coaching, and have access to great facilities to train on. So as we move forward, instead of continuing to put money into projects, I'm looking at saying that at some point we need to make sure we get this resident program going, and the sooner the better.

Domestic Alpine Program--Critical issues--communication and management of FIS information. One of the things that has challenged Walt and his staff is making sure that we are right on with the FIS. We need to remain proactive and aggressive with the FIS and do a great job of making sure everything we need to support our athletic program is provided by the FIS and we have good relationships there. He has taken that as a big initiative.

Implementation of the competencies--taking a leadership role there is an important part of what our regional directors are doing now. They did a lot of administration of rules, rankings, and races, but now we're going on and saying, 'let's get that staff focused on implementing competencies, too.' It's an important part of what we're doing, and it's a very critical success factor for us in the future, and something that the people in the field are requesting.

Integration of education and domestic alpine programs--This is to eliminate any area where we might have overlap. Don't create two programs to do the same thing. Create one program, and all of us support it, and make sure it is exactly what we need, and continue to improve communication with clubs.

Cross-Country Skiing--We have made some adjustments there. We have a good, focused plan right now. It's very goal oriented for the athletes. Again, in cross country, and you'll hear me say this with each of the sports, people are sitting down together to figure out what their goals are and then figuring out the system to achieve their goals. All of our athletes now have systematic training programs.

In endurance sports, the ability to train systematically, to periodize your training in the short- and long-term sense and to monitor that, is absolutely essential to success. Without it, we go nowhere. So we have that now. Then, what we're looking at is a long-term plan with cross country. Everybody keeps saying, you know, cross country, they're just not going to go anywhere. What I'm saying is, set up a benchmark for 2002. Let's go for a top 10 finish. Let's go for top 10 finishes. But let's look out to 2006 and see if we can't be on the podium. If we take that attitude right now and create our programs and help facilitate our programs and our athletes that way, then we can get there. We can't take any shorter term look at that.

Critical issues--attainment of personal goals by current national team athletes. A lot of the athletes who are in the national team program right now are getting a refreshed look at what their goals are, and now we've got to move forward to those goals.

Integration of our national development effort with club and divisional programs--We're going through a process right now saying we've got our national team athletes buttoned down, but all of our athletes who are coming through the pipeline are going to be trained by the clubs. How do we make sure that our efforts are properly coordinated and we're communicating well so that, when they emerge on the national team, they come with the skills?

Implementation of special projects to help with 2002 is a joint effort. I'll get into the Nordic Summit a little later, but the idea is that we work our nordic sports together, and then, the need for long-term perspective. This can't be a short-term perspective. If it is, we won't succeed. If that's the way we're going to take, why do it?

Disabled Skiing--We have some crux issues that are critical, such as identification of where these sports fit within the Olympic movement. The Paralympics is part of the Olympic movement, they're part of the Salt Lake City Olympics, but it appears that, within the Olympic Committee itself, and within USSA, we need to continue to solidify the relationship. We've got to formalize our relationship with Disabled Sports USA. That's the actual disabled sports organization recognized by the US Olympic Committee, but they don't have elite athletic programs. That's where we come in. We've got the elite athletic programs. But if we're going to do that, I want to have a formalized relationship there and make sure everybody knows what their role is in it. And finally, what is the relationship of the Paralympics to the Olympic movement? Are we going to be serious about this and go out and continue to dominate the Paralympics in the skiing disciplines? Those are crux issues.

With Disabled Alpine, we need to solidify our international competition program so that we know where that fits with regard to the FIS and we also know what to expect over the long term in terms of international competitions. We need to formalize the formation of our Sport Committee. Jack's here, he's had his first committee meetings, and now we're getting things rounded up there. We need to establish our event priorities. There are a lot of disabled events out there, and frankly, they're for our athletes, so let's make sure that we have the correct priority when it comes to competing in those events, and we have to analyze what our athlete training funds are.

Critical issues in Disabled Cross Country--athlete funding--but the real problem there that we have to address is the depth of the athletic program. I talked to Jack about this yesterday. Cross country is not a fundamental part of how disabled people get into sports. How do we make it a part of a mainstream program so we have a lot of athletes in it? Right now we don't have many athletes, and consequently, you have to look at it and ask how do we get more athletes? If we want to be competitive and we want to have a part of this organization to have elite teams, we need athletes.

Freestyle Skiing--We've had changes in staff recently. Jeff Goode retired. He was the head mogul coach. He had great success and a great relationship working with the athletes in the freestyle program. He has expressed interest in staying involved with our organization, but he has had as much as he can take of life on the road and would like to spend time with his family. We'll miss him, but I hope we can replace that position quickly and move on.

We have a program right now that's focused on the next generation of athletes. One of the things I've had a lot of conversations with Wayne about is, where are we in the whole sequence of periodization within the sport programs? We had such great success in 1998. How do we have better success in 2002? He said we've got to take a few steps back right now. The intensity of the program, the way the athletes are working, the way the coaches are working in order to get to that level of success, you don't want to try to sustain that for four years. You take some steps back. You work on the fundamentals, you work on the basics, get everybody working efficiently at those, and then start to build back to 2002.

One thing I would say is that this is one of the big push programs for Podium 2002. This is an area the Olympic Committee is interested in pushing, and that I'm interested in pushing, and consequently, it's a focus for us with our Podium 2002 programs.

Some critical issues we face here--evolution of athletic program for top athletes. What we have is a situation where athletes are looking at choices. It isn't always the best to go to Piancavallo, Italy, and compete; it might not be the best competition. Ultimately, while that is a fundamental part of our plan and a fundamental part of the Olympic movement, we have to look at what the other options are for top athletes. We need to figure out an athlete management plan that makes sense so the top athletes in our freestyle program, as well as athletes that are coming up, have the best options for athletic success.

We need to build out both the aerial and mogul staff. I'm at the point right now where Kris Feddersen was working with Wayne last year; he's not going to do that again this year. We need to get someone in the system. We need to replace Goode's position, and we need to fulfill on the initiatives of FY 98/99, which is to add some staff to the freestyle program. Ultimately what I'm looking to do is make sure that the athlete to coach ratio is appropriate. It hasn't been appropriate in the past, and we have to move it forward.

Lussi: Alan, I noticed in your budget that you've more than doubled your freestyle budget for next year. Is that because of Podium 2002, and are we to assume, for example, this year, if Wayne wants to pay a little bit more to a coach, could you put that into his budget this year if you had to?

Ashley: Let me address the first one. The first one is to try to continue to build the program. My goal in this whole thing is to develop competitive programs. When I say competitive programs, it's at or above what the international competition does that's winning. That's what we've got to do. That's got to be the goal of this whole

operation and exercise. So, as I go through, that's what I'm looking at is how we become as good or better than anybody else in the world, and creating a program for athletes that achieves that. That's one of the reasons we want to do that, to continue to improve, it's not contingent upon Podium 2002. I'm not saying we're going to approve every initiative, but we want to grow that staff and grow that program up because there is a future there.

We also want to make sure that, as we analyze each of the sports that are targeted for 2002, we're creating competitive programs. When we analyze what the Austrians do in alpine skiing or what Norway does in nordic combined, we're operating on a similar basis or better. That's got to be the key, because otherwise we have no shot.

When it comes to coaches, I want to get the best coaches. I'm not going to say whether I'm going to pay more or less, but I do have flexibility, and I'm not locked into a number. What I'm looking at is, if we've got somebody we need, somebody we want, someone who needs to be part of this program and fits with our staff and fits with our athletes, let's get him in here and, ultimately, that's going to pay off more than negotiating over a few dollars here and there.

Funding for potential 2002 athletes for competition--right now we're moving forward because we're funding more training, but we still don't fund competition expenses for athletes who potentially could be on the podium in 2002. That's a critical issue, and we've got to get it taken care of.

Finally, the position of acro within the Olympics and the future of that sport within this country--As it stands right now, we have no movement on that with the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee. From the standpoint of my priorities, I'm looking at how do I make sure that I get buttoned down in moguls and aerials? How do I insure that we keep those at the very top? With no further answers on acro right now, I'm looking at that as definitely a second priority as the athletic director. It's not that I don't believe that it's part of the foundation fundamentals of the sport, but I know that there are critical issues in the sports that are part of the Olympics, and I know that we have to address those critical issues first. As a staff, that's where I am right now and that's what I'm focusing on.

Walsh: In freestyle you just made a comment about the fact that we fund our athletes in training; we don't fund them in competition. That seems antithetical to me. We should be funding the competition opportunities first. The athletes who train themselves, participating in our programs or other programs or however they can, if they can make it to the competition programs and be the best in the tryout series or, however we do it, then they should be going to the competition series that we fund.

Ashley: From my standpoint, one of the critical things is supplying the resources to insure that the highest-quality training is available. Ultimately, if someone wants to compete, they'll go out and compete. If we fund competition but they have no training to back it up, how do we continue to increase and improve the quality of the training opportunity available to the athletes? It's a fundamental question that people come down on both sides, but from my standpoint, if you fund good quality training, find the leadership, fund that aspect of it, then the competition will come along and you'll have athletes who are well prepared to go. That's not to say that some might not do it on their own, but there's no guarantee of that.

Walsh: But then you put the athletes in the position of either having the money and the resources to go to the competition or not, whereas somebody may be able to do their training on their own and do just as well as if they are in a group situation. Not

ideal, but it seems a lot fairer access and probably a lot more supportive in terms of our overall competition goals.

Ashley: Well, I just have to say that I'm a believer that we should try to fund and to provide the absolute best training possible, and that's where we've gone. Now, I'd like to do both, and that's the next step here. When it came down to it, if we're going to have a team and we're going to have resources available, I felt it was important to provide quality training for athletes.

Rodman: The assistant aerial position for a traveling World Cup coach, there is a possibility that may not get filled this year. Wayne, from what I understand, is looking to initially fill the C team aerial coach position, which is certainly needed. There needs to be some kind of coach for those athletes, because they travel on a different circuit. So, if you can't get the right person, he's adamant about looking for the right person who fits into the mix, which is justifiable, but what's going to happen to that money if we don't find the right person this year? Is that going to go back to the athletes?

Ashley: You'll spend it in the program. We're not going to take it elsewhere, but I have to cross that bridge when essentially we make the decision of what's the next priority. I'll go back to the initiatives and, given the circumstances, where we are in the season, given what are priorities are within the plan, what's the next best use of those resources?

Walsh: As I recall, the FY 98/99 freestyle budget, the first unfunded initiative was funding B-team competition, so hopefully that's where it goes.

Ashley: I guarantee you, I like the planning process, I use that plan every day. It reminds us of what we sat down and hammered out in terms of priorities. So that's the answer. Further questions on freestyle?

Ski Jumping--High-quality, goal-oriented program. That's where we are. We're headed down that road again with ski jumping. The athletes who are in the program right now have a great opportunity to focus themselves on exactly what their peer group is doing internationally. They've been spending a lot of time in Scandinavia. They've been with their peer group, and that is a positive situation for us, because in this sport you've got to know exactly where the rest of the world lies. So, between that and a real specific conditioning focus, I'm happy with the jumping program. The next report on this is just going to have to be we're seeing how things are going, because the process and the system are in place. There are good athletes in place, the coaching staff is working well, and I want to see what the results are now. We do have to make sure of the implementation of a complete competition plan for the development athletes. That means that we hone in on which are the best events for those athletes to participate and compete in, that we make sure that they get to those particular competitions and that we make sure there is a staff there for them, essentially.

Women's Ski Jumping--And then, the future of women's ski jumping. There is a girl here in town that's quite good. I ran into her mom in the supermarket the other day, and she asked what we were doing with women's ski jumping. My answer is, we should support it at some point to see how the sport evolves. I am not in favor of going out and trying to get it on the 2002 docket right now, because it's a mistake to go out and try to force the evolution of a sport and the evolution of athletes too quickly. I am in favor of working it into our national championship program with the men's jumping champion-ships and then offering that and saying, 'all you club programs out there currently conducting men's jumping programs, are you going to

get women in them?' And if you get women in them, we will start to build the population, we'll start to train them, we'll start to see a quality improvement to the national championships, and beyond that it will start to grow internationally. That's the strategy that I've taken with the sport so far. It's a balanced strategy that recognizes that we would like to see it grow but doesn't try to force it into a position where we essentially end up with an Olympic team that hasn't matured to that level of competition yet.

Nordic Combined--A young, focused group of muscle and bone athletes. That's the name they're going by these days. We have two national team members. We have five development athletes, the muscle and bone group. They're all training hard in Steamboat, and it's a professional situation. I mentioned that Kerry Lynch had joined our staff, and we have a good buttoned-down staff there. We've got good leadership in cross country, we've got good leadership in jumping, we have good leadership at the top with Steitz. We now have a real strong person in our office working with nordic combined. I'm happy, and we'll be interested to see what the results are. In training they've done what's been expected of them and obviously what we have to see now is what happens at the top.

Marolt: This is a program that does represent where we want to go with all of our sports. This is a true residence program where the athletes and coaches work together on a daily basis. As you analyze our organization and what is going to get us to our ultimate potential, it's got to be in an environment where we have access to each other 365 days a year. That's what we're doing with nordic combined, and I share Alan's enthusiasm for this program, because it has wonderful potential.

Ashley: The critical issues with nordic combined, we're making sure that the World Cup B is funded. That's the muscle and bone circuit. So that's the next thing they'd like to see happen as an initiative. Also equipment, making sure that we broaden our perspectives and have absolutely the best equipment for our athletes.

I've got an interesting situation with nordic combined. What they do is work exclusively with *Rossignol*. So all their cross country skis come from *Rossignol*. They get 40 pair of skis and they go out and test them all and run around with them for a while, and they pick six pair and prioritize those six pair based upon the snow conditions. The guy skiing the fastest gets pair number 1. The guy skiing second fastest gets pair number 2. As we go through this I'm saying, 'Ok, well you've got 40 pair of skis, now let's get 65 pair of skis next time. Give yourself a few more options, and maybe you ought to go talk to *Atomic*. Maybe you ought to go talk to *Fisher*.' The concept is a neat one, because the guy that's doing it, he's getting the best equipment. I want to make sure that we broaden and diversify there to have the best equipment coming into 2002.

