Rules Review Discussion by Referee Committee
11/6/19 7:30p E

10 Committee members to vote
Present: Lyn Wylder, Kris Thorsness, Jessica McAlear, Bob Appleyard, Terry Friel Portell, Dee McComb, Derek Blazo, Howard Meisner, Elaine Roden, Eric Weir – (joined at 8:30 PM Eastern (all but John M.)

1-202 Definition of a crew.

Want to include singles in a crew and change definition to be 'one or more'.

Currently because it is singular, it should include a single, but does the word 'entity' by definition mean more than one? Someone who is new might not realize that it could be a single. Adding the words 'one or more' if it clarifies the situation, it is ok. Should the definition of 'competitor' be updated? Competitor covers it.

Motion for approval by Kris. Seconded by Dee. **All in favor (approved).**

2-205 Violation of Safety Rules. (p5 is printed incorrectly with 'may' rather than what the 2018 Rulebook says 'shall'. A Crew that violates the posted traffic pattern, or otherwise operates in an unsafe or unfair manner, may be assessed one of the penalties as described in Rule 2-602 ("Types of Penalties") by any Race Official. Such penalties ~~**may**~~ shall be applicable to the next Race in which the Crew competes.)

The first thing we will discuss is adding an asterisk to this rule. Why would we waive this rule? One example is at Youth Nationals, we had different traffic patterns each session because they were trying different ones for U23s. At a NW regatta, they had weeds so they changed the traffic pattern in the middle of the regatta. Guessing the reason for this proposal is for safety to crews. Thinking about field of play, one could argue we might need a traffic pattern for the return dock. Field of play could be from leaving the dock to return to dock. Thinking about regional regattas, sometimes there aren't marshals in warm-up and cool down; we don't have anyone to 'shall' this rule. If an accident would occur off field of play, a referee would be considered liable. By far the majority of accidents which occur on the water, do occur in the warm up and cool down areas. Do we create a difficult policing issue where crews are watching for other crews to violate? Going back to 2-601c "race officials shall inform a crew of a penalty at the earliest practical time". With regard to creating a situation where a start marshall is sending penalities to the Starter or the marshall is flying around the warm-up area creating disturbance to give penalties. Practice does give room for the marshall not to have to tell the crew. If we change both to 'shall' would that create a gamesmanship situation, and what if the referee isn't able or Starter forgets? One of the choices of penalty is reprimand. Bigger problem is if there is no referee sees it. If a referee doesn't see it, it didn't happen because we are the arbiters of fact.

Vote on adding asterisk. Motion to reject by Dee. Seconded by Kris. **All in favor (rejected**).
Vote on changing 'may' to 'shall'. Motion to reject the 'shall' by Kris. Seconded by Dee. **All in favor (rejected).**

Note – this is the 2nd or 3rd time Sandy has submitted this proposal so it would be good if someone would talk to him about the challenges to him about implementing this.
After Board votes, the goal is to reach out to those who submitted proposals and explain what happened.

2-404 Interference or Foul
Discussion of if Clarification saying that a wash by a crew in it's own lane to another crew in its own lane might be helpful. The wording 'or obstructs' makes it muddy. First sentence is also a problem.
Motion that we reject by Bob. Seconded by Kris. **All in favor (rejected).**

2-409 Outside Assistance (Barrett)
This talks about clarifying what is 'shore' and talks about what team members volunteering can do in terms of cheering. There is a huge logistical issue with the way the change is proposed (Jules).
Motion that we reject by Howard. Seconded by Jessica. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries**.

2-409 Outside Assistance (Berry)
Ability to add outside assistance for visually or hearing-impaired rower. Is this something that is better covered in the adaptive section of the rules? Should this be here? A rower who qualifies for assistance is covered by the adaptive category. We probably don't want this here. Interesting proposal but so many logistical questions…. Miami Beach was sent this equipment for testing. It was enjoyed by the rowers and technology likely is coming.
Motion that we reject by Howard. Seconded by Jessica. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries.**

Comment: it should be addressed in adaptive rules. We also would like to know what USRowing's Adaptive group thinks of this and we need their recommendations on implementation.

2-502 Placement of Crews; Dead Heats
Motion to reject by Dee. Kris seconds. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries.**

Eric Weir joins the meeting so there are now 10 voting members

3-111 Buoyancy
Discuss centers on if we should require that all hatch covers for the buoyance areas of the boat should be required to be sealed. Discussion centered on how to monitor and enforce this rule if it was enacted. It was considered by some to be a critical safety issue, but uniform enforcement seemed to be difficult at best.

Motion to reject. **9 in favor. 1 against (Thorsness). Motion carries.**
Comment: Suggestion that it is a good idea; might need to be reworked.

3-201 Uniforms (Fraser)
Regarding uniforms; organizations who have a strong feeling about this.
Motion to reject by Howard. Seconded by Kris. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries.**

3-202 Oars
Last year we felt this was unnecessarily restrictive.
Motion to reject by Kris. Seconded by Derek. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries.**

4-103 Eligibility to compete in events
Women should be allowed to compete in men's events at master's nationals.
This is not an asterisked rule so is not binding. Any regatta can choose to make this change by getting it approved by USRowing (for a registered regatta).
Motion to reject by Kris. Dee seconded. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries.**

4-104.3 Lightweights
No comment from Referee Committee as we are not experts on what weights should be.

4-105.1 Coxswain's weight (Newman)
No comment from Referee Committee as we are not experts on what weights should be.

4-105.1 Coxswain's weight (Mannle)
Maximum deadweight is limited to 33.0 pounds for U15, U17 and U19 events.
Was a situation in France where a coxswain was carrying so much deadweight that there wasn't enough room for the coxswain and deadweight. Technically, they were distributing the weight when they put it at the feet of the bow person which they didn't want to do but had to. Thirty-three pounds (33 lbs – 15 kg) is the value that FISA uses. Tom also made the coxswains wear reflective vests who are carrying a lot of weight. Bob agrees this is the scope of our purview as a committee.
Motion to accept by Bob. Dee seconded. Discussion.

The interpretation is that the coxswain must meet the rule weight (110 and 120) and cannot carry more than 33 lbs. The way this is worded 'in U15, U17, U19 events' means only in THOSE specific events. Should this be broadened to include more. Jules thinks Tom intended this to apply at Youth Nationals as well. Since it is not an asterisked rule, can USRowing pilot this next year at U15, U17, U19 and see what happens? We should have one rule across the board. If this is only for U15, U17, U19 then cox could end up with two weight situations. Last year there was a detailed proposal from Rachel and Tom based on ages which was going to be overwhelming to enforce. Would it be better to say in Youth and Scholastic events? Shouldn't this be for everyone?! Sometimes as masters you have a kid coxing a masters event. Clarification – if you have to carry more than 33 lbs, you are ineligible? Or the maximum weight a coxswain can carry is 33 lbs and if you happen to have a really light cox carrying 33 lbs and they are still under, they get a few free pounds? It Is a fairness issue if the weight has to reach the minimum. We are excluding really small people from the sport. Trinith, who wrote this with Tom Mannle, said the intent is not exclude athletes their intent for this was that no kid carry more than 33 lbs. Little people often do end up carrying heavy weight. Would an unintended consequence of this rule be that teams find smaller people and coxswains are now more worried about their weight? Perhaps USRowing could test next year since it is non-asterisked at some youth regattas. If there is a valid argument that weight contributes to competitive outcome, then you have a basis for a rule. Then it isn't discriminatory. Kris says ADA does not apply to all people in all situations. Our rules don't let us differentiate boat classes.
All opposed. Motion does not carry (rejected).

Comment: We have serious concerns about how a coxswain can carry more than 33 lbs. And the issue is significantly about carrying such weight in a bow-loader.

Part B – Insignia and Advertising
Motion to reject by Dee. Seconded by Howard. **All in favor (rejected). Motion carries.**
Is this the exact same as last year? Yes. Word for word. There is some merit to this but it is impossible to enforce. If the previous proposals were not voted for, this is moot.

Referee Procedure Manual 2019 - (holding your hand over cloth on flag to signal to partner ref)
Motion to reject by Dee. Seconded by Jessica. **All in favor (reject). Motion carries.**

Are changes to the Referee Manual approved by the board? When we split into the 3 parts we thought we were splitting out the rules, but everything must be kept together and approved by the Board.
Comment: At some point in the future, there will be a proposal to separate the Procedures Manual and LOC Manual which won't need Board approval and can be owned by other entities. There has been some discussion about that in conjunction with the IOP Manual.

Referee Procedure Manual 2019 - (add white flag to start installation equipment)
Would be confusing to all crews. Follow the same as you would when you are on the water.
Motion to reject by Dee. Seconded by Eric. **All in favor (reject). Motion carries.**
*******Send Bob your best verbal instruction that the starter would use to correct the course for a crew who is off course. *******

Typographical Errors Corrections 2-407 & 2-608
In the past, these have been under Administrative changes and do not have to be voted upon.

Next meeting 11/13 7:30p for normal meeting and indoor rowing rules.

Kris made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Eric seconded. All in favor.
Meeting was adjourned at 10:15p E.

###