Snowboarding--In snowboarding, we need to have an organized systematic program planned for the top riders which has an athletic focus. The reason I say this is that, in snowboarding, you could take the perspective that we're just going to go out and compete in FIS events and that's it with our top riders. But ultimately, what we want to be doing is say, 'our top riders need to go to the top events, and those are some FIS events, those are some ISF events, those are some events that are neither the FIS or the ISF, but that's the place where the best riders will be.' What we want to do is create an environment where the best riders compete with the best riders. That's why, at this point, I'm looking at flexibility in the scheduling of our top riders. That doesn't mean that we won't have people at all of the FIS World Cups, but the best riders ought to go where the best riders are, and that may not always be at the FIS World Cup on any given weekend. What this means for us is that we can design a system for the future which can focus on the big events. Ultimately, in the

grand dream of what I'd like to see done, is utilize those events just like our Olympic team so if we look down the road in 2002, we're not having to create some artificial situation because of one circuit or another. We're looking at it as these are where the riders want to be. This is where the best people are. Now let's choose our Olympic team from those events.

Finally, what goes hand in hand with that in being prepared for 2002 is to look beyond and see if we can design a system of training of the best athletes. All the best athletes are not on the US Snowboard Team. It's a fact; everybody knows it. That doesn't preclude the fact that the best athletes should go to the Olympics, and they should be the best prepared possible in the Olympic disciplines. So we've got a challenge there, and we've got to figure out a way to get it done.

Critical issues--replacing the program manager. Our program manager resigned this summer, and I'm in the process of replacing that position. Resolution of judges' issues--what we have to look out for here is the athletes and make sure that judging at the freestyle events is the highest quality possible. Let's not preclude anything, but let's make sure it's the absolute best possible situation for athletes. We need to establish a team and big events selection leading into 2002, and this goes back to when we establish the team for next year, we're not going to look at FIS World Cup results only. We're going to look at where the athletes perform in the big events and use that same philosophy as we go toward 2002 Olympic selection. And then the integration of riders--if a rider is out there, being sponsored by *Burton* and they're doing a great job, how do we make sure that we as an organization and they as riders all come together when it's time if they want to perform in the Olympic disciplines? Ultimately, it's not anything other than trying to get the best prepared and best athletes to ride in 2002.

Bill touched on Podium 2002. I won't add much other than we have a good relationship with Jim Page on this. We're going through every single initiative put forth by every sport and analyzing how that can contribute towards success in 2002, and that's the basis by which we're going to get approval from the USOC. My first focus is to make sure we have a competitive program, which is equal to the international competition and equal to the international competitors' programs. Then, look at what it takes to get a winning program. If we can't get to the point where we can be competitive with the nations and the world, then we've got a problem. We have a thorough process for evaluation of the program and the success of it, so we are moving forward there.

I have a few updates on additional important topics and then I will conclude. Athletics always has a long presentation, but there is a lot here, and a lot of good things happening.

World Championship Selection Criteria--On June 12 when we had our board meeting, we reviewed the World Championship selection. At that point there was general approval of, I believe, alpine, nordic combined, cross country, and jumping. We had discussion that needed to take place further on freestyle and snowboarding; and we agreed that there would be a rewrite through our counsel of the World Championship selection criteria so we could standardize the format, address any issues we thought were important to address, and put it forth as a model for how we proceed through 2002. We're nearly complete with the rewrite right now.

The rewrite, as it stands, will look quite a bit different from what was put forth at the board meeting. I'm going to ask that the Sport Committee executive groups review that rewrite to make sure there were no substantive changes in those criteria. I don't

think there were, but if you look at it you will say, 'this is quite a bit different,' and from there we basically get approval.

There has been a second additional issue that's been raised in the rewrite process that we need to address as a board, and that is that in our bylaws, it calls for 10 days for an athlete to submit an appeal on a selection. As I started working backwards from the World Championships this year, you take 10 days, and you need to add 11 because it actually is the 10 days you can file and the 11th day is when you start to process it, and if you want to make it a system that works within our judicial process, you require two weeks. If you go back to two weeks from the day the entries are due for the World Championships in Vail, it looks like you miss Kitzbühel and Cortina as selection events. Well, I'm not too interested in that. It's unfair to the athletes, and it's unfair to think that we'd take those out of the mix for selection. So based upon that, I'm going to turn over to Todd and have him talk about a potential change that I would like to suggest that would help us tighten things up a little bit.

USSA Bylaw Amendment--Wakefield: I'll start by distributing some written materials that outline a proposed bylaw change. The bylaw change can be stated pretty simply. It's to shorten the amount of time during which an athlete can file an appeal of a team selection decision from 10 days to three days. The initial reaction to that might be one of concern, but in fact, it's tremendously beneficial, to the athletes in particular. Let me explain why. For the most part, when team selection decisions are made, athletes know within a very short time frame after that whether or not they think those selections are fair, appropriate, and whether or not they would like to try to challenge those decisions. A 10-day waiting period to get that filed in the days of telephones, faxes, and E-mail doesn't seem to serve much of a purpose. It drags out the decision process unnecessarily long, and the cost of that is there is less time left for the actual judicial processes themselves, and we end up losing events that would give athletes more opportunities to qualify for Olympics and World Championships.

If we can bring that time frame down to three days, that still gives athletes adequate time to assess where they are, look again at the selection process, and determine whether they feel good about it, and then, if they want to appeal, to get that appeal on file. That still gives us a few days to get USSA Judicial Committee review in, to give athletes the first chance to have the team selection decisions reviewed. After that, it still leaves them an opportunity to get in front of an American Arbitration Association arbitrator in accordance with USOC procedures.

What you lose in the time to make a decision on whether or not to appeal, you gain so much more in terms of the time that can be dedicated to the judicial process to make sure that the appeal is done well and fairly. You also pick up the opportunity to have more competition opportunities and to qualify that way. The materials we've distributed contain the proposed amendment on the second page. I apologize that we had to hand write some verbiage in at the last minute. But we wanted to make sure, with a time frame as tight as three days, if one of those days fell on a weekend or a holiday, that it didn't throw a wrench in to the judicial works. What we've added here is the provision that, if the third day is a weekend or a holiday, then the deadline for filing that appeal will be the next business day. That protects everyone.

The amendments apply to both our team selection appeals provision and also to our non-disciplinary start rights judicial committee provision. The reason for that is, in some cases, it won't be clear whether or not the appeal that the athlete wants to file is properly categorized as a team selection appeal or as a start right appeal. We want to make sure that we're covered in both instances so nobody is confused and

nobody loses the right to have meaningful review of a team selection decision. Are there any questions?

Ingemie: Why was it 10 days?

Wakefield: It was 10 days because, when we sat down and first crafted these bylaws, that was the number we arbitrarily came up with that seemed to work, but we've learned. I was reminded as we started taking this problem apart of what Jim said when we adopted these bylaws--they need to be a living document. And this is an example of that. We've just learned through experience that that much time to make a decision about whether to go forward with an appeal takes too much away from the appeal process itself and also from competition opportunities.

McCarthy: David, there wasn't any magic with the 10-day number that I can recall from the drafting process. We may have been at two weeks or longer previously, but previously we were also looking at certified mail and different ways of communication. Frankly, with E-mail and fax, three days is probably almost more than adequate. I agree with Todd, and my experience, and most people in the room might also concur, is that in selection situations, the athletes know almost immediately whether they're going to file an appeal or not. There is usually not a long gestation period for whether or not they're going to do anything.

Walsh: Jim, is this on the table as an action item for today?

McCarthy: The intention here is to get it on the table. The bylaws provide that it has to be on the table at this meeting. It literally came up this morning as Todd and Alan were trying to finalize selection criteria.

Wakefield: The bylaws require that a proposed bylaw amendment be distributed to the board 30 days before any vote is taken, so this would constitute the distribution to the Board.

McCarthy: And then the plan would be to do either a telephone or mail-in ballot within 30 or 35 days of this date covering this issue, and at that time we would also ratify the selection criteria for the various disciplines. While there haven't been any changes in substance in most of them, except for freestyle, there have been changes in the format, and we want to make sure that the discipline committee executive groups have an opportunity to review them and make sure they are satisfied with that representation. So it gives us a chance to do two things, (1) review the selection criteria in an orderly process and (2) also take care of this proposed change in the bylaws. We would also like, at that same time, to address the freestyle selection criteria.

Walsh: As I recall the conversation at the June board meeting, the motion that we made was for the board to empower the Executive Committee to approve the criteria pending legal ratification and language refinement after the Sports Committees' Executive Committees reviewed them for substance. The comments I remember were that each of the Sports Committee chairs said they hadn't reviewed it for substance, so they didn't know if it was an appropriate selection criteria.

McCarthy: It's motion number 3 on page 124. "To approve the World and World Junior Championship criteria subject to non-substantive changes from staff and counsel and subject to final approval by the Executive Committee of USSA." That was the exact wording on the motion.

Ashley: Could I speak to that for a minute? Where we are is that, if we look at alpine, cross country, jumping, and nordic combined, those are pretty brushed out. Nothing has changed much in those. One of the reasons I want to insure this is that I'm going to give them back to the Sports Committees' Executive Committees to look at anyway, but what I'm saying right now is that they're going to look at them and say, 'this is what we expected.' With freestyle, we're still working on one issue, and in snowboard, we just finalized what the selection criteria will look like so that we're flushing that through the Executive Committee as it stands right now. My opinion and position from the standpoint of where we are is that we are at different stages with different sports.

McCarthy: And what was motion number 3 from our June meeting, the Executive Committee of this board never considered those selection criteria, because they were slightly slow in getting done. But the issue here is (a) we've got to find a way to get them done in a more timely manner; but (b) while we're doing that, I don't think we want to rush into adopting selection criteria that have not been reviewed by the various disciplines so we don't get into that problem. We have the continuing discussions with freestyle, and now we also have the bylaw amendment that is necessitated by the close proximity of the selection events to the world championships.

Rodman: Motion number 3 does seem a bit confusing as it comes in the middle of the Alpine Sport Committee action items. It is confusing in that sense.

McCarthy: Well, we've been known to do things out of order on occasion. I can't tell you exactly why it's there, but that's where it appears on page 124, and it is the motion we adopted. Todd, do we need a motion to accept this proposed amendment and then set a date not sooner than 30 days from this date to consider it further? Doc, you're shaking your head no.

Sosman: You are supposed to present it at a pertinent time ahead of time, and if you want to discuss it, fine, but you don't need a motion and a second.

Wakefield: I agree. I would say this. For the sake of the staff and the Sport Committees and providing them some good direction on an issue that they're going to need to have clearly in focus, it probably would be useful to have kind of a preliminary indication of the Board's reaction to this bylaw amendment proposal. If the staff and the Sport Committees are going to come back in 30 days with criteria that they believe are ready to be voted on and ready to be adopted, they will have to have incorporated a conclusion date for selection processes.

McCarthy: A straw vote or an indication one way or another. Let's do a straw vote. All who, based on their brief review of the proposed amendment, would be in favor of its adoption, raise your hand. It looks like there isn't a lot of concern about it. Then we all understand what the procedure will be. We're going to set up either a telephone or a mail ballot, whichever will be easier, and also allow us to have the requisite discussion not sooner than 30 days from today's date, and at that time we will also consider selection criteria. In most instances it is probably fairly routine. We may have some more interesting discussions with freestyle, but hopefully by that stage, the Executive Committee of freestyle, the Sports Committee, and the staff will have reached agreement.

Lussi: Jim, could we do it by ballot instead of by phone? It would be easier.

McCarthy: We can do it by ballot if (a) our bylaws currently provide that; and (b) we've resolved the freestyle issue. If there is nothing that needs discussion, we're not going to have discussion for the sake of discussion.

Lange: You commented a couple of times that there may be some substantive change to the freestyle criteria, and I should point out that we're talking about a relatively minor issue. What you'll see is very close to what was already distributed. It's just a matter of tweaking a few numbers.

McCarthy: My sense is, Jeff, that we're down to one small issue at the bottom of the pile, and we've got to get that resolved. But I know freestyle, so I'm not taking anything for granted.

Acro—(McCarthy): Since you raised freestyle, I want to raise another issue for this board, and that's this whole situation regarding acro. Jeff and I have had informal conversations about this going back to last spring about what the situation is going to be for acro in terms of continued funding, if it is not on the program for 2002.

The background here, very briefly, is the United States has been a leader in freestyle. Acro is an integral part of the freestyle program, particularly as perceived by the freestyle community, but it is not part of the Olympic program for 2002 nor has it been in the past. It's been an uphill battle to try to get it onto the program. Efforts have been made by Irv Kagan, Nick Badami, the people at SLOC, and perhaps to a lesser degree, the FIS, by the freestyle community itself, which may have some division internationally over including acro in the Olympic program. But the status is, as of right now, it's not included.

The informal discussion Jeff and I had, was that, if acro had not appeared on the Olympic program by this September board meeting, we would consider as a board whether we want to continue funding the acro program. Again, to short circuit this, I've had discussions with Jeff, Alan and Bill regarding this. Acro is a funded program as part of our athletic program for this year, and there would be no proposal to change that. We would continue to fund acro for this year, but as a board we need to look to what we're going to be doing next year and give the staff some direction.

Lussi: Budget impacts?

McCarthy: I don't know the exact amount. Alan, do you?

Ashley: I can't give you an exact number right now.

Lussi: It's not very much.

McCarthy: Well, every dollar that goes to acro doesn't go to moguls or aerials. I know you're very concerned about the amount of money going to those two sports so that we can win Olympic medals. If it goes to acro, and we have no chance of winning Olympic medals in that discipline, it's going to come out of the other part of the freestyle budget.

Marolt: Serge, it's not just a matter of money. It's also a matter of staff time. It's a matter of our Events Department creating an additional competitive arena. There are a lot of other parts to this decision in terms of resources.

Lussi: I agree with that, but how are we proceeding with winter now? What do we do this winter?

McCarthy: What I said was that this winter we would continue to fund acro. We'd continue to fund it through this season, because we've made that commitment to the athletes. But we've got to look forward to next year, because what we do is get into every year and continue to fund it because we're a little short, or a little late, or we've committed, what have you. This is an issue I'm raising for the board to give direction to the staff, whether or not it should be funded after this year if it is not on the program for the 2002 Olympics. My concept is, if it comes back onto the program in 2001, we fund it. In discussions with Alan, he's suggested the idea of maintaining it as part of the National Championship program. I don't want to speak for him, I'm sure he'll speak for himself, but Jeff and the freestyle community are very concerned about the message this would give regarding acro generally. But we do have a finite budget, and monies that are spent on non-Olympic medal sports are not available for Olympic medal sports.

Lange: Jim, if I could make a couple of comments on this. We did talk about this a few days ago. Quite frankly, with the exception of the potential negative impact it might have on the perception of the position of this company, this issue didn't bother me a great deal. The reality of our situation with acro is we've been working essentially to get it on the IOC slate to get a final or a definite decision from the IOC, yes or no on the issue. If that decision either is made in a negative fashion in the short time we have available or no decision is made by the end of this year, (December of this year), essentially the result is going to be the same thing. That would be the death of acro on an international competition basis or World Cup basis. So, effectively, there isn't going to be anything to fund next year if, in fact, the decision is either no or no decision is made by as late as December 30 of this year.

As a result, in some sense this is a relatively moot issue except for potentially planning what we're going to do. I can say, however, that we talked about this in our Sport Committee meetings earlier today, and there was some substantial and very positive discussion about how to respond to acro if, in fact, it is not included in the Olympic program. There are some definite directions that we're talking about potentially taking our domestic programs, which involve incorporation with other emerging sports, which essentially are a different form of acro or could be argued as such.

Some of those sports coming out right now are some very new growth kind of things happening in skiing that I kind of shake my head about. I look at them and say, 'this is acro 20 years ago,' essentially. There are some possibilities. It may reinvent itself, re-emerge, and there is a significant chance of something like that occurring. It could be an opportunity for this organization.

Nonetheless, we'd be talking about domestic programs only. While the FIS Freestyle Committee hasn't gone on the record one way or another, I can tell you from the sentiments that I've heard in that committee meeting, that if it doesn't have Olympic status by the end of this year, then certainly there is no support for acro on an international level from that point forward.

Ashley: I have just one further comment on that, too. As we go down the road on this, every single aspect has to be analyzed. Jim mentioned we had a discussion about national championships, but even at that, we have to make sure we focus carefully on moguls and aerials right now and do a bang-up job of promoting and continuing to improve those sports.

When I look at the national championships in freestyle, the first thing we've got to do is make sure that we continue to up the stature of that event. I don't want to ever get in a position to limit ourselves in terms of where we can host the event or the quality

of those two Olympic disciplines, if we get into a situation down the road where acro is not a part of the World Cup or the Olympic program. We're just going to have to walk through this as it transpires and evolves over the next few months.

Lussi: Jim, we sound a little bit like the USOC right now.

McCarthy: I don't take that as a compliment.

Lussi: No, you shouldn't. It was not meant as a compliment. I guess we've got to wait, if we don't know what budget impacts we're talking about, I can certainly empathize with what Jeff is saying, but I haven't heard our freestyle community going to bat for acro in a big way anyway.

Lange: That's not true, though, Serge. They've been fighting for it. I've spent a great number of hours over the last six months after taking over from Irv trying to champion this issue. I've had conversations with a number of people who have also been equally active. In doing so, we've had contacts with various members of the IOC, and various members of FIS.

What became apparent in my early endeavors into this, and, again there was a transition from Irv spearheading this effort to myself with Irv's retirement last spring, but, number one, nobody had a clue as to exactly how you get this accomplished in real facts and, secondly, as a result, everybody was pointing at everybody else saying they've got to do it first. What we quickly outlined as a plan, and I spent just a few minutes on the phone with Anita DeFrantz at Jim McCarthy's suggestion, and she quickly said, 'Well, it's an IOC decision.'

I guess that seems rather obvious in hindsight, but nobody had approached it from that direction. But the IOC will make a decision based on a recommendation from the international governing body, in our case, FIS. So we obviously needed the support of the FIS and need to get IOC finally to have it presented to them in a formal basis so they can make a decision.

At that time, of course, we hope to make every lobbying effort possible and be able to do a nice presentation on the discipline and explain why it would benefit the Olympic program. In any case, that's the step we need to do. At the spring meeting in Prague, Johnnie Johnston, Chairman of the FIS Freestyle Committee, myself, Bill Marolt, and Jim McCarthy were present, and we sat down with Marc Hodler. Alan, you were there too. There were a number of people. We sat down with Marc Hodler to outline what we've done so far with acro, the frustrations we've had, and where we've run with it, and we tried to get some sort of feeling for what he should do.

My feeling going into this meeting is it was a set-up by our illustrious freestyle Chairman, Johnnie Johnston, to basically kill the thing on the spot. Contrary to what I expected, Marc Hodler stopped the conversation part way through in the explanation and said this is a chicken and the egg thing. You're talking about acro suffering, and yet you're arguing that could be because it doesn't have Olympic status and the other disciplines do. Marc went on to say that he felt that the way to handle it was to put it in the Olympic program to see what happens, if it is viable and works, and give it a chance. So that was quite a change in position from what I've heard in the past, and he still being on the IOC Executive may have some influence in getting them to consider the issue. That's what we're looking at right now. They're meeting in just a couple of days, actually, and we're hoping to make some progress at that point. We're essentially running out of time, and it's going to be decided one way or another, by the clock if nothing else.

McCarthy: I want to remind you that several hours later Marc Hodler resigned as the head of FIS after what he said. The point here is, I want to put this on the docket for this board so you are (a) aware of what's going on; and (b) in our March meeting, if acro is not on the 2002 Olympic agenda, we have started our discussion of what we're going to do about funding this program. This lifts it beyond the informal discussions that Jeff and I had and brings it to this board's attention. It's clear at this stage that we probably don't want to take action which might precipitate the demise of the chances for acro being on the 2002 calendar. I don't think there's much point in going further with this discussion. Again, the dollars are hard to come by, and if it's not an Olympic medal sport, we have a very difficult time allocating resources to it, and I would cite the example of telemark skiing and speed skiing. John, you had a question?

Aalberg: It's not a question, but working at SLOC, I can tell you we are looking forward to finalizing our Olympic program in December. Hopefully, that will bring some resolution to these questions. I also have a question regarding other international events. Are we only focusing on Olympic medals, or are we also concerned about world championship medals? There are other sports, I can give an example in nordic combined, where the sprint competition is not an Olympic event while it is a world championship medal event. We could have other financial decisions based on those facts. I don't know if acro is a world championship event or not. We ought to think about this and not only, as Serge alluded to, becoming a USOC-driven organization.

Ashley: I'll comment on that. There are certain instances where we're having to look at the comings and goings of the disciplines within sports. The sprint event you bring up, actually the sprint event in cross country is one that may evolve in a short period of time here. What we have to do is look out to the future and decide where is this going and try to take proactive steps towards it. The fundamental basis by which we go ahead and do our planning and go ahead and do the bulk of our budgeting and focus, is to make sure the ones we know are in there are our focus efforts. From there, we have to make some strategic decisions on a case-by-case basis based upon where some of the sports are evolving in different disciplines.

McCarthy: John, you have to recall, too, we are the NGB for Olympic level sports. We're not the NGB for sports that are not on the Olympic program. Our primary responsibility is for Olympic medal sports, and within that context, we look at events like sprint, acro, what have you, and do our best to support them, particularly when they further our chances of getting more medals. If we broaden our scope, we're going to lose our focus, so it's very important to keep that in mind. Any other comments on this discussion?

Rodman: I was going to make just a couple of quick comments. One is that there has been a tremendous effort in the US to get this rolling at an Olympic level, so I wanted to come to Jeff's defense on that. Basically, it's seen as an additional event that we can win medals in, which is certainly true. The US has been dominant in this discipline for quite some time and continues to be. Additionally, I wanted to address one of the things Jeff started to go into, the possibility of embracing slope style--that's basically skiers in a terrain park. This goes back to what you were saying. It's not an Olympic event, yet there is a tremendous opportunity for growth there, and it's one of those things that's starting to explode and take off. If we ignore it, we might be missing the boat, so I don't think we should slam the door altogether.

Ashley: In response to that, the way I look at those right now is that maybe we don't put them in our event organization packet, but we figure out ways to make sure that our athletes are not precluded from participating in them. That's a pretty fundamental

issue right there. If there is a way for them to participate that doesn't impact their focus on the Olympic sports but gives them a chance to start working in it, then we meet both needs.

Rodman: Something like slope style would help develop skills for your Olympic events such as mogul skiing or even aerials.

McCarthy: Anything else? If not, Sport Committee action items. Alpine, Bill Slattery.

Athlete Membership Agreement--Ashley: Let me finish up. I just want to run through five more quick things to update you. We're doing an athlete membership agreement right now. It's basically an outline of the responsibilities of the organization and the athletes and their relationship as a team member, either on the snowboard team or one of the ski teams. I've got this pretty much to the point where I have to go through one small modification, then I'm going to distribute it and ask that each member of the team sign it and we'll sign it. What I am hoping for here is that it will define specifically certain things which have been unwritten over the years in terms of our relationship between organization and athlete. I'm happy that it's moving forward, because that definition is something that the athletes have asked for and that the organization needs to provide.

Equipment Pool Relationships--As I mentioned earlier, we're now providing all the service within alpine, not all of it, the primary service for the athletes in the alpine program at the World Cup and the Europa Cup. NorAm level is coming through USSA. Because of that, I'm looking to reestablish and re-ignite our relationship with the manufacturers, particularly in skis, boots, and bindings. I don't think the pool is working particularly well. The rules written for the pool were written at a time when the pool and the relationship of the industry to ski racing was quite a bit different than it is now. We're looking to forge a different kind of partnership there, one that works better for the companies and works better for the athletes. So, I'm starting to pursue that line of thinking. My major concern from an athletic standpoint is that the athletes have access to the best equipment, and from the manufacturers' side, that they see value in being involved with our organization and our programs. If they can't find value in being associated with our athletes and our programs, then we have a problem down the road making sure that the highest quality ski equipment and snowboards are available to our athletes.

Nordic Summit--We held a Nordic Summit a few weeks ago. It was the staff from jumping, cross country, and nordic combined. The purpose of this was to reestablish the roots of nordic skiing. For those of you who don't know, the nordic sports fundamentally come out of the same roots, and there are some things we should be doing together. It was nice to see Bard Elden sitting across from Christer Skog. They didn't know each other. Here we have a cross country coach for nordic combined and a cross country coach for cross country skiing, and now maybe we can reestablish some links and start to facilitate the growth and education of each other, working together to do a better job for our athletes. It's the same with Kerry Lynch and Kari Ylianttila. It was a nice effort towards getting our nordic sports focused and working cooperatively.

Salt Lake City Venue Development—This is a critical issue for us, not only prior to the Olympics but after the Olympics. The legacy issue--the "L" word is not very popular at SLOC, but I'll tell you, it should be very popular in this room. It's something that I'm working hard to establish between the Utah Sports Authority, the US Olympic Committee, and the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee, and I'm working on the relationship with USSA to insure that the day the Olympics are over, there are fundamentals in place for all of our discipline--to continue to be able to

conduct major events and to conduct high-level training for all of our athletes--and that leading into the Olympics they don't forget about that home court advantage. I expect we'll get a lot out of this and that it will be a very positive relationship, but it is one that has to be established now. It has to be finalized by the time the budget is completed with the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee. To those ends, I would say that probably the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee, at least at the management level, look at the NGB's as having their hands out all the time. I'm looking at it as a partnership, and one that we should all be in together. They want medals, they want our athletes to perform very well, and to do that, we need to have fundamental parts of our sports in place and good support for our athletes in Utah.

Resident Programs--This leads me to my final topic for today and one that is targeted on the future. I want to see, us in the future, develop athletic programs which are resident based. Utah is a great place to do this with the Olympics coming. What we see is that, the more time we're able to spend together as athletes, coaches, physical therapists and trainers, the more we're able to develop facilities to support the athletes in the achievement of their goals and the achievement of medals, ultimately, the better off we are.

Right now, you look at how we do business, and we go to camp, we're together, and then we all go home, and we lose our athletic focus potentially. If we could develop resources here in Utah that supported our future, that is the most efficient way that we can support the athletes in the long term. That doesn't mean we're going to be skiing here in the middle of July, but what it does mean is that we'll be conditioning here, we'll be using the facilities to evaluate athletes, we'll have good leadership here, and the best athletes will be together in training. As we proceed, that's the next broad-based initiative for the Athletic Department that I'll be working on. That is a change for some of the sports, but when I get right down to it, a lot of athletes and a lot of coaches want to do this. That's where we're headed to the future. That concludes the athletics report.

Walsh: Alan, would it be possible for the Athletes' Council to have a look at some input in the development of that athlete agreement you spoke of?

Ashley: Yes, I can get it over to you so you can take a look at it.

Walsh: That would be great. Thanks.

McCarthy: Any other questions for Alan? Thank you, Alan. I appreciate all your effort and the effort of your staff.

7.0 Sport Committee Action Items:

McCarthy: By way of introduction here, in mid-August or so a letter went out to the Sport Committee Chairs asking them to get their action items in sufficiently far in advance of this meeting so that the staff and the board would have an opportunity to review them. I realize that's somewhat of a functional impossibility, since you had committee meetings here, which generated more action items. In the past, we've had the problem of things coming up to the board where we don't get an opportunity to give them the kind of thoughtful review and consideration that they deserve. While I know there are action items that have been passed out from each committee, we are going to have to take a close look at the items and determine whether they are very routine things that can be acted on at this meeting, whether they are emergency items that have to be acted on at this meeting, or whether they fall in the third category of things that we're not going to act on at this meeting.

Alpine Bill Slattery: I got a note from my compadre here not to take more than 15 minutes. Apparently the snowboard report is going to be quick. First of all, I'd like to thank Walt Evans and his staff and the other staff members for their assistance and cooperation for our meetings. Their support was invaluable to the success of our meetings this week. Thank you again, Walt. We had most of our meetings here this week, but not all of them, because there was no need to have all of our working groups here at the fall meeting. I have passed out a document of eight items based on our sports committee activities this week. I forgot a ninth item I have sitting here which I will read to you and then pass out the document. I'll quickly run through these at the discretion of the Chair. He can handle any of the items appropriately.

Item One, is self explanatory, and that's the mission statement.

The Alpine Sport Committee believes in the vision of the USSA to become the best alpine skiing nation in the world and is committed to doing everything in our power to achieve that goal.

Item Two, World University Games.

World University Games selection criteria has been approved in principle pending quota information and cut-off dates from FIS and USOC.

We redrafted that, and that was accepted in principle. We're waiting for the cutoff dates and for the quotas from FIS and USOC. Alan has a statement on that in reference to funding which he may or may not want to make.

Item Three, Resolved that USSA has an obligation to publish and to distribute the rules which apply to its members.

McCarthy: Let's stop there for a minute. I mean, that's like reciting our bylaws again. Would you like to recite all the bylaws again? We have that obligation from the USOC, and what do we add by having this?

Slattery: We're not doing it.

McCarthy: Well, if we're obligated in our bylaws to do it, then we have to do it. Adding another motion that says we've got to do it isn't going to change the bylaw obligation.

Slattery: This is an item, Jim, that we're bringing to the board's attention.

Item 4, I don't believe that's in our bylaws.

To recommend that USSA establish a process to review educational materials originating in USSA committees, working groups, divisional entities and local clubs, for potential adverse risk management issues. And furthermore, to recommend that all USSA clubs and race organizers, divisions, regions, and states must use only USSA approved educational materials.

Committees and working groups of the USSA as well as Divisional organizations and local clubs, frequently develop materials and positions to educate racers, officials, parents and other interested parties. These materials are developed with enormous effort and in good faith. However, they must be reviewed for risk management implications prior to publication and distribution.

McCarthy: And I don't know if we want to get into the risk management business for working groups, divisional entities, and local clubs.

Slattery: Ok, fine, I'll just run through this.

Lussi: Are these individual items or not?

McCarthy: I don't know. I don't know how he's going to present them. I'm just raising issues with them as he goes through. In my judgment, I don't think we want to get into the business of providing risk management decisions for divisional entities or corporations that aren't part of us.

Slattery: Jim, we have documents out there being circulated and printed by people who are using these in reference to training and education that don't agree with our rules and regulations, and right now we don't have any control over this. This was brought up and discussed in our working groups, and they feel very strongly about it.

McCarthy: I'm sure they feel strongly about it, but the question for this board is whether it's an area we should get into.

Slattery: I'm only presenting the issues that the sports committee wished to present to this board.

Sommerville: Are there rules in this book?

Slattery: No, there are not.

McCarthy: Should we go back to that one and maybe discuss that a little? Let's take them issue by issue, Bill. Number 3, what are they talking about?

Slattery: We have state rules, divisional rules, regional rules that we need to approve, because they are involved in our sanctioned competition. If they have rules that go against what we're doing, obviously this Board has to approve all our rules. We certainly discussed it in the June meeting that you didn't want rules dropped upon you. We need to approve it as a sports committee and then pass it on to the USSA Board for ratification. But in improving the process, we also need to circulate them. In the process of circulating them, putting them on the web was discussed which would cost us little or no money.

Lussi: Go ahead. You don't have to have permission to do that.

McCarthy: I don't see why you need board action to do that.

Slattery: It's a budget consideration, and I thought all budget considerations had to be brought in front of the board. It's not a freebie.

McCarthy: Are these competition rules we're talking about?

Slattery: Yes, they are.

McCarthy: And they're competition rules that have been adopted by the Alpine Competition Committee?

Slattery: No, we haven't seen all of these. We haven't approved all of them yet. We're trying to get all these rules in to look at. We can approve the ones we

generate on our own committee level, but we don't see all the state, divisional and regional rules, and I'm concerned.

McCarthy: I share your concern, but as an organization we can publish our own rules and take responsibility for those, and the board can approve those as they come from the competition committees.

Ingemie: May I ask a question? Would these other rules that you're talking about be published under the guise of USSA because they are a committee or somebody that's using your name?

Slattery: These are rules, David, that are being used in sanctioned competition in the various regions for selection, for points, for vertical drop, for just about anything.

Ingemie: You are already obligated and under liability, so what I hear is that somebody is not going along with your rules.

McCarthy: Rules that come to this board and this organization from the sport committees and are approved by them and by this board are, in turn, published. Somehow I'm missing the point.

Sosman: The question is rules that are devised in regions or divisions. We have a small working group in the rules and technical subcommittee to review those and see that they do not conflict with USSA policies. Once that decision is made in the rules and technical committee here that these are ok, the committee felt that we were obligated in some form to publish these as approved. The other part of that proposal was that anything that hadn't been approved was null and void.

For example, your ordinary rule in slalom is two runs and you score on a basis of two runs. For various types of junior selection things in different regions, they will allow everybody to have two runs and score each run separately towards qualification for a higher level junior race, even though the winner of the race is still the guy who has the best combined two runs. That's just an example, but there are a lot of those things, and they vary from division to division and region to region, and in a rather large group in the East, they even vary from state to state. Alan Hayes does go over these (he's head of that working group) to try to make sure that they conform. The idea is that in some form we need to pass on to our competitors what are the rules that have been approved.

Slattery: Jim, we'll take care of it another way.

Lussi: But I have a bigger problem than that. You're talking about alpine right now, but what you're saying applies to all of our sports. So let it go back.

Sosman: This came up in alpine. I can't speak to other sports.

McCarthy: Serge's right. If the board adopts it, it applies to everybody. This is why we wanted action items segregated into things we can act on immediately and things that need further study. This needs further study.

Lussi: But number one is the same thing.

McCarthy: That it believes in the mission? I'm glad they do.

Lussi: I'm glad you do. I hope you do, but we don't need it as a motion.

McCarthy: But it falls into the innocuous category that we could adopt without difficulty.

Slattery: We don't adopt much up here, so some of these things would be easier to adopt. Last time we gave a report on June 12, and that wasn't done properly, and we tried to run this thing down, and I'm still running for cover.

McCarthy: Well, we'll learn as we go along here.

Slattery: I know. It's a learning experience.

McCarthy: Number four is another one that should go back for a little more study and see what budget and other impacts it has.

Slattery: Well, the reason that some of these are up here, Jim, are budget impact. Let's go to Item 5. Item 2 is held for Alan, because there is a budget involved.

Ashley: Actually, we could approve the selection criteria, but it doesn't say we're going to fund it, right? Where we are right now is that originally the Olympic Committee had come to me and said, 'We had to do some interesting things, and we'd like you to support the World University Games.' I said, 'Well, in the alpine, cross country, nordic combined, and snowboarding pipelines, the World University Games never shows up. I'm just being frank, because that has not been part of our athletic pipeline.' I said we are likely to instead apply for international grants to support pipeline projects. They came back and said, 'No, we need you to go to World University Games, and we'll help you'. Well, I got a fax this morning from the USOC that specifically said, 'We've analyzed the situation, and any funding that you want to make available for the World University Games will have to come out of existing funds.' If there's no funding involved and we have a selection criteria, we can send athletes.

Lussi: That's a no brainer.

McCarthy: If we adopt this, it's clear that we are not funding anything. It doesn't obligate us to fund.

Slattery: Item 4 we skipped over.

Item 5, To request that staff include an additional initiative in the USSA Five Year Plan Update 1999-2000 to "extend support for the educational efforts necessary for the continued expansion of the number of officials and the continued improvement in the quality of officials."

This would include 1) expansion of the pool of qualified official for the 2002 Winter Olympic Games, 2) broaden education of race organizers at the club level, 3) expand educational efforts for masters, collegiate, youth events, etc. This is a tie-in into the 2002 initiative that staff is working on. Am I correct, Alan?

Ashley: Yes, and the only thing I'd ask is that we'll need to review that and prioritize it like we would with each of the other initiatives. I'd want to work through staff with it, but as a suggestion to staff, it's absolutely acceptable.

Slattery: The other one is Item 6. To request that USSA officially contact FIS to nominate Dr. Robert Calderwood as an alpine course inspector.

It's strictly that USSA has to send this individual's name in for inclusion as an inspector.

Item 7, The Alpine Sport Committee is opposed to those FIS children's initiatives that are counter to our established Alpine Athlete competencies' statement and committed to self determination of training and competition needs for J3 and younger athletes in USSA competitions and training.

This generated a considerable amount of discussion at our sports committee meeting, there is a series of FIS initiatives on youth rules that could be very detrimental to the outcome of our alpine program and our development program. If the FIS comes out with rules that are not in keeping with our development plan, then the USSA Board would probably have to make some decision on which direction we're going to go--follow them or not follow them. This is put in here to alert the board that this will come up after the FIS meeting and that there could be some complications with our program. The motion is self-explanatory, and it came from a member of our sports committee who is in charge of development in the USSA.

McCarthy: So these are all the motions?

Slattery: Yes.

McCarthy: Alan, you're comfortable with this one?

Ashley: I am.

Slattery: I ran these all through Alan earlier.

Lussi: But it's a non-action item.

Slattery: It has board impact if the FIS comes out with rules that are detrimental to our development program, Serge, this board will be big time involved.

Ashley: This goes back to discussions in Prague, and back to fundamental issues that we have with how we want to operate our athletic program. If we're truly committed to it, the professional staff and the people in the field have come to the table and said, 'This is the way we want to operate athletics,' then we better stand by it. We should not allow the International Federation to determine the United States' policy on athlete development.

Lussi: I agree with what you are saying, Alan, but you have to have them come out with it first. If they come out with a rule that you have to be alive to ski race, that is a pretty good rule. But if they come with something like you have to be dead, then that's something else, too. But let's act when it comes out.

Wakefield: Is the purpose of this to establish the official position of USSA opposing this for the FIS?

Slattery: Yes.

McCarthy: Other questions or discussion on Item 7? Item 8?

The USSA needs to represent the needs of the USST relative to the scheduling of international events, to ensure scheduling conducive to our athletic success.

◆ Blocked scheduling that allows equal breaks for all competitors.

- ◆ Scheduling that is athletically based to maintain an equal playing field for World Cup competitors.

Slattery: This is a proposal from Bill Egan. There is a difficult situation in the calendaring philosophy of the FIS in allowing break time for our athletes to come home. For the Europeans, obviously, it's a lot easier. This was a concern of Bill and Marjan that it be brought in front of the board to try to work with other nations and see if we can secure a more favorable calendar. Alan and I talked about it, and he's heard about it from Bill.

Ashley: What's happened is that each and every year we go in with the same initiative. From the standpoint of the board it always helps if we're all in it together on these sorts of issues. It's absolutely something we ought to keep working on.

Marolt: The way that we will address this issue is through our own planning and knowing what we need to do as we go down the road. Essentially, we've got a strategy to deal with the FIS, to deal with FIS committees to take our initiatives forward. We've got a strategy to deal with USOC and take our initiatives forward, and that has to be done through the normal process, through our staff taking the initiative to get it done. We're addressing that.

Slattery: Well, it came up from staff that they wanted to funnel it through the board this way.

Lussi: Jim, it goes a lot deeper than that. I'm not saying where we should go from here, but you're talking about our representation at FIS. So we can sit here all day long and say these nice words, but either Hank has to act for us or we have to do something about that. Henry is busy doing other things, and I understand that right now, but if we have any problem with representation, rules, regulations, and so forth with FIS, I don't think we've been maximizing our efforts on the Council. That's a whole new issue we should be talking about.

McCarthy: Maybe we should move that one to the FIS report time and try to get through the action items first, which I'm sure will be intriguing enough.

Slattery: I have one more, Item 9.

Request that the Board of Directors create and implement a mechanism to handle all grievances, suspensions, and appeals beginning at the state, divisional, regional and national levels in the alpine discipline.

This goes back to the bylaws, Jim, and it's been brought up a number of times, and that is to request that the board of directors create and implement a mechanism to handle all grievances, suspensions, and feuds beginning at the state, divisional, regional, and national levels. We discussed this with Faris. Everything dumps on her committee, even the little nitty-gritty stuff, and there isn't any vehicle like we had prior to the new bylaws in order to implement this. We needed to bring it again to the board in the form of a motion to see if we can't get some action through the legal area and through the staff. As you well know we had a procedure prior to the bylaws.

McCarthy: We did have a procedure. We also had divisions that were corporate entities affiliated with us, and at this stage, they no longer are. The intent is to provide some sort of guidance to those programs, and I've discussed that with Faris and Todd Wakefield. It will, hopefully, be done this fall. Because we have a different

corporate relationship, how far we can go in providing anything other than guidance is probably an issue to be decided.

Slattery: There are some people down there adjudicating some grievances and other things without the proper authority. That's what we're finding out. That's what came up in our discussion, which concerns me.

McCarthy: It's an agenda item under the judicial committee, and is in the process of being addressed. I'm trying to work through these things, and I'm not sure what's added, if we're already trying to address that with the judicial committee, by having another motion asking to do the same thing.

Slattery: But the thing is, we have no feedback on that. We didn't know what was being addressed or not being addressed in this relationship. Had we known what was going on, it probably wouldn't have been there.

McCarthy: So now that you know, you withdraw this one?

Slattery: Certainly.

McCarthy: Of the nine that remain, Item 1, If you want to leave it there, that's fine.

Ingemie: It's not the same as you've written; it's not as stated in your book. I don't know if you know that.

McCarthy: They believe in the vision to become the best alpine skiing nation.

Ingemie: Yes, but that's not what your vision says.

McCarthy: I would agree. It's a little more all inclusive than that.

Ashley: Just take out best alpine nation in the world and say committed to the vision.

Ingemie: I just wondered if they were trying to change...

McCarthy: When these things come out of committee meetings they're not artfully worded. They're trying to be supportive. Why don't you submit these for information only, and we won't need a motion by the board to adopt them. We appreciate your efforts and your committee's efforts.

Slattery: I'll tell you, it's a learning experience here. I've got one other item, Jim, that is not a motion. It's in your minutes on page 122. We discussed in June about the scheduling of the primary legislative meeting for alpine. It was brought up and discussed heavily at our sports meeting, and it is a conclusion and consensus that they would prefer to see the main meeting in the spring, that is between mid-May and June. It's just a point of information that was discussed. I don't know if the other disciplines had the same feeling or not, but that's our feeling, and it was in the previous packet that we gave you in June, which is part of your document.

McCarthy: What do they mean by 'main' meeting?

Slattery: They feel that the legislation and the rules and regulations that they can deal with, most of the volunteers are here in the spring, and many of them didn't come because there was no activity. They don't particularly care to come back twice for a week. It's a matter of time and money. Also, they feel that, when most of the key volunteers or a large segment of the volunteers are here, certainly the USSA

awards would have a better backing and more individuals there. After seeing last night, it was an awesome performance and certainly a major event in the fall. I'm just expressing, as the chairman, bringing forth these issues. I have to do that in my responsibility.

McCarthy: I asked for those comments, and I appreciate them. As this is evolving, certainly the awards ceremony last night was indicative of what this meeting could be. I also think this series of meetings is going to evolve as more planning, more policy oriented, less rule-oriented, and the spring meetings are going to be more rule-oriented and more technically-oriented. I'm not sure that's bad. One of the real advantages of doing it at this time of year is the obvious one, you get a lot of athletes here. It seems to be a better time for them. It's a continuing evolution, let's see how it goes.

Slattery: That's an appropriate answer. I appreciate your counsel on this, and unless an action item stands out real graphically, it won't show up as an item for the board.

Cross Country Lee Todd: We actually have two action items, and before I go through them, I'd echo what Bill says only on behalf of the Cross Country Committee and thanks to Luke and Christer and Miles. They've done a great job, so our hats go off to all the work they've done. It was very professional, and the pipeline is now part of the cross country vernacular. Of the two items, the second item is a moot point now. Alan, it's a selection criteria issue, and the steps that you're taking takes care of Item #2.

Jim, I guess in the spirit of being proactive, and after reviewing the minutes that have come out of the FIS and a long discussion by the cross country committees, (both the officials committee and the development committee), we'd like to approve the addition of a sprint event on the national championship calendar as a full medal event with full recognition. I believe this is an item that would come up in front of the board. We did it before with the pursuit start and again, as you know, on the FIS World Cup schedule, there are now sprint events and, obviously, from what John Aalberg, myself, and Luke have heard, this may be a consideration in 2002 as an event at that time as well. Those are being discussed at the October FIS meetings as a proposal.

McCarthy: This would be for the 1999 Championship?

Todd: Correct.

McCarthy: And it obviously has a budget impact?

Todd: It does.

Ashley: Because this event is managed by the Events Department and essentially impacts it, Annette has to be consulted in this process. Ultimately, what happens is, in the bid process for a site selection, does this mean we add more cash to the cross country championships, or do we just divide it up a different way? While athletically it makes some sense down the road, it has to be run by the Events Department to make sure we can accommodate it and that it makes sense in that whole process. The Events Department will consult with Luke and me on that, but I would recommend that it be taken there.

Todd: Do we have a time line on that Alan? Because the organizer is prepared to take the event on, but obviously it's got some implications in the calendaring.

McCarthy: Can you do that in 30 days so we can put this on the mail ballot?

Ashley: With this action item, basically within 30 days can we get a resolution? We'll have to work together on it and, it has a budget impact and also event organizer impact.

Royle: Within 30 days we definitely can. We tentatively have on the calendar for this year with our organizers a written agreement that they will conduct sprint events.

Ashley: Then we should move it forward.

McCarthy: So you'll get back with the recommendation within thirty days.

Todd: That's fine. Actually, Item #2 has been taken care of.

Disabled Jack Benedick: No action items. One point of information: Next week at the FIS Council meeting, several World Cup issues are on their agenda. We've talked with Franco Kasper about this both on the telephone and in writing. The Austrian Federation will support it and the US Federation will support it. We'll see how it all comes out. It's simply to recognize and acknowledge that we're not asking them for money or television yet. That will come. That takes it out of the IPC, the disabled world, and puts into the able-bodied world, which, as long as I'm here and I can talk, we're going to continue to fight for that. Thank you.

Freestyle Jeff Lange: I have three items to address. Let's start with the easy one first. The first motion I would like to bring to you is a relatively simple item, which shouldn't be controversial. It's simply that the freestyle sport committee voted to modify the structure of our executive committee to include the USSA athlete board member representing freestyle on that executive committee by way of a position. That places Craig Rodman on our executive committee, which will now be made up of our sport committee chair, our sport committee board rep, which at the present is myself, our athlete rep, and our head coach and head staff person as well (Polly Jo Clark and Wayne Hilterbrand). I assume that will probably not be too controversial. The next two items are with respect to old business. I refer to the minutes on page 127.

McCarthy: Are they controversial?

Lange: Yes.

McCarthy: Why don't we take Item 1 first?

Lussi: Make the motion, Jeff.

Motion #3: That the Freestyle Executive Committee include as a member the freestyle athlete representative to the board of directors.

M/S/C Lange/Badami/Carried

Lange: The next two items, I need to start with an apology by saying that, as you know, I wasn't present at the June meetings. I had understood these two issues to be discussed in entirety and taken care of, but it has been pointed out to me that they weren't properly addressed in the form of motions. Those were identified at the time by Craig Rodman. The discussion during the meeting is on page 127 and 128 of the minutes. The first motion I will read to you from our minutes.

Motion #4: The Freestyle Sport Committee requests that the USSA Board of Directors adopt a resolution that insures all Olympic allocations will be filled and the athletes be allowed to participate in the Olympic Games.

M/S/W Lange/Rodman/Withdrawn

This is intended primarily as a statement of position by Freestyle. It's presented to this board for an informational purpose, to let you know where we stand on the issue, and also to ask that the board consider the issue at this level, because it's obviously something that needs to be decided at this level. Again, I believe this was discussed in the spring. Although the wording of the actual motion wasn't available, it was discussed in concept as opposed to a motion.

McCarthy: Is the second item related to the first or are they separate?

Lange: They're separate.

McCarthy: OK, let's do them one at a time. We have a motion by Jeff and a second by Craig to send full teams to the Olympics, which is contrary to the policy this board adopted in November of 1996.

Lussi: And the USOC.

Amateur Sports Act--McCarthy: It's relevant at this stage to give you a bit of background about what's going on with the amendments to the Amateur Sports Act. This was our number one priority. The proposed amendment to the Amateur Sports Act would allow NGB's or the USOC to send incomplete teams, their term, to the Olympics. That's what the thrust of the amendment is. That's the policy that the USOC supports. It's also the policy that Senator Stevens' office supports. In all fairness, I have to tell you that the language of the amendment as applied to USSA would mandate just the opposite. It would include within the eligibility standards referenced in the section of the IOC, the IF, the USOC, and the NGB, and under those standards in almost every one of our disciplines we would have to send full teams. We are in the process of attempting to have that language amended by dropping out the IOC and the IF. We appear to be the only NGB that is impacted in that way by the language out of 40-some NGBs. The clear intent of the language based on my conversations with Trevor McCabe in Senator Stevens' office and with the people at the US Olympic Committee, the clear intent of the language was to allow NGBs and the USOC to send less than full teams to the Olympics. So that's the background I can provide you from the Amateur Sports Act, and with that I would open it to further discussion or questions.

Sommerville: Was the freestyle team a full complement at the last Olympic Games?

McCarthy: Slim, this is the one that we went to litigation or to arbitration on. Under our selection criteria, there would have been, I believe the number was three, vacancies, on the freestyle team. After going through arbitration, it was the judgement of the arbitrator that, while our policy was sustainable, remembering that our selection criteria, our recommendations to the USOC and approved by their Games Prep Committee, while the policy was sustainable, the way we had executed it was not, and he mandated that we fill the three additional slots. In the 1998 Olympics, we did not send full teams in cross country or jumping. We did send full teams in freestyle as a result of arbitration, and frankly, the fallout of that was we sent a full team in alpine and snowboarding. The amendment to the Amateur Sports Act would, at least as I read it now, appear to allow the NGB the freedom to send

less than full teams to World Cups, World Championships, non-Olympic-level events. Again, only because of the peculiarities of the language would we wind up in the box of having to send a full team.

Badami: I would like to address the motion. I am opposed to any change in our board policy, and I still think that our teams should be populated by people who earn the right to be on the team, and it shouldn't be legislated that we have to fill a full team. I don't think it does our athletes any good, I don't think it does our funding any good, and it certainly doesn't do the Olympic movement any good to have athletes who have not passed some kind of criteria to get there. I just don't want to see something in a written word give people the right to be on that team. They have to earn it. That's true in every other international sport, and I don't know why it would be different for us.

McCarthy: That was certainly the thrust of the discussion that we had in November of 1996. They concluded in that policy; it was a heated discussion then. The way to approach this is that, as a matter of athletic policy, Bill and Alan would much rather fill the teams with qualified athletes. This comes up in a fairly negative form in terms of incomplete teams. Our goal is to get as many athletes into the Olympics who are qualified, i.e. capable of doing as well as possible.

Rodman: Part of the rationale of forming this motion as I recall is that the freestyle team is certainly competent and has proved so in the past by the 11 Nations Cups that they have won. We have a number of extremely qualified athletes, and by filling full slots, we by no means were sending mediocre athletes to this last Olympics. That was certainly part of the rationale on this, and our rationale hasn't changed much. Well, mine and pretty much everyone in the freestyle community, except the staff, has not changed much from their stance.

Walsh: The USOC resolution that is mirrored in the Amateur Sports Act amendments that Jim referred to does afford NGBs and the Olympic Committee the option of sending incomplete teams to the Olympics. The wording of it and the intent of it is to guard against what is referred to as Olympic tourists, namely, those who are going to events and not racing, those who are going to the Olympics who are not going to be at all competitive. The reason for the language that Jim referred to regarding FIS standards, (IF standard, and NGB standard in defining who would be qualified or not), was that increasingly the International Federations, especially in the summer sports, are taking tighter control over selecting who goes to different events, who is allowed to go to the Olympics, rather than giving that power to each individual country and the National Olympic Committees and the national governing bodies.

The reaction (to the arbitration hearing and the situation that we were in last February just prior to the Olympics in naming the freestyle athletes to the team through arbitration), to that by the people who formed the motion to send incomplete teams was one of shock in that they did not ever imagine that it would be used in such a restrictive manner as to keep such qualified athletes as those who were in the arbitration process, and who got named to the team through arbitration, to keep athletes of that caliber off the team. So while the notion of filling the teams and the motion that is on the floor that we always send complete teams probably is inappropriate in terms of the relationship between this NGB and the US Olympic Committee, we need to rethink our policy about what qualified and what competent might mean in light of our National Olympic Committee and our own teams and policies.

Badami: Of course, Joe, that's a different proposition. I agree with you wholeheartedly. I don't think anyone in this room could disagree with that.

Lussi: Jim McCarthy made it very clear, and you're saying the same thing, Joe, that the Amateur Sports Act says that we do not require you to fill a full team. And Craig, I agree with what you're saying also. We should fill a full qualified team, and in this room we all agree to that. Right now, freestyle happens to have a lot of qualified athletes, and hopefully in years to come that will always be the same case. But there will be times, I'm sure, in our lifetime, maybe not in my lifetime or somebody else's here, but it's going to happen where we will not field a full team because we won't have qualified athletes. That's all we're saying. Craig, right now, of course, we have qualified athletes, but I don't think we should mandate ever to our staff or people here that you've got to fill a full team if those athletes aren't qualified.

Lange: If I can address the motion, it's becoming very evident to me, based on what Nick Badami just said as well as Joe Walsh, I'm in complete agreement with the both of you, and I can speak for the freestyle committee when I say that we'd be in agreement with that position. That is, we're not saying we should so widely open the flood gates that we would never ever restrict entry into that event in the event that we had disastrous teams and nobody qualified to go on any level. I don't think that's the intent of this motion, although based on the way it's written, it certainly may be so.

The real frustration that the committee was trying to express here is the feeling that we had adequate depth of talent to fill the team and that, in fact, did not happen except in the case of arbitration. I guess it would probably be appropriate to withdraw the motion as it is written with the idea in mind that maybe we readdress this and try to come up with some better standards for exactly what constitutes a qualified athlete versus an athlete who isn't qualified.

Badami: That was the objective in this reorganization of having these sport committee actions, because that input is very necessary to the overall operation. Rather than have this board set that criteria, the sport committee action should be advising and consenting to those criteria so this doesn't happen. I mean, we'd like to have full teams in everything, and if we have athletes out there who should be there, the criteria ought to show that. It needs that sport committee to make sure the criteria will be established.

Lange: Again, trying to address the motivations behind this motion, I agree with you, and I believe that that's the way it should be as well. We've been frustrated in those efforts in the past. I have to say that we've made some real progress. In fact, just earlier, Alan and I were talking about an issue, and we kind of got into the semantics of what constitutes filling teams and that sort of thing, and we just happened to hit upon something that may actually address a lot of these kinds of issues, that is, we do fill our teams except when we don't have qualified athletes.

By way of example, it happened to come up in the World Championship selection criteria that we have right now. Technically, there is no way we can possibly fill our team the way it's written regardless of how good they are across the board, simply because of the number of athletes that are available to be selected via objective criteria versus coaches' discretion and the limits on coaches' discretion. There are ways around that, and we can work on it, and we certainly are working on it as this point. At this time, we are a ways apart between the freestyle community and freestyle staff in terms of what constitutes a qualified athlete, but we are making progress.

McCarthy: So you're withdrawing the motion and the second?

Lussi: You'll withdraw your second?

Rodman: All right, I withdraw.

McCarthy: That completes the discussion. There are two issues that have impressed me in the course of this somewhat painful process. The Olympics are the largest carrot and the biggest incentive we have for most of our disciplines because they tend to fall into the amateur sports category. It's very important that we use that incentive very judiciously to maintain our quest for our goals. I forgot the second one, so I'll bring it up at some other time when I remember it. Jeff, you had a third motion.

Lange: I'd rather give you time to think about it, but the third item involves, in reading back through the minutes, I believe this issue was discussed, and I'm paraphrasing my recollections here, but I believe that you said that unless there was specific wording to the recommendation, you didn't want to take action on it. It has to do with the request for a formal apology to the athletes who had to defend their rights through arbitration. I'm here to present you with the wording to that.

Motion #5: The Freestyle Sport Committee recommends that the USSA Board of Directors formally apologize to the athletes who out of necessity had to legally defend their rights.

M/S/F Lange/Rodman/Failed

Lange: It's a motion the committee wanted me to bring before you, and I put it out to this board for consideration.

McCarthy: Well, let me begin the discussion by saying that I made my living for a long time by disagreeing with people, hopefully, without being too terribly disagreeable. That's the situation here. People disagreed. They had honest disagreements over selection criteria, the application of it, the use of it. The athletes pursued their remedies under the arbitration provision, as they are certainly entitled to. They were granted relief because the arbitrator felt they were entitled to it, but I can't imagine this board apologizing for a good faith action, and the actions of the staff and the board were done in the highest good faith. No one here is setting out to get the athletes or to get the staff or get the board. They are people struggling their very best to do their very best. In my judgment, I can't think of anything more inappropriate than for this board to apologize to anyone when it has struggled to do its very best, or for the staff to do it. That's my position; it's unchanged from June 12. You can reword it any way you want; it's not going to change, but it's open for discussion.

Rodman: This is something we need to vote on, because it is something that many members in our sport committee have confronted us with. Jeff wasn't at the last meeting, but they came to me and said you didn't follow through with this. If we vote on it, at least it will have some resolution to our sport committee.

McCarthy: Are we ready to vote on a motion to apologize to the freestyle athletes?

Sommerville: It's almost like asking our coaches to apologize for a decision that they made. It's pretty dangerous. Every time the coaches make a decision or tell somebody to give me 25 pushups or take two more laps, we're going to have some letter written to apologize to the parent and to the athlete, etc. I have to convey with Jim, if the structure wasn't set up for when problems arise that obviously when there is some disagreement, that they have a route to go. I would certainly hope that they would win sometimes; they shouldn't lose every time. The blessing here is from their

standpoint that they won, and that's great. I don't think anybody here is mad or upset about that. The structure was there, and I'm pretty proud of it. The decision was made, and we abided by it, and they went, and, great. I hate to see us put our coaches in a position that every time an athlete judges that it was an indiscretion, and maybe the coach made an honest decision, maybe the coach apologizes because he feels it in his heart, but I hate to see this board tell every coach what he's got to do every time somebody says I was mistreated.

Walsh: This is for sure a difficult issue. Jim, you may not feel that it's so difficult, but it is. The situation that arose, while perhaps I will believe that the staff was acting in good faith and with its best judgement, the error was quite egregious. The response since the ruling of the arbitrator has been in such denial by the staff, that there was absolutely nothing wrong except for a few typos in the selection procedure documents, that I almost think that this is a situation in which we do need to extend to our staff the guidance that says, look, when you make a screw up this bad, it's something that you need to address, and we as a board want to take that leadership to address the extreme situation that resulted.

Lussi: Boy, I'll tell you. I don't think that our staff screwed up that badly, and I'm sitting here in amazement that Bill Marolt is sitting there so calmly and quietly. So before we say something else, I'd like to call the question. Motion to call a question.

McCarthy: Is there any objection to calling the question? Hearing none, the question is called. All in favor of the motion being presented indicate by raising your right hand. Opposed? Motion fails.

Joe Walsh: Could you put the number of the vote in the minutes?

McCarthy: 2 in favor, 8 opposed, 5 abstentions. Any other issues on freestyle?

Jumping and Nordic Combined--Alan Johnson: This was an uneventful week for jumping and nordic combined. We had no action items. One thing I would like to say, and it may go along with what Bill was talking about with regard to the scheduling of the meeting, that no one is here shouldn't be construed as a lack of interest in what's going on or lack of support. Actually, it's quite the opposite. With the sport committees being set up the way they are, having the two head coaches there is the driving force to bring everyone together. Both of our two head coaches are in Europe right now at training camps, two other committee members had, previous to the scheduling of this meeting, USSA clinics that they were putting on. It would have been futile for us to try to get together the second time around. You need the coaches to know how the last four months went, are we on track, what's going on, and then how that next tier of development underneath them is fitting in and working. I'm not sure what the answer is, but if this is going to be the case next year that this is the big one, we need to make sure through scheduling through the Athletic Department that they don't schedule training camps or competitions at the same time. Then we'll all be here.

McCarthy: And we've got the dates for these meetings established, so we can, as we discussed, at least one of them would be a good idea.

Snowboard--Gary Taylor: I'm happy to report that all of our action items were addressed in June in Salt Lake City, and I have nothing further to report. Thank you.

McCarthy: Snowboarders learn fast.

Marolt: I would like to say, Alan, in regard to the jumping and the nordic combined programs, the board should know that we do have good, even though they're small, the leadership we're getting from the coaches and the programs that are being implemented are good. It may be down the road, but we're going to see some good action there. I feel good about where we are with those programs.

McCarthy: Just working the agenda a little bit here, Serge has to leave at 5:00 p.m. and has asked that we move the USOC report up. We can do that unless somebody has a big objection.

12.0 USOC Report: Jim McCarthy/Serge Lussi

Lussi: I'll ask that Jim speak on the Amateur Sports Act; most of the things in my report we've been discussing the last couple of hours. Bill covered the 2002 Podium, we've been talking a lot about selection for Winter Olympic Games, and these are all things that were very high priority at our last meetings. Jim, why don't we go with you first then and do the Amateur Sports Act. Bill, and Jim and I sat in Chicago for almost two days on something of a definition of an athlete, and, Joe, you were involved with us also. It was kind of an interesting conversation, but, Jim, why don't you sum it up for us if you would.

McCarthy: Of the Amateur Athlete Act amendments, there were four that we chose as being significant for this NGB. Again, it did come up very quickly. I'll be candid with you, at first I couldn't figure out why Serge hadn't alerted us to it, and then I quickly realized the problem wasn't Serge but our franchisor, the USOC, which has a unique way of doing things. Nonetheless, we addressed the act and the four priorities.

First was the complete teams issue, second was including damage awards in arbitration, third was a proposal to create an ombudsman position within the USOC, and fourth was the addition of Paralympics to the exclusive jurisdiction of the U. S. Olympic Committee. We've covered the complete teams issue, and there's no need to discuss that further unless somebody has a question. The second one, in terms of damages, is related to the third one in terms of ombudsman.

By way of background, the current arbitration provision that we have to accept as being part of, or franchisee, of the USOC requires that we submit to arbitration under rules formulated by the USOC with the American Arbitration Association. It was what happened in the freestyle situation. In the 20 years that the Amateur Sports Act has been in effect, those rules have been construed to exclude damages and focus the arbitration proceeding on selection procedures and the selection of athletes to teams, but not to include damages.

The amendments to the act initially would have included damages as part of the arbitration proceeding unless the Athletes' Council agreed to delete that since they proposed that it had basically given them veto power. The current standing of that is, by a two-thirds vote of its 125+ person Board of Directors, the USOC could exclude damages from the arbitration process. It was something we tried to strongly oppose in Chicago. I was amazed to find out that many NGBs don't seem to be concerned about having damages assessed against them and almost embraced the concept, for reasons that absolutely escape me, but nonetheless that seemed to be the context it was going down in. I don't think that's something that's going to change. The athletes control one-third of the USOC board. They have proved them-selves exceptionally effective in acquiring and exercising power. Joe would agree there are

very little discussions of performance among the athletes. I don't know how damages relate to performance, but that's something we're going to confront.

The ombudsman provision originally was, in its very wording, designed to provide the athletes with free legal advice to allow them to sue their NGBs. By way of very brief background, and Serge might want to mention this, whether you agree or disagree, the impression I got is many of the athletes on the AAC have a very hostile relationship with their NGB, far beyond anything that we have experienced. Thankfully, our athletes and our relationships have been very good, but many of them come from NGBs where there is a great deal of conflict and animosity between the NGB and the athlete, and many of the athletes' proposals reflect that animosity. This is one of them.

The end result on this one is there will be an ombudsman in all likelihood at the USOC whose main job will be to advise athletes on their legal rights, vis-à-vis NGBs and the USOC, although the language was expanded to include an obligation to attempt to mediate those, so we won't go right to litigation. But you can see the connection between the ombudsman and the damages provision.

The fourth one dealt with the Paralympics. They've been added as an exclusive responsibility to the USOC, so the language would read, "The US Olympic Committee has exclusive responsibility for Olympic-level sports, Paralympic sports, and..."

Lussi: we all accepted it with our eyes wide open. It will probably cost something downstream, but we still accepted it.

McCarthy: The way the structure is set up, each NGB will be given an opportunity to elect whether or not it wants to become a Paralympic NGB. It's unspecified what happens to those disciplines where an NGB elects not to be a Paralympic NGB. Funding is unspecified. The Athletes Advisory Council pretty unanimously rejected including Paralympic athletes under the definition of athletes used to determine the 20% athlete membership for the USOC, the Athletes Advisory Council, what have you. This is an area of continuing lack of definition and concern, and this board in the probably near-term future is going to be confronted with the election of whether or not it wants to become a Paralympic NGB. There is no discussion of how that would impact the basic license agreement we currently have with *Disabled Sports USA* under which we operate the elite alpine and cross country teams, so this is a to-be-continued story and to be developed. Funding is certainly an issue when it comes to any activity that we are involved in.

Lussi: Didn't the USOC also say it would be in federal court, not in state court, if it did go to court?

McCarthy: Yeah, they have a whole litany of wonderful things that they've done. They would only have to have one agent for service of process instead of 50. Those things are of small significance to us and of great significance to their attorney, who recently resigned. That's where it's going. The Monica Lewinsky situation in Congress may knock the Amateur Sports Amendments off the agenda momentarily.

Badami: But it's also only on the Senate side so far, so it's not this year.

McCarthy: This has been going around for a long time. Whether this will actually come to fruition is another issue. That's basically where it is.

Lussi: You've covered most of the things, Jim. The only thing that you did not cover as far as our association here is, we are doing pretty well with representation at the USOC. Slattery is on the committee, Jim's on the committee, we've got Joe, myself. I've been recently put on a committee called the Athletes Performance Group. The USOC has had a difficult time separating administration and athleticism, so they formed this whole new group called the Athletes Performance Group, and our mission is to say how monies will be spent on athletes. I'm not sure how it will come out, but the USOC is taking a firm stance, allegedly, that they are going to fund only sports that have medal potential. That means if badminton and some other things have no medal potential, they'll get very little funding, and that filters down to all of our organizations. That's something that we're going to decide again at two more meetings we have coming up. If this is true, it will be very interesting if it happens. The Athletes Performance Group is said to have the power to do that, and we will do it. How that's acted upon by the Executive Committee, I can't tell at this point in time, but our representation is good. Jim has done a fine job with this arbitration business. It's been great, and we are doing very well. As far as funding goes, Bill is up to speed on that. We're getting our fair share, and our fair share will be more than that if we can get a little bit closer with SLOC. You're pretty satisfied, are you not, Bill?

McCarthy: Just a couple more things, Serge. Lee Todd was elected to the Board of the US Olympic Committee this summer as a disabled sport representative. Lee, as usual, is wearing a number of hats in this and has been very helpful with us through the USOC relations. He's knowledgeable and respected there. I've also been asked to serve on the Venture 2000 and the Podium 2002 Committee, which is a six-person group reviewing the grant program. It's not a grant program it's a performance-based funding program that Bill described earlier, the \$25 million.

Lussi: One thing that's coming up is called VIK, value in kind. That's an issue that Bill Gorton I'm sure will have a great time with. What the USOC is saying to the NGBs is that, if we're going to give you dollars, we want to have at least 25% to 50% of those dollars in value in kind. How they do this, I have no idea. It's a very controversial issue. If they said to us, for example, we'll give you your VIK all in airline tickets, we could certainly do that with no problem, if we got there first. But every NGB wants to get there first. It's a big question we're facing right now, how that is handled. Training centers are also a big issue. I am the chairman of all the training centers, which is kind of nice in many ways, but I'm seeing lots of issues about how they are to be utilized. We talked about that with our staff here, and although we utilize the training centers, they can be very expensive sometimes because we're charged for them. It's not a free item, and these are also ongoing discussions.

McCarthy: Thanks, Serge. Just one summary point, Bill and I have had a lot of discussion in the last year over two positions, FIS and USOC. I didn't know much about USOC, so I went to a lot of the meetings. It seems like a lot, maybe it's just two or three. Serge does a marvelous job at sort of the iron butt contest. I mean, these things go on beyond endurance and beyond reason, and it's amazing that you can stay there. One of the things we've determined is that we've done Serge and Hank a disservice by not giving them firm agenda items of what we need to do and what we want to do in each one of these organizations. We've already, and Bill will probably allude to this if he does the FIS report, are in the process of correcting that with Hank. He went off to a FIS meeting in Switzerland with a very clear agenda of what the interests of the organization are, and with both organizations we're formulating that. USOC, Serge is exactly right, it's mainly a money distribution organization, but what we want to do there is make sure we are in positions where we establish the policy for determining how the money is distributed, and we're not just there with our hand out. Any questions?

Walsh: I have one more comment while we're on the USOC. One of the activities that is ongoing in the Sport Science Department at the USOC is a complete program review of their drug control and drug testing policies and procedures. They're all programmed. That review will be presented to the Executive Committee of the Olympic Committee next weekend, and hopefully we'll get a look at it not too long after that. As you are all pretty aware with the issues of the Tour de France and Michelle Smith and the Chinese swimmers and everything else that's going on, it's a pretty hot international topic/issue.

Some of the things that we need to be paying attention to are that the USOC will be doing, not increased drug testing overall, but increased out-of-competition testing and increased unannounced at-competition testing. So, instead of the national championships, where you have six weeks or more notice that there is something coming up, and you know not to take any Benadryl two nights before your national championship race, even if you have a bad cold, because if you have to pee in the cup, you're going to get burned. Whereas, with this increased unannounced testing, that's generally an extremely good thing, because it's going to catch more people who are actually using performance-enhancing substances.

It's also a potentially dangerous thing, because it creates the opportunity for someone to inadvertently test positive by not knowing what they're taking or not knowing what's in their system from taking a Benadryl or some other over-the-counter medication that might show up as a masking agent that they didn't know about. We need to be very attentive to looking at our own program of educating our athletes on substances and doping control so that we don't end up in a situation where one of our athletes gets caught in an inadvertent positive test.

Lussi: Let me pick that up a little bit, Joe. What's happened also with the training centers--it has not happened yet, but it's about to happen--is that we will be doing random testing at training centers, if you're going to use training centers. It also will be for social drugs. There will be testing for marijuana, alcohol, the whole nine yards. If it happens, it's real. I have not taken a stand on it yet as far as being the training center chairman. I have mixed emotions. I'm certainly going to have a tough time testing 15- and 16-year-old kids, but maybe we're going to have to do that. I don't know. It's a wait and see thing. Bill, has staff had any feelings on that yet?

Marolt: We have strong feelings about drug use, whether it's performance enhancing or social. My experience, when I was in Colorado, we established a tough policy, and it was beneficial. It developed a sense of pride in our athletes that they weren't using drugs, and that's the path that we want to go down now. We want to do this stuff right. Ultimately, we're role models, and at the end of the day, that's one of our major responsibilities.

Lussi: I know we're pressed for time here, but I would like to have a motion from this board to that effect that I could carry back to the USOC that we would like this.

Benedick: So moved.

McCarthy: Serge, could you just word that motion again?

Lussi: As an attorney, no, but what Bill is saying is that we look forward to all types of drug testing for all of our athletes in all situations, and that's what we're talking about.

Marolt: It's more than just testing, it's education. As part of an educational program, it has to have a testing component.

Ashley: If the USOC plans on implementing any kind of testing program, it's critical to back it up with a high-quality education program.

Lussi: Alan, that is a good point. We have not done that yet. So we want to add the word education?

Benedick: You've got a motion. You have to have a second before you can discuss it.

McCarthy: I thought you seconded, or did you make the motion? For clarity, I know this is the difficulty in dealing with lawyers, but could we just word the motion once as one complete declarative sentence.

Motion #6: The USSA Board supports a drug program that includes both education and testing.

M/S/C M/Ingemie, S/Benedick, Carried

McCarthy: All in favor indicate by saying Aye.

All: Aye

McCarthy: Opposed?

Lussi: Thank you.

Jim McCarthy: Thank you, Serge.

9.0 FIS Report: Hank Tauber/Bill Marolt

McCarthy: Hank isn't here. We mentioned that he went to the meetings in Switzerland and left today. With that, I'll turn it over to Bill to give the FIS report.

Marolt: Before I give the FIS report, I was interested at the USOC committee meetings that I went to, (It was the first ones that I had gone to and spent any time. Like Jim has mentioned, we were there for four days) and not one time did we talk about anything substantive in terms of competition or training our athletes. Frankly, I was disappointed; I was dismayed that we would have that group of people, which is the NGB Sports Executive Directors or their representatives and the Athletes' Council. Not one time in four days.

My point is that we have a unique opportunity with this NGB. We're on track, our focus is right, and if we stay after our vision and our mission, then we're going to be a forerunner in terms of the Olympic movement in this country. As a result of driving that agenda, which we can do, and we can do it everywhere we go, what our coaches were saying is drive this agenda for us with the FIS. Make sure that we're putting together schedules that make sense and work for us. That's what we've got to do. Clearly we need to protect athletes' rights, clearly we need to do the right things in terms of drug education, but at the end of the day, we've got to make sure that we're focused on the competitive environment. I'll say that when I sit in front of my USOC brethren. I feel strongly about that.

In terms of the FIS, we have a similar agenda. Make sure that we find ways to put our people on committees and, more importantly, find ways to put our people in committee chairmanships. If we do that, we're going to start to drive the same sort of agenda that we're driving with the USOC. As you know, the retirement of Marc Hodler from his presidency of the FIS after 47 years clearly gives a lot of opportunity for the FIS as an international federation and the USSA as a national association to modify and change how the FIS does business.

In my discussions with Franco and with Hank, that means we have to take a close look at the committee structure. We have to perhaps eliminate some committees, we have to streamline some of the work the committees do, and we have to encourage Franco to take a real proactive position in terms of being the president. We need to find a way to have the FIS professionals drive the agenda a little bit more, very similar to what we're doing with the US Ski and Snowboard Association.

This meeting that Hank is going to, which is going to happen on Sunday and Monday, the whole issue of governance, the staff, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, all of those functions are going to be evaluated and looked at, and clearly we'll start to see a different look with the FIS.

With that action and with that direction, we, as a national ski and snowboard association, have got to be prepared to protect our rights, our marketing and our television rights, specifically. As we know, our marketing rights especially, we have gone down the road to seek corporate sponsorship to support our programs, so we have to make sure we negotiate tough and that our representatives and I are in a position to protect those rights.

Hank went to Europe with this agenda. We have also let the FIS know this is our position. This is a watershed meeting in a sense. I'm going to be interested to see how Franco conducts these meetings and how this Council reacts and responds to his leadership. Clearly, we have a lot to do. We need to make sure that we protect our position, but on the other side, that we're also good partners. The United States clearly should be in the leadership role. We will ascend to that leadership role and do our part in being a good partner with the FIS. That's possible, and we'll get that done. Any questions?

McCarthy: Just one comment. The USOC meetings that Bill attended were two days long, not four days long. It just seemed like four days. Again, I'm sure this gets tiresome, particularly given the USOC example, and Joe may be able to confirm this, there was just no discussion of how any of these things related to athlete performance. It wasn't an issue. It's just about power, who has it and who doesn't, and that's unfortunate. Our next topic here is to go back to the agenda to Item 8.

10.0 Judicial Committee: Todd Wakefield

Wakefield: I will again deliver the report on behalf of the Judicial Committee. Although not a member of the Judicial Committee, I sit in an advisory capacity. No grievances or appeals have been filed since the report I delivered to the board on June 12 in Salt Lake City. A summary of Judicial Committee activities during the last 12 months, rather than restate them again, I would refer you to pages 136 through 137 of your notebook. That is as adequate a summary now as it was at that time.

It should be noted that, at the June Board meeting, it was discussed that the Judicial Committee would be working within the next four to six weeks after that meeting on developing some policies and procedures to help guide local programs and coaches

in dealing with disciplinary problems that arise within short time frames before competitions. No action has been taken on that subject yet; however, it's my understanding that the committee has committed to addressing that issue between now and the board's next meeting, whether by teleconference or mail, in the next 30 days. We'll also take up the issue that Bill raised in Item 9. That would be an appropriate task for the Judicial Committee, and I'll make sure that we get it on the agenda. That's the extent of the Judicial Committee Report. Any questions?

11.0 Ethics Committee Report: Jim McCarthy/Whitey Willauer

McCarthy: Whitey has submitted a draft ethics policy statement. It has been reviewed by Todd and should be available for this board in a final form well in advance of the March meeting. In the interim, we are looking seriously at the issues of how we do background checks on coaches whom we license and hold out to the world possibly as being certified in some way by this organization. That is the type of thing we're looking at, and this was again discussed in June. It is an ongoing project, but I sense that it's nearing completion. Any questions on that?

12.0 U. S. Ski & Snowboard Team Foundation Report: Bill Bindley

McCarthy: Bill Bindley is not here. Bill, do you want to do the Foundation Report?

Marolt: What I said in my report and your report are probably the same thing.

McCarthy: I could go along with that. Does everybody else agree? Ok, back to Bill Slattery for the U. S. Skiing Foundation Report.

13.0 U. S. Skiing Foundation Report: Bill Slattery

Slattery: Jim, our skiing foundation meeting is scheduled for tomorrow morning, so maybe I got off the hook rather easily. At that time we will discuss the investment policy, granting policy, and officers, board members, and the procedures for running the corporation as was discussed with staff and yourself. We'll have a detailed report following the meeting outlining all the areas I just covered for review and action by the Board. Any questions?

Badami: I have the same question I've been asking for years. Will you please reexamine the policy of guaranteeing a loan where we're paying interest money out to First Security Bank instead of paying it to ourselves?

Slattery: That is on the agenda, and has already been discussed, and it will be corrected.

Badami: Thank you.

McCarthy: Bill and I have made the same request to Bill. What we suggested was that this organization that Bill Slattery is heading first do exactly what you said, Nick, use the assets to provide our cash flow relief rather than guaranteeing a loan--that we pay interest to ourselves rather than to First Security, bottom line.

Number two is that we look at these resources as a way to provide Bill Marolt and his staff some budget relief, some risk capital, something so that at the end of every month he's not just barely making it. A budget surplus of \$148,000 on a \$17 million

budget is not a very big surplus. We'd like to give him a little more flexibility so, if he makes a mistake, it doesn't look quite as bad on our record, and he has the opportunity to take a bit of a risk now and again.

Third, to look at the idea of creating an endowment that might be sport-specific and how we can do that without conflicting with our other foundation, which is something we're going to have to look at quite seriously. Basically, Nick, that's the agenda for that group.

Nominating Committee--We had scheduled a Nominating Committee meeting for this morning. We did not have a quorum. If we had, I would have proposed one addition to the executive committee, Lee Todd, and would have proposed that the acting or interim phrase in front of Bill Slattery's name on the foundation be removed and that he be appointed as the president or chairman of that association. As soon as we can get the nominating committee together again, I'll make those proposals, and, hopefully, we can report back with favorable action. I wanted the board to be aware of that. Moving on to the next agenda item, the legal report.

14.0 Legal Report: Todd Wakefield

Wakefield: The legal report will consist of its usual three components: The litigation report, some proactive initiatives that we're working on, and we'll also discuss some USOC matters.

Litigation--On the competition side, which means personal injury cases, there are no new personal injury lawsuits since our June meeting. Again, rather than rehash what is pending, I would refer you to pages 140 through 142 of your notebook. The discussion there remains accurate and adequately describes the status of pending personal injury litigation. The defense of those cases by our insurance company continues, and all potential liability continues to appear to be within our coverage limits. On the administrative side, I am pleased to report for the second time in as many board meetings that USSA is not a defendant in any administrative-side litigation. Bill Gorton is still puzzled at how we spend so much every month on legal bills given that state of affairs. We remain active as plaintiffs in three trademark enforcement cases. Those were also addressed during the June board meeting, and the report on pages 140 through 142 is up to the task there, also. Unless there are any questions about any of those lawsuits, that would conclude the litigation portion of the report.

USOC--The board should know that on July 15 an athlete who was involved in last winter's Olympic team selection arbitration filed a complaint against USSA with the U. S. Olympic Committee alleging that USSA was in violation of Articles 8 and 9 of the U. S. Olympic Committee constitution. For those of you who don't speak fluent USOC constitutionese, Article 8 addresses compliance with the Amateur Sports Act, and Article 9 addresses athletes' rights to compete in protected competition. We filed a very detailed and very well documented reply at the request of the Executive Director of the USOC. I have not provided copies of it, because we were not certain there were enough rain forests left to yield enough paper to do that. If anyone would like to have a copy of this, we would certainly make it available to the board members who request it. Suffice it to say that we did a thorough job of researching the allegations, and we are very confident that USSA is not in violation of Articles 8 or 9 of the USOC constitution. It remains to be seen whether the Executive Director of the USOC will conduct any further investigation on the complaint, but at this time we don't have any indication one way or the other on that question.

Proactive Initiatives--Some proactive initiatives that we've been working on in connection with efforts that were mentioned earlier by Tom Kelly to help standardize the way in which our trademarks are used, we've also undertaken a thorough inventorying and maintenance process of the names and marks that USSA uses. There are a surprising number of those for a lot of different events, different programs that we do, different teams that we field. We're in the process of inventorying those, making sure that every-thing that needs to be registered with the patent and trademark office is registered, and making sure that everything that needs to be protected is protected. We've engaged a firm in London to help us register our key marks internationally so that we can insure that there's no overseas misuse of our marks.

As was covered earlier in Alan Ashley's report, we've spent a good deal of time, using a Bill Gorton term, "scrubbing selection criteria," cleaning them up. We think that the criteria format is solid. The goal was to develop criteria that were clear, understandable, fair, and defensible, and we've accomplished that. When the sport committees see those criteria and have a chance to go through them and make sure that substantively they are where they need to be, you all should be pleased at the progress that's been made in terms of making them more clear and fair. Are there any questions on any of the matters I've reported on? That concludes the legal report.

McCarthy: Thanks Todd. I'd like to thank both Todd and both Bills for what I view, maybe with some bias, as using legal counsel preventively, because it's going to save a lot of money in the long run. We've been winging it for a long time, and this is a much better way to go, and a good use of resources.

15.0 **Athletes' Council Report: Joe Walsh**

USOC Athletes Advisory Council--Walsh: I'll start with just a few follow-up notes on the Olympic Committee Athletes' Advisory Council report. The definition of athlete that we came up with, and was agreed upon at the Chicago meeting, USSA currently is not out of compliance with that definition. Although all of the representatives who have read it and worked with it don't necessarily agree that it's the best definition that we should be pushing for. We'll continue to look at that and work with it at the Olympic Committee to see what revisions we can make in order to bring it into a fair representation. One of the principle items in it that is not to our liking is that it excludes Paralympic and disabled athletes, not explicitly, but implicitly, through some of the language and perhaps somewhat inadvertently.

Lussi: That was unanimously agreed by the NGB Council and the Athletic Council. They all agreed to that.

McCarthy: You can't say inadvertently. They voted to exclude it. It was my motion to include it.

Walsh: Implicitly.

Lussi: Joe, it was totally agreed when the AAC and the NGB passed the definition of an athlete. That was done.

Walsh: Ok. Well, I tend to not be so hard on them. In any case, it stands that Paralympic and disabled athletes cannot serve within the 20% representation. That's the end result. We'll work on correcting that.

Lussi: Who will?

Walsh: I will.

Lussi: You will, Joe, but not from the Council. The Athletes' Council was unanimously opposed to that. Is that correct?

Walsh: That's where the inadvertent language came up, Serge. The Athletes' Council was unanimously opposed, with some abstentions, to representation on the Athletes Advisory Council at the Olympic Committee. However, the Athletes Advisory Council thought that, in the language they had put forth, the disabled and Paralympic athletes would be included as potential representatives within the NGBs. That's why I pushed the implicitly and perhaps inadvertent.

McCarthy: This is a definition that took over seven years to craft. The use of the word inadvertent after seven years of thinking about it, to me flies in the face of what happened, Joe. It's unfair to this organization and the athletes here. The athletes on the AAC, when confronted with involving Paralympic athletes under the definition of athlete, unanimously, or virtually unanimously, voted to exclude it, and they were given the veto power to do that. That's actually what happened. To put it under inadvertent, like they just sort of missed that word, it distorts what happened. Anyway, I'm sorry, go on.

USSA Athletes Council--Greg Boester apologizes for not being here. He is trying to save all of our financial securities on Wall Street. He called last night and said things were a little busy for him, and he wasn't going to be able to make it out. He tasked me with presenting this report. The Athletes' Council has taken on a very strong role in working with the respective sports committees. I, as one outside of that circle, want to compliment all of the athlete sport representatives for taking on that role and being so aggressive and positive in working towards Bill's stated, and our collective, goal of *athletic excellence*.

The Athletes' Council members who have been reporting and talking on a regular basis are pushing for athletic excellence, and I hope that is clear at the sport committee level and that's working well. With that said, we do have one administrative action item that we hope is a minor item that we can formalize and move through quickly.

At our June meeting, the Board of Directors charged the Athletes' Council with coming up with a proposal for the funding of athlete representatives to the various USSA governance: sport committee, executive committee, and these Board of Directors' meetings. The proposal I have distributed, you all have it on the table, at the top of the page it says, Proposal--Funding for Athlete Representatives to USSA governance meetings. The basis of this is to meet the Amateur Sports Act and the USOC Constitution and our own bylaw regulation of having 20% athlete representation in various governance structures.

We already, as a matter of courtesy, perhaps, but not necessarily policy, fund the athlete representatives. The USSA funds the athlete representatives to the Board of Directors meetings. With the restructuring of the organization and the board to include the strong role of the sport committees and the restructuring of meetings at Jim McCarthy's direction in order to trim the number of meetings we all have to attend, we've come up with four different scenarios outlined in this proposal that will adequately provide athlete representation and allow for athletes to participate at the 20% level in these respective meetings. John, do you want to move this proposal? I can't move it because I don't have a vote.

Motion #7: I move that we accept the athlete funding proposal that has been submitted by USSA's Athletes' Council.

M/S M/Aalberg, S/Rodman

McCarthy: Discussion.

Lussi: All right, Joe. So what you're asking, right now, the USOC funds all members of all committees at all times.

Badami: Not for transportation, though.

Lussi: Yes, they do.

Walsh: He's not referring to this particular item. He's talking about USOC meetings.

Lussi: Right, so all USOC meetings that happen they fully fund the AAC Board, so this has nothing to do with that. Is that correct or not?

Walsh: That is correct.

Lussi: OK, so you're asking also for an alternate athlete from this board to be funded by us to go to USOC meetings, is that correct?

Walsh: The number four item on this proposal is to have the AAC alternate representative, who is Edith Thys at this point, be funded by this organization to go to that meeting for an additional voice there. The USOC will pick up lodging.

Lussi: She has no voice there and she does not have a vote. My feeling from the USOC point of view is, if I can't go, should I take two more people to the NGB Council meeting? I don't think so. If we have a voice and a vote, that's what we should do. Now, Joe, if you can't go or someone can't go, and Edith wants to go in your place, I would agree with that. We don't need two. That's my feeling.

McCarthy: Based on what I've seen of the Athletes' Advisory Council, I would agree.

Lussi: They can't agree among themselves without any more numbers. Let's not throw any more numbers out there.

McCarthy: I understand where Joe is coming from and the athletes with this proposal. However, the specter out there is the USOC specter, and they fund everybody to every meeting. They have a \$5.7 million dollar meeting budget, and everyone goes for free. So guess what, everyone shows up, but no one gets involved. When you're on your own ticket, there's a different level of involvement. There are different circumstances with the athletes, and I understand that, than there are with other members of the board, and that's something that bears being addressed, but the specter of the USOC situation is not a pleasant one.

Walsh: John, would you accept an amendment to strike number 4 from the proposal?

Aalberg: Yes.

Walsh: So if the proposal--and the second?

Bower: Second.

Walsh: So if I leave the proposal at cutting out Item 4.

McCarthy: Ok. First level of negotiation.

Amended Motion #7: I move that we accept the athlete funding proposal submitted by USSA's Athletes' Council deleting Item 4.

M/S/C M/Aalberg, S/Bower, Carried

Rodman: I would like to make a comment concerning #3 for the sport committee athlete representatives. Freestyle has done an excellent job with funding these athletes to the sport committee. That's very commendable of Polly Jo Clark, but I've come to understand that not all sport committee athletes are funded to their sport committees. Therefore, we should try to make it a policy to get two sport committee athletes to the sport committee meetings each year and also take it off the burden of the actual sport committee budget and apply that to administration. That's a good move.

McCarthy: Just for a point of reference here: the bylaws provide 'that no director of USSA, member of the discipline committee, or other USSA member shall receive any form of compensation or reimbursement for travel expenses from USSA unless specifically authorized by the board except that eligible athlete representatives may be reimbursed for travel expenses.'

Badami: It's already done. We're just not doing it, but it's already in there.

McCarthy: And we do it for the board meetings. By way of background, the athlete representatives to these board meetings are reimbursed for their travel expenses is my understanding and always have been.

Badami: What about for the committee meetings?

McCarthy: They're not reimbursed for the committee meetings, and that's what the issue comes down to. Will we reimburse athletes for the committee meetings?

Badami: I'd like to address that. If we want athlete representation, and we all do, we should fund to those committee meetings. Their input is very important to each individual discipline.

McCarthy: I agree, Nick, that their input is important. We have to watch, also, the budget impact of this potentially slippery slope. While it's relatively small now, if the committee memberships expand . . .

Badami: Then we're going to have to have a discipline to take care of it, but the point is that we ought to solicit their participation, and we may have to pay for it.

Rodman: The way this is worded, we're going to have one board of directors representative who is already funded plus one other athlete representative to two sport committee meetings each year. So, therefore, it's only one additional person to the meetings per sport.

Badami: It looks like the budget implication is somewhere around \$7,000 to \$9,000 more than what we're doing now; I don't think that's objectionable.

Walsh: Those budget figures, I hope, are very generous. They're based on Greg Boester's and my travel from New England in the northeast.

Slattery: I read through this proposal, and we talked about it a little bit at our sports meeting. The concern that one of our athletes has is that we have four athletes who are participating, and how do you determine which two get paid and which two pay their own expenses? That was a question that he had to me. They're all fantastic, so there are no two best.

McCarthy: Mark, did you want to add anything on budget impact here? I know it's a little preliminary.

Lampe: The budgetary numbers down here are not that accurate. We haven't been spending anywhere near that kind of money. I have some reservations about mandating this spending. We have, as Joe said, supported this as a courtesy, but we also have a number of other activities like that, and we have an awful lot of athletic initiatives that are still going unfunded. I would like to see this listed as an initiative that gets consideration amongst all the other administrative and athletic initiatives by priority.

Walsh: I guess I put this in the same type of activity as the financial audit that we perform or the legal advice that we contract. This is an effort for us to responsibly fulfill the legal obligation to have 20% athlete representation at our governance meeting.

McCarthy: I'm fairly naive when it comes to accounting, but we can put this almost anywhere we want, and it's still going to cost money. It's ultimately going to come out of the pot.

Lange: My understanding with freestyle is that we have been funding it. In that sense, the issue of whether it comes out of the sport budget or the administrative budget is somewhat relative in that we're spending the money. I agree with what you said, Nick. It seems to me that this is something that's important to us and that we should be doing. I support what we've done in the past and think it should be accompanied by policy.

Benedick: Does this require a change to the bylaws?

McCarthy: No. It wouldn't require that. We already fund the athlete representatives to these board meetings, so Item #1, we're already doing that. Item #2, the executive committee meetings are usually by phone, so I don't think that has any budget impact. The funding of athletes to the foundation meeting, frankly, maybe that is something that could be done out of the foundation budget. We're down to number 3, the funding of two athletes to each sport for two meetings a year. That's the core of the motion.

Benedick: If one is already on this board, maybe the president of the committee, in our case Cathy Gentile-Patty. She's funded to come here, she also sits on the committee for disabled.

McCarthy: How about nordic combined which funds its meetings outside of this. It's basically number 3 that we're looking at, the discipline committee meetings and two people to the discipline committee meetings. That's what it boils down to.

Slattery: I have four because of the size of the committee, I'm 20%.

McCarthy: Well, we're only going to fund two. The athletes have only asked for two of the four to be funded.

Slattery: We have four, that's all.

McCarthy: The athletes will have to decide how to draw straws on that one.

Rodman: We saw this as somewhat of a compromise rather than throwing everyone in there that's on the sport committee. We decided to do board of directors' representative plus one other. We kind of felt like we already negotiated that somewhat amongst ourselves, and some of the feedback we were thinking of is you could alternate the years or you could do it various ways between who gets funded when. Overall this is good policy.

McCarthy: The motion is basically proposals number 1, 2, and 3. Number 4 is withdrawn. Any further discussion? All in favor of the motion as presented indicate by saying aye.

All: Aye

McCarthy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Walsh: Thank you. That's all for Athletes Council.

McCarthy: Not an easy organization to get money from, Joe.

Benedick: Just a quick comment. On this language that's being used in the Amateur Sports Act where we define an athlete representative to whatever, for just the USA, it doesn't affect any other countries, or it may if they choose to do so. If the FIS accepts Disabled Alpine World Cup, that includes a world championships, etc., and it says in there, athlete who competes in a world championships recognized by the IF for all three, for us, for this board, for skiing. Also, maybe some do and some don't, at the international level, tennis and sailing have a disabled version integrated at the IF, not necessarily at all on the national levels.

McCarthy: Right now it's a mess. It may be less of a mess, but right now, a Paralympic athlete would not qualify to be an athlete representative of Paralympic athletes on the USOC board. But that's just matter of interest.

16.0 Old Business: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: Under old business we have just the meeting schedule through September of 1999. There is a more extensive meeting schedule in the back of the book.

17.0 New Business: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: I don't think we have anything under new business, any new business?

18.0 Comments from Membership: Jim McCarthy

McCarthy: Item 18, comment from the membership. The bylaws provide that, at our annual meeting, we set aside time for comments from the membership. This is it.

Bruce Crane: This is a comment on Item 4 of the alpine report. My apologies to the board and others since this item came up in my subcommittee and was not worded in such a way as to make the need, the intent, and the reason for board interest crystal clear. As to the suggestion that this proposal would increase the exposure of the organization, the opposite is the case. This proposal will help USSA manage risk and thereby preserve resources for the athletes. The need for this action or for an equivalent action already exists in that materials, which include very compromising language, are being used in our programs and with our knowledge. The intent is simply to provide needed direction with the authority of the USSA Board to correct and to avoid these situations and mistakes in the future. I hope that the interest of the board in this general concern might be such to affirm on record the authority of the sports committees to proceed along these lines if and when needed or to redirect this concern to legal counsel. The item as presented in the alpine report should have at least been referred to counsel.

McCarthy: Bruce, thank you. I appreciate it on two levels. Number one, you've done a nice job implicitly of defining what information this board needs with every motion that comes to it. We need to know where it fits into the context of that discipline, why it's being made, why it's important, what have you. As we evolve, rather than just beating up on Bill Slattery at every meeting, maybe this is an easier way to do it. Bruce, I have asked Todd Wakefield to work with you on investigating this and seeing what, if any, action is necessary. So if you could contact Todd, that would be good.

Fraser West: Jim, just as a matter of information on risk management, a few years back when I was active in FW, I was an expert witness for the plaintiffs in a million dollar settlement. For the plaintiffs, not the defendant. This thing on the junior language should be defined tomorrow so that you won't have to refer to the ICR if that's what you want. I referred to the ICR, and the plaintiff won over a million dollars. That's all I'm going to say.

McCarthy: Thanks, Fraser, I appreciate that comment, and it is something we have to be aware of and monitor, and we will endeavor to do that. Any other business?

One thing that I should have started this meeting with, and I regrettably did not, I just want to mention that Ned Gillette, who was a member of the ski team in the '60's and '70's was killed this August in, I believe it was, Pakistan. Ned was a world traveler, adventurer, and writer in his early 50's. He was a very inspirational and exciting person to be around, and he had a big impact on me early on in my involvement with USSA. He epitomized in many ways the kind of lifestyle that frequently follows a career on the ski team. It's a sad loss, and I just wanted to mention that. Also, I would mention that Stew Turley is not here today. Stew had an operation this summer, and I'm sure he would appreciate your concern, prayers, and thoughts. We look forward to seeing him back here very soon.

Ashley: A little late breaking news. I just checked my voice mail, and I'm pleased to announce that we've come to a conclusion with a new freestyle mogul head coach. Donny St. Pierre, who is our C team coach, will be moved up to be the head coach for the mogul team. One of the things I believe in is trying to move our good people into better positions and keep working with them, so I just wanted to say that we've come to a conclusion, and we're moving on with that one as well.

Motion #8: To adjourn.

M/S/C Badami/Ingemie/Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Minutes transcribed by Secretarial Source
11/10/